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Abstract

Throughout history, the Qur’ān has been translated for religious and political reasons resulting in more than 150 English translations with significant differences among them. However, not enough critical consideration has been paid to those translations in the academic world (Manzoor Dar, 2020). Despite the multifarious studies examining the lexical, semantic, and syntactic equivalence in Qurʾān translations (QTs), very few have investigated the influence of the translators’ beliefs on their translation choices. This thesis aims to identify the nature of the ideologies expressed in contemporary QTs and measure the frequency and percentages of the verses whose translations reflect the translators’ views in the selected versions. To achieve this goal, the study analytically compares four English translations of the Qurʾān, two authorised and two unauthorised, to explore the impact of authorisation on the translators’ interference in their QTs. It hypothesises that translators express their convictions in their translations (Hatim & Mason, 2005) and that authorisation might reduce the effect of the translators’ ideologies on their lexical and syntactic rendition (Halimah, 2014). This thesis applies a mixed-methods design, a combination of qualitative and quantitative approaches. The underpinning theoretical framework is Lefevere’s ideological turn (1992), which states that the translation system is controlled by either the patrons (publishers/authorising institutions) or professionals (translators). The main finding is that the dominant ideologies in the selected QTs are those of the patrons due to the power of money and status. Furthermore, the translators’ cultural hybridity results in their application of hybrid approaches to Qurʾānic exegesis, which increases the demonstration of diverse theological stances and sociocultural perspectives. Moreover, the utilisation of al-bāṭin [esoteric] method, a non-mainstream approach, results in the production of more radical QTs. The significance of this thesis resides in its contribution to designing a conceptual model for describing and comparing QTs to facilitate the inspection of QTs on the textual, paratextual, and contextual levels. With minor modifications, this model can be used in future to examine not only QTs but also a wide range of translated sacred texts because in an era of cultural hybridisation there can never be a model that is universally applicable.
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## List of Abbreviations

The abbreviations mentioned below are used throughout this thesis:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSIs</td>
<td>Cultural-Specific Items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CQTS</td>
<td>Comparative Qur’ān Translation Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTS</td>
<td>Comparative Translation Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTS</td>
<td>Descriptive Translation Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QT</td>
<td>Qur’ān Translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Source Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL</td>
<td>Source Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR</td>
<td>Source Reader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>Source Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC</td>
<td>Target Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TL</td>
<td>Target Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR</td>
<td>Target Reader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS</td>
<td>Translation Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT</td>
<td>Target Text</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Definitions and Key Terms

A **comparative study** is a study that compares features of a source text (e.g. the original Qur’ān) with features of target texts (e.g. different English translations of the Qur’ān) (Williams & Chesterman, 2002, p. 97).

**Descriptive Translation Studies (DTS)**, also known as the polysystem approach, the manipulation school, or the Tel-Aviv Leuven Axis, is an approach that “delves into translation as cultural and historical phenomena, to explore its context and its conditioning factors, to search for grounds that can explain why there is what there is” (Hermans, 1999, p. 5).

**Ideology** is “the tacit assumptions, beliefs and value systems which are shared collectively by social groups” (Hatim & Mason, 1997, p. 144); it emerges from group conflict and struggle (Van Dijk, 1998, p. 8). **Ideology** is “constructed from the knowledge, beliefs and value systems of the individual and the society in which he or she operates” (Munday, 2007, p. 195).

“[T]he ideology of a translation resides not simply in the text translated, but in the voicing and stance of the translator, and in its relevance to the receiving audience” (Tymoczko, 2003, p. 183).

**Traces of ideologies** are the hidden “ideological perspectives . . . [that are] rediscovered and read through the lens of a meticulous, critical and in-depth analysis” (Sideeg, 2015a, p. 168).

**Qur’ān Translation** is merely an interpretation of the Qur’ān, so it is “an attempt to transfer the meanings, messages, and Divine Will into other languages” (Raof, 2001, p. 14).

**Authorised Qur’ān translations** are translations approved by Al-Azhar in Egypt or the General Presidency of Islamic Research, Ifta, Call and Propagation in Saudi Arabia.

**Unauthorised Qur’ān translations** are the translations published individually not by authorising institutions such as Al-Azhar in Egypt or the General Presidency of Islamic Research in Saudi Arabia.
This study adopts the Arabic transliteration scheme, applied by *the Journal of Qur’ānic Studies*. In this scheme every Arabic sound is written in its similar English counterpart with or without diacritical marks.

Consonants:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arabic</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
<th>Arabic</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>١</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>١٠</td>
<td>š</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>٢</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>١١</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>٣</td>
<td>th</td>
<td>١٢</td>
<td>َٰٓ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>٤</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>١٣</td>
<td>z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>٥</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>١٤</td>
<td>gh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>٦</td>
<td>kh</td>
<td>١٥</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>٧</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>١٦</td>
<td>q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>٨</td>
<td>dh</td>
<td>١٧</td>
<td>k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>٩</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>١٨</td>
<td>l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>٢٠</td>
<td>z</td>
<td>١٩</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>٢١</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>٢٠</td>
<td>h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>٢٢</td>
<td>sh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vowels:

- **Monophthongs**
- **Diphthongs (examples)**
- **Geminate (examples)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monophthongs</th>
<th>Diphthongs (examples)</th>
<th>Geminate (examples)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ا</td>
<td>ā</td>
<td>ل٠  lo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>و</td>
<td>ū</td>
<td>سَيْرٌ sayr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ي</td>
<td>ī</td>
<td>طَيَّ تَوَا tawwan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ى</td>
<td>ā</td>
<td>نَوَا tawwan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**tā‘marbūta:** final position and the construct state: to be transliterated as follows:

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ثَقاَفَةٌ</td>
<td>ثَقاَفَةُ العَصْر</td>
<td>ثَقاَفَةَ المَعاَصرَة</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thaqāfa</td>
<td>thaqāfat al-ʿaṣr</td>
<td>al-thaqāfa al-muʿāṣira</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**hamza:** Initial hamza is not to be marked, e.g., asbāb NOT ʿasbāb.

**Initial madda** is to be marked as follows: أَرَاء = ārāʾ

**iʿrāb:** only to be marked for the Qurʾān and poetry.

---

1 Arabic Transliteration Scheme. *Journal of Qur’ānic Studies.*

https://www.euppublishing.com/userimages/ContentEditor/1266940716739/JQS_transliteration.pdf
Introduction

“There can never be an absolutely final translation”. — Alan Watts

Translating the Qur’an is not an easy task not only because some of its verses are difficult to understand even for Arabic speakers due to the eloquence of the Arabic language but also because, to Muslims, the Qur’an is the Word of God, while its translation involves elements of human judgement. Nowadays there are more than 150 English translations of the Qur’an on the market; these translations have significant differences. Muslims relate these discrepancies to several reasons, including the inimitability of the Qur’an and the disparities of the translators’ ideologies. Many studies have examined Qur’an translations (QTs) on the textual levels; however, the impact of authorisation on the display of the translators’ ideologies has not been sufficiently addressed previously. This study aims to investigate the nature of the traces of ideologies in contemporary QTs and measure the degree of the inclusion of these ideologies in the selected authorised and unauthorised QTs in order to fill the gap in the unexplored area of the influence of authorisation on QTs. A key outcome of this research is to design a model for describing and comparing QTs based on Lambert and van Gorp's systematic schema (2006) to facilitate the examination of the chosen QTs. The new model is used to analytically compare the translations of 300 verses in the four selected QTs (two authorised and two unauthorised) to measure the frequency and percentages of the translators’ choices that reflect their beliefs. The designed model also facilitates the examination of the effect of the translators’ ideologies on shaping the meanings and messages of the Qur’an. To provide background information, this section comprises a brief overview of the history of QT, the research problem, aims, objectives, questions, significance, and outline of the chapters.

0.1 A Brief History of Qur’an Translation

Muslims believe that the Qur’an, the central religious text of Islam, was revealed to Prophet Muhammad through the archangel Gabriel, as guidance to humanity. It covers a wide range of themes about all aspects of life ranging from faith to social instructions, including moral teachings, human rights, and laws. The Qur’an narrates stories of past
societies and highlights the lessons that can be learned from the people of these communities and their subsequent fates. It provides a teaching code for the benefit of all mankind with no boundaries of time, place, or nation. This sacred book also defines what is permissible and what is forbidden for all human beings to live peacefully. In Q 15: 9, God says: 

\[\text{innā nahnu naẓzālā adh-dhikra wa innā lahu lahafiẓūn, “We revealed the Reminder, and We are its Protectors” (Hussain, 2020, p. 211).} \]

Thus, the Arabic text we have today is believed by Muslims to be identical to the text revealed to Prophet Muhammad.

Qur’ān translation (QT) started at the time of Prophet Muhammed for political and religious purposes. In 615, Ja‘far Ibn Abī Taleb interpreted the first four verses from Sūrat Maryam to Negus, the king of Abyssinia, now known as Ethiopia (Al-Munjid, 2020; Al-Baidhānī, 2014; Safieddine, 2011). The purpose of Ja‘far 's translation was to persuade Negus to accept Muslim immigrants in his country and to protect them from the unbelievers of Islam. Another partial translation was in 884 when Salman the Persian, or Salman Al-Farsī, "translated Sūrat Al-Fatihah into Persian to be used in prayers" (At-Ṭabarī, 1963, p. 447; Zadeh, 2015, p. 375). The first fully attested complete versions of QTs were translated between the tenth and twelfth centuries by priests to know Islam, the religion of the Ottomans (Al-Jarf, 2014). Since then, the Qur’ān was translated into European languages, and these translations followed four itineraries: from Arabic into Latin; from Latin into other European languages; from Arabic into European languages by orientalists;\(^2\) and from Arabic into European languages by Muslims.

The first fully attested translation of the Qur’ān was into Latin by Christian priests in the twelfth century. At that time, people in the West considered Islam as a religious threat, and “crusading became a special class of war called by the pope against the enemies of the faith, who were by no means confined to the Levant, [the East]” (Madden & Baldwin, n. d.). In 1143, the French Priest Peter the Venerable, Head of the Cluny Abbey in southern France, thought that Islam should not be fought with violence, but with reason.

\(^2\) An orientalist is a Westerner who specialises in the study of the Eastern world. (see Merriam Webster Dictionary. https://www.merriamwebster.com/dictionary/Orientalism#:~:text=Definition%20of%20Orientalism,and%20cultures%20of%20the%20East.%E2%80%94)
and words. As a result, he proposed the translation of the Qur’ān into Latin in an endeavour to know about Islam and to convert Muslims to Christianity. The task was accomplished by the English Priest Robert of Ketton and the German Priest Hermann of Carinthia (Al-Bundāq, 1980). The title of this translation, *Lex Mahumet pseudoprophete* (The Law of the False Prophet Muhammad), reflects the translators’ bias against Islam by the use of the word “false” to describe Prophet Muhammad. Several critics have stated that the errors in this translation were attempted to deceive and show Islam as inferior to Christianity, while others confirm the unintentionality of these mistakes (Burman, 1998). This translation, kept by Christian clerics in the Abbey until 1543, remained the standard Latin translation for four centuries despite its inaccuracies.

The fifteenth century witnessed another wave of interest in Islam and QTs. In 1453, John of Segovia produced a trilingual translation of the Qur’ān (Arabic-Spanish-Latin). Like Peter the Venerable, John believed that peace and doctrine would be more successful solutions for the growing Muslim threat than the military response (Roth, 2014). According to Jesse D. Mann (2019), this translation did not include any additions, explanations, or omissions since John did not have the intention to promote crusading wars. Nonetheless, John aimed at an interreligious communicative approach based on thorough knowledge of the religion of the other to guarantee peace, either through converting people of different religions or at least convincing them to stop warfare. Therefore, John renounced the crusades and called for critical editions of the Qur’ān as a means to better understand and more effectively engage the enemy. He shows a notable fondness for Q 29: 46. Below is a translation of this verse:

*Believers,* debate courteously with People of The Book – except the oppressors among them – and tell them: We believe in what’s revealed to us and what’s revealed to you, Our God and your God is One, and we submit to Him. (Hussain, 2020, p. 320)

John saw in this verse approbation of his plan for interreligious dialogue (Mann, 2019); he cited the Qur’ān to persuade both Christians and Muslims that there was a need for a dialogue between them.

The second itinerary of QT was translating the Qur’ān from Latin into other European languages. In 1543, the Italian Pope Alexander VII (1567-1555) allowed the
church to translate the Latin translation of the Qur’ān, which was produced in 1143 by Robert and Hermann, into Italian, German, Dutch, and Hebrew. These versions were erroneous and distorted since the Latin translation was literal and inaccurate (Glei & Reichmuth, 2012). Like Robert and Hermann, later translators of the Qur’ān into European languages adopted prescribed polemical roles in order to portray Islam in a negative light. These translators applied literal, insensitive, and reductive approaches of translation (Lawrence, 2017). QTs from Arabic into Latin and then from Latin to many other European languages were tools to promote missionisation; hence, they were biased against Islam.

In the seventeenth century, the Western perception of Islam changed from a religious threat to a political threat. In 1698, Father Louis Maracci, the confessor of Pope Innocent XI, created a QT from Arabic into Latin after he had learned Arabic from a Turk. Maracci’s QT included the original text, explanatory notes from various Arabic works of exegetes, a section about the life of Prophet Muhammad, and refutations of the Qur’ān (Zwemer, 1939). The title of his QT is Prodromus Ad Refutacionem Alcorani, [A Refutation of the Qur’ān]; this title demonstrates that Maracci aimed at discrediting Islam. He attempted to portray Islam in the worst possible light. Gorge Sale said that Maracci’s QT is accurate with valuable notes, yet it is adherent to the Arabic idiom, which makes it difficult to understand, also, the refutations are unacceptable and sometimes insolent (cited in Lawrence, 2017). Thus, the power of the Ottomans, their control over trade in Europe, and their alliances with European countries resulted in translating the Qur’ān to know about Islam and Muslims; nonetheless, these translations were prejudiced against Islam.

The first English translation of the Qur’ān, indirect from the French language, was made with dubious aims (Malcolm, 2014). In 1647, André du Ryer published a QT from Arabic directly into French, from which in 1649 Alexander Ross, chaplain to Charles I of England, produced the first English rendition of the Qur’ān called The Alcoran of Muhammad (Khan, 1997; Watt & Bell, 1970). Ross’s translation was from French into English because Ross was unacquainted with the Arabic language (Kidwai, 2008). After nearly a century, mainly in 1734, George Sale, a British Orientalist and practising solicitor, rendered his first edition entitled: The Koran, commonly called The Alcoran of
Based on Maracci’s Latin version (Bevilacqua, 2013), Sale’s QT remained dominant in English for two further centuries (Kidwai, 1978). The translator anglicised the word ‘Qur’ān’ by using ‘Koran’ and attributed the Qur’ān to Prophet Muhammad. Sale explicitly declared that the Qur’ān was invented by Prophet Muhammad and not a revelation from God like the Book revealed to Christ. These elements in Sale’s translation imply his desire to show the superiority of Christ over Muhammad and Christianity over Islam. However, Lawrence (2017) argues that “Sale was publicly more salacious in his attacks on Muhammad than Ross, but privately perhaps he was in even deeper sympathy with Islam” (p. 39) to the extent that some of his contemporaries suspected him of secret conversion to Islam. Hence, it is obvious from the titles of the first English translations of the Qur’ān that the translators attributed the Sacred Book to Prophet Muhammad.

Like Ross’s QT in the seventeenth century and Sale’s in the eighteenth century, Medows Rodwell’s in the nineteenth century was a good example of manipulation. In 1861, Rodwell, an English oriental clergyman of the Church of England, translated the Qur’ān; he misinterpreted it due to its nonlinear structure and the cultural connotations of its Arabic words (Kidwai, 2008). He rendered the word ﯽو ﯽا ﯽع ﯽم ﯽا ﯽصر ‘al-asr in Q 103: 1 as “by the afternoon”; however, one of the acceptable interpretations is “Time through the Ages or long period (Dahr)” (Ali, 2002). In addition, Rodwell compiled the Sūras of the Qur’ān based on thematic considerations, changing their order and ignoring the structure of the source text (ST). In his introduction, Rodwell described Prophet Muhammad as “the crafty author” (cited in Sarawr, 1973, xxi-xxvii). Furthermore, he translated the word ﯽع ﯽب ﯽد ‘abd, which means ‘a created being’ in Q 7:194 and ‘a servant’ in Q 39: 10 as “a slave”, which is a literal translation and a poor choice. Rodwell commented in his translation that only ﯽع ﯽب ﯽد [slaves] had embraced Islam. Although Rodwell’s quasi-versified translation tried to balance accuracy with the need to reproduce a similar effect on the target reader (TR) (Hitti, 1970), it demonstrated both his misunderstanding of the Qur’ān and malice against it (Shāh, 2013).

Like earlier English QTs, those in the late nineteenth century were rancorous against Islam; however, they were not explicitly venomous (Kidwai, 2008). In 1880, Edward Henry Palmer, a Cambridge scholar and translator, produced an erudite, relatively un-polemical translation “in two volumes and about fifteen editions” (Rafiabadi, 2003, p.
Rafiabadi confirmed that Palmer’s translation, entitled *Qur’an, Translated*, was too colloquial for the TR to understand clearly, and it lacked the passion and rhythm of the Qur’ān. Palmer used few notes and to avoid detailed extensive commentaries he referred the TR to Sale’s translation. Even though Palmer used simple language and detached himself to transfer the message of the ST, his translation did not attract as many readers as Rodwell’s (Lawrence, 2017). Like Rodwell, Palmer viewed Prophet Muhammad as the creator of the Qur’ān (Nykl, 1936), but he did not change the order of the *Sūras* of the Qur’ān as Rodwell did.

The first forty years of the twentieth century witnessed a turning point in the English translation of the Qur’ān with the advent of Muslim translators. At that time, South Asia became the incubator for QT projects, and the most famous Muslim translators of this period were Muhammad Ali, Muhammad Marmaduke Pickthall, Abdullah Yusuf Ali, and Muhammad Asad. In 1917, Ali, an Ahmādī3 Indian scholar, produced *The Holy Qur’an: With English Translation and Commentary*. In his translation, he denied miracles. For example, in translating the miracle of Moses in Q 2: 60, Ali rendered the sentence اضْرِبِّ يُصَاصِكَ الْحَجَّرَ *iḍrib bi’āṣāka al-ḥajar* as “March on to the rock with your staff”. He departed from a faithful rendition of the ST since an accurate translation could be “strike the rock with your staff” (Hussain, 2020, p. 25). Also, in his footnotes, Ali claimed that the Qur’ān equates *jinn* [genie] with Jews and Christians (Mohammed, 2005). Moreover, Ali not only denied Jesus’ virgin birth but also distorted the verses saying that Muhammad is the last messenger (Lawrence, 2017). Therefore, Ali’s translation was banned in Egypt and was revised at least twenty-three times (Nur Ichwan, 2001). In 1951, its last comprehensive revised edition was praised by contemporary reviewers for its excellent English and explanatory notes despite its sectarian attitude (Nadwi, 1996).

---

3 An Ahmādī was a follower of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad (d. 1908), who claimed to be the Mahdi, the one who will emerge in the end of time to establish peace, justice, and revive Islam. Mainstream Islam opposed Ahmad’s beliefs, and after his death, his sect was divided into the *Qadianī* and Lahorī subgroups. His followers are severely persecuted in Pakistan and declared non-Muslims. (see Khan, A. H. (2015). *From Sufism to Ahmadiyya: A Muslim minority movement in south Asia*. Indiana University Press.)
Although some of Ali’s minor points appeared eccentric, his basic points were always sound, and no insincerity was suspected.

Unlike their forerunners, most of the Qur‘ān translators in the twentieth century were un-dogmatic (Lawrence, 2017); however, some of them were criticised for producing inaccurate translations. In 1930, Pickthall, a convert from Christianity to Islam, named his QT *The Meaning of the Glorious Koran* and then *The Meaning of the Glorious Qur’an*. Pickthall’s translation was authorised by Al-Azhar and was praised by the *Times Literary Supplement* (Kidwai, 2008). It served as the touchstone against which later ventures were evaluated for their mastery of the English idioms and usage; hence, it was reprinted 80 times throughout the last twenty years (Pirzada, 2018). Nonetheless, some scholars did not approve Pickthall’s translation due to his use of “archaic Biblical language and shortage of explanatory notes” (Al-Dahesh, 2019, p. 295). Thus, Pickthall’s Qur‘ān translation is influenced by his former religion.

Pickthall’s Biblical knowledge affected his lexical choices (Balla & Siddiek, 2017). He translated the *Sūras* that take their names from the prophets’ names using Biblical equivalents as ‘Jonah’, ‘Joseph’, ‘Abraham’, ‘Noah’ and ‘Mary’. He also used archaic pronouns such as “thy” and “thou”. Furthermore, he ignored the textual meaning; for example, he translated Q 17:29

\[\text{And let not thy hand be chained to thy neck nor open it with a complete opening lest thou sit down rebuked, denuded}.\]

Pickthall’s literal translation resulted in conveying incorrect meaning. Moreover, not giving footnotes or endnotes about “miser” or “spendthrift” caused semantic loss because he did not transfer the intended meaning of the ST (Fremantle, 1938, p. 417). Additionally, Pickthall was against miracles, so he argued that the Qur‘ānic description of Muhammad’s night voyage to the heavens was just a vision. Consequently, like Ali’s translation, which was influenced by the translator’s *Ahmādī* doctrine, Pickthall’s was impacted by his religious and cultural background.

Similar to Pickthall, Yusuf Ali was affected by his religious background, which impacted his Qur‘ān translation (Kidwai, 2008). As a wealthy and aristocrat British-Indian lawyer, Yusuf Ali received his education during the British Raj as the son of a *Sūnī*
mother and an Ismaʿīlī (Shiʿi) father. In 1937, Yusuf Ali produced his translation of the Qurʾān entitled: The Holy Qurʾān: Text, Translation, and Commentary. This translation included 6,000 footnotes, which offered interpretations whose meanings differ from the accepted meanings mentioned over the ages in the exegetical books (Pickthall, 1935). Yusuf Ali’s QT was shortened and then “reprinted in contemporary English over 204 times” (Kidwai, 2008, p. 300). He mistranslated Q 15:16, ِوَلَقَدْ جَعَلْنَا فِي السَّمَاءِ بَرُوجًا، ١٦ وَزَيَّنَّاهَا لِلنَّاظِرِينَ as “It is We Who have set out the zodiacal signs in the heavens, and made them fair-seeming to (all) beholders”. One of the acceptable translations is “We positioned constellations of stars in the sky, making it beautiful for the onlookers” (Hussain, 2020, p. 211). Also, Yusuf Ali changed some aspects of the ST by emphasising the twelve Imamiyya5 believing in the twelve Imāms and the appearance of the Mahdi against the Dajjal (Hasan, 1993). Yusuf Ali made changes in the translation and added misleading information in his footnotes.

Similar to Ali and Yusuf Ali, Asad was influenced by his religious sectarianism. According to Mohammed (2005), Asad, a Jew who was born in Poland in 1900 as Leopold Weiss and who converted to Islam in 1926, included thorough footnotes in his QT named The Message of the Qurʾān (1980). He was influenced by his education and life in the West; therefore, he imposed in his translation independent thoughts contradicting what the Fuqahāʾ, jurists, agreed upon in a number of important issues (Kidwai, 2008, p. 399). For example, he mentioned in his paratext that Abraham’s sacrificial son was Ishmael and not Isaac, which is known for Muslims. However, the Bible clearly states that it was Isaac, so he was influenced by his religious background. Asad’s QT was banned from Saudi

---

4 Ismaʿīlī is a branch or sub-sect of Shiʿaism, the second largest Islamic school of thought, after that of Ahl As-Sunna wa Al-Jamaʿa. Ismaʿīlīs believe that Prophet Muhammad designated his cousin Ali Ibn Abi Ṭālib as his successor and the Imam (spiritual and political leader) after him. (see Tabatabaei, S. M. H. (1979). Shiʿite Islam. (S. H. Nasr. trans.). State University of New York Press)

5 Imamiyya is the largest branch of Shiʿa Islam, with about 85% of all Shiʿas; it is also known as the twelvers referring to its adherence to the belief in the twelve divinely ordained leaders, Imāms. (see al-Mudhaffar, S. M. R. (2012). The faith of the Imamiyyah Shiʿah. Books on Islam and Muslims. (B. Shahin. trans.). Al-Islam.org

https://www.academia.edu/39821190/The_faith_of_the_imamiyyah_shi039ah
Arabia because he challenged the miracles of the prophets due to his belief in *Muʿtazila*, a group of Muslims form a rationalist school of Islamic theology (Mohammed, 2005). Despite its lengthy annotations, As’ad’s QT remains one of the best translations available, in terms of its comprehensible English and generally knowledgeable footnotes.

The last decade of the twentieth century witnessed the advent of women Muslim writers who created a considerable body of liberal thought about Islamic understanding and practice. Their body of work is characterised as ‘progressive Islam’ (Duderija, 2020). After the Qurʾān had been interpreted almost entirely by men for fourteen centuries, it was translated by women. One of these women was Amina Wadud, born Mary Teasley to an African-American family; she converted to Islam in 1972 and called herself a ‘Muslim theologian’. Wadud interpreted the Qurʾān and validated the female voice (Wadud, 1999). She argued that it was not the religion but the patriarchal interpretation of the Qurʾān that had kept women oppressed; Wadud called for reformation by re-examining and reinterpreting the Qurʾān. Applying a hermeneutic methodology, she referred to ‘Allah’ as *nafs* [soul] claiming that both words, ‘Allah’ and *nafs*, refer “to something Unseen and cannot be understood in the human context of maleness or femaleness” (p. 20). Wadud dismantled gender bias in the interpretation of the Qurʾān (Jawad, 2003). Wadud’s work has been vulnerable to criticism because she did not provide a systematic analysis of the traditional commentaries that she opposed.

Another Muslim feminist is Riffat Hassan, a Pakistani-American who openly calls herself a ‘feminist theologian’ (Hassan, 2001). Like Wadud, Hassan supports a non-rigid interpretation of the Qurʾān. They both agree that the Qurʾān does not reveal gender bias, precedence, or prejudice. Hassan believes that the meaning of the Qurʾān should be

---


7 Feminist theologians argue that religion itself is not the core cause of misogyny or gender equality, but rather that male-dominated religious traditions reflect broader structural inequalities that oppress and denigrate women. (see Sorensen, R. B. (2020). Feminist theology. ResearchGate, 1-16. [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/340594506_Feminist_Theology](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/340594506_Feminist_Theology)
determined through hermeneutics — examination of what its words meant at the time it was written not what it means today (Khalid, 2003). She rejects the use of the Qur’ān to perpetrate injustice, saying that the God of Islam is just. In an interview, Hassan said that everything in the Qur’ān is capable of being interpreted in many ways; she interprets the word ḥijāb in an innovative way saying:

> The word hijab means curtain. The law of hijab laid down in Sūrat An-Nūr applies equally to men and women. ‘Lower your gaze and guard your modesty.’ The Qur’ān puts a lot of emphasis on dignity, elevating human beings, calling them the children of Adam and putting them above the rest of Allah's creations. (The Qur’ānic injunction) is not restricted to the dress code, it includes the way you talk, walk and how you conduct yourself in public space. The message is to be mindful of your human dignity. (Hassan, Personal communication, 2014)

In this quote, Hassan states that ḥijāb is an attitude not a piece of clothing; it is for men and women. Hassan’s feminist approach is unconventional to Islam and QT; it deconstructs the patriarchal traditional interpretation to establish gender balance.

Wadud and Hassan have inspired other women to interpret the Qur’ān, and the first decade of the twenty-first century witnessed a proliferation of QTs into English by women. The most known women who translated the Qur’ān are Umm Muhammad, Camille Adams Helminiski, Taheereh Saffarzadeh, and Laleh Bakhtiar. Umm Muhammad, Amina Assami an American converted to Islam, is affected by her life in Syria and Saudi Arabia (Al-Sowaidi et al., 2021), while Helminiski, also an American converted to Islam, is influenced by her Sufī beliefs. Bakhtiar, born to an American mother and Iranian father, adopted a feminist perspective in her QT (Kidwai, 2018). Like Umm Muhammad, the Iranian poetess Saffarzadeh followed the stream of patriarchal traditions in QT (Hassen, 2012). It can be concluded that these female translators applied different approaches to QTs.

**0.2 Research Problem**

Although there are more than 150 English translations of the Qur’ān with significant differences between them, these translations have not been sufficiently reviewed (Manzoor Dar, 2020). While several studies have examined the translators’ lexical, semantic, and syntactic choices, very few have investigated the influence of the
translators’ beliefs on their translation choices. Of the large number of studies included in this thesis, three have played a significant role in spotting the gap in literature. El Hassane Herrag (2012) investigated eight QTs into English, Spanish, and Catalan; he focused on the impact of the translators’ ideologies on their translations. Herrag concluded that the percentage of manipulation skyrockets when the translators use paraphrase by explaining a different meaning.

Also, Abdo and Abu Mousa (2019) compared the translation of ten verses translated by George Sale, a Christian, with the interpretation of these verses by Haleem, a Muslim, to investigate the effect of the translators’ ideologies on their versions of QTs. The scholars confirmed that addition is the procedure used to display the translator’s ideologies. Furthermore, Ahmad Mustafa Halimah (2014) evaluated five English translations of the Qur’ān to determine the degree of deviation from the normative understandings and interpretations of the ST. His study is the only one that examined the impact of authorisation on Qur’ān translation. Halimah concluded that the authorised QT he selected is more appropriate than the unauthorised versions. Halimah suggested establishing an authorising institution that continually evaluates and gives feedback on QTs.

The thorough, thematic literature review showed that, like all types of translations, each Qur’ān translation reflects an ideology. Although ideologies in QTs might be reflected unconsciously, we cannot deny the fact that they affect the TRs’ understanding of the meanings and messages of the Qur’ān. Therefore, there is a need for investigating the impact of authorisation on reducing the reflection of translators’ ideologies in their QTs. However, this goal cannot be achieved without using a conceptual model for describing and comparing QTs. Hence, this study fills the gap in the area of comparative Qur’ān translation studies. Its main contribution is designing a model that facilitates describing and comparing QTs to help measure the frequency and percentages of the translators’ choices that reflect their beliefs in the selected authorised and unauthorised QTs.

0.3 Research Aims, Objectives, and Questions

The aim of this dissertation is to gain an understanding of the influence of the translators’ beliefs on their choices in contemporary Qur’ān translations (QTs) and the
impact of authorisation on the translators’ interference. The main objective is to investigate four translations of the Qur’ān into English, two authorised and two unauthorised, to identify the nature of the traces of ideologies displayed in contemporary QTs. The second objective is to design a model for describing and comparing QTs to facilitate the examinations of the selected QTs. The new model is designed to compare QTs on the textual, contextual, and paratextual levels (see section 1.4.5); it is built on Lambert and van Gorp's systematic schema for comparing literary translations (2006). The third objective is to examine the effect of the translators’ ideologies on shaping the meanings and messages of the Qur’ān. The fourth objective is to analytically compare the translations of 300 verses in the four TTs to measure the frequency and percentages of the verses expressing the translators’ ideologies in the selected authorised and unauthorised translations.

This research attempts to answer the following questions:

1. What is the nature of the traces of ideologies displayed in contemporary Qur’ān translations into English?
2. To what extent does authorisation influence the demonstration of ideologies in the selected authorised and unauthorised Qur’ān translations?

The general area of this dissertation is translation studies (TS); it focuses on comparative Qur’ān translation studies (CQTS), and the specific topic is the influence of translators’ ideologies on their choices in Qur’ān translation (QT). The scope of this study is limited to examining four Qur’ān translations into English. It examines 300 verses whose interpretations are controversial among the followers of the different schools of Islamic theology. The study conducts semi-structured interviews with the translators and analyse these interviews thematically to determine the common ideologies in contemporary QTs. In these interviews, the interviewees raised the point of authorisation and its relevance to understanding how ideology operates in a more general way. They all suggested independently that a process of authorisation might help limit ideological influences on QTs; therefore, I formed question two to explore the impact of authorisation on QTs and to understand the way in which ideology works.
The study detects ideologies in the paratextual devices of the translations; then it investigates the appearance of these detected ideologies in the selected verses. It does not discuss the translation procedures applied in the translations of all the selected verses, but those that increase the possibility of revealing the translators’ ideologies. The underpinning framework is Lefevere’s ideological turn (1992). Matthew Wing-Kwong Leung (2006) argues that this ideological turn has changed the perspective of seeing translation as a tool to resist ideologies, and he praises its role in expanding the “scope for investigation” (p. 138). While Lefevere relates translation ideologies to either those of the patrons or translators, Leung links them to the translator’s adherence to the ideologies of either the SC or TC. However, I argue in this thesis that translation ideologies result from several factors and that translators can never be totally neutral; their voices are presented in their translations even if the dominant translation ideologies are those of the patrons. Furthermore, in this study the conceptual model is a new designed one, built on Lambert and van Gorp's. This new model describes and compares QTs on the textual, contextual, and paratextual levels.

0.4 Research Hypotheses

After formulating the problem and forming the research questions, I developed five empirical hypotheses, based on real evidence that is verifiable by observation and examination. First, “translators intentionally or unintentionally display their own beliefs in their translations” (Hatim & Mason, 2005, p. 122). Second, translation ideologies are influenced by the place of the translation (Tymoczko, 2003). Third, Qur’ān translators attempt to make their translations convenient for their target readers; hence, Qur’ān translations intended for non-Arab Muslims differ from those produced for everyone who speaks English, Muslim or non-Muslim and Arab or non-Arab (Haleem, 2016). Fourth, the reflection of the translators’ ideologies in Qur’ān translations shapes the meanings and messages of the sacred Book, which might result in misguiding the target reader (Gunawan, 2022). Fifth, the demonstration of translators’ ideologies reaches a higher degree in unauthorised than authorised translations of the Qur’ān because of the criteria set by authorising institutions (Halimah, 2014). These hypotheses are tested at the end of
chapters three and four, and they are discussed with graphs and statistics in the sections of findings and recommendations.

0.5 Corpus

The corpus of this study consists of the original Qur’ān and four Qur’ān translations into English. The four selected translations are as follows:

I. *Translation of the Meanings of The Noble Qur'ān into the English Language* (2020) was translated by Muhammad Taqī-ud-Dīn Al-Hilali and Muhammad Muhsin Khan, Moroccan and Pashtun/Pakistani Muslims. Hilali and Khan’s translation is published and distributed for free by King Fahd Glorious Qur’ān Printing Complex, Madinah, Saudi Arabia, and it is authorised by Dar-ul-Iftā’, Saudi Arabia (see Appendix A).

II. *The Clear Qur’an: A Thematic English Translation* (2019) was translated by Mustafa Khattab, a Canadian-Egyptian Muslim. Khattab’s translation is published by Darussalam for Printing, Publishing, Distribution and Translation, Cairo, Egypt, and it is authorised by Al-Azhar, Egypt (see Appendix B).

III. *The Qur'an: A New Translation* (2016) was translated by Muhammad A. S. Abdel Haleem, an Egyptian Muslim. Haleem’s translation is published by Oxford University Press, UK.

IV. *The Sublime Quran: English Translation* (2012) was translated by Laleh Mehree Bakhtiar, an Iranian-American convert. She converted from Christianity to Islam; she published her translation, which is distributed by Kazi Publications.

There are two reasons for choosing these four translations. First, these target texts are produced by translators with different religious/theological backgrounds to have a diverse landscape that can enrich the study. Hilali and Khan were *Sunnī-Salafī*, Khattab and Haleem are *Sunnī-Ash’ārī*, and Bakhtiar was a *Sufī* woman from a *Shī‘ī* background. Information about the status of these translators is given in section 1.5.1. Second, these translations were published in different contexts: Saudi Arabia, Egypt, the UK, and the USA. These diverse environments endow the translations with distinct socio-cultural ideologies. I did not know the translators’ ideologies before I collected the empirical data. I aimed to determine the source of the dominating ideology (translator, affiliation, or state) and the influence of authorisation on the degree of the display of the translators’ ideologies.
0.6 Research Rationale and Significance

The reason for choosing my topic goes back to the year 2019 when I started writing a paper in which I compared two English translations of Naguib Mahfouz’s novel *Midaq Alley* (1947) to analyse the transference of Qur’ānic allusions. One translation was by Trevor Le Gassick (1966), and the other one was by Humphery Davies (2011). The characters in the novel use verses from the Qur’ān in their everyday language. For example, when the owner of a coffee house was caught committing child sexual abuse, he used Q 109: 6 saying “You have your religion, and I have mine”. The context of the situation reveals that the owner of a coffee house means ‘mind your own business’ or ‘do not interfere in my life’. The two translators rendered the Qur’ānic verses mentioned in the novel differently. Le Gassick applied literal translation, and he ignored the contextual meaning, which caused translation semantic loss, while Davies utilised communicative translation; he used cultural equivalence and paraphrase to transfer the intended meaning. These translations were an impetus to my project. They made me think of the differences between Qur’ān translations (QTs) produced by translators from different cultures and backgrounds. I thought of the impact of the translators’ ideological and theological views on their translation choices.

The rationale for this study is that ideology in translation is not limited to the political sphere; it is the beliefs which control the translators’ choices. There is a gap in our knowledge about the effect of the translators’ ideologies on their choices and the impact of authorisation on the display of these ideologies in QTs. Although few studies have investigated the effect of translators’ ideologies on their choices in English translations of the Qur’ān, measuring the frequency and percentages of the demonstration of the translators’ ideologies in authorised and unauthorised translations has not been sufficiently addressed. Therefore, this study brings a new topic to the table to assist in improving the process of QT by identifying the translation procedures that have increased the display of the translators’ ideologies. The findings might help future Qur’ān translators to maximise the accuracy of their QTs.

The significance of this study is to contribute to the body of knowledge in the area of comparative Qur’ān translation studies (CQTS), mainly the effect of authorisation on
the demonstration of the translators’ ideologies in their QTs. This dissertation designs a conceptual model for comparing QTs; this model can be used to examine the translations of a wide range of sacred texts. Thus, this study might be replicated on different translations and benefit translators and students in translation studies. It also provides useful information for English speaking Muslims and non-Muslims interested in reading the interpretation of the Qur’an in English. Furthermore, this study gives recommendations for future research in the field of CQTS.

0.7 Research Structure

This thesis comprises an introduction, five chapters, and a conclusion. In the introduction, I give a brief overview of the history of Qur’an translation (QT), set the frame of the study, and articulate the research problem, aims, objectives, questions, hypotheses, and significance.

In the first chapter, I provide the theoretical framework of this study focusing on Lefevere’s ideological turn (1992). I summarise the history of translating religious texts highlighting approaches such as sense for sense and equivalence. I also discuss the contribution of Biblical translators to religious translation and explain milestone translation theories. Furthermore, I show how descriptive translation studies (DTS) “delves into translation as cultural and historical phenomena, to explore its context and its conditioning factors searching for grounds that can explain why there is what there is” (Hermans, 1999, p. 5). I highlight the drawbacks of the models for describing translations, highpoint the need for adapting a model that suits describing and comparing QTs, and introduce the elements included in the new model, built on Lambert and van Gorp’s scheme (2006).

In chapter two, I explain the research methodology: the qualitative and quantitative approaches. I conduct qualitative semi-structured interviews with six professionals in QTs and analyse these interviews thematically to collect data about the common ideologies in contemporary QTs and the indicators of ideologies. I also examine the recorded interviews with the translators and the reviews on their translations. Furthermore, I introduce the selected authorised and unauthorised translations. Lastly, I explain the procedures of
coding the qualitative and quantitative data along with the criteria of selecting the 300 Qur’ānic verses used in the analysis.

In chapter three, I review the previous works related to the topic of my thesis, mainly studies on issues in translating the Qur’ān into English, approaches to QT, and translation strategies applied to QTs. I also survey studies that use different models for describing QTs and revealing the dominant ideologies of these studies. Finally, I examine works on the impact of authorisation on QTs. This literature review chapter functions as a data mining lens that uses knowledge from research done to date to facilitate the identification of the gap in the field and make sense of the data in this study.

In chapter Four, I examine the paratexual devices (peritexts and epitexts) in the four selected Qur’ān translations. In the first section, I extract information from the publishers’ peritexts: the covers, visibility/invisibility of the translators’ names, titles, title pages, and blurbs. In the second section, I examine the translators’ peritexts: prefaces, forewords, introductions, and footnotes. I also use the epitextual devices such as the translators’ interviews and reviews on the translations to support the findings gathered from the publishers’ and translators’ peritexts. In this chapter, I analyse eight verses discussed in the paratexts of the translations to reinforce and support the findings in relation to the paratextual information.

In chapter five, I discuss the differences between the beliefs of the followers of schools of Islamic theology detected in the interviews (see Appendix F) and the ideologies observed in the paratextual devices (see chapter three). I explore the effect of the display of the translators’ Ash’arī views in the translations of Qur’ānic verses about تأويل صفات الذات الإلهية ta’wil źifāt adh-dhāt al-Ilahiyya [interpretation of God’s Essence Attributes], تأويل صفات الأفعال الإلهية ta’wil źifāt al-af‘āl al-Ilahiyya [interpretation of God’s action attributes], نظرية الكسب Error! Bookmark not defined. the concept of kash [acquisition], and الكلام النفسي لله al-kalām an-nafṣī lillah [God’s eternal speaking]. In this chapter, I also investigate the demonstration of Sufī beliefs regarding اخلاق المريد akhlak al-murīd [practicing spiritual integrity], وحدة الوجود waḥdat al-wujūd [the unity of existence], المعنى الباطن al-ma’na al-bāṭın [the esoteric meanings], and الولادة والإمامة al-walāya and al-imāma. Moreover, I examine the existence of the tenets of Salafism, mainly
in the translation of verses about التوحيد والشرك tawḥīd [monotheism] vs شرك [polytheism], رؤية الله يوم القيامة ruʿyat Allah yawm al-qiyyāma [seeing God on the Day of Judgement], زيادة ونقصان الإيمان ziyyādat wa nuqṣān al-imān [the increase and decrease of faith], and إثبات علو الله ithbāt ʿulūww Allah [God’s transcendence].

Finally, in the section of the findings, limitations, and recommendations, I utter the findings yielded by the analysis and the discussion; I wrap up the elements and the procedures followed in conducting the study. I also present the answers of the research questions and the outcome of testing the research hypotheses. Moreover, I showcase the research contribution to the field of comparative Qur’ān translation studies (CQTS). I conclude the study by focusing on its limitations and suggestions for further research.
Chapter One: Translation Theories

“Patronage wields most power in the operation of ideology”. — Andre Lefevere

1.1 Introduction

In the general introduction of this thesis, I stated that the aim of the thesis is to investigate the influence of the translators’ ideologies on their translation choices and to determine the impact of authorisation on the degree of the translators’ ideologies in their Qur’ān translations (QTs). I explained that the problem is that translators are affected by their ideologies or those imposed by the patrons, and this influence is manifested at the lexical, syntactic, discursive, and cultural levels of their translations, resulting in discrepancies among QTs. I set some objectives for a better understanding of the research problem and bringing new information to the field of comparative Qur’ān translation studies (CQTS). Furthermore, I formed the research questions and formulated the five hypotheses tested in this thesis.

In this chapter, I attempt to answer sub-questions such as what translation theories I can utilise to gain information about the topic of this thesis and what tools I can use to collect and analyse data to produce evidence-based findings. The chapter comprises an introduction, four sections, and a conclusion. In section 1.2, I introduce milestone translation theories to emphasise the appropriateness of the chosen theoretical framework. In section 1.3, I define ideology in many disciplines, including translation studies (TS), and show how the ideological turn serves in seeing translation as a means to either resist or impose ideologies. In section 1.4, I discuss the inappropriateness of the entirely linguistic-oriented models for describing translations, and I design a new schema for describing and comparing Qur’ān translations.

1.2 Translation Theories

1.2.1 Word-for-Word and Sense-for-Sense

Translation theory was tied to ‘literal versus free’, or ‘word-for-word versus sense-for-sense’ until the second half of the twentieth-century. The dominant debate over either
to apply word-for-word or sense-for-sense translation goes back to Cicero\(^8\) (106-43 BC), Horace\(^9\) (65-8 BC), and St. Jerome\(^{10}\) (347-420 AC). St. Jerome commented on his translation of the Bible saying:

I not only admit, but freely proclaim that in translation from the Greek—except in the case of Sacred Scripture, where the very order of the words is a mystery—I render not word for word, but sense for sense. (St. Jerome’s letter to Pammachius, section V, line 85, cited in Venuti, 2012, p. 23)

This quote shows that St. Jerome prioritises word-for-word for translating the Bible to pay “closer attention to the words, syntax and ideas of the original” (Munday, 2016, p. 32). He defines sense-for-sense as a method that lies somewhere between extremely free translation and totally literal translation (Redmann, 2020; Al-Ali, 2015). St. Jerome argues that this method considers the meaning of words in the source text (ST) within their context and the requirements of the target language (TL); however, to be faithful to the ST when translating the Bible, St. Jerome favours word-for-word rendition.

Similarly, within the Eastern society, the literal and free poles appeared in the Abbasid period (750-1250 AC). During this period, a huge number of Greek scientific and philosophical topics were translated into Arabic. Baker and Hanna (2009) contended Yuhanna Ibn Al-Batriq’s literal translation because he used Greek loanwords in Arabic to solve the problem of lack of equivalence between the Arabic and Greek language, which resulted in unsuccessful translation. Nevertheless, the scholars praised Ibn Ishaq’s and Al-

---

\(^8\) Marcus Tullius Cicero (106-43 BC), a Roman statesman, lawyer, scholar, philosopher and Academic Skeptic, was the first to consider the segmentation approach to translation, which considers the length of a segment (word, phrase, or sentence) before moving on to the next. (see Robinson, D. (1992). Classical theories of translation from Cicero to Aulus Gellius. TextCONText, 7, 15–55.)

\(^9\) Quintus Horatius Flaccus, known in the English-speaking world as Horace, was the leading Roman lyric poet during the time of Augustus, and he warned against word for word translation. (see Robinson, D. (1992). Classical theories of translation from Cicero to Aulus Gellius. TextCONText, 7, 15–55.)

\(^{10}\) St. Jerome (d. 420), a Latin priest, theologian, and historian, was a great religious translator in the late period of ancient Rome. (see Guo, Y. & Wan, Y. (2022). Retracing the history of “word for word”, “sense for sense” translation—confronting and inheriting of the ancient Roman translation theories. Open Journal of Modern Linguistics, 12, 568-577. [https://www.scirp.org/journal/paperinformation.aspx?paperid=120128])
Jawahari’s sense-for-sense translations. At that time, Arab translators favoured the use of Arabic neologism\textsuperscript{11} rather than transliteration of Greek words, and they employed instructive and explanatory commentaries and notes (Salama-Carr, 1995) to compensate for translation loss due to literal translation. The drawbacks of applying literal translation to religious texts resulted in the advent of Eugene Nida’s (2003) theory of formal vs dynamic equivalence. Of the four translators selected in this study, Bakhtiar (2012) states “this translation, then, is one of formal equivalence in order to be as close to the original as possible” (xiv). She confirms that formal equivalence results in producing objective translation as it focuses on words, rather than dynamic equivalence, which produces subjective translation as it focuses on the ideas in the text. To investigate Bakhtiar’s Qur’ān translation (QT), it is significant to evaluate these two types of equivalence.

1.2.2 Equivalence and Equivalent Effect

In the twentieth century, Nida, a missionary, wanted to encourage people to read the Bible. He used dynamic equivalence as a middle approach between literal and free interpretations since formal equivalence focuses attention on the form and content, while dynamic equivalence seeks the closest natural equivalence to the source text (ST). Nida aspired to transfer the same meaning and provoke the same effect from the Inuits people in the Eskimo (Nida & Taber, 1982); therefore, he rendered the phrase ‘Lamb of God’ as ‘Seal of God’. Nida’s translation of the Bible gives an example of dynamic equivalence as a receptor-oriented approach beneficial for understanding the message of the ST. Nida borrowed theoretical concepts and terminology from semantics, pragmatics, and syntax; he relied on Noam Chomsky’s work on syntactic structure which formed the theory of a universal generative-transformational grammar (Chomsky, 1965; Chomsky, 1957). Nida’s approach, a milestone in translation studies (TS), frees translators from using the

\textsuperscript{11} Neologism is the coinage of a new term, word, or phrase as a result of changes in culture. (see Elmgrab, R. A. (2011). Methods of creating and introducing new terms in Arabic contributions from English-Arabic translation. \textit{2011 International Conference on Languages, Literature and Linguistics IPEDR}, 26, 491-500, IACSIT Press, Singapore. \url{https://www.academia.edu/14839508/Methods_of_Creating_and_Introducing_New_Terms_in_Arabic_Contributions_from_English_Arabic_Translation})
grammatical forms of the ST and allows them to apply cultural adaptation, which might entice them to exceed the bounds of an accurate translation. Similar to word-for-word, Nida’s approach is mainly concerned with the word level (Lefevere, 1993), which is also Bakhtiar’s focus in her QT.

The old terms ‘literal vs free’ and ‘formal vs dynamic’ are replaced with ‘semantic’ vs ‘communicative’ translation (Newmark, 1988, p. 38). Although the theoretical basis of Newmark’s and Nida's translation approaches are both linguistics, Newmark’s translation theory is based on comparative linguistics (Fengling, 2017). The kernel of Newmark’s theory is text-centered, while the core of Nida’s theory is functional equivalence. Newmark defined communicative translation as an attempt to “produce in its readers an effect as close as possible to that obtained on the readers of the original”, and he described semantic translation as “the exact contextual meaning of the original” (p. 39). He differentiated between semantic and literal translation, saying that semantic translation respects the context and remains within the culture of the SL. King James Version, the English Standard Bible translation, and Qur’ān translations (QTs) into Latin can be classified as semantic translations, yet the Good News Bible Translation published in 1976 and contemporary QTs fall under communicative, free, and idiomatic translations (Kireti, 2016). Although Newmark’s translation theory considers three dichotomies: text, languages, and target reader (TR), it enhances prescriptive over descriptive translation as it provides guidance and suggestions for translators.

Since this thesis focuses on describing and comparing QTs, it is noteworthy to review theories of descriptive translation studies (DTS). These theories link the purpose of translation to the strategies applied to achieve this purpose. The four selected translators disclose their purposes in their prefaces and introductions. While Hilali and Khan (2020) aim “to enable the non-Arabic-speaking Muslims to understand [the Qur’ān]” (IV), Bakhtiar (2012) argues that “the absence of a woman’s point of view in Quranic translation and commentary for almost 1500 years since the revelation began clearly needs to change” (xix). On the other hand, Haleem (2016) and Khattab (2019) state that their Qur’ān translations are communicative and that their purpose is to produce reader-friendly, impactful, and accurate translations. The translators’ different purposes
necessitate reviewing skopos functional theory, which allows translating the same text in different ways depending on the purpose of the target text (TT).

1.2.3 Skopos Functional Theory

Skopos functional theory was introduced in Germany in 1978 by Hans J. Vermeer, who aimed to produce a general translation theory for all texts. It dethrones the ST and elevates the TT, “by emphasising the role of the translator as a creator of the target text (TT) and giving priority to the purpose (skopos) of producing the TT” (Jabir, 2006, p. 37). Skopos theory designates three guiding rules: “skopos (purpose), coherence, and fidelity” (Reiss & Vermeer, 2013, p. 101). Although Skopos theory was rooted in early translation of the Bible (Schaffner, 2001), in modern societies, sacred texts could not fulfill the same communicative functions intended in their original social and cultural setting. Skopos theory suggests applying target-oriented strategies to give the TT a new independent function, different from the function of the original. The nominated strategies link the purpose of the translation to the function of the TT in the target culture (TC) and range between ‘free’, ‘faithful’, or anything between these two extremes. According to Naudé (2010), as a result of prioritising the functional goal of the TT situation, skopos theory “invariably implies a degree of manipulation of the ST in order to achieve a particular purpose” (Naudé, 2010, p. 286). In this kind of translation, adequacy overrides equivalence as the measure of the translation action. However, when there is a large cultural distance between the SC and TC, as it is in the case of translating religious texts, “it is impossible that the sender’s intention becomes the text function for the target readership” (Nord, 2016, p. 570). Thus, skopos theory links language function, text type, genre, and translation strategy; nevertheless, translating religious texts, whose intention and function may not be congruent but overlapping, requires a theory which considers the systems of the TC.

1.2.4 Polysystem Theory

The drawbacks of skopos theory result in the appearance of Even-Zohar’s polysystem theory, based on Russian Formalism and Czech structuralism. It moves translation studies (TS) out of purely linguistic analysis of shifts and one-to-one notion of equivalence into an investigation of the position of translated literature as a whole in the
historical and literary systems of the TC. The polysystem theory is based on three oppositions: the opposition between “canonised and noncanonised products or models”, “the system’s centre and periphery”, and “primary and secondary activities” (Even-Zohar, 2012, pp. 15-21). Based on these oppositions, the translation enters its system to occupy either a central role and become very important for the culture or a peripheral role and acts in a conservative way. When the translated work “assumes a central position”, the translator tends to produce TT “close to the original in terms of adequacy”, but “when translated literature occupies a peripheral position”, the TT appears to be “a non-adequate translation” (Even-Zohar, 2012, p. 203). In the polysystem theory, translation has a role within society as a system, so it is either conservative or revolutionary. It can be regarded as dynamic functionalism which stresses “the complexity, openness and flexibility of cultural systems existing in a historical continuum” (Hermans, 1999, p. 106). Although the “polysystem theory has had a profound influence on TS” through moving it forward into a less prescriptive observation of translation within its different contexts (Munday, 2016, p. 174), its application is restricted to literature. Hence, to gain more information about describing and comparing Qur’ān translations (QTs), it is significant to consider the role of each QT in its context (society) and the norms in this context; therefore, I review Toury’s norms, a more descriptive theory.

1.2.5 Toury’s Norms

The polysystem theory paved the way for Toury's descriptive translation studies (DTS). Toury (2012) proposed a tripartite approach for systemic DTS, integrating a description of the TT, the wider role of the sociocultural system, and the languages involved. He considered translation as an activity governed by norms acquired through repetitive behaviour, not through the imposition of laws. Toury distinguished three kinds of translation norms at different stages of the translation process. Initial norms refer to the translator’s general choice between two polar alternatives: adequacy and acceptability. When translators subject themselves to the norms of the ST, the TT will be adequate, but if the TC prevails, the TT will be acceptable. Preliminary norms are concerned with the translation policy in terms of the choice of the texts to translate, the introduction of these texts to the TC, and the indirectness of translations. Operational norms describe the
presentation and linguistic matter of the TT. They are *matricial norms*, which include omission or relocation of passages, and *textual-linguistic norms*, which govern the selection of the sentence construction, word choice, and the use of italics or capitals for emphasis. Toury’s DTS is criticised for not being fully objective or replicable (Munday, 2016; Rosa, 2010). Hermans (2007) states that Toury did not consider complex ideological and political factors such as the status of the ST in its own culture neither did he take into account the SC’s possible promotion of translating the ST through grants from public or privately funded institutions. Another drawback is neglecting the effect of the translation on the system of the SC. Consequently, the polysystem theory is utilised in this thesis as it defines translation as a system in systems; nevertheless, Lefevere’s (1992) ideological turn defines other essential concepts.

1.3 Ideological Turn in Translation Studies

Based on the discussion above, ideological turn is the most appropriate theoretical framework for this study. It explains why the research problem under study exists, gives an understanding of the concepts that are relevant to the topic of the research, and relates the research to the broader body of knowledge. Like other translated religious texts, Qur’ān translation (QT) into English is a means to evolve ideology into the target readers’ (TRs) everyday life (Fu et al., 1997). According to Venuti (1998), Linguistic-oriented approaches “remain reluctant to take into account the social values and ideologies that enter into translating as well as the study of it” (p.1). Terms such as “ideology”, “patronage”, “authorised/ undifferentiated patron”, and “unauthorised/ differentiated patron” are explained in Lefevere’s ideological turn (1992). These terms are main factors in QT since the relationship between religious translation and ideology is manifold. Therefore, it is eminently reasonable to embed the theory of ideology in comparative religious studies (Fang, 2011). Moreover, ideological turn is easy to apply because it permits critical evaluation of the theoretical assumptions and the research methods. Hence, Lefevere’s ideological turn paves the way for a better understanding of the control factors inside and outside the translation system since it discusses the ideological components that affect translation. In section 1.3.1, I define the complex and elusive term
‘ideology’ in different disciplines, and in section 1.3.2, I explain the term in translation studies (TS) to specify a definition that serves this thesis.

1.3.1 The Concept of Ideology in Different Disciplines

The term ‘idéologie’ was coined by the French rationalist philosopher, Count Antoine Destutt de Tracy in 1796 to define a “science of ideas” as opposed to metaphysics. Since then, the term has been associated with manipulation and deceit (Tracy, 2017). In the field of politics, it is “the political opponents’ views and actions which tend to be branded as ideological” (Bennett et al., 2006, p. 175). Modern uses of the notion of ideology have been influenced by Napoleon and Marxism and even post-Marxist thinking, lending the term negative connotations. Napoleon imputed the failure of France-Russian war on the negative influence of ideologies, and Karl Marx described a set of ideas and beliefs that were dominant in society and used to justify the power and privilege of the ruling class. For post-Marxists, ideology can foster progress and encourage a new way of social construction namely legitimate cultural construction. A neutral and much broader conception sees ideology as a shared system of thought tied to group interests in the pursuit of individual and collective objectives. In addition to politics, psychology defines ideology as the organisation of beliefs in the mind of the individual, while sociology describes ideology as the “cultural beliefs that justify particular social arrangements, including patterns of inequality” (Macionis, 2010, p. 257). However, linguistics defines it as the motive behind the use of languages in their social worlds (Hodge & Kress, 1993). Thus, psychologists are mostly concerned with the individual, sociologists highlight the context (including the author), and linguists focus on the actual text.

1.3.2 The Concept of Ideology in Translation Studies

In the field of translation studies (TS), ideology is linked to translators, institutions, and the society in which ideology is formed. “Any interpretation depends on the purpose of the translation, its situational context, and the analyst’s viewpoint of the concept of ideology itself” (Baumgarten, 2012, p. 61). Hatim and Mason (2005) describes ideology as “the set of beliefs and values which inform an individual’s or institution’s view of the world and assist their interpretation of events, facts and other aspects of experience” (p.
Ideology produced in society is not confined to politics; it is “the conceptual grid that consists of opinions and attitudes deemed acceptable in a certain society at a certain time, and through which readers and translators approach texts” (Bassnett & Lefevere, 2001, p. 48). Hatim and Mason (1997, p. 144) define ideology as “the tacit assumptions, beliefs and value systems which are shared collectively by social groups”. It emerges from group conflicts and struggles (Van Dijk, 1998, p. 8). This study adopts the definition of ideology by Munday (2007), who explains it as “the knowledge, beliefs and value systems of the individual [the translator] and the society in which he or she operates” (p. 195).

This definition necessitates investigating the translators’ ideologies and the ideologies in the places of the translations. These concepts are defined in Lefevre’s ideological turn.

1.3.3 Lefevere’s Ideological Turn

Translation has been an ideological act. Lefevere (1992) designates translation as a type of rewriting, “potentially the most influential because it is able to project the image of an author and/or those works beyond the boundaries of their culture of origin” (p. 9). He refers to the majority of readers of literature in contemporary societies as non-professional readers who use rewriting/translation with no access to the actual manuscripts. Lefevere confirms that the impact of rewriting/translation is not negligible on these readers; he gives an example of St. Augustine:

When faced with the fact that a fair number of pages in the Bible could, to put it mildly, not be said to correspond too closely to the kind of behaviour the then still relatively young Christian Church expected from its members, he suggested that these passages should, quite simply, be interpreted, ‘rewritten,’ until they could be made to correspond to the teaching of the Church. (p. 7)

Lefevere emphasises how St. Augustine was inspired by the ideologies of the Western Church and attempted to destroy rival ideologies. St. Augustine’s exegeses revealed the influence of his reading in his early, non-Christian years, and showed a fusion of the Platonic tradition of Greek philosophy with the religion of the New Testament. Besides, St. Augustine made extensive use of allegory, a dominant current in the poetry of his time.
Lefevere (1992) concludes that rewriters/ translators are motivated by either ideology and/ or poetics, saying:

If some rewritings are inspired by ideological motivations, or produced under ideological constraints, depending on whether rewriters find themselves in agreement with the dominant ideology of their time or not, other rewritings are inspired by poetological motivations, or produced under poetological constraints. (p.7)

This quote reveals that the ideologies of translations are influenced by the dominant ideologies of their time and place. Lefevere uses the translation of *Rubaiyat of Omar Khayyam* by Edward Fitzgerald as an example of the combination of ideological and poetological motivations/ constraints (Sabzei, 2015). Lefevere states that ideologically the translator thinks the Persians are inferior to their English counterparts, and this frame of mind allows him to rewrite Khayyam’s poems in a way “he would have never dreamed of rewriting Homer, or Virgil” (Lefevere, 1992, p. 8). He explains that, poetologically, Fitzgerald decides these poems should be made to read more like the dominant current in the poetry of his own time. Fitzgerald’s attitude in his translation can be seen in Hilali and Khan’s translation since they are content with transliterating some terms such as *zaka* and *zihār* without giving translation. They might use this strategy either as a way to teach non-Arabs the pronunciation of these terms or to show superiority of the SL and SC.

For Lefevere (1992), the two factors that control the system of literature in which translation functions are *professionals* within the literary system and *patronage* outside the literary system. The former includes critics, reviewers, academics, teachers, and translators, while the latter involves individuals, publishers, the media, a political class, and institutions; both affect the reception of a work. Translators decide on the poetics and at times influence the ideology of the translated text; also, publishers regulate the distribution of literature. Thus, *patronage* represents the power that can promote or obstruct the reading, writing, and rewriting of literature. Lefevere identifies three elements to this patronage, saying:

Patronage basically consists of three elements that can be seen to interact in various combinations. There is an *ideological component*, which acts as a constraint on the choice and development of both form and subject matter. Needless to say, ‘ideology’ is taken here in a sense not limited to the political
sphere; rather ‘ideology would seem to be that grillwork of form, convention, and belief which orders our actions’ (Jamson 107) . . . There is also an economic component: the patron sees to it that writers and rewriters are able to make a living, by giving them a pension or appointing them to some office . . . Finally, there is also an element of status involved [emphasis added]. (p. 16)

Lefevere sees patronage as being mainly ideologically focused exemplifying the forms of status as appointment of some office, membership of a particular support group, or shift to a certain life style. He classifies patronage as either differentiated or undifferentiated. Patronage is undifferentiated when the ideological, economic, and status components are dispensed by the same patron. However, patronage is differentiated when economic success is independent of ideological factors and does not bring status with it. Lefevere states that in the fifth century of the Christian Era, rewriters/translators allegorise Greek and Latin literature to serve the newly dominant ideology of Christianity to be acceptable to the new patrons. These rewriters/translators promote the ideologies of the time of translation to escape destruction, so they show Odysseus on his voyage home as a representative of the soul on its pilgrimage to heaven (Ford & Conners, 2020). Lefevere confirms that ideology can be imposed by the ruling power, publishers, translators, and/or target readers.

While patronage wields most power in the operation of ideology, professionals determine the poetics, whose components are defined by Lefevere (1992) as follows:

[O]ne is an inventory of literary devices, genres, motifs, prototypical characters and situations, and symbols; the other a concept of what the role of literature is, or should be, in the social system as a whole. The latter concept is influential in the selection of the themes that must be relevant to the social system if the work of literature is to be noticed at all. (p. 26)

Lefevere determines that literary devices affect the way in which a literary theme is treated, while the role of literature influences the selection of themes that must be relevant to the social system if the work of literature is to be accepted. The selection of certain themes means the exclusion of others, and the way the selected themes is treated reveals the dominant poetics. Poetics is not absolute or static, but relative and dynamic in a constant change in accordance with the social context. However, in a certain period of time, there are stages of “steady state” in which all elements are in equilibrium with each
other (p. 38). There is also a constant struggle between dominant poetics and rival (oppositional) poetics, which is decided by translators because translations are a perfect gauge for poetics.

Like writers, translators play an important role in the establishment of poetics of a literary system. Lefevere (1992) gives an example of Al-mu‘allaqāt [quatrails] in the Islamic system and explains that the canonisation of the seven qaṣīdās was a result of the润ar-rawīs [narrators] or apprentice poets (Blunt, 2018). Lefevere states that these poets began as professional reciters, and they spread the fame of the original writers along with the poetics of the time. He proposes that any poetics is a historical variable; it is not absolute as both the dominant poetics and its inventory in a system are changeable. He distinguishes between differentiated and undifferentiated patronages in changing poetics, saying that, in systems with differentiated patronage, “different critical schools will try to elaborate different canons of their own, and each of these schools will try to establish its own canon as the only ‘real one’” (29). Nevertheless, in systems with undifferentiated patronage, each dominant poetics controls the dynamics of the system easily.

Lefevere (1992) gives an example from the translation of the Bible explaining how this translation resulted in the creation of new words. When the early Christians translated the word musterion, “they did not want simply to Latinize it because it was too close to the vocabulary used by the ‘mystery cults,’ Christianity’s main competitor at the time” (Lefevere, 1992, p. 39). For the same reason, they rejected other words such as sacra, arcana, and initia although they would have been semantically acceptable. They settled for the term sacramentum since it is neutral and close to the original. However, musterion was Latinized into mysterium when St. Jerome wrote the Vulgate translation of the Bible.

Lefevere (1992) states that the faithful translator tends to be conservative in both ideological and poetological terms due to their reverence for the cultural prestige of the source text. Lefevere confirms:

The greater that prestige, the more ‘grammatical and logical’ the translation is likely to be, especially in the case of texts regarded as the ‘foundation texts’ of a certain type of society: The Bible, the Quran, The Communist Manifesto. This translator will use the ‘explanatory note’ to ensure that the reader reads the translation – interprets the text, and certainly the foundation text – in the ‘right’ way. He will also use the note to ‘resolve’ any discrepancies that may be thought
to exist between the actual text of the original and the current authoritative interpretation of that text, gladly changing both translation and notes as that interpretation changes. (p. 50)

This quote confirms that faithful translators of religious texts are sensitive to the prestige of the source text (ST) so that they use notes to narrow the gap between the source culture (SC) and target culture (TC). On the other hand, spirited translators are more courageous to update the original by the intention to lose some of its classical status to make the reader questions the prestige and received interpretation of the original in both ideological and poetological terms. Struggles between rival poetics are often sparked off by translations, which results in risks where foundation texts are involved; many “spirited” Bible translators were burned at the stake. For example, in 1536, William Tyndale “was strangled to death while tied at the stake, and then his dead body was burned” (Farris, 2007, p. 37). Thus, based on Lefevere’s ideological turn, the Qur’ān can be translated by faithful or spirited translators, whose voices might be presented in their translations.

In his article “The Ideological Turn in Translation Studies”, Leung (2006) discusses the advantages of the ideological turn in translation studies after the linguistic turn and culture turn. He argues that this ideological turn has changed the perspective of seeing translation as a tool to resist ideologies. Leung states that the ideological turn increases the extent for investigation, so researchers can examine different aspects of translation such as the impact of the translators’ feminist perspectives, religious ideologies, and postcolonial thinking on their translation choices. Unlike Lefevere, who links translation ideologies to the patrons or translators, and Leung, who relates them to the SC or TC, I believe that translation ideologies are linked to all these factors together. Hence, in each and every translation the translator’s voice is presented.

Based on Lefevere’s ideological turn (1992), the patron of Hilali and Khan’s and Khattab’s QTs are undifferentiated since these translations are authorised by the systems of the societies in which the translations are published. Hilali and Khan’s translation is printed by King Fahd Glorious Qur’ān Printing Complex, which is a prestigious religious institution in Saudi Arabia. This authorising institution sets standards, rules, and obligatory norms to approve any translations. It provides the fund for producing the translation, so, based on Lefevere’s ideological turn, it accords the ideologies, finance, and status. Also, Khattab’s translation is approved by Al-Azhar, existing in Egypt and
considered the foremost institution in the Islamic world for the study of Islamic laws. Al-Azhar has almost similar standards and rules as King Fahd Complex. The improvement of Khattab’s translation from Al-Azhar guarantees its alignment with the patron’s ideologies. On the other hand, the unauthorised translations are differentiated since the three components, the ideological, economic, and status, are not dependent on one another. Haleem’s translation is published in the UK by Oxford University Press, a secular prestigious publisher seeking profits, while Bakhtiar’s translation is published by her own publishing house, which is almost unknown. Bakhtiar might display gender-related ideologies since she is the translator and publisher, and Haleem might demonstrate liberal beliefs as his translation is published by a profitable publishing house in the UK.

For more understanding of the translators’ voices in their QTs, in the following section, I review Venuti’s concept of the translator’s invisibility.

1.3.4 Venuti’s Concept of the Translator’s Invisibility

Venuti (2008) introduced the concept of the translator’s invisibility as a response to the hegemony of the Anglo-Saxon world in the field of culture production and translation. He realised that the number of translations of texts originally written in English outweighs the number of translations of texts written in widely spoken languages such as Chinese, Japanese, and Arabic. This realisation made him link translation to political and economic power, which imposes the ideology of the most powerful in the world. Venuti states that translation is determined by the ideologies of governments and institutions, and it depends on the norms of the target culture, so domestication is commonly applied by translators. He defines domestication as writing in a transparent, fluent, and invisible style in order to minimise the foreignness of the text. In this case, the translator produces a fluent and easy to read English TT, which looks original without the peculiarities of the ST language. In this context, fluency is dangerous as it runs the translation so similar to the original text that it is impossible to tell them apart. Therefore, Venuti introduced foreignisation to respond to domestication and make the reader aware of the foreign origin of the translated text. Foreignisation maintains the ST structures and syntax, transfers the otherness of the ST, and escapes from the hegemony of the Anglo-American culture. Venuti confirms that domestication and foreignisation are not binary
opposites, but they complete each other to expand the receiving culture’s range. Thus, when translators make ethical choices, they normally use a hybrid of foreignisation and domestication.

Venuti (2012) warns translators against being invisible and submissive to the target culture (TC); he encourages them to listen to the voice of source text (ST). However, the politics of translation dictates the translator’s position, so translators can be positioned within the source culture, target culture, or a third culture. In most translations, translators are positioned within the TC, while in authorised translations, they stick to the SC, and in Biblical translations, they are adherent to a third culture, somewhere between the two cultures (Simms, 1983). Tymoczko (2003) argues that translators are influenced by their sociocultural contexts since the positionality of the translator is the social, cultural, and political context that creates his/her identity. This positionality describes how the translator’s identity influences his/her understanding of the world. Tymoczko negates the neutrality of the translator saying:

[T]he ideology of a translation resides not simply in the text translated, but in the voicing and stance of the translator, and in the relevance to the receiving audience. These latter features are affected by the place of enunciation of the translator: indeed they are part of what we mean by the ‘place’ of enunciation, for that ‘place’ is an ideological positioning as well as a geographical or temporal one. These aspects of a translation are motivated and determined by the translator’s cultural and ideological affiliations as much as or even more than by the temporal and spatial location that the translator speaks from. (Tymoczko, 2003, p. 183)

This quote explains that the translator has a stance which is affected by many factors, among which is the target audience and the translators’ cultural and ideological affiliations. Translators are committed to the cultural frameworks that have shaped their identities and the way they view and understand the world around them. In other words, the ideology of translation is a result of the translator’s position, and this position is within the translator’s social, cultural, and political context.

This view is confirmed by Abdel Wahab Khalifa (2014), who differentiates between agents and agency in agent-based translation studies. He defines agents as the human and non-human actors involved in translation activities and agency as “a perception-decision-action loop” (p. 14; emphasis in the original). The two types of agents are one who causes changes in styles of translation and “broadened the range of
translations available” and one who innovates “by selecting new works to be translated and introducing new styles of translation for works entering their own society” (Milton & Bandia, 2009, p. 2). Khalifa highlights the interplay of the translator’s tendencies, inclinations, and external sociocultural context, asserting that translators’ decisions and final products are impacted by the different translation networks in which the translators are involved.

Honghua Liu (2019) classifies translatorial agency, the translator’s willingness and ability to act, into textual, paratextual, and extratextual agency. Textual agency refers to the translator’s voice, which is influenced by the translator’s subjectivity. Paratextual agency consists of the translator’s role in adding notes and prefaces; it is influenced by both social context and the translator’s subjectivity. Extratextual agency includes the selection of books to be translated, the use of different editions, and the role of translators in ‘speaking out’; it is influenced by the social context of each translation activity. Accordingly, translation ideologies are a mixture of those of the translators and sociocultural context.

According to Abderraouf Chouit (2017), the retranslation of sacred texts is common; it “leads to the broadening of the existing interpretations” (p. 185) of these texts; 12 Retranslation means producing a new translation of a text that has already been translated into the same language. It is seen as an act of betterment of initial translations that are deemed blind, adaptive to the source text (ST) and hesitant, regarded as literal translation. Berman believes that STs are ageless and remain forever young, while translations age and need to be replaced. (see Berman, A. (1990). La retraduction comme espace de la traduction. *Palimpsestes, 4*, 1-7. doi:10.4000/palimpsestes.596) Antony Pym classifies retranslation into passive and active: the former refers to translations that are separated by geographical area and time and do not compete against each other. The latter, however, includes those that share the same cultural location and generation and are rivals that often compete against each other. (see Pym, A. (1998). *Method in translation history*. St. Jerome.) On the other hand, Isabelle Vanderschelden uses the metaphors “hot” referring to early translations and “cold” denoting later ones. (see Vanderschelden. I. (2000). Re-Translation. In O. Classe (Ed.) Routledge encyclopedia of literary translation into English (p. 1155). Routledge.) It is also argued that “retranslations are not necessarily the result of ageing first translations or changing times [because] a text may be translated more than once within a very short span of time” (p. 5) (see Susam-Sarajeva, S. (2003). Multiple-entry visa to travelling theory: Retranslations of literary and cultural theories. *Target International Journal of Translation Studies, 15*(1), 1-36. doi:10.1075/target.15.1.02sus) Despite the relevance of the retranslation theory to the topic of my thesis, I believe that it cannot be used because

---

12 Retranslation means producing a new translation of a text that has already been translated into the same language. It is seen as an act of betterment of initial translations that are deemed blind, adaptive to the source text (ST) and hesitant, regarded as literal translation. Berman believes that STs are ageless and remain forever young, while translations age and need to be replaced. (see Berman, A. (1990). La retraduction comme espace de la traduction. *Palimpsestes, 4*, 1-7. doi:10.4000/palimpsestes.596) Antony Pym classifies retranslation into passive and active: the former refers to translations that are separated by geographical area and time and do not compete against each other. The latter, however, includes those that share the same cultural location and generation and are rivals that often compete against each other. (see Pym, A. (1998). *Method in translation history*. St. Jerome.) On the other hand, Isabelle Vanderschelden uses the metaphors “hot” referring to early translations and “cold” denoting later ones. (see Vanderschelden. I. (2000). Re-Translation. In O. Classe (Ed.) Routledge encyclopedia of literary translation into English (p. 1155). Routledge.) It is also argued that “retranslations are not necessarily the result of ageing first translations or changing times [because] a text may be translated more than once within a very short span of time” (p. 5) (see Susam-Sarajeva, S. (2003). Multiple-entry visa to travelling theory: Retranslations of literary and cultural theories. *Target International Journal of Translation Studies, 15*(1), 1-36. doi:10.1075/target.15.1.02sus) Despite the relevance of the retranslation theory to the topic of my thesis, I believe that it cannot be used because
also, Khalifa (2020) confirms that retranslations fill gaps or address shortcomings in initial translations. In the preface of her translation, Bakhtiar (2012) states that “in previous English translations [of the Qur’an she] found that little attention had been given to the women’s point of view” (xix). This declaration implies that she might display feminist perspectives in her translation. Therefore, I utilise theories on the positionality and ideology of feminist translators.

1.3.5 The Positionality and Ideology of Feminist Translators

The last decades of the 20th century witnessed interest in cultural studies in translation, which “took translation studies away from purely linguistic analysis and brought it into contact with other disciplines” (Munday, 2016, p. 205). This hybridity in translation studies created a link between gender, language, and translation. As women seek identity in their societies, feminist translators aspire for visibility in their translations (Simon, 1996). They argue that the voice of feminist translators can be heard through their position and stance in their translations.

Barbara Godard (1990) argues that female translators are influenced by their gender and aim to produce translations that highlight their identities and ideological positions as women. Feminist translators may take the view that the Bible is the direct Word of God and remain unquestionable and unrevisable both in form and content. However, they “seek to read it against its patriarchal frame and, through critical engagement with the text, challenge sociocultural stereotypes” (Simon, 1996, p. 107). Hence, when translating fundamental texts such as the Bible or the Qur’an, these women attempt to recuperate what was lost in patriarchy and display their gender-related ideologies.

In addition to the feminist translators’ ideologies, the ideologies of the religious institutions affect religious translations. Elisabeth Fiorenza (1993) debates that the

the aim of this thesis is to investigate the evident or more hidden ideologies in contemporary Qur’an translations and the influence of authorisation on the increase/decrease of these ideologies. However, the retranslation theory is always applied for the evaluation of translations of the same ST since it helps explore translation norms, intertextual relations, and changes of sociocultural evolution. This thesis does not aim to evaluate or assess the selected translations.
institutional Church had plunged women into “absolute slavery” (p. 53). Believing that the correct interpretation of the Bible would promote the equality of women, Elizabeth Cady Stanton (1972) reads the Bible against the Enlightenment beliefs\(^\text{13}\) to discard the traditional patriarchy dominating the interpretation of the Bible. She announces that she does not find biblical basis for women’s subordination. Likewise, Phyllis Trible (1973) attempts to exonerate the Bible from the patriarchal domination, so she translates it from a feminist perspective. However, she has been criticised for turning the Bible into a feminist text, “where every detail suspiciously ends up supporting women’s liberation” (Pardes, 1992, p. 24). Thus, women translators of the Bible reveal their gender in their translations to counter patriarchy.

Similarly, in Qur’ān translation, Muslim women translators apply a hermeneutic methodology in their interpretation to dismantle gender bias and discard the darkness of the status of women (Jawad, 2003). In this thesis, I apply the elements of Godard’s (1990) and von Flotow’s (1997) feminist theory to examine Bakhtiar’s translation (2012). These theorists assume that applying translation strategies that highlight the feminist perspective results in translations that are overwhelmingly influenced by feminist thoughts to create a feminist identity in the target text (Von Flotow, 1997). To assure their visibility in their translations, feminist translators apply prefacing,\(^\text{14}\) supplementing,\(^\text{15}\) and hijacking\(^\text{16}\) (Godard, 1990). These procedures are used as ideological instruments to guide and influence the reader along a certain line. Feminist translators also neutralise the language

\(^{13}\) Enlightenment was a European intellectual movement during the 17\(^\text{th}\) and 18\(^\text{th}\) centuries; in this movement ideas concerning God, reason, nature, and humanity were synthesised into a worldview that gained wide assent in the West and that instigated revolutionary developments in art, philosophy, and politics. The use of reason was the center of the Enlightenment thought. (see Vopa. A. J. L. (2017). *The labor of the mind: Intellect and gender in enlightenment cultures*. University of Pennsylvania Press. [https://doi.org/10.9783/9780812294187](https://doi.org/10.9783/9780812294187))

\(^{14}\) Adding feminist meanings in the preface of the translated text. (see Von Flotow, 1991; Godard, 1990)

\(^{15}\) A strategy which explains the over-translation to add feminist meanings (e.g. adding “e” in a French language translation and “f” in an English one). (see Von Flotow, 1991; Godard, 1990)

\(^{16}\) The process by which a feminist translator applies corrective measures to the work at hand, appropriating the text in order to construct feminist meaning. (see Von Flotow, 1991; Godard, 1990).
they use by creating synonyms for words or phrases which are otherwise sex-definite (de Lotbinière-Harwood, 1991). Moreover, they feminise language by going beyond neutralisation and desexisation. Thus, feminist translators employ strategies to avoid using humiliating words for women; they coin new words to support the position of women in their translations.

Of the four translators selected in this thesis, Bakhtiar, an Iranian-American woman, is the only female translator; she might be affected by the Western culture and might display feminist perspectives in her QT. Consequently, I will examine her translation to identify whether she uses any of the elements of feminist translation and to determine whether the display of feminist perspectives has changed the meanings and messages of the Qur’ān. Consequently, there is a strong need for a model that facilitates the description and comparison of QTs to reveal their dominant ideologies and identify the power behind these ideologies.

1.4 Models for Describing and Comparing Translations

1.4.1 Nida and Wonderly’s Three-Stage Technique

Before theorists of descriptive translation studies (DTS) made their mark, Eugene Nida and William Wonderly developed a three-stage bottom-up technique (Nida, 2003) to compare translations. The first stage is Literal transfer which identifies lexical units in the ST and maps their interlinear units in the TT. The second stage is Minimal transfer which applies obligatory grammatical rules to the interlinear version to obtain a readable TT. The third stage is Literary transfer which allows the identification of all manner of optional changes and modifications as they occur in actual translations. The model is source-oriented and too rudimentary to provide information about compared translations on the contextual level (Hermans, 1999). It does not suit the current study, which requires the investigation of the impact of the culture and ideology of the translators along with the place and time of Qur’ān translations.

1.4.2 Van Leuven-Zwart’s Model

Another model for comparative translation is Van Leuven-Zwart’s bottom-up pattern (1990), which aims to both describe shifts in translation and deduce the translator’s
underlying strategy or norm. The model consists of two parts: “one comparative [and] the other descriptive” (Hermans, 1999, p. 58). The former analyses the micro-structure of the two texts, and the latter examines their macro-structure. The model operates a basic unit called transeme, which has two types: ‘state of affairs transeme,’ clause(s), and ‘satellite transeme,’ extra phrase(s). Each transeme is compared with the Architranseme or ART, what the two transemes share, (synonymy/no shift, hyponymy, contrast, or no relation). The comparative part, which analyses the micro-structure of the two texts (semantic, stylistic, or pragmatic shifts below the sentence level) has two stages. Modulation focuses on semantic relation between transemes, and Mutation has no counterpart, so no ART for this unit. The descriptive part, which analyses the macro-structure of the two texts, combines three functions of language: Interpersonal function, Ideational function, and Textual function. The model then follows narratological practice in distinguishing three textual levels: history (corresponding to what the Russian formalists called fabula, deepest abstract events), story (the formalists termed sujet, concrete actions), and discourse (referring to the linguistic expressions of the functional world). This complex model involves the description and comparison from the smallest units of language and “treats texts as if they existed in a vacuum” (Hermans, 1999, p.63). The model does not consider the source culture (SC) nor the TC; it does not suit the current study due to its neglection to genre-specific conventions which are crucial in QT.

1.4.3 Jell Stegeman’s Model

Another model is Jell Stegeman’s, which considers the translation and the reader, testing the way in which actual readers respond to different translations (cited in Hermans, 1999; Hermans, 2014). Stegeman claims that equivalence is obtained when the TR reacts to the TT as the SR reacts to the ST. The model ponders micro-structural, macro-structural, and paratextual aspects of literary works and their translations. Testing the reader response to QT is difficult since it is impossible to define “the exact point where an accumulation of micro-level shifts will trigger a higher-order shift” (Hermans, 1999, p.64). Also, the slight manipulation of names or culture-specific items (CSIs) can change the reader’s reception, and in turn their response. Moreover, the model lacks the cultural factors of translation and information about the translators; therefore, it cannot be applied
in this study since the status, experience, and background of the translators are crucial in comparative Qur’ān translation studies (CQTS). The drawbacks of these models necessitate searching for another model that considers the cultural aspects in translation to be used to compare translations.

1.4.4 The Manipulation School and Lambert and van Gorp’s Model

The Manipulation School\textsuperscript{17} in translation studies (TS) appeared in the 1980s in the works of Toury, Holmes, and Even Zohar, who reject the idea that the target text (TT) is a faithful reproduction of the source text (ST) (Schjoldager, 1995). It emphasises the comparisons of different translations of the same source. The theorists see translation as a manipulation of the ST and draw heavily on sociology and cultural studies. Rabassa (1984) denies the possibility of perfect translation because of the lack of identical equivalence between the ST and TT since phonemes, and words used to denote certain phenomena or concepts differ in various languages. Hermans (2014) states that manipulation is unavoidable and “all translation implies a degree of manipulation of the source text for a certain purpose” (p. 11). He adds:

Translation is evidently a goal-oriented activity, as the translator strives to attain conformity with a model, and uses norms as the way to get there. Models provide the incentive for the adoption of particular norms. The models and norms, of course, are those of socio-cultural system in which the translator works, i.e., as a rule, those of the recipient or target system. The act of translating is a matter of adjusting and (yes) manipulating a Source Text as to bring the Target Text into the line with the particular correctness notion, and in so doing secure social acceptance. (Hermans, 1991, p. 165)

Hermans confirms the translator’s surrender to the norms and rules of the target cultures, which might cause the manipulation of the ST to secure the acceptance of the translation by the target reader. Also, Lefevere (1992) sheds light on rewriting/translation as

\textsuperscript{17} The theorists of the manipulation school define translation as an interdisciplinary field, which adopt the linguistic aspect and other aspects from useful disciplines such as comparative literature, communication theory, film and media studies, intercultural management, history, and sociology. (see Hermans, T. (ed.) (1985). \textit{The manipulation of literature: Studies in literary translation}. Croom Helm.)
“manipulation undertaken in the service of power” (vii). Aiga Kramina (2004) categorises manipulation into two types: conscious and unconscious. The former arises due to various ideological, economic, social, political and cultural reasons, and the latter happens because of the translator’s lack of language or world knowledge. Striving to produce a text acceptable for the target community, the translator consciously or unconsciously manipulates the linguistic and stylistic structures of the ST, which results in different translations of the same ST. For example, the translation of the Bible by missionary societies differs from the translation by Bible societies since the former aim to get their sacred texts into the hands of their converts, whereas the latter aspire to use English as the language of education in the British colonies (Klimovich, 2017, p. 545). Thus, translators inevitably think and act under ideological norms in the culture of the target language.

The occurrence of manipulation can be intentional or unintentional. Like Kramina (2004), Farahzad (1998) classifies manipulation into conscious or unconscious, stating that:

The conscious process leads to conscious manipulation intentionally carried out by the translator because of various social, political and other factors. The unconscious manipulation is mostly a psychological phenomenon, and occurs under the influence of psychological factors. (p.156)

In explaining the reasons for unconscious manipulation, Farahzad relies on Toury’s translation laws: the law of growing standardisation and the law of interference (Pym, 2008). The first refers to the disruption of the ST patterns in translation and the selection of linguistic options that are more common in the TL. The second refers to ST linguistic features (mainly lexical and syntactical patterning) being copied in the TT, either “negatively” because they create non-normal TT patterns or “positively” because their existence in the TT makes them more likely to be used by the translator. The tension between the translator’s desire to produce translation close to the original and to comply with the dominant requirements for a fluent TT is due to the power relations and the reciprocal prestige of the cultures and languages in question. The more prestigious the SC from the vantage point of the TC, the higher the likelihood of interferences, and vice versa. In addition to power relations, finance causes manipulation as the translator has to
conform to the expectations of the publisher. Thus, outside factors of conscious manipulation are power relations, finance, and the dominant ideologies in the TC.

José Lambert and Hendrik van Gorp’s (2006) top-down model, compatible with Toury’s approach (2012), studies translation as a cultural phenomenon and pays attention to the contextual and historical setting of translations, and beyond. It considers the contextual and paratextual elements, moving from the macro-structures to micro-structures, and then to the sociocultural context. The diagram below shows the translator as a mediator between the SC and TC.

**Figure 1**
Describing Translations
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Source: (Lambert and van Gorp, 2006, p. 43)

Figure 1 shows that system 1 refers to the SC and system 2 to the TC. The diagram shows the communication between author-text-reader in the SC and its counterpart in the TC since author 2 is the translator. The translation description has four steps: paratextual, contextual, textual, and intertextual (see Appendix C). The elements of the paratexts include elements beyond the texts (titles, translators’ names, author’s name, and translation strategy). These preliminary data should lead to hypotheses for further analysis on both the macro- and micro-structural levels. The former considers the internal narrative structure, while the latter emphasises the shifts on phonic, graphic, micro-syntactic, lexico-semantic, stylistic, elocutionary and modal levels. The fourth step is the oppositions between micro- and macro-levels and between text and theory, intertextual relations (other translations and ‘creative’ works) and intersystemic relations (e.g. genre structures or
stylistic codes). Lambert and van Gorp’s model needs modification to be used as a framework which suits describing and comparing Qur’ān translations.

1.4.5 The Designed Model for Comparing Qur’ān Translations

To produce results which go beyond the comparative level of the selected target texts, it is vital to develop a framework which helps provide an in-depth insight into the interaction between culture, ideology, and text, on the one hand, and translators and the publishing industry, on the other hand. This is because there are chains of relationships between translations, translators, and institutions (printing presses or publishers) within and beyond national and international borders (Rizzi et al., 2019). I will build on Lambert and van Gorp’s model to design a new model for comparing Qur’ān translations (QTs); the new model will shape and determine the analysis in this thesis. Thus, the new model links theory with practice; it is a combination of different elements with a focus on culture, ideology, translation, and language; it comprises three stages to allow the comparison on the paratextual, contextual, and textual levels.

I aim to design a top-down model, which allows less subjectivity from the researchers who compare QTs; I integrated Genette’s two types of paratexts (1997): peritexts and epitexts. Examining these forms can provide thorough understanding of the dominant ideologies demonstrated in the paratexts of the examined QTs. I kept the first section in Lambert and van Gorp’s model, the preliminary data (see Appendix C); however, because this section is limited to the author’s/translator’s peritexts, I combined the peritextual and epitextual elements (see figure 2 & Appendix D). The publisher’s peritexts comprise covers, the visibility/invisibility of the translator’s names, titles/title pages, and blurbs, whereas the translators’ peritexts contain prefaces, forewords, introductions, and footnotes. These peritextual tools give messages about the contents of the translations along with the translators’ views. Nevertheless, the epitexts involve interviews with the translators, reviews, and criticism on the translations among other components. These elements give access to the status of a QT and more objective data about its dominant ideologies.

Another limitation of Lambert and van Gorp’s model to be used for comparing QTs is that it is confined to literary translations. According to Marjolijn Storm (2016), Lambert
and van Gorp never change paradigms and have remained ‘faithful’ to the polysystem theory (PST) which focuses on literary works (see section 1.2.4). Despite Lambert’s refutation of the claim that the PST is limited to research on literature and literary translation only (Lambert & van Gorp, 2006), the model is often associated with literary domains (Delabastita, 2006). Therefore, the second change is replacing the second section in Lambert and van Gorp’s model with the approaches to Qur’ānic exegesis and the types of publishers. These two factors are more crucial in QTs than the divisions of the texts and presentation of the chapters, which will not reveal the hidden ideologies in QTs.

Qur’ān translations are forms of tafsīr [exegesis], explanation of the Qurʾān to provide elucidation and commentary for clear understanding of God’s words. Each translation is a form of a Qur’ānic tafsīr, dealing with the issues of linguistics, jurisprudence, and theology. Qur’ānic tafāsīr [exegeses] are divided into tafsīr bi-l-maṭthur, which is transmitted from prophet Muhammad and his companions, and tafsīr bi-r-ra’y, which is conveyed through personal reflection or rational thinking. Other approaches to Qur’ānic tafsīr are linguistic and hybrid (Ali, 2018; Raof, 2012). Hence, I added to the new model these four types of approaches to Qur’ānic exegesis: traditional, rational, linguistic, and hybrid.

In addition, I integrated the fourth section in Lambert and van Gorp’s model (see Appendix C) into the new model since checking the oppositions between the micro- and macro-levels will be done interweavingly in the three stages of comparison. Also, comparing the genre structures is for no help in comparative Qur’ān translation studies (CQTS) as by default the genre of the QTs is the same in the TTs. Furthermore, intertextuality in the Qur’ān differs from intertextuality in literary translation, which is defined by Genette (1997) as “the shaping of a text meaning by another text [by using] quotations, plagiarism, calque, translation, pastiche, and parody” (p. 18). However, in the Qur’ān, intertextuality is an exegetical approach concerned with establishing textual links within the Qur’ān in terms of an expression, an individual phrase, or an aya [verse]. This approach can unfold the meaning of an expression through reference to thematically and semantically similar expressions (Raof, 2012); “exegetes substantiate their views through the intertextual reference” (Raof, 2010, p. 68). Intertextuality is already a tool in the traditional approach to Qur’ānic exegesis, tafsīr bi-l-maṭthur, and it is applied extensively.
by Hilali and Khan. It is also a device in rational and linguistic approaches to QT; for example, Bakhtiar uses Biblical terms, Khattab implements Christian and Jewish texts in his footnotes, and Haleem alludes to historical and cultural texts (see section 3.3.1). Thus, in the new model, the examination of lexicalisation can help disclose intertextuality in the selected QTs.

Another drawback of Lambert and van Gorp’s model is that it does not consider contemporary intellectual and social movements, nor does it include the new interdisciplinary approach of the human sciences (Hermans, 1999). According to Munday (2016) and Lefevere (1992), Lambert and van Gorp’s model does not take ideology into account. Additionally, Naudé (2010) states that in analysing translations of sacred texts, “the focus is rather on description and explanation of the translation in the light of the translator’s ideology, strategies, [and] cultural norms” (p. 286-7). On the other hand, Chesterman (2017) argues that “the decisions that translators make, and hence the translations that they produce, have effects on the people that read them, and also on intercultural relations more widely” (p. 113). Therefore, I specified the linguistic tools that are considered as markers of ideologies. According to Hatim and Mason (1997), the linguistic elements that highlight ideologies are nominalisation (changing a verb into a noun), modalisation (expressions of certainty or uncertainty), passivisation (shifting from the passive voice to active voice and vice versa), and Lexicalisation (lexical differences & lexical equivalent inconsistency). These elements facilitate the examination of the shifts that increase the demonstration of ideology. These linguistic units can help overcome the generalisation of the old model, which is criticised by Hermans (1999) as being too general because it does not “specify a unit for comparative micro-level analysis” (p. 69). Consequently, specifying the ideological markers in the new model can help provide more accurate results.

Another element I added to the designed model for comparing QTs is the identification of the translation procedures that increase the display of ideologies in QTs. Lefevere (1992) argues that “the influence of ideology on the translation process may be traced in omissions, shifts, and additions of various kinds (as cited in Asimakoulas, 2009, p. 242). Hence, these translation procedures are added to the new model, so researchers who compare QTs can investigate the impact of applying these translation techniques on the
translators’ lexical and grammatical choices. I also added “interpolation”18 as a translation procedure. I borrowed this term from other sciences such as biology and mathematics to refer to any insertion of words, phrases, or clauses of a different nature into the target text (TT). A close and careful observation shows that Hilali and Khan interpolate/insert Arabic words and phrases in their translation. Their application of “interpolation” as a translation procedure surged the display of their ideologies and increased the visibility of their views (see chapter five).

Figure 2 below shows the elements of the model I designed for comparing Qur’ān translations:

**Figure 2**
A Model for Describing and Comparing Qur’ān Translations

---

Figure 2 shows the elements which I chose from the designed model (see Appendix D) to apply in my thesis to examine the selected authorised and unauthorised Qur’ān translations on the paratextual, contextual, and textual levels. However, this new model comprises other elements, from which future scholars can choose to compare not only QTs but also an extensive variety of sacred texts. It can be said that the continuous change in our contemporary world influences social sciences, including CQTS; there can never be a model that is universally applicable. Thus, the new model provides the basic framework for comparing religious texts: paratexts, approaches to translations, status of the publishers, linguistic choices, and translation procedures.
In this section, I highlighted the limitations of Lambert and van Gorp’s model to be used for comparing QTs and the reasons for the modifications I implemented. I introduced the elements that I added to the original model in order to produce a new model, appropriate as a conceptual framework for describing, examining, and/or comparing the translations of sacred texts.

1.5 Conclusion

In this chapter, I summarise the movements in translation studies from focusing on the word to the text, to the culture, and finally to the power that dominates the translation ideologies. I also discuss the appropriateness of Lefevere’s ideological turn (1992) as a theoretical framework for my study and defined the concepts used in the study. I explain Bassnett and Lefevere’s view (1990) that all rewritings/translations reflect a certain ideology to function in a given society and in a given way. I state the positive and negative sides of manipulation in rewriting/translation and discuss the contribution of translation to the evolution of literature and society.

Furthermore, in this chapter, I clarify how the manipulation school is interested in the ideological and social factors of translation. This clarification paves the way to conceptualise how the Qur’ān, a sensitive text, is a subject to the judgement of the professionals/translators and patronage/publishers. This scope of translation surpasses the limits of linguistic and literary norms and becomes determined by the ideologies of translators, governments, and institutions. I demonstrate how translation has become dependent on the TC and prioritises the TR to produce fluent translation through linguistic and cultural modifications and through avoiding the use of foreign words and complex syntactic structure. I explain Venuti’s view of translating peripheral texts in SCs that are less powerful in politics and economy and how these cultures resist the hegemony of imperialism, and hence the visibility of the translator.

Moreover, I discuss how translating the Qur’ān into English is subject to a number of ideological and doctrinal assumptions that exist outside of the text itself. I illustrate that the more fluent the translation, the more invisible the translator, and, presumably, the more visible the meaning; however, this invisibility of the translator can result in the imposition of ideological assumptions. I explain that, based on Lefevere’s ideological turn, the
patrons of Hilali and Khan’s and Khattab’s translations can be classified as undifferentiated since the translations are authorised by the systems of the societies in which the translations exist. On the other hand, the patrons of Haleem’s and Bakhtiar’s translations are differentiated since the ideological, economic, and status components are not dependent on one another. In the next chapter, I explain the methods of data collection and data analysis.
Chapter Two: Research Methodology

“Empirical facts do not exist independently of the scholar’s viewpoint”. — Edoardo Crisafulli

2.1 Introduction

In the previous chapter, I covered translation theories to gain a better understanding of the concepts that are utilised in this thesis. I reviewed word-for-word and sense for sense translation approaches, equivalence and equivalent effect, skopos theory, polysystem theory, and Toury’s norms. I defined the concept of ideology in linguistics, psychology, sociology, and translation studies. I also demonstrated the appropriateness of applying Lefevere’s ideological turn (1992) as a theoretical framework for this thesis. Furthermore, I surveyed Venuti’s concept of translator’s invisibility and the positionality and ideology of feminist translators. Finally, I examined models for describing translations and designed a model to facilitate the inspection of Qur’an translations (QTs) on the textual, paratextual, and contextual levels.

In this chapter, I introduce the research methodology, the general approach which “shows how [the] research questions are articulated” (Clough & Nutbrown, 2012, p. 22). I explain the methods, the instruments used to test the “theory in order to reach the understanding it offers” (Chesterman, 2007, p.1). Based on the research questions, aim, and hypotheses, I apply a mixed-methods approach, a combination of qualitative and quantitative tools, to provide grounded findings (Keyton, 2014). This approach is a third paradigm between positivism (purely quantitative research relying on measurement and reason) and interpretivism (an entirely qualitative approach depending on questioning and observation) (Saldanha & O’Brien, 2013). Perceiving that “not everything is completely knowable” (Krauss, 2005), I adopt this post-positivism paradigm to provide a broader understanding of the impact of translators’ ideologies on their lexical choices and the influence of authorisation on QTs.

This chapter comprises an introduction, three main sections and a conclusion. In section 2.2, I demonstrate the methods of data collection: the primary sources and empirical data (semi-structured interviews) and the secondary sources and analytical data (recorded interviews and reviews on translations). In section 2.3, I show the methods of analysing the qualitative data (thematic analysis of the semi-structured interviews) and the
quantitative data (comparison of the translations of 300 verses selected based on the analysis of the semi-structured interviews, paratexts, and reviews on the target texts). In section 2.4, I explain the criteria and procedures of selecting the Qur’anic verses, which are representative samples of the divergent exegetical and theological views of the mainstream and non-mainstream exegetes to mirror the major objectives of this thesis.

2.2 Methods of Data Collection

In this study, I employ a mixed-methods design to understand how different ideologies affect Qur’ân translations (QTs). The interpretivist approach assumes that both the truth (i.e., ontology) and knowledge (i.e., epistemology) are subjective and socially constructed (Thomas, 2009). Therefore, the interpretivist research consequently emphasises the subjective interpretation of social phenomena and qualitative methods. The positivist approach, on the other hand, is radically against the notion of supposed existence of things that cannot be seen or heard (Burns, 2000, p. 7). For positivists, the truth is objective, existing outside the human mind, but can be scientifically measured and investigated. Saldanha and O’Brien (2013) state that the combination of these approaches provides more comprehensive insights of the phenomenon under investigation. Hence, post-positivism, promoting qualitative and quantitative forms of analysis (Bernstein, 1983), is a highly suitable paradigm for my research in order to critically study various opinions, views, and interpretations and to change the explored data into numbers. Thus, for research validity (accurate results), the study depends on primary and secondary data, and for research reliability (consistent results), it relies on quantitative data.

The techniques I used for data collection were semi-structured interviews, videoed interviews, reviews on the selected translations, and quantitative text analysis. I implemented the new model for describing and comparing QTs (see section 1.4.5) to collect, analyse, and integrate data. Using interviews as a method to explore the translators’ understanding and social norms can support and validate the study (Adams, 2015). The thematic interpretation of the data collected from the interviews provided deep-insight into the translators’ views of the nature of ideologies in contemporary QTs, the translators’ theological stances, and the Qur’anic verses that might help explore the ideologies behind the translators’ choices. Mason (2002, p. 56) claims that an interpretive
approach not only treats people as a primary data source but also seeks their perceptions of the “insider view”, rather than imposing an ‘outsider view’. To avoid bias, I relied on a neutral and measurable (quantifiable) observation of the translators’ different lexical choices. Hence, I sought data from primary and secondary sources, and to give grounded findings, I collected and quantitatively analysed 300 verses (I measured the frequency and percentages of the display of the translators’ ideologies in the selected authorised and unauthorised QTs).

2.2.1 Primary Sources and Empirical Data

The primary data were collected on the macro- and micro-levels; the former is aligned with the ideological approach to research in translation, while the latter is associated with the linguistic approach (Tymoczko, 2002). On the macro-level, the research pertains translation ideologies to the translation system, controlled by the status of the translators and the power of the patronage (Lefevere, 1992), whereas on the micro-level it is linked to comparative textual analysis of linguistic choices. In this research, the primary sources providing empirical data were qualitative semi-structured interviews and comparative text analysis.

I utilised qualitative semi-structured interviews to provide data from Qur’ān translators and to connect accounts of their views about contemporary ideologies. These interviews helped to gauge the perceptions and perspectives of the interviewees, which maintains the integrity of the research content. Based on Saldanha and O'Brien (2013) the open-ended questions are more flexible in their order, so this tool shifts “the balance of power away from the researcher and towards the research participant, allowing for the co-construction of knowledge” (173). The interviewees were six experts in the field of Qur’ān Translation studies:

I. **Prof. Abdel Haleem** is a Professor of Islamic Studies at the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London and the editor of *the Journal of Qur’anic Studies*. His translation, *The Qur’an*, is used in this study as a main text.

II. **Dr. Mustafa Khattab** is the Muslim chaplain at Brock University, a member of the Canadian Council of Imams, and a Lecturer of Islamic Studies in English at Al-Azhar University. His translation, *The Clear Qur’an*, is used in this study as a main text.
III. **Prof. Musharraf Hussain** is the chief Executive of the Karimia Institute Nottingham, the Chief Editor of *The Invitation*, a Muslim family magazine. His translation of the Qur’ān is entitled, *The Majestic Quran*.

IV. **Prof. Abdur Raheem Kidwai** is the author of 128 reviews on English Translations of the Qur’ān. Three of his books are cited in this study.

V. **Dr. Said El-Najar** is the Director of the General Department for Research, Writing and Translation at the Islamic Research Academy in Al-Azhar. He translated the Qur’ān into French.

VI. **Prof. Omar Sheikh Al-Shabab** is a professor of text linguistics and translation theories, King Abdullah Institute for Translation and Arabisation, Imam Muhammad Ibn Saud University, Saudi Arabia. He is a specialist in analysing Qur’ān translations and religious texts.

I prepared twelve questions prior to the interviews (Appendix E) to probe for more detailed information by asking the participants to clarify their responses or elaborate their answers further. Questions 1, 2, and 3 address the nature of the hidden ideologies in contemporary QTs, while Questions 4 and 5 tackle the effect of displaying translators’ ideologies on the target reader (TR). Questions 6, 7, and 8 probe into the changes in meanings in translating controversial issues in the Qur’ān, whereas questions 9, 10, 11, and 12 explore the idea of authorising QTs. I converted the audios into scripts and saved them on google drive; then I appended the links of the audios and scripts to the study (Appendix F). After I collected data from the translators, I analysed this information to select the verses for analytical comparison.

The interview with Khattab showed that he is an *Ash’arī* Canadian-Egyptian *imām* who memorised the entire Qur’ān at a young age, and later obtained a professional *ijāzah* in the *Hafs* style of recitation. He received his PhD, MA, and BA in Islamic Studies in English with Honours from Al-Azhar University. He is the Muslim Chaplain at Brock University, a member of the Canadian Council of Imams, a Lecturer of Islamic Studies in English at Al-Azhar University, and Fulbright Interfaith Scholar. Khattab has served as

---

19 A Muslim Chaplain supports students and staff to explore, discover and/or affirm their faith at university, by working collaboratively within the university and Chaplaincy Team to develop spiritual work amongst staff and students in a vibrant and modern university context.
an imām in the USA and Canada since 2007 and was a member of the first team that translated tarāwīh [the Ramadan night prayers] live from the Sacred Mosque in Makkah and the Prophet’s Mosque in Medina (2002-2005).

The interview with Haleem demonstrated that he is an Ashʿarī Egyptian, who received his education at Al-Azhar University and earned his PhD degree from Cambridge University. Like Khattab, he memorised the entire Qurʾān at a young age, and obtained a professional ijāza in the Ḥafṣ style of recitation. He has taught Arabic and Islamic studies courses in advanced translation and the Qurʾān at Cambridge University and London University since 1966. Now Haleem is a professor of Islamic Studies at the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London, and the editor of the Journal of Qurʾānic studies. He was appointed an Officer of the Order of the British Empire (OBE)\(^\text{20}\) in the Queen's Birthday Honours in 2008 (The London Gazette, 2008, p. 10).

The interviews highlight Khattab’s and Haleem’s high status as Qurʾān translators since they are well-qualified and experienced in Qurʾānic studies. Although there are no agreed indicators of the translator’s status (Dam & Zethsen, 2010), because the concept itself is “a complex, subjective and context-dependent construct” (Dam & Zethsen 2008, p. 74), education, experience, and beliefs are areas which can be investigated to explore translators’ status. According to Dam and Zethsen (2008), translators’ education, expertise, and visibility are important status parameters. Similarly, Haleem (2020) confirms that a high level of education, knowledge, and expertise in religious translation gives the translation prestige and a high rank in QT. Reaching this level of expertise can influence the TRs positively because the high status of the translators affects the reception of their translations (Chesterman & Wagner, 2002). Thus, the qualitative semi-structured interviews sent messages about Khattab’s and Haleem’s translations.

To gain information about the status and beliefs of the late translators, it was necessary to collect data from the introductions of their translations and other books they wrote. In the introduction of Hilali and Khan’s QT published in Egypt, Hilali gives a brief autobiography about himself and his co-translator Khan:

\(^{20}\) An Officer of the Order of the British Empire (OBE) is the second highest ranking Order of the British Empire awards created in 1917. (see Nominate someone for an honour or award. GOV.UK. \(\text{https://www.gov.uk/}\)
Hilali (1893 - 1987), a Salafi21 scholar, was born in Rissani, near Sajalmasah, Morocco, where he obtained a bachelor of Arts from University of Al-Karaouine after dropping his study at Al-Azhar University, Egypt. He travelled to pursue religious knowledge and livelihood in many countries including India, Iraq, and Egypt; then he earned a PhD degree in Arabic literature in 1940 from the University of Berlin, Germany (Khaleel, 2005). When Hassan Al-Banna, the founder of Muslim Brotherhood,22 sent Hilali a letter asking him to be the correspondent of the organisation in Morocco, he agreed and wrote a number of letters to the organisation’s magazine using a pseudonym (Hilali, 2003, p. 82). Hilali escaped from Morocco after being sentenced to death in absentia for his rebellious activity against the French protectorate of Morocco. He lastly worked as a professor at the Islamic University, Al-Madinah, Saudi Arabia (Al-Jabari, 2008).

Khan (1927 - 2021) is a Salafi Pashtun23 Islamic scholar, who was born in the city of Qasur, the Punjab Province. His grandfathers emigrated from Afghanistan to Pakistan

---

21 Salafism, an intellectual current of Sunni Islam, appeared in the 20th century. It refers to Medieval scholars, such as Ibn Taymiyya (1263-1328) and advocates a return to the traditions of the salaf [pious predecessors], the first three generations of Muslims. Salafis maintain that Muslims should rely on the Qur’ān, the Sunna and the Ijma’ [consensus] of the Salaf. Salafist ideas inspired movements including the Muslim Brotherhood in Egypt, Jordan and Syria; it encompasses a huge range of beliefs extending from non-violent religious devotion at one extreme to Salafi-jihadism of the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS) at the other. (See Brown, J. A.C. (2014). Salafism. Oxford Bibliographies. https://www.oxfordbibliographies.com/view/document/obo-9780195390155/obo-9780195390155-0070.xml)

22 Muslim Brotherhood is a transnational Sunni Islamist organisation founded in Egypt by the Islamic scholar and schoolteacher Hassan Al-Banna in 1928. Al-Banna’s teachings spread far beyond Egypt, influencing today various Islamist movements from charitable organisations to political parties—not all using the same name. (see Obaid, N. (2017). The Muslim brotherhood a failure in political evolution. https://www.belfercenter.org/sites/default/files/files/publication/Muslim%20Brotherhood%20-%20final.pdf)

23 Pashtuns are native to the land of southern Afghanistan and north-western Pakistan (occasionally referred to as the Pashtunistan region) where the majority of them reside. The overwhelming majority of Pashtuns follow Sunnī Islam, belonging to the Hanafi school of thought. (see Bodetti, A. (11 July 2019). “What will happen to Afghanistan's national languages?”. The New Arab).
escaping from the wars and tribal strifes (Hilali & Khan, 2011, p. 1188). Khan gained a degree in surgical medicine from the University of Punjab, Lahore, and worked in Lahore University Hospital. He had a Diploma in Chest Diseases from the University of Wales. Then he moved to Saudi Arabia to perform Umrah24 during the period of late King Abdul Aziz Al-Saud, but he stayed and worked in the Ministry of Health in Taif for fifteen years. After that, he worked as a Chief of the Department of Chest Diseases in the King’s Hospital and lastly as the Director of the Islamic University Clinic, Al-Madinah. Khan became a very close friend to King Faisal and was granted early retirement to dedicate himself to translating the Qur’ān.

The information about Hilali and Khan from the introductions of their books is focusing on their education and work; therefore, it was essential to gather data about their beliefs from secondary sources.

2.2.2 Secondary Sources and Analytical Data

Secondary data refer to data collected by other researchers to support their studies. Collecting secondary data is significant due to the complexity of the research questions since the concept of ideology is abstract (Saldanha & O’Brien, 2013). This study relies on written accounts on the translators and the selected authorised and unauthorised translations; these sources of secondary data are based upon the evidence from primary sources. For example, the study depends on academic studies, journals, research papers, and books about the topic of the current study. These sources can save time by providing larger and higher-quality databases that would be unfeasible to collect by the researcher. In addition, these secondary sources give access to surveys that can adequately give information about the status of the translators and provide reviews on the translations. The qualitative methods that serve to collect useful secondary information are existing recorded interviews and reviews on the selected translations.

a) Recorded Interviews with the Translators

24 Umrah is the name given to a pilgrimage to Mecca, a shorter version of the annual Hajj gathering. The word “Umrah” in Arabic means “visiting a populated place”. Muslims perform Umrah to refresh their faith, seek forgiveness, and pray for their needs.
Based on the theoretical framework of this research, the status of the translator is an important component of the professional/translator and patron/publisher (Lefevere, 1992). I use existing interviews to obtain information about the status, beliefs, and experience of the translators who died: Bakhtiar, Hilali, and Khan.

In an interview with Bakhtiar, she stated that she was a Sufi Iranian-American author, translator, and clinical psychologist, who was born Mary Nell Bakhtiar (Bakhtiar, n.d.). Her mother was a Protestant American from Idaho, and her father was an Iranian physician from Tehran. Bakhtiar said that she grew up in Los Angeles and Washington D.C. as a Catholic. She held a BA in history from Chatham College in Pennsylvania, an MA in philosophy, an MA in counselling psychology, and a PhD in educational foundations. She married an Iranian-Muslim architect and moved to Iran when she was twenty-four years. At that age, she converted from Christianity to Islam (Colson, 2007). At Tehran University, her teacher and mentor Seyyed Hossein Nasr taught her the teachings of Islam, Qur’anic Arabic, Persian, and Sufism.

In another interview, Bakhtiar declared that she translated the Qur’an because there was a necessity for a new version that is as close as possible to the original without interpretation. She asserted being Sufi and refuted the claim that the twelve statements against women were by Ali Ibn Abi Ṭālib; she confirmed that these elements were added over time to denigrate all women. Bakhtiar also asserted that the Qur’an does not deny listening to women's advice (Peace Talk With Sara, 2020) and that traditions are not against women. She insisted that the Qur’an is universal and Prophet Muhammad did not bring a new religion, but he came to confirm the religions of the past (MacFarquhar, 2007); therefore, the messages of the previous prophets are as important as the message of our prophet. She added that it is important to emphasise what the Qur’an means today not what its history was (Bakhtiar, part 1, 2009). About her methodology of QT, Bakhtiar confirms beginning with the words, preparing lists of all the nouns, verbs, and particles that appear in the Qur’an, translating from these lists, and then creating a database. She thought that focusing on the words instead of the text was a new method, but she was told that this was the method of King James Version of the Bible in the 17th century (Bakhtiar, part 2, 2009). Thus, Bakhtiar applies formal
equivalence to produce an inclusive and universal type of Qur’ānic translation for easy understanding.

There were no interviews found with Hilali and Khan; however, their translation was commented on in videos. One commentary reveals that since 1977 Hilali and Khan’s translation had over a hundred million copies distributed for free in Saudi Arabia, which makes it the most widely disseminated Qur’ān in most Islamic bookstores of Sunnī mosques (Kidwai, 2008). Lawrence (2017) states that it is a replacement of Yusuf Ali’s translation, an antisemitic and anti-Christian polemic rather than a rendition of Islamic Scripture. It was an effort undertaken before 9/11 for American Muslims, but it still remains the most widely circulated because of the media attention of Qur’ān translations. Lawrence criticised Hilali and Khan’s translation for the manner in which aḥadīth [Prophet Muhammad’s sayings] are integrated into the translation because some of these aḥadīth include an anti-Jewish or anti-Christian flavour. Lawrence stated that footnotes and parentheses are two strategies applied by Hilali and Khan; however, these techniques prevent the flow of the reading and cause over-translation due to the too much information that hinders the TRs’ understanding of the text.

In an interview with Khattab, he confirmed that his translation is accurate (Let the Qur’ān, 2017) because of his mastering of the Arabic language and studying at Al-Azhar. Khattab added that his translation is clear and idiomatic because he has “the qualifications to translate the Qur’an” (FurqaanStudios, 2018). He argued that the clarity, accuracy, eloquence, and flow of his translation guarantee sound reception by English speaking audiences. Khattab declared that he structured his QT by breaking down Sūras to themes and gave an introduction for each Sūra to explain its topic. He also provided a general introduction and footnotes; the former shows the approach and features of translation, and the latter gives more details about complex terms and ideas. Khattab confirmed that it took him over five years to finish the translation and four years to revise, proofread, and edit it. He announced that, in editing his translation, he involved over 75 people including scholars, editors, proof readers, university students, high school students, men, women, Muslims, and non-muslims. For these reasons, he
believes that his QT is very accessible and easy to understand by Muslims and non-Muslims.

In one of Haleem’s existing recorded interviews, he focused on his rationale for translating the Qur’ān. He said the reason for his translation is the misrepresentation of QT by many Muslim and non-Muslim translators due to literalism (Islamic Circles, 2020). He confirmed his desire to give the flow of the English language in the 21st century by producing an idiomatic translation and avoiding archaic language and literal translation. Haleem asserted that his main focus was the context because the Qur’ān explains itself and that is the main tool of analysis (UCLA Subtitle Project, 2019). He declared his reliance on traditional and modern tafāsīr [exegeses]. Haleem values the use of footnotes as a procedure in translating some words such as “jinns” to reconcile with current understanding. In another interview, he explained that punctuation is a feature of his translation. He divided the text into paragraphs based on shifts in topics to “clarify the meaning and structure of thoughts and to meet the expectation of modern readers” (Islamic Circles, 2020). He also numbered the verses using superscripts at the start of each verse and letters for his footnotes. Haleem confirmed that the Qur’ān does not deny women the right to be the head of states or lead men in the prayer; he added that this denial results from the cultures which have set ideas not in the Qur’ān.

**b) Reviews on the Selected Translations**

Reviews on the selected translations give insights into the translators’ viewpoints and methodologies of translation. Lefevere’s ideological turn (1992) emphasises examining the beliefs of the translators and the position of their works in the translation system. This examination reveals translators’ views and what people think of their works. Contemporary reviews highlight the role of paratextual devices such as prefaces, introductions, and footnotes as ideological indicators that give data about the translator’s personal views and/or sectarian bias (Kidwai, 2018). Critiquing the assessments of the selected translations widens the understanding of these works. The two authorised translations are Khattab’s and Hilali and Khan’s; they are approved by Al-Azhar, Egypt,
and Dar Al-Ifta, Saudi Arabia, respectively. The unauthorised translations are Haleem’s and Bakhtiar’s published individually in the UK and the USA.

**Reviews on the Authorised Translations**

Khattab’s translation is approved by both Al-Azhar (see Appendix B) and the Canadian Council of Imams (Khattab, 2019, p. 693-4). It delivers much of what its title promises and is marked by a number of reader-friendly features as it transfers the meanings and message of the Qur’ān (Kidwai, 2018). Khattab demonstrates command over both the Arabic, his mother tongue, and English languages. He uses lucid and idiomatic English and gives detailed notes on the structure, style, proper names and pronouns in the Qur’ān (Khattab, 2019, ii-xvi). Khattab’s proper understanding of the Arabic language and reliance on *tafāsīr* [exegeses] help him faithfully convey the meanings and messages of the Qur’ān in an easy-to-understand English language (Haleem, 2021, Appendix F). He displays his astute alertness to the denotations and connotation of both the ST and TT by addressing issues agitating the mind of the present-day Muslims, especially those settled in the West (Kidwai, 2018). Although Khattab’s translation is more improved than the conventional translations, it includes a number of verses that are mistranslated (Quran Talk Blog, 2019). Convincingly, Khattab vindicates the Islamic stance on tricky issues such as women as witnesses, adherence to *taqwa* in marital life, polygamy, and treating wives well.

Hilali and Khan’s translation, by Muhammad Taqi-ud-Din al-Hilali and Muhammad Muhsin bin Mohyi-ed-Din bin Ahmad al-‘Isa, known as Muhsin Khan,25 has been approved by the General Presidency of Islamic Research, Ifta, Call and Propagation, Saudi Arabia since 1984 (Hilali & Khan, 2020, I) (see Appendix A). It was first published in 1977 by Dar-us-Salam in many countries, including Saudi Arabia (Boyle, 1978). Hilali and Khan adopt a traditional source-oriented approach identified for being a lengthy exegetical interpretation to capture exegetical comments of mainstream early exegetes such as Ibn Kathīr (d. 1373), Aṭ-Ṭabarī (d. 923), and Al-Qurṭubī (d. 1273) (Sabrina &

---

25 The word Khan is a title that means respect and reverence like Khanum/ Hanim for women. (see Khan in Dictionary.com. <https://www.dictionary.com/browse/khan>)
Hilali and Khan’s translation of Q 5: 21 shows political twist by adding the word “Palestine” between parentheses; however, at the time of the Qur’ān revelation this name did not exist; this addition endows the translation with a political aspect (Khaleel, 2005).

Reviews on the Unauthorised Translations

Haleem’s translation in general is modern, idiomatic, not archaic, and not including biblical expressions. It conveys the meanings and sense of the Arabic text in readable English offering a coherent and easy-to comprehend rendering without awkward grammatical structures (Atlas, 2015). Haleem’s translation of Q 17: 54 reveals his contemporary usage and sentence structure with avoidance of confusing phrases; he produces coherent and clear translation (Shah, 2010). Kolkailah (2010) mentions that Haleem’s translation includes an introduction that covers numerous topics, such as the life of Prophet Muhammad, an overview of some significant English translations, a brief explanation of his methodology, and reasons for embarking on a new translation. He states that Haleem’s introduction helps provide a foundation for the reader to better appreciate the Qur’ān’s structure, language, and meanings. According to Kidwai (2018), Haleem’s translation discloses his openness to other religions and belief in gender equality.

Bakhtiar’s translation does not reach a high degree of understanding of the meanings and messages of the Qur’ān (Kidwai, 2018). Kidwai opines that she is known as an editor and not as an Islamic scholar and three years of classical Arabic are not enough for undertaking the translation of the Qur’ān into English. Her method of translating that relies on dictionaries and other English translations is confusing as it does not consider the textual meaning (Hassen, 2012). Bakhtiar’s translation is intriguing on several counts; firstly, it does not touch upon what its title promises to deliver. She declares in her introduction that her work is “based on the Hanafi, Maliki and Shafi Schools of law” (Bakhtiar, 2012, p. xix), but she does not include any explanatory footnotes (MacFarquhar, 2007). According to Hassen (2011), “there are clearly some similarities between Bakhtiar’s work and that of feminist translators such as Godard and Wilderman both on the textual and paratextual level” (p. 34). Thus, Bakhtiar’s translation exemplifies progressive interpretation of the Qur’ān as it transfers contemporary socio-cultural ideas.
2.3 Data Analysis

2.3.1 Analysing Qualitative Data

In this research, I work empirically and apply qualitative and quantitative methods. Working empirically means analysing problems by means of data rather than relying solely on logical argument (Saldanha & O’Brien, 2013). I collect qualitative data through semi-structured interviews for an in-depth understanding of the beliefs of the interviewees under scrutiny. In this section, I explain the procedures of analysing the qualitative interviews and apply an inductive approach to code the information based on the research questions and hypotheses.

First, I transferred the audios of the interviews into scripts (see Appendix F) and examined them without overlooking the contributions made by the less eloquent participants. Then I analysed the data thematically since thematic analysis is described as “[a] process of working with raw data to identify and interpret key ideas or themes” (Matthews & Ross, 2010, p. 373). I attempted to find common themes because the goal of semi-structured interviews is to find common patterns across the data set. The main themes in this analysis are the ones suggested by Lefevere’s ideological turn (1992) and the model I have designed for describing and comparing Qur’ān translations. These themes are the common ideologies in contemporary QTs, indicators of ideologies in QT, status of the translators, and effect of the publishing houses on QT (see Appendix G).

The interpretation of the semi-structured interviews highlighted the translators’ agreement on religion as an ideology and the reflection of this ideology in the translators’ paratexts and lexical choices. The first theme, the contemporary ideologies in Qur’ān translations, illustrated that the common ideologies are theological and sociocultural, primarily gender equality. The second theme revealed that the indicators of ideologies in QTs are paratexual elements (e.g., prefaces, introductions, and footnotes) and the translators’ mental lexicon26 (lexis and syntax). The third theme, the status of the translator, showed that the elements of the translator’s status are qualification, religion, and experience. According to Callison-Burch et al. (2008), the translator’s status

---

26 The translators as interpreters present ST utterances through their languages, experiences and identities using their mental dictionaries, so their choices of lexis and syntax reveal their ideologies. (see Al-Shabab, O. S. (2008). From necessity to infinity: Interpretation in language and translation. Janus Publishing Company.)
determines the translation approach and translation procedures. The interviewees agree that procedures such as addition, omission, compensation, and interpolation\textsuperscript{27} might cause manipulation in QTs. The fourth theme, the effect of the patron/publishing house/authorising institution on QT, highlighted the translators’ consensus that authorisation might decrease the occurrence of the translators’ ideologies in QTs.

The thematic analysis of the interviews showed that the six interviewees agree that theological and sociocultural ideologies are common in contemporary Qur’ān translations (QTs). It also disclosed the status of the translators; Haleem and Khattab have high status in translating the Qur’ān since they master the two languages, Arabic and English, and are specialists in Islamic studies. Moreover, the thematic analysis illustrated that the indicators of ideologies are patatextual devices (peritexts and epitexts) and the translators’ lexical choices. It demonstrated that certain translation procedures such as paraphrase and cultural equivalence increase the adherence to the target language and target culture (Appendix G). Interpreting the theme of authorisation has led to the hypothesis that authorising institutions can reduce the display of the translators’ ideologies in QTs.

2.3.2 Analysing Quantitative Data

Although this study is interpretivist, anti-positivist in nature, I applied a quantitative approach to connect the views, attitudes, and choices of the translators. This quantitative method involved the collection and examination of the translations of 300 verses that I selected based on the analysis of the semi-structured interviews, paratexts, and reviews on the target texts. The interviewees explicitly referred to these verses and their importance in revealing the differences between the schools of Islamic theology. The analysis of the qualitative semi-structured interviews showed that the translators have different theological tendencies (Sufism, \textit{Ashʿarism}, and \textit{Salafism}) and socio-cultural

\textsuperscript{27} Interpolation means the insertion of something of a different nature into the TT; it is a new technique in statistical machine translation (SMT); it integrates multiple features of translation by combining all models from multiple SMT engines into a single decoding process. (see Steffenson, J. F. (1950). \textit{Interpolation} (2\textsuperscript{nd} ed.). Chelsea Publishing Company.) In Hilali and Khan’s translation interpolation lies in their insertion of words and phrases in the Arabic language in the TT. (see note 18)
ideologies (see Appendix F). Also, the exploration of the paratextual devices confirmed these findings (see chapter four). I used a quantitative analysis to measure the translators’ display of their theological views and to test the hypothesis about the impact of authorisation on the demonstration of translators’ ideologies in QTs.

2.4 The Criteria and Procedures of Selecting Qur’ānic Verses

No doubt all writers/ translators, including myself, reflect an ideology since the display of ideology may occur unconsciously. Although I am a Sunnī Muslim, I attempted to be objective in selecting and analysing the data in my research. I started the procedures by the recitation of the 114 chapters following the Ḥafṣ28 punctuation and recitation system for a deep understanding of the meanings and messages of the Qur’ān. I used Ḥafṣ because it is applied by the four selected translators; it is the official version recognised and followed in Saudi Arabia and Egypt, where the two authorised translations selected in this study were published. Also, like Haleem (2020), Bakhtiar (2012) states that her “translation is based on Ḥafṣ version of the reading of Asim” (xxi).

For a methodical selection of the examples, I chose the verses based on the analysis of the publishers’ peritexts (titles, title pages, the visibility of the translators’ names, and blurbs), the translators’ peritexts (introductions, prefaces, forewords, and footnotes) and epitexts (semi-structured interviews with the translators and reviews on the translations). The interviews, reviews, and paratexts showed that Khattab and Haleem are Ashʿarīs, Hilali and Khan were Salafīs, while Bakhtiar was Sufī. Therefore, I investigated the differences between these schools and considered the topics and verses whose interpretations reveal these differences. I used Muhammad Fouad Abdel Baqi’s (1945) Al-Mu’jam Al-Mufahras Li’alfaz Al-Qur’ān Al-Karim [The Indexed Lexicon for the Words of the Holy Qur’ān]29. This source was used to gather all the verses whose interpretations

---

28 Ḥafṣ is one of the ten modes of the Qur’ān recitation. The name comes from the name Abū Amr Ḥafṣ Ibn Sulaymān Ibn al-Mughīrah Ibn Abi Dawūd Al-Asadī Al-Kūfī, who created this form of recitation which is followed in Saudi Arabia, Egypt, and many other countries (see Al-Meneese, W. E. (2021). The fourteen Qur’ānic readings: Impact on theology and law. Islamic University of Minnesota for Publication and Distribution.)

29 An indexed lexical book in which the words contained in the Qur’ān are arranged alphabetically according to the linguistic conjugation of each word, with an
might reveal the translators’ beliefs in specific Islamic aspects. Thus, the purpose of using this source was to gather all the verses including the words and phrases that could be interpreted differently as a result of the translators’ theological views.

The followers of Islamic schools of theology differ in their beliefs in *ta’wil* *ṣifāt* *Adh-Dhāt Al-Ilaḥiyya* [interpretation of God’s Essence Attributes]. Sufis believe that “by interpreting (*ta’wil*) *Ash’arīs* only passed from declaring similarity with corporeal things (*ajsām*) to declaring similarity with temporally originated meanings (*al-ma’ānī al-muḥdatha*) . . . Hence, they never passed beyond declaring God similar with temporally originated things” (Chittick, 1989, p. 73). To select the verses that highlight the *Ash’arī* belief in this concept, I gathered thirty-four verses including the words face, hand, leg, and eye(s). I also selected the verses about *ta’wil* *ṣifāt al-af’āl Al-Ilaḥiyya* [Interpretation of God’s Action] as they constitute the crux of conventional theological debates between *Ash’arīs* and other Islamic schools of theology (Al-Bouṭī, 1990). They were thirty-three verses, comprising the words *ghaḍab* [anger], *sakhaṭ* [extreme anger], *nasyā* [forgot], *istawā’ alā al-ʿarsh* [sat on the throne]). Moreover, to examine the translators’ choices for the concept of *Kasb* [acquisition], I selected the eighteen verses that include this term and its derivatives: *kasaba* [earned], *kasabat* [earned], *kasabā* [earned], *kasbatum* [earned], *iktasaba* [acquired], and *iktasabū* [acquired]). Finally, to examine the translators’ choices for God’s External Speaking, I selected the ten verses about this concept. These verses include the words *yukalim* [speaks], *nādā* [called], *kalamahu* [spoke to him], *bi-kalāmi* [by my speech], and *qāl* [said]).

Similarly, to examine the impact of the translators’ beliefs in *Sufism* on their choices, I selected the verses whose interpretation might reveal the views of this school of thought. Chittick (1989) states that “Chivalry “futuwwa” is a divine attribute by way of meaning, but there is no word derived from it by which God is named” (p. 65). I selected indication of the appearance of the word with its various conjugations. The word is placed and in front of it the verse or verses in which it is mentioned, the *Sūra* in which it is contained, and the verse number.
the ten verses including the word *fatā* [a young man] and its derivatives because this is a key concept in Sufi thought and practice. I also gathered the ten verses that include the word *khaliifa* [successor] to demonstrate the influence of the translators’ Sufi belief in *waḥdat al-wujūd* [the unity of existence] on their choices for this word. Furthermore, in Sufism, *imān* implies the *murūd’s*/seeker’s realisation of the inner meaning of the Qur’ān and *Sunna* of Prophet Muhammad (Campo, 2009; Knysh, 2000). To explore the translators’ beliefs in *al-bāṭin* [esoteric interpretation of the Qur’ān], I gathered the six verses including the words *bāṭinahu* [hidden], *baṭanahu* [concealed], and *al-bāṭin* [secret]). Lastly, because the concepts *walāya* and *imāma* are significant in Sufism (Ghilani, 1993; Al-Bouṭī, 1990), I selected the forty-seven verses including these words (thirty-five verses comprising the word *awliya* [allies/supporters] and twelve verses including the word *imām*).

However, I applied a different technique when I selected the verses whose interpretations might highlight the translators’ *Salafī* views. I selected the verses based on the insertion of the *Salafī* beliefs in their translations. The reason behind this change was that Hilali and Khan insert the term “monotheism” 260 times and the term “polytheism” 213 times in different places, while Bakhtiar uses the word “monotheism” twelve times, and Haleem and Khattab do not use these terms in their QTs. Therefore, I chose two terms in whose translations Hilali and Khan add the word “monotheism” and two terms in whose interpretations they insert the word “polytheism”. The total number of the selected verses were 102, including the phrases: *al-ladhin ʿamanū* [those who believed], *millat Ibrahīm ḥanīfan* [the religion of Ibrahīm], *al-mujrimūn* [criminals], and *az-zālimūn* [wrongdoers]). Additionally, to investigate the impact of the translators’ belief in seeing God on the Day of Judgement, I selected the six verses in whose translations Hilali and Khan reflect their views regarding this concept. These verses include the words *nazira* [looking], *aunzur* [look at], *al-ḥusnā wa ziyāda* [the best reward and more], *mazīd* [more], and *al-ghaib* [unseen]).
Furthermore, the increase and decrease of imān [faith] and God’s Transcendence are two main concepts in Salafism (Al-Bouṭī, 1990). To examine the effect of the translators’ belief in the increase and decrease of imān [faith] on their choices, I selected fourteen verses. These verses include phrases and sentences such as  

\[\text{liyazdādū imānan mma`a imānihim} \text{ [to increase in faith],}\]

\[\text{Fazadahum rijsan ilā rijsihim} \text{ [disbelief on disbelief],}\]

\[\text{fazadahum Allāh maraḍan} \text{ [Allāh increases their sickness].}\]

\[\text{ma z`adhūm ēlā nhwura} \text{ [it increased them but with flight],}\]

\[\text{Arbabān min dun Allāh} \text{ [lords instead of Allāh],}\]

\[\text{liyudī`a īmānakum} \text{ [to waste your belief],}\]

\[\text{arbaban min dun Allāh} \text{ [lords instead of Allāh],}\]

\[\text{liyathbat al-ladhīn amanū} \text{ [to reassure the believers],}\]

\[\text{liyaṭma`in qalbi} \text{ [for my heart to be reassured].}\]

Finally, to investigate the influence of the translators’ belief in ithbāt ʿuluww Allāh [God’s Transcendence], I selected ten verses including words and phrases such as  

\[\text{fawqihum} \text{ [above them],}\]

\[\text{fawqahum} \text{ [above them],}\]

\[\text{ilā as-samā`} \text{ [towards the sky],}\]

\[\text{wajhu Allāh} \text{ [the Face of God],}\]

\[\text{liqqā'ih} \text{ [meeting Him],}\]

\[\text{albayt al-ma`ghmūr} \text{ [the visited house],}\]

\[\text{sidrat al-munttahā} \text{ [the Lote Tree of the Utmost Boundary],}\]

\[\text{rabi`hum} \text{ [their fourth].}\]

2.5 Conclusion

In this chapter, I cover the methodology that I have adopted to answer the research questions. I explain the methods of data collection and data analysis of the selected primary and secondary sources. First, I gather primary data from qualitative semi-structured interviews with Qur’ān translators and analyse these data thematically. Furthermore, I gather secondary data from existing recorded interviews with the translators of the selected QTs and reviews on these translations. I compare the primary and secondary data, taking into account the time of data collection because it may affect the comparability of the two data sets (Matthews & Ross, 2010). In order to enhance the research results, I adopt a combination of qualitative and quantitative approaches for valid and reliable answers to the research questions.
I applied several procedures to select the 300 verses whose translations are compared and to measure the frequency and percentages of the display of the translators’ ideologies. First, on the paratextual level, I investigated and compared the covers of the translations, their titles, prefaces, introductions, and footnotes. Then, on the macro-level, I examined the status of the translators, reviews on their Qur’ān translations, their other translations, and the common ideologies in the translators’ countries at the time of their translations. After that, on the micro-level, I analytically compared the translations of the verses interpreted differently by schools of Islamic theology. The interpretivist data were quantised to produce numerical tabulations of the qualitative data. I measured, in the form of scores, the frequency of the translators’ choices that reflect their ideologies from carefully chosen examples based on the characteristics of each school of Islamic theology followed by the translators.
Chapter Three: Literature Review

“Translation is not a matter of words only: It is a matter of making intelligible a whole culture”. — Anthony Burgess

3.1 Introduction

In the previous chapter, I explained the mixed-methods approach applied in this study, a combination of qualitative and quantitative tools, and collected the primary and secondary data. I thematically analysed the qualitative semi-structured interviews conducted with six professional translators of Islamic texts, among whom are Haleem and Khattab, whose translations are examined in this thesis. These interviews gave an in-depth insight into the translators’ experience and beliefs, revealing that Haleem and Khattab, living in the UK and Canada respectively, have liberal ideologies\(^\text{30}\) (see Appendix F). Harrison and Boyd (2018) assume that their choices show religious tolerance and acceptance to gender equality. The interviews also disclosed that Haleem and Khattab studied at Al-Azhar - a complex of Islamic schools and research institutes whose scholars hold *Ashʿarism*\(^\text{31}\) as their doctrine (Abdul Hamid, 2020) - and that both have theological tendencies to this school. Additionally, I examined recorded interviews with Laleh Bakhtiar, an Iranian-American who converted from Christianity to Islam. These interviews show that she took “classes in Islamic culture and civilisation by Seyyed Hossein Nasr”, a descendant of Sheikh Fazlollah Nouri, a prominent Shiʿī Muslim Scholar (Bakhtiar, 2012, xx), which raises the assumption of possible influence of *Sufi*\(^\text{32}\) beliefs.

\(^{30}\) Liberalism has become the dominant ideology at the start of the third millennium. The term originated in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Like early liberals such as Locke, Voltaire, Montesquieu, and Adam Smith, liberals in the twenty-first century call for religious toleration and demand gender equality. (See Zafirovski, M. (2007). *Liberal modernity and its adversaries: Freedom, liberalism and anti-liberalism in the 21st century*. Brill.)

\(^{31}\) *Ashʿarism* is a theological school of Sunni Islam (see Abu Zahra, M. (2015). *Tarikh al-madhahib al-Islamiyah fi al-siyasat wa-l-ʿaqa'id wa tarikh al-madhahib al-fiqhia* [The history of Islamic schools of thought in politics and beliefs and the history of jurisprudence schools]. Dar Al-Fikr Al-Arabi.)

\(^{32}\) *Sufism* is the mystic school of Islamic theology; it is more prominent among *Sunnis*, but there are also *Shiʿī-Sufi* orders, or *tariqa*. Followers of *Sufism* believe that they can become closer to Allah through inner purification and introspection. They meditate and receive guidance from their spiritual leaders, or *murshid* [guide]. It is
on her choices (Khanam, 2011). Moreover, I discussed reviews on the four selected translations disclosing Hilali and Khan’s* Salafī* tendencies. Finally, I elucidated the process and criteria of selecting the Qur’ānic verses I examine in this study.

In this chapter, I perform a systematic literature review structured thematically to explore sources related to the topic of this study and identify the main issues and debates in Qur’ān translation (QT). According to Fink (2005), a systematic literature review facilitates “identifying, evaluating, and synthesising the existing body of completed and recorded work” (p. 3). In section 2.2, I survey works that discuss the difficulty of translating the Qur’ān due to its* إعجاز* [imitable genre]. I review contemporary articles exploring translation problems on the micro (semantic and syntactic) and macro (rhetorical and cultural) levels. These articles investigate the problems faced by Qur’ān translators on the word and sentence levels, on the one hand, and on the textual and contextual levels, on the other hand. In section 2.3, I scrutinise concepts in comparative Qur’ān translation studies (CQTS), translation strategies that might cause manipulation in QT, and the most common approaches to CQTS. In section 2.4, I analyse studies on the beliefs that can affect QTs (feminism, reformism, fundamentalism, and sectarianism) and the models that disclose translators’ ideologies. Finally, in section 2.5, I review the only study on the effect of authorisation on QTs. Thus, in this chapter, I spot the gap in literature and highlight the contribution of this research to the knowledge in the field of translation studies, mainly the area of comparative Qur’ān translation studies (CQTS).

3.2 Key Issues in Qur’ān Translation

3.2.1 Translating the Genre of the Qur’ān

In this section, I seek to identify the issues that translators face when they translate the Qur’ān. I gathered previous works that illustrate the challenges of transferring the style of the unique genre of the Qur’ān. According to Ali (1993), the Qur’ān-specific language results from the style of the Qur’ān which “is neither poetry nor prose but [a combination]

---

believed that some aspects of the Shi ’ī theology are influenced by Sufism (see Khanam, F. (2011). The origin and evolution of Sufism. *Al-Idah | Shaykh Zayed Islamic Centre University of Peshawar, 22*(1), 1-10. )

*Salafism* is an intellectual current of Sunni Islam (see note 21).
of both in such a splendid manner” (p. 7). The letters and words of the Qurʾān are similar to those of the Arabic language; however, the way these letters and words are joined make them Qurʾān-specific and impossible to imitate (Al-Halawani, 2018; Raof, 2018a; Al-Rafii, 1997). This impossibility is caused by the nature of the Qurʾānic lexis, which is culture-bound (Abassian & Nazerian, 2016). Similarly, Arberry (1996, x) asserts that the eloquent and rhetoric language of the Qurʾān cannot be rendered into any other language “because each time one returns to the Arabic text, he finds new meanings and fresh ways of interpreting” (Irving, 1985, p. 27). Read Al-Jabari (2008) agrees with Arberry and Irving on the untranslatability of the Qurʾān due to its lofty language and highly spiritual thoughts.

The vigorous style of the Qurʾān makes it difficult for translators to transfer its rich meanings. In the introduction of his QT, Pickthall (1977) states:

The Qurʾān cannot be translated. That is the belief of old-fashioned Sheikhs and the view of the present writer. The Book here is rendered almost literary, and every effort has been made to choose befitting language. But the result is not the Glorious Qurʾān, the inimitable symphony, the very sounds of which move men to tears and ecstasy. (xv)

This quote reveals that Pickthall agrees with the Sheikhs of Al-Azhar that the language of the Qurʾān is unique and its style cannot be imitated. Thus, the inimitability of the Qurʾān genre obstructs the possibility of its translation and results in the debate of the permissibility of QT.

This debate divides Muslim theologians into two groups; one approves QT, relying on the declaration of Abu Ḥanifa,34 the Iraqi scholar and theologian, while the other is adamant that QT is impermissible due to the nature of the Qurʾānic language (Mousa & Dahrug, 1992). Hassan Mustapha (2009) affirms the impossibility of translating the Qurʾān. He explains “There is Arabic and there is Qurʾanic Arabic . . . Whereas hadith

---

34 Imām Abū Ḥanīfa (699 – 767) was a Ṣunnī Muslim theologian and jurist. He declared that it was permissible to recite the Qurʾān in Persian in prayer, whether the reader knew Arabic or not. This declaration was used by scholars to approve the translation of the Qurʾān. (see Tibawi, A.L. (n.d.). Is the Qurʾan translatable? Early Muslim opinion. Harvard University. [https://www.answeringislam.org/Books/MW/translatable/koran.htm](https://www.answeringislam.org/Books/MW/translatable/koran.htm)
(the sayings of the profit) may be legitimately translated and quoted in translation, it has traditionally been considered illegitimate to translate the Qur’ān” (p. 226). Mustapha confirms that the proponents of the absolute untranslatability of the Qur’ān find explicit support for their view in Q 12: 2 إِنَّا أَنزَلْنَاهُ قُرْآنٌ أَنْزِلْنَا عَلَيْهِۦٓ: “We revealed it as an Arabic Qur’ān” (Hussain, 2020, p. 190). Mustapha adds that these supporters of Qur’ān untranslatability think that the Qur’ān can be translated only by a Muslim, but the “translation would function merely as a commentary, explaining or paraphrasing of the ST but not replacing it” (p. 226). He affirms that QTs lack the i’jaz [inimitability] of the original Qur’ān because of the exclusive genre of the Qur’ān.

The metaphorical and syntactical mode of the Qur’ānic expressions causes the untranslatability of the Qur’ān. According to Abou Sheishaa (2001), Sheikh Al-Azhar Muhammad Shakir states that the lexicons of the Qur’ān cannot be replaced even in Arabic. Abou Sheishaa gives an example of two words that have the same meaning but cannot be substituted: the word ولد [son] in Q 3: 47 and غلام [son] in Q 19: 20. Abou Sheishaa agrees with Shakir that QTs cannot convey the sense of the original, and they will be different from one to the other. Furthermore, Abou Sheishaa asserts that Sheikh Hasanayn Makhluf, a former Mufti of Egypt, agrees with Sheikh Shakir that effective interpretation of the Qur’ān is permitted, but it cannot be considered Qur’ān.

After Al-Azhar permitted Qur’ān translation, the debate shifted over whether to consider QT as Qur’ān or interpretation of the meanings of the Qur’ān. In 1930, the rector of the University of Al-Azhar, Shaykh Al-Marghenani said that the Arabic Qur’ān is the Qur’ān, and any QT is merely an interpretation or an attempt to understand the Qur’ānic message (Hossain, 2009). Hossain adds that in 1932 Sheikh Muhammad Mustafa Al-Maraghi, a former Grand Sheikh of Al-Azhar, announced in a fatwa [formal legal opinion] that the interpretation of the Qur’ān is permissible (Gibb & Kramers, 1974). On the other hand, Mustafa Sabry, the last Sheikh of Islam in the Ottoman Empire, disagrees with Al-Maraghi, who allowed prayer with the Qur’ān translated into Turkish (Şeyhun, 2014). Sabry refuted this view from al Sharīʿa [religious jurisdiction] point of view and disapproved the permissibility of diligence in jurisprudence based on translation. To end the dispute, in 1936 Sheikh Mahmud Shaltut, a former Grand Sheikh of Al-Azhar, said that if the translation could not transfer the inimitable rhetoric features of the Qur’ān, it
could transfer the other great aspects of inimitability and the original meanings. Thus, it is possible to interpret the meanings of the Qurʾān to understand its messages; however, a QT cannot be considered Qurʾān but interpretation of its meanings.

Qurʾān translators find themselves in a dilemma whether to sacrifice the style or message of the Qurʾān, and they agree to keep the message because the uniqueness of the Qurʾān causes loss in translation due to semantic, syntactic, and cultural voids between the SL and TL. Raof (2004) and Najjar (2020) rely on Nida’s claim (2003) that “if the translator attempts to approximate the stylistic qualities of the original, he is likely to sacrifice much of the meaning, while strict adherence to the literal content usually results in considerable loss of the stylistic flavour” (p. 2). However, Haleem (2010) suggests that “a grasp of certain features of the Qurʾānic style is essential for proper understanding” (p. viii). He agrees with Baker (2016, p. 86) that differences in the grammatical features of the SL and TL often result in changes in the informational content of the message during the process of translation. Halimah (2014) states that the Qurʾān “combines miraculous expressive rhetoric and discourse, on the one hand, and prodigious past and unseen future events for each of which there is evidence in the Qurʾān, on the other hand” (125). Similarly, Inaʾm Jaber (2010) argues that the meaning of the Qurʾān is shrouded within its distinctive “linguistic, cultural, historical, stylistic, rhetorical, and structural features” (p. 946). Although these scholars have explored the nature of the Qurʾānic language, they focus on translating the Qurʾānic lexis ignoring other features of inimitability.

In this section, I review articles discussing the debate of the untranslatability of the Qurʾān due to its inimitable genre. These articles show that translators sacrifice the style for the sake of transferring the meanings and the messages of the Qurʾān; they conclude that QT is considered the interpretation of the meanings of the Qurʾān but not the Qurʾān. In the next section, I aim to review studies revealing the challenges of transferring the syntactic and semantic features of the Qurʾān-specific language into English, a language with different grammatical and cultural systems.

3.2.2 Syntactic and Semantic Challenges in Qurʾān Translation

Syntactic challenges are related to the set of rules or principles that govern how words are put together to form phrases, while semantic ones are linked to meaning or logic
in language (Sportiche et al., 2014). Noureldin Abdelaal and Sabariah Rashid (2016) argue that grammatical equivalence is not less important than lexical equivalence in giving meaning. They investigate the grammatical loss in Qur’ān translation (QT) and the result of this loss in causing partial or complete semantic loss. Abdelaal and Rashid adopt Hervey and Higgins’s perception of loss in translation, which defines translation loss as failure to replicate the ST exactly through omission or addition. They investigate the translation of the conjunction ﺛﻢ thumma [then] in Q 7: 11 

وَلَا ﺗَرْكُنَّ إِلَى ٱﻟﱠﺬِﯾﻦَ ظَﻠَﻤُﻮاْ ﻓَتَﻤَﺴَّﮑُﻢُ ٱﻟﻨﱠﺎرُ وَمَﺎ ﻟَﻜُﻢ ﻣِّﻦ دُونِ ٱللهٍ ﺛُﻢﱠ ﻻَ ﺗُﻨﺼَﺮُونَ wa lā tarkanū iylā al-ladhina ẓalamū fatamassakum an-nāru wa mā lakum min dūn Allahi min awliyā’ thumma lā tunṣarūn, “And incline not to those who do wrong, or the Fire will seize you; and ye have no protectors other than Allah, nor shall ye be helped”. Najjar states that the conjunctive particle و wa is translated into “and”, ف fa into “or”, and then thumma is omitted. He finds that semi-adequate translation dominates the translation of Qur’ānic conjunctive particle shift, with ف fa being inadequately translated more than 和 wa and ﺛﻢ thumma. Najjar also finds that the semantic function changes into
a causal function in some verses and is distorted in others. Both studies by Abdeltaal and Rashid (2016) and Najjar (2020) show that the mistranslation of conjunctive particles can affect the message in QT; however, the scholars ignore the effect of neglecting the context in translating prepositional phrases.

Like prepositions, prepositional phrases cause semantic loss of their implicatures if they are mistranslated. Hummadi et al. (2020) confirm that translators make mistakes when transferring the meanings of prepositional phrases due to the different linguistic structures between English, stemming from Germanic languages, and Arabic, belonging to Semitic languages. The scholars give an example from Q 37: 88

\[\text{fanaẓara nazrat an annujümī,}\]

in which \(\text{fanaẓara}\) is translated as “at the stars”. They confirm that in the Arabic language the verb \(\text{naẓr} \) is followed by the preposition \(\text{الى} \) (to/into), and the use of \(\text{في}\) implies that Ibrahim’s heart and thought were preoccupied by the creation of the stars. Hummadi et al. conclude that the translation is inadequate due to betraying the real intended meaning or the implicature of the verse because the alternation of prepositions in the Qur’an is accompanied with a new meaning that is not explicitly stated, but pragmatically inferred. Hummadi et al. state that \(\text{التضمين at-tadmīn}\) [implication/embedding] offers a modest solution to bridge the gap of translation inadequacy as it enables translators to choose from the multiple parts of speech to imply the original verb of the ST and to match the preposition with which it appears.

Another reason of semantic loss in QT is shifts in personal pronouns. Haleem (1992) gives an example of \(\text{iltifāt}\) [changing pronouns] in Q 108:2:

\[\text{إِنَّا أُعْطَيْنَا al-kawthar,}\]

in which \(\text{inna a’ṭayynaka al-kawthar, faṣali lirobika wa ānhar,}\) which he translates as “We have given you abundance, therefore pray to your Lord”. He explains that the reference here is to one and the same, God. Also, Al-Badayni et al. (2014) investigate the translation strategies employed by Yusuf Ali to transfer reference switching in his translation of Q 2. The scholars define reference switching, \(\text{التفاوت iltifāt}\), a unique style in the Qur’an, as the change of speech from one mode to another stating that it constitutes a problem in translation. Al-Badayni et al. classify personal reference switching into five categories: from third to first person pronoun, first to third person pronoun, third to second person pronoun, second to third person pronoun, and first to second person pronoun. The
researchers apply Newmark’s translation strategies (1988) and Halliday and Hasan’s framework of cohesion. Al-Badani et al. conclude that implicatures are realised through reading and exegeses.

Like shifts in conjunctive particles and personal pronouns, shifts in tenses can cause semantic loss. Raof (2007) explains that the shift from the present tense of the verb 

\[
yaddilu \text{ [to stray]} \] in Q 6: 117 to the past tense 

\[
dalla \text{ [strayed]} \] in Q 16: 125 is the result of Qur’ān stylistic variation. Q 6: 117: 

\[
\text{إنّ رَبُّكَ هوُ أَعْلَمُ مِنْ يَضُلُّ عَنْ سَبِيلِهِ وَهُوُ (آَلُمُ بِمُهْتَدِينَ)
\]

is rendered as “Your Lord knows best who strays from His way. He knows best who they are that receive His guidance”. Q 16: 125: 

\[
\text{إِنَّ رَبُّكَ وَهُوُ أَعْلَمُ بِمِنْ يَضُلُّ عَنْ سَبِيلِهِ (آَلُمُ بِمُهْتَدِينَ)
\]

is translated as “Your Lord knows best who strays from His way. He knows best who they are that receive His guidance”. Raof concludes that shifts in tenses occur in structurally similar sentences.

In addition to shifts in tenses, the lack of lexical equivalence in the target language causes semantic loss. Raof (2007) shows how the translation of collocations in the Qur’ānic genre can violate the rule for a given rhetorical function. He gives an example of Q 3: 21: 

\[
\text{fa-bashshirhum bi’adhābin ālīm “Give them good tidings of a painful punishment”}
\]

Raof explains that although the verb 

\[
\text{بَشِّرُ} \]

collocates with positive news, in Q 3: 21 it appears with the word 

\[
\text{عَذَابٌ} \]

‘adhāb, negative news, in order to achieve the rhetorical purpose of irony. Ali et al. (2012) link lexical problems to the lack of equivalent of some Islamic terms; they give an example of the word 

\[
\text{تَقِوَى} \]

taqwā, which is translated in a communicative manner as “piety”, to give an approximate meaning because it does not have a direct counterpart in English. Similarly, Saleh Al-Ghamdi (2015) evaluates the accuracy and consistency of rendering the root-sharing Divine Names in five English translations of the Qur’ān using Nida’s componential analysis, Hatim and Munday’s (2004) contrastive semantic structure analysis, and exegetical analyses of the meanings of Divine Names. Al-Ghamdi gives an example from Q 23: 91: 

\[
\text{mā āttakhadha Allahu min waladin wa mā kāna ma’ahu min ilahin idhan ladahaba kullu ilahin bimā khalaq.}
\]
Al-Ghamdi clarifies that the five translators treat both terms, *ilah* and *Allah*, as complete synonyms, which is inaccurate as it would confuse the TRs, particularly non-Muslims. Ghamdi’s study is confined to examining the English rendition of thirty-five root-sharing Divine Names mentioned in the Qur’an, and it ignores the cultural aspects.

Additionally, semantic loss is caused by over-translation, under-translation, or mistranslation of the ST. Abdelaal and Rashid (2015) examine the term َالواقعةُ al-wāqi‘a, translated by Yusuf Ali as “the event inevitable”; however, it means “The Day of Judgment” (Ibn Kathīr, 2002, p. 514), which is one day, but there can be many inevitable events. The researchers give another example in َعُرَبًا urban, which cannot be translated into one-word equivalent. They explain that this cultural-bound term is rendered as “Beloved (by nature)”, but this translation shows a complete loss of meaning as it means women who approach their husbands with sweet words and playful actions (Ibn Kathīr, 2002). The scholars find two types of semantic loss: partial and complete, and they relate the difficulties in translating the Qur’an to the specific nature of its complex unique lexicons and to the lack of equivalents in English.

Also, semantic loss results from the shifting of the grammatical category and the inclusion of metaphoric and metonymic words in the ST. Sehrish Islam (2018) compares translations of Q 36 by Yusuf Ali and Arberry finding partial and complete semantic loss. Islam gives an example of shift in translating َالْقُرْآنِ الْحَكِيمِ al-Qur’ān al-ḥakīm to “the Qur’an, Full of Wisdom” by Yusuf Ali and “the Wise Koran” by Arberry, who shifts the grammatical category from noun “Wisdom” to adjective “Wise” resulting in shift in meaning. Islam relates the semantic loss to cultural gaps, literal translation, and communicative translation suggesting exegetical translation by a team of scholars. Similarly, Abdalati Ali (2020) compares the translations of selected metaphoric and metonymic words confirming that the word َأَرْحَامَ arḥām in Q 3: 6 هوَ الَّذِي يَصَوَّرُكُمْ في الأَرْحَامِ ُ huwa al-ladhi yusawrukum fi al-arḥām, has a different meaning than in Q 4: 1 َوَانْتَقِوا الله الَّذِي تَساَؤلُونَ بِهِ واَلْأَرْحَامَ wātqū Allah al-ladhi tasā’lūna bihi wa-l-arḥām. In Q 3: 6 it means “wombs”, while in Q 4: 1 it means “kinship”, but it is translated as “the wombs (that bear you)” by Pickthall, who does not consider the context. These two studies are effective but limited in variables as they rely on few examples.
In this section, I review studies showing that the syntactic and semantic challenges in QT result from the lack of equivalence, shifts in grammatical category, literal translation of metaphoric and metonymic words, and culture-specific items. These studies verify that Qur’ānic shifts in conjunctive particles, personal pronouns, and tenses result in partial and complete semantic loss. In the succeeding section, I critique studies on the issues that occur in QT due to the rhetorical features of the Qur’ān.

3.2.3 Rhetorical Challenges in Qur’ān Translation

The eloquence, balāgha, of the Qur’ān-specific language bestows the Qur’ān with the i‘jaz [inimitable] genre, which in turn causes mistranslation. Haleem (2018) accentuates that the articulateness of the Qur’ān is the reason of its distinctive genre. He argues that the context of the Qur’ān plays a crucial role in understanding, interpreting, and translating it into other languages. He introduces two types of contexts: siyāq an-nass [the context of the text] and siyāq al-mawqif [the context of the situation]. Haleem confirms that the Arabic rhetoricians had used the term ‘the context of the situation’35 a thousand years before Bronislaw Malinowski36 coined it in 1923 (Wolf, 1989). Haleem elaborates on this point stating that the Qur’ān uses a highly concise mode of expressions, clarifying that its succinct lexis is so condensed, which results in difficulties in identifying the context and applying consistency in translation. He gives an example of translating the word وَلَد walad in Q 19: 88, which is rendered by Arberry and other translators literally and in isolation from its context as “son”, while the correct rendition in some places is “offspring”. Haleem also discusses the non-existence of

35 The term siyāq al-mawqif [the context of the situation] refers to the cultural context of use in which an utterance was located. Meaning is context-dependent, so the cultural context has to be considered when an utterance is interpreted. (see Wolf, G. (1989). Malinowski’s ‘context of situation’. Language and Communication, 9(4), 259-267.)

36 According to Malinowski, “the study of any language, spoken by a people who live under conditions different from our own and possess a different culture, must be carried out in conjunction with the study of their culture and their environment”. (see Malinowski, B. (1923). The problem of meaning in primitive languages. In C. K. Ogden and I. A. Richards The meaning of meaning: A study of the influence of language upon thought and of the science of symbolism (4th ed. revised 1936), (pp. 296-336). Nature.)
synonyms exemplifying words such as الكتاب al-kitāb, which occurs 1,230 times with ten different meanings (p. 55).

Similarly, Amin Hawamdeh (2019) relates the uniqueness of the Qurʾān genre to its inimitable style including contextual features such as “dialogue, regional accents, and individual idioms” (p. 209). He asserts that rendering the Qurʾānic style into a completely different culture and language has been ever a challenge. Hawamdeh investigates the English translation of six small Sūras by Hilali and Khan, and he opposes the translators’ focus on the meaning more than the style because the form and content of the Qurʾān constitute its message. These two studies relate the sublime of the Qurʾān to its eloquence; nonetheless, they discuss only the two types of contexts: textual and situational.

Other Qurʾān rhetorical features are lexical, syntactic, and phonological. Nida Omar (2016) examines the English translation of Q 81: 1-2; the translator adopts the concept of style by Traugott and Pratt (1980), who view style as a linguistic choice. She examines the rhetorical styles at the grammatical, lexical, and phonological features in the verses: إِذَا اﻟﺸﱠﻤْﺲُ ﻛُﻮِّرَتْ. وَإِذَا اﻟﻨﱡﺠُﻮمُ اﻧْﮑَﺪَرَتْ idhā ashshamsu kūwirat. wa idhā annujūmu inkadarat, “When the sun (with its spacious light) is folded up; when the stars fall, losing their luster”. Omar shows how the repetition of the passive voice in all the verses of the Sūra is shifted to active voice in some verses such as Q 81: 2 “When the stars fall”. She also examines the use of “when” for إذَا, which can be translated as “if” or “when” and the figurative language in وَاﻟﺼﱡﺒْﺢِ إِذَا ﺗَﻨَﻔﱠﺲَ wa assubḥi idhā tanaffas “And the Dawn as it breathes away the darkness” as the “dawn” is personified. Omar also emphasises the translator’s failure to compensate the end-rhyme. Like Al-Jurjānī (2008), she finds that the rhetorical style of the Qurʾān is hard to translate because of its inimitability, confirming the inferiority of the translation to the ST since the translator failed to provide equivalents in accordance with the phonological features, aesthetic, beauty, and eloquence of the Arabic text. Although Omar’s study gives examples of the inimitability of the Qurʾān, it relies on one translation with a small sample of data.

Another rhetoric feature of the Qurʾān is euphemism, the act of softening existing terms and replacing them with neutral words. Inadequate knowledge of the Qurʾān and ignoring the contextual meaning of this feature result in mistranslation of euphemistic expressions. Osama Al-Qahtani (2017) argues that translators often underestimate the
complexity of translating euphemism in the Qurʼān. In his study, he evaluates the translation of euphemistic expressions in five English translations to gauge the transference of the meanings of these expressions. For example, he compares the translation of Q 13: 84 wa َābiyaḍḍ ʿaynāhu min al-ḥuzn, and finds that among the five translators, only Hilali and Khan give the right meaning by saying “And he lost his sight because of the sorrow”. Al-Qahtani relates the challenge of translating Qur’ānic euphemistic expressions to the lack of direct equivalents and the translators’ insufficient knowledge of the Qur’ān. He finds that due to the untranslatability of these concepts, translators use archaic English and complex words ignoring the contextual meaning, and he suggests using footnotes for more explanation. Al-Qahtani’s study does not rely on a systematic method to analyse the translations.

Understanding the context of euphemistic expressions facilities their translation. Sameer Olimat (2018) investigates how intratextuality and contextuality affect understanding of euphemism in the Qurʼān. He adopts Newmark’s model, which suggests eight strategies of translating euphemisms: word-for-word translation, literal translation, faithful translation, semantic translation, adaptation, free translation, idiomatic translation, and communicative translation (Newmark, 1988a, pp. 45-47). Olimat gives an example of a euphemistic term related to death from Q 20: 15 ﴿fawakazahu Mūsa faqaḍ aʿalayh, meaning “killed him”. He explains how the expression قضي qadā has many meanings; one of them is departure from life; it is used implicitly in the Qurʼān to elevate the meaning of killing and can be interpreted through analysing and understanding surrounding verses in the Qurʼān.

Likewise, Rafid Al-Rubaii (2019) explores the nature, types, and translation of euphemisms in Q 4 in three translations. He concludes that the degree of success in transferring the meaning of euphemisms seems to be ascribed to the degree of the translator's acquaintance with the Qurʼān and their linguistic and religious background. Also, Fadwa Quzmar (2020) confirms that Rodwell, Hilali and Khan, and Al-Kuli ignore the euphemistic metaphor and its connotations in ما ملكت إيمانكم ma malakat aymanukum; they fall into the trap of literal translation for the same reason. She examines the terms: اللاتي يأتين الفاحشة allātī yaʿīn alfaḥisha, “commit illegal sexual intercourse”, أمسكهن,
amsikūhuna, “confine them”, qānitāt, “devoutly obedient”, and ḥāfiẓāt lilghayb, “guard in the husband’s absence what Allah orders them to guard (e.g. their chastity, their husband’s property)”. Olimat, Al-Rubaii, and Quzmar connect the translator's failure to translate euphemisms to their linguistic and religious background.

In this section, I survey studies on the challenges of translating the rhetorical characteristics of the Qur’ān, mainly the phonological/ musical aspects and figurative language. These studies illustrate the difficulties of transferring the meanings of euphemistic, metonymical, and metaphorical words, highly concise mode of expressions with connotative meanings. In the following section, I discuss the issues that result from translating cultural-specific items.

3.2.4 Cultural Challenges in Qur’ān Translation

Cultural-specific items (CSIs) in the Qur’ān refer to terms that have no equivalence nor different positions in the system of the TC, so these terms cause difficulties in QT. Larson (1998) declares that dealing with cultural items is problematic in finding equivalence and analysing the source vocabulary. Valipoor et al. (2019) investigate the strategies employed in rendering CSIs in Irving’s QT (1985), the first American English translation of the Qur’ān. They conduct a comparative descriptive study using Venuti’s (2008) domestication and foreignisation as a theoretical framework to analytically examine the transference of CSIs collecting the data from Q 2. Valipoor et al. classify cultural-bound terms into four categories: religious activities, proper nouns, places, and miscellaneous items, words which could not be categorised in any of the other groups. The scholars count the number of using domestication and foreignisation strategies and then tabulate their frequency and percentage. The most frequently used types of CSI in the original text are: proper nouns 35%, places 30%, religious activities 23%, and miscellaneous items 12%. Valipoor et al. find that Irving uses domestication, target-text oriented approach, as the main technique to render CSIs, reaching 79.75%. The study displays an effective method to measure the frequency of applying domestication in rendering religious-cultural items.

Similarly, Mojtaba Moradi and Hossain Sadeghi (2014) conduct a comparative descriptive study to investigate the strategies used in translating culture-bound elements
in three English QTs by Shakir, Yusuf Ali, and Pickthall. The scholars examine the translation of terms related to Islamic law in thirty-six Sūras in chapter thirty. The aim of their study is to identify the most appropriate translation procedures applied by the three translators. They used Ivir’s model (1987) as a theoretical framework to analyse their data. The model suggests seven strategies to translate CSIs: definition, literal translation, substitution, lexical creation, omission, addition, and borrowing. Some terms such as الكَفَّارَات وَأَبِن السَّبِيل al-kafārāt wa ābn as-sabīl are translated the same in the three versions as “expiation” and “wayfarer” respectively, while الزكاة al-zaka is rendered as “poor-rate”, “regular charity”, and “poor-due”. The finding shows that literal translation, definition, borrowing, and addition are the frequently applied strategies. However, the most appropriate procedure for translating culture-bound terms in the Qur’ān into English are literal translation and definition. Valipoor et al. focus on one Sūra translated by one translator, whereas Moradi and Sadeghi examine one chapter; for more valid results, there is a need for examining more verses by several translators from different cultures.

Like Moradi and Sadeghi (2014), Mohammed El-Haj Ahmed and Alaa Abu Shammala (2020) agree that literal translation of CSIs results in complete foreignisation. El-Haj Ahmed and Abu Shammala analyse two QTs by Talal Itani and Abdullah Ali to investigate if the translators succeed in achieving cultural equivalence in rendering fifty CSIs from Q 4. The scholars emphasise the inimitability of the Qur’ān because of its metaphorical and connotative language. The scholars find that the two translators fail to capture the full cultural equivalence and use a combination of foreignisation and domestication. They also find that the percentage of Itani’s use of domestication is 55.5%, while Ali’s is 57.4%. El-Haj Ahmed and Abu Shammala confirm that the strategies used for foreignisation are literal translation and borrowing, while the strategies applied for domestication include addition, substitution, definition, deletion, and lexical creation.

The translators’ cultures can affect their translation of CSIs. Al-Azzam et al. (2015) agree with El-Haj Ahmed and Abu Shammala that translating CSIs in the Qur’ān is problematic because of the cultural idiosyncrasies of these terms. However, they emphasise the role of the translator’s cultural background in rendering these CSIs. Al-Azzam et al. analyse three English translations of some verses from the Qur’ān to identify the translation strategies applied to transfer cultural and the technical meanings. For
example, they discuss the translation of the term ʿawrāt an-nisāʾ [women’s private organs]. Al-Azzam et al. show how Hilali and Khan fail to semantically preserve the euphemistic aspect of the CSI, rendering it “feminine sex,” and Ali dysphemises the euphemistic feature of the expression by articulating it “shame of sex,” (p. 29). Al-Azzam et al. reveal that Pickthall, who is from a Western culture, translates it explicitly and openly as “women’s nakedness”. The scholars confirm that Arabic CSIs are not easy to relay into English, so translators use paraphrasing, explanatory details, footnotes, transliteration; however, these strategies do not compensate the translation cultural and social loss.

Hence, in this section, I review studies that explore the challenges of rendering Qur’ānic CSIs. These studies highlight the fact that a combination of foreignisation and domestication can provide adequate translations. In the following section, I explore comparative Qur’ān translation studies.

3.3 Comparative Qur’ān Translation Studies

3.3.1 Introduction to Comparative Qur’ān Translation Studies

Comparative Qur’ān translation studies (CQTS) is an approach that helps in understanding the features of QT. This type of comparative translation studies (CTS) is text-oriented. Luc Van Doorslaer (2017) states that CTS, a recent product-oriented and text-bound approach, “started in 2014” (p. 215). He maintains that it would not be possible to understand the nature of translation better without considering the basic source-target text or source-target language formula. Also, Chung Alan Tse (2012) declares that CTS discloses information about “social or personal background against which a particular translation was done, as well as the various constraints which bear on a particular act of translating” (p. 84). It can be understood that CQTS also requires a deep comparison between the ST and SL and TT and TL, on the one hand, and SC and TC, on the other hand along with background about the translators.

In addition to determining the approach to CQTS, identifying the conceptual model is significant to achieve reliable findings. Van Doorslaer (2017) states that models in functionalist or descriptive approaches to DTS can be used to describe both the realisation of a translation and its function in different circumstances. He explains that
these models can reveal the extra-textual (paratextual), the textual, and contextual elements of translation. Hence, these models can be applied to CQTS to explore the contents and translators’ approaches. On the other hand, Alexander Burak (2013) suggests integrating CTS into a larger view, on cultural change; he focuses on linguistic features, translation techniques, cultural situations, and aspects such as impact and reception. He uses the term ‘otherness’ in CTS relating it to the “translation-resistant elements” (p. 5) that the translator meets, most importantly realia (culture-specific items). The aforementioned discussion confirms the appropriateness of the adapted model for CQTS (see section 1.4.5) since it covers elements on the micro- and macro-levels considering linguistic, socio-cultural, and translational elements.

Unlike Burak (2013), who starts from the text level and works bottom-up, Anthony Pym (2019) introduces a top-down approach and starts from hypotheses related to phenomena at a larger level, studying the differences between cultural and organisational systems. Also, in their book which focuses on translation methodologies, Saldanha and O’Brien (2013) emphasise the significance of comparison on the linguistic and textual levels. They insist that any CTS, at a systemic and sociocultural level, has to be conducted cautiously and structurally if it wishes to avoid ending up in mere generalisations. Van Doorslaer (2017) confirms:

the existing (conceptual) maps of the discipline can offer a helping hand, since these maps are fundamental structuring tools. The creation of typologies and explanatory schemes that have the ambition of being universal runs many risks and will inevitably be a long-term project with an uncertain outcome. (p. 227)

Thus, similar to CTS, CQTS proposes comparing the ST (the Qur’ān) to the TT or TTs relying on conceptual maps or models to understand more about the translations by analysing the paratextual, textual, contextual, and socio-cultural aspects. The model that I suggest for CQTS (see section 1.4.5) includes elements inside and beyond the TTs as it considers the publishers, translation procedures, linguistic choices, and paratextual tools.

---

The term ‘otherness’ was originally created by Jacques Lecercle and introduced into translation studies by Lawrence Venuti in 1998 (see Venuti, L. (1998). *The scandals of translation: Towards an ethics of difference.* Routledge.)
In the following section, I review studies on the paratextual devices, conceptual aspects, and approaches to CQTS.

3.3.2 Paratextual Elements in Comparative Qur’ān Translation Studies

Analysing the paratextual features of QTs can reveal information about not only the translator but also the effect of the translation’s time and place on the final product. Paratexts are framing devices outside the main body of the text. These tools are used to contextualise works, generate interest, and influence the way a text is received (Batchelor, 2018; Genette, 1997). Eman Al-Kroud (2018) compares three Berber QTs by Mensur, Baomrani, and Tayeb to investigate the role that these translations have played in renegotiating the political landscape of Berber communities in the past eighteen years. She applies Genette’s paratextual theory (1997), which suggests two types of paratextual devices that help to understand the translators’ choices: peritexts and epitexts. Al-Kroud examines the traditional peritexts, the elements around the text, such as cover images, the title, prefatory materials, appendage, title page, introductions, footnotes, endnotes, epigraphs, and layout. She also investigates epitexts, elements beyond the text, including interviews, self-reviews, TV shows, self-commentaries by the translators, and the awards received by the translators. Al-Kroud traces the impact of these devices on the reception of the target texts and on limiting the texts’ interpretations. She highlights the role of these devices in (re)narrating the Berber history, promoting Tamazight, and disclosing aspects of Berber culture and heritage.

Analysing internal and external paratextual features can disclose manipulation in QTs. Al-Kroud (2018) argues that paratextual elements are used as manipulating tools in the three selected translations. She discusses the title of the translation by Jehad al-Hussain Baomrani: ترجمة معاني القرآن الكريم باللغة المازيغية Translating the Meanings of the Holy Qur’an in the Tamazight Language. Al-Kroud asserts that using the Arabic

---

38 Berbers are indigenous people of North Africa; they are dispersed over a wide area: Siwa in the Western Desert of Egypt, the Fezzan in Southern Libya, in Niger, in Mali, in Morocco (40% of the population), and in Algeria (20% of the population). (see Montagne, R. (2018). The Berbers: Their social and political organisation. Routledge; Skutsch, C. (2013). Encyclopedia of the world's minorities. Taylor and Francis. p. 119.)

39 The language spoken by Berber groups (see note 38).
language in the title gives the Tamazight language a subordinate status. She states that the three translators write the introductions in other languages than Tamazight, the TL. Al-Kroud confirms that the three translators make use of epitexts to promote the translations by providing a vast wealth of information. She finds that indigenous languages are not always used to write paratextual material in minority contexts as shown in Tayeb’s use of Arabic and Mensur’s use of French. Another finding is that typographical choices, such as colour, script, calligraphy, font size and type, ornaments and cover image, are tools to either activate a network of the translation or manipulate it. Al-Kroud concludes that Tayeb makes use of his publisher, King Fahad Complex, to reinforce his credential, defend himself against criticisms of his translational abilities, and enhance the perceived value of his translation. Al-Kroud’s study is a milestone in QT as it shows the importance of the paratextual aspects in comparing different translations.

Paratextual elements can also uncover information about the translators’ attitude towards Islam. Ameneh Mohaghegh and Hossein Pirmajmuddin (2013) argue that translating controversial expressions without explanatory notes might smear the image of Islam and change its message or make some wrong ideas permissible. They compare the translations of Q 9: 5 and Q 8: 12 translated by Saffarzade, Pickthall, Arberry, and Sale to investigate the effect of the translators' ideologies on QT. The researchers find that in Q 9: 5 the sentence ﻓَﺎﻗْﺘُﻠُﻮا اﻟْﻤُﺸْﺮِﻛِﯿﻦ fāqtulū al-mushrikīn [kill the polytheists] is translated as “slay the idolaters” by Arberry, Pickthall, and Saffarzade, while it is rendered as “kill the idolaters” by Sale. Mohaghegh and Pirmajmuddin find that Sale shows bias against Islam by taking liberty with the text in his footnotes, through which he tries to give the impression that Islam, unlike Christianity and Judaism, is not a heavenly religion. Thus, the researchers confirm that the exaggeration of explanations in footnotes can reveal the translators’ intentions and help classifying translators as either faithful in transferring the meanings and messages of the Qur’ān or biased against Islam.

Like Mohaghegh and Pirmajmuddin (2013), Ahmad Nadeem and Raja Nasim Akhtar (2017) argue that Sale does not bridge the cultural gap or maximise communication between the SR and TR, but he challenges the ST discourse and adds footnotes explanations. They confirm that Sale claims that Prophet Muhammad is himself the author of the Qur’ān and it is not a revealed book and that the Qur’ānic discourses are
borrowed from different religious traditions. Nadeem and Akhtar say that Sale does not use the common translation theories of his time: Autonomy (free translation), equivalence, or function, which focuses on the audience with reference to the purpose of translation and the reception of the translated text. They confirm that Sale applies discursive strategies such as preface, the preliminary discourse, and footnotes to reduce the appeal of the ST and to form a negative impression on the TR. Nadeem and Akhtar argue that Sale’s punctuation tools such as commas, full stops and capitalisation, are abrupt and incoherent, which reflects his intention to give the TR incoherent impression of the ST. The scholars conclude that Sale uses footnotes and commentaries to manipulate the ST and serve his own ideological purposes.

Footnotes and commentaries can possibly narrow or widen the cultural gap between the ST and the TT. Al-Aqad et al. (2019) compare three versions of English translations to investigate the semantic meaning of pun in six examples. One of these examples is Q 30:55

وَيَوْمَ تَقُومُ الْسَّاعَةُ ﯽَقْسِمُ الْمُجْرَمُونَ مَا لَبِثَوا ﻏَيْرً ﺳَﺎﻋَةٍۚ ﻛَذَٰﻟِﻚَ ﻛَﺎﻧُﻮا ﯽُؤْفَكُﻮنَ

wa yawma taqūmu as-sā’atu yuqsimu al-mujrimūna mā labithū ghayyra sā’atin kadhalika kānū yu’fakūn. Al-Aqad et al. declare that the pun expression is in the lexemes الساعة and الساعة; the former means “The Day of Resurrection”, while the latter means “an hour”. However, they are translated as “the Hour” with capital “H” which implies the meaning, and “the Hour,” with the prepositional phrase (of Reckoning) in brackets inside the script and footnotes to elucidate the meaning. The scholars conclude that the use of footnotes and commentaries reveals hidden messages and narrows the gap between the SC and TC.

Lack of footnotes and commentaries might cause translation loss. Daoud Nassimi (2008) compares four QTs giving examples of Asad’s interference through commenting on his metaphorical interpretation of the swallowing of Qārūn قارون by the earth. He explores Asad’s approach to rationalise the miracles, such as Jesus speaking in the cradle and being lifted alive at the end of his mission. The researcher finds that Asad’s over-paraphrasing changes the meaning, affirming that useful commentaries give meaningful insight about words and expressions loaded with connotations. Also, Zu and Dong (2015) assert that even when a hybrid of communicative (effect-oriented) and semantic (semantic-syntactic-oriented) translation is applied, footnotes and commentaries are
required. These two studies show that footnotes and commentaries play a crucial role in producing accurate QTs.

In addition to narrowing the cultural gap between the SC and the TC, commentaries are informative about translators’ milieus. Like Nassimi (2008), Muzaffar Iqbal (2000) compares the QTs by Yusuf Ali and Muhammad Asad to show that the translators are impacted by the norms of the society, economy and politics of their milieus. The researcher states that Yusuf Ali includes “6311 footnotes, 300 pieces of running commentary in rhythmic prose written in blank verse, and fourteen appendices” (p. 108), while Asad accompanies “5371 footnotes and four appendices . . . [relying] heavily on classical sources . . . [by] Aṭ-Ṭabarī, Al-Zamakhsharī,40 Al-Razi and Rida” (p. 109). Confirming that each translator is affected by his time, Iqbal argues that Yusuf Ali adopts the general sense of accepted commentaries avoiding the extreme views, whereas Asad relies more on Al-Zamakhshari’s rationalistic approach. Iqbal states that Yusuf Ali is influenced by the replacement of science over traditional religions during the colonial era, yet Asad is impacted by the Islamic revivalist movements during the oil boom in the Arab world. Iqbal determines that although Yusuf Ali chooses mystical archaic words to produce the same effect of the ST on the TR, Asad attempts to convey the message of the ST in idioms closer to modern English. The researcher asserts that the translators’ titles emphasise their techniques as Yusuf Ali focuses on the inner meaning of the Qurʾān, and his title is *The Meaning of the Glorious Qur’ān*. On the other hand, Asad is concerned with the message of the Qurʾān and his title is *The Message of the Qurʾān*. Iqbal finds that Yusuf Ali uses comments and notes, while Asad inserts extensive notes and appendices referring to classical lexis.

In this section, I survey studies revealing the effects of paratexts: peritexts (internal elements) and epitexts (external elements). These studies show that peritextual features

---

are divided into publisher’s tools (titles, covers, title pages & blurbs) and authorial devices (prefaces, introductions, footnotes & commentaries), whereas epitexts features are interviews, reviews, and criticism. In the following section, I critique studies on conceptual aspects in CQT.

3.3.3 Contextual Aspects in Comparative Qur’ān Translation Studies

Another factor in comparative Qur’ān translation studies (CQTS) is analysing the transference of the contextual meanings from the source text (ST) to the target text (TT). Juliane House (2006) assumes that translation is an act of re-contextualisation as the translator overcomes the separateness between the time and place of the ST and those of the TT creating a new unity by linking the linguistic elements of the text to both its old and its new context. She defines re-contextualisation as taking a text out of its original frame and context and placing it within a new set of relationships and culturally conditioned expectations. House affirms that the different strategies of re-contextualisation result in two types of translation: overt tied to the context of the source culture (SC), and covert attached to the context of the target culture (TC). She states that religious texts require overt translation because the SC needs to be considered, while tourist information booklets can be rendered through covert translation. The scholar acknowledges that the translator’s task in overt translation such as QT is to give the target reader (TR) access to the ST, SC and same impact on SR. House declares that the meaning of a linguistic unit cannot be captured unless one takes account of the interrelationship between the linguistic units and the context of the situation. Thus, accurate translation necessitates understanding the STs in their contexts.

Wujūḥ al-Qurʾān [the multiple meanings of words in the Qurʾān] rely heavily on the context. According to Salwa El-Awa (1998), the context determines the meaning of the homonymous and polysemous words. Also, Haleem (2018) relates al-īṣṭirāk [polysemy] recognised in wujūḥ al-Qurʾān to difficulty in translating the contextual aspects of the Qurʾān. He gives an example of the word ḥakīm in Q 2: 209, which is rendered by various translators as “wise,” as they link it to ḥikma, “wisdom.” However, in the context, the word ḥakīm means a threat that God has the power to decide to punish the believers if they backslide. Therefore, Haleem (2016) translates Q 2: 209
١٨١٧ ﻓَﺎﻋْﻠَﻤُﻮا ﺍﻥَّ ﻋَﺰِﯾﺰٌ ﻋِزْﯾَرٌ ﺣَﮑِﯿﻢٌُ

٨٩

as “be aware that God has the power to decide” (p.123). Haleem (2018) gives another example of the words of “oaths on the pattern wa’l-fā’ilāt found in Q 37, Q 51, Q 77, Q 79, Q 100” (p. 6), as these words have different meanings due to their contexts, so they cause problems in translation if the context is ignored. Haleem explains that Q 100 begins with the oath wa’l-ʿādiyāt, whose root is ʿadw meaning “to run, speed, gallop, dash, race, or charge” (p. 6). Since a literal translation does not transfer the meaning, as it refers to “horses,” he renders it as “by the charging steeds”. Haleem gives a third example of the word al-ʿālamīn, which occurs 73 times in the Qurʾān, in different contexts so that a consistent translation using only one word would create havoc (Abu Ḥayyan, 2010). Haleem’s study is significant as it shows al-ishtirāk [polysemy”] as a crucial contextual feature in CQT.

Another contextual feature in CQTS is the Qurʾānic metaphorical expressions since Qurʾānic metaphors have linguistic, conceptual, and cultural aspects. Al-Sowaidi et al. (2021) compare QTs by Yusuf Ali and Bakhtiar to investigate the translation of 105 metaphorical expressions. They apply a combination of Mandelblit’s cognitive translation hypothesis (CTH) (1995), Maalej’s strategies of translating metaphor (2008), and Kövecses’s concept of cultural variation (2006). Al-Sowaidi et al. reconceptualise the ST into the TT, intersect the conceptual theory of metaphor with the theoretical cultural aspects of universality and variation, and investigate the strategies adopted by translators to minimise gaps of “untranslatability” between languages and cultures. They give an example of istiʿāra taṣrīḥyā [explicit metaphor] in Q 2: 255 وَسِﻊَ ﻛُﺮْﺳِﯿﱡﮫُ اﻟﺴﱠﻤَﺎوَاتِ وَاﻷَْرْضَ wasiʿa kursīyyuhu as-samāwātī wa al-ard, which expresses Allah’s Existence, Sovereignty, Supremacy and Knowledge. However, it is translated by Yusuf Ali as “His Throne doth extend over the heavens and the earth” and by Bakhtiar as “His Seat encompassed the heavens and the earth”. Al-Sowaidi et al. find that the translators apply literal translation failing to maintain the same metaphorical mapping of the ST because the conceptual meaning of the metaphor is ignored. The scholars conclude that culture is a crucial factor in QT, and most Qurʾānic metaphors do not have plausible equivalents in English since they are culture-bound. They suggest the use of footnotes and explanations without interrupting the flow and coherence of the text to avoid the clash with the TC. Al-
Sowaidi et al.’s study emphasises comparing QTs based on the translators’ abilities to transfer the contextual meanings.

The lack of equivalence in the target language (TL) results in not transferring the intended contextual meaning. Like Al-Sowaidi et al. (2021), Batoul Omer (2018) argues that the cultural gap between the ST and TT in QTs results from lack of equivalence, misunderstanding of the intended/contextual meanings, and unfamiliarity with the rules of Arabic grammar. She adopts a descriptive comparative approach to investigate the translation of five examples of similar Qur'anic verses based on the linguistic interpretation of lexical, grammar, and rhetoric features along with the contextual dimension that underlies these verses. Omer confirms that the verse "فِبَأَيِّ آلاء رَبُّكَمَا نُكْتَذِبَانَ fabi‘ayī ālā’ rabikumā tukadhibān, “Then which of the favours of your Lord will Ye deny?”, is repeated 31 times in the Qur’ān, and in each time, it gives a new meaning according to the context. She agrees with Raof (2004) and Arberry (1996) that the Qur’ān is untranslatable because of its idiosyncratic features which causes partial or complete semantic loss. Omer recommends adopting exegetical translation based on exegesis books for translators to transfer the contextual meaning and produce translations with minimum shortcomings.

The large gap between the word and object is one of the contextual aspects in CQTS. Ziad El-Marsafy and Mustapha Bentaïbi (2015) conduct a comparative analysis of eight QTs to explore certain aspects of semantics through the manifold translations of the word حجاب ḥijāb, mentioned in the Qur’ān seven times. They state that although the word حجاب ḥijāb is used as a cloth designed to cover a woman’s head, in the Qur’ān it does not have anything to do with the item of clothing but used as a “screen, curtain, veil, or separation”. El-Marsafy and Bentaïbi explain that Haleem renders it as “seclusion” in Q 19:17 فَاتَخَذَتْ مِنْ دُونِهِمْ حَجابًا فَأَرْسَلْنَاهُ إِلَيْهَا رَوْحَنَا فَتَمَاثَلَ لَهَا بِشَرَا سَوْيًا ḡattakhadhat min dūnihim ḥijāban fā‘arsalnā īlayhā rawḥanā fatamaththala lahā basharan sawiyyā. They argue that semantically ḥijāb connotes separation rather than clothing. The study finds that metaphorical meaning of a Qur’ānic word cannot be conceived without paying attention to the surrounding deictic and referential contexts, in which the relationship between the word and the object is faked.
In this section, I evaluate works on the contextual features of the Qur’ān. I discuss the types of contexts siyāq an-naṣṣ [textual context] and maqām/siyāq al-mawqif [situational context]), al-ishtirāk [polysemy], wujūh al-Qur’ān [multiple meanings], isti‘āra taṣrīḥya [explicit metaphor], and al-wujūh wa al-naza‘ir [homonymous and polysemous words]. In the subsequent section, I critique studies to identify the approaches applied to QT.

3.3.4 Approaches to Comparative Qur’ān Translation Studies

The approaches applied to Qur’ān translations (QTs) can be used as tools in comparative Qur’ān translation studies (CQTS) since effective translation strategies can maximise the accuracy of QT representing a close meaning to the source text (ST). The linguistic approach focuses on the static linguistic typologies of translation shifts, which might give a better understanding of QT. Reza Rezvani and Peyman Nouraey (2014) apply Catford’s translation shift typology (1965) to compare the translation of the first thirty verses of Q 12 in seven English translations to identify the types of shifts. Rezvani and Nouraey conclude that unit shift and level shift hold the highest degree in QT; the former includes linguistic unit of sentence, clause, group, word and morpheme, while the latter comprises grammar in one language and lexis in another. The scholars add that class shift (a change from one part of speech to another), structural shift (a change in grammatical structure), and intersystem shift (an approximate corresponding system between the SL and the TL) hold the lowest frequency. Rezvani and Nouraey provide a better understanding of CQTS by measuring the frequency of translation shifts; however, their emphasis on the fundamental units drags the attention from the socio-cultural aspects.

In addition to Catford’s translation shift typology, Newmark’s semantic and communicative translation are two approaches that can be applied to compare QTs. Abdul-Raof (2001) compares QTs, classifying the translations by Bell, Pickthall, Ali, Asad, and Arberry as literal, whereas the translation by Haleem as communicative. The scholar’s classification is based on Newmark’s (1988) semantic (close to the syntactic structures of the ST) and communicative (close to the effect of the ST). He points out that “the provision of the literal translation can at times be attributed to negligence on the part of Qur’ān translators who do not refer to Muslim exegetes to check what the accurate
underlying Qur’ānic meaning is” (p. 29). In another study, Raof (2018b) states that semantic translation renders the semantic and syntactic structure of the TL” (p. 93), while communicative translation tries to produce on the TR the same effect obtained on the SR (Fengling, 2017). He claims that literal translation imposes the Qur’ān-specific features on the TR creating cultural damage to the Qur’ān architectural beauty. Raof also argues that since there is no perfect equivalence between two languages with different cultures and language systems, “the Qur’ānic message will always be inflicted with inaccuracies and skewing of information that can only be accounted for by the inclusion of informative exegetical footnotes” (p. 106). Raof’s studies illustrate the effectiveness of the communicative approach in QTs.

Another approach applied by scholars to compare QTs is the functionalist. Tommi Ahonen (2019) compares four Nordic Translations of Q 101 adopting Koller’s five types of equivalence: denotative (content/meaning), connotative (emotional and associative response of the TR), text-normative (the fulfilment of the ST and TT of the norms in their cultures), pragmatic (communication function), and formal (artistic dimension). Ahonen finds that denotative and connotative equivalences are the two commonly used approaches to CQTS because translation should be viewed as a contextual communication event driven by a skopos, a communicative function or purpose. He also finds that the compared translations lean towards a future-oriented interpretation of the ambiguous tenses of the Arabic. Ahonen reports that the translators add explanatory additions within the text and use a literal style resembling that of the Bible. He also finds that although the language of the translations might be modern, none of the translations is read like something written by a contemporary author. Ahonen concludes that since translation is not strictly limited to linguistic points, the linguistic equivalence is often not a prerequisite for exploring QTs.

Like Ahonen (2019), Abdelaal and Rashid (2019) apply skopos theory, Nord’s (1997) equifunctional and heterofunctional equivalence to compare the English translation of six verses from Q 6 and Q 7. The scholars examine whether the translators convey the primary meaning of ST and its function, or they attempt to render its stylistic features, which is considered unachievable. Based on skopos theory with its three guiding rules: skopos, coherence, and fidelity, Abdelaal and Rashid argue that equivalence does not mean sameness, but it means achieving the least dissimilarity to achieve the purpose of
the translation. The scholars give an example of translating \( \text{ٱﻟﱠﺬِﯾﻦَ ﻛَﻔَرُوٓاْ} \) \( al-ladhîn kafarû, \) [those who disbelieved], explaining that the grammar of the ST is violated by the four translators. The phrase is rendered by Haleem as “the disbelievers” (a noun phrase instead of a relative clause), by Pickthall and Shakir as “those who disbelieve” (present instead of past), and by Sarwar as “unbelievers” (a noun instead of a relative clause). Abdelaal and Rashid confirm these translations are faithful to the ST because the skopos of the TT is achieved, since they convey the primary meaning. They argue that translating \( ﺮَﺴُﻠُﻦَ ﺭِﯾَّﺋَا ﻳَوْنَ ﺔٓاِلِﻃِّﯿِﺒَﺎتِ ﻣِﻦَ اﻟﺮِّزْقِ \) \( rusulu Rabinâ \) by Sarwar as “(angelic) messengers” and omitting the word \( اﻟﻄﱠﯿِّﺒَﺎتِ ﻣِﻦَ اﻟﺮِّزْقِ \) \( wa aṭ-ṭayyibâti mina ar-rizq \) cause semantic loss. Abdelaal and Rashid confirm that if translators fail to achieve equifunctional translation, they can attempt heterofunctional translation to convey the aim of the sender; nonetheless, it is unattainable in QT, so QT should be guided by its skopos.

Detecting translation procedures is another approach to CQTS. Sukarno et al. (2020) adopt Newmark’s seventeen translation procedures (1988a) to investigate the translation of Q 1 by Saheeh International and Haleem to reveal the variation of lexicons and grammatical structures. The scholars show that there are lexical and grammatical differences in the translations. \textit{Saheeh International} uses ST-oriented strategies (transcription, componential analysis, and lexical synonymy), while Haleem applies TT-oriented procedures (transposition, modulation, compensation, cultural equivalence, contraction, and recasting sentences). Sukarno et al.’s study relies on one short \textit{Sûra}; therefore, its findings are not cogent. Similarly, Noureldin Abdelaal (2018) examines the translation of seven verses from Q 6, Q 7, and Q 52 translated by Haleem. He explains that translating \( ﻲَﻌْﻠَﻢُ ﺳِﺮﱠﻛُﻢْ \) \( yaʿlamû sirrakûm \) as “He knows your secrets” is a loss in connotative meaning because the word “secrets” does not convey the intended meaning that God is omnipresent, knowing what is inside people that no one knows. To reduce translation loss, Abdelaal suggests footnoting, transliteration, periphrastic translation, and peer-/expert-checking. However, Amjad and Farahani (2013) confirm that synonymy, paraphrasing, footnoting, and addition are useful strategies when there is no clear one-to-one equivalent.
In addition to identifying translation procedures, uncovering translation strategies is another approach to CQTS. Fatemeh Robati (2016) compares QTs to identify the adopted translation strategies in rendering the term *jilbāb* in Q 33: 59 in 64 Persian and English translations taken from *Jami’al-Tafsîr*, Noor software, in addition to two other translations by *Saheeh International* (1997) and Bakhtiar (2007). Robati considers the linguistic aspects of the two languages and the translators’ gender. She uses Davies’s seven strategies: preservation (maintaining the ST term: loan or repetition), addition, omission, globalisation (neutral or general term), localisation (TC-oriented term), transformation (distortion of the original), and creation. Robati finds that the strategy adopted most is localisation with 35.71% in Persian translation and 46.66% in English translation. She notices that male translators use localisation accounting for 36.53%, whereas female translators apply addition and globalisation reaching 50% for each strategy. Robati’s study shows that translators’ gender affects the strategies they apply and hence their translations.

Like Robati (2016), Amal Metwally (2019) compares three QTs to examine the strategies used for the interpretation of colour-terms used metaphorically and measure the consistency of using these strategies. She applies Venuti’s (2008) foreignisation, SL-oriented strategy, as a theoretical framework arguing that paraphrase maintains the lexical constituents, the semantic content, and the effect of the source text. Metwally gives an example of the colour ‘white’ in Q 3: 107

*wa āmā al-ladhīn ābiyyaḍat wūjūhuhum fafi ῥаḥmаtаti Allah хум fihа kхālīdūn.*

The colour ‘white’ is translated as “whitened” and “(lit with) white”, causing difficulty in understanding the meaning. Opposing to Metwally, Aladdin Al-Tarawneh (2018) argues that there is a deficiency of communicating the original meaning of the Qur’ān in the light of the foreignisation approach. He develops a hybrid model of foreignisation and domestication, pointing out this model transfer the figurative language of the Qur’ān.

In this section, I survey studies on the approaches applied to QT: Catford’s linguistic equivalence, Nida’s formal and dynamic, Newmark’s semantic and communicative, Venuti’s (2008) domestication and foreignisation, skopos (purpose, coherence, and fidelity), and the cultural approach. These studies highlight the significance of identifying translation approaches and procedures in CQTS. In the
following section, I discuss the effects of translators’ ideologies on their translations of the Qur’ān.

3.4 Translators’ Ideologies and Qur’ān Translation

This study investigates the nature of translators’ ideologies in the selected Qur’ān translations (QTs) and the impact of authorisation on the display of these ideologies. In section 3.4.1, I review articles disclosing the attitude of women translators of the Qur’ān toward patriarchal linguistic elements and the stimuli stirring this attitude, namely the socio-cultural environment in which they live. Also, in section 3.4.2, I critique articles revealing the effects of the translators’ religious backgrounds on their QTs, specifically the translators’ beliefs in modern Islamic movements such as Qur’ānism. In section 3.4.3, I survey studies discussing the influence of translators’ theological views on their QTs. Finally, I examine the models used in previous studies to uncover the translators’ ideologies.

3.4.1 Feminist versus Traditionalist Interpretations

Qur’ān translations (QTs) by women falls into feminist or traditionalist versions. Al-Sowaidi et al. (2021) declare that QT by Umm Muhammad, Amina Assami, published under the pseudonym Saheeh International, is traditional, yet Kidwai (2018) argues that Bakhtiar’s the Sublime Quran comprises feminist elements. Commenting on the differences between QTs, Burçin K. Mustafa (2019) states that translators’ linguistic choices, religious backgrounds, and viewpoints result in either feminist interpretations or traditionalist ones. He explains that translation ideologies are formed in the place of the translation. On the other hand, Sheikh Omar Al-Shabab (2016) argues that “various factors outside of texts influence the reader's inference: ‘being’, ‘environment’, ‘understanding’, ‘experience’ (knowledge), ‘assertion’, and ‘identity’” (p. 20). Al-Sowaidi et al. and Mustafa confirm that translators’ ideologies impact Qur’ān translations, which in turn influences the target readers (TRs).

Women translators with feminist perspectives attempt to be visible in their translations. Rim Hassen (2012) compares four translations by women to determine whether these women translators are challenging or reproducing patriarchal gender
hierarchies through their renditions of the Qur’ān. She investigates whether the translators’ feminine gender results in a feminist reading of the Qur’ān or a traditionalist one. Hassen assesses the translations of wa ʿāḍribūhunn from Q 4: 34 showing that the translations are classified as conservative or moderate. She confirms that the former depends on traditional exegetic texts derived from patriarchal discourse rendering it as “beat”, whereas the latter focuses on equal positions, using “go away” (p. 230). Hassen relates the changes of QTs to women translators’ backgrounds as those who live in the USA assert women’s position, while those who live in Muslim countries choose a conservative position obeying the patriarchal traditions of the place where they live. Hassen finds that gender, language, and power relations intersect in the process of QT.

Women translators from liberal backgrounds seek to transfer feminine meanings and images into the TT and to maintain gender balance. Hassen (2011) declares that Helminski, a Christian American who converted to Islam, and Bakhtiar, born to an American mother and Iranian father, consistently reject and avoid exclusive and male-centred words. In sharp contrast, Hassen shows that Umm Muhammad, living in Saudi Arabia, and Saffarzadeh, living in Iran, maintain patriarchal language, which could be read as a reflection of their cultural, social, and religious environment. Hassen says that Helminski and Bakhtiar neutralise the expression yāʾyūha al-nās using “O Humankind!” and “Oh humanity” unlike Umm Muhammad and Saffarzadeh, who internalise male-centred linguistic norms by using “O mankind” and “O, people”. Najlaa Aldeeb (2023) compares QTs by Umm Muhammad and Bakhtiar concluding that the former provides a softer tone between the dominant male and diluted feminist voice, whereas the latter applies feminist strategies to reveal her objection to using masculine generic terms and to make herself visible as a woman translator.

Women translators’ beliefs resulting from their societies underpin their divergence from previous interpretations of the Qur’ān. According to Fatma Osman Ibnouf (2015), “there is nothing inherent in Islam to prevent the equality of women and men and that Muslim woman’s degraded position today is a result of the rigid and ill-interpretations of Islam” (p. 13). Moreover, Fatima Mernissi (1991) negates the applicability of wearing
hijab for women in a contemporary setting, and she justifies her assumption by her interpretation of فَمَا نَ أَفْلَى هُنَّ مِنْ وَرَاءِ حِجَاب fās ālūhunna min warā’i hijāb in Q 33: 53. She explains that the word hijāb in this verse is not related to women's clothing; it is a way of talking and behaving. Mernissi identifies her reading as a feminist one, yet the ideological and doctrinal assumptions that have produced her reading are not exclusive to feminism per se. Mernissi considers hijab as a symbol of oppression, inequality, and regression.

Like Mernissi (1991), Wadud (1999) and Hassan (2001) confirm that the word hijāb in the Qur’ān does not represent women’s clothing and that the patriarchal interpretation of the Qur’ān results from societal ideologies and keeps women oppressed. Likewise, Asma Barlas (2002) interprets خَلَاقَكُمْ مِنْ نَفْسٍ وَاﺣِدَةٍ khalaqakum min nasfin wāḥida in Q 4: 1 from Islamic feminist point of view. She explains that nafs is either male or female and that Adam in the Qur’ān is both universal and a specific term. Barlas states that the Qur’ān uses nafs in its universal (generic) sense. Also, Barlas (2016) argues that the Qur’ān “patriarchal moments are in the nature of ‘periodic and contextual’ contents since they pertain to a historical situation in which men had a certain type of authority over women” (p. 33). These studies demonstrate that feminists determine their choices from their societies whose ideologies are formed in their systems of power.

In this section, I review studies illustrating the impact of women Qur’ān translators’ beliefs, formed in their contexts, on their choices. These studies show the two streams in QTs by women: feminism and traditionalism. In the next section, I survey studies on QTs by extremists to show the effect of translators’ beliefs in modern Islamic movements on their choices.

3.4.2 Reformist versus Fundamentalist Interpretations

Similar to liberal Muslims who call themselves Islamic feminists and who challenge the patriarchal ideologies in their QTs, reformists challenge the traditional interpretations based on Sunna and ḥadith and exceed the boundaries in their QTs. Helmi Yuhda (2018) argues that despite its title: Qur’an book: A Reformist Translation, Edip

41 The word ‘hijab’ as a piece of clothing is not italicised; it is italicised when it is a word from the Qur’ān.
Yüksel et al.’s QT\textsuperscript{42} is far from reformation of the traditional interpretation of the Qur’ān. He states that Yüksel et al. were Sunnī; nonetheless, their use of the subtitle “Why Trash All the Hadiths as Secondary Authority Besides the Quran?” (Yüksel, 2007, p. 493) reveals their bias against Prophet Muhammad and rejection to hadīth. Yuhda criticises Yüksel et al. for not using hadīth as a tool to interpret the Qur’ān; however, they, ironically, implement the Bible as a cross-reference. The scholar confirms that Yüksel et al. reject “the authority of Prophet Muhammad and . . . try to embrace all groups, ideologies, sects, followers of religion, and even those atheists to jointly maintain unity in order to create peace” (p. 60).

Like Yuhda (2018), Nadya Sitanggang (2017) argues that Yüksel et al. fight the mainstream interpretation of the Qur’ān. She gives an example of their translation of Q 4: 34 as they rely on the Bible and explain the concept ‘polygamy’ by quoting a number of verses from the Genesis elucidating that it goes back to seven generations after Habil practiced polygamy. Sitanggang confirms that Yüksel et al. say that polygamy is allowed only for widows who have children to provide them with psychological, social, and economic support. Furthermore, she states that Yüksel et al. interpret 
\begin{equation*}
\text{mā} \text{ mālakat} \text{ āyymānukum}
\end{equation*}

in Q 4: 3 as “whom you already have contract with”. Sitanggang concludes that Yüksel et al.’s attitude towards the Bible is critical and selective, as they display what is in accordance with the Qur’ān and criticise what is contrary to it.

Similarly, Afif Suaidi and Moh Nur Arifin (2021) employ a systemic functional linguistic (SFL) approach to compare six translations of Q 30: 41. The scholars confirm that the translation of the Qur’ān has a connection with the ideology embraced by translators; they state that Edip Yüksel et al.’s QT “bears the ideology of reformism combined with the ideology of Ahlussunnah” (p. 279). Also, Sideeg (2015a) gives another example of a reformist QT, stating that Khalifa’s Qur’an: The Final Testament: The Quran: A Reformist Translation (2007) is a Qur’ān translation by Edip Yüksel, Layth Al-Shaiban, and Martha Schulte-Nafeh, co-founders of Islamic Reform. These three translators rejected ahadīth and interpreted the Qur’ān relying on the Bible. Edip Yüksel, a Kurdish-American, was a colleague and friend of the late Rashad Khalīfa, who distorted many verses in his translation of the Qur’ān and who claimed that he was the last messenger. (See Sitanggang, N. U. B. (2017). An examination on Edip Yûksel’s interpretation of Q.4:34. Jurnal Studi Ilmu-ilmu Al-Qur an dan Hadis 18(2), 275-306. DOI:10.14421/qh.2017.1802-07)

\textsuperscript{42} \textit{The Quran: A Reformist Translation} (2007) is a Qur’ān translation by Edip Yüksel, Layth Al-Shaiban, and Martha Schulte-Nafeh, co-founders of Islamic Reform. These three translators rejected ahadīth and interpreted the Qur’ān relying on the Bible. Edip Yüksel, a Kurdish-American, was a colleague and friend of the late Rashad Khalīfa, who distorted many verses in his translation of the Qur’ān and who claimed that he was the last messenger. (See Sitanggang, N. U. B. (2017). An examination on Edip Yûksel’s interpretation of Q.4:34. Jurnal Studi Ilmu-ilmu Al-Qur an dan Hadis 18(2), 275-306. DOI:10.14421/qh.2017.1802-07)
Authorized English Version of the Original is full of distortions, blasphemy, and deviations despite the word “authorised” in the title. He highlights Khalifa’s claim that Prophet Muhammad was the last prophet but not the last messenger and refutes Khalifa’s ‘number 19-theory’. Sideeg gives an example of Khalifa’s translation of ‘innaka lamin al-mursalīn, in Q 36: 3 as “Most assuredly, you (Rashad) are one of the messengers” (p. 218). He explains that Khalifa manipulates the ST by adding his name to the TT and by claiming being the real messenger.

Sideeg (2015a) also rejects Khalifa’s omission of the last two verses in Q 9: 128-129 and his claim that these verses are not canonical, but satanic verses added to the Qur’ān in order to glorify the Prophet. Sideeg argues that Khalifa’s translation reveals not only his own schema for understanding the Qur’ān but also his offshoot group, United Submitters International (USI). Members of this group prefer not to use the terms Muslims or Islam but Submitters and Submission. Sideeg explains that Khalifa uses “to proclaim” for verb لَتُبَيِّنَ litubayyin [explain] in Q 16: 44, which reveals Khalifa’s ideological motivation and belief in the separation between the Qur’ān and Sunna. He adds that Khalifa’s translation implies that ideological agendas may produce fictional scenarios never accommodated in the ST and that the translator’s hidden ideologies can result in a radical QT.

Sideeg (2015b) asserts that similar to Yüksel et al. (2007) and Khalifa (2010), Shabbir Ahmed (2011) believes that the Qur’ān must be separated from the Prophet;


44 An organisation that promulgated Khalifa’s beliefs. The United Submitters International (USI) are “an offshoot group that usually prefers not to use the terms Muslims or Islam, and instead they use the English terms ‘Submitters’ and ‘Submission’ . . . [They are] staunch Qur’ānists who vehemently reject Hadith and Sunna as falsehood and fabrications”. (see Sideeq, 2015, p. 218).

thus, he interprets it with no reference to *Sunna* or *ḥadith*. According to Sideeg, Ahmed states that Bukhari and other narrators of *ḥadith* are virtually criminals and “the so-called sacred books on Islam, including *As-Sahah As-Sittah* (The so-called Six Right Ones) are nothing but piles of shameful, irrational stories” (p. 4). Sideeg (2015a, p. 224) explains that Ahmed goes too far when he translates Q 31: 7 *wa idhā tutlā ʿalayhī āyātunā wa lā mustakbirā* as “Whenever Our verses are conveyed to such a purchaser of Hadith, he turns away in arrogance”. Sideeg affirms that Ahmed manipulates the ST to fit his whimsical rejection of *ḥadith*. He illustrates Ahmed’s extremist attitude in QT by showing how he adds phrases and translates verbs to serve his beliefs. For example, Sideeg discusses Ahmed’s rendition of verbs *ﻟِﺘُﺒَﯿِّﻦَ* and *تُﺘْﻠَﻰ* using “to convey” to send his intended message. Sideeg confirms that Ahmed’s QTs is extreme and naïve as his distortions lack common sense, linguistic clues, and contextual indications.

In this section, I survey studies on manipulation in QT; these studies confirm that reformist Qur’ān translators reject the traditional interpretations of QT. I evaluate other studies that explore the views of Qur’ānists; these studies find that Qur’ānists do not rely on *Sunna* and *ḥadith* in their QTs. In the subsequent section, I assess studies on the effect of translators’ theological views on their QTs.

### 3.4.3 Theological Views

According to Hassan Salman (2005), translators’ religious thoughts affect their Qur’ān translations (QTs). He states:

[The absence of boundaries between religion and religious thought, i.e. the sacred and the ideology of the sacred, has resulted in making the latter contain the former. Religious thought interprets religion according to its own epistemological conditions and the understanding and circumstances of its producers. Explanation and interpretation have led to making religion . . . an ideology per se].

This quote suggests that ideology has become the container of religious views. This idea is also confirmed by Hassan Rachik (2009), who postulates that “religion turns into ideology . . . [and] religious ideas stop being what they are and become instead an ideology” (p. 347) through political and cultural processes. He claims that religious ideologies tend to deal less with metaphysical and theological issues and increasingly stress social and political topics. Rachik states that the spread of modern politics and its consequence results in the breakdown of traditional religious consensus and the appearance of the ideologisation of religion. He assumes that the first forms of ideological reformism have been Salafism and Wahhabism. Since one feature of ideology is its selectiveness, QTs differ based on the translators’ theological tendencies: Ashʿarism, Maturīdism, Neo-Muʿtazilism, Wahhabism, or any other Islamic movements (Campanini, 2012). In contrast, Afrouz (2019) confirms that translators’ religious backgrounds such as Shiʿa or Sunna do not affect the translators’ lexical choices nor the applied translation strategies.

Although Muʿtazilism originated during the first half of the eighth century and flourished until the middle of the eleventh century, the doctrine continues to the modern period, occasionally finding favour with contemporary Qurʾān translators. Robinson (2007) states that the Muʿtazila deny that Allah has any of the characteristics of bodies such as colour, form, movement, and localisation in space, and these beliefs affect their translations. He argues that Shakir eliminates the reference to “the Throne” in most instances rendering it as “Power” or “Dominion”. Robinson gives an example of ﻋَﻠَﻰ ﺍﻟْﻌَﺮْشِ اﺳْﺘَﻮَىٰ, which is translated as “He is firm in power”,

---

46 Salafism, an intellectual current of Sunnī Islam (see note 21).
48 Muʿtazila, an Islamic group, appeared in early Islamic history during the dispute over Ali’s leadership of the Muslim community after the death of the third caliph, Uthman Ibn Affān. The Muʿtazila were affected by Ancient Greek philosophy, based on three fundamental principles: the oneness and justice of God, human freedom of action, and the creation of the Qurʾān. (see Fakhry, M. (1983). A history of Islamic philosophy (2nd ed.). Columbia University Press.)
“established on the throne of His almightiness”, and “He took hold of the Throne” by Shakir, Asad, and Khatib respectively. The researcher confirms that the term is eliminated by Ahmed and changed to “of authority” by Yusuf Ali.

Robinson (2007) also discusses the impact of the Neo-Muʿtazila⁴⁹ and pseudo-scientific thoughts on interpreting the Qurʾān confirming that both Ali’s and Ahmed’s versions switch the act of destroying the invading army from ‘birds’ to ‘men’ in Q 105: 

\[ \text{wa ārsala ʿalayhim tāvyran ābābīl tarmīhim biḥijārat min sijjīl} \]

He clarifies that this verse is rendered by Ali as “And sent hordes of chargers flying against them, (While) you were pelting them with stones of porphyritic lava”. Nevertheless, it is rendered by Ahmed as “And sent upon them swarms of flying creatures. Then you showered them with hard stones earmarked with requital (‘Sijjil’ = Inscribed = Marked out)”. Robinson’s study reveals that the scientific thought of Qurʾān translators creates a drastically different interpretation that the ST never accommodates.

The rationalistic thought of translators with Neo-Muʿtazilism ideas impacts their QT. Betty Bustam and Rika Astari (2018) investigate the influence of translators’ ideologies in QT in Indonesia. They measure the extent to which the ideology can influence the translators’ style and choice of words that will shape the audience reception of the Qurʾānic message. Bustam and Astari argue that Muhamamad Ali’s English translation and Mahmud Yunus’s Dutch translation are affected by the translators’ time, the independence of Indonesia and the activist movement, when young Muslim are more religious and intellectual. The scholars state that the two translations have modern style of writing and follow the rationalistic approach; however, many verses especially the ones about the miracles of the prophets are translated differently because of translators’ different ideological backgrounds. Bustam and Astari find that Ali avoids translating

---

⁴⁹ Neo-Muʿtazila are Muslims attempting to revive Muʿtazila beliefs, especially as a counterbalance to traditionalist Salafī and Wahhabī schools; notable examples of Neo-Muʿtazila include Harun Nasution and Nasr Abu Zayd, whose efforts have not been particularly successful. (see Hamza, A. M. (2014). Faith and reason: The re-emergence of neo-muʿtazīlī thought in the discourse of modern Muslim scientists. Social Epistemology Review and Reply Collective 3(10), 53-55.)
things beyond logical reasoning, he only describes the situation, which goes in line with the thoughts of the Ahmadiyya group. For example, he translated فَاوَحَيْنَا إِلَىٰ مُوسَىٰ أنَّ أَصْرُبْ بِعَصَاكَ الْبَحْرَ فَأَفْتَقُ فَكَانَ كُلُّ فَرْقٍ كَالطُّوْدِ الْأَعْظَيمُ faʾawḥaynā ʿilā Mūsā an iḍrib bīʾašāka al-bahra fanfalaqa kullu firqin kālṭṭūdi al-ʿaẓīm as “Then We revealed to Moses: March on to the sea with thy staff. So it parted, and each party was like a huge mound”. Bustam and Astari confirm that Ali frames the ST through paratexts reflecting his subconscious and ideologies unlike Yunus who transfers the miracles of the prophets as they are written in the ST without changing the meaning.

In this section I survey studies on the change of religion into ideology, and I evaluate articles revealing that Neo-Muʿtazila apply a rationalistic approach in their QT. In the following section, I discuss the models applied in comparative Qurʾān translation studies (CQTS) to reveal translators’ ideologies.

3.4.4 Models Revealing Translators’ Ideologies

To reveal translators’ ideologies, there is a need for a model that investigates the cultural and linguistic factors that intervene in the translation process. Herrag (2012) applies Toury’s model of comparative translation, Newmark’s procedures along with exegetical references to examine the influence of the translators’ ideologies on the translation of Qurʾānic issues into English, Spanish, and Catalan. Herrag uses the manipulation school as an underpinning approach to test his hypotheses. He selects 50 verses that deal with issues about marriage, hijab, fighting, and Jesus. Herrag detects the use of six main translation procedures: literal translation, paraphrase by explaining source meaning, paraphrase by explaining a different meaning, cultural equivalent, omission, and transference by borrowing. He argues that non-Muslim translators have established their own norms as they include introductions and studies about the Qurʾān as extratextual elements and that literal translation is dominantly used. Herrag concludes that the percentage of manipulation skyrockets when the translators use paraphrase by explaining a different meaning. He addresses the adequacy of the translations signalling the differences between the ST and TTs due to manipulation. Despite Herrag’s valuable findings, the model he used in his study is complicated as it comprises many tools, which makes the study difficult to replicate.
A combination of foreignisation and domestication can be an effective model to highlight the translators’ ideologies. Ibrahem Bani Abdo and Safa Abu Mousa (2019) compare QTs by George Sale, a Christian, and Abdel Haleem, a Muslim, to investigate the impact of the translators’ ideologies on their versions. Applying Venuti’s model (2008), the scholars argue that domestication distorts the original text, while foreignisation deliver the message and the clear image of Islam. Examining the translations of ten verses about Jesus, Abdo and Mousa show that in Q 19: 19 the phrase غُلَٰﻤًﺎ زَﻛِﯿ ghulaman zakiyyā is translated by Sale and Abdel Haleem as “a holy son” and “a pure son” respectively, which reflects Sale’s belief that Christ is holy. The scholars confirm that when Sale translates بِﻜُﻔْﺮِھِﻢْ bikufrihim, he adds the phrase “in Jesus;” he also says in his introduction that Muhammad is the author of the Qur’an, which reflects his bias against Islam. Abdo and Mousa find that Sale twists the meanings of the Qur’an by adding information not in the ST. Although the study reveals the motivation behind the translator’s manipulation, it focuses only on addition as the procedure used to display the translator’s ideologies.

Critical discourse analysis (CDA) is a more systematic model to reveal the translator’s ideologies in comparative Qur’an translation studies (CQTS). Davood Bazargani (2015) applies Fairclough’s three-dimensional model (2002) to compare the translation of Arthur Arberry (1955) and that of Tahereh Saffarzadeh (2001). He shows that Saffarzadeh’s translation is full of interpretive lexical choices loaded with ideological implications and discursive structures. Bazargani argues that Saffarzadeh’s translation includes over completeness, euphemism, nominalisation, passivisation, and addition, while Arberry’s translation is neutral, less interpretive, and less ideological. He demonstrates that إن تتَّقَوا َٰللَّah in tataqū Allah in Q 8: 29 is translated as “If you fear God” and “If you fear Allah by regarding piety”, while رَب الْعالمين rab alʿālamīn in Q 1: 2 is rendered as “The Lord of all Being” and “The Creator & Nurturer of the worlds (and their inhabitants)” by Arberry and Saffarzadeh respectively. Bazargani explains that Arberry was a Christian and Saffarzadeh was a Muslim, so their socio-cultural attitudes towards Islam and the Qur’an are different. These attitudes are shown in Saffarzadeh’s use of Allah” and Arberry’s use of “God” along with her use of “Obedient Worshipper” for عبد abd instead of “Servant” by Arberry. The model used in Bazargani’s study discloses
the effect of the translators’ religious background on their translations, but it does not excavate deeply by investigating the footnotes.

Critical discourse analysis (CDA) can also be applied to uncover the hidden motivations of the choices loaded with explicit and implicit traces of ideology and to determine how these traces shape the Qur’ānic message. Both Sideeg (2015a) and (2015b) use Van Dijk’s CDA model (2001); they state that it offers a way of critical thinking. Sideeg (2015b) compares three cases across fourteen Qur’ān translations to examine the controversy of “neutral-gender” language in the context of translating the Qur’ān into English. He explores the ideology that produces ‘neutral-gender’ in English translations of the Qur’ān and its effect on the Qur’ānic message. Sideeg shows that Helminski’s ideological stance regarding ‘gender-neutral’ language can be seen in her use of the pronouns “Hu” and “He/She” to refer to Allah. The former reflects her Sufi ideological and cultural background, whereas the latter reveals her feminist agenda.

Sideeg (2015b) states that Tarazi’s shift of the third person pronoun system “He, Him, and His” to the first-person pronouns “I, Me, and My” distorts the texture and structure, which impacts the meaning in the Qur’ānic discourse. He demonstrates that the translation of the lexical item أُزْوَاجِكُمْ āzwājakum as “wives” and “spouses” produces two readings of the Qur’ānic verse. The former is a conservative version, while the latter is “gender-neutral,” including both husbands and wives. Sideeg confirms that Helminski’s translation uncovers her cultural, linguistic, and religious backgrounds, and this ideological translation causes loss of core stylistic and discoursal features peculiar to the ST. Sideeg’s two studies focus on linguistic analysis without examining the translation strategies that might increase manipulation in QT.

A modification of CDA is used to uncover more about CQTS. Habibeh Khosravi and Majid Pourmohammadi (2016) apply Farahzad's model of comparative translation criticism, which has three levels: textual, paratextual, and semiotic to investigate the role of the translators’ religious ideologies in four translations. The model is based on Fairclough's approach to CDA. The scholars implement their investigation on the textual and paratextual level to examine four verses from Q 4, Q 33, and Q 24, which are mostly referred to as evidence that Islam oppresses women. At the textual level, Khosravi and Pourmohammadi scrutinise the lexical choices and the translation strategies, and at the
paratextual level, they analyse the translators’ footnotes. The translation strategies included in Farahzad's model are: borrowing, calque, addition/overwording, undertranslation, omission, substitution/alteration, explicitation, adoption of any specific type of translation (literal translation), reordering of content, selection of parts from whole and rearrangement of sentence elements.

In this section, I survey studies demonstrating the models used to reveal the translators’ ideologies. These models are Toury’s comparative translation, Venuti’s (2008) foreignisation and domestication, Fairclough’s CDA, Van Dijk’s CDA, and Farahzad's comparative translation criticism. These models either focus on linguistic analysis or the textual and paratextual levels. The reviewed studies show that the dogmatic approaches of Qur’ān translation are linguistic and theological (Qudah-Refai, 2014; Raof, 2012). These models need modification to suit CQTS on both the macro- and micro-levels. In the next section, I review studies on authorised and unauthorised Qur’ān translations to identify the impact of authorisation on Qur’ān translation.

3.5 The Effect of Authorisation on Qur’ān Translations

The literature review has shown that QT is affected by the translator’s beliefs, which impact their choices and translation strategies. Ahmad Mustafa Halimah (2014) evaluates five English translations of the Qur’ān to investigate the degree of deviation from the normative understandings and interpretations of the ST. He argues that producing perfect translations of religious texts in general and of the Qur’ān in particular is unachievable due to the disparity between the SL and TL, on the one hand, and between SC and TC, on the other hand. Halimah emphasises that Qur’ān translators attempt to meet the linguistic and cultural expectations of the TRs and to satisfy the TRs’ taste without violating the main theological concepts of the ST. He proclaims that although the hermeneutic approach in QT enables translators to use their exegetical tools for understanding and interpreting the Qur’ān, applying this approach gives rise to ‘differences’ in translations. Halimah finds that the five selected translators fail to replicate both the complex web of the stylistic features found in the ST and the theologically and culturally loaded concepts carried in the Qurānic words, so they do not achieve equivalence or communicative effectiveness. He also finds that the translation
published by King Fahd Glorious Qur’ān Printing Complex is more appropriate than the other selected versions; however, it needs revising. Halimah suggests establishing an authorising institution that continually evaluates and gives feedback on QTs. These findings imply that authorisation might reduce the impact of translators’ interference in their QTs.

In this section, I survey the only study investigating the degree of deviation in authorised and unauthorised QTs; however, this reviewed study does not focus on the impact of authorisation on the display of the translators’ ideologies in their target texts.

3.6 Conclusion

In this literature review chapter, I survey studies on issues in QT to spot the gap in the field of comparative Qur’ān translation studies (CQTS). To do so, I first review studies on the syntactic, semantic, and cultural challenges in QT. These studies discuss the difficulties of translating the Qur’ān on the textual and contextual levels, relating them to under-translation, over-translation, mistranslation, grammar shifts, and lack of equivalence of cultural-specific items. The reviewed articles confirm that the translators’ backgrounds could affect their translations of religious and cultural items (Ali, 2020; Islam, 2018; Nadeem & Akhtar, 2017; Abdelaal & Rashid, 2015).

In the second section of the literature review, I evaluate studies comparing Qur’ān translations (QTs); these studies emphasise the influence of the time and place of translation on the translators’ final product. They reveal the impact of the place of translation on the translators’ lexical choices and highlighted the role of paratextual devices (peritexts and epitexts) in the interpretation and reception of the target text (TT) (Al-Kroud, 2018; Mohaghegh & Pirnajmuddin, 2013). These studies also investigate peritexts (title, cover, binding, foreword, preface, introduction, commentaries, and footnotes) and epitexts (interviews, reviews, and criticism). The reviewed studies show that the approaches applied to CQTS are Catford’s linguistic equivalence, Nida’s formal and dynamic, Newmark’s semantic and communicative, Venuti’s domestication and foreignisation, skopos (purpose, coherence, and fidelity), and Bassnett and Lefevere’s cultural approach.
Furthermore, I survey other studies on the ideologies that affect QTs; these studies highlight the impact of interpreting the Qur’ān from religious and feminist perspectives on increasing the translators’ visibility in QTs (Mustafa, 2019; Al-Shabab, 2016; Hassen, 2012; Mernissi, 1991). They confirm that the demonstration of the translators’ religious ideologies results in radical QTs since translators of different Islamic sects: Sunna and Shi’a transfer the Qur’ānic message differently (Yuhda 2018). The literature review shows that the models used to disclose translators’ ideologies are Fairclough’s CDA, Van Dijk’s CDA, and Farahzad's comparative translation criticism. Nonetheless, these models are too broad and lack objective and comprehensive criteria of evaluation. Thus, this study fills in the gap in the field of comparative Qur’ān translation studies by designing a model for comparing QTs to be used to explore the impact of authorisation on QTs. In this thorough review, only one study investigates the impact of authorisation on QTs. Therefore, there is a need for investigating the effect of authorisation on the display of translators’ ideologies in QTs.

In the following chapter, I apply the elements of the developed model (see section 1.4.5) to detect ideologies in the paratexts of the selected translations. I investigate the publishers’ and translators’ peritexts to obtain information about the dominant ideologies in the selected translations. Furthermore, in the next chapter, I analytically compare the translations of some verses to disclose the effects of the translators’ ideologies on their translation choices.
Chapter Four: Detecting Ideologies in the Paratexts of the Selected Qur’ān Translations

“The paratext is what enables a text to become a book and to be offered as such to its readers and, more generally, to the public”. — Gérard Genette

4.1 Introduction

In the previous chapter, I surveyed studies on Qur’ān translations (QTs) to identify the problems that translators faced on the micro (semantic, syntactic, and stylistic) and macro (sociocultural) levels. I also reviewed articles exploring the effects of the translators’ religious backgrounds on their QTs; these studies conclude that Qur’ānists and Neo-Mu’tazila reflect their thoughts in their translations. The literature showed that translating the Qur’ān requires considering the textual and contextual elements of the source text (ST) along with the external factors that might impact the translators’ decisions. I identified a gap in the area of comparative Qur’ān translation studies (CQTS), mainly the effect of authorisation on QTs since the literature review showed that only one study compared authorised to unauthorised QTs to investigate the degree of deviation. Moreover, the studies evaluated in the preceding chapter demonstrated the drawbacks of the models used to reveal the translators’ ideologies as these models focus on linguistic analysis ignoring the power of the publishing houses and translators’ theological stances. Therefore, the previous chapter highlighted the need for a model for describing and comparing QTs on the textual, contextual, and paratextual levels to identify the impact of the translators’ ideologies on shaping the meanings and messages of the Qur’ān.

In the current chapter, I link the theory with practice by considering Lefevere’s ideological factors of translation (publishing houses and translators) and the elements of Lambert and van Gorp's systematic schema for describing and comparing translations (2006). I apply the new model (see section 1.4.5) that I have developed to be a conceptual framework for this study to facilitate both the detection of the ideologies reflected in the paratexts of the selected Qur’ān translations and the examination of the verses. With this new model, I compare the selected translations on the paratextual, textual, and contextual levels to explore the dominant ideologies in each QT. Thus, in this chapter, I answer the sub-question about the messages that the paratexts of the selected QTs send regarding the contents and dominant ideologies of these translations.
This chapter is divided into two main sections to obtain information about the ideologies of the selected translations. In section 4.2, I extract information from the publishers’ peritexts: the covers, visibility/invisibility of the translators’ names, titles, title pages, and blurbs. In section 4.3, I examine the translators’ peritexts: prefaces, forewords, introductions, and footnotes. I inextricably apply the two types of paratexts, peritexts and epitexts (see section 3.3.2), to give enough evidence and cross-check the existence of the ideologies detected. I use epitextual devices such as the translators’ interviews and reviews on the translations to support the findings gathered from the publishers’ and translators’ peritexts. Also, I analyse eight examples mentioned in the translators’ paratexts to reinforce and assist the exploration of the paratexts. Finally, in the conclusion, I highlight the ideologies identified in the paratextual tools.

4.2 The Publishers’ Peritexts

The term “paratexts” is defined as “a threshold, a zone between text and off-text. . . and a strategy of an influence on the public, an influence that . . . is at the service of a better reception for the text and a more pertinent reading of it” (Genette, 1997, pp. 1-2). Paratexts comprise peritexts and epitexts (see section 3.3.2). Peritexts are elements around the text, such as cover images, the title, prefatory materials, appendage, title page, introductions, footnotes, endnotes, epigraphs, and layout. On the other hand, epitexts are elements beyond the text, including interviews, self-reviews, TV shows, self-commentaries by the translators, and the awards received by the translators. The peritexts are divided into publishers’ and translators’ tools. Publishers’ peritexts are the covers of the books, the visibility of the translators’ names, titles, title pages, and blurbs, while translators’ peritexts are prefaces, forewords, introductions, and footnotes. In the following section, I detect ideologies in the selected Qur’ān translations (QTs) through the examination of their covers.

4.2.1 Covers: Designs and Colours

The translation cover is the first publishers’ peritext zone, which attracts the target reader (TR) and provides an in-depth insight into the interaction between cultures, ideologies, translators, texts, and publishing houses. The cover is the “first manifestation
of the book offered to the reader’s perception” (Genette, 1997, p. 27). Anthony pym (2019) states that a translation cover reveals information about the translation and its place of publication; therefore, in addition to generating the TR’s interest, it plays a key role in framing and placing a translation within a specific context. Commenting on the importance of the translation cover, Kathryn Batchelor (2018) states:

The cover of the translated text is not treated any differently to the cover of non-translated texts; both are considered to be part of the paratext, conveying certain messages about the content of the book. (p. 20)

This analogy confirms that examining the design of a translation cover can reveal information about the target text (TT) and the “sociocultural and ideological environment” of the TR (Hassen, 2012, p. 133). The design elements of a translation cover, including imagery and colour schemes, make statements about the audience and content of books (Schlenker, 2014). Similarly, the covers of Qur’ān translations (QTs) reveal information about the content of the translations, the intended TRs, and the places of publication. The designs of these covers trigger a public reaction to appreciate the sacred values contained in their content (Kusumandyoko et al., 2021). The comparison of the four covers of the selected QTs highlights the differences between their designs and colours. These differences send messages about both the content and the publisher of each translation since translation covers are the responsibility of the publishers. The figure below shows the covers of the four selected translations:
Figure 3
The Covers of the Selected Authorised and Unauthorised Translations

The covers of the translations by Khattab and Hilali and Khan, published in two countries in the Arab world: Egypt and Saudi Arabia respectively, maintain the traditional Islamic design. According to Kusumandyoko et al. (2021), traditional Islamic designs are free from figures and have either geometric or abstract floral patterns. Similarly, the covers of the translations by Khattab and Hilali and Khan include floral ornamentation (arabesque) common in the Islamic style. However, the covers of the Qur’ān translations by Haleem and Bakhtiar, published in countries in the West: UK and USA, have modern designs:
The flowery design of the cover of the QT by Bakhtiar, the female translator born of an Iranian father and American mother, is completely unconventional in the Arab world. As the translator and publisher, Bakhtiar is the one responsible for choosing this flowery design. The floral motifs carry a religious significance in Iranian culture, in which “flowers and roses convey the ideas of both spiritual and physical refreshment and imply heaven” (Hassen, 2012, p. 121). Bakhtiar lived in Iran after her marriage and converted from Christianity to Islam. In her acknowledgement, she thanks her daughter “Mani Farhadi and grandson Rodd Farhadi for their creative energies, comments and suggestions regarding the cover design” (Bakhtiar, 2012, xi). This gratitude to the cover designers reflects her acceptance of this cover. Hassen (2020) stated that she contacted Bakhtiar and asked her about her choice of the cover of her Qur’ān translation and that Bakhtiar said that this cover shows her Iranian heritage and the feminine in her society. Hassen added that Bakhtiar’s choice is very political since she demonstrates her culture and stand out of the usual book cover of the Qur’ān.
In addition to their designs, the colours of the covers of QTs send messages about the publishers, cultures, and the ideologies of the places of publication. The colours of covers reveal the tendencies of the publishers and traits of the content (Genette, 1997). The dominant colours used in the covers of the Qur’ān are “red, green, blue, brown, yellow, and gold” (Kusumandyoko et al., 2021, p. 69). Nonetheless, I observed that green and blue are the colours of the covers of QTs in Saudi Arabia, while red, green, blue, and black are the common colours in Egypt. The colours of the covers of the three translations by the male translators selected in this study are blue, a colour which is associated with male (Del Giudice, 2017), whereas the prevailing colour of Bakhtiar’s translation is orange. The orange flowers on the cover of her translation are contrasted with the dark brown background and the white colour of the title and translator’s name. The colour orange has been associated with feminism (Caputi, 2015), and it is more popular within women than men (Vatral, 2018) as sex differentiated colour preference has a social learning (Hurlbert & Ling, 2007). Thus, the colours of the covers of the four selected QTs give information about not only the places of publishing these translations but also the translators’ gender.

The flowery design and orange and white colours of the cover of Bakhtiar’s translation imply her visibility in her translation, which raises two questions: whether she intervenes in her translation and how she might intervene to stress matters of gendered identity. To answer these questions, Bakhtiar’s translation needs to be examined to investigate whether she adopts a feminist perspective and applies the feminist strategies introduced by Von Flotow (1991) or she is faithful to the source text (ST). These strategies are prefacing50, supplementing51, and hijacking52 (see section 1.3.5). Thus, the covers of the QTs send messages, whose accuracy requires textual analysis of the translations.

In this section, I discuss the importance of the covers of QTs as they send messages about their contents. I focus on the publisher’s responsibility for the designs and colours of these covers revealing the differences between the covers of translations by male and

---

50 Adding feminist meanings in the preface (see note 14).
51 A strategy which explains the over-translation by addition (see note 15).
52 The process by which a feminist translator applies corrective measures to the work at hand in order to construct feminist meanings (see note 16).
female translators. I argue that, being the translator and publisher, Bakhtiar might consciously choose a cover that makes her gender visible; she might adopt a feminist perspective to oppose the counter-ideology of patriarchy and to conform with her social group by speaking their language. To prove or negate these assumptions, in the next section, I explore the messages retrieved from the visibility and/or invisibility of the translators’ names on the covers of their translations.

4.2.2 Visibility/ Invisibility of the Translators’ Names

Not writing the translator’s name on the cover of the translation reveals information about the translation strategy and status of the patron (publisher/ authorising institution). Eliminating the translator’s name from the cover is a tool to stress the importance of the source text (ST) and the high position of the publisher (Hermans, 1996). When “the name of the translator appears on the title page, rather than on the more prominent front cover, the translation . . . [is] authorised” (Batchelor, 2018, p. 80) and is “shaped by the sociocultural conditions of production” (Deane-Cox, 2014, p. 18). Hence, in this section, I argue that the invisibility of Hilali and Khan’s names from the cover of their translation reflects the power of the authorising institution and indicates the adherence to the source language (SL) and source culture (SC).

On the invisibility of the translator’s name, Venuti (2008) states:

The translator’s shadowy existence . . . defines translation as an ‘adaptation’ or ‘derivative work’ based on an ‘original work’ . . . The translator is thus subordinated [since] the viability of a translation is established by its relationship to the cultural and social conditions under which it is produced and read. (p. 9-18)

Venuti agrees with Batchelor (2018) that the place of writing the translator’s name sends messages about the translation. The names of Khattab, Haleem, and Bakhtiar are written on the covers of their translations, whereas the names of Hilali and Khan are written on the fifth page of their translation. This delay lessens Hilali and Khan’s subjectivity, “especially regarding the conceptual space available for thought about responsibility” (Pym, 2011, p. 1). It also implies that the translation is adequate, or overt, 53 whose purpose

53 Overt translation conveys knowledge from the source culture more deeply in the target text, while covert translation uses the target-language to explain the source
is to give the TT insight into the function of the ST in the original language and SC (House, 2009; House, 1977). Hilali and Khan’s translation published in Saudi Arabia is expected to be faithful to the ST and SC since the patronage is undifferentiated. Lefevere (1992) argues that the undifferentiated patronage provides the ideology, money, and status (see section 1.3.3); hence, the patron of Hilali and Khan’s translation has the power to ensure that the translation ideologies are those of the state not the translators since the publication is sponsored by the state.

Also, the invisibility of the translator’s name is a tool to give superiority to the ST and SC in Hilali and Khan’s translation. This tool helps familiarise the TR with the Islamic terms with no aim to preach the Qur’ān. Unlike Nida’s concept of dynamic equivalence (2003), which links the translator to the missionary by advocating domesticating translation, Lefevere’s undifferentiated patronage links the translation to the ideologies of either the translator or the publisher/authorising institution. The ideologies of Hilali and Khan’s translation reside in the sociocultural ideologies of its context and are dominated by the patron. This can be seen in the differences between Hilali and Khan’s translation published in Saudi Arabia and the one published in Egypt. These two versions differ not only in their presentations but also their contents; therefore, I assume that these two translations might display different ideological characteristics as a result of the influence of the ideologies in the places of the translations.

Figure 4 below shows the two covers of Hilali and Khan’s translations published in Saudi Arabia and Egypt:

Figure 4
The Covers of Hilali and Khan’s Translations Published in Saudi Arabia and Egypt

![Covers of Hilali and Khan’s Translations](image)

*Translation of the Meanings of the Noble Qur’ân in the English Language (Hilali & Khan, 2020)*  
*Saudi Arabia*

*Interpretation of the Meanings of the Noble Qur’ân in the English Language (Hilali & Khan, 2011)*  
*Egypt*

Figure 4 shows that the translators’ names are written on the cover of the version published in Egypt unlike the one published in Saudi Arabia. Another difference is that the title of Hilali and Khan’s translation published in Egypt is modified to suit the common beliefs in its context because Al-Azhar, the prominent authorising institution in Egypt, approves the interpretation of the meanings of the Qur’ân. Therefore, the word ‘interpretation’ substitutes the word ‘translation’ written on the cover of the translation published in Saudi
Arabia. Furthermore, it is written on the cover of Hilali and Khan’s translation published in Egypt that it is “a summarised version of Aṭ-Ṭabarī,⁵⁴ Al-Qurṭubī⁵⁵ and Ibn Kathīr⁵⁶ with comments from Sahih Al-Bukhari”. This information is confirmed by Mirza (2014), who states that Hilali and Khan rely on Orthodox exegeses and might produce traditional translation.

The invisibility of the translators’ names on the cover of Hilali and Khan’s translation published in Saudi Arabia reflects the domination of the publishing houses to produce a version adherent to the source text (ST) and source culture (SC). Also, the information on their version published in Egypt implies their use of a more communicative approach. Munday (2016) states that the translation that considers the receptor is ‘read well’ in the target language (TL). In this exploratory chapter, I investigate the different translation approaches applied in these two contexts (Saudi Arabia and Egypt).

---

⁵⁴ Aṭ-Ṭabarī (839 – 923) was an Iranian historian and Islamic scholar from Amol, Tabaristan. He is known for his historical works and his expertise in *tafsīr [exegesis]*. His approach is *tafsīr bi-l-ma’thūr/ tafsīr bi-r-riwayyah/ tafsīr bi-n-naql*. (see Rippin, A. (2013). *Approaches to the history of the interpretation of the Qur’an*. Gorgias Press. https://doi.org/10.31826/9781463234898)

⁵⁵ Al-Qurṭubī (1214 – 1273) was from Cordoba of Maliki origin. He was an Andalusian jurist, Islamic scholar, and *muḥaddith*. His approach is *tafsīr bi-l-ma’thūr/ tafsīr bi-r-riwayyah/ tafsīr bin-naql*. (see Nasr, S. H. (2015). *Commentator key: the study Quran*. HarperOne.)

⁵⁶ Ibn Kathīr (1300 – 1373) was a highly influential Arab historian, exegete, and scholar during the Mamluk era in Syria. He was an expert on *tafsīr [exegesis]* and *Fiqh* (jurisprudence). His approach is *tafsīr bi-l-ma’thūr/ tafsīr bi-r-riwayyah/ tafsīr bi-n-naql*. (see Britannica, T. Editors of Encyclopaedia (2022, January 28). *Ibn Kathīr. Encyclopedia Britannica*. https://www.britannica.com/biography/Ibn-Kathir)
Table 1 below shows Hilali and Khan’s translations of the terms صلاة [prayers] and زكاة [charity] in these two contexts:

### Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Hilali &amp; Khan (Saudi Arabia)</th>
<th>Hilali &amp; Khan (Egypt)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q 2: 3</td>
<td>الصلاة</td>
<td><em>Aṣ-Ṣalāt (Iqāmat-as-Ṣalāt)</em>(^{(2)})</td>
<td><em>Aṣ-Ṣalāt</em>(^{(2)}) (the prayers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 2: 43</td>
<td>الزكاة</td>
<td><em>Zakāt</em></td>
<td><em>Zakāt</em> (obligatory charity)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 2: 83</td>
<td>واقيموا الصلاة و أتوا الزكاة</td>
<td>perform <em>Aṣ-Ṣalāt (Iqāmat-as-Ṣalāt)</em>, and give <em>Zakāt</em>’</td>
<td>perform <em>Aṣ-Ṣalāt (the prayers)</em>, and give <em>Zakāt</em> (obligatory charity)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 demonstrates that Hilali and Khan’s translation published in Saudi Arabia is ST-oriented since it transliterates the Islamic terms without giving meanings, while the one published in Egypt is TT-oriented as it gives equivalent meanings. Transliteration is the transcription of the SL characters or sounds in the TL (Newmark, 1988); it is the conversion of foreign letters into the letters of the TL to compensate the lack of equivalents of nouns in the TL or to preserve the local colour of the SL (Zahir, 2008). Not giving meanings of the transliterated terms although they have equivalents in the TL, Hilali and Khan might aim to promote the imitation of these words and make the TR reconvert them back into Arabic. The use of this translation procedure highlights the gap between the source culture (SC) and target culture (TC) to familiarise the TRs with the Arabic terms since the translation targets “non-Arab speaking Muslims” (Hilali & Khan, 2020, III).

Another element of the translator invisibility is the editor/publisher power to add or omit from the translation. The translator’s role is weak in the network of power in the translation industry (Venuti, 1992). According to Kuhlwczak and Littau (2007), omission and addition by the editor/publisher are meant to either clarify or hide a meaning from the TR. Addition is a tool that might be used to reveal ideologies in translation (Dickins et al., 2002). The translation of the word الضالِّينَ *ad-dālīn* in Q 1: 7 shows the power of...
the editor/publisher to add a non-restrictive clause in Hilali and Khan’s translation published in Saudi Arabia:

Table 2
Addition in Hilali and Khan’s Translation Published in Saudi Arabia (Q 1: 7)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Hilali &amp; Khan (Saudi Arabia)</th>
<th>Hilali &amp; Khan (Egypt)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q 1: 7</td>
<td>الدَّالِينَ</td>
<td>those who went astray (i.e. those who have lost the (true) knowledge, so they wander in error, and are not guided to the Truth)</td>
<td>those who went astray</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 shows that the meaning of the word الدَّالِينَ ad-dālīn is transferred in the two versions since it means “go astray” (Al-Mu’jam Al-Wasīṭ, 2004, p. 543). However, Hilali and Khan’s translation published in Saudi Arabia includes a long addition giving extra information to describe those who go astray. This addition reveals that the version published in Egypt is more reader friendly, and the one published in Saudi Arabia is more educational as it gives detailed interpretation of the ST. Hence, the invisibility of Hilali and Khan’s names from the cover of their translation published in Saudi Arabia highlights the work as a translation, subordinate to the original text, and reveals the status and power of the authorising publishing house.

In this section, I discuss the invisibility of the translator’s name on the cover of Qur’ān translation as an indication of the imitation of the original as it highlights the idea that this book is a translation not the real Qur’ān. I also emphasise the role played by the publisher/authorising institution in the presentation of the translation and its translation process. I elucidate that Hilali and Khan’s translation published in Saudi Arabia includes both commentaries and transliteration; these tools are used to reflect ideas in the SC and teach Islamic terms. In the following section, I investigate the titles and title pages of the selected translations; these elements of the publishers’ peritexts give more information about the ideologies of the translations.
4.2.3 Titles and Title Pages

In addition to the cover, the title and title page, two paratextual devices, include additional information about the translation content and the culture of the community in which it is produced. The title of a translation is of paramount importance; it is a means of attraction as it advertises the book and allures readers. As noted by Genette (1997), “the responsibility for the title is always shared by the [translator] and the publisher . . . because the position and social function of the title give the publisher stronger rights and obligations to the title than to the body of the text” (p. 74). Genette also states that the title page, the publisher’s peritext next zone after the cover, includes the printer’s colophon and reveals “ideological variations” (p. 40). Analysing the titles and title pages of the selected translations divulges details about the publishers, translations, and the ideologies of the translations.

The publishers of the Qur’ān translations (QTs) consider the target readers (TRs) and agree on titles that suit the culture in the place of publication. Contemporary TRs value their “cultural place as the locus for authentic and legitimate hermeneutics” (Coker, 2012, p. 27). Therefore, publishers take into consideration “the role of the reader . . . [and] the complex relationship between the task of interpretation and the social location of the interpreter” (Segovia, 1995, xlviii). Hence, the variations between the titles of translations published in different cultures result from the impact of the places of publication since the sociocultural ideologies of the context influence both the publishers and translators.

Hilali and Khan’s translation published in Saudi Arabia and Khattab’s translation published in Egypt follow the traditions in these Arab, Middle Eastern, and Muslim countries, where people utter words of respect before mentioning the word ‘Qur’ān’. The titles of these translations are *The Noble Qur’ān* and *The Clear Quran* respectively. The translators implement the words ‘noble’ and ‘clear’ because in the Arab world honorifics

57 In publishing, a colophon is a brief statement containing information about the publication of a book such as the place of publication, the publisher, and the date of publication. It is sometimes called a ‘biblio-page’ or the ‘copyright-page’. (see Cowley, J. D. (1939). *Bibliographical description and cataloguing*. Grafton and Co. https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=mdp.39015030342920&view=1up&seq=97)
are commonly inserted before mentioning God or His book. This is because “Arabic politeness is structured and controlled by two main influences: religion and social convention” (Samarah, 2015, p. 2015). Thus, Hilali and Khan and Khattab are affected by the sociocultural ideologies of their contexts and use honorific titles.

These honorific titles indicate the translators’ ideological mindsets formed in their cultures and the norms in the places of the publication of their translations. In Saudi Arabia and Egypt, the word ‘Qur’ān’ is always preceded by the words الکرم al-karim [the noble] or اللمین al-mubīn [the clear], and the name of Prophet Muhammad is followed by صلى الله عليه وسلم salā Allahu ʿalayhi wa sallam [peace be upon him]. In the table of contents of Hilali and Khan’s translation, one of the sections is “The Noble Qur’ān, A Miracle from Allāh (to Prophet Muḥammad صلى الله عليه وسلم)”, and in Khattab’s translation, one of the sections is entitled “Select Teachings from Prophet Muḥammad (ﷺ)”. Khattab and Hilali and Khan use honorifics, words of respect, in the tables of contents and introductions of their translations. The table below demonstrates that Khattab and Hilali and Khan conform to the norms in their cultures by using honorifics when they mention the name of Prophet Muhammad in their translations:

Table 3
The Translators’ Choices for ʿabdanā and محمد Muhammad in Q 2:23 and Q 3:144

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Khattab</th>
<th>Hilali &amp; Khan</th>
<th>Haleem</th>
<th>Bakhtiar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q 2:23</td>
<td>ʿabdanā</td>
<td>Our servant(1)</td>
<td>Our slave Muhammad (ﷺ)</td>
<td>Our servant</td>
<td>Our servant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1) Muhammad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 3:144</td>
<td>محمد</td>
<td>Muhammad</td>
<td>Muhammad  صلى الله عليه وسلم</td>
<td>Muhammad</td>
<td>Muhammad</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 shows that to transfer the meaning of the word ʿabdanā Khattab, Haleem, and Bakhtiar choose “servant,” while Hilali and Khan select “slave”. The meaning of this word is “a servant or someone not free” (Al-Mu’jam Al-Wasiṭ, 2004, p. 579). The translations by Hilali and Khan and Khattab reveal the influence of the Eastern culture on
the translators who utilise words to show gratitude to Prophet Muhammad. Hilali and Khan add “Muhammad صلى الله عليه وسلم” in the target text (TT), while Khattab inserts a footnote saying “Muhammad (ﷺ)”; these additions reflect the style of writing in the Eastern culture and the translators’ Sunnī beliefs. However, in translating the name محمد [Muhammad], Hilali and Khan insert the phrase صلى الله عليه وسلم “peace be upon him” unlike Khattab who renders it without any addition. Hence, the use of honorifics in the titles of the translations by Khattab and Hilali and Khan imply the appearance of these words in the translations due to the norms of the culture in the Middle East. Nonetheless, Hilali and Khan’s consistent use of honorifics in the TT reflects the significance of this use in Saudi culture.

The title of Bakhtiar’s translation published in the USA might be resulted from her influence by her Iranian culture. Bakhtiar descended from an Iranian family and lived in Iran for many years. She confirms that she is Sufī and that she chooses the title of her translation from the Qur’ān. Bakhtiar (2012) states:

> The Quran refers to the Recitation by different names, one of which is The Sublime Quran (al-qur’an al-azīm, 15:87), the name chosen for this present translation. Being sublime refers to the Quran’s spiritual value. In its sublimity it guides and inspires beyond the material world that it transcends. (xxvii).

This quote shows that Bakhtiar’s choice of the title is taken from the Qur’ān itself. The use of the honorific ‘sublime’ is the result of the influence of spirituality, an important aspect in Sufism. On the other hand, Haleem does not use a word of reverence in the title of his translation, The Qur’an, which implies that his translation, published in the UK, is target-reader oriented. This community does not emphasise the use of honorifics. Haleem (2021, Appendix F) confirms that he focuses on the target reader’s understanding of the exact message of the ST; therefore, he applies communicative translation.

In addition to the titles, the title pages disclose whether the translations adhere to the SC or the TC. According to El-Hadary (2008), “communicative translations deal with non-authoritative texts . . . [They adhere to the target culture] to suit the comprehension of the reader” (p. 31); hence, authoritative translations are expected to be closer to the ST. The title pages of the selected translations reveal information about the publishers and translation strategies. Hilali and Khan’s title page has two verses from the Qur’ān written
in Arabic (Q 15: 9 and Q 56: 77-80), the name of the king in English, and the name of the publisher in Arabic. The visibility of the name of the publisher along with the use of the Arabic language demonstrates the status of the publisher and faithfulness to the SC. Opening their translation with these verses implies a message sent by the publisher of Hilali and Khan’s translation since their translation published in Egypt does not have these verses on the title page. The comparison of the translations of Q 15: 9 might reveal the meant message:

**Example 1: Q 15: 9**

إِنَّا نَحْنُ نَزْلَنَا الْذِّكْرَ وَإِنَّا لَا لَهُ لَحَافِظُونَ (الحجر 9)

*Innā Naḥnu nazzalnā adh-dhikra wa Innā lahu laḥā ḥaţūn*

**Khattab:** It is certainly We Who have revealed the Reminder, and it is certainly We Who will preserve it. (p. 286)

**Hilali and Khan:** Verily, We, it is We Who have sent down the Dhikr (i.e. the Qur’ān) and surely, We will guard it (from corruption)\(^{[i]}\). (p. 436)

**Haleem:** We have sent down the Qur’an, Ourself, and We Ourself will guard it. (p. 162)

**Bakhtiar:** Truly, We, We sent down the Remembrance and, truly, We are ones who guard it. (p. 242)

**Table 4**

The Translators’ Choices for *الذِّكْر* `adh-dhikr` in Q 15: 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Khattab</th>
<th>Hilali &amp; Khan</th>
<th>Haleem</th>
<th>Bakhtiar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>الذِّكْر</em></td>
<td>the Reminder</td>
<td>the Dhikr (i.e. the Qur’ān)</td>
<td>the Qur’an</td>
<td>the Remembrance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The word *الذِّكْر* `adh-dhikr` has different meanings such as “memorising something, reminding someone of his need, and mentioning something after forgetting it” (*Al-Mu‘jam Al-Wasit*, 2004, p. 324). In Ibn-Manẓur’s *Lisan Al-’Arab* (1955), the term also means the opposition of forgetting, the sacred book, the Qur’ān, and prayers (p. 1507-8). Both Aṭ-Ṭabarī (1963) and Ibn Kathīr (2002) interpret Q 15: 9 as a proof that the Qur’ān is protected by God; they transfer *الذِّكْر* `adh-dhikr` as ‘the Qur’ān’. Also, Al-Mahallī, and Al-Suyūṭī (2003) state that in this verse God says that He revealed the Qur’ān, and He is
protecting it from distortion, substitution, omission, and addition. Haleem transfers ﺛِﻛْﺮ adh-dhikr as the “Qur’ân”; Hilali and Khan put the word Qur’ân in parentheses. They add a footnote saying:

This Verse is a challenge to mankind and everyone is obliged to believe in the miracles of this Qur’ân. It is a clear fact that more than 1400 years have elapsed and not a single word of this Qur’ân has been changed, although the disbelievers tried their utmost to change it in every way, but they failed miserably in their efforts. As it is mentioned in this holy Verse: ‘We will guard it.’ By Allāh! He has guarded it. On the contrary, all the other holy Books [the Taurāt (Torah), the Injeel (Gospel)] have been corrupted in the form of additions or subtractions or alterations in the original text.

This quote states that the Qur’ân is the miracle of Prophet Muhammad and the sacred Book which will be guarded by God. The quote confirms that “the other holy Books [the Taurāt (Torah) and the Injeel (Gospel)] have been corrupted” through additions and omissions. In their introduction, Hilali and Khan (2020) state “Allah, the Exalted, has also described the Glorious Qur’ân as a Criterion, a Reminder, a source of Guidance, a Light, a Healing, a Wise Book, and an Admonition, among other descriptions which point to its sublimity and the perfection of its message” (VIII). The appearance of Q 15: 9 on Hilali and Khan’s title page sends a message about Hilali and Khan’s detailed and source-oriented translation that relies on intertextuality, unfolding the meaning of an expression in a verse through reference to thematically and semantically similar expressions in other verses. Unlike Hilali and Khan, Khattab and Bakhtiar rely on linguistic exegesis to give the meaning of the word ﺛِﻛْﺮ adh-dhikr; they render it as “the Reminder” and “the Remembrance” using a meaning from the dictionary.

Like Hilali and Khan’s title page, Khattab’s title page includes the title in Arabic, and then in English, the name of the translator, and the name of the publisher. The use of the Arabic language on the title pages of Khattab’s and Hilali and Khan’s translations is mirrored in their translations in the names of the Sūras and the utilisation of bilingual texts. The word نِﺴَﺎءٌ [women] in Q 4:1, for example, is translated the same by the four translators; however, the translation of the same word differs when it is a Sūra name:
Table 5
The Different Lexis for *Nisāʾ* [women] as a Word and as a *Sūra* Name

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Khattab</th>
<th>Hilali &amp; Khan</th>
<th>Haleem</th>
<th>Bakhtiar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Verse Q 4:1</td>
<td>نساء</td>
<td>women</td>
<td>women</td>
<td>women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sūra</em> Name</td>
<td>سورة النساء</td>
<td>Women (An-Nisāʾ)</td>
<td><em>Sūrat An-Nisāʾ</em> (The Women)</td>
<td>*Sūrat al-<em>Nisāʾ</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 shows a conformity among the four translators in selecting ‘women’ to render the word نساء *nisāʾ* [women] in Q 4:1, yet transferring the same word as a *Sūra* name is different. Khattab follows the translation of the *Sūra* name “women” with transliteration “(An-Nisāʾ)”, while Hilali and Khan use transliteration “*Sūrat An-Nisāʾ*”, translate it in English between brackets (The Women), and add the name of the *Sūra* in Arabic سورة النساء. Hilali and Khan’s translation targets “non-Arab speaking Muslims” (III), so it might emphasise the transliteration to teach Muslims the proper pronunciation of the *Sūra*.

In line with the communicative approach to translation, Haleem renders the *Sūra* name only in English as ‘Women’. He states “many suras combine several subjects within them . . . and the titles were allocated on the basis of either the main theme within the sura, an important event that occurs in the sura, or a significant word that appears within it” (Haleem, 2016, xvii). Therefore, Haleem names the *Sūra* based on its main theme. Like Khattab, Bakhtiar uses translation and transliteration, yet her utterance of it as “al-*Nisāʾ*” does not match with the phonology of the word in accurate Arabic pronunciation of the silent Arabic definite article الالام الشمسية الال [assimilated “al”]. In the Arabic language, the letter ل “L” is silent when ال is followed by the sound “n”. Therefore, the word النساء should be transliterated as “An-Nisāʾ”, but Bakhtiar mis-pronounce it because Arabic is not her first language since she was raised in America; this mis-pronunciation shows that she does not master the Arabic language.

Unlike the title pages of Hilali and Khan’s and Khattab’s translations, the title page of Haleem’s has the name of the publisher twice, on the top and bottom of the page, and the name of the translator in a smaller size, which reflects the status of the publisher (see section 1.3.3). Also, the title page of Bakhtiar’s translation has the title of the translation, the name of the translator in the same size, and the website of the publisher in a smaller
size. Being the translator and the publisher might give Bakhtiar the power not only to write her name in a big size but also to be visible in her translation.

The use of the Arabic language on the title pages of Hilali and Khan’s and Khattab’s translations aligns with the implementation of the typographical choices such as colour, script, calligraphy, and cover image to give the SC a superior status. Figure 5 below demonstrates the differences between the translations, mainly Khattab’s and Hilali and Khan’s bilingual TTs:

**Figure 5**

Bilingualism in the Two Translations Published in the Middle East

---

Translation of the Meanings of The Noble Qur’ān into the English Language  
(Hilali & Khan, 2020)  

The Clear Quran: A Thematic English Translation  
(Khattab, 2019)
The Qur’an: A New Translation (Haleem, 2016)  

The Sublime Quran: English Translation (Bakhtiar, 2012)

Figure 5 shows the use of the two languages Arabic and English by Hilali and Khan and Khattab, and the reading direction from right to left, while Haleem and Bakhtiar’s translations are only in English and are read from left to right. Also, figure 5 illustrates the long footnotes by Hilali and Khan. The authorised translations by Hilali and Khan and Khattab make good use of footnotes to enlighten the TR and correct wrong information about Islam unlike the unauthorised translation by Haleem that uses few footnotes and the one by Bakhtiar that uses no footnotes.

In this section, I highlight the link between the titles and title pages of Qur’an translations. I discuss the role of these two paratextual elements in revealing information about the languages and approaches of Qur’an translations by Khattab and Hilali and Khan published in the Middle East and those by Haleem and Bakhtiar produced in the UK and USA respectively. In the following section, I examine the blurbs, the fourth publisher’s peritextual element, which discloses more features of the selected translations.

4.2.4 Blurbs

Another paratextual element in Qur’an translation (QT) is the blurb, a short description on the back cover of a book written for promotional purposes. The
word ‘blurb’ was coined in 1907 by the American humourist Gelett Burgess (Crystal, 1995, p. 132), who defined it as a short piece of writing describing and advertising a book, film, or a new product (Longman Dictionary, 2013). As a commercial tool, the blurb gives the target reader (TR) information about the translation to enhance the sale; therefore, it matters for the publisher to increase the profits. Of the four selected translations in this thesis, Haleem’s translation (2016), published by Oxford University Press, is the only one that has a blurb. The comparison of the blurb of Haleem’s translation to the title page of Hilali and Khan’s shows that the former seeks profit, while the latter is distributed for free, as it is shown in figure 6 below:

Figure 6
The Blurb of Haleem’s Translation and the Title Page of Hilali and Khan’s Translation

Figure 6 shows that it is written on the title page of Hilali and Khan’s translation that this translation is “NOT FOR SALE: For Free Distribution”, this declaration gives the reason
for not having a blurb, which functions as a tool to promote sale. However, the price is written on the blurb of Haleem’s translation. It is written on the blurb of Haleem’s translation that “the Qur'an, believed by Muslims to be the word of God”, while it is inscribed on the title page of Hilali and Khan’s translation that the translation is an “endowment for Allah’s sake”. The use of the word “God” implies that the translation is target reader friendly, whereas the implementation of the word Allah indicates that the translation is source text-oriented. This difference entails the investigation of the other selected translations. Table 6 below shows the translators’ different choices for the word ﷽ ﷴ ﷴ ﷴ ﷴ ﷴ:

Table 6
The Translators’ Choices for the Word ﷽ ﷴ ﷴ Allāh [God]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Khattab</th>
<th>Hilali &amp; khan</th>
<th>Haleem</th>
<th>Bakhtiar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>﷽ ﷴ ﷴ</td>
<td>Allah</td>
<td>Allāh</td>
<td>God</td>
<td>God</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 shows that Hilali and Khan and Khattab render the word ﷽ ﷴ ﷴ Allāh [God] as “Allah”, which keeps the original wording of the source culture (SC) to mirror the ideologies of their SC. Khattab (2019) states “Arab Muslims . . . call God ‘Allah.’ The word Allah’ is unique in the sense that it has no plural or gender. It literally means in Arabic ‘the One, True God’” (p. 37). On the other hand, Haleem and Bakhtiar translate the word ﷽ ﷴ ﷴ Allah [God] as “God”. Haleem (2021, Appendix F) argues that the use of the word “Allah” might cause misperception among non-Muslim target readers who would think that “Allah” is “the God of the Arabs only,” (See Appendix F). Haleem’s use of the word “God” instead of “Allah” resonates with the target culture (TC) and produces a user-friendly translation. Similarly, Bakhtiar (2012) states that translating ﷽ ﷴ ﷴ Allah [God] as “Allah” “does not follow the Sunna of the Prophet who did speak to people in their own language” (xviii). Thus, Haleem’s lexical choices in the blurb of his translation reflect his beliefs and send a message that his translation is TR-oriented.

Like Hilali and Khan’s translation, Khattab’s translation has no blurb as it is published by a non-profit establishment, which aims to serve the Arab Islamic culture.
Similarly, Bakhtiar’s translation has no blurb although it is published by the translator. Bakhtiar (2012) states:

I had to publish my findings as soon as possible to initiate a dialogue with the exclusivists. Hopefully, the initiating of a dialogue will further open the minds and awaken to consciousness and conscience those men who place their hand on the World of God giving themselves permission to beat their wives and those women who believe they deserve to be beaten! (xxii)

This quote demonstrates Bakhtiar’s intention from translating and publishing her text. She does not seek profit, but her purpose is to publish her translation as a woman who “sees man and woman as complements of one another, not as superior-inferior” (xix).

The blurb of Haleem’s translation is a way of advertising the text. This attractive and well-written tool has resulted in many editions of Haleem’s translation: 2004, 2005, 2010, and 2016. This blurb is a selection of sentences from Haleem’s introduction. Genette (1997) argues that the publisher issues the blurb, but this blurb distinguishes “the voice of the author” (xx). One of the sentences on the blurb says, “This new translation is written in idiomatic language that remains faithful to the original, making it easy to read while retaining its powers of eloquence” (see figure 6). Idioms are expressions whose meanings cannot be completely understood from the meanings of the component parts; their meanings are above the word level (Baker, 2016). The Qur’ānic expressions are associated with the Arabic culture, and the failure in transferring Arabic idioms into English poses a great obstacle to the TR to comprehend the intended meaning (Raof, 2007). Haleem’s blurb gives indication that his translation is TR-friendly, which encourages the TRs to choose the translation and, in turn, promotes its selling.

It is written on the blurb that “Archaisms and cryptic language are avoided, and the Arabic meaning preserved by respecting the context of the discourse” (see figure 6). Archaisms, words or expressions that are no longer used, constitute obstacles in Qur’ān translation because they increase the complexities of TT through distorting the meaning and confusing the TR (Musleh, 2019). Announcing the avoidance of archaism on the blurb of Haleem’s translation is a tool to advertise the translation. In his introduction, Haleem gives examples of verses whose translations demonstrate his easy, modern, and simple TR-oriented style.
Moreover, it is stated on the blurb of Haleem’s translation that “The message of the Qur’ān was directly addressed to all people regardless of class, gender, or age, and this translation is equally accessible to everyone” (see figure 6). This declaration reveals the intention to make the translation accessible to every person; thus, it has a paperback not a hardcover like Khattab’s and Hilali and Khan’s translations. The paperback cover can enhance the publishers’ income as blurbs have had “a role to play in the marketing of books [since] the nineteenth century [because] the materiality of the book’s cover . . . generates a great deal of meaning” (Matthews & Moody, 2007, xii). The paperback in the UK and USA is “a key vehicle for cultural transmission” (McCleery, 2007). If paperbacks are less expensive than hardcovers, they are used for commercial reasons. That is why Hilali and Khan’s and Khattab’s translations, published in the Middle East, have hard covers since they have undifferentiated non-profitable patrons (see section 1.3.3). Consequently, the publisher of Haleem’s translation utilises a paperback cover and blurb to lessen the expenses of publication and promote profits, and that is why the translation has several editions.

In this section, I discuss the publishers’ peritexts: the designs and colours of the covers, visibility/ invisibility of translators’ names, titles, title pages, and blurbs. In the following section, I examine the elements of the translators’ peritexts: prefaces, forewords, introductions, and footnotes. These devices help reveal the nature of the translators’ ideologies, and the textual analysis either confirms or negates the influence of the ideologies detected in the paratexts of the selected QTs on the translators’ choices.

4.3 The Translators’ Peritexts

Paratexts are devices within the translated text (peritexts) and outside it (epitexts). Peritexts are divided into the publisher’s peritexts and translator’s peritexts (Genette, 1997). In the previous section, I discussed the publishers’ peritexts in the selected QTs (covers of the texts, visibility of translators’ names, titles and title pages, and blurbs). In this section, I explore the translators’ peritexts: prefaces, forewords, introductions, and footnotes. These elements, which accompany the main texts, provide certain information about the source text and reveal certain issues regarding the translation methods (Munday, 2016). I investigate these tools and support the discussion with evidence from the epitexts.
(the interviews with the translators and reviews on the translations) to detect the dominant ideologies in the selected QTs.

4.3.1 Prefaces

Prefaces, one of the translators’ peritextual devices, convey different messages about the translator’s ideologies. “Among the key tools used by feminist translators to ensure their visibility are paratextual elements such as prefaces” (Hassen, 2012, p. 103). Of the four selected translations in this study, Bakhtiar’s translation is the only one that has a preface, in which she praises the language of the Qur’ān, gives the motive and method of her translation, and negates her being biased to any religious or sociocultural thoughts. In his book published in 2018, Kidwai, a reviewer of Qur’ān translations (QTs), states that Bakhtiar’s preface emphasises her feminist agenda and Sufī beliefs. In this section, I argue that Bakhtiar’s preface reveals her visibility as a Sufī, a former Christian, and a woman translator.

In the preface of her translation, Bakhtiar (2012) announces her schooling in Sufism, which includes the Shi’tī and Sunnī views. She states:

I have chosen to continuously engage in the greater struggle of self-improvement. This is the beginning stage of the Sufī path (including muruwwa or moral reasonableness leading to futuwwa or spiritual chivalry) and I cannot even claim that I have moved beyond that. (xx)

This extract reveals Bakhtiar’s Sufī position as she is engaged in the “struggle of self-improvement”. Bakhtiar explains that the Sufī path starts with muruwwa, which leads to futuwwa, which she has not moved beyond. Ignaz Goldziher (2009) confirms “the ‘virtue’ (literally and etymologically the Latin word Virtus corresponds to the Arabic muruwwa) of the Arabs” (p. 22). He explains that muruwwa means all virtues constituting the fame of a tribe. The scholar asserts that in Islam muruwwa is the virtue of considering forgiveness and reconciliation of enemies; it is one of the teachings of Islam. Muslims reach muruwwa when they forgive and return evil with good at the time when they could take revenge. It is an element of akhlaq al-murīd/ practicing spiritual integrity, and it must be acquired before one attains futuwwa, which must be acquired before one attains walāya, the highest rank in Sufī relationships with God (Knysh, 2000; Murata, 1992; Chittick,
In the preface of her translation, Bakhtiar states that she surpassed the Sufī stage of muruwwa and reached the phase of futuwwa.

Bakhtiar clarifies that “The Sublime Quran is the translation of a person who practices spiritual integrity (futuwwa) or spiritual chivalry as it is sometimes called” (xix). Futuwwa is one of the terms of 'Irfanī Sufism, a form of Islamic mysticism that emphasises introspection and spiritual closeness with God (Algar, 2019; Al-Jader, 1999; Chittick, 1989); this branch of Sufism focuses on the hidden and spiritual meaning of the Qur’ān. According to Muhammad Salim El-Awa (2016):

الفتوة: عند الطائفة (الصوفية) أن لا تشهد لنفسك فضلاً ولا ترى حقاً و هي فوق التراضي، لأن صاحبه يرى لنفسه حقاً يضعه، و فضلاً يرضى دونه، و صاحب الفتوة لا يرى على أحد حقاً، فضلًا عن أن يرى لنفسه فضلًا، بل هو يعتقد أن الحقوق عليه لا أنها تجب له! (ص 259)

[According to the Sufi sect, futuwwa is not to appropriate rights for oneself nor regard oneself superior over others; it is an intense form of humility. Since a person who practices futuwwa does not believe he has rights over others rather he should be humble, he does not see he has rights over anyone, but others have rights over him that he must fulfil.]

The quote above explains that the term futuwwa means being humble and giving people their rights, so it is linked to good morals such as nobleness and self-denial. In Iran, futuwwa is associated with manliness and chivalry and used to describe someone brave and manly (Karamipour, 2018). This term “symbolises the quality of the spiritual warrior who conquers his lower self to attain makārim al-akhlāq [good manners]” (Ali, 2020, p. 8). The term futuwwa means chivalry; it is originated from the characteristics of the fatā, Ali Ibn Abi Ṭālib, the symbol of good manners and manliness.

Since this chapter functions as a discovery tool to give insight into the selected translations, it is necessary to scan Bakhtiar’s translation and check her transference of the word fatā [a young man] and its derivatives to identify the ideology that underlines her choices. This term is mentioned in the Qur’ān in the singular form fatā [a young man] in Q 12: 30, Q 18: 60, Q 18: 62, and Q 21: 60, in the plural forms fetya and fetyān [young men] in Q 12: 36, Q 12: 62, Q 18: 10, and Q 18: 13, and in the plural form for female fatayātikum in Q 4: 25 and Q 24: 33. A quick look at these verses has shown that Bakhtiar imbues her translation with an ideological colour of Sufism, which has flourished in Iran
since the Mongols-domination period in the 12th century (Lewisohn, 1998). Thus, the translations of these verses are examined in section 4.4.1 to identify Bakhtiar’s voicing and stance.

In addition to her Sufi beliefs, Bakhtiar’s former religion might impact her lexical choices. In her preface, she states “My mother was not a Catholic, but she sent me to a Catholic school. At the age of eight I wanted to become a Catholic” (xx). Bakhtiar converted to Islam when she left America for Iran at the age of twenty-four. Her upbringing and early educational experience might influence her lexical choices since people’s mental lexicons, the words they repeatedly use, are formed as a result of the integration of their cultures, religions, and languages (Richardson et al., 2021; Gui, 2000). Among the ways to investigate people’s religious thoughts is the language they use; therefore, I will give a significant focus to Bakhtiar’s choices to examine whether she uses Biblical words.

This investigation has revealed that the comparison of the translations of the term al-āhkira in Q. 3: 85 demonstrates the influence of Bakhtiar’s former religion on her lexical choices. The three male translators use the word “Hereafter”, whereas Bakhtiar uses “the world to come”, a phrase commonly used in Christianity. Bakhtiar’s rendition of other terms discloses her mental lexicons formed due to the impact of her former religion and familiarity with Biblical terms. I realised that in addition to the word al-āhkira in Q 3: 85, the words ash-shayṭān in Q 19: 83 and al-maṣīr in Q 2: 285 are coloured with the effect of her being a former Christian. Table 7 below shows Bakhtiar’s different choices for these terms:

Table 7
The Translators’ Choices for al-āhkira, ash-shayṭān, and al-maṣīr

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Khattab</th>
<th>Hilali &amp; Khan</th>
<th>Haleem</th>
<th>Bakhtiar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q 3: 85</td>
<td>al-āhkira</td>
<td>Hereafter</td>
<td>Hereafter</td>
<td>Hereafter</td>
<td>the world to come</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 19: 83</td>
<td>ash-shayṭān</td>
<td>devils</td>
<td>Shayātin</td>
<td>evil ones</td>
<td>Satans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 2: 36</td>
<td>al-maṣīr</td>
<td>Satan</td>
<td>Shaiṭān</td>
<td>Satan</td>
<td>Satan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7 shows that unlike the originally Muslim translators, who use “Hereafter” for а³££-a³¬¬l²£µ£ (Hereafter), Bakhtiar resorts to “the world to come” which connotes in Christianity the second coming of Christ. This phrase appears in The King James Version of the Holy Bible at Matthew 12:32, Mark 10:30, Luke 18:30, Hebrews 2:5, and Hebrews 6:5. Matthew 12:32 says “neither in this world, neither in the [world] to come” (p. 565). Also, in Q 19: 83, Bakhtiar’s choice of “satans” for ﺍš-šayyâṭîn [devils] echoes the use of the word “satan” in the singular and plural with no difference between devils and Satan as a creature from fire. The term is presented in Luke 10:18, 1 Chronicles 21:1, Luke 10.19, Job 1:6, 1:7, 1:9, and 1:12. Unlike the originally Muslim translators, Bakhtiar uses “Satan” and “satans” whenever she transfers the meaning of Shayyân [a devil] or Shayyâṭîn [devils] and this consistency might be due to the influence of her former religion on her mental lexicon58 (Gui, 2000). Moreover, Bakhtiar’s choice of “Homecoming” for ﺍلْمَﺼِﯿﺮُ [destiny] highlights her Knowledge of Christianity since seventeen Biblical verses such as Mark 5: 19, Genesis 28: 15, and Luke 15: 11-32 are about Homecoming, a term which means ‘a final home’ or ‘eternal home’ (New Testament, 2004). Thus, Bakhtiar’s preface sends a message about the probability of her choices of biblical words.

Another aspect of Bakhtiar’s translation revealed in her preface is her feminist perspective. Her gender identity is stressed in her preface when she identifies herself as “a woman translator” and points out “that this is the first critical English translation of the Qur’an by a woman [because she] found that little attention had been given to the woman’s point of view in Quranic translation” (xix). In this statement, she constructs an identity for herself as a competent translator. Similar to feminist translators, Bakhtiar (2012) uses prefacing59 as a tool to specify her aims stating:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q 2: 285</th>
<th>إِﻟَﯿْﮏَ</th>
<th>to you ‘alone’ is the final return</th>
<th>to You is the return (of all)</th>
<th>To You we all return!</th>
<th>to You is the Homecoming</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
It can be said that this translation was undertaken by a woman to bring both men and women to equity so that the message of fairness and justice between the sexes can be accepted in Truth by both genders. (xxi)

Bakhtiar’s statement of gender equality is highlighted in her translation by applying supplementing. This translation strategy is applied by feminist translators to make up for linguistic and semantic losses between the source language and the target language (von Flotow, 1991) (see section 2.3.5). Supplementing could be viewed as a textual or paratextual strategy depending on the tools employed by the translator. Bakhtiar chooses compensation as a strategy to make up for the linguistic losses between the gender marked Arabic and the English language. In her preface, she explains that:

[W]hen words in a verse refer directly to a woman or women or wife or wives and the corresponding pronouns such as (they, them, those), I have placed an (f) after the word to indicate the word refers to the feminine gender specifically. (2012, xix).

The presence of the letter (f) to inform the reader which words are meant to be feminine in the source text highlights the difference between Bakhtiar’s translation and the translations by the three male translators. Bakhtiar knows that Arabic is a highly gendered language (Hassen, 2011), so she tries to make feminine nouns, pronouns and verbs visible in English. It can be considered an over-translation since the meanings of the verses are clear without this supplement (see section 1.3.5). This strategy creates a stronger effect on the TR and stresses the feminine visibility in the target text, which is a high priority for a feminist translator of a religious text. Hence, Bakhtiar’s application of supplementing is governed by the sociocultural ideologies and the social norms of her community as feminism in America is a movement promoting empowering women.

In this section, I discuss prefaces as significant tools revealing information about translations’ ideologies. I shed light on the ideologies detected in the preface of Bakhtiar’s translation; these ideologies make her version of QT different from the other translations selected in this study. I elucidate that Bakhtiar’s lexical choices are affected by her being a former Christian, descending from an Iranian father, and having Sufī theological views.

---

60 A strategy which explains the over-translation to add feminist meanings. (see note 15)
In the next section, I examine the foreword in Hilali and Khan’s translation to identify the dominant ideologies that affect their translation.

4.3.2 Forewords

In addition to prefaces, forewords reveal information about the content of translations. Forewords are introductory sections written by prominent figures to lend credibility to the books. Such inscriptions “may be consciously crafted as thresholds . . . [T]hey might influence how the text is received . . . [by] the reader of that particular copy” (Bachelor, 2018, p. 144). Forewords disclose factors behind translation decisions, “ideology, economics, and the subjectivity of the translator” (Deane-Cox, 2014, p. 13). Of the four selected translations, Hilali and Khan’s translation is the only one which has a foreword. This translation begins with its attestation by Dar-ul-Iftā’ [Presidency of Islamic Research, Ifta, Call and Propagation] and then a short foreword by the Minister of Islamic Affairs. This section argues that the foreword in Hilali and Khan’s translation reveals information about not only the translation procedures but also its ideologies.

The literal translation of the foreword implies the application of the same method in the TT. The translation of the foreword follows the Arabic structure; it starts with several long introductory phrases, taking twelve lines, before the subject and the verb of sentence are stated. These phrases announce the purpose of the translation and mention the name of the patronage. Below is an illustration:

Following the directives of the Custodian of the Two Holy Mosques, King Salman ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz Āl Sa‘ūd, may Allah guard him, to give the book of Allah all the importance due to it, its publication, its distribution throughout the world, preparation of its commentary and translation of its meanings into different world languages; and in view of the firm faith of the Ministry of Islamic Affairs, Da‘wah and Guidance in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia . . . to enable the non-Arabic-speaking Muslims to understand it . . . , King Fahd Glorious Qur’ān Printing Complex has the pleasure to present the English-speaking reader with this English translation. (Hilali & Khan, 2020, IV)

This quote gives insight into the translation of the text; first, it shows that this translation is approved by the ruling power in Saudi Arabia and distributed for free to all non-Arabic-speaking Muslims to enable them to understand the Qur’ān. Second, mentioning the name of the publishing house before the names of the translators reveals the status of this
publishing house as undifferentiated (see section 1.3.3). Third, the structure of the translation of this extract is an imitation of the structure of the Arabic language, and this method hinders the flow of the translation and makes it difficult for the TR to understand. Thus, this quote provides information about the method and procedures of the translation.

The foreword includes the translations of Q 10: 37 and Q 3: 85. The former affirms the impossibility of fabricating the Qur’ān by anyone because it is a revelation from the Lord of the Worlds, and it confirms the truth of the Scriptures before it. The latter foretells the fate of those who follow a path other than what God has legislated, declaring that they will not be accepted and in the Hereafter will be among the losers (Ibn Kathīr, 2002). The foreword of Hilali and Khan’s translation also includes a saying by Prophet Muhammad along with its translation, which highlights Hilali and Khan’s reliance on *al-aḥādīth al-ṣaḥīḥah* [authentic narrations of words and deeds by Prophet Muhammad] (Brown, 2009). According to Kidwai (2018), Hilali and Khan’s translation is an abridged copy of *tafsīr* Ibn Kathīr. The choice of these two verses and the prophet’s saying sends a message about the ideologies of the translation. The comparison of the translations of Q 3: 85, appearing in Hilali and Khan’s foreword, reveals the translators’ views of the meaning of the word ‘Islam’:

**Example 2: Q. 3: 85**

\[
\text{Example 2: Q. 3: 85}
\]

\[
\text{wa man yabtaghi ghayyra al-Islam dīnā fālān yuqbal min huwa fi-l-ākhira min al-khāsirīn}
\]

**Khattab:** Whoever seeks a way other than Islam,\(^{(1)}\) it will never be accepted from them, and in the Hereafter they will be among the losers. (p. 106)

**Hilali-Khan:** And whoever seeks a religion other than Islam, it will never be accepted of him and in the Hereafter he will be one of the losers\(^{(1)}\) (IV/ p. 108)

---

\(^{61}\) The bulk of Islamic law comes from *aḥādīth*, first-hand reports of Prophet Muhammad’s words and deeds, passed from generation to generation. *Al-aḥādīth al-ṣaḥīḥah* are the authentic ones whose validity is agreed upon by all *ḥādīth* scholars that they are related to the chain of narrators. (see Brown, L. A. C. (2009). *Hadith: Muhammad’s legacy in the medieval and modern world*. One World Publications.)
Haleem: If anyone seeks a religion other than [islam] complete devotion to God, it will not be accepted from him: he will be one of the losers in the Hereafter. (p. 40-41)

Bakhtiar: And whoever be looking for a way of life other than submission to God, it will never be accepted from him. And, he, in the world to come, will be among the ones who are losers. (p. 55)

Table 8
The Translators’ Choices for The Translators’ Choices for the religion Islam in Q 3: 85

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Khattab</th>
<th>Hilali &amp; Khan</th>
<th>Haleem</th>
<th>Bakhtiar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>الإسلام دينًا</td>
<td>a way/ Islam, (1) i.e. full submission to the Will of Allah.</td>
<td>a religion/ Islam</td>
<td>a religion/ [islam] complete devotion to God</td>
<td>a way of life/ submission to God</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8 highlights the translators’ views of the religion Islam. Before discussing these views, it is important to explain that the word الإسلام دينًا al-Islam [Islam] in the Arabic language means showing submission and acceptance of the religion that Prophet Muhammad brought (Al-Mu’jam Al-Wasít, 2004, p. 446). In Q 3: 85, God reprimands whoever prefers a religion other than the religion that He sent in His Books, saying that this will never be accepted on the Day of Judgment and whoever does it will be one of the losers. Table 8 shows that Khattab’s choice demonstrates his thought that Islam, as a religion, is a way of life; he explains in a footnote that it is the “full submission to the Will of Allah”. Also, in his introduction, Khattab (2019) answers the question “What is Islam?” saying:

Islam is the message that was delivered by all prophets of Allah from Adam (ﷺ) to Muḥammad (ﷺ). Islam is neither named after a person or a tribe nor does it end with an -ism. Though each prophet had a relatively different law, the essence of the message of Islam was always the same: have faith in one God and do good . . . All prophets and their followers (including Jesus and his disciplines) are simply called ‘Muslims’ in the Quran. Hence, anyone who submits to Allah and strives to be a good person can be called a ‘muslim’ (with a small ‘m’) from a linguistic perspective . . . Islam is not only a religion, but a comprehensive way of life. (p. 35)
This extract from Khattab’s introduction aligns with his choice for الإسلام in Q 3: 85 as “a way/ Islam”, a “full submission to the Will of Allah”. The quote explains that Islam is the religion of all prophets, and it “is not only a religion, but a comprehensive way of life”. Khattab employs descriptive equivalent and a footnote to give the meaning of the term and reveal his views.

Furthermore, table 8 shows that, like Khattab, Haleem combines two translation procedures: transliteration “[islam]” and paraphrase “complete devotion to God”. It also demonstrates that Bakhtiar translates الإسلام al-Islam [Islam] as “a way of life/ submission to God”. Similarly, in her preface, Bakhtiar defines Islam as “a way of life that has existed continuously from ancient times” (xxv). She confirms that Prophet Muhammad completed this religion. Khattab’s, Haleem’s, and Bakhtiar’s translations imply religious tolerance and acceptance to people who devote themselves to God.

However, Hilali and Khan (2020) add a very long footnote using ḥādīth from Sahîh Al-Bukhârî. This ḥādīth gives Prophet Muhammad’s reply to the question, “What is Islam?” saying that Islam means “To worship Allâh Alone and none else, to perform Aṣ-Ṣalât (Iqâmat-Aṣ-Ṣalât), to give the Zakât and to observe Saum (fast) during the month of Ramadân” (p. 109). They not only stick to the ST but also utilise a translation that emphasises the Islamic rituals, while the other translators give interpretation that encourages interreligious acceptance. Unlike Hilali and Khan’s translation, Khattab’s, Haleem’s, and Bakhtiar’s imply that whoever submits himself to God is a Muslim. Thus, Hilali and Khan might rely on ḥādīth to produce an educational translation.

In addition to their focus on Islamic rituals, their emphasis on using the term “Islamic Monotheism” (VI) is detected in Hilali and Khan’s foreword, which reflects their utilisation of the ideologies formed in the translation place of publication. This term represents the teachings of Salafism, a theological movement in Saudi Arabia (Spannaus, 2018). This movement of Sunnî Islam is revived by Muhammad Ibn Abd Al-Wahab in Najd, central Saudi Arabia (Harikandahi, 2021) and was derived from the opinions and thoughts of some Sunnî predecessors such as Ibn Taymiyyah (661-728 AH) and Ibn Qayyim Al-Jawziyya (691-751 AH) (Hijazi, 2013). Salafism is known for emphasising

---

62 Salafism, an intellectual current of Sunnî Islam (see note 21).
the concepts *tawḥīd* [Monotheism], and warning against *shirk* [polytheism] (Al-Thaalibi, 1995). These terms are explained in Appendix II in Hilali and Khan’s translation; therefore, I investigate the translations of verses about these concepts in section 5.5.1.

In this section, I explore how the foreword of Hilali and Khan’s translation gives information about not only the content of the translation but also the status of the publishing house. I show that it is published by King Fahd Glorious Printing Complex, an undifferentiated patronage since ideologies, payment, and status are from the same group. I demonstrate that authorisation gives Hilali and Khan’s translation a high status. In the next section, I discuss introductions as translators’ peritextual tools revealing evidence about the ideologies reflected in the translations.

### 4.3.3 Introductions

The third tool of the translator’s peritexts is the introduction, a paratextual tool that provides a systematic link with the order of the text. Unlike the preface, the introduction announces information about circumstantial and historical association with the internal logic of the book. It presents the translation general division and self-differentiation (Genette, 1997), so it affects the reception of the target text (TT) and makes the translator visible (Bachelor, 2018). In this section, I argue that the introductions of the Qur’ān translations (QTs) by Khattab, Hilali and Khan, Haleem, and Bakhtiar divulge the translators’ religious and sociocultural ideologies.

The introduction of Khattab’s translation includes nine sections, among which are a brief overview of the history of QT, the approach to the translation, and the stylistic features of the translation. It also answers questions about “the link between *jihād* and terrorism, relevance and aptness of *Shari‘a* law, compatibility of Islam with democracy, rights of non-Muslims, [and] abuse of women” (Kidwai, 2018, p. 129). Khattab’s introduction informs the reader of his thirty years of his education at Al-Azhar, a governmental institution whose imams follow the *Ash‘arī* theological school.63 *Ash‘arī* deny the negative attributes of God (Ibn-Hazm, 1899). The later *Ash‘arī* theologians interpret the meanings of certain words in the Qur’ān that God has added to Himself in His book believing that these words are not meant to be used literally but to establish a

---

63 *Ash‘arism* is a theological school of *Sunni* Islam (see note 31).
meaning to avoid falling into anthropomorphism. In my interview with Khattab (2021, Appendix F), he states that he has Ashʿarī views; however, he denied displaying these beliefs in his translation saying:

I studied at Al-Azhar, and you know we have the Ashʿaria and Māturīdia schools of thought, which interpret the names and attributes of Allah. However, I disagree with Ashʿaria and Māturīdia taʾwīl [interpretation] of names and attributes of Allah. When I translated the Qurʾān, I tried to stick to Ahl As-Sunna wa-l-Jamaʿa’s understanding of Allah’s Names and Attributes. So if the Qurʾān says that Allah has a hand, then Allah has a hand. If it says He has a face, then He has a face, and so forth. I do not go through these controversial issues between these different schools of Islamic theology.

Khattab states that he does not apply taʾwīl [interpretation] approach when he interprets names and attributes of Allah. Khattab (2019) also criticises attributing negative description to God:

قد يقع بعض المترجمين في أخطاء فيما يتعلق بصفات الله ( سبحانه وتعالى) . . . ومن ذلك ترجمة معظم المترجمين قوله تعالى: (نسوا الله فنسبه) [التوبة 27], وقوله: (يُخْدِعُونَ الله وَهُوَ خَدَعُهُمْ) [النساء 142] بنسبة النسيان والخداع لله تعالى وهو منزه عن ذلك. (ص 11)

[Some translators might make mistakes regarding the translations of the Attributes of God (Glory be to Him) . . . For example, most translators interpret Q 9: 67 as ‘They have forgotten God, so He has forgotten them’ and Q 4: 142 as ‘They deceive God, but He deceives them’. These translators attribute forgetting and deception to God, but God is above that.]

The quote from the interview sends a message that Khattab transfers the Attributes of God without interpretation of their meanings; however, in the introduction of his QT, he disapproves of the attribution of forgetting or deceiving to God. Surveying his translation, I observed that Khattab is inconsistent as he swings between applying taʾwīl [interpretation] and ithbāt [affirmation]. Khattab faithfully transfers يد الله [Allah’s hand] in Q 5: 64 as “Allah is tight-fisted”, ساق الله [Allah’s leg] in Q 68: 42 as “Shin of Allah,” and باعينانا [with Our Eyes] in Q 11: 37 as “under Our ‘watchful’ Eyes”. Nevertheless, he

64 Anthropomorphism is the attribution of human characteristics to God. (see Baho, M. (2012). Aqaʿid al-Ashʿaria [Ashʿarī beliefs]. Al-Maktaba Al-Islamia.)
interprets the phrase "وجهة الله" [Allah’s face] as “your Lord Himself”, which reflects his belief in Ash’arism. Hence, I investigate the translations of the verses that include the Attributes of God in detail to measure the frequency and percentages of the translators’ choices which reveal their Ash’arī views (see sections 5.3.1 & 5.3.2).

In Khattab’s introduction, the section entitled “Select Teaching from Prophet Muhammad (ﷺ)” discusses sayings by Prophet Muhammad about marriage states. One of the aḥādīth [Prophet’s sayings] that Khattab mentioned says “the best among the believers are those who are best to their wives” (p. 43). Khattab confirms that his translation is “accurate, smooth, and accessible” (p. 7). He asserts that he produces a simple and reader-friendly translation. This kind of translation requires dealing with cultural differences through applying the appropriate translation procedures (Newmark, 1988). In his introduction, Khattab gives some examples of Qur’ān translations that do not consider the culture-bound terms and/or the context. The comparison of the translations of Q 58: 2 sheds light on Khattab’s choices for the culture-bound term ﯾُﻈَٰﮭِﺮُونَ:

Example 3: Q 58: 2

 Ал-لذين يُظْهِرُونَ منكم من نساهم ممن هن أمهاتهم (المجادلة 2)

al-ladhīn yuẓahirūn minkum min nisā’ihim mina hunna ummahātihihm

Khattab: Those of you who ‘sinfully’ divorce their wives by comparing them to their mothers ‘should know that’ their wives are in no way their mothers. (p. 579)

Hilali and Khan: Those among you who make their wives unlawful to them by Zihār(1), they cannot be their mothers. (p. 959)

Haleem: Even if any of you say to their wives. ‘You are to me like my mother’s back,’ they are not their mothers; (p. 362)

Bakhtiar: Those who say to their wives: Be as my mother’s back, they (f) are not their mothers. (p. 529)

Table 9
The Translators’ Choices for ﯾُﻈَٰﮭِﺮُونَ yuẓahirūn in Q 58: 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Khattab</th>
<th>Hilali &amp; Khan</th>
<th>Haleem</th>
<th>Bakhtiar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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‘sinfully’ divorce their wives by comparing them to their mothers
make their wives unlawful to them by Zihār[1]
say to their wives. ‘You are to me like my mother’s back’
*a form of divorce

Table 9 highlights the translators’ different choices; however, to examine the ideologies behind these choices, it is important to explain the meaning of the culture-bound term yuẓahirūn. The root of the term is ziḥār which means “to put something behind your back” (Al-Mu’jam Al-Wasīṭ, 2004, p. 578). Q 58: 2 gives the message that ziḥār was a form of divorce present in the Arabian Peninsula before the emergence of Islam and continued for some time in Islam, yet it is unlawful in Islam (Haleem, 2016).

Table 9 shows that Khattab applies a functional equivalent and chooses the word “divorce”, whereas Haleem uses a descriptive equivalent and a footnote. According to Newmark (1988), descriptive equivalent is the meaning of the cultural words explained in few words. Applying this approach, Haleem explains the situation and renders the term yuẓahirūn as “say to their wives ‘You are to me like my mother’s back’”. In the footnote, he adds that the term means ‘divorce’ and that “the pagan Arabs used to separate themselves from their wives by saying, ‘You are to me like my mother’s back,’ which deprived the wife of her marital rights, yet prevented her from marrying again” (Haleem, 2016, p. 362). Khattab and Haleem overcome the cultural specificity of the term yuẓahirūn by using the universal term “divorce” combined with footnotes, which reflects their application of the communicative translation approach.

However, Hilali and Khan use transliteration, interpolation, the insertion of the Arabic word “(الظهر)” in the TT, and a footnote. In their footnote, they explain the meaning of the problematic term yuẓahirūn and give insight to the SC; nevertheless, they do not make it clear to the contemporary TR that az-ziḥār equals divorce nowadays. They state “Az-Zihār is the saying of a husband to his wife: You are to me like the back of my mother (i.e. unlawful for me to approach)” (Hilali & Khan, 2020, 65).

Interpolation means the insertion of something of a different nature into the TT (see note 18).
Hilali and Khan detach themselves by being faithful to the ST and SC, leaving the TR without clarifying the meaning neither in the TT nor in a footnote.

Hilali and Khan’s translation approach is reflected in their introduction, which is added to their version published in Saudi Arabia in the edition of 2020. This introduction includes nine sections, among which are “Commentary (tafsīr) of the Glorious Qur’ān”, “The Inimitability (iʿjāz) of the Glorious Qur’ān”, and “Translation of the Meanings of the Glorious Qur’ān” (VIII-XVIII). In this introduction, it is stated that this translation cannot be called the Qur’ān because the Qur’ān is the Word of Allah, and “the translation represents the understanding of the translator of the meanings of the Glorious Qur’ān” (XVIII). The introduction says that the condition of producing an acceptable translation of the Qur’ān is to explain the correct meanings of the Qur’ān without offending Muslims or displaying wrong beliefs that harm the values of Islam. It states that:

[T]he King Fahd Glorious Qur’ān Printing Complex in Madinah Munawwarah has undertaken the preparation and publication of correct translations of the meanings of the Glorious Qur’ān, with the objective of conveying the sublime message of the Glorious Qur’ān to non-Arabic speaking peoples in their respective languages.

This quote highlights the role of the publishing house to produce a correct translation. The detailed introduction and the appendices reveal that Hilali and Khan rely on traditional tafāsīr [exegeses], mainly Aṭ-Ṭabarī and Ibn Kathīr. In their introduction, Hilali and Khan declare that “Al-tafsīr al-maʿṭūr (transmitted commentary) is the preferred kind of tafsīr of the Glorious Qur’ān, because it has been transmitted from the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم, or from his Companions and their students from among the tābiʿūn” (XIV). They set the guidelines of the method applied to choosing these tafāsīr: to be authentic, agree with the general content of the Qur’ān, consider the inimitability of the Qur’ān, and give correct interpretation. Thus, the introduction of Hilali and Khan’s translation demonstrates that their translation depends on traditional tafāsīr [exegeses].

Similar to the introductions of Khattab’s and Hilali and Khan’s translations, the introduction of Haleem’s translation accentuates his comprehensive and extensive
knowledge of the Qur’ān. Haleem (2016) mentions information about the Qur’ān known only by an expert and a Hāfīz66 as he states:

The Qur’ān contains some 6,200 verses and out of these only 100 deal with ritual practices, 70 verses discuss personal laws, 70 verses civil laws, 30 penal laws, and 20 judiciary matters and testimony. Moreover, these tend to deal with general principles such as justice, kindness, and charity, rather than detailed laws: even legal matters are explained in language that appeals to the emotions, conscience, and belief in God. (xviii)

This quote gives specific details about the content of the Qur’ān and reflects Haleem’s understanding of its morals and structure. His introduction comprises eight sections giving an immense and illuminating overview of his translation. These sections are: “the life of Muhammad and the historical background”, “the revelation of the Qur’ān”, “the compilation of the Qur’ān”, “the structure of the Qur’ān: Suras and Ayas”, “stylistic features, issues of interpretation, and a short history of English translations of the Qur’ān” (x-xxix). These articles would help new English-speaking Muslims to know more about Islam and the Qur’ān.

Haleem’s introduction also reflects his awareness of contemporary issues and reveals his stance. Haleem (2016) states:

[The Qur’ān] is the book that ‘differentiates’ between right and wrong, so that nowadays, when the Muslim world is dealing with such universal issues as globalisation, the environment, combating terrorism and drugs, issues of medical ethics, and feminism, evidence to support the various arguments is sought in the Qur’ān. (Haleem, 2016, ix)

This quote shows Haleem’s belief that the Qur’ān is intended for all times and all people and that gender equality and the environment are current topics globally. This information is supported by what he said in his interview (see Appendix F) that he has to translate in modern English understood by everyone at present. He uses accessible English relevant to contemporary non-Arab TRs to facilitate their understanding of the Qur’ānic worldview. Kidwai (2018) argues that, in his introduction, Haleem’s comment on the translation of Q 2: 282 shows that he is “swayed by the current notion of absolute gender equality in the West” (p. 12). The verse says that a judge accepts the witness of one man

66 A Muslim who has completely memorised the Qur’ān.
or two women, yet in his introduction, Haleem (2016) comments on the translation of this verse revealing his liberal ideologies stating:

[Q 2: 282] gives instructions on how to secure the agreement in writing and by testimony to avoid conflict or loss of the lender’s money. It calls on people to do this in a cultural environment where women generally were less involved in money matters and calculations than men, and less literature. Modern interpreters take the view that the cultural context is different now and that a woman can be as well educated as a man, or even better. Therefore, they confine this verse to its cultural context and allow a woman now to give witness alone, just as she is allowed to be a judge on her own. (xxvi)

The quote shows Haleem’s liberal thoughts; it highlights his ideologies that nowadays a woman can not only witness alone, as does a man, but can also rule countries. According to Hatim and Mason (2005), translators’ ideologies are beliefs “which are shared collectively by social groups” (p. 120); thus, living in the West for more than forty years, Haleem considers gender equality and the changes taking place concerning gender issues (see Appendix F). However, in his translation he adheres to the ST and explains the historical background for the TR to understand that the Qurʾān can be interpreted in regard with its “cultural context”.

Haleem’s adherence to the meanings in the ST does not prevent him from showing sensitivity to contemporary issues such as the environment. Haleem considers his target reader and produces a modern translation. “[M]odern translations of the sacred texts are often based primarily on sensitivity towards the needs of their prospective reading audience to the detriment of the principle that sacred texts should be heard, read and understood as religious artifacts derived from their ancient world” (Naudé, 2010, p. 287). In his introduction, Haleem (2016) argues that the Qurʾān has “evidence to support various arguments [about contemporary] universal issues as . . . the environment” (ix). Haleem’s translation of Q 30: 41 shows his consideration to people’s relationship with their natural environment:

**Example 4: Q 30: 41**

اﻟﻨّـَﺎسِ ﻟِﯿُﺬِﯾﻘَﮭُﻢ ﺑَﻌْﺾَ اﻟﱠﺬِي ﻋَﻤِﻠُﻮا ﻟَﻌَﻠﱠﮭُﻢْ ظَﮭَرَ اﻟْﻔَﺴـَﺎدُ ﻓِﻲ اﻟْﺒَﺮِّ وَاﻟْﺒَﺤْﺮِ ﺑِمَﺎ ﻛَﺴـَﺒَﺖْ أَﯾْﺪِي اﻟﺮُّوم)ﯾَﺮْﺟِﻌُﻮنَ 41(
Corruption has spread on land and sea as a result of what people’s hands have done, so that Allah may cause them to taste ‘the consequences of’ some of their deeds and perhaps they might return ‘to the Right Path’. (p. 430)

Evil (sins and disobedience to Allāh) has appeared on land and sea because of what the hands of men have earned (by oppression and evil deeds), that He (Allāh) may make them taste a part of that which they have done, in order that they may return (by repenting to Allāh, and begging His Pardon). (p. 701)

Corruption was manifested on the dry land and the sea because of what the hands of humanity earned. He causes them to experience some of what they did, so that perhaps they will return repentant. (p. 388)

Corruption has flourished on land and sea as a result of people’s actions and He will make them taste the consequences of some of their own actions so that they may turn back. (p. 259)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 10</th>
<th>The Translators’ Choices for al-fasād in Q 30: 41</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Khattab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-fasād</td>
<td>Corruption</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10 shows that Haleem’s choice of the word “corruption” for al-fasād is similar to Khattab’s and Bakhtiar’s, yet it is different from the rendition of Hilali and Khan, who use “Evil (sins and disobedience to Allāh)”. The traditional interpretation of Q 30: 41 says that when a society degenerates to the point that the prophets and their messages are completely ignored, the inevitable result is punishment through natural disasters, such as a flood, sandstorm, earthquake, among others (At-Ţabarī, 1963; Ibn Kathīr, 2002). Table 10 demonstrates that Hilali and Khan follow the traditional approach to Qur’ānic exegesis as they relate the environmental crisis to people’s sins and disobedience to God, whereas the other translators show environmental sensitivity, which reflects their perspectives of the relationship between man and the environment.
According to Muhammad et al. (2010), the Qurʾān touches on the issue of the environment, and Q 30: 41 is one of the verses that highlight the relationship between people and nature and confirm people’s responsibility towards the environment. Soumaya Ouis (1998) states that this verse includes the term فَسَاد fasād, “which is translated as mischief, destruction, or corruption” (p. 159). On translating verses about the environment, Nüzhet Aksoy (2020) argues that “ecologically-minded translators” (p. 29) prefer lexical choices that reflect an ecological vision, which at the same time aligns with the perspectives of their potential TRs (Naudé, 2010). Like Khattab and Bakhtiar, Haleem gives a modern ecologically sensitive interpretation of Q 30: 41 and deals with the verse as a powerful prophecy describing the environmental current situation and explaining that man has corrupted the land and the sea in the literal sense. His application of the communicative approach to translation is a tool for the TR to receive this message. Overall, the examination of the translations of this verse confirms that the introduction of Haleem’s translation sends messages about his sensitivity to contemporary issues and TRs.

In addition to revealing Haleem’s understanding of the Qurʾān and his awareness of universal problems, his introduction reveals his expertise in the Arabic and English languages. He states that in his translation, he considers وُجُوْحُ الْقُرْآنِ wujuh al-Qurʾān, a Qurʾānic feature of having “different meanings for different contexts” (xxx). He advises translators “to recognise when it is appropriate to be consistent in translation of a repeated term, and when to reflect the context” (xxxi). This belief gives the reason why Haleem “has placed great emphasis on information gleaned from classical Arabic dictionaries, including Lisān Al-ʿArab by Ibn Manzūr, Al-Qāmūs Al-Muḥiṭ by Al-Fayruzabadi, and Al-Muʿjam Al-Wasīṭ” (xxxi). He uses these dictionaries to select the proper contextual meanings. For example, among the meanings of the word إِصلاَحًا islāḥan [repair, correction, fixation, or reconciliation], Haleem chooses “put things right” to transfer the contextual meaning since the verse says that husbands and wives have the same rights according to the Shariʿa.

Haleem uses simple, modern, idiomatic, and accurate English language to ascend to an appropriate level suitable for the TR.
Moreover, Haleem’s introduction shows both modern style and avoidance of the use of old English to produce an easy-to-understand translation for the TR. Haleem (2016) states:

This translation is intended to go further than previous works in accuracy, clarity, flow, and currency of language. It is written in modern, easy style, avoiding where possible the use of cryptic language or archaisms that tend to obscure meaning. (xxix)

This quote discloses Haleem’s intention to produce a target reader-oriented translation. He confirms that he does not rely on archaism or pompous language. He expresses his beliefs concerning the use of “cryptic language or archaisms” and comments on previous translations of the Qur’an emphasising the impact of using archaic language. Haleem gives an example of his translation of the word لباسا libāsan [clothes] in Q 7: 26:

Example 5: Q 7: 26

يَا بَنِي أَدَمَ أَنْزَلْنَا عَلَيْكُمْ لِبَاسًٰٓ يُوَارِي سَوَاكَتِكُمْ

Khattab: O Children of Adam! We have provided for you clothing to cover your nakedness (p. 188)

Hilali-Khan: O Children of Adam! We have bestowed raiment upon you to cover your private parts (p. 260)

Haleem: Children of Adam, Surely, We have given you garments to cover your nakedness (p. 95)

Bakhtiar: O Children of Adam! Surely, We caused to descend to you garments to cover up your intimate parts (p. 140)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Khattab</th>
<th>Hilali &amp; khan</th>
<th>Haleem</th>
<th>Bakhtiar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>لباسا</td>
<td>clothing</td>
<td>raiment</td>
<td>garments</td>
<td>garments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11 shows the different choices for the term لباسا libāsan, which is defined as “dress”, “something that covers the body”, “garments”, and “clothing” (Al-Mu jam Al-Wasīt, 151
2004, p. 813). In Q 7: 26, God reminds people that He has given them *libās* referring to clothes to conceal their nakedness/private parts (Ibn Kathīr, 2002). Haleem’s simple choice of the word “garments” gives a direct clear translation that conveys accurate meaning, which is accessible to the TR. Like Haleem, Khattab and Bakhtiar choose easy and modern words; nonetheless, Hilali and Khan’s choice of “raiment”, an archaic word, might be incomprehensible by the contemporary TR, so it might lead to a significant loss of the intended meaning.

Furthermore, Haleem’s introduction shows his consideration to the TR through his use of idiomatic English as one element of communicative translation. Haleem (2016) states:

Throughout this translation, care has been taken to avoid unnecessarily close adherence to the original Arabic structures and idioms, which almost always sound unusual in English. Literal translations of Arabic idioms often result in meaningless English. (xxxi)

The comparison of the translations of Q 94:1 highlights Haleem’s use of idiomatic English:

**Example 6: Q 94: 1**

أَﻟَﻢْ ﻧَﺸْﺮَحْ ﻟَﻚَ ﺻَﺪْرَكَ

**alam nashraḥ laka ṣadrak**

**Khattab:** Have We not uplifted your heart for you ‘O Prophet’, (p. 660)

**Hilali and Khan:** Have We not opened your breast for you (O Muhammad صلى الله عليه وسلم) (p. 1096)

**Haleem:** Did We not relieve your heart for you, (p. 426)

**Bakhtiar:** Expand We not your breast, (p. 558)

**Table 12**

The Translators’ Choices for **nashraḥ laka ṣadrak** in Q 94: 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Khattab</th>
<th>Hilali &amp; Khan</th>
<th>Haleem</th>
<th>Bakhtiar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>نَﺸْﺮَحَ لِلْکَ صَﺪْرُکَ</td>
<td>uplifted your heart</td>
<td>opened your breast</td>
<td>relieve your heart</td>
<td>Expand We not your breast</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 12 highlights Hilali and Khan’s literal translation, Khattab’s and Haleem’s impactful translations, and Bakhtiar’s odd structure. The root of the word *nashrah* is *sharaḥ* which means “Explained,” “interpreted”, or “opened”, while the phrase *sharaḥ as-sadr* means “made it love something” (*Al-Mu’jam Al-Wasīṭ*, 2004, p. 477). In Q 94: 1, God reminds Prophet Muhammad of more blessings to reassure him of His continued support. The collocation *sharaḥ al-sadr* literally means “opening the breast,” and figuratively means “softening the heart with faith” (*Ibn Kathīr*, 2002). *AL-Zamkhšāhrī* (1934) states that the collocation means expanding the prophet’s heart so that it can deal with the concerns of prophethood. Haleem’s and Khattab’s choices of “relieve your heart” and “uplifted your heart” are more reader friendly since they express the contextual meaning. Table 12 also shows that Bakhtiar sticks to the syntax of the ST, which results in a confusing, unreadable, and unintelligible text (*Nida & Taber*, 1982). The aforementioned discussion shows that Haleem conveys the idiomatic meaning of the collocation *nashrah ṣadrak*, to avoid complete or partial semantic loss.

Also, Bakhtiar’s introduction reveals more about her translation and her ideologies. In her introduction, she states “The Quran is the eternal Word of God for those who are Muslims” (xxv) and that it was revealed to Prophet Muhammad to complete “the message of a way of life that has existed continuously from ancient times” (xxv). The introduction reveals Bakhtiar’s belief that Islam is a way of life, an open system with no beginning and no finite end. Like the introduction of Hilali and Khan’s translation, Bakhtiar’s confirms that every translation of the Qur’ān is an interpretation and not the Qur’ān itself. Bakhtiar introduces the divisions of Qur’ān into chapters and verses; she also focuses on the style of the Qur’ān as a combination of prose and poetry. Furthermore, Bakhtiar highlights the different names of the Qur’ān, “*al-furqān* or the Criterion: The discernment between right and wrong, good and evil, lawful and unlawful, truth and falsehood” (xxvii). She ends her introduction saying that her “method is called *tafsīr al-qur’ān bi-l-qur’ān*” (xxvii). Thus, the introduction of Bakhtiar’s translation sends a message that she does not rely on *tafāsīr* [exegeses].

On thirteen pages in her introduction, Bakhtiar argues that Q 4: 34 “has been interpreted over the centuries, interpretations which oppose the Sunnah of the prophet” (xxv). She argues that the interpretation of the verb *-idribūhunna* “as beat
(lightly) goes against the rest of the verse” (xxx) which starts with men as supporters to women. She supports her argument with the fact that Prophet Muhammad never beat his wives and that the verb has other meanings than ‘beat’. Bakhtiar rejects having a feminist perspective and confirms her intellectual endeavor saying:

It should be noted that none of the reasons given as to how this translation differs from all other English translations has anything to do with my being a woman. They are all indications of gender-free-intellectual reasoning. (xix)

In this quote, Bakhtiar negates displaying feminist views; therefore, textual analysis of her translation is required to examine the truth of this statement. The comparison of the translations of Q 4: 34 by the four selected translators highlights Bakhtiar’s position:

Example 7: Q 4: 34

الرجال قَوَامُونٌ عَلَى اﻟنساء بما فَصَلَ اللّه بَعْضٍ ﻋَلَى بَعْضٍ وَبِمَا أنفقوا مِن أَمْوَاﻟِهِمْ ﻓَالصِّلﺎحات قَانِتاتٌ حَافِظاتٌ ﻟَلَّغيب ﻋَلَى حَفِظِ اللّه ﻟَوَاللائي تَخَافُونَ ﻟِلْمَّا يُشْرُوُهُنْ ﻓَعَظُوهُنْ وَإِهْﺠُروُهُنْ ﻓِﻲ اﻟْمَضْاﺟِﻊِ وَأَضْرِبُوُهُنْ ﻓَإِنْ أَطَعْنَكُمْ ﻓَﻼَ ﺗَبْغُو أَسَبِيلًا (النساء 34)

ar-rijāl qawwāmūn ʿalīn an-nisa bima faḍḍalā Allāhu ba’adhum ʿalā ba’d wa bimā anfaqū min amwālihim fās-sāliḥāt qānitāt ḥāfiẓāt lilghayb bima haʃīza Allāhu wa allātī takhāfūna nushūzahūnna fā’izūhunna wāḥjurūhunna fī-l-maadājī wa ādribūhunna fā’īn āta ʿnakum fālā tabghā ʿalayhinna sabīlā.

Khattab: Men are the caretakers of women, as men have been provisioned by Allah over women and tasked with supporting them financially. And righteous women are devoutly obedient and, when alone, protective of what Allah has entrusted them with.(3) And if you sense ill-conduct from your women, advise them ‘first’, ‘if they persist,’ do not share their beds, ‘but if they still persist,’ Then discipline them ‘gently’. (1) But if they change their ways, do not be unjust to them. (p. 126-7)

Hilali and Khan: Men are the protectors and maintainers of women, because Allāh has made one of them to excel the other, and because they spend (to support them) from their means. Therefore the righteous women are devoutly obedient (to Allāh and to their husbands), and guard in the husband’s absence what Allāh orders them to guard (e.g. their chastity, their husband’s property). As to those women on whose part you see ill-conduct, admonish them (first), (next), refuse to share their beds, (and last) beat them (lightly, if it is useful); but if they obey you, seek not against them means (of annoyance). (p. 112)
**Haleem:** Husbands should take good care of their wives, with [the bounties] God has given to some more than others and with what they spend out of their own money. Righteous wives are devout and guard what God would have them guard in their husbands’ absence. If you fear high-handedness from your wives, remind them [of the teaching of God], then ignore them in bed, then hit them. If they obey you, you have no right to act against them: (p. 54)

**Bakhtiar:** Men are supporters of wives because God gave some of them an advantage over others and because they spent of their wealth. So the females, ones in accord with morality are the females, ones who are morally obligated and the females, ones who guard the unseen of what God kept safe. And those females whose resistance you fear, then admonish them and abandon them in their sleeping places and go away from them. Then if they obeyed you, then look not for any way against them. (p. 76)

**Table 13**
The Translators’ Choices for Q 4: 34

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Khattab</th>
<th>Hilali &amp; khan</th>
<th>Haleem</th>
<th>Bakhtiar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>﴿ﻗَﻮﱠاﻣُﻮنَ﴿</td>
<td>caretakers</td>
<td>protectors and maintainers</td>
<td>take good care</td>
<td>supporters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>﴿قَﺎﻧِﺘَﺎتٌ﴿</td>
<td>obedient</td>
<td>obedient</td>
<td>devout</td>
<td>morally obligated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>﴿ﻧُﺸُﻮزَھُﻦﱠ﴿</td>
<td>ill-conduct</td>
<td>ill-conduct</td>
<td>high-handedness</td>
<td>resistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>﴿اھْﺠُﺮُوھُﻦﱠ ﴿</td>
<td>do not share their beds</td>
<td>refuse to share their beds</td>
<td>ignore them in bed</td>
<td>abandon them (f) in their sleeping places</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>﴿اﺿْﺮِﺑُﻮھُﻦﱠ ﴿</td>
<td>discipline</td>
<td>beat</td>
<td>hit</td>
<td>go away</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13 illustrates that the translators’ approaches to Qur’ānic exegesis range between traditional, rational, and linguistic. This can be seen in their renditions of the word ﴿ﻗَﻮﱠاﻣُﻮنَ﴿ qawwāmūn, whose derivatives are often used in the Qur’ān in the sense of establishing religion or prayer; however, the usage of this term in Q 4: 34 is different as it carries the overall sense of guarding or taking care of someone. Qawwāmūn is the plural of the singular word Qawwām; in the dictionary, the term means “to stand, to make something stand, or to establish something” (Al-Mu’jam Al-Wasīṭ, 2004, p. 767); it also has a sense of continuity in the action involved. Q 4: 34 discusses the husband’s role as a helper and financial supporter to his wife and the wife’s devotion to her spouse.
Ibn Kathīr⁶⁷ (2002), for example, interprets the term qawāmūn as men are the guardians of women and in charge of them, so they are their leaders, chiefs, rulers and discipliners. Also, Aṭ-Ṭabarī ⁶⁸ (1963) says it means that men are the guardians of women and in charge of them, while Al-Maḥallī’s and Al-Suyūṭī’s interpretation (2003) supports the idea that men have absolute rights over women. They state that men discipline women, as men have a degree over women because men have been endowed with knowledge, reason, and authority in addition to their financial support to women. The exegetical comments cited above show that the interpretations of the three male translators represent traditional exegetical views of the word Qawwāmūn by rendering it as “caretakers”, “protectors and maintainers”, and “take good care”. Their choices are based on exegetical books, which interpret this gender-related term from a patriarchal perspective (Wadud, 1999). The three male translators align with the conventional tafsīr bi-l-maʾthūr; their choices contrast with the choice of the female translator who selects “supporter” to give gender equality.

Also, the term qanitat, an adjective in the feminine form with no direct equivalent in the English language, could be translated as religiously obedient or devout. Bakhtiar translates qanitat as “morally obligated” to avoid the use of ‘obedient’ for wives to their husbands; she also renders nushuz as “resistance” unlike the male translators who utilise “ill-conduct” and “high-handedness”. In the Arabic language, the word al-maḍājiʿ, the plural of maḍājiʿ, means “beds,” “places for sleeping and resting,” or “the position of sleeping” (Al-Muʾjam Al-Wasīṭ, 2004, p. 534). Unlike the male translators who rely on traditional exegetical books, Bakhtiar (2012) relies on dictionaries (xiv); she confirms that her translation “is not a personal interpretation but one that calls for the elevation of the prophet and a return to the Sunnah” (xxxi).

---

⁶⁷ Ibn Kathīr (1300 – 1373) was a highly influential Arab historian, exegete, and scholar during the Mamluk era in Syria (see note 56).
⁶⁸ Muhammad Ibn Jarir Ibn Yazid (839 – 923), known as Aṭ-Ṭabarī, was an Iranian historian and Islamic scholar from Amol. He first followed the Shafiʿi madhhab, and then he developed his own interpretation of Islamic jurisprudence. He was an expert in Qurʾānic exegesis (Tafsīr bi-l-maʾthūr/tafsīr bi-n-naql, based on ḥadīthh). (see note 54).
Moreover, Bakhtiar (2012) states that she “placed an ‘f’ after the word to indicate the word refers to the feminine gender specifically” (xix). The presence of the letter (f) in Bakhtiar’s translation highlights its difference from the other interpretations. Although the overall meaning of the verse might be relatively clear, the feminine aspect of it is certainly not. The letter ‘f’ that Bakhtiar employs helps highlight that aspect. This strategy creates a stronger effect on the TR and stresses the feminine visibility in the text. It informs the reader which words are meant to be feminine in the source text, which is a high priority for a feminist translator of a religious text. Bakhtiar’s translation mirrors the relationship between the language she uses and the socio-cultural ideologies governed by the norms of her Western society. Thus, this addition makes Bakhtiar’s feminist perspective and cultural choices visible in her Qur’ān translation.

Furthermore, Bakhtiar translates the word wa ḍribūhunn [beat them] differently than the male translators; she applies a linguistic approach. In her introduction, Bakhtiar (2012) comments on her choice for this word saying:

The word ḍaraba means ‘go away from them’ or ‘leave them’ . . . the Prophet knows that marriage was based on mutual respect and love. The Qur’an often tells husbands and wives to consult on issues with each other. It would be unfair and unjust to think that God would have revealed a verse that allowed husbands to beat their wives instead of separating for a short period of time and allowing the anger to subside. (xxxiii)

Bakhtiar explains that Prophet Muhammad respected his wives and the Qur’ān teaches husbands and wives to respect each other. Her use of lexis such as “supporters” for qawwwāmūn and “go away” for ḍribah differs from the choices of the other translators because she does not rely on tafāsir [exegeses] but on a dictionary, “tāj al-Arūs” (xxx). Her linguistic choices are conditioned by her social norms due to the inseparable relationship between language and society (Wardhaugh & Fuller, 2015). Hence, influenced by the Western ideologies, Bakhtiar does not condone wife-beating under any circumstances (Bakhtiar, 2011); therefore, she selected a lexical meaning that demonstrates her view.

Like Bakhtiar, Khattab (2019) avoids using “beat” or “hit” for ḍrab and selects “discipline”. In a footnote, he justifies his choices stating:
Disciplining one’s wife gently is the final resort. The earlier commentators understood that this was to be light enough not to leave a mark, should be done with nothing bigger than a tooth stick, and should not be on the face. Prophet Muhammad (ﷺ) said to his companions, ‘Do not beat the female servants of Allah.’ He said that honourable husbands do not beat their wives, and he himself never hit a woman or a servant. If a woman feels her husband is ill-behaved, then she can get help from her guardian or seek divorce. (p. 127)

Khattab’s mild term “discipline” for the word *iḍrib* [beat] shows that he dexterously translates the verse, with an eye on its circumstantial setting, and he deviates from the ST’s meaning. As an Egyptian-Canadian, Khattab is aware of the image that Westerners have about marginalised Muslim wives and familial violence against them; consequently, he uses a clever choice that is acceptable by Islamic feminists. He exonerates Islam from such accusation by explaining in the footnotes if an act of violence is committed, it is due to social practice rather than religious teachings. Khattab adds to his translation the clause “if they persist” twice to give an excuse for not sharing the wives’ beds; also, he uses the adverb “gently” to show that beating here is like patting only to draw the wife’s attention to her “ill-conduct”. In some places, Khattab shows liberal thought; due to his working in Canada, he is familiar with the stereotype of Islam in the West, which affects his choices to deny the beat of women in Islam. His choice of “discipline” is not just from traditional *tafsīr*, but from the direct meaning of the ST; this choice aligns with the liberal ideologies of his current context. Unlike Khattab, Haleem chooses “hit” and sticks to the meaning in traditional *tafsīr* [exegesis] although he has Western influence, too.

Also, in her introduction, Bakhtiar states that Sunnī and Ja’fārī schools are similar in content. Born of an Iranian father and living in Iran, Bakhtiar might be influenced by *Shī‘a* beliefs. Therefore, the translations of Q 4: 3, a verse that has controversial interpretations by *Sunnī* and *Shī‘a* theologians, are analytically compared to reveal Bakhtiar’s theological view:

**Example 8: Q 4: 3**

وَإِنْ خَفُّتُمْ أَلَا تُقْسِطُوا فِي اﻟْﯿَﺘَﺎمَﻰٰ ﻓَﺎﻧْﻜِﺤُﻮا ﻣَﺎ طَﺎبَ ﻟَﻜُﻢْ ﻣِﻦَ اﻟﻨِّﺴَﺎءِ ﻣَﺜْﻨَﻰٰ وَﺛُﻼَثَ وَرُﺑَﺎعَ ﻓَﺈِنْ خَفُّتُمْ ﻓَﻮَاﺣِﺪَةً أَوْ ﻣَﺎ أَﻻﱠ ﺗَﻌْﺪِﻟُﻮا ﻣَﻠَﻜَﺖْ أَﯾْﻤَانُﻜُﻢْ ۚ ذَٰﻟِﻚَ أَدْﻧَﻰٰ أَلَا ﺗَﻌُﻮﻟُﻮا اﻟﻨﺴﺎء

wa in khiftum allā tuqsiṭū fī-l-yatāmā fankiḥū mā ṭāba lakum min an-nisa' mathnā wa thulāth wa rubā' fā'in khiftum allā ta'dilī fawāḥidatan aw mā malakat aymānukum dhālika adnā allā ta'ūlū.
Khattab: If you fear you might fail to give orphan women their ‘due’ rights if you were to marry them, then, marry other women of your choice—two, three, or four. But if you are afraid you will fail to maintain justice, then ‘content yourselves with’ one\(^2\) or those ‘bondwomen’ in your possession.\(^1\) This way you are less likely to commit injustice. (p. 120-1)

Hilali and Khan: And if you fear that you shall not be able to deal justly with the orphan-girls, then, marry (other) women of your choice, two or three, or four; but if you fear that you shall not be able to deal justly (with them), then only one or (the slaves) that your right hands possess. That is nearer to prevent you from doing injustice. (p. 105)

Haleem: If you fear that you will not deal fairly with orphan girls,\(^c\) you may marry whichever [other]\(^d\) women seem good to you, two, three, or four. If you fear that you cannot be equitable [to them], then marry only one, or your slave(s):\(^e\) that is more likely to make you avoid bias. (p. 50)

Bakhtiar: And if you feared that you will not act justly with the orphans, then, marry who seems good to you of the women who have orphans, by twos, in threes or four. But if you feared you will not be just, then, one or what your right hands possessed. That is likelier that you not commit injustice. (p. 70)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Khattab</th>
<th>Hilali &amp; Khan</th>
<th>Haleem</th>
<th>Bakhtiar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>مَا طَﺎبَ ﻟَﻜُﻢْ ﻣِﻦَ اﻟﻨِّﺴَﺎءِ</td>
<td>other women of your choice</td>
<td>(other) women of your choice</td>
<td>[other](^d) women seem good to you</td>
<td>who seems good to you of the women who have orphans</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14 shows that Bakhtiar limits the other women that a caretaker might marry to “women who have orphans”. This interpretation is based on the *Ja‘farī*\(^69\) interpretation of the Qur’ān, which says that Islam commands the marriage of widows who have orphans to preserve social solidarity (Mawdūdī, 1989; Al-Haydarī, 2018). This interpretation is

approved by Kamal Al-Husaynī Al-Haydarī (2010), a grand Shiʿī scholar in Iran. Q 4: 3 addresses the caretakers of female orphans who fear to fail in giving the orphan girls their care dowry, suitable for women of their status. It encourages these caretakers to marry other women if they fear that they might deal unjustly with the orphan-girls (Ibn Kathīr, 2002; Al-Shaʿrawy, 1997). Al-Mahallī and Al-Suyūṭī (2003) state that God orders people who fear not to be fair with the orphans if they marry them to marry other women as they can marry one wife, or two, or three, or four wives, or their bondwomen. In her preface, Bakhtiar (2012) states that she “lived nine years in a Jafari [Shiʿa] community in Iran” (xx); thus, this might be the reason that she resorts to the Shiʿa interpretation because people’s religious ideologies are formed in their society.

In addition to Bakhtiar’s distinctive translation of مَا طَابَ لَكُمْ مِنِ النِّسَاء mā ṭāba lakum min an-nisa’, her choice for mathnā wa thulāth wa rubā’ [two, three, or four] differs from the other translators, but the difference appears to be based on a grammatical point of view. Her choice of “by twos, in threes or four” lacks parallelism since parallel structure would require: “by twos, in threes or in fours”. Not maintaining this structure remains a question of speculation. First, it could be a matter of quick, spontaneous use of English and not paying the same degree of attention to every utterance in a long text. Second, it might be a question of idiosyncratic use determined by Bakhtiar’s own idiolect. A third possibility might be the grammar of use as the words “twos” and “threes” in a random British English corpus (like BEC) are more frequent than “fours” (Al-Shabab, 2021). Hence, Bakhtiar’s lexical choices affect the Qur’ānic message more than her grammatical choices; limiting the women that caretakers marry to those “who have orphans” shapes the meaning and reveals Bakhtiar’s Shiʿa beliefs.

In addition to her translation of Q 4: 3 which reveals her linguistic approach and theological views, Bakhtiar’s rendition of Q 24 gives another example of demonstrating her Shiʿa beliefs. Raof (2010) states:

Shiʿī exegetes do not regard the ayahs 11 to 20 of Q 24 as a direct reference to ʿA’ishah, the Prophet’s wife . . . However, the [mainstream and] the rest of non-mainstream exegetes such as the Muʿtazilah, the Ashʿarī, the Sufīs and the philosophers argue that Q 24: 11–20 specifically refer to ʿA’ishah. (p. 58)
This quote shows that Q 24 alludes to the claim made against ʿAʾisha, Prophet Muhammad’s wife. It also designates the non-mainstream exegetes. Comparing the translations of Q 24: 11 reveals that although the three male translators refer to the allusion to ʿAʾisha, Bakhtiar does not mention ʿAʾisha’s name. Hilali and Khan (2020) render the expression بِالإِْﻓْﮏِ bi-l-ifk in Q 24: 11 as “the slander (against ʿĀishah the wife of the Prophet ﷺ صلی الله عليه وسلم)” and in a footnote they refer the reader to “Q 24:12 and Šaḥīḥ Al-Bukhārī, Vol.6, Ḥadīth No. 274” (p. 601). Also, Khattab (2019) translates it as “’outrageous’ slander” and gives a footnote saying that this verse “is referring to an incident where the Prophet’s wife, ʿAʾishah, was accused of adultery” (p. 373), and, in this footnote, Khattab tells the whole story. Similarly, Haleem (2016) uses “the false accusation” for the term بِالإِْﻓْﮏِ bi-l-ifk and states in a footnote saying that the verse “alludes to the accusation of unfaithfulness made against ʿAʾishah, the Prophet’s wife” (p. 221). However, Bakhtiar (2012) translates the term as “with the calumny” (p. 331) without any reference to ʿAʾisha. These choices highlight the differences between the interpretations by the mainstream and non-mainstream exegeses. Figure 7 below illustrates the ramifications of approaches to Qurʾānic exegesis:

**Figure 7**
The Mainstream and Non-Mainstream Qurʾānic Exegesis

![Diagram of Qurʾānic Exegesis]

Source: (Raof, 2010, p. 9)
Figure 7 demonstrates that non-mainstream exegetes encompass Sunnī and non-Sunnī; they include Sufī, classified as Sunnī, and Shiʿī, categorised as non-Sunnī. Based on figure 7, it can be concluded that Bakhtiar applies a hybrid approach to Qurʾānic Exegesis, a mixture of mainstream and non-mainstream, since she comprises Sunnī-Sufī and Shiʿī-Sufī views in her translation.

In this section, I discuss the significance of introductions as translators’ peritexts in unveiling the translators’ ideologies. I examine the introductions by Khattab, Hilali and Khan, Haleem, and Bakhtiar and highlight the messages these paratextual elements sent about their translations. Khattab’s introduction reveals his theological tendencies of Ashʿarism, while Hilali and Khan’s introduction shows their reliance on al-tafsīr bi-l-maʿthūr (transmitted commentary). Additionally, Haleem’s introduction discloses his knowledge of the Qurʾān, mastering both languages English and Arabic, and awareness of current universal issues, which affects his choices and translation approach. Finally, the introduction of Bakhtiar’s translation gives messages about her feminist perspective, reliance on dictionaries, and hybridity of Sunnī-Sufī and Shiʿī-Sufī beliefs. The following section investigates footnotes as the fourth element of translators’ peritexts to uncover more about the translators’ ideologies.

4.3.4 Footnotes

Footnotes are notes written at the bottom of a page in a text to supplement information about concepts that are not known by the reader. They are generally linked to culture-bound words which are transferred unchanged from the source text to the translation (Haroon, 2019). Footnotes are significant in Qurʾān translation (QT); however, they should be neither too brief nor too long. In this section, I argue that examining the translators’ footnotes can reveal information about the dominant ideologies of their translations.

The footnotes in the selected translations provide information about these target texts. As she mentioned in her preface, Bakhtiar uses no footnotes, while the other three translators make a good use of footnotes. She relies on ʿijtihād, which reflects her Jaʿfarī (Shiʿa) belief since by the 19th century Shiʿa practice had been spread in Iran, the country
of Bakhtiar’s father (Farzaneh, 2015). Bakhtiar (2012) justifies her application of *ijtihād* saying that the Qur’ān interprets itself (xxvii) and “it relates to the person reading or reciting it” (xvi). According to Abdelaal (2019), in translating the Qur’ān, the TT word conveys “a very narrow shade of the meanings of the ST word, but the actual meaning of the ST word is lost in the translation” (p.7); he suggests using footnotes to explain the meanings of Qur’ānic words. Commenting on the number of footnotes, Hassan (2019) states “footnotes are useful but should be used sparingly as too many footnotes can distract the reader” (p. 203). The number of footnotes varies in the three translations by males.

The table below shows the number of footnotes and pages in the selected translations:

Table 15

The Number of Footnotes and Pages in the Selected Translations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Khattab</th>
<th>Hilali &amp; Khan</th>
<th>Haleem</th>
<th>Bakhtiar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of footnotes</td>
<td>1324</td>
<td>779 (Some notes are very long, e.g. the note for Q 14: 37 takes three pages.)</td>
<td>767</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of pages</td>
<td>679</td>
<td>1232</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>601</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15 illustrates that Haleem’s translation contains 767 footnotes, and his translation has 446 pages. Kidwai (2018) states that Haleem adds brief notes “drawn from the twelfth century *tafsir*, Razi’s *Mafatih Al-Ghayb*. Worse, these notes taken from a dated *tafsir* explain, at most, some nuances of the Arabic idiom and the finer shades of usage” (p. 11). In the semi-structured interview with Haleem (2021, Appendix F), Haleem gives the reason for his brief footnotes declaring:

Oxford University Press has what is called classics, and it is that small size of the book. You can’t make it longer or write like Asad, for instance. . . . The way that the Qur’ān connect things is different from what modern English prose does in connecting things by cohesion and coherence. Qur’ān has its own way. I wish I could increase my footnotes a bit just to clarify that rather than to preach the Qur’ān and say it’s better than Christianity or better than the West. It is not my intention.

Haleem’s comment on the length of footnotes reflects the importance of these additions in QTs; nonetheless, the power of the publisher prevents Haleem from achieving this goal.
due to the fixed rules that the publishing house applies on both literary and religious books. The comment also shows that he does not intend to preach the Qur’ān; his aim is to interpret it faithfully.

Unlike Oxford University Press, King Fahd Glorious Qur’ān Printing Complex allows prolonged footnotes, so Hilali and Khan use 779 notes, drawn from Ibn Kathīr, Al-Qurṭubī, and Aṭ-Ṭabarī. These footnotes are informative as they explain Qur’ānic terms and concepts; they focus on issues related to the unseen, monotheism, stories of prophets, the pillars of Islam, and jihad (Kidwai, 2008). Some of these commentaries are too long for the TR to keep the flow of the translation. For example, the note about the story of building the Ka’ba in Makkah in Q 14: 37 takes three pages from page 333 to page 335. Inserting too long footnotes and bracketed commentaries makes Hilali and Khan’s translation 1232 pages, and this over-translation might confuse the TR.

In contrast to Hilali and Khan, Khattab uses more, yet shorter and more concise footnotes. Khattab inserts 1324 explanatory footnotes drawn from a range of authentic classical tafsīr by Ibn Kathīr, Al-Qurṭubī, Aṭ-Ṭabarī, Al-Jalallīn, Ar-Razī, Al-Alusī, Al-Bayḍāwī, Al-Zamakhsharī, and Al-Suyūṭī. He also uses Israiliyat, tafsīr about the Judaeo-Christian origin. Khattab’s footnotes explain the bounties of Paradise, Prophet Jesus’s ascension, Prophet Muhammad’s advent as foretold in the Bible, and Prophet Moses's miracles in accord with the consensus viewpoint of Ahl As-Sunna wa-l-Jama‘a. Despite the large number of footnotes, Khattab’s translation has 692 pages because his additions are not too long, and they do not violate the textual flow (Qadhi, 1999). He stoutly vindicates the standard Islamic stance without twisting the Qur’ānic descriptions. Although Khattab uses Israiliyat, he does not apply the approach of pseudo-rationalism and apologia as did Yusuf Ali, Asad, and Ahmed Ali.

Khattab does not take the track of these Muslim apologists, who followed the path of old Christian writers. These writers first appeared in the second century in an

---

70 Early Christian apologists defended their beliefs against critics and recommended their faith to outsiders. In the 21st century, Muslim apologists defend the Islamic doctrines through systematic argumentation and discourse, debating over the beliefs and body of the teachings of Islam and schools of Islamic theology. (see Sarrió Cucarella, D. R. (2015). Muslim-Christian polemics across the Mediterranean: The splendid replies of Shihāb Al-Dīn Al-Qarāfī (D. 684/ 1285). Brill.)
attempt to defend their beliefs and recommend their faith to non-Christians. Similar to Christian apologists who defended their religion, in the 14th century, Ibn Qayyim Al-Jawziyya (1292 - 1350) wrote a book to support the faith and identity of ordinary Muslims who were threatened by Christian and Jewish polemic against Islam (Hoover, 2010; Cross, 2005). However, in the 21st century, the term “Muslim apologists” is endowed with a more positive connotation, and the usage of apologetics is linked to debates over religion and theology, which is the case in Khattab’s translation. Therefore, when compared to the older Muslim apologists, Khattab employs his footnotes with less obvious bias.

In addition to the function of footnotes as a tool to explain the meanings of culture-bound terms, they go hand in hand with comparative textual analysis to divulge the translators’ ideologies. However, examining footnotes “cannot be a substitute for textual translation analysis” (Bachelor, 2018, p. 26), so analysing Qur’ānic verses is required to disclose information about the translators’ beliefs. The analysis of the footnotes by Khattab reveals his stance and method to address issues agitating the mind of the present-day Muslims and non-Muslims. Explaining the context of polygamy in a footnote, Khattab states:

The Qur’an is the only scripture that says marry only one. Unlike any previous faith, Islam puts a limit on the number of wives a man can have. Under certain circumstances, a Muslim man may marry up to four wives as long as he is able to provide for them and maintain justice among them—otherwise it is unlawful. With the exception of Jesus Christ and John the Baptist (neither of whom were married), almost all religious figures in the Bible had more than one wife. According to the Bible, Solomon (ﷺ) had 700 wives and 300 concubines (1 kings 11: 3) and his father, David (ﷺ), had many wives and concubines (2 Samuel 5: 13). (p. 120)

Khattab highlights the historical background of polygamy to make it clear for the TR that it was a universal issue when the Qur’ān was revealed and to emphasise that Qur’ān says “marry only one” if you are afraid you will fail to “maintain justice”. Khattab also makes use of footnotes to explain the meaning of the culture-specific expression malakāt al-yamīn [bondwomen] saying:

A bondwoman is a female slave that a man owned either through purchase or taking her captive in war—a common ancient practice in many parts of the world. Islam opened the door for ending slavery by making it an act of charity to free slaves. Many sins (such as breaking one’s oath, unintentional killing, and
intercourse with one’s wife during the day of fasting in Ramadan) can be atoned by freeing a slave. According to Islamic teaching, no free person can be enslaved. Islam also improved the condition of slaves. It was unlawful to separate a mother from her child. Children born to a slave-master were deemed free, and their mother would gain her freedom upon the death of her master. With regards to slaves, Prophet Muhammad (ﷺ) says, ‘Feed them from what you eat, clothe them from what you wear, and do not overwhelm them with work unless you assist them.’ He (ﷺ) also says, ‘Whoever kills his slave will be killed and whoever injures his slave will be injured.’ In recent times, slavery has been outlawed in all countries— including the Muslim world. (p. 21)

Khattab explains to the modern TR that having “bondwomen” was one of the facts at the time of Qur’ān revelation, and Islam commanded its elimination. These two footnotes reveal Khattab’s understanding of the needs of the contemporary TRs, who want to know the facts of these controversial issues. “These notes contextualise the Qurānic message to our time and thus highlight the relevance of the Qurānic guidance today” (Kidwai, 2018, p. 131). On the other hand, interpreting the same verse, Hilali and Khan do not use any footnotes to explain the historical context or the cultural-specific term, which suggests that similar terms might be kept intact.

In this section, I discuss the use of footnotes revealing that Bakhtiar does not use footnotes nor parenthetical commentary. I also examine Hilali and Khan’s footnotes that are too long and teemed with ahādīth to maintain adequate translation, adhesive to the ST since they address “non-Arabic speaking Muslims” to teach the TRs the Islamic terms and their meanings (Hilali & Khan, 2020, III). Furthermore, in this section, I explore Khattab’s footnotes unveiling his use of Israiliyat to address the non-Muslim TRs and his attempt to clarify controversial issues attributed to Islam. Additionally, I explain that Haleem uses brief footnotes due to the power of the publisher; consequently, he could not explain concepts unknown to the contemporary TR. Thus, unlike the unauthorised translations by Haleem and Bakhtiar, the authorised translations by Hilali and Khan and Khattab make good use of footnotes to clarify the meanings of Qur’ānic terms and concepts that lack equivalence in the English language.

4.4 Conclusion

It is worth mentioning that the textual and paratextual analyses in this chapter are neither to criticise nor to evaluate the selected translations but to examine whether the
translators’ choices are influenced by the translators’ ideologies. These selected translations are praised by reviewers, and it is hypothesised that any occurrence of the translators’ religious, sociocultural, or theological ideologies is unintentional. Kidwai (2018) states “Among the Muslim translators, [Khattab] stands tall for displaying a thorough understanding of the needs of readers. His translation therefore is most likely to win a wide acclaim” (p. 133). Kidwai adds that Haleem’s translation is reader-friendly, impactful, and accurate, whereas Hilali and Khan’s is an abridged version of tafsīr Ibn Kathīr. Also, Hassan (2012) states that Bakhtiar’s translation is clear and smooth.

The answer of the sub-question about the messages that the paratexts of the selected QTs send is that the publisher’s and translator’s peritexts reveal information about the contents and ideologies of the selected translations. One message is that the common ideologies in the English translations of the Qur’ān are religious, Islamic theological, and sociocultural. The paratexts of Bakhtiar’s translation reveal that she is affected by her former religion, Christianity, and her Sufī beliefs along with the social and cultural norms in her American community. Also, the introductions of Khattab’s and Haleem’s translations show that they are influenced by their learning at Al-Azhar, so they resort to the Ashʿarī interpretation. They are also affected by living in the West, but not in all incidents. For example, Haleem translates iḍrīb as ‘hit’ without changing the direct and traditional meaning despite the incompatibility of this meaning with the Western concepts. In some places Haleem and Khattab show faithfulness to the ST with embracement for contemporary issues. For instance, they are sensitive to ecological problems and religious tolerance in their QTs and apply tafsīr bi-r-ra’y. Nonetheless, the introduction of Hilali and Khan’s translation highlights their adherence to the ST and SC; they employ tafsīr bi-l-ma’thūr and use very long bracketed and parenthetical commentaries in the text along with prolonged footnotes to add information that aligns with the Salafī beliefs.

In the following section, I focus on examining Qur’ānic verses to expand on the analysis that I carried out in this chapter. I examine the verses that involve the words and phrases that can be interpreted differently as a result of the translators’ different theological views. First, I explore the translations of verses about the Names and Attributes of God to investigate the degree of interference in translating these verses by Khattab and Haleem, who confirmed having Ashʿarī beliefs. Also, I examine the
translations of verses that reveal Sufi beliefs such as the belief in *futuwwa* [young men] and *awlia'* [guardians/ allies] to detect the impact of Bakhtiar’s *sufi* theological views on her translation. Moreover, in the next chapter, I compare the translations of specific verses to investigate the influence of Hilali and Khan’s *Salafi* belief in monotheism vs polytheism on their translation choices.
Chapter Five: The Influence of the Translators’ Theologies

“[T]he ideology of a translation resides not simply in the text translated, but in the voicing and stance of the translator”. — Maria Tymoczko

5.1 Introduction

In the previous chapter, I detected ideologies in the paratexts of the selected translations. I examined the publishers’ peritexts (covers, title pages, visibility/invisibility of the translators’ names, and blurbs) and the translators’ peritexts (prefaces, forewords, introductions, and footnotes). I also explored the epitexts (the interviews with the translators and reviews on the translations) to double check the findings. The examination of the paratexts (peritexts and epitexts) indicated that the translators’ theological views and sociocultural ideologies are reflected in their translation choices. Furthermore, to double check the reliability of the data gathered from the paratexts, I analysed eight examples used in the title pages and introductions. These examples revealed that Bakhtiar’s translation is affected by her beliefs in Sufism and the norms in her community in relation to gender equality. Additionally, the investigation of the examples uncovered the Ashʿarī views in Khattab’s and Haleem’s translations and Salafī beliefs in Hilali and Khan’s translation. I found that Hilali and Khan are adherent to the source culture (SC) and focus heavily on transliteration when they render Islamic terms. I concluded that the ideologies detected in the paratexts are religious/theological and sociocultural.

In this chapter, I apply a purposive sampling technique because the Qur’ānic verses that have different interpretations among the followers of the schools of Islamic theology are not condensed in specific chapters. I have selected 300 verses from the whole Qur’ān to investigate the differences between the translators’ choices; however, there might be more verses including derivatives of the selected terms that have not been covered here. The selected verses are controversial between Ashʿarīs, Sufīs, and Salafīs due to the different interpretations of these verses among the schools of Islamic theology. I started the methodology of selecting the verses by reciting the 114 chapters of the Qur’ān line-by-line following the Ḥafs punctuation and recitation system because it is the

---

71 Ḥafs is one of the ten modes of Qur’ān recitation; it is the most common mode in Saudi Arabia and Egypt. (see note 28)
official mode of recitation recognised and followed in Saudi Arabia, Egypt, and most Muslim countries (Denny, 1989). After that, I selected the verses that are interpreted differently by the followers of the schools of Islamic theology. To ensure objectivity of the selection of verses, I used Muhammad Fouad Abdel Baqi’s (1945) *Al-Mu’jam Al-Mufahras Li’alfaż Al-Qur’ān Al-Karim* [The Indexed Lexicon for the Words of the Holy Qur’ān]. I checked the meanings of the selected terms in *Al-Mu’jam Al-Wasīṭ* [The Intermediate Dictionary] (2004); I also used other sources as needed. Finally, I analytically compared the translations of the selected verses to examine the translators’ choices. Thus, in this chapter, I answer two sub-questions to identify the controversial aspects among the followers of the schools of Islamic theology detected in the paratexts of the selected translations and to determine which of these beliefs are reflected in the authorised and unauthorised QTs.

The chapter is divided into four main sections. In section 5.2, I discuss the differences between the beliefs of the schools of Islamic theology detected in the previous chapter: *Ash’arism* and *Māturīdism*, *Ithnā’ashriyya/ Twelver/ Ja’fari School*, *‘Irfaniyya Bāṭiniyya/ Sufism*, and *Salafism*. In section 5.3, I explore the effect of the translators’ *Ash’arī* views in the Attributes of God, the concept of *kasb* [acquisition], and God’s eternal speaking on their translation choices. In section 5.4, I investigate the influence of the translators’ *Sufī* beliefs in the practice of spiritual integrity, the unity of existence, esoteric meanings of Qur’ānic verses, and *al-walāya* and *al-imāma* on their translation choices. In section 5.5, I examine the existence of the tenets of *Salafism* in the selected translations, mainly the emphasis on monotheism vs polytheism, seeing God on the Day of Judgement, the increase and decrease of *imān* [faith], and God’s transcendence. Finally, I create summary tables to highlight the frequency and percentages of the verses that reveal the translators’ views in these aspects in the authorised and unauthorised translations. Hence, in this chapter, I compare the translations of 300 verses vividly mirroring the differences in exegetical opinions among the followers of schools of Islamic theology.
5.2 Schools of Islamic Theology

Muslims, regardless of their doctrines, believe in the oneness of God, the prophecy of Prophet Muhammad, and the five pillars of Islam. However, after the death of Prophet Muhammad, Muslims were divided into three sects: Sunnī, Shiʿa, and Khawarij. Sunnī Muslims agreed on Abu Bakr as the legitimate successor to Prophet Muhammad on the basis of election, and the Shiʿa chose Ali Ibn Abi Ṭālib because of his kinship to Prophet Muhammad, while Khawarij struggled for political leadership over the Muslim community (El-Awa, 2006). The figure below demonstrates the three sects in early Islam:

Figure 8
The Main Islam Branches and Schools between the 7th and 9th centuries

Source: (Abdulrafeh, 2020)

Figure 8 shows the three main Islamic theological schools during the period between the seventh and nineth centuries (Sunnī, Shiʿa, and Khawarij). Nowadays, the Ibadiyya Khawarij are still in existence - Ibadiyya is the main madhhab in Oman, for example.
Sunnism and Shi’ism contain different schools of theology, movements, and ṭuruq [Sufi orders]. The essence of the difference between these two sects is political, so the Grand Imām of Al-Azhar Sheikh Mahmoud Shaltout issued a fatwa⁷² permitting Muslims to worship according to the approach of Shi’a-Twelver Imāms (Abu Zahra, 2015). This fatwā was confirmed by the Grand Mufti⁷³ of Egypt Ali Gomaa based on the fact that the Qur’ān recited by the Sunnī and Shi’ī Imāms is the same with no difference in a word or letter, so Zaydī, Isma’īlī, Ḥanafī, Shafīʾī, Malikī, or Ḥanbalī imāms recite the same Qur’ān. Consequently, the origin of the dispute between Sunnī and Shi’ī Muslims is political not doctrinal, and it is permissible for Muslims to follow any of these two Islamic sects; nevertheless, the followers of these sects embrace different schools of Islamic Theology. The map below shows the branches and schools of Islamic theology in the 21st century:

Figure 9
Islam branches and Schools in the 21st Century

Source: (Madhhab Map 4 (branches), 2022)

---

⁷² A verdict issued by the Muftī, a Muslim legal expert who is qualified and empowered to give rulings on religious matters.

⁷³ An Islamic jurist qualified to issue a nonbinding opinion (fatwa) on a point of Islamic law (shari’a).
Figure 9 shows that the Egyptians follow Sunnī Islam, and the schools of Islamic theology followed in Egypt are Ashʿarism and Māturīdism (Al-Maqrizi, 2017). It also demonstrates that Saudis adhere to Sunnī Islam, and they follow Salafism, while a few adopt the Shiʿī-Jaʿfarī madhab. However, Shtiwi Al-Ghithi (2019) states that there is coexistence of all sects and clans in Saudi Arabia. As it is shown in the map, Iranians embrace the Jaʿfarī madhab. The immense majority of Iranians are Muslims of the Ithnā ʿAshariyya/Twelver/Jaʿfarī (Shiʿa) branch, and few Iranians are Sunnī (Sayed, 2013). Thus, the map reveals that Sunnism is the main doctrine in Egypt and Saudi Arabia, while Shiʿism is highly embraced in Iran.

Although all Muslims read the same Qurʿān, they interpret it differently based on their theology. Throughout history, Muslim theologians were preoccupied with the existence and nature of God along with His actions and creation of humankind. These theologians questioned related issues such as “anthropomorphism and the conceptualisation of the divine attributes and their ontological foundation; the thorny related questions of theodicy and human freedom versus determination” (Schmidtke, 2016, p. 2). Based on their doctrinal thinking, Muslim scholars gave contrasting answers for those questions due to either ʿilm al-kalām74 [logic] or uṣūl ad-dīn [traditional religious principles] (Majid & Jassem, 2019; Al-Asharī, 1976). Oliver leaman and sajjad rizvi (2008) state:

[T]he Arabic word for ‘theology’ is kalām, or speech, which represents well the scope of early theology, which was to confront the arguments of non-Muslims in the vastly expanding Islamic empire, and to deal with the early polemics between the Ashʿarites, the Muʿtazilites and the Qadarites over the nature of the basic concepts of Islam itself. This was taken in two directions, the first allowing the use of reason, as in the case of the followers of Shafiʿī and Abu Hanīfa, and the second based on a literal reading of hadith, as with the supporters of Ibn Hanbal. (p. 81)

---

The quote above reveals that the rational Muslim group employing ʿilm al-kalām used reason to argue with their opponents, while traditionalists utilised the literal reading of the Qur’ān and ḥadīth. These two groups disagreed with each other in interpreting the Names and Attributes that are both ascribed to God and have equivalents in humans. The interpretation of verses including these attributes vary among the groups belonging to Sunnism: Salafism, Ashʿarism, and Māturīdism. In the previous chapter, the beliefs of these groups are detected in the paratexts of the selected translations, which have shown that Haleem and Khattab belong to Ashʿarism, Hilali and Khan follow Salafism, and Bakhtiar holds Sufi beliefs, a mixture of the views held by the followers of Ithnāʾashriyya/Jaʿfarī and ʿIrāniyya Bāṭiniyya schools. Therefore, in the following sections, I offer a summary of the key views of the theological schools to which the authors of the four translations subject to analysis belong.

5.2.1 Ashʿarism and Māturīdism

The interviews with the translators of the target texts (TTs) selected in this study and the investigation of their paratexts revealed that Khattab and Haleem are Ashʿarī-Māturīdī. Ashʿarism is a school of Sunnī Kalām, a predominant theological school which appeared after the decline of Muʿtazilism, a theological movement which applied reason. Like Māturīdism, another school of Sunnī Kalām, the Ashʿarī school is attracted to Avicennan philosophy, which applies reason in making “judgements related to matters of worship ibādāt and punishments uqūbāt” (Özturan, 2019, p. 24). Similar to Muʿtazila, Ashʿarīs and Māturīdīs encourage the use of kalām, which is discredited by the Sunnī traditionalists who refute many of the conclusions of the Muʿtazila, Ashʿarīs, and Māturīdīs (Al-Maturīdī, 2004). “Ashʿarite kalām—with significant Māturīdī

---

75 Muʿtazila, an Islamic group, appeared in early Islamic history during the dispute over Ali’s leadership of the Muslim community after the death of the third caliph, Uthman Ibn Affan (see note 48).

76 Ibn Sīnā (d. 1037) was a significant Muslim philosopher, whose practical philosophy is religious-based, dependent, and partially covered by Islamic jurisprudence. His method is similar to the syllogism, qiyās in fiqh. (see Özturan, H. (2019). The practical philosophy of Al-Fārābī and Avicenna: A comparison. Journal for the History of Islamic Philosophy and Sciences, 5(1):1-35. https://doi.org/10.12658/Nazariyat.5.1.M0071en)
representation—has been a central part of an Egyptian scholar’s education from at least the time of Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn al-Ayyūbī, through the late nineteenth century” (Spevack, 2016, p. 542). According to Abu Zahra (2015), Ashʿarī and Māturīdī beliefs are held by imāms in Al-Azhar, who interpret the Essence Attributes of God and avoid using anthropomorphic expressions; thus, they do not attribute human characteristics or behaviour to God.

In addition to interpreting the Attributes of God, Jan Thiele (2016) states that Ashʿarīs and Māturīdīs apply a rationalist method when they interpret the existence of the Throne of God. He explains that the Ashʿarī scholars of the later generations have allowed taʿwīl [interpretation] when they interpret this concept. Also, Al-Ashʿarī (1976) argues that ʿاستَوَى عَلَى الْعَرْشِ  истَوَى  علىَ  the concept of ʿala alʿarsh does not mean that God is sitting on the throne because He exists everywhere, but “He firmly established Himself over the Kingly Throne and began decreeing orders (ahkāms)” (p. 21). Ashʿarī and Māturīdī followers support their side by using Q 42: 11: َلاِيْسَ كَمِثْلِهِ شَيْ  laysa ka-mithlihi shay’ “nothing is like Him” (Hussain, 2020, p. 387) as a proof of Al-Ashʿarī’s interpretation of the verse. Like the early mutakallimūn, the late Ashʿarīs and Māturīdīs believe that the verses of the Qurʾān related to God’s nature, attributes, and anthropomorphism need to be interpreted through argument based on logical proofs (Treiger, 2016; Baho, 2012).

Ashʿarīs and Māturīdīs apply taʿwīl [interpretation] when they transfer the verses about the Attributes of God, the concept of Kasb [acquisition], and God’s external speaking (Al-Bouṭī, 1973; Al-Asharī, 1903). Thus, in section 4.3, I investigate whether those concepts are reflected in Khattab’s and Haleem’s translation choices and whether the translators apply the taʿwīl [interpretation] approach.

5.2.2 Jaʿfarī (Ithnāʾashrīyya/ Twelver) School

In the preface of her translation, Bakhtiar (2012) states that she “lived in a Jafari community in Iran” (xx); however, she confirms that in her translation she does “not

---

Muslim scholars classify the attributes of God mentioned in the Qurʾān into four types: ʿaṣ-ṣifat an-naṣfiya (the essence attributes), ʿaṣ-ṣifat ʿaṣ-ṣalbiya (the negating attributes), ʿṣifat al-mʿānī (the meaning attributes) and ʿaṣ-ṣifat al-maʿnawiya (attributes derived from the meaning attributes) (see Al-Ashʿarī, H. I. (1903). al-ibāna ʿan usūl ad-diyāna, [Evidence for the origins of religion]. Dar Ibn Hazm.)
represent [the beliefs] of any specific [sect]” (xx). Consequently, in this section, I explore the beliefs of the followers of Jaʿfarī (Ithnāʿashriyya/ Twelver) school, one of the Shiʿī schools of theology whose advocates adhere to Jaʿfarī fiqh [jurisprudence], to determine whether these views are reflected in Bakhtiar’s translation. Like the other Shiʿī schools (see figure 8), the Jaʿfarī focuses on the concepts of imāṃ78 and walāya (Al-Assāl, 2006; Askarī, 1993; Amir-Moezzi, 1992). “This ‘imām’s religion’ has developed revolving two worldviews: an external, apparent, exoteric level, and a secret, esoteric level which remains hidden under the apparent level” (Amir-Moezzi, 2016, p. 84; Al-Qafarī, 1994).

The followers of this school believe that God Himself has two ontological levels: the Essence, which is forever inconceivable, unimaginable, beyond all thought, and the Names and Attributes, which He made known in the Qur’ān. In Shiʿism prophets and imāms unveil al-bāṭin [hidden/ esoteric] meaning of the Word of God (Campo, 2009; Askarī (1993). According to Amir-Moezzi (2016), “The messengers and their imams are connected through an unbroken chain of ‘minor’ prophets, imams, saints, and sages which together form the sublime family of ‘Friends of God’ (awliyāʾ, sg. wali) who carry and transmit the divine friendship (walāya)” (p. 85). The table below shows az-zāhir [exoteric] and al-bāṭin [esoteric] visions in the Jaʿfarī school:

Table 16
Manifest and Non-Manifest Visions in the Shiʿī Jaʿfarī School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Visions</th>
<th>Manifest</th>
<th>Non-manifest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Qur’ānic meaning</td>
<td>Zāhir [exoteric]</td>
<td>Bāṭin [esoteric]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central themes</td>
<td>God’s names and attributes</td>
<td>God’s essence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Transmitters of the Word of God

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>God’s means to communicate to humankind</strong></td>
<td>nubuwwa [prophecy]</td>
<td>imāma/walāya [imāma/friendship with God]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nature of revelation</strong></td>
<td>tanzīl [letter of revelation]</td>
<td>ta’wil [spiritual hermeneutics]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16 demonstrates that Ja’farīs believe that imāms/awliya’ are significant characters as they represent messengers and that they are affected by two world views, exoteric and esoteric. Ja’farī followers consider imāms as bearers of walāya, and the ones who reveal the word of God on Earth (Amir-Moezzi, 2016, p. 85). Hence, Ja’farīs are faithful to imāms and awliya’, believe that the Attributes of God are made known in the Qur’ān, and adopt al-bāṭin [esoteric] meaning of the Qur’ānic verses.

### 5.2.3 ‘Irfāniyya Bāṭiniyya and Tasawwuf/Sufism

In her interviews and the preface of her translation, Bakhtiar (2012) states that she has “been schooled in Sufism which includes both the Jafari (Shia) and Hanbali, Maliki and Shafii (Sunni) points of view” (xix). She adds that her translation is “of a person who practices spiritual integrity (futuwwa) or spiritual chivalry as it is sometimes called” (xix). This statement highlights Bakhtiar’s Sufī-bāṭini beliefs, which necessitates exploring ‘Irfāniyya Bāṭiniyya/ Sufi key concepts. The term ‘Sufism’ is used across the religious and secular worlds, including the academic and public fields. This term was coined in Kufa, where Jabir Ibn Hayyan was described as a sufi, a man who seeks deeper and more intimate relation to God (Ibn Arabī, 1961; Nicholson, 1947). Like Dhu An-Nun Al-Masry, Ibn Hayyan imitated al-bāṭin [esoteric] knowledge, known in Islam as Sufism. The Sufī school in Kufa was close to Shi’a teachings, in which Sufism calls for the unification with God and stresses the inner experience of tawḥīd [God’s unity] (Knysh, 2000). “Sufism cannot be separated from ‘Irfan’, meaning knowledge; both are interrelated” (Baried & Hannase, 2021, p. 229). Inseparable from Sufism, ‘Irfān [spiritual knowledge] pursues the purification of the soul (Chittick, 1989). In many religions, the person who is familiar with the mysteries and secrets of his religion is called العارف al-ʿārif, the one who has knowledge of the world and this knowledge cannot be obtained by the usual means.
The meaning of ʿIrfān is connected to Gnosticism, a philosophical movement. Gnosticism is a Greek word meaning ‘knowledge’ or ‘understanding’ and, in the Gnostic tradition, it means “redeeming knowledge” (Rudolph, 1984, p. 55). In the Gospel of Phillip, it is mentioned that a free man is the one who has knowledge of the truth (Attridge, 2016). ʿIrfān and Gnosticism emphasise the meaning of maʿrifa [the intuitive knowledge] in contrast to ḫilm [the scientific knowledge]. ʿIrfān and Gnosticism are sorts of religious or spiritual intellectual movements in antiquity. Similar to Gnosticism, ʿIrfān means ‘knowledge’, and it is emphasised in the Shi’a sect of Islam. ʿIrfān highlights the acknowledgement of God’s unity, the belief in monotheism, and the existence of al-bāṭin [esoteric] meaning of the Qur’ānic verses (Ghilani, 1993). About ʿIrfānī beliefs, Muhammad Al-Naser Sidiqi (2019) states that:

[The ʿIrfān spiritual sense of the ‘believer’ remains that what Islam brought does not contradict the religions and beliefs of the ‘other’. It completes the message of creation that began in the early part of the journey of human thought directed toward monotheism revealed by Prophet Abraham. Therefore, no wonder that the Islamic Gnosticism adopts thoughts that transcend the human spirit.]

This quote demonstrates the thought of ʿIrfānīs, who believe that Islam came to complete the message of the messengers who were sent before Prophet Muhammad. It also highlights ʿIrfānīs’ beliefs in Islamic monotheism, spirituality, and self-development; these ideas are detected in Bakhtiar’s translation, which explains her use of the term “monotheism” similar to Hilali and Khan.

---

In the preface of her translation, Bakhtiar (2012) emphasises that she has “chosen to continuously engage in the greater struggle of self-improvement. This is the beginning stage of the Sufi path (including muruwwa or moral reasonableness leading to futuwwa or spiritual chivalry)” (xx). “In the Shi’a School in Iran, the term Sufism is known as ‘irfan. The dimension of ‘irfan in Imam Khomeini's view is expressed in (spiritual practice)” (Baried & Hannase, 2021, p. 239). From these two quotes, it can be perceived that Bakhtiar believes in ‘Irānī Sufism stemmed from Shi’a teachings as she considers spirituality and the existence of bāṭin [esoteric] meaning of the Qur’ānic verses. Hence, since she might display the ‘Irānī-Sufī beliefs in her translation of verses about waḥdat al-wujūd [the unity of existence] and akhlāq al-murīd [practicing spiritual integrity], I will focus on examining whether or not those beliefs are reflected in Bakhtiar’s translation decisions.

5.2.4 Salafism

The reviews on the Hilali and Khan’s translation and the investigation of its paratextual tools show the translators’ adherence to literalism, the reliance on the Sunna of the righteous predecessors, and the denial of any stray from their words and actions. Hilali and Khan (2020) state that they adopt “al-tafsīr al-ma’thūr (transmitted commentary) . . . because it has been transmitted from the Prophet” (XIV), or aš-ṣaḥaba [the companions], at-tabī’īn [the first successors], and tabī’ at-tabī’īn [the successors of the successors] (Abu Zahra, 2015; Al-Buṭī, 1990). Hilali and Khan’s adaptation of this approach reveals their conformity with the norms of the patron of their translation. Hilali was a Sufī who became a Salafī (Melchert, 2015), similarly, Khan was a Sufī who became a Salafī; he relied on aḥādīth in his interpretation of the Qur’ān (Jassem, 2014). Thus, in their Qur’ān translation, as Salafīs, Hilali and Khan rely on az-ḍāhir [exoteric] meaning of the Qur’ān.

Salafism, a revivalist movement within Sunnī Islam, appeared in the late 19th century in the Arab world as a response to the European imperialism (Commins, 2015; Esposito & Shahin, 2013); it has been calling for returning to the traditions of as-Salaf [pious predecessors]. Salafīs are divided into three groups: apolitical, institutional, and Jihadi. The first, mainly religious, denies bida’ [innovative doctrines] and applies Shari’a
[Islamic law], the second maintains regular involvement in politics, and the third advocates armed struggle to restore the early Islamic conquests (Turner, 2014; Bonnefoy, 2012). In their interpretation of the Qur’ān, Salafīs rely on the literal meaning of the verses, Sunna, and Ijma’ [consensus of the Salaf] (Brown, 1999) without inserting political views. This approach to translation aligns with the ideologies in Saudi Arabia confirmed by its King. In 2011, King Salman bin Abdulaziz Al-Saud gave a lecture at the Islamic University in Madinah, confirming that Saudi Arabia follows the teachings of as-salaf, the true Islam (Al Saud, 2011). This lecture was turned into a book, entitled Al-Usus At-Tārikhiyya wa Al-Fikriyya Lildawla As-Saudia [The Historical and Intellectual Foundations of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia]. Hence, it is expected that Hilali and Khan’s translation reflects views of traditional exegetes.

In their interpretation of the Qur’ān, Hilali and Khan rely on the traditional tafāsīr [exegeses] such as Aṭ-Ṭabarī, Al-Qurṭubī, and Ibn Kathīr as tools to highlight the early practices of Islam by the first three generations of Muslims. Salafīs disregard human reasoning and ta’wil [interpretation] of the meanings of the Qur’ān (Adh-Dhahabī, 2014); therefore, they follow ithbāt [affirmation]. Salafism in Saudi Arabia emphasises the concept of tawḥīd [Islamic Monotheism] vs shirk [polytheism] (Ibn Al-Uthaymīn, 2015; Al-Maghrawī, 1994). Since Salafīs consider kalām theology as bid’a (Jackson, 2006), it is expected that Hilali and Khan transfer the meanings and messages of the Qur’ānic verses literally. Unlike Ashʿarīs and Sufīs, Salafīs believe in the increase and decrease of imān [faith], seeing God on the Day of Judgement, and God’s transcendence (Al-Bouṭī, 1990). Consequently, I analytically compare the translations of the verses about these concepts to examine whether Hilali and Khan’ translation choices reflect these ideologies.

5.3 Ashʿarī Beliefs Reflected in the Translators’ Choices

5.3.1 Taʾwil Ṣifāt Adh-Dhāt Al-Ilahiyya/ Interpretation of God’s Essence Attributes

Ashʿarīs do not accept anthropomorphism, the attribution of human qualities or behaviour to God (see section 5.2.1). They believe that attributing human body parts to God is to name God Himself and that “the use of these expressions in the Qurʾān is merely to reflect the idea of the understandability of the Qurʾānic message among humans” (Al-Ubaidy & Al-Ubi 2009, p. 1). The translators’ different ideologies might cause bias in
translation since the translators’ decision-making process, whether intentional or unintentional, is “guided by ideological criteria [for] ‘the objective translator’ does not exist” (Nord, 2003, p. 111). Unlike Salafīs and Sufīs, who believe that the Attributes of God are made known in the Qur’ān, so they apply the ithbāt [affirmation] approach, Ash’arīs employ the ta’wil [interpretation] method. According to At-Taftāzānī (1950), Ash’arīs believe that God sees, wills, hears, and knows, not through the distinct attributes, but rather through his essence. They assert that wherever the ‘hands’, ‘eyes’, and ‘face’ of God are mentioned, they have a metaphorical meaning: the ‘hands’ of God denote His blessings, and His ‘eyes’ indicate His knowledge.

I have gathered references to these terms from the whole Qur’ān by using Abdel Baqi’s The Indexed Lexicon for the Words of the Holy Qur’ān (1945) and examined their Qur’ānic meanings in tafāsīr [exegeses] by theologians from different schools of Islamic theology. I depend mainly on exegetical books by the traditional Salafī Ibn Kathīr (2002), Ash’arīs Al-Mahallī and Al-Suyūṭī (2003), Salafī Ibn Al-‘uthaymīn80 (2015), and Sufī Hulusī (2013) among others. I analytically compare the translations of the selected terms to examine whether the translators’ theological beliefs are reflected in their choices. Thirty-four verses including body parts attributed to God are selected: eleven comprising the word face, seventeen hand, one leg, and five eye(s) (see Appendix H).

In an interview, Khattab (2021) states that he transferred these attributes literally saying “if the Qur’ān says that Allah has a face, then He has a face. I do not go through these controversial issues” (see Appendix F). However, I observed that he applies ta’wil [interpretation] approach and avoids attributing ‘face’ to God. The comparison of the translations of Q 28: 88 highlights the translators’ choices when rendering the word وَﺟْﮭَﮫُ wajhahu meaning [God’s face]:

Example 9: Q 28: 88

كل شيء هاالله إلا وجهه (القصص 88)

---

80 Muhammad bin Salih Al-Uthaymin (1929–2001), a renowned Saudi Islamic scholar, was a Sunnī Hanbalī who graduated from the College of Shari’a in Riyadh. He interpreted the Qur’ān based on the Athari [traditional] creed. (see Al-Uthenaemen, S. M. S. (2013). The beautiful Names and Attributes of Allah. Darussalam)
kullu shay‘in haliku illā wajhahu

**Khattab:** Everything is bound to perish except He Himself.\(^{(2)}\) (p. 418)

**Hilali-Khan:** Everything will perish except His Face. (p. 530)

**Haleem:** Everything will perish except His Face. (p. 251)

**Bakhtiar:** Everything is that which perishes, but His Countenance. (p. 377)

### Table 17

The Translators’ Choices for 
\[ wajhahu \] in Q 28: 88

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Khattab</th>
<th>Hilali &amp; Khan</th>
<th>Haleem</th>
<th>Bakhtiar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
\[ hjîh\]     | He Himself   | His Face      | His Face   | His Countenance |

Table 17 shows that Khattab (2019) selects “He Himself” for \[ wajhahu \] [His Face] and writes in a footnote that the term literally means “your Lord’s Face” (p. 418). The ideological dissimilarity between different translations of the same source text is due to the variation between the translators' lexical choices (Lefevere, 1992). Khattab conveys a different ideology by means of selecting different grammatical structures and vocabulary than the source book. He avoids giving God any characteristics of human beings and adopts an interpretative approach to evade God’s resemblance to humans. This choice aligns with the thought of *Ashʿarī* and *Suﬁ* interpretations; the former says everything is dead except God’s face (Ibn Kathîr, 2002) and who think that this Attribute of God is ambiguous and requires some form of interpretation (Al-Zamakhsharî, 1934). Q 28: 88 is translated by *Ashʿarī*, as that everything perishes but Him, God (Al-Mahallî & Al-Suyûṭî, 2003).

On the other hand, table 17 demonstrates that Hilali and Khan, Haleem, and Bakhtiar transfer the word \[ hjîh \] \[ wajhahu \] as “His Face”, “His Face”, and “His Countenance” respectively. They capitalise these words to give the impression that they refer to God and are different from the faces of humans. These renditions agree with the *Salafi* and *Suﬁ* interpretations; the former says everything is dead except God’s face (Ibn Kathîr, 2002), and the latter states “Everything (in respect of its ‘thingness) is inexistent, only the face of HU (only that which pertains to the Absolute Reality) exists!” (Hulusi,
Thus, the translators’ lexical choices are influenced by their theological tendencies.

In addition to lexis, grammar reveals translators’ beliefs. According to Li Long (2017), “modality has the potential to reveal ideological shifts in the translation” (p. 119). Khattab uses “is bound to perish” to give inevitability to the everlasting existence of God; this phrase expresses future, but it connotes not knowing the exact time of perishing. Hilali and Khan and Haleem use the modal verb “will”, which expresses a future fact and a stronger meaning than “is bound to” (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014). Bakhtiar uses present simple, which expresses present facts. The use of different grammar does not affect the meaning as much as do the lexical choices. Thus, Khattab follows the approach of ta’wil [interpretation], adds a footnote, and utilises modalisation in an attempt to avoid tajsīm [anthropomorphism], while Hilali and khan, Haleem, and Bakhtiar apply the ithbāt [affirmation] method; they reveal the exoteric meaning of the Qur’ānic expression.

Unlike Khattab who is consistent in the application of ta’wil [interpretation] approach in translating the word وَجْهَ (face), Haleem shows inconsistency. Haleem interprets the meaning of this word in the translations of six verses: Q 2: 272, Q 18: 28, Q 30: 38, Q 30: 39, Q 76: 9, and Q 92: 20, but he uses ithbāt [affirmation] when rendering it in Q 55: 27, Q 28: 88, Q 13: 22, Q 6: 52, and Q 2: 115. Below are the translations of Q 2: 272 by the four selected translators to show that Haleem’s choice for the same word differs from his choice in Q 28: 88:

Example 10: Q 2: 272

٢٧٢

wa mā tunfiqūna illā abtīghā ‘a wajhīl lāh

Khattab: Whatever you ‘believers’ spend in charity, it is for your own good—as long as you do so seeking the pleasure of Allah.(2) (p. 92)

Hilali-Khan: And whatever you spend of good, it is for yourselves, when you spend not except seeking Allāh’s Countenance. (p. 79)

Haleem: Whatever charity you give benefits your own souls, provided you do it for the sake of God. (p. 31)
**Bakhtiar:** And whatever of good you spend, *it is* for yourselves. And spend not but looking for the Countenance of God (p. 41)

### Table 18

The Translators’ Choices for wajhil lāh in Q 2: 272

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Khattab</th>
<th>Hilali &amp; Khan</th>
<th>Haleem</th>
<th>Bakhtiar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ﱪﱦ ﱮ</td>
<td>the pleasure of Allah.⁽²⁾</td>
<td>Allāh’s Countenance</td>
<td>the sake of God</td>
<td>the Countenance of God</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 18 illustrates that Haleem chooses “the sake of God” for wajhil lāh [God’s Face], which is different from his choices in translating the derivatives of the same word in Q 6: 52, Q 28: 88, Q 55: 27, Q 13: 22, and Q 2: 115. He translates the term in these verses as “His Face,” “His Face,” “the Face of your Lord,” “the Face of your Lord,” and “His Face” respectively. Haleem swings between the approaches of *ta‘wil* [interpretation] and *ithbāt* [affirmation] in translating wajhil lāh (see Appendix H).

Similarly, in translating the word ﱪﱦ [leg] in Q 68: 42 when the word is attributed to God, Haleem applies the *ta‘wil* [interpretation] approach. However, in his translation of the same word when it is ascribed to humans in Q 75: 29, Haleem utilises the *ithbāt* [affirmation] approach. The translators’ different choices for the same word when it describes a human and when it refers to God reveal their ideologies. The example below highlights their choices:

**Example 11: Q 68: 42 & Q 75: 29**

yawma yukshafu ‘an sāq

**Khattab:** ‘Beware of’ the Day the Shin ‘of Allah’ will be bared,(⁽¹⁾) (p. 610)

**Hilali-Khan:** (Remember) the Day when the Shin⁽²⁾ shall be laid bare (i.e. the Day of Resurrection). (p. 1005)

**Haleem:** On the Day when matters become dire,a (p. 385)

**Bakhtiar:** On a Day the great calamity will be uncovered (p. 554)
Wa altaffatis sāq bissāq

**Khattab:** and ‘then’ their feet are tied together ‘in a shroud’ (p. 628)

**Hilali-Khan:** And one leg will be joined with another leg (shrouded) \(^{(1)}\). (p. 1038)

**Haleem:** when his legs are brought together: \(^{b}\) (p. 399)

**Bakhtiar:** and one leg was intertwined with the other leg (p. 569).

**Table 19**

The Translators’ Choices for ساق sāq in Q 68: 42 and Q 75: 29

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Attribution</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Khattab</th>
<th>Hilali &amp; khan</th>
<th>Haleem</th>
<th>Bakhtiar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q 68: 42</td>
<td>To God</td>
<td>ساق</td>
<td>the Shin of Allah(^{(1)})</td>
<td>the Shin(^{(2)})</td>
<td>When matters become dire(^{a})</td>
<td>The great calamity will be uncovered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 75: 29</td>
<td>To humans</td>
<td>ساق</td>
<td>their feet</td>
<td>one leg</td>
<td>his legs</td>
<td>one leg</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 19 shows that Khattab translates the word ساق sāq [leg] literally as “the Shin of Allah”. This word means the part of the body between the foot and the knee (*Al-Mu’jam Al-Wasīṭ, 2004, p. 437); however, in Q 68: 42, يُكْشَفُ عَن ساقٍ yukshafu ‘an sāq implies uncovering the facts and truths. The verse describes the Day when the dreadful calamity will unfold and all truths shall be uncovered, when people will be summoned to prostrate themselves, and yet they will not be able to prostrate (Ibn Kathīr, 2002). Khattab adds a footnote saying:

> Like the Face and the Hands, the Shin is believed by many to be one of the qualities of Allah, in a way befitting His Majesty and Greatness. Since baring the shin in the Arab culture is associated with the heat of battle, some interpret the verse metaphorically, so the meaning would be: ‘Beware of’ the Day when horror sets in’. (p. 610)

The quote states that ساق الله sāq Allah [God’s leg] is “befitting His Majesty and Greatness” and that the verse have a metaphorical meaning. Table 19 demonstrates Hilali
and Khan’s literal translation and explanation of this idiomatic meaning in a footnote. Hilali and Khan (2020) state:

Allāh will lay bare His Shin and then all the believers, men and women, will prostrate themselves before Him; but there will remain those who used to prostrate themselves in the world for showing off and for gaining good reputation. Such a one will try to prostrate himself (on the Day of Judgement) but his back (bones) will become a single (vertebra) bone (so he will not be able to prostrate). (Ṣaḥīḥ Al-Bukhārī, Vol.6, Ḥadīth No.441) (p. 1005-6)

The footnote highlights Hilali and Khan’s reliance on aḥadīth and literal translation. Unlike Khattab and Hilali and Khan, Haleem selects the metaphorical meaning saying “When matters become dire” and adds a footnote saying “This is the meaning of the Arabic expression ‘when shins are bared’”. Like Haleem, Bakhtiar chooses the idiomatic or interpretive meaning “The great calamity will be uncovered”. She applies ta’wil [interpretation] and ignores the exoteric meaning. Thus, Khattab and Hilali and Khan translate the term literally and use footnotes, whereas Haleem and Bakhtiar resort to interpreting the meaning.

Table 19 also illustrates that the four translators render the word ساق sāq [leg] in Q 75: 29: وَٱﻟْﺘَﻔﱠﺖِ ٱﻟﺴﱠﺎقُ ﺑِﭑﻟﺴﱠﺎقِ literally when it attributes to humans. The verse says that at death one lean leg will join the other lean leg as an indication to the difficulty that disbelievers, hypocrites, and sinners will experience (Ibn Kathīr, 2002). Khattab uses “their feet”. Hilali and Khan utilise “one leg” with a footnote saying “it may mean: hardship and distress will be joined with another hardship and distress (i.e. distress of death, and of the thought as to what is going to happen to him in the Hereafter). (Tafsīr At-Ṭabarī)” (p. 1038). Haleem chooses “his legs” and a footnote saying “This is taken to refer to when a corps is wrapped in the shroud” (p. 399), and Bakhtiar selects “one leg” (p. 569). Hence, the four translators follow the ithbāt [affirmation] approach when ساق sāq [leg] attributes to humans.

As the four translations differ in translating وَﺟْﮭِهِ الَّذِي وَﺟَّهَهُ اللَّهُ wajhil lāh [God’s Face] and ساق sāq [leg], they vary in their translations of the five verses that mention the word عين ʿayn [eye] as an attribution of God. In their translations of the word ‘eye’ in Q 11: 37, Q 20: 39, Q 23: 27, Q 52: 48, and Q 54: 14, Khattab and Haleem add the word ‘watchful,’
which gives interpretation of God’s Eye. The comparison of the translators’ choices in Q 23: 27 highlights their different approaches:

**Example 12: Q 23: 27**

\[
an 	ext{iṣna’il fulka bi a’yunīnā}
\]

- **Khattab**: Build the Ark under Our ‘watchful’ Eyes (p. 365)
- **Hilali-Khan**: Construct the ship under Our Eyes (p. 588)
- **Haleem**: Build the Ark under Our watchful Eye (p. 216)
- **Bakhtiar**: Craft you the boat under Our Eyes (p. 323)

**Table 20**

The Translators’ Choices for bi a’yunīnā in Q 23: 27

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Khattab</th>
<th>Hilali &amp; khan</th>
<th>Haleem</th>
<th>Bakhtiar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bi a’yunīnā</td>
<td>under Our ‘watchful’ Eyes</td>
<td>under Our Eyes</td>
<td>under Our watchful Eye</td>
<td>under Our Eyes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 20 shows that the four translators render गुन्य [eye] when it refers to one of the qualities of God as “Eyes” with capital “E” to say that they are different from the eyes of humans. Khattab and Haleem add the word ‘watchful’, which reveals their interpretation of ‘Eye’ as God’s vigilance and Knowledge of everything. This use of the word ‘watchful’ makes Khattab and Haleem align with the Ashʿarī tafsīr [exegesis] saying that the Ark/ship is built under the observation/watchful of God (Al-Mahallī & Al-Suyūṭī, 2003), while Hilali and Khan’s choice of “under our Eye” allies with the Salafī tafsīr of Ibn Kathīr (2002).

The fourth anthropomorphic expression is yad [Hand]. I selected the seventeen verses including this word; in sixteen verses, the four translators render this word literally as “Hand”. However, they interpret it metaphorically in their translation of Q 49: 1.
Example 13: Q 49: 1

yā ayyuha al-ladhina āmanū lā tuqaddimū bayna yadayil lāh wa Rasūlihi

Khattab: O believers! Do not proceed ‘in any matter’ before ‘a decree from’ Allah and His Messenger. (p. 544)

Hilali-Khan: O you who believe! Make not (a decision) in advance(1) before Allāh and His Messenger صلى الله عليه وسلم (p. 896)

Haleem: Believers, do not push yourselves forward in the presence of God and His Messenger (p. 338)

Bakhtiar: O those who believed! Put not yourselves forward in advance of God and His Messenger (p. 498)

Table 21
The Translators’ Choices for bayna yadayi Allāh in Q 49: 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Khattab</th>
<th>Hilali &amp; khan</th>
<th>Haleem</th>
<th>Bakhtiar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>يَـٰٓﺄَﯾﱡﮭَﺎ ﱠزِّﯾَـنَ ﱠدِїَ ﱠلَاَحَّ</td>
<td>before ‘a decree from’ Allah</td>
<td>before Allāh</td>
<td>forward in the presence of God</td>
<td>forward in advance of God</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 21 shows that the four translators interpret the meaning of bayna yadayi Allāh [before God’s hands]. Khattab gives the meaning as “before ‘a decree from’ Allah”, while Hilali and Khan apply generalisation by using “before Allāh” for the instructions or degrees from God. Similarly, Haleem uses “forward in the presence of God”, and Bakhtiar applies “forward in advance of God”. The choices of Khattab and Haleem align with the Ash ‘arī tafsīr by Al-jalallayn, which says that God is commanding believers not to do or say anything without His permission and that of Prophet Muhammad. Similarly, the Salafī interpretation by Ibn Kathīr (2002) explains that God instructs the believers on the proper conduct towards Prophet Muhammad, commanding them not to give their own opinions over the decision of God and His Messenger and not to precede them, but to be subordinate
to them. Giving the meaning of the anthropomorphic word ﯽد yad [hand] in one verse out of seventeen verses shows the inconsistency of the translators in rendering the Attributes to God.

However, in Q 39: 67, Khattab, Hilali and Khan, and Bakhtiar choose “His Right Hand” for ﯽدیمنه biamīnih. They apply tafsīr by mainstream exegetes, for whom this verse is evidence that God possesses specific attributes such as hearing, sight, hands, face, mercy, anger, coming, encompassing, being above the throne, etc. Nonetheless, Haleem selects “His grip” to reflect God’s power; he follows the interpretation by non-mainstream scholars, who argue that God dissociates Himself from the limitations of human attributes or human imagination.

Table 22 below demonstrates a summary of the frequency and percentages of the translators’ display of Ashʿarī views regarding God’s Essence Attributes:

**Table 22**
The Frequency and Percentages of the Translators’ Choices Reflecting the Ashʿarī Belief in God’s Essence Attributes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I. God’s Essence Attributes</th>
<th>Khattab</th>
<th>Hilali &amp; Khan</th>
<th>Haleem</th>
<th>Bakhtiar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Verses</td>
<td>freq.</td>
<td>freq.</td>
<td>freq.</td>
<td>freq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 (11 ﯽبٌھَجَةُ wajh [face], 17 ﯽدَ yad [hand], 1 ﯽسَاق sāq [leg], 5 ﯽعَدَن ʿayn [eye])</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 22 illustrates that the number of the selected verses about God’s Essence Attributes is thirty-four (see Appendix H); these verses include the terms ﯽبٌھَجَةُ wajh [face], ﯽدَ yad [hand], ﯽسَاق sāq [leg], and ﯽعَدَن ʿayn [eye]. Khattab has the highest percentage of displaying Ashʿarī beliefs accounting for 59%, while Haleem has the second highest percentage reaching 47%. The table also demonstrates that Hilali and Khan have the lowest percentage accounting for 12%, whereas Bakhtiar reaches the second lowest percentage accounting for 15%.
Thus, the proportions shown in table 22 show a significant correlation between the translators’ theological views and their lexical choices. These ratios align with the assumption that translators’ ideologies become naturalised in their TTs (Calzada-Pére, 2003). The percentages are also consistent with Lefevere’s (1992) ideological turn stating that translators’ ideologies are in the centre of the translation system. However, the translators’ inconsistency in their translation of the Attributes of God and their making of choices that align with approaches that they do not belong to indicate that they apply a contemporary approach to Qur’ānic exegesis, a hybrid of tafsīr bi-l-ma’tūr and tafsīr bi-r-ra’iy.

5.3.2 Ta’wil Šifāt Al-Af’āl Al-Ilaahiya/ Interpretation of God’s Action Attributes

*Sifāt al-af‘āl al-Ilaahiya* [God’s action attributes] comprise verbs of negative attributes of God and the expression of the ā‘lā al-istawā’ ‘alā al-ʿarsh [sitting on the throne]. The negative Attributes of God are among al-ayat al-mutashabihāt, whose exact meanings are not completely agreed upon among interpreters, so these Attributes are open to two or more interpretations (Al-Wahbi, 2015; Kinberg, 1988). The translations of these Attributes take one of two paths: either *ithbāt* [affirmation], applied by Salafīs, who utilise tafsīr bi-l-ma’thūr, or *ta’wil* [allegorical interpretation], adopted by Ashʿarīs, who employ tafsīr bi-r-ra’iy (Sheekhoo, 2012). Agreeing with Lefevere (1992), Camus-Camus (2015) confirms that ideology is “involved in the sociocultural context and its relationship with the systems of power” (p. 10). The examination of the translators’ lexical choices might reveal the impact of their theological stances that are determined by their cultural and ideological contexts and detected in the paratexts of their translations. Thus, in this section I examine the translations of the terms غضْب ghadaḥ [anger], سخط sхват.
sakhaṭ [extreme anger], nasyā [forgot], and istawāʿ ‘alā al-ʿarsh [sat on the throne] as examples of the interpretation of God’s Action Attributes.

Ashʿarīs believe that the attributes of God are those of actions belonging to a specific kind of predication which allows people to say something positive about the divine subject without an attempt to describe its essence (see section 5.2.1). They deny any similarity between God and His creation, mainly attributing negative characteristics to God (Abdo & Abu Mousa, 2019). In the introduction of his translation, Khattab (2019) states that “attributing anger, forgetting, or deception to God is a serious mistake in translation” (p. 11). This statement confirms that he is affected by the Ashʿarī beliefs common at Al-Azhar, where Khattab learned for thirty years. According to Aichele (2002), the translator’s “selection of possible meanings to be excluded or included is always ideological” (p. 527); ideologies are formed by the educational system and social environment.

Of the seventeen verses including the word غضب ghadab [anger], eleven verses are translated by Khattab applying taʾwil [interpretation]; these verses are Q 1: 7, Q 2: 61, Q 3: 112, Q 4: 93, Q 5: 60, Q 8:16, Q 16: 106, Q 24: 9, Q 48: 6, Q 58: 14, and Q 60: 13 (see Appendix I). In these eleven incidents, Khattab chooses “displeased” six times, “displeasure” four times, and “condemn” one time. The comparison of the translations of these verses highlights the translators’ different choices. Below is an example of the translations of Q 1:7 by the four translators along with Hilali and Khan’s translation published in Egypt to foreground the impact of the patrons:

Example 14: Q 1: 7

ṣirāṭ al-ladhīn anʿamt ʿalayhim ghayr al-maghdūbi ʿalayhim walā ad-ḍālīn

Khattab: The Path of those You have blessed—not those You are displeased with, or those who are astray.\(^2\) (p. 53)

Hilali-Khan (Saudi Arabia): The Way of those on whom You have bestowed Your Grace\(^2\), not (the way) of those who earned Your Anger (i.e. those whose intentions are perverted: they know the Truth, yet do not follow it), nor of those who went astray (i.e. those who have lost the (true) knowledge, so they wander in error, and are not guided to the Truth).\(^3\) (p. 2)
Hilali-Khan (Egypt): The Way of those on whom You have bestowed Your Grace[^2], not (the way) of those who earned Your Anger[^3], nor of those who went astray[^4].[^5].[^6] (p. 2)

Haleem: The path of those You have blessed, those who incur no anger[^7] and who have not gone astray. (p. 3)

Bakhtiar: The path of those to whom You were gracious, not the ones against whom You are angry, nor the ones who go astray. (p. 1)

**Table 23**
The Translators’ Choices for *الْمَغْضُوبِ عَلَيهِمْ* al-maghḍūbi ʿalayhim in Q 1: 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Khattab</th>
<th>Hilali &amp; khan (Saudi Arabia)</th>
<th>Hilali &amp; khan (Egypt)</th>
<th>Haleem</th>
<th>Bakhtiar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>المَغْضُوبِ عَلَيهِمْ</td>
<td>those You are displeased with</td>
<td>those who earned Your Anger (i.e. those whose intentions are perverted: they know the Truth, yet do not follow it)</td>
<td>those who earned Your Anger</td>
<td>those who incur no anger</td>
<td>the ones against whom You are angry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 23 shows Khattab’s avoidance of using “anger” or “angry” unlike the other translators. Q 1: 7 is from Sūrat al-Fātiha, which sums up the relation between God and His creation, His undisputed authority in this world and on the Day of Judgement, and humanity’s constant dependence on Him for guidance and assistance. This verse acknowledges that God guides humans to the straight path, the path of those upon whom He has bestowed His grace - the people of guidance, sincerity, and obedience to Him and His Messengers, not those who knew the truth but denied it (Ibn Kathīr, 2002; Al-Mahallī & Al-Suyūṭī, 2003). The interpretation of the Salafī scholar Ibn Al-Uthaymīn (2015) says that *الْمَغْضُوبِ عَلَيهِمْ* al-maghḍūbi ʿalayhim are the ones who know the truth but do not follow it. Q 1: 7 is a controversial verse among the followers of the schools of Islamic theology, such as Ashʿarīs, who deny attributing any negative characteristics to God, and Salafīs, who affirm the Attributes of God.

Khattab’s preference for “displeased” aligns with the beliefs of Ashʿarīs who apply taʿwil [interpretation]. Khattab’s voice represents his method of interpreting the meanings.

[^2]: New English translation
[^3]: New English translation
[^4]: New English translation
[^5]: New English translation
[^6]: New English translation
[^7]: New English translation
of the Qurʾān, and his approach reflects the ideologies and cultural norms of his context, environment. The word المغضوب al-maghḍūb is a singular masculine noun; its root is ghaḍab meaning “anger” (Al-Muʿjam Al-Wasīṭ, 2004, p. 654). In the Arabic language, al-maghḍūbi ʿalayhim “is a passive participle literally means those who earn anger without mentioning who exactly gets angry” (Nugraha, 2016, p. 9); this statement explains Haleem’s lexical choice. Although Haleem (2016) transfers المغضوب al-maghḍūb ʿalayhim as “those who incur no anger,” he states in a footnote “the verb here is not attributed to God, as it is in many translations” (p. 122). It seems that Haleem avoids attributing anger to God; however, his avoidance results from the text structure, his reliance on linguistic exegesis, and his application of the communicative approach to translation. Thus, the wording of Q 1: 7 is consistent with the Ashʿarī doctrine, which does not attribute anger to God.

Another point shown in table 23 is the addition in Hilali and Khan’s translation published in Saudi Arabia when they translate al-maghḍūb ʿalayhim. The detailed parenthetical explanation of al-maghḍūb ʿalayhim describe them as “(i.e. those whose intentions are perverted: they know the Truth, yet do not follow it)”. This addition does not appear in Hilali and Khan’s translation published in Egypt, which reflects the power of the patronage/publishing house to impose the ideologies of the translation context, the place of publication (Lefevere, 1992). Hence, Hilali and Khan’s adaptation of the ithbāt [affirmation] approach, tafsīr bi-l-maʾthūr, and their use of addition as a translation procedure are tools to subordinate the translation to the original text and educate the TRs about Islam.

The differences between the translators’ choices for the word al-maghḍūb necessitate checking other verses that include this term to give a clear image of their stances. The comparison of the translations of Q 16: 106 confirms Haleem’s inconsistency in rending the Attributes of God:
Example 15: Q 16: 106

*fa‘alayhim ghaḍabun mina Allah*

**Khattab:** They will be condemned by Allah (p. 302)

**Hilali-Khan:** on them is wrath from Allāh (p. 466)

**Haleem:** those … will have the wrath of God upon them (p. 173)

**Bakhtiar:** on them *is* the anger of God (p. 259)

### Table 24

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Khattab</th>
<th>Hilali &amp; Khan</th>
<th>Haleem</th>
<th>Bakhtiar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>غَﻀَﺐٌ</td>
<td>condemned</td>
<td>wrath</td>
<td>wrath</td>
<td>anger</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 24 shows that Hilali and Khan, Haleem, and Bakhtiar render the term غَﻀَﺐٌ ghadabun which means “anger” (*Al-Mu‘jam Al-Wasīṭ*, 2004, p. 654) as “wrath,” “wrath,” and “anger” respectively, whereas Khattab translates it as “condemned.” Q 16: 106 announces that the wrath from God is on whoever opens their breasts to disbelief, and those will be tormented (*Ibn Kathīr*, 2002). Unlike the three translators who keep the category of the word, Khattab changes the noun in the ST into a verb in the TT. According to Catford (1974), class shift is the change from one part of speech to another to convey the meaning of the ST. Khattab changes the noun into a verb in the passive voice saying “They will be condemned by Allah” to focus on the action of condemnation and avoid ascribing “anger” to God. Naudé (2010) states translators’ ideologies and cultural norms describe and explain their translations. Khattab’s choice implies his *Ash‘arī* stance as he applies the method of *tawīl* [interpretation] unlike the other translators who follow *ithbāt* [affirmation], applied by the school of *Salafīs*.

However, Khattab does not apply the approach of *tawīl* [interpretation] in translating the word غَﻀَﺐٌ ghadab [anger] in six verses: Q 2: 90, Q 7: 71, Q 7: 152, Q 20: 81, Q 20: 86, Q 42: 16 (see Appendix I). Although Q 20: 86 is almost similar to Q 16: 106, Khattab translates it differently:
Example 16: Q 20: 86

أَمْ أَرَدَّتُمْ أَنْ يَجَلَّ عَلَيْكُمْ غَضَبٌ مِّن رَّبِّكُمْ (ظِهْرٍ 86)

Or have you wished for wrath from your Lord to befall you? (p. 341)

Or did you desire that wrath should descend from your Lord on you? (p. 542)

Did you want anger to fall on you from your Lord? (p. 199)

Or wanted you that the anger of your Lord alight on you? (p. 298)

Table 25

The Translators’ Choices for غَضَبٌ ghaḍab in Q 20: 86

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Khattab</th>
<th>Hilali &amp; Khan</th>
<th>Haleem</th>
<th>Bakhtiar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>غَضَبٌ</td>
<td>wrath</td>
<td>wrath</td>
<td>anger</td>
<td>anger</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 25 shows that the four translators apply the *ithbāt* [affirmation] approach when they translate the word غَضَبٌ ghaḍab [anger], which reveals Khattab inconsistency in utilising *ta’wil*. The table below highlights the translators’ different choices for this term:

Table 26

The Translators’ Choices for the Word Ghadaab

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Khattab</th>
<th>Hilali &amp; Khan</th>
<th>Haleem</th>
<th>Bakhtiar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q 2: 90</td>
<td>غَضَبٌ</td>
<td>wrath</td>
<td>wrath</td>
<td>wrath</td>
<td>anger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 7: 71</td>
<td>غَضَبٌ</td>
<td>wrath</td>
<td>wrath</td>
<td>anger</td>
<td>anger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 7: 152</td>
<td>غَضَبٌ</td>
<td>wrath</td>
<td>Wrath</td>
<td>wrath</td>
<td>anger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 20: 81</td>
<td>غَضَبٌ</td>
<td>wrath</td>
<td>Anger</td>
<td>wrath</td>
<td>anger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 20: 86</td>
<td>غَضَبٌ</td>
<td>wrath</td>
<td>wrath</td>
<td>anger</td>
<td>anger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 42: 16</td>
<td>غَضَبٌ</td>
<td>wrath</td>
<td>wrath</td>
<td>anger</td>
<td>anger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 1: 7</td>
<td>غَضَبٌ</td>
<td>displeased</td>
<td>Anger</td>
<td>anger</td>
<td>angry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>말씀كم عنكم</td>
<td>displeased</td>
<td>Wrath</td>
<td>wrath</td>
<td>anger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 2: 61</td>
<td>غَضَبٌ</td>
<td>displeasure</td>
<td>Wrath</td>
<td>wrath</td>
<td>anger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 3: 112</td>
<td>غَضَبٌ</td>
<td>displeasure</td>
<td>Wrath</td>
<td>wrath</td>
<td>angry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 4: 93</td>
<td>غَضَبٌ</td>
<td>displeased</td>
<td>Wrath</td>
<td>angry</td>
<td>angry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 5: 60</td>
<td>غَضَبٌ</td>
<td>displeasure</td>
<td>Wrath</td>
<td>angry</td>
<td>angry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 26 illustrates Khattab’s inconsistency in transferring the word غضب as he swings between ithbāt and ta’wīl. It also illustrates Haleem’s reliance on linguistic exegesis. The consistency in Hilali and Khan’s choices confirms their adoption of ithbāt [affirmation]. The table also stresses Bakhtiar’s consistency in applying a linguistic approach and reliance on dictionaries.

Moreover, Khattab is inconsistent in rendering the term سخط sakhaṭ [extreme anger] appearing in Q 3: 162, Q 5: 80, and Q 47: 28 as he translates it as “wrath,” “wrath,” and “displeases” respectively (Appendix I). The comparison of the translations of Q 5: 80 shows the translators’ choices in rendering the term سخط sakhaṭ [extreme anger] as an Attribute of God:

Example 17: Q 5: 80

ﱠُ ﻋَﻠَﯿْﮭِﻢْ أَن ﺳَﺨِﻂَ ﻣَﺎﺋِدَةاﻟ arabic

an sakhiṭa Allāhu ʿalayhim (الماندة 80)

Khattab: which have earned them Allah’s wrath (p. 159)

Hilali-Khan: Allāh’s Wrath fell upon them (p. 206)

Haleem: God is angry with them (p. 75)

Bakhtiar: God was displeased with them (p. 110)

Table 27

The Translators’ Choices for سخط sakhiṭa in Q 5: 80

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Khattab</th>
<th>Hilali &amp; Khan</th>
<th>Haleem</th>
<th>Bakhtiar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>سخط</td>
<td>wrath</td>
<td>Wrath</td>
<td>angry</td>
<td>displeased</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 27 shows that Bakhtiar’s choice for the wordِ sakhtُ sakhiṭa differs from the choices of the other translators. The wordِ sakhtُ sakhiṭa is a verb in the past tense, and its root is sakhaṭa, which means to hate, become angry, or annoy someone (Al-Mu’jam Al-Wasīṭ, 2004, p. 421). In Q 5: 80 Mūsā returned to his people angry reminding them that God promised them to reveal the Torah for their guidance and now they are worshipping the calf. Mūsā is asking what the reason is for breaking their promise to him wondering whether the time was so long or they want the wrath of God to fall upon them (Hulusī, 2013; Al-Mahallī & Al-Suyūṭī, 2003; Ibn Kathīr, 2002). Of the twenty-six verses of the Attributes of God, Q 3: 162, Q 5: 80, and Q 47: 28 are translated by Bakhtiar based on ta’wil [interpretation] as shown in the table below:

Table 28
The Translators’ Choices forِ sakhtُ sakhiṭ in Q 3: 162, Q 5: 80, and Q 47: 28

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Khattab</th>
<th>Hilali &amp; khan</th>
<th>Haleem</th>
<th>Bakhtiar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q 3: 162</td>
<td>ِ sakhtُ wrath</td>
<td>wrath</td>
<td>wrath</td>
<td>wrath</td>
<td>displeasure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 5: 80</td>
<td>ِ sakhtُ wrath</td>
<td>wrath</td>
<td>wrath</td>
<td>angry</td>
<td>displeased</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 47: 28</td>
<td>ِ ashtā displease</td>
<td>angered</td>
<td>wrath</td>
<td></td>
<td>displeased</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 28 shows that Khattab sways between applying ta’wil [interpretation] and ithbāt [affirmation] when he translates the wordِ sakhtُ sakhiṭ [extreme anger] as he does in translating the wordِ ghadabُ [anger]. It also reveals Bakhtiar’s consistency in translatingِ sakhtُ sakhiṭ [extreme anger] as “displeasure” and “displeased”; however, she translatesِ ghadabُ [anger] in 17 verses as “anger” or “angry”.

Khattab’s and Haleem’s inconsistency in renderingِ ghadabُ [anger] due to relying on different approaches to Qur’ānic exegesis can also be seen in their translations of the wordِ naseē [forgot] in six verses: Q 7: 51, Q 9: 67, Q 19: 64, Q 20: 126, Q 32: 14, and Q 45: 34. Khattab and Haleem apply ta’wil [interpretation] in five verses and ithbāt [affirmation] in one verse: Q 19: 64. As it is mentioned in section 4.3.3, Khattab criticises the translators who attribute forgetting to God. The comparison of the translations of Q 9: 67 highlights the translators’ theological views:
Example 18: Q 9: 67

nasū Allah fanasīyahum

Khattab: They neglected Allah, so He neglected them. (p. 226)

Hilali-Khan: They have forgotten Allāh, so He has forgotten them. (p. 256)

Haleem: They have ignored God, so He has ignored them. (p. 122)

Bakhtiar: They forgot God, so He forgot them. (p. 180)

Table 29
The Translators’ Choices for ﻓَﻨَﺴِﯿَﮭُﻢ nasīyahum in Q 9: 67

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Khattab</th>
<th>Hilali &amp; Khan</th>
<th>Haleem</th>
<th>Bakhtiar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ﻓَﻨَﺴِﯿَﮭُﻢ nasīyahum</td>
<td>neglected</td>
<td>has forgotten</td>
<td>has ignored</td>
<td>forgot</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 29 shows Khattab and Haleem’s use of “neglected” and “has ignored” respectively, which confirms Khattab and Haleem’s alignment with the Ashʿarī beliefs unlike Hilali and Khan and Bakhtiar who utilise “has forgotten” and “forgot”. The word ﻓَﻨَﺴِﯿَﮭُﻢ nasīyahum [forget] means to leave something unintuitively or forget (Al-Muʿjam Al-Wasīṭ, 2004, p. 920). The context of the verse is that hypocrites, men and women, are alike. In their disobedience, they forgot God, so He forgot them and left them out of His kindness. Ashʿarīs consider this word as a negative Attribute of God; they avoid translating it literally and rely on interpreting the meaning (Al-Ashʿarī, 1976). In their translations of Q 19: 64, Khattab and Haleem illustrate their utilisation of the ithbāt [affirmation] method followed by the school of Salafīs:

Example 19: Q 19: 64

wa mā kāna Rabbuka nasiyyā

Khattab: And your Lord is never forgetful. (p. 333)

Hilali-Khan: and your Lord is never forgetful. (p. 526)

Haleem: your Lord is never forgetful. (p. 194)
Table 30
The Translators’ Choices for نسيّا in Q 19: 64

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Khattab</th>
<th>Hilali &amp; Khan</th>
<th>Haleem</th>
<th>Bakhtiar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>نسيّا</td>
<td>forgetful</td>
<td>forgetful</td>
<td>forgetful</td>
<td>forgetful</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 30 shows that the four translators use “forgetful” because the verse confirms the belief that God does not forget. In Q 32: 14 and Q 45: 34, Khattab and Haleem use “will neglect” and “shall ignore” for نسيّاك [forgot you] and ننساكم [forget you] (see Appendix I). These two verses talk about the deniers of the Resurrection and their punishment. The two verbs indicate future action although نسيّاك is in the past and ننساكم is in the present simple since “in the language of the Qur’ān, a bare present may refer to the past or future, whereas the past could indicate a command” (Al-Taher, 2014, p. 51). The four translators apply modality: Hilali and Khan, Khattab, and Bakhtiar use the future model “will,” while Haleem utilises “shall,” which “is traditionally believed to be a variation on the modal ‘will’ when the subject is ‘I’ or ‘we’, especially in British English, conveying intention or ‘intermediate volition’” (Quirk et al., 1972, p. 99). Haleem’s use of present simple gives formality to his translation. Thus, the translators’ lexical choices influence the meanings of the verses, while the grammatical choices affect the degree of formality.

Another element of Ash’arī beliefs is the concept of God's establishment on the throne, which is interpreted differently by the different schools of Islamic theology. This expression means “sit down/ settle on the throne” (Al-Mu’jam Al-Wasīt, 2004, p. 17). Ibn Ḥanbal states “The throne of the Merciful is above the water, and God is on his throne. His feet rest upon the stool” (cited in Heer, 1993, p. 81). This interpretation is confirmed in Q 11: 7 saying وَكَانَ عَرْشُهُ عَلَى اسْتَوَىٰ “His throne is over the water” (Hussain, 2020, p. 180); this traditional tafsīr [exegesis] is applied by Salafīs who render the expression literally (Abu Zahra, 2015). The process of translation is usually affected by the translator’s ideology and affects the selection of words in the target text (Tymoczko, 2003). The verses that include the expression استَوَى عَلَى الْعَرْشُ istawā ’alā
The example below shows the translators’ different choices in rendering this expression in Q 57: 4:

**Example 20: Q 57: 4**

\[ \text{astawāʿ alā alʿarsh} \]

**Khattab:** established Himself on the Throne (p. 574)

**Hilali-Khan:** rose over (Istawā) the Throne (in a manner that suits His Majesty) (p. 951)

**Haleem:** established Himself on the throne (p. 359)

**Bakhtiar:** He turned his attention to the Throne (p. 524)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 31</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Translators’ Choices for \text{astawāʿ alā alʿarsh} in Q 57: 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Khattab</th>
<th>Hilali &amp; Khan</th>
<th>Haleem</th>
<th>Bakhtiar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>\text{astawāʿ alā alʿarsh}</td>
<td>established Himself on the Throne</td>
<td>rose over (Istawā) the Throne (in a manner that suits His Majesty)</td>
<td>established Himself on the throne</td>
<td>He turned his attention to the Throne</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 31 shows the similarity between Khattab’s and Haleem’s choices by using “established Himself on the Throne”. As \text{Ash’arīs}, Khattab and Haleem use \text{tawīl} [interpretation] in rendering the expression. \text{Ash’arīs} believe that God is not localised in one place, and they deny \text{tajsīm} [Anthropomorphism] or assimilating God to creatures. \text{Ash’arīs} believe that God and creatures bear no resemblance (Hoover & Mahajneh, 2018). According to Al-Ash’arī (1976), the phrase \text{astawāʿ alā alʿarsh} means “He firmly established Himself over the Kingly Throne and began decreeing orders (ahkāms)” (p. 21). Also, the table demonstrates that similar to the traditional interpretation of \text{Salafīs}, Hilali and Khan express the meaning that God is on his throne high above the seventh heaven (Ibn Al-Uthaymīn, 2015), behind the veils of lights, shadows, and water (Schmidtke, 2016). They transfer the expression as “rose over (Istawā) the Throne (in a manner that suits His Majesty)”. Table 31 also demonstrates that Bakhtiar renders the expression as “He turned his attention to the Throne”, a different choice from the rendition by \text{Ash’arīs} and \text{Salafīs}. 200
Table 32 below illustrates a summary of the frequency and percentages of the translators’ display of *Ashʿarī* beliefs in relation to God’s Action Attributes:

**Table 32**
The Frequency and Percentages of the Translators’ Choices Reflecting the *Ashʿarī* Belief in God’s Action Attributes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>II. God’s Action Attributes</th>
<th>Total Number of Verses</th>
<th>Khattab</th>
<th>Hilali &amp; Khan</th>
<th>Haleem</th>
<th>Bakhtiar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>freq.</td>
<td>perc.</td>
<td>freq.</td>
<td>perc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 (17 غضب [anger], 3 سخط [extreme anger], 6 نسي [forgot], 7 استَوَى عَلَى [sat down/settled on the throne])</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 32 demonstrates that 33 verses are selected; 17 of them contain the term غضب [anger], 3 سخط [extreme anger], 6 نسي [forgot] and 7 استَوَى عَلَى [sat down/settled on the throne] (see Appendix I). In 24 verses out of 33, Khattab reflects his theological views in his choices, whereas Hilali and Khan express this view in the translation of one verse only. The table reveals that the percentages of displaying *Ashʿarī* beliefs regarding God’s Action Attributes are 73%, 3%, 36%, and 9% in the translations by Khattab, Hilali and Khan, Haleem, and Bakhtiar respectively. Hence, Khattab’s translation accounts for the highest percentage followed by Haleem.

The information shown in table 32 indicates that the translators’ beliefs, formed in their contexts, are reflected in their translation choices. The figures confirm the hypothesis that translators push aside the uncommon beliefs in their communities and assimilate the common ones (Calzada-Pére, 2003). The ratios in the table illustrate that the Egyptian translators Khattab and Haleem, who learned at Al-Azhar and embrace the *Ashʿarī* beliefs, are not consistent to the views of this school of theology. The low figures by Hilali and Khan and Bakhtiar demonstrate that they follow the ideological norms of their contexts. Furthermore, the percentages imply that the translators’ lack of consistency results from
applying a hybrid approach to Qur’ānic exegesis, apply a combination of ta’wil [interpretation] and ithbāt [affirmation], due to using traditional and modern tafāsīr [exegeses] or their being affected by the hybridisation of theological beliefs in their contexts.

5.3.3. The Concept of Kasb/ Acquisition

Another element of the Ashʿarī school of theology is the concept of كسب kastāb [acquisition], a means to explain people’s actions. Ashʿarīs use the concept kasb as an intermediary position between free-will and determinism (Al-Ashʿarī, 1940). They distinguish between khalq [creation] and kasb [acquisition] of an action, explaining that God is the khāliq [creator] of human actions and man is the muktasib [acquisitor] (Abrahamov, 1989). According to Michel Allard (2014), Ashʿarīs argue that God is the creator of the actions of human beings, and the human being is Kāsib [acquirer]. The scholar states that Ashʿarīs place human free-will within the framework of God’s omnipotent knowledge and power. Ashʿarīs view human beings responsible for their deeds not because they are the ones who bring these actions into existence but because God creates their acts upon their choices (Abdul Hye, 1963). They confirm that the will of human beings is not absolute, for God wills to create according to human choice. The Ashʿarīs’ notion of kasb [acquisition] brings together الجابريّة Jabriyya⁸² and المعترضة Muʿtazila.⁸³ The former highlights God’s causation of all things, while the latter focuses on human moral responsibility. Explaining Al-Ashʿarī’s view, Al-Shahrastani (1992) states:

---

⁸²According to Jabriyya, human beings are compelled in their actions; they are predestined by God and devoid of choice and free will. Jabriyya was first argued by Jahm bin Safan (696 - 745), a Muslim theologian who attached himself to Al-Harith Ibn Suraj, a dissident in Khurasan towards the end of the Umayyad period. (see Mourad, S. A. (2007). Ibn Al-Khallāl Al-Baṣrī (d. after 377/988) and his oeuvre on the problematic verses of the Qurʾān kitāb al-radd ‘alā al-Jabrīyya al-Qada’iriyya [Refutation of the Predestinarian Compulsionists]. In A common rationality: Mu'tazilism in Islam and Judaism (pp. 81-100). Ergon-Verlag.)

⁸³Mu’tazila, an Islamic group, appeared in early Islamic history during the dispute over Ali Ibn Abī Ṭālib’s leadership of the Muslim community after the death of the third caliph, Uthman Ibn Affān. (see note 48).
This quote says that God creates human actions; however, man appropriates these actions and becomes responsible for them. Thus, in Ash’arism, the concept Kasb [acquisition] refers to human actions; each action has two aspects: a godward and a manward as God creates and man acquires.

The verses that include the word كَسَبَ Kasaba [acquired or earned] and its derivatives are ten: Q 2: 81, Q 52: 21, Q 111: 2, Q 5: 38, Q 2: 134, Q 2: 141, Q 2: 267, Q 24: 11, Q 2: 286, and Q 4: 32 (see Appendix J). The example below highlights the differences between the translators’ choices:

Example 21: Q 2: 81

balā man kasaba sayyi’atan wa aḥāṭat bihi khaṭī’atuḥu fā’ūlā’ika aṣḥābu an-nār

Khattab: But no! Those who commit evil and are engrossed in sin will be the residents of the Fire (p. 62-63)

Hilali-Khan: Yes! Whosoever earns evil and his sin has surrounded him, they are dwellers of the Fire (i.e. Hell) (p. 21)

Haleem: Truly those who do evil and are surrounded by their sins will be the inhabitants of the Fire (p. 10)

Bakhtiar: Yea! Whoever earned an evil deed and is enclosed by his transgression, then those will be the Companion of the Fire (p. 11)

Table 33

The Translators’ Choices for كَسَبَ kasaba in Q 2: 81

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Khattab</th>
<th>Hilali &amp; khan</th>
<th>Haleem</th>
<th>Bakhtiar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q 2: 81</td>
<td>But no! Those who commit evil and are engrossed in sin will be the residents of the Fire (p. 62-63)</td>
<td>Yes! Whosoever earns evil and his sin has surrounded him, they are dwellers of the Fire (i.e. Hell) (p. 21)</td>
<td>Truly those who do evil and are surrounded by their sins will be the inhabitants of the Fire (p. 10)</td>
<td>Yea! Whoever earned an evil deed and is enclosed by his transgression, then those will be the Companion of the Fire (p. 11)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 33 shows that Hilali and Khan and Bakhtiar use “earns” and “earned”. These choices reveal the translators’ alignment with the interpretation of Ibn Kathîr. According to Ibn Kathîr (2002), in Q 2: 81, God says that on the Day of Resurrection whoever earns an evil and is surrounded by his sins will be among the people of the Fire. This interpretation highlights that in the Qur’ân the verb كسب كسب Kasaba, which means to earn money or collect things, is used to refer to human actions that merit either reward or punishment. Also, table 33 demonstrates that Khattab and Haleem choose “commit” and “do”. These choices agree with the lexical meaning of the term Kāsib [acquirer] as “the one who acts or makes efforts to earn” (Al-Mu’jam Al-Wasîṭ, 2004, p. 786). Khattab’s and Haleem’s choices reflect the thought of Ashʿarīs, who believe that people acquire either the reward or the punishment of their actions. The translations of Q 4: 32 show Khattab’s consistency in reflecting the Ashʿarī beliefs:

Example 22: Q 4: 32

لَيْلِّلرَّجَالِ نَصِيبٌ مَّا كَتَسَبَّبَ وَلِلْنسَاءِ نَصِيبٌ مَّا كَتَسَبَّبَنَّ (النساء 32)

li-l-rijāli naṣībum mimmā aktasabū wa li-l-nisā’i naṣībum mimmā aktasabn

Khattab: Men will be rewarded according to their deeds and women ‘equally’ according to theirs. (p. 126)

Hilali-Khan: For men there is a reward for what they have earned, and (likewise) for women there is a reward for what they have earned (p. 145)

Haleem: men have the portion they have earned and women the portion they have earned (p. 53)

Bakhtiar: For men is a share of what they deserved and women is a share of what they (f) deserved (p. 75)

Table 34

The Translators’ Choices for aktasabū أكتسبوأ in Q 4: 32

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Khattab</th>
<th>Hilali &amp; Khan</th>
<th>Haleem</th>
<th>Bakhtiar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>aktasabūأ</td>
<td>their deeds</td>
<td>earned</td>
<td>earned</td>
<td>desired</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Linguistically, the difference between the words "Kasaba" and "iktasaba" is that the former means “earned,” while the latter means “act, work hard, and earn” (Al-Mu’jam Al-Wasīṭ, 2004, p. 786). When "iktasaba" is linked to sins, it means to bear the consequence. In Q 4: 32, the Ash’arī tafsīr of Al-Jalallīn interprets the verse saying that men are rewarded for what they did of jihad and other deeds (Al-Mahallī & Al-Suyūtī, 2003), whereas the Salafī Ibn Al-Uthaymīn (2015) says that God gives whomever He wills, and He gives men the reward for their good deeds. In the Ash’arī interpretation, there is a focus on man, so people are taking part of the responsibility for their deeds, and this belief is displayed in Khattab’s translation by saying “Men will be rewarded according to their deeds”. Nevertheless, the Salafī interpretation focuses on God’s omnipotence; therefore, the translators use “For men there is a reward for what they have earned”. Furthermore, table 34 shows that Khattab chooses “their deeds” which reflects his belief in human beings as acquirers and which aligns with the Ash’arī thought of the concept of kasb [acquisition]. The comparison of the translations of Q 111: 2 shows Hilali and Khan’s reliance on ḥadīth to give the meaning of kasab:

Example 23: Q 111: 2

\[ mā aghnā ‘anhu māluh u wa mā kasab \]

**Khattab:** Neither his wealth nor ‘world’ gains will benefit him. (p. 677)

**Hilali-Khan:** His wealth and his children will not benefit him! (p. 1117)

**Haleem:** Neither his wealth nor his gains will help him. (p. 443)

**Bakhtiar:** His wealth avails him not nor whatever he earned. (p. 600)

Table 35

The Translators’ Choices for \( \text{kasab} \) in Q 111: 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Khattab</th>
<th>Hilali &amp; Khan</th>
<th>Haleem</th>
<th>Bakhtiar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \text{kasab} )</td>
<td>‘world’ gains</td>
<td>children</td>
<td>gains</td>
<td>whatever he earned</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 35 demonstrates that the noun clause \( mā \text{ kasab} \) [what he earned] is shifted by Khattab to a noun phrase “‘world’ gains” and by Hilali and Khan and Haleem to
nouns “children”, and “gains” respectively. Nonetheless, it is transferred by Bakhtiar as a relative clause that functions as a noun: “whatever he earned”. Hilali and Khan rely on Qur’ān and ḥadīth as their translation aligns with Ibn Al-Uthaymīn’s interpretation (2015) saying that Abu Lahab’s wealth and children will not benefit him. They use children for kasb; similarly, Q 71: 21 says “They followed one whose wealth and children give him no increase but loss”. Ibn Al-Uthaymīn relies on the ḥadīth below:

إن أطيب ما أكلتم من كسبكم، وإن أولادكم من كسبكم. (الترمذي، حديث رقم: 1358)

[The best of what you have eaten is from your earnings, and your children are from your earnings] (Al-Tirmidhī, Ḥadīth No: 1358).84

In the ḥadīth above, children are mentioned as an example of kasb, and this meaning is given in the translation by Hilali and Khan, which aligns with the interpretation of the Salafī Ibn Al-Uthaymīn.

Table 36 below illustrates a summary of the frequency and percentages of the translators’ display of the Ashʿarī beliefs in relation to the concept of kasb [acquisition]:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>III. The Concept of Kasb/Acquisition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Number of Verses</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>kasaba</strong> [earned]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>kasabat</strong> [earned]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>kasaba</strong> [earned]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>kasbatum</strong> [earned]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>iktasaba</strong> [acquired], and 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

84 Sunan Al-Tirmidhī: abwāb al-ahkam: bab mā jā’ an al-walid ya’khudhu min māl waladih [Sunan Al-Tirmidhī: The chapters on rules: The chapter of what the father takes from his son’s money]. [https://hadithprophet.com/hadith-59556.html]
Table 36 shows that the verses about the concept of *kasb* [acquisition] are 18 (see Appendix J). The highest percentage of reflecting *Ashʿarī* beliefs regarding this concept is reached by Khattab accounting for 78%, and the second highest percentage is reached by Haleem accounting for 67%. Then Hilali and Khan account for 6%, while Bakhtiar reaches 0%.

These figures support the hypothesis that translators demonstrate their views in their translations (Hatim & Mason, 2005). The percentages in table 36 illustrate that the *Ashʿarīs* Haleem and Khattab reflect their theological views in their translations. They are influenced by the common ideologies in the place of the translation since the translators’ theological views are formed by the religious beliefs in their contexts. Furthermore, the zero percent by Bakhtiar highlights her disbelief in this concept. The variation between translators’ percentages shows that ideologies are not simplistically reflected in translations, nor are they controlled by authorisation.

### 5.3.4 Al-Kalām An-Nafṣī/ God’s Eternal Speaking

*Ashʿarīs* reject the idea that the speech of God is with *al-ḥarf wa al-ṣawt* [voice and letters]; they follow the *Kullābiyya,* who innovate the phrase *al-kalām an-nafṣī* to reach an area between Ahl As-Sunna and Muʿtazila. *Ashʿarīs* affirm that God has speech in His Self, explaining that this divine attribute is *qadīma* [eternal] and *zāʾida* [augmented] to the divine essence (Al-Ashʿarī, 1940, p. 37). They confirm that the speech of God is different from that of His servants who lack the knowledge and power of the creator. *Ashʿarīs’* interpretation of *al-kalām an-nafṣī li-dh-dhāt al-Ilahiyya* is purely philosophical. They say that the speech of God is eternal and part of His divine essence, so it is without letters or sound. Both *Ashʿarīs* and *Salafīs* think that God spoke to Moses; however, *Ashʿarīs* believe that God’s speech has no beginning nor end and is

---

85 *Kullābiyya* is a rationalist school, named after Abdullāh Ibn Saʿīd Ibn Kullāb (d. 240 H); it is the closest school of theology to the *Sunnī* beliefs. The Māturīdīs and *Ashʿarīs* picked up the fundamental principles of the *Kullābiyya* and added to them. (see Al-Ashʿarī, H. I. (1976). The Jahmiyyah and Muʿtazila—and the rise of the Kullābiyyah, Ashāʿirah and Māturīdiyyah. In H. I. Al-Ashʿarī *Al-ibāna ‘an usūl ad-diyyān* [Evidence for the origins of religion] (pp. 17-22). Dar Al-Ansar.)
without voice, eternal in His Self (Al-Ash’arī, 1940). In this section, I discuss the translations of the Qur’ānic verses regarding this concept (see Appendix K). The example below shows the translators’ choices in translating the word *kallama*:

**Example 24: Q 4: 164**

```plaintext
wa kallama Allāhu Mūsā taklīmā
```

**Khattab:** And to Moses Allah spoke directly. (p. 144)

**Hilali-Khan:** and to Mūsā (Moses) Allāh spoke directly. (p. 176)

**Haleem:** to Moses God spoke directly. (p. 65)

**Bakhtiar:** God spoke directly to Moses, speaking directly. (p. 347)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Khattab</th>
<th>Hilali &amp; khan</th>
<th>Haleem</th>
<th>Bakhtiar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>كَلَّمَ</td>
<td>spoke</td>
<td>spoke</td>
<td>spoke</td>
<td>spoke</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 37 shows that the word *kallama* is rendered as “spoke” by the four translators. The verb is in the past tense; it means “to use words to communicate with someone” (Al-Mu’jam Al-Wasīṭ, 2004, p. 796). Q 4: 164 is “theologically controversial in Qur’ānic exegesis as it has two modes of reading that lead to two theologically divergent views” (Raof, 2012, p. 125). It can be read as the act of speaking has indeed taken place, or as it is allegorical. The first mode is *kallama Allāhu Mūsā*, in which Mūsā is the direct object, while the second mode is *kallama Allāha Mūsā*, in which Allāh is the direct object. In Q 4: 164, God says that He spoke to Moses directly (Hulusi, 2013; Al-Mahallī & Al-Suyūṭī, 2003; Ibn Kathīr, 2002); its interpretation is the same in Ash’arism, Salafism, and Sufism. Salafis use this verse to negate the possibility that God’s speech is metaphorical and to confirm that He spoke in a real way. The four translations show that Mūsā is the object of the sentence. Khattab’s philosophical belief in *al-kalām an-nafsī li-idh-dhāt al-Ilahiyya* [the speech of God] is not displayed in translating this verse due to the use of *تَﻜْﻠِﯿﻤًَا* which
emphasises the action of speaking. However, in his translation of Q 42: 51, Khattab displays his Ash’arī beliefs as shown below:

Example 25: Q 42: 51

wa mā kāna libasharin an yukallimahu Allāhu illā wahyān aw min warā’ī ḥiğābin aw yursila Rasūlan jā yūḥiya bi idhnihi mā yashā’

**Khattab:** It is not ‘possible’ for a human being to have Allah communicate with them, except through inspiration, or from behind a veil, or by sending a messenger-angel to reveal whatever He wills by His permission. (p. 513)

**Hilali-Khan:** It is not given to any human being that Allāh should speak to him unless (it be) by Revelation, or from behind a veil, or (that) He sends a Messenger to reveal what He wills by His Leave. (p. 847)

**Haleem:** It is not granted to any mortal that God should speak to him except through revelation or from behind a veil, or by sending a messenger to reveal by His command what He will. (p. 314)

**Bakhtiar:** And it had not been for a mortal that God speak to him, but by revelation or from behind a partition or that He send a Messenger to reveal by His permission what He wills. (p. 470)

**Table 38**

The Translators’ Choices for yukallimahu, wahyān, and rasūlan in Q 42: 51

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Khattab</th>
<th>Hilali &amp; khan</th>
<th>Haleem</th>
<th>Bakhtiar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yukallimahu</td>
<td>communicate with them</td>
<td>speak to him</td>
<td>should speak to him</td>
<td>speak to him</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wahyān</td>
<td>inspiration</td>
<td>Revelation</td>
<td>revelation</td>
<td>revelation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rasūlan</td>
<td>messenger-angel</td>
<td>Messenger</td>
<td>messenger</td>
<td>Messenger</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 38 shows that Khattab’s choices differ from those by the other translators. The word yukallimahu is a verb in the present tense, and it means “to utter words or to address someone with words and sound” (*Al-Muʿjam Al-Wasīṭ*, 2004, p. 796). Q 42: 51 says that God speaks through inspiration, revelation in a dream, or revelation by an angel, without being seen as it happened with Mūsā (*Al-Mahallī & Al-Suyūṭī*, 2003). However, the verse
is interpreted by the Salafī Ibn Al-Uthaymīn as God speaks to messengers through revelation or from behind a veil. He affirms that God speaks with letters and heard words and explains that this verse also confirms ʿulūww Allah [God’s Transcendence]. These two interpretations highlight the different ideologies between the translators. Khattab uses “communicate with them” for ﯽُﻛُلَّمُهُ، “inspiration” for وَﺣُيَا, and “messenger-angel” for ﺭَﺳُﺆُلًا. These choices align with the Ashʿārī belief that God talks to messengers by inspiring them or sending angels to them and that He spoke to Mūsā through inspiration and without words.

Furthermore, in Q 26: 10, the verb نَادَى nādā [call] reveals the emphasis of Salafīs on kallām as an attribution to God. The comparison of the translators’ choices highlights their beliefs:

**Example 26: Q 26: 10**

إِذْ ﻧَﺎدَىٰ رَﺑﱡﻚَ ﻣُﻮﺳَﻰٰ أَنِ اﺋْﺖِ اﻟْﻘَﻮْمَ اﻟﻈﱠﺎﻟِﻤِﯿﻦَ وَاﻟﺸﻌﺮاء

wa idh nādā Rabbuka Mūsā an a’ti al-qawm az-zālimīn

**Khattab:** ‘Remember’ when your Lord called out to Moses, “Go to the wrongdoing people — (p. 390)

**Hilali-Khan:** And (remember) when your Lord called Mūsā (Moses) (saying): “Go to the people who are Zālimūn (polytheists and wrong-doers) — (p. 629)

**Haleem:** Your Lord called to Moses: ‘Go to those wrongdoers, (p. 232)

**Bakhtiar:** And when your Lord proclaimed to Moses saying that: Approach the unjust folk (p. 347)

**Table 39**

The Translators’ Choices for نَادَىٰ رَﺑﱡﻚَ ﻣُﻮﺳَﻰٰ nādā Rabbuka Mūsā in Q 26: 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Khattab</th>
<th>Hilali &amp; khan</th>
<th>Haleem</th>
<th>Bakhtiar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>نَادَىٰ رَﺑﱢﻚَ ﻣُﻮﺳَﻰٰ</td>
<td>your Lord called out to Moses</td>
<td>your Lord called Mūsā (Moses) (saying)</td>
<td>Your Lord called to Moses</td>
<td>your Lord proclaimed to Moses saying</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 39 shows Hilali and Khan’s and Bakhtiar’s emphasis on God’s speech with voice by adding the word “saying” unlike Khattab and Haleem who use the phrases “called out
to” and “called to” respectively. One of the meanings of these phrasal verbs is to “summon into service or action” or “to make a strong request” (Oxford Collocations Dictionary, 2002, p. 94; Longman Collocations Dictionary and Thesaurus, 2013, p. 271). These meanings imply that God might call Mūsā in a dream, inspiration or by sending someone, such as an angel, to inform Mūsā that he is wanted by God. The word ﻥاﺪى nādā [called] is a verb in the past tense, meaning to meet, gather, order, shout something, telephone someone who provides service, or criticise someone about something (Al-Mu’jam Al-Wasīṭ, 2004, p. 911). In Q 26: 10, God asks Prophet Muhammad to remind his people with the night in which Mūsā saw the fire and the tree and in which God inspired him (Al-Mahallī & Al-Suyūṭī, 2003). The translators’ lexical choices helped them to convey their beliefs.

In addition to lexical choices, grammar is utilised by Khattab and Haleem as a tool to display their theological stance. Their translation of Q 2: 118 is an example:

**Example 27: Q 2: 118**

وَقَالَ ٱﻟﱠﺬِﯾﻦَ ﻟَوْﻻَ يُﻌْﻠَﻤُﻮنَ ﻟَوْﻻَ ﯾُﻜَﻠِّﻤُﻨَﺎ ٱllāhu aw ta’înâ aya

wa qāla-l-ladhîna lâ ya’lamūna law lâ yukallimunā Allāhu aw ta’înâ aya

**Khattab:** Those who have no knowledge say, “If only Allah would speak to us or a sign would come to us!” (p. 67)

**Hilali-Khan:** And those who have no knowledge say: “Why does not Allāh speak to us (face to face) or why does not a sign come to us?” (p. 29)

**Haleem:** Those who have no knowledge also say, ‘If only God would speak to us!’ or ‘If only a miraculous sign would come to us!’ (p. 14)

**Bakhtiar:** And those who know not said: Why does God not speak to us or a sign approach us? (p. 16)

**Table 40**

The Translators’ Choices for ﻲﻜَﻠِّﻤُﻨَﺎ yukallimunā in Q 2: 118

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Khattab</th>
<th>Hilali &amp; Khan</th>
<th>Haleem</th>
<th>Bakhtiar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ﻲﻜَﻠِّﻤُﻨَﺎ would speak</td>
<td>Speak (face to face)</td>
<td>would speak</td>
<td>speak</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 40 shows the differences between the translators’ grammatical choices. Khattab and Haleem use ‘if’ conditional saying “If only Allah would speak to us” and “If only God
would speak to us”. The second conditional of ‘if’ is used to express something imaginary, an unreal situation (Azar & Hagen, 2005), and this grammatical tool might be applied by Khattab and Haleem to display their Ash‘arī position regarding God’s eternal speaking. However, Hilali and Khan use interrogation in the present simple tense saying “Why does not Allāh speak to us (face to face)?” Their addition of the phrase “(face to face)” emphasises their belief that God speaks with words and voice; similarly, Bakhtiar utilises “Why does God not speak to us”. The present simple tense is used to describe general truths (Azar & Hagen, 2005). Hilali and Khan’s and Bakhtiar’s use of present simple indicates that God’s speech in words is a fact. Thus, Khattab and Haleem utilise modalisation to display their beliefs, while Hilali and Khan and Bakhtiar employ present simple to demonstrate theirs.

Table 41 below illustrates that Khattab’s and Haleem’s translations are affected by the translators’ Ash‘arī views regarding the philosophical interpretation of al-kalām an-nafsī li-dh-dhat al-Ilahiyya [God’s Eternal Speaking].

**Table 41**
The Frequency and Percentages of the Translators’ Choices Reflecting the Ash‘arī Belief in Al-Kalām An-Nafsī [God’s Eternal Speaking]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IV. God’s Eternal Speaking</th>
<th>Khattab</th>
<th>Hilali &amp; Khan</th>
<th>Haleem</th>
<th>Bakhtiar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Verses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 yukalim (speaks), 1 nādā called, 1 kalamahu spoke to him, 1 bi-kalāmi [by my speech] &amp; 2 qāl [said])</td>
<td>freq. 3 perc. 30%</td>
<td>freq. 0 perc. 0%</td>
<td>freq. 2 perc. 20%</td>
<td>freq. 0 perc. 0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 41 shows that 10 verses about God’s Eternal Speaking are selected (see Appendix K). Khattab and Haleem are the only translators who display Ash‘arī views regarding al-kalām an-nafsī; the former accounts for 30%, while the latter reaches 20%. The table shows that Hilali and khan and Bakhtiar do not express the beliefs of Ash‘arīs in translating these verses.
Table 42 below demonstrates the frequency and percentages of the translators’ display of *Ash’arī* beliefs in the selected authorised and unauthorised Qur’ān Translations:

**Table 42**  
*Ash’arī* Views in the Selected Authorised and Unauthorised Qur’ān Translations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><em>Ash’arī</em> Beliefs (95 Verses)</th>
<th>Khattab</th>
<th>Hilali &amp; khan</th>
<th>Haleem</th>
<th>Bakhtiar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>freq.</td>
<td>perc.</td>
<td>freq.</td>
<td>perc.</td>
<td>freq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God’s Essence Attributes</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God’s Action Attributes</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Concept of <em>Kashb</em>/Acquisition</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God’s Eternal Speaking</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 42 illustrates that Khattab’s translation reaches the highest percentage in displaying the *Ash’arī* belief in the concept of *kashb* [Acquisition] reaching 78% and God’s Action Attributes 73%. It also shows that the second highest percentage is in Haleem’s translation, yet Hilali and Khan and Bakhtiar do not display any *Ash’arī* beliefs in God’s Eternal Speaking and *kashb* [Acquisition]. Furthermore, the figures in table 42 show that the four translators are influenced by their approaches to Qur’ānic exegesis. Their reliance on different *tafāsir* [exegeses], a hybrid of *tafīsir* bi-*l*-ma’tūr, *tafīsir* bi-*r*-ra’iy, and linguistic exegesis, results in their inconsistency in their choices of the lexis that align with their views.

5.4 *Sufī* Beliefs Reflected in the Translators’ Choices

5.4.1 *Akhlāq Al-Murūd*/Practicing Spiritual Integrity

*Sufis* apply *al-bāṭin* [esoteric] approach when they interpret the Qur’ān (see section 5.2.2). In *Sufism*, *makārim al-akhlāq* [good morals] is a central concept, and it is “attained through *jihād an-nafs*” (Ali, 2020, p. 9; Al-Jader, 1999). This concept was generated in Persia, now Iran, where *Sufis* believe in the spirituality of Prophet Muhammad and confirm that “the *futuwwa* characteristic has always been part of his *akhlāq*” (Saparmin,
A Sufī, futuwwa is represented in the fatā Imām Ali Ibn Abi Ṭālib, Prophet Muhammad’s cousin and son-in-law. Nasr (1970), Bakhtiar’s teacher, states:

The guilds and different orders of chivalry (futuwwāt) reveal a link between Shiʿism and Sufism because on the one hand they grew in a Shiʿite climate with particular devotion to ‘Alī and on the other hand many of them became attached to Sufī orders and became their extension in the form of ‘craft initiations’. (p. 238)

Nasr’s quote explains that the term futuwwa is a Sufī expression, originated in Shiʿism, the belief in Imām Ali Ibn Abi Ṭālib as al-fatā, who has makārim al-akhlāq. Bakhtiar’s paratextual devices give messages about her Sufī views (see section 4.3.1). Therefore, it is crucial to compare Bakhtiar’s translation to Sunnī, Shiʿī, and Sufī tafāsīr [exegeses] to identify the dominant stream in her translation. As there is no authorised Shiʿa translation, I have chosen Alsyyed Abu Muhammad Naqvi’s Shiʿī translation (2016), available online and recommended by some Shiʿī friends. Furthermore, I use the translation by the Sufī Mufasir Ahmed Hulusī (2013) to check its compatibility with Bakhtiar’s translation.

Bakhtiar renders the word ﻓَﺘًﻰ fatā [a young man] as “a spiritual warrior (m)” (Bakhtiar, 2012, p. 308). Her unusual choice confirms her Sufī views detected in her preface; therefore, I selected the ten verses including this word and its derivatives to examine the translators’ lexical choices and measure the percentages of their interference. These words are mentioned in Q 4: 25, Q 12: 30, Q 12: 36, Q 12: 62, Q 18: 10, Q 18: 13, Q 18: 60, Q 18: 62, Q 21: 60, and Q 24: 33 (see Appendix L). I compare the translations of these terms to highlight the influence of Bakhtiar’s Sufī stance on her lexical choices. The translations of the word ﻓَﺘًﻰ fatā in Q 21: 60 reveal the translators’ different choices and highlight Bakhtiar’s views:

Example 28: Q 21: 60

qālū sami´nā fatā yadhkuruhum yuqāl lahu Ibrāhīm.

Khattab: Some said, “We heard a young man, called Abraham, speaking ‘ill’ of them.” (p. 350)
**Hilali and Khan:** They said: “We heard a young man talking against them, who is called Ibrāhīm (Abraham).” (p. 559)

**Haleem:** Some said, “We heard a youth called Abraham talking about them.” (p. 206)

**Bakhtiar:** They said: We heard a spiritual warrior (m) mention them. It is said he is Abraham. (p. 308)

**Table 43**

The Translators’ Choices for ﷿ fatā in Q 21: 60

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Khattab</th>
<th>Hilali &amp; khan</th>
<th>Haleem</th>
<th>Bakhtiar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>﷿ fatā</td>
<td>a young man</td>
<td>a young man</td>
<td>a youth</td>
<td>a spiritual warrior</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 43 shows Bakhtiar’s choice of “a spiritual warrior” for the word ﷿ fatā, which means “a young man between adolescence and manhood” (Al-Mu’jam Al-Wasīṭ, 2004, p. 673). This choice reveals her display of al-bāṭin [esoteric] meaning; her choice differs from the rendition by the Shi‘ī Naqvi (2016, p. 337) and the translation by the Sufī Hulusi (2013, p. 324), who transfer this word as “a young man”. Q 21: 60 reports that when people saw the idols that they were worshipping smashed, they said that they heard a young man called Ibrāhīm talking with inferiority about their idols, and perhaps he was the one who plotted against them (Ibn Kathīr, 2002). The verse does not imply that the reporters in the verse were praising the one who was talking negatively about the idols; these people were against Ibrahim; consequently, they did not describe him as “a spiritual warrior”. However, Bakhtiar imbues her translation with an ideological colour of Sufism, which flourished in Iran since the Mongols-domination period in the 12th century (Lewisohn, 1998). Her choice of the esoteric meaning “a spiritual warrior” conveys her Sufī belief in al-futuwwa al-Ibrāhīmiyya which smashed the polytheists’ idols. For her, Ibrāhīm symbolises a series of ethical values.

Below is an example of the translations of Q 24: 33, which includes the word ﷿ fatayātikum [your young women], the female form of the word ﷿ fatā [a young man]:

**Example 29: Q 24: 33**
wa lā tukrihū fatayātikum ‘ala al-bighā'

**Khattab:** Do not force your ‘slave’ girls into prostitution (p. 376)

**Hilali and Khan:** And force not your maids to prostitution (p. 606)

**Haleem:** Do not force your slave-girls into prostitution (p. 223)

**Bakhtiar:** Compel not your spiritual warriors (f) against their will to prostitution (p. 334)

**Table 44**

The Translators’ Choices for **fatayātikum** in Q 24: 33

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Khattab</th>
<th>Hilali &amp; Khan</th>
<th>Haleem</th>
<th>Bakhtiar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>فَتَيَاتِكُمْ</td>
<td>your ‘slave’ girls</td>
<td>your maids</td>
<td>your slave-girls</td>
<td>your spiritual warriors (f)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 44 shows that Bakhtiar renders the word **fatayātikum** as “your spiritual warriors (f)”. The word **fatayāt** means “young women between adolescence and manhood” (*Al-Mu’jam Al-Wasīṭ*, 2004, p. 673). However, in Q 24: 33, it means “slave girls” (Al-Mahallī & Al-Suyūṭī, 2003; Ibn Kathīr, 2002). Like the *Ash’arī* translators Khattab and Haleem, the *Shi‘ī* translator Naqvi (2016) transfers the term as “slave girls” (p. 376); similarly, the *Salafī* translators Hilali and Khan utilise “your maids”. Although “Sufis were not convinced by the apparent meaning (*al-zahir*) of the verses, and they sought to discover (*al-batīn*) the hidden meanings of the Qur’ān’s phrases” (Musharraf, 2013, p. 34), the Sufi Hulusi renders the word **fatayātikum** as “bondmaids” (p. 350). Bakhtiar selects the esoteric meaning of the word, which is only understood by Sufis who are familiar with this hidden meaning, which is not mentioned in the ST.

Moreover, table 44 demonstrates that Bakhtiar’s lexical choice of “your spiritual warriors (f)” reflects the influence of the norms of her society as she selects the meaning which is acceptable in her Iranian Sufi community, and she adds the letter “f” to emphasise the feminist perspective common in America. Mona Baker (2016) states that the three bases that restrict the translators’ choices on the word level are geographical, temporal, and social. Also, Gayatri Spivak (1992) alludes to translation as an activity “where
meaning hops into the spacy emptiness between two named languages” (p. 178). Bakhtiar’s voicing reveals that she is affected by living in Iran and America; using “spiritual warriors” reflects her Sufi stance, and adding of the letter “(f)” echoes her feminist perspective. Thus, Bakhtiar’s choices confirm not only her theological stance but also her sociocultural ideologies regarding gender equality.

Bakhtiar does not show difference in her choices for the words الفتيان والفتية, two plurals of the singular word fatā [a young man]; however, there is a difference between these plural forms. The example below highlights Bakhtiar’s rendition of the meaning of the word فتيانه fityānihi in Q 12:62:

Example 30: Q 12: 62

وَقَالَ لِفَتْيَٰنِهِ أَجِلُّوا بَصَائِعَهُمْ فِي رَحَالِهِمْ (يوسف 62)

wa qāla lifityānihi ij’ālū bīṣā‘ātum fī rihālīhim

**Khattab:** Joseph ordered his servants to put his brothers’ money back into their saddlebags (p. 266)

**Hilali and Khan:** And [Yūsuf (Joseph)] told his servants to put their money (with which they had bought the corn) into their bags (p. 401)

**Haleem:** Joseph said to his servants, ‘put their [traded] goods back into their saddlebags (p. 149)

**Bakhtiar:** And Joseph said to his spiritual warriors: Lay their merchandise into their saddlebags (p. 223)

Table 45 shows that Khattab, Hilali and Khan, and Haleem consider the context and use “his servants”, while Bakhtiar sticks to al-bāṭi nī [esoteric] Sufi meaning in all contexts. Also, the Shi‘ī translator Naqvi (2016, p. 243) and the Sufi Hulusi (2013, p. 240) utilise “his servants”. The term فتيانه fityānihi [his young men] is the plural of فتى fatā [a young man]. Q 12: 62 is part of the story of Prophet Yusuf. When his brothers entered on him in

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Khattab</th>
<th>Hilali &amp; Khan</th>
<th>Haleem</th>
<th>Bakhtiar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>فتيانه</td>
<td>his servants</td>
<td>his servants</td>
<td>his servants</td>
<td>his spiritual warriors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 45

The Translators’ Choices for فتيانه fityānihi in Q 12: 62
his court, he knew them the minute he saw them, yet they did not recognise him because they threw him in the well when he was a child. Yusuf ordered fityānihi [his servants/slaves] to put the money or the merchandise his brothers brought with them to exchange for food into their saddlebags (Ibn Kathīr, 2002). There is a difference between al-fityā in Q 18: 10 and fityānihi in Q 12: 62. The former refers to “religious young men” (the people in the cave), whereas the latter means “servants”; nonetheless, Bakhtiar does not show any difference in her choices.

The table below shows the translators’ choices for the word ﺒَﺕَﺎُٰ ﻃَﺎ† [a young man] and its derivatives:

**Table 46**
The Translators’ Choices for Fatā and Its Derivatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Khattab</th>
<th>Hilali &amp; khan</th>
<th>Haleem</th>
<th>Bakhtiar</th>
<th>Naqvi (Shiʿi)</th>
<th>Hulusi (Sufi)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q 21: 60</td>
<td>ﻃَﺎ† a young man</td>
<td>a young man</td>
<td>a youth</td>
<td>a young man</td>
<td>a spiritual warrior (m)</td>
<td>a young man</td>
<td>a young man</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 18: 60</td>
<td>ﻃَﺎ† his young assistant</td>
<td>his boy servant</td>
<td>his servant</td>
<td>his spiritual warrior</td>
<td>boy [i.e. servant], the youngster in his service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 18: 62</td>
<td>ﻃَﺎ† his assistant</td>
<td>his boy servant</td>
<td>his servant</td>
<td>his spiritual warrior</td>
<td>boy</td>
<td>his servant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 12: 30</td>
<td>ﻃَـٰﺘِﻜُﻢْ her slave-boy</td>
<td>her (slave) young man</td>
<td>her slave</td>
<td>her spiritual warrior</td>
<td>slave boy</td>
<td>her slave</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 4: 25</td>
<td>ﻃَـٰﺘِﻜُﻢْ your bondwoman</td>
<td>your girls from among those (slaves)</td>
<td>your slave</td>
<td>your female spiritual warriors</td>
<td>slave girls</td>
<td>bondmaids</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 24: 33</td>
<td>ﻃَـٰﺘِﻜُﻢْ your ‘slave’ girls</td>
<td>your maids</td>
<td>your slave-girls</td>
<td>your spiritual warriors (f)</td>
<td>slave girls</td>
<td>bondmaids</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 46 shows that the Sunnī, Shiʿī and Sufī translators agree on choosing “servant(s)”, “young man (men)/ girls”, or “youths” for the word ﷼ائ، [a young man] and its plural forms unlike Bakhtiar, who adheres to a different type of Sufism as she selects “spiritual warrior(s)”. Bakhtiar’s choices display her ʿIrfānī-Sufī belief in futuwwa and reveal her emphasis on using al-bāṭin [esoteric] meaning, which is known only among this school of thought.

Table 47 below shows a summary of the frequency and percentages of the translators’ reflection of Sufī beliefs in relation to practicing spiritual integrity:

**Table 47**
The Frequency and Percentages of the Translators’ Choices Reflecting the Sufī Belief in Akhlak Al-Murīd [Practicing Spiritual Integrity]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I. Practicing Spiritual Integrity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Verses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 (1 ﷼ائ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[a young man], 2 ﷼ائ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[his young man], 1 ﷼ائ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[her young man], 2 ﷼ائ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fatayātikum [your young women], 1 ﷼ائ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 47 demonstrates that Bakhtiar is the only translator who expresses a Sufi stance in her translation of the term ﻓَﺘًﻰ [young man] and its derivatives: ﻓَﺘًﺎ ﻓَﺘًﺎ, ﻓَﺘًﺎ, ﻓَﺘًﺎ, ﻓَﺘًﺎ, and ﻓَﺘًﺎ. Reaching 100% shows that Bakhtiar adheres to al-bāṭin [esoteric] meaning in an attempt to extract the hidden meaning known only by ‘Irfanī-Sufīs. The table also illustrates that Khattab, Hilali and Khan, and Haleem consider az-zāhir [exoteric] meaning, which results in displaying 0% of the Sufi tendency.

The figures in table 47 indicate the first hypothesis in this thesis, which states that translators’ ideologies impact their translation choices (Hatim & Mason, 2005). This can be seen in Bakhtiar’s link of philosophy, ‘Irfanī-Sufī beliefs, and the Qur’ān, resulting in producing an unusual rendition of the term ﻓَﺘًﻰ [young man] and its derivatives. Studying philosophy and working as a clinical psychologist, Bakhtiar relies on a philosophical approach to QT, applies al-bāṭin [esoteric] meaning, and adheres to the same choice. Furthermore, Bakhtiar’s choice of unorthodox meanings, understood only by ‘Irfanī-Sufīs, verifies the fourth hypothesis stating that the display of translators’ ideologies in Qur’ān translations shapes the meanings and messages of the Qur’ān (Gunawan, 2022). Not taking into consideration the contextual meaning of the selected terms, Bakhtiar produces unconventional meanings. Thus, the target readers, who are unfamiliar with the ‘Irfanī-Sufī views, will not be able to get a close sense of the Arabic text.

5.4.2 Waḥdat Al-Wujūd/The Unity of Existence

Sufism metaphysics is centred in the philosophical aspect of waḥdat al-wujūd [the unity of existence]. Sufis believe that there is a relationship between God and the universe and that al-wujūd refers to the existence of everything, including man/ KH.LIF.A khalīfa. The
**Sufi mufasir** [interpreter] Ibn ʿArabi\(^{86}\) states that \(khalīfa\) means that man is the shadow of God on earth. However, early commentators, such as Aṭ-Ṭabarī and Al-Zamakhsharī, affirm that Adam is called \(khalīfa\) [successor] because each generation of people succeeds the one that went before it (Aṭ-Ṭabarī, 1954). These two different views of the concept \(khalīfa\) result in different interpretations by traditional and Sufi mufasirīn [exegetes]. In this section, I argue that Bakhtiar’s choices for the word \(khalīfa\) are influenced by her Sufi belief in \(waḥdat al-wujūd\) [the unity of existence].

Ibn ʿArabi (2015) explains the concept of \(waḥdat al-wujūd\) [the unity of existence] saying:

\[
\text{الله تعالى خلق أدّم على صورته، أي على الصورة الإلهية، وبنى على هذا الأثر نظريته في}
\]

الحلول مفرقاً بين ناحيتين مختلفتين في الطبيعة الإنسانية هما اللاهوت والناسوت. وهما
طبيعتان لا تتحدان أبداً، بل يتزوج أحدهما بالأخرى. الوجود الحق قاصرًا على الله، والعالم
ظلًا له وصورة، ووجه الحقيقة الوجودية الواحدة (الحق والخلق) ص 35

[God Almighty created Adam in His image, that is, in the divine image, and based on this concept, He established His theory of incarnation, differentiating between two different aspects of human nature: the divine and the human. They are two natures that never unite, but one of them mixes with the other. The real existence is limited to God, and the world is a shadow and image of Him; It is the two faces of the sole existential reality (God and the creation)] (p. 35).

The quote shows that Ibn ʿArabi gives man a significant position with specific principles, mainly man is \(al-maqṣūd\) [the goal] of the creation of the world and the \(khalīfa\) of God on earth. It confirms that man is the divine deputy in the universe and the axis of existence. In this quote, Ibn ʿArabi confirms that God is the real existence and ‘Adam/ man/ \(khalīfa\) is God’s image on earth.

The word \(khalīfa\) and its derivatives appear in Q 2: 30, Q 38: 26, Q 6: 165, Q 10: 14, Q 10: 73, Q 35: 39, Q 7: 69, Q 7: 74, Q 27: 62, and Q 7: 129 (see Appendix M).

---

\(^{86}\) Ibn ʿArabi (1165–1240) was an influential Arab Andalusian Muslim scholar, mystic, poet, and philosopher. He was born in Murcia, Spain and died in Damascus, Syria; he was influenced by Abu Hamid Al-Ghazalī, Mansur Al-Hallaj, and Averroes. Ibn ʿArabī was classified as Sufi. (see Nasr, H. (1976). *Three Muslim sages: Avicenna, Suhrawardī, Ibn ʿArabī*. Caravan Books.)
The comparison of the translations of Q 2: 30 highlights the translators’ choices, which in turn reflect their ideologies:

**Example 30: Q 2: 30**

\[ \text{And when your Lord said to the angels: 'I am putting a successor on earth.' (p. 7)} \]

Table 48

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Khattab</th>
<th>Hilali &amp; Khan</th>
<th>Haleem</th>
<th>Bakhtiar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>خَلِيَّةٌ khalīfa</td>
<td>successive ‘human’ authority</td>
<td>(mankind) generations after generations</td>
<td>successor(^a)</td>
<td>viceregent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 48 demonstrates that the word خَلِيَّةٌ khalīfa is translated differently in the four selected versions. This word means a successor, someone who succeeds another one, comes after another one, takes someone’s place, or acts on behalf of someone (Al-Mu’jam Al-Wasīṭ, 2004, p. 251). The translators choose lexis that align with their theological beliefs. Hilali and Khan use “(mankind) generations after generations”, which reflects the Salaf’s rendition of خَلِيَّةٌ khalīfa as “a person who gives birth to offspring/reproduces” (Ibn Al-Uthaymīn, 2015, p. 112). Ash’arīs interpret this term as “the successor of God; Adam, human, who carries out God’s judgments on earth” (Al-Mahallī & Al-Suyūṭī, 2003, p. 6). This meaning can be seen in Khattab’s utilisation of “successive ‘human’ authority”. Also, Haleem (2016) uses the word “successor” meaning ‘follower or heir’ and inserts a footnote saying:
The term *khalīfa* is normally translated as ‘vicegerent’ or ‘deputy’. While this is one meaning of the term, its basic meaning is ‘successor’—the Qur’an often talks about generations and individuals who are successors to each other, cf. 6: 165, 7: 129, etc.—or a ‘trustee’ to whom a responsibility is temporarily given, cf. Moses and Aaron, 7: 142. (p. 7)

Haleem’s explanation confirms that ‘vicegerent’ and ‘deputy’ are choices for the word *khalīfa*; these choices associate with the Sufī beliefs. The Sufī Mufasir Hulusi (2013) interprets Q 2: 30 as follows:

And when your Rabb said to the angels (angels here are personifications of the qualities of the Names comprising one’s body, hence the addressee here is you), ‘I will make upon the earth (the body) a *vicegerent* (conscious beings who will live with the awareness of the Names).’ (p. 55) [The emphasis is mine.]

This interpretation demonstrates that Sufīs believe that man is the Divine deputy on earth, and this meaning can be seen in Bakhtiar’s use of the word ‘vicegerent’ employed in the *Sufī tafsīr*. The word ‘vicegerent’ is formed from the prefix ‘vice’ meaning ‘deputy, assistant, dispute,’ and the root ‘regent,’ standing for ‘ruling, governing’; it means “a person exercising delegated power on behalf of a sovereign or ruler” (Hobson, 2004, p. 365). This meaning aligns with the Sufī belief in comprising the names of God in man’s essence. Thus, Bakhtiar’s choice displays her theological views.

In addition to the translators’ theological stances, their socio-cultural ideologies affect their choices. Jaafar Sheikh Idris (1990) agrees with Ibn Arabī that God is the sole reality of everything and that the world is God in disguise; nonetheless, Idris disagrees that *khalīfa* means ‘vicegerent’ claiming that it is a contemporary intellectual and psychological interpretation. He states that “it is not true that every human being is an actual vicegerent of God in event of this sense” (p. 109). Idris relates the choice of ‘vicegerent’ for *khalīfa* to the secular outlook of the Western world to make Islam fit within its materialistic framework. Idris states:

The claim that man is the *khalīfa* of God—especially when that is taken to be a generic characterization of the human person as such, and when *khalīfa* is taken to mean vicegerent—is not warranted by any text of Qur’ān or *ḥadīth*, nor warranted by the linguistic meaning of the word. (p. 99)

The quote demonstrates that the use of ‘vicegerent/ viceregent’ for خَلِيفَةً *khalīfa* is not supported by the traditional *tafāsīr* [exegeses] of the Qur’ān or by *ḥadīth*, and it is not one of the meanings of the word. Idris (1990) concludes that man as a species is the خَلِيفَةً *khalīfa* in the sense of being responsible for the material development of the planet earth on behalf of God. Thus, the interpretation of this term خَلِيفَةً *khalīfa* as ‘viceregent’ aligns with either the *Sufī* beliefs regarding *wahdat al-wujūd* [the unity of existence] or Western secular outlook of the world in relation to the material development.

Of the 10 verses including the word خَلِيفَةً *khalīfa* or its derivatives, Q 7: 129 is the only verse that includes the word as a verb. The translators’ choices for the verb *yastakhlifakum* in Q 7: 129 magnifies Bakhtiar’s display of the *Sufī* beliefs:

**Example 31: Q 7: 129**

قَالَ ﻋَﺎﺱَى رَبُّكُمْ أَن يُهْلِكَ ﻋَدُوَّكُمْ وَيَسْتَخْﻠِفَكُمْ فِي ٱﻟْأَرْضِ

qāla ʿasā Rabbukum ai yuhlika ʿaduwakum wa yastakhlifakum fi-l-arḍ

**Khattab:** He replied, “Perhaps your Lord will destroy your enemy and made you successors in the land (p. 198)

**Hilali and Khan:** He said: “It may be that your Lord will destroy your enemy and make you successors on the earth (p. 279)

**Haleem:** He said, ‘Your Lord may well destroy your enemy and make you successors to the land (p. 102)

**Bakhtiar:** He said: Perhaps your Lord will cause your enemy to perish and make you successors to him on the earth (p. 152)

**Table 49**
The Translators’ Choices for *yastakhlfakum* in Q 7: 129

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Khattab</th>
<th>Hilali &amp; Khan</th>
<th>Haleem</th>
<th>Bakhtiar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>yastakhlifakum</em></td>
<td>made you successors</td>
<td>make you successors</td>
<td>make you successors</td>
<td>make you successors to him</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 49 shows that the four translators resort to “successors,” yet Bakhtiar adds the phrase “to him”. The word يَسْتَخْلِفَكُمْ yastakhifakum is a verb whose root is istakhlafa meaning “to make someone a successor” (Al-Mu’jam Al-Wasīṭ, 2004, p. 251). Khattab, Hilali and Khan, and Haleem utilise “successors in the land,” “successors on the earth,” and “successors to the land” respectively. Bakhtiar renders it as “successors to him on the earth”; her addition of the phrase “to him”, which refers to God, emphasises her Sufī belief that man is the successor of God on earth. Also, her use of “earth” rather than “land” reveals her emphasis on the unity of the existence. The phrase في آلّارض fi-l-ard can be translated as “on the earth” or “on the land”. The words ‘earth’ and ‘land’ differ in the degree of space involved: ‘earth’ encompasses the whole planet, whereas ‘land’ designates a limited area (Farid, 2006). Since translators choose the lexis based on the meaning they contextualise from the text, selecting ‘earth’ rather than ‘land’ reveals the translators’ emphasis on the existence of “successors” in the whole world. Thus, Bakhtiar choices align with the Sufī beliefs in wahdat al-wujūd [the unity of existence].

Table 50 below shows the translators’ different choices of the word خَلِیفَةُ khalīfa:

**Table 50**
The Translators’ Choices for the Word خَلِیفَةُ Khalīfa:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Khattab</th>
<th>Hilali &amp; Khan</th>
<th>Haleem</th>
<th>Bakhtiar</th>
<th>Naqvi (Shi’i)</th>
<th>Hulusi (Sufi)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q 2: 30</td>
<td>successive ‘human’ authority</td>
<td>(mankind) generations after generations</td>
<td>successor</td>
<td>viceregent</td>
<td>Khalifa [a successive authority]</td>
<td>vicegerent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 38: 26</td>
<td>authority</td>
<td>successor</td>
<td>mastery</td>
<td>viceregent</td>
<td>Khalifa [successor]</td>
<td>vicegerent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 6: 16 5</td>
<td>successors</td>
<td>generations coming after generations</td>
<td>successors</td>
<td>viceregent</td>
<td>successors</td>
<td>vicegerents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 10: 14</td>
<td>successors</td>
<td>generations coming after generations</td>
<td>successors</td>
<td>viceregent</td>
<td>successors</td>
<td>vicegerents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 50 shows that Khattab swings between using “authority” and “successor”, swinging between *taʿwil* [interpretation] and *ithbāt* [affirmation], whereas Hilali and Khan moves between using “generations after generations” and “successors” applying *tafsīr bi-l-maʿthūr*. Haleem uses more choices such as “successors”, “heirs”, “mastery”, “left behind”, and “succeed others” since he considers the contextual meaning, while Bakhtiar uses “viceregents” and “successors to him”, which mirrors the translation by the *Sufī* Hulusi (2013) and differs from the version by the *Shiʿī* Naqvi (2016). The table illustrates that Bakhtiar adopts *al-bāṭin* [esoteric] meaning.

Table 51 below demonstrates a summary of the frequency and percentages of the translators’ reflection of *Sufī* views regarding *wahdat al-wujūd* [the unity of existence]:

**Table 51**  
The Frequency and Percentages of the Translators’ Choices Reflecting the *Sufī* Belief in *Wahdat Al-Wujūd* [the Unity of Existence]
Table 51 demonstrates that 10 verses including the term خَلِيفَةٍ khalīfa and its derivatives are selected (see Appendix M) and that Bakhtiar is the only translator who displays the Sufi belief in wahdat al-wujūd [the unity of existence] reaching 100%. This percentage along with Bakhtiar’s agentic reflection of Sufism at the start of her translation confirm that her translation is Sufi-oriented. The table also shows that Khattab, Hilali and khan, and Haleem do not reflect Sufi views in their translations of this word.

Thus, the figures shown in table 51 illustrate that Bakhtiar’s beliefs in Sufism affects her translation choices, which supports the hypothesis that “the ideology of a translation resides . . . in the voicing and stance of the translator” (Tymoczko, 2003, p. 183). The table also shows that the Salafīs Hilali and khan are consistent to the traditional approach, tafsīr bi-l-ma‘thūr; therefore, they rely on the exoteric meaning, which elucidates their 0% of demonstrating Sufi beliefs. The 0% by the Ashʿarīs Khattab and Haleem might be due to their consideration of the contextual meaning of the term خَلِيفَةٍ khalīfa.

5.4.3 Al-Bāṭin/ Esoteric Interpretation of the Qurʾān

Sufism is found in Shiʿa and Sunnī Islam. Sufis believe that the Qurān has an inner meaning, which conceals up to seven successive levels of deeper meanings that support this inner meaning (Newby, 2004). In Ithnā’ashriyya/ Twelver, interpreting the Qurʾān follows two schools: the Akhbārī and the Usūlī. The former interprets the Qurʾān mainly through reliance upon traditions or ḥadīth, while the latter gives more power to independent reasoning and judgment, or ijtihād (Nicholas, 2021). According to Quasem...
(1979), Abu Hāmid Muhammad Al-Ghazalī88 confirms that “the Qur’ān has an outward aspect, an inward aspect, a limit and a prelude” (p. 87). Similarly, Saari (1999) states that the Sufī theologian Al-Ghazalī uses the Sufīs’ attempt to understand the meaning of the nearness to God and its specification with prostration as an example of their adaptation to al-bāṭin [esoteric] interpretation of the Qur’ān. Al-Ghazalī (1998) explains that outward exegesis cannot guide us to the secrets of the nearness to God; therefore, Sufīs find a relief in exploring the essence of the Qur’ān as opposed to its external aspect.

In the preface of her translation, Bakhtiar (2012) cited Al-Ghazalī, who confirms that the Qur’ān “relates to the person reading or reciting it” (xvi). Like Al-Ghazalī (1998) and the Sufī-ʿIrfānī exegete Nasr (1970), Bakhtiar emphasises the outward and inward meanings of the Qur’ān. To examine the influence of Bakhtiar’s Sufī beliefs on her translation choices, in this section, I examine the translations of the six verses including the term بَاطِن bāṭin [esoteric]: Q 6: 120, Q 6: 151, Q 7: 33, Q 31: 20, Q 57: 3, and Q 57: 13 (see Appendix N). The comparison of the translations of Q 6: 120 highlights the influence of Bakhtiar’s Sufī beliefs on her choices:

Example 32: Q 6: 120

wa dharū ẓāhir al-ithmi wa bāṭinahu

Khattab: Shun all sin—open and secret. (p. 179)

Hilali and Khan: Leave (O mankind, all kinds of) sin, open and secret. (p. 242)

Haleem: Avoid committing sin, whether openly or in secret. (p. 89)

---

**Bakhtiar:** And forsake manifest sin and its inward part. (p. 131)

**Table 52**
The Translators’ Choices for *bāṭinahu* in Q 6: 120

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Khattab</th>
<th>Hilali &amp; khan</th>
<th>Haleem</th>
<th>Bakhtiar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>bāṭinahu</em></td>
<td>secret</td>
<td>secret</td>
<td>secret</td>
<td>inward</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 52 shows that the translators’ choices align with their theological beliefs since the *Ashʿarī* Khattab and Haleem and the *Salafī* Hilali and Khan link the word *bāṭin* to sins as secret concrete deeds, while the *Sufī* Bakhtiar relates it to the sins in the mind, those that one thinks of but has not committed. The root of the word *bāṭin* is *baṭn* meaning something hidden, secret, unseen, or conceptual; also, *al-bāṭin* is one of the Attributes of God, which means that God knows what people reveal and what their souls whisper to them (*Al-Muʿjam Al-Wasīṭ*, 2004, p. 62). The *Sufī* interpretation of Q 6: 120 says that God commands people to “abandon both the apparent and the conceptual sins” (Hulusī, 2013, p. 159), whereas the *Ashʿarī* *tafsīr* interprets it as God commands people to “avoid the open and secret sins” (Al-Mahalli & Al-Suyūṭī, 2003, p. 143). Similarly, the *Salafī* *tafsīr* decodes it as God orders people to “avoid the sins that they do openly (the sins that are known for people) and those that are committed secretly” (Ibn Al-Uthaymīn, 2015, p. 260). These choices reflect the translators’ belief in the secret sin.

Similarly, the comparison between the translators’ choices for the word *al-bāṭin* in Q 57: 3 confirms that these choices are influenced by the translators’ theological beliefs:

**Example 33: Q 57: 3**

Huwal awalu waṭ ṣāhir waṭ zāhir waṭ bāṭin

**Khattab:** He is the First and the Last, the Most High and Most Near,\(^{(1)}\) (p. 574)

**Hilali and Khan:** He is the First (nothing is before Him) and the Last (nothing is after Him), the Most High (nothing is above Him) and the Most Near (nothing is nearer than Him). (p. 951)
**Haleem:** He is the First and the Last, the Outer and the Inner; (p. 359)

**Bakhtiar:** He is The First and The Last, The One Who is Outward and The One Who is Inward. (p. 524)

**Table 53**
The Translators’ Choices for al-bāṭin in Q 57: 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Khattab</th>
<th>Hilali &amp; Khan</th>
<th>Haleem</th>
<th>Bakhtiar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>الْبَاطِنُ</td>
<td>Near</td>
<td>Near</td>
<td>Inner</td>
<td>Inward</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 53 shows Bakhtiar’s adherence to choosing “inward” for al-bāṭin. The interpretation of Q 57: 3 by Ash’arīs is that God is the first before everything and the last after everything; He has no beginning nor ending, and He is Near (Al-Mahalli & Al-Suyūṭī, 2003). The Salafi Mufasir Ibn Al-Uthaymīn (2015) interprets the verse saying that God is High and nothing is above Him; however, He is Near and nothing is nearer than Him. The Sufi Mufasir Hulusī (2013) explains that God is the first and initial state of existence and the infinitely subsequent One, to all manifestation, “the Ṣahir (the explicit . . . ) and the Bāṭin (the unperceivable reality . . . )” (p. 550). Although in the preface of her translation, Bakhtiar declares that she does not rely on tafsīr [exegeses] but relies on dictionaries and tafsīr al-Qur‘ān bi-l-Qur‘ān, she uses the word “inward”, which gives the esoteric meaning. Bakhtiar’s alignment with the Sufi beliefs, mainly her focus on the unperceivable reality within the perceivable manifestation, reveals the influence of her theological views on her translation choices.

Hilali and Khan’s interpretation of the word الْبَاطِنُ al-bāṭin in Q 57: 3 emphasises the nearness of God and confirms His ‘uluwaw by using “nothing is above Him”; these choices display the Salafī beliefs (see section 4.5.4). Like Hilali and Khan, Khattab uses “Near” and adds a footnote giving another possible translation: “the Manifest ‘through His signs’ and the Hidden ‘from His creation’” (p. 574). Likewise, Haleem utilises the word “Inner” and inserts a footnote saying that “Theologians add, ‘without a beginning and without an end’” (p. 359). These choices reflect the translators’ theological beliefs.
Table 54 below shows Bakhtiar’s adherence to using “inward” in her rendition of the word *bāṭin*, which is a different choice from the choices by the Shi‘ī Naqvi and the Sufī Hulusi:

**Table 54**  
The Translators Choices for *al-Bāṭin* and Its Derivatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Khattab</th>
<th>Hilali &amp; khan</th>
<th>Haleem</th>
<th>Bakhtiar</th>
<th>Naqvi (Shi‘ī)</th>
<th>Hulusi (Sufī)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q 6: 120</td>
<td>بَاطِنُهُ</td>
<td>secret</td>
<td>secret</td>
<td>secret</td>
<td>inward</td>
<td>secret</td>
<td>conceptual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 31: 20</td>
<td>بَاطِنُهُ</td>
<td>unseen</td>
<td>hidden</td>
<td>inwardly</td>
<td>inward</td>
<td>hidden</td>
<td>concealed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 57: 13</td>
<td>بَاطِنُهُ</td>
<td>near</td>
<td>Inside</td>
<td>inside</td>
<td>inward</td>
<td>interior</td>
<td>interior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 6: 151</td>
<td>بَطنَهُ</td>
<td>secretly</td>
<td>secretly</td>
<td>secret</td>
<td>inward</td>
<td>concealed</td>
<td>hidden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 7: 33</td>
<td>بَطنَهُ</td>
<td>secret</td>
<td>secretly</td>
<td>hidden</td>
<td>inward</td>
<td>concealed</td>
<td>concealed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 57: 3</td>
<td>البَاطِنُ</td>
<td>Near</td>
<td>Near</td>
<td>Inner</td>
<td>inward</td>
<td>Intimate</td>
<td>unperceivable reality</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 54 shows Bakhtiar’s consistency in using “inward” for the word *al-bāṭin* and its derivatives; her choices differ from those by the Shi‘ī and Sufī translators. Her constant use of “inward” reflects her belief in ‘Irfanī-Sufī inward meaning of the Qur’ān (the seven layers of the meanings of the Qur’ān) (Al-Ghazalī, 1998). Furthermore, the table demonstrates Khattab’s and Hilali and Khan’s beliefs in the nearness of God, yet Hilali and Khan emphasise God’s *‘uluww* saying that “nothing is above Him”. Table 54 also highlights Bakhtiar’s adherence to a new type of *Sufism* which is a hybrid of *Sunnī* and *Shi‘ī* Islam.
Table 55 below demonstrates a summary of the frequency and percentages of the translators’ display of Sufi views regarding *al-bāṭin* [esoteric] meanings:

### Table 55
The Frequency and Percentages of the Translators’ Choices Reflecting the Sufi Belief in *Al-Bāṭin* [Esoteric] Meanings of the Qur’ānic Verses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>III. Esoteric Meanings</th>
<th>Total Number of Verses</th>
<th>Khattab</th>
<th>Hilali &amp; Khan</th>
<th>Haleem</th>
<th>Bakhtiar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>freq.</td>
<td>perc.</td>
<td>freq.</td>
<td>perc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 (3 <em>bāṭinahu</em> [hidden], 2 <em>bāṭana</em> [concealed], 1 <em>البَاطِنَْ</em> [secret])</td>
<td>freq.</td>
<td>perc.</td>
<td>freq.</td>
<td>perc.</td>
<td>freq.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 55 shows that the number of the verses including the word *bāṭin* and its derivatives is six (see Appendix N) and that Bakhtiar is the only translator who adopts the esoteric meanings of the Qur’ān when rendering these words, which aligns with her Sufi beliefs detected in the preface of her translation.

The percentages shown in table 55 demonstrate the translators’ consistency when they translate the word الْبَاطِنَْ *al-bāṭin*. Their choices reflect their beliefs and approaches to Qur’ānic exegesis. The zero percent by Hilali and Khan, Khattab, and Haleem reveals their views that secret sins are those unknown by people and that God is Near. These choices confirm their reliance on traditional *tafsīr* [exegesis], *tafsīr bi-l-ma’thūr*/*tafsīr bi-n-naql*. However, the 100% by Bakhtiar indicates her belief in the inner meanings of the Qur’ānic words and expressions. This thought is also reflected in her translation of *fatā* and its derivatives (see section 5.4.1). Thus, table 55 highlights Bakhtiar’s uniformity in applying the esoteric meaning.

#### 5.4.4 Walāya and Imāma

*Walāya* and *imāma* are general concepts in Islam in general and key concepts in Shi’a Islam and Sufism in particular (see section 5.2.2 and 5.2.3). In this section, I examine the translators’ choices for these terms to explore the influence of their theological stances on making these choices. The comparison between the interpretation of the terms *walāya*
and imāma by the Salafī scholar Ibn Taymiyya and the Sufī Ibn ʿArabī facilitates the understanding of the thoughts of Salafīs and Sufīs regarding these terms.

Ibn Taymiyya differentiates between أُوْلِيَاءَ اللَّهِ وأُوْلِيَاءَ السَّيِّطَانِ [the allies of God and the allies of the devil]; he considers every Muslim as a walī. On the other hand, the Sufī scholar Ibn ʿArabī agrees that “In the Sufī sense walī is better translated as ‘protégé’ of God (Trimingham, 1998, p. 135); “like mawlā, it can be ‘protector’ or ‘patron’” (Al-Isfahanī, 1992, p. 885). According to Ibn ʿArabī (1992), the spiritual hidden meaning of walāya is “support and protection” (p. 70). The advent of kalām [philosophy] into the teachings of Islam has resulted in the different interpretations of walāya (see section 4.2). Salafīs apply the ithbāt [traditional] approach, and Sufīs use taʾwīl [interpretation] method. Translators who hold Sufī beliefs interpret the term أُوْلِيَاءَ as “the friends of Allāh” or “protectors,” (Adams, 2006, p. 12). The former expresses az-ẓāhir [exoteric] meaning, and the latter conveys al-bāṭin [esoteric] meaning.

The word أُوْلِيَاءَ and its derivatives are mentioned ninety times in the Qur’ān; the direct term is mentioned thirty-five times, and the derivatives appeared fifty-five times. In fifty-four incidents out of the ninety, the term is mentioned on the side of God, and in thirty-six times it is on the side of those who took refuge in Satan and those who did wrong (Dimashqieh, n.d.). The fifty-five direct terms articulated in the Qur’ān are selected to avoid missing any derivatives (see Appendix O). The translations of these terms are examined to identify whether the translators apply the Sufī al-bāṭin [esoteric] meaning or the Salafī az-ẓāhir [exoteric] meaning. The example below highlights the translators’ choices in translating Q 10:62:

Example 34: Q 10: 62

الآ إِنَّ أُوْلِيَاءَ اللَّهِ لَا خَوْفٌ عَلَيْهِمْ وَلَا هُمْ يَحزَنُونَ

Khattab: There will certainly be no fear for the close servants of Allah, nor will they grieve. (p. 242)

Hilali-Khan: No doubt! Verily, the Auliyā’ of Allāh [i.e. those who believe in the Oneness of Allāh and fear Allāh much (abstain from all kinds of sins and evil deeds which he has forbidden), and love Allāh much (perform all kinds of good
deeds which He has ordained), no fear shall come upon them nor shall they grieve. (p. 359)

**Haleem:** But for those who are on God’s side there is no fear, nor shall they grieve. (p. 133)

**Bakhtiar:** No doubt with the faithful friends of God there will be neither fear in them nor will they feel remorse. (p. 197)

Table 56 shows that Bakhtiar applies the *Sufi* exoteric meaning and renders أولياء الله *awliyāʾ Allah* as “the faithful friends of God”. It also illustrates that Khattab and Haleem adopt an interpretive approach and render the term as “the close servants of Allah” and “those who are on God’s side”. The table demonstrates that Hilali and Khan use transliteration and detailed explanation, not in the ST, to link *Awliyāʾ Allah* to those who believe in His “Oneness”.

The term أولياء الله *awliyāʾ* means “allies, lovers, or supporters” (*Al-Mu’jam Al-Wasīṭ*, 2004, p. 1058). In Q 10: 62, God tells people that His *Awliyāʾ* are those who believe and have *taqwa* [righteousness] and that no fear shall come upon them nor shall they grieve (Ibn Kathīr, 2002). In *Sufi* teachings “awliya’ [are] (Friends of God)” (Nasiri et al., 2018, p. 77). *Sufis* use terms such as “’godfriend’ (or ‘Godfriend’) and ‘friend-of-God’ for *wali*; (*walāya* is rendered ‘godfriendship’), ‘godservant’ for ‘*abd*’ (Von Schlegell, 2002, p. 585). In the introduction of his translation, Haleem (2016) states “*awliyaʾ* is commonly translated as ‘friends’ when it in fact generally means ‘allies’ or ‘supporters’” (xxxi). He
relates the different meanings of the term to the “different contexts, a feature known in Arabic as \textit{wujuh al-Qur'\'an}” (xxx).

Bakhtiar’s choice does not align with the \textit{Shi'\i} translation, in which the phrase \textit{Awliyā’ Allah} is transferred as “Aoliya of Allah [i.e. the Masumeen\textsuperscript{89} swsa and their followers]” (Naqvi, 2016, p. 215). These different choices confirm that Bakhtiar adheres to the \textit{Sufi} interpretation not the \textit{Shi'\i} one. Since “translators’ ideologies are constructed from their knowledge, beliefs, value systems, and the societies in which they operate” (Munday, 2007, p. 195), Bakhtiar might be influenced by her living in Iran and being a student of a \textit{Sufi} teacher.

Furthermore, table 56 highlights Bakhtiar’s grammatical shift. Unlike the other translators who use “no fear for” or “no fear upon,” Bakhtiar uses the phrase “neither fear in” to give the message that the \textit{awliyā’} of God have no fear inside themselves. Also, Khattab and Bakhtiar use the auxiliary verb “will” which gives the meaning of a future fact, while Hilali and Khan use the model “shall,” which is less in certainty than “will” as it gives the meaning of probability. On the other hand, Haleem uses a compound sentence in the present simple tense by utilising verb to be, “are and is”, and the model verb “shall”. These model verbs “will” and “shall” give different degrees to the action.

Unlike in Q 10: 62, in Q 8: 73, the term \textit{Awliyā’} [allies/ lovers/ supporters] is used for the disbelievers:

\textbf{Example 35: Q 8: 73}

\[
\text{wal ladhīna kafarū ba’duhum awliyā’u ba’d}
\]

\textbf{Khattab:} As for the disbelievers, they are guardians of one another. (p. 216)

\textbf{Hilali-Khan:} And those who disbelieve are allies of one another. (p. 310)

\textbf{Haleem:} The disbelievers support one another. (p. 115)

\textbf{Bakhtiar:} And those who were ungrateful, some are protectors of some others. (p. 171)

\textsuperscript{89} The Twelve \textit{Shi'a} Imāms (see note 78).
Table 57
The Translators’ Choices for أَوْلِيَﺂءِ awliyā’ in Q 8: 73

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Khattab</th>
<th>Hilali &amp; Khan</th>
<th>Haleem</th>
<th>Bakhtiar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>أَوْلِيَﺂءٍ</td>
<td>guardians</td>
<td>allies</td>
<td>support</td>
<td>protectors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While the term أَوْلِيَﺂءِ awliyā’ in Q 10: 62 describes أَوْلِيَﺂءِ awliyā’ of God, in Q 8: 73, it depicts ‘disbelievers’. Table 57 shows that the male translators make different choices based on the contextual meaning and that Bakhtiar sticks to the esoteric meaning “protectors”. She does not align with the Shi‘ī elucidation as Naqvi (2016) renders it as “allies” (p. 186). Bakhtiar’s choice aligns with that of the Sufi theologian Hulusī (2013, p. 195) since both adheres to “protectors”. Bakhtiar is consistent in her choices, which might be due to the influence of her scientific education as she was a psychologist. In the preface of her translation, she states:

> Armed with this science, I began this translation as a scientific study to see if it was possible to apply these principles to a translation by finding a different English equivalent for each Arabic verb or noun in order to achieve a translation of a sacred text that has internal consistency and reliability” (xiv).

This quote highlights Bakhtiar’s scientific way in translating the Qur’ān and her use of fixed terms for each meaning. She also sticks to “protectors” for awliyā’ ash-shayṭān [the guardians of Satan] as shown in the example below:

Example 36: Q 4: 76

فَقَاتِلُوا أَوْلِيَﺂءَ آلِشَيْطَانِ (النساء 76)

\textit{faqātilū awliyā’ ash-shayṭān}

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textbf{Khattab}: So fight against Satan’s ‘evil’ forces. (p. 132)
  \item \textbf{Hilali-Khan}: So fight you against the friends of \textit{Shaiṭān} (Satan). (p. 155)
  \item \textbf{Haleem}: Fight the allies of Satan (p. 57)
  \item \textbf{Bakhtiar}: So fight the protectors of Satan. (p. 81)
\end{itemize}

Table 58
The Translators’ Choices for أَوْلِيَﺂءَ آلِشَيْطَانِ awliyā’ ash-shayṭān in Q 4: 76
Table 58 shows that Bakhtiar uses “protectors” for *أولياءَ آلِيلِينَ*, even when it refers to Satan, which demonstrates her consistent approach in rendering the meaning of the term. In translating the three categories of *أولياءَ آلِيلِينَ*, Bakhtiar utilises “the faithful friends of God”, “protectors of some others”, and “protectors of Satan” respectively. Bakhtiar’s translation of the term differs from that of the Shi‘ī translator Naqvi (2016), who renders the term as “Aoliya of Allah [i.e. the Masumeen swsa and their followers]” (p. 215), “allies” (p. 186), and “allies of Shaitan” (p. 81). Thus, Bakhtiar’s translation is affected by her Sufi beliefs; she sticks to “protectors” when the term refers to people and Satan, whereas she uses “friends” when it refers to God.

In addition to the term walāya, *imāma* is a main concept in Sufism. Shi‘īs believe that their specific *imāms* were chosen by God to be like prophets in their infallibility (Musharraf, 2013; Amir-Moezzi, 1992). Unlike Sunnī Muslims who believe that *imāms* are normal people with worldly positions, Shi‘īs confirm that *imāma* is fundamental in Islam, so *imāms* must be followed since they are appointed by God and are free from sins (Abu Zahra, 2015). They consider *imāms* as caliphs [successors] of the Messengers of God in all prophetic duties and ranks (Nasiri et al., 2018). They define the term *إمام* as a “leader” or “guide”; Naser Al-Shirazi (1992) states:

> [Imāma, in short, is the status of the comprehensive leadership of all concrete, abstract, physical, spiritual, exoteric and esoteric domains. The *imām* is the head of state, the leader of society, the teacher of morality, and the leader of the internal content of qualified individuals].

The quote explains that *imāma* means leadership, so the *imām* is ‘a leader’. Also, Nasr (1970) confirms:
Closely associated with walāyat is the concept of the Imam in Shiʿism, for the Imam is he who possesses the power and function of walāyat. The role of the Imam is central to Shiʿism. From the spiritual point of view, it is important to point to his function as the spiritual guide, a function that very much resembles that of the Sufi master. (p. 234)

The extract reveals that in Shiʿism imāma is linked to walāya; the imām is a leader and a guide for his people, a spiritual successor or khalifa of his Prophet. Like the master in Sufism, the imām in Shiʿism is the leader and guide. The contemporary Sufi scholar Muhammad Ghazi Orabi (1985) states:

[Imāma is of two types: exoteric and esoteric. Aẓ-ẓāhira [exoteric] deals with matters of Sharia, so the imām is a judge, and a muftī in worldly matters, issues of jurisprudence, and the problems of Muslims. As for al-bātina [esoteric], it is when God wants to facilitate for his servants the understanding of their religion and to enable them to know their religion that He accepts.]

It can be understood from the excerpt that a Sufi translator might transfer the term إِمَامٍ imām and its derivatives as “leader” or “guide”, exoteric and esoteric meanings. Lefevere (1992) states that translators influence the ideology of the target text (TT) since their beliefs order their choices. Bakhtiar’s beliefs are formed in two cultures with different ideologies due to her living in America and Iran. Hence, Bakhtiar might display Sufi beliefs in her translation of this term as she did in translating fatā and khalīfa.

The term إِمَامٍ imām is mentioned in the Qurʾān in twelve verses: seven times in the singular form in Q 2: 124, Q 11: 17, Q 15: 79, Q 25: 74, Q 36: 12, Q 46: 12, and Q 17: 71 and five times in the plural form أَئِﻤﱠﺔً a'imma in Q 21: 73, Q 9: 12, Q 28: 5, Q 28: 41, and Q 32: 24 (see Appendix O). The term can have different meanings in these verses based on the interpretation of the context; the main three meanings are “book”, “road,” and “leader”. In this section, I examine three verses including the term إِمَامٍ imām with different meanings to investigate the choices of the selected translators. The comparison of the
translations of Q 36: 12 shows that the translators make the same choices when the term is used for the Qur’ān:

**Example 37: Q 36: 12**

إِنَّا نَحْنُ نُحْيَنَّ الْمُوتَّى وَنَكْتُبُ مَا قَدَّمَوا وَءَاثَارَهُم وَكُلُّ شَيْءٍ أَحْصَيْنَـٰهُ فِي إِمَامٍ مُبِينٍ (بِسِّ ۖ ۖ)

*innā Nahnu nuhyī-l-mawtā wa naktubu mā qaddamū wa āthā rahum; wa kulla shay’ in ahşaynāhu fī imāmin mubīn*

**Khattab:** It is certainly We Who resurrect the dead, and write what they send forth and what they leave behind. Everything is listed by Us in a perfect Record. (p. 464)

**Hilali and Khan:** Verily, We give life to the dead, and We record that which they send before (them), and their traces\(^{(1)}\) and all things We have recorded with numbers (as a record) in a Clear Book. (p. 758)

**Haleem:** We shall certainly bring the dead back to life, and We record what they send ahead of them as well as what they leave behind: We keep an account of everything in a clear Record. (p. 281)

**Bakhtiar:** Truly, We give life to the dead and We write down what they put forward and their effects. We counted everything in a clear record. (p. 420)

**Table 59**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Khattab</th>
<th>Hilali &amp; Khan</th>
<th>Haleem</th>
<th>Bakhtiar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>إِمَامٍ</td>
<td>Record</td>
<td>Book</td>
<td>Record</td>
<td>record</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One of the meanings of the word إِمَامٍ *Imām* is “the Qur’ān for Muslims, *al-lawh al-mahfūz* [the saved record], or the guide for travellers” (Al-Mu’jam Al-Wasīṭ, 2004, p. 27). In Q 36: 12, God says that He brings the dead to life and writes what they send forth and what they leave behind in *al-lawh al-mahfūz,* in which all deeds have been written (At-Ṭabarī, 1963; Al-Qurtubī, 1964). Also, إِمَامٍ مُبِينٍ *Imāmin mubīn* means ‘Protected Table,’ The Book in which all the deeds of men and the whole beings and events of this world are recorded and protected (Kashani, 1994). Table 59 shows that Khattab, Hilali and Khan, Haleem, and Bakhtiar transfer إِمَامٍ *Imām* as “Record,” “Book,” “Record,” and “record” respectively. The four translators transfer it without colouring it with the beliefs of Shi’īs
or Sufis, who render it as “Imam [Ali swsa]” (Naqvi, 2016, p. 465). Another example is Q 15: 79, in which the term إِمَامٍ Imām refers to something:

Example 38: Q 15: 79

فَأَنْتَقَمْنَا مِنْهُمْ وَإِنْهُمَا لِإِمَامِ مُبِينٍ (الحجر 79)

Khattab: so We inflicted punishment upon them. The ruins of both nations still lie on a well-known road. (p. 290)

Hilali and Khan: So, We took vengeance on them. They are both on an open highway, plain to see. (p. 443)

Haleem: and We took retribution on them; both are still there on the highway (p. 164)

Bakhtiar: so We requited them and they were both on a clear high road. (p. 246)

Table 60

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Khattab</th>
<th>Hilali &amp; Khan</th>
<th>Haleem</th>
<th>Bakhtiar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>إِمَامٍ</td>
<td>road</td>
<td>open highway</td>
<td>highway</td>
<td>high road</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Also, the word *imām* means “the wide path/road” (Al-Mu’jam Al-Wasīṭ, 2004, p. 27). In Q 15:79, the word *imām* is used to refer to an inanimate object and not a human; this verse is interpreted differently by Sunnis and Shi‘īs. The Sunnī mufasir Al-Qurṭubī (1964) explains that إِمَامٍ مُبِينٍ imāmim mubīn refers to the road to the cities of Lut and the People of Aikah, to whom Shuaib was sent. Similarly, Ibn Kathīr (2002) elucidates that the phrase points to the “road” that serves as a reminder and warning to all those who pass through it. Like the Shi‘ī translator Naqvi (2016) who transfers the term إِمَامٍ in Q 15:79 as “Imam” (p. 268), the Shi‘ī mufasir Muhsin Fayḍ Kashani (d. 1091) says that *imāmim mubīn* is named as “imam”; however, he adds that it is given this name because it refers to “a Clear Road” that leads people during their journeys (Kashani, 1994, p.119). The Shi‘ī mufasir and Shi‘ī translator use the word “Imam”. Table 60 shows that Kattab, Hilali and Khan, Haleem, and Bakhtiar render the term إِمَامٍ *imām* as “road,” “open highway,” “highway,”
and “high road”. Thus, Bakhtiar consider the context in her rendition of the term إِمَامُ imām in Q 15:79 since it refers to an object not a human being.

The comparison of the translations of Q 28: 5 highlights the translators’ choices in their translation of the term أَئِﻤﱠﺔَ a’imma [leaders] when it refers to people:

**Example 39: Q 28: 5**

وَنُرِيدُ أن نَفْسَنَ عَلَىٰ أُمْمٍ أَسْتَطْعَوْا فِي الأَرْضِ وَنِجْعَلُهُمْ أَئِمَّةً (القصص 5)

wa nurīdu an-namunna ‘ala al-ladhīn ustūḏ ‘ifū fi-l-arḍī wa naj‘alahum a’imma

**Khattab:** But it was Our Will to favour those who were oppressed in the land, making them models ‘of faith’ (p. 409)

**Hilali and Khan:** And We wished to do a favour to those who were weak (and oppressed) in the land, and to make them rulers (p. 662)

**Haleem:** but We wished to favour those who were oppressed in the land, to make them leaders (p. 245)

**Bakhtiar:** And We want to show grace to those who were taken advantage of due to their weakness on the earth and to make them leaders (p. 367)

**Table 61**
The Translators’ Choices for أَئِﻤﱠﺔَ a’imma in Q 28: 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Khattab</th>
<th>Hilali &amp; Khan</th>
<th>Haleem</th>
<th>Bakhtiar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>أَئِﻤﱠﺔَ</td>
<td>models ‘of faith’</td>
<td>rulers</td>
<td>leaders</td>
<td>leaders</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When the word إِمَامُ imām refers to people, it means “the person who leads Muslim worshippers in prayers”, “a leader of soldiers”, “a model” (Al-Mu‘jam Al-Wasīṭ, 2004, p. 27). It also refers to the head of the Muslim community (Zeidan, 2022). In Q 28: 5, God says that He wants to favour those who were oppressed by Pharaoh in the land and make them leaders in goodness and advocates to it (Ibn Kathīr, 2002). The translators’ choices reveal their different beliefs. Table 61 shows that Khattab changes the word imām which is a noun into a phrase describing imāms as “models ‘of faith,’” while Hilali and Khan translate it as “rulers”, which represents the political reality and the cultural phenomenon of the translation place of articulation (Khan, 2017). In the ideological context of Hilali and Khan’s translation, أُولِي الْأَمْر [rulers] are the leaders of the nation;
therefore, this choice might be selected unconsciously. Haleem and Bakhtiar apply a literal meaning and use “leaders”, whereas the Shi‘ī Qur’ān translator Naqvi (2016) transliterates أئمةً a‘īma as “Imāms” (p. 406) with a capital letter, which reflects his reference to the twelve Imāms. Bakhtiar’s choice reveals that the term imām has become, at least for her, a word devoid of its symbolic power as she does not stick to it, and she prioritises the context.

Table 62 below shows the translators’ choices for the term إمامًā imām and its plural form أئمةً a‘immā in the twelve selected verses:

Table 62

The Translators’ Choices for the Term إمامًā imām and its plural form أئمةً a‘immā:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Khattab</th>
<th>Hilali &amp; Khan</th>
<th>Haleem</th>
<th>Bakhtiar</th>
<th>Naqvi (Shi ‘ī)</th>
<th>Hulusi (Sufi)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q 36:12</td>
<td>إمامُ</td>
<td>Record</td>
<td>Book</td>
<td>Record</td>
<td>record</td>
<td>Imam [Ali swsa]</td>
<td>Clear Book</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 15:79</td>
<td>إمامً</td>
<td>road</td>
<td>open highway</td>
<td>highway</td>
<td>road</td>
<td>Imam</td>
<td>places clearly observable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 2:124</td>
<td>إمامًا</td>
<td>role model</td>
<td>Imām (a leader)</td>
<td>leader</td>
<td>leader</td>
<td>Imam</td>
<td>leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 11:17</td>
<td>إمامًا</td>
<td>guide</td>
<td>guidance</td>
<td>guide</td>
<td>leader</td>
<td>leader</td>
<td>leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 25:74</td>
<td>إمامًا</td>
<td>models</td>
<td>leaders</td>
<td>good examples</td>
<td>leaders</td>
<td>Imam from the righteous [i.e. Masumeen swsa]</td>
<td>leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 46:12</td>
<td>إمامُ</td>
<td>guide</td>
<td>guide</td>
<td>guide</td>
<td>leader</td>
<td>guide</td>
<td>to lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 17:71</td>
<td>إمامُ هم</td>
<td>leader</td>
<td>(respective ) Imām [their Prophets]</td>
<td>leader</td>
<td>leader</td>
<td>Imam</td>
<td>leader</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 62 shows that Bakhtiar interprets the term إِمَامًةٍ as “leader” when it refers to human beings and considers the context when it indicates objects. This choice equates the word “master” in Sufism and aligns with the choices of the Sufī Hulusi (2013). The table demonstrates that her translation does not associate with that by the Shiʿī Naqvi (2016). According to Raof (2012), Shiʿī exegetes use “Imam” and they support their view by using a Shiʿī ḥadīth “on the authority of the Shiʿī Imam Abu Jaʿfar Al-Bāqir (d. 114/732)” (p. 178), who confirmed that Prophet Muhammad announced that imāms after him would come from his household. Table 62 demonstrates that Bakhtiar’s translation choices reflect her Sufī belief in imāma.

Furthermore, table 62 demonstrates that Hilali and khan render the term as “guidance” and “a guide,” in Q 11: 17 and Q 46: 12; however, in Q 28: 5, they translate it as a “ruler”, which has a political connotation. They transfer it in Q 17: 71 as “their (respective) imām [their Prophets]”. These choices reveal Hilali and khan’s belief in imāms as “rulers”. Moreover, the table illustrates that Haleem uses “a guide” in Q 11: 17 and Q 46: 12 and “the champions of disbelief” in Q 9: 12. He uses “leader” in Q 2: 124, Q 17: 71, Q 21: 73, Q 9: 12, Q 28: 5, Q 28: 41, and Q 32: 24. Similarly, Khattab uses “a guide” in Q 11: 17 and Q 46: 12 and utilises “leader” in Q 17: 71, Q 21: 73, Q 28: 41, and Q 32: 24. Thus, table 62 highlights Bakhtiar’s Sufī belief in the leadership of imāms, which is also considered by the other translators, yet with less intense.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Bakhtiar</th>
<th>Hilali</th>
<th>Haleem</th>
<th>Khattab</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q 21: 73</td>
<td>leaders</td>
<td>leaders</td>
<td>leaders</td>
<td>leaders</td>
<td>leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 9: 12</td>
<td>champion</td>
<td>leaders</td>
<td>leaders</td>
<td>leaders</td>
<td>leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 28: 5</td>
<td>models ‘of faith’</td>
<td>rulers</td>
<td>leaders</td>
<td>leaders</td>
<td>Imams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 28: 41</td>
<td>leaders</td>
<td>leaders</td>
<td>leaders</td>
<td>leaders</td>
<td>leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 32: 24</td>
<td>leaders</td>
<td>leaders</td>
<td>leaders</td>
<td>leaders</td>
<td>leaders</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 62 demonstrates that Bakhtiar interprets the term إِمَامًةٍ as “leader” when it refers to human beings and considers the context when it indicates objects. This choice equates the word “master” in Sufism and aligns with the choices of the Sufī Hulusi (2013). The table demonstrates that her translation does not associate with that by the Shiʿī Naqvi (2016). According to Raof (2012), Shiʿī exegetes use “Imam” and they support their view by using a Shiʿī ḥadīth “on the authority of the Shiʿī Imam Abu Jaʿfar Al-Bāqir (d. 114/732)” (p. 178), who confirmed that Prophet Muhammad announced that imāms after him would come from his household. Table 62 demonstrates that Bakhtiar’s translation choices reflect her Sufī belief in imāma.

Furthermore, table 62 demonstrates that Hilali and khan render the term as “guidance” and “a guide,” in Q 11: 17 and Q 46: 12; however, in Q 28: 5, they translate it as a “ruler”, which has a political connotation. They transfer it in Q 17: 71 as “their (respective) imām [their Prophets]”. These choices reveal Hilali and khan’s belief in imāms as “rulers”. Moreover, the table illustrates that Haleem uses “a guide” in Q 11: 17 and Q 46: 12 and “the champions of disbelief” in Q 9: 12. He uses “leader” in Q 2: 124, Q 17: 71, Q 21: 73, Q 9: 12, Q 28: 5, Q 28: 41, and Q 32: 24. Similarly, Khattab uses “a guide” in Q 11: 17 and Q 46: 12 and utilises “leader” in Q 17: 71, Q 21: 73, Q 28: 41, and Q 32: 24. Thus, table 62 highlights Bakhtiar’s Sufī belief in the leadership of imāms, which is also considered by the other translators, yet with less intense.
Table 63 below shows the frequency and percentages of the translators’ reflection of Sufi views regarding the concepts walāya and imāma:

**Table 63**
The Frequency and Percentages of the Translators’ Choices Reflecting the Sufi Belief in Walāya & Imāma

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Number of Verses</th>
<th>Khattab</th>
<th>Hilali &amp; Khan</th>
<th>Haleem</th>
<th>Bakhtiar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>47 (35 awliya’ &amp; 12 imām)</strong></td>
<td>freq. 12, perc. 26%</td>
<td>freq. 30, perc. 64%</td>
<td>freq. 17, perc. 36%</td>
<td>freq. 44, perc. 94%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 63 reveals that the number of the verses including the terms awliya’ and imām is 47 (35 awliyā’ and 12 imām respectively) (see Appendix O) and that the highest percentage of displaying the Sufi thought is in Bakhtiar’s translation accounting for 94%. The table also shows that the second highest percentage of demonstrating the Sufi thought is in Hilali and Khan’s translation reaching 64%, which is followed by Haleem’s reaching 36%. Table 63 shows that Khattab’s translation has the lowest percentage accounting for 26%. These percentages show that the Sufi belief in walāya and imāma is present in the four selected translations and this could be because some Sufi ideas have percolated into all Muslim schools of thought.

Table 64 below highlights the frequency and percentages of the translators’ reflection of Sufi beliefs regarding practicing spiritual integrity, the unity of existence, esoteric meanings, and walāya and imāma in the four selected translations:
Table 64

*Sufi Ideologies in the Selected Authorised and Unauthorised Qur’ān Translations*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sufi Beliefs (73 Verses)</th>
<th>Khattab</th>
<th>Hilali &amp; khan</th>
<th>Haleem</th>
<th>Bakhtiar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>freq.</td>
<td>perc.</td>
<td>freq.</td>
<td>perc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practicing Spiritual Integrity</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Unity of Existence</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esoteric Meanings</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Walāya &amp; Imāma</em></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 64 shows that Bakhtiar is the only translator who reflects the *Sufi* beliefs in practicing spiritual integrity, the unity of existence, and *al-bātin* [esoteric] meaning. Moreover, the table demonstrates that she accounts 94% concerning *walāya* and *imāma*, whereas Hilali and Khan reach the second highest percentage in giving a high position to these concepts accounting for 64%. Furthermore, the table demonstrates that Khattab reaches the lowest percentage in displaying *Sufi* beliefs accounting for 26%, and Haleem accounts for 36% to reach the second lowest percentage.

The figures in Table 64 highlight the fact that the *Salafī* Hilali and khan and the *Ashʿarī* Khattab and Haleem are consistent to the exoteric meanings in their translations of the terms *fātā*, *khalīfa*, and *bātin*. Their zero percent in showing *Sufi* views reveal that they do not apply *taʾwīl* in rendering these terms. Furthermore, the 100% by Bakhtiar shows her belief in the inner meanings of the the Qur’ānic words and expressions. However, her inconsistency in displaying *Sufi* beliefs in translating *imām* and *wālī* highlights her applying a new type of *Sufism*, a hybrid of *Sunnism* and *Shiʿism* because she considers the contextual meaning when the term *imām* refers to an object unlike the *Shiʿī* *mufasirīn* [exegetes].

In the following section, I discuss the influence of the translators’ *Salafī* beliefs in *tawḥid* [monotheism] vs *shrik* [polytheism], seeing God on the Day of Judgement, the
increase and decrease of *imān* [faith], and *ithbāt* *ʿulūw* Allah [God’s Transcendence] on their Qurʾān translations.

### 5.5 Salafi Beliefs Reflected in the Translators’ Choices

#### 5.5.1 Tawḥīd/Islamic Monotheism vs Shirk/Polytheism

In this section, I argue that unlike Haleem’s and Bakhtiar’s Qurʾān translations that are influenced by the translators’ ideological affiliations and orientations, Hilali and Khan’s translation is impacted by the ideologies of the translation place of articulation. Calzada-Pérez (2003) states “translators translate according to the ideological settings in which they perform their tasks” (p. 7); therefore, “the ideology of a translation is that of the actual physical and cultural space that the translator occupies” (p. 185). Hilali and Khan’s translation, published in Saudi Arabia, adheres to the interpretation of Al-Qurṭubī, Ibn Kathīr, and Aṭ-Ṭabarī, as it is mentioned in the introduction of the translation. It also sticks to the teachings of the legal school of Aḥmad Ibn Ḥanbal. Hilali was Moroccan, and “the official doctrine of the kingdom of Morocco is Sunnite Islam, according to the legal tradition of the Malikite law school and the theological tradition of the Ashʿarīte creed” (Van Koningsveld, 2002, p. 272). Khan was Pakistani, and about 90% of Pakistani Muslims are *Sunnīs* following Sufism (Khan, 2017). Both Hilali and Khan were *Sufīs* and became *Salafī-zāhirīs*; they interpret the Qurʾān applying *tafsīr bi-l-maʿthūr* without any display of *Ashʿarī* or *Sufī* beliefs. They produce a literal interpretation relying on the Qurʾān and *Sunna* (Al-Ghamdi, 2015) and apply a combination of translation procedures: transliteration, addition, expansion, and interpolation, characterised by adding another language in the TT (Callison-Burch et al., 2008). Thus, the dominant ideologies in Hilali and Khan’s translation are those of the patron/authorising institution. Hilali and Khan’s translation is regulated/authorised by the local authority in Saudi Arabia. The three components of ideology in translation are provided from the same patronage since appointing the translators, setting the criteria of the translation, and paying for the publication are all provided by King Fahd Glorious Qurʾān Printing Complex.

---

90 Interpolation means the insertion of something of a different nature into the TT (see note 18).
According to Robinson (2000), authorisation involves strict controls on who translates, how the source text is translated, and for whom it is translated. Similarly, Lefevere’s (1992) ideological turn defines the undifferentiated patronage as the person or organisation that makes the decision of translation, dispenses the payment, and dominates the ideologies of the translation (see section 1.3.3). The phrase “NOT FOR SALE [and] For Free Distribution” is written on the title page of Hilali and Khan’s translation. Also, in the foreword, it is written that the translation is ordered by the King of Saudi Arabia to enable the non-Arabic-speaking Muslims to understand the Qurʾān (see section 4.2.3 & figure 6). Consequently, Hilali and Khan’s translation is expected to display the Salafi beliefs common in the translation place of enunciation, mainly the affirmation of tawḥīd [monotheism] and denial of shirk [polytheism].

The concept tawḥīd [monotheism] is controversial among the followers of the schools of Islamic theology. All Muslims, regardless of their schools of theology, believe in the oneness of God, yet the triple division of monotheism differs between Salafis and Ashʿarīs. For Salafis, this notion comprises توحيد الروبية وتوحيد الألوهية وتوحيد الأسماء والصفات tawḥīd-ar-rubūbiyyah [the oneness of the Lordship of God], tawḥīd al-ulūhiyyah [the oneness of the worship of God], and tawḥīd al-asmā’ was-ṣifāt [the oneness of the names and attributes of God] (Hilali & Khan, 2020). Salafis put more emphasis on tawḥīd-al-ulūhiyyah (Ibin Abdul Wahhab, 2015; Philip, 2005). They believe that tawḥīd-al-ulūhiyyah combines tawḥīd at-ṭalab waš-qaṣd waš-irada [Oneness of goal, purpose, and will]. Salafis think that whoever devotes some of his/her worship to someone else than God goes astray with regard to this tawḥīd and drift away from the true belief since Muslims should worship God alone, perform what He commanded, and avoid what He forbade (Al-Bijuri, 2004).

On the other hand, Ashʿarīs view tawḥīd [monotheism] as توحيد الذات وتوحيد الأفعال, tawḥīd adh-dhāt [the Oneness of the Divine Essence], tawḥīd as-ṣifāt, [the Oneness of the Attributes of God], and tawḥīd al-afʿal [the Oneness of the Actions of God]. They believe that tawḥīd-ar-rubūbiyyah [the Oneness of the Lordship of God] negates pluralism and division of divinity since God has no partners and His Attributes make Him deserve to be worshiped (Ibn Khzyma, 2008; Al-Jader, 1999; Al-Ashʿarī, 1976). According to Abu Ameenah Bilal Philip, (2005), tawḥīd in the view of
Ashʿarīs is tawḥīd-ar-rubūbiyyah [the Oneness of the Lordship of God]. The Sufī theologian Ibn ʿArabī (2015) states that tawḥīd refers to the oneness of God and His granting of existence to everything in the universe. Thus, like Ashʿarīs, Sufīs emphasise the oneness of God in His Lordship, having complete mastery over the universe in every way, and, like Salafīs, they accentuate Islam as an Abrahamic monotheistic religion.

The translators’ beliefs regarding the concept tawḥīd [Monotheism] are expressed in their rendition of the phrase رَبُّكَ وَحَدَّهُ Rabbaka wahdahu in Q 17: 46:

Example 40: Q 17: 46

وَإِذَا ذَكرْتَ رَبَّكَ فِي الْقُرْءَانِ وَحَدَّهُ وَلَوْا عَلَىٰ أَنْبَرُوهُمْ نُفُورًا (الإسراء 46)

Khattab: And when you mention your Lord alone in the Quran, they turn their backs in aversion. (p. 310)

Hilali and Khan: And when you make mention of your Lord Alone [Lā ilāha illallāh (none has the right to be worshipped but Allāh) Islāmic Monotheism (توحید اللہ)] in the Qurʾān, they turn on their backs, fleeing in extreme dislike. (p. 481)

Haleem: When you mention your Lord in the Qurʾan, and Him alone, they turn their backs, and run away. (p. 178)

Bakhtiar: And when you remembered your Lord in the Qurʾan. (p. 266)

Table 65

The Translators’ Choices for Rabbaka wahdahu in Q 17: 46

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Khattab</th>
<th>Hilali &amp; Khan</th>
<th>Haleem</th>
<th>Bakhtiar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>رَبُّكَ وَحَدَّهُ</td>
<td>your Lord alone</td>
<td>your Lord Alone [Lā ilāha illallāh (none has the right to be worshipped but Allāh) Islāmic Monotheism (توحید اللہ)]</td>
<td>your Lord, and Him alone</td>
<td>your Lord</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 65 shows that Hilali and Khan put emphasis on tawḥīd-al-ulūhiyyah [Oneness of the worship of Allāh] as they insert “[Lā ilāha illallāh (none has the right to be worshipped but Allāh) Islāmic Monotheism (توحید اللہ)]. This addition focuses on the basic beliefs of
Islam, *ash-shahada*, and the use of interpolation (inserting Arabic words in the TT) emphasises the doctrine of *tawḥīd* [Islāmic Monotheism]. David Long (2009) states that the focus on *tawḥīd* in Salafism makes its followers call themselves *Muwaḥidin*. The emphasis on *tawḥīd* [Islāmic Monotheism] can be seen in the traditional interpretation of the Qurʾān. Similar to Ibn Kathīr (2002) and Aṭ-Ṭabarī (1963), Ibn Al-Uthaymīn (2015) interprets Q 17: 46 saying that God placed coverings over the hearts of the polytheists so that they would not understand the Qurʾān and put deafness in their ears. These traditional interpreters use addition to confirm that when people mention their Lord in the Qurʾān calling for His monotheism and forbidding polytheism, polytheists turn back on their heels.

Table 65 also demonstrates Khattāb’s, Haleem’s, and Bakhtiar’s beliefs in *tawḥīd* ar-rubūbiyyah [the oneness of the Lordship of Allāh] since they choose “your Lord alone,” “your Lord, and Him alone,” and “your Lord”. These choices exemplify the Ash’arī and Sufī interpretations, which have the same degree of emphasis on the phrase ‘Islāmic Monotheism’. To make sure that the translators are consistent in their choices, the translations of the words *waḥid*, أَحَد, and *wahdhu* are selected and shown in table 66 below:

![Table 66](image)

The Translators’ Choices for the Word *Waḥid* and Its Derivatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Khattab</th>
<th>Hilali &amp; Khan</th>
<th>Haleem</th>
<th>Bakhtiar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q 2: 133</td>
<td>إِلَٰﮭٗا وَٰﺣِﺪٗا</td>
<td>the One God</td>
<td>One <em>Ilāh</em> (God)</td>
<td>one single God</td>
<td>One God</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 18: 110</td>
<td>إِلَٰﮭُﻜُﻢۡ إِلَٰﮭٞ وَٰﺣِﺪٞۖ</td>
<td>your God is only One God</td>
<td>your <em>Ilāh</em> (God) is One <em>Ilāh</em> (God — i.e. Allāh)</td>
<td>your God is own</td>
<td>your God is One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 17: 46</td>
<td>رَّبِّكَ وَﺣَدَهُ</td>
<td>your Lord alone</td>
<td>your Lord Alone [<em>Lā ilāha ِiλιλ‌اَ‌َِ‌</em> (none has the right to be worshipped but Allāh) Islāmic Monotheism <em>(توحید الله)</em>]</td>
<td>your Lord, and Him alone</td>
<td>your Lord</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 7: 70</td>
<td>أَلْلَٰھَ وَﺣَدُهُ</td>
<td>Allah alone</td>
<td>Allāh alone</td>
<td>God alone</td>
<td>God alone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 66 shows that the word واحِد and its derivatives are mentioned in Q 2: 133, Q 7: 70, Q 17: 46, Q 18: 110, Q 39: 45, Q 40: 12, Q 40: 84, Q 60: 4, and Q 112: 1. Of these nine verses, Q 17: 46 is the only verse in whose translation Hilali and Khan display their Salafi beliefs and use eclectic translation procedures: literal translation, transliteration, expansion, addition, and interpolation. They apply literal translation in saying “your Lord Alone” for ﷲ ﺭَبﱠﻚَ ﻭَﺣْﺪَهُ, transliteration of the added phrase “Lā ilāha illallāh”, and addition of “İslāmic Monotheism”. Hilali and Khan apply expansion in giving another meaning for the same transliterated sentence, “(none has the right to be worshipped but Allāh)”. Moreover, they use interpolation in their insertion of the Arabic phrase تﻮﺣﯿﺪ ﷲ in the TT; this addition is new data with different nature. I argue that Hilali and Khan apply interpolation to reinforce the concept of tawhīd [İslāmic Monotheism] and to teach the target reader (TR) Islamic terms in both English and Arabic. Also, table 66 illustrates that, in translating Q 112: 1, Khattab inserts the word “Indivisible” which is not included in the source text, yet it aligns with the Ashʿarī belief that God cannot be perceived through vision since He has no physical body, nor any location or direction.

Table 67 below shows that Hilali and Khan insert Arabic words when translating other verses:

Table 67
Examples of Hilali and Khan’s Insertion of Arabic Words

91 Interpolation means the insertion of something of a different nature into the TT (see note 18).
Table 67 highlights Hilali and Khan’s use of interpolation, the insertion of Arabic words in the TT to increase the display of their ideologies. The translators might use this method to familiarise the TR with terms such as القضاء والقدر al-qaḍā’ wa al-qadar [Decree and Preordainment] and الصَّمَد as-ṣamad [the Self-Sufficient Master], emphasised in Salafism (Al-Ashqar, 2005). The table also shows that Hilali and Khan add the word كبش kabs [a ram] as an expansion of ‘sacrifice’; this addition is not in the ST; it might be used to teach the TR. Furthermore, in Q 58: 2, the use of “Zihār (الظهران)” does not give the meaning as the transliteration in ‘Zihār’ and interpolation in (الظهران) are of no help to the TR. Consequently, I conclude that Hilali and Khan implement interpolation as a translation procedure to express the ideologies of the translation place of enunciation, mainly the superiority of the SL and didactic approach to Islam and the Qur’ān.

In addition to interpolation, transliteration and addition reveal Hilali and Khan’s beliefs and approach to QT. Table 68 below shows examples of these procedures:

Table 68
A Sample of Hilali and Khan’s Use of Transliteration and Added Brackets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q</th>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Hilali and Khan</th>
<th>Khattab</th>
<th>Haleem</th>
<th>Bakhtiar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q 2: 3</td>
<td>الصلاة</td>
<td>Aş-Ṣalāt (İqāmat-aş-Ṣalāt)</td>
<td>prayer</td>
<td>prayer</td>
<td>prayer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 2: 43</td>
<td>الزكاة</td>
<td>Zakāt</td>
<td>alms-tax</td>
<td>alms</td>
<td>alms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 2: 23</td>
<td>سورة</td>
<td>Sūra (chapter)</td>
<td>surah</td>
<td>sura</td>
<td>chapter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 2: 14</td>
<td>شياطين</td>
<td>Shayyātīn (devils — polytheists, hypocrites)</td>
<td>evil</td>
<td>evil</td>
<td>satans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 1: 2</td>
<td>العالمين</td>
<td>the ‘Alamīn (mankind, jinn and all that exists)</td>
<td>all worlds</td>
<td>all worlds</td>
<td>the worlds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 2: 39</td>
<td>آياتنا</td>
<td>Our Āyāt (proofs, evidences, verses, lessons, signs, revelations, etc.)</td>
<td>signs</td>
<td>messages</td>
<td>signs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 2: 35</td>
<td>الطالمين</td>
<td>Zālimūn (wrong-doers)</td>
<td>wrongdoers</td>
<td>wrongdoers</td>
<td>unjust</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 16: 120</td>
<td>المشركين</td>
<td>Al-Mushrikūn (polytheists, idolaters, disbelievers in the Oneness of Allāh, and those who joined partners with Allāh)</td>
<td>polytheists</td>
<td>idolater</td>
<td>polytheists</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 2: 2</td>
<td>المتفقين</td>
<td>Al-Muttaqūn [the pious believers of Ḩaḍrāt-Allāh who fear Allāh much (abstain from all kinds of sins and evil deeds which He has forbidden) and love Allāh much (perform all kinds of good deeds which He has ordained)]</td>
<td>those mindful ‘of Allah’(3)</td>
<td>those who are mindful ‘of God</td>
<td>the ones who are Godfearing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 68 highlights Hilali and Khan’s use of transliteration in transferring the meaning of صلّة [prayer] and الزكاة [alms]; they transliterate them as “Aṣ-Ṣalāt” and “Zakāt” without providing the meaning unlike the other translators who use “prayer” and “alms”. Furthermore, in translating the word سورة [chapter], Hilali and Khan use transliteration and added brackets although the word “chapter” transfers the meaning, while transliteration does not achieve its function. These two procedures might be applied to emphasise the pronunciation of the words. “The use of transliterated religious terms . . . displays a high estimation of the transliterated Islamic concepts at the expense of their counterparts in other religions” (El-Shiekh & Saleh, 2011, p. 146). In translating العالمين
[the worlds], they combine the article “the” and “ʻĀlamīn” with the explanation of the word between parentheses. Hilali and Khan might aim to introduce the word ʻĀlamīn to the English language and teach the non-Arab Muslims its pronunciation.

Moreover, table 68 shows that Hilali and Khan use transliteration, synonymy, and expansion in their transference of the word آیاتنا to display their ideologies. They combine the pronoun “our” with the word “ʻĀyāt” instead of saying ‘ʻĀyātinā’; they might aim to introduce the Islamic term آیات as a way of teaching the TR. Unlike Khattab and Bakhtiar who use “signs” and Haleem who uses “messages”, Hilali and Khan use expansion by adding six words each of which gives the meaning and employ “Our ʻĀyāt (proofs, evidences, verses, lessons, signs, revelations, etc.)”. According to Newmark (1988), expansion refers to the case where the translator exceeds the number of the words of the ST in the TT. Hilali and Khan apply the same translation procedures in translating the words شیاطین as “Shayātīn (devils — polytheists, hypocrites)” and المشرکین as “Al-Mushrikūn (polytheists, idolaters, disbelievers in the Oneness of Allāh, and those who joined partners with Allāh)”. They use transliteration, addition, and expansion for the word المنقین al-muttaqīn although using “the pious believers” is enough to give the meaning. Adding the phrase “Islāmic Monotheism” demonstrate their views. Thus, Hilali and Khan’s translation procedures might be implemented to teach the TR the meanings and pronunciation of Islamic terms and to display their ideologies.

As Hilali and Khan add the phrase ‘Islāmic Monotheism’ when translating the word واحد wahīd and its derivatives, they insert this phrase on other occasions, to the total of 260 times in their whole translation. For example, they employ it when translating terms such as الدین آمنوا al-ladhin amanū [those who believed/believers], خنیفًا ہنیفان [leaned to the right path], المتنقین al-muttaqīn [the righteous], مسلمین Muslimīn [Muslims], هدی اللہ hudā Allah [God’s guidance], دینه dīnahu [his religion], المعروف al-ma‘rūf [what is good], الإبیر al-abrār [virtuous], and الحق al-hāq [the truth]. Similarly, Hilali and Khan utilise the word ‘polytheists/ polytheism’ 213 times for words such as المشرکین al-mushrikūn [polytheists], الكافرون al-kāfirūn [unbelievers], الظالمون az-zālimūn [wrongdoers], المجرمون al-mujrimūn [criminals], الخاطئون al-khāti‘ūn [the sinful], الجاهلون al-jāhilūn
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[ignorant people], المجرمون al-mujrimūn, the tyrants al-ṭāghūn, and the spiritual deviations al-munkar. The translations of the terms أَلْذِينَ آمَنُوْا al-adhīn amanū, حَنِيْفَّة al-Hanīfī, and the criminals az-zālimūn are selected as a sample to analytically compare the translators’ choices regarding Islamic monotheism vs polytheism (see Appendix P). The comparison of the translations of Q 30:30 reveals Hilali and Khan’s use of the phrase ‘Islamic monotheism’ for مَلَّة إِبْرَٰھِـۧﻢَ Fiṭrah:

**Example 41: Q 30: 30**

**Khattab:** So be steadfast in faith in all uprightness ‘O Prophet’—the natural Way of Allah which He has instilled in ‘all’ people. Let there be no change in this creation of Allah. That is the Straight Way, but most people do not know. (p. 429)

**Hilali and Khan:** So, set you (O Muḥammad ﷺ) your face towards the religion (of pure Islāmic Monotheism) Ḥanīf (worship none but Allāh Alone). Allāh’s Fiṭrah (i.e. Allāh’s Islāmic Monotheism) with which He has created mankind. No change let there be in the religion of Allāh (Islāmic Monotheism): that is the straight religion, but most of men know not(1). [Tafsīr At-Ṭabarī] (p. 699)

**Haleem:** So [Prophet] as a man of pure faith, stand firm and true in your devotion to the religion. This is the natural disposition God instilled in mankind—there is no altering God’s creation—and this is the right religion, though most people do not realize it. (p. 259)

**Bakhtiar:** So set your face towards a way of life as a monotheist. It is the nature originated by God in which He originated humanity. There is no substitution for the creation of God. That is the truth-loving way of life, but most of humanity knows not. (p. 387)

**Table 69**
The Translators’ Choices in Q 30: 30

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Khattab</th>
<th>Hilali &amp; Khan</th>
<th>Haleem</th>
<th>Bakhtiar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>جَهْرْكَ الْذَّيْنَ آمَنُوْا</td>
<td>فَأَقِمْ وَجْهَكَ لِلْدِّيْنِ حَنِيْفَّةٍ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>حَنِيْفًۭا إِبْرَٰھِـۧﻢَ</td>
<td>ﻓَأَقِمْ وَجْهَكَ لِلْدِّيْنِ حَنِيْفَّةٍ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ﻓَأَقِمْ وَجْهَكَ لِلْدِّيْنِ حَنِيْفَّةٍ</td>
<td>ﻓَأَقِمْ وَجْهَكَ لِلْدِّيْنِ حَنِيْفَّةٍ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ﻓَأَقِمْ وَجْهَكَ لِلْدِّيْنِ حَنِيْفَّةٍ</td>
<td>ﻓَأَقِمْ وَجْهَكَ لِلْدِّيْنِ حَنِيْفَّةٍ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
faith in all uprightness | the religion (of pure Islamic Monotheism) Ḥanīf (worship none but Allāh Alone) | pure faith … in your devotion to the religion | a way of life as a monotheist

the natural Way of Allah | Allāh’s Fitrah (i.e. Allāh’s Islamic Monotheism) | the natural disposition God instilled in mankind | the nature originated by God

creation of Allah | the religion of Allāh (Islamic Monotheism)⁴ | God’s creation | the creation of God

Table 69 shows that Hilali and Khan use the phrase ‘Islamic Monotheism’ three times in the translation of three terms in Q 30: 30 to emphasise the oneness of God although it is not in the ST. In this verse, God commands Prophet Muhammad and his followers to worship God alone by following the religion of Ibrāhīm and confirms that people are created with this fiṭra, which does not change (Ibn Kathīr, 2002). The ḥanīf religion refers to Islam since “the hanafīs are a group of pre-Islamic Arabs who denied idolatry”; ḥanīf also means “leaning from evil to good, or from falsehood to truth” (Al-Mu’jam Al-Wasīt, 2004, p. 203). Salafi and Sufī tafsīr [exegeses] assert that a monotheist is whoever affirms that Allah is the creator, the giver of life and death (Ibn ‘Arabī, 2015; Quasem, 1979).

Moreover, table 69 demonstrates that Hilali and Khan utilise “Allāh’s Fitrah (i.e. Allāh’s Islamic Monotheism)” for ﻓِﻄْﺮَتَ ٱﻠِّﻳَـﺪِﯿﻦِ “true faith of Islāmic Monotheism (i.e. to worship none but Allāh Alone),” combining transliteration and parenthetical explanation emphasising the concept ‘Islamic monotheism’. This focus results from Hilali and Khan’s reliance on tafsīr Al-Ṭabarī, which is tafsīr bi-l-ma’thur, bi-r-riwaya, or bi-n-naql [received or transmitted interpretation] from the early days of Islam (Mir, 1995). In tafsīr Al-Ṭabarī, ﻓِﻄْﺮَتَ ٱﻠِّﻳَـﺪِﯿﻦِ fitrat Allāh is the Islam. In addition to these translation procedures, Hilali and Khan (2020) insert a footnote to support their choices by giving a ḥadīth [report of Prophet Muhammad’s words] saying:

Narrated Abu Hurairah رضي الله عنه: The Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم said, ‘Every child is born on Al-Fitrath [true faith of Islāmic Monotheism (i.e. to worship none but Allāh Alone)], but his parents convert him to Judaism or Christianity or Magianism, as an animal gives birth to a perfect baby animal. Do you find it mutilated?’ (Ṣaḥīḥ Al-Bukhārī, Vol.2, Ḥadīth No.467). (p. 351)
The information in the footnote is reflected in Hilali and Khan’s translation, which confirms their dependence on the transmitted interpretation from *aṣ-ṣaḥaba* [the companions of Prophet Muhammad] and *at-tabi’un* [followers of the companions of Prophet Muhammad]. To transfer the meaning in traditional exegetical books forming the theological beliefs of the patron, Hilali and Khan add the phrase “Islamic Monotheism” which is not in the source text, nor does it convey the lexical or contextual meaning. Hilali and Khan insert the name of the exegesis that they rely on in the TT. They apply this technique in several places and supplement their TT with the names of “*Tafsīr Al-Qurṭubī*” 11 times, “*Tafsīr Ibn Kathīr*” 7 times, and “*Tafsīr At-Ṭabarī*” 18 times. The table below shows the places of adding the names of the *Tafṣīr* [exegeses]:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><em>Tafsīr</em></th>
<th>Al-Qurṭubī (11 times)</th>
<th>Ibn Kathīr (7 times)</th>
<th>At-Ṭabarī (18 times)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Verses</td>
<td>Q 18: 34, Q 19: 45, Q 23: 88, Q 25: 43, Q 28: 7, Q 33: 48, Q 38: 7, Q 38: 19, Q 40: 11, Q 41: 45, Q 68: 43</td>
<td>Q 18: 42, Q 20: 27, Q 21: 92, Q 34: 26, Q 37: 3, Q 47: 6, Q 55: 6</td>
<td>Q 20: 81, Q 22: 4, Q 24: 43, Q 27: 25, Q 28: 46, Q 29: 36, Q 30: 8, Q 30: 18, Q 30: 30, Q 42: 35, Q 42: 45, Q 43: 60, Q 43: 81, Q 45: 18, Q 52: 47, Q 56: 85, Q 71: 17, Q 68: 43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 70 shows that Hilali and Khan rely on traditional *tafṣīr* [exegeses] that interpret the Qur’ān following the *ithbāt* [affirmation] approach without *ta’wīl* [interpretation]. This approach can be seen in Hilali and Khan’s rendition of “وَﺟْﮭَﻚَ ﻓَﺄَﻗِﻢْ” in Q 30: 30 as “set your face”, while Khattab and Haleem explain it saying “be steadfast” and “as a man” respectively. These choices highlight Khattab’s and Haleem’s application of *ta’wīl* [interpretation] method. It would be suggested that the translators include the names of these *tafṣīr* in the introduction to avoid disturbing the flow of the translation by these additions.

Like Hilali and Khan, Bakhtiar uses ‘Monotheist’ for *li-dīni ḥanīfā*.

The table below highlights the translators’ choices:

| Table 71 |
The Translators’ Choices for the Word حَﻨِﯿﻔًۭﺎ Hanîfan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Khattab</th>
<th>Hilali &amp; khan</th>
<th>Haleem</th>
<th>Bakhtiar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q 2: 135</td>
<td>حَﻨِﯿﻔًۭﺎ upright</td>
<td>Hanîf [Islâmîc Monotheism, i.e. to worship none but Allâh (Alone)]</td>
<td>upright</td>
<td>monotheist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 3: 67</td>
<td>حَﻨِﯿﻔًۭﺎ upright</td>
<td>Hanîf (Islâmîc Monotheism — to worship none but Allâh Alone)</td>
<td>upright</td>
<td>monotheist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 3: 95</td>
<td>حَﻨِﯿﻔًۭﺎ upright</td>
<td>Hanîf (Islâmîc Monotheism, i.e. he used to worship Allâh Alone)</td>
<td>true faith</td>
<td>monotheist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 4: 125</td>
<td>حَﻨِﯿﻔًۭﺎ upright</td>
<td>Hanîf (Islâmîc Monotheism — to worship none but Allâh Alone)</td>
<td>true in faith</td>
<td>monotheist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 6: 79</td>
<td>حَﻨِﯿﻔًۭﺎ upright</td>
<td>Hanîf (Islâmîc Monotheism, i.e. worshipping none but Allâh Alone)</td>
<td>true believer</td>
<td>monotheist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 6: 161</td>
<td>حَﻨِﯿﻔًۭﺎ upright</td>
<td>Hanîf [i.e. the true Islâmîc Monotheism — to believe in One God (Allâh i.e. to worship none but Allâh, Alone)]</td>
<td>a man of pure faith</td>
<td>monotheist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 10: 105</td>
<td>حَﻨِﯿﻔًۭﺎ upright</td>
<td>Hanîf (Islâmîc Monotheism, i.e. to worship none but Allâh Alone)</td>
<td>a man of pure faith</td>
<td>monotheist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 16: 120</td>
<td>حَﻨِﯿﻔًۭﺎ upright</td>
<td>Hanîf (i.e. to worship none but Allâh)</td>
<td>true in faith</td>
<td>monotheist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 16: 123</td>
<td>حَﻨِﯿﻔًۭﺎ upright</td>
<td>Hanîf (Islâmîc Monotheism (¹) — to worship none but Allâh)</td>
<td>a man of pure faith</td>
<td>monotheist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 22: 31</td>
<td>حَﻨِﯿﻔًۭﺎ upright</td>
<td>Hunafâ’ (i.e. worshiping none but Allâh)</td>
<td>devote yourselves to God</td>
<td>monotheists</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 30: 30</td>
<td>حَﻨِﯿﻔًۭﺎ upright</td>
<td>Hanîf (worship none but Allâh Alone)</td>
<td>pure faith</td>
<td>monotheist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 98: 5</td>
<td>حَﻨِﯿﻔًۭﺎ upright</td>
<td>Hanîf (worship none but Him Alone (abstaining from ascribing partners to Him))</td>
<td>true faith</td>
<td>monotheists</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 71 reveals the translators’ choices for the word حنیناً hanīfan and highlights Hilali and Khan’s use of transliteration and both parenthetical and bracketed details. These translation procedures might be applied as tools to enhance spirituality (Wright, 2012) or to familiarise the TT with the Islamic terms. Transliteration makes a language more accessible to people who are unfamiliar with the alphabets of that language (Al-Shabab, 2008), and “added brackets mostly contain short synonyms facilitating target-reader comprehension” (Levin & Herold, 2021, p. 121). These two translation procedures surge the demonstration of Hilali and Khan’s views.

Despite the differences between the beliefs of Salafis and Sufis to the extent that some Salafis consider Sufis to be infidels, table 71 shows the similarity between the Salafis Hilali and Khan and the Sufi Bakhtiar in their translation of حنیناً hanīfan. Philip (2005) states Sufis consider tawḥīd [monotheism] as the unique contribution of Islam to the monotheistic tradition. Also, in his book Mishkāt Al-Anwār [The Niche of Lights], Al-Ghazalī (1998) states that monotheism, the opposite of polytheism which teaches plurality of gods, means the oneness of God; it teaches the sense of worshiping only one God, the creator and ruler of the universe. Hashi (2013) declares that Sufis differentiate between monotheism and tawḥīd saying that “the Islamic concept of tawhid, goes one step further [than monotheism] and teaches not only the unity of Creatorship (al-khaliqiyyah) of God but the unity of His Lordship (uluhiyyah)” (p. 26). Bakhtiar’ choice of “monotheism’ for حنیناً [upright] highlights her belief in Islam as a monotheistic religion, which aligns with the Sufi views.

Although Bakhtiar employs “monotheists” twelve times for حنیناً hanīfan [upright], Hilali and Khan utilise “Islamic monotheism” twelve times for حنیناً hanīfan [upright] and thirty-three times out of thirty-nine for أَلْدَيْنَ أَمْنُوا alladhīna āmanū [those who believe]. Below is an example:

Example 42: Q 9: 20

الَّذِينَ أَمْنُوا وَهَاجَرُوا وَجَـٰﮭَدُوا فِى سَبِیلِ اللَّهِ بَيَٰتَلَّوْا وَأُنفُسِهِمْ أَعْظَمُ دَرَجةً عِندَ اللَّهِ وَأُولَٰئِكَ هُمُ الْفَاتِرُونَ (التوبة 20)

al-ladhīna āmanū wa hājarū wa jāhadū fī sabīli Allāh bi amwālihim wa anfūsihim aʿzamu darajatan `ind Allāh; wa ulū‘ika humul fāʿizūn
Khattab: Those who have believed, emigrated, and strived in the cause of Allah with their wealth and their lives are greater in rank in the sight of Allah. It is they who will triumph. (p. 219)

Hilali and Khan: Those who believed (in the Oneness of Allāh — Islāmic Monotheism) and emigrated and strove hard and fought in Allāh’s Cause with their wealth and their lives are far higher in degree with Allāh. They are the successful. (p. 316)

Haleem: Those who believe, who emigrated and strove hard in God’s way with their possessions and their persons, are in God’s eyes much higher in rank, it is they who will triumph (p. 117-8)

Bakhtiar: those who believed and emigrated and struggled in the way of God with their wealth and their lives are sublime in their degree with God. (p. 174)

Table 72
The Translators’ Choices for ‘Al-Ladhīn Amanū’ in Q 9: 20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Khattab</th>
<th>Hilali &amp; khan</th>
<th>Haleem</th>
<th>Bakhtiar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Al-Ladhīn Amanū</td>
<td>Those who have believed</td>
<td>Those who believed (in the Oneness of Allāh – Islāmic Monotheism)</td>
<td>Those who believe</td>
<td>those who believed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 72 shows the similarity between the translators’ choices of using relative clauses as the four of them use “those who” and the verb believe; however, they differ in their use of the tense and addition. The variant grammar tenses are present perfect “have believed” by Khattab, simple past “believed” by Hilali and Khan and Bakhtiar, and simple present “believe” by Haleem. The grammatical shift from the past tense in the ST to present simple or present perfect does not change the meaning. Nonetheless, the addition of “(in the Oneness of Allāh – Islāmic Monotheism)” by Hilali and Khan reveals the translation ideology formed in its place of enunciation. According to Tymocko (2003), the ideology of a translation resides in the voicing of the translator and relevance to the place of articulating the translation. Hilali and Khan’s added description of believers in Q 9: 20 discloses their beliefs.

Table 72 highlights Hilali and Khan’s insistence on linking the faith in God and the true believer to the “Oneness of Allāh – Islāmic Monotheism,” while the other three translators do not place a strong emphasis on the concept of tawhīd. Q 9: 20 says that God
gives a higher rank for those who believed, migrated, and strove in His cause with their belongings and their lives; He confirms that those are triumphant (Ibn Kathîr, 2002). The phrase اَلدُّينِ اَمَنُوا al-ladhîna āmanū can be translated as ‘those who believe in God’. Of the thirty-nine verses including this phrase, thirty-three are translated by Hilali and Khan with the addition of the phrase “Islâmîc Monotheism” (see Appendix P). Thus, addition as a translation procedure increases the display of the translation ideology.

The concepts tawhîd [Islâmîc monotheism] and shîrkh [polytheism] are inseparable in the Salafî beliefs, which promote the former and deny the latter. The comparison of the translations of the term اَلْمُجِرَمِينَ al-mujrimîn [criminals] in Q 14: 49 shows the difference between the translators’ choices:

Example 43: Q 14: 49

وَتَرَى اَلْمُجِرَمِينَ ﻲَوْمَ اِذْهَابِ ﻢُﻗَرَّنِينَ ﻓِي اَﻟْاَﺻِفَادِ إِبْرَاهِيم) 49( wa tara al-mujrimîna Yawma idhim muqarranîna fi-l-âṣfâd

Khattab: On that Day you will see the wicked bound together in chains. (p. 285)

Hilali and Khan: And you will see the Mujrimûn (criminals, disbelievers in the Oneness of Allâh — Islâmîc Monotheism, polytheists) that Day Muqarranûn (1) (bound together) in fetters. (p. 434)

Haleem: you [Prophet] will see the guilty on that Day, bound together in fetters. (p. 161)

Bakhtiar: you will consider the ones who sin that Day, ones who are chained in bonds. (p. 241)

Table 73

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Khattab</th>
<th>Hilali &amp; Khan</th>
<th>Haleem</th>
<th>Bakhtiar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>اَلْمُرَجِمِينَ</td>
<td>the wicked</td>
<td>the Mujrimûn (criminals,</td>
<td>the guilty</td>
<td>the ones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>disbelievers in the Oneness of Allâh</td>
<td></td>
<td>who sin)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>— Islâmîc Monotheism, polytheists)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 73 shows that Hilali and Khan use the phrases ‘Islâmîc Monotheism’ and ‘polytheists’ in Q 14: 49 to emphasise the oneness of God and give a feature of al-mujrimîn although these terms are not in the ST. In this verse, God says that on the Day
of Resurrection the criminals who committed the crimes of *shirk* [polytheism] and mischief will be chained together (Ibn Kathīr, 2002). The root of the term *al-mujrimīn* is *ajrama* [committed sin or a felony] (Al-Mu’jam Al-Wasīṭ, 2004, p. 118). Table 73 illustrates that Khattab and Haleem use noun phrases to give one of the characteristics of *al-mujrimīn*, whereas Bkhtiar utilises a relative clause.

The table also demonstrates that Hilali and Khan employ an eclectic approach: transliteration, synonymy, and addition. Adding ‘Islāmic Monotheism’ and ‘polytheists’ to emphasise the oneness of God confirms the translators’ *Salafī* beliefs. Unlike Hilali and Khan who add the term ‘polytheists’ in rendering the selected thirty-three verses including the word *al-mujrimīn*, Bakhtiar applies a scientific approach and adheres to the same choice of ‘the ones who sin’. Nonetheless, Khattab uses ‘the wicked’, ‘wrongdoing people’, and ‘aggressors’, while Haleem employs ‘the evildoers’, ‘sinners’, ‘the guilty’, ‘wicked people’, ‘insolent people’, and ‘those who do evil’ (see Appendix P).

In addition to *al-mujrimīn* mentioned thirty-three times and rendered by Hilali and Khan as “polytheists”, *aḥ-ẓālimīn* is mentioned eighteen times, of which fourteen times are translated as ‘polytheists’ by Hilali and Khan (see Appendix P). The example below highlights the translators’ choices for *aḥ-ẓālimīn* in Q 19: 72:

**Example 44: Q 19: 72**

\[
\text{thumma nunajji al-ladhīna attaqū wa nadharu aẓ-ẓālimīna fīhā jithiyyā (72)}
\]

**Khattab:** Then We will deliver those who were devout, leaving the wrongdoers (p. 334)

**Hilali and Khan:** Then We shall save those who used to fear Allāh and were dutiful to Him. And We shall leave the Ṭālimūn (polytheists and wrongdoers) therein (humbled) to their knees (in Hell). (p. 527)

**Haleem:** We shall save the devout and leave the evildoers there on their knees. (p. 194)

**Bakhtiar:** Again, We will deliver those who were Godfearing and We will forsake the ones who are unjust, in it, ones who crawl on their knees. (p. 291)
Table 74
The Translators’ Choices for أَزْـَلِمِينَ aż-źālimīn in Q 19: 72

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Khattab</th>
<th>Hilali &amp; Khan</th>
<th>Haleem</th>
<th>Bakhtiar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>أَزْـَلِمِينَ</td>
<td>the wrongdoers</td>
<td>the Zālimūn (polytheists and wrong-doers)</td>
<td>the evildoers</td>
<td>the ones who are unjust</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is apparent from table 74 that Hilali and Khan are the only translators who choose ‘polytheists’ for أَزْـَلِمِينَ aż-źālimīn, while Khattab, Haleem, and Bakhtiar use ‘the wrongdoers,’ ‘the evildoers,’ and ‘the ones who are unjust’. The word أَزْـَلِمِينَ aż-źālimīn is a noun in the plural form, and its root is ظَلَمَ ظَلاَمًا ظَلَمَ which means to “exceed the limits, put something not in its place, dig the land, deal with someone unjustly, oppress someone, or do wrong to someone” (Al-Mu’jam Al-Wasīṭ, 2004, p. 577). Q 19: 72 talks about the deniers of the Day of Resurrection, the tyrants and the hardened sinners who will go to hell; the verse explains that the believers will have a different end; they will be saved, but the wrongdoers will be left on their knees in hell (Ibn Kathīr, 2002).

Hilali and Khan utilise language common in the society where the translation is published since “language is social practice and not a phenomenon external to society to be adventitiously correlated with it” (Fairclough, 1989, vii). They emphasise the word “polytheists” echoing the ideologies of the translation place of articulation. For Salafīs, the violation of tawḥīd is considered polytheism and a wrong deed which deserves punishment (Algar, 2002). Salafīs believe that “everyone can make ijtihād” in interpreting the Qurʾān; however, they limit it “to ideas based only on the verbal (zahir) meaning of the Qurʾānic verses and the Hadiths (the sayings of the Prophet)” (Özev, 2017, p. 998). Translators are influenced by the “local culture specificity, [which plays a role in the] increase or decrease of their visibility” (Ardelean, 2009, p. 54) since translation is not a mere transfer of words from one language to another. The translators’ lexical and grammatical choices determine the meanings and messages of the Qurʾānic verses and display the dominant ideologies of the society (Calzada-Pérez, 2003; Fawcett, 1998). Consequently, Hilali and Khan’s over-use of the words ‘Islamic monotheism’ and ‘polytheism’ comprises societal beliefs.
Table 7 below shows the frequency and percentages of the translators’ reflection of *Salafī* views in monotheism vs polytheism in the translations of 102 Qur’ānic verses:

**Table 75**
The Frequency and Percentages of the Translators’ Choices Reflecting the *Salafī* Belief in *Tawḥīd* [Islamic Monotheism] vs *Shirk* [Polytheism]

<p>| I. <em>Tawḥīd</em>/ Islamic Monotheism vs <em>Shirk</em>/ Polytheism |
|-----------------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Number of Verses</th>
<th>Khattab</th>
<th>Hilali &amp; Khan</th>
<th>Haleem</th>
<th>Bakhtiar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>102 (39 <em>al-ladhín āmanū</em> [those who believed] &amp; 12 <em>millát Ibráhím ḥanîfân</em> [the religion of Ibrahîm], 33 <em>al-mújrimín</em> [criminals] &amp; 18 <em>aṣ-ṣâlimûn</em> [wrongdoers])</td>
<td>freq. 0</td>
<td>perc. 0%</td>
<td>freq. 92</td>
<td>perc. 90%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 75 shows that 102 verses are selected: 39 include *al-ladhín āmanū* [those who believed], 12 *millát Ibráhím ḥanîfân* [the religion of Ibrahîm], 33 *al-mújrimín* [criminals] and 18 *aṣ-ṣâlimûn* [wrongdoers] (see Appendix P). Hilali and Khan’s translation comprises the phrase ‘Islamic monotheism’ and the term ‘polytheists’ reaching 90% followed by Bakhtiar accounting for 12%. The table illustrates that Khattab and Haleem show no display of *Salafī* views regarding these expressions since they account for 0%.

The percentages demonstrated in table 75 highlight the influence of the ideological context on the translators since Hilali and Khan display the *Salafī* tendency common in Saudi Arabia, the place of the translation enunciation. These *Salafī* translators insert the phrases ‘Islamic monotheism’ and ‘polytheism’ in their TT although these expressions are not in the ST to affirm the Islamic teachings. Furthermore, these figures show that *Salafîs* and *Sufîs* share the affirmation of the Qur’ānic teaching of the Unity of God (monotheism); *Sufîs* “believe in monotheism as the only attribute of God” (Raof, 2012, p. 33). The figures
shown in table 75 indicate that the dispute between these schools of theology is not on the context of the Qur‘ān but on their understanding of the Qur‘ānic teachings and their approaches to Qur‘ānic exegesis.

5.5.2 Seeing God on the Day of Judgement

Seeing God on the Day of Judgement is a controversial topic between the followers of both Islamic sectarians and schools of Islamic theology. Sufīs believe that God is unlimited and has no body; therefore, He cannot be seen anywhere, whereas Salafīs think that God can be seen in the Hereafter and that He is over the seventh heaven (Abu Zahra, 2015; Al-Bouṭī, 1990). Ash‘arīs apply reason and say that God is seen by righteous people in the Hereafter, but He is not seen from any direction, because God is everywhere (Özturan, 2019; Treiger, 2016; Al-Ash‘arī, 1976). Ash‘arīs are convinced that “On the Day of Judgment, believers will see God ‘as the moon is seen on the night when it is full’, [but] unbelievers will not see him” (Culp, 2007, p. 94). Thus, Salafīs, Ash‘arīs, and Sufīs have different beliefs regarding seeing God on the Day of Judgement.

Ahmad Al-Hamad (1991) mentions the verses used to confirm seeing God on the Day of Judgement: Q 75: 23, Q 7: 143, Q 10: 26, Q 83: 15, Q 50: 35, and Q 67: 12 (see Appendix Q). Ash‘arīs use Q 75: 23 to support the idea that righteous people will see God in the world hereafter. The comparison of the translations of Q 75: 22-23 highlights the influence of the translators’ theological orientations on their choices:

Example 45: Q 75: 22-23

wujūhun yawma idhin nāḍira ilā rabbihā nāẓira

Khattab: On that Day ‘some’ faces will be bright, looking at their Lord. (p. 628)

Hilali and Khan: Some faces that Day shall be shining and radiant. Looking at their Lord (Allāh). (p. 1038)

Haleem: On that Day there will be radiant faces, looking towards their Lord, (p. 399)
**Bakhtiar:** Faces on that Day will be ones that beam, ones that look towards their Lord. (p. 568)

**Table 76**
The Translators’ Choices for ناظرة Nāẓira in Q 75: 23

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Khattab</th>
<th>Hilali &amp; Khan</th>
<th>Haleem</th>
<th>Bakhtiar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ناظرة</td>
<td>looking at</td>
<td>looking at</td>
<td>looking towards</td>
<td>look towards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 76 shows that Hilali and Khan use “looking at”, meaning “to turn your eyes in a particular direction” (Oxford Collocations Dictionary, 2002, 470), which confirms seeing God who is over the seventh heaven as Salafis believe. Similarly, the table demonstrates that Khattab utilises “looking at” which reflects the Ash’arī philosophical belief that believers will see God on the Day of Judgement. The similarity between the Ash’arī Khattab and the Salafīs Hilali and Khan results from the text structure and the exoteric meaning of the verse. However, Haleem and Bakhtiar choose “looking towards” and “looking towards”. Adding the particle “towards” to verb “look” gives it a different meaning such as “to consider, regard, or think about something” (Longman Collocations Dictionary and Thesaurus, 2013, p. 1283). This meaning aligns with the beliefs of Sufis and Ash’arīs who confirm that God has no specific direction.

Another example used by Salafīs to confirm seeing God on the Day of Judgement is Q 10: 26:

**Example 46: Q 10: 26**

اللَّذِينَ أَحْسَنُوا الْحُسْنَى وَزِيَادَةٌ (lilladhīna aḥsanu al-ḥusnā wa ziyāda)

**Khattab:** Those who have do good will have the finest reward\(^1\) and ‘even’ more.\(^2\) (p. 238)

**Hilali and Khan:** For those who have done good is the best (reward, i.e.Paradise) and even more (i.e. having the honour of glancing at the Countenance of Allāh جَلاَلَهُ. (p. 535)

**Haleem:** Those who did well will have the best reward and more besides. (p. 130)
Bakhtiar: For those who did good is the fairer and increase. (p. 193)

Table 77
The Translators’ Choices for Al-Husnā wa Ziyāda in Q 10: 26

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Khattab</th>
<th>Hilali &amp; Khan</th>
<th>Haleem</th>
<th>Bakhtiar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>الحُسْنى وزيادة</td>
<td>the finest reward(^{(1)}) and ‘even’ more(^{(2)})</td>
<td>the best (reward, i.e. Paradise) and even more (i.e. having the honour of glancing at the Countenance of Allāh جَلَّ جَلالَهُ)</td>
<td>the best reward and more besides</td>
<td>the fairer and increase</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 77 highlights Hilali and Khan’s emphasis on the possibility of seeing God by believers on the Day of Judgement. They render الحُسْنى وزيادة as “the best” and add parenthetical details “(reward, i.e. Paradise)”; they transfer وزيادة as “and even more” and exemplify this more as (i.e. having the honour of glancing at the Countenance of Allāh جَلَّ جَلالَهُ). They apply eclectic translation procedures, addition and interpolation, to reveal their beliefs. Their choices align with the interpretations by Salafīs and Ashʿarīs saying that whoever does good is rewarded by paradise and more, which is seeing God in the Hereafter (Al-Mahallī & Al-Suyūṭī, 2003; Ibn Al-Uthaymīn, 2015). On the contrary, Ashʿarīs believe that believers will see God as the moon. The Ashʿarī Khattab uses footnotes saying that the reward is Paradise and what is more is “seeing Almighty Allah in the Hereafter”. Also, Bakhtiar’s rendition as “the fairer and increase” aligns with the Sufi interpretation by Hulusī (2013), who does not emphasise the seeing of God stating: “For the doers of good (ihsan) is the Beautiful (Names) and more (pleasure)” (p. 214). Thus, table 76 shows that the translators’ choices reflect their theological beliefs in seeing God on the Day of Judgement.

Q 83: 15 is an example that unbelievers will be prevented from seeing God on the Day of Judgement:

Example 47: Q 83: 15

calla innahum ‘an Rabbihim yawma’idhīn lamahjūbūn

Khattab: Undoubtedly, they will be sealed off from their Lord on that Day. (p. 643)
**Hilali and Khan**: Nay! Surely they (evil-doers) will be veiled from seeing their Lord that Day. (p. 1067)

**Haleem**: No! on that Day they will be screened off from their Lord (p. 413)

**Bakhtiar**: No indeed! They will be from their Lord on that Day ones who are alienated. (p. 581)

**Table 78**
The Translators’ Choices for لَمَحْجُوبُونَ in Q 83: 15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Khattab</th>
<th>Hilali &amp; Khan</th>
<th>Haleem</th>
<th>Bakhtiar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>لَمَحْجُوبُونَ</td>
<td>sealed off from their Lord</td>
<td>veiled from seeing their Lord</td>
<td>screened off from their Lord</td>
<td>from their Lord … ones who are alienated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 78 shows that Hilali and Khan render َعَن رَبِّهِمُ يَوْمَئِذٍ لَمَحْجُوبُونَ ‘an Rabbihim yawma’idhin lamahjūbūn as “veiled from seeing their Lord” unlike the other translators who use “sealed off from their Lord”, “screened off from their Lord”, and “from their Lord . . . are alienated”. Hilali and Khan’s addition of the word “seeing” reveals the Salafi beliefs that only believers will see God on the Hereafter. Q 83 warns those who defraud scales about the horrible Day ahead and confirms that the wrongdoers will be severely punished, whereas the righteous will be rewarded. The Sūra closes by stating that the disbelievers will be paid back for ridiculing the believers. Q 83: 15 is interpreted by Ibn Al-Uthaymîn (2015) as only believers will see their Lord in Paradise and unbelievers will be deprived from seeing God. This verse is decoded by Sūfīs and Ash‘arīs without the addition of the word “seeing”. Hence, following َتَفَاسِيرَ [exegeses] that represent Salafi beliefs, Hilali and Khan place more emphasis on seeing God by believers on the Day of Judgement.

Table 79 below shows the frequency and percentages of the translators’ display of Salafi views regarding seeing God on the Day of Judgement:

**Table 79**
The Frequency and Percentages of the Translators’ Choices Reflecting the Salafi Belief in Seeing God on the Day of Judgement
II. Seeing God on the Day of Judgement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Number of Verses</th>
<th>Khattab</th>
<th>Hilali &amp; khan</th>
<th>Haleem</th>
<th>Bakhtiar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ناظرةُ</td>
<td>freq. 2</td>
<td>perc. 33%</td>
<td>freq. 6</td>
<td>perc. 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>أنظر</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>اﻟْﺤُﺴْﻨَﻰٰ</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>واﻟْﺤُﺴْﻨَﻰٰ وَزِﯾَﺎدة</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ﻣﺰﯾﺪ</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ﻟﱢﻤَﺤْﺠُﻮن</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>اﻟﻐﯿﺐ</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 79 shows that the number of the selected verses regarding seeing God on the Day of Judgement is 6 (see Appendix Q); it demonstrates that Hilali and Khan reflect the Salafi beliefs accounting for 100%. The table also illustrates that Khattab reaches 33%, while Haleem and Bakhtiar account for 17%. The translators’ making of choices that align with the beliefs of other schools of Islamic theology than the ones they follow might result from the text structure.

5.5.3 The Increase and Decrease of Imān/Faith

The concept of imān [faith] is another controversial concept among the followers of the schools of Islamic theology. Salafīs believe that imān [faith] is in the heart, tongue, and limbs. The tongue utters ash-shahada [saying that there is no God but Allah], and the limbs pray, pay zaka, fast, and perform Hajj. Salafīs confirm that imān [faith] increases and decreases, while Ash’arīs believe that imān [faith] is only in the heart, and it neither increases nor decreases (Halverson, 2010; Al-Badr, 2006; Al-Bijuri, 2004; Al-Ash’arī, 1976). According to Quasem (1979), in Sufism, imān [faith] is in the heart, and it is the belief in God; Sufīs differentiate between al-imān az-ẓāhir and al-bāṭin [exoteric and esoteric faith]. The esoteric faith is complete, and it neither increases nor decreases.

In this section, I examine the translations of fourteen verses from the Qur’ān referring to the growth and decline of imān [faith]: Q 48: 4, Q 74: 31, Q 9: 124, Q 3: 173, Q 8: 2, Q 33: 22, Q 16: 102, Q 3: 64, Q 2: 260, Q 9: 125, Q 2: 10, Q 2: 143, Q 4: 65, and
Q 35: 42 (see Appendix R). The comparison of the translations of Q 8: 2 highlights Hilali and Khan’s application of translation shift to display their theological stance:

**Example 48: Q 8: 2**

![Arabic text](image)

**Khattab:** The ‘true’ believers are only those whose hearts tremble at the remembrance of Allah, whose faith increases when His revelations are recited to them (p. 208)

**Hilali and Khan:** The believers are only those who, when Allāh is mentioned, feel a fear in their hearts and when His Verses (this Qur’ān) are recited to them, they (i.e. the Verses) increase their Faith (p. 297)

**Haleem:** true believers are those whose hearts tremble with awe when God is mentioned, whose faith increases when His revelations are recited to them (p. 110)

**Bakhtiar:** The ones who believe are only those whose hearts took notice when God was remembered. When His signs were recounted to them, their belief increased (p. 162)

**Table 80**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Khattab</th>
<th>Hilali &amp; Khan</th>
<th>Haleem</th>
<th>Bakhtiar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>زَادَتْﮭُﻢْ إِﯾﻤَﺎﻧًﺎ</td>
<td>whose faith increases</td>
<td>they (i.e. the Verses) increase their Faith</td>
<td>whose faith increases</td>
<td>their belief increased</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 80 demonstrates that Hilali and Khan utilise literal translation as a translation procedure to suit their application of al-ithbāt [affirmation] approach and to reflect Salafī beliefs. They keep the same order of the ST saying “they (i.e. the Verses) increase their Faith” emphasising the word “Verses”, which reflects the Salafī belief in the Qur’ān as a method to increase faith. Q 8: 2 defines the true believers as those whose hearts tremble when God’s threat/punishment is mentioned and whose faith increases with the recitation of the Qur’ānic verses (Al-Mahallī & Al-Suyūṭī, 2003). To keep the theme and rheme of the sentence, the translators are supposed to say “when His Verses (this Qur’ān) are recited
to them, their Faith increases”. However, Hilali and Khan shift the structure and move the focus from the believers to the verses. They shift the theme from the believers to the verses to structure information, which helps display their theological position since Salafīs believe that reciting the Qur’ān increases the imān [faith]. According to Halliday (1994), the theme is “the element which serves as the point of departure of the message . . . [and the rheme is] the part in which the theme is developed” (p. 37). Thus, Hilali and Khan’s Translation procedure and approach demonstrate their theological belief regarding the increase of imān [faith].

Table 80 also shows Khattab’s and Haleem’s use of transposition as a translation procedure. They employ grammar shift in their translation of زَادَﺗْﮭُﻢْ إِﯾﻤَﺎﻧًﺎ [increased their faith]. They first apply inversion by changing the order of the sentence and then shift the verb and object pronoun into a relative clause rendering the expression as “whose faith increases”. Catford (1974) defines transposition as a shift in grammar, and it includes five types: level, structural, class, unit, and intra-system; similarly, Newmark (1988), classifies shifts as word form and position. Like Khattab and Haleem, Bakhtiar shifts إِﯾﻤَﺎﻧًﺎ [faith] from object into subject saying “their belief increased”. Her use of the word “belief” instead of “faith” reflects her Sufī beliefs. Donald Evans (1974) differentiates between faith and belief saying that the spiritual journey begins with faith and ends with belief, the truth by engaging in various spiritual practices and pursuits. Hence, Bakhtiar lexical choice of “belief” and her translation approach display her beliefs in spirituality and her adaptation of esoteric meaning.

In addition to thematic and grammar shift, addition is another translation procedure to display the translators’ theological position. The comparison of the translations of Q 48: 4 highlights Hilali and Khan’s utilisation of addition to send ideological messages.

**Example 49: Q 48: 4**

Huwa al-ladhī anzala as-sakīnata fī qulūbi-l-muʾinīna liyazdādu imānan mmāʾa imānihim

**Khattab:** He is the One Who sent down serenity upon the hearts of the believers so that they may increase even more in their faith (p. 538)
**Hilali and Khan:** He it is Who sent down *As-Sakīnah* (calmness and tranquillity) into the hearts of the believers, that they may grow more in Faith along with their (present) Faith. (p. 889)

**Haleem:** It was He who made His tranquillity descend into the hearts of the believers, to add faith to their faith (p. 334)

**Bakhtiar:** He it is Who caused the tranquillity to descend into the hearts of the ones who believe that they add belief to their belief (p. 493)

### Table 81
The Translators’ Choices for لَيْزَدَادُوا إِيَمانًا مَعَ إِيَمَانِهِمْ *Liyazdādū Imānan mmaʿa Imānihim* in Q 48: 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Khattab</th>
<th>Hilali &amp; Khan</th>
<th>Haleem</th>
<th>Bakhtiar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>لَيْزَدَادُوا إِيَمانًا مَعَ إِيَمَانِهِمْ</td>
<td>they may increase even more in their faith</td>
<td>they may grow more in Faith <strong>along with their (present) Faith</strong></td>
<td>to add faith to their faith</td>
<td>they add belief to their belief</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 81 shows the addition by Hilali and Khan to emphasise the increase of *imān* [faith]. Addition is a translation procedure that might result in the display of the translator’s ideologies. Newmark (1988) names additions as supplementary materials needed to express the real intention of the translator. The table highlights Hilali and Khan’s use of addition to transfer the sentence لَيْزَدَادُوا إِيَمانًا مَعَ إِيَمَانِهِمْ *liyazdādū imānan mmaʿa imānihim* as “they may grow more in Faith along with their (present) Faith”. Hilali and Khan add the prepositional phrase “along with their (present) Faith” to accentuate the increase of *imān* [faith], which makes them align with the *Salafī* beliefs. Table 81 also demonstrates Bakhtiar’s consistent use of the word “belief” for *imān* [faith], which aligns with the *Sufī* belief that the *bātin* [esoteric] faith is complete and does not increase or decrease and that the belief in God is the result of the spiritual journey (Evans, 1974). Hence, table 81 reveals that Hilali and Khan implement addition as a translation process to display their ideologies, and Bakhtiar uses the word “belief” for *imān* [faith] which agrees with the *Sufī* thought that “faith” is in the mind unlike *Salafīs* who believe that it is in the heart.

Unlike *Salafīs*, *Ashʿarīs* and *Sufīs* do not believe in the decrease of *imān* [faith]. *Ashʿarī* Qurʾān translators rely on *tafāsīr* [exegeses] that support their beliefs and apply
translation procedures that help reveal these beliefs. The comparison of the translations of Q 9: 125 highlights the translators’ choices and reveal their beliefs:

Example 50: Q 9: 125

وَأَمَّا الَّذِينَ فِى قُلُوبِهِمْ مَرْضٌ فَزَادَتْهُمْ رَجْسًۢا إِلَىٰ رَجْسِهِمْ وَمَاتُوۣ وَهُمْ كَافِرُونَ

Khattab: But as for those with sickness in their hearts, it has increased them only in wickedness upon their wickedness, and they die disbelievers. (p. 234)

Hilali and Khan: But, as for those in whose hearts is a disease (of doubt, disbelief and hypocrisy), it will add suspicion and doubt to their suspicion, disbelief and doubt; and they die while they are disbelievers. (p. 345)

Haleem: but, as for the perverse at heart, each new sura adds further to their perversity. They die disbelieving. (p. 127)

Bakhtiar: But as for those who, in their hearts, is a sickness, it increased disgrace to their disgrace and they died while they are the ones who are ungrateful. (p. 189)

Table 82
The Translators’ Choices for فَزَادَتْهُمْ رَجْسَۢا إِلَىٰ رَجْسِهِمْ Fazādathum Rijsan ilā Rijsihim in Q 9: 125

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Khattab</th>
<th>Hilali &amp; Khan</th>
<th>Haleem</th>
<th>Bakhtiar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>فَزَادَتْهُمْ رَجْسَۢا إِلَىٰ رَجْسِهِمْ</td>
<td>it has increased them only in wickedness upon their wickedness</td>
<td>it will add suspicion and doubt to their suspicion, disbelief and doubt</td>
<td>each new sura adds further to their perversity</td>
<td>it increased disgrace to their disgrace</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 82 shows the translators’ different choices for the word رَجْسُ rijs relying on tafāsīr [exegeses]. This term means “something forbidden, curse, disbelief, or agony” (Al-Mu’jam Al-Wasīṭ, 2004, p. 330). Q 9: 124 states that the revelation of Sūras increases the believers’ faith, and Q 9: 125 asserts that Sūras increase the disbelief of hypocrites since their faith is already weak (Al-Mahallī & Al-Suyūṭī, 2003). Ibn Al-Uthaymīn (2015) states that Q 9: 124-125 show that imān [faith] increases and decreases; he adds that Q 9: 125 confirms that reciting Sūras on hypocrites increases doubt to their doubt, suspicion to their suspicion, and disbelief to their disbelief. However, The Sufī interpreter Hulusi (2013)
explains Q 9:125 saying “But as for those with ill thought, it has only added filth to their filth, they have died as deniers of the knowledge of the reality” (p. 110). The table demonstrates that the translators choose the lexis that align with their theological beliefs.

Furthermore, table 82 highlights Hilali and Khan’s use of expansion as a translation procedure. Expansion in translation occurs when the target text (TT) takes more space than the source text (ST), and it results from the differences in grammar, sentence structure, or lexis between the ST and the TT. There is “a tendency for all good translations to be somewhat longer than the originals” (Nida & Taber, 1982, p. 163) as this procedure is acceptable to explicate in the target language (TL) what can stay implicit in the ST. Larson (1998) argues that the rare match between the SL and TL necessitates expressing similar meaning with more words. The table shows that Hilali and Khan apply the words “suspicion, doubt, and disbelief” for the term رِجْﺲ rijs to explain the kinds of رِجْﺲ rijs that decrease ان [faith]. Thus, unlike the other translators, Hilali and Khan utilise expansion to express their ideological understanding of the concept of ان [faith].

Table 83 below demonstrates the frequency and percentages of the translators’ reflection of Salafī views regarding the increase and decrease of ان [faith]:

**Table 83**
The Frequency and Percentages of the Translators’ Choices Reflecting the Salafī Belief in the Increase and Decrease of ان [Faith]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>III. The Increase and Decrease of ان/Faith</th>
<th>Khaattab</th>
<th>Hilali &amp; khan</th>
<th>Haleem</th>
<th>Bakhtiar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Verses</td>
<td>freq.</td>
<td>freq.</td>
<td>freq.</td>
<td>freq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>لِيِزَادَنَّا إِيمَانًا مَعَ إِيمَانِهِمْ</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>فَزَادَهُمْ رِجْسًا إِلَى رِجْسِهِمْ</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>فِزَادَتْهُمْ رِجْسًا إِلَى رِجْسِهِمْ</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>فِزَادَتْهُمْ انًا إِلَى انِّهِمْ</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fazadahum rijsan ilâ rijsihim [disbelief on disbelief], 1</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fazadahum Allâh marâdan [Allâh increases their sickness.], 1</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is apparent from table 83 that 14 verses are selected to examine the concept of the increase and decrease of imān [faith] (see Appendix R). Hilali and Khan’s translation is the only translation that emphasises this notion accounting for 86%. The table highlights the 0% by the other translators, which confirms the existence of this concept only among Salafīs. The figures assert that the Ashʿarīs believe that imān [faith] is only in the heart, and Sufīs think that “faith” is in the mind. The percentages show that unlike Salafīs, both Ashʿarīs and Sufīs do not reflect any beliefs in the increase and decrease of imān [faith].

5.5.4 Ithbāt ʿuluww Allah/ God’s Transcendence

Unlike Ashʿarīs who believe that God is not in a particular place and that He is everywhere, Salafīs affirms ʿuluww Allah [God’s transcendence] confirming that God is over the seventh heaven (see section 4.2.4). The ten verses selected to examine the presence of the translators’ belief in this concept are: Q 67: 16, Q 6: 18, Q 16: 50, Q 2: 29, Q 2: 115, Q 32: 23, Q 41: 11, Q 52: 4, Q 53: 14, and Q 58: 7 (see Appendix S). Hilali and Khan’s translation choice for Q 58: 7 is influenced by their belief in ʿuluww Allah [God’s transcendence]:

Example 51: Q 58: 7

ما يَكُونُ مِن نَجَوَى ثَلَاثَةٍ إِلَّا ﻟَهُ زَاِبِهِمْ (المجادلة 7)

mā yakūnu min najwā thalāthatin illā Huwa rābiʿuhum

Khattab: If three converse privately, He is their fourth. (P. 580)
**Hilali and Khan:** There is no secret counsel of three but He is their fourth (with His Knowledge, while He Himself is over the Throne, over the seventh heaven). (p. 960)

**Haleem:** There is no secret conversation between three people where He is not the fourth. (363)

**Bakhtiar:** There will be no conspiring secretly of three, but, He is their fourth. (529)

Table 84
The Translators’ Choices for ھُﻮَ رَاﺑِﻌُﮭُﻢْ Huwa Rābi‘uhum in Q 58: 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Khattab</th>
<th><strong>Hilali &amp; khan</strong></th>
<th>Haleem</th>
<th>Bakhtiar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ھُﻮَ رَاﺑِﻌُﮭُﻢْ</td>
<td>He is their fourth.</td>
<td>He is their fourth (with His Knowledge, while He Himself is over the Throne, over the seventh heaven).</td>
<td>He is not the fourth.</td>
<td>He is their fourth.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 84 highlights Hilali and Khan’s supplement to confirm that God is “over the seventh heaven”, which aligns with the Salafi beliefs. Although they apply the *ithbāt* [affirmation] approach of interpreting the Qur’ān, they add information not written in the source text (ST). This addition results from the influence of their theological stance as Salafī. Both *Ash‘arī* and *Sufi tafṣīr* [exegeses] of Q 58: 7 emphasise God’s infinite knowledge and overwhelming power. These interpretations say that God knows whatever is in the heavens and in the earth; He knows the whispering among people (He is the fourth of any three, the sixth of any five; nor fewer nor more but He is with them wherever they may be) (Al-Mahallī & Al-Suyūṭī, 2003; Hulusi, 2013). The *Salafī* interpretation adds that Q 58: 7 is a proof of *ithbāt ʿuluww Allah* [God’s transcendence] and focuses on inserting the sentence “He Himself is over the Throne, over the seventh heaven” (Ibn Al-Uthaymīn, 2015). This interpretation is mirrored in Hilali and Khan’s translation.

Both Baker (2016) and Newmark (1988) confirm that the added information in the target text (TT) is normally cultural due to the differences between the source language (SL) and target language (TL) to explain culture-specific concepts. Nonetheless, Hilali and Khan’s addition results from their reliance on *tafṣīr bi-l-ma’tūr*. As it is shown in table 84, Hilali and Khan render ھُﻮَ رَاﺑِﻌُﮭُﻢْ Huwa rābi‘uhum as “He is their fourth (with His Knowledge, while He Himself is over the Throne, over the seventh heaven)”; they add extra information not mentioned in the ST to emphasise their views. Thus, unlike
Khattab, Haleem, and Bakhtiar, Hilali and Khan add extra information that reveals their beliefs.

Besides addition, translators’ choices of prepositions reveal their different beliefs. The translations of Q 67: 16 is an example:

**Example 52: Q 67: 16**

ءَأَﻣِﻨﺘُﻢ مَنَ فِﯽ اﻟﺴَّﻤَﺎءِ أَنَّ ﻋَنْ أَﻻِرْضَ فَإِذَا هِيَ تَمْوَرُ (الْمَلْك 16)

*a‘āmintum man fis samā’ aiyakhsīfa bi kumu al-arḍa fa ḫā hiya tamūr*

**Khattab:** Do you feel secure that the One Who is in heaven will not cause the earth to swallow you up as it quakes violently? (p. 606)

**Hilali and Khan:** Do you feel secure that He, Who is over the heaven (Allāh), will not cause the earth to sink with you, and then it should quake? (p. 1000)

**Haleem:** Are you sure that He who is in Heaven will not make the earth swallow you up with a violent shudder? (p. 383)

**Bakhtiar:** Were you safe from He Who is in the heaven that He will not cause the earth to swallow you up when it spins? (p. 550)

**Table 85**
The Translators’ Choices for ﻓِﯽ اﻟﺴَّﻤَﺎءَ in Q 67: 16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Khattab</th>
<th>Hilali &amp; Khan</th>
<th>Haleem</th>
<th>Bakhtiar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ﻓِﯽ اﻟﺴَّﻤَﺎءَ</td>
<td>in heaven</td>
<td>over the heaven (Allāh)</td>
<td>in Heaven</td>
<td>in the heaven</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 85 shows that Hilali and Khan in comparison to Khattab, Haleem, and Bakhtiar translate the preposition ﻓِﯽ differently. This preposition can be combined with prepositional complements to form prepositional phrases such as noun phrases or noun clauses (Quirk & Greendbaum, 1973). In Q 67: 16, the noun phrase ﻓِﯽ ﺟِﻣَهُرَ ﻓِﯽ اﻟﺴَّﻤَﺎءَ can be translated literally as [in the sky]. It functions as prepositional phrase indicating the place of God; however, in rendering this phrase, the translators display their theological tendencies. For example, Hilali and Khan utilise “over the heaven (Allāh)” unlike Khattab, Haleem, and Bakhtiar, who use “in heaven”, “in Heaven”, and “in the heaven”. Using the preposition “over” for ﻓِﯽ makes Hilali and Khan align with the beliefs of Salafīs who confirm that God is over the seventh heaven. Another example of
utilising prepositions to display translators’ views can be seen in Hilali and Khan’s choices in translating Q 2: 29:

**Example 53: Q 2: 29**

Huwa al ladhī ḥallī ḥāli la kum mà fil arḍī jamī‘an thumma astawā ilās samā’

**Khattab:** He is the One Who created everything in the earth for you. Then He turned towards the heaven (p. 57)

**Hilali and Khan:** He it is Who created for you all that is on earth. Then He rose over (Istawā) the heaven (p. 9)

**Haleem:** It was He who created all that is on earth for you, then turned to the sky (p. 6)

**Bakhtiar:** It is He Who created for you all that is in and on the earth. Again, He turned His attention to the heaven. (p. 4)

**Table 86**
The Translators’ Choices for إِلَى ٱلسَّمَآءَ ilās samā’ in Q 2: 29

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Khattab</th>
<th>Hilali &amp; Khan</th>
<th>Haleem</th>
<th>Bakhtiar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>إِلَى ٱلسَّمَآءَ</td>
<td>towards the heaven</td>
<td>over (Istawā) the heaven</td>
<td>to the sky</td>
<td>to the heaven</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 86 shows that Khattab, Haleem, and Bakhtiar give the same meaning of the prepositional phrase: إِلَى ٱلسَّمَآءَ ila as-samā’, which can be translated literally as [to the sky], as “towards the heaven”, “to the sky”, and “to the heaven” respectively. In contrast, Hilali and Khan resort to “over (Istawā) the heaven” combining two concepts in the Salafī school of Islamic theology. Hilali and Khan focus on both ithubat ’uluww Allah [God’s transcendence] by using “over the heaven” and the affirmation of the attributes of God by adding “(Istawā)”. Contrary to Hilali and Khan, Khattab and Haleem choose “turned towards” and “turned to” for أَسْتَوَى astawā, which aligns with the Ashʿarī beliefs in negating attributing anthropomorphisms to God, while Hilali and Khan’s use of “rose over (Istawā)” confirms the beliefs promoted by the followers of the school of Salafīs regarding the position and attributes of God. Hence, Hilali and Khan employ addition and grammatical shifts as tools to reflect their ideologies in their TT.
The table below demonstrates the frequency and percentages of the display of Salafī tendencies regarding *Ithbāt ʿuluww Allah* [God’s transcendence]:

**Table 87**

The Frequency and Percentages of the Translators’ Choices Reflecting the Salafī Belief in *Ithbāt ʿuluww Allah* [God’s Transcendence]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Number of Verses</th>
<th>Khattab</th>
<th>Hilali &amp; khan</th>
<th>Haleem</th>
<th>Bakhtiar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>freq.</td>
<td>perc.</td>
<td>freq.</td>
<td>perc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 (1 في السماء ، [in the sky], 1 فوق عباده [over his servants], 1 فوقهم [above them], 2 إلى السماء [towards the sky], 1 وجوهه [the Face of God], 1 لقائه [meeting Him], 1 النبت ألمنثى [the visited house], 1 سدرة المُنتهى [the Lote Tree of the Utmost Boundary], 1 رابعهم [their fourth])</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 87 shows that the number of the verses about *Ithbāt ʿuluww Allah* [God’s transcendence] is 10 (see Appendix S) and that Hilali and Khan’s translation is the only translation that expresses Salafī ideological understanding of this concept accounting for 80%. The choices of the other translators illustrate that they do not believe in this concept.

Table 88 below illustrates the frequency and percentages of the display of Salafī beliefs regarding *tawḥīd* [Islamic monotheism] vs *Shirk* [polytheism], seeing God on the Day of Judgement, the increase and decrease of *imān* [faith], and *Ithbāt ʿuluww Allah* [God’s transcendence]:
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### Table 88
*Salaﬁ Ideologies in the Selected Authorised and Unauthorised Qur’ān Translations*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><em>Salaﬁ Beliefs</em> (132 Verses)</th>
<th>Khattab</th>
<th>Hilali &amp; khan</th>
<th>Haleem</th>
<th>Bakhtiar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Islamic Monotheism vs Polytheism</td>
<td>freq.</td>
<td>perc.</td>
<td>freq.</td>
<td>perc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeing God on the Day of Judgement</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Increase and Decrease of <em>Imān</em>/<em>Faith</em></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God’s Transcendence</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tables 88 shows that Hilali and Khan reach the highest percentage in revealing the *Salaﬁ* beliefs, mainly seeing God on the Day of Judgement and *tawḥīd* [Islamic monotheism] vs *shirk* [polytheism] accounting for 100% and 90%. It also highlights Bakhtiar’s, Haleem’s, and Khattab’s 0% concerning the increase and decrease of *imān* [Faith] and God’s Transcendence. The table also demonstrates that Bakhtiar reflects her *Sufī* belief in monotheism.

Table 89 below shows the number of using the terms ‘Islamic monotheism’ and ‘polytheists’ in the four translations:

### Table 89
The Use of the Terms ‘Islamic Monotheism’ and ‘Polytheists’ in the Four Translations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Number of Mentioning the Terms Displaying <em>Salaﬁ</em> Tendencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Terms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islamic Monotheism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polytheists</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 89 shows that, in Hilali and Khan’s translation, the term ‘Islamic Monotheism’ appears in 260 places and ‘Polytheists’ occurs 213 times. Haleem renders the term ‘Monotheism’ two times in footnotes: in Q 2: 62 to render Al-Sabi’īn [Sabians] and in Q 22: 17 to give more explanation about the term Al-Mjūs [Magians]. He articulates the term ‘Polytheists’ 4 times in Q 2: 96, Q 6: 22, Q 6: 79, and in a footnote in Q 2: 150. Bakhtiar uses the term ‘Monotheism’ 12 times in verses about the Ḥanīf religion: Q 2: 135, Q 3: 67, Q 3: 95, Q 4: 125, Q 6: 79, Q 6: 161, Q 10: 105, Q 16: 120, Q 16: 123, Q 22: 31, Q 30: 30, and Q 98: 5. Nonetheless, Bakhtiar uses the word ‘Polytheists’ 37 times for al-mushrikīn, and Khattab uses ‘Polytheists’ 39 times for the same term, yet he does not use the word ‘Monotheism’.

Table 90 below demonstrates the frequency of the verses reflecting ideologies in the selected authorised and unauthorised Qurʾān translations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 90</th>
<th>The Number of Verses Reflecting Ideologies in the Selected Authorised and Unauthorised Qurʾān Translations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Authorised Translations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Khattab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashʿarī</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufī</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salafī</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 90 shows that the influence of the translators’ ideologies on their translation choices is higher in the authorised translations than in the unauthorised ones. It demonstrates that the Salafī beliefs are dominant in Hilali and Khan’s authorised translation, while Sufī views are prevailing in Bakhtiar’s unauthorised Qurʾān translation. The table also demonstrates that Ashʿarī perspectives are prevalent in Khattab’s translation; it illustrates that the frequency in authorised translations is 229, while it is 151 in unauthorised translations.
5.6 Conclusion

The first sub-question raised in this chapter is to identify the controversial aspects among the followers of Ashʿarism, Salafism, and Sufism. The answer of this question is that unlike Salafis, Ashʿarīs apply taʾwīl when they render anthropomorphic expressions, including the terms وَجوُهُ wajh [face], يَد yad [hand], ساق sāq [leg], and عين ʿayn [eye]) and God’s establishment on the Throne. Ashʿarīs and Sufis apply ʿilm al-kalām [logic], whereas Salafis implement ʿusūl ad-dīn [traditional religious principles]. However, Haleem and Khattab are inconsistent in applying the taʾwīl [interpretation] approach when they translate these terms. This inconsistency might result from their living the West and being affected by their new communities as Haleem lives in the UK, and Khattab lives in Canada. It can be concluded that, living in different places and being exposed to different religious practices, these translators display hybrid theologies in their translations.

Also, unlike Salafis and Ashʿarī, Sufis rely on al-bātin [esoteric] meaning when they translate verses including the terms fatā, which they render as “spiritual warrior” and awliya’, which they transfer as “protectors”, and khalīfa, which they articulate as “viceregent”. Bakhtiar’s schooling in Sufism and living in different cultures result in the production of a Qurʾān translation which includes both Shiʿī and Sunnī perspectives along with Sufī points of view. She adopts a “situation of in-betweenness . . . [as a result of] operating in an environment characterized by hybridization of language, culture, and religious systems” (Hassen, 2012, p. 99). This third place might also result from her conversion from Christianity to Islam and living “nine years in a Jafari community in Iran and a Hanafi community in Chicago for fifteen years with Malki and Shafīī friends” (Bakhtiar, 2012, xx). Bakhtiar’s reliance on al-bātin [esoteric] meaning has a pivotal effect on her QT (Nazzal, 2012).

Furthermore, unlike Ashʿarī and Sufis, Salafis emphasise the concepts: tawḥīd [Islamic monotheism] vs Shirk [polytheism], seeing God on the Day of Judgement, the increase and decrease of imān [faith], and iṭḥbāt ṣulūww Allah [God’s transcendence].

---

Salafis do not apply *ta’wīl* [interpretation] approach in their translation; they apply the *ithbat* [affirmation] approach. The Salafis Hilali and Khan do not display Sufi tendencies regarding *walāya*; they render the word “rulers” for *imams*, which has a political connotation. These findings align with Lefevere’s (1992) ideological turn (see chapter 1), which confirms the power of the undifferentiated patronage. The patronage of Hilali and Khan’s translation is undifferentiated since ideology, payment, and status are provided from the same group.

The second sub-question is to determine the beliefs that are reflected in the authorised and unauthorised QTs. The examination of the translations of the selected verses reveals that the ideologies of the patronage are more dominant than those of the translators. The ideology of the authorised translation by Hilali and Khan is that of the place of its articulation since the ideology in translation consists of “the set of ideas, values and beliefs that govern a community by virtue of being regarded as the norm” (Calzada-Pérez, 1997, p. 35). Hilali and Khan came from *Ash’arī* and Sufi communities respectively; however, they reflect the ideologies of the patron of their translation. Similarly, Khattab’s translation authorised from Al-Azhar and Haleem’s unauthorised translation reflect the common ideologies held by *Ash’arīs*. Nonetheless, Bakhtiar’s unauthorised translation reflects a combination of ideologies, including those of Sunnīs, Shi’īs, and Sufis.
Findings, Limitations, and Recommendations

“[T]he translation of religious texts is also used for teaching the basics of religion throughout the world”. — Seledean Smith

The main purposes of this thesis were to identify the nature of the ideologies displayed in contemporary English translations of the Qur’ān and explore the influence of authorisation on Qur’ān translations (QTs). Therefore, I analytically compared four QTs, two authorised and two unauthorised, to investigate the effect of the translators’ beliefs on transferring the meanings and messages of the Qur’ān. To achieve this aim, it was significant to scrutinise the translators’ choices and examine the views behind these choices. I, first, reviewed related studies to ensure that the topic had not been interrogated in sufficient depth previously. Then I interviewed the translators who are still alive and analysed recorded interviews with the ones who are dead in order to answer the research questions from their perspectives and to identify their ideologies. After that, I designed a model for describing and comparing QTs, and inspected the paratextual devices of the selected translations to detect the dominant ideologies in each translation. Finally, based on the data I gathered from the semi-structured interviews, the investigation of the paratexts of the nominated translations, and the reviews on these translations, I selected 300 Qur’ānic verses for textual analysis. In this section, I summarise the research I undertook to connect all chapters, recap the research questions, acknowledge the research limitations, make recommendations for future work, and showcase the research contribution to the field of Qur’ān translation studies.

I attempted to answer two questions. The first question was aimed to identify the nature of the traces of ideologies expressed in the current English translations of the Qur’ān and the second question was intended to measure the degree of the translators’ ideologies in the selected authorised and unauthorised translations. To answer the research questions, I surveyed the studies that are relevant to the areas of importance to explore and analyse such areas and spot the gap in the field. I divided the literature review chapter into four main sections to recognise the problems faced by Qur’ān translators. I surveyed studies on the syntactic, semantic, and cultural challenges in QT and studies on comparative Qur’ān translation (CQT). I also surveyed studies on the ideologies that
affected QT to highlight the impact of interpreting the Qurʾān from religious and feminist perspectives on increasing the translators’ visibility in QTs. I observed that the models used to disclose translators’ ideologies were not designed for comparing Qurʾān translations.

I briefly explored the milestone translation theories to choose the proper theory for this study. I discussed the changes in the field of translation studies from the focus on linguistic aspects, to equivalence, to culture, and then to ideology. I adopted Lefevere’s ideological turn (1992), which relates the dominant ideologies of translation to professionals/ translators inside the literary system and/ or patronage /publishing houses outside the literary system. I critically analysed the models for comparing translations to find a suitable model for my study. Since these models were designed for literary works, I designed a new one based on Lambert and van Gorp’s schema (2006) to suit comparative Qurʾān translations (CQT). The new model facilitated providing an in-depth insight into the interaction between culture, ideology, and text, on the one hand, and translators and publishing industry, on the other hand. It enabled me to compare QTs on the textual, contextual, and paratextual levels.

For better understanding of the research problem and to give grounded findings, I applied a mixed-methods approach, a combination of qualitative and quantitative tools chosen depending on the research questions, aim, and hypotheses. I adopted a sequential approach as I first undertook qualitative data collection and analysis and then identified the statistics of the quantitative data. I conducted qualitative semi-structured interviews with Qurʾān translators to gain an in-depth insight into their beliefs and investigate the common ideologies displayed in contemporary Qurʾān translations (QTs). The thematic analysis of these interviews showed that the common ideologies are religious and sociocultural and that the translation paratextual devices send messages about the content of a QT and its dominant ideologies. The translators agreed that paraphrase and cultural equivalence facilitate the adherence to the target language (TL) and target culture (TC). Furthermore, they suggested that authorising institutions could reduce the display of the translators’ ideologies in QTs (see Appendix F).

The data collected from the interviews and the translations’ paratextual tools showed that the selected translators hold beliefs in Ashʿarism, Salafism, and Sufism; also,
the views of Shiʿī-Jaʿfarī (Ithnā′ashrīs/ Twelvers) and Shiʿī-ʿIrfanīs are detected in the paratext of Bakhtiar’s translation. I selected 300 Qur’anic verses, whose interpretations are controversial among the followers of these schools of Islamic theology, and I analytically compared them in three sections. In the first section, I explored Ashʿarī beliefs and included ninety-five verses regarding taʿwīl ṣifāt adh-Dhāt al-Ilahiyya [interpretation of God’s Essence Attributes], taʿwīl ṣifāt al-afʿāl al-Ilahiyya [interpretation of God’s Action Attributes], the concept of kasb [acquisition], and al-kalām an-nafsī [God’s Eternal Speaking]. In the second section, I focused on Sufī views and covered seventy-three verses regarding akhlāq al-murīd [practicing spiritual integrity], waḥdat al-wujūd [the unity of existence], al-bāṭin [esoteric] meaning of Qur’ānic verses, and walāya and imāma. In the third section, I investigated the Salafī tendencies and examined 134 verses regarding tawḥīd [Islamic monotheism] vs Shirk [polytheism], seeing God on the Day of Judgement, the increase and decrease of imān [Faith], and ʿithbāt ʿuluww Allah [God’s transcendence].

0.1 Findings and Answers of the Research Questions

Based on the research questions, this study arrived at ten main findings that can be displayed as follows:

I. Qurʾān translation (QT) is subjective and ideological. The selected translators Khattab, Hilali and Khan, Haleem, and Bakhtiar expressed their theological beliefs in their translations. Although they are inconsistent in revealing such beliefs, they did not manipulate in their QTs since each translator relied on tafsīr [exegetes] by exegetes whose Qurʾān interpretations align with the translators’ views. Khattab and Haleem relied on different exegetical books; among them Tafsīr Al-Jalāllayn by the Ashʿarī exegete Al-Suyūṭī, who employs tafsīr bi-r-raʾy. However, Hilali and Khan utilised tafsīr bi-l-maʾthūr (transmitted commentary) by the traditional Salafī theologians: Al-Qurṭūbī, Ibn Kathīr, and At-Ṭabarī, while Bakhtiar relied on ijtihād [independent reasoning], which increased her visibility in her QT.
II. The designed model for describing and comparing QTs, based on Lambert and van Gorp's systematic schema (2006), has been proven beneficial in mapping out and detecting the translators’ ideologies in the paratextual devices of the translations (the peritextual and epitextual tools). The investigation of the publishers’ peritexts (covers, the visibility of the translators’ names, titles, and blurbs) revealed that the ideologies of the publishing houses and the editors are more likely to influence QTs than the translators’ ideologies. The examination of the translators’ peritexts (prefaces, forewords, introductions, and footnotes) along with the epitextual instruments (the interviews with the translators and reviews on the translations) emphasised the impact of the translators’ theological views formed in their contexts (see chapter four).

III. The application of *ta`wīl* [interpretation] approach increased the display of the Qur`ān translators’ ideologies (see section 5.4). Khattab and Haleem expressed their *Ash’arī* beliefs, dominant in their educational context at Al-Azhar. They revealed their views through inconsistency and fluctuation between the approaches of *ithbāt* [affirmation] and *ta`wīl* [interpretation] in translating anthropomorphic expressions. This inconsistency implies that they apply a hybrid approach to Qur`ānic exegesis, which might result from their living in different cultures since Haleem, an Egyptian, has lived for 40 years in the UK, and Khattab, a Canadian-Egyptian, lived in the USA and Canada. Similarly, Bakhtiar’s *ta`wīl* is not exclusive to her theological views; it is theologically, scientifically, and linguistically oriented.

IV. Believing in *Sufism* and adopting *al-bāṭīn* [esoteric] meaning (see section 5.4) might result in sending radical messages completely different from those in the ST. It is found that the display of *Sufī* beliefs in Bakhtiar’s QTs changed the meanings and messages of the Qur`ān more than any other views of the schools of Islamic theology. Being affected by her Iranian father and *Sufī* teacher, Bakhtiar held *Sufī* beliefs and followed *al-bāṭīn* [esoteric] interpretation of the Qur`ān. Her translation of the word *فَتًﻰ* fatā [a young man] in Q 21: 60 as “a spiritual warrior”
and fatayātikum [bondwomen] in Q 4: 25 and Q 24: 33 as “your spiritual warriors (f)” reflects her belief in the Sufi concept futuwwa. The hidden meanings of these terms are not commonly known among the followers of the other schools of Islamic theology. The readers’ unfamiliarity with the Sufi concept futuwwa can make Bakhtiar’s QT unorthodox.

V. Qur’ān translators are affected by the ideologies in their contexts, and they transfer these ideologies in their QTs. Bakhtiar was influenced by her learning, former religion, and environment. She lived in the West, converted from Christianity to Islam at the age of 24, and worked as a psychologist. Affected by her former religion and Western community, Bakhtiar produced a QT that includes Biblical words, demonstrates a feminist perspective, and applies a systematic approach. As a hybrid female offspring of an Iranian Muslim father and American Christian mother, Bakhtiar transferred the dominant ideologies in these environments, which results in producing a QT with a new form of Islamic theology characterised by hybridisation.

VI. When the publisher is a governmental authorising institution, the prevailing ideologies are those of the state. Hilali and Khan were Sufis; then they held the beliefs of Salafism, the doctrine in Saudi Arabia. They applied az-zāhīr [exoteric] meanings of the Qur’ān and adhered to the source text (ST) to give superiority to the ST and SC (see section 5.5) and make the target readers (TRs) know that they are reading a work of translation (see section 4.3.2). The differences between Hilali and Khan’s QT published in Egypt and the one published in Saudi Arabia highlight the fact that QTs are influenced by the ideologies in their places of enunciation.

VII. Qur’ān translation (QT) is reader-driven because the intended target readers (TRs) impact the translators’ choices. Haleem applied a communicative approach and used simple idiomatic English since his translation targets everyone who speaks English, Muslims or non-Muslims. He adhered to the target culture (TC). Nevertheless, Hilali and Khan applied literal translation as their translation is
intended to non-Arab Muslims. They gave detailed interpretation from traditional *tafāsir* [exegeses] along with *ahadīth* [Prophet Muhammad’s sayings and actions] to provide the TR with an educational translation.

VIII. The translation procedures applied in QTs can affect the degree of the display of the translators’ ideologies. The translation procedures that increased the presentation of ideologies in the selected QTs are transliteration, addition, expansion, interpolation, compensation, detailed parenthetical comments, and footnotes. Hilali and Khan applied all these procedures, whereas Bakhtiar utilised compensation and repetition.

IX. In Qurʾān translation, structural shift, a shift in grammatical structure, does not result in a wide change in the meaning as much as does the unit shift, a shift in the hierarchical linguistic unit of sentence, clause, group, and word. Khattab utilised modalisation in an attempt to avoid *tajsīm* [anthropomorphism]. However, this grammatical shift did not affect the meaning or the degree of demonstrating the translators’ ideologies as did the unit shifts employed by Hilali and Khan, who shifted the themes and applied nominalisation.

X. Authorisation does not guarantee lessening the degree of the ideological demonstration. The percentage of the display of ideologies is higher in the selected authorised translations than in the unauthorised ones because the ideologies of the patrons (state/authorising houses) are more dominant than those of the translators as a result of the power of money and status. Although both Hilali and Khan’s translation and Khattab’s translation are authorised, Hilali and Khan’s translation shows the highest percentage of display of ideologies since this translation is sponsored by the state. Published by a governmental authorising institution, Hilali and Khan’s translation has a high status, which gave the translators the freedom to demonstrate the ideologies of the state. Thus, finance causes more display of ideologies as the translator has to conform to the expectations of the publisher.
0.2 Testing the Research Hypotheses

This section tests the empirical hypotheses to either prove their credibility and confirm their validity or disprove them and verify their invalidity:

I. The first hypothesis was that “translators intentionally or unintentionally display their own beliefs in their translations” (Hatim & Mason, 2005). This hypothesis was proven true since in some places it was clear that Khattab expressed his beliefs and in other places he demonstrated the views of the mainstream exegetes. In his interview, Khattab (2021, Appendix F) stated that despite his being Ashʿarī, he did not display the Ashʿarī beliefs when he transferred the Attributes of God (see Appendix F); however, he showed inconsistency and swung between *ithbāt* [affirmation] and *taʾwīl* [interpretation] approaches. According to Fahim Gunawan (2022), “translating the Qurʾan might contain certain ideologies depending on who the translator is, what their socio-religious background is, [and] what their ideologies are” (p. 1). Khattab’s translation is fuelled by the beliefs of *Ashʿarism* and his version remains different regarding his language in reference to the Attributes of God. The graph below highlights the different tenets of *Ashʿarism* in the four translations:

**Figure 10**

*Ashʿarī Beliefs in the Selected Authorised and Unauthorised Qurʾān Translations*
Figure 10 illustrates that Khattab reaches the highest percentages in reflecting the *Ashʿarī* beliefs (see Appendices H, I, J & K). Of the four notions that the *Ashʿarīs* believe in, the concept of *kāsb* [acquisition] keeps the highest percentage (78%), while the lowest percentage (30%) is given to God’s Eternal Speaking, a concept which is not believed in by *Salafīs* and *Sufīs*. Khattab reaches 59% in displaying the *Ashʿarī* beliefs regarding God’s Essence Attributes and 73% concerning God’s Action Attributes. The second highest percentage is reached by Haleem; however, he accounts for 36% in the concept of God’s Action Attributes, half the percentage achieved by Khattab. Figure 10 also shows that Bakhtiar aligns with the *Ashʿarī* beliefs only in the concept of God’s Essence Attributes and God’s Action Attributes as these are common views among *Sufīs*; she reaches 15% and 9% respectively. Nonetheless, Hilali and Khan display the lowest percentages in reflecting the concepts of God’s Essence Attributes (12%), God’s Action Attributes (3%), and *kāsb* [acquisition] (6%); they account for 0% in revealing the notion of God’s Eternal Speaking.

II. The second hypothesis was that translation ideologies are influenced by the place of articulating the translation (Tymoczko, 2003). This hypothesis was proven right since Hilali and Khan’s translation published in Saudi Arabia differs from the one published in Egypt (see section 4.2.2). The former was published and distributed for free; it adheres to the source language (SL) and source culture (SC). In this version, Hilali and Khan transliterate Islamic words such as الصلاة as *Aṣ-Ṣalāt* (Iqāmat-aṣ-Ṣalāt) and الزكاة as *Zakāt* without giving meaning in the target text (TT). However, these terms are transferred as *Aṣ-Ṣalāt* (the prayers) and *Zakāt* (obligatory charity) in the version published in Egypt. The differences between these two translations confirm that ideologies derive from “the taken-for-granted assumptions, beliefs and value systems which are shared collectively by social groups” (Simpson, 1993, p. 5). In their translation published in Saudi Arabia, Hilali and Khan attempted to give superiority to the SL and SC and to highlight the beliefs of *Salafism*. The graph below highlights the different creeds of *Salafism* in the four translations:
Figure 11 shows that Hilali and Khan and Bakhtiar are the only translators who emphasise the concept of *tawḥīd*; however, Hilali and Khan reach 90% and Bakhtiar accounts for 12%. These percentages illustrate that *Sufīs* agree with *Salafīs* on this concept; nonetheless, Bakhtiar’s 0% in displaying the increase and decrease of *imān* [faith] and *ithbat ʿulūww Allah* [God’s transcendence] reveals that *Sufīs* do not believe in these notions. The figure demonstrates that Hilali and Khan are the only translators who utilise the *Salafī* beliefs, regarding the increase and decrease of *imān* [faith] reaching 86%, and God’s Transcendence reaching 80% (see Appendices P, Q, R & S). The figures shown in the bar chart highlight the fact that both *Salafīs* and *Sufīs* accentuate Islam as an Abrahamic monotheistic religion, which teaches not only the unity of Creatorship of God but the unity of His Lordship.

III. The third hypothesis was that QTs depend on their target readers; hence, the ones intended for non-Arab Muslims differ from those produced for everyone who speaks English, Muslim or non-Muslim (Haleem, 2016). Khattab’s and Haleem’s translations are reader friendly and impactful due to the criteria of translation aimed at Western
people. The two translations were edited by specialists and the translators are experts in both translation and Islamic studies; their education and experience gave their translations high status. On the other hand, Hilali and Khan’s and Bakhtiar’s translations are not reader-friendly because the former comprises too many comments and footnotes, while the latter applied *al-bāṭin* [esoteric] approach promoted by ʿirfanī-Sufis. Hilali and Khan’s addition affects the flow of the translation, whereas Bakhtiar’s approach impacts the meanings of the verses. The bar chart below shows the percentages of the display of *Sufi* ideologies:

**Figure 12**

*Sufi* Beliefs in the Selected Authorised and Unauthorised Qur’ān Translations

![Sufi Beliefs in the Selected Authorised and Unauthorised Qur’ān Translations](image)

Figure 12 shows that Bakhtiar is the only translator who displays the *Sufi* beliefs in relation to translating the concepts about practicing spiritual integrity, the unity of existence, and *al-bāṭin* [esoteric] meanings. Moreover, the figure demonstrates that Bakhtiar accounts for 94% regarding *walāya* and *imāma*, while Hilali and Khan reach the second highest percentage with 64%, followed by Haleem reaching 36%, and Khattab reporting the lowest percentage accounting for 26%. Figure 12 highlights the fact that the *Salafīs* Hilali and khan and the *Ashʿarīs* Khattab and Haleem do not apply *taʾwīl* in rendering *Sufi* terms and that the 100% by Bakhtiar verifies her belief in the inner meanings of the Qurānic
words and expressions. However, her inconsistency in displaying *Sufi* beliefs in translating *imām* and *walī* highlights her application of a new type of *Sufism*, a hybrid of *Sunnism* and *Shi‘ism*. It also reveals the impact of her upbringing in an environment characterised by the hybridity of language, culture, and religious systems on her translation lexical choices.

IV. The fourth hypothesis was that the display of translators’ ideologies in QTs shapes the meanings and messages of the Qur‘ān, which might result in misguiding the target reader (Gunawan, 2022). Bakhtiar’s ideologies were dual as she was influenced by the *Sufi* traditions and sincere exponent of gender equality. Her QT remains the most radical one of the four selected translations because her *Sufi* perspectives have their own legacy in her interpretation of particular terms to support certain *Sufi* and gnostic beliefs. In her attempt to avoid the ambiguity that might be created by transliteration, Bakhtiar gave descriptive equivalents without footnotes nor terms known by the TRs. She integrated the *Sufi* concept *futuwwa*, which made the meaning more obscure. Bakhtiar also translated from a feminist perspective by applying prefacing and supplementing, two devices defined by Godard (1990) as tools to reveal feminist views (see section 4.3.3). Like Khattab and Haleem, Bakhtiar applied *ta‘wil* [interpretation] approach to express her ideologies. The bar chart below shows the translators’ approaches to translation:
Figure 13 confirms that the translators were inconsistent in rendering the verses that reveal the controversies among the schools of Islamic theology. It demonstrates that Khattab applied *ta’wīl* [interpretation] more than *ithbāt* [Affirmation] regarding *Ashʿarī* beliefs, reaching the highest degree in transferring the meaning of God’s Action Attributes. However, Haleem utilised *ta’wīl* reaching the highest degree in transferring God’s Essence Attributes. Furthermore, figure 13 illustrates that Hilali and Khan were not consistent in applying *ithbāt* [Affirmation] since they reach the highest percentage in using *ta’wīl* in utilising the concept *tawḥīd*. The bar chart also shows that Bakhtiar’s highest percentage in using *ta’wīl* is in translating *walāya* and *imāma*, followed by *tawḥīd*. It can be concluded that employing *ta’wīl* increases the display of the translators’ ideologies.
V. The fifth hypothesis was that the display of translators’ ideologies is more frequent in unauthorised QTs than authorised ones because of the criteria set by authorising institutions (Halimah, 2014). This hypothesis was tested by means of the comparison between the translators’ interference in the authorised and unauthorised translations, and the opposite was proven. The results of the textual analysis show that the degree of the display of the translation ideologies was higher in the authorised translations than the unauthorised ones. This finding shows that the influence of patronage is more powerful than that of the translator. The pie chart below shows the percentages of the display of ideologies in the authorised and unauthorised translations:

**Figure 14**
Traces of Ideologies in the Selected Authorised and Unauthorised Qurʾān Translations

Figure 14 demonstrates that the percentage of the display of ideologies in the authorised translations accounts for 60%, 20% higher than the percentage in the unauthorised translations, which reaches 40%. These percentages indicate that authorisation might increase the impact of the ideologies of the patron on the translators’ choices due to the power of money and status of the patrons, especially in a totalitarian system in a single-
party state. Figure 14 highlights the fact that the ideologies of the patronage might be more dominant than those of the translators.

**0.3 Research Contributions**

In my thesis, I made important contributions in my attempt to address multiple gaps in the field of comparative Qur’ān translation studies.

First, I designed a model for comparing Qur’ān translations (QTs) to fill in the gap in this area since there was not any model for describing and comparing QTs. This model, focusing on the textual, contextual, and paratextual levels, comprises several elements (see Appendix D), some of which were used in this study (see Figure 2). It has been proven beneficial in mapping out and detecting the translators’ ideologies when I used it in my thesis and has given reliable findings since I utilised it to analyse the primary and secondary sources. Therefore, the study can be duplicated on different QTs in other contexts. Future scholars can make minor modifications in this model; with slight changes, they can apply it to examine not only QTs but also a wide range of translated sacred texts because in an era of cultural hybridisation there can never be a model that is universally applicable.

The compound methodology developed in this thesis can be used for purposes beyond this case study. The qualitative and quantitative methods of gathering information can be implemented in any research in the field of translation studies to fully explore the research question(s). According to Nur-E Hafsa (2019), qualitative research can provide depth, answering questions on the why and how, whereas quantitative research can answer questions about breadth, so it answers questions starting with ‘how many, to what extent, and how often’. Quantifying qualitative data can boost the dependability of the data and allow a better understanding of the results obtained. Thus, the two approaches can supplement each other and increase research validity and reliability.

Furthermore, this thesis has been among the first to consider the influence of the translators’ theological beliefs and sociocultural ideologies on their translation choices. There is no previous study, to the best of the author’s knowledge, that empirically explored the impact of the translators’ theological views on their lexical choices, nor is there a study that linked translators’ ideologies to the influence of authorisation on QTs. The practical
examination of the selected QTs showed that translators select *tafāsir* [exegeses] that align with their views on what constitutes true Islam, it also demonstrated that translators utilise *ta’wil* [interpretation] and *ithbat* [affirmation] as tools to transfer their ideas.

Moreover, in this thesis, I have made a contribution to knowledge by answering the question of a possible approach for producing reliable QTs for our present time. Reflecting on QTs in general and the selected ones in particular, I can conclude that when Qur’ān translators apply reason and avoid relying heavily on traditional *tafāsir* [exegeses], transliteration, interpolation, and literal translation, they produce QTs sensitive to contemporary issues. When Qur’ān translators think back and compare present situations to the time of the Qur’ān, they interpret the Qur’ān meaningfully for current time. Thus, translation is a means for recontextualising the meaning of the Qur’ān in relation to contemporary questions.

This recontextualisation appears in Khattab’s and Bakhtiar’s movement away from the traditional interpretation of the term اضْرِبُوهُنْ *iḍribuhunna* [beat them] and their use of “discipline them” and “go away from them” respectively. They rely on linguistic exegesis to solve a problem in the Arab world, where a large number of men beat their wives using Q 4: 34 which includes this term as a license. After these two translations, many preachers and theologians started focusing on these interpretations, and others who promote *Sunni* Orthodox interpretation, at least, highlighted the fact that Prophet Muhammad never beat his wives and that he described whoever does so as ill-behaved. Also, Khattab, Haleem, and Bakhtiar considered ecological problems and man-environment relation in their QTs. Hence, the free market conditions in the contexts of these translations have resulted in the production of meaningful QTs suitable for our time. In contrast, Hilali and Khan’s translation, sponsored by a governmental institution and distributed for free, is traditional and it needs proper revision.

### 0.4 Research Limitations

The scope of this study was to examine four Qur’ān translations into English. It focused on 300 verses whose interpretations are controversial among the followers of different schools of Islamic theology. One of the limitations of this study was the lack of previous research studies on the impact of authorisation on Qur’ān translations. Another
limitation was the inability to access the publishers of the selected Qur’ān translations as they did not reply to the emails sent to them, which limited the data gathered about the influence of the publishing houses. A third limitation was the neglection of approaching the target readers since the three angles of translation are translators, target texts, and target readers. Approaching the target readers might broaden the understanding of the effect of the display of the translators’ ideologies on shaping the meanings of the Qur’ānic verses. However, there is no questionnaire in the translation field that can measure the effect of translations on the receptors. A fourth limitation was spotting only the procedures that increased the display of the translators’ ideologies and not discussing the translation procedures applied by the four translators in all the examined verses. Finally, the study was limited to investigating the display of the translation ideologies; thus, it did not discuss the inaccurate grammar in Bakhtiar’s translation nor the weak structure in Hilali and Khan’s translation.

0.5 Recommendations for Future Research

The findings and limitations of this study have indicated areas of recommendations for further research. First, it is recommended that future Qur’ān translators identify and mention their religious ideologies and theological tendencies in the paratexts of their translations to guide the target reader. Also, Qur’ān translation is an interpretation of the Qur’ān, and each verse in the Qur’ān can have different interpretations based on the translator’s doctrine; therefore, translators are encouraged to produce a much greater variety of translations to see a plethora of interpretations. These interpretations will give post-modern perspectives, since different translations serve different purposes, which might lessen the enmity among Muslims believing in different schools of Islamic theology. Furthermore, I do not think that Qur’ān translations should be monitored and authorised to protect the truth since it is impossible to find a translation free from ideologies.

A potential future avenue of research could be the exploration of the reception of Qur’ān translations. There is a need for a study that investigates the influence of the translators’ ideologies from the reader’s point of view. Another suggestion for further study is to examine the effect of the display of the contemporary Sufi ideologies on QTs.
The current research found that *Sufism* is no longer a movement linked to *Sunnism* or *Shi’ism*, but that it has become a hybrid school of Islamic theology with its own philosophical beliefs. Further studies can investigate the impacts of other types of ideologies than the theological tendencies; this is because Bakhtiar’s former religion and Western community influenced her lexical choices. Moreover, it is recommended that the same research is constructed in a new context, which might enhance the field of Qur’ān translation studies. It is suggested that the effect of authorisation on QTs in languages other than English is examined in Qur’ān translations published by the same publisher of Hilali and Khan’s translation. The translation published by King Fahd Holy Qur’ān Printing Complex is much longer than the source text, and the addition and footnotes have increased the display of ideologies, so examining other translations published by the same organisation might reveal the impact of authorisation. Furthermore, the new model used in this study needs to be applied to other studies to be reassessed; it can be used to investigate political ideologies in Qur’ān translations.
Appendices

Appendix A: The Attestation of Hilali and Khan’s Translation

سلام عليكم ورحمة الله وبركاته، أما بعد:
فإن الرئاسة العامة لإدارات البحوث العلمية والإفتاء والدعوة والإرشاد بالمملكة العربية السعودية تقرر أن الدكتور محمد تقي الدين الهمالي والدكتور محمد محسن خان قد قاما بترجمة معاني القرآن الكريم وصحيح الإمام البخاري وكتاب اللؤلؤ والمرايا فيها اتفاق عليه البخاري ورسول الله وسلم إلى اللغة الإنجليزية ترجمة صحيحة وذلك أثناء عملهم في الجامعة الإسلامية بالمدينة المنورة، فلا يمنع من الفسخ لهذه الكتب بالدخول إلى المملكة ونداوها لعدم الحذر فيها والله ولي التوفيق.
وصلى الله وسلم على نبينا محمد وآله وصحبه.

الرئيس العام
لإدارات البحوث العلمية والإفتاء والدعوة والإرشاد

عبد العزيز بن عبد الله بن بار
Appendix B: The Attestation of Khattab’s Translation

Al-Azhar’s Letter of Approval

AL-AZHAR
ISLAMIC RESEARCH ACADEMY
GENERAL DEPARTMENT
For Research, Writing & Translation

الإمامة
جمعية البحوث الإسلامية
الإدارة العامة
للبحوث والشئون والترجمة

السلام عليكم ورحبتم الله وبركاته.

فيما يلي رخصة كتابة الأيت الاقزامية والأحاديث النبوية

الشريعة والالتزام.

(5) خمسة نصوص لمكتبة الأزهر الشريف بعد صدورها.

وإذن بأعماله متممة على الطبعة الأولى للكتاب التي أصدرت في 1387 هـ.

وإن هذه المواقف ليست أثراً، ويعتبر تجديدها على أي طبعة جديدة تطبع بخلاف

الطبعة الأولى أو بمرور خمس سنوات من تاريخ ترقيق تلك الطبعة أحياناً قريبًا.

ومن ثم فإنه لا يجوز إرفاقها بأي طبعة أخرى، اتباعًا بحكام القانون الذي يعين

الالتزام بها.

وكل التحية والصبر على رضوان الخيرات،

السلام عليكم ورحمة الله وبركاته

تُوَرِّجَبِ 19 / 7 / 1488 هـ
الموافق 30 / 6 / 2010 م

مدير عام
الإدارة العامة للبحوث
والتأليف والترجمة
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Appendix C: Lambert and van Gorp’s Model

1. Preliminary data:
   - titles and title page (e.g. presence or absence of genre indication, author’s name, translator’s name, …)
   - metatexts (on title page; in prefaces; in footnotes – in the text or separate?)
   - general strategy (partial or complete translation?)

These preliminary data should lead to hypotheses for further analysis on both the macro-structural and the micro-structural level.

2. Macro-level:
   - division of the text (in chapters, acts and scenes, stanzas …)
   - titles of chapters, presentation of acts and scenes, …
   - relation between types of narrative, dialogue, description; between dialogue and monologue, solo voice and chorus, …
   - internal narrative structure (episodic plot? open ending? …); dramatic intrigue (prologue, exposition, climax, conclusion, epilogue); poetic structure (e.g. contrast between quatrains and tercets in a sonnet)
   - authorial comment; stage directions; …

These macro-structural data should lead to hypotheses about micro-structural strategies.

3. Micro-level (i.e. shifts on phonic, graphic, micro-syntactic, lexico-semantic, stylistic, elocutionary and modal levels):
   - selection of words
   - dominant grammatical patterns and formal literary structures (metre, rhyme, …)
   - forms of speech reproduction (direct, indirect, free indirect speech)
   - narrative, perspective and point of view
   - modality (passive or active, expression of uncertainty, ambiguity, …)
   - language levels (sociolect; archaic/popular/dialect; jargon …)

These data on micro-structural strategies should lead to a renewed confrontation with macro-structural strategies, and hence to their consideration in terms of the broader systemic context.

4. Systemic Context:
   - oppositions between micro- and macro-levels and between text and theory (norms, models, behaviour and systems)
   - intertextual relations (other translations and ‘creative’ works)
   - intersystemic relations (e.g. genre structures, stylistic codes…)
Appendix D: A Model for Comparing Qur’ān Translations

1. Preliminary data: Paratextual Level (Peritexts & Epitexts)
   - Publisher’s Peritexts: (e.g. cover colour and design, translator’s name, title page, blurb, prefatory materials, appendage, epigraphs, layout, …)
   - Translator’s Peritexts: (e.g. preface, forward, introduction, footnotes, commentaries, …)
   - Epitexts: (e.g. interviews, reviews, self-reviews, criticism, TV shows, self-commentaries, awards received by the translators, …)
   - general strategy (Source text-oriented translation or target text-oriented translation)

   These preliminary data should lead to hypotheses for further analysis on both the macro-structural and the micro-structural level.

2. Macro-level: Contextual Level (Tafsīr & Publishing)
   - Approaches to Qur’ānic Exegesis: (e.g. (1) traditional exegesis (al-tafsīr bil-ma‘thūr/ al-tafsīr al-naqli), (2) hypothetical opinion exegesis (al-tafsir bir-ra‘i/ al-tafsir al-‘aqli), (3) linguistic exegesis (grammar-based, rhetorical features-based, text linguistic), (4) hybrid, …)
   - Publisher: (e.g. governmental institution, private institution, self-publishing, …)
   - The official school of Islamic theology in the translation context

   These macro-structural data should lead to hypotheses about micro-structural strategies.

3. Micro-level: Textual Level (Linguistic Shifts & Translation Procedures)
   (i.e. shifts on phonic, graphic, micro-syntactic, lexico-semantic, stylistic, elocutionary and modal levels):
   - Lexicalisation (Lexical Differences & Lexical Equivalent Inconsistency)
   - Nominalisation (changing verbs or adjectives to nouns)
   - modalisation (expression of certainty or uncertainty)
   - passivisation (passive or active)
   - language levels (archaic or modern)

   These data on micro-structural strategies should lead to translation procedures
   - interpolation
   - expansion
   - omission
   - compensation
   - addition
   - comments
   - transliteration
   - footnotes
   - literal translation
   - paraphrasing by explaining source meaning
   - paraphrasing by explaining a different meaning
   - cultural equivalent

   It is impossible to summarise all relationships involved in the activity of translation; therefore, scholars can describe and compare the elements found in the translations in hand.
Appendix E: Qualitative Semi-Structured Interview Questions

Research Title: Traces of Ideologies in Four English Translations of the Qur’ān: A Comparative Study of Authorised and Unauthorised Versions

Dear Interviewee,

This interview is conducted by a PhD student at Swansea University, UK to better understand the factors that can affect Qur’ān translation (QT), specifically the impact of the translator’s ideologies on shaping the meanings and messages of the Qur’ān. The participation in this interview is voluntary and there is no financial compensation available, but the researcher hopes that your responses will help gain in-depth insight into your experience to support her argument. Your answers can be anonymized, so the researcher will not link your name to your answers and will aggregate it to other responses. However, providing your names and mobile number is required in case the researcher wants to contact you again for further questions and/or to share with you the findings of the study.

Najlaa Aldeeb

Interviewee’s signature: ____________________________

Interview number: __________ (to be linked to name and phone number of the interviewee, kept on a separate piece of paper)

Interviewee’s name: __________

Date: ________________

Profession/Position: ________________

Years of experience as a translator: ________________

Would you mind if I included the audio and script of this interview in my study?

Q1. What are the best and worst Qur’ān translations (QT) from your point of view? Name ones or mention the criteria of classifying them as such? And why?

Q2. What are the ideologies that translators might display in contemporary QT?
Q3. What are the reasons that make translators display their ideologies? Can the translator’s status be a factor? Do the time and place of the translation affect the QT?

Q4. What are the effects of displaying translators’ ideologies in QT? How do they shape the thoughts of the English-speaking reader about Islam?

Q5. What is your approach/methodology in translating the Qur’an?

Q6. What are the most problematic issues you encountered in QT (collocations, idioms, images, poetic devices such as embellishments, etc.) or other types of expressions that could cause issues in QT?

Q7. What are the most difficult translation decisions you had to make (e.g., decisions about difficult words or certain terminologies)?

Q8. What would you do when you perceive controversial issues such as gender, Muslim-non-Muslim affairs, Shiʿi, Salafi, or Sufi beliefs?

Q9. How does the publishing house affect your decision making in translation? Does it have standards for QT?

Q10. What do the following four translations reflect about the translators’ ideologies? Which one reflects the ideologies of the 21st century (feminist view, democracy, social equality, capitalism, etc.)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST</th>
<th>TT1</th>
<th>TT2</th>
<th>TT3</th>
<th>TT4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>وَلِبَاسُ التَّقْوَى ذلك خَيْرُ</td>
<td>However, the best clothing is <strong>righteousness</strong>.</td>
<td>The garment of <strong>God-consciousness</strong> is the best of all garments.</td>
<td>But the garment of <strong>God-consciousness</strong>, that is better.</td>
<td>And the raiment of consciousness, that is better.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>أَوْ مَآ مَلكْتُكُمْ أَيْمَٰنُكُمْ</td>
<td>Or those ‘<strong>bondwomen</strong>’ in your possession.(1)</td>
<td>Or your slave(s):“</td>
<td>Or what your right hands possessed.</td>
<td>Or (the slaves) that your right hands possess.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>وَأَسْتَرَّتْهُنَّ</td>
<td>Then <strong>discipline</strong> them ‘gently’.(1)</td>
<td>Then hit them.”</td>
<td>then, <strong>go away</strong> from them (f).</td>
<td>(and last) beat them (lightly, if it is useful)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q11. Which translation: TT1, TT2, TT3, or TT4 can be considered an authorised translation?

Q12. Do you think having authorising institutions can reduce displaying translators’ ideologies in QT? Why?
Appendix F: External Links to the Interviews (Audios and Scripts)

a) Audios

Haleem, M.A. S. (2021, May 24). Personal interview [zoom meeting].
https://drive.google.com/file/d/1Y8Hu5HI4JXA_VWNaQCrft9RZuFghOf4I/view?usp=sharing

https://drive.google.com/file/d/1gkjyqLcdZEEv0ghLm8wWDjFRsTgls09/view?usp=sharing

https://drive.google.com/file/d/1S0H85UA2e5VCQCxbF5bLonQy4zPCvMyK/view?usp=sharing

https://drive.google.com/file/d/1S0H85UA2e5VCQCxbF5bLonQy4zPCvMyK/view?usp=sharing

Hussain, M. (2021, May 27). Personal interview [zoom meeting].
https://drive.google.com/file/d/1rKg9HRlKk7MkC8eJZoiQjCWSst1U13g/view?usp=sharing

b) Scripts

Haleem, M. A. S. (2021, May 24). Personal interview [zoom meeting].
https://drive.google.com/file/d/1SOSytAE54dBY76Nq0c5ABsfrPzMWtkRY/view?usp=sharing

https://drive.google.com/file/d/1p64V4Qpo82h1Yli59Gr3rHcKF0gB_795/view?usp=sharing

https://drive.google.com/file/d/1gRpvII4LOVxARlnhHXDWAELtoUd3esrQ/view?usp=sharing

https://drive.google.com/file/d/11G9TpCV1KqKe8B_V2lyLbS6_1XPO7cNk/view?usp=sharing
Kidwai, A. R. (2021, May 26). Email interview
https://drive.google.com/file/d/1runnZ7fvhJo6ukwq1c7D6esuurKddoad/view?usp=sharing

Hussain, M. (2021, May 27). Personal interview [zoom meeting].
https://drive.google.com/file/d/17-OylLdxZEp3JxfDpwiBOk1Q7p3exg/view?usp=sharing
Appendix G: Tables of the Thematic Analysis of the Interviews

Appendix G.1: Sample of Coding Semi-Structured Interviews: Common Ideologies in Contemporary QTs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Participant 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unit of analysis</td>
<td>The message of the Qur’ān is universal for the entire mankind, including non-Muslims and for all the sects among Muslims. A translator (for example a Shi‘ī or representative of any sect should clearly specify his/her affiliation in the preface in order to let readers know his/her mindset. One’s ideological presuppositions and theological positions should not be paraded as the thrust of the Qur’ānic text itself.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of coding (Theme 1)</th>
<th>Code label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Religious ideologies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sectarianism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Theological tendencies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of coding (Theme 2)</th>
<th>Code label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Indicators of ideologies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Paratextual devices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Prefaces</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Participant 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unit of analysis</td>
<td>My translation is based on my proper understanding of the Qur’ān, regardless of specific opinions of different sectarians such as Ahmadiyya, Shi‘a, and non-Muslim ideologies and this is why I use reliable tafāṣṣir without dealing with these controversial issues or showing my Ash‘arī theological tendency. If there is no equivalence in English, I do my best to find a similar word or a word that conveys a close meaning and explained in the footnotes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of coding (Theme 1)</th>
<th>Code label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Religious ideologies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sectarianism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Theological tendencies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of coding (Theme 2)</th>
<th>Code label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Indicators of ideologies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Paratextual devices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Footnotes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix G.2: Theme 1

1. Ideologies in Contemporary Qur’ān Translations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P</th>
<th>Types</th>
<th>Reasons</th>
<th>Effects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>religious</td>
<td>social</td>
<td>Political</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Theological Tendencies</td>
<td>Feminism</td>
<td>Liberlism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ash‘arī</td>
<td>Sufi</td>
<td>Salafi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institutions</td>
<td>Background</td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P5</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P6</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix G.3: Theme 2

2. Indicators of Ideologies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Patertextual devices</th>
<th>Mental lexicon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peritexts</td>
<td>Epitexts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prefaces</td>
<td>Forewords</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P5</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P6</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Appendix G.4: Theme 3

## 3. The Status of the Translators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P</th>
<th>Ethnicty</th>
<th>Qualification</th>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Creed</th>
<th>Translation Approaches</th>
<th>Visibility</th>
<th>Translation Procedures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arab</td>
<td>Non-Arab</td>
<td>Qualified</td>
<td>Unqualified</td>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td>Shii</td>
<td>Sunni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P5</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P6</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# Appendix G.5: Theme 4

## 4. The Power of the Patronage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P</th>
<th>Place of publication</th>
<th>Publisher imposing power</th>
<th>authorisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>America</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P6</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix G.6: Summary of the Themes Extracted from the Semi-Structured Interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Contemporary Ideologies</th>
<th>Indicators of Ideologies</th>
<th>Status of Translators</th>
<th>Patronage Influence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>Socio-cultural</td>
<td>Paratextual</td>
<td>Textual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P5</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P6</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix H: List of Verses Revealing Views about God’s Essence Attributes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Q</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Khattab</th>
<th>Hilali &amp; khan</th>
<th>Haleem</th>
<th>Bakhtiar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Q 2: 115</td>
<td>Fathamma wajh Allah</td>
<td>You are facing ‘towards’ Allāh (p. 67)</td>
<td>the Face of Allāh (p. 29)</td>
<td>His Face (p. 14)</td>
<td>The countenance of God (p. 16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Q 2: 272</td>
<td>wajh Allāh</td>
<td>the pleasure of Allāh (p. 92)</td>
<td>Allāh’s Countenance (p. 79)</td>
<td>The sake of God (p. 31)</td>
<td>The countenance of God (p. 41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Q 6: 52</td>
<td>wajhahu</td>
<td>His approval² (p. 171)</td>
<td>His Face (p. 226)</td>
<td>His Face⁴ (p. 83)</td>
<td>His countenance (p. 122)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Q 13: 22</td>
<td>wajhī rabbīhim</td>
<td>their Lord’s pleasure (p. 276)</td>
<td>their Lord Countenance (p. 416)</td>
<td>the face of their Lord (p. 155)</td>
<td>the Countenance of their Lord (p. 232)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Q 18: 28</td>
<td>wajhahu</td>
<td>His approval³ (p. 320)</td>
<td>His Face (p. 500)</td>
<td>His approval (p. 185)</td>
<td>His countenance (p. 276)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Q 28: 88</td>
<td>wajhahu</td>
<td>He Himself (p. 418)</td>
<td>His Face (p. 679)</td>
<td>His Face (p. 251)</td>
<td>His Countenance (p. 377)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Q 30: 38</td>
<td>wajhu Allāh</td>
<td>the pleasure of Allāh (p. 429)</td>
<td>Allāh’s Countenance (p. 700)</td>
<td>God’s approval (p. 259)</td>
<td>the Countenance of God (p. 388)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Q 30: 39</td>
<td>wajhu Allāh</td>
<td>the pleasure of Allāh (p. 430)</td>
<td>Allāh’s Countenance (p. 700)</td>
<td>God’s approval (p. 259)</td>
<td>the Countenance of God (p. 388)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Q 55: 27</td>
<td>wajhu rabbika</td>
<td>Only your Lord Himself (p. 567)</td>
<td>the Face of your Lord (p. 938)</td>
<td>the Face of your Lord (p. 354)</td>
<td>the Countenance of your Lord (p. 517)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Q 76: 9</td>
<td>liwjahu Allāh</td>
<td>for the sake of Allāh (p. 629)</td>
<td>Allāh’s Countenance (p. 1041)</td>
<td>for the sake of God (p. 401)</td>
<td>for the Countenance of God (p. 570)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Quran:</td>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>92:20</td>
<td>وَجْهِ رَبِّﮫِ</td>
<td>the pleasure of their Lord (p. 658)</td>
<td>the Countenance of his Lord (p. 1093)</td>
<td>his Lord (p. 424)</td>
<td>the Countenance of his Lord (p. 591)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3:26</td>
<td>بِيَدِكَ اﻟْﺨَﯿْﺮُ</td>
<td>All good is in Your Hands (p. 99)</td>
<td>In Your Hand is the good (p. 92)</td>
<td>All that is good lies in Your Hand (p. 36)</td>
<td>In Your Hand is the good (p. 48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>3:73</td>
<td>بِيَدِ ﷺ</td>
<td>in the Hands of Allah (p. 104)</td>
<td>in the Hand of Allāh (p. 105)</td>
<td>in God’s Hands (p. 39)</td>
<td>in the hand of God (p. 54)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>5:64</td>
<td>ﷺ مَاغْلُﻮ</td>
<td>Allah is tight-fisted (p. 156)</td>
<td>“Allāh’s Hand is tied up (i.e. He does not give and spend of His Bounty).” (p. 199)</td>
<td>God is tight-fisted (p. 74)</td>
<td>the hand of God is one that is restricted (p. 107)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>5:64</td>
<td>يِداَھُ مَبْسُﻮطُن</td>
<td>He is open-handed (p. 156)</td>
<td>both His Hands are widely outstretched (p. 200)</td>
<td>God’s hands are open wide (p. 74)</td>
<td>His hands are ones that are stretched out (p. 107)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>7:57</td>
<td>ﷺ ﺮَﺣْﻤَﺘِﮫِ</td>
<td>His mercy (p. 192)</td>
<td>His mercy (rain) (p. 268)</td>
<td>His coming grace (p. 98)</td>
<td>His mercy (p. 144)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>25:48</td>
<td>ﷺ ﺮَﺣْﻤَﺘِﮫِ</td>
<td>His mercy (p. 386)</td>
<td>His mercy (rain) (p. 622)</td>
<td>His mercy (p. 229)</td>
<td>His mercy (p. 343)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>27:63</td>
<td>ﷺ ﺮَﺣْﻤَﺘِﮫِ</td>
<td>His mercy (p. 405)</td>
<td>His mercy (rain) (p. 657)</td>
<td>His mercy (p. 242)</td>
<td>His mercy (p. 364)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>36:71</td>
<td>ﺎًدِـًنَا</td>
<td>Singlehandedly (p. 468)</td>
<td>Our Hands (p. 765)</td>
<td>Our Hands (p. 284)</td>
<td>Our Hands (p. 424)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>36:83</td>
<td>ﺑِيَدِهِ مَلْکَتُ كُلُّ شَيْء</td>
<td>in whose hand is the authority (p. 469)</td>
<td>in Whose Hand is the dominion</td>
<td>in whose hand lies control over</td>
<td>in whose hand is the Kingdom of everything (p. 425)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 38: 75</td>
<td>бидаи</td>
<td>بايد</td>
<td>with My Own <strong>Hands</strong> (p. 483)</td>
<td>Both My <strong>Hands</strong> (p. 792)</td>
<td>with My Own <strong>Hands</strong> (p. 293)</td>
<td>with My two <strong>Hands</strong> (p. 439)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 39: 67</td>
<td>قبضته</td>
<td>قبضته</td>
<td>His <strong>Grip</strong> (p. 491)</td>
<td>His <strong>Hand</strong> (p. 806)</td>
<td><strong>grasp</strong> of God’s true measure (p. 299)</td>
<td>His <strong>Handful</strong> (p. 447)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 39: 67</td>
<td>بيمينه</td>
<td>يدي</td>
<td>His <strong>Right Hand</strong> (p. 491)</td>
<td>His <strong>Hand</strong> (p. 806)</td>
<td>His <strong>grip</strong> (p. 299)</td>
<td>His <strong>right hand</strong> (p. 447)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 48: 10</td>
<td>يد الله</td>
<td>yadu Allah</td>
<td>Allah’s <strong>Hand</strong> (p. 539)</td>
<td>The <strong>Hand</strong> of Allah (p. 890)</td>
<td>God’s <strong>hand</strong> (p. 335)</td>
<td>The <strong>hand</strong> of God (p. 494)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 49: 1</td>
<td>بين يدي الله</td>
<td>bain yaday Allah</td>
<td>Before ‘a decree from’ Allah (p. 544)</td>
<td>Before Allah (p. 896)</td>
<td>The <strong>presence of</strong> God (p. 338)</td>
<td>In advance of God (p. 598)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 57: 29</td>
<td>بيد الله</td>
<td>biyadi Allah</td>
<td>in Allah’s <strong>Hands</strong> (p. 578)</td>
<td>In His <strong>Hand</strong> (p. 958)</td>
<td>in the <strong>hand</strong> of God (p. 361)</td>
<td>in the <strong>hand</strong> of God (p. 528)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 67: 1</td>
<td>يد المالك</td>
<td>biyadihi almulk</td>
<td>In Whose <strong>Hands</strong> rests all authority (p. 605)</td>
<td>Whose <strong>Hand</strong> is the dominion (p. 998)</td>
<td>Holds all control in His <strong>hands</strong> (p. 382)</td>
<td>In Whose <strong>Hands</strong> is the dominion (p. 549)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 69: 45</td>
<td>باليمين</td>
<td>bilyamîn</td>
<td>by his <strong>right hand</strong> (p. 613)</td>
<td>by his <strong>right hand</strong> (or with power and might) (p. 1013)</td>
<td>his <strong>right hand</strong> (p. 388)</td>
<td>by the <strong>right hand</strong> (p. 557)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 68: 42</td>
<td>ساق</td>
<td>sâq</td>
<td>the Shin of Allah (p. 610)</td>
<td>the Shin (p. 1005)</td>
<td><strong>matters</strong> (p. 385)</td>
<td>The great calamity (p. 554)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 11: 37</td>
<td>باعيننا</td>
<td>bi’a’yununa</td>
<td>under Our ‘watchful’ Eyes (p. 251)</td>
<td>under Our Eyes (p. 376)</td>
<td>under Our [watchful] Eyes (p. 138)</td>
<td>under Our Eyes (p. 207)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Khattab</td>
<td>Hilali &amp; khan</td>
<td>Haleem</td>
<td>Bakhtiar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1:7</td>
<td>غیر المغضوب علیهُ ghayrilmaghdub 'alayhim</td>
<td>not those You are displeased with (p. 53)</td>
<td>not (the way) of those who earned Your Anger (i.e. those whose intentions are perverted: they know the Truth, yet do not follow it) (p. 2)</td>
<td>those who incur no anger (p. 3)</td>
<td>the ones against whom You are angry (p. 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2:61</td>
<td>وبأوا بغضب من الله wa bā'ū bighḍab min Allah</td>
<td>and they invited the displeasur e of Allah (p. 60)</td>
<td>and they drew on themsellves the Wrath of Allāh (p. 17)</td>
<td>and they incurred the wrath of God (p. 9)</td>
<td>and they drew the burden of anger from God (p. 8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Arabic Text</td>
<td>English Translation</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Note</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Q 2: 90</td>
<td>ﻓِﺒَاء ﺑِﻐَﻀَﺐ َٰٓﺍَِّلَ ﺑِﻐَﻀَﺐ</td>
<td>They have earned wrath upon wrath (p. 108)</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>They drew the burden of anger on anger (p. 12)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Q 3: 112</td>
<td>ﻭَبَأَوْا ﺑِﻐَﻀَﺐٍ ﻣِن َٰﷲ</td>
<td>They have invited the displeasur e of Allah (p. 108)</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>and they drew the burden of anger from God (p. 58)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Q 4: 93</td>
<td>وَغَﻀِﺐُ ﻋَلَيْهِ ﻋَلَيْهِ</td>
<td>Allah will be displeased with them (p. 135)</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>And God was angry with him (p. 84)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Q 5: 60</td>
<td>ﻏَﻀِﺐَ ﻋَﻠَيْهِ</td>
<td>those who earned Allah’s displeasur e (p. 156)</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>with whom He was angry (p. 107)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Q 7: 71</td>
<td>ﻏَﻀَﺐٌ ﻏَﻀَﺐَ ﻋَﻦ ﷲ</td>
<td>wrath (p. 193)</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>anger (p. 146)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Q 7: 152</td>
<td>ﻏَﻀَﺐَ ﻣِن ﺓُيُبُمُ ﻟَزَنَ ﺑِغَداً ﺑِغَداً ﻣِن ﻟَزَنَ ﻟَزَنَ</td>
<td>Allah’s wrath from their Lord (p. 200)</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>anger from their Lord (p. 155)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Q 8: 16</td>
<td>ﺑَاء ﺑِﻐَﻀَﺐ ﻣِن َٰﷲ</td>
<td>will earn the displeasur e of Allah (p. 210)</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>drew the burden of the anger from God (p. 164)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Q 16:106</td>
<td>They will be condemned by Allah (p. 302)</td>
<td>Wrath from Allāh (p. 466)</td>
<td>the wrath of God upon them (p. 173)</td>
<td>the anger of God (p. 259)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Q 20:81</td>
<td>My wrath will befall you (p. 341)</td>
<td>My Anger should justly descend on you. (p. 541)</td>
<td>My wrath will descend on you (p. 199)</td>
<td>My anger not alight on you. (p. 298)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Q 20:86</td>
<td>wrath from your Lord to befall you (p. 341)</td>
<td>wrath should descend from your Lord on you (p. 542)</td>
<td>Did you want anger to fall on you from your Lord? (p. 199)</td>
<td>the anger of your Lord alight on you. (p. 298)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Q 24:9</td>
<td>Allah may be displeased with her (p. 373)</td>
<td>the Wrath of Allāh be upon her (p. 601)</td>
<td>calls God to bring down His anger on her (p. 221)</td>
<td>the anger of God be on her (p. 331)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Q 42:16</td>
<td>Upon them is wrath (p. 510)</td>
<td>on them is wrath (p. 840)</td>
<td>anger will fall upon them (p. 312)</td>
<td>on them is His anger (p. 466)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Q 48:6</td>
<td>Allah is displeased with them (p. 539)</td>
<td>the Anger of Allāh is upon them (p. 890)</td>
<td>the burden of God’s anger (p. 334)</td>
<td>And God was angry with them (p. 494)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Q 58:14</td>
<td>with whom Allah is displeased (p. 581)</td>
<td>upon whom is the Wrath of Allāh (p. 962)</td>
<td>with whom God is angry (p. 363)</td>
<td>against whom God was angry (p. 531)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Ayat</td>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>60:13</td>
<td>غ١٩٠١٣٩٠٩٠١٣٩٠١٣٩٠١٣٩٠١٣٩٠١٣٩٠١٣٩٠</td>
<td>Allah is displeased with (p. 589)</td>
<td>incurred the Wrath of Allāh (i.e. the Jews) (p. 975)</td>
<td>those with whom God is angry (p. 369)</td>
<td>against whom God was angry (p. 538)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>3:162</td>
<td>بسخط من الله bi sakhat min Allah</td>
<td>Allah’s wrath (p. 114)</td>
<td>The wrath of Allāh (p. 126)</td>
<td>God’s wrath (p. 46)</td>
<td>the displeasure of God (p. 65)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>5:80</td>
<td>سخط الله علیهم sakhat Allah ‘alayhim</td>
<td>earned them Allāh’s wrath (p. 159)</td>
<td>Allāh’s wrath fell upon them (p. 206)</td>
<td>God is angry (p. 75)</td>
<td>God was displeased (p. 110)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>47:28</td>
<td>ما أُسخط الله mā askhata Allah</td>
<td>Whatever displeases Allāh (p. 536)</td>
<td>that which angered Allāh (p. 886)</td>
<td>Things that incurred God’s wrath (p. 333)</td>
<td>what displeased God (p. 492)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>7:51</td>
<td>فَنَسِيهِم fal yawma nannsāhu m</td>
<td>Today We will ignore them (p. 191)</td>
<td>So, this Day We shall forget them (p. 266)</td>
<td>Today We shall ignore them (p. 98)</td>
<td>So today We will forget them (p. 144)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>9:67</td>
<td>فَنَسِيهِم fa nasīyahu m</td>
<td>He Neglected them (p. 226)</td>
<td>He has forgotten them (p. 329)</td>
<td>He has ignored them (p. 122)</td>
<td>He forgot them (p. 180)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>19:64</td>
<td>وما كان رك نسيًا wa mā kan rabbika nasīya</td>
<td>And your Lord is never forgetful (p. 526)</td>
<td>your Lord is never forgetful (p. 194)</td>
<td>your Lord is not been forgetful (p. 290)</td>
<td>your Lord has not been forgetful (p. 290)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>20:126</td>
<td>تنسى tunsā</td>
<td>You are neglected (p. 344)</td>
<td>you will be neglected (in the Hell-fire, away from Allāh’s)</td>
<td>you will be ignored (p. 201)</td>
<td>you will be forgotten (p. 302)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Verse</td>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>32:14</td>
<td>نسیناكم</td>
<td>We ‘too’ will certainly <strong>neglect</strong> you. (p. 439)</td>
<td>We shall <strong>ignore</strong> you. (p. 715)</td>
<td>We <strong>forgot</strong> you. (p. 396)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>45:34</td>
<td>اليوم ننساكم</td>
<td>This Day We will <strong>neglect</strong> you (p. 527)</td>
<td>This Day We will <strong>ignore</strong> you (p. 871)</td>
<td>This Day We will <strong>forget</strong> you (p. 484)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>7:54</td>
<td>اِسْتَوَى عَلَى الْعَرْشِ</td>
<td>He <strong>rose</strong> over <em>(Istawā)</em> the Throne (p. 235)</td>
<td>He turned His attention to the Throne (p. 191)</td>
<td>He turned His attention to the Throne (p. 144)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>10:3</td>
<td>اِسْتَوَى عَلَى الْعَرْشِ</td>
<td>He <strong>rose</strong> over <em>(Istawā)</em> the Throne (p. 273)</td>
<td>He turned Himself to the Throne (p. 190)</td>
<td>He turned Himself to the Throne (p. 190)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>13:2</td>
<td>اِسْتَوَى عَلَى الْعَرْشِ</td>
<td>He <strong>rose</strong> above <em>(Istawā)</em> the Throne (p. 273)</td>
<td>He turned his attention to the Throne (p. 229)</td>
<td>He turned his attention to the Throne (p. 229)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Q 20:5</td>
<td><strong>عَلىَّ الْعَرْشَ أَسْتَوَىَّ 'alā al'arsh istawā</strong></td>
<td><strong>estabilished on the Throne (p. 336)</strong></td>
<td><strong>The Most Gracious (Allāh) rose over (Istawā) the (Mighty) Throne (in a manner that suits His Majesty) (p. 532)</strong></td>
<td><strong>The Merciful turned His attention to the Throne (p. 293)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Q 25:59</td>
<td><strong>عَلَىَّ الْعَرْشِ 'alā alʿarsh</strong></td>
<td><strong>estabilished Himself on the Throne (p. 387)</strong></td>
<td><strong>He (Istawā) rose over the Throne (in a manner that suits His Majesty) (p. 624)</strong></td>
<td><strong>He turned his attention to the Throne (p. 344)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Q 32:4</td>
<td><strong>عَلَىَّ الْعَرْشِ 'alā alʿarsh</strong></td>
<td><strong>estabilished Himself on the Throne (p. 438)</strong></td>
<td><strong>rose over (Istawā) the Throne (in a manner that suits His Majesty) (p. 713)</strong></td>
<td><strong>He turned His attention to the Throne (p. 395)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Q 57:4</td>
<td><strong>عَلَىَّ الْعَرْشِ 'alā alʿarsh</strong></td>
<td><strong>estabilished Himself on the Throne (p. 574)</strong></td>
<td><strong>rose over (Istawā) the Throne (in a manner that suits His Majesty) (p. 951)</strong></td>
<td><strong>He turned his attention to the Throne (p. 524)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix J: List of Verses Revealing Views about the Concept of Kasb/Acquisition

### Ash'arī Beliefs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Q</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Khattab</th>
<th>Hilali &amp; Khan</th>
<th>Haleem</th>
<th>Bakhtiar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Q 2: 81</td>
<td>من كَسَبَ سِيَة</td>
<td>Those who commit evil</td>
<td>Whoever earns evil (p. 21)</td>
<td>Truly those who do evil (p. 10)</td>
<td>Yea! Whoever earned an evil deed (p. 11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Q 52: 21</td>
<td>بما كَسَبَ رَهْيِن</td>
<td>will reap only what they sowed&lt;sup&gt;(1)&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>is a pledge for that which he has earned (p. 918)</td>
<td>is in pledge for his own deeds (p. 343)</td>
<td>will be pledged for what he earned (p. 508)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Q 111: 2</td>
<td>مَا أَغْنِي عَنْهُ مَا لَهَ وَمَا كَسَبَ</td>
<td>Neither his wealth nor ‘world’ gains will benefit him. (p. 677)</td>
<td>His wealth and his children will not benefit him! (p. 1117)</td>
<td>Neither his wealth nor his gains will help him. (p. 443)</td>
<td>His wealth avails him not nor whatever he earned. (p. 600)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Q 5: 38</td>
<td>جَزَاءَ بِمَا كَسَبَ</td>
<td>for what they have done (p. 152)</td>
<td>as a recompense for that which they committed (p. 192)</td>
<td>in return for what they have done (p. 71)</td>
<td>for what they earned (p. 103)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Q 2: 134</td>
<td>مَا كَسَبَتْم</td>
<td>what you have earned (p. 69)</td>
<td>what you earned (p. 34)</td>
<td>what you earn (p. 15)</td>
<td>what you earned (p. 18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Q 2: 141</td>
<td>مَا كَسَبَتْم</td>
<td>what you have earned (p. 70)</td>
<td>what you earn (p. 37)</td>
<td>what you earn (p. 16)</td>
<td>what you earned (p. 19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Q 2: 267</td>
<td>مِن طَيِّبَاتِ مَا كَسَبَتْم</td>
<td>the best of what you have earned (p. 91)</td>
<td>the good things which you have acquired (legally)</td>
<td>the good things you have acquired (p. 31)</td>
<td>what is good that you earned (p. 41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter</td>
<td>Verse</td>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Q 24:11</td>
<td>مَا اَكْتَسَبَ ﻣَن اﻟْإِﺛْمِ mā aktsaba min al-ithm</td>
<td>earned, (p. 78)</td>
<td>the sin he has earned (p. 221)</td>
<td>what he deserved of sin (p. 331)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Q 2:286</td>
<td>ﻞُﮭَٰذَا ﻣَا ﻛَسَبْتَ ﻭَﻋَلَیْهَا ﻣَا اَكْتَسَبَتْ lahā mā kasabat wa ʿalayha mā aktasabat</td>
<td>All good will be for its own benefit, and all evil will be to its own loss (p. 95)</td>
<td>He gets reward for that (good) which he has earned, and he is punished for that (evil) which he has incurred. (p. 86)</td>
<td>For it is what it earned and against it is what it deserved. (p. 44)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Q 4:32</td>
<td>ﻟِﻠرِﺒْلَاءِ ﻧُﺼِبْ ﻣَا اَكْتَسَبَوا; lī-riji dāli nasibum mimmak tasabū</td>
<td>Men will be rewarded according to their deeds (p. 126)</td>
<td>For men there is a reward for what they have earned (p. 145)</td>
<td>For men is a share of what they deserved (p. 75)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Q 40:17</td>
<td>ﺑِمَا ﻛَسَبْتِ bimā kasabat</td>
<td>what it has done (p. 494)</td>
<td>what he earned (p. 812)</td>
<td>whatever it has done (p. 302)</td>
<td>what it earned (p. 450)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Q 42:30</td>
<td>ﻓِﯽ ﻣَا ﻛَسَبْتِ اِدْيَكُمْ fimā kasabat aydiakum</td>
<td>what your hands have committed (p. 511)</td>
<td>what your hands have earned (p. 843)</td>
<td>what your own hands have done (p. 313)</td>
<td>what your hands earned (p. 468)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Q 2:225</td>
<td>ﺑِمَا ﻛَسَبْتِ قَلْوُبُكْ bimā kasabat</td>
<td>what you intended in your hearts (p. 83)</td>
<td>that which your hearts have earned (p. 63)</td>
<td>what you mean in your hearts (p. 25)</td>
<td>what your hearts earned (p. 32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Q 3:161</td>
<td>ﻣَا ﻛَسَبْتِ mā kasabat</td>
<td>what it has done (p. 114)</td>
<td>what he has earned (p. 126)</td>
<td>what it has done (p. 46)</td>
<td>what he earned (p. 65)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Khattab</td>
<td>Hilali &amp; Khan</td>
<td>Haleem</td>
<td>Bakhtiar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Q 2:</td>
<td>118 کلمنا اللہ (yukallimun Allāh)</td>
<td>would speak</td>
<td>speak (p. 29)</td>
<td>would speak</td>
<td>peak (p. 16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(p. 67)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Q 4:</td>
<td>164 کلام اللہ موسی (kalam Allāh Mūsā)</td>
<td>spoke (144)</td>
<td>spoke (p. 167)</td>
<td>spoke</td>
<td>spoke (p. 347)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Q 42:</td>
<td>51 يکلمه اللہ (yukalimahu Allāh)</td>
<td>Allah communicate</td>
<td>Allah should speak to</td>
<td>God should speak to</td>
<td>God speak to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>with them</td>
<td>him (p. 513)</td>
<td>him (p. 847)</td>
<td>him (p. 470)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(p. 513)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Q 2:</td>
<td>174 يکلمهم اللہ (yukalimahum Allāh)</td>
<td>Allah will</td>
<td>Allah will not speak</td>
<td>God will not speak</td>
<td>God will not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>neither speak to</td>
<td>to them (p. 74)</td>
<td>to them (p. 45)</td>
<td>speak to them (p. 24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>them (p. 74)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Q 3:</td>
<td>77 يکلمهم اللہ (yukalimahum Allāh)</td>
<td>Allah will</td>
<td>Neither will Allāh</td>
<td>God will neither</td>
<td>God will neither</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>neither speak to</td>
<td>speak to (p. 105)</td>
<td>speak to (p. 105)</td>
<td>speak to them (p. 54)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix K: List of Verses Revealing Views about God’s Eternal Speaking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ash’arī Beliefs</th>
<th>IV God’s Eternal Speaking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Q 2:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Q 4:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Q 42:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Q 2:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Q 3:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Q 26:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Q 7:143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Q 7:144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Q 15:28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix L: List of Verses Revealing Views about Practicing Spiritual Integrity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sufi Beliefs</th>
<th>Practicing Spiritual Integrity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Q 4:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Q 12:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Q 12:36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix M: List of Verses Revealing Views about the Unity of Existence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Q</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Khattab</th>
<th>Hilali &amp; khan</th>
<th>Haleem</th>
<th>Bakhtiar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Q 2:30</td>
<td>إِنِّي جَاعِلٌ فِي أَلْزَرُ خَلِيْفَةٍ (innī jā ilun fil ardi khalifatā)</td>
<td>I am going to place a successive ‘human’ authority on earth. (p. 57)</td>
<td>Verily, I am going to place (mankind) generations after generations on earth. (p. 10)</td>
<td>I am putting a successor a on earth (p. 7)</td>
<td>I am assigning on the earth a viceregent. (p. 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Q 38:26</td>
<td>إِنَا جَعَلْتُكُمْ خَلِيْفَةٌ فِيِ أَلْزَرٍ (inna)</td>
<td>We have surely made you an authority in [الزَرُ]</td>
<td>We have placed you as a successor on [الزَرُ]</td>
<td>We have given you mastery over the [الزَرُ]</td>
<td>We made you a viceregent [الزَرُ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Verse</td>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Q 6:</td>
<td>جَعَلَكُمْ خَلَـٰٓﺌِﻒَ الْأَرْضِ</td>
<td>Has placed you as <strong>successors</strong> on earth.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>165</td>
<td>ja’alaku m khalā’īfa l arḍi</td>
<td>(p. 185)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the land (p. 480)</td>
<td>the earth (p. 786)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>land. (p. 291)</td>
<td>on the earth. (p. 415)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Q 10:</td>
<td>جَعَلَكُمْ خَلَـٰٓﺌِﻒَ الْأَرْضِ</td>
<td>We made you <strong>successors</strong> in the land</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>ja’alaku m khalā’īfa l arḍi</td>
<td>(p. 237)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>We made you their <strong>successors</strong> after them, <strong>generations after generations</strong> in the land (p. 350)</td>
<td>We made you <strong>successors</strong> after them, <strong>generations after generations</strong> in the land (p. 129)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>We made them <strong>successors</strong> (p. 243)</td>
<td>We made them the <strong>viceregents</strong> (p. 199)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Q 10:</td>
<td>جَعَلْنَـٰﮭُﻢْ خَلَـٰٓﺌِﻒَ</td>
<td>We made them <strong>successors</strong> replacing one after another</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>73</td>
<td>ja’alnah um khalā’īfa</td>
<td>(p. 362)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Left behind (p. 133)</td>
<td>We made them the <strong>viceregents</strong> (p. 199)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Q 35:</td>
<td>جَعَلَكُمْ خُلَفَـٰۃٌ الْأَرْضِ</td>
<td>has placed you <strong>successors</strong> on earth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>ja’alaku m khalā’īfa</td>
<td>(p. 462)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>has made you <strong>successors</strong> generations after generations in the earth (p. 754)</td>
<td>made you <strong>viceregents</strong> on the earth (p. 418)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Q 7:</td>
<td>جَعَلَكُمْ خُلَفَـٰۃٌ</td>
<td>He made you <strong>successors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>69</td>
<td>ja’alaku m khulafā’</td>
<td>(p. 193)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>He made you <strong>successors</strong> (p. 270)</td>
<td>He made you <strong>successors</strong> (p. 146)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Q 7:</td>
<td>جَعَلَكُمْ خُلَفَـٰۃٌ</td>
<td>He made you <strong>successors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>74</td>
<td>ja’alaku m khulafā’</td>
<td>(p. 193)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>He made you <strong>successors</strong> (p. 271)</td>
<td>He made you <strong>viceregents</strong> (p. 146)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix N: List of Verses Revealing Views about Esoteric Meanings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sufi Beliefs</th>
<th>Esoteric Meanings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Q 6: 120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Q 6: 151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Q 7: 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Q 31:20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
He is the First and the Last, the Most High and Most Near, (p. 574) (1) Another possible translation: “the Manifest ‘through His signs’ and the Hidden ‘from His creation’”

He is the First (nothing is before Him) and the Last (nothing is after Him), the Most High (nothing is above Him) and the Most Near (nothing is nearer than Him). (p. 951)

Theologians add, ‘without a beginning and without an end’.

There would be a fence set up between them for which there is a door. That which is inward is mercy and that which is outward is towards the punishment. (p. 526)

### Appendix O: List of Verses Revealing Views about *Walāya* and *Imāma*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sufi Beliefs</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>Wilāya and Imāma</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Q 3: 28</td>
<td>أوَلِيَاءُ <em>Awliya’</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Q 4: 89</td>
<td>أوَلِيَاءُ <em>Awliya’</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 4:</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>allies (p. 141)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 4:</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>allies (p. 141)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 5:</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>guardianship (p. 155)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 5:</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>allies (p. 159)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 6:</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>their ‘human’ associates (p. 179)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 6:</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>their human associates (p. 180)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 7:</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>guardians (p. 186)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 7:</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>allies (p. 188)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Arabic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Q 7:30</td>
<td>اولَياء’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Q 8:34</td>
<td>اولَياء’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Q 8:34</td>
<td>اولَياء’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Q 8:73</td>
<td>اولَياء’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Q 9:71</td>
<td>اولَياء’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Q 9:23</td>
<td>اولَياء’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Q 11:20</td>
<td>اولَياء’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Q 11:113</td>
<td>اولَياء’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Q 5:51</td>
<td>اولَياء’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Q 17:97</td>
<td>اولَياء’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Verse</td>
<td>Arabic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>18:50</td>
<td>鲩亜’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>18:102</td>
<td>鲩亜’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>25:18</td>
<td>鲩亜’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>39:3</td>
<td>鲩亜’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>42:6</td>
<td>鲩亜’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>29:41</td>
<td>鲩亜’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>42:9</td>
<td>鲩亜’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>10:62</td>
<td>鲩亜’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Q 42: 46</td>
<td>أُوْلِيَاءَ awliya’</td>
<td>protectors (p. 512)</td>
<td>Auliyā’ (protectors, helpers, guardians, lords) (p. 846)</td>
<td>allies (p. 314)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Q 45: 10</td>
<td>أُوْلِيَاءَ awliya’</td>
<td>protectors (p. 524)</td>
<td>Auliyā’ (protectors, helpers,) (p. 867)</td>
<td>protectors (p. 481)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Q 45: 19</td>
<td>أُوْلِيَاءَ awliya’</td>
<td>patrons (p. 525)</td>
<td>Auliyā’ (protectors, helpers,) (p. 869)</td>
<td>to protect (325)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Q 46: 32</td>
<td>أُوْلِيَاءَ awliya’</td>
<td>protectors (p. 531)</td>
<td>Auliyā’ (lords, helpers, supporters, protectors) (p. 879)</td>
<td>any protector (p. 329)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Q 2: 257</td>
<td>أُوْلِيَاءِهِمَّ uhum at-ṭāghūt</td>
<td>their guardians are the false gods (p. 89)</td>
<td>their Auliyā’ (supporters and helpers) are Tāghūt [false deities and false leaders] (p. 75)</td>
<td>close to the disbelievers are their false Gods (p. 30)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

their protectors are false deities of (p. 39)
<p>| Q 62: 6 | اَوْلِيَاءُ اللَّهِ | friends of Allāh (p. 981) | friends of God (p. 372) | the protectors of God (p. 540) |
| Q 3: 175 | اَوْلِيَاءُ | his followers (p. 116) | his followers (p. 47) | his protectors (p. 66) |
| Q 2: 124 | iμām | a role model (p. 68) | a leader (p. 14) | a leader (p. 17) |
| Q 11: 17 | iμām | a guide (p. 249) | guidance (p. 372) | a leader (p. 205) |
| Q 15: 79 | iμām | a well-known road (p. 290) | an open highway (p. 443) | on the highway (p. 164) | a clear high road (p. 246) |
| Q 25: 74 | iμām | models (p. 389) | leaders (p. 626) | good examples (p. 231) | leaders (p. 346) |
| Q 36: 12 | iμām | a perfect Record (p. 464) | a Clear Book (p. 758) | a clear Record (p. 281) | a clear record (p. 420) |
| Q 46: 12 | iμām | a guide (p. 529) | a guide (p. 875) | a guide (p. 328) | a leader (p. 485) |
| Q 17: 71 | بِإِمَامِهِمْ | their leader (p. 312) | their (respective) Imām [their Prophets] (p. 486) | its leader (p. 179) | their leader (p. 369) |
| Q 21: 73 | أَئِمَّةً | leaders (p. 351) | leaders (p. 560) | leaders (p. 206) | leaders (p. 309) |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Q</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Khattab</th>
<th>Hilali &amp; khan</th>
<th>Haleem</th>
<th>Bakhtiar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Q 2: 82</td>
<td>الدَّيْنِ أَمَّنْوَا al-ladhbîna āmanû</td>
<td>those who believe (p. 63)</td>
<td>those who believe (in the Oneness of Allâh — Islāmic Monotheism) (p. 21)</td>
<td>those who believe (p. 10)</td>
<td>those who believed (p. 11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Q 2: 172</td>
<td>الدَّيْنِ أَمَّنْوَا al-ladhbîna āmanû</td>
<td>believers (p. 74)</td>
<td>who believe (in the Oneness of Allâh — Islāmic Monotheism) (p. 44)</td>
<td>You who believe (p. 19)</td>
<td>those who believed (p. 23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Q 4: 57</td>
<td>الدَّيْنِ أَمَّنْوَا al-ladhbîna āmanû</td>
<td>those who believe (p. 130)</td>
<td>who believe (in the Oneness of Allâh — Islāmic Monotheism) (p. 151)</td>
<td>those who believe (p. 56)</td>
<td>those who believed (p. 79)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Q 4: 122</td>
<td>الدَّيْنِ أَمَّنْوَا al-ladhbîna āmanû</td>
<td>those who believe (p. 138)</td>
<td>who believe (in the Oneness of Allâh — Islāmic Monotheism) (p. 166)</td>
<td>those who believe (p. 62)</td>
<td>those who believed (p. 88)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Q 4: 173</td>
<td>الدَّيْنِ أَمَّنْوَا al-ladhbîna āmanû</td>
<td>those who believe (p. 145)</td>
<td>those who believe (in the Oneness of Allâh — Islāmic Monotheism) (p. 66)</td>
<td>those who believe (p. 66)</td>
<td>those who believed (p. 95)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Surah</td>
<td>Ayah</td>
<td>Arabic Text</td>
<td>English Translation</td>
<td>Monotheism) (p. 179)</td>
<td>Those who have faith (p. 69)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Q 5:9</td>
<td>ﺍﻟﱠﺬِﯾﻦَ آﻣَﻧُوا al-ladhînā āmanū</td>
<td>those who believe (p. 148)</td>
<td>those who believe (in the Oneness of Allāh — Islāmic Monotheism) (p. 185)</td>
<td>those who have faith (p. 69)</td>
<td>those who believed (p. 98)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Q 7:42</td>
<td>ﺍﻟﱠﺬِﯾﻦَ آﻣَﻧُوا al-ladhînā āmanū</td>
<td>those who believe (p. 190)</td>
<td>those who believe (in the Oneness of Allāh — Islāmic Monotheism) (p. 264)</td>
<td>those who believe (p. 97)</td>
<td>those who believed (p. 142)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Q 8:27</td>
<td>ﺍﻟﱠﺬِﯾﻦَ آﻣَﻧُوا al-ladhînā āmanū</td>
<td>Believers (p. 211)</td>
<td></td>
<td>believers (p. 112)</td>
<td>those who believed (p. 165)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Q 8:29</td>
<td>ﺍﻟﱠﺬِﯾﻦَ آﻣَﻧُوا al-ladhînā āmanū</td>
<td>Believers (p. 211)</td>
<td></td>
<td>believers (p. 112)</td>
<td>those who believed (p. 165)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Q 8:45</td>
<td>ﺍﻟﱠﺬِﯾﻦَ آﻣَﻧُوا al-ladhînā āmanū</td>
<td>Believers (p. 213)</td>
<td></td>
<td>believers (p. 113)</td>
<td>those who believed (p. 167)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Q 8:75</td>
<td>ﺍﻟﱠﺬِﯾﻦَ آﻣَﻧُوا al-ladhînā āmanū</td>
<td>those who believed (p. 216)</td>
<td></td>
<td>those who come to believe (p. 115)</td>
<td>those who believed (p. 171)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Q 9:20</td>
<td>ﺍﻟﱠﺬِﯾﻦَ آﻣَﻧُوا al-ladhînā āmanū</td>
<td>Those who have believed (p. 219)</td>
<td>Those who believe (in the Oneness of Allāh — Islāmic Monotheism) (p. 316)</td>
<td>Those who believe (p. 117)</td>
<td>those who believed (p. 174)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Q 9:88</td>
<td>ﺍﻟﱠﺬِﯾﻦَ آﻣَﻧُوا al-ladhînā āmanū</td>
<td>the believers (p. 229)</td>
<td>those who believed with him (in Islāmic Monotheism) (p. 333)</td>
<td>those who believed with him (p. 124)</td>
<td>those who believed (p. 183)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Q 10:4</td>
<td>ﺍﻟﱠﺬِﯾﻦَ آﻣَﻧُوا al-ladhînā āmanū</td>
<td>those who believe (p. 235)</td>
<td>those who believe (in the Oneness of Allāh — Islāmic Monotheism) (p. 348)</td>
<td>those who believe (p. 128)</td>
<td>those who believed (p. 190)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Q 10: 9</td>
<td>ﺍﻟﱠﺬِﯾﻦَ آﻣَنُوا al-ladhīna āmanū</td>
<td>those who believe (p. 236)</td>
<td>those who believe (p. 349)</td>
<td>those who believe (p. 129)</td>
<td>those who believed (p. 191)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Q 10: 63</td>
<td>ﺍﻟﱠﺬِﯾﻦَ آﻣَنُوا al-ladhīna āmanū</td>
<td>those who are faithful (p. 242)</td>
<td>Those who believed (in the Oneness of Allāh – Islāmic Monotheism) (p. 360)</td>
<td>those who believe (p. 133)</td>
<td>those who believed (p. 197)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Q 11: 23</td>
<td>ﺍﻟﱠﺬِﯾﻦَ آﻣَنُوا al-ladhīna āmanū</td>
<td>those who believe (p. 249)</td>
<td>those who believe (in the Oneness of Allāh – Islāmic Monotheism) (p. 374)</td>
<td>those who believe (p. 138)</td>
<td>those who believed (p. 205)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Q 13: 28</td>
<td>ﺍﻟﱠﺬِﯾﻦَ آﻣَنُوا al-ladhīna āmanū</td>
<td>those who believe (p. 277)</td>
<td>Those who believed (in the Oneness of Allāh – Islāmic Monotheism) (p. 417)</td>
<td>those who have faith (p. 155)</td>
<td>those who believed (p. 233)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Q 14: 23</td>
<td>ﺍﻟﱠﺬِﯾﻦَ آﻣَنُوا al-ladhīna āmanū</td>
<td>those who believe (p. 283)</td>
<td>those who believe (in the Oneness of Allāh and His Messengers and whatever they brought) (p. 426)</td>
<td>those who believe (p. 238)</td>
<td>those who believed (p. 238)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Q 14: 27</td>
<td>ﺍﻟﱠﺬِﯾﻦَ آﻣَنُوا al-ladhīna āmanū</td>
<td>The believers (p. 283)</td>
<td>those who believe (p. 427)</td>
<td>those who believe (p. 160)</td>
<td>those who believed (p. 239)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Q 18: 107</td>
<td>ﺍﻟﱠﺬِﯾﻦَ آﻣَنُوا al-ladhīna āmanū</td>
<td>those who believe (p. 327)</td>
<td>Those who believed (in the Oneness of Allāh Islāmic Monotheism) (p. 516)</td>
<td>those who believe (p. 190)</td>
<td>those who believed (p. 284)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 22:14</td>
<td>those who believe in <strong>Islamic Monotheism</strong> (p. 356)</td>
<td>those who believe (in Islamic Monotheism) (p. 572)</td>
<td>those who believe (p. 210)</td>
<td>those who have believed (p. 314)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 22:23</td>
<td>The believers (p. 357)</td>
<td>those who believe (in the Oneness of Allâh — Islamic Monotheism) (p. 572)</td>
<td>those who believe (p. 210)</td>
<td>those who believed (p. 315)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 22:56</td>
<td>those who believe (p. 361)</td>
<td>those who believed (in the Oneness of Allâh Islamic Monotheism) (p. 580)</td>
<td>those who believed (p. 213)</td>
<td>those who believed (p. 319)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 26:227</td>
<td>those who believe (p. 399)</td>
<td>those who believe (in the Oneness of Allâh Islamic Monotheism) (p. 646)</td>
<td>those [poet] who believe (p. 238)</td>
<td>those who believed (p. 357)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 29:58</td>
<td>those who believe (p. 424)</td>
<td>those who believed (in the Oneness of Allâh — Islamic Monotheism) (p. 691)</td>
<td>those who believed (p. 255)</td>
<td>those who believed (p. 383)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 30:15</td>
<td>those who believed (p. 427)</td>
<td>those who believed (in the Oneness of Allâh Islamic Monotheism) (p. 696)</td>
<td>those who believed (p. 358)</td>
<td>those who believed (p. 386)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 31:8</td>
<td>those who believe (p. 433)</td>
<td>those who believe (in Islamic Monotheism) (p. 706)</td>
<td>those who believe (p. 261)</td>
<td>those who believed (p. 391)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 32:19</td>
<td>those who believe (p. 439)</td>
<td>those who believe (in the Oneness of Allâh Islamic Monotheism) (p. 716)</td>
<td>those who believed (p. 265)</td>
<td>those who believed (p. 392)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 34:4</td>
<td>those who believe (p. 452)</td>
<td>those who believe (in the Oneness of Allâh Islamic Monotheism) (p. 737)</td>
<td>those who believe (p. 272)</td>
<td>those who believed (p. 408)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 35:7</td>
<td>the believers (p. 498)</td>
<td>those who believe (in the Oneness of Allāh Islāmic Monotheism) (p. 749)</td>
<td>those who believe (p. 277)</td>
<td>those who believed (p. 415)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 40:51</td>
<td>those who believe (p. 499)</td>
<td>those who believe (in the Oneness of Allāh Islāmic Monotheism) (p. 818)</td>
<td>those who believe (p. 305)</td>
<td>those who believed (p. 454)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 40:58</td>
<td>those who believe (p. 526)</td>
<td>those who believe (in the Oneness of Allāh — Islāmic Monotheism) (p. 869)</td>
<td>those who believe (p. 325)</td>
<td>those who believed (p. 482)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 45:21</td>
<td>those who believed (p. 526)</td>
<td>those who believe (in the Oneness of Allāh — Islāmic Monotheism) (p. 871)</td>
<td>those who believed (p. 326)</td>
<td>those who believed (p. 483)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 45:30</td>
<td>those who believe (p. 534)</td>
<td>those who believe (in the Oneness of Allāh — Islāmic Monotheism) (p. 883)</td>
<td>those who believe (p. 332)</td>
<td>those who believed (p. 490)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 95:6</td>
<td>those who believe (p. 661)</td>
<td>those who believe (in Islāmic Monotheism) (p. 1097)</td>
<td>those who believe (p. 427)</td>
<td>those who believed (p. 593)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 103:3</td>
<td>those who have faith (p. 669)</td>
<td>those who believe (in Islāmic Monotheism) (p. 1108)</td>
<td>those who believe (p. 435)</td>
<td>those who believed (p. 597)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 2:135</td>
<td>The faith of Abraham, the upright (p. 69)</td>
<td>the religion of Ibrāhīm (Abraham), Hanīf [Islāmic Monotheism, i.e. to worship none</td>
<td>he religion of Abraham, the upright (p. 16)</td>
<td>the creed of Abraham a monotheist (p. 18)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Quranic Reference</td>
<td>Arabic Text</td>
<td>English Translation</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Q 3: 67</td>
<td>مِنْهَا مُسْلِمٌ hanīfan Musliman</td>
<td>He submitted in all uprightness¹ (p. 104)</td>
<td>He was a true Muslim Hanīf (Islamic Monotheism — to worship none but Allāh Alone) (p. 103)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Q 3: 95</td>
<td>مَلِّةَ إِبْرَاهِيْمَ millata Ibrāhīma hanīfan</td>
<td>the Way of Abraham, the upright (p. 107)</td>
<td>the religion of Ibrāhīm (Abraham) Hanīf (Islamic Monotheism, i.e. he used to worship Allāh Alone) (p. 111)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Q 4: 125</td>
<td>مَلِّةَ إِبْرَاهِيْمَ millata Ibrāhīma hanīfan</td>
<td>the Way of Abraham, the upright (p. 139)</td>
<td>the religion of Ibrāhīm (Abraham) Hanīf (Islamic Monotheism — to worship none but Allāh Alone) (p. 167)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Q 6: 79</td>
<td>هَنِيفًا hanīfan</td>
<td>being upright (p. 174)</td>
<td>Hanīf (Islamic Monotheism, i.e. worshipping none but Allāh Alone) (p. 233) as a true believer (p. 85) as a monotheist (p. 125)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Q 6: 161</td>
<td>مَلِّةَ إِبْرَاهِيْمَ millata Ibrāhīma hanīfan</td>
<td>the faith of Abraham, the upright (p. 185)</td>
<td>the religion of Ibrāhīm (Abraham), Hanīf [i.e. the true Islamic Monotheism — to believe in One God (Allāh i.e. to worship none but Allāh, Alone)] (p. 255) the faith of Abraham, a man of pure faith (p. 93) the creed of Abraham, the monotheist (p. 137)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Q 10: 105</td>
<td>للدِّينِ حَنِيفًا lil dīn hanīfan</td>
<td>faith in all uprightness (p. 246)</td>
<td>the religion Ḥanīf (Islamic Monotheism, i.e. to worship none as a man of pure faith (p. 135) the way of life of a monotheist (p. 202)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passage</td>
<td>Quranic Reference</td>
<td>Arabic Expression</td>
<td>English Translation 1</td>
<td>English Translation 2</td>
<td>English Translation 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 47      | Q 16:120         | قَانِتُّ اِلَّهَ حَنِيفٌ  
qānitan lil lāhi hanīfan | devoted to Allah, ‘perfectly’ upright (p. 303) | obedient to Allah, Hanīf (i.e. to worship none but Allāh) (p. 469) | obedient to God and true in faith (p. 174) |
|         |                  |                 |                      |                      | obedient to God—a monotheist (p. 260) |
| 48      | Q 16:123         | مِلْلَةَ إِبْرَّاهِـۧіمَ حَنِیفًۭا  
millata Ibrāhīma hanīfan | the faith of Abraham, the upright (p. 303) | the religion of Ibrāhīm (Abraham) Hanīf (Islamic Monotheism) (1) — to worship none but Allāh (p. 470) | the creed of Abraham—a monotheist (p. 261) |
|         |                  |                 |                      |                      | |
| 49      | Q 22:31          | حَنَفَانَ لِلْدِّیْنِ  
 Hunafā’ lil dīn hanīfan | Be upright ‘in devotion’ to Allah (p. 359) | Ḥunafā’ Lillāh (i.e. worshiping none but Allāh) (p. 574) | Devote yourselves to God (p. 211) |
|         |                  |                 |                      |                      | Turn to God as monotheists (p. 316) |
| 50      | Q 30:30          | لِلدِّیْنِ حَنِیفَان  
 lil dīn hanīfan | faith in all uprightness (p. 429) | the religion (of pure Islamic Monotheism) Ḥanīf (worship none but Allāh Alone). (p. 699) | pure faith … in your devotion to the religion (p. 259) |
|         |                  |                 |                      |                      | a way of life as a monotheist (p. 387) |
| 51      | Q 98:5           | حَنَفَانَ  
 Hunafā’ | devotion to Him in all uprightness (p. 665) | worship none but Him Alone (abstaining from ascribing partners to Him) (p. 1101) | devoting their religion to Him as people of true faith (p. 430) |
|         |                  |                 |                      |                      | devoted in the way of life to Him, as monotheists (p. 595) |
| 1       | Q 6:55           | المَجْرِیْمِن  
 al mujrimūn | the wicked (p. 171) | the Mujrimūn (criminals, polytheists, sinners) (p. 227) | the ones who sin (p. 122) |
|         |                  |                 |                      | sinners (p. 84)      | |
| 2       | Q 6:147          | المَجْرِیْمِن  
 al mujrimūn | the wicked people (p. 183) | Mujrimūn (criminals, polytheists or sinners) (p. 250) | the evildoers (p. 92) |
|         |                  |                 |                      |                      | ones who sin (p. 135) |
| 3       | Q 7:40           | المَجْرِیْمِن  
 al mujrimūn | the wicked (p. 190) | the Mujrimūn (criminals, polytheists, sinners) (p. 264) | the guilty (p. 97) |
<p>|         |                  |                 |                      |                      | the ones who sin (p. 142) |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q</th>
<th></th>
<th>Arabic</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>7: 84</td>
<td>المجرمين</td>
<td>the wicked (p. 194)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>al mujrimīn</em></td>
<td><em>Mujrimūn</em> (criminals, <em>polytheists</em>, sinners) (p. 272)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the evildoers (p. 100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the ones who sin (p. 147)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>7: 133</td>
<td>مجرمين</td>
<td>a wicked people (p. 198)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>al mujrimīn</em></td>
<td><em>Mujrimūn</em> (criminals, <em>polytheists</em>, sinners) (p. 280)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>wicked people (p. 103)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ones who sin (p. 152)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>8: 8</td>
<td>المجرمون</td>
<td>the wicked (p. 209)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>al mujrimīn</em></td>
<td><em>Mujrimūn</em> (disbelievers, <em>polytheists</em>, sinners, criminals) (p. 328)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the guilty (p. 110)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the ones who sin (p. 163)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>9: 66</td>
<td>مجرمون</td>
<td>their wickedness (p. 226)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>mujrimīn</em></td>
<td><em>Mujrimūn</em> (disbelievers, <em>polytheists</em>, sinners, criminals) (p. 350)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>evildoers (p. 122)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ones who sin (p. 180)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>10: 13</td>
<td>مجرمون</td>
<td>the wicked people (p. 237)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>al mujrimīn</em></td>
<td><em>Mujrimūn</em> (disbelievers, <em>polytheists</em>, sinners, criminals) (p. 357)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the guilty (p. 129)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the ones who sin (p. 192)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>10: 50</td>
<td>مجرمون</td>
<td>the wicked (p. 241)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>al mujrimūn</em></td>
<td><em>Mujrimūn</em> (disbelievers, <em>polytheists</em>, sinners, criminals) (p. 362)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the guilty (p. 132)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the ones who sin (p. 196)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10: 75</td>
<td>مجرمين</td>
<td>the wicked people (p. 243)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>mujrimīn</em></td>
<td><em>Mujrimūn</em> (disbelievers, <em>polytheists</em>, sinners, criminals) (p. 363)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>wicked people (p. 134)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ones who sin (p. 199)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>10: 82</td>
<td>مجرمون</td>
<td>the wicked (p. 244)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>al mujrimūn</em></td>
<td><em>Mujrimūn</em> (criminals, disbelievers, <em>polytheists</em>, sinners) (p. 362)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>evildoers (p. 134)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the ones who sin (p. 199)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>11: 116</td>
<td>مجرمين</td>
<td>becoming wicked (p. 259)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>mujrimīn</em></td>
<td><em>Mujrimūn</em> (criminals, disbelievers in sin) (p. 144)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>persisted in sin (p. 144)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ones who sin (p. 215)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 12:110</td>
<td>the wicked people (p. 271)</td>
<td>Mujrimūn (criminals, sinners, disbelievers, polytheists) (p. 410)</td>
<td>guilty people (p. 152)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 14:49</td>
<td>the wicked (p. 285)</td>
<td>the Mujrimūn (criminals, disbelievers in the Oneness of Allāh — Islāmic Monotheism, polytheists) (p. 434)</td>
<td>the guilty (p. 161)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 15:12</td>
<td>the wicked (p. 286)</td>
<td>the Mujrimūn [criminals, polytheists and pagans (because of their mocking at the Messengers)] (p. 436)</td>
<td>evil doers (p. 162)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 15:58</td>
<td>a wicked people (p. 289)</td>
<td>Mujrimūn (criminals, disbelievers, polytheists, sinners) (p. 441)</td>
<td>a people who are guilty (p. 164)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 19:86</td>
<td>the wicked (p. 335)</td>
<td>the Mujrimūn (polytheists, sinners, criminals, disbelievers in the Oneness of Allāh) (p. 529)</td>
<td>the sinful (p. 195)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 20:102</td>
<td>the wicked (p. 343)</td>
<td>the Mujrimūn (criminals, polytheists, sinners, disbelievers in the Oneness of Allāh) (p. 441) (p. 544)</td>
<td>the sinful (p. 200)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 25:31</td>
<td>the wicked (p. 385)</td>
<td>the Mujrimūn (disbelievers, polytheists, sinners) (p. 229)</td>
<td>the wicked (p. 342)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Q Verse</td>
<td>Arabic Term</td>
<td>English Translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>26:200</td>
<td>المجرمين al mujrimīn</td>
<td>the wicked (p. 398)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>26:99</td>
<td>المجرمون al mujrimūn</td>
<td>the wicked (p. 394)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>28:17</td>
<td>المجرمين al mujrimīn</td>
<td>the wicked (p. 410)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>30:12</td>
<td>المجرمون al mujrimūn</td>
<td>the wicked (p. 427)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>32:22</td>
<td>المجرمين al mujrimīn</td>
<td>the wicked (p. 439)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>34:32</td>
<td>مجرمين mujrimīn</td>
<td>wicked (p. 455)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>36:59</td>
<td>المجرمون al mujrimūn</td>
<td>wicked ones (p. 467)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>37:34</td>
<td>المجرمين al mujrimīn</td>
<td>the wicked (p. 471)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 44:22</td>
<td>mujrimūn</td>
<td>a wicked people (p. 522)</td>
<td>Mujrimūn (disbelievers, polytheists, sinners, criminals) (p. 862)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 44:37</td>
<td>mujrimūn</td>
<td>wicked (p. 523)</td>
<td>Mujrimūn (disbelievers, polytheists, sinners, criminals) (p. 863)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 45:31</td>
<td>mujrimūn</td>
<td>a wicked people (p. 527)</td>
<td>Mujrimūn (polytheists, disbelievers, sinners, criminals) (p. 871)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 46:25</td>
<td>al mujrimūn</td>
<td>the wicked people (p. 531)</td>
<td>Mujrimūn (criminals, sinners, polytheists, disbelievers) (p. 878)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 51:32</td>
<td>mujrimūn</td>
<td>a wicked people (p. 552)</td>
<td>Mujrimūn (polytheists, sinners, criminals, disbelievers in Allāh) (p. 912)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 54:47</td>
<td>al mujrimūn</td>
<td>the wicked (p. 564)</td>
<td>The Mujrimūn (polytheists, disbelievers, sinners, criminals) (p. 934)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 6:58</td>
<td>az-zālimūn</td>
<td>the wrongdoers (p. 171)</td>
<td>the Zālimūn (polytheists and wrong-doers) (p. 228)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 6:68</td>
<td>az-zālimūn</td>
<td>the wrongdoing people (p. 172)</td>
<td>the people who are the Zālimūn (cruel, violent, proud,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
<td>Verse</td>
<td>Arabic Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Q 6:144</td>
<td>the wrongdoing people (p. 182)</td>
<td>the wrongdoers (p. 230)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Q 9:109</td>
<td>the wrongdoing people (p. 232)</td>
<td>the wrongdoers (p. 249)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Q 10:85</td>
<td>the folk who are Zālimūn (polytheists and wrong-doers) (i.e. do not make them overpower us) (p. 363)</td>
<td>the wrongdoers (p. 246)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Q 10:106</td>
<td>the folk who are Zālimūn (polytheists and wrong-doers, oppressors) (p. 373)</td>
<td>the wrongdoers (p. 250)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Q 11:18</td>
<td>unjust (p. 268)</td>
<td>the wrongdoers (p. 283)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Q 11:31</td>
<td>unjust (p. 238)</td>
<td>the wrongdoers (p. 250)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Q 11:44</td>
<td>unjust (p. 238)</td>
<td>the wrongdoers (p. 251)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Q 12:79</td>
<td>unjust (p. 150)</td>
<td>unjust (p. 268)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Q 14:22</td>
<td>unjust (p. 238)</td>
<td>unjust (p. 283)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Q.</td>
<td>Arabic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>14:44</td>
<td>ﺍﻟﺬﯾﻦ ظﻠﻤوا al ladhīna zalamū</td>
<td>the wrongdoers (p. 285)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>14:45</td>
<td>ﺍﻟﺬﯾﻦ ظﻠﻤوا al ladhīna zalamū</td>
<td>people who had wronged themselves (p. 285)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>19:72</td>
<td>ﺍﻟﻈﺎﻟﻤﯿﻦ aẓ-ẓālimīn</td>
<td>the wrongdoers (p. 334)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>21:29</td>
<td>ﺍﻟﻈﺎﻟﻤﯿﻦ aẓ-ẓālimīn</td>
<td>the wrongdoers (p. 348)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>2:193</td>
<td>ﺍﻟﻈﺎﻟﻤﯿﻦ aẓ-ẓālimīn</td>
<td>aggressors (p. 77)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>28:21</td>
<td>ﺍﻟﻈﺎﻟﻤﯿﻦ aẓ-ẓālimīn</td>
<td>wrongdoing people (p. 411)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>28:40</td>
<td>ﺍﻟﻈﺎﻟﻤﯿﻦ aẓ-ẓālimīn</td>
<td>wrongdoers (p. 413)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix Q: List of Verses Revealing Views about Seeing God on the Day of Judgement

| Salafi Beliefs |
## Seeing God on the Day of Judgement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Q</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Khattab</th>
<th>Hilali &amp; Khan</th>
<th>Haleem</th>
<th>Bakhtiar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>75:23</td>
<td>looking at their Lord.</td>
<td>Looking at their Lord (Allah).</td>
<td>looking towards their Lord.</td>
<td>ones that look towards their Lord.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7:143</td>
<td>“My Lord! Reveal Yourself to me so I may see you.”</td>
<td>“O my Lord! Show me (Yourself), that I may look upon You.”</td>
<td>‘My Lord! Show Yourself to me: let me see you.’</td>
<td>O my Lord! Cause me to see that I look on you</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10:26</td>
<td>Those who have done good will have the finest reward(1) and ‘even’ more.</td>
<td>For those who did well will have the best reward and more besides.</td>
<td>For those who did good is the fairer and increase.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>83:15</td>
<td>Undoubtedly, they will be sealed off from their Lord on that Day.</td>
<td>Nay! Surely they (evil-doers) will be veiled from seeing their Lord that Day.</td>
<td>No! on that Day they will be screened off from their Lord</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

(1) Parade
(2) Seeing Almighty Allah in the Hereafter
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Q</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Khattab</th>
<th>Hilali &amp; khan</th>
<th>Haleem</th>
<th>Bakhtiar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Q 50: 35</td>
<td>لِهْمَ مَا يَشَاءُونَ فيْهَا وَلَدَيْنَا مَزِيْدٌ</td>
<td>There they have whatever they desire, and with Us is ‘even’ more. (p. 549)</td>
<td>There they will have all that they desire — and We have more (for them, i.e. a glance at the All-Mighty, All-Majestic جَلَالُ جَلالِهِ. (p. 905)</td>
<td>They will have all that they wish for there, and We have more for them. (p. 341)</td>
<td>They will have what they will in it and with Us there is yet an addition. (p. 502)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Q 67: 12</td>
<td>إِنَّ الَّذِينَ يَخْشُونَ رَبَّهُمْ لَهُمْ فَråبْحَا مَغْفِرَةً وَأَجْرٌ كَبِيرٌ</td>
<td>Indeed, those in awe of their Lord without seeing Him will have forgiveness and mighty reward. (p. 606)</td>
<td>Verily, those who fear their Lord unseen (i.e. they do not see Him, nor His punishment in the Hereafter), theirs will be forgiveness and a great reward (i.e. Paradise) (p. 999)</td>
<td>But for those who fear their Lord in private there is forgiveness and a great reward. (p. 382)</td>
<td>Truly, those who dread their Lord in the unseen, for them is forgiveness and a great compensatio n. (p. 550)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix R: List of Verses Revealing Views about the Increase and Decrease of Imān/ Faith

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Salafi Beliefs</th>
<th>The Increase and Decrease of Imān/ Faith</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>III: The Increase and Decrease of Imān/ Faith</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Q</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Khattab</th>
<th>Hilali &amp; khan</th>
<th>Haleem</th>
<th>Bakhtiar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Q 48: 4</td>
<td>لَيِزَادَوْا إِيمَانًا مَاْ اِمْنَانِهِمْ</td>
<td>they may increase even more in their faith (p. 538)</td>
<td>they may grow more in Faith along with their (present) Faith (p. 889)</td>
<td>to add faith to their faith (p. 334)</td>
<td>to add belief to their belief (p. 493)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quran</td>
<td>Verse</td>
<td>Arabic Text</td>
<td>English Translation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Q 74:31</td>
<td>وَيَزْدَادَ الْذِينَ آمَنُوا إِيَّامَانًا wayazdā dal ladhīna amanū imānan</td>
<td>and the believers will increase in faith (p. 625)</td>
<td>and the believers may increase in Faith (as this Qur’ān is the truth) (p. 1033)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Q 9:124</td>
<td>فَأَمَّا الْذِينَ آمَنُوا فَزَادَتْهُمْ إِيَمَانًا fa ammal ladhīna amanū fazādat hum imānan</td>
<td>As for the believers, it has increased them in faith (p. 234)</td>
<td>As for those who believe, it has increased their Faith (p. 345)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Q 3:173</td>
<td>فَأَخْشَوْهُمْ فَزَادَتْهُمْ إِيَمَانًا fakhshaw hum fazādat hum imānan</td>
<td>so fear them the warning only made them grow stronger in faith (p. 115-116)</td>
<td>Those whose faith only increased ... so fear them (p. 47)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Q 8:2</td>
<td>وَإِذَا ﺗُﻠِﯿَﺖْ ﻋَﻠَﯿْهِﻢْ آﯾَﺎتُﮫُ wa idhā tuliyat ʿalaihim ayatuhu zādat hum imānan</td>
<td>whose faith increases when His revelations are recited to them (p. 208)</td>
<td>whose faith increases when His Verses (this Qur’ān) are recited to them, they (i.e. the Verses) increase their Faith (p. 297)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: The table above provides a translation of verses from the Quran, with references to specific pages where the information is discussed in detail.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arabic</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 Q 33:22</td>
<td>And this only increased them in faith and submission. (p. 444)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Q 33:22</td>
<td>And it only added to their Faith and to their submissiveness (to Allāh). (p. 722)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Q 33:22</td>
<td>and this only served to increase their faith and submission to God. (p. 268)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Q 33:22</td>
<td>And it increased them not but in belief and to resign themselves to submission to God. (p. 440)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Q 2:260</td>
<td>so my heart can be reassured (p. 90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Q 2:260</td>
<td>to be stronger in Faith (p. 67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Q 2:260</td>
<td>to put my heart at rest (p. 30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Q 2:260</td>
<td>0o my heart be at rest (p. 40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Q 16:102</td>
<td>to reassure the believers (p. 301)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Q 16:102</td>
<td>it may make firm and strengthen the believers (p. 173)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Q 16:102</td>
<td>to make firm those who believed (p. 258)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Q 3:64</td>
<td>lords instead of Allah (p. 103)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Q 3:64</td>
<td>others as lords besides Allāh (1). (p. 101)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Q 3:64</td>
<td>And such is faith when its delight enters the heart and mixes with it completely. Then I asked you whether his followers were increasing or decreasing. You claimed that they were increasing, that is the way of true faith till it is complete.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Q 3:64</td>
<td>others beside God as lords (p. 39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Q 3:64</td>
<td>others to ourselves as lords besides God (p. 53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Q 9:125</td>
<td>it has increased them only in wickedness upon their wickedness, (p. 234)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Q 9:125</td>
<td>it will add suspicion and doubt to their suspicion, disbelief and doubt (p. 345)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Q 9:125</td>
<td>each new sura adds further to their perversity. (p. 127)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Q 9:125</td>
<td>it increased disgrace to their disgrace. (p. 189)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Q 2: 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Q 35: 42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Q 2: 143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Q 4: 65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Q 67:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Q 6:18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Q 16:50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Q 2:29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Q 2:115</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Appendix S: List of Verses Revealing Views about *Ithbāt ‘uluww Allah* / God’s Transcendence

#### The Display of Salafī Beliefs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IV</th>
<th><em>Ithbāt ‘uluww Allah/God’s Transcendence</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Q Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Q 67:16 man fis samā’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Q 6:18 Wa Huwāl gāhiru fawqa ‘ibādih</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Q 16:50 yakhāfūn Rabbaḥum min fawqihim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Q 2:29 thummas tawā ilās samā’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Q 2:115 fā’yānā tuwallū fathamma wajhullāh</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
 فلا تَكُن فِي مَرْيةٍ مَّن لِّقَآئِهِ falā takun fī miryātim mil liqā’īihī

So let there be no doubt ‘O Prophet’ that you ‘too’ are receiving revelations\(^{(1)}\)

\(^{(1)}\) Other possible translations: 1. “Do not be in doubt that Moses received it.”
2. “Do not be in doubt of your meeting with Moses.” (p. 440)

So be not you in doubt of meeting him [i.e. when you met Mūṣa (Moses) during the night of Al-Isrā’ and Al-Mi’rāj\(^{(1)}\) over the heavens].

\(^{(1)}\) (V.32:23): [Al-Mi’rāj المَعَرَج—See the footnote of (V.53:12), Ḥadīth No. 429].

So be not you in doubt that you are receiving it (p. 265)

So be you not hesitant about meeting Him (p. 397)

وَالْبَيْتِ المَغْفُور ِ wal baitil ma’mūr

And by the ‘Sacred’ House frequently visited!\(^{(3)}\) (p. 555)

And by Al-Bait-ul-Ma’mūr (the house over the heavens parallel to the Ka’bah in Makkah, continuously visited by the angels). (p. 916)

By the much-visited House,\(^b\) (p. 345)

\(^b\) Understood to refer to the Ka’ba in Mecca.

and by the frequented House (p. 507)

عَندَ سِدْرَةِ ‘inda sidratil muntaha

at the Lote Tree of the most extreme limit ‘in the seventh heaven’ (p. 558)

Near Sidrat-ul-Muntahā (a lote-tree of the utmost boundary over the seventh heaven beyond which none can pass). (p. 924)

by the lote tree beyond which none may pass\(^d\) (p. 347)

\(^d\) Cf. 5628.

and near the Lote Tree of the Utmost Boundary (p. 510)
| 10 | Q 58: 7 | مَآ ﯽِﻜُﻮَنُ مَﻦ نَـﺟْﻮَى ﺛَﻠَـٰﺜَﺔٍ إِﻻﱠ هُﻮَ رَﺎِﺒِﮭُﻢ mā yakūnu min najwā thalāthatin illā Huwa rābi‘uhum | If three converse privately, He is their fourth. (P. 580) | There is no secret counsel of three but He is their fourth (with His Knowledge, while He Himself is over the Throne, over the seventh heaven) (p. 960) | There will be no conspiring secretly of three, but, He is their fourth (529) |
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