10. Larson , M. L., *Meaning –based Translation* , University Press of America, Lanham, 1984.

11. Mir Ahmam Ali, S.V., *The Holy Qur'an* (translated into English) , Tahrike Tarsile Qur'an Inc. , New York, 1988.

12. Mustapha , H., *"Qur'an (Koran) Translation"* , cited in Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies, edited by M. Baker , Routledge, London , 1998.

13. Newmark, P., *Approaches to Translation* , Prentice Hall International (UK) , Ltd. , Cambridge, 1988.

14. Nida, E. A. , *Toward a Science of Translating* , E. J. Brill, Leiden , 1964.

15. Nida , E. A . and C. R. Taber , *The Theory and Practice of Translation* , E.J. Brill, Leiden, 1969.

16. Pickthall, M., *The Meaning of the Glorious Qur'an* , Salehi Publications , Tehran , dateless.

17. Shakir, M. H., *The Holy Qur'an* (translated into English) , Ismailian Publications, Tehran, dateless.

communicate the original meaning as clearly as possible in a natural equivalent which is the closest one to the original .

Sources

1. Abdul-Raof , H., *Qur'an Translation : Discource, Texture and Exegesis* , Curzon, 2001.

2. Arberry, A.J, *The Koran Interpreted* , Oxford university Press. London , 1972.

3. Asad, M., *The Message of the Qur'an* , Dar al-Andalus Limiuted , Gibraltar, 1980.

4. Beekman , J. and J. Callow, *Translating the Word of God*, Zondervan, Texas , 1989.

5. Clarke , H. W. , *The Bustan of Sa'di Shirazi* (translated into English) , Dars Publishers, London , 1988.

6. Dawood , N. J. , *The Koran* (translated into English) , Penguin Books, 1974.

7. Ernst-August Gutt, *Translation and Relevance: Cognition and Context*, Blackwell Publishers, Oxford, UK, 1993.

8. Hatim , B. and I. Mason , *Discourse and the translator* , Longman , London, 1993.

9. House , J. , *A Model for Translation Quality Assessment*, Tubingen: Gunter Narr Verlag, 1976.

any of its translations is ultimately the difference between God as the Author, Authority and Source on the one hand, and man as a mere translator/interpreter on the other" (cited in Baker, 1998: 202).

Linguistically speaking, each language has its own characteristics which are different from those of others. To reproduce the meaning of a source text in a translation, one must make some adjustments in the process of transfer so that the translated text may be intelligible in meaning and normal in style. However, focusing on intelligibility and naturalness should not cause the distortion of the original meaning, since it is the original text which is considered as the decisive factor in evaluating the level of accuracy and adequacy in a translation. This point is of vital importance in evaluating religious translations, especially those of the Qur'an, which is the very Word of Allah, inimitable in both its meaning and style. A translator is allowed, and often obliged, to make some adjustments in order to avoid obscurity and produce a clear and natural translation; but in translating a highly sensitive text such as the Qur'an, one is not allowed to sacrifice accuracy of the meaning for the sake of the natural flow. What one must do is to

B. Therefore he who disbelieveth the rebels (*false deities)* and believeth in God, hath indeed laid hold on the strongest handle no break for it ; ...

(Ahmad Ali's translation –without reduction)

C. And he who rejecteth false deities and believeth in Allah hath grasped a firm handhold which will never break .

(Pickthall's translation –without reduction)

Conclusion

The result of this study reveals some undeniable facts: The Qur'an, the Word of Allah, is a divinely revealed book that can never be replaced by any translation of it , however precise it may be , as no translation of the Qur'an can match it or be a total equivalent to it; that is ,total equivalence of the Qur'an is a chimerical idea that can never be achieved. Modern Bible translations are generally audience-oriented, while most of the Qur'an translations are source-oriented. According to H. Mustapha , "readers of the Gospels in a language such as English may have some awareness that the verses being read are a translation of some original text, but this awareness would not particularly mar the text concerned or detract from its authority . In the eyes of a Muslim , by contrast, the difference between the Qur'an and

۱. یاۤ اَیُّهَا الَّذینَ اۤمَنُوا (اول آیهٔ ۹ ، سورهٔ ۶۲ قرآن) :

ای کسانی که ایمان دارید

A. o believers, ... (Arberry's translation –with reduction)

B. Believers,... (Dawood's translation –with reduction)

C. O you who believe! ... (Shakir's translation –without

reduction)

۲. وَالَّذینَ کَفَرُوا اَوْلِیاؤُهُمُ الطّاغُوتُ﴾ قسمتی از آیهٔ ۲۵۷، سورهٔ ۲ قرآن)

و کسانی که کافرند اولیایشان خدایان دروغین اند

A. And the unbelievers – their protectors are idols,...

(Arberry's translation-with reduction)

B. As for those who disbelieve, their patrons are false

deities.

(Pickthall's translation –without reduction)

Another way of producing reduction is to use ellipsis

and leave some words implicit in the translation. Example:

فَمَنْ یَکْفُرْ بِالطّاغُوتِ وَ یُؤْمِنْ بِاللهِ فَقَدِ اسْتَمْسَکَ بِالْعُرْوَةِ الْوُثْقی لاَانْفِصامَ لَها

(قسمتی از آیهٔ ۲۵۶، سورهٔ ۲ قرآن)

پس هر کس به طاغوت کافر شود و به الله ایمان آورد ، به محکمترین دستاویز چنگ زده

است که گسستن ندارد ؛

A. So whosoever disbelieves in idols and believes in

God , has laid hold of the most firm handle, <u>unbreaking</u> ; ...

(Arberry's translation-with reduction: ellipsis)

the Persian. This is reducing two emphatic particles in Arabic to a single emphatic word in English or Persian . See the following examples.

١. فَلَيَعْلَمَنَّ اللهُ الَّذِينَ صَدَقوُا وَ لَيَعْلَمَنَّ الْكاذِبينَ (آخر آيةَ ٣ ، سورةَ ٢٩ قرآن)

پس یقیناً خدا می شناسد کسانی را کــه راســت مـی گوینـد ، و بـه یقیـن او مـی شناسـد دروغگویان را .

1. … and assuredly God knows those who speak truly, and assuredly He knows the liars. (Arberry's translation)

٢. وَ لَتُسْئَلُنَّ عَمَّا كُنْتُمْ تَعْلَمونَ (آخر آيةَ ٩٣، سورةَ ١٦ قرآن)

و یقیناً از آنچه عمل می کردید سئوال خواهید شد .

2. … and you will surely be questioned about the things you wrought .

(Arberry's translation)

     The two examples can be considered as the instances of 'reduction of repetitions' or 'simplification of doublets' , since the two particles of intensification or emphasis in the original Arabic texts have been simplified and reduced to a single emphatic word in both Persian and English translations .

     Equivalents in the receptor language can also be simplified and made smaller than the original texts in some other ways. They can be reduced to more extensive forms and be on the extreme side of descriptive equivalents.

both of them are employed to produce the closest natural equivalent in the receptor language .

Nidan and Taber (1969:168) argue that reduction in translation can be considered as simplification of the style of the original text, especially repetitious styles, in order to put the meaning into a simpler or more extensive form in the target language so that natural or dynamic equivalence may be introduced. Languages differ in their linguistic forms. A certain style may be regarded as natural or even 'excellent' in producing emphasis in some languages, while it can be considered as unnatural or unusual in some other tongues. In Arabic, for instance, *"la"* (ل) is an intensifying particle , which means 'truly', 'verily', 'surely' or 'certainly'. Letter *"nun"* (ن) in its doubled form whit intensified pronunciation (نّ) is also emphatic and it is used at the end of a verb to show intensification . Sometimes these two intensive letters are both used together in the same verb , the former at the beginning and the latter at the end. This style in Arabic language is introduced to produce a high degree of emphasis on the indubitableness of a statement . In translating such an emphatic expression from Arabic it is enough to employ a single emphatic word like "surely" in English and an intensifying word like (لي نا) in

٣. کرم کن که فردا که دیوان نهند   منـــازل بمقــدار احســان دهنـد
(بوستان سعدی)

Practise liberality that to-morrow (the Judgment Day) when they (the angels) place the account-book,

They may give thee dignities, according to the extent of thy beneficences.

(Clarke's translation)

The expansions in both parentheses in the English translation make the implicit information explicit in order to prevent obscurity and misunderstanding , and make the translation clear and more 'swallowable' or intelligible to the potential readers in English language . However, this type of expansion may sometimes disrupt the ' polyvalence' or 'multiplicity' of meaning in the translation of literary texts.

Reductions

Reduction is another kind of semantic adjustment employed by translators in order to produce natural equivalence in the target language . It occurs when a translator reduces an expression in the process of transfer and makes the translation smaller, in lexical components, than the original text. Although reductions are not so frequent as expansions

In the second example the underlined part is an expanded equivalent to the word 'فرقان' . It is described in a long expression so that it may be intelligible to the English readers.

An equivalent may also be expanded in some other ways . See the examples below.

١. وحى :divine revelation

وعظ:religious admonition

وضو :minor ritual ablution

In each of the three examples above the last word alone can also be used as a contextual English equivalent to the word given ; the expansion is just to identify the meaning and prevent ambiguity and probable misunderstanding .

٢. وَ هُوَ العَزيزُ الحَكيمُ (آخر آيهٔ ٣ از سورهٔ ٦٢ قرآن):
و اوست عزيز و حكيم

And He is the Mighty, the Wise One .

Many English translators of the Qur'an have employed 'the Wise' ,without the word 'One',as an equivalent corresponding to 'الحكـــيم' . The word 'One', which refers to God , is employed just to identify the equivalent by

intelligible to the potential readers in the receptor language.
Some English translators of the Qur'an have described
certain Qur'anic terms in this manner. See the following
examples .

١. الَّذينَ يُؤْمنُونَ بِالغَيْبِ (قسمتى از آيهٔ ٣ ، سورهٔ ٢ قرآن):

آنانكه به غيب ايمان دارند

…who believe in [the existence of] <u>that which is beyond
the reach of human perception</u>, … (M. Asad's translation).

The underlined part is a descriptive equivalent
corresponding to the word 'الغيب' in the original Arabic text.

It is expanded descriptively and made longer in lexical
components than the original so that the English readers
may grasp the meaning. Many other translators have
employed a single word, such as 'Unseen' or 'invisible' , as
an English equivalent corresponding to the word 'غيب' in
Arabic.

٢. يا ايُّها الَّذينَ آمَنُوا إنْ تَتَّقُوا اللهَ يَجْعَلْ لَكُمْ فُرْقاناً(اول آيهٔ ٢٩ از سورهٔ ٨ قرآن)

اى كسانى كه ايمان داريد ، اگر از خدا پروا كنيد او براى شما فرقان (قــوه تميـيز) (قـرار)

مى دهد .

O you who have attained to faith! If you remain conscious
of God, He will endow you with a <u>standard by which to
discern the true from the false,</u> …

swallow it . The meat and the bones are all there. They are just in a different form."

Nida and Taber (ibid.) confirm this point of view and say : "This is precisely what the translator does with an 'unswallowable' linguistic portion of text. He analyzes its components, builds in proper redundancy by making explicit what is implicit in the original , and then produces something the readers in the receptor language will be able to understand ." Therefore, a translator is allowed to make justifiable expansions, so that the translation may be 'swallowable' or 'understandable' to the potential readers in the targer language . However, adding any extra information which is not implicit in the original text will be out of the scope of such legitimate or justifiable expansions, since it will bring about unjustifiable redundancies in the translation , and , as such , make the expansion illegitimate and the translation unacceptable.

To make a translation longer than the original text in order to produce legitimate expansion and understandable equivalence a translator can expand it in various ways. A single word in the original text may require a descriptive equivalence in the target language . In this way the meaning will be described in more lexical items so that it may be

Expansions

Expansions, which are semantic adjustments, occur in a translation when it is syntactically or semantically expanded and made longer than the original text in lexical components. Justifiable expansions are sometimes required in the translation in order to produce dynamic or functional equivalence in the receptor language. But this does not mean that the translator is allowed to make the translation longer than the original text in any way he likes, as adding any information which is not implicit in the source-language text will expand the translation with some unjustifiable redundancy. Therefore, the aim of expansion or making the translation longer is to make it understandable to the potential readers, and this should be done when needed, that is, when it prevents ambiguity, unintelligibility and unnaturalness. Making the translation longer in order to make it comprehensible is like what a python does in order to be able to swallow his unswallowable prey. As Nida and Taber (1969:165) quote an African man, justifiable expansion in translation is like "what a python does when he kills an animal he cannot swallow . He coils his body around the animal, crushes it , and thus squeezes it out long and thin . Then he can

there will be information which is implicit; that is , it is not stated in an explicit form in the text itself."

To make implicit information explicit , a translator may expand the equivalent in the target language , but he should be careful not to apply unnecessary or illegitimate expansions , as "unnecessary explicit information may also give rise to obscurity, ambiguity, or excessive redundancy" (Beekman and Callow, 1989 : 66) . According to Abdul-Raof (2001: 15) , "unlike Qur'an translations , the modern Bible translations generally adopt a communicative , free strategy and are therefore audience-oriented." In such translations the focus is on producing an intelligible text in a natural language . Nida (1964: 166) Proposes dynamic-equivalence translation and describes it as " the closest natural equivalent to the source-language message." According to Nida (ibid.) , a translation " must clearly reflect the meaning and intent of the source ." Therefore, a translation must aim at intelligibility of the meaning , naturalness of expression, and accuracy of the information . To attain this aim , one may sometimes be obliged to use expansion and make explicit some information left implicit in the source text , or employ reduction by simplification of some redundancies.

translations, the achievement of strict functional equivalence is, in fact, impossible." According to House, even in covert translations functional equivalence is not so easy to be achieved because of differences in the sociocultural norms of the two languages.

Implicit and Explicit Information

In some languages it is natural to leave certain information implicit, while in others such information should be made explicit when an intelligible and natural text is to be produced. For example , in translating from Greek into English some of the implicit information should be expressed in explicit form , as according to Beekman and Callow (1989: 47) "leaving the implicit information of the original implicit in the RL version can mislead the readers of the RL version and cause them to misunderstand the original message. "Therefore, to avoid misunderstanding, obscurity, and awkwardness in the translated text , one is sometimes obliged to express explicitly some information left implicit in the original text. Larson (1984: 38) argues that "in every communication , some information which is being communicated is left implicit in conversation or written text... In every text that one may want to translate,

that the recipients of the translation will be able to understand the message with ease. The function of the translation in the target language should be equal to that of the original text in the source language . This 'functional equivalence' is almost that which is called 'dynamic equivalence' by Nida and Taber (1969: 24) . As Beekman and Callow explain, "the naturalness of the translation and the ease with which it is understood should be comparable to the naturalness of the original and to the ease with which the recipients of the original documents understood them. "(p.34)

A translation , as House (1981) puts it ,can be labelled as 'covert translation' or 'overt translation' regarding the degree of its naturalness in the receptor language. Covert translation is that which reads not like a translation, but like an original ,i.e., it is so natural that its being a translation is concealed by the naturalness of the language . Overt translation is that which appears to be a translation. Natural equivalence, dynamic equivalence or functional equivalence can be produced in covert translations . Ernst-August Gutt (1993: 46) , quoting House (1981: 204-5) , says: "... it is only in cases of covert translations that it is in fact possible to achieve functional equivalence, ... In the case of overt

equivalence to the original ." However, according to Hatim and Mason (1993:6) pragmatic equivalence is frequently at variance with referential equivalence.

A translation must be intelligible and acceptable to the potential readers; so the message must be conveyed in an equivalence which is actually used in the receptor language . Nida and Taber (1969: 163) say that "there should not be anything in the translation itself which is stylistically awkward, structurally burdensome, linguistically unnatural , and semantically misleading or incomprehensible , unless, of course, the message in the source language has these characteristics (the task of the translator is to produce the closest natural equivalent , not to edit or to rewrite) But to judge these qualities one must look to the potential users."

According to J. Beekman and J. Callow (1989: 33) , in a faithful translation the linguistic form should be natural and the message should be meaningful , i. e., there should be fidelity to both the meaning and the dynamics of the original . As they say, "a translation which transfers the meaning and the dynamics of the original text is to be regarded as faithful translation."(ibid.).By the expression 'the dynamics' they mean that the translation should make a natural use of the linguistic structures of the receptor language in such a way

say, its 'faithfulness to the original' as determined by the extent to which people really comprehend the meaning), (2) the ease of comprehension, (3) the involvement a person experiences as the result of the adequacy of the form of the translation.

Testing a translation should cover all possible problems. According to Nida and Taber (ibid: 163) , to test a translation "one must focus attention not upon the extent of verbal correspondence but upon the amount of dynamic equivalence. This means that testing the translation does not consist in merely comparing texts to see the extent of verbal consistency or conformity (translators can be consistently wrong as well as consistently right) , but in determining how the potential receptors of a translation react to it." They maintain that "dynamic equivalence has priority over formal correspondence." So, a translator may be consistently wrong ,i.e., he may reproduce a dynamic equivalence in the target language without a formal correspondence. He may also be consistently right, i.e., he may, if the meaning is not distorted, have a literal translation, which is mostly distinguished from word-for-word translation. As Newmark (1988: 68-69) points out, "literal translation is correct and must not be avoided , if it secures referential and pragmatic

process should include a careful comparison of the translation with the original text to see whether any additions, deletions, or change of information have crept in .

Larson also suggests another way for testing a translation, and it is back-translating , which should be done by a person who knows the two languages and has not already read the original text:

A second way to check a translation is by having someone else, who is bilingual in the source and receptor languages, make a back-translation of the translated text into the source language ... It is literal rendering of the translation to be used for checking purposes ...Translating and back-translating are very different. In translating , one uses natural and clear forms; in back-translating, literal forms are used in order to show up the structure of the translation being back-translated. (p.490)

The evaluation criteria Proposed proposed by Larson are very similar to those suggested by some other translation scholars. Nida, E.A. and C.R. Taber (1969:173) have suggested a similar method:

The ultimate test of a translation must be based upon three major factors: (1) the correctness with which the receptors understand the message of the original (that is to

linguistic norms of the target language with the aim of making the translation intelligible in meaning and normal in style, provided that neither intelligibility nor normality makes the translation inaccurate in comparison with the original text. In evaluating any translation of the Qur'an , the criterion is the original text . Although clarity , intelligibility , and naturalness all are important in a translation , they are not considered as decisive factors in making a sound judgement about the level of accuracy and adequacy. It is only comparing the translated text with the original that can clarify the level of accuracy and adequacy in a translation .

Translation Evaluation

As Mildred L. Larson (1984: 49) points out , the purpose of translation evaluation is threefold: accuracy, clearness and naturalness. He proposes the following three questions to be answered regarding the evaluation of a translation: 1) Does the translation communicate the same meaning as the source language? 2) Does the audience for whom the translation is intended understand it clearly? and 3) Is the form of the translation easy to read and natural receptor language grammar and style? The evaluation

content and the container both are Divine and inseparable from one another . No translation of the Qur'an can take the place of the original Arabic text , as any rendering is a target text constructed by man , and as such , impossible to be a substitute for the unchallengeable divinely revealed Word of Allah. According to H. Abdul-Raof(2001: 9-10), "for a sacred and highly sensitive text like the Qur'an , the translation , magnum opus or otherwise , cannot escape the trap of exegetical inaccuracies. A translated Qur'an , will, of course , have new structural, textural and rhetorical features ad hoc to the target language." Regarding the naturalness of language in the translated text, Abdul-Raof (ibid.: 10) quotes Keenman (1978:157) as saying : "The nature of natural language is such that we do not expect perfect translatability between languages to hold ."

Adjustments are inevitable in translation , so to preserve the meaning one must often change the form of the original . As Beekman and Callow (1989:33) state , "preserving the linguistic form of the original in a translation often results in wrong and obscure meaning." However, no kind of adjustment is considered legitimate when it brings about distortion of the meaning. Therefore, a translator is allowed to apply adjustments according to the

be a translation that is so rich in vocabulary , so idiomatic in phrase, so correct in construction , so smooth in flow of thought , so clear in meaning, and so elegant in style , that it does not appear to be a translation at all , and yet , at the same time , faithfully transmits the message of the original." (ibid)

To produce a clear and natural target text , one needs to make some semantic and structural adjustments in the process of transfer, as each language has its own linguistic characteristics that sound unnatural in other languages . Therefore, the linguistic features of the source text should often be transformed and adjusted to the norms of the receptor language . However, accuracy is of prime importance in religious translations. A translation may be intelligible in its meaning and normal in its style , but not accurate in conveying the message of the original , and that is why the keystone for evaluating a translation , especially that of a religious text, is the original text . Thus, in making any adjustment one must be very careful so that he may not misrepresent the meaning for the sake of intelligibility and naturalness.

The Holy Qur'an , the very Word of Allah, is matchless and inimitable in both its meaning and style. The

unnatural . What on should do is to produce a translation natural in language, intelligible and accurate in meaning .

Key Words: adjustment , expansion, reduction , divinely revealed, the very Word of Allah .

Introduction

The aim of any translator should be producing a translation which is intelligible and accurate in communicating the content of the original message, and natural in its language. Ignoring any of these factors will most probably result in a target text which is obscure and awkward , and sounds like a translation , not like an original text in the receptor language. This point is of vital significance in translating religious texts, as unintelligibility, obscurity, and unnaturalness of a text will cause many of its readers to lose their interest in it and stop reading it . As regards Bible translation , J . Beekman and J. Callow (1989:32) maintain that one is not going to pay any serious attention to a translation of the Bible that is often unintelligible and sounds foreign in many respects. These authors believe that a Bible translator should aim at producing a clear and natural target text: "The goal should

Expansion and Reduction
In English Translations of the Qur'an

Salar Manafi Anari, Ph.D.*

Abstract

The modern dominant approach to translation is that which aims at intelligibility of the meaning and normality of the style in the translated text. Many translation theorists maintain that a translator should attempt to produce a target text which is clear and understandable in meaning, normal in style , and natural in language. To attain this goal , one is allowed , and sometimes obliged , to make some adjustments such as expansion and reduction in the process of transfer according to the linguistic norms of the receptor language . However, in translating a highly sensitive religious text like the Qur'an , the accuracy of the meaning conveyed in the translated text is of primary importance, since it is the source text which is considered as the main criterion in evaluating the translation . Therefore, no translator is allowed to sacrifice accuracy of the meaning for the sake of intelligibility and naturalness in the translation, nor is it legitimate to make the meaning unintelligible or distorted by producing a target text which is awkward and

---

*** Allamah Tabataba'i University