Ideology and the Language of Translation

Tariq Elhadary
Scholarships Office/ Ministry of Presidential Affairs/ UAE

Abstract: *The paper is constructed in a way that the impact of ideology or ideologies on translation of the meaning of the Qur'an has been studied from both the translatological and the theological retrospective. The discussion in this paper lends itself to a tripod of linguistic, cognitive, and cultural rules. In addition, different cases have been exemplified from different English translations of the meaning of the Qur'an wherever is relevant and needed.*

1. Introduction

The choice of a certain text for translation purposes carry in itself a queue of questions as to the real motivating reasons beyond translating that particular text. For the sake of argument, the discussion deals with the circumstances and the event of the text translation. From this prospective, the projection of the translator's own interests, beliefs and dogmas is considered an extratextual factor of his ideology. This extratextual factor can express itself in many different ways e.g. in the introduction to the work, where the translator states his own objectives of translating the text or in the comments (imprints, preface, epilogue, footnotes or endnotes, etc.) which can be found in some translations of the Qur'an and help bring the ideology to the fore. The personal beliefs of the translator affect drastically both the style and the content of the translation. Besides, the intratextual factor shows itself within the text lexically, grammatically, etc.

Schäffner Chrsitina (2003:23) holds that "The relationship between ideology and translation is multifarious. In a sense, it can be said that any translation is ideological since the choice of a source text and the use to which the subsequent target is put is determined by the interests, aims, and objectives of social agents. But ideological aspects can also be determined within a text itself, both at the lexical level (reflected for example, in the deliberate use choice or avoidance of a particular word) and the grammatical level (for example, use of passive structures to avoid an expression of agency)." Suffice it here to say that investigating the ideology in translation almost always reveals the tension and friction with the Other. More surprisingly, transgression and aggression amounts to the limit of negating the existence of the Other to establish specific ideas and achieve assigned goals. In this connection, Van Dijk (1998:2) proposes that "Few of 'us' (in the West or elsewhere) describe our own belief systems or convictions as 'ideologies'. On the contrary, Ours is the Truth, Theirs is the Ideology." It should be taken into consideration that translating the Qur'an is not only translating just another religious text, but it is indeed a translation of the Qur'anic culture as well and this doubles the burden and responsibility of those who bear the challenge to translate. In this regard, and in Homi K. Bhabha's words, (1994:27) 'Cultural translation is not simply appropriation or adaptation; it is a process through which cultures are required to revise their own systems and values, by departing from their habitual or "inbred" rules of transformation. Ambivalence and antagonism accompany any act of cultural translation, because negotiating with the "difference of the other" reveals the radical insufficiency of our systems of meaning and signification."

2. Ideology

Plamenatz (1970:15) defines ideology as "a set of closely related beliefs or ideas, or even attitudes, characteristic of a group or community." He (ibid: 144) holds that man is an ideological

animal and is not less natural when compared with man, the pursuer of interests. He further ascertains (ibid.144) that "The exploitation of ideology for political purposes is difficult and precarious. It is a game that hardly anyone plays successfully for long." Whereas Dant (1991: 6) points out that ideology is "the general determinative relationship between the social and material conditions of existence and the abstract relations construed in knowledge." On the other hand Plamentaz (1970: 75) observes that "Ideology is overtly descriptive and explanatory. Sets of beliefs or theories that are ideological purport to tell us how things are or were, how they come or came to be so. Rules and standards are not, in themselves, ideological, nor are value judgments. Nor, of course, are requests or commands, nor expressions of mood or feeling. Art, merely as such, is not ideological. Ideology is primarily 'persuasive' and is only, if I may so put it, secondarily 'prescriptive'. In that respect, it is like a fable by Aesop or La Fontaine; it is, on the face of it, a tale, though a tale that points a moral. If there were only the moral and not the tale, there would be no ideology; and it is always the tale that is put into words, and not always the moral. Besides, the teller of the tale may not wish to point the moral. What makes the tale ideological is that his audience, consciously or unconsciously, draws a moral from it."

Naess (1956:148) confirms that Destatt de Tracy introduced the term 'ideology' in 1796 as a philosophical and anthropological term. Nevertheless, Destatt's main interest was the 'science of ideas' which, as Dant (1991:57) holds, "sought the origin of ideas in human sensations." The main concern of 'ideology' was true and false knowledge, but to put things so starkly is to mention here that 'knowledge' is an elusive term. In other words if the knowledge the other party has matches mine then the situation is normal , however, things change when the rate of matching differ. Thus it appears that the same knowledge becomes 'ideological' when it intersects with people's interests. It will immediately be clear that 'knowledge' by definition is closely related with the thought, presupposition and epistemology. But to put things so starkly is to elaborate the most important issue raised by Marx when he materializes the term 'ideology' and uproots it from its psychological background. In fact there has been much elaboration in the literature about the social and economic relations influencing knowledge. In this context, Marx and Engels (1974:51) hold, "Language is as old as consciousness, language is practical consciousness that exists also for other men, and for that reason alone it really exists for me personally as well, language like consciousness, only arises from the need, the necessity of intercourse with other men."

It is important to remember what Dant (1991:28) claims that the limits of a Hegelian account of ideology in the writings of Marx and especially Lukacs, as well as the limits of a reductionist account, were the starting points for both Habermas (1974) and Althusser (1971) in their investigation of ideology. They both propose the concept that ideology is just an illusion and classify it as false knowledge. It so appears that the term 'ideology' has seen a lot of contradictions, though Larrain (1979:46) believes that "Ideology is, therefore, a solution in the mind to contradictions which cannot be solved in practice, it is the necessary projection in consciousness of man's practical inabilities." Habermas (1974:12) has raised the notion 'blocks in communication' that interferes and vehemently impedes the 'verbal and non verbal forms of expression' and the same issue applies to 'communication and discourse'. Whereas Althusser declares the epistemological break with ideology: "While speaking in ideology and from within ideology we have to outline a discourse which tries to break with ideology in order to dare to be the beginning of a scientific discourse on ideology" (Althusser 1971:162). A lot has been said in the literature of ideology about a combination of dichotomies, for instance, 'science and ideology', 'power and ideology', 'knowledge and power', 'language and ideology', 'truth and falsity', 'language and consciousness', 'ideology and false consciousness', 'ideology and class consciousness', 'ideology and communication', 'ideology and resistance', etc. The multitude of richness in the term 'ideology' provokes Naess (1956:141) to state, "The term ideology enjoys considerable popularity. It is one of the key terms in political and cultural discussion. Very little criticism is directed against its use. It is seldom charged with ambiguity, vagueness, looseness or similar properties, which is often the case with other popular terms."

It will help if a definition of the category of ideology used in the study is stated right from the start. What is meant by ideology in this connection, then, is the concepts, beliefs, dogmas, presuppositions and sentiments which originate from the social, political, contextual history of a particular individual, class, group, or certain culture and represent themselves through a certain medium. (This definition is built from Naess (1956), Dant (1991) and Khashim, M.A. (1984))

In fact the notion of ideology has almost always been a source of inspiration for thinkers and authors throughout the course of history. One of the images which is unmistakable is that of Naess (1956:06) when he affirms that "The ideology research must cultivate the same sort of objectivity as the chemist. To the chemist such things as mercaptans – sulphur-containing organic compounds – which have an exceedingly bad odour are chemically as interesting as some with a delightful smell. The chemist cannot afford to replace exact description of mercaptans by denunciation of their bad odour."

It is at this point that the implications which the term 'ideology' has in the Arabic Language should be brought to the forefront of this study. Most of the reference books and encyclopedias which have been consulted rely basically on foreign references and provide an Arabic translation of the term as it is used in the English resources. However, in the Global Arabic Encyclopedia, 'ideology' means an approach in (tafkir) thought based on the related assumptions, and explanation of social political movements. Whereas in Encyclopedia of Psychology and Psycho-analysis, it is a general philosophy of a certain class which it holds for a certain time and exploits it to provoke reactions from its advocates. In al Munjid fîl-lugha wal-iᶜlam (an Arabic Dictionary, 1998) the art of searching the (tasawurat and afkar) concepts and ideas, an approach considers the ideas themselves irrespective of its metaphysical counterpart. Khashim, M.A. (1984) in Mawsuᶜat ᶜilm as-siyasah (The Encyclopedia of Politics) defines 'ideology' as a group of ideas reflecting the hopes and social needs of an individual, class, group, or certain culture. Or a group of ideas which reflect an ideal social system and a certain way of living; types of beliefs and concepts related to presenting, organizing, understanding, justifying techniques and activities employed by the political body on one hand, and directing severe criticism to the Other, on the other hand. Thus it appears that the Arabic definition of 'ideology' is not that different from the English definition. This is because the term is not originally an Arabic term and consequently it carries the same weight it bears in the literature of 'ideology'.

Despite the huge issued works on language so far, language has always been and will be for generations to come a source of constant investigation and consistent exploration. That is because language is an open system and it is flexible as to whatever new things people can add. Bickerton Derek (1996:9) argues that "If one envisages language as no more than a skill used to express and communicate the product of human thought, it becomes ispo facto impossible to regard language as the Rubicon that divides us from other species." It has to be admitted here that language is akin to humanity and so is the case with ideology. More surprisingly still, language and ideology is both so inextricably entangled that it is a strenuous work to attempt finding a clear line of disembarkation between the two entities. For the sake of completeness, Sandikcioglu Esra (2001:186) has emphasized that "there is neither language without ideology nor is there ideology without language. Above all, both language and ideology are culturally embedded." In the same vein Fairclough (1989:2) claims "that the exercise of power, in modern society, is increasingly achieved through ideology, and particularly through the ideological workings of language".

It will be immediately clear that while processing texts, translators tend to melt away their own cultural stands, name it, beliefs, ideas, knowledge and attitudes etc., into their production whatever goodwill or impartial intention they might have. It is suffice to say here that it is logical to assume that the translator, almost unconsciously, is going to take sides eventually. Hatim& Mason (1990:13) asserts that "To study translations in isolation from the factors affecting their production is consequently to miss out an important dimension of the phenomenon.

In fact, the social context of translating is probably a more important variable than the textual genre …"

2.1 Textual Profiles and Social Context

Language and consequently ideology relay part of their identities to the social theory. In this connection, it has to be noted that language is a social being. Inevitably, studying translation away from its social setting is almost always difficult. Plamentaz (1970:91) holds that "Since man is a social being, his conception of himself is revealed in his conception of the society in which he has his being." What is needed then is a study of translation which deals with the social horizon of text production and this by turn will ultimately shed illuminating lights on the ideology of the translation. In broad terms, Hodge& Kress (1979:1) states that "Language is given to the individual by the society in which he or she lives. It is a key instrument in socialization, and the means whereby society forms and permeates the individual's consciousness." Therefore, it will be looked with some detail at the social, political and historical contexts of the different translations in English of the Qur'an.

We must notice, fist of all, that ideology is overtly descriptive and explanatory. Sets of beliefs or theories that are ideological purport to tell us how things are or were, and how they come or came to be so. Rules and standards are not, in themselves, ideological, nor are value judgments. Nor, of course, are requests and commands, nor expressions of mood or feeling. Art, merely as such, is not ideological. Ideology is primarily 'persuasive' and is only, if I may so put it, secondarily 'prescriptive'-making or giving directions-. In that respect, it is like a tale, though a tale that points a moral. If there were only the moral and not the tale, there would be no ideology; and it is always the tale that is put into words, and not always the moral. Besides, the teller of the tale may not wish to point a moral. What makes the tale ideological is that his audience, consciously or unconsciously, draws a moral from it.

In fact, the place in which the translation sees the light of the day plays a critical role in deciding the final outlook of the translation, along with other factors, obviously. The argument is structured to allow for space the discussion of the social background of the circumstances that led to each respective translation: al Hilali and Khan's, Dawood's, Yousif Ali's. Pickthal's, Aarbary's and Richard Bell's.

Al Hilali and Khan's biography shows the traces of main stream Islam lurking behind their translation of the meanings of the Qur'an. It is worth noting here that the translation took place in Saudi Arabia in which the translators had worked more than 16 years. Here, the place as a prominent factor, decides the social background of the event and gets infected with the prevailing trends which govern the place. It is a fact of life that the Saudis hold a strict stand which harbours the main stream Islam, consequently the translation almost always complies with and represents this trend. It should go without saying that the translators have adopted a way of translating in which they use parentheses to indicate the interpolation. Examples abound. Q2:2 helps put the threads together:

(Thalika alkitabu la rayba fihi hudaan lilmuttaqin) (Q.2:2)

This is the Book (the Qur'an), whereof there is no doubt, a guidance to those who are *Al-Muttaqun* [the pious believers of Islamic Monothesim who fear Allah much (abstain From all kinds of sins and evil deeds which He has forbidden) and love Allah much (perform all kinds of good deeds which He has ordained)]. (Q.2:2)

In this connection, it has been observed that the interpolation implemented here serves many a good reasons. First of all, the translators intend to direct their readers towards their understanding of the text which ultimately represents their ideology. Secondly, their understanding which appears in the text goes back to the social bearing al Hilali and Khan hold. It will be immediately clear when the translation of the same *aya* is investigated in other different translations. In Yusuf Ali's, for instance, it is translated as:

This is the Book; in it is guidance sure, without doubt, to those who fear Allah; (Q.2:2)

Whereas in Arberry's:

This is the Book, wherein is no doubt, a guidance to the godfearing …(Q.2:2)

On the other hand, it is translated in Pickthall's as follows:

This is the Scripture wherein there is no doubt, a guidance unto those who ward off (evil); (Q.2:2)

While in Richard Bell's it says:

That is the Book, in which there is no doubt, guidance for those who act piously. (Q.2:2)

It is agreed that language depicts the life time of people socially, politically and as a matter of course ideologically. Language works as a core of anyone's life as it is the means of communication with the other in order to achieve particular personal and/or social goals. Hawkins Bruce (2001:5) ascertains that "As with language, human beings interact with ideology on a daily basis without stopping to think about it. Furthermore, ideology tends to become the focus of human attention only in problematic situations. In the case of ideology, these problems are often a matter of tensions that arise with people working from different ideological systems disagree in their perceptions of and behaviours toward particular experiences." What goes on in the translator's black box when he chooses his words is what colours his objectives beyond his work. In addition, He almost always keeps in mind the target audience for whom he conveys his message.

The projection of the text the way it is presented in al Hilai and Khan's translation renders the hidden, unconscious part of their ideology, namely they drive the readers to certain ends. They assign their understanding to existing terms. Hodge& Kress (1979:1) holds that "Language is one of man's most remarkable attributes. It is an absolute precondition for nearly all our social life, and it is the medium in which most organized thought and communication proceed. So the study of language, linguistics, ought to be an acknowledged part of any human education designed to lead to an understanding of one's self and one's world. To meet this challenge, linguistics needs to have been an ambitiously wide scope. It must be virtually concerned with the relation between language and mind, since language is only interesting when we see it as a living process. For all humans, language and thought are inextricably bound together. But linguistics must be equally concerned with the relation between society and language, since language is so distinctly a social phenomenon." Suffice it here to say that language is the tool any society utilizes to express its ideology. It is logical to say that the translator, almost unconsciously, is going to take sides. In this connection, the partiality of the translator protruding out daringly expresses the society in which he breathes. An investigation of (Q.3:43) is a supportive example:

(Ya Maryamu aqnuti lirabbiki wa asjudi wa arka^{c}i ma^{c}a arraki^{c}in) (Q.3: 43)

Pickthall: "O Mary ! Be obedient to thy Lord, prostrate thyself and bow with those who bow (in worship)." (Q.3:43)

Yusuf Ali: "O Mary! Worship Thy Lord devoutly: prostrate thyself, and bow down (in prayer) with those who bow down." (Q.3:43)

Whereas it is translated differently and part of it has been exposed to omission in Arberry's:

Arberry: "Mary, be obedient to thy Lord, prostrating and bowing before Him." (Q.3:43)

Dawood: "Mary, be obedient to your Lord; bow down and worship with the worshippers." (Q.3:43)

al Hilali& Khan: "O Mary! 'Submit yourself with obedience to your Lord (Allah , by worshipping none but Him Alone) and prostrate yourself, and *irka^{c}i* (bow down) along with *ar-raki^{c}in* (those who bow down).' " (Q.3:43)

Richard Bell: "O Mary, be obedient to thy Lord, prostrate thyself and bow with those who bow." (Q.3:43)

It should be abundantly clear by now that what made Arberry omit the part (and bow down with those who bow down) is obviously ideological. This event makes sense when Hodge and Kress (1979:22) state that "Reducing the complexity of an argument and limiting the terms which it can contain is a drastic intervention. Showing less means someone else seeing less. And seeing less means thinking less." The current situation is sustained by Hodge& Kress (1979:78)

when they made a sort of declaration that "Whatever the rational, the basis is clearly ideological, a projection of social relationship onto a world of objects." So to speak all ideologies seem apparently different in style but what almost always remains the same are the underlying characteristics and functions. There appears to be some situations in which a translator works against his beliefs and interests and the consequence is apparently ideological. Beeby *et al* (1988:7-8) hold "… a translator has a further factor that often influences his or her work, namely, the degree to which a translator can identify with the evident value system of the original author. Professional translators are often called upon to translate texts that are contrary to the translator's set of values and word view. The capacity to do justice to something which seems so culturally abhorrent demands a degree of objectivity beyond the power of many translations."

More confirmingly still, the picture Pickthall (1997:forward) paints for the translator of Scripture holds that ideology runs under any work of translation, he claims that "… no Scripture can be fairly presented by one who disbelieves its inspiration and its message; …" Pickthall states squarely clearly his ideology, the ideology of a Muslim who believes that Qur'an is the verbatim word of Allah when he maintains (ibid. forward) that "… every effort has been made to choose befitting language. But the result is not the glorious Qur'an, that inimitable symphony, the very sounds of which move men to tears and ecstasy." Abdul-Raof (2001:1) emphasizes that "The translation of the Qur'an remains in limbo for the word of God cannot be reproduced by the word of man." However, other translators of the Qur'an have different stands, Dawood, for instance, (2003: 3) holds that "It is acknowledged that the Qur'an is not only one of the most influential books of prophetic literature but also a literary masterpiece in its own right." Whereas right from the start, in al Hilali and Khan's, it is declared that the Qur'an is a miracle from Allah to Prophet Muhammad:

(Wa ma kana hatha al Qur'anu an yuftara min duni allahi wa lakin tasdiqa allathi bayna yadayhi wa tafsila alkitabi la rayba fihi min rabbi al ᶜalamin) (Q.10:37)

" And this Qur'an is not such as could ever be produced by other than Allah (Lord of the heavens and the earth), but it is a confirmation of (the revelation) which was before it [i.e. the Taurat (Torah), and the Injeel (Gospel)], and a full explanation of the Book (i.e. laws, decreed for mankind) – wherein there is no doubt – from the lord of the '*alamin* (mankind, jinn, and all that exists)." (Q.10:37)

Followed from this a hadith (the sayings, deeds and approvals accurately narrated from the Prophet) narrated by Abu Huraira:

Narrated Abu Huraira: The Prophet said, "There was no Prophet among the Prophets but was given miracles because of which people had belief, but what I have been given is the Divine Revelation which Allah has revealed to me. So I hope that my followers will be more than those of any other Prophet on the Day of Resurrection." (Hadith No. 370, Vol. No.9, *Sahih al-Bukhari*)

The case in point shows how the translator can be so fussy sometimes as to convey to the readers an unambiguous message by resorting to so many devices, name a few, footnotes, inner footnotes in order to make the translation as informative as possible. Moreover, in seemingly ambiguous situations they have to refer to Qur'an exegetes so as to clear the issue. It is crystal clear that al Hilali and Khan almost always follow form. If Q.10:37) is taken into investigation, just for the sake of argument, it shows the story quite sparkly. It is justified then to elaborate more how it is translated in the following:

Pickthall: And this Qur'an is not such as could ever be invented despite of Allah; but it is a confirmation of that which was before it and an exposition of that which is decreed for mankind – Therein is no doubt – from the Lord of the Worlds.

Yusuf Ali: This Qur'an is not such as can be produced by other than Allah; on the contrary, it is a confirmation of (revelation) that went before it, and a fuller explanation of the Book – wherein there is no doubt – from the Lord of the Worlds.

Dawood: This Qur'an could not have been devised by any but God. It confirms what was revealed before it and fully explains the Scriptures. It is beyond doubt from the Lord of the Universe.

Arberry: This Qur'an could not have been forged apart from God; but it is a confirmation of what is before it, and a distinguishing of the book, wherein is no doubt, from the Lord of all Being.

Bell: This Qur'an is not such as to have been invented apart from Allah; but it is a confirmation of what is before it, and a distinct setting forth of the Book in which there is no doubt, from the Lord of the worlds.

It has been admitted as Jansen holds (1974:55) that "The Qur'an is a difficult book. Its language has always troubled people who attempted to understand it." That is why translators tend to make their translation more informative, though this could lead to a source-centered translation but in translating the Qur'an it is noticed that strict adherence to the text is really accommodating as in all the cases it is not without good reasons.

There is a final issue that often causes confusion amongst scholars; that is the limit of intervention from the part of the translator. It is a truism that translation is not at all times a sort of betrayal but in fact as Harvey keith (2003:45) conceives that "A translation has the potential to reveal (and should be probed for) challenges, transgressions, contradictions and fissures, (weaknesses) all of which are outcomes of the interaction between, on the one hand, an underlying systematic configuration of values and assumptions and on the other, the irruption of alterity within a domestic sphere." Translation is a projection of the self on the production of the others. Steiner George (1992:317) conceptualizes translation as "a mirror which not only reflects but also generates light"; however, this light doesn't always have a safe journey home. More surprisingly, instead of guiding, the light sometimes misleads. Nevertheless, Harvey Keith (2003: 46) considers translation "As not merely the outcome of established determinations, manipulations in the receiving socio-cultural system but as an event opening up the possibility (however minor) of ideological innovation." In this connection, Bobzin (1993:193) states that "the refutation of the Qur'an as the logical basis for any successful missionary efforts towards Muslim people became from the very beginnings of Western Christian interest in the Islam, the principal impetus for any attempt at translation."

If the translation of Richard Bell is to be taken as a case in point, there are immediately a group of issues which should be raised. First, he (1937: VI) believes that Muhammad has written the Qur'an himself, "The translation goes frankly on the assumption that the Qur'an was in written form when the redactors started their work, whether actually written by Muhammad himself, as I personally believe, or by others at his dictation." Secondly, he has carried out his own transformation of the order of the Qur'an and that does not at its best benefit the readers or even incite them to understand. On the contrary, the readers almost spend quite sometime to find where the location of a certain *ayah* (verse) is, because it does not carry the same number as the original. Richard Bell (1953:82) proposes in *Introduction to the* Qur'an that he has doubts as to the compilation and collecting of the Qur'an which leaves its impact on his translation of the Qur'an. He personally believes (ibid.83) that "… the most conclusive proof of the Prophet's part in the compiling of the *suras* (chapters) comes from a detailed study of their structure, which discloses evidences of revisions and alterations such as could hardly been made without his authority, …" Robinson Neal (1996, 2003:85) comments on what Bell has tried to do with the Qur'an and added that Bell "…thought that Muhammad made frequent emendations to his material. Hence the redactors, who edited the Qur'an after his death, had to cope with corrections, interlinear additions, additions on the margin, deletions and substitutions." From a different prospective, Wild Stephen (1996:137) has an alternative argument that "In Islam, God's word becomes text, a text to be recited in Arabic and to be read as an Arabic book. One can go even further and compare the Christian dogma that Christ was born of the Virgin Mary with the Muslim concept of the '*ummiyya* of the Prophet Muhammad. There was no human father for

Jesus, and there was no written text taken down by man which might have influenced the Prophet Muhammad."

Next, according to QCM[1] the Qur'an is the word of Allah and consequently its order goes back to the way it is revealed to Prophet Muhammad By Gabriel. Just for the sake of illustration, it is worthy to investigate (Q.75:16-18)

(La tuḥarrik bihi lisanka litaᶜjala bih) ('Inna ᶜalayna jamᶜahu wa qur'anah) (Fa'itha qar'anahu fa'attabiᶜ qur'anah) (Q. 75: 16-18)

 "Move not your tongue concerning (the Qur'an, O Muhammad) to make haste therewith. It is for Us to collect it and to give you (O Muhammad) the ability to recite it (the Qur'an). And when We have recited it to you [O Muhammed through Jibril (Gabriel), then follow its (the Qur'an's) recital."

It is illuminatingly clear now why the Qur'an is a difficult text because according to the Qur'anic Cognitive Model (QCM) it is the word of Allah , consequently any change to the original order whatsoever is not accepted at all and considered as an ideological hazard. Thus, it opens up the argument for the reasons and motives beyond such a drastic change and leaves the room for suspicion whether overtly or covertly. To conclude, it is worthy to mention what Lakoff has argued in an interview with De Oliveira (2001:34) "As for ideologies, ideologies tell you what is right and wrong and hence are comprised to a considerable extent by moral conceptual systems. Moral systems do not arise from ideologies; they are part of what constitutes ideologies."

2.2 Textual manifestation of linguistic structures and ideologies

At this preliminary juncture, it is important to state what a text is. According to Halliday and Hassan (1976:2) "A text is best regarded as a semantic unit: a unit not of form but of meaning. Thus it is related to a clause or sentence not by size but by realization, the coding of one symbolic system in another." To elaborate the issue a bit further, it is understood that a text is realized by means of cohesion without which it is not an integrated whole, in other words, it loses its unity. So cohesion as Halliday and Hasaan (ibid.4) hold "occurs where the interpretation of some element in the discourse is dependent on that of another. The one presupposes the other, in the sense that it cannot be effectively decoded except by recourse to it." However, Abdul-Raof (2001:106) argues that in case of the Qur'anic text, "Linguistic constituents of texture are not the sole cohesive elements which contribute to the hanging together or the totality of a given text." Abdul-Raof (ibid.106) emphasizes that "Rhetorical elements of texture can equally be regarded as cohesive constituents that contribute positively to the realization of an overall effective texture of sensitive texts like the Qur'an where linguistic and rhetorical features embrace each other." However, the whole work should be evaluated from the point of view of the translator's purposes. Hatim and Mason (1990:190) "have identified the text as the structural unit which informs translator's decision about lexical, syntactic and other choices. In doing so, we have stressed the importance of rhetorical purpose as the basis of the evolution of text type. It is crucial that rhetorical purpose (and the lower-level rhetorical functions which contribute to it) should be identified. The appropriateness of translation can be judged in the light of these considerations. The whole matter of structural modifications and the degree, to which they are permitted, needs to be considered with the text producer's purpose in mind."

Reviewing the translations under discussion, it is observed that the Qur'anic linguistic and rhetorical features are not always met in the same grandeur as such the way it is dealt with in the Qur'an. In Bell's for instance,

---

[1] According to Elhadary T. (2009:69) Qur'anic Cognitive Model (QCM) is a 'frame' which refers to a knowledge structure or structured set of elements drawn from the Qur'an conceptual domains and consisting of encyclopedic knowledge associated with the Qur'an linguistic form."

(Wa ma qadaru Allah ḥaqqa qadrihi ʾith qalu ma ʾanzala Allahu ᶜala basharin min shayʾ qul man ʾanzala alkitaba allathi jaʾa bihi Musa nuraan wa hudaan lilnnasi tajᶜalunahu qaratisa tubdunaha wa tukhfuna kathiraan wa ᶜullimtum ma lam taᶜlamu antum wa la ʾaba ʾuukum quli Allahu thumma tharhum fi khawdihim yalᶜabun) (Q. 6: 91)

"They have not estimated the power of Allah aright, when they said: "Allah hath sent down anything to a human being"; say (thou): "Who sent down the Book which Moses brought as a light and guidance to the people,   ye make it parchments (……………………………………………..………………..) Which ye show while concealing much─and ye have been taught what ye did not know, neither ye nor your father?" Say: "Allâh," and leave them in their discussion playing about." (Q:6:91)

It is worth noting here that the glamour and grandeur of the Qur'anic linguistic and rhetorical features is not realized in this translation. The reader observes the gaps and spaces left intentionally by Bell to show the unsurely impact of the translation, through the apparently missing cohesiveness. Bell (1934:112) declares in the introduction to the translation of Q: VI that "This surah is very confused … Verse 91 seems to be early Medinan, though it might possibly be Meccan; it has been done at the same time as the revelation of the preceding passage, and the insertion of the following one, which must date from after the complete break with the Jews and the resolution to produce an independent Book." It should not go without saying that Bell's comment is ideological. More significantly still, he does not employ as most of the rest of the translators of the Qur'an the informative model of translation. The informative model of translation means giving the reader all information possible to make a sensible understanding of the Qur'an by so many ways and devices, name a few, interpolation, footnotes, endnotes, etc. Taken together and in contrast with Bell's translation, it is observed that the cohesion is maintained in the rest of the translations.

Mannheim states (1943: 89) "By ideologies we understand those interpretations of situations which are not the outcome of concrete experience but are a kind of distorted knowledge of them, and which serve to cover up the real situation and work upon the individual like a compulsion."

Pickthall:

"And they measure not the power of Allah its true measurement when they say: Allah hath naught revealed unto a human being. Say (unto the Jews who speak thus): Who revealed the Book which Moses brought, a light and guidance for mankind, that ye have put on your parchments which ye show, but ye hide much (thereof), and by which ye were taught that which ye knew not yourselves nor (did) your fathers (know it)? Say: Allah. Then leave them to their play of caviling." (Q:6:91)

There is no doubt that the use of built-in-the- text interpolation helps make the reader understand the message Allah has meant to convey, according to QCM. It is noteworthy to mention that the tools of cohesion device used (*unto the Jews who speak thus – thereof – did know it*) facilitate to grasp the totality of the text. While in Bell's nothing is made to achieve the cohesiveness so the result is a disfigured text. Apparently, the misunderstanding is twofold.

For the sake of comparison, the employment of interpolation is quite noticeable in al Hilali and Khan's. Such an interpolation carries their ideology as well:

"They (the Jews, Quraish pagans, idolaters) did not estimate Allah with an estimation due to Him when they said: "Nothing did Allah send down to any human being (by revelation)." Say (O Muhammad): "Who then sent down the Book which Musa (Moses) brought, a light and guidance to mankind which you (the Jews) have made into (separate) paper sheets, disclosing (some of it) and concealing much. And you (believers in Allah and His messenger Muhammad) were taught (through the Qur'an) that which neither you nor your fathers knew." Say: "Allah (sent it down)." Then leave them to play in their vain discussions. (Q.6:91)

It is true then the text has become a complete whole, a complete unit of semantics due to its cohesion and its astound comprehensibility. Suffice it here to say that it is the ideological

orientation of the translators which makes all the difference in deciding the final version of the text and assisting in creating such discrepancies in the translations as it is investigated so far.

It will be immediately clear now that translation transfers the textuality of a source text into a textuality of a target text through a communication medium. Therefore, translation is so essential in making people understand the culture and the knowledge of one another. In this effect, Neubert and Shreve (1992:69) have the following to say, "The process of translation is a textual process that connects one knowledge system with another. The translator makes the connection by inserting linguistic indices in the target text. These indices give the L_2 reader access to the underlying knowledge structure of the author's original message. Translators must link L_1 frames and scenarios with corresponding L_2 frames and scenarios using the L_2 linguistic system. Results of this matching process have to be L_2 texts. The translation has to compete in the target text world as a natural example of an L_2 text, and it must exhibit all of the features which make it recognizable as a native text." It is at this point that the term textuality should come to the fore of the discussion. Thus it appears that textuality interweaves the text and makes its identity. Textuality is then, (ibid.:70) " the complex set of features that texts must have to be considered texts. Textuality is a property that a complex linguistic object assumes when it reflects certain social and communicative constraints. The operation of these constraints is manifested in recognizable linguistic patterns at the textual surface." It is important to remember that the textuality of a certain text is not always straightforwardly translatable into matching categories similar to that of the source text. It is for this reason that Nord ascertains that (1991:24) "Each text has its place in a configuration of particular, interdependent elements whose constellation determines its function. If only one element is changed, the constellation of the other elements within the configuration will inevitably change as well."

Linguistically speaking, words and constructions need to be visualized meticulously in order to judge correspondence between the source and the target languages. Neubert and Shreve (1992:20) claim that "Most correspondence rules are of a complex grammatico-lexical type. The corpus of knowledge about the rule-governed linguistic behaviour of the translation pair is the basis of the contrastive linguistics of translation."

There is a primary and simple fact about translators and the nature of their work is that they work in certain socio-political circumstances with one purpose in mind which is the projection of a target text meeting the needs of the expected readers. Schäffner Christina (2003:24) states that "the target text will reveal the impact of social, discursive, and linguistic conventions, norms and constrains."

An investigation of (Q.5:116- 117) is a supportive example:

(Wa 'ith qala Allahu ya ᶜIsa 'abna Maryama 'a'anta qulta lilnnasi attakhithuni

wa 'ummiya 'illahayni min duni Allahi qala subhanaka ma yakunu li 'an 'aqula ma laysa li

bihaqqin 'in kuntu qultuhu faqad ᶜalimtahu taᶜlamu ma fi nafsi wa la 'aᶜlamu ma fi

nafsika 'innaka 'anta ᶜalamu alghuyub) (ma qultu lahum 'illa ma 'amartani bihi 'ani aᶜbudu

Allah rabbi wa rabbakum wa kunta ᶜalayhim shahidaan ma dumtu fihim falamma tawaffaytani

kunta 'anta arraqiba ᶜalayhim wa 'anta ᶜala kuli shay'in shahid) (Q.5: 116- 117)

Arberry: "And when God said, 'O Jesus son of Mary, didst thou say unto men, "Take me and my mother as gods, apart from God"?' He said, 'To Thee be glory! It is not mine to say what I have no right to. If I indeed said it, Thou knowest it, Knowing what is within my soul, and I know not what is within Thy soul; Thou knowest the things unseen. I only said to them what Thou didst command me: "Serve God, my Lord and your Lord." And I was a witness over them, while I remained among them; but when Thou didst take me to Thyself, Thou wast Thysef the watcher over them; Thou Thyself art witness of everything." (Q.5:116-117)

Al Hilali& Khan: And (remember) when Allah will say (on the day of Resurrection): "O 'Isa (Jesus), son of Maryam (Mary)! Did you say unto men: 'Worship me and my mother as two gods besides Allah?' " He will say: "Glory be to You! It was not for me to say what I had no right (to

say). Had I said such a thing, You would surely have known it. You know what is in my inner-self though I do not know what is in Yours; truly, You, only You, are the All-Knower of all that is hidden (and unseen). "Never did I say to them aught except what You (Allah) did command me to say: 'Worship Allah, my Lord and your Lord.' And I was a watcher over them while I dwelt amongst them, but when you took me up, You were the watcher over them; and You are a Witness to all things. (This is a great admonition and warning to the Christians of the whole world). (Q.5:116-117)

Richard Bell: "(Recall) when Allah said: 'O Jesus, son of Mary, was it thou who didst say to the people: 'Take me and my mother as two gods apart from Allah?' He replied: 'Glory be to thee! It is not for me to say what to me is not true; if I did say it, Thou knowest it; Thou knowest what is in my (inner) self, but I know not what is in Thy (inner) self; verily it is Thou who art the knower of secret things. I did not say anything to them but what Thou didst command me: 'Serve Allah, my Lord and your Lord'; I was a witness over them as long as I remained amongst them, but when Thou didst take me to Thyself, it was Thou who wert the watcher over them, for Thou over everything art witness.' " (Q.5:116-117)

Dawood: "Then God will say: 'Jesus son of Mary, did you ever say to mankind: "Worship me and my mother as gods besides God?" ' Glory be to You,' he will answer, 'I could never have claimed what I have no right to. If I had ever said so, You would have surely known it. You know what is in my mind, but I know not what is in yours. You alone know what is hidden. I told them only what you bade me. I said: "Serve God, my Lord and your Lord." I watched over them while living in their midst, and ever since You took me to Yourself, You have been watching them. You are the witness of all things." (Q.5:116-117)

Translation studies do not exhaust the standing points from which issues in cross-cultural differences among languages have been investigated. It does seem reasonable to hold that all language use is ideological. Perez (2003:2) affirms that "Translation is an operation carried out on language use. This undoubtedly means that translation itself is always a site of ideological encounters (which turn 'sour')." In order not to get sidetracked from the main purpose of the argument, there are some primary discrepancies in the translations above: Arberry's …"Take me and my mother as gods, apart from God"?'…, alHilali& Khan's …'Worship me and my mother as two gods besides Allah ?'… It is worth mentioning here the difference in the shades of meaning between, *apart from* and *besides*. In this effect, it is observed that *besides* clearly depicts the idea of Shirk, where *apart from* does not enjoy the same underlying semantic characteristics. At this juncture, another issue should be raised which is the death of Jesus (the issue which has been refuted down the ages by both Muslims and Christians). In fact, it must be made quite plain that there are two opposing views held by Muslims and Christians concerning the death of Jesus as the translations reveal:

Arberry's …Thou didst take me to Thyself… Bell's Thou didst take me to Thyself …

alHilali & Khan's … you took me up…

Dawood's … You took me to Yourself …

Thus the case under discussion is another illustrating example for the textual manifestation of the linguistic structures which carry lots of loads of ideology and cross-cultural differences. According to QCM Jesus was not crucified by the Jews as revealed in the Qur'an by Allah in a crystal clear manner: (Q.4:157,158)

(Wa qawlihim 'inna qatalna al Masiha ᶜIsa abna Maryam rasula Allahi wa ma qataluhu wa ma salabuhu wa lakin shubbiha lahum wa 'inna al lathina akhtalafu fihi lafi shakkin minh ma lahum bihi min ᶜilmin 'illa attibaᶜa al zanni wa ma qataluhu yaqina) (bal rafaᶜahu Allahu 'illayhi wa kana Allahu ᶜazizaan hakima) (Q.4: 157- 158)

 "And because of their saying (in boast):'We killed Messiah Jesus, son of Mary, the Messanger of Allâh; - but they killed him not, nor crucified him, but it appeared so to them [the resemblance of Jesus was put over another man (and they killed that man)], and those who differ therein are full

of doubts. They have no (certain) knowledge, they follow nothing but conjecture. For surely, they killed him not (i.e., Jesus, son of Mary). But Allah raised him (Jesus) up (with his body and soul) unto Himself (and he is in the heavens).. And Allah is Ever All-Powerful, All-Wise." (Q: 4:157-158)

1.4 Conclusion

Now that we have analyzed the selected translations of the meaning of the Qur'an, we have come to a conclusion that translation is transformation. In other words, transformation can occur either by not conveying the same impact of the original due to certain recurrent features, such as archaism, paraphrasing, alienation or familiarization, etc. In archaizing the text for example, the translator makes the rendition difficult to understand. In taking liberty with the text, the TT suffers from noticeable deformity in case of Richard Bell for instance. As it has been seen throughtout the present paper, translations of the meaning of the Qur'an may suffer from mistranslation in the form of addition, subtraction, and alteration which leads to semantic loss. In addition, translation of the Qur'anic discourse must present the message in such a way that people feel its relevance (the expressive element in communication) and can respond to it in action (the imperative function) (cf. Nida and Taber, 1969:24). However, Abdul Raof (2005:172) holds that "the translator's creativity is tied to the SL linguistic and cultural norms. Paraphrase, through domestication, transposition or dynamic equivalence, may be the solution, but it robs the Qur'anic discourse of its distinctive religious character."

References

- **Abdul-Raof, H.** (2001). *Qur'an Translation: Discourse, Texture, and Exegesis*. London: Curzon.
- _____ (2005). "Cultural Aspects in Qur'an translation," in Lynne Long (ed.) *Translation and Religion: Holy Untranslatable?* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- **Al-Hilali and Khan.** (1998). *The Noble Qur'an: English Translation of the meaning and commentary*. Madina Munawwarah: King Fahad Complex for the Printing of the Qur'an.
- **Ali, A. Y.** (2000) *The Qur'an. Translation*, London: Wordsworth Classics.
- **Althusser, L.** (1971). *Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays*. London: New Left Books.
- **Arberry, A. J.** (1998). *The Koran Interpreted*. London: Oxford University Press.
- **Beeby Allison,** *et al*. (ed.) (1998). *Investigating Translation*, selected papers from the 4th international conference on translation, Barcelona, 1998, Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- **Bell, Richard.** (1937). *The Qur'an: Translated, with a Critical Re-Arrangement of the Surahs*. Vpl. 1&2. Edinburgh: T.&T. Clark.
- _____ (1953). *Introduction to the Qur'an*. Edinburgh: the University Press.
- **Bell, Roger T.** (1991). *Translation and Translating: Theory and Practice*. London: Longman.
- **Bhabha, Homi K.** (1994). The location of culture. *London Times Literary Supplement,* 27 May, p. 14.
- **Bickerton Derek.** (1996). *Language and Human Behaviour*. London: UCL
- **Bobzin, Hatmut.** (1993). "Latin Translations of the Koran," in *Der Islam*, v. 70; pp. 193-206
- **Chaudhuri Sukanata.** (1999). *Translation and Understanding*. London: Oxford University Press.
- **Dant, Tim.** (1991). *Knowledge, Ideology, Discourse, A Sociological Perspective*. London & New York: Routledge.
- **Dawood, N. J.** (2003). *The Koran, Translation with Notes*. London: Penguin Classics.
- **De Oliveira, Roberta Pires.** (2001). *An Interview with George lakoff*, in Rene Driven, Bruce Hawkins, Esra Sandikcioglu (eds.) (2001). *Language and Ideology*. V.1: Theoretical Cognitive Approaches. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- **Dirven, René/Hawkins, Bruce/Sandikcioglu, Esra.** (edd.). (2001). *Language and Ideology*. Volume 1: Cognitive Theoretical Approaches, Amsterdam: John Benjamins,
- **Eagleton, Terry.** (1991). *Ideology: an introduction*. London: Verso.
- **Elhadary, T.** (2009). *Equivalence and Translatability of Qur'anic Discourse- A comparative and analytical evaluation*. Saarbrücken: VDM
- **Fairclough, Norman.** (1989). *Language and Power*. London: Longman.
- **Global Arabic Encyclopedia.** (1996). Riyadh: Encyclopedia Works Publishing& Distribution.
- **Halliday, M.A.K. and Hassan, R.** (1976). *Cohesion in English*. London:Longman.
- **Harvey Keith.** (2003). "'Events' and 'Horizons' Reading Ideology in the 'Bindings' of Translations". In Perez Maria Calzada (2003). *Apropos of Ideology: Translation Studies on Ideology – Ideologies in Translation Studies.* Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.
- **Hatim, B. and Mason, I.** (1990). *Discourse and the Translator*. London: Longman.
- **Hawkins Bruce.** (2001). "Incorporating Tensions- On the Treatment of Ideology in Cognitive Linguistics", in Rene Driven, Bruce Hawkins, Esra Sandikcioglu (eds.) (2001).

Language and Ideology. V.1: Theoretical Cognitive Approaches. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

- **Habermas, J.** (1974). *Theory and Practice*. London: Heinemann.
- **Hodge R. & Kress G.** (1979). *Language as Ideology*. London: Routledge& Kegan Paul.
- **Jansen, J. J. G.** (1974). *The Interpretation of the Koran in Modern Egypt*. Leiden, E. J. Brill.
- **Khashim, Mustafa Abdullah.** (1984). *Encyclopedia of Politics*. libya: Dar A-Jamihiria.
- **Larrain, J.** (1979). *The Concept of Ideology*. London: Hutchinson.
- **Lukacs, G.** (1971). *History and Class Consciousness*. London: Merlin Press.
- **Mannheim Karl.** (1943). *Diagnosis of our time: wartime essays of a sociologist*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- **Marx, K. and Engels, F.** (1968). *Selected Works*. London: Lawrence& Wishart.
- **al Munjid fîl-lugha wal- iʿlam** (1998). Beirut: Dar El Mashreq.
- **Naess, Arne.** (1956). *Democracy, Ideology and Objectivity: Studies in the Semantics and Cognitive Analysis of Ideological Controversy*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- **Neubert, N.& Shreve, M.** (1992).*Translation as Text*. London: The Kent State University Press.
- **Nida, Eugene A. and Charles Taber.** (1969). *The theory and practice of translation*. Leiden: Brill.
- **Nord, Christiane.** (1991). *Text Analysis In Translation*: Theory, methodology, and didactic application of a model for translation-oriented text analysis. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- **Perez Maria Calzada.** (ED.) (2003). *Apropos of Ideology: Translation studies on ideology, ideologies in translation studies*, Manchester: St. Jerome.
- **Pickthall, M.** (1997), *The Meanings of the Glorious Qur'an*, Delhi: Farid Book Depot.
- **Plamentaz, John.** (1970). *Ideology*. London: Pall Mall.
- **Qutb Muhammad.** (1964). *Islam: The Misunderstood Religion*. Kuwait: Dar al-bayan
- **Qutb Sayyid.** (1989)(translated), *Milestones*, Kuwait: Al Faisal Press.
- **René Dirven/Roslyn Frank/Cornelia Ilie.** (edd.) (2001). *Language and ideology. Volume 2: Descriptive cognitive approaches*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins,
- **Rene Driven, Bruce Hawkins, Esra Sandikcioglu.** (eds.) (2001). *Language and Ideology*. V.1: Theoretical Cognitive Approaches. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- **Ricento, Thomas.** (eds.), (2000), *Ideology, Politics and Language Politics: Focus on English*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- **Robinson Neal.** (1996, 2003). *Discovering the Qur'an: A Contemporary Approach to a veiled Text*. London: SCM Press.
- **Sandikcioglu Esra.** (2001). "The Otherness of the Orient: Political-cultural implications of ideological categorizations," in René Dirven/Roslyn Frank/Cornelia Ilie, edd. 2001. *Language and ideology*. Volume 2*: Descriptive cognitive approaches*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins**.
- **Schäffner Christina.** (2003). "Third Ways and New centres: Ideological Unity Or Difference?" In Perez Maria Calzada (2003). *Apropos of Ideology: Translation Studies on Ideology – Ideologies in Translation Studies.* Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.
- **Van Dijk, T.A.** (1998). *Ideology, A Multidisciplinary Approach*. London: Sage.
- **Wild, Stefan.** (1996). *The Qur'an as text*, New York: Brill.

Ideology and the Language of Translation

Abstract: *The paper is constructed in a way that the impact of ideology or ideologies on translation of the meaning of the Qur'an has been studied from both the translatological and the theological retrospective. The discussion in this paper lends itself to a tripod of linguistic, cognitive, and cultural rules. In addition, different cases have been exemplified from different English translations of the meaning of the Qur'an wherever is relevant and needed.*

Dr. Tariq Elhadary is Acting Head/ Admission & University Preparation at UAE Ministry of Presidential Affairs/ Scholarships Office. He is an ex-Lecturer of English Language at Ajman University of Science and Technology. He received his PhD in Applied Linguistics and Qur'anic Studies, University of Leeds, 2008. His main areas of research interests are translation, comparative stylistics, and Qur'anic studies.