

Translation, Rewriting and the Manipulation of The Holy Qur'an: The Sublime Quran as a Case Study

Saber Oubiri*

Ph.D. Researcher ,
Arabic & Islamic Unit, Ku Leuven, Belgium

Received: 21.12.2021

• Accepted: 09.04.2022

• Published: 17.07.2022

Abstract: This paper examines Translation, Rewriting and the Manipulation of the Holy Qur'an, with specific reference to the translated Quran from Arabic into English by Bakhtiar, namely The Sublime Quran. The study focuses on the translation of Surat Al Kafirun, the term Kafirun in some ayat in Surat Al Baqara, Al Imran, Al Nissa, Fusilat, and Qaf using the same translations of the Holy Quran by the translators stated below. The researcher looks at the process of translation used by Bakhtiar and examines whether we may consider the translation of the concerned Surat as a translation, a rewriting, or a manipulation for specific purposes. The study is a comparative one. The researcher compares the translation of the Surat in question with three women translators. The concerned translators are known under the name of Saheeh International, the translation of King Fahd Complex, M. Taqi-ud-Din Al-Hilali & M. Muhsin Khan, J.A.Arberry, Abdullah Yusuf Ali as well as M.A.S. Abdel Halim. Based on the findings of the study, the researcher concludes that Bakhtiar has rewritten and did not translate the term kafirun, but has manipulated its translation through rewriting it probably for Ideological Reasons.

Keywords: Translation Studies, Translation of Sacred Texts, Translation of the Meanings of the Holy Qur'an, The Sublime Quran, Rewriting, Manipulation.

1. Introduction

Translation undoubtedly has played a significant and longstanding role in human history from the earliest to modern times. Translation has been present wherever people have brought new languages and cultures together, transforming societies, texts, and traditions. However, translation has often done its work in the shadows of official history, then becomes visible with the globalizing culture of the twentieth and twenty-first centuries. Translation's effects and complexities brought about themes for novels, films, and Internet sites (Bermann & Porter, 2014: 1).

Whether commercial or literary, translation is an activity that is growing remarkably in today's world. We may say that the twenty-first century is the golden age of translation due to the huge number of people travelling around the globe: some are displaced by wars, persecution, oppression, and famine; others are looking for better opportunities in their life. Under these circumstances, they take their language, culture, and traditions with them. Consequently, they are forced to connect with translation, consciously or unconsciously. Furthermore, translation has become an object of study in many disciplines. Since the late 1970s, it has been a new field of research, meaning translation studies acquired so much

* Corresponding Author: Saber.oubiri@kuleuven.be

importance worldwide (Bassnett 2014:2), and brought together work in several fields, including linguistics, literary study, history and anthropology.

The translation covers various fields: medical, economic, psychological, etc. It deals with quite different types of texts. The translation of sacred texts is one of the themes that translation has addressed. It is considered amongst the most difficult types of text to translate, given the nature of its terminology, and it abounds with culture-specific words. The researcher, in this paper, is solely considering the translation of the Quran, and precisely the abovementioned ayat.

2. Literature Review

This research section reviews related literature on translation, rewriting and manipulation. André Lefevere is considered the main proponent of the concept of rewriting, which he brought into the discipline of translation studies through the publication in 1992 of the book entitled: *Translation, Rewriting, and the Manipulation of Literary Fame* and the collection of sources Lefevere considered key for his theories: *Translation/Culture/ History: A Source Book* (Forrai 2018: 29). In this regard, we cite the most recent book (2017) on the matter written by Edwin Gentzler, that is *Translation and Rewriting in the Age of Post- Translation Studies*.

3. Methodology and corpus

The researcher has chosen the comparative study as a model to fulfil the purpose of the current paper. As Collier (1993: 105) puts it: "*Comparison is a fundamental tool of analysis. It sharpens our powers of description and plays a central role in concept-formation by bringing into focus suggestive similarities and contrasts among cases. Routinely used in testing hypotheses, it can also contribute to the inductive discovery of new hypotheses and to theory-building*".

This research is corpus-based: the primary corpus is the English translation of the Quran by Bakhtiar, entitled *The Sublime Quran* (2007). The secondary corpus comprehends six English translations of the Quran respectively, *The Qur'an: English Meanings* (1997), edited by Saheeh International, *The Holy Quran: English translation of the meanings and commentary* by King Fahd Complex (1990), *Interpretation of the Meanings of the Noble Qur'an* (1996) by M. Taqi-ud-Din Al-Hilali & M. Muhsin Khan, *The Koran Interpreted* (1955) by J. A. Arberry, *The Holy Quran* (2000) by Abdullah Yusuf Ali, and *The Quran: a new translation* (2015) by M.A.S. Abdel Halim. Furthermore, the researcher uses the *Arabic-English Lexicon* (1863) by Edward William Lane to explain the linguistic meaning of the noun kafirun (verb kafara), and *Tafsir Ibn Kathir* abridged by a group of scholars under the supervision of SHAYKH SAFI Li R-RAHMAN AL-MUBARAKPURI (2003), to explain the religious meaning and reasons of revelation.

4. Translation, rewriting and manipulation

4.1. Translation

The translation view and translation as a science (translation studies) constantly continued to evolve and expand since the dawn of time, from Cicero, who is considered the first who theorized translation in passing in *De oratore* (On the Orator, 55 B. C.) and *De optimo genere oratorum* (On the Best Kind of Orator, 52 B. C.) as a pedagogical device in the education of the orator (Robinson 19: 1992), Pliny, Quintilain, Horace and Aulus Gellius, St-Jérôme (348–420 AD), to Nida (the theory of equivalence). Some scholars considered translation as a process in which the *word-for-word*

translation (Cicero) is the best method to be followed by the translator. However, others proclaim that for the translator to succeed in his translation, he should apply the method of *sense for sense translation* (St-Jérôme), who undertook the Herculean task of producing the Vulgate translation of the Bible. The latter writes: "*Now, I not only admit but freely announce that in translating from the Greek- except in the case of the Holy Scripture, where even the syntax contains a mystery- I render not word-for-word, but sense-for-sense*" (in Munday 2001: 20). He added that the best way to grasp the complexities of translation was to invite literal translations of Homer:

If there is anybody who does not believe that the power of a language is changed in translation, let him translate Homer literally into Latin – or rather, let him translate Homer into prose. Then he will see a laughable bit of work and the greatest of poets scarcely able to speak. (Hieronymus, 2006: 29)

In their remarks on translation, both Horace and Cicero make an important distinction between word-for-word translation and sense-for-sense translation.

The literature on theory, practice and history has been divided by George Steiner into four periods. The first one extends from the statements of Cicero and Horace on translation up to the publication of Alexander Fraser Tytler's *Essay on the Principles of Translation* in 1791. The second one runs up to the publication of Larbaud's *Sous l'invocation de Saint Jérôme* in 1946. The third one starts with publishing the first papers on machine translation in the 1940s. Steiner claims that the fourth period coexisted with the third one and originated in the early 1960s (Bassnett 2005: 47-48).

The researcher does not intend to present a complete history of the translation theory but would like to outline it.

The seventeenth century has seen the emergence of influential theories, amongst others, those of John Dryden (1631-1700), whose trichotomy on translation types (metaphrase, paraphrase and imitation) makes big strides (Ghanooni 2012, p. 77).

At the beginning of the nineteenth century, Romanticism investigated the issue of translatability and untranslatability. In 1813, Friedrich Schleiermacher wrote a seminal paper on "*The Different Methods of Translating*." He moved beyond word-for-word, literal, sense-for-sense. He argues that the real question is how to bring together the ST writer and TT reader. He writes: "*Either the translator leaves the writer alone as much as possible and moves the reader towards the writer, or he leaves the reader alone as much as possible and moves the writer towards the reader*" (Schleiermacher 1813/1992, p. 41-2, qtd in Munday 2001, p. 28).

The concept that prevailed from the 1960s to the 1970s in translation studies is "equivalence". Translating consists of reproducing in the receptor language the closest natural equivalent of the source-language message, first in terms of meaning and secondly in terms of style. (Nida & Taber 1969:12)

The translation was considered solely a process of finding an equivalence to the ST and disregarded other elements such as culture. Werner Koller and Eugene Nida were amongst other scholars who theorized the concept of equivalence. In answering what this concept means, Koller enunciates five types of equivalence

1. "Denotative equivalence" or equivalence of the extralinguistic content of a text. It is called "content invariance."
2. "Connotative equivalence," depending on the similarities of register and style. Koller refers to this as "Stylistic equivalence."

3. "Text-normative equivalence" relates to text types, with different kinds of texts behaving differently.
4. "Pragmatic equivalence," or "communicative equivalence," is oriented toward the receiver of the text or message.
5. "Formal equivalence," relating to the text's aesthetics and form (Koller 1979a: 99-104). However, Nida, the American Bible translator, who continues to follow the old word-for-word versus sense-for-sense distinction, argues that there are two different types of equivalence, i.e., formal and dynamic equivalence. Formal correspondence "focuses attention on the message itself, in both form and content", unlike dynamic equivalence, which is based upon "the principle of equivalent effect" (Nida 1964: 159). Dynamic equivalence is defined as a translation principle according to which a translator seeks to translate the meaning of the original in such a way that the TL wording will trigger the same impact on the TL audience as the original wording did on the ST audience (Nida and Taber 1982: 200).

After the concept of equivalence comes to the term "shift", Catford defined it as "departures from formal correspondence in the process of going from SL to TL, departures that can occur at a linguistic level as graphology, phonology, grammar and lexis (Catford 1965: 73). Yet, he concludes that translation equivalence does not entirely match formal correspondence and such deviations occur (Catford 1965: 82).

Nida (1964) called his theories a "science of translating"; however, the seminal paper "*The Name and Nature of Translation Studies*" by James Holmes (1972) paved the way for the development of translation studies as an independent discipline. And in 1978, André Lefevere suggested that the name *Translation Studies* should be adopted for the discipline that concerns itself with "the problems raised by the production and description of translations" (Bassnett 2005: Introduction). Lefevere announced this during a seminar entitled 'Translation Studies: The Goal of the Discipline' (Lefevere, 1978).

The 1980s saw the publication of the book by Susan Bassnett entitled *Translation Studies*. Translation studies was regarded as a separate field overlapping with linguistics, literary criticism and philosophy.

The 1990s saw the emergence of new schools as well as concepts: gender research, postcolonial translation theory, polysystems theory, the cultural turn and the cultural studies-oriented analysis of Lawrence Venuti, who champions the cause of the translator (Munday 2001: 14). Venuti's publication entitled *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*, has come to be highly influential in translation studies.

4.2. Translation as Rewriting

One definition, amongst others, of translation in contemporary translation theory, claims that rendering a text from one language into another is a form of rewriting. We start this section with a quote by Jorge Luis Borges:

I do not write; I rewrite. My memory produces my sentences. I have read so much, and I have heard so much. I admit it: I repeat myself. I confirm it: I plagiarize. We are all heirs of millions of scribes who have already written down all that is essential a long time before us. We are all copyists, and all the stories we invent have already been told. There are no longer any original ideas.
(Chancel 1999: 74-75)

The translation is not an isolated activity since translations are not made in a vacuum, and it has always served a special purpose or purposes (skopos theory). Consequently, translation takes the form of rewriting since it is performed under certain constraints and for certain purposes, and to fit that purpose, rewriting is bound to happen during the translation process (Shuping 2013: 56).

Gérard Genette, in his *Palimpsests: Literature in the Second Degree* (1982), claims that every text is a hypertext connected to an earlier hypertext that it modifies through transformation or imitation. Thanks to André Lefevere, Rewriting as a concept entered translation studies. Lefevere is considered its main proponent. The concept of Rewriting appeared in 1992 in Lefevere's seminal monograph *Translation, Rewriting, and the Manipulation of Literary Fame* and the abovementioned collection of sources he considered key for his theories: *Translation/Culture/History: A Source Book* (Forrai 2018: 29).

Theo Hermans (2004 :126) argues that Lefevere developed his idea about systems and the place of "rewriting" in them over a period of about fifteen years. André Lefevere moved away from polysystem terminology to examine translation as "rewriting" and consider the role of ideology, poetics and patronage in the system of translated literature (Zhang 2012: 754). In 1981, Lefevere introduced the concept of the "refracted text". By "refracted text" he means "texts that have been processed for a certain audience (children, for example)", or adapted to a certain poetics or a certain ideology (qtd. in Gentzler 2004: 137). In 1982 Lefevere took the term "refraction" to mean "the adaptation of a work of literature to a different audience, with the intention of influencing how that audience reads the work" (qtd. in Hermans 2004: 127). In 1984, Lefevere defined and added the concept of "patronage" to his model to better investigate ideological pressures (Gentzler 2004: 137). In 1985 "Refraction" gave way to "rewriting". By "rewriting", Lefevere referred to any text produced based on another with the intention of adapting that other text to a certain ideology or a certain poetics and, usually, to both (Hermans 2004: 127).

According to Bassnett and Lefevere:

All rewritings, whatever their intention, reflect a certain ideology and poetics and manipulate literature to function in a given society in a given way. Rewriting is manipulation undertaken in the service of power, and its positive aspect can help in the evolution of literature and society. Rewriting can introduce new concepts, new genres, and new devices and the history of translation in the history of literary innovation, of the shaping power of one culture upon another. But rewriting can also repress innovation, distort and contain, and in an ever-increasing manipulation of all kinds, the study of the manipulation processes of literature is exemplified by translation can help us towards a greater awareness of the world in which we live." (Bassnett and Lefevere 2004a: vii)

In this regard, Theo Hermans (2004: 127) states that rewriting includes translation, criticism, reviewing, summary, adaptation for children, anthologizing, making into a comic strip or TV film, and so on. Lefevere considers translation as "the most obviously recognizable type of rewriting, and potentially the most influential because it is able to project the image of an author and/or a (series of) work (s) in another culture, lifting that author and/or those works beyond the boundaries of their culture of origin" (Lefevere 2004a: 9). (qtd. in Shuping 2013: 56)

Lefevre adds that translating is one of several types of rewriting that result in partial representations of literary oeuvres or aspects of reality: anthologizing, editing, reviewing and historiography (Lefevere 1992:9/2017:7). Lefevere argues that translation is not merely a language change between texts, but also rewriting of the original works based upon politics, culture, consciousness level in the target language society (Shen 2016: 1). Rewriting, he claimed, is both

innovation and manipulation; it is literature's way of shaping society (Forrai 2018: 29). He pointed out that rewriting is subject to certain intrasystemic constraints: language, the universe of discourse and poetics. It is also subject to the influence of regulatory forces: the professionals within the literary system and patronage operating from outside the system (Asimakoulas 2020: 494). As for the universe of discourse, it refers to "the knowledge, the learning, but also the objects and the customs of a certain time, to which writers are free to allude in their work" (Lefevere 1985:233), that is, to "cultural scripts" (1992:87/2017:66). Lefevere argues that poetics refers to aesthetic precepts that dominate the literary system at a certain point in time. It is composed of two components, an inventory component (a repertoire of genres, literary devices, motifs, certain symbols, prototypical characters or situations) and a functional component, which concerns the issue of how literature has to or can function within society (Lefevere 1992:26/2017:20). As for professionals, they are the individuals, including critics and translators, who elaborate aesthetic criteria, control the literary system and filter material in or out of it. The Academie Française and similar language institutions are good examples of the literary system (Lefevere 1985:232). We can understand patronage as the powers, either persons or institutions such as publishing houses, which can further or hinder the reading, writing or rewriting of literature and are usually more concerned with the ideology of literature than its poetics (1992:15/2017:12). Patronage is formed of three components, that is, the ideological, economic and status components (Asimakoulas 2020: 494). Patronage is usually more interested in the ideology of literature than in its poetics, or it could be said that the patron' delegates' authority to the interpreter where poetics is concerned (Lefevere 1985: 227).

In summary, we can say that the essential idea of rewriting includes the use of a base text that is changed in various ways (additions, rearrangements, and omissions), resulting in a text that varies, whether slightly or significantly, from the base text (Screnock 2018: 485). Moreover, rewriting is influenced by three factors: language, the universe of discourse and poetics.

4.3. Translation as manipulation

The approach of translation as manipulation is mostly connected to the descriptive branch of Translation Studies (DTS) or the Manipulation School, also known as the Polysystem Approach (Dukate 2007: 39). The Manipulation School of translation studies appeared in the 1980s, which arose first as a word-play deriving from the collection of essays called *The Manipulation of Literature* edited by Theo Hermans (1985). It was influenced by the works of Toury, Holmes and Even Zohar. The Manipulation School is centred around the Dutch-speaking area and is represented in particular by scholars such as André Lefevere, José Lambert, and Theo Hermans (Snell-Hombly 1995: 22). Originally, the ideas of the Manipulation School were applied for literary translation, however, later, the focus shifted from written to oral and non-literary translation. According to Hermans, "all translation implies a degree of manipulation of the source text for a certain purpose" (1985: 11). As a result, either of intentional choices made by the translator or target system constraints. Hermans claims that from the target perspective, "*all translation implies a degree of manipulation of the source text for a certain purpose*" (1985: 11). This purpose is linked to the operation of ideology, patronage and poetics (Lefevere 1992).

Manipulation is a multi-disciplinary concept that deals with many disciplines from physics, chemistry and medicine to journalism, discourse and media studies. Yet, studies on manipulation did not present a comprehensive definition of the concept of manipulation in translation, and it is still an ambiguous notion in the present status of the field of Translation Studies. We can notice that no specific entry was allocated to manipulation in Delabastita, Baker and Saldanha's Encyclopedia

of Translation Studies (2020), contrary to other notions such as rewriting, ideology ...etc. (Chinaveh and Suzani 2014: 1294).

Manipulation scholars demonstrated that translations rather than being secondary and derivative, were instead one of the primary literary tools that larger social institutions - educational systems, arts councils, publishing firms, and even governments - had at their disposal to manipulate a given society in order to construct the kind of culture desired. (Tymoczko & Gentzler 2002: 29)

The manipulation School rejects the classical view to the translated target text as being faithful to the source text, however, it sees translation as a manipulation of the source text for a certain purpose. Moreover, it claims that translation is manipulation, thus, it is unavoidable (Klimovich 2015:245).

It is said that translation has a manipulative character. This assertion is included in the collection of articles *Translation, History and Culture* edited by Bassnett and Lefevere (1995). The introduction of the collection suggests a new approach to the study of translation, the "cultural turn" in Translation Studies, that is to mean translation is studied within a broader political and cultural context. They claim that translation is not innocent and liken it to other modes of 'rewriting', which present the source text in the target culture. Furthermore, the key notions for this approach are power and manipulation. "The translation is viewed from a rather radical perspective, for example, the feminist and the postcolonial perspective, paying particular attention to institutional and ideological factors which influence the translation process." (Dukate 2007: 41)

Dukate argues that manipulation in translation is the translator's handling of a text which results in the adaptation of the text for the Target Audience, considering the cultural, ideological, linguistic and literary differences between the cultures in contact, which takes place within a particular cultural setting and is carried out by a human translator/ interpreter, with the consequence of a possible influence of individual- or psychology-related factors upon the end product" (Dukate 2007: 185).

Dukate asserts that based on the manipulation group's views all translation might be manipulative —because of the factors in place and processes at work in three translation "*related stages, the pre-production stage, the production stage and the post-production stage*" (2007: 5). She adds that in the first stage regarding the selection of a text to be translated, "*there are certain agents, certain powers at the source or the target pole, who make decisions on which works to translate and how.*" (p. 6) According to Dukate, in the next stage, that is, the production stage, the translator works under various constraints and receives certain guidelines, indications and hints about the way a certain text should be translated through patronage. In this stage, there are also "*various objectives (e.g. language-related) and subjective (e.g. ideological and psychological) factors*" which have direct impact on the translator's work. (Mehrdad and Maryam 2016: 88)

In general, manipulation is perceived negatively by different scholars when they talk about it as biased, abused or illegitimate (van Dijk 2006:360) or hiding the negative and truth (Wilson 2001: 400) or particularly in translation as mediation, intervention or distortion (Hatim & Mason 1990, 1997; Katan 1999; Munday 2007). Nevertheless, others see manipulation as multifunctional. Dukate (2007) claims that manipulation may be used for discourse improvement, handling and distortion, and may be due to linguistic, cultural, psychological and ideological factors or sometimes ignorance. For Katan (1999, p.138), manipulation is neither good nor bad and simply zooms in what

the translator prefers and sends to the background and what s/he does not. (Sanatifar 2013,p. 99) However, Chrisafulli, (as cited in Kramina, 2004) says that the term manipulation is understood in two ways. It can be understood as something negative and as the sign of the translator's ideological influences in the target text. Dukāte (2007: 185) believes that manipulation can be either a positive or negative phenomenon,

According to Farahzad

manipulating texts in translation seems to result from the activation of at least two types of processes: a conscious process, and an unconscious one. The conscious process leads to conscious manipulation intentionally carried out by the translator under the influence of various social, political and other factors. The unconscious process, which leads to unconscious manipulation is, at least in part, a psychological phenomenon, and occurs under the influence of psychological factors.(Farahzad 1998,p.1)

Furthermore, Hatim and Mason assert that the translator's intervention might be consciously or unconsciously filtered (1997,p. 144).

3.4 Why manipulation occurs?

Manipulations introduced to a translation can affect any kind of text type for various reasons such as "ideology, identity and ... gender" (Jones, 2009) (qtd. in Chinaveh & Suzani 2015,p. 1296).

Lefevere believes that translation, being "the most obvious recognizable type of rewriting" (1992:9), can never free itself from the political and literary power structures existent within a given culture. On the one hand, manipulation occurs because of financial considerations; many works are not translated or are translated partly owing to the lack of time or money for carrying out the particular task. On the other hand, cultural myths or cults are created with the profit motive in mind, e.g. Harry Potter or Madonna's children's book series. (Kramina 2004 : 38)

Lefevere writes:

Institutions enforce or, at least, try to enforce the dominant poetics of a period by using it as a yardstick against which current production is measured. Accordingly, certain works of literature will be elevated to the level of 'classics' within a relatively short time after publication, while others are rejected, some to reach the exalted position of a classic later, when the dominant poetics has changed (Lefevere 1992,p.19)

Additionally, ideological motivations play a major role in defining translation policy. It is known that during certain periods of history some texts were not translated at all or had to be translated according to certain constraints and requirements. The translation policy adopted in

the former Soviet Union can be cited as one of the best examples of this practice. (Kramina 2004 : 38)

4-Analysis and discussion

The researcher organizes the translation of Surat Al-Kafirun in a table, along with the Arabic version as well as the translators versions. Afterwards, he will explain linguistically the meaning of the term *Kafirun* (root of the verb *kafara*), and the meaning according to a religious point of view, through the usage of the well-known exegesis of the Quran, i.e., Tafsir Ibn Kathir.

Surat in Arabic	
<p>قُلْ يَا أَيُّهَا الْكَافِرُونَ (1) لَا أَعْبُدُ مَا تَعْبُدُونَ (2) وَلَا أَنْتُمْ عَابِدُونَ مَا أَعْبُدُ (3) وَلَا أَنَا عَابِدٌ مَّا عَبَدْتُمْ (4) وَلَا أَنْتُمْ عَابِدُونَ مَا أَعْبُدُ (5) لَكُمْ دِينُكُمْ وَلِيَ دِينِ (6)</p>	
The translator	English translation
Bakhtiar	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.Say: O ones who are <u>ungrateful</u> 2. I worship not what you worship, 3.and you are not ones who worship what I worship 4.And I am not one who worships what you worshipped 5.And you are not ones who worship what I worship 6.For you is <u>your way of life, and for me my way of life</u>
Complex King Fahd	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Say: <u>0 ye That reject Faith!</u> 2. I worship not that Which ye worship, 3. Nor will ye worship That which I worship. 4. And I will not worship That which ye have been Wont to worship 5. Nor will ye worship That which I worship. 6. <u>To you be your Way, And to me mine.</u>
International Saeed	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1- Say, "<u>O disbelievers,</u> 2- I do not worship what you worship. 3- Nor are you worshippers of what I worship. 4- Nor will I be a worshipper of what you worship. 5- .Nor will you be worshippers of what I worship. 6- <u>For you is your religion, and for me is my religion."</u>

Taqi-ud-Din Al-Hilali & Muhsin Khan	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Say (O Muhammad (Peace be upon him) to these Mushrikoon and Kafiroom): <u>"O Al-Kafiroon (disbelievers in Allah, in His Oneness, in His Angels, in His Books, in His Messengers, in the Day of Resurrection, and in Al-Qadar, etc.)!"</u> 2. "I worship not that which you worship, 3. "Nor will you worship that which I worship. 4. "And I shall not worship that which you are worshipping. 5. "Nor will you worship that which I worship. 6. <u>"To you be your religion, and to me my religion</u> (Islamic Monotheism)."
Arberry	<p>1 Say: 'O unbelievers, 2 I serve not what you serve 3and you are not serving what I serve, 4nor am I serving what you have served, 5neither are you serving what I serve 6 <u>To you your religion, and to me my religion!</u>"</p>
Ali Yusuf	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Say: <u>0 ye That reject Faith!</u> 2. I worship not that Which ye worship, 3. Nor will ye worship That which I worship. 4. And I will not worship That which ye have been Wont to worship 5. Nor will ye worship That which I worship. 6. <u>To you be your Way, And to me mine</u>
Abdel Haleem	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Say: <u>0 ye That reject Faith!</u> 2. I worship not that Which ye worship, 3. Nor will ye worship That which I worship. 4. And I will not worship That which ye have been Wont to worship 5. Nor will ye worship That which I worship. 6. <u>To you be your Way, And to me mine</u>

4.1 Aya one:

We notice that Bakhtiar rendered the term *Kafirun* in aya one by ungrateful. However, all the remaining translators rendered it either by disbelievers, unbelievers or those who reject faith. Taqi-ud-Din and Muhsin Khan translated it by Al-Kafiroon, which is a procedure used in the translation called transliteration.

Lanes stated seven significations of the verb *kafara*. *Kafirun* is the plural of *kafer*. We will herein mention two of them, then we deduce which term is the most relevant to the context of the Surat.

كفر - Entry: 1.—Signification: A2

Hence, (Mṣb, TA,) كَفَرَ (Ṣ) and النِّعْمَةَ كَفَرَ, and بِالنِّعْمَةِ: (Mṣb); and نِعْمَةَ اللَّهِ كَفَرَ, and نِعْمَةً لِلَّهِ; (K;) aor. - {يَكْفُرُ}, (TA,) inf. n. كُفْرَانٌ. (Ṣ, K,) which is the most common form in this case, (El-Basā'ir,) and كُفُورٌ, (Ṣ, K,) and كُفْرٌ; (El-Basā'ir;) *He covered, or concealed,* (Mṣb,) and

denied, or disacknowledged, the favour or benefit [conferred upon him]; (Ş, Mşb;) he was ungrateful, or unthankful, or behaved ungratefully or unthankfully; contr. of شَكَرَ; (Ş;) and he denied, or disacknowledged, and concealed, or covered, the favour or benefit of God: (K:) God's favours or benefits are the signs which show to those who have discrimination that their Creator is one, without partner, and that He has sent apostles with miraculous signs and revealed scriptures and manifest proofs. (Az, TA.) وَ لَا نَكْفُرُكَ وَلَا [termed الْقَنُوتُ], means وَ لَا نَكْفُرُ نِعْمَتَكَ [And we will not deny, or disacknowledge, thy favour; or we will not be ungrateful, or unthankful, for it]. (Mşb.) [The verb when used in this sense, seems, from what has been said above, to be a عَرَفِيَّةٌ حَقِيقَةٌ, or word so much used in a particular tropical sense as to be, in that sense, conventionally regarded as proper.]

Root: كَفَرَ - Entry: 1.—Signification: A3

And hence, كَفَرَ, inf. n. كُفْرَانٌ, is used to signify [absolutely] He denied, or disacknowledged. (TA.) [See the act. part. n., below: and see 3. See also art. ف, p. 2322 a.] You say بِالصَّانِعِ كَفَرَ He denied the Creator. (Mşb.)

Root: كَفَرَ - Entry: 1.—Signification: A4

Hence also, (TA.) كَفَرَ, (Ş, Mşb,) aor. - { يَكْفُرُ }, (Mşb, TA,) inf. n. كُفْرٌ, (Ş, Mşb, K,) which is the most common form in this case, (El-Basáir,) and كَفَرَ (K) and كُفْرَانٌ (Mşb, K) and كُفُورٌ, (K,) He disbelieved; he became an unbeliever, or infidel; contr. of أَمِنٌ, inf. n. إِيمَانٌ. (Ş, K.) You say بِاللَّهِ كَفَرَ (Ş, Mşb) He disbelieved in God: (Ş:) because he who does so conceals, or covers, the truth, and the favours of the liberal Dispenser of favours [who is God]. (MF.) [Also, as shown above, He denied God.] It is related in a trad. of 'Abd-El-Melik, that he wrote to El-Hajjáj, أَقْرَ بِالْكُفْرِ فَخَلَّ سَبِيلَهُ مَنْ, meaning, Whosoever confesses the unbelief of him who opposes the Benoo-Marwán, and goes forth against them, let him go his way. (TA.) (p.2621)

http://lexicon.quranic-research.net/data/22_k/130_kfr.html

Root: دِينَ - Entry: 1.—Signification: A2

[Hence,] He became [a servant of God, or] a Muslim. (TK.) You say, دَانَ بِالإِسْلَامِ, inf. n. دِيْنٌ, with kesr, [and دِيَانَةٌ.] He became, or made himself, a servant of God by [following the religion of] El-Islám; [i. e. he followed El-Islám as his religion;] and so تَدِينُ. (Mşb.) And دَانَ دَانَ [and تَدِينُ بِهِ,] [and تَدِينَتْ بِهِ,] He, and I, followed such a thing as his, and my, religion;] (Ş, TA;) from دِيْنٌ as signifying "obedience." (Ş.) And دَانَ بِدِينِهِمْ He followed them in their religion; agreed with them, or was of one mind or opinion with them, upon, or respecting, their religion; took, or adopted, their religion as his. (TA.) And the trad. of 'Alee, الْعِلْمَاءُ دِيْنٌ يُدَانُ اللَّهُ بِهِ مَحَبَّةً [The love of the learned is a kind of religion with which God is served]. (TA.) In the phrase وَلَا يَدِينُونَ دِيْنََ الْحَقِّ [Nor follow the religion of the truth, or the true religion], in the Qur ix. 29, El-Islám is meant. (Jel.) (p.0943).

http://lexicon.quranic-research.net/data/08_d/165_dyn.html

Tafsir Ibn Kathir

"The Declaration of Innocence from Shirk

This Surah is the Surah of disavowal from the deeds of the idolaters. It commands a complete disavowal of that.

Allah's statement, Say: "O disbelievers!", includes every disbeliever on the face of the earth, however, this statement is particularly directed towards the disbelievers of the Quraysh. It has been said that in their ignorance they invited the Messenger of Allah to worship their idols for a year and they would (in turn) worship his God for a year. Therefore, Allah revealed this

Surah and in it He commanded His Messenger to disavow himself from their religion completely. Allah said, {worship not that which you worship.} meaning, statues and rival gods. {Nor will you worship whom I worship.} and He is Allah Alone, Who has no partner. So the word Ma (what) here means Man (who). Then Allah says. And I shall not worship that which you are worshipping. Nor will you worship whom I worship .} meaning, I do not worship according to your worship, which means that I do not go along with it or follow it. Only worship Allah in the manner in which He loves and is pleased with.' Thus, Allah says, Nor will you worship whom I worship.} meaning, "you do not follow the commands of Allah and His Legislation in His worship. Rather, you have invented something out of the promptings of your own souls.' This is as Allah says, They follow but a guess and that which they themselves desire, whereas there has surely come to them the guidance from their Lord!} (53:23) Therefore, the disavowal is from all of what they are involved. For certainly the worshipper must have a god whom he worships and set acts of worship that he follows to get to him. So, the Messenger and his followers worship Allah according to what He has legislated. This is why the statement of Islam is "There is no God worthy of being worshipped except Allah, and Muhammad is the Messenger of Allah." This means that there is no (true) object of worship except Allah and there is no path to Him (i.e., way of worshipping Him) other than that which the Messenger came with. The idolaters worship other than Allah, with acts of worship that Allah has not allowed. This is why the Messenger said to them, 'S3}. {To you be your religion, and to me my religion.} This is similar to Allah's statement, And if they believe you, say: "For me are my deeds and for you are your deeds! You are innocent of what I do, and I am innocent of what you do!"} (10:41) and He said, To us our deeds, and to you your deeds.} (28:55) Al-Bukhari said, "It has been said, Tafsir Ibn Kathir .{To you be your religion.} means disbelief. And to me my religion, means Islam.

This is the end of the Tafsir of Surat Qul ya Ayyuhal-Kafirun. (p.615-616)".

4.2 Aya six

As far as the translation of the term *Din* in aya six is concerned, Bakhtiar rendered it by way of life, King Fahd Complex by way, Sahih International by religion, Taqi-ud-Din & Muhsin Khan by religion, Arberry by religion, Yusuf Ali by way, and Abdel Haleem by way.

Despite the fact that the root *Kafara*, shown above in the significations mentioned by Lane could have the meaning of "ungrateful" as translated by Bakhtiar, it is quite obvious through the context of the surat and the Tafsir of Ibn Kathir that the proper meaning for *Kafirun* is "unbelievers" or "disbelievers", and not "ungrateful".

As for the term *Din*, the linguistic meaning and the religious one refers to the religion, and in particular to "Islam", and do not have the meaning of "way" or "way of life" as translated by Bakhtiar.

4.3 Miscellaneous Surats

The researcher, hereafter, selected herein most of the ayat in the Quran containing the root *kafara* and analyzed them with reference to the same translators and to the exegesis of Tafsir Ibn Kathir.

Ayat in Arabic	
<p>1- إِنَّ الَّذِينَ كَفَرُوا سَوَاءٌ عَلَيْهِمْ أُنذِرْتَهُمْ أَمْ لَمْ تُنذِرْهُمْ لَا يُؤْمِنُونَ (Al-Baqara 6)</p> <p>2- لَا يَغُرَّتْكَ تَقَلُّبُ الَّذِينَ كَفَرُوا فِي الْبِلَادِ مَتَاعٌ قَلِيلٌ ثُمَّ مَأْوَاهُمْ جَهَنَّمُ وَبِئْسَ الْمَهَادُ (Al Imran 196-197)</p> <p>3- إِنَّ الَّذِينَ كَفَرُوا وَصَدُّوا عَنْ سَبِيلِ اللَّهِ قَدْ ضَلُّوا ضَلًّا بَعِيدًا إِنَّ الَّذِينَ كَفَرُوا وَظَلَمُوا لَمْ يَكُنِ اللَّهُ لِيُغْفِرَ لَهُمْ وَلَا لِيَهْدِيَهُمْ طَرِيقًا إِلَّا طَرِيقَ جَهَنَّمَ خَالِدِينَ فِيهَا أَبَدًا وَكَانَ ذَلِكَ عَلَى اللَّهِ يَسِيرًا (Al Nissa 167-168-169)</p> <p>4- وَقَالَ الَّذِينَ كَفَرُوا لَا تَسْمَعُوا لِهَذَا الْقُرْآنِ وَالْغَوْا فِيهِ لَعَلَّكُمْ تَعْلَبُونَ فَلَنُذِيقَنَ الَّذِينَ كَفَرُوا عَذَابًا شَدِيدًا وَلَنَجْزِيَنَّهُمْ أَسْوَأَ الَّذِي كَانُوا يَعْمَلُونَ (Fusilat 26-27)</p> <p>5- بَلْ عَجِبُوا أَنْ جَاءَهُمْ مُنذِرٌ مِنْهُمْ فَقَالَ الْكَافِرُونَ هَذَا شَيْءٌ عَجِيبٌ (Qaf 2)</p>	
The translator	English translation
Bakhtiar	<p>1- Truly, as for those who were ungrateful, it is the same to them whether you warned them or you warn them not. They believe not.(p.1)</p> <p>2- Let not the going to and fro delude you of those who were ungrateful in the land- a little enjoyment- again their place of shelter will be hell.(69)</p> <p>3- Truly, those who were ungrateful and barred others from the way of God, they, surely, went astray a wandering far astray. Truly, those who were ungrateful and did wrong, God will never be forgiving of them, nor guide them to a road, but the road to hell, ones who will dwell in it.(p.95)</p> <p>4- And who were ungrateful said: Hear not this, the Quran, but talk idly about it while it is being recited so that perhaps you will prevail .(p.460)</p> <p>5- Nay! They marveled that there drew near them one who warns from among themselves. So, the ones who were ungrateful said: This is a strange thing. (p.500)</p>
King Fahd Complex	<p>1- As to those who reject Faith. It is the same to them Whether thou warn them or do not warn them; They will not believe.(p.8)</p> <p>2- Let not the strutting about Of the Unbelievers Through the land Deceive thee: Little is it for enjoyment: Their Ultimate abode Is Hell: what an evil bed (To lie on)! (p.202)</p> <p>3- Those who reject Faith And keep off (men) From the Way of Allah, Have verily strayed far, Far away from the Path. Those who reject Faith And do wrong,- Allah Will not forgive them nor guide them to any way- except the way of Hell, to dwell therein for ever. And this to Allah is easy.(p.271)</p> <p>4- The Unbelievers say: "Listen not to this Qur'an but talk at random in the midst of its (reading), that ye May gain the upper hand!". But We will certainly Give the Unbelievers a taste of a severe Chastisement, And We will requite them for the worst of their deeds (p.1461-1462)</p> <p>5-</p>

<p style="writing-mode: vertical-rl; transform: rotate(180deg);">Saheeh International</p>	<p>1- Indeed, those who disbelieve – it is all the same for them whether you warn them or do not warn them – they will not believe.(p.2)</p> <p>2- Be not deceived by the [uninhibited] movement of the disbelievers throughout the land. [It is but] a small enjoyment; then their [final] refuge is Hell, and wretched is the resting place. (p.68)</p> <p>3- Indeed, those who disbelieve and avert [people] from the way of Allah have certainly gone far astray. Indeed, those who disbelieve and commit wrong [or injustice] – never will Allah forgive them, nor will He guide them to a path, Except the path of Hell; they will abide therein forever. And that, for Allah, is [always] easy.(p.93)</p> <p>4- And those who disbelieve say, "Do not listen to this Quran and speak noisily during [the recitation of] it that perhaps you will overcome." But We will surely cause those who disbelieve to taste a severe punishment, and We will surely recompense them for the worst of what they had been doing. (p.475)</p> <p>5- But they wonder that there has come to them a warner from among themselves, and the disbelievers say, "This is an amazing thing.(p.521)</p>
<p style="writing-mode: vertical-rl; transform: rotate(180deg);">Taqi-ud-Din Al-Hilali & Muhsin Khan</p>	<p>1- Verily, those who disbelieve, it is the same to them whether (O Muhammad) warn them or do not warn them, they will not believe.(p.5)</p> <p>2- Let not the free disposal (and affluence) of disbelievers throughout the land deceive you. A brief enjoyment, then their ultimate abode is Hell; and worst indeed is that place for rest. (p.134)</p> <p>3- Verily, those who disbelieve [by concealing the truth about Prophet Muhammad and his message of true Islamic Monotheism written in the Taurat (Torah) and the Injil (Gospel) with them] and prevent (mankind) from the path of Allah (Islamic Monotheism); they have certainly strayed far away. (Tafsir Al-Qurtubi). Verily, those who disbelieve and did wrong [by concealing the truth about Prophet Muhammad and his message of true Islamic Monotheism written in the Taurat (Torah) and the Injil (Gospel) with them]; Allah will not forgive them, or will He guide them to any way - (Tafsir Al-Qurtubi). Except the way of Hell, to dwell therein forever; and this is ever easy for Allah.(p178-179)</p> <p>4- And those who disbelieve say: "Listen not to this Qur'an and make noise in the midst of its (recitation) that you may overcome. But surely, We shall cause those who disbelieve to taste a severe torment, and certainly, We shall requite them the worst of what they used to do.(p.808)</p> <p>5- Nay, they wonder that there has come to them a warner (Muhammad) from among themselves. So the disbelievers say: "This is a strange thing! (p.875)</p>

J. Arberry	<p>1-As for <u>the unbelievers</u>, alike it is to them whether thou hast warned them or hast not warned them, they do not believe.(p.50)</p> <p>2- Let it not delude thee, that <u>the unbelievers</u> go to and fro in the land; a little enjoyment, then their refuge is Gehenna- an evil cradling!(p.98)</p> <p>3-Surely <u>those who disbelieve</u>, and bar from the way of God, have gone astray into far error. Surely <u>the unbelievers</u>, who have done evil, God would not forgive them, neither guide them on any road, but the road to Gehenna, therein dwelling forever and ever, and that for God is an easy matter.(p.124)</p> <p>4-<u>The unbelievers</u> say, 'Do not give ear to this Koran, and talk idly about it; haply you will overcome.' So We shall let <u>the unbelievers</u> taste a terrible chastisement, and shall recompense them with the worst of what they were working. (p.187)</p> <p>5-Nay, but they marvel that a warner has come to them from among them; and <u>the unbelievers</u> say, 'This is a strange thing !.(p.233)</p>
Ali Yusuf	<p>1-As <u>those who reject faith</u>, it is the same to whether thou warn them or do not warn them, they will not believe.(p.7)</p> <p>2-Let not the strutting about of <u>the unbelievers</u> through the land deceive thee: Little is it for enjoyment: their ultimate abode is Hell: what an evil bed (to lie on!) .(p.59)</p> <p>3-<u>Those who reject Faith</u> and keep of (men) from the way of Allah, have verily strayed for, far away from the Path. <u>Those who reject Faith</u> and do wrong- Allah will not forgive them not guide them to any way-except the way of Hell, to dwell therein for ever. And this to Allah is easy.(p.79)</p> <p>4- <u>The Unbelievers</u> say:" Listen not to this Qur'an, but talk at random in the midst of its(reading), that ye may gain the upper hand!". But We will certainly give <u>the Unbelievers</u> a taste of a severe Penalty, and We will requite them for the worst of their deeds. (p.406)</p> <p>5-But they wonder that there has come to them a Warner from among themselves. So <u>the Unbelievers</u> say: A strange thing is this! .(p.445)</p>
Abdel Haleem	<p>1-As for <u>those who disbelieve</u>, it makes no difference whether you warn them or not: they will not believe. (p.5)</p> <p>2-[Prophet], do not be deceived by <u>the disbelievers</u>' [lucrative] trading to and fro in the land: this is only a brief enjoyment, after which Hell will be their home- a miserable resting place! (p.49)</p> <p>3- <u>Those who have disbelieved</u> and barred others from God's path have gone far astray; God will not forgive <u>those who have disbelieved</u> and do evil, nor will He guide them to any path except that of Hell, where they will remain for ever-this is easy for God. (p.66)</p> <p>4-<u>The disbelievers</u> say, 'Do not listen to this Qur'an; drown it g frivolous talk: you may gain the upper hand'. We shall certainly give <u>the disbelievers</u> a severe punishment. We shall repay them according to their worst deeds.(p.309)</p> <p>5-But <u>the disbelievers</u> are amazed that a warner has come from among them and they say, 'How strange! (p.341)</p>

Tafsir Ibn Kathir

Al-Baqara 6:

{Verily, those who disbelieve} meaning, covered the truth and hid it. Since Allah has written that they would do so, it does not matter if you (O Muhammad) warn them or not, they would still have disbelieved in what you were sent with. (p.119).

{Verily, those who disbelieve, it is the same to them whether you (O Muhammad warn them or do not warn them, they will not believe} . "That the Messenger of Allah was eager for all the people to believe and follow the guidance he was sent with. Allah informed him that none would believe except for those whom He decreed happiness for in the first place, and none would stray except those who Allah has decreed to do so in the first.(p.120)

Al Imran 196-197

Warning Against Being Deceived by This Life; the Rewards of the Righteous Believers

Allah said, do not look at the disbelievers, who are enjoying various delights and joys. Soon, they will lose all this and be tied to their evil works, for verily, we are only giving them time, which deceives them, when all they have is,

{A brief enjoyment; then their ultimate abode is Hell; and worst indeed is that place for rest}. (p.355)

Al Nissa 167-168-169

{Verily, those who disbelieve and prevent (others) from the path of Allah, they have certainly strayed far away}.

For they are disbelievers themselves and do not follow the truth. They strive hard to prevent people from following and embracing Allah's path. Therefore, they have defied the truth, deviated, and strayed far away from it. Allah also mentions His judgment against those who disbelieve in His Ayat, Book and Messenger, those who wrong themselves by their disbelief and hindering others from His path, committing sins and violating His prohibitions. Allah states that He will not forgive them. (p.53)

Fusilat 26-27

How the disbelievers advised One Another not to listen to the Qur'an, and the Recompense for that

{ And those who disbelieve say: "Listen not to this Qur'an..." } means, they advised one another not to pay heed to the Qur'an or obey its commands.

{ and make noise in the midst of its } means, when it is recited, do not listen to it. This was the view of Mujahid. "And make noise in the midst of its (recitation)" means whistling and trying make the Messenger of Allah confused when he recited Qur'an, which is what the Quraysh did.

{ that you may overcome . } means, this is the practice of these ignorant disbelievers and those who follow in their footsteps, when they hear the Qur'an. Allah commanded us to be different from that, and said:

{So, when the Qur'an is recited, listen to it, and be silent that you may receive mercy. } (7:204).

Then Allah says:

{But surely. We shall cause those who disbelieve to taste a severe torment}, meaning, in return for what they do when they hear the Qur'an.

{ and certainly. We shall requite them the worst of what they used to do.} means, for their evil deeds. (p.534-535)

Qaf 2

{ Qaf. By the Glorious Qur'an. Nay, they wonder that there has come to them a warner from among themselves. So, the disbelievers say : "This is a strange thing!" } They wondered at the

wisdom behind sending a Messenger who is a human being. Allah the Exalted and Most Honored said in another Ayah:

{Is it a wonder for mankind that We have sent Our revelation to a man from among themselves (saying) : "Warn mankind. "} (10:2), meaning, this is not strange, for Allah chooses Messengers from angels and humans. (p.219)

The translation of the term "Kafirun" shows in the abovementioned ayat that it was in almost all cases translated by *disbelievers*, *unbelievers*, *those who disbelief*, *those who reject faith*, excepting the translation of Bakhtiar, who decided to use in all the ayat the term "*ungrateful*". Moreover, the term "Kafirun" was interpreted in Tafsir Ibn Kathir by "*disbelievers*" in all the discussed ayat.

It is worthy to note that the notion of context is central to translation studies as it is to other disciplines concerned with the use of language (House 2005: 338). According to Lefevere and Bassnett (1990), the study of translation practices has moved on from a formalist approach and turned instead to the larger issues of context, history and convention. Translation cannot be defined a priori, once and for all. What translation means has to be established in certain context. Contextualization of translation brings first culture and then politics and power into the picture. Consequently, the translator should consider both text and context in any translation undertaken, and this applies much more to sacred texts, especially to the Quranic text and discourse, because every revealed aya has its reason(s) of revelation. Furthermore, the knowledge of the reasons for revelation as well as the science of the exegesis of the Quran considerably helps the translator in his task and avoids mistranslation, the distortion of the text as well as accusations of manipulation.

Conclusion

Definitely, we can assert that Bakhtiar has substituted the use of **disbelievers/ unbelievers** (المشركون) by the term "ungrateful". I consider this substitution as a kind of manipulation. The latter includes deletions and omissions as well as antonymous translation. This is also the case for the translation of the term **Din** (دين) rendered by "way of life" instead of "religion". In the light of the above discussion, we could also describe the rendition of Bakhtiar as a *rewriting* instead of being a *translation* due to the same reasons the researcher has discussed and established. Nevertheless, our conclusion concerns only the ayat studied and it does not concern the whole "*Sublime Quran*" translated by Bakhtiar. We invite the Translation Studies Researchers, particularly Researchers specialised in the translation of the Meanings of the *Holy Qur'an* to undertake more Studies to be able to answer the question : whether all the

"Sublime Qur'an" is a Rewritten, a Translated, or a Manipulated text taking into consideration more samples of Surats and adopting the quantitative research, as a Recommendation.

References

- [1] Abdel Halim, M.A.S. (2015). *The Quran: a new translation*. Oxford University Press.
- [2] Al-Hilali, M. Taqi-ud-Din & Khan, M. Muhsin (1996). *Interpretation of the Meanings of the Noble Qur'an*. Maktaba Dar-us-Salam.
- [3] Ali, Abdullah Yusuf (2000). *The Holy Quran*. Wordsworth Editions.
- [4] Arberry, J.A. (1955). *The Koran Interpreted*. Collier Books.
- [5] Bakhtiar, L. (2007). *The Sublime Quran*. Kazi Publications.
- [6] Bassnett, S. (2005). *Translation Studies*. Routledge, Third edition.
- [7] Bassnett, S. (2014). *Translation*. Routledge.
- [8] Bermann, S., & Porter, C. (Eds.). (2014). *A companion to translation studies*. John Wiley & Sons.
- [9] Chinaveh, M., & Suzani, S. M. (2015). Investigating manipulation in literary translation: A study on a Persian translation of Hamlet. *Indian Journal of Fundamental and Applied Life Sciences*, 5, 1294-1301. Retrieved from: www.cibtech.org/sp.ed/jls/2015/02/jls.htm
- [10] Collier, D. (1993). The comparative method. *Political Science: The State of Discipline II*, Ada W. Finifter, ed., *American Political Science Association*. Editors: Ada W. Finifter, pp.105-119
- [11] Delabastita, D., Baker, M., & Saldanha, G. (2020). *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*.
- [12] Dukate, A. (2007). Manipulation as a specific phenomenon in translation and interpreting. *Riga: University of Latvia*.
- [13] Farahzad, F.(1998). *A Gestalt Approach to Text Manipulation in Translation*. Retrieved from: <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED429437.pdf>
- [14] Forrai, R. (2018). *Translation as Rewriting: A modern theory for a premodern practice*. Issues in Translation. Renaissanceforum 14. Retrieved from: www.renaessenceforum.dk
- [15] Gentzler, E. (2017). *Translation and Rewriting in the Age of Post-Translation Studies*. New York: Routledge.
- [16] Hermans, T. (1999). *Translation in Systems: Descriptive and System oriented Approaches Explained*, London.
- [17] House, J. (2005). *Text and context in translation*. *Journal of Pragmatics* 38, p 338–358. Retrieved from: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0378216605002109>
- [18] Hutcheon, L. (2006). *A Theory of Adaptation*. Routledge.
- [19] Khorsand, M., & Salmani, B. (2014). Manipulation of original ideology through translation: A discourse-based translation quality assessment of speeches. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, 3(5), 134-149. <http://dx.doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.3n.5p.134>
- [20] Kramina, A. (2004). *Translation as Manipulation: Causes and Consequences, Opinions and Attitudes*. KALBŪ STUDIJS, Studies About Languages, No. 6. Retrieved from: https://www.kalbos.lt/archyvas2_en.html
- [21] Lane, E. W. (1863). *Arabic-English Lexicon*. Online: <http://lexicon.quranic-research.net/index.html>
- [22] Lefevere, A (1992a). *Translation, Rewriting and the Manipulation of Literary Fame*, London & New York.
- [23] Lefevere, A (1992b.). *Translation/ History/ Culture: A Sourcebook*, London and New York.
- [24] Lefevere, A. (1984). On the refraction of texts: An Interdisciplinary Approach. Dans Spariosu, Mihai (dir.), *Mimesis in Contemporary Theory* (p. 217-237). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- [25] Lefevere, A. (1985). "Why Waste our Time on Rewrites? The Trouble with Interpretation and the Role of Rewriting in an Alternative Paradigm", *The Manipulation of Literature: Studies in Literary Translation*, ed.: Theo Hermans, London, 215-243.
- [26] Lefevere, A., & Bassnett, S. (1990). Introduction: Proust's grandmother and the thousand and one nights: The 'cultural turn'in translation studies. *Translation, history and culture*, 1-13.
- [27] Natalya V. Klimovich (2016). *Manipulative Strategies in the Translations of Literary Texts Carried Out in the Soviet Union*. *Journal of Siberian Federal University. Humanities & Social Sciences* 3 (2016 9), 543-550 Retrieved from :<https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/38647327.pdf>

-
- [28] Robinson, D (1997a). *What is Translation? Centrifugal Theories, Critical Interventions*, Kent, OH & London.
- [29] Robinson, D. (1992). *Classical theories of translation from Cicero to Aulus Gellius*. *TcT* 7, 15-55. Retrieved from: https://www.academia.edu/35015463/Classical_Theories_of_Translation_from_Cicero_to_Aulus_Gellius
- [30] Rosa, A. A. (2016). Descriptive translation studies of audiovisual translation: 21st-century issues, challenges and opportunities. *Target. International Journal of Translation Studies*, 28(2), 192-205.
- [31] Sanatifar, M. S. (2013). Translation, Manipulation and Social Movement. *American Journal of Translation Studies*, 2, 95-117.
- [32] Screnock, J. (2018). Is Rewriting Translation?: Chronicles and Jubilees in Light of Intralingual Translation. *Vetus Testamentum*, 68(3), 475-504. Retrieved from: <https://ixtheo.de/Record/1577822153>
- [33] Shen, C. (2016, December). The Comparison of 'Rewriting' of Howard Goldblatt & Andre Lefevere's Translation Thoughts. In *2016 International Conference on Advances in Management, Arts and Humanities Science (AMAHS 2016)* (pp. 1-5). Atlantis Press.
- [34] Shuping, R. (2013). Translation as rewriting. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 3(18), 55-59. October. http://www.ijhssnet.com/journals/Vol_3_No_18_October_2013/6.pdf
- [35] Snell-Hornby, M (2006). *The Turns of Translation Studies*. Benjamins Translation Library.
- [36] Snell-Hornby, M. (1989). *Translation Studies: An Integrated Approach*. John Benjamins Publishing
- [37] Tafsir Ibn Kathir (2003). Abridged by a group of scholars under the supervision of SHAYKH SAFI LI RAHMAN AL-MUBARAKPURI. Darussalam.
- [38] *The Holy Quran: English translation of the meanings and commentary* (1990). King Fahd Complex.
- [39] *The Qur'an: English Meanings* (1997). Edited by Saheeh International.