

The Place of Marracci's Latin Translation of the Holy Quran: A Linguistic Investigation

Omar A. Sheikh Al-Shabab

*Assistant Professor, Department of Foreign Languages,
King Faisal University, Al-Ahsa, Saudi Arabia*

(Received A. H. 6/11/1420, accepted A.H. 22/1/1421)

Abstract. Ludovico Marracci's Latin translation of the Quran, published in 1698, has not been studied by a native speaker of Arabic. The views and purpose of the work, as the title *Refutatio Alcorani* suggests, have overshadowed the contribution of Marracci as a translator. In this paper, Marracci's contribution is examined in light of his methodological achievement. His main strategy is seen in a strong commitment to "exactitude". This is evident in his use of parallel grammatical structures. Marracci also employed communicative strategies as seen in providing explanatory subtitles and translating by "default". His translation, therefore, shows features of difference, inadequacy and impossibility. The painstaking achievement of Marracci is seen in his influence on later translations of the Quran into European languages. In this subculture, which generated misunderstanding of Muslims and Arabs in the West, Marracci is central. But, his contribution to the field of translation, the paper argues, is everlasting.

1. Marracci's Translation of the Quran

The Quran is, undoubtedly, the most influential text in the Arabic language [1; 2] and its translation has preoccupied scholars more than any other Arabic text. Ludovico Marracci's Latin translation of the Holy Quran (published in 1698)[3] is, in our view, one of the most elaborate translations of this text into European languages. The abundance of impressionistic and sketchy views on this translation [4 ; 5], which have been, by and large, evoked by Marracci's anti-Muslims sentiments and arguments, have overshadowed his painstaking linguistic achievement. The linguistic merits of his translation have not, to my knowledge, been studied by a native speaker of Arabic[6].

By the year 1698, the date of publication of Marracci's translation, Muslim Turks were in control of all North Africa and a number of European countries. This seems to have evoked a number of translations of the Quran including the first German

translation by Schweiggern (1623)[7]. Against this evolving background, Marracci's translation came to pin down the exact wording of the Quran in Latin, a task which was not undertaken by the first Latin translation by Retenensis and Dalmati[8] completed in 1143 and published in 1543. More important from Marracci's point of view, the translation of the Quran was to provide a rebuttal to the Muslims' faith and way of life.

No Arabic text other than the Quran has been translated into so many languages. Its translations, therefore, make up the best corpus for the study of different theoretical and practical aspects of translation. The translation of the Quran has been opposed by Muslim scholars on linguistic and rhetorical ground (see the views of Al-Jahiz in [9]), as well as on theological grounds [10 ; 11].

Marracci's translation under the title *Refutatio Alcorani* is central to the study of the rise of a specific religious genre in European languages. The present paper is based on a wide-scale on-going project which studies the translation of the Quran into European languages[6], which will shed light on the pivotal role of Marracci's translation in European context.

2. The Present Paper

The present paper aims at investigating the linguistic manifestations of Marracci's translation in terms of his language, purpose and strategy. This should, on the one hand, establish the role Marracci's translation has played in the European context, and should, on the other hand, highlight its influence on the European scene. Our present endeavor, therefore, amounts to examining Marracci's translation in order to (1) evaluate this translation in terms of exactitude, (2) discover the strategy employed by the translator, and (3) study the Latin text from the point of view of the reader of this translation. This last point touches on the question of the theoretical implications of introducing, via translation, a new genre into a given language. This will be viewed in light of Al-Shabab's assumptions about the nature of the language of translation [6;12; 13], a frame which is developed to incorporate linguistic and cultural "difference" within a hermeneutic approach to translation [14].

3. Aspects of Marracci's Purpose and Strategy

A hundred and fifty-three years after the publication of the first Latin translation of the Quran by Retenensis and Dalmati in 1543[8], and one hundred and forty-nine years after the first Italian translation by Arrivabene in 1547[15] came Marracci's translation. Before it, there were also the first German translation (from the Italian translation) by Schweiggern in 1623[7], the first French translation by Du Ryer 1647[16], and the first English translation (from the French translation) by Ross in 1649[17]. Marracci's translation seemed determined to give the coup de grace to the project of translating the Quran into European languages, since his *Refutatio Alcorani*, he may have thought, would be enough to end any interest in that text[18]. To secure the best results for his purpose, he used the universal language of Europe at the time, Latin. But the fascinating side of Marracci's endeavor is the strategy (or method) which

he adopted to achieve his purpose. This method came in the form of a meticulous translation, which acts as a concrete background used as a launching pad for his theological "attack" against the Muslims and their Holy Book [19 - 21]. In the following sections, some linguistic features of Marracci's translation will be investigated, and its success or failure in achieving its purpose will be evaluated.

The present paper also examines Marracci's translation from the point of view of the theoretical frame provided by Al-Shabab [6]. According to this frame, translation is taken to be an interpretive activity. This will necessarily yield "difference" no matter who the translator is or what text-type he is handling [14 ; 22]. The last paper has also designated "inadequacy" and "impossibility" as two theoretical notions operational at all levels of translation and in any utterance of a translated text (TT). The present paper, therefore, remains a statement in a wider argument which is being currently formulated by the researcher, to explain the translations of the Quran into European languages, and at the same time test the theory about the independence of the language of translation [6; 23]. The paper will trace the germs of the emergence of a translation culture which shows internal cohesion (i.e., following set conventions) and external tension in the context of the target language and culture.

4. Exactitude: Grammatical Aspects of Marracci's Translation

The most striking aspect of Marracci's translation of the Quran is the fact that, contrary to the general belief, and quite unexpectedly following his flamboyant title, *Refutatio Alcorani*, it is "faithful" to the original. This "faithfulness" in Marracci's translation harbors an apparent paradox. Doubtlessly, the debate about "faithfulness" to the original is outdated [23; 24]. The current use in the literature of the umbrella term "literal translation" is not satisfactory, because the term is vague. But worse than that, it is impossible to attain what is termed "literal translation" [23 - 29].

- (1) The Ciceronean dictum 'non verbum pro verbo...' (Cicero, 5, 14-15), echoed in Horace, 'nec verbum verbo curabis reddere fidus interpres...' (Horace, 128-35), should not be understood as a desire for having a different translation, but as a necessity for producing a viable acceptable translation. Any theory of translation, therefore, should aim at explaining and incorporating difference, rather than chasing the mirage of 'equivalence' via constructed formulae and short-winded instances [14].

It is hoped that this paper will shed some light on the apparent conflict between purpose and strategy/method in this translation. To scrutinize this method, a close look into the language of Marracci's translation is necessary. In this section, three grammatical units in a typical example will be studied.

Below is Marracci's translation of the well known "creed verse" (the verse of the Throne, Sura 2, verse 256), preceded by the Arabic 'aya (verse).

اللَّهُ لَا إِلَهَ إِلَّا هُوَ الْحَيُّ الْقَيُّومُ لَا تَأْخُذُهُ سِنَّةٌ وَلَا نَوْمٌ لَهُ مَا فِي السَّمَوَاتِ وَمَا فِي الْأَرْضِ مَنْ ذَا الَّذِي يَشْفَعُ عِنْدَهُ إِلَّا بِإِذْنِهِ يَعْلَمُ مَا بَيْنَ أَيْدِيهِمْ وَمَا خَلْفَهُمْ وَلَا يُحِيطُونَ بِشَيْءٍ مِنْ عِلْمِهِ إِلَّا بِمَا شَاءَ وَسِعَ كُرْسِيُّهُ السَّمَوَاتِ وَالْأَرْضَ وَلَا يَئُودُهُ حِفْظُهُمَا وَهُوَ الْعَلِيُّ الْعَظِيمُ . (٢٥٦)

[سورة البقرة ، الآية ٢٥٦ ، القرآن الكريم من نسخة إصدار صخر للحاسب الآلي]

Deus: non est Deus præter ipsum: Vivus, Subsistens. Non capit eum dormitatio, neque somnus. Ipsi est quod in Caelis, & quod in terra reperitur. Quis est ille qui intercedat apud eum, nisi per voluntatem ejus? Scit quod *suit* ante eos, & quod erit post eos: & non comprehendent rem ullam de scientia ejus, nisi quatenus *ipse* voluerit. Ambit amplitudine sedes ejus, Cælos, & terram, neque gravat illum custodia arborum: & ipse est Excelsus, Magnus.

(Sura II. Verse 257; [3, p. 95]).

Systemic grammar as expounded by M. A. K. Halliday and his followers will be used to describe the grammatical structures in the ST and the translated text (TT). The systemic model was formulated in Halliday (1961)[30], and later developed in Halliday (1967-8)[31] and Halliday (1985)[32]. This model proved to be a powerful apparatus when used to describe actual, not constructed, corpora, by Huddleston et al.[33], by Baka[34] and by Al-Shabab[35]. The systemic model has additional advantage in that it has also developed a textlinguistic analysis under the study of cohesion[36] and discourse analysis[37]. This component of the systemic model has been later developed by a number of linguists, including Burton[38], Martin[39], Al-Shabab[35], Berry[40], Fauwcet[41], Baka[34], Baker[42] and Baka[43].

Three grammatical units, the three upper units of the grammatical rank-scale[44], will be investigated here. They are: the sentence, the clause and the group. The description of the first unit, the sentence, is shown below. The Arabic sentence appears in the middle of the line and the parallel Latin translation follows:

(3) / اللَّهُ لَا إِلَهَ إِلَّا هُوَ الْحَيُّ الْقَيُّومُ /

/ Deus: non est Deus præter ipsum: Vivus, Subsistens. /

/ لَا تَأْخُذُهُ سِنَّةٌ وَلَا نَوْمٌ /

/ Non capit eum dormitatio, neque somnus. /

/ لَهُ مَا فِي السَّمَوَاتِ وَمَا فِي الْأَرْضِ /

/ Ipsi est quod in Caelis, & quod in terra reperitur. /

/ مَنْ ذَا الَّذِي يَشْفَعُ عِنْدَهُ إِلَّا بِإِذْنِهِ /

/ Quis est ille qui intercedat apud eum, nisi per voluntatem ejus? /

/ يَعْلَمُ مَا بَيْنَ أَيْدِيهِمْ وَمَا خَلْفَهُمْ /

/ Scit quod *suit* ante eos, & quod erit post eos: /

/ وَكَأَيُّ حَيْطُونَ بِشَيْءٍ مِنْ عِلْمِهِ إِلَّا بِمَا شَاءَ /

/ & non comprehendent rem ullam de scientia ejus, nisi quatenus *ipse* voluerit./

/ وَسِعَ كُرْسِيُّهُ السَّمَوَاتِ وَالْأَرْضَ /

/ Ambit amplitudine sedes ejus, Caelos, & terram, /

/ وَكَأَيُّ نُوذَةٍ حَفِظُهَا /

/ neque gravat illum custodia amborum: /

/ وَهُوَ الْعَلِيُّ الْعَظِيمُ /

/ & ipse *est* Excelsus, Magnus. /

(Sura II, Verse 256) [3].

The verse contains nine sentences in Arabic. The first four sentences are rendered in four sentences in Latin. Sentences five and six are translated as one sentence with a colon to separate two Coordinated clauses. The last three sentences in Arabic are rendered in one three-clause sentence; each Latin clause parallels one Arabic sentence. Hence, each Arabic sentence has a parallel Latin sentence or coordinated clause, yielding a regular parallel structure between the source text (ST) and the translated text (TT). One can also see the essential fact that the “verse” as a Quranic unit, is completely independent from the grammatical level in general, and from the sentence as a grammatical unit in particular. One “verse” (or *aya*) may realize one clause in a complex sentence, or, otherwise, it may realize a number of sentences as in (3) above.

At stake in (3) above are two grammatical features. Firstly, the high degree of structural parallelism between ST and TT is maintained. This, however, does not amount to one-to-one relation at the level of the sentence. It is clear that nine sentences in the Arabic ST have been realized in six sentences in the Latin TT. The sentence initial use of the coordinator “*wa*” (and) is a normal feature of sentence structure in Arabic [45]. This practice is not common in Latin, in which coordination is, by and large, an intrasentential relation. Secondly, despite this structural difference at the level of the sentence, it is quite clear that the translation shows a high degree of exactitude at the grammatical level of sentence boundary, i.e., a ST sentence is translated either as a sentence or as a coordinated clause.

Now in (4) below a description of the same “verse” at the level of sentence structure, i.e., clause boundary in both ST and TT in undertaken. Following systemic conventions [46], two slanted bars “//” are used to indicate clause boundary and three slanted bars “///” are used to indicate a rank-shifted clause. A rank-shifted clause is a clause which functions as a lower unit, (a group), inside another cause [46], and see the debate about rank-shifted reported clauses in Al-Shabab 1986) [35].

(4) // اللَّهُ // لَأِ إِلَهَ إِلَّا هُوَ /// الْحَيُّ /// الْقَيُّومُ /// (4)

// Deus: // non est Deus præter ipsum: /// Vivus, /// Subsistens. ///

// لَمْ تَأْخُذْهُ سِنَةٌ // وَتَا نَوْمٌ //

// Non capit eum dormitatio, // neque somnus. //

// لَهُ مَا فِي السَّمَوَاتِ // وَمَا فِي الْأَرْضِ //

// Ipsi est quod in Caelis, // & quod in terra reperitur. //

// مَنْ ذَا الَّذِي يَشْفَعُ عِنْدَهُ // إِلَّا بِإِذْنِهِ //

// Quis est ille // qui intercedat apud eum, // nisi per voluntatem ejus? //

// يَعْلَمُ // مَا بَيْنَ أَيْدِيهِمْ // وَمَا خَلْفَهُمْ //

// Scit // quod suit ante eos, // & quod erit post eos: //

// وَتَا يُحِيطُونَ بِشَيْءٍ مِنْ عِلْمِهِ //

// & non comprehendent rem ullam de scientia ejus, //

// إِلَّا بِمَا شَاءَ //

// nisi quatenus ipse voluerit. //

// وَسِعَ كُرْسِيُّهُ السَّمَوَاتِ وَالْأَرْضَ //

//Ambit amplitudine sedes ejus, Cælos, & terram, //

// وَتَا يَتُودُهُ حِفْظُهُمَا //

// neque gravat illum custodia amborum: //

// وَهُوَ الْعَلِيُّ الْعَظِيمُ //

// & ipse est Excelsus, Magnus. //

(Sura II, Verse 256) [3].

A thorough examination of clause boundary in both ST and TT reveals an obvious, but surprising effort on behalf of the translator to stay as close as possible to the ST sentence structure. Every clause boundary is observed and rendered as a clause boundary in the TT. Thus, the level of the clause shows a higher degree of parallel structure: nineteen Arabic clauses are realized in nineteen Latin clauses. This means that the grammatical structures and the semantic functions realized in the clause, (such as the function of focus in topic/comment structuring, and transitivity functions) underline the importance of the clause as a grammatical unit. This is true not only at the monolingual level [30- 32], but also at the level of translation. Thus, the clause seems to resist divisibility and omission in the translation of a sensitive religious text.

The third unit to be used to investigate exactitude at the level of grammatical structure is the group. The boundary of the group designates the functional units inside

the clause. Three slanted bars “///” normally indicate the boundary of the group. A rank-shifted group will have four slanted “////”, and a number sign “#” is used to indicate group boundary within a graphological word as (5) shows.

(5) //// اللَّهُ //// لَا إِلَهَ // إِلَّا هُوَ //// الْحَيُّ //// الْقَيُّومُ ////

/// Deus: /// non est Deus // præter ipsum: /// Vivus, /// Subsistens. ///

/// // لَا // تَأْخُذُهُ // سِنَةٌ // وَإِنَّا // نَوْمٌ //

/// Non // capit # eum // dormitatio, // ne#que // somnus. ///

/// لَهُ // مَا // فِي // السَّمَوَاتِ // وَإِنَّمَا // فِي // الْأَرْضِ //

/// Ipsi // est quod // in Caelis, /// & // quod // in terra reperitur. ///

/// مَنْ // ذَا // الَّذِي // يَشْفَعُ // عِنْدَهُ // إِلَّا // بِإِذْنِهِ //

/// Quis // est ille // qui // intercedat // apud eum, // nisi // per voluntatem ejus? ///

/// يَعْلَمُ // مَا // بَيْنَ // أَيْدِيهِمْ // وَ // مَا // خَلْفَهُمْ //

/// Scit /// quod // suit ante eos, /// & quod // erit post eos: ///

/// وَ // مَا // يُحِيطُونَ // بِشَيْءٍ // مِنْ // عِلْمِهِ //

/// & non // comprehend#ent // rem // ullam de scientia ejus, ///

/// // إِلَّا // لِمَا // شَاءَ //

/// nisi // quatenus // ipse voluerit. //

/// وَسَمِعَ // كُرْسِيِّهِ // السَّمَوَاتِ // وَالْأَرْضِ //

///Ambit // amplitudine // sedes ejus, // Cælos, // & terram, ///

/// وَ // مَا // يَتُودُ# // حِفْظُهُمَا //

/// neque // grav#at // illum custodia amborum: ///

/// وَهُوَ // الْعَلِيُّ // الْعَظِيمُ //

/// & ipse est // Excelsus, Magnus. ///

(Sura II, Verse 256)[3].

A brief look at the elements of clause structure will reveal that these elements, which are nothing but groups, show the specific obligatory features of the SL and TL. It was seen in the previous section that at the level of the clause, optimal structural parallelism is maintained. This means that the outside frame, the upper unit, in which groups are realized is properly fixed. But inside this frame the groups abide by the requirements of the specific grammatical options available in a given language, Arabic or Latin in this case. A prominent difference at group level is seen in the use of the Latin verb “esse” (to be), in equative sentences. In Arabic this will take the form of a

nominal sentence, i.e., a verbless sentence or a clause with the structure of noun and complement, with no surface verb. Thus, the second group in (6) has a negative “لَا” operator and a noun “إِلَهٌ”. The parallel Latin has the negative operator “non”, the verb “est” and a noun “Deus”.

In fact, Marracci has written the word in *italic* script to point out to the absence of this verb in the Arabic text.

(6) *لَا إِلَهَ إِلَّا هُوَ ۖ الْحَيُّ الْقَيُّومُ* *///*

/// Deus: /// non est Deus // præeter ipsum: /// Vivus, /// Subsistens. ///

This use of the verb “esse” is quite frequent in Latin as the two following cases from the example under analysis show.

(7) *مَنْ ذَا الَّذِي يَشْفَعُ عِنْدَهُ إِلَّا بِإِذْنِهِ* *///*

/// Quis // est ille // qui // intercedat // apud eum, // nisi // per voluntatem ejus? //

يَعْلَمُ مَا بَيْنَ أَيْدِيهِمْ ۖ وَ مَا خَلْفَهُمْ *///*

/// Scit /// quod // suit ante eos, /// & quod // erit post eos: ///

The second group in the first sentence translates “ذَا” as “*est ille*” and the third group in the second sentence translates “بَيْنَ أَيْدِيهِمْ” “*suit ante eos*”. In each of these three cases, in (6) and (7), Latin requires two groups (an extra verb group) where Arabic requires only one. The use of italic writing shows the strategy adopted by Marracci at its best. It is a relentless strife for achieving what has been called here “exactitude” as measured by parallel structures.

5. Aspects of Marracci’s Communicative Strategies

The previous section has illustrated Marracci’s strife for “exactitude” at the level of grammatical structure. But is that all that can be said about his strategy? A more fundamental question is the following: Would the presence of exactitude end the search for difference in translation? To give a brief answer, two communicative strategies, the use of explanatory subscript, the use of loan words, and the omission of Latin cohesive conjunctions, will be sketched in this section.

It was seen earlier that Marracci did his best to indicate Latin grammar words which do not appear in the Arabic text (see section 4 above). This practice exemplified by the use of the verb “esse”, follows an obligatory principle dictated by the grammatical rules of Latin. Providing extra information to clarify an aspect of meaning or to highlight certain views is very different in nature from grammatical necessity. In (8) below the extra utterance (written in *italic* and put in brackets by Marracci) amounts to a “footnote”, or rather a subscript, against which the translation of the relevant preceding counterpart should be read.

(8) *عَلِمْتُ نَفْسًا مَا أَخْضَرْتُ*

Sciet anima, quid præsentalverit (*idest operata fuerit*).

The Latin translation has rendered the Arabic utterance as "what everyone has presented". The verb "present" is nearest in meaning (i.e., dictionary denotation) to the Arabic "أَحْضَرَتْ". Between brackets in italic writing, Marracci explains the specific meaning of "præsentalverit" by "*idest operata fuerit*" (*what she/he has done*). This shows that the translator had on his mind, in addition to providing an "exact" Latin translation, the wider and deeper communicative concern of making sense. Thus, despite his determination to "stick" to the ST, Marracci found it impossible to produce a meaningful translation that way (see [47 - 50] for the manipulation of information in TT). Therefore, he guarded himself against any divergence from the ST by providing clear signals in the form of bracketed italic subscripts. The source, scale and nature of using such subscripts are currently being investigated by the researcher outside this paper. However, for the sake of the present argument, it is clear that in this respect, Marracci has poised the balance in favor of communicative strategies at the expense of the general strategy which requires exactitude. Upholding the communicative stance on the part of Marracci assumes and allows the receiver to read the TT as one united independent text, with no reference to the ST[23, pp. 75]).

The second communicative strategy is seen in his use of Arabic loan words, a phenomenon which is as old as translating the Septuagint[51]. This particular practice can be seen as running a course diametrically opposed to "exactitude" (i.e., an exact translation is not expected to use foreign words). From a different point of view, it can be said that by employing loan words, Marracci is able to obtain absolute exactitude, since he uses the "exact" (in fact the same) words as "functional" elements in the TL communicative system. But loan words are *not* "translations".

The significance of loan words in translation is best understood when this phenomenon is analyzed as a failure to translate on the part of the translator. The translator seems to flout his/her *raison d'être* when s/he decides to translate by "default" (i.e., not to translate but temporarily yield to ST logic). This seems natural enough and a simple interpretation of the use of loan words in TTs. The theoretical implications, however, are far-reaching, since translation by default presupposes the presence of an Arabic lexicon at work in Marracci's translation. Loan words have to undergo, via translation, a period of "rehabilitation" within the realm of the TT. The unity of the TT as seen in its cohesion and coherence will bring about this process of rehabilitation (for the notion of unity of the TT see [52] 1994, and for the notion of cohesion and coherence see [41; 42]. Later, loan words may gain acceptance and start to function in the TT regardless of the SL lexicon. At stake here are two theoretical notions: (1) the independence of the TT, and, consequently, the LT; (2) the fact that when initiated in translation loan words are not translations in the accepted sense of the term. The second point constitutes the bedrock for our argument which questions the very possibility of translating religious texts.

The third communicative feature of Marracci's translation is a "negative" one, namely the lack of cohesive conjunctions in his translation. In a comparable Latin text one would find intersentential conjunctions which would bring out the relationships between sentences and at the same time present the text within the Latin rhetorical tradition. This communicative strategy has been sacrificed by Marracci, in what seems to be an effort to remain "faithful" to the ST.

6. The Place of Marracci's Translation in Its European Context

Linguistically and culturally, Marracci's translation stands out as central on the European scene (see section 1 above). The dynamic momentum created by this work deserves thorough investigation. In this short space, however, mention can be made of the primary functions of this translation in the context of the European culture.

Firstly, Marracci's translation had established a standard which directly or indirectly, influenced all subsequent translations of the Quran into European languages. Sale's celebrated English translation (first published 1734)[53] owes, at least, its method to Marracci's contribution. Sale's translation was in effect a great improvement on that of Ross who translated Du Ryer's French translation into English [16; 17]. Savery's French translation (1783)[54] also bears witness to the Marracci text. **The thread which holds the Marraccian subculture together, runs through all the major translations of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.** These translations include the German translations by Rückert[55] 1888, and by Paret[56] 1983; the French translations by Fatma Zaida[57] 1861, and Blachère[58] 1957, 1980; the English translations by Rodwell[59] 1861, and Arberry[60] 1956; the Italian translations by Calza[61] 1872, and Bonelli[62] 1987; the Spanish translations by Puebla[63] 1872, and Vernet[64] 1980, 1993; and the Russian translations[65] by Sablounkova 1878 and by the Ahmadi sect (no date). The internal concern of this subculture gives it a unifying purpose and independence which will buttress the independence of the TT and the language of translation (for the unity of the TT see Rosenzweig[52] and for the independence of the LT see Al-Shabab [6]).

Secondly, Marracci has superceded previous translations, especially the first Latin translation by Retenesis and Dalmati[8] produced in 1143 and published in 1543, to establish a European subculture, a European trademark, in the field of translating the most important Arabic text, the Quran. **This subculture which was born in the Middle Ages with the crusaders, is responsible for maintaining a deeply-rooted misunderstanding of Islam and the Arabs in the West [20; 66].**

The emergence of the Quran translation subculture is a move toward independence from the ST, i.e., toward the appropriation of the original[26]. In this sense translation produces tension, since the TT refuses to be read as a subscript to the ST, or to stand in permanent intertextual relation to the ST, albeit the great potential and the inherent power of the ST[23 ; 25]. To study the nature and the independent status of the breakaway translation subculture is essential for providing evidence to support the hypothesis about the independence of the language of translation)[6; 67].

From this perspective, it is assumed that any text, including translated texts, no matter how short or "trivial" strives to say what it means regardless of other texts. The TT assumes complete autonomy when it functions as an independent text as witnessed in "language in use".

Thirdly, Marracci succeeded in transforming the practice of translating the Quran from a marginal activity to a scholarly, original and purposeful enterprise. Previous translations started as "compromised" regimes[68; 69] undertaken by isolated figures. These figures included a team of foreigners in Spain (the first Latin translation 1143)[8], an Italian by the name Arrivabene (the first Italian 1547)[15], a German who came across this Italian translation (first German translation 1623)[7], the French consul to Alexandria (the first French translation 1647)[16] and an Englishman who translated the first French translation (Ross 1649)[17]. Marracci worked from the original Arabic text and provided a running commentary which shows both his biased ideology and his erudition. **When Marracci's translation is studied in its wide European context, it will reveal that he has succeeded in establishing a well-defined translation genre in European languages.**

Fourthly, Marracci's translation has created a number of tension points. There is tension between Arabic and Latin, tension between Islamic concepts (monotheistic ideology) and Christian concepts (trinity). There is an overall tension between Islamic-Arabic culture and Western culture. Translation, therefore, can be seen here, not as a deliberate effort to produce a "regime" (of compromises) as suggested by Pym [68; 69], but rather a vehicle of bringing cultures and civilizations to face-to-face confrontation. Unfortunately, the translations of the Quran have not succeeded in generating more good will and understanding, history teaches anyone who is interested[70]. In fact, Marracci's basic purpose of refuting the Quran has not succeeded from the Muslims' point of view, since no Muslim would read Marracci's translation or books with the view of learning about his/her religion. **Marracci's purpose, we hold, is originally to reaffirm and buttress the belief of priesthood in the Muslim's Holy Book. In this sense Maracci was preaching to his fellow believers who were well converted and won to his message.**

7. Linguistic Features of the Language of Translation

In sections (2) and (3) above Marracci's translation showed features of difference at the level of grammatical structure, inadequacy at the level of style and rhetoric, and impossibility in the case of loan words and concepts. Though these notions are fundamentally linguistic notions, still they have revealed that translation generates and harbors tension between two texts, two cultures and two different worlds. Monolingual Babel is an exotic dreamland, the bedrock on which culture is built. Translated – adulterated – texts store enough tension to pressurize users, under the urge of understanding, to subscribe to false stereotypes, and under the urge of need, to appropriate the ST. Hence, an interpretative theory of translation can use difference, inadequacy and the impossibility in translation to explain the nature of the language of

translation and aspects of translation culture as manifested in 6 above. But such a theory should also incorporate appropriation as evidently resulting from need and from language in contact.

8. Conclusions

The findings of the present work can be summarized in a number of concluding remarks.

1. In Marracci's translation exactitude is vehemently pursued and a high percentage of it is attained.
2. Explanatory subscripts are sparingly employed as a communicative strategy. When they are necessary, they are given priority over exactitude. Thus, the strategic decision of creating a TT, i.e., a unified and independent TT, is above considerations of fidelity and accuracy.
3. Arabic words are used in the Latin text when translation is impossible. However, translation by default is a pragmatic principle which relegates translation itself. Hence, the drive for translation and its mechanisms are suspended when impossibility persists.
4. The receiver of the translation is a scholar priest who is interested in Marracci's arguments and is patient enough to endure foreign "thought", Arabic diction and unusual collocations. In short, the receiver must face the world of Islam in Latin in order to "make sense" of the new genre.
5. The presence of the linguistic features of difference, inadequacy and impossibility amounts to an evidence of the interpretive power of the translator. These linguistic notions make up the main areas of study which test the general hypothesis about the independence of the language of translation from both the SL and the TL.
6. Marracci has established a standard, a blueprint of the method and practice, for the translators of the Quran into European languages.
7. Marracci has played a central role in a subculture specific to the translators of the Quran into European languages, a subculture which has fostered and propagated distorted views about Islam and the Arabs.
8. Marracci's *Refutatio Alcorani* has failed to refute the Quran. It has, however, supplied non-Muslims with enough argumentation to reaffirm and maintain their own beliefs and world-view.

The present paper has attempted to outline the place of Marracci's translation in European context. Marracci's significant contribution, which is evident in his language and the influence of his translation on the European scene, needs a thorough investigation. This contribution seems to lie in his method and strategy and not in fulfilling his set purpose. If his purpose was to refute the Quran itself, then, his was an

aim which could not be achieved, since the logic of knowledge and belief[71] preempts that scheme. In other words, no one can conquer "faith". Still, Marracci should be credited for his deliberate effort and elaborate methodology. However, as it is always the case, translation seems to beguile the translator. In the case of Marracci though, it seems that translation has secured him a definite place in the history of the field.

Note

1. The words (i.e., characters and spelling) from Marracci's Latin translation are quoted as they are written in the original document, in the British Library copy.

References

- [1] Al-Jabiri, Muhamed A. *Takwiin al'aql al'arabii* (The Make-Up of the Arab Mind). Beirut: Arabic Cultural Centre, 1991.
- [2] Al-Jabiri, Muhamed A. *Bunyat al'aql all'arabii* (The Structure of the Arabic Mind). Beirut: Arabic Cultural Centre, 1993.
- [3] Marracci, L. *Refutatio Alcorani*. 2 Volumes. Patavii: Typographia Seminarii, 1698.
- [4] Badawi, Abdulrahman. *Diraasaan wa nusuus fii alfalsafa 'inda al'arab* (Studies and Texts on Arabic Philosophy and Science). Beirut: Arabic Studies and Publications, n. d.
- [5] Badawi, Abdulrahman. *Mawsuu'at almustashriqiin* (Orientalists' Encyclopaedia). Beirut: Dar al'ilm lilmalayin, 1989.
- [6] Al-Shabab, Omar S. *Interpretation and the Language of Translation: Creativity and Convention in Translation*. London: Janus, 1996.
- [7] Schweiggem, S. *Alcoranus Mahometicus, das ist: der Türcken Alcoran*. Nürnberg, 1623.
- [8] Retenensis, R., and H. Dalmat. *Machumetis Sarracenorum Principis Vita ac Doctrina Omnis, Quae & ... Alcoranum Dicitur, ex Arabica Lingua ante cccc Annos in Latinam Translata...* 3 Volumes. Basle (translated 1143, published 1543).
- [9] Banati, Muhamed S. *Alnazariyaat allugawiya waalbalaagiya waal'adabiya 'inda aljaaHiZ in albayaan waaltabyiin* (Linguistic, Rhetorical and Literary Theories in Albayan and Altabyiin). Algiers: University Publication Bureau, 1983.
- [10] Othman, Abdulaziz. *Tarjamat alquraan alkartiim baiyna waaqi'inaa almu'aash wamustaqbalinaa almanshuud* (The Translation of the Holy Quran between Our Reality and Our Prospects). Hyderabad: Hyderabad University, 1992.
- [11] Al-Safi, Othman A. A. *Alqur'aan alkartiim: bid'iyatu tarjamati ...* (The Holy Quran: The Hearsay of Its Translation ...). Beirut and Damascus, 1991.
- [12] Al-Shabab, Omar S. "Transitivity Analysis of Radio News and Recipe Texts." in F. Baka and Omar S. Al-Shabab, eds., *Discourse Structuring and Text Analysis of Three Varieties of English*. London: Janus, 1996, 103-43.
- [13] Al-Shabab, Omar S. "Organizational and Textual Structuring of Radio News Discourse in English and Arabic." Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Aston University, UK, 1986.
- [14] Al-Shabab, Omar S. "Translating with Difference." In O. S. Al-Shabab and F. Baka, *Linguistic Applications: Teaching English in Arabic Context*. Damascus, Dibs Typesetting, 1997, 83-165.
- [15] Arrivabene. *L'Alcorano di Macometto, ...* Venice, 1547.
- [16] Du Ryer. *L'Alcoran de Mahomet*. Paris: Antoine de Sammauille, 1647.

- [17] Ross, A. *The Alcoran of Mahomet, Translated out of Arabique into French, by the Sieur Du Ryer. And Newly Englished, for the Satisfaction of All That Desire to Look into Turkish Vanities.* London, 1649.
- [18] Al-Shabab, Omar S. "Arabic Linguistics in British Universities from 1950 to 1985." *Al-Baath University Research Journal*, Syria, 6 (1989), 132- 67.
- [19] Smaluvich, Ahmed. *Falsafat al'istishraaq wa 'atharahaa fii al'adab al'arabii* (The Philosophy of Orientalism and Its Influence on Arabic Literature). Cairo: Dar Alfikr Al-Arabi, 1998.
- [20] Daniel, Norman. *Islam and the West: The Making of an Image.* London: One World Publishers, 1993.
- [21] Al-Haji, Sami Salim. *Alzaahira alstishraqiya wa 'atharahaa 'alaa al'adab alarabii* (Orientalism and Its Influence on Islamic Studies). Malta: Centre for Islamic Studies, 1991.
- [22] Al-Shabab, Omar S. "Aspects of the Language of Translation in the Translations of the Quran into European Languages." *Damascus University Journal*, Syria, 16. No. 1 (2000), 19-49.
- [23] Benjamin, Walter. "The Task of the Translator." In Rainer and John Biguenet, eds., *Theories of Translation: An Anthology of Essays from Dryden to Derrida.* Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1992, 71-82.
- [24] Kelly, L. G. *The True Interpreter: A History of Translation Theory and Practice in the West.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1989.
- [25] Derrida, Jacques. "Des Tours de Babel." [Translated by Joseph F. Graham]. In R. Schulte and J. Biguenet, eds., *Theories of Translation: An Anthology of Essays from Dryden to Derrida.* Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1992, 218-27.
- [26] Copeland, Rita. *Rhetoric, Hermeneutics and Translation in the Middle Ages.* Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- [27] Nida, Eugene A. "Translation: Possible and Impossible." *Turjuman*, Morocco, 3, No. 2 (1994), 147-63.
- [28] Nida, Eugene A. "Translating a Text with Long and Sensitive Tradition." In Karl Simms, ed., *Translating Sensitive Text: Linguistic Aspects.* Amsterdam – Atlanta, 1997, 189-96.
- [29] Prasad, Indira. "Translation and Adaptation: Their Respective Realms." *International Journal of Translation*, India 2, No.1 (1990), 37-45.
- [30] Halliday, M. A. K. "Categories of the Theory of Grammar." *Word*, 17, No. 3 (1961), 242-92.
- [31] Halliday, M. A. K. "Notes on Transitivity and Theme in English." Parts 1-3, *Journal of Linguistics*, (1967), 37-81; (1967), 199-244; (1968), 179-215.
- [32] Halliday, M. A. K. *An Introduction to Functional Grammar.* London: Edward Arnold, 1985.
- [33] Huddleston, R. et al. *Sentence and Clause in Scientific English.* Mimeograph, Department of General Linguistics, University College, London University, 1968.
- [34] Baka, Farida. *The Discourse of Biology Lecture: Aspects of Its Mode and Text Structuring.* Unpublished Ph.D. thesis. Aston University, UK, 1986.
- [35] Al-Shabab, Omar S. *Organizational and Textual Structuring of Radio News Discourse in English and Arabic.* Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Aston University, UK, 1986.
- [36] Halliday, M. A. K., and R. Hassan. *Cohesion in English.* London: Longman, 1976.
- [37] Sinclair, John M., and M. Coulthard. *Towards an Analysis of Discourse: The English Used by Teachers and Pupils.* London: Oxford University Press, 1975.
- [38] Burton, Deidre. *Dialogue and Discourse: A Sociolinguistic Approach to Modern Drama Dialogue and Naturally Occurring Conversation.* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1980.
- [39] Martin, James R. "Participant Identification in English, Tagalog and Kate." *Austrian Journal of Linguistics*, 3, No. 1 (1983), 45-74.

- [40] Berry, Margaret. "Systemic Linguistics and Discourse Analysis: Multi-Layered Approach to Exchange Structure." In Malcolm Coulthard and Michael Montgomery, eds., *Studies in Discourse Analysis*. London: Routledge, 1981.
- [41] Fawcett, Robin P. "Towards a Systemic Flowchart Model for Discourse Analysis." In R. P. Fawcett and David Young, eds., *New Developments in Systemic Linguistics: Theory and Application*. London: Pinter, 1989, 116-43.
- [42] Baker, Mona. *In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation*. London: Routledge, 1992.
- [43] Baka, Farida, and Omar Skeikh Al-Shabab. *Discourse Structuring and Text Analysis of Three Varieties of English*. London: Janus, 1996, 29-85.
- [44] Roger, A., J. Ure, and J. Ellis. "Somn: Sleep: An Exercise in the Use of Descriptive Linguistic Techniques in Literary Translation." *Babel*, 15, No. 1 (1069), 4-14.
- [45] Al-Jaburi, Adnan. *Connectives in Arabic and English*. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Aston University, UK, 1987.
- [46] Bloor, Merial, and Thomas Bloor. *The Functional Analysis of English: A Hallidayan Approach*. London: Edward Arnold, 1995.
- [47] Nida, Eugene A. *Towards a Science of Translating*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1964.
- [48] Shunnaq, Abdullah T. "Semantic Redundancy and Translation from Arabic into English." *Turjuman*, Morocco, 3, No. 2 (1994), 103-20.
- [49] Al-Shabab, Omar S. "Type-Token Ratio in the Language of Translation." *Damascus University Journal*, 13, No. 1 (1997), 41-55.
- [50] Baker, Mona. Internet home page, 1999.
- [51] Worth, Roland. *Bible Translations: A History through Source Documents*. North Carolina: McFarland, 1992.
- [52] Rosenzweig, Franz. "The Unity of the Bible." In Martin Buber, and Franz Rosenzweig, *Scripture and Translation*, Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1994, 22-26.
- [53] Sale, G. *The Korân: Translated into English from the Original Arabic*. London: Frederick Warne, 1734.
- [54] Savary, M. *Le Coran*. 2 Volumes. Paris: Knapen and Fils, 1783.
- [55] Rückert, F. *Der Koran*, Frankfurt am Main, 1888.
- [56] Paret, Rudi. *Der Koran*, Stuttgart and Berlin: W. Kohlhammer GmbH, 1979.
- [57] Fatma-Zaida. *L'Alkoran: Le Livre par Excellence*. Lisbonne: Imprimerie de la Société Typographique Franco-Portugaise, 1861.
- [58] Blachère, R. *Le Coran: (al-Qor'ân)*. Paris: G. P. Maisonneuve & Larose, 1957, 1980.
- [59] Rodwell, J. M. *The Koran: Translated from the Arabic, the Suras Arranged in Chronological Order*. London and Edinburgh: Williams and Norgate, 1861.
- [60] Arberry, A. J. *The Koran Interpreted*. New York: Macmillan, 1955.
- [61] Calza, V. *Il Corano Versione Italiana del Cav...*. Bastia Della Tipografia Di Cesare Fabiani, 1847.
- [62] Bonelli, D. L. *Il Corano: Nuova Versione Letterale Italiana*. Milano: Ulrico Hoepli Editore, 1987.
- [63] De la Puebla, D. V. Ortiz, *El Coran :Biblia Mahometana Seguido de la Biografia de Mahoma: Primera Version Española Anotada y Coentada*. Barcelona: Juan Aleu, 1872.
- [64] Vernet, J. *El Coran*. Barcelona: Plaza & Janés Editores, 1980, 1993.
- [65] Sabloukova, Gordia Huran. *Zakanodatelinaya Kniga Maxammedahckago (The Quran: The Legislation Book of the Muslims)*. Kazani: Emperorckago Press, 1878.
- [66] Angold, Mickael. *The Byzantine Empire: 1025-1224*. London: Longman, 1997.

- [67] Al-Shabab, Omar S. "Type-Token Ratio in the Language of Translation." *Damascus University Journal*, 13, No. 1 (1997), 41-55.
- [68] Pym, Anthony. "Twelfth-Century Toledo and Strategies of Literalist Trojan Horse." *Target*, The Netherlands, 6, No. 1(1994), 43-66.
- [69] Pym, Anthony. *Method in Translation History*. Manchester: Jerome,1998.
- [70] Daniel, Norman. *Islam and the West: The Making of an Image*. London: One World Publishers, 1993.
- [71] Hinitikka, J. *Knowledge and Belief*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1962.

مكانة ترجمة مراتشي للقرآن الكريم إلى اللغة اللاتينية : بحث لغوي

عمر أحمد شيخ الشباب

أستاذ مساعد ، قسم اللغات الأجنبية،

جامعة الملك فيصل، الاحساء، المملكة العربية السعودية

ملخص البحث. لم يقم باحث ممن يتقن اللغة العربية كلغة أم بدراسة ترجمة لودوفيكو مراتشي للقرآن الكريم إلى اللغة اللاتينية والتي نشرت الترجمة في ١٦٩٨ ميلادي . وكما هو واضح من عنوان هذه الترجمة " نقد القرآن " ، فإن الآراء في هذه الترجمة والأهداف التي وراءها قد أبعدت الكثيرين عن دراسة الجوانب اللغوية لهذه الترجمة . ونقوم في هذا البحث بدراسة مكانة هذه الترجمة بين ترجمات القرآن الكريم ومساهمة هذه الترجمة في زيادة معرفتنا في الاستراتيجيات المتبعة في الترجمة . وهنا نكتشف أن أهم مظاهر طريقة مراتشي في هذه الترجمة هو التزامه بـ" الدقة" . وهذا يتضح من خلال استعمال المترجم للتراكيب اللاتينية الموازية للتركيب العربي كما جاءت في النص القرآني .

ويبين البحث كذلك لجوء مراتشي إلى استخدام استراتيجيات تواصلية في ترجمته للقرآن الكريم ، وتتمثل هذه بزيادة تفسيرات نصية ضمن الترجمة ، وكذلك الترجمة عن طريق استعارة كلمات من الأصل العربي . ونجد في هذه المظاهر الثلاثة لترجمة مراتشي دليلاً على وجود الاختلاف وانعدام الكفاية والاستحالة في لغة الترجمة . إن الجهد الذي بذله مراتشي في إنجاز ترجمته ظاهر في الأثر الكبير لهذه الترجمة على ترجمات القرآن الكريم

إلى اللغات الأوروبية منذ صدورها وحتى الآن . كما يبين الباحث أن مراتشي يحتل مكاناً هاماً في المجموعة الثقافية الأوروبية المختصة بالاستشراق وترجمات القرآن الكريم إلى اللغات الأوروبية ، هذه المجموعة التي أشاعت الكثير من المفاهيم الخاطئة عن الإسلام بعامة والقرآن بخاصة . أما من الناحية اللغوية فيرى الباحث أن لترجمة مراتشي مساهمة هامة في مجال الترجمة .