AN ANALYSIS OF VENUTI'S DOMESTICATION AND FOREGNIZATION OF NOUNS IN THE TRANSLATIONS OF SELECTED VERSES OF SURAH AL-QASAS

¹Inam Ullah*, ²Lubna Ali Muhammad, ³Anum Saleem
Inam Ullah **(Principal & corresponding)**
Email: iullah@lincoln.edu.my/ inamullah.eng@bkuc.edu.pk

Lubna Ali Mohammed (Corresponding)
Email: lubnaali@lincoln.edu.my

Anum Saleem
Email: anumsaleem.eng@bkuc.edu.pk

1&2 Department of TESL, Faculty of Social Science, Arts, and Humanities, Lincoln University College (LUC), Malaysia,
1&3 Lecturer Department of English, Bacha Khan University, Charsadda

Abstract

The paper in hands aims to discuss the concept of domestication and foreignization from the perspective of translation studies. People usually domesticize or foreignize texts to achieve certain goals. However, this, in the field of translation studies in general and in theological or religious translations in particular, can create a big problem for the readers. The paper analyzes two translations of some of the nouns and Arabic letters mentioned in first 15 verses of Surah Al-Qasas (chapter 28). It has been explored through the conceptual framework made of Venuti's Domestication and Foreignization and Newmark's criticism plan that mostly these nouns are domesticated which is the prime cause of confusion between them and Biblical references. It is, therefore, recommended that translators need to understand this difference and needs to be careful in this regard. Similarly, researchers should also focus this issue and apply it to other aspects of religious or non-religious texts for more in-depth understanding of the issues. In addition, this should also be taught in the classrooms to the novice translators for circumventing the problem in future translations.

Key Words: *Translation Strategy; Domestication; Foreignization; Surah Al-Qasas; Teaching*

Introduction

The translation of texts from one language into another has always bothered translators since as (Armstrong, 2005) stated that "energy loss is inevitable; similarly, the translator's aim is to reduce translation loss" (p.46). For the reduction of losses, translators have tried different techniques and have adopted different approaches in the process of translation. However, achieving a hundred percent equivalence between both the target texts and source texts is beyond a translator's capacity. According to (Lorscher, 1991) a translation process is "a potentially conscious procedure for solving a problem faced in translating a text, or any segment of it." These processes are further classified by (Bell, 1988) who argues that there are two types of techniques i.e. global and local. The former deals with whole texts, and the later deals with text segments. (Newmark, 1981) used the terms translation procedures for the later and translation method for the former. Newmark

---

* This paper is part of PhD thesis of the principal author titled "Loss of Meaning in Translation: A Comparative Linguistic Analysis of the Story of Moses in The Discourse of The Holy Quran"

(1988) has worked further in this regard and has tried to specify ways of translating cultural specific terms from one language to another. He mentions a few types which are: Cultural Equivalent, Descriptive Equivalent, Transference, Functional Equivalent, Naturalization, Modulation, Through Translation, Synonym, Compensation, Paraphrase, Recognized Translation, Componential Analysis, Couplets, and Additions.

Moreover, (Chesterman, 1997) also proposed a model comprising a number of translation procedures which are summarized in the following table by (Elewa, 2015).

Syntactic strategies	Semantic Strategies	Pragmatic strategies
Literal Translation	Synonym	Cultural Filtering
Calque	Antonym	Explicitness Change
Transposition	Hyponymy	Information Change
Unit Shift	Converses	Interpersonal Change
Phrase Structure Change	Abstraction Change	Illocutionary Change
Clause Structure Change	Distribution Change	Coherence Change
Sentence Structure Change	Emphasis Change	Partial Translation
Cohesion Change	Paraphrase	Visibility Change
Level Shift	Trope Change	Transediting
Scheme Change	Other Semantic Changes	Other Pragmatic Changes

Figure1: Translation Procedures by Chesterman (1997) cited in (Elewa, 2015)

Further, scholars presented some strategies specifically for cultural translations. They believed that the strategies would be helpful in the translations of culture specific terms. In this regard the strategies of Hervy and Heggins (1992) are worth mentioning. They stated five procedures for translating the cultural transposition: 1) Cultural borrowing, 2) Exoticism, 3) Communicative translation, 4) Calque, and 5) Cultural transplantation.

Besides, Venuti (1992) presented two strategies i.e. domestication and foreginization for translation of one language into another with emphasis on cultural differences. The former is defined as "an ethnocentric reduction of the foreign text to target-language cultural values, bring the author back home" while the latter means "an ethno-deviant pressure on those (cultural) values to register the linguistic and cultural difference of the foreign text, sending the reader abroad." According to Venuti it is the discretion of the translator to choose among them which means the translator will either bring in his perception or will follow the dominant ideology in the translation process. But in doing so, the response of target audience must be taken into consideration since ultimately they are the ones who will be consuming the translation/s. If their level of understanding and comprehension of the ST are not considered, the translators may fail to stimulate any response from them for they may not understand the jokes, literary symbols, or other elements of the ST. That is why there is a conflict among scholars as which of the strategies has got the upper hand and is more suitable for translating an ST into a TT.

The problem becomes graver with the translation of religious texts or scriptures since they are more sensitive because there is very little margin of mistake. A small slip on the part of a translator could draw an immense criticism for both the readers and critics. Nonetheless, as mentioned earlier, translation without loss is not possible. Most of the religious scholars and translators agree that an absolute translation (Abdul-Raof, 2001) of revelations is beyond reality. Specifically talking about the Holy Quran, many Muslims and non-Muslims scholars have mentioned that translatability of this book in absolute terms is impossible (Amjad & Farahani, 2013). This task particularly gets even more difficult when the Holy Quran is translated into English language because both languages i.e. Arabic and English are entirely different in their

cultures, linguistics structures, lexemes, social norms, pragmatic contexts, and religious practices. This is why the chances of pragmatic losses are high and is agreed upon among many translators despite their maximum struggle for minimizing these losses. Nevertheless, the focus of this paper is only to identify the translation strategy of the two translators employed in their translations.

Statement of Problem

The above discussion and the below literature review entails that translators are always at pains to minimize the gaps between ST and TT while translating. To achieve this purpose they adopts various techniques and strategies presented by different experts of the field such as (Newmark, 1981; Lorscher, 1991; Bell, 1988; Venuti, 1992). Many researchers (To be cited after Literature review) have toiled to identify these approaches and strategies utilized by various translators. However, this paper focuses only in the identification of Venuti's domestication and foreginization in the selected translations of surah Al-Qasas of the Holy Quran.

Research Objectives

1. To identify instances of domestication and foreginization of nouns in the selected translations of surah Al-Qasas.
2. To explore the reasons behind domestication and foreginization of nouns in the translations of surah Al-Qasas.

Research Questions

1. What strategies of translation have been adopted by the translators in translations of the selected nouns of surah Al-Qasas?
2. Why the translators have favored one strategy over another in their translations of selected nouns of surah Al-Qasas?

Significance of the Research

This research paper is significant in terms of understanding the usual strategy adopted by the two translators in their translations since the conclusion of this research can be generalized. In addition, it is also contributing in terms of comprehending the rationale behind selection of either strategy on part of the translators. The readers will understand how and why the translators have either "brought them home" or "sent them abroad".

Research Methodology

This paper adopts a qualitative approach and tries to describe and discuss the instances and reasons behind domestication and foreignization. The reason behind the selection of two different English translations of the Surah is to elaborate the difference or similarity of approaches adopted by these translators. It is for this reason that the researchers have devised the following model.

Verse No			
S. No	ST	T1	T2
Instances of Domestication and Foreiginization			
Understanding Reasons behind Domestication or Foreiginization through Newmark's criticism plan			
Conclusion			

This model is based on the framework presented below in the literature review section and entails that atop the table, there would be verse number for the clarity of readers. On the left side is serial number which has been followed by source text and then translation of Arberry (T1) and translation of Usmani (T2). They are followed by detailed discussion on identification of Domestication and Foreignization in the translations along with the reasons behind them through

Newmark's criticism plan. The discussion of the every verse has been summarized in the conclusion section of the verse.

Literature Review

The traces of translation studies in history reveal that there has always been controversy in presenting the solution to the issue of equivalence between target and source texts. Different approaches have been developed over time to overcome this issue. There had been controversies regarding the suitability of direct versus oblique, form versus content, syntactic versus semantic, formal versus informal, literal versus free, and lexical versus communicative or dynamic translation (Abdallah, 2009). But despite this, there is a consensus on the functional aspects of language (Abdullah & Asghar, 2018). In this regard, John Austin states that reality is not merely described by words or sentences but is also acted and constructed through them (Austin, 1975).

The field of translation further flourished from the perspective of language use. But the problem of equalizing an ST with a TT remains there specially, when a STs are comprised of meta-linguistic elements along with the description of realities. The meta-linguistic elements refer to instances of traditional, social, and cultural values which are responsible for creating problems in translations due to ST's and TT's differences. These differences make the task of translators even more difficult since they have to focus not only on semantic and syntactic equivalence but also on the meta-linguistic equivalence. The incorporation of illocutionary aspect of language in translation was known to the theorists of translation studies but they were also aware that classical methodology was not appropriate for translation (Abdullah & Asghar, 2018). Now they were focused also on translating the meta-linguistic elements into the TT.

Jacobson (1996) is among the first few theorists who talked about an organized approach to translation studies. He divided translations into the following three types:

Intra-Lingual Translation
Inter-Lingual Translation
Inter-Semiotic Translation

This categorization by Jacobson in translation studies has laid the foundation of contemporary debate on translation theories. This research falls in the category of inter-lingual translation since it analyzes the gap between two different languages i.e. Arabic and English. Further, it takes into consideration the two different translations of English i.e. Literal translation and Running translation with syntactic and lexical expansions for the analysis.

The issue of equivalence of an ST and TT has been presumably solved by the categorization of Jacobson and is widely accepted as well by the theorists of translation studies (Bassentt, 2002). However, Jacobson also mentioned that conveying an accurate version of an ST to a TT is not possible by any means. There are three prime reasons behind this discrepancy: differences in linguistic systems of languages; contrasting cultural norms, traditions, and values beside social settings of all the languages; deficiency in TTs' linguistic structures in expressing the sings or expressions of STs. Translators and translation theorists have been putting all their efforts, since the realization of meta-linguistic elements as prime cause of loss in translated texts, to find ways for maximizing equivalence between the STs and TTs as much as possible.

Nida (1964) has also reached a conclusion similar to Jacobson's. While spending a lot of time on resolving the problems surfaced in the translations of Bibe into other languages of, he summed up that an absolute correspondance between Bible and its translations is beyong reality. He mentioned that the translations may be close to ST in many ways but exact similarity is without question since it is a fact that all the languages are different in their semantic syntactic, and

symbolic representations and linguistic symbols which paves the path for the occurance meta-linguistic discripencies. However, there may also be some exceptions such as in the case of very simple texts. A formal equivalence through certain adjustments might be possible in the TT to convey the exact meaning of ST.

In addition, the concept of equivalence gets difficult as far as the translation of cultural terms is concerned. Theorists like Bassnet (1991: 30) have stressed that the translation of religious terms is particularly the most difficult problem. Larson (1984: 180) also stated that translation of the terms which belong to the religious aspect of a culture is difficult for two reasons: in analysis of ST vocabulary; in identification of best TT equivalents. The reason for this is usually the ignorance of TT readers. They are often unaware of the meanings involved in a certain term which is more evident in translation of the Holy Quran into English language. Though linguistic elements might be manipulated but the transfer or manipulation of cultural aspects poses a grave issue because of the involvement of multitude of meaning and the potential ignorance of TT readers. Lefevere and Bassnett (1990: 26) stated that "language is not the problem. Ideology and poetics are, as are cultural elements that are not immediately clear, or seen as completely misplaced in what would be the target culture version of the text to be translated". If the Holy Quran is considered, it is full of culture and religion specific terms which are often incomprehesible for the non-Muslims and non-Arab speakers. The main reason for this is that it was in Arabic language and culture which is totally alien to the English speaking communities outside the Arabian peninsula (Raof, 2005: 162). The Quranic cultural elements are generally mingled with linguistic patterns of Arabic language. Moreover, these cultural and linguistic patterns also carries the tone of connotational meaning making the Quranic text highly translation-resistant.

All the culture specific items in the Holy Quran do not present the same level resistance to translation. The cases of those instances are miscellaneous where these features create problems. Long (2005) classified (Raof, 2005: 166-171) the situations into six types where cultural elements of the Holy Quran posed problems which are: Theological expressions; Ritual expressions; Linguistic void; Delixicalized expressions; Material culture; and Abstract moral concepts.

Furthermore, another approach which highlights the aim of translation has been refered to by Munday (2001). It talks from the perspective of communication and is mainly dependent on the traslational rubric presnted by a German functionalist Holz Manttari. According to this approach a translation should be TT oriented and should remain objective in terms of conveying messages from one culture to another. Manttari states that "it is about steering the intended cooperation over different cultural barriers that make intercultural communication possible on the basis of functionality (Abdullah & Asghar, 2018, p. 7)." This approach also accommodates implicitely a few actors where everyone acts for one aim: to efficiently communicate the perspectives and functionalites of STs into TTs (Munday, 2001).

The view point of (Lefevere, 1992), "the translation is a rewriting process and a manipulative behavior is adopted for justification of the issues relevant to culture and society." This rewriting makes changes to the register of texts along with their pragmatic impacts. It is not only shifting of texts from language into another but also a process of negotiation among source and target texts and relevant cultures. But the process is incomplete without the translator since he plays the role of a mediator. Bassentt (2002) mentions that one culture should not be enforeced on the other and that it is moral responsibilty of a translator to be faitful to both the target and source audience despite one being more influential than the other.

In the light of the above discussion, it has been clear that losses occur when one language is translated into another because of the phonological, lexical, morphological, syntactic, and

grammatical structures. But they also occur because of the socio-cultural values and pragmatic implications of different languages. The case of losses becomes more grave when sacred texts such as the Holy Quran is being translated into another language. In the translations many types of losses have been identified by scholars and translators (El-Said, Al-Azab, & Misnad, 2012). One such study is the research of (Alahj & Omer, 2017) who analyzed the losses of meaning and discrepicies of style in the translation of euphemistic expressions of the Holy Quran in English. They took three English translations and analyzed the way they presented the euphemistic expressions of the Holy Quran. The study explored the correctness of the translations in euphemistic expressions and concluded that they are usually unattended by the translators. The translations of the expressions were incorrect for both cultural and linguistic diversity of the two languages. They suggested that the translators should be aware of the problem while translating such expressions and that they should focus on the contextual meaning of the ST. Though the said study is a significant in the field of translation, in the present study the researchers are not finding the types of losses occur in the selected English translations but are focused on the strategies adopted by the translators. That is why the following conceptual framework has been adopted.

Conceptual Framework

The concepts of domestication and foreignization were presented in the field of translation studies by Lawrence Venuti in 1995. The difference between the two terms has been defined in introduction (see 1). However, the role of translator is to remain passive in the former and to render the message of the ST into the TT compatible and popular way. This sometimes makes the readers believe that the TT they are consuming is in fact the original ST. The role of translators becomes noticeable in the latter since they are introducing and producing a foreign culture in the TT which is apparent from their choices. Venuti (1995) has used the terms "ethno-centric" and "ethno-deviant" to explain the difference between the two. But achieving either of them requires a process which has been explained by many theorists such as (Bassentt, 2002; E. Nida, & C. R. Taber, 1969; Newmark, 1981). Nonetheless, instead of analyzing processes, the current research is analyzing the reasons behind the domestication and foreignization which is why Newmark's criticism plan has been chosen.

Peter Newmark (1988) stated that accurate criticism of TTs is possible if the following five points are followed. They are: 1 the study of function and implicature of SL; 2 Translators' way of translation; 3 comparisons of both ST and TT; 4 assessment of translation from different perspectives; 5 and the future of a translation. Nevertheless, since the focus of this paper is to find reasons of domestication, that is why point 2 and 5 are not applied here.

This can be further elaborated by the following figure.

Venuti's Domestication and Foreignization

Through Newmark's Criticism Plan

Newmark's Criticism Plan

1. "Brief study of SL focusing its implicature and function,

2. Translator's method of translation and the interpretation of SL text's purpose,

3. Detailed comparison of SL and TL,

4. Evaluation of the translation from both the translator's and critic's perspective,

5. And the future of the translation in the target culture, language or discipline"

Figure 2: Venuti's Domestication and Foreignization through Newmark's criticism plan (Newmark, 1988)

Data Analysis

The analysis starts with the drawing of tables for each verse with both the ST and TT. It is followed by a thorough discussion through the above given framework.

Table 1

S. No	Verse 1		T2
	ST	T1	
1	طٰسٓمّ	Ta Sin Mim	Ta Sin Mim.

Instances of Domestication and Foreignization

The above table shows that the word has been foreignized by both the translators. They are presented in a way where the meaning is not clear. Although the meaning of the words is not clear in ST either, the purpose and function of these words are clear. These words are known as Muqatta'at (مُقَطَّعَات) or disjoined letters. Talking about the characteristics of true believers, the Holy Quran mentions "We believe in it (clear or unclear); all of it is from our Lord (3:7)." Another function of these disjoined letters is according to Ibn-e-Kathir is that Allah wants people to learn to recite them. (Kathir, 2003). However, both the translators have only rendered the phonological represention of the letters without making the context clear. In addition, the phonological representation is also not appropriate since the accents on the ST letters are not fully presented. The possible reasons behind this is the differnce of structures and phnological patterns of both Arabic and English languages. The two cannot be equilized in terms of their phonological organizations.

The discussion shows that both the translators have foreignized the words of ST by presenting only part of the phonological pattern in the TT without making the meaning and purpose clear.

Table 2

S. No	Verse 2		T2
	ST	T1	
1	ءَايَٰتُ	the signs	verses of

Instances of Domestication and Foreignization

The table two presents that the ST word in serial 1 has been translated as 'the signs' by T1 which is a distant rendition of the word. Although it sometimes means 'signs', it does not imply signs in this context. Arberry has done so because the word 'sign' is more domesticated, meaningful, and easy to understand than 'verses' since the latter usually applies to rhetoric and aesthetics. Usmani on the other hand has used the word 'verses' because he has the knowledge of the context of the Holy Quran. He has apparently foreignized the word for the readers with an assumption that most of the English speaking are Christians and that they know the concept of 'verse' from the study of bible.

In the case verse two, the translation of Arberry is domesticized while Usmani has foreignized the translation.

Table 3

	Verse 3		
S. No	ST	T1	T2
1	مُوسَى	Moses	Musa
2	فِرْعَوْن	Pharaoh	Pharaoh
3	يُؤْمِنُونَ	who believe	who believe

Instances of Domestication and Foreignization

In the above table serial one shows that T1 has equalized the word 'مُوسَى' to 'Moses' since this is how it is mentioned in the bible. T2 on the hand has foreignized it by not translating the proper noun and presenting is as it is in the ST. The translator here might have intended that most of his readers would be Muslims and they know what Musa is. Another possibility is that he is aware of the universal rule of language that proper nouns are not translated thus, presented the way they actually are in the ST. However, this second argument is not valid for he has also adopted a biblical version of the word 'فِرْعَوْن' in serial two thus, domesticating the noun just like T1. Lastly, the word 'يُؤْمِنُونَ' has also been domesticated by both the translators since they have used the verb 'believe' instead of noun 'believers' which is more suitable and carries somewhat equivalent meaning of the word 'مُؤْمِن'. This is a special reference to the ones who believe in Islam and is a religion specified term.

The discussion shows that there Arberry has domesticized all the words of ST while Usmani has foreignized the first ST word while domesticized the rest of the words.

Table 3

	Verse 4		
S. No	ST	T1	T2
1	ٱلْمُفْسِدِين	workers of corruption	the mischief-makers

Instances of Domestication and Foreignization

The table presents that T1 has translated the word in a way which makes the meaning confusing thus, resulting in foreignizing the word. It shows that Arberry has either limited knowledge of the complexity of meanings involved or has failed to find equivalent of the word in English language. T2 has used instead, a broader term 'mischief-maker' which accommodates all types of wrong doings. Along with linguistic meaning, this word has also got a religious meaning and according to (Almaany English Arabic Dictionary, 2010-2024) it means 'the one who spread disorder and corruption'. In that context, the word 'mischief' is more accurate and domesticized.

The discussion could be summed up by mentioning that Arberry has unintentionally foreignized the translation by making the meaning ambiguous. Usmani on the other hand has domesticized it by using a broader term and accommodating all the meanings i.e. linguistic or religious present in the word.

Table 5

	Verse 6		
S. No	ST	T1	T2
1	هَـٰمَـٰنَ	Ha man	Haman

Instances of Domestication and Foreignization

The table shows that T1 has again made the same mistake of domesticating the ST noun by trying to present its phonological structure. In the ST word, there is no space between the letters and that it is special reference to a person who was among the close councilors of Pharaoh. T2 has presented the noun without disturbing its phonological organization resulting in its foreignization. T2 has assumed that the readers understand that proper nouns are not translated and that they should preserved in the TT.

In the nut shell, Arberry has once again domesticized the proper noun 'هَامَـٰنَ' through phonological translation without preserving the integrity of ST. T2 on the other hand has preserved the integrity and has sent the readers abroad.

Table 6

	Verse 7		
S. No	ST	T1	T2
1	ٱلۡمُرۡسَلِینَ	the Envoys	(Our) Messengers

Instances of Domestication and Foreignization

The table shows that T1 has again used common TT word/s to represent the act of 'رِسَالَة'. Though the ST word 'رَسُول' linguistically means an 'envoy' but here this is not intended in the ST. Usually, when the word 'رَسُول' is used in the context of the Holy Quran, it means 'messenger'. And from the context of this verse it is clear that here prophet 'Musa' is being referred to which makes the translation of T2 more accurate.

Both the translations are domesticated since the translations do not make any confusions do not use any foreign words but contextually the translation of Usmani is accurate while Arberry's translation renders only linguistic meaning of the ST.

Table 7

	Verse 12		
S. No	ST	T1	T2
1	نَاصِحُونَ	"Look after him"	"Will be his well-wishers"

Instances of Domestication and Foreignization

The table 7 presents that T1 has translated the word 'نَاصِح' as 'look after' which is neither linguistic nor cultural meaning of the word. Although he has domesticated by using the words 'look after', the word does not carry this meaning in its essence. He has done so because he was more focused on the context of the verse instead of considering the linguistic or religious meaning. On the contrary, T1 has used the word 'well-wisher' which is also domesticated but accurate. The word 'نَاصِح' in ST actually means 'advisor' or 'sincere'. In both cases, it resonates with the translation of T2 for he has rendered the same meaning by using the synonym 'well-wisher'.

The translations of both Arberry and Usmani are domesticated for no such word/s have been used to send the readers abroad. Both the translations are within the range of readers yet the latter is more accurate and context complementing.

Table 8

S. No	ST	T1	T2
	Verse 13		
1	ٱللَّهِ	God	Allah

Instances of Domestication and Foreignization

The above table shows another important element of ST. The noun 'ٱللَّهِ' has been translated and equalized with the word 'God' by T1 which is for the sack of domestication and giving the readers the impression that they are equal. Nonetheless, the two are neither equal linguistically nor religiously. The ST word stands for a bigger picture and carries the meanings which the latter lacks. For instance, the word 'ٱللَّهِ' does not have plural while 'God' does have plural 'gods'. Similarly, the ST word have no gender while there *god* have the feminine *goddess.* Thus, equalizing God with Allah is not accurate and is against the basic principle of languages.

To summarize, Arberry has domesticated the word Allah with God which may create many problem for the readers in understanding the two concepts. Unlike T1, Usmani being a religious scholar understands the complexity and differences between the two terms has foreignized the word for non-Muslim readers but has accurately done so.

Table 9

S. No	ST	T1	T2
	Verse 14		
1	ٱلْمُحْسِنِينَ	'the good-doers'	'who are good in their deeds'

Instances of Domestication and Foreignization

The above table shows that both the translators have translated the ST almost in a similar way. They have equalized the word 'مُحْسِن' with 'good-doer' and 'good in deed'. This is a domesticated version of the ST. Despite the presence of another ST word 'إِحْسَان'or 'إِحْسَٰن' with the same root which means 'kindness' as in (46:15:4) of the Holy Quran, they have perfected the translation of the ST word 'حَسَن' which also means 'good' and thus, leaving no gap between ST and TT. This because of their understanding of the ST and TT contexts and the illocution it will have on the target audience.

The discussion could be summed up by stating that both the translators have domesticated the ST noun in this case and have found a perfect match in TT to convey the meaning.

Table 10

S. No	ST	T1	T2
	Verse 15		
1	ٱلشَّيْطَٰنِ	Satan's	Satan's

Instances of Domestication and Foreignization

The translations show that both T1 and T2 have foreignized the ST word 'ٱلشَّيْطَٰنِ' for the immediate equivalent of this in the TT is 'devil'. Oxford dictionary 9th edition defines the word 'Satan' through intra-lingual translation as 'devil'. There is no specific definition available in English for the term 'Satan'. The reason behind defining it this way is that it a common entity among the heavenly religions such as Christianity, Judaism, and Islam. The readers would have no problem

in understanding the concept unlike the word 'Allah' where the belief systems are totally contradicting.

The discussion clarifies that both the translators have used the technique of foreignization in rendering their translation of the word 'ٱلشَّيْطَـٰنِ' because the concept of the devil is the same and does not need any clarification for the readers.

Table 11

	Verse 17		
S. No	ST	T1	T2
1	رَبِّ	My Lord	O my Lord

Instances of Domestication and Foreignization

The above translation of the ST shows that the word has been domesticized. Both the translators have tried to equalize the ST word with the TT through the word *Lord.* Although the word *Lord* in English is used in different senses, the most common is an entity that is in a higher position or rank. It also refers to Jesus Christ and most of the times it is used in this sense. Nonetheless, the ST word 'رَبِّ' and its translation *Lord* are not equal for the ST word carries more meaning than the TT word. The features of ST word are explained in the context of the Holy Quran which are: It can create and guide, It provides food and water, It cure illness, It brings death and the afterlife, and It also forgives the sins. Considering the properties of ST word, the TT word is falling behind in meaning is not equivalent of the ST. The domestication of this noun may create problem in understanding the essence of the word.

The above discussion shows that though the ST noun has been domesticized by both Arberry and Usmani but this is not free of misunderstanding since the TT and ST words are not equal. The correct translation would have been the transfer of ST words into TT such Rabb/Rubb.

Conclusion

The analysis of the all the proper nouns and adjectival nouns shows that it is not always possible to translate them from one language into another. As mentioned earlier, the issue becomes worse when the translation of religious scriptures such as Quran is involved. The domestication of these Quranic nouns such as Allah into God and Phir'aon into Pharaoh, and Musa into Moses may be misleading in terms of their narratives. Although many of the references are similar between the Bible and the Holy Quran, differences still lie there which often makes the readers baffled between what Quran mentions and what Bible says. For example, a Christian reader who is reading the Holy Quran may consider Joseph and Yousaf as the same entity upon encountering them. But in reality what is mentioned in Genesis and what is mentioned in the Holy Quran are different.

11 Recommendations

The researchers recommend the following points in the light of above analysis:

1. Translators need to thoroughly study SL before translating.
2. They should understand the pragmatic perspectives of ST before translating it to a TT.
3. Understanding of only linguistic background is not enough for translation. The study of meta-language is also required.
4. Owing to the outlook of Arabic culture, the researchers do not recommend domestication in the translation of the Holy Quran because it results in the loss of actual meaning.
5. It is not always required to domesticize the ST words. Let the readers explore and understand.
6. More research work is needed in this domain since this paper has focused only nouns.

7. The readers are advised to study exegeses of the Holy Scriptures along with reading the translations for better understanding the gap between ST and TT.
8. Teachers of translation studies should also highlight this issue in their classes.

References

Almaany English Arabic Dictionary. (2010-2024). Retrieved 4 5, 2024, from Almaany.com: https://www.almaany.com/en/dict/ar-en/%D9%85%D9%81%D8%B3%D8%AF/?c=Islamic

Abdallah, M. (2009). Translating English Euphemisms into Arabic: Challenges &strategies. *PhD Thesis*. Sharja, UAE: Department of Arabic and Translation Studies, College of Arts and Sciences.

Abdallah, M. A. (2009). Translating English euphemisms into Arabic: Challenges & strategies. Sharja, UAE: Department of Arabic and Translation Studies, College of Arts and Sciences.

Abdul-Raof, H. (2001). *Quran Translation Discourse, Texture and Exegesis.* Richmond: Curzon.

Abdul-Raof, H. (2004). The Qur'ān: Limits of translatability. In F. Said, *Cultural encounters in translation from Arabic.* Clevedon Buffalo, Toronto: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Alahj, A. A., & Omer, M. A. (2017). Problems of Translating Qur'anic Euphemisms: A Comparative Socio-pragmatic Study. *American International Journal of Contemporary Research, 7*(4), 104-117.

Amjad, F., & Farahani, M. (2013). Problems and Strategies in English Translation of Quranic Divine Names. *International Journal of Linguistics, 5*(1).

Arberry, A. J. (Arthur John), 1905-1969. (1955). *The Koran interpreted, by Arthur J. Arberry*. London, New York : Allen & Unwin; Macmillan

Armstrong, N. (2005). *Translation, Linguistics, Culture.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Ashaer, T. N. (2013). A semantic and pragmatic analysis of three English translations of Surat "Yusuf". *(Master dissertation)*. Palestine: Faculty of Graduate Studies, An-Najah National University.

Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to do things with words.* London: Oxford University Press.

Austin, J. L. (1975). *How to Do Things with Words.* Harvard University.

Baker, M. (2005). *Routledge encyclopedia of translation studies.* London: Routledge.

Baker, M. (2006). *Routledge encyclopedia of translation studies.* USA & Canada: Routledge.

Bassentt, S. (2002). *Translation Studies* (2 ed.). UK: Ruthledge.

Bell, R. T. (1988). *Psychological/cognitive approaches.* London & New York: Routledge.

E. Nida, & C. R. Taber. (1969). *The theory and practice of translation.* Leiden: E. J. Brill.

El-Said, A., Al-Azab, E., & Misnad, O. A. (2012). Pragmatic Losses of Qur'an Translations: A Linguistic Approach. *English Language and Literature Studies, 2*(3).

Halliday, M. A., & Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English.* London: Longman.

Jacobson, R. (1996). On Translation. In R. Brower, *On Linguistic Aspects of Translation.*

Kathir, I. A. (2003). *Tafsir Ibn Kathir* (Vol. 7). (S. S.-R. Al-Mubarakpuri, Trans.) Riyadh: Maktaba Dar-us-Salam.

Larson, M. L. (1984). *Meaning-based translation: A guide to cross language equivalence.* Lanham: University Press of America.

Lefevere, A. (1992). *Translation, Rewriting and the Manipulation of Literary Fame.* London & Now York: Routledge.

Long, L. (2005). *Translation and Religion, Holy Untranslatable Place.* London: Clevedon.

Lorscher, W. (1991). *Translation performance, translation process and translation strategies.* Tuebingen: Guten Narr.

Munday, J. (2001). *Introduction to Translation Studies: Theories and Applications.* London, New York: Routledge Press.

Munday, J. (2001). *Introduction to translation studies: Theories and applications.* London: Ruthledge.

Newmark, P. (1981). *Approaches to translation.* Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Newmark, P. (1995). *A textbook of translation.* London: International Book Distributors Ltd.

Nida, E. (1964). *Toward a Science of Translating: With Special Reference to Principles and Procedures Involved in Bible Translating.* Netherlands: E.J. Brill, Leiden.

Usamni, M. M. (2016). *The Noble Quran.* Karachi: Maktaba Ma'ariful Quran.

Venuti, L. (1992). *Rethinking Translation.* London: Routledge.

Venuti, L. (1998). *The scandals of translation: Towards an ethics of difference.* London: Ruthledge.

7069