with lexical and syntactic expansion. Among the remaining two translations running translation with lexical and syntactic expansion incorporates comparatively lesser pragmatic losses than literal translation. However, these translations result into multiple pragmatic losses which are distinctively mentioned in the findings.

8. Summary and Findings

*Sūrah Ikhlāṣ*is a very simple *Sūrah* of the Holy Qur'ān. It revolves around a unique and single theme i.e. the Oneness of Allah. It is also famous among those *Sūrahs* which are generally memorized by the common Muslims. Seven elements of pragmatic losses have been identified in the Arabic text of this *Sūrah.* The selected translations of the *Sūrah* reflect the manifestations of pragmatic losses in the forms of 1) loss of tense, 2) loss of grammatical category, 3) loss of the referential versatility of Qur'ānic words, 4) loss of culture specific terms, 5) loss of texture and 6) loss of gender. The variation among these translations in terms of manifestations of pragmatic losses is not considerably significant as reflected in the data analysis. The similarities and differences are quite significant which have been identified in terms of morphological selections, use of tense and grammatical category of the linguistic choices.

The study of pragmatic losses in this *Sūrah* of the Holy Qur'ān elaborates that the elements of pragmatic losses need careful handling by the translators. It is a matter of serious concern. The translators must be aware of the elements of pragmatic losses in the text of the Holy Qur'ān before they transfer the Qur'ānic message into another language. The manifestations of these elements of pragmatic losses must be controlled to avoid or minimize (as much as possible) distortion in the message which is conveyed to the target language audience. It is very important to spread the true message of the Holy Qur'ān to the whole of humanity.

❂ ❂ ❂

a noun in the category of accusative masculine noun which has been translated as *coequal/comparable* in word-for-word translation, *equal* in the literal translation and *comparable* in the running translation with lexical and syntactic expansion. Two words have been used in these translations. The first word *co-equal* is used as a noun as well as an adjective whereas the word comparable is used mostly as an adjective, therefore, these translations may result into a loss of grammatical category.

7.4   Similarities and Differences

There are similarities in terms of morphological choices and use of the tense. The first element of pragmatic losses has been translated similarly in word-for-word translation and running translation with lexical and syntactic expansion. In the translation of second element of pragmatic losses the word '*One*' is similar in three translations. The phrase '*self-sufficient*' is similar in case of third element of pragmatic losses between word-for-word translation and running translation with lexical and syntactic expansion. The translations of the fourth, fifth and sixth elements of pragmatic losses are similar in terms of the loss of tense along with the morphological choices. In the translations of the last element of pragmatic losses word-for- word translation is also similar to other two translations in terms of the morphological choice.

The differences among these translations are found in terms of morphological choices and the use of tense with reference to the first manifestation of the pragmatic losses, the literal translation differs with word-for-word translation and running translation with lexical and syntactic expansion. Morphological difference is also observed in the translations of second element of pragmatic losses. The literal translation of third element of pragmatic losses differs with the other two in morphological choice and conspicuous meanings. The tense of the literal translation differs with the other two in the translations of fourth and fifth elements of pragmatic losses. The word-for-word translation of the sixth element of pragmatic losses also differs with the other two translations. The literal translation of the last element of pragmatic losses differs with the running translation with lexical and syntactic expansion in choice of morphological items.

7.5   Conclusion

The comparative pragma-linguistic analysis of the translations of Sūrah *Ikhlāṣ* reflects that there are significant variations in translations. The word-for-word translation has the least amount of pragmatic losses as compared to other translations i.e. literal translation and running translation

dependent on Him) in running translation with lexical and syntactic expansion. In case of first translation, three different phrases (*the one source of all*, *the one independent* and *the one self-sufficient* preceded by (*alone is*) result into losses of grammatical category and the referential versatility of Qur'ānic words. The second translation result into the losses of the referential versatility of Qur'ānic words and the grammatical category as well. In the third translation, meanings clearly match with the context and themes of the *Sūrah*, but it also result into a loss of grammatical category. All three translations also result into a loss of texture of the original Arabic text.

The next word " يَلِدْ " mentioned at number four among the elements of pragmatic losses above is a verb in the category of third person masculine singular imperfect verb jussive mood which has been translated as *(He) begets/fathers* in word-for-word translation, *who has begotten* in literal translation and *He begets* in running translation with lexical and syntactic expansion. These translations reflect the use of present indefinite and present perfect tense distinctively, whereas imperfect verb in Arabic language has the potential of to be translated either in the present or future tense. These translations have lost this potential, therefore, the loss of tense takes place in these English translations in terms of pragmatic losses with respect to the Arabic language.

The fifth word " يُولَدْ " identified as an element of pragmatic losses as tabulated above is a verb in the category of third person masculine singular passive imperfect verb jussive mood which has been translated as *(He is) begotten/fathered* in word-for-word translation, *who has been begotten* in literal translation and *He is begotten* in running translation with lexical and syntactic expansion. These translations are in the passive voice in the passive structure of present tense. Here again, the pragmatic losses result into a loss of tense as discussed above in case of fourth element of pragmatic loss.

The next word " يَكُنْ " among the elements of pragmatic losses mentioned at number six above is a verb in the category of third person masculine singular imperfect verb, jussive mood. It has been translated as *(it) is (was/will be)* in word-for-word translation and *is* in both literal and running translation with lexical and syntactic expansion. Once again the loss of tense takes place in terms of pragmatic losses in these translations, and in first translation it has been tried to be compensated by reflecting the past and future in the brackets.

The last word " كُفُوًا " among the elements of pragmatic losses above is

7.3   Comparative Analysis

This analysis pertains to the four verses of *Sūrah Ikhlāṣ*. There are seven elements of pragmatic losses which have been identified in the Arabic text of this *Sūrah.* These elements of pragmatic losses cause pragmatic losses in the English translations with respect to the Arabic text. The word mentioned above among the elements of pragmatic losses "اللَّهُ" is a noun in the category of nominative proper noun which has been translated as *Allah* in word-for-word and running translation with lexical and syntactic expansion, and *God* in literal translation. The word God is not the appropriate translation of Allah in the first case and target language audience must be aware of the meaning of word *Allah* in the second case. The word God results into a loss of culture-specific terms because the word Allah is one of the most familiar among the Muslims and Arabs. This word is used for none except Allah Almighty the creator of the universe. This word is non-gender and has no plural where as the word god has goddess and gods as its female gender and plural respectively. However, this translation results into a loss of gender and culture specific terms.

The next word " أَحَدٌ "mentioned at number two among the elements of pragmatic losses is a noun in the category of nominative masculine indefinite noun which has been translated as *(is) One / Unique* in word-for-word translation, *One God* in literal translation and *the One and Only* in running translation with lexical and syntactic expansion. In case of first translation, two options have been exercised in terms of morphological choices (*One and Unique*). The first word '*One'* has multiple meanings in English language in collaboration with other words and is also independently used as a noun, determiner and a pronoun. The second word *'Unique'* is an adjective. Therefore, the first translation results into a loss of grammatical category and the referential versatility of the Qur'ānic words. In case of second translation, the Arabic noun has been translated into an English noun-phrase (a combination of adjective and noun) *'One God'* which results into losses of grammatical category and culture specific terms. The third translation '*the One and Only'* translates the Arabic noun clearly as compared to the other two but it also results into a loss of grammatical category (one word translated into a phrase of four words).

The third word"الصَّمَدُ"identified as an element of pragmatic losses is noun in the category of nominative masculine singular noun and it has been translated as *(alone is) the One Source of all/Independent/Self sufficient* in word-for-word translation, *the Everlasting Refuge* in literal translation and *the Self-Sufficient (independent of all, while all are*

TRANSLATOR	QUR'ĀNIC TEXT WITH ENGLISH TRANSLATION
	قُلْ هُوَ اللَّهُ أَحَدٌ ﴿١﴾ اللَّهُ الصَّمَدُ ﴿٢﴾ لَمْ يَلِدْ وَلَمْ يُولَدْ ﴿٣﴾ وَلَمْ يَكُنْ لَهُ كُفُوًا أَحَدٌ ﴿٤﴾

ZIA

يَلِدْ	لَمْ	الصَّمَدُ	اللَّهُ	أَحَدٌ	اللَّهُ	هُوَ	قُلْ
(He) -begets -fathers	Did not	(alone is) the One -Source of all -Independent -Self sufficient	Allah	(is) -One -Unique	Allah	He	(You) say!

أَحَدٌ	كُفُوًا	لَهُ	يَكُنْ	لَمْ	و	يُولَدْ	لَمْ	و
any one	-coequal -comparable	for Him	(it) is (was / will be)	did not	And	(He is) -begotten -fathered	Did not	and

ARBERRY

Say: 'He is God, One,
God, the Everlasting Refuge,
who has not begotten, and has not been begotten,
and equal to Him is not any one.'

FAROOQ

Say: He is Allah the One and Only;[1] Allah is the Self-Sufficient (independent of all, while all are dependent on Him);[2] He begets not, nor is He begotten;[3] And there is none comparable to Him.[4] 112:[1-4]

7.2   Elements of Pragmatic Losses in Arabic Text

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
كُفُوًا	يَكُنْ	يُولَدْ	يَلِدْ	الصَّمَدُ	أَحَدٌ	اللَّهُ

target language[1]. According to Baker (2006), cohesion is the innate property of the text and coherence is a feature of the reader's evaluation of the same text.[2] Cohesion gives the surface meaning of the text through lexical, syntactical, and semantic structure of a language. Only cohesiveness is not enough for the intended aims of communicative process, it requires coherence as well. Coherence is more subjective and cohesion is more objective. It is coherence that poses big problems in the process of translation.

The above discussion clearly reflects that in the process of translation of a text from one language to another language, pragmatic losses occur due to differences in morphological, phonological or grammatical structure, pragmatic implications and socio-cultural values of the language involved. The case of pragmatic losses becomes more severe when the message of the creator of the universe (revelation) is translated by a human being (non-Prophet) into another language. In the translations of the Holy Qur'ān that is from Arabic to other languages of the world, pragmatic losses have been recognized by almost all the translators. These pragmatic losses distort the message of source text when transferred into target text and have severe practical implications for the receptors.[3] It is established among the translators that pragmatic losses cannot be entirely eliminated but minimized. In the present study, the researchers are intended to identify the elements of pragmatic losses in *Sūrah Ikhlāṣ*, carryout comparative pragma-linguistic analysis of three different English translations of these elements, highlight the similarities and differences, and suggest recommendations for minimizing the pragmatic losses in the English translations of the Holy Qur'ān.

7. Data analysis

Comparative Pragma-linguistic Analysis of *Sūrah Ikhlāṣ*(Verse-1~4)

7.1   Textual Presentation

Text of *Sūrah Ikhlāṣ* (original text) and relevant translated texts are tabulated in the following:

---

(1) Susan Bassnett, *Translation Studies* (3rd ed. UK: Routledge, 2002), 42-43.
(2) Mona Baker, *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies* (USA & Canada: Routledge, 2006), 105-117.
(3) Amir El-Said Ebrahim Al-Azab& Othman Abdulaziz Al-Misned, "Pragmatic Losses of Qur'an Translation: A linguistic approach", *English Language and Literature Studies,* Vol. 2, No. 3, ISSN 1925-4768 Canada, (2012): 17-32.

translation in the perspective of communication.[1] This approach solely depends upon translational action indicated by the German functionalist Holz-Manttari. Under the rubric of translational action, translation remains objective and target language oriented with a message to be disseminated and communicated from one culture to another culture. In the words of Manttari, it is not translation of words, sentences or texts but in every case, it is about steering the intended co-operation over different cultural barriers that make intercultural communication possible on the basis of functionality. The approach of translational action implicitly includes a number of actors where each player or actor works for an aim for achieving such a translated text that efficiently communicates in the perspective of functionality for the target language audiences.[2]

In accordance with the point of view of Lefevere, the translation is a re-writing process and a manipulative behavior is adopted for justification of the issues relevant to culture and society.[3] Subsequently, the register of the text is altered along with pragmatic impact. In fact translation is a process of negotiation between source text and target text, and between relevant cultures not only shifting of texts between languages. This whole process is mediated by the personality of the translator.[4] In the perspective of Bassnett's concept of cultural contact between source text and target text, the enforcement of cultural values of the former on the later is quite harmful and demands the translators to be morally responsible to the audiences of target language. When a text of a popular culture is translated into a comparatively less influential culture, the translators need to be cautious about ensuring balance between faithfulness to source text and ideological as well as cultural demands of the audiences of target language.

Pragmatics is defined as the study of language in use, and the meanings of the text are not comprehended as produced by the linguistic system but as transmitted and intended or maneuvered by senders and receivers in a communicative situation. The text needs to maintain the cohesion and coherence for being meaningful both in source language and

_____

(1) Eugene Nida, *Toward a Science of Translating: With Special Reference to Principles and Procedures Involved in Bible Translating*, Netherlands: E. J. Brill, Leiden (1964): 140. Orthophemism in grammarabout.com, http://grammar.about.com/od/mo/g/orthophemismterm.htm
(2) Jeremy Munday, *Introduction to Translation Studies: Theories and Applications,* (London, New York: Routledge Press, 2001), 76.
(3) Susan Bassnett, *Translation Studies* (3rd ed. UK: Routledge, 2002), 87.
(4) Andre Lefevere, *Translation, Rewriting and the Manipulation of Literary Fame* (London & Now York: Routledge, 1992), 102.

translation into three kinds: (1) intra-lingual translation (2) inter-lingual translation and (3) inter-semiotic translation.[1] This three dimensional categorization of translation has become the basis of current debate on translation theories. The present study falls under the category of inter-lingual translation. Under this rubric, three types of translations are included: (1) literal translation, (2) word-for-word translation and (3) running translation with lexical and syntactical expansion.

According to Bassentt, Jacobson predicted a solution to the issue of equivalency or non-equivalency in translation from source text to target text that has become broadly popular and acceptable among the theorists of translation studies.[2] Jacobson proclaimed that the messages (translated texts) might serve as an accurate version of the source text but full equivalence through translation is not achievable by any means. The major reasons behind this discrepancy are: (1) the prevalent differences in language systems, (2) contrast in cultural norms, values, traditions and social settings of the languages involved, (3) incompatible linguistic structures and expressions or signs in target language as compared to source language. Since the identification of meta-linguistic aspects as a major cause of non-equivalency and realization of its significance for the translated text, translation theorists have put their best efforts in finding ways to reach equivalency as much as possible.

Like Jacobson, Nida also reached the same conclusion.[3] He spent a lot of time to resolve the issues that emerged in the translations of the Bible into different languages of the world. He concluded that there is no possibility of absolute correspondence or exact translation between different languages of the world e.g. the translated text may be reasonably close to source text but cannot be identical since no two languages are identical in semantic considerations, symbolic representations and syntactical structures of linguistic symbols in the form of phrases or sentences. There may be some exception in case of a very simple text where formal equivalency may be possible through adjustment of the source text for a similar function in the target language.

Munday refers to another approach, which highlights the purpose of

_____

(1)   Roman Jacobson, "On Linguistic aspects of translation," In R. A. Brower (ed.) *On Translation* (1966): 233.
(2)   Susan Bassnett, *Translation Studies*, (3rd ed. UK: Rutledge, 2002), 32.
(3)   Eugene Nida, *Toward a Science of Translating: With Special Reference to Principles and Procedures Involved in Bible Translating,* Netherlands: E.J. Brill, Leiden (1964): 156. Orthophemism in grammarabout.com, http://grammar.about.com/od/mo/g/orthophemismterm.htm

texts and 6) conclusion.

The comparative pragma-linguistic analysis specific to this study is based upon morphological element of linguistic structures of Arabic and English languages. The present study is descriptive and qualitative in its type and the data has been analyzed qualitatively.

6. Literature Review

The history of translation studies begins with the struggle of finding solutions to the issues of equivalency or non-equivalency between the source text and target text through different approaches. The discussion reflects contrasts and contradictions of (1) *word-for-word*, (2) *sense-for-sense*, (3) *form versus content*, (4) *formal equivalence versus dynamic equivalence*, (5) *syntactic and semantic versus communicative translation,* (6) *literal versus free translation.*[1] However, the consensus prevails only on the functional facets of language. According to John Austin words and sentences not only describe reality (true or false) but perform acts as well and also form social realities.[2]

Translation studies flourished in the perspective of language functions in the domain of language use. The problem of equivalency or non-equivalency becomes more serious when a source text also includes meta-linguistic deliberations besides the mere description of reality, because meta-linguistic considerations refer to social, cultural and traditional values which create problems in translation due to differences of source language and target language. The task of the translators becomes even more difficult, and besides lexical and semantic equivalencies they need to focus on meta-linguistic aspects of the text as well. The theorists were aware of the incorporation of illocutionary aspect of language in translation since the beginning of translation studies. However, later on most of them realized that classical methodology was not an ample approach to translation. The mere incorporation of lexical and semantic features would not be enough. Now the issue for the translation theorists was to incorporate meta-linguistic aspects of language or text in the translation.

Roman Jacobson is one of the earlier translation theorists who advocated a systematic approach to translation studies. He categorized

---

(1)   Abdallah Manar Abdelhafeeth, *Translating English Euphemisms into Arabic: Challenges & strategies,* Department of Arabic and Translation Studies, College of Arts and Sciences, Sharja: UAE (2009): 16.

(2)   John Langshaw Austin, *How to Do Things with Words,* Edited by Urmson & Sbisa, Harvard University: USA (1975): 5.

identification of the elements of pragmatic losses in the text of *Sūrah Ikhlāṣ*, highlighting the manifestation of these pragmatic losses in these different English translations, and sorting out the similarities and differences in these translations, a comparative pragma-linguistic analysis of these translations will be carried. The researchers have developed the following model for comparative pragma-linguistic analysis of multiple translations of the Qur'ānic text:

TRANSLATOR	ORIGINAL TEXT WITH TRANSLATION(S)
	Original Text
1st	TT (Type-1)
2nd	TT (Type-2)
3rd	TT (Type-3)
Elements of Pragmatic Losses in Original Text	
Comparative Analysis: Manifestations of Pragmatic Losses in the Translated Text (s)	
Similarities	
Differences	
Conclusion	

Model for Comparative Pragma linguistic Analysis of Different Translations

This model has been developed for the academic research (PhD Thesis) titled as "A Comparative Study of Pragmatic Losses in English Translations of the Holy Qur'ān" by Muhammad Abdullah. The same has been utilized for the present study for the comparative pragma-linguistic analysis. This model has been specifically developed for comparative pragma-linguistic analysis of more than one (multiple) translations of a source text. The model comprises six steps: 1) textual presentation (source text and translated texts), 2) identification of the elements of pragmatic losses in the source text, 3) comparative analysis of the manifestations of pragmatic losses in the translated texts, 4) perusal of the similarities in the manifestations of pragmatic losses in the translated texts, 5) perusal of the differences in the manifestations of pragmatic losses in the translated

subsequent manifestations in different English translations (word-for-word translation, literal translation and running translation with lexical and syntactic expansion).

3. Research Questions

Following main and subsidiary research questions were formulated for this research in particular.

Main research question:

What are the elements of pragmatic losses in the text of *Sūrah Ikhlāṣ* and their manifestations in terms of pragmatic losses in three different types of translations (word-for-word translation, literal translation and running translation with lexical and syntactic expansions)?

Subsidiary Questions:

(1) What are the elements of pragmatic losses in the Arabic text of the *Sūrah Ikhlāṣ?*

(2) What are the manifestations of pragmatic losses in word-for-word English translation of the *Sūrah Ikhlāṣ*?

(3) What are manifestations of pragmatic losses in literal English translation of the *Sūrah Ikhlāṣ*?

(4) What are manifestations of pragmatic losses in running English translation with lexical and syntactic expansion of the *Sūrah Ikhlāṣ*?

(5) What are the similarities and differences in these translations in terms of manifestations of pragmatic losses?

4. Significance

Sūrah Ikhlāṣ is one of the most famous *Sūrahs* of the Holy Qur'ān. It falls in the last section of the Holy Qur'ān. In accordance with one of the traditions of the Holy Prophet (SAW), it is considered as equal to one third (⅓) of the Holy Qur'ān[1]. It may be taken as if one recites *Sūrah Ikhlāṣ* three times, it is as he has recited the whole Qur'ān. The above significance of the *Sūrah* is the main cause of its selection for this study.

5. Research Methodology

The purpose behind the selection of three different types of translations of this *Sūrah* is to elaborate the variations among these translations in terms of the manifestations of pragmatic losses. For the

---

(1) Muḥammad bin Ismael Bukhari, Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhari, (Translator, M. Muhsin Khan, 1st edition Edited by Mika'il al-Almany, Volume 6, Book 61, Number 534, 2009), 1120.
https://d1.islamhouse.com/data/en/ih_books/single/en_Sahih_Al-Bukhari.pdf

1. Introduction

The Qur'ān is the book of eternal and divine message of Allah for mankind. In the present circumstances, it is obligatory for all human beings to understand this divine message and implement it in their lives for success, sense of accomplishment and achievement of eternal piece in this world and hereafter with the consent and blessings of Allah. In order to facilitate the acquisition of this goal, the book has been translated into multiple languages of the world since the time of its revelation. In the present age English has achieved the status of not just an international language but a global language. It has become the mean of international communication in terms of world business, social interaction, cultural exchange and global orientation through an advanced and progressive use of information technology. The Holy Qur'ān has also been translated into English by Arab and non-Arab as well as Muslim and non-Muslim scholars. For some scholars/translators English is a native language and for others a foreign one.

It is agreed upon among the translators and religious scholars that absolute translation of the revelation is not possible[1]. Muslim and non-Muslim scholars have written about the translatability of the Holy Qur'ān at large. The available literature on the subject may be concluded that the book cannot be translated in absolute terms[2]. In case of English and Arabic, this task becomes more difficult as these are entirely two different languages in terms of their culture, syntax, morpho-syntactic patterns, pragmatic considerations, social norms, religious practices, etc. In such cases, the possibility of pragmatic losses is also agreed upon among the translators all over the world.

In this perspective, it is pertinent to highlight the elements of pragmatic losses and their subsequent manifestations in the selected text from the translations of the Holy Qur'ān. Present research is meant to highlight the same in the English translations of *Sūrah Ikhlāṣ*. In this regard three different English translations have been selected under the categories of word-for-word translation, literal translation and running translation with lexical and syntactic expansions.

2. Objective

The objective of this research is to identify the elements of pragmatic losses in the morphs-syntactic structure of *Sūrah Ikhlāṣ* and highlight their

---

(1) Hussein Abdul Raof, *Quran Translation – Discourse, Texture and Exegesis* (Richmond: Curzon, 2001), 179.
(2) Amjad Fazel Asadi & Farahani Mohammad, "Problems and Strategies in English Translation of Quranic Divine Names", *International Journal of Linguistics* ISSN 1948-5425, Vol. 5, No. 1(2013): 128-142.

Study of Pragmatic Losses in the English Translations of Sūrah Al Ikhlāṣ
A Comparative Pragma-linguistic Analysis

Muhammad Abdullah[*]
Dr. Jamil Asgher[**]

ABSTRACT

The comprehension of the message of the Holy Qur'ān is obligatory for the whole of humanity which is revealed in the Arabic language. Scholars all over the world, Muslims as well as non-Muslims have devoted their best efforts to translate the word of Allah Almighty in different languages of the world, although absolute translation is not possible. These translations from Arabic to other languages of the world result into pragmatic losses. Small wonder, these pragmatic losses cause problems in the process of understanding the actual message of the Holy Qur'ān enshrined in the source text. This study was conducted to analyze the pragmatic losses in the English translations of Sūrah Ikhlāṣ (chapter 112) through a comparative pragma-linguistic analysis. Three different translations have been selected for the study.

A comparative and critical study of these translations has established the presence of certain pragmatic losses which are likely to bear upon the comprehension of the reader in more than one way. To the researchers, the presence of these losses calls for the greater sensitivity towards and understanding of the pragmatic aspects of interlingual translation, specifically for a text which in its primordial form was intended to be a Speech (Kalām). To retain the pragmatic value and meaning of the source text become all the more paramount when the text translated is sacred one with its own canonical conventions and discursive norms.

Keywords: *pragmatic losses, translation, comparative, pragma-linguistic, analysis.*

_____
[*]   PhD Scholar, NUML, Islamabad
[**]   Assistant Professor, English Department, NUML, Islamabad