

A Comparative Analysis of Two English Translations of Ya Seen (Q.36): A Schema-Based Approach

Ebrahim Khodadady

Saeideh Alsadat Eslami

Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, International Branch
Mashhad, Iran

Abstract

The present study explored whether the schemata comprising Saffarzadeh (2007) and Sale's (1979) translations of the thirty sixth chapter of the Quran, i.e., surah Ya Seen, differed significantly from each other. To this end, the schemata of the two translations were parsed and assigned to three semantic, syntactic and parasyntactic domains. The genera of the domains were also specified in terms of their tokens and types to test three hypotheses. The results showed that the two translations differed significantly in the number of 1) schema domain tokens, 2) common and different schema domain types and 3) common and different schema genus types. With the exception of few schemata, Saffarzadeh has secured the content validity of her translation by offering appropriate semantic, syntactic and parasyntactic equivalents for the Arabic schemata. Sale has, however, violated the content validity of his translation by deleting certain schemata and changing the domains of others to Christianize his translation. The findings are discussed and suggestions are made for future research.

Keywords: Schemata, validity, tokens, types

1 Introduction

English Translations of the *Quran* have played an indispensable part in transferring its written knowledge to its English readers throughout the world. While Arabic speaking readers can be sure that they are getting its message directly from its creator, the readers of its English translations must of necessity accept the intermediary role of their translators and be aware that they are dealing with second hand knowledge which contains the translators' views expressed directly and/or indirectly. In other words, the readers have no choice but to rely on a given translator's faithful rendition identified as one of the methods of translation by Newmark (1988) and defined as "faithfulness to the meaning rather than the words of the author" (cited in Munday, 2001, p. 24).

Concepts such as "faithfulness" and "meaning" are, however, too broad or macro structural (Khodadady, 2001) to be captured within an objective framework and thus render judging translated texts "vague and subjective" (Bassnett, 2002, p. 128). Khodadady (2008a, 2011) therefore, suggested the micro structural approach of schema theory as the best rationale to explain the translation process and its assessment. The theory is based on the differentiation of what words stand for in isolation and as dictionary "entries" and what a given speaker or writer (henceforth addresser) uses those entries to express a specific concept or "schema" to a specific listener or reader (henceforth addressee). In guiding the addressees of *The Heritage Illustrated Dictionary of the English Language International Edition*, Hoss (1973), for example, demarcated the "entry" as 'a single "word"' (p. XLVII) which has multiple numbered senses or definitions. Based on this demarcation, Morris (1973) provided his readers with nine definitions for the entry "word". These definitions are gathered over years as conventional pieces of knowledge some of which may or may not form the background knowledge of given addressers and addressees at a specific period of their lives.

Similarly, "a schema is a set of interrelated features which are associated with an entity or concept" (Field, 2003, p. 39) as is a word. In contrast to a word which exists in a dictionary with fixed senses, a schema is, however, formed in the mind of a real person and its interrelated features are constantly modified or expanded as that person encounters or produces the same schema in various situations. In translating a specific schema of a source text, a translator, for example, chooses one of its specific features which s/he believed relates best to other schemata constituting the text. The validity of his/her translation will thus depend on the degree to which the specific feature of the concept represented by the schema offered as target equivalent is the same as the feature expressed by the author of source schema.

In other terms, while a word contains static and fixed features offered as definitions, a schema represents a specific and individualized feature of a concept not only by itself but also in semantic, syntactic and discoursal relationships with other schemata with which it is used (Khodadady & Lagzian, 2013).

Saffarzadeh (2007), for example, employed the schema “word” (p. 1) as an equivalent for the Arabic schema AYAT (آيَات) to describe each of the “verses” comprising the 114 chapters or surahs of the *Quran*. Employing the schema “word” instead of “verse” thus shows that she has added another feature to her English schema of “word” which is not shared by other English translators of the *Quran* such as Arberry (1955) and Asad (1980). In other words, Saffarzadeh has translated the schema AYAT idiosyncratically to introduce each of the 114 surahs. For example, she introduces the first or opening surah of the *Quran*, Fatiha, as “Revealed at Makka 7 Words of Revelation” (p. 1).

The micro structural approach of schema theory, therefore, views schemata as the building blocks of translation and assigns them to three main domains, through which English translations of the *Quran* can be compared with each other and their content validity be evaluated psychometrically. The domains were first referred to as semantic, syntactic and parasyntactic by Khodadady (2008b). In collaboration with other researchers, he designed research projects to find out whether schema domains could be employed to test reading comprehension ability (Khodadady, 1997) and to teach English to university students of medicine (Khodadady & Elahi, 2012) and theology (Khodadady et al., 2012). The results show that schema-based reading comprehension tests enjoy face and content validity as well as reliability. The findings also show that university students receiving schema-based instruction score significantly higher on reading comprehension tests than those sitting in translation-based classes. The present study extends the application of schema theory to translation and attempts to find out whether Saffarzadeh (2007) and Sale’s translations of surah Ya Seen (Q.36) differ significantly from each other in terms of the schemata the translators have employed

1.1 Semantic Schemata

Semantic schemata are the single/phrasal words of given texts whose meanings do not depend on other schemata. The Arabic schema MORSALIN (مرسلين), for example, means messengers and thus invokes the concept of “a person who carries a message” in the minds of its readers. As a domain, semantic schemata consist of four genera, i.e., adjectives, adverbs, nouns and verbs. Each genus in turn comprises several species. Khodadady and Lagzian (2013), for example, established seven species for adjectives, i.e., agentive, comparative, dative, derivational, nominal, simple, and superlative.

Since semantic schemata represent whatever concepts humans can conceptualize within the variables of place and time to meet their ever evolving needs they are open in nature. This very unique feature of semantic schemata yields species which are many in types but few in frequency. Textually analyzing *Reading Media Texts: Iran-America Relations*, Khodadady (1999), for example, found that the 23 news articles comprising the textbook consisted of 1310 adjectives. The agentive adjectives “bordering”, “budding”, “changing”, “confidence-building” and “conflicting” had been, for instance, used only once in the entire textbook and thus had a frequency or token of one. The two nominal adjectives “Iranian” and “American” had, however, the highest token among the adjective types, i.e., 82 and 47, respectively.

1.2 Syntactic Schemata

The syntactic domain of schemata consists of five genera, i.e., conjunctions, determiners, prepositions, pronouns and syntactic verbs. They are in turn subcategorized into species to reveal the multidimensional levels of human concepts. Determiners, for example, consist of demonstrative, interrogative, numeral, possessive, quantifying, ranking and specifying species. The types of syntactic species such as conjunctions and determiners depend on semantic schemata in order to fulfill their linguistic function and convey their intended meaning. For this very reason, there are few syntactic types in English. Syntactic schemata are, however, many in tokens. Khodadady’s (1999) analysis, for example, showed that 39 conjunction types comprise the entire *Reading Media Texts: Iran-America Relations*. Among these types, the conjunction “and” had a token of 468.

1.3 Parasyntactic Schemata

The parasyntactic domain of schemata comprises seven genera, i.e., abbreviations, interjections, names, numerals, para-adverbs, particles, and symbols (Khodadady & Lagzian, 2013). The types forming the species of parasyntactic domain can be many in types but few in tokens.

Similar to syntactic schemata they, however, depend on semantic schemata to convey their intended meaning, hence parasyntactic. Fakhar (2010), for example, analyzed the schemata comprising pages 4 to 39 of the book *True To Life Intermediate* (Gairns & Redman, 1996) textbook to develop several tests on its content. She found that 72 proper names were mentioned in the specified pages most of which had a token of one, e.g., Eric and Greg. Following Khodadady and Lagzian (2013), schema theory was, therefore, employed in this study to examine the content validity of Saffarzadeh (2007) and Sale's (1979) translations of surah Ya-Seen (Q. 36). These two translators were chosen because they had both translated the holy book from the original Arabic. Saffarzadeh was a contemporary Iranian Shiite Muslim whereas Sale was an "English Orientalist" (Neilson, 1980, p. 1304). The content validity of the two translations was determined by assigning all the schemata comprising the two renditions into semantic, syntactic and parasyntactic domains and genera. Based on their tokens, the types of these domains as well as genera were also specified. It was hypothesized that there would be no significant difference in the number of schema tokens and types if the two translators had translated the Quranic schemata without committing any deletions and/or additions containing their personal understanding of the *Quran*.

2. Methodology

2.1 Materials

The original Arabic surah of Ya Seen (Q.36) consists of 416 semantic (50.0%), 297 syntactic (35.7%) and 119 parasyntactic (14.3%) schema tokens. Table 1 presents the genus tokens of the three domains. As can be seen, 832 schema tokens comprise the whole surah. The 191 Verbs and 177 nouns form the first and second highest percentage of semantic schema genera, i.e., 23.0% and 21.3%, respectively. Similarly, the 112 prepositions and 93 conjunctions are the first and second most frequently used tokens, i.e., 13.5% and 11.2%, respectively, among the syntactic genera.

Table 1: Arabic genus tokens comprising Ya Seen

Genus Tokens	Frequency	Percent	Genus Tokens	Frequency	Percent
Adjectives	46	5.5	Syntactic verbs	21	2.5
Adverbs	2	0.2	Interjections	7	0.8
Nouns	177	21.3	Names	7	0.8
Verbs	191	23	Para-adverbs	97	11.7
Conjunctions	93	11.2	Particles	6	0.7
Determiners	8	1	Symbols	2	0.2
Prepositions	112	13.5	Total	832	100
Pronouns	63	7.6			

The schema types of the Arabic text were not specified because of its orthography. One of the most distinctive features of the English language is that each schema in a text plays a specific and distinct syntactic and semantic role. To achieve the function, each schema is separated from the other schemata by a space. The schema "in," for example, plays a syntactic role by connecting "... a 'prepositional object' – a noun clause or pronoun" (Swan, 2005, p. 434) that comes after it. Semantically, it activates a specific concept in its readers' minds in relation to the semantic schemata which precede and follow it. According to *Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English* (1995), "in", for example, shows where someone or something is" (p. 716).

Arabic orthography, however, does not allow researchers to assign specific syntactic roles to given schemata by resorting to spaces and they must, therefore, focus on their constituting morphs. The schema BISM (بِسْمِ) which is separated by a space from the second schema Allah (الله) in the opening utterance of Ya Seen, for example, consists of four schemata when it is translated into English, i.e., in the name of. In traditional as well as generative grammar, this phrase is referred to as prepositional. In schema-based grammar, however, it is broken down into three syntactic schemata, i.e., "in", "the" and "of", and one semantic schema, i.e., "name". Since this procedure is not applicable to Arabic texts, the schema types of Ya Seen could not be determined.

2.2 Procedure

The English translation of Ya Seen by Saffarzadeh (2007, pp 803-814) and Sale (1929, pp. 430-435) were typed and their constituting schemata were parsed.

The species of these schemata were then specified on the basis of 122 codes established by Khodadady (2010) as were the domain and genus schema tokens of the Arabic surah. Each species code consists of four digits, e.g., 1110 and 1120. The first two digits on the left specify semantic (11), syntactic (12) and parasyntactic (13) domains. The third stands for the species of each domain ordered alphabetically. Thus the third digits, i.e. 1 and 2 in 1110 and 1120, represent agentive and comparative adjectives, respectively. The last digit on the right reveals the conceptual complexity of a schema. While 1110, for example, codifies “Interesting”, and “fascinating” as agentive adjectives, 1111 represents adjectives such as “flesh-eating”, an “fine-looking” which are both linguistically and conceptually complex because they consist of nouns described by the attached agentive adjectives.

2.3 Data Analysis

In order to find out whether Saffarzadeh and Sale’s translation of the tokens and types of semantic, syntactic and parasyntactic schemata comprising the Ya Seen (Q. 36) differed from each other significantly in their domains or not Chi-Square test was employed. Since the genera and species of domains consisted of more than two categories Crosstabulation statistics was employed to find out whether the two translations differed in the number of English equivalents they provided for the Arabic schema domain and genera tokens and types. IBM SPSS Statistics 20 was utilized to run the statistical analyses and test the following three hypotheses.

H1. *There will be no significant difference in the number of schema domain tokens employed by Saffarzadeh and Sale.*

H2. *There will be no significant difference in the number of common and different schema domain types employed by Saffarzadeh and Sale.*

H3. *There will be no significant difference in the number of common and different schema genus types employed by Saffarzadeh and Sale.*

3. Results

Table 2 presents the number of schema domain tokens employed as English equivalents of Arabic schemata by Saffarzadeh and Sale. As can be seen, the number of the former’s semantic tokens (n=663, 35.5%) is more than the latter’s (n= 564, 33.6%). Similarly, the number of syntactic (n=1035, 55.9%) and parasyntactic (n=155, 8.4%) schema tokens offered by Saffarzadeh is more than those of Sale (n=1002, 59.6%, n=114, 6.8%, respectively.) The Pearson Chi-Square test shows that the difference in the number of semantic, syntactic and parasyntactic domain tokens is significant ($\chi^2 = 6.315$, $df = 2$, $p < .04$). These results disconfirm the *first* hypothesis that *there will be no significant difference in the number of schema domain tokens employed by Saffarzadeh and Sale.*

Table 2: Translator by Domain Tokens Crosstabulation

Translators	Token and Percent	Semantic	Syntactic	Parasyntactic	Total
Saffarzadeh	Count	663	1035	155	1853
	% within Translator	35.8%	55.9%	8.4%	100.0%
	% within Domain Tokens	54.0%	50.8%	57.6%	52.4%
Sale	Count	564	1002	114	1680
	% within Translator	33.6%	59.6%	6.8%	100.0%
	% within Domain Tokens	46.0%	49.2%	42.4%	47.6%
Total	Count	1227	2037	269	3533
	% within Translator	34.7%	57.7%	7.6%	100.0%
	% within Domain Tokens	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

One of the main problems involved in analysing the tokens offered by the two translators is its indifference towards those schemata which are offered as equivalents by both. In other words, the tokens comprising target texts include the schemata which are common to both translators. This problem was, however, solved in tabulating the schema types by adding a third value to the dichotomous category of translator variable, i.e., 1) Saffarzadeh, 2) Sale and 3) both Saffarzadeh and Sale. In determining the common schema types, the linguistic as well as the conceptual sameness were taken into account. For example, while “knows” and “knoweth” were treated as one single type, “knew” and “know” were codified as two separate verb types differing in tense.

Table 3: Translator by Domain Types Crosstabulation

Domain	Types	Saffarzadeh	Sale	Saffarzadeh & Sale	Total
Semantic	Count	274	224	152	650
	% within Domain Types	42.2%	34.5%	23.4%	100.0%
	% within Translator	89.0%	86.8%	58.0%	78.5%
Syntactic	Count	27	23	95	145
	% within Domain Types	18.6%	15.9%	65.5%	100.0%
	% within Translator	8.8%	8.9%	36.3%	17.5%
Parasyntactic	Count	7	11	15	33
	% within Domain Types	21.2%	33.3%	45.5%	100.0%
	% within Translator	2.3%	4.3%	5.7%	4.0%
Total	Count	308	258	262	828
	% within Domain Types	37.2%	31.2%	31.6%	100.0%
	% within Translator	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 3 presents the number of schema domain types offered by Saffarzadeh, Sale and both Saffarzadeh and Sale in their translation of *Ya Seen*. As can be seen a total of 828 schema types have been used in the translations of which 650 (78.5%) are semantic in nature. When the common semantic schemata ($n=152$, 23.4%) are singled out, Saffarzadeh's types ($n=274$, 42.2%) prove to be more than those of Sales ($n=224$, 34.5%) as are her syntactic types ($n=27$, 18.6% and $n=23$, 15.9%, respectively). The number of parasyntactic schema types used by Sale ($n=11$, 33.3%) is, however, more than that of Saffarzadeh' ($n=7$, 21.2%). Chi-Square test shows that the difference in the number of semantic, syntactic and parasyntactic domain types is significant ($\chi^2 = 101.807$, $df = 4$, $p < .000$). These results disconfirm the second hypothesis that *there will be no significant difference in the number of common and different schema domain types employed by Saffarzadeh and Sale*.

Table 4: Translator by Genus Types Crosstabulation

Genera	Types	Saffarzadeh	Sale	Saffarzadeh & Sale	Total
Adjectives	Count	46	30	12	87
	% within Genus Types	52.3%	34.1%	13.6%	100.0%
Adverbs	Count	14	21	8	44
	% within Genus Types	32.6%	48.8%	18.6%	100.0%
Nouns	Count	109	69	77	255
	% within Genus Types	42.7%	27.1%	30.2%	100.0%
Verbs	Count	105	104	55	264
	% within Genus Types	39.8%	39.4%	20.8%	100.0%
Conjunctions	Count	3	4	6	13
	% within Genus Types	23.1%	30.8%	46.2%	100.0%
Determiners	Count	3	4	21	28
	% within Genus Types	10.7%	14.3%	75.0%	100.0%
Prepositions	Count	8	3	21	32
	% within Genus Types	25.0%	9.4%	65.6%	100.0%
Pronouns	Count	8	7	25	40
	% within Genus Types	20.0%	17.5%	62.5%	100.0%
Syntactic verbs	Count	5	5	22	32
	% within Genus Types	15.6%	15.6%	68.8%	100.0%
Interjections	Count	0	2	1	3
	% within Genus Types	0.0%	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
Names	Count	3	4	4	11
	% within Genus Types	27.3%	36.4%	36.4%	100.0%
Para-adverbs	Count	4	5	9	18
	% within Genus Types	22.2%	27.8%	50.0%	100.0%
Symbols	Count	0	0	1	1
	% within Genus Types	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Total	Count	308	258	262	828
	% within Genus Types	37.2%	31.2%	31.6%	100.0%

Table 4 presents the number of schema genus types offered by translators. As can be seen, among 255 and 87 noun and adjective schemata comprising the translations, 77 and 12 are commonly used by Saffarzadeh and Sale, respectively. However, Saffarzadeh has used more nouns (n=109, 42.7%) and adjectives (n=46, 52.3%) than Sale (n=69, 27.1% and n=30, 34.1%, respectively) has. While both translators have used almost the same number of distinct semantic and syntactic verb schemata, Sale has employed more adverbs (n=21, 48.8%) than Saffarzadeh has (n=15, 32.6%). Chi-Square test shows that the difference in the number of semantic, syntactic and parasyntactic domain types is significant ($x^2 = 130.043$, $df = 24$, $p < .000$). These results *disconfirm* the third hypothesis that *there will be no significant difference in the number of common and different schema genus types employed by Saffarzadeh and Sale*.

4. Discussions

Sale’s biased approach towards translating the *Quran* reveals itself in the very translation of the first utterance with which its 113 surahs start, i.e., BISM ALLAH ARRAHMAN ARRAHIM (بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ). Although he acknowledges in a footnote that the utterance is ‘otherwise rendered as “in the name of the merciful and compassionate god,” and “in the Name of God, the Compassionate, the Merciful”’ (p.1) he offers “in the name of the most merciful God” as his preferred rendition and equates it with the sign of the cross in Christianity in his foot note. If the adjective schema “merciful” is accepted as an equivalent for ARRAHMAN, then it must also be accepted that Sale has deliberately avoided translating ARRAHIM 113 times throughout the *Quran*.

To the present researchers, the best equivalents for the two Quranic schemata ARRAHMAN and ARRAHIM have been offered by Toorawa (2010), i.e., full of compassion and ever compassionate, respectively (p. 149). Although Saffarzadeh has not committed any deliberate deletion as Sale has, her proposed equivalents, i.e., “Merciful” and “Beneficent,” stem from two different morphs, i.e., French “merci” and Latin “bene”. Although “compassion” has a Latin root, it is used consistently as the main morph of the two English equivalents, “full of compassion” and “ever compassionate”, representing ARRAHMAN and ARRAHIM and thus represent the common Arabic morph RAHM as consistently as intended in the *Quran*. Sales’ adamant attempt to translate it by resorting to his Christian background did not, however, let him see any difference between *full of* compassion and *ever* compassionate, when he chose “merciful” alone for both ARRAHMAN and ARRAHIM.

Table 5 presents the distinct adjective schemata employed by the two translators. The identification and alphabetically ordering of these schemata can help reviewers and readers alike discuss the validity of the two renditions as exactly and as fairly as possible. An examination of the first two adjectives used by Sale, for example, shows that he has committed addition unjustifiably. In his translation of RAJOLON (رَجُولٌ) and ALAZVAJ (زَوَاجٌ) verses (V) 20 and 36, for example, he has added “certain” to the former and “different” to the latter along with his inappropriate translation of ALAZVAJ as “kinds” instead of “pairs”.

Table 5: Distinct adjective schema types employed by translators

Saffarzadeh	Sale
Absolute, Alive, Appointed, Astray, Believing, Beneficent, Deep, Destined, Divine, Embracing, Evident, Expositoring, Expository, False, Fellow, Frail, Glad, Grace-bestowing, Guided, Guilty, Harsh, Knowing, Last, Lengthy, Loaded, Martyred, Motionless, Omnipotent, Omniscient, Onward, Ordinary, Past, Pure, Raised, Remote, Serious, Silent, Single, Small, Straight, Sudden, Supreme, Transgressing, Truthful, Unaware, Unseen, Vain	Certain, Different, Equal, Expedient, Extinct, Farther, Former, General, Good, Greater, Honourable, Instructive, Magnificent, Manifest, Mighty, New, Peculiar, Perspicuous, Plain, Public, Ready, Righteous, Rotten, Separated, Several, Shady, Skilled, Thankful, Various, Wicked, Wise

Sale’s footnote added to the noun schema “man” representing RAJOLON (رَجُولٌ) in V20, however, shows his applaudable attempt to provide its historical background, i.e., “This was Habib al Najjar, whose martyrdom is here described. His tomb is still shown near Antioch, and is much visited by the Mohammadens” (p. 432). Similar to Sale, Saffarzadeh has deliberately added the adjective schema “believing” to the “man” without providing any footnotes as regards her addition or the man’s assumed identify. She has also employed some adjective schemata inappropriately. In her translation of the last verse, for example, she offers “so absolute pure is Allah” for FASOBHAN (فَسُوبْحَانَ). The schema SOBHAN means roughly either “glory” or “praise” and thus using “absolute pure” as its equivalent attests to the translator’s idiosyncratic rendition.

Similarly, the adjectives “expository” and “divine”, the nouns “material” and “text” and the preposition “of” and determiner “the” in the phrase “an expository material of the Divine Text” have all been offered as an equivalent for the Arabic schema Quran (أَنْ) in V69 of the surah arguing in a footnote that “here Quran is a verbal noun not a proper noun, so I have translated the meaning of it” (p. 812).

Table 6 presents the distinct adverbs used by the two translators. While both Saffarzadeh and Sale have used the schemata “publicly”, “surely”, “unjustly” and “verily”, they have employed eight and ten different adverbs, respectively, as well. Even some common adverbs such as “verily” have been used in different contexts, emphasizing the very different concepts they have conveyed through the same adjective. For example, while Saffarzadeh offers it for the schema ENNA (نَا), ENNAKA (نَاكَ) and ENNAMA (نَا مَا) in V12, V3 and V83, respectively, Sale drops it in the translation of these three verses and employs it as an equivalent for BAL (لِ) translated as “the truth is that” by Saffarzadeh. Similarly, in the case of distinct adverbs they have inserted some idiosyncratically. Saffarzadeh has, for example, added “exactly” between the two Quranic schemata HAZA MA (هَذَا مَا) in V52 as Sale has done with “privately” in his translation of YOSSEROON (يُورُون) in V76 where he has added it to modify “conceal”.

Table 6: Distinct adverb schema types employed by translators

Saffarzadeh (n=8)	Sale (n=10)
Exactly, Hurriedly, Immediately, Mentally, Obstinate, Physically, Spiritually, Well	Certainly, Exceedingly, Hastily, Highly, Justly, Privately, Really, Rightly, Utterly, Wholly

Seventy six noun schemata have been used by the two translators, i.e., Bones, Book, Cattle, Chins, City, Creation, Creator, Creatures, Darkness, Day, Duty, Earth, Enemy, Error, Example, Eyes, Family, Fathers, Feet, Fire, Fruits, Generations, God, Grain, Graves, Hand, Heads, Heaven, Hell, Hope, Inhabitants, Intercession, Lie, Life, Man, Men, Mercy, Messenger, Milk, Moon, Mouths, Name, Necks, Night, Orbit, Paradise, Part, Peace, People, Place, Poetry, Preaching, Punishment, Reason, Resurrection, Revelation, Reward, Ship, Sign, Sorts, Soul, Sun, Thanks, Thing, Third, Tidings, Time, Tree, Troops, Trumpet, Way, Witness, Wives, Word, Worship, Yokes. While some of these nouns are used in the same sense by both translators, some are not.

Both Saffarzadeh and Sale, for example, employ “bones” as the equivalent of ALEZAM (أَلْظَام) in verse 78. The former, however, employs “book” redundantly for the Quran in verse 2 and as the equivalent of EMAM (إِمَام) in verse 12 translated as “register” by the latter. Saffarzadeh has gone even further by elaborating EMAM as “the Expositing Book of Guidance” (p. 805). As another common schema, Sale has employed “god” redundantly in translating the ALMORSALEEN (الْمُرْسَلِينَ) V3 and the ARRAHIM (الرَّحِيم) V5 as “the messengers of God” and “the merciful God”, respectively as has Saffarzadeh in translating BELGHAYB (الْغَيْب) in V11 as “the unseen god”. These analyses show that the two translators have used some common noun schemata to convey different concepts as they have done with adjectives and adverbs.

Table 7 presents distinct noun schemata employed by the two translators. As can be seen, Saffarzadeh has used more nouns than Sale. These findings show that they have provided their readers with two different understandings of Ya Seen. While the former has, for example, translated BEMAGHFERAH (بِمَغْفِرَةٍ) as “absolvement” in V11, Sale has opted for “mercy”. These two schemata are inappropriate for the proper equivalent “forgiveness” provided by other translators such as Arberry (1955, p. 114) and Asad (1980, p. 856). Thus, the very classification of schemata in terms of their being common and distinct shows how different the understanding of different translators of the same original text can be. While both Saffarzadeh and Sale have used the schema “mercy” in their translation of some schemata comprising Ya Seen, the replacement of MAGHFERAH with “mercy” shows that Sale equates it with ARRAHIM translated as “the merciful” while Saffarzadeh opts for a totally different and conceptually inappropriate schema of “absolvement”.

Table 7: Distinct noun schema types employed by translators

Saffarzadeh (n=103)	Sale (n=69)
Absolvement, Abundance, Account, Ark, Attention, Barrier, Blessings, Bounties, Chance, Chastisement, Childhood, Children, Corpses, Deeds, Deities, Direction, Disbelief, Disbelievers, Disputant, Dominion, Drop, Dust, Event, Existence, Faith, Folk, Followers, Forgiveness, Fountains, Future, Grace, Gratitude, Greeting, Grooves, Guidance, Happiness, Health, Help, Helper, Hereafter, Host, Ignorance, Knowledge, Land, Left, Light, Majority, Mankind, Martyr's Material, Means, Meat, Message, Nurturer, Omen, Ordainment, Outcry, Pagans, Pairs, Palm, Path, Person, Power, Presence, Present, Process, Profits, Promise, Question, Record, Rejecters, Reminder, Ridicule, Right, Salaam, Seal, Security, Shades, Share, Sofas, Sperm, Stalk, Station, Sustenance, Teaching, Term, Text, Tongues, Torture, Towns, Trace, Use, Variety, Vineyards, Warmth, Warning, Weakness, Will, Wisdom, Woe, Wool, World, Wrongs	Advantages, Age, Alms, Answer, Apostles, Army, Art, Assistance, Bar, Bed, Body, Branch, Command, Comparison, Condemnation, Conveniences, Couches, Course, Cry, Defence, Destruction, Disposition, Disputer, Effect(s), Emulation, Footsteps, Fuel, Gardens, Groves, Imposture, Instruments, Joy, kind(s) Kingdom, Labor, Luminaries, Mansions, Merchandise, Misery, Mockery, Multitude, Negligence, Offspring, Palm-tree(s) Party, Poet, Possessors, Praise, Presage, Rain, Register, Rest, Season, Secret, Seed, Sentence, Sexes, Shapes, Sons, Sound, Species, Speech, Springs, Subjection, Turn, Unbelievers, Vegetables, Vines, Works

One of the most distinct noun schemata highlighting Sale's Christianized translation of Ya Seen is his application of "apostle" as an equivalent for MORSALOON (رُسُلُونَ) in V13, V16 and V52 and RASOOL (رَسُول) in V30. According to Betz (2005), "the word apostle is known mainly from the Christian religion as a title of a religious leader, especially in early Christianity" (p. 434). Erich Haupt (1896) believed that what the word "apostle" stands for "is one of the most intricate and difficult problems of New Testament scholarship" (cited in Betz, 2005, p. 435). Sale did know the difference between "messenger" and "apostle" because he uses the former two times in V3 and V20, and the latter six times in V13, V14, V16, V19, V30 and V52, to advance his own version of Christianity. For example, he translated the schema MORSALOON (رُسُلُونَ) in V13 as "the Apostles of Jesus" and provided his footnote three as follows:

To explain this passage, the commentators tell the following story: The people of Antioch being idolaters, Jesus sent two of his disciples thither to preach to them; and when drew near the city they found Habib, surnamed Al Najjar, or the carpenter, feeding sheep, and acquainted him with their errand; whereupon he asked them what proof they had of their veracity, and they told him they could cure the sick, and the blind, and the lepers; and to demonstrate the truth of what they said, they laid their hands on a child of his who was sick, and immediately restored him to health. Habib was convinced by this miracle, and believed; after which they went into the city and preached the worship of one true God, curing a great number of people of several infirmities; but at length the affair coming to the prince's ear, he ordered them to be imprisoned for endeavoring to seduce the people. When Jesus heard of this, he sent another of his disciples, generally supposed to have been Simon Peter; who coming to Antioch, and appearing as a zealous idolater, soon insinuated himself into the favour of the inhabitants and of their prince, and at length took an opportunity to describe the prince would order the two persons ... (Al Zamakh., Al Beidawi, & c Vide etiam Marrace. In Alc. p. 580). [p. 431]

To save space, the whole footnote is not given here and the readers are referred to Sale's translation. The verse 13 of Ya Seen does not mention Jesus at all. Sale, however, inserts it in the body of his translation as if it did. Neither are there any indications of miracles performed by the three so-called disciples among whom one pretends to be an idolater and waits for an opportunity to save the other two! It must also be noted that at the beginning of the quotation, Sale misleads his readers by using the schema "commentators" at the beginning of his footnote by leading them to assume that he has consulted Al Zamakh and Al Beidawi in their original Arabic works. The incorrectness of assumption is, however, revealed by Ross (1979).

It is difficult to decide to what extent Sale's citations in the notes represent first-hand use of the Arabic commentators, but I fear that the result of a close inquiry only points to very little original research on his part (p. vii)

In addition to common adjectives, adverbs and nouns, Saffarzadeh and Sale have used 56 verbs in common, i.e., Afflict, Bear, Became, Believe, Bestowed, Came, Cause, Come, Comes(th), Create, Created, Deliver, Delivered, Desire, Destroyed, Does/doth, Eat, Enter, Fear, Fears(th), Feed, Fulfilled, Give, Gives(th), Grieve, Gush, Hasten, Help, Knew, Know, Knows/knoweth, Leaning, Left, Let, Make, Outstrip, Overtake, Produce, Promised, Receive, Return, Ride, Said, Say, See, Sent, Sent, Speak, Stone, Take, Taught, Treated, Use, Wait, Warn..

Both Saffarzadeh and Sale, for example, offer the verb “afflict” as an equivalent for ZORR (زُور) in V23. Saffarzadeh, however, adds the schemata “with a harsh punishment” idiosyncratically to show what it involves whereas Sale leaves it to the readers. Besides the questionable translation of a noun such as ZORR into a verb, Sale leaves the object of last verb, i.e., YONGHEZOOM (يَنْزِعُونَ) unknown. Arberry (1955) offered “affliction” as an appropriate equivalent from which believing people can be “delivered”. The noun schema ZORR in V23 thus provides an excellent example to differentiate schemata from words. Words are concepts which are found in dictionaries as isolated entries whereas schemata such as ZORR and YONGHEZOOM are the specific and contextualized features of the words which form parts of a given text and must therefore be understood not only by themselves but also in syntactic and discursal relationship to each other.

Table 8 presents the distinct verb schema types used by the two translators. The verbs “addressed” and “saying” have been offered by Saffarzadeh as equivalents for GHALA (قَالَ) in V20 whereas Sale employed “said”, indicating that the former has opted for verbosity. As an equivalent for A’HOD (أَمَرَ) in V60, Saffarzadeh and Sale offered “admonish” and “command”, respectively. The former, however, utilized “admonish” for TONZERO (تَنْزِرُ) in V11 whereas the latter translated it as “preach with effect”. These equivalents show that while Saffarzadeh is not consistent in employing equivalents for different schemata, both translators have not translated some key verb schemata properly and been idiosyncratic at best.

Table 8: Distinct verb schema types employed by translators

Saffarzadeh (n=107)	Sale (n=104)
Addressed, Admonish, Admonished, Attain, Be, Belied, Blown, Bore, Brought, Brought back, Called, Capture, Caused, Cite, Commands, Continue, Conveys, Cover, Created, Decide, Decides, Denying, Descended, Disbelieve, Disbelieving, Disclose, Disobeying, Draw, Drawn, Express, Fall, Forgetting, Gave, Get, Giving, Guard against, Guide, Guiding, Had, Hide, Honored, Included, Inflict, Intend, Involve, Join, Kept on, Known, Lack, Led, Listen, Made, Makes, Meant, Move, Moves, Nail, Needed, Obey, Ordained, Ordaining, Own, Owns, Paying, Place, Proclaimed, Produces, Producing, Proved, Proves, Provided, Put, Put, Quarrelling, Raised, Remove, Resembles, Returned, Revealed, Reversed, Saying, Send, Sent away, Spend, Stated, Stating, Stop, Subjected, Supported, Supposed, Take place, Taken account Taking, Talks, Telling, Think, Told, Travel, Turn away, Turned, Turned away, Wages, Want, Willed, Worship, Writing, Writing down	Answered, Appointed, Assembled, Assisted, Avail, Awakened, Behold, Bow down, Bring, Bringeth, Burned, Carry, Cast, Change, Charged, Command, Committed, Conceal, Consider, Covered, Defend, Demandeth, Depart, Desist, Destroyed, Died, Directed, Discover, Disputing, Drink, Drown, Enjoy, Executed, Filled, Follow, Followeth, Forced, Forgetteth, Forming, Found, Grant, Hasteneth, Have, Hearken, Hold up, Honoured, Inflicted, Kindle, Laugh, Live, Living, Made, Moving, Obtain, Open, Persist, Please, Pleaseth, Pleaseth, Pleaseth, Preach, Presage, Produced, Promise, Pronounced, Propound, Propoundeth, Publish, Put, Put out, Quicken, Repent, Replied, Rest, Restore, Rewarded, Riding, Run, Saith, Scorn, Seal, Seduced, Set, Set down, Show, Slain, Sounded, Sounding, Spoke, Spoken, Stoned, Strengthened, Swear, Taken, Taken up, Threatened, Transform, Transgress, Understand, Warned, Warned, Withdraw, Write down, Wrought

As another inappropriate verb equivalent for the Quranic schema NONAKKESHO (نَوَكَّسَهُ) Saffarzadeh and Sale have offered “cause to be reversed” and “cause to bow down”, respectively. While the object of cause in both verbs is missing, Sale’s equivalent is inappropriate and could have best been replaced with “bent” suggested by Arberry (1955). BAATHNA (بَاعَثْنَا) in V52 provides another Quranic verb translated differently by the two translators. While Saffarzadeh offers the appropriate equivalent “raise” Sale has translated it as “awaken,” relating it sentimentally to “bed” as an equivalent of MARGHAD (مَرَّ قَدْ) for which Saffarzadeh has offered “graves”, indicating that Sale is not familiar with the way the Quran relates the present life to the day of resurrection.

The syntactic and parasyntactic schema genera will not be discussed to limit the scope of the study. The proper names employed in the two translations will, however, be addressed to highlight Sale's deliberate attempt to foreground his Christian preference on his rendition. First, both Saffarzadeh and Sale employ the names Adam, God, Koran/Quran, Mohammad/ Mohammed and Satan in their translations. Among these Mohammad/ Mohammed is not mentioned but implied in the Arabic text. Secondly, the simple noun "god" has been used once and thirteen times by Saffarzadeh and Sale, respectively. Being a Muslim, Saffarzadeh, however, knows that Allah is a proper name which is unique and refers only to one God. For this reason, she employs Allah throughout her translation and offers "gods" for ALEHATAN (آلهة) as Sale does. They do, nonetheless, use certain proper names which are distinct as shown in Table 9.

Table 9: Distinct proper names employed by translators

Saffarzadeh (n=3)	Sale (n=4)
Allah, Ar-rahman, Noah	Antioch, Gabriel, Jesus, Lord

Sale (1979), for example, translates the proper noun Allah to God in the opening statement as well as V47 and V74. He manages to remove its unique reference by offering "my God" as an equivalent for RABBI (رَبِّي) in V27 and "our Lord" for RABBONA (رَبَّنَا) in V16, implying that God and Lord are basically the same and can both be used interchangeably with Allah! Then he translates ALMORSALEEN (الرُّسُلِ الْمُرْسَلِينَ) "the messengers of God" in V3 and goes even further and adds Jesus to ALMORSALOON (الرُّسُلِ الْمُرْسَلِينَ) translated as "apostles of Jesus [i.e., Christ]" (p. 431) in V13 to imply Trinity central to Christianity and strongly rejected by Islam. According to Lacugna (2005),

Christ is not looked upon as an intermediary between God and world but as an essential agent of salvation. The Spirit poured out at Pentecost, by whom we live in Christ and are returned to God (Father), is also not a "lesser God" but one and the same God who creates and redeems us. The doctrine of the Trinity is the product of reflection on the events of redemptive history, especially the Incarnation and the sending of the Spirit. (p. 9360)

5. Conclusions

The schema-based analysis of Ya Seen shows that Saffarzadeh and Sale's translations at the domain and genus level provides statistical evidence to determine their content validity. While the former, for example, has used 663 semantic schemata in her translation, the latter has employed 564. Among the genera of semantic domain, the largest number of schemata translated by Saffarzadeh and Sale are nouns, i.e., 109 and 77, respectively. It is suggested that the two translations be analyzed in terms of their species as well to provide a more specific and detailed evaluation in future studies. The findings of the present study show that the two translations are significantly different from each other.

Saffarzadeh utilized "Translation with Commentary" as part of the title given on her front cover to reveal the nature of what she has done in practice. She has, however, fallen short of her professed "translation" and "commentary" objectives as regards the schemata she has offered as equivalents for the Arabic schemata constituting Ya Seen. Her translation is wrought with few additions which are given either as part of the verses themselves or specified by hardly visible brackets added to the text of 25 out of 83 verses (30%). Her "commentary" is, in fact, confined to six footnotes three of which refer her readers to 2nd, 8th and 39th surahs of the Quran! With the exception of few additions, her translation enjoys content validity.

In contrast to Saffarzadeh's Islamic though infinitesimally idiosyncratic approach towards the translation of Ya Seen, Sale has deliberately inserted some key Christian concepts in his translation of the same surah and thus Christianized it without specifying them as explanations. While V13 of Ya Seen, for example, refers to ASSHAB ALGHARIYA (أَسْهَابَ الْغَارِيَّةِ) the inhabitants of [an unspecified] town, Sale translates the noun "town" as a name, i.e., Antioch, as part of V13 to render an ever-true Islamic message a historic event which happened in the past and has no application any more. Ya Seen, for example, proclaims it as a fact that the majority of town people worship gods other than Allah and persecute those who worship Him alone. In his third explanatory note Sale, however, introduces Simon Peter as the messenger of Jesus "appearing as a zealous idolator" through him "a great many of the people" (p. 431) embraced the true faith, i.e., Christianity, and thus idolatry is a tale of the past and is not followed any more. Future studies should show whether Sale has followed the same strategy in the translation of other surahs.

References

- Arberry, A. J. (1955). *The Koran Interpreted* (Vol. 2). New York: Macmillan.
- Asad, M. (1980). *The Message of the Qur'an*. Gibraltar: Dar al-Andalus.
- Bassnet, S. (2002). *Translation studies* (3rd ed.). London: Routledge.
- Betz, H. D. (2005) Apostles. In L. Jones (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of religion*, Vol. 1(2nd ed.) (pp. 434-437). Farmington, Hills, MI: Thomson Gale.
- Fakhar, M. (2010). *The effect of consciousness-raising in syntactic knowledge vs. vocabulary breadth on the reading comprehension of Iranian intermediate EFL learners*. Unpublished MA thesis, Islamic Azad University of Garmsar, Iran.
- Field, J. (2003). *Psycholinguistics: A resource book for students*. London: Routledge.
- Gairns, R., & Redman, S. (1996). *True to life: Intermediate class book*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hoss, N. (1973). Guide to the dictionary. In W. Morris (ed.), *the Heritage illustrated dictionary of the English language international edition* (pp. XLI-XLIX). Maynard, Mass.: American Heritage Publishing Co.
- Khodadady, E., & Lagzian, M. (2013). Textual analysis of an English dentistry textbook and its Persian translation: A schema-based approach. *Journal of Studies in Social Sciences*, 2(1), 81-104.
- Khodadady, E. (2001). Schema: A theory of translation. In S. Cunico (Ed.), *Training and Translator Interpreters in the New Millennium, Portsmouth 17th March 2001 Conference Proceedings* (pp. 107-123). Portsmouth, England: University of Portsmouth, School of Languages and Areas Studies.
- Khodadady, E. (2008a). Measuring translation ability and achievement: A schema-based approach. *Quarterly Journal of Humanities, Al-Zahra University*, 18(70), 56-76.
- Khodadady, E. (2008b). Schema-based textual analysis of domain-controlled authentic texts. *Iranian Journal of Language Studies (IJLS)*, 2(4), 431-448.
- Khodadady, E. (2011). *Research principles and methods in applied linguistics*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Khodadady, E., & Elahi, M. (2012). The effect of schema-vs-translation-based instruction on Persian medical students' learning of general English. *English Language Teaching*, 5 (1), 146-165.
- Khodadady, E., Alavi, S. M., Pishghadam, R., & Khaghaninezhad, M. S. (2012). Teaching general English in academic context: Schema-based or translation-based approach? *International Journal of Linguistics*, 4(1), 56-89.
- Lacugna, C. M. (2005). Trinity. In L. Jones (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of religion*, Vol. 14 (2nd ed.) (pp. 9360-9364). Farmington, Hills, MI: Thomson Gale.
- Morris, W. (Ed.) (1973). *The Heritage illustrated dictionary of the English language international edition*. Maynard, Mass.: American Heritage Publishing Co.
- Munday, J. (2001). *Introducing translation studies theories and Applications*. London: Routledge.
- Neilson, W. A. (ed.) (1980). *Webster's biographical dictionary*. Springfield, Mass: G. & C. Merriam.
- Newmark, P. (1988a). *A textbook of translation*. New York: Prentice Hall.
- Presidency of Islamic Researches, IFTA, Call and Guidance (1984). *The holy Quran: English translation of the meanings and commentary*. Al-Madinah Al-Munawarah: The Custodian of the Two Holy Mosques King Fahd Complex.
- Ross, E. B. (1979/originally after 1877). Introduction. In: G. Sale (Translator), *The Koran: translated into English from the original Arabic* (pp. v-x). London: Frederick Warne.
- Saffarzadeh, T. (2007). *The holy Quran: Translation with commentary*. Tehran: Iran.
- Sale, G. (1979/originally1734). *The Koran: Translated into English from the original Arabic*. London: Frederick Warne.
- Toorawa, S. M. (2011) Sūrat al-Rahmān (Q. 55), Sūrat al-Alā (Q. 87) and Sūrat al-Balad (Q. 90) translated into cadenced, rhyming English prose. *Journal of Qur'anic Studies*, 13(2), 149–154. DOI: 10.3366/jqs.2011.0026.