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kualitatif dan kuantitatif. Justeru, model kajian terjemahan deskriptif (descriptive translation studies, DTS) membentuk rangka kerja yang 54 sampel dianalisis secara kualitatif (analisis teks) dan kuantitatif (kekerapan penggunaan prosedur tambahan), Berdasarkan dapatan analisis teks berorientasikan terjemahan (aplikasi model Nord), elipsis dikaji berasaskan faktor intratekstual daripada analisis teks. kandungan, struktur ayat, dan sifat suprasegmen. Ditemui bahawa faktor ini perlu dipertimbangkan oleh penterjemah dalam menterjemah elipsis. Dapatan analisis IDOE menunjukkan bahawa kesemua penterjemah tidak menggunakan prosedur penambahan terjemahan secara kerap. Prosedur penambahan lain ditunjukkan melalui penggunaan tanda kurungan, nota kaki, dan / atau nota marginal, masukan teks utama, yang diletakkan selepas penggunaan prosedur bukan tambahan.
ADDITION AS A TRANSLATION ADJUSTMENT TECHNIQUE IN THE SELECTED ENGLISH TRANSLATIONS OF IMPLICIT DIRECT OBJECT ELLIPSIS IN THE HOLY QUR’ĀN

ABSTRACT

The Holy Qur’ān is one of the most fascinating and widely-read religious and divine books. Belonging to Islamic and Arabic cultures, some concepts and meanings of the Qur’ān might not be so transparent to the speakers of other languages, as they are ellipted. As a frequent type of nominal ellipsis used in the Qur’ān, studying instances of implicit direct object ellipsis (IDOEs) with respect to their translation procedures have been the objective of this research. The study aims at studying IDOE and their relevant translation procedures. The questions as to how such IDOE are translated in the selected English translations of the Qur’ān and what addition adjustment techniques are applied to these translations are also raised. The research rests on the linguistic theory of ellipsis proposed by Halliday and Hassan (1976) and McShane (2005) since ellipsis plays a key role in English and Arabic to establish cohesion in the text. However, in the Qur’ānic Arabic, due to the conciseness of the Holy Qur’ān text and the language of revelation, identifying and explicating ellipted items by translators would help the readers understand the meanings more clearly. The translation models applied to the present study are addition as translation adjustment technique by Nida (1964) and translation devices model by Abdul-Raof (2001). Nord’s (2005) model is also applied to the corpora of the study to give a general image of the source text and target texts and to investigate ellipsis based on such a translation-oriented model. Although the design of research is primarily descriptive, it gains advantage of both qualitative and quantitative research. Accordingly, the descriptive translation studies (DTS) model
from the framework within which 54 samples were textually and translationally analyzed qualitatively (textual analysis) and quantitatively (frequency of adopted addition procedures). Based on the translation-oriented text analysis findings (application of Nord's model), ellipsis is investigated according to intratextual factors of text analysis, content, sentence structure, and suprasegmental features. It is found that these factors are needed to be taken into account in translating ellipsis. The findings of the IDOE analysis show that none of the selected translators used any translation addition procedures more frequently. Other addition procedures are manifested through bracket, parenthesis, footnote, and/or marginal note, main text insertion which are placed after no addition procedure use.
CHAPTER 1- INTRODUCTION

1.1. Overview

Translation is a complex process that needs sufficient knowledge and skill. There are two main types of translation, text translation and interpretation. Text translation is the written act of translating while interpretation is the oral one. Each of these two types demands its own skills. The texts are of different types. Due to the characteristics of different types of texts, translation strategies applied to translations would be different as well.

Trosborg (1997) claimed that obviously not all texts are of the same type. There is a distinction between “political texts, legal text, and medical texts; fairy tales, novels and short stories differ from newspaper reports essays and scientific papers.” (Trosborg, 1997, p. 3).

Translation can be defined as an activity through which the translator renders linguistic and pragmatic meanings of source text (ST) to target text (TT). As some translation scholars such as Nida (1964) believed, translation is equivalence. According to Nida’s (1964) equivalence theory, an appropriate translation is the one which endeavors to produce appropriate and natural corresponding words in the target text. Therefore, a good translation is the translation that has the closest natural meaning to the original text (Nida, 1964).

Sajjadi (2005) and Shahsavandi (2006) claimed that religious and ideological text types are among those that exert a considerable influence on readers. Translating such a text demands a good command of linguistic, translation, specialized knowledge in the field, and a good knowledge of the source and target language texts. Translating holy books such as the Holy Qur'ān, the Holy Bible, the Holy Torah and other religious books and scripts is significant because there are
many people around the world who read these books and practice these religions. Gomola (2010) defined religious texts as the ones which reflect themes and address issues in the area of religion, often in an institutionalized structure. “These themes include readers’ beliefs, moral attitudes, religious practices, or ways of identification with a community of faith.” (p. 42). Gomola (2010) believed that religious texts such as the Bible and the Qur’ān are religious par excellence. Based on the above definition, Gomola (2010) claimed that religious texts seek to influence their audiences, to change the readers’ ideologies, to encourage or to relieve them, and to establish or to fortify their readers’ or followers’ moral standards. Thus, religious texts utilize a persuasive text type.

To translate such an important text type, the translator’s qualifications and proficiencies matter. The Holy Qur’ān is the most readable Islamic book. The language of the Qur’ān is so unique and monotypic, that translating its meanings needs courage and proficiency. Therefore, the translator of the Holy Qur’ān is faced with a multidimensional and complicated text (Sajjadi, 2005; Shahsavandi, 2006).

To acknowledge the superiority of the Qur’ān to other Islamic texts, it could be noted that as the Qur’ān is the only common divine book among Muslims, who all act according to its instructions and commandments, this book rise through an upper rank than other Islamic texts. The distinction between the Qur’ān and other ordinary Islamic religious texts is that the Holy Qur’ān has a distinctive and complicated text that its comprehension, analysis, and interpretation are sometimes beyond human’s perception. Therefore, some scholars have claimed that it cannot be fully translated by human, as it is the word of the Supreme Lord (Abdul-Raof, 2005 in Long).
However, there are opposing ideas about translatability of the Qur′ān. According to Al-Kharabshesh & Al-Azzam (2008), merely skilled translators who have a linguistic and religious background can successfully translate the Qur′ānic discourse. Nevertheless, if their linguistic-exegetical background is poor, the outcome of their attempts is disappointing.

A translator of the Qur′ān needs to possess qualifications such as high proficiency and mastery over both source and target languages, a good command of linguistics, and familiarity with contrastive analysis. The Qur′ān translator is supposed to analyze two language systems and to come up with the appropriate equivalence. The one who aims at translating the Qur′ān should be a competent translator who needs to know both the theoretical and practical dimensions of translation. Knowing the linguistic features and stylistics of the source text helps the Qur′ān translator render the word of Allah as natural and proper as possible, since the Holy Qur′ān enjoys the language of revelation. The Qur′ān translators should do their best to produce authentic translations in the target language. Therefore, the above-mentioned criteria are basic for the translator of the Qur′ān. Not satisfying any of them, it would end in producing an inappropriate translation of the Holy Qur′ān. (Sajjadi, 2005; Shahsavandi, 2006; Ushama, 2011).

Therefore, as there is a strong connection between translation and linguistics, this study is to approach English translations of the Holy Qur′ān with a linguistic perspective. The linguistic theories applied to this study are Halliday & Hassan′s (1976) and McShane′s (2005) theories of ellipsis. As a cohesive device, ellipsis is very important in making a text cohesive and coherent. According to Abdulsalam (1991), ellipsis in the Holy Qur′ān is a rhetorical and linguistic feature. Ellipsis appears abundantly in the Qur′ān in different linguistic forms such as verbal ellipsis,
adjectival ellipsis, prepositional ellipsis and nominal ellipsis. The existence of such linguistic and rhetorical elements, besides other elements, has made the interwoven Qur’ānic text unique and coherent (Abdulsalam, 1991).

In some parts of the Qur’ān, based on the verse or surah contexts, the ellipted items might be understandable for an attentive reader, but mostly grasping clear ellipted meanings might not be so easy to the readers. Therefore, resorting the Qur’ānic translations or exegeses can be helpful to the readers, hence, the important role of translators should not remain neglected.

Various factors are to be taken into account in translating holy texts and namely the Qur’ān. Translators who desire to translate the Holy Qur’ān are perhaps aware of the fact that they should be careful not to ignore principles concerning holy texts. Translating the Holy Qur’ān is a significant task, since one will find many distinguishing and delicate intricacies in it. Its linguistic coherence is very complex and difficult to analyze (Abdul-Raof, 2001). Such principles are related to the language of revelation, sacredness of the Qur’ān, succinctness (i‘jaz) of this book, being a miracle (i‘jaz), and son and so forth.

Starkovsky (2005) claimed that translating the Qur’ān is intricate, because the text of the Qur’ān is an irregular succession or overlap of disparate passages without observable transitions. "The surprising contour of some verses cut to
comply with rhythm and rhyme, and the elliptical style, compact to the extreme and yet prone to endless repetitions and new starts” (Starkovsky, 2005, p.535). The lack of punctuation in the ST poses a serious challenge, as punctuation marks play two roles that are not always compatible; they assist the reader and apply the grammatical rules (Starkovsky, 2005).

According to Al-Daryabadi (1981, cited in Ushama, 2011), among these problems, translating Qur’anic verbs is of the most difficult issues, as these verbs carry some unique loads of meaning for which finding exact equivalents into English is difficult. Another problematic issue is translating dual numbers present in Arabic called muthanna as there is singular or plural numbers only in English. Repetition of synonyms in Arabic is common to place an emphasis on an issue and to create beauty, which is considered as a literary advantage, whereas English lacks this characteristic.

Al-Malik (1995) believed that translating the Qur’ān may lead to numerous problems, some of which are due to the unfamiliarity of English speakers to some Qur’anic concepts and situations, while others are due to the linguistically creative nature of the Qur’ān to express its meanings. There are also some other difficulties in translating the Qur’ān, according to Al-Malik (1995). As Arabic words carry a big load of meaning, English equivalents may not convey all the aspects of their meanings. Thus, the quality of Arabic word meanings rendered in English is minimized. By studying the exegeses of the Qur’ān, the exegetes bear different meanings to a specific word or phrase which makes the translator's task difficult to decide which of these words should be chosen as the source language text (SLT) equivalent (Al-Malik, 1995). Contrary to the point Al-Malik (1995) raised, it could be mentioned that exegeses of the Qur’ān present the translator some equivalents
that might best suit the ST based on the verse context. Then, the translator can judge to choose the best equivalent.

1.2. Statement of the Problem

As Al-Daryabadi (1981, p. 9) stressed, one of the difficulties a translator of the Qur’ān faces is translating ellipsis. Ellipsis is present in Arabic in its best and finest style. Therefore, the translator’s task in such cases is challenging, because he has to decide whether to keep the ellipsis in English so that the beauty of source language is preserved or to render it in English in a way that the sound meaning is conveyed. The major task of the translator in all such situations is to fill out the omitted text, although he must exert a minimal effort. This statement by Al-Daryabadi (1981) could be the most ideal method for translating Qur’ānic ellipses, but as he asserted at the end of his sentence, it is nearly impossible and translators have to resort to adjustment techniques such as adding to the ST.

There are some reasons leading to a mistranslation of the Holy Qur’ān. The first reason is the sacredness of the language of revelation, which impedes the complete transference of ST message to the target text, since the translator desires to render ST message in the structure and the context of target language text (TLT). Secondly, in some cases, SL and TL share the same syntactic structures with different functions. Mistranslation arises if these differences are not considered. A large proportion of the Holy Qur’ān consists of implied meanings and ellipted items, i.e. since there are different types of ellipses in the Holy Qur’ān, the readers may not get the meanings of the verses deeply and due to the existence of many ellipted items, the implied meanings are not explicit to the reader. Consequently, the translator of the Holy Qur’ān should do his/her best to do enough research on the meanings of these ellipted items first and to explicate these ellipted meanings and
structures then, so that the reader can understand the meanings of this Divine Book easier (Amid Zanjani, 2001).

To produce natural and proper translations of the ellipted parts, the translators need to implement some translation adjustment techniques (Nida, 1964). Therefore, since some information is ellipted, they have to add the necessary information to the original text material in their own translations. (Azimpour, 2001). Among different kinds of ellipsis in the Qur’ān, implicit direct object ellipsis (IDOEs) devote a considerable number to itself, 1337 ones, according to Al-Hamooz (1986). Therefore, it is important to the researcher to find the samples of implicit direct object ellipsis (IDOEs) in the Qur’ān and to analyze their English translations according to Nida’s (1964) model of addition as a translation adjustment technique and Abdul-Raof’s (2001) translation devices model. The researcher is to examine whether English translators have been able to apply such translation technique and devices to their translations or not. To generally analyze the source text and its translations, the researcher has applied the exteratextual and interatextual factors of translation text analysis model by Nord (2005).

This study is to focus on a translation-oriented textual analysis of the Qur’ān and the challenges and procedures of translating ellipsis from Arabic into English. Such studies can attract the Qur’ān translators’ attention to these linguistic discrepancies so that they may pay more attention to employ proper translation procedures in translating the sacred. Ellipsis is a linguistic feature that exists in all languages. On occasions, the ellipted parts in the Qur’ānic Arabic texture may carry linguistic ambiguity. Therefore, it is on the part of the translator to explicate and disambiguate the source text message in the target text. It has happened that due to the translator’s misunderstanding, the ambiguous meaning of the source text is
transferred to the target text, which has led to another ambiguity in the translated text per se.

There are instances of ellipses in the Qur’ān which seems to be confusing to the readers. It is observed that an ambiguous instance of ellipsis in one verse could be rendered differently by different translators as while some of them have explicated the ellipted part, the others have not. Abdul-Raof (2001) stated that “ellipted items in the source language can cause misunderstanding and misrepresentation of the meaning of Qur’ānic texture, unless a footnote is provided or the source language ellipted elements themselves are added by the translator” (Abdul-Raof, 2001, p. 128).

Since ellipsis is considered as a rhetorical feature in the Divine Word, which is different from the ellipsis and its referent in human languages, explicating the ellipted words by mentioning their referents helps the translators produce more accurate translations. On some occasions, such explicitations and additions are necessary and inevitable (Azimpour, 2001).

Abdul-Raof (2006) defined that “Arabic rhetoric is concerned with the semantics of stylistics. It aims to promote the language user’s communicative oral and written skills through eloquence criteria which bestow linguistic elegance upon the speech act. Its main concern is to focus on effective interpersonal communication” (p. xiii). The three main disciplines that consist Arabic rhetoric are “ilm al-ma āni (word order), ilm al-bayan (figures of speech), and ilm al-badi (embellishment)” (p. 25). Each of these three categorizations includes different linguistic issues, and ellipsis is an Arabic rhetorical feature that falls under ilm al-ma āni (word order) category. Abdul-Raof (2006) argued that:
Word order has become an independent rhetorical discipline that is concerned with the changes in the order of sentence constituents for different pragmatic purposes. Word order has, thus, become an investigation of language in context. According to word order, constituent unit of a proposition can be rearranged in order to achieve specific pragmatic effects and various communicative functions. Thus, inverted orders of the lexical items can lead to various pragmatic interpretations. Arabic allows the occurrence of different orders of lexical items in a given proposition. The communicator can employ a number of linguistic mechanisms to provide inverted orders such as definiteness, indefiniteness, thematic structures, negation, the use of affirmation particles, ellipsis, asyndeton, foregrounding, back-grounding, verbosity, the different methods of al-jinās, and simile (p. 25).

According to issues mentioned earlier, therefore, studying the linguistic issues of the Qur’ānic text with reference to their translations is considerable. As there are linguistic differences in the Qur’ānic Arabic with their translations, translators’ attentions need to be drawn to them to overcome the translational problems.

1.3. Objectives of the Study

The main objectives of this study are as follows:

1. to generally assess the Qur’ān, as the ST, and to present the related profile of the selected English translations, as the TTs, based on Nord’s (2005) extratextual and intratextual factors of text analysis in translation.

2. to investigate ellipsis phenomenon based on Nord’s (2005) extratextual and intratextual factors of text analysis in translation and to study ellipsis according to the linguistic and translation theories of the research.

3. to explore the translation devices procedure through which the explicated ellipted implicit direct objects of the Qur’ānic verbs are manifested and realized in the analyzed English translations. To make the implicit and ellipted information explicit, the translator may add some information to the original source text by using the following addition procedures: bracket,
parenthesis, footnote, extended commentary or marginal note, and no
addition procedures.

4. to examine the extent of each addition procedure used in the English
translations more frequently.

1.4. Research Questions

1. How can the Qurʾān and its selected English translations in general be
assessed based on Nord’s (2005) extratextual and intratextual factors of text
analysis in translation?

2. What intratextual factors of text analysis investigate ellipsis?

3. How additions are manifested in the English translations of implicit direct
object ellipsis in the Qurʾān?

4. To what extent do the English translators use addition as a translation
adjustment technique to explicate implicit direct object ellipsis in the
Qurʾān?

1.5. Significance and Justification of the Study

Ushama (2011) believed that translating the Holy Qurʾān is significant, since
it has its own benefits for both Muslims and non-Muslims. By resorting to the
Qurʾān translations, non-Muslims are capable of reaching to a correct and
comprehensive picture of the Islamic teachings and reflect on the signs of God as
echoed in this Holy Book. Likewise, it is advantageous to the Muslims, who are not
masters in Arabic, to understand the Qurʾānic meanings. As Ushama contended, from
its translations, the Muslims who do not have a good command of Arabic can come
a little closer to understanding the meanings of the Qurʾān.

Rezaee Isfahani (2004) claimed that if the translations of the Qurʾān are
problematic, people will not be able to understand the Word of Allah, and such
translations may not function as a means of directing people to the right path. As the translators of the Qurʾān are humans and the Word of Allah is superior to that of humans', translating the Qurʾān would be challenging. It is not possible to overcome all the translation problems, but at least mistakes can be minimized.

The Holy Qurʾān is originally written in the Arabic language, and there are many people all over the world who are not familiar with this language. Learning Arabic for the sake of understanding the meanings of the Qurʾānic verses is difficult. Therefore, for all those who seek to understand the Holy Qurʾān's supreme meanings, resorting to the appropriate translation of the Holy Word of Allah is important.

Sawyer, Simpson & Asher (2001) believed that translating the Qurʾān into other languages became significant since Islam were widespread geographically and was based on the logic of propagation. Therefore, translating the Qurʾān for the people in different parts of the world became more significant. The process of translating the Qurʾān was also impeded in some periods, since some scholars raised some “theological hesitations” such as the Qurʾān translatability (Sawyer, Simpson & Asher, 2001, p. 166). Some theologians believed that due to the following reasons, the Qurʾān is untranslatable. First, the Qurʾān is “mu’jiz, inimitable. Second, the Qurʾān is free of any distortion and any translation would make it a distorted text” (p. 166). In spite of such problems, translating the meanings of the Qurʾān “have, however, been regarded as permissible as study aids, examples being reported from as early as the second and third centuries of the religion” (p. 166). Because Muslims come from different races and countries, translating the Word of Allah has been necessary and this Book is rendered into many different languages. Not only is translating the Qurʾān permissible, but also is necessary as scholars such
as Al-Sabuni (1970) stressed. Vahid Dastjerdi & Jamshidian (2011) similarly believed that translating all texts, especially sacred texts from a source-text language to a target-text language is possible as in so doing the forms of the two languages may differ but the message is conveyed. Due to the intricacies of the Qur’ān, thematic translation of the Qur’ān is not accomplishable as there is no language which can correspond to Arabic in terms of its lexis. Thus, the meanings of the Qur’ānic verses are translated whereby they are prone to distortion because of polysemy of the Qur’ān words (Ushama, 2011).

Due to the significance of translating the Qur’ān into other languages, studying Qur’ān translations and coming up with beneficiary recommendations from such a study could help the translators to identify and to highlight the existing shortcomings and motivates them to produce natural and proper translations. Among the problematic issues of translating the Qur’ān, linguistic issues such as ellipsis phenomenon are of significance for translators. Carrying out such Qur’ānic translation studies is significant in highlighting such linguistic issues with reference to their translations.

1.6. Operational Definition of Key Terms

Translatability:

Hermans (2009) maintained that “debates about translatability concern primarily the question whether translation from one language into another is possible at all, or in what sense or to what degree it is possible.” (p. 300).

Qur’ānic Arabic:

Mustapha (2009) claimed that the Qur’ān is regarded as an incomparable and a unique masterpiece in the Arabic language from a linguistic and stylistic point of view. “Its grammatical structure, for instance, is specific to it and in many cases
different from the grammatical structure of non-Qur’ānic Arabic. So much so that there is a field of linguistic study dedicated to Qur’ānic grammar and syntax (Al-Ansari 1405H). In other words, there is Arabic and there is Qur’ānic Arabic” (p. 226).

**Implied or implicit meaning:**

As ellipsis is regarded a kind of implicit meaning, in some occasions, its meaning is understood, while in others, the context is helpful in determining its meaning. Since, such studies focus on the relation of linguistic concepts such as implicit meaning to the translation issues, the definition of implicitation is given based on this criterion. The implicit meaning is the information for which there is no form but the information is part of the total communication intended or assumed by the writer. Vinay & Darbelnet (1995) defined implicitation as an antonym to explicitation, i.e. “a stylistic translation technique which consists of making what is explicit in the source language implicit in the target language, relying on the context or the situation for conveying the meaning” (p. 344).

**Ellipsis:**

Ellipsis is defined by Aelbrecht (2010) as “the omission of elements that are inferable from the context and thus constitutes a mismatch between sound and meaning” (p. 1). Therefore, Aelbrecht maintained that what is understood from the ellipted message is more important than what is actually uttered. The most important linguistic element involved in ellipsis is syntax. In some Arabic dictionaries such as “A Dictionary of Terms of Declension and Structure in Universal Arabic Grammar: Arabic-English and English-Arabic”, another equivalent is provided for the word ellipsis, which is elimination (McDermott & Matar, 1988, p. 180).
Translation strategy vs. translation procedure:

The difference between the terms strategy and procedure is that, in the technical perspective, a strategy is a general direction of the translator (e.g. toward ‘free’ or ‘literal’ translation, toward the TT or ST, toward domestication or foreignization), while a procedure is a specific technique or method the translator uses at a definite point in a text (e.g. the borrowing of a word from the SL, the addition of an explanation or a footnote in the TT) (Munday, 2012).

Explicitation:

Explicitation means “making explicit in the target text information that is implicit in the source text” (Klaudy, 1998, p. 80). Sometimes, when the translator is translating implicit meanings or ellipted information, s/he should use some explicitation strategies such as additions.

Translation adjustment techniques:

Sometimes, in the process of translating, some equivalents are not easily rendered due to the linguistic and/or cultural differences in the source text and the target text. To create a dynamic equivalent in the target language text, the translator needs to carry out some modifications or apply some adjustment techniques in the source language text. The main role of these techniques as Nida (1964) held is that “they are designed to produce correct equivalents- not to serve as an excuse for tampering with the source language message” (p. 226).

According to Hatim (2001), adjustment can be a set of techniques of change with the purpose of keeping translation equivalence, which attempts to ensure accessibility of the receptor language in the process of translating. “Adjustment may involve ironing out structural differences, establishing semantic harmony, achieving
stylistic appropriateness and taking care of problems associated with what Nida (1964) called the information load” (p. 20).

**Addition:**

To undertake some modifications or to apply some adjustment techniques in the source language text, translators need to add information or explicate the ellipted meaning (Nida, 1964). The added information is manifested through the use of any of the following procedures: use of parentheses, footnotes, extended commentary or marginal notes, bracket and no addition procedure. Such procedures are also labeled by Abdul-Raof (2001) as translation devices. Translation devices are within-the-text notes, marginal notes, and exegetical footnotes or commentaries.

**Implicit direct object in the Qur’ānic Arabic:**

The direct object in Arabic or “Mafoolon bih” is of two types: explicit and implicit. The implicit direct object appears in three kinds: first, as an interpreted original after the infinitival particle, e.g. (عَﻠِﻤَﺖُ اِﻧَﮏَ ﻗِﺪِﮭِﺪٌ) (Alimtu Inakah Mujtahidun), secondly, as an isolated interpreted sentence, e.g. (ظُﻨُﻨَﻨَﺘُ ﻗِﺪُﮭِﺪُ) (Dhanantuka Tajtahidu), and thirdly, as reducer and reduced, e.g. (اَﻤﺴَﮑَﺘُ ﺑِﯿَﺪِ کَ) (Amsaktu Biyadika) (Al-Ghalayeeni, 1997, p. 6; Mc Dermott & Matar, 1988).

**Ellipted implicit direct object in the Qur’ānic Arabic:**

The implicit direct object ellipsis in the Qur’ānic Arabic refers to the implicit direct object or the prepositional phrase whose headword is an object mentioned implicitly which is ellipted or left unsaid. To be noted that in this study, the word implicit is the equivalent for the word غير صريح (ghayr sarih) and the word ellipted is the equivalent for the word أو (mḥazoof or modhmar).
Factors of source-text analysis

Based on Nord’s (2005) translation-oriented text analysis model, source-text analysis is possible based on analyzing extratextual and intratextual factors. Extratextual factors deal with text sender, sender’s intention, the audience of the text, the medium, the place, the time, and the motive for communication. The intratextual factors are subject matter, content, presuppositions, text composition, paralinguistic elements accompanying a text, syntactic structure, and supersegmental features.

1.7. Limitations and Scope of the Study

This study is limited in applying two linguistic theories of ellipsis and its related translation models of addition. The study was narrowed down to implicit direct object ellipsis as a kind of nominal ellipsis. Since there are sufficient samples of implicit direct object ellipsis as nominal ellipsis, other ellipses aspects such as verbal ellipsis, pragmatic ellipsis and prepositional ellipsis are not included in this study. As the translation models correspond with the linguistic theories, among other translation theories, addition is used as the translation models of this study. The sample data collected in this study are also limited in number. The researcher has collected 300 samples out of 1337 ones with their respective selected translations. As compiling and analyzing 300 verses with their transliterations and their five respective selected English translations make the thesis too bulky, the researcher has analyzed all 300 samples, but 54 of them (the first half of the Arabic alphabet) are mentioned in detail and others are analyzed in related tables. Noteworthy that raw samples (second half of Arabic alphabet), which are analyzed in the study are mentioned in appendix. The study is also limited in selecting the numbers of surahs and giving more Qur’anic-specific information about the selected surahs, i.e. the
place of revelation, the time of revelation and the context of situation (asbab nozzol) for each surah.

As the scope of this study represents, Halliday & Hassan’s (1976), McShane’s (2005), Nord’s (2005), Nida’s (1964), and Abdul-Raof’s (2001) theories/models have been implemented in this research. Among the religious texts, the Qur’ān is the ST of this study and is included in the scope of his research. Because Nord’s (2005) model is a detailed one, an in-depth application of this model with all aspects in ST and TT(s) requires some other independent deep research, hence, this model is applied to this study briefly and generally to present a picture of the corpora of the study based on a translation-oriented textual approach.
CHAPTER 2- REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.1. Overview of the History of Translation Studies and Translation Theories

Since the history of translation studies and translation theories is too vast to be discussed in one chapter concisely, this study attempted to shed light on central issues of the translation history, which are relevant to the research. The time span in the field of translation studies is of consideration and shows the developmental process of translation studies and translation theories chronologically. It is significant for translation studies researchers to pay close attention to this process to do more in-depth research in the field.

According to Bassnett (1980), during the different periods and eras, there have been some dominant specific translation theories. To make a credible explanation of the history of translation theories, Bassnett (1980) pointed out to the earlier efforts taken into the compilation and documentation of translation theories by translation studies scholars such as Steiner (1975), Lefevere (1977, 1992), Webb (1976) & others. Each of these scholars has studied and investigated the translation theories history at a specific point of time based on the situation of that era.

Lefevere (1977, 1992) has compiled the theories of translation with respect to the German tradition of translation by focusing on the translation theories trends from Luther to Gottsched, and Goethe to Schlegels, Schleiermacher and Rosenzeig. Steiner’s (1975) contribution to the documentation and compilation of the history of theories of translation has been the analysis of the English theories of translation from 1650-1800, with a focus on Sir John Denham to William Cowper. He similarly examined the main notion in the eighteenth century, which supports the idea that a translator is a painter or an imitator (Bassnett, 1980; Lefevere, 1977, 1992).
The systematic and scientific study of translation in this period focused on the notion of a sign as constituent elements of a culture. The other concept gained significance in this period was the concept of influence, meaning the translation effect on the target text is known as the translation product in the context of a culture. This notion was later defined and hypothesized by Nida (1964) as the theory of equivalence. He classified equivalence into two types of dynamic and formal. The dynamic equivalence is about the translation effect on the target text readers, while the formal equivalence sticks to the form and content in translation (Bassnett, 1980; Nida, 1964).

2.1.1. The Romans Era of Translation

A number of translation studies scholars believed that the Romans period is a very important age in translation theories. To emphasize the importance of the Romans roles, Eric Jacobsen (1958) claimed that translation is a Roman creation. In fact, the most important field of translation in the Romans period has been literary translation because of the existence of the period's rich literature. The most significant characteristics of Roman translation are its literary genre and linguistic features. Bilingualism and trilingualism are other important phenomena that emerged in this period (Bassnett, 1980).

Copeland (1991) maintained that Roman translation theories mostly highlighted the contribution of grammar and rhetorics to translation. The most general theories of translation in this period are literal (word for word) or loose (sense for sense) theories. Copeland (1991) wrote that in Roman educational and analytical hypothesis, translation was closely related to the theory and practice of imitation in literature, i.e. literary models imitation. They studied translation and literary imitation grammatically and rhetorically, although theories of imitation were
enforced by “rhetorical concepts of oratorical education, at least in the Rome of the late republic and early Empire” (Copeland, 1991, p. 10).

2.1.2. Bible Translation

Early bible translations had been produced by Samaritan Community in the pre-Christian period. Aramaic translation is another translation made in this period. By the order of the royal library of Alexandria, the Old Testament was rendered into Greek around 250 B.C. Guthrie (2010) explained the developmental process of early bible translations. “The evangelistic thrust of the early church gave impetus for many translations to impart the gospel to people in diverse language areas of the Roman Empire” (Guthrie, 2010, p. 1). Before A.D. 400, the Bible had been translated into Latin, Syriac, Coptic, Ethiopic, Armenian, and Georgian, and other translations were done in the next centuries as well (Guthrie, 2010).

In the second century, the primary language of translation used by the Western Church had been Latin. The translations produced into this language were mostly informal ones. Pop Damasus asked Jerome to make a revision in the existing Latin translations of the Bible which were mainly according to Greek and Hebrew manuscripts. It took 18 years for Jerome to complete the task, i.e., he made a new translation in this period in Bethlehem. This translation of the Bible, which was later named as Volgate, was the acceptable translation of the Bible by 1200 A.D. It was the valid version of the translated Bible of the Roman Catholic Church. After this period, another period in the Bible translation emerged. With the emergence of printing industry, the Bible was translated into more languages and then became widespread. This period was later called the reformation translations. The Bible was translated and printed in German in 1466, Italian in 1471, Spanish in 1478 and French in 1487 (Guthrie, 2010).
2.1.3. Early Translation Theories

The early translation theories were influenced by the advent of printing by which these theories were disseminated as kinds of changes in the field of translation. Among the most important characteristics of early translation theories, the “affirmation of the present through the use of contemporary idiom and style” is of significance (Bassnett, 1980, p. 57). The example Bassnett (1980) made to show this phenomenon is the languages of some older Bible translations which were updated by other Bible new versions while making no major interpretive changes. Another important field of translation, which was changed in developing new translation procedures and theories, was poetry translation (Bassnett, 1980, p. 57).

The translations made in this era were different from those made before. Source Language Texts (SLTs) were adjusted. Therefore, as a new translation technique during this period, the adjustment was criticized. Bassnett (1980) considered such adjustment criticisms deceptive. Such adaptations like adding to or omitting from the original text or mindful changes and modifications, as Bassnett (1980) reported, are known as translator universals. For instance, Philemon Holland (1552-1637) was one of the translators who considerably applied adjustment in his works. Another endeavor in making adjustments in translation was made by Livy, who had adjusted the style and claimed that such style alteration can be viewed with the use of words, for example, changing some Roman key words. (Bassnett, 1980).

All these developments had been progressed until the seventeenth century. The importance of translation in this period is vividly observable in Renaissance Europe translation. Steiner (1975) considered the translation as a very significant issue in this period and furthered that it was translation, which bridged past and present with a logical relation. Therefore, Translation managed to reconcile different
languages and customs which were scattered due to the pressure of nationalism and religious clash. Translation was not solely viewed as a marginal practice or activity, but it had been a prominent and leading matter that revolutionized the cultural and intellectuality (Bassnett, 1980; Steiner, 1975).

2.1.4. Translation in the Seventeenth Century

The seventeenth century was the era of translating literary works from French into English. The translation theories by scholars such as Sir John Denham were proposed in his poems. In France, translation of classic works, especially in the field of poetry translation began to emerge. The French writers’ works were translated into English (Bassnett, 1980).

The most salient theories in this century belonged to John Dryden. He formulated three kinds of translation, then as: “metaphrase, or turning an author word by word, and line by line, from one language into another; paraphrase, or translation with latitude, the Ciceronian sense-for-sense view of translation; and imitation, where the translator can abandon the text of the original as he sees fit” (Bassnett, 1980, p. 60). Since Dryden’s main contribution to translation studies had been mainly made in poetry translation, he chose the paraphrase type as the best one, if the translator observes some rules. To provide a good poetry translation, according to Dryden, the translator must be a poet himself and must have a good mastery over the ST and TT. More importantly, the translator should convey the “spirit” of the source text while he takes the aesthetic points of his own language into account. The expression used by Dryden to introduce a qualified translator of the poetry is the famous translator/portrait painter one (Bassnett, 1980, p. 60).
2.1.5. Translation in the Eighteenth Century

The significance of the eighteenth century had been due to the emergence of domestication theory. During this era, especially in its cultural turning point, domesticating translations was dominant. To make an example of domesticating translations in the eighteenth century, Venuti (2004) referred to William Guthrie’s English translation entitled as The Orations of Marcus Tallius Cicero (1741) (Venuti, 1995, 2004).

The English translation trend was reshaped or had gotten a new shape by the end of the eighteenth century as obviously evident in the English translations produced by Tytler (1791). His Essays on Principles of Translation attracted attentions in 1791. By formulating some laws and principles of translation, Tytler redefined translation and gave a new shape to the discipline. He defined translation as a process which means to produce the equivalent effect that goes beyond linguistic and cultural differences. According to Tytler (1978), a good translation is the one which can instill the value of the source language text into the target language text. Such a translation should convey the message and feelings in the target text language as they are in the source text language. Good translators, according to Tytler (1978, p. 15), are those who deploy facile translation strategies by not using syntactical fragmentation and polysemy in their own translations. Hence, as Tytler maintained, transparency is the best strategy a translator can adopt (Venuti, 1995, 2004; Tytler, 1978).

2.1.6. Translation in the Nineteenth Century

The nineteenth century played an important role in translation studies. Venuti (2004) referred to the main trends of translation studies in this century. Indeed, by studying translation theories in the nineteenth century, it is revealed that
the most important theories of translation have been developed in this century. Therefore, he classified the nineteenth century theories to different decades.

The theories of translation from 1900s-1930s had been first proposed by German philosophical and literary traditions and schools of Romanticism, Hermeneutics and Existential Phenomenology. According to the ideologies of these schools, language was viewed as a means of manifesting thought and reality rather than a means of communication. Therefore, translation was consequently viewed as a means of reconstituting and transforming the source text. Friedrich Schleiermacher and Wilhelm von Humboldt were two prominent translation theorists in this century who believed that translation is a creative activity using certain translation strategies to fulfill various cultural and social functions, creating languages, literatures, and nations (Venuti, 1995, 2004).

According to Venuti (2004), the theories of translation during 1940s-1950s have mostly focused on the problems of translatability. Most of philosophers, literary critics, and linguists of this period questioned the function of translation in bringing together the linguistic and cultural differences. They maintained that linguistic and cultural differences are translation barriers that should be lifted. As a result, the translation theorists began to formulate systematic and disciplinary theories and models. The types of theories varied from philosophical skepticism to practical optimism. Among the translation scholars of this period, Willard Van Orman Queen whose “concept of radical translation” was basic in the school of skepticism is of significance. Nabokov, a translation scholar in literary translation, was another leading scholar in translation studies who is known to be a famous figure for his criticisms of literary text translations (Venuti, 2004, p. 67).