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Abstract

The present research aimed at a syntactic analysis of some problematic accusative structures in four English translations of the Qur’an. The corpus of research includes renderings by Pickthall (1930), Arberry (1955), Saffarzadeh (2007) and Iranpanah (2001). The syntactic structures studied comprised twenty-three cases of translations of Quranic accusatives. To carry out the present study, the pathology of these structures was conducted using Arabic syntactic graphs to further clarify the analyses of the accusative structures in Source Text. Finally, a classification of the identified problems in the translations of the accusative structures and a qualitative and quantitative comparison among the translations of the two British and two Iranian translators are given. The paper also deals with probable origins of the problematic translations.
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1. Introduction

Arabic cannot be separated from ūáb and without it, understanding the accurate and precise meaning of different linguistic structures would be impossible (Khazali & Shirzadeh, 2012, p. 12). Case endings in Arabic lead the audience towards getting the meaning (Maziyani, 2002, p. 76). In other words, by using ūáb, the words can play their syntactic and semantic roles in the sentence (al-Masadi, 2010, p. 65). So, a certain syntactic form carries specific semantic subtleties whose delicate underlying meanings can be quite difficult to transfer in translation. Such a
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condition also prevails in the syntactically delicate, highly sensitive text of the Qur’ān.

The present research examines twenty-three instances of accusative structures in the Qur’ān whose translations are considered to be non-equivalent with their ST (Source text) counterparts due to lack of enough attention to accusative case endings. These samples were selected from different verses of the Qur’ān and their corresponding English translations by Pickthall (1930), Arberry (1955), Saffarzadeh (2007) and Iranpanah (2001). The first two translators are British, and the last two Iranian. The term “problematic translation” is used in the paper to refer to the non-equivalent target texts for the ST accusative structures, which are somehow incorrect. The ST syntactic graphs were also used in the research to present the syntactic analysis of the samples for elaborating on the problematic translations. The research mainly tries to answer the following questions:

1. What are the main and typical syntactic problems of the English translations of the Qur’ān in the accusatives examined?

2. Are the types of problems identified in the translations of the accusatives similar? If yes, what are the probable reasons for such a similarity?

3. Is the frequency of the problematic translations of accusatives the same in the translations of the Iranian translators and the British ones? What does this fact imply?

According to Munday (2012, p. 16), this paper can be subsumed under the “pure descriptive product-oriented” branch of Translation Studies, for it aims at identifying the problematic areas as well as the causes of different mistranslations of the accusatives as one of the Qur’ān-specific syntactic structures. Due to the evaluative nature of the present work, it can also be considered an applied instance of translational research for as Munday (2012, p. 12) shows ‘translation evaluations’ are a sub-branch of translation criticism in applied Translation Studies.
This study is based on a traditional approach to Arabic and English syntax. So, part-of-speech tags in the Arabic syntactic graphs are adopted from traditional Arabic grammar, and mapped to English equivalents. In so doing, the tags of the syntactic dependency graphs provided by University of Leeds\(^4\) were followed. To ensure the syntactic analyses, the \(\text{\textit{\textipa{r\~a\textlangle b}}}}\) presented by King Fahad Complex\(^5\) and many other syntax books of the Qur'an were checked too.

2. Review of Literature

There are some researches based on an eclectic methodology of error analysis, translation evaluation and criticism of the Qur'an, which are similar to the present work. One of such studies is Ansari's critical paper (2002) on Saffarzadeh's Persian translation of the Qur'an. This research, in which reference is made to accusatives, is simply a criticism of Saffarzadeh's Persian translation of the Qur'an. Extending his critical approach to different aspects of her Persian translation, Ansari (2002, pp. 42-44) refers to two types of accusatives i.e. cognate and circumstantial accusatives. Since Ansari's article is an overall criticism of Saffarzadeh's translation, his examination of accusatives is limited to a cursory evaluation of her translations of \(\text{\textipa{4\textlangle \textipa{a\textlangle s}}}}\) and \(\text{\textipa{4\textlangle \textipa{l\textlangle a}}}\).

Gholizadeh (2009, p. 6) also examines the \textipa{mas\textlangle ul-bihi} or object as an accusative case in Arabic and its Persian equivalents in Qur'an translations. His article is divided into two parts: syntactico-semantic rhetoric of object, and a linguistic analysis of translating object. Each part of his article deals independently with some problems concerning object. Principally, Gholizadeh (2009, p. 16) points out that

\(^4\) www.corpus.quran.com
\(^5\) www.qurancomplex.org
presenting a rhetorical and faithful rendering of such meanings of object requires
the translator’s comprehensive understanding of syntactic structures in different
positions in the ST.

3. Discussion

Two of the specific accusative structures of the Qur’ān, that variably function as
cognate accusative or object and circumstantial accusative are defined as follows:

Cognate accusative, as Abd al-Latif, Mokhtar Omar, and Zahrān (1997, p. 331)
say, “is an infinitive which comes after the verb, and has its root derived from it and
emphasizes the verb, or expresses its type or the number of times an action has
occurred”. So, cognate accusative is an elegant way of emphasizing or enhancing
a previous statement by deriving a verbal noun from the main verb. As an example,
in the verse (80:25) below, the verbal noun ُيَفُوِّدُ is a cognate accusative for the verb
يَفُوِّدُ. This verbal noun is derived morphologically from the verb and both share the
same root َتُهِدَُّ (ب ب):

In this example, the َتُهِدَُّ or governor of sabban is the verb, and the cognate
accusative emphasizes the verb; the reason for which it is translated as ‘in
abundance’ or ‘abundantly’ most of the times.

Circumstantial accusative, as another form of the accusatives studied, means
circumstance, condition, or state in Arabic. It can be added to an already complete
sentence as a supplementary adverbial clause or phrase answering the question of
كيف or ‘how?’ or ‘in which manner and condition?’ (Abu-Chacra, 2007, p. 303). In
English, circumstantial accusative mostly corresponds to a (co)predicative or adverbial participle (referring to subject or object), as in "He came laughing" or 'I saw him standing'. In Arabic, this syntactic structure acts mostly as adjective or active participle in the indefinite accusative, which agrees in gender and number with the noun to which it refers. Verse (4:143) below starts with a circumstantial accusative that refers to an attached subject pronoun in the preceding verse.

Here, ٌرُكَأُونُ is circumstantial accusative for the plural form ْوَلَوْ in ُرُكَأُونُ which stands for the subject.

As the syntactic translation problems in specific cases of accusatives in English translations of the Qur'an mostly result from overlooking the problem of government, it is defined briefly below.

Government is a syntactic principle in which certain words cause others to inflect in particular ways—not in agreement with the governing word (or āmil, عامل), but as a result of the effect of the governing word (Ryding, 2005, p. 57). This term refers to the power of one word, one structure and concept to affect the inflection of another word. Typical governors or Awaamil in Arabic are verbs, prepositions, and particles. The existence of such relations between governor and governee, ma’mūl, in Arabic, is a characteristic feature of Arabic in phrases and clauses, that creates a kind of dependency network in this language necessary for understanding the ST meanings before translation.
Three examples of such structures, namely ⱪ ⱪ ⱪ ⱪ ⱪ ⱪ ⱪ ⱪ ⱪ ⱪ ⱪ ⱪ ⱪ ⱪ ⱪ ⱪ ⱪ ⱪ ⱪ ⱪ ⱪ ⱪ ⱪ ⱪ ⱪ ⱪ ⱪ ⱪ ⱪ ⱪ ⱪ ⱪ ⱪ ⱪ ⱪ ⱪ and some single case accusatives of the Qur‘an are analysed below.

3.1. Illustrative Examples

The first instances of such cognate accusative to be examined are ⱪ ⱪ ⱪ ⱪ ⱪ ⱪ ⱪ ⱪ ⱪ ⱪ ⱪ ⱪ ⱪ ⱪ ⱪ ⱪ ⱪ ⱪ ⱪ ⱪ. In the Qur‘an, the frequency of the former is five and the frequency of the latter, ⱪ ⱪ ⱪ is four. The syntactic dependency graph below presents the syntactic function of the accusative ⱪ ⱪ ⱪ which is a cognate accusative for an omitted verb:

Based on this fact, the syntactic structure ⱪ ⱪ ⱪ in which ⱪ ⱪ ⱪ ⱪ ⱪ ⱪ ⱪ ⱪ ⱪ ⱪ ⱪ ⱪ ⱪ ⱪ ⱪ ⱪ ⱪ ⱪ ⱪ ⱪ is in the accusative case is different from ⱪ ⱪ in the nominative case or otherwise marfū‘ in Arabic. In ⱪ ⱪ ⱪ ⱪ is the subject or mobi‘ādā and ⱪ ⱪ ⱪ is the predicate (Doās et al., 2004, Vol. 1:224; Sāfī, 1997, Vol. 5:179). So, ⱪ ⱪ ⱪ has also been unexpectedly taken by the four translators to be a simple subject-predicate structure which is wrong. In other words, if the above phrase is to be restructured, it would be a sentence like ⱪ ⱪ ⱪ ⱪ ⱪ ⱪ ⱪ ⱪ ⱪ ⱪ ⱪ ⱪ ⱪ ⱪ ⱪ ⱪ ⱪ ⱪ ⱪ ⱪ ⱪ ⱪ ⱪ ⱪ ⱪ ⱪ ⱪ ⱪ ⱪ ⱪ ⱪ ⱪ ⱪ ⱪ ⱪ ⱪ and ⱪ ⱪ ⱪ ⱪ ⱪ not ⱪ ⱪ ⱪ. As a result, a translation of such a structure that conveys the distinguished, specific structure of the ST as well as its emphatic nature should be different from the usual subject-predicate grammatical construction.

To clarify it further, in Nida’s term, there is a problem in the translators’ ST analysis which is the first stage of his model (Nida & Taber, 1969, p. 33) leading to deficiency of their translations. The translators have not paid due consideration to the analysis and consequently, they could not produce an equivalent translation for the ST structures in a natural way to convey the same meaning. Table 1 shows different translations of ⱪ ⱪ ⱪ by the four translators.
Table 1 Translations of وعَدُّ اللَّهُ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Translators/Verse/No.</th>
<th>Pickthall</th>
<th>Arberry</th>
<th>Saffarzadeh</th>
<th>Iranpanah</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>وَعَدَ اللَّهُ الرُّومَ ۖ ۚ أَ يَبْنُي يَهُودٍ</td>
<td>It is a promise of Allah</td>
<td>The promise of God</td>
<td>Such is Allah’s promise</td>
<td>The promise of Allah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>وَعَدَ اللَّهُ الرُّومَ ۖ (ۚ أَ يَبْنُي يَهُودٍ)</td>
<td>(It is) a promise of Allah</td>
<td>God’s promise</td>
<td>This is a promise of Allah</td>
<td>Allah’s promise</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the above translations for وَعَدٌ اللَّهُ، Arberry (1955) and Iranpanah (2001) have just provided a surface level translation of the verse without paying attention to the syntactic function of the components of the verse in ST. As regards to the case ending of وَعَدَ اللَّهُ، it cannot be translated as a simple NP into English. According to Doâs et al (2004, Vol. 3:11) وَعَدٌ is a cognate accusative for an omitted verb. This is why Samarqandi (1992, Vol. 3:6) restructures it as وَعَدَ اللَّهُ وعَدًا. In his book, Sâfi (1997, Vol. 21:25) suggests that وَعَدٌ is a cognate accusative which emphasizes the content of the previous sentence, thus he reorders (وعدهم) اللَّهُ وَعَدًا as وَعَدَ اللَّهُ وَعَدًا وعَدًا.

However, as it can be seen in the translations of (13:31) the translators have used the same structure for translating وَعَدَ اللَّهُ in which وَعَدَ is in nominative case and اللَّهُ in which وَعَدَ is an accusative case:

احْتَلِلَّى جَعَلَى وَعَدَ اللَّهُ إِنَّ اللَّهَ لَا يُخَلِّفُ الْمِيعَادَ (الرَّعد: ۳۱)

Pickthall: ... until the threat of Allah come [sic] to pass. Lo! Allah faileth not to keep the tryst. Arberry: ...until God’s promise comes; and God will not fail the tryst.

Saffarzadeh: ...until the Promise Of Allah comes to pass; verily, Allah Does not break his Promise;
Iranpanah: ... until the promise of Allah comes about; surely Allah will not fail in (His) promise.
Therefore, most of the equivalents used for translating وَعَدَ اللهُ the are unexpectedly similar to those for translating وَعَدَ اللهُ. Two suggestive substitutes for each of the four non-equivalent translations of وَعَدَ اللهُ, which is syntactically equivalent to the ST syntactic components functions, can be

Allah promised it [to them] indeed, or Allah did promise it

So the best translation of وَعَدَ اللهُ is one with a derivation of وَعَدَ as the verb and الله as the subject in addition to an adverb which somehow shows the emphatic structure of the ST.

In the three other cases of وَعَدَ اللهُ in (4:122), (31:9), and (10:4), it is accompanied by another cognate accusative الله with an omitted verb as its governor illustrated in the following graph:

Syntactically speaking, the words وَعَدَ and الله are cognate accusatives for omitted verbs. There is almost a consensus among the syntacticians regarding the syntactic function of the present words as cognate accusative (cf. Sāfī 1997, Vol. 5:178; Doās et al., 2004, Vol. 1:224). This idea is also accepted by Quranic commentators like Shebr (1991, Vol. 1:216), Tantavi (1997, Vol. 7:23) Tabatabaei (1995, Vol. 10:11) etc.

Some authorities have also taken الله to be circumstantial accusative. As an instance, in his analysis of the present verse, Rāzi (1987, Vol. 10:96) suggests that وَعَدَ اللهُ is cognate accusative, whereas الله is circumstantial accusative restructured as ذلك الوعد حقاً حقاً by him. So, الله can either be taken as cognate accusative with an omitted verb or it may be considered circumstantial accusative for وَعَدَ الله. In other words, although الله is taken as cognate accusative by some authorities, it can at the same time be an accusative for emphasizing وَعَدَ الله (Shokānī, 1993, Vol. 2:482;
Beidhaví (1997, Vol. 3:105): an idea which is also adopted by Ghomi (1989, Vol. 6:29) who considers َعْمَلْ a cognate accusative emphasizing whatever emphasized by وَعَدَ اللَّهُ. Thus, if both of them are considered cognate accusative, a suggested translational version would be:

**Allah did promise it; He guaranteed it firmly**

Furthermore, if َعْمَلْ is to be taken as a circumstantial accusative, a proposed version for it could be:

**Allah did promise it truthfully/rightfully.**

Different instances of وَعَدَ اللَّهُ and their translations by the four translators are given in table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Translators/Verse/No.</th>
<th>Pickthall</th>
<th>Arberry</th>
<th>Saffarzadeh</th>
<th>Iranpanah</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>وَعَدَ اللَّهُ 122 السَّابِعَة</td>
<td>It is a promise from Allah in truth</td>
<td>God's promise in truth</td>
<td>Allah's Promise is true</td>
<td>God's promise in truth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>وَعَدَ اللَّهُ 9 افْتِلنَّة</td>
<td>It is a promise of Allah in truth</td>
<td>God's promise in truth</td>
<td>Allah's Promise is True [since He has never Failed His Promise]</td>
<td>Allah's promise in truth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>وَعَدَ اللَّهُ 4 بَيْنِيَة</td>
<td>It is a promise of Allah in truth</td>
<td>God's promise, in truth</td>
<td>Allah's Promise is True</td>
<td>It is a promise of Allah in truth</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As seen in table 3 below, the translators have overlooked another accusative structure، وَسَأَلَ اللَّهُ، by translating it as nominative case. Syntacticians and commentators such as Doës et al. (2004, Vol. 3:247), Ibn-e Äshür (1984, Vol. 26:154), Tabātabāei (1995, Vol. 18:429), and Mahalli and Suyuti (1995, p. 516) regard it as cognate accusative which is used to convey emphasis on meaning. All the above commentators have almost restructured it as: سن الله ذلك سنة.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Translators/Verse/No.</th>
<th>Pickthall</th>
<th>Arberry</th>
<th>Saffarzadeh</th>
<th>Iranpanah</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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In Table 4, some other samples of single-case accusatives as well as their translations, which are problematic in a similar way to the above-mentioned instances of accusatives, are presented.

**Table 4 Translations of Single case accusatives by each translator and the suggested versions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Verse No.</th>
<th>The accusative in each verse</th>
<th>Pickthall</th>
<th>Arberry</th>
<th>Safarzadeh</th>
<th>Tranpanah</th>
<th>Suggested version</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>111:4</td>
<td><strong>حَمَايَةُ الْخَلَقِ</strong></td>
<td>the wood-carrier</td>
<td>The carrier of the firewood</td>
<td>while Carrying wood for the Fire</td>
<td>the carrier of the firewood</td>
<td>Saffarzadeh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>75:4</td>
<td><strong>كَافَّارِينَ</strong></td>
<td>We are Able</td>
<td>We are Able</td>
<td>We are Able</td>
<td>we are able</td>
<td>being able to reshape his fingertips as well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>12:23</td>
<td><strong>يَسِيرُ الْحَمْرَاء</strong></td>
<td>I seek refuge in Allah!</td>
<td>I seek refuge in God</td>
<td>I seek refuge in Allah!</td>
<td>I seek refuge in Allah!</td>
<td>All translations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>33:61</td>
<td><strong>مَغْفِرَمُونَ</strong></td>
<td>Accursed, they shall be</td>
<td>Cursed they shall be</td>
<td>They are the accursed ones</td>
<td>These are accursed</td>
<td>Being accursed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>27:88</td>
<td><strong>صُنُعُ اللَّه</strong></td>
<td>the doing of Allah</td>
<td>God's handiwork,</td>
<td>Such is the Creating Power Of Allah</td>
<td>Allah's handiwork</td>
<td>Behold Allah's handiwork, or Allah has made it verily/indeed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4:24</td>
<td><strong>كِبَارِ اللَّه</strong></td>
<td>It is a decree of Allah for you.</td>
<td>So God prescribes for you</td>
<td>thus Allah has Ordained for you</td>
<td>(This is) Allah's ordinance to you</td>
<td>Allah wrote it as a decree on you [indeed] Or Take heed of the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3.2. Data Analysis

In this section, all of the examined accusatives as well as the problematic and non-problematic translations for them by each of the translators are given. Next, the percentage of each type of the problems is determined to present a quantitative account of the results of the research.

The problems are named using three terminologies based on their shared characteristics. Non-equivalent for partially or totally problematic renderings, over-
translation as defined by Manafi (2006, p. 143) for translating a source-language text in a way that some extra information is added to that of the original and finally, no patho for the accusatives whose translations qualify none of the two other problematic features. A summary of different types of problematic translation by each translator is presented in table 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Verse No.</th>
<th>Pickthall</th>
<th>Arberry</th>
<th>Saffarzadeh</th>
<th>Iranspanah</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The accusative (المقادرين)</td>
<td>30:6</td>
<td>Non-equivalent</td>
<td>Non-equivalent</td>
<td>Non-equivalent</td>
<td>Non-equivalent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The accusative (الفرد)</td>
<td>39:20</td>
<td>Non-equivalent</td>
<td>Non-equivalent</td>
<td>Non-equivalent</td>
<td>Non-equivalent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The accusative (القط)</td>
<td>4:122</td>
<td>Non-equivalent/ No patho</td>
<td>Non-equivalent/ No patho</td>
<td>Non-equivalent/ No patho</td>
<td>Non-equivalent/ No patho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The accusative (القط)</td>
<td>31:9</td>
<td>Non-equivalent/ No patho</td>
<td>Non-equivalent/ No patho</td>
<td>Non-equivalent/ No patho</td>
<td>Non-equivalent/ No patho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The accusative (الخطاب)</td>
<td>10:4</td>
<td>Non-equivalent/ No patho</td>
<td>Non-equivalent/ No patho</td>
<td>Non-equivalent/ No patho</td>
<td>Non-equivalent/ No patho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>The accusative (الحب)</td>
<td>48:23</td>
<td>Non-equivalent</td>
<td>Non-equivalent</td>
<td>Non-equivalent</td>
<td>Non-equivalent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>The accusative (الحنْب)</td>
<td>33:62</td>
<td>Non-equivalent</td>
<td>Non-equivalent</td>
<td>Non-equivalent</td>
<td>Non-equivalent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>The accusative (الخبر)</td>
<td>33:38</td>
<td>Non-equivalent</td>
<td>Non-equivalent</td>
<td>Non-equivalent</td>
<td>Non-equivalent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>The accusative (المراد)</td>
<td>40:85</td>
<td>Non-equivalent</td>
<td>Non-equivalent</td>
<td>Non-equivalent</td>
<td>Non-equivalent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>The accusative (المفتتح)</td>
<td>111:4</td>
<td>Non-equivalent</td>
<td>Non-equivalent</td>
<td>No patho</td>
<td>Non-equivalent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>The accusative (المقترن)</td>
<td>75:4</td>
<td>Non-equivalent</td>
<td>Non-equivalent</td>
<td>Non-equivalent</td>
<td>Non-equivalent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>The accusative (المضاف)</td>
<td>12:23</td>
<td>No Patho</td>
<td>No Patho</td>
<td>No Patho</td>
<td>No Patho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>The accusative (المضاف)</td>
<td>33:61</td>
<td>Non-equivalent</td>
<td>Non-equivalent</td>
<td>Non-equivalent</td>
<td>Non-equivalent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>The accusative (المراد)</td>
<td>27:88</td>
<td>Non-</td>
<td>Non-</td>
<td>Non-</td>
<td>Non-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The qualitative and quantitative accounts as well as an analysis of the types of problematic and non-problematic versions by each translator will be given in the next parts based on the information given in table 5.

### 3.2.1. Pickthall’s Translation

Out of 23 cases of accusatives shown in table 5 (in spite of the fact that the table shows the number 19 for the accusatives, there are two more accusatives in ١٩٦٨ and two in ١٩٥٨ which have increased the number of accusatives to 23), there are about 16 instances of non-equivalents that do not accord to their ST syntactic structures’ case endings. As it was mentioned, in most of these cases the translators have produced a nominative-case rendering of the ST accusative-case syntactic structures. As table 6 below shows, there are just five instances of non-problematic renderings of accusatives in Pickthall’s translations. Out of these non-problematic renderings, 3 translations are related to the latter but not the former accusative in ١٩٦٨, ١٩٥٨, or ١٩٧٨, which has been mostly translated using a prepositional phrase. Moreover, perhaps the origin of a non-problematic rendering
of the phrase by wide number of Muslims, leading the translators to translate it more efficiently. The other remaining faithful rendering of the 23 accusatives is that of which is rather acceptably translated by Pickthall using the adverb "especially", that somehow conveys the meaning the syntactic ending has added to the ST.

In table 6, the frequency of the two types of problematic translations and the non-problematic renderings is shown. In the second part of the verse 91:13 and also in 22:78, the translator has gone beyond what is expected of a translation and his translation overlaps with the boundaries of commentary; that is why these two cases are called over-translation.

Table 6 Percentage of different types of problems in translating accusatives in Pickthall’s Translations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Problems</th>
<th>Non-equivalent</th>
<th>Over-translation</th>
<th>No patho</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of Problems</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>69.56%</td>
<td>8.69%</td>
<td>21.73%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2.2. Arberry’s Translation

As table 7 shows, in Arberry’s translation of accusatives, the case with the over-translation has reduced to 1 instance. The number of acceptable renderings is the same for Pickthall and Arberry. In Arberry’s translation, there is no new type of problem, hence changing the number of non-equivalent and over-translation slightly.

Table 7 Percentage of different types of problems in translating accusatives in Arberry’s Translations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Problems</th>
<th>Non-equivalent</th>
<th>Over-translation</th>
<th>No patho</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of Problems</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>73.91%</td>
<td>4.34%</td>
<td>21.73%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The similarity between the frequency of the problematic translations made by Arberry and Pickthall might be due to the influence he has gained from Pickthall (cf. Arberry, 1955, p. 30).

3.2.3. Saffarzadeh’s Translations

Based on table 8, the problematic renderings in her translations hold the same number as Arberry’s problematic translations, namely about 17. She also has the equal number of over-translations as Pickthall. However, the number of non-problematic renderings by Saffarzadeh is fewer than the two British translators of the Qur’ān due to one additional problem of non-equivalent.

Table 8 Percentage of different types of problems in translating accusatives in Saffarzadeh’s Translations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Problems</th>
<th>Non-equivalent</th>
<th>Over-translation</th>
<th>No patho</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of Problems</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>73.91%</td>
<td>8.69%</td>
<td>17.39%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2.4. Iranpanah’s Translations

Iranpanah, perhaps because of the influence he has received from Pickthall, has the minimum number of non-equivalent problems in translating accusatives. This fact can be seen in table 9. Meanwhile, he has the highest number of non-problematic renderings of accusatives, which amounts to 6.

To make the comparison easier using numbers, the percentage of each problem, i.e. non-equivalent, over-translation and the non-problematic renderings, is shown in table 9.

Table 9 Percentage of different types of problems in translating accusatives in Iranpanah’s Translations
As it can be seen, like Arberry, there is just one example of over-translation in Iranpanah’s translations of accusatives.

4. Conclusion

Different case markers in Arabic are employed to convey different meanings that needs to be observed when translating from this language. In the samples scrutinized, the translators’ inconsideration of some of the special kinds of cognate accusatives, objects or circumstantial accusatives have made them produce a translation of the Qur’anic marked accusative structures at the surface level. These translations don’t convey the meaning of the original or are not in conformity with their ST syntactic functions, a fact which has affected the translations made by all four translators. However, as chart 1 shows, from among the four translations, the lowest percentage in accusative-related problems belongs toIranpanah by 73.90%. Pickthall and Arberry have received 78.25% of the problems whereas Saffarzadeh has the highest problem percentage in translations of accusatives that is 82.60%. So, moving from Pickthall to Arberry the trend is rather stable while in Saffarzadeh the tendency for problems is growing. The descending move starts from Saffarzadeh and ends in Iranpanah.
A Syntactic Analysis of English Translations of the Qur’an

Figure 1 Frequency of problematic translations of accusatives by each translator

Probably, borrowing inefficient translation strategies from Pickthall and mostly Arberry might be the reason for such a similarity of problems as the case goes with Iranpanah. A further reason for such a fact might be the ST syntactic structures complexity, which led the translators (both Iranians and non-Iranians) to the same kind of problems as far as accusative case endings are concerned.
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