دراسة تحليلية لتأثير الأسئلة البلاغية في الترجمة

Analytical Study of the Impact of Rhetorical Questions in Translation

م.م. احمد محمود شهاب

Asst. Lect. Ahmed Mahmood Shihab

جامعة تكريت/ كلية هندسة العمليات النفطية

Tikrit University\ Department of Gas and Petroleum Refining Engineering

E-mail: a.mahmood@tu.edu.iq

ORCID No: 0009-0001-0716-8522

الملخص

يعد السؤال البلاغي أداة متعددة الاستخدامات تُستخدم لتوضيح نقطة معينة أو للتأكيد أو الإقناع بدلاً من البحث عن إجابة. ان ترجمة الاستفهام البلاغي هي عملية صعبة. لذلك، تهدف هذه الدراسة إلى تقييم جودة ترجمة الأسئلة البلاغية في القرآن الكريم، وتحديد وظائفها، وتحديد أفضل طريقة لترجمتها، مع إبراز الفروقات بين الأسئلة البلاغية والاستفهامية. جمعت عينات الدراسة من ثلاث نسخ مترجمة من القران الكريم من اللغة العربية الى الانكليزية، متمثلة بثلاثة عشر آية وتراجمها من سور مختلفة من القران الكريم. تعتمد هذه الدراسة على النهج الانتقائي من خلال الدمج بين نهج عتيق في اللغة ونهج فينوتي في الترجمة. وتؤكد الدراسة ان جميع التراجم مقاربة الى النص الاصلي مع وجود بعض الاختلافات. وإن الطريقة المثلى لترجمة الاستفهام البلاغي هي التقريب. الدراسة حددت ١٣ وظيفة للأسئلة البلاغية وأشارت إلى أنها لا تحتاج دائمًا إلى علامة استفهام. على عكس الأسئلة العادية، قد تتضمن الأسئلة البلاغية انقلابًا بين الفاعل والفعل. تم اقتراح علامة ترقيم جديدة لتمييزها، مع استخدام مصطلحات مثل "how!" للتعبير عن التعجب، و"really" أو "actually" للتكثيف، و"What!" للتعبير عن العاطفة، و"indeed" للتأكيد على التزام المتحدث.

Abstract

A rhetorical question is a versatile device used to make a point, highlight, or persuade instead of seeking an answer. The translation of rhetorical questions is a tricky process. This study is intended to assess the quality of translating rhetorical questions in the Noble Quran, identify their functions, and determine the best translation method while highlighting the differences between rhetorical and interrogative questions. The study samples are collected from three English versions of the translation of the Noble Quran, represented in (13) verses, and their translations are collected from different Quranic surahs. This study is based on an eclectic method, combining Ateeq's linguistic model and Venuti's translation model. The study confirms that all the translations are close to the original text, but there are some differences. The most optimal translation method is domestication. The study identified 13 functions of rhetorical questions and noted that they don't always need question marks. Unlike standard questions, rhetorical questions may involve subject-verb inversion. A new punctuation mark is proposed to distinguish them, with terms like "how!" expressing exclamation, "really" or "actually" intensifying, "What!" conveying emotion, and "indeed" emphasizing commitment.

1. Introduction

Language is the best means of communication between interlocutors in our daily life because it affects our thinking and feelings. One of the most important areas of language is rhetoric. Rhetoric is usually used to persuade the reader, create suspense, influence the reader, or clarify the meaning. This study deals with one of the rhetorical devices, which is the rhetorical question. The Rhetorical question is a question asked to make a point rather than to have information, for example:

(هَلْ عَلِمْتُم مَّا فَعَلْتُم بِيُوسُفَ وَأَخِيهِ إِذْ أَنتُمْ جَاهِلُونَ) (يوسف: ٨٩)

(Do you know what you did to Joseph and his brother when you were ignorant?) (Rowad Translation Center, 2020: 309)

Furthermore, this study provides important insights into the concept of rhetorical questions for native and non-native English speakers. It helps to find a new technique to translate the rhetorical question. It identifies many functions of rhetorical questions that are used in the Arabic language.   In accordance with those mentioned above, this study has five objectives:

1. Assessing the appropriateness of the translation.
2. Choosing the best method to translate the rhetorical question.
3. Identifying the functions of rhetorical questions used in Quranic texts.
4. Explaining the differences between rhetorical questions and interrogative
   questions.
5. Suggesting a suitable technique to overcome the problem of translating
   The rhetorical question.

2. Investigating the Concept of Rhetorical Question

In general, when the speaker poses a question, he expects an answer from the hearer. In a rhetorical question, the speaker does not expect an answer. It is the question that involves the answer. The rhetorical question and hypophora are figures of speech. Both include questions, but they differ in how the answer is handled. The hypophora asks and answers the question directly. Whereas the rhetorical question asks and gives the answer within the question, for instance:

In this age of modernity, can we truly condone such horrific acts?

Moreover, it provides the speaker / writer a chance to spotlight something known by the hearer/reader. Before using a rhetorical question, it's important to understand its purpose: what function does a rhetorical question serve? The correct way of using rhetorical questions is to make the reader think over the subject or to make your point clear. Considering that the rhetorical question does not provide an answer like hypophora, it

is crucial to avoid using this device unless you are certain that the reader will reach at the same conclusion as you. Finally, the properly used rhetorical question will attract and excite the reader to find out the idea you want to elaborate (McGuigan,2007:26-27).

One kind of question that most people think is not intended to be answered is the rhetorical question. But sometimes, this question can be answered in conversations. It is worth noting that such questions have something in common: they are not asked and comprehended to obtain information. Alternatively, they are a claim or the opposite assertions to the question at hand. This means that a positive rhetorical question indicates a negative assertion, whereas a negative one indicates a positive assertion as follows:

Is that a reason for despair?

Positive rhetorical question. (of course, this is not a reason for despair)

Isn't the answer obvious?

Negative rhetorical question. (of course the answer is clear)

(Koshik,2005:2)

The concept of rhetorical questions encompasses three kinds of questions according to their nature. The first is a question that is useful to attack the hearers, the second is a question that cannot be denied, and the last one is a question that is hard to answer. Moreover, the answers to the interrogative sentences are formed in two ways: Wh-questions or yes-no questions. While the answers to the rhetorical question can be gotten from the mind of the speaker by restating the answers as declarative equivalents (Risa, 2018:8-9).

The speakers\writers usually use rhetoric either to inform, persuade, entertain, or engage the hearers\ readers with the texts. A rhetorical question, a non-seeking information question, is a device employed to highlight particular ideas, notions, or attitudes. It can be an effective tool in developing the hearer's answers when it is left unanswered (Malo-Juvera et al., 2021:23-24).

Language can be complicated when there is a mismatch between illocutionary force and structural form. Larson says that there are other functions for interrogative statements. Certain question formats, traditionally used to make a point without seeking information, are referred to as rhetorical questions. Alternatively, they are used to giving orders, making statements, or making negations rather than inquiring. In addition, if there is not a biasing between illocutionary force and grammatical form, the question is real, but if there is a basing, the question is rhetorical (Larson, 1998: 257).

3. The Nature of Rhetorical Questions in Arabic

Since it presents a self-evident fact, a rhetorical question is one that is asked by someone and does not need an answer. The writer uses this method in his works to evoke persuasion in the mind of the reader and watcher. Using rhetorical questions is more effective than using narrative speech (Al—Tunji,1999:532).

The concept of a rhetorical question is a request to get something in specific devices. It is a question that goes beyond the frame of question and answer to other connotations connecting with a conversational setting. In addition, interrogation as a conversational style involves various parties: the addresser, the addressee, and utterances and their meaning, and this is a matter of common sense. There is no utterance without addresser, nor addresser without addressee (Jumaah, 2015:61).

The interrogation techniques in the literary language come out of other artistic meanings and connotations. Understanding these meanings and connotations is the real domain of the rhetoric. Where the interrogative particles do not stand for rhetorical signs, but the context clues form the rhetorical functions of the interrogative statement. Therefore, the context clues can clarify the rhetorical meaning more than the interrogative devices. The identification of rhetorical meanings of interrogative statements is a difficult matter. This is because they change in the context that involves verbal and nonverbal behaviors between the sender and the recipient (Ateeq, 2012:180-181).

Rhetorical questions are more powerful than logical arguments. When the speaker poses an embarrassing denial question, he completely prevents the opponent from continuing to hold their position (Samawi,2008:110).

The Noble Quran is full of interrogative statements made by Almighty Allah to creatures. This kind of question is used to affect and persuade the minds of human beings. This kind of question performs other meanings rather than interrogation, such as:

Exclamation

(كَيْفَ تَكْفُرُونَ بِٱللَّهِ وَكُنتُمْ أَمْوَٰتًا فَأَحْيَٰكُمْ) (البقرة: ٢٨)

(How can you disbelieve in Allah when you were lifeless, then He gave you life) (Rowad Translation Center, 2020: 6)

Negation

(أَفَأَنْتَ تُكْرِهُ النَّاسَ حَتَّى يَكُونُوا مُؤْمِنِينَ) (يونس:٩٩)

(Will you then compel people to become believers?) (Rowad Translation Center, 2020: 275)

And other types of rhetorical questions in the Noble Quran.(Abdulkarim, 2021:120).

4. Domestication and Foreignization

Venuti (1995:19-20) mentions two kinds of translation methods, namely domestication and foreignization. Venuti's phenomenon is modeled on German philosopher Schleiermacher's lecture in 1813. He says that the reduction of the original text in relation to ethnicity is the domestication method, where the translator " leaves the reader in peace, as much as possible, and moves the author toward him." This means that the translator has to make the text familiar and grasp the target listeners. In addition, he should bridge the cultural and linguistic gaps between the two languages. Foreignization is the pressure on the cultural values in the target text in order to register linguistic and cultural differences of the original text and engage the reader in the foreign culture. Foreignization, in the eye of Schleiermacher," leaves the author in peace, as much as possible, and moves the reader toward him". Venuti argues that the phrase *as much as possible* in Schleiermacher's lecture is a sign that translation can never be identical to the original text.

Kemppanen, Jänis, & Belikova (2012:51) state that domestication in translation is the practice of substituting unfamiliar components in the original text with components that are more familiar to the target listeners. In addition, the domestication translation method is marked by the conceptual and linguistic characteristics of the target culture. The main distinct feature of domestication is the transparency, fluency, clarity, and modernity of the text form. Meanwhile, the foreignization translation method preserves foreign features of the original text in the target text. Foreignization, unlike domestication, is marked by the linguistic characteristics of the original text. It rejects the features of fluency, clarity, and modernity. Lastly, domestication tends to avoid using jargon, archaic terms, and repetition.

Chesterman, San Salvador, &Gambier (2000:374) explain that one of the most prominent critics of domestication is Venuti. He prefers foreignization to domestication not because it avoids using fluency but because it undermines the target text culture and forces ethnocentric violence on the translated text. Venuti provides three arguments for preferring foreignization more than domestication. The first one is that domestication is identical to the prevailed cultural standards, whereas foreignization challenges the main aesthetics. The second one is that foreignization points out the linguistic and cultural difference in the target text. The third one is that foreignization endeavors to keep the ethnocentric violence at the process of translation.

Panda (2022:33) points out that domestication as a method of translation involves a transparent and fluent style to reduce the foreignness of the source text for the target listeners. At the other end, foreignization translation aims to provide text that intentionally breaches the target text norms by making the readers communicate with the foreignness in their native tongue.

5. Rhetorical Question in the Practical Framework

This study examines the translation of the rhetorical question in Quranic texts into English. Thirteen verses and their translations are taken from three English versions of the Noble Quran. The first is for Abdullah Yusuf Ali, the second is for Dr. Muhammad Muhsin Khan and Dr. Muhammad Taqi-ud-Din al-Hilali, and the last is for Rowad Translation Center. Domestication and foreignization are the models adopted for translation in this study. The concept of rhetorical questions needs to be covered in more detail in the English language than in the Arabic language. Since the rhetorical question has many functions in Arabic and the data are chosen from the Noble Quran, this study adopts an Arabic model for rhetorical questions. Actually, various scholars and scientists in Arabic classify rhetorical questions into various kinds, but the model that would be adopted is Omer Ateeq's model. According to Ateeq (2012:180-186), the rhetorical question is divided into thirteen kinds as follows:

5.1. Declarative Question   السؤال التقريري

{أَفَمَن يَخْلُقُ كَمَن لَّا يَخْلُقُ ۚ أَفَلَا تَذَكَّرُونَ} (النحل: ١٧)

1. Is then He Who creates like one that creates not? Will ye not receive admonition? (Ali,1934:660)

2. Is then He, Who creates as one who creates not? Will you not then remember? (Al-Hilali and Khan ,1999:298)

3. Is then He Who creates equal to one who cannot create? Will you not then take heed? (Rowad Translation Center, 2020:341)

It is a question that is used to make the addressee acknowledge what he already knows. An interrogative particle that is used in this kind of question is hamza, and it is followed by the addressee. In the above verse, Allah Almighty addresses His servants in question form to compare the Creator who creates (Allah) with the one who does not do that. Admittedly, Allah does not pose this question to get an answer, but He wants to make His servants admit what they really know. As for the English translations, all the translators use (yes or no question) form with some Differences. Ali uses the adjective *like* to compare between the Creator and non-creator. He uses old language via the pronoun *ye* in his translation and uses the word *admonition* as a kind of reminder and warning. While Khan and al-Hilali use plain English language in the word *as* and then the word *remember* that indicates (think over) of the right thing. Rowad Translation Center uses

middle English as in the verb *equal to* in order to draw the contrast between the Creator and non- creator. Then it uses idiomatic expression *take heed* to refer to the attention and warning. Ali and Rowad Translation Center employ the foreignization translation method, while Khan and al-Hilali employ the domestication method. The domestication aligns more closely with the intended meaning.

5.2. Denial question   السؤال الانكاري

{أَيَحْسَبُ الإِنسَانُ أَلَّن نَجْمَعَ عِظَامَهُ}   (القيامة: ٣)

1. Does man think that We cannot assemble his bones? (Ali, 1934:1649)
2. Does man (a disbeliever) think that We shall not assemble his bones?
 (Al-Hilali and Khan, 1999:648)
3. Does man think that We cannot reassemble his bones? (Rowad Translation Center, 2020: 814)

According to Ateeq, this kind of question in Arabic is divided into two subcategories. The first is denial of truth, and the second is reprehensive denial. The above verse is taken from Surah Al-Qiyamah, and it is a kind of denial of truth. This kind of question is not used to seek information on whether Almighty Allah can do that or not. Still, it is used to reply and deny the disbelievers' statement that how Almighty Allah can put our bones together again after our death. The reply is if Allah cannot put your bones together once again, how can He create you from nothing at the beginning? With regard to the translation, all the translators use (yes or no) question form. The vocabulary is nearly similar, but there are some differences. They Capitalize the pronoun *We* to show reverence and achieve a specific effect. Khan and al-Hilali employ a good expression of *disbelievers* to elaborate more about the addressees in the verse. Moreover, Khan and al-Hilali and Ali employ the term *assemble*, and Rowad Center employs the term *reassemble* which is more acceptable in the context. According to Merriam-Webster(2023), "*assemble*" means to fit together the parts of something," while "reassemble" means "to put together the parts of something again." The three translators employ the domestication method of translation. Note that the third translation is more appropriate because it provides a clear picture to the addressee.

5.3. Suspense   التشويق

{هَلْ أَتَاكَ حَدِيثُ مُوسَى} (النازعات:١٥)

1. Has the story of Moses reached thee? (Ali, 1934:1681)
2. Has there come to you the story of Musa (Moses)? (Al-Hilali and Khan 1999:658)
3. Has there come to you the story of Moses,(Rowad Translation Center, 2020: 828)

Suspense is the arousal of the addressee's curiosity to know the thing inquired about. The aforementioned verse is verse 15 from surah An-Nazi 'at. It is a kind of rhetorical question that is used in the Noble Quran to make the addressee excited about the story that follows this verse. Indeed, such a question is used to captivate the addressee / the reader and to create suspense in the speech. As for the question, Ali and Khan and al-Hilali use (or no question form), whereas Rowad Center does not. Rowad Center makes the sentence seem like a kind of anticipation rather than a question by omitting the question mark. It makes the readers wonder what the following is, and this is a good point. On the other hand, Khan al-Hilali and Rowad Center employ the rule of inversion of the verb. By using such a rule, the two translators want to emphasize and draw attention to the story itself or to give special effects. Ali uses (yes or no) question form without invert the word order. Furthermore, he employs the archaic word *thee* in his translation. The second and third translations are foreignized because the translators move to the readers in the same word order and style as the original text. Culturally, it is a more appropriate translation. The first translation is mixed between domestication and foreignization translation, as the translator translates the original text by the same style and word order of his language and, at the end, uses archaic terms.

5.4. Impatience   الأستبطاء

{مَتَى نَصْرُ اللَّهِ}   (سورة البقرة: ٢١٤)

1. When (will come) the help of God? (Ali, 1934:84)
2. When (will come) the Help of Allah?(Al-Hilali and Khan, 1999:41)
3. When will the help of Allah come??(Rowad Translation Center, 2020:40)

Impatience is the long-awaited inquiry about the date of something happening. The above verse tells that prophet Mohammed (peace be on him) and his companions endured hardship and poverty while seeking Allah's help. You may think that help from Allah is slow to come. Indeed, Allah's help is so close to His servant. Allah by this a kind of question wants to show us how to be patient in our life. Everything is in his specific time. The translators use the wh-question form in translation. Concerning Ali and Khan, and al-Hilali's translation, they put auxiliary and main verbs together between two brackets to emphasize the time of the help from Allah. They follow the Arabic grammatical structure. Rowad Center

follows the English word order in translation. With respect to vocabulary, Khan and al-Hilali, and Rowad Center prefer to use the word Allah in their translation, while Ali uses the word God. The word *Allah* is more common in Islam than *God*. The translators employ the word help instead of victory in their translation to indicate that the victory may come to support us from the inside rather than outside. The foreignization is the method applied in one and second translation above. The third translation is domestication, but the more accurate translation is translation number two.

5.5. Command   الأمر

﴿وَقُل لِّلَّذِينَ أُوتُوا الْكِتَابَ وَالْأُمِّيِّينَ أَأَسْلَمْتُمْ﴾ (ال عمران :٢٠)

1. And say to the People of the Book and to those who are unlearned: "Do ye (also) submit yourselves?"(Ali, 1934:127)
2. And say to those who were given the Scripture (Jews and Christians) and to those who are illiterates (Arab pagans): "Do you (also) submit yourselves (to Allah in Islam)? (Al-Hilali and Khan, 1999:63)
3. And say to those who were given the Scripture and to the illiterate, "Have you submitted yourselves?"(Rowad Translation Center, 2020:62)

        Command in the above verse is the change of the context of the question to imperative in meaning. Almighty Allah orders His prophet Mohamed (peace be upon him) to say to the (Christian and Jews) and the pagans he submitted himself to Almighty Allah in Islam. Therefore, they should submit themselves to Almighty Allah in Islam. The verb (say) at the beginning of the verse confirms that this kind of question is a command, so the address is directed to the prophet Mohamed (peace be upon him) and the others. Regarding the translation, Ali, Khan and al-Hilali and Rowad Center employ (yes or no) question format with different tenses. Ali and Khan and al-Hilali employ present simple, while Rowad Center employs present perfect. As for Ali's translation is foreignization because he uses archaic and ambiguity terms and style of English language. However, Khan and al-Hilali 's translation is more transparent in expressing the original verse. It is domestication translation because it maintains the modernity of the vocabulary and employs the clear language. Rowad Center's translation is foreignization because it uses the form and the content of English language.

5.6. Sarcasm and irony   التهكم و الأستهزاء

﴿أَهَٰذَا الَّذِي بَعَثَ اللَّهُ رَسُولًا﴾   (الفرقان: ٤١)

1. Is this The one whom God has sent As an apostle? (Ali, 1934:935)
2. Is this the one whom Allah has sent as a Messenger? (Al-Hilali and Khan, 1999:406)

3. Is this the one whom Allah has sent as a messenger? (Rowad Translation Center, 2020:476)

It is a way of speaking to show the sarcasm and irony towards the addressee. In the preceding verse Allah describes the disbelievers' state. He tells His prophet that when those people see you they scoff at you and say how can this man to be a messenger as a kind of mockery. The verse above is a kind of question that is intended to be mockery. Ali employs an old language in his translation such *God* and *apostle* that are used commonly in the religious target text. He also writes the word *God* in a capital letter to be nonverbal sign to respect Allah in one side. On the other side, the words *The one* and *As* is used to express the refuse and irony of how to be prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him) an apostle. In contrast, Al-Hilali and Khan, and Rowad Center use the same structure and the same vocabulary in translating the above verse. The form *is this* is used to indicate the specific person and express the surprise in this context. The difference is that Al-Hilali and Khan write the word *Messenger* in capital to convey the real meaning of the event. They depict the disbelievers' state that they cannot believe how this man is going to be a messenger. Al-Hilali And Khan along with Rowad Center employ domestication method to convey the meaning of the verse above, while Ali employs foreignization. To me the translations above are difficult to understand for the foreign reader in term of the function of the question. I would like to propose using explanation between two brackets or invent new sign refers to sarcasm and mockery such as: (؟) .

5.7. Improbability   الأستبعاد

{أَإِذَا كُنَّا تُرَابًا أَإِنَّا لَفِي خَلْقٍ جَدِيدٍ} (الرعد: ٥)

1. When we are (actually) dust, shall we indeed then be in a creation renewed? (Ali, 1934:604)
2. When we are dust, shall we indeed then be (raised) in a new creation? (Al-Hilali and Khan, 1999:274)
3. what! When we become dust, will we be created anew? (Rowad Translation Center, 2020:314)

Improbability means to consider the matter is far away to happen. Per to the verse above the disbelievers ask if we dead, shall we recreate again? Extrinsically, this verse indicates that it is a kind of question that seeks information with yes or no. while, intrinsically it is a question used to exclude the belief in the day of the resurrection. With respect to the translation all the translators use *when* at the beginning to draw attention and emphasis of uncertainty. Ali uses word *actually* and *indeed,* Al-Hilali and Khan use word *indeed*, Rowad Center uses word *what!* to express shock and surprise in this situation. The word *become* is more identical to

the Arabic word كنا than *are*. The expression *in a new creation* states that we will create differently, whereas *be created anew* and *be in a creation renewed* point out that we will be recreated. Rowad' center translation is more expressive in illustrating the verse above. The exclamation mark with interrogative words depicts the deep meaning of the text. The translations are domestication since they are written in simple language and can be understood by listeners.

5.8. Negation   النفي

{وَمَنْ أَصْدَقُ مِنَ اللَّهِ قِيلاً}   (النساء: ١٢٢)

1. and whose word can be truer than Allah's?(Ali, 1934:218)
2. and whose words can be truer than those of Allah? (Of course, none).(Al-Hilali and Khan, 1999:114)
3. Who is more truthful than Allah in speech? (Rowad Translation Center, 2020:120)

     Although there are no negative particles in the form of the verse above, the negation is involved in the content. The verse is written in a way that confirms the assertion that there is no one more truthful in their word than Allah. The translators employ the same structure in their translations with subtle differences. Ali, and Al-Hilali and Khan prefer to use comparative degree the structure *er + than* in the translation. This type of comparative is used to compare between two things. Rowad Center uses also comparative degree the structure *more + adjective*. It does not use to compare between two things, but it makes the adjective more intense and more stronger. The first and the second translators render the word قيل into *word*, while the third translator uses word *speech*. It should be noted that Al-Hilali and Khan give explanation between two brackets to give clear vision about the meaning of the verse. The third translation is more simple and keep the meaning of the foreign text. All the translations are nearer to the domestication.

5.9. Exclamation   التعجب

{أَفَلَا يَنظُرُونَ إِلَى ٱلْإِبِلِ كَيْفَ خُلِقَتْ}   (الغاشية:١٧)

1. Do they not look at the Camels, how they are made? (Ali, 1934:1728)

2. Do they not look at the camels, how they are created? (Al-Hilali and Khan, 1999:674)

3. Do they not reflect on the camel, how it is created; (Rowad Translation Center, 2020:851)

Exclamation is anything that is unexpected because it is unusual. The rhetorical question above describes the greatness of Allah in creating the camels. The wonder in this verse is directed to the disbelievers who deny Allah's omnipotence. Almighty Allah exemplifies in creating this amazing animal which has different functions help him in travel. It is one of Allah signs to His servants. Grammatically, the structures are (yes or no) questions and the way to pose question is by inversion the auxiliary verb without negative particle. This way is more common in English than inverse the auxiliary and negative particle. The first way indicates to disbelieve or doubt while the second insists on the negation more. The word *look* in the first and the second translation reflects the literal meaning of the word ينـظـرون . While the word *reflect on* comes closer to the figurative meaning. It means to think over in creating the camel. In the first and the second translation the pronoun *they* is used to describe the camels. As opposed to, the pronoun *it* is used to describe the camel depending on the camel is non-human animate. The word *create* is more expressive in translating the word خلـقـت than the word *made*. The third translation captures the figurative meaning of the original text. It conveys the author's meaning toward the reader so it domestication. The first and the second render the literal meaning of the original text so it is foreignization.

5.10. Contempt   التحقير

{مَا هَـٰذِهِ ٱلتَّمَاثِيلُ ٱلَّتِىٓ أَنتُمْ لَهَا عَـٰكِفُونَ}   (الأنبياء: ٥٢)

1. What are these images, to which ye are (so assiduously) devoted? (Ali, 1934:834)

2. What are these images, to which you are devoted? (Al-Hilali and Khan, 1999:367)

3. What are these statues to which you are so devoted? (Rowad Translation Center, 2020:422)

Contempt means to belittle or diminish the subject of inquiry. The prophet Ibrahim peace be upon him asks his father and people about worship of idols. It is a type of question that is used to underestimate these statues. They are not useful and harmful nor hear and see. The word تماثيل is rendered into *images* and *statues* in the above translations. *Statues* provides the common meaning to the original term. Al-Hilali and Khan, and Rowad s' writing style is more simple than Ali's. They use simple vocabulary in their translation to bridge the gap of the linguistic and

cultural differences of the original verse namely domestication translation. Separately, Rowad Center uses the appropriate register that suits the audience. Ali uses old English language such *ye* in his writing style namely foreignization translation. He tries to make the readers read the Quran in his own old language like in bible and old religious texts.

5.11. Warning and Threatening   الوعيد والتهديد

{أَفَحَسِبْتُمْ أَنَّمَا خَلَقْنَاكُمْ عَبَثًا وَأَنَّكُمْ إِلَيْنَا لَا تُرْجَعُونَ} (المؤمنون:١٥)

1. Did ye then think that We had created you in jest, and that ye would not be brought back to Us (for account)? (Ali, 1934:893-894)
2. Did you think that We had created you in play (without any purpose), and that you would not be brought back to Us? (Al-Hilali and Khan, 1999:391)
3. Did you think that We created you with no purpose, and that you would not be brought back to Us? (Rowad Translation Center, 2020:455)

It is the question that is designed to cause fear inside the addressee. Besides, it makes him think about dire consequences if he does not comply with the command. Almighty Allah addresses His servants and says that do you think that you create in vain? Life is not just eating, drinking and playing there are punishment and reward in the doomsday. Structurally, all the translators use the simple past question form in the first part then Ali, and Al-Hilali and Khan use past perfect form in the second part. While Rowad Center uses past simple form again. Grammatically, Ali, and Al-Hilali and Khan forms are more appropriate because we have two actions in the past the first is the creation and the second is the suppose. The word عبثا is rendered in different ways. Al-Hilali and Khan prefer to use *in play (without any purpose)* and it is more clear. Rowad Center chooses the expression *with no purpose* and it is more common in English. Ali would rather use *in jest* and dead language as the pronoun *ye* unlike Al-Hilali and Khan and, Rowad who use plain language. The second translation leaves no room for misinterpretation. It is more precise to the original verse. It keeps the meaning of the original text within the limitation of target text. The translations applied in the second and the third are domestication. The first translation is foreignization where the translator attempts to keep the cultural and linguistic features of the original text by using dead language and spiritual meaning of Quran text.

5.12. Intimidation   التهويل

{هَلْ أَتَاكَ حَدِيثُ ٱلْغَاشِيَةِ} (الغاشية: ١)

1. Has the story reached thee of the overwhelming (Event)? (Ali, 1934:1727)

2. Has there come to you the narration of the overwhelming (i.e. the Day of Resurrection)? (Al-Hilali and Khan, 1999:673)

3. Has there come to you the story of the Overwhelming Event? (Rowad Translation Center, 2020:850)

Intimidation is an act of making something seems like more dangerous through fear and threat. The question in this verse comes to exalt the horrors that are going to be in the Day of Judgment. Noteworthy, the word الغاشـــية is translated into *overwhelming event* and this is in fact unclear for the foreign reader. Al-Hilali and Khan state this meaning between two brackets *(i.e. the Day of Resurrection)* which means the end of the world. The word حديث is translated into *story* and *narration* and the more appropriate word is *narration* because it focuses on the act of telling the story. Syntactically, the tense is used to translate the verse above is present perfect with some differences in the second and third translation. They use demonstrative pronoun *there* in their translation not to refer to physical location but to add emphasis and formality. The second translation is faithful and precise to the original meaning of the text. It more fluent and clear to the original text i.e. domestication translation. The first and the third are more ambiguous and archaic i.e. foreignization translation.

5.13. Alerting   التنبية

{وَمَا تِلْكَ بِيَمِينِكَ يَٰمُوسَىٰ}   (طه: ١٧)

1. And what is that in thy right hand, O Moses? (Ali, 1934:793)

2. And what is that in your right hand, O Mûsâ (Moses)? (Al-Hilali   and Khan, 1999:353)

3. What is that in your right hand, O Moses? (Rowad Translation Center, 2020:403)

It is a way designed to alert the addressee and the reader about something that needs to be reported to him. The question in the verse above is not a question about what is in the prophet's hand, but it has another dimensions. Surly, Almighty Allah knows that what in the Moses' hand (peace be upon him) is a stick. Nonetheless, Allah wants to draw his attention to the importance of the stick in his hand. The point of this question is the miracle that will be happen after the prophet sees and contemplates the stick. Arabic text is clear and simple so all the translations are appropriate and palatable. The first translator uses possessive adjective, but in archaic term *thy* not as the second and the third translator who use simple terms. They are more faithful to the original text. It is worth emphasizing that Al-Hilali and Khan use word Mûsâ (Moses) in two forms Turkish and English. In the first form they want to make this word familiar to the target reader. Whereas, in the second they want to indicate to the

prophet Moses in their religion. The translations are easy and well written and can be understood by common readers. Al-Hilali and Khan and, Rowad Center employ domestication by simplifying the target text. Ali emploies foreignization by using archaic term.

6. Conclusion

Translation of rhetorical question involves understanding the connotative meaning rather than denotative one. The translator's task is to maintain the function of the rhetorical question in translation process. Consequently, the translator has to consider the cultural context, connotative meaning, linguistic experience, and the kind of the required impact in the mind of the target audience. This study set out to evaluate the quality of translating the rhetorical question. It found that all the translations are accurate and faithful to the original text. Nevertheless, they have their own strengths and weaknesses. The research also examined the best method to translate the rhetorical question. It showed that the more accurate and precise method to translate the rhetorical question is domestication than foreignization. Domestication translation uses simple vocabulary, explanatory phrases, non-verbal clues, In addition to the syntax, word choices, and stylistic genre of the translated text that can be understood by target audience easily. The research was designed to determine the functions of rhetorical questions. It only determined (13) functions of the rhetorical question used in the Nobel Quran according to Ateeq's model mentioned earlier. As for the differences between rhetorical and interrogative questions, the research found that rhetorical questions do not seek information from the addressee, but they are used to make a point with specific function. The rhetorical questions sometimes do not require question mark as the interrogative one. Using the subject verb inversion is allowed in the rhetorical question, against the interrogative question. The research set out to find new technique to solve the problem of translating the rhetorical question. It is believed that the best technique to translate the rhetorical question is to invent punctuation marks for each function of the rhetorical question. For instance, interrobang ‽ was invented by Speckter in 1962 to engage the functions of question and exclamation marks. Interrobang has many functions, such as excitement, disbelief, and confusion when it comes at the end of the rhetorical question. In addition, there are general terms that help to translate the function of rhetorical question. The word (how) followed by exclamation mark covers the function of exclamation. The intensifiers, such us (really) and (actually) that are used in the translation to intensify the adjective or the adverb that they modify, make the question be more rhetorical. Exclamation words, such as (what!) that expresses strong emotion, and the qualifiers, such as (indeed) modifies the speaker 's obligation to his/her word.

References

Abdulkarim, F.(2021). Althani Eashar fi Adhar Alshaykh Alduktur Aihmad Nufal Hayaatah wa Atharahi – Twelve March: Sheikh Dr. Ahmed Nawfal, his life and works. Amman: Dar Academic for Publishing and Distributing Co.

Al– Tunji, M. (1999). Almuejam Almufasal fi Aladb– The Detailed Dictionary of Literature (2nd edition). Bruit: Dar al–kutub al–llmiyah.

Al–Hilali, Khan. (1999). Translation of the Meaning of the Noble Quran in the English Language. Madinah, K,S,A: King Fahd Complex for the Printing of the Holly Quran.

Ali, A. (1934). The Holly Qur–an Text, Translation and Commentary. Cambridge Massachusetts: Murray Printing Company.

Ateeq, O. (2012). Eilm Albalaghat bayn Alasalih wal Maeasirihi –Rhetoric between Originality and modernity. Jordan: Al Manhal.

Chesterman et al., (2000). Translation in Context. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Jumaah, M. (2015). Alhiwar fi Alsayrih Alnabawih: wa Jadiluhum Bialati hi Ahsan– The Prophetic Biography: And argue with them in a way that is better. Egypt: Shams for publishing & media.

Kemppanen et al., (2012). Domestication and foreignization in Translation Studies. Berlin: France & Timme GmbH Verlag fur wissenschaftliche Literature.

Koshik, I .(2005).Beyond Rhetorical Questions: Assertive questions in everyday interaction. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Larson, M. L. (1998). Meaning –based translation: a guide to cross–language equivalent (2ndedition). New York: University Press of America.

Malo–Juvera, Victor et al. (2021). Shakespeare and Young Adult Literature: Pairing and Teaching. London: The Rowman & Littlefield Publishing Group.

McGuigan, D. (2007). Rhetorical Devices: A Handbook and Activities for Students Writers. United States of America: Prestwick House, Inc.

Panda, A.(2022). Words, Texts and Worlds in Translation. United Kingdom: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Risa, G. (2018). Rhetorical Questions A Relevance – Theoretic Approach Interrogative Utterances in English and Japanese. Japan: Hituzi Syobo Publishing.

Rowad Translation Center. (2020). Explanation of the Meanings of the Noble Quran in the English Language. Riyadh: Cooperative Office for Islamic Propagation in Rabwah.

Samawi, A. (2008). Almaqal Aladibiu– Literary Article. Egypt: Masciliana.

Venuti, L.(1995). The Translator's Invisibility. London & New York: Routledge.

Merriam–Webster. (2023). Assemble. In Merriam–Webster.com Dictionary[Online]. https://www.merriamwebster.com/dictionary/assemble: https://www.merriam–webster.com/dictionary/assemble.

Merriam–Webster. (2023). Reassemble. In Merriam–Webster.com Dictionary[Online]. https://www.merriamwebster.com/dictionary/reassemble: https://www.merriam–webster.com/dictionary/reassemble.

Speckter, Martin K. "The Interrobang." The Interrobang, 1962, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Interrobang: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/I