

- Ma'luf, Louis. *al-Munjid fi l-Lugati w l-A'l m.* 23rd. ed. (Feriut: Daru l-Mashreq, 1978)
- (ibn) Mandhur, Jamal dDin Mahammad ibn Mukarram al-Ansari. *Lisamu l-Arab.* (Cairo: The Egyptian House for Writing and Translation.
- Qarri, Harun ibn Masa. *al-wujuhu wa n-Nadha'ir fi l-Qur'ani l-Karim.* Edited by Dr, Hatim Saleh adh-Dhamin. (——).

IV. DICTIONARIES USED (English)

- Courtney, Rosemary. *Longman Dictionary of Phrasal Verbs.* (Essex: Longman Group Limited, 1983). Fourth Impression, 1985.
- Hornby, A. S. *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English.* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1974). 21st. Impression, 1986.
- Mish, Frederick C. (Editor-in-Chief). *Webster's Ninth Collegiate Dictionary.* (Massachusetts, USA: Merriam-Webster Inc. Publishers, 1986.)
- Onions, C. T. (Revisor and Editor). *The Shorter Oxford English Dictionary on Historical Principles.* (London: Oxford University Press, 1964). First Published, 1933.
- Procter, Paul. (Edito-in-Chief) *The Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English.* (Essex: Longman Group Limited, 1978) .
- Wehr, Hans. *A Dictionary of Modern Written Arabic.* Edited by J. Milton Cowan. Otto Harrassowitz, 1961, 1966, 1971, 1974. Reprinted by Librarie du Liban, Beirut: 1980, by special arrangement with Otto Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden. Third printing.

V. REFERENCE

- Quirk, Randolph et al. *A Grammar of Contemporary English.* (Essex: Longman Group Limited, 1972). 12th Impression, 1986.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

II TRANSLATIONS USED

- Ali, A. Yusuf. *The Holy Qur'an: Translation and Commentary*.
(Jedda: Dar Al-Qiblah for Islamic Literature, 1935)
- Arberry, Arthur J. *The Koran Interpreted*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983). Copyright, 1982.
- Dawood, N.J. *The koran*. (Hammondsworth: Penguin Books Ltd., 1956)
- Pic'thali, Marmaduke. *The Meaning of the Glorious Qur'an*.
(Karachi: T j Company, ———)

11. COMMENTARIES USED (All in Arabic)

- Jalali: JalaludDin Mu'mmad' ibn Ahmad al Ma'jisi n J l l udDin
AbdurRahman ibn abi Bakr as — Suyuti. *AL— Qur'a nul— Karim
wa bi— Hamishihi Tafsiru l— Imamain al— Jalilain*. (Beirut: The
Library of Muhammad N'had a — Kut. bi, ———)
- (ibn) Kathir, ImadudD'n abu l— Fida' Isma'il al— Qurashi. *Tafsiru
l— Qur' ni l— Alhim*. (Beirut: Daru l— Ma'rifa f r printing and
Publishing, 1969)
- Mausuli, Rashid al— khatib. *Aula ma Qil fi Ayati t— Tanzil*. (Mosul:
Daru l— Ku ub for Printing and Publishing, 1974)
- (az) Zamakhs'ari, abu l— Qasin Jara l Ia Mahmud ibn l' mar.
*al— kashshafu an Haqa' iqi t— Tanzil wa Uyuni l— Aqawil
fi wujuhi t— Ta'wil*. Cairo Library & Printing House of Mustafa
al— Bab l— Halabi & Sons, 1966)

DICTIONARIES USED (Arabic)

- ALESCO Arab League Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization). *al— M'jan al— Ar bi al— Asas*. (Basic Arabic Dictionary).
(Beirut: Laruos, 1989).
- Farahidi, abu AbleRaman al khali' ibn Ahmad. *kitab: l— 'in*.
Edited by Dr. Mahd l— Makhzumi and Dr. Ibrahim s— Sa
arra'i Vol. 5 Taghdal: Daru r— Rashid for Printing and
Publishing, 1982.
- Farra', abu Zakariy: Yahya Ziy d. *Ma'ani l— Qur'an*. Vol. 3. (d.2.
(Beirut: Alamu l— Kutub, 1980).

	Ahi	Arberry	Dawood	Pickthall
(أيد يوطشون بها)	يوطشون	to lay hold	hold	hold
بطاشم (فعل شرط)	ye exert your	you assault	you exercise your	you seize by force
the verb of the prbtasis	strong hand	you assault	power	seize
(جواب الشرط)	بطاشم	do you do it...	you act	
the verb of the apodosis	يوطش (فعل أن آزاد آن	to lay hold	he would have	would have fallen
وطاش بالذي ...	أشد بطاشا	stronger in valour	assaulted	upon
		stronger in power	mightier	mightier in prowess
(يوم نوطش...)	فوطش	We shall seize...	We shall assault	We will inflict...
الباطة الكبرى	... الباطة الكبرى	with a mighty	most mightily	with the greater
أشد بطاشا	stronger in power	onslaught	punishment	seizure
		stronger in valour	far greater in	mightier in prowess
			prowess	
بطاشنا (وقد أنزلتم بطاشنا)	Our Punishment	Our assault	Our vengeance	Our blow
وطاش (إن بطاش ريك...)	Grip (and power)	assault	vengeance	punishment

'truly' is an emphazier that has a sealing and a heightening effect, "but it is formal... For some speakers it sounds slightly archaic" (Quirk et al, 8,21).

Pickthall, alone, uses the interjection 'Lo!' to introduce the emphatic sense of the original nominal sentence, as if inviting the listener or the reader's attention to the following statement. He and Arberry use the usual SVC type of sentence. Arberry uses the technique of thematizing the disjunct 'surely' in order to give force to the statement.

Ali, Dawood and Pickthall use the of- genitive with regard to the (batsh) that is ascribed to 'the Lord' while Arberry uses the -s genitive.

Ali, Arberry and Pickthall use the Old-English possessive 'thy', while Dawood uses the common word 'your' as an alternative.

Ali fronts the predicate which consists of an adjective modified by the emphazier 'truly'. Dawood does the same with regard to the signature of the sentence. He fronts the predicate which takes the form of an adjective there, 'stern'. This, of course, would give the sense of a highly literary style.

III. CONCLUSION

The word (batsh) has occurred ten times in eight Verses of the Holy Qur'an. It has some special, though at times repeated, senses. The basic meaning, however, is strongly related to the use of force. This word and its derivatives have been used of Allah, Moses and people. It has been used in a variety of linguistic contexts.

The main problem with the translation of the notion (batsh) is that there is no agreement among commentators on one single meaning. This is one of the reasons behind the differences among translators too. The other reasons might be ascribed to the nature of the linguistic context and the subjective choice and understanding of the word on the part of the translator. As tabulated below, the vertical columns mainly show differences of personal understanding of the meaning of all occurrences in the text with regard to each translator. The horizontal arrangement, however, mainly shows differences among translators with regard to the translation of each occurrence of the word (batsh).

c. **Dawood**

Stern indeed is the vengeance of your Lord.

d. **Pickthall**

L ! the punishment of thy Lord is stern.

The four translators use four different words to refer to the Arabic word (batsh) in this Verse. They are:

- a. Grip (and power)
- b. assault
- c. vengeance
- d. punishment

The new thing here is the word 'Grip' which again is usually associated with 'seizing someone or something tightly'. Ali supports the idea of the 'Grip' with a parenthetical phrase which shows the idea of 'power'. However, the combination of the two ideas is somewhat neutral when compared with 'vengeance' or 'punishment'.

While the concept of the 'Grip' and 'power' can be applied positively or negatively, 'vengeance' and 'punishment' are usually applied by one party against another. The emphatic sense of (inna) is supported by the use of the particle (ta) that is attached to the beginning of the predicate (sahd-deed). It introduces the concept (batsh) and is given in the form of adverb in the first three translations:

- a. Truly...
- b. Surely...
- c. ..indeed...

Translators are not to blame since commentators interpret the word (batsh) using all these forms. Al-Qarri (p.370) says that the word (batsh) here means 'punishment'. Ibn Kathir (p.496) says that it means, vengeance. Az-Zamakshari (vol. 4, p.239) says that it means 'holding or seizing violently'. It seems that translators have used these meanings, each according to personal preference.

'Surely' is a disjunct that "is commonly used to invite agreement from the persons or person addressed" (Quirk et al, 8.84 N a).

'Indeed' is an emphasiser that has a heightening effect with non-gradable verbs" (Quirk et al 8.21).

The four suggested equivalents are:

- a. punishment
- b. assault
- c. vengeance
- d. blow

Once more, here is a clear example of the influence of commentators and lexicographers, together with subjectivity on the translators. The Basic Arabic Dictionary (ALESCO, 1989) says that (batshatun) is 'a blow or a powerful act of seizing someone or something.' Although this would support Pickthal's choice, the word 'blow' is very common. Az-Zamakhshari (vol. 4, p. 40) and al-Jalalain (p. 704) say that it means 'seizing someone in order to inflict punishment on him'. Ibn Kathir (vol. p. 266) says that (batshatansa) means our power and punishment.' These four alternatives, in fact, can all be used since they overlap with one another. The 'assault' can be staged to punish' or 'take vengeance on' someone for doing something bad. The 'blow' can also be intended for the same reason.

These four words are, as is clear, different in the way they are viewed. Although the common factor is the use of force, the behaviour and the mental attitude implied by each are not the same. While 'punishment' can be defined as imposing a penalty on someone for a fault, offence or violation; 'assault' is a sudden violent attack; 'blow' is a hard stroke with the hand or a weapon; and 'vengeance' is a punishment inflicted in retaliation for an injury or offence. Even though 'vengeance' is basically a punishment, it is done to someone in retaliation for harm he has done. If it is possible to see these two words as having some sort of affinity with regard to the basic meaning, it is not equally possible to see that 'assault' and 'blow' have the same thing. As a native speaker of Arabic, I can say that (batshatana) can possibly permit, 'punishment', 'assault', 'vengeance' and 'blow' as potential meanings.

11.8 Verse LXXXV. 12

«إن بطش ربك شديد.»

البروج/ ١٢

a. Ali

Truly strong is the Grip
(And power of thy Lord.

b. Arberry

Truly thy Lord's assault it is terrible.

Here is another example of the reference to power. In Verse XLIII.8 above, there has been mention of the destruction of peoples who were much more powerful than some other peoples. With regard to (batsh), the four translations offered the following :

- a. ... Stronger in power than they?
- b. ... Stronger in valour than they, ...
- c. ... far greater in power, ...
- d. ... mightier than these in prowess ...

In fact, Ali and Dawood use words that indicate power. Dawood uses the comparative 'greater' as a degree on the scale of power. Ali, on the other hand, compares the generations with regard to power, Arberry compares them as regards valour and Pickthall with regard to prowess. Of course, valour and prowess are highly formal, but they indicate something other than power. Ali and Dawood, therefore, have used the correct words. The other two are not very far away, though not precise. 'Mightier' is formal, while 'stronger' is common.

Al-Jalla'n (p.68) says that (batsh) here has the meaning of 'might' or 'power'. Ibn Kathir (vol.4, p.229) says that the reference is made to the fact that they were greater in number and power.

11.7 Verse LI 36i

«وَلَقَدْ أَنْذَرَهُمْ بَطْشَتَنَا فَتَمَارَوْا بِالنَّدْرِ»
القمر / ٣٦

- a. Ali

And (Lut) did warn them
Of Our Punishment, but
They disputed about the Warning.

- b. Arberry

He had warned them of our assault, but they
disputed the warnings.

- c. Dawood

He had warned them of Our vengeance, but they
doubted his warnings.

- d. Pickthall

And he indeed had warned them of Our blow but they did doubt
the warnings.

We are given here four different equivalents for the word (hatanshatana). According to Arabic grammar, (batshatana) is not an infinitive but an instance of the infinitive. The infinitive is (batsh).

thing. Pickthall is approximately on the same lines. Dawood follows al-Qarri in translating the Verse with the view that (baish) means 'punishment'. Arberry uses the verb 'assault' that semantically functions in conformity with the remainder of the Verse. The assault, therefore, can be meant to inflict punishment or use strong arm against transgressors. However, the diversity of opinion among commentators and lexicographers, in addition to the translator's subjective views, are the main reasons behind the diversity of translations with regard to notion (baish). Hermeneutically, az-Zamakhshari (vol.3, p. 502) says that (al-batshata I-kubra) is the Day of Resurrection. Al-Jalalain (p.657), al-Farra' (vol. 3, 0.40) say that (al-batshata I-kubra) is a reference to the battle of Badr, where and when Allah inflicted His stern punishment on the infidels.

11.6. Verse L. 36

« وكم أهلكنا قبلاهم من قرن هم أشد منهم بطشاً فنقبوا في البلاد هل من محيص . »

٣٦ / ق

a. Ali

But how many
Generations before them
Did We destroy (for their
Sins),- stronger in power
Than They? then did they
Wander through the land:
Was there any place
Of escape (for them)?

b. Arberry

How many a generation we destroyed before them that was stronger in valour than they, then they searched about in the land; was there any asylum?

c. Dawood

How many generations, far greater in prowess, have we destroyed before them! They searched the entire land: but would they find any refuge?

d. Pickthall

And how many a generation we destroyed before them, who were mightier than these in prowess so that they overran the land! Had they any place of refuge (when the judgment came)?

11.5 Verse XLIV.16

« يوم نبطش البطشة الكبرى انا منتقمون .
الدخان / ١٦

a. Ali

One day We shall seize
You with a mighty onslaught;
We will indeed (then)
Exact Retribution !

b. Arberry

upon the day when We shall assault most mightily,
then We shall take Our vengeance.

c. Dawood

But on the day We will inflict on them
the sternest punishment and avenge Ourself.

d. Pickthall

On the day when We shall seize them with the greater
seizure (then), in truth We shall punish.

Generally, Arabic uses the *al-maf'ul al-mutlaq* (Lit. the absolute object), especially that type which describes a quality or emphasizes an action, in order to give force to the meaning intended. In English, this is best rendered by the use of an adverb of manner. Arberry uses the adverbial construction in his translation of this Verse that it looks very much English with Qur'anic content. Ali and Pickthall use the verb 'seize' together with the prepositional phrases that would fill the place of the adverbials. Arberry uses 'assault', and Dawood uses 'inflict'. These verbs are used in association with certain phrases that consist of an adjective+noun. Dawood and Pickthall use the objective pronoun 'them', Ali, 'you', while Arberry uses no objective pronouns at all. The Qur'anic Text itself uses no explicit objective pronouns with regard to the verb (*nabtushu*) in order to make the reference general; i.e. the people to be punished.

To refer to (*al-batshata I-kubra*), Ali uses the absolute form of 'mighty' in 'a mighty onslaught', Arberry uses the adverb 'mightily' premodified by the superlative degree indicator 'most', Dawood uses the superlative degree of the word 'stern', while Pickthall uses 'the greater' as if there were a comparison between two things.

Ali, it seems, follows the Commentary of al-Jalalain (p,655) in his translation of the notion (*batsh*) as referring to 'seizing someone or some

everyday's language, which would appeal to the common reader.

11.4. Verse XLIII.8

«فأهلكنا أشد منهم بطشاً ومضى مثل الأولين»
الزخرف / ٨

a. Ali

So We destroyed (them)-
Stronger in power than these;-
And (thus) has passed on
The Parable of the peoples
Of old.

b. Arberry

so We destroyed men stronger in valour than they, and the example
of the ancients passed away.

c. Dawood

We utterly destroyed them, though were mightier than these.

d. Pickthall

Then we destroyed men mightier than these in prowess; and the
example of the men of old hath gone (before them).

Excepting Dawood's, all translations look very formal and employ approximately the same structure. Ali tries to be as close as possible to the Arabic structure. He and Arberry use the comparative degree of 'strong'. Dawood and Pickthall use the comparative degree of 'mighty'. Ali uses 'stronger in power', Arberry uses a more literary word, 'stronger in valour', 'though with a different meaning., Dawood finds the word 'mightier' sufficient to be an equivalent, and Pickthall's 'prowess' is another example of literary or highly-formal style.

All Arab commentators and lexicographers, however, agree that (batsh) here means "power, force, or even strength". On this basis, Arberry and Pickthall have used inaccurate equivalents for (batsh). One does not, however, preclude the possibility of using the word (batsh) here to mean something other than the suggestions of commentators, The association of 'strength' and 'valour' in Arberry's translation and 'might' and 'prowess' in Pickthall's could then be regarded as examples of the linguistic and stylistic charm with which they have translated the Verse. Dawood's translation, on the other hand, is very brief and direct. The main problem with it is that it drops the second part of the Verse which mentions the ancients.

b. Arberry

But when he would have assaulted the man who was an enemy to them both, the man said, 'Moses, dost thou desire to slay me, even as thou slewest a living soul yesterday? Thou only desirest to be a tyrant in the land; thou desirest not to be of them that put things right.'

c. Dawood

And when Moses was about to lay his hands on their enemy, the Egyptian said: 'Moses, would you kill me as you killed that wretch yesterday? You are surely seeking to be a tyrant in this land, not an upright man'.

d. Pickthall

And when he would have fallen upon the man who was an enemy unto them both, he said: 'O Moses! wouldst thou kill me as thou didst kill a person yesterday? Thou wouldst be nothing but a tyrant in the land, thou wouldst not be of the reformers.'

Here is another example of the notion (batsh). The four translators view this differently. Ali uses, 'to lay hold of', Arberry, 'to assault', Dawood, 'to lay his hands on' and Pickthall, 'to fall upon'. The main idea implied by Ali and Dawood's translation is that of catching or holding someone firmly, while the situation is different with regard to Arberry and Pickthall. But whether it is a matter of laying hold of, assaulting, or falling upon someone, the contextual meaning is further explained by the later mention of killing or slaying, which comes in the form of a question. Taking such associations into consideration, the word (batsh) here might have some shade of meaning of the act of killing, as suggested by the question. However, to lay hold of, and to lay one's hands on someone are less grave than to assault or fall upon him. Both cases are even less grave than slaying. The idea of laying hold of, assaulting or falling upon someone can be coupled with later mention of tyranny or cruel use of power: "Thou only desirest to be a tyrant in the land, and not to be of them that put things right." On this basis, it is believed that all the translations can be blended together into the following: 'to lay hold of, or assault, people with a view to kill them and be tyrannically, or wrongfully powerful'.

Ali and Arberry use the literary term, 'slay', while Dawood and Pickthall use the common word, 'kill' to refer to the Arabic word, (yaqtul).

Ali, Arberry and Pickthall use highly formal, or literary languages: 'thou', 'dost', 'thou', 'desirest', 'wouldst', etc, while Dawood uses

prefers the word Envoys) of Allah. According to Ali and Pickthal, this Verse is a question following two other questions, while Arberry regards only the two preceding Verse (Vs 128 and 129) as question, and Dawood regards as question only part of Verse 128. To clarify the situation, the following citation will be from Arberry's translation; beginning with Verse 123 and ending with Verse 131;

Ad cried lies to the Envoys when their brother Hood said to them, 'will you not be godfearing? I am for you a faithful Messenger, so fear you God, and obey you me, I ask of you no wage for this; my wage falls only upon the Lord of all Being. What, do you build on every prominence a sign, sporting, and do you take to your castles, haply to dwell forever? When you assault, you assault like tyrants! So fear you God, and obey me;... Commentators, such as az-Zamakhshari, ibn Kathir, al-Jalalain and al-Mausuli; and lexicographers such as ibn Mandhur, al-Farahidi and al-Qarri, do not give the exact meaning of this word in this context. they only say that this (batsh) is performed tyrannically and wrongfully, either with a sword or a whip. This (batsh) can have the form of merciless beating and killing.

11.3 Verse xxviii.19

«فلما أن أراد أن يبطش بالذي هو عدو لهما قال ياموسى أتريد أن تقتلني كما قتلت نفساً بالامس. أن تريد إلا أن تكون جباراً في الارض يوماً تريد ان تكون من المصلحين»

القصة ص 19 /

- a. Ali
- Then when he decided to lay
 Hold of the man who was
 An enemy to both of them,
 That man said; "O Moses!
 Is it thy intention to slay me
 As thou slewest a man
 Yesterday? Thy intention is
 None other than to become
 A powerful violent man
 In the land, and not to be
 One who sets things right?

strong-arm adj (1901): having or using undue force.

strong-arm vt (ca 1903): 1. to use force on: ASSAULT.
2. to rub by force .

The Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English states the following: strongarm adj using (unnecessary) force.

The Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English states that 'strong-arm' is used of methods, tactics, etc. to mean 'violent; bullying ,

The modern use of 'strong arm', however, has expanded to include positive connotations. The Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English offers the following within the entry, 'strong':

sense 10. *the strong arm of the law* = the police and forces of law especially considered for their power.

It seems that Ali has used a late Middle-English expression, rather metaphorically, as an English equivalent for the Arabic notion (*batsh*) in this Verse, and left the modern alternative 'strong arm.' The reason behind this is thought to be the translator's desire to use archaic style to give more weight to the English translation of the Verse.

Pickthall, however, goes back to the basic function of the hand, i.e. 'holding, grasping, or more broadly to cover 'the taking possession of something by force', especially when this is done by people who do it tyrannically. The four translations, 'exerting a strong hand', 'assaulting', 'exercising power' and 'seizing by force' refer to the use of force, but differently: while Ali and Dawood translate the Text as simply referring to the 'tyrannical use of power', Arberry prefers 'assault' which indicates a sudden violent attack, and Pickthall uses the expression, 'seize by force', which straddles both 'the basic function performed by hands' and 'the taking possession of something by force'. The use of 'men of absolute power', 'tyrants', (twice), and 'cruel tyrants' is another reinforcing element in the possibility of interpreting the notion (*batsh*) in this context as referring to the (tyrannical) use of power..

As for form, Ali and Pickthall render the Verse in the form of question, Arberry uses an exclamation mark and Dawood uses a period indicating that it is nothing more than a declarative statement. This Verse, however, is a continuation of a dialogue, or a number of points preached by the Apostle Hud (Arberry prefers the spelling, Hood). In the dialogue, the Apostle Hud addresses the People of Ad when they disbelieved the Messengers (Arberry

a. Ali

"And when ye exert
Your strong hand,
Do ye do it like men
of absolute power?"

b. Arberry

...When you assault, you assault like tyrants!

c. Dawood

...When you exercise your power, you act like cruel tyrants.

d. Pickthall

And if you seize by force, seize ye as tyrants?

The Qur'anic text repeats the word (*batashtum*) in the main clause of the conditional construction mainly to give force to the general meaning of the sentence. In English sometimes, this repetition is rendered by the use of a proform.

Ali uses the proform 'do', and Dawood uses the lexical verb ACT, as a proform to refer to the verb mentioned in the subordinate clause. Arberry and Pickthall, however, repeat the words used twice. They do so, it seems in their attempt to keep as forceful as possible the tone intended by Arabic Text. The use of the verb 'ACT' and the 'DO-proform' however, seems to be more forceful as an English equivalent than a repeated form: There are four different forms to refer to the Arabic word (*batashtum*) in the above translations. The only thing common here is the use of force.

The use of the 'strong hand' indicates the use of the force. The 'hand' itself refers to the power used in ruling or dealing with other people. The Shorter Oxford English Dictionary states the following with regard to the expression 'strong hand':

Strong hand. (Now rare) [Late M.E.] The exercise of superior power; the use of force.

We notice that 'strong hand' is described as (Now rare) and (Late Middle English). This Late Middle-English concept, in fact, has given way to modern 'strong-arm'. The Webster's states the following as regards 'strong -arm,;

In addition, no commentator has ever given a special interpretation of the usage of the word (yabtushun). The reason is believed to be the reference to the basic function of holding performed by the hands, otherwise they could have given it, at least, for the sake of clarity or disambiguating the context. That is why all four translators have translated (yabtushun) into English using "hold" or "lay hold". So, the word (batsh) is interpreted as having the sense of "holding" rather than any other suggested idea.

Arberry and Pickthall use the conjunction 'wherewith', while Ali and Dawood use the preposition 'with'. Although, according to the Webster's, 'with' (before 12 c) is older than 'wherewith' (13 c), the former is commoner in formal and informal style. "Wherewith" has a sense of an archaism. In the Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English, 'wherewith' is described as (old use). In the Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English, it is not given at all. The usage of 'wherewith' is perhaps done on purpose to give the translation a flavour or mark of the text's age as belonging to the remote past. Ali and Arberry use the phrasal verb 'to lay hold', while Dawood and Pickthall use the single lexical verb 'hold'.

All four translators use the verb 'have' as operator; whether directly as in *b*, *c* and *d*, or indirectly as in *a*, where the operator 'have' is ellipted. It might have been mere coincidence because "this use of HAVE as operator is much more common in BrE than in AmE, where it is formal as well as restricted." (Quirk et al, 1972; 10.54 N). The transitive lexical verb HAVE" can be constructed either as an auxiliary (without DO-periphrasis) or as a lexical verb (with DO-periphrasis). In the stative sense of possession HAVE is often (especially in BrE) constructed as an auxiliary. AmE prefers the DO-periphrasis." (Quirk et al, 1972; 3.18 N). There is, however, no semantic difference between the two constructions. The only thing to be noted here is that HAVE can be used both as a stative or a dynamic verb, as an auxiliary or lexical verb.

The use of the coordinator OR usually indicates an alternative. The Arabic particle (au) is called in Arabic 'the al-Munqati'a (approx.= "a disjunct"). In such leading questions suggestive of a NO-answer as the above, the alternative is somewhat added to something earlier, in the sense that what is being stated is an addition functioning as a reinforcing argument.

order of their occurrence in the Holy Qur'an. The occurrence of the cited items in the present work will be according to the alphabetical order of the names of the translators. The text of the Verse will be given in Arabic, followed by the translations, then the present writer's comment. The work is provided with a final section of conclusions. The main thing to be noted here is the dependence on both the lexical meaning and the linguistic context of each occurrence.

II: THE TRANSLATED VERSES STUDIED

II.1 Verse VII. 195

«أَلَهُمْ أَرْجُلٌ يَمْشُونَ بِهَا أَمْ لَهُمْ أَيْدٍ يَبْطِشُونَ بِهَا أَمْ لَهُمْ أَعْيُنٌ يَبْصُرُونَ بِهَا أَمْ لَهُمْ آذَانٌ يَسْمَعُونَ بِهَا»

الإعراف/ ١٩٥

a. Ali

Have they feet to walk with?

Or hands to lay hold with?

Or eyes to see with?

Or ears to hear with?

b. Arberry

...What, have they feet wherewith they walk, or have they hands wherewith they lay hold, or have they eyes wherewith they see, or have they ears wherewith they give ear?

c. Dawood

Have they feet to walk with? Have they hands to hold with? Have the eyes to see with? Have they ears to hear with?

d. Pickthall

Have they feet wherewith they walk, or have they hands wherewith they hold, or have they eyes wherewith they see, or have they ears wherewith they hear?

From the preceding and the following Verses, it becomes clear that this is a dialogue between Allah, the addressor, and the pagans, who worship besides Allah, deities made of wood or stone. The pronoun 'they' in the Verse refers to these deities. The mention of the usual physical function of the feet, eyes and ears in connection with walking, seeing and hearing respectively leads to the assumption that the 'hands' are consequently associated with the basic function, of catching or holding. Therefore, the linguistic and the logical context makes this point clear enough to be interpreted this way.

nings. But to generalize one meaning is to make mistakes, or even to commit blasphemy, because, for example, it is religiously unlawful to use (batsh) with its "tyrannical use of power" of Allah.

According to Arab lexicographers and commentators of the Holy Qur'an, the basic element of the meaning of the word (batsh) is 'holding or seizing someone or something'. Some thasaet the verb (batash) a means, "to attack suddenly and destroy, annihilate, wipe out, exterminate or extirpate". In Standard Arabic, for example (fulanun yabtushu bi-l (ilmi) would mean, "So-and-so learns very quickly". Al-Farahidi (vol. 6, p. 240) says that (batsh) means "to seize in an assault; to grip something violently". Hans Wehr provides the following:

بطش batasa i u (bats) to attack with violence; to bear down on, fall upon s.o. (ب or ني) ; to knock out (s.o.); to hit, strike (ب s.th.), land with a thud (ب on).

بطش bats strength, power, force, violence; courage, valour, bravery; oppression, tyranny.

Some of the senses given by Hans Wehr can further be interpreted. The Longman Dictionary of Phrasal Verbs, (1983), gives the following definitions, in addition to some irrelevant meanings:

to bear down on = to punish (someone) severely.

to fall upon s.o. = to attack (something or someone) eagerly.

to knock s.o. out = to defeat (someone) or destroy (something) completely; make (someone or something) helpless or useless.

Although these senses are somewhat different, they in fact represent all the uses of this word in different contexts. Commentators agree to these senses because each time the word (batsh) or any of its derivatives occurs, it gives a special sense. In the Holy Qur'an, it is used of Allah, Moses and communities in which apostles lived. This variety of contexts has led to the existence of a variety of standpoints or senses and the eventual vague interpretability on the part of commentators and translators.

L3 PROCEDURE

The present work makes use of four translated texts of the Holy Qur'an. There are only eight Verses which contain this word, or any of its derivatives. Therefore, these eight Verses have been taken out according to the

**THE TRANSLATIONS OF THE NOTION (batsh)
IN THE HOLY QUR'AN: A CONTRASTIVE STUDY**

By

JAMIL HUMMADA MUGALLAD

Department of Translation, College of Arts
University of Mosul

I. INTRODUCTION

I.1. GENERAL REMARKS

The translations of the Holy Qur'an into foreign languages, especially English, have been an object of great controversy. This controversy stems from theological and linguistic considerations. Some of these translations contain many archaisms. They even isolate the Verses, number them and show them as independent wholes. Hence, they affect the dynamic force of the text. In addition, literal translations suffer from the fact that an English word is not always the exact equivalent of an Arabic word (and vice versa). This is usually ascribed to both cultural and linguistic differences between the two languages. It is, therefore, difficult, though not impossible, to transfer accurately into English every shade of meaning contained in the words of the Qur'an in a free translation that can convey in English the meaning of an Arabic sentence as a whole, if that meaning is not ambiguous in the original text.

One of the problematic notions for translators is the notion (batsh) in the Holy Qur'an. The word which refers to this notion together with its derivatives, unfortunately, has posed a controversial issue for translators, because in the Holy Qur'an it refers to different things in different contexts. These different meanings will be the subject of the present work. Standard Arabic today uses this word and its derivatives with negative connotations strictly related to the tyrannical use of power or force against people.

I.2. DEFINITION

The main problem of translating the word (batsh) arises from the fact that it has different senses in different contexts. It is eligible to say that this word is context-dependent. On this basis, it is possible to subdivide the notion (batsh) into further subnotions to cover the whole range of its mea-