

Tenor of Quranic Rhetorical Questions: with reference to two English Translations

Ibrahim I.I. Najjar^{1*}, Soh Bee Kwee¹, Thabet Ahmad Abu-Alhaj²

¹*Faculty of Languages and Linguistics, University of Malaya, Malaysia*

²*Academy of Islamic Studies, University of Malaya, Malaysia*

Corresponding Author: Ibrahim I.I. Najjar, E-mail: ibrahim99@siswa.um.edu.my

ARTICLE INFO

Article history

Received: December 15, 2018

Accepted: February 12, 2019

Published: March 31, 2019

Volume: 8 Issue: 2

Advance access: February 2019

Conflicts of interest: None

Funding: None

ABSTRACT

A rhetorical question is that question whose form does not match its function. In other words, a rhetorical question has the form of a question, but does not expect an answer. Rather, it aims to serve a specific rhetorical function. This study investigates the two English translations that are used in the translation of the Quranic rhetorical questions. In particular, this is a comparative study that aims to determine to what extent the two English translations sustain the tenor of the Quranic assertion, negation, testing, denial and exclamation rhetorical questions. To this end, the study makes use of Halliday and Hasan's (1985) context of situation and especially the tenor variable in the comparison between the two English translations, namely "the Koran Interpreted" by Arberry (1955) and "the Noble Quran: English translation of the meanings and commentary" (1996) by al-Hilali and Khan. The study concludes that the tenor of the Quranic rhetorical questions encounters some distortions in the two English translations. Therefore, it is better for translators to understand the context of situation of the source text's rhetorical question before the process of translation.

Key words: Meaning, Quran, Rhetorical Question, Tenor, Translation

INTRODUCTION

Translation is the transference of one language into another, where the ultimate goal of the translator is keeping the original message of the source text in the translated language. Religious translation is not an easy process. It in fact requires professional translators since religious texts are sensitive ones. According to Lehrberger (1982, p. 214), religious texts are "associated with specific contexts or situations and with specific functions of language in those contexts". Ilyas (1989, p.89) provides that the meaning of the religious text is not easily understood as there is more than one interpretation for the textual material of the text. The Quran, Allah's word to the Prophet Muhammad (PBUH), has been a good chance for translators. The Quran has been translated into different languages so that Muslims especially non-speakers of Arabic understand the word of Allah. However, the meaning of the Quranic text faces lots of changes and distortions in the process of translation. This can be attributed to firstly the Quranic language itself and secondly to the target language. The language of the Quran is in fact very rhetorical and cannot be compared to the Arabic normal language. AbdelWali (2007, p.2) confirms this by saying that the text of the Quran is a linguistic miracle that is characterised by semantic, syntactic, rhetorical, cultural and phonetic features which no Arabic text is equivalent to. According to el-Zeiny (2009, p.36), the Quran is a distinctive text which cannot be put in

the list of texts "informative", "expressive" or "vocative" as mentioned by (Newmark, 1988, p.15).

In the Quran, there is a great deal of rhetorical questions. A rhetorical question is that question which does not expect an answer. It is used to fulfil a function intended by the speaker. According to Larson (1984, p.257) "the label, rhetorical questions, has often been used to indicate interrogative grammatical forms which are used with a non-question meaning". In translation, the Quranic rhetorical questions must be seriously considered by the translator so that he/she does not translate them wrongly. The translator has to differentiate between the rhetorical question and the real question. Further, because of the different functions of rhetorical questions, the translator must firstly determine the function of such questions before any translation. Therefore, it is important for the translator to take care of the context of situation of the RQ since it plays the greater role in generating the meaning of the RQ, since the religious language is better understood by the context of situation. One important matter regarding this is the relationship of the participants or interlocutors who take role in the rhetorical question. That is, understanding the tenor of discourse of the rhetorical question as one important variable in the context of situation is important to save the intended function of the rhetorical question in the process of translation. Hence, this study compares between two English translations that are used in the translation of the Quranic rhetorical questions with a concentration

on the tenor of such rhetorical questions to discover to what extent it is sustained.

LITERATURE REVIEW

About Rhetorical Question

The rhetorical question is a visible notion that exists in all languages spoken by people. According to Siemund (2001, p.1015), "arguably, rhetorical questions can be found in all languages of the world, and they also appear to be functioning in a comparable manner." Moreover, Hackstein (2004, p.167) emphasizes rhetorical questions as a across-linguistic phenomenon in both written and oral discourse. The rhetorical question is generally seen as a non-seeking information question. Larson (1984, p.257) explains that "the label, rhetorical questions, has often been used to indicate interrogative grammatical forms which are used with a non-question meaning". Further, Larson states that the speaker makes use of a grammatical form which its basic use indicates that it's a question, but the speaker's purpose is not seeking information; rather, he/she might want to command, request, emphasize and etc. Larson (1984, p.257) then concludes that such a grammatical skewing is called a rhetorical question. According to Abioye (2011, p.291), the rhetorical question is a figure of speech that comes in the form of a question used for its persuasive effect. Rhetorical questions thus seem to have a great role in languages so that they have taken great attention from scholars. In Arabic, rhetorical questions are extensively studied due to their widely occurrence in the Quran. The "rhetorical question" in Arabic is called "istfham balagi" which means the interrogation that deviates its basic meaning and indicates another one. Ranganath et al. (2016, p.1) remark that rhetorical questions do not give the message or meaning in an explicit way. Rather, their messages are implicitly understood from their contexts. This is also confirmed by Bhattasali et al. (2015, p.743), where that state that the question is deemed rhetorical by considering its context of situation.

With respect to translation, Larson (1974) confirms the importance of considering the context of situation of the rhetorical question by further stating the significance of "how the communicative situation and the attitude of the speaker relate to the grammatical forms used". That is, considering these important factors according to Larson (p.14) would provide "a more careful analysis of the ST for the translation purposes." al-Malik (1995, p.137) remarks that in translating rhetorical questions found in religious texts, the context of situation must be considered since it plays the greater role in generating the meaning. el-Sa'adany (2010, p.8) explains that language and especially the religious language is best understood by context of situation; therefore, in his study of the translation of the rhetorical questions in Hadith, he focused on the context of situation.

Rhetorical Questions in Arabic

Rhetorical questions have been studied by Arab rhetoricians and grammarians since they have a great role to play in the

Quran. Rhetorical questions have been discussed by the grammarians when they tried to clarify and explain the different faces and uses of interrogation in Arabic. Briefly, an interrogative is the grammatical classification of a sentence type that is used for the sake of getting an answer. Thus, grammatically, questions are usually referred to as interrogatives in form. Therefore, Arab grammarians defined interrogation as a question that is posed by the speaker to get an answer from the hearer. In relation to this, the Arabic word for interrogation is "al-Istifham". Etymologically speaking, the word "al-Istifham"/interrogation/is a verbal noun derived from the verb "Istafhama" which means asking for understanding (Bofama, 2014, p.11). Moreover, "al-Istifham" is related to the noun "al-Fihim"/understanding/which means understanding things by heart by means of interrogative tools (al-Fayroz Abadi, 2001, p.1056). Like English, interrogative sentences in Arabic are divided into yes/no question and wh/question. This division is related to the tool used to form the question. The question particles "هـ"/hamza/ and "لـ"/hal/form yes/no questions while the question nouns like "مـ" (*man*)/who/, "نـ" (*ayna*)/where/, "متـ" (*mata*)/when/and etc. form wh/questions (Fakih, 2012, p.68). The grammarians noticed the deviation of the Arabic question, whether in the form of yes/no question or wh/question, from its original meaning, where it gave rise to another meaning. We find for example al-Mubarak (1997, p.227) who mentioned that "the question in Arabic is not always real. Sometimes you might notice that it carries a rhetorical meaning". Likewise, Sibawayh stated that the question in Arabic might sometime skew its normal meaning and give another one. To explain this, he talked about the rebuke function (Ibn Fares, 1998, p.52).

In the same way as the grammarians, Arab rhetoricians paid great attention to rhetorical questions. Generally, the rhetoricians defined the question as asking to get information from the hearer. However, they also found that it is not always used for this purpose. In this context, Sa'ad al-Deen al-Taftazani was the first rhetorician who noticed that questions in Arabic deviate their meanings and give others. He said that "these questions are sometimes used with non-interrogative purposes" (Aida, 2012, p.62). By the same way, al-Subbki (1992) in his book "A'ros al-afrah" stated that "interrogation is a kind of request which might not be used for this purpose." The explanation of the Quranic text by Abdul al-Qahir al-Gurgani (2008), who is considered the chief of Arab rhetoricians, benefited others who came after him. He considered the sentence from rhetorical and linguistic point of views and stated that it has different meanings. His theory of Nazem (theory of composition) paved the way to show different meanings for Arabic rhetorical questions in different chapters of his books that were attributed to interrogation in Arabic especially the one talks about foregrounding and backgrounding of interrogation in Arabic. Thus, the rhetoricians considered that the question in Arabic might be real and might also be rhetorical to serve some other meanings. These rhetorical meanings or function are not arbitrarily generated. However, there are some factors which form the basis for them. The context of the question, the speaker's intention, the relationship between the speaker and the hearer

and also the structure of the question are important for the function of the question (al-Balakhi, 2007, p.54).

Functions of Arabic Rhetorical Questions

الإنكار/Denial

Denying something means refusing of admitting something. al-Balakhi (2007, p.101) stated that denial is a means used by a speaker to make the hearer be aware of himself/herself and feel that he/she did or said a wrong thing, lied or pretended that he/she is able to do something. Denial is of two types:

الإنكار التوبيخي/denial indicates rebuke

To rebuke someone about a thing happened in the past. In other words, the thing which happened must not had happened. Further, this kind of denial is also used to rebuke someone because of something happening at the moment or expected to be in future (al-Balakhi, 2007, p.103).

الإنكار التكميبي/Denial indicates refutation

To refute the sayings and thoughts of liars. Abbas (1997, p.194) mentioned that this kind of denial is used to refute the sayings and thoughts of someone in the past and present.

التقرير/Assertion

To indirectly make the listener to confess on things he/she has or knows (al-Ameri, et al, 2012, p.86).

النفي/Negation

Linguistically, the word negation in Arabic revolves around ejection and the cessation of a particular issue. Using a question with the function of negation influences the hearer and makes the speech more elegant.

الاختبار/Testing

Another function for rhetorical questions is testing. In this context, the speaker tries not to get an answer from the hearer, rather, he/she tries to test the hearer (Rajdal, 2013, p.54).

التعجب/Exclamation

A question that carries this function is used to make the hearer astonished. According to (al-Balakhi, 2007) exclamation is related to the emotions of Man due to something new or unknown. The exclamation function is expressed by all question tools in Arabic and the difference between them is related to the psychological status that accompanies the situation.

METHODOLOGY

Data Type

The data for the current study originated from the Quran. One rhetorical question that bears a function from the

functions discussed above is studied and compared with the two English translations being “the Koran Interpreted” by Arberry (1955) and “the Noble Quran: English translation of the meanings and commentary” (1996) by al-Hilali and Khan. For better understanding such functions, “al-Kashaf” Interpretation of al-Zamakhshri (2009) is used.

Context of Situation

According to SFL, the context of situation determines the meaning of a text, sentence or word. In (1985) Halliday and Hassan talked about the context of situation or “register”, where they claimed that register is studied under three variables which are “field, tenor and mode”. Each of these variables represents a different aspect in the world. Field focuses on the subject matter. It is also about what is being engaged in. Or as Eggins (2004, p.90) says “what the language is being used to talk about” in different situations. Tenor as the second variable revolves around the participants in the situation. It uncovers the role, nature and status of participants. It focuses on what social relation exists between or among the participants. As the relation could have an effect on the formality of the language, it could be persistent and or temporary. The status of the participants “equal or unequal”, “the affective involvement” “low or high” and “frequent or occasional” clarifies their relation. Mode, on other hand, is about the role that is being played by language in the situation. It cares about the participants’ expectations of the language. It looks at the organization of language and thus the participants’ intentions. Mode channel might be “(spoken, written)”. Halliday and Hassan (1985) mentioned also three metafunctions of language which are the ideational, interpersonal and textual metafunctions. These metafunctions have related relations with the three variables mentioned above. The ideational metafunction deals with how the text represents the external reality and is related to the field variable. The interpersonal metafunction is about the speakers and the hearers’ relationship and is related to the tenor variable. The textual metafunction deals with the structure of information, cohesion and the thematic structure and is related to the mode variable (Halliday, 1987, p.143). This study does only focus on the tenor variable to see to what extent it is sustained in the two English translations of the Quranic rhetorical questions.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

Context of Assertion

ST: أَفِي قُلُوبِهِمْ مَرَضٌ أَمْ ارْتَابُوا أَمْ يَخَافُونَ أَنْ يَجِيفَ اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِمْ وَرَسُولَهُ؟

TT1: Is there a disease in their hearts? Or do they doubt or fear lest Allah and His Messenger (SAW) should wrong them in judgement. al-Hilali and Khan.

TT2: What, is there sickness in their hearts, or are they in doubt, or do they fear that God may be unjust towards them and His Messenger? Arberry.

TT1: The ST is clearly directed from Allah towards the disbelievers, where He asserts that these people have their hearts sick (no faith). He also asserts that they doubt and

fear that Allah and His messenger will wrong them in judgment. Thus, three important participants are found in such a question. They Allah who forms the superior authority, the messenger (the Prophet Muhammad) who maintains a high status, and the disbelievers who represent a lower status. This assertion of Allah is due to: firstly, Allah is the all-knowing of everything. He knows the features of these people. Secondly, the behaviors of the disbelievers indicate their feelings towards Allah and His messenger. In this ST, the participant related to the disbelievers is mentioned four times as personal pronouns that come two object pronouns and two subject pronouns. In fact, having this participant in this way is important. The object pronouns show the confirmation of Allah that there is a disease in their heart. Having the subject pronouns shows their behavior and feeling as doubting in Allah and his messenger. In the translation, the translators do in fact sustain the role played by the disbelievers in the ST. On the part of the other participants, Allah and His messenger, they are also maintained with their role and status. All in all, the participants of this RQ are saved. As a result, the tenor of this RQ is saved.

TT2: The participants of the RQ as seen above are three. They are Allah who forms the superior authority, the messenger (the Prophet Muhammad) who maintains a high status, and the disbelievers who represent a lower status. This RQ comes as an assertion from Allah that the disbelievers' hearts are sick (no faith) and that they always doubt in Allah and His messenger and fear that Allah and His messenger will be unjust toward them in judgment. As mentioned above, the participant related the disbelievers is mentioned four times as personal pronouns, two object pronouns and two subject pronouns to assert that they have no faith and to show their doubt toward Allah and His messenger. Such feeling and behavior of this participant are in fact maintained by the translator. However, a look at the participant related to the messenger (فلوسر), it is not saved in this rendering. This is due to a structural shift occurred in the translation. The ST states that the disbelievers doubt and fear that Allah and His messenger will be unjust toward them in judgment. However, in the TT2, this description is changed. According to the translator, the disbelievers doubt and fear that Allah will be unjust towards them and His messenger. The translator changes the role of the messenger from the one doubted in and afraid from to the one who doubts and fears. Therefore, the tenor of this Quranic rhetorical question is highly distorted.

Context of Negation

ST: وَمَنْ أَحْسَنُ مِنَ اللَّهِ صِبْغَةً؟

TT1: And which Sibghah (religion) can be better than Allah's? al-Hilali and Khan.

TT2: and who is there that baptizes fairer than God? Arberry.

TT1: The tenor of this Quranic rhetorical question involves two participants, Allah and the negated person. This rhetorical question is generally directed from Allah to all human beings to negate that there is someone from them to give people a religion better than Him. Thus, the two participants found in this rhetorical question are the superior authority

represented by Allah and the negated one who comes in a lower status. The superior authority is seen as a lexical pronoun "الله"/Allah/. The negated one is understood from the question noun "مَنْ" (*man*)/who/which means/no one/ (Abu-Haiyan, 1993, p.584). Even though the participant related to Allah is the main one here and although the negated one is represented in a lower status, but its role is important. It is the one focused upon in this rhetorical question. In the translation, however, the tenor of the ST is partially distorted. This is said here since there is no role or appearance for the negated person/human being in the TT1. Hence, the tenor of the ST is partially distorted.

TT2: As mentioned above, the current rhetorical question involves two participants represented by the superior authority related to Allah and the negated one/human beings comes in a lower status. As mentioned above, besides being the addresser, Allah comes in the ST as a lexical noun "الله"/Allah/. The negated one/person is understood from the question noun "مَنْ" (*man*)/who/which means/no one/(Abu-Haiyan, 1993, p.584). As stated before, the negated one although is a lower status, but it has an important role in the ST. It is the thing that the superior authority talks about and negates. Contrary to the TT1, this participant is saved in the TT2. However, the status of the main participant represented by the superior authority, Allah, is distorted in the translation. As it is seen, Allah is stripped of His status. The major problem is found in the translation of the lexical noun "صِبْغَةً" (Sibghah) into the verb "baptizes". Using the verb "baptizes" to render the noun "صِبْغَةً", the translator compares Allah to a priest who baptizes people. Hence, the tenor of this rhetorical question is partially distorted.

Context of Testing

ST: نَنْظُرُ أَتَهْتَدِي أَمْ تَكُونُ مِنَ الَّذِينَ لَا يَهْتَدُونَ؟

TT1: that we may see *whether she will be guided (to recognise her throne), or she will be one of those not guided.* al-Hilali and Khan

TT2: and we shall behold *whether she is guided or if she is of those that are not guided.* Arberry

TT1: The tenor of this Quranic rhetorical question involves three participants that are different in their role and status. Such participants are related to the speaker/the Prophet Solomon who represents a high status, the Queen Balqees of Sheba who is implicitly addressed, and in addition the ignorant people who are supposed not to know the throne. The Prophet as understood from this RQ informed his people to change some of the decoration of the throne of the Queen to test whether she will know it or will be like those who do not know (the ignorant people). In fact, the role played by the Queen and the ignorant people is outstanding. In the ST, the participant related to the Queen is implicitly addressed while the participant related to the ignorant people is realized as the subject pronoun "و" /those/in the imperfect verb phrase "نَوَدَّتْهُي" (*yahtadun*)/those who recognize/. On the part of translation, the translators do show the participant related to the Queen as "she". This is done since the translators changed the ST from active into passive. This by turn affects the role played by the Queen and also the ignorant people.

In the ST, the Queen and the ignorant people are the doers of the action while in the TT1 the Queen and the ignorant people need somebody to guide them to know the throne. Then, the tenor of this discourse is highly distorted.

TT2: As noted above, three participants that are different in their role and status are presented in this Quranic rhetorical question discourse. They are the speaker/the Prophet Solomon who represents a high status, the addressees/Queen Balqees of Sheba who is implicitly addressed, and in addition the ignorant people. In the ST, the Prophet tries to test the Queen whether she will be able to know her throne. To do this, he ordered his people to change some of the throne of the Queen. Even though the main participant of this tenor is the Prophet, but the prominent role is played by the Queen and the ignorant people. In the ST, the participant of the Queen comes implicit while the participant related to the ignorant people is realized through the subject pronoun “و”/those/in the imperfect verb phrase “يَهْتَدُونَ” (yahtadun)/those who recognize/. In translation, changing this RQ into the passive voice led the translator to clearly present the participant of the Queen as “she”. In the ST, these two participants are the doers of the action. However, similar to TT1, the TTs states that someone will lead them to know the truth, whether the throne is that of the Queen or else. To this end, the role played by such participants is distorted. Then, the tenor of this discourse is highly distorted.

Context of Denial

ST: أَأَشْفَقْتُمْ أَنْ تُقَدِّمُوا بَيْنَ يَدَيْ نَجْوَاكُمْ صَدَقَاتٍ ؟

TT1: Are you afraid of spending in charity before your private consultation (with him)? al-Hilali and Khan

TT2: Are you afraid, before your conspiring, to advance freewill offerings? Arberry

TT1: The role and status of the participants are very clear in this Quranic rhetorical question. The participants involved are the believers and the Almighty Allah who rebukes him. His rebuke comes as a result of not doing in charity before consulting the Prophet Muhammad as He/Allah had asked them before. Thus, the participants are different in their role and status. In addition, the participants have a formal relationship. Allah forms the superior authority while the believers come a lower status. The superior authority shows how the lower status (believers) became afraid to do in charity before consulting the Prophet. Although the participant related to Allah is the main one, but the one related to the believers is outstanding. They, the believers, have relation with the Prophet since he teaches them Islam and they ask him lots of questions with this respect. This is clear in the verse “إِذَا نَاجَيْتُمُ الرَّسُولَ فَقَدِّمُوا بَيْنَ يَدَيْ نَجْوَاكُمْ صَدَقَاتٍ” (al-Mujadila, 12)/if you consult the prophet, do in charity before you do so (consultation)/(my translation). In the translation, both participants have maintained their role and status. As it looks the translators do show that the believers are rebuked from Allah due to their fear. Thus, they show their condition. They also show that the believers approach the Prophet for consulting him with things related to Islam.

TT2: As mentioned above, the two participants in the ST have a kind of formal relationship. These two participants

are the addressees/the believers, and the addresser/Allah who rebukes them. Such participants are different in their status. Allah is the superior authority while that related to the believers is lower in status. As we stated above, the rebuke of Allah is due to not doing in charity before consulting the Prophet Muhammad with things related to Islam. In fact, the participant related to the believers is very important here. The believers have a relation with the Prophet since they used to ask him things related to Islam. Allah says in a verse before this rhetorical question “إِذَا نَاجَيْتُمُ الرَّسُولَ فَقَدِّمُوا بَيْنَ يَدَيْ نَجْوَاكُمْ صَدَقَاتٍ” (al-Mujadila, 12)/if you consult the prophet, do in charity before you do so/(my translation). Contrary to the TT1, the TT2 did not manage to save this participant in his translation. The status of the participant, the believers, is changed and affected. In the eyes of the translator, the believers have been portrayed as a group of people who are arranging for something tricky together with the Prophet when using “conspiring” to translate “نجواكم”/consultation/.

Context of Exclamation

ST: وَكَيْفَ يُحْكُمْوَنكَ وَعِنْدَهُمُ التَّوْرَةُ فِيهَا حُكْمُ اللَّهِ لَئِنْ يَتَوَلَّوْنَ مِنْ بَعْدِ ذَلِكَ ؟

TT1: But how do they come to you for decision while they have the Taurat (Torah), in which is the (plain) Decision of Allah; yet even after that, they turn away. al-Hilali and Khan

TT2: Yet how will they make thee their judge seeing they have the Torah, wherein is God’s judgment, then thereafter turn their backs? Arberry

TT1: This rhetorical question is directed from Allah towards the Prophet Muhammad in a way of exclamation due to the people of the Tourat. Thus, three participants are involved in this Quranic rhetorical question. They have different role and status. The first participant is related to Allah/the superior authority who articulates this RQ. The second participant represents a high status and refers to the Prophet Muhammad. The third participant is related to a lower status represented by the people of Tourat, the Jews. Although the third participant is in a lower status, but the role played by this participant is outstanding. This participant is realized by two pronouns in the ST. The first is a subject pronoun affixed to the VP “يُحْكُمْوَنكَ”/they make you their judge/to show that they go to the Prophet to judge between them. The second one comes as a possessive pronoun seen in “عِنْدَهُمْ”/they have/to show that they have their own book, the Tourat. Allah in fact wonders from their tricky actions. They have their own book, but they make a Prophet in whom they do not believe as their judge and then do not take his judgment. This is a feature of such people who are always in conflict with the Prophets of Allah. On the whole, the translators have managed to save the status and role of each participant mentioned in the ST. Then, the tenor of this ST is sustained.

TT2: As mentioned above, the tenor of this Quranic rhetorical questions is related to three participants who have different role and status. They are Allah who represents the superior authority, the Prophet Muhammad who represents a high status and the people of Tourat, the Jews, who represent a lower rank. Even though the third group is considered as a lower status, its role is important. In fact,

Allah uses this rhetorical question due to this participant. The participant related to the Jews is mentioned twice as pronouns. The first one comes as a subject pronoun to indicate that these people go to the Prophet and make him their judge. The second is a possessive pronoun to show that they have their religious or holy book. The Jews who are mentioned several times in different chapters of the Quran to have clashes and conflicts with the messengers and Prophets of Allah do go to the Prophet Muhammad to judge between them, then they do not take his judgment. This is again their feature. All in all, the participants of this ST have saved their role and status in the translation. Consequently, the tenor of this RQ is saved.

CONCLUSION

The current study compared between two English translations of the Quranic assertion, negation, testing, denial and exclamation rhetorical questions with the aim of determining to what extent the tenor of such questions is sustained in the two English translations, namely “the Koran Interpreted” by Arberry (1955) and “the Noble Quran: English translation of the meanings and commentary” (1996) by al-Hilali and Khan. For this purpose, it employed the register theory of Halliday and Hasan (1985). The tenor of discourse is an important variable in the context of situation. Further, understating the tenor of discourse is important in the process of translation. Sometimes, it might be distorted or changed due to a wrong translation committed by translators or due to grammatical and also semantic changes. As noted in the analysis, the tenor of the said questions was subjected to a great distortion. This is can be attributed to some grammatical shifts that the translators made. Clearly, managing to change the grammatical category or structure of the Qur’anic rhetorical questions in the two English translations resulted in distorting the tenor of such questions. In general, the two English translations resulted in distorting the tenor of the Quranic rhetorical questions. In particular, it might be said that al-Hilali and Khan’s (1996) translation was better in saving this important variable. This is due to considering some interpretations of the Quran. Further, the theory of register or context of situation was an interesting and a beneficial analytical tool in the Quranic text translation into English.

REFERENCES

- Abbas, F. (1997). *Albalagha fonunha wa afnanuha: ilmualm’ani*. Daru alfurqan.
- Abdelwali, M. (2007). The Loss in the Translation of the Qur’an. *Translation Journal*, 11(2).
- Abioye, T. (2011). Preference for rhetorical questions as an index of textual message effectiveness. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*. V 1. No.1.
- Aida, N. (2012). Uslub alistifham fi alahadith alnabuyah fi riadh alsalhin: dirasa nahuwih balaghya. Unpublished M.A Thesis, Moluod Mu’amari University, Algeria.
- Al-Amri, S., Khursindi, M., & Tarhami, S. (2012). ‘Tajahul al-arif fi alquran: ist’malatuhu wa aghrathuhu albalaghya. *Majalat dirasat alogat alarabya wa adabuha*. 8 (2): 75-92.
- Abu-Haiyan, M. (1993). *Tafsir albahar almuhit*. Dar alkitab alilmiah, Beirut.
- Arberry, A. J. (1955). *The Koran Interpreted*: London: Allen & Unwin.
- al-Balakhi, M. (2007). Asalyib al-istifham fi al-bahith al-balaghi wa asraruha fi al-quran alkarim. Unpublished PhD Thesis, the international Islamic University, Pakistan.
- Bhattasali, S., Cytryn, J., Feldman, E., & Park, J. (2015). Automatic identification of rhetorical questions. *In ACL*.
- Bofama, S. (2014). Uslub alistifham fi qisat Ibrahim. *Dirasah nahuwya balaghya*. Unpublished M.A Thesis, Abdur Qadir University, Constantine: Algeria.
- Eggins, S. (2004). *An introduction to systemic functional linguistics* (2nd ed.). New York: Continuum.
- al-Fayroz Abadi, M. (2001). *Alqamos almuhit*. Dar ihya’ alaturath alarabi. Beirut. Lebanon.
- al-Gurgani, A. (2008). *Dala’il al-ia’jaza*. Egypt: Maktabat al-Khanji.
- Hackstein, O. (2004). Rhetorical questions and the grammaticalization of interrogative pronouns as conjunctions in Indo-European. In Adam Hyllested, *Anders Richard Jørgensen, Jenny Helena Larsson et Thomas Olander* (eds.), *Per Aspera Ad Asteriscos*, Studia Indogermanica in honorem Jens Elmegård Rasmussen sexagenarii Idibus Martiis anno MMIV.
- Halliday, M. A. K., & Hasan, R. (1985). *Language, Context and Text: Aspects of Language in Social –Semiotic Perspective*. Waurn Ponds, Victoria: Deakin.
- Ilyas, A. I. (1989). *Theories of Translation*. Mosul: Mosul University Press.
- Larson, M. (1974). *The communicative situation and rhetorical questions*. Notes on Linguistics.
- Larson, M. (1984). *Meaning-Based Translation: A Guide to cross-language equivalence*. New York: University Press of America.
- Lehrberger, J. (1982). *Sublanguage: Studies of Language in Restricted Semantic Domain*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- al-Malik, F. M. (1995). Performative utterances: their basic and secondary meanings with reference to five English translations of the meanings of the holy Qur’an. Unpublished PhD Thesis, Durham University, UK.
- al-Mubarak, M. (1997). *al-Kamil*. Beirut. Mu’asasat al-Risalah.
- Newmark, P. (1988). *A textbook of Translation*. U.K.: Prentice Hall International Ltd.
- Rajdal, H. (2013). Balaghat alistifham wa dalalatuhu fi al-Quran alkareem. Unpublished M.A Thesis, Wahran University, Algeria.
- Ranganath, S., Hu, X., Tang, J., Wang, S., & Liu, H. (2016). Identifying Rhetorical Questions in Social Media. *Proceeding of the Tenth International AAAI Conference on Web and Social Media*.
- el-Sa’adany, K. (2010). Function of interrogations in the Hadith: a sociolinguistic study. Retrieved from www.docplayer.net.

- Siemund, P. (2001). *Interrogative constructions*, In Haspelmath et al.(eds.). *Language Typology and Language Universals*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- al- Soyoti, J. (1985). *al-Ishbah wa al-nathair fi alnahu*. Altaba alwla. Muasasat Risalit Beirut.
- Al-Subbki, B. (1992). *Aurus al-Afrah fi sharh talkhis al-Muf-tah*. Beirut: Dar al-Bayan al-Arabi.
- al-Zamakhshri, M. (2009). *Tafseer al-kashaf an haqaiq altanzeel wa oyon alaqaweel fi wujuh alta'weel*. Dar almarifa.
- el-Zeiny, I. (2009). The Translation of the Qur`anic Ambiguity: A linguistic Contrastive Study. *Paper presented at the Saudi Association of Languages & Translation*, Saudi Arabia.