



Ahmed Allaithy
**Qur'anic
 Term
 Translation**
 A Semantic Study from
 Arabic Perspective

As its title suggests, this book is mainly concerned with the meaning and English translation of Qur'anic terms which are therefore, analyzed both out of and in context. This book establishes a method of investigation and analysis that linguists and translators could adopt when embarking on analysis of lexical items of the Qur'an and/or when translating it. Owing to the intrinsic difficulties inherent in the translation of the Qur'an, analytical studies on Qur'anic terms are almost unheard of, in spite of the fact that many are the works that deal with the Qur'an in all languages. Bearing in mind that 'perfect' translation is no more than an illusion, and that absolute synonymy is nothing but a myth, establishing the meaning of specialized Qur'anic terms with any degree of accuracy is an extremely daunting task, especially when addressing this issue in a language that is not that of the Qur'an. The present work is an attempt to bring the Qur'an a step closer to both the general reader as well as the specialized researcher. In addition to the semantic study of the Qur'anic terms and investigating their translations in six other renowned works, this book also addresses a number of important linguistic and cultural issues that no serious researcher of the Qur'an can afford to miss. Its depth of analysis and extensive notes are meant to save the reader the extraordinary effort required to check a multitude of works necessary to understand the issues at stake.

Ahmed Allaithy obtained his PhD in Comparative Translation of the Holy Qur'an from the University of Durham, UK. He is an Associate Professor of Translation, and the current President of Arabic Translators International (ATI) (www.atinternational.org). He is also the General Editor of ATI-Academic Series, and ATI-Literary Series (Arabic Literature Unveiled). He is an established translator and linguist, writer and poet with many works to his credit. He is a specialist in Translation Studies, Arabic Language, Qur'anic Studies, Arabic Rhetoric and Intercultural Communication.



Garant

ISBN 978-90-441-3118-5



9 789044 131185

Ahmed Allaithy
 Qur'anic Term Translation



Ahmed Allaithy
**Qur'anic
 Term
 Translation**

A Semantic Study from
 Arabic Perspective



Qur'anic Term Translation

ATI-Academic Publication, N° 7

As one of the aims of Arabic Translators International (ATI) is to build bridges of communication between world cultures and languages on the one hand and the Arab-Islamic world with its varied and rich cultures on the other, ATI-Academic Publications and ATI-Arabic Literature Unveiled are but a step in this direction.

The series endeavours to introduce the world to the works of distinguished scholars, writers as well as translators of the highest calibre. It is part of our commitment to encourage and promote high quality works and academic research relating to Arabic Studies, literature, translation, and all other forms of intercultural communication.

Series Editors: Abied Alsulaiman & Ahmed Allaithy
www.atinternational.org

Also Available:

Nr° 1: What everyone should know about the Qur'an – Ahmed Al-Laithy

Nr° 2: Arabesques – Ibrahim Mumayiz

Nr° 3: Studies in modern Arabic literature – Mawasi Faruq

N° 4: Cultures in dialogue – Said Faiq

N° 5: Pride, Prejudice and Ignorance – Muhammad Fahmy Raiyah

N° 6: A Textbook of Translation – Said M. Shiyab

Every attempt has been made to ensure the accuracy and reliability of the information in this book. Neither the author nor the publisher can be held responsible for any inconvenience due to possible inaccuracies which readers may encounter in this book.

Ahmed Allaithy

Qur'anic Term Translation:
A Semantic Study from Arabic Perspective

Garant

Antwerpen-Apeldoorn

For all the true seekers of knowledge

Ahmed Allaithy
Qur'anic Term Translation
A Semantic Study from Arabic Perspective
Antwerp – Apeldoorn
Garant
2014

359 pp – 24 cm
ISBN 978-90-441-3118-5
D/2013/5779/108
NUR 630

Cover design: Danni Elskens (Koloriet)

© Ahmed Allaithy & Garant Publishers

All rights protected. Other than exceptions specified by the copyright law, no part of this publication may be reproduced, stored or made public, in any way whatsoever, without the express, prior and written permission of the author and of the publisher.

Garant Publishers

Somersstraat 13-15, 2018 Antwerp, Belgium
www.garant-uitgevers.be info@garant.be
Koninginnelaan 96, 7315 EB Apeldoorn, The Netherlands
www.garant-uitgevers.nl info@garant-uitgevers.nl

Garant/Central Books

99, Wallis Road, London E9 5 LN, Great-Britain
www.centralbooks.com bill@centralbooks.com

Garant/Coronet Books

311, Bainbridge Street, Philadelphia PA 19147, USA
www.coronetbooks.com jeffgolds@comcast.net

Garant/University Book House

130, Planning Street Box 16983, Al Ain, UAE
www.universitybookhouse.com bookhouse@emirates.net

Contents

Transliteration	viii
Notes	ix
Introduction	1
The Subject of This Book	8
Chapter One: Faṣāḥah and Balāghah	17
The Concept of Al-Faṣāḥah	17
The Faṣāḥah of The Word	19
The Faṣāḥah of The Discourse	21
The Faṣāḥah of The Speaker	24
The Concept of Al-Balāghah	25
Chapter Two: Semantic Analysis	27
* <i>b-kh-s</i> بَخَسَ	27
* <i>th-q-l</i> ثَقُلَ	30
* <i>kh-f-f</i> خَفَّفَ	32
* <i>kh-s-r</i> خَسِرَ	34
* <i>t-gh-w</i> طَغَوُ	38
* <i>t-f-f</i> طَفَّفَ	41
* <i>q-s-t</i> قَسَطَ	46
* <i>k-y-l</i> كَيْلَ	56
* <i>n-q-s</i> نَقَصَ	66
* <i>w-z-n</i> وَزَنَ: الْوَزْنُ	71
** <i>mīzān</i> مِيزَانٌ	83
** <i>mawāzīn</i> مَوَازِينُ	96
* <i>w-f-y</i> وَفِي	105
Chapter Three: General Considerations	118
* Introduction	118
* Perfect Translation	119

* Word and Sense in Religious Texts	121
* Basic Requirements of the Translator	122
* Intentionality of Text	123
* Synonymy and Translation	125
* Translation Loss	129
* Changes of Meaning	130
* The Impact of the ST on the Translation	132
* Translating the Word of God	133
* Culture and Translation	135
* The Qur'an and Cultural Differences	136
* Translation and Addition	139
* The Business of The Translator	139
* Legitimate Additions	140
* Decision-Making in Translation	143
* Cultural Differences: An Obstacle?	144
* Exoticism: An Answer?	145
* Repetition	147
* Other Features	154
* Itifāt (Reference Switching)	155
* The Impact of The translator's Intentions	156
* Permissibility of Translating The Qur'an	157
* Translatability of The Qur'an?	158
Chapter Four: Translation Analysis	160
Surat Al-Rahmān, Ayah 7	سورة الرحمن آية 7 163
Surat Al-Rahmān, Ayah 8	سورة الرحمن آية 8 168
Surat Al-Rahmān, Ayah 9	سورة الرحمن آية 9 175
Surat Al-Shūrā, Ayah 17	سورة الشورى آية 17 182
Surat Al-Hadīd, Ayah 25	سورة الحديد آية 25 186
Surat Al-Anām, Ayah 152	سورة الأنعام آية 152 190

Surat Al-Arāf, Ayah 85	سورة الأعراف آية 85	193
Surat Hūd, Ayah 84	سورة هود آية 84	196
Surat Hūd, Ayah 85	سورة هود آية 85	199
Surat Al-Isrā, Ayah 35	سورة الإسراء آية 35	201
Surat Al-Shuarā, Ayahs 181-3	سورة الشعراء الآيات 181-183	205
Surat Al-Mutaffifīn, Ayahs 1-3	سورة المطففين الآيات 1-3	212
Surat Al-Anbiyā, Ayah 47	سورة الأنبياء آية 47	222
Surat Luqmān, Ayah 16	سورة لقمان آية 16	
Surat Al-Nisā, Ayah 40	سورة النساء آية 40	224
Surat Yūnus, Ayah 61	سورة يونس آية 61	
Surat Saba, Ayahs 3 & 22	سورة سبأ الآيات 3 و 22	
Surat Al-Zalzalah, Ayahs 7 & 8	سورة الزلزلة الآيات 7 و 8	
Surat Al-Hijr, Ayah 19	سورة الحجر آية 19	229
Surat Yūsuf	سورة يوسف	232
Surat Al-Anbiyā, Ayah 47	سورة الأنبياء آية 47	240
Surat Al-Arāf, Ayahs 8-9	سورة الأعراف الآيات 8-9	243
Surat Al-Muminūn, Ayah 102	سورة المؤمنون آية 102	
Surat Al-Muminūn, Ayah 103	سورة المؤمنون آية 103	
Surat Al-Qāriah, Ayah 6	سورة القارعة آية 6	
Surat Al-Qāriah, Ayah 8	سورة القارعة آية 8	
Surat Al-Kahf, Ayah 105	سورة الكهف آية 105	254
Chapter Five: Concluding Remarks		258
Endnotes		266
Appendix (1): Some English Translations of The Qura'n		323
Appendix (2): Qur'anic Ayahs Quoted in This Work		325
Appendix (3): Lines of Poetry Quoted in This Work		335
Bibliography: Arabic ثبت المراجع العربية		339
English		351

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ

﴿رَبَّنَا آتِنَا فِي الدُّنْيَا حَسَنَةً وَفِي الْآخِرَةِ حَسَنَةً وَقِنَا عَذَابَ النَّارِ﴾

Transliteration

ء	^c postscript	د	<i>d</i>	ط	<i>ṭ</i>	م	<i>m</i>
ا	<i>a</i>	ذ	<i>dh</i>	ظ	<i>ẓ</i>	ن	<i>n</i>
ب	<i>b</i>	ر	<i>r</i>	ع	<i>ʿ</i>	هـ	<i>h</i>
ت	<i>t</i>	ز	<i>z</i>	غ	<i>gh</i>	و	<i>w</i>
ث	<i>th</i>	س	<i>s</i>	ف	<i>f</i>	ى	<i>y</i>
ج	<i>j</i>	ش	<i>sh</i>	ق	<i>q</i>	ـَـ	<i>a</i>
ح	<i>h</i>	ص	<i>ṣ</i>	ك	<i>k</i>	ـِـ	<i>i</i>
خ	<i>kh</i>	ض	<i>ḏ</i>	ل	<i>l</i>	ـُـ	<i>u</i>
ج الجيم المصرية غير المعطشة			g				
للمد بالفتح ā			للمد بالكسر ī		للمد بالضم ū		

Notes

ال /al/. Whether pronounced (*qamariyyah*) or unpronounced (*shamsiyyah*) the /l/ in the Arabic definite article /al/ is always transcribed. The reader is advised to follow Arabic rules of pronunciation in this regard. In other words, the /l/ is not pronounced when followed by any of the following letters: ت، ث، د، ذ، ر، ز، س، ش، ص، ض، ط، ظ، ل، ن. Instead, the letter following the /l/ should be pronounced as a double letter. For example, al- *Ŝūrā* should be pronounced as /a^hŝ-*ŝūrā*/.

The rest of the Arabic alphabet letters, that is, أ، ب، غ، ح، ج، ك، و، خ، ف، ع، ق، ي، م، ه، do not have an impact on the pronunciation of the /l/ sound.

- is used above the letter a, i and u (that is, ā, ī, and ū) to indicate that the vowel is a long vowel (i.e., slightly longer than the usual *fathah*, *kasrah*, or *dammah*).

This applies to all the words transliterated in this book including Arabic reference titles and names of authors except for non-Arabic references where the authors provide their own spelling for their names which may not conform to this transliteration system. Accordingly, a name like *الخطيب* is written as Al-Khatib, not Al-*Kātib*.

Exceptions also extend to those Arabic words whose different spelling is already widely accepted in English, such as *Qur'an*, *Koran*, *Ayah*, *Surah (Surat)*, *hadith*, *Muhammad*, *Uthman*, *tafsir*, *Ummah*, *Islam*, *Jihad*, *Mujahideen*, *Ulema*, *Imam*, *Ramadan*, *Intifada*, *Kufa*, *Mecca*, *Medina*, *Abu*, etc.

^c The transliterated *hamzah* is dropped when initial, and replaced by the relevant vowel sound, unless its presence is imperative

ð is transliterated as *h* when final, hence, Ayah and Sūrah, except when difficulty in pronunciation arises especially, for example, when followed by a *maftūh* vowel sound, it is then rendered *t*.

ي The /yā[◌]/of ascription is a geminated (double) (y) sound used in Arabic to render a noun into an adjective. This is a common feature in many Arabic last names. For ease of reference, this (yā[◌]) is rendered (i) when final; hence, Al-Misri, not Al-Misriy.

For the same purpose of ease, this transliteration system is only used for Arabic items of vocabulary with the exception of proper names. Reader's discretion is advised.

* For quotations from the Holy Qur'an, the reader should refer to a printed copy if the spelling herein used happens to differ from the Uthmāni writing.

* When transliterating words that have some letters underlined, such as d, h, immediately following one another the lines underneath joint automatically. Thus الأضحى for example, is transliterated *al-^cadhā*. The reader's discretion is advised here to treat these letters as separate.

* It is customary in Arabic to follow the names of the Prophets and Messengers of Allah with (ﷺ), meaning, peace be upon him, and the names of the companions of the Prophet Muhammad (ﷺ) with (رضي الله عنه). Although this custom is not very strictly followed in this book, the reader is advised to assume the existence of such customary honorary formulae as no disrespect is intended.

* For ease of reference, the names of the Qur'an translators referred to in Chapter Four are written in **bold**; thus, for example, **Yusuf Ali** instead of Yusuf Ali, etc.

“Khan and Helali” is always written in Chapter Four “**Khan&Helali**” only to avoid long references to their names. They are, therefore, considered one unit. In the possessive form, they are written as **Khan&Helali**'s. Apart from this they are always dealt with as plural.

“Al-Khatib” is referred to as “**Khatib**”, where the (Al) is dropped and the spelling adopted is as it appears on the said author’s translation.

* Several Arabic references have no publication date, others mention only the Hijri date, and therefore, they are referred to as such. The former are represented as “(n.d)”, and in the latter, the date is followed by “A.H”.

* Qur’anic Ayahs are written either between ﴿-----﴾ or { ----}.

Introduction

In a nutshell, this book deals with two main issues: the Qur'anic use of Arabic and the translation of Qur'anic terms into English. Since dealing with the entire text of the Qur'an as well as its translation is not humanly possible, the focus here is on certain terms and their English translation. The aim is to establish a method of investigation and analysis that linguists and translators may use when embarking on analysis of lexical items of the Qur'an or when translating it.

Proper understanding of the Qur'anic language can reveal many hidden meanings that can be easily missed by the untrained eye. The reader of the Qur'an is invited and indeed urged in many places to ponder upon everything around them; to try to understand and appreciate God's creation. One example that is always cited in a different context and for a yet different message is that the first word revealed of the Qur'an to the Prophet Muhammad was *iqra'* ﴿اقْرَأ﴾, meaning 'read'. This is always used to encourage people to read or at least make reading part of their daily life. This is a typical example of what this present work is trying to do, that is, dig deeper into the words of the Qur'an in an attempt to unravel some of the hidden layers and nuances and then gauge how well such meanings have been grasped and rendered in the translation. The

method used is linguistic analysis that is accessible to all and is not prohibitive in any way as will be explained in due course. For today's speakers of Arabic, the first meaning that comes to one's mind when reading/hearing *iqra'* is indeed related to 'reading'. However, to stop at just 'read' would be doing grave injustice to the Arabic word. The word itself bears much more meanings that are, in every way, consistent with the call for intellectual investigation and firmly grasping the meaning of whatever is involved. It is this kind of understanding that one can contrive from *iqra'* that should not be missed as one investigates what *iqra'* means and how the Arabs have used it together with its derivatives, with the word Qur'an itself being one of them.¹

Many and varied are the translations of the holy Qur'an. They all however seem to share, as one of the reasons for conducting a fresh translation, the conviction that existing translations, at the time, were not satisfactory for one reason or another. There is still though no indication, of any kind, that future translations of the Qur'an would achieve better results or even treat, once and for all, some of the old issues *new* translations have tried/are trying to *more efficiently* address as being claimed.

In actual fact, to embark on a fresh translation of this holy Writ does not require a specific reason or justification beyond what has been stated. Anyone familiar with the Arabic language, the Qur'an and/or the Arabic of the Qur'an can easily and correctly deduce that the Qur'an holds meanings that cannot be accommodated with any degree of satisfaction by one translation. Existing translations, old and new, are clear testimony that even a number of translations, individually and/or collectively, still fall a long way short from comfortably accommodating the entire content of the Qur'anic message, let alone reflect the multi-layered meanings within its Ayahs. At the same time, this is not something that any one translation has claimed to have been trying to achieve.

The problems relating to translating the Qur'an are abundant. At some point in time, there were arguments regarding whether it was Islamically permissible to attempt a translation of the Qur'an. In spite of the fact that such arguments do not arise any more, it is

obvious that they were initially and on part based on gross misunderstandings and, to a great extent, being a case of making a mountain out of a molehill.

Muslim scholars unanimously agree that the Qur'an is only the Qur'an when it is in its original Arabic form. Arabic interpretation (*Tafsir*) of the Qur'an is not the Qur'an, nor is it understood to be encompassing all the meanings or aspects of the Qur'an; hence the many books of tafsir produced throughout the ages until today. Also, there was never a claim that a translation of the Qur'an into any foreign language substitutes, or is meant to substitute, the Qur'an or holds as much authority as the Arabic original version of this Holy Book. As a matter of fact, claims to the contrary have always been made. Translation by default is known to be fraught with inaccuracies and involves inevitable loss of various kinds and degrees. So, to translators it is inconceivable to claim that a translation of any text could indeed be a perfect replacement of an original, let alone if the original happens to be the Qur'an.

It is therefore obvious that arguments put forward by way of objecting to Qur'an translation seem to have been instigated by the *fear* that the translation was meant to do away with the Arabic Qur'an. Between 1925 and 1936 CE, debates were stirred in the Arab-Islamic world about whether it was permissible to translate the Qur'an. The politics of the time seems to have contributed a great deal to this issue. At one point, Al-Azhar of Egypt objected to allowing a translation of the Qur'an into Egypt and requested that the Egyptian Customs burnt the shipment. In Turkey before that, Ataturk's government ordered a translation of the Qur'an be made.² This decision received mixed reactions especially with the fall of the Islamic Caliphate and the steps taken by the Turkish government at the time towards complete secularization of their state at the expense of Islam and Arabic. This and other factors set the scene for a wave of objections and condemnation to Qur'an translations. Al-Azhar scholars eventually led some aggressive discussions on this issue and concluded that there was nothing to support the idea of prohibiting the translation of Qur'anic *Tafsir* (not text), and recommended that this be conducted.

To put things into their right perspective, books of Hadith narrate the story that Salmān al-Fārisī (the Persian), a companion of the Prophet Muhammad ﷺ's, was asked by some of his fellow countrymen to translate for them al-Fātiḥah, the opening Surah of the Qur'an. Whether it was/is allowed for anyone to use a translation in the daily *Ṣalāh* (prayers) or not,³ the translation undoubtedly must have helped those Persians understand what the *Surah* was generally saying. This, naturally, is the case assuming that the story itself is correct.⁴ The Prophet Muhammad ﷺ himself, as will be shown by example later, took into consideration the fact that the messages he sent to non-Arabic speaking rulers would require translation on their part. As a result, his messages were written in an Arabic that is easy to understand and translate. Also, when the *Ṣaḥābah* (companions of the Prophet ﷺ's) migrated to Abyssinia, King Negus asked them about what Islam said about Jesus ﷺ and his mother. Ga'far ibn Abī Tālib recited to him Ayahs from Surah Mariam (no. 19) and as Negus's native language was not Arabic, it is only fair to assume that some form of translation was offered.

So, it seems that in principle, at least, translation of texts of religious nature was not frowned upon when the threat of misrepresentation is absent and with the understanding that translation in such contexts is the only means of facilitating communication and propagation of the faith. Translation, since then, has taken long strides and such fears seem to have dwindled away and simply gone to oblivion. The issue of the permissibility of translating the Qur'an is no longer controversial, especially with high Islamic institutions conducting, sponsoring and/or encouraging such translation into all languages. The question of the translation may simply be stated in these words: as the Qur'an is believed to be the word of Allah, and as any translation is indeed the word of man, the difference between the two words can only be the difference between Allah (God), and man. While God's word is perfect and infinite, man's word is imperfect and finite. So, words loaded with layers upon layers of meaning and apply to many different contexts and situations, can only be rendered in very limited ways into a foreign language. As Arabic is not English, the Qur'an cannot be its translation.

So, in another nutshell, translation is only an approximation.

This should not and must not stop us though from investigating the Qur'an and trying to unravel some of its multitude of mysteries, be them linguistic or otherwise. Q4:82 urges just this ﴿أَفَلَا يَتَدَبَّرُونَ الْقُرْآنَ﴾, literally, "Do they not ponder on the Qur'an?"⁵ This is stated in a question form in Arabic by way of challenging and enticing all to investigate the Qur'an thoroughly. The word translated as "ponder" is *yatadabbarūn*, a verb whose shades of meaning go far beyond 'pondering'. This hints at another problem that translators encounter as they approach the Qur'an. Translators can only use the 'tools' available to them as provided by the target language, and while linguists/translators differ in the levels of knowledge, competence, style, etc. there is very little they can do when the target language can only provide so much in terms of semantics and syntax, etc.

This is, however, is not the only problem faced when dealing with the translation of the Qur'an and/or its linguistic aspects. In spite of the fact that the Qur'an is one of the world's most written about books, it is rare to find a work focusing on one specific linguistic aspect. Random and patchy references may be made, which in turn, create another research difficulty. As for references in languages other than Arabic, they seem to be oblivious to this issue altogether and the linguistic aspects of the Qur'an with any kind of deep analysis seem to be a subject everyone is understandably doing their best to avoid. This issue is too difficult, and too time consuming to entertain.

In addition, books of *Tafsir* which are meant to facilitate one's work can also be an added hinderance for the simple fact that the exegetes were working under different premises and for different audiences. They do not always cater for one's specific needs; yet, they also do not always give enough details as to the extent to which the meaning of individual words affects and is affected by the meaning of the entire context. One often comes across claims, good as they may be, that are made by some exegetes concerning the meaning of certain words/terms or the interpretation of an utterance in a certain way without giving reasons for how such interpretations

were reached. Simply quoting them would be defeating the purpose of what this work is set to achieve.

It is, however, fair to assume that the classical Qur'anic exegetes must have had better understanding of the language than most modern readers, and with regard to a great number of words, they must have felt no need to be so specific as to their meaning since presumably the majority of their audience and readers knew, perhaps even exactly, what various words meant which we consider problematic or ambiguous. In modern times, our command of the Arabic language cannot be compared to that of the early grammarians, rhetoricians and or exegetes of the Qur'an. It is rather amusing to read that early lexicographers of Arabic-Arabic dictionaries such as *Lisān al-ʿArab*, *al-Sihāh*, etc., carried out the task of producing such enormous works as a result of their seeing the rapid deterioration of people's command of the language and the widespread use of *lahn* لَهْن (error). In spite of all this, it was clear during the investigation of this work that some explanations were not satisfactory, and that other explanations were better, and other times one had to consider his own view as, at least, more likely if not by far better. It always gave me confidence at times when I felt reluctant to express my own views and provide my own explanations, to remember what Prof. Muhammad Abdul-Haleem, quoting Imam Abu Ḥanīfah, said to me many years ago with regard to differing from the views of others who are believed to be much more qualified, even if they were Qur'anic exegetes: “هُم رِجَالٌ وَنَحْنُ رِجَالٌ” (that is, they were men (of intellect) and we are men (of intellect)).

As an example of the type of problems described above, Al-Rāzi (v.8, p.7) says that ﴿الْمِيزَانَ﴾ in Q55:7-9 is mentioned three times, each with a different meaning; the first مِيزَان means “الآلة” scales, i.e., the weighing instrument, the second “الْوَزْن” the act of weighing, and the third “الْمَوْزُون” the thing weighed. He also adds that ﴿الْمِيزَانَ﴾ is used instead of these words as it is more comprehensive in meaning. Although his explanation may be satisfactory to some people,

especially if we test his explanation against outside reality, it was not so for me as Al-Rāzi does not refer to the possibility of any differences that might exist between ﴿أَلَا تَطْعَمُوا فِي الْمِيزَانِ﴾ and ﴿أَلَا تَطْعَمُوا فِي الْوِزْنِ﴾ or between ﴿وَلَا تُخْسِرُوا الْمِيزَانَ﴾ and ﴿وَلَا تُخْسِرُوا الْمَوْزُونَ﴾. The truth of the matter is that, even with his explanation, one wording remains Qur'anic and the other is not.

Al-Rāzi's explanation does not refer to ﴿الْمِيزَانَ﴾ in ﴿وَضَعَ الْمِيزَانَ﴾ as having a possible metaphorical reference or meaning, given the above as an explanation. The great majority of the books of *Tafsir* consulted have this very same feature and it is extremely rare that an exegete refers to such differences had the wording been different.

Another example is the reference to the meaning of ﴿الْكَيْلِ﴾ in Q7:85 which reads ﴿فَأَوْفُوا الْكَيْلَ وَالْمِيزَانَ﴾. Although Al-Rāzi (v.4, p.258) and Al-Zamakhshari (v.2, p.127) raised the question of the use of the word ﴿الْكَيْلِ﴾ rather than ﴿الْمِكْيَالِ﴾ in this Ayah, in contrast with Q11:85 which uses the word ﴿الْمِكْيَالِ﴾ rather than ﴿الْكَيْلِ﴾, their answer is simply that: "by *al-kayl* الكَيْلِ, He (Allah) means the instrument for measuring", i.e., *al-mikyāl* الْمِكْيَالِ. (For more details, see the discussion under *k-y-l* كَيْل, and *mīzān* مِيزَان later on).

As is clear, their comment still does not answer the question about the difference in meaning had ﴿الْمِكْيَالِ﴾ been used in this Ayah (Q7:85) instead of ﴿الْكَيْلِ﴾. If there is no difference between those two words here, would not it have been better if ﴿الْمِكْيَالِ﴾ had been used since it at least agrees with the word ﴿الْمِيزَانَ﴾ as a weighing instrument? The explanations given cannot in many ways be considered proper answers. Such is the type of questions that this work attempts to investigate; and it is hoped that proper and satisfactory answers are provided in the course of this book.

The Subject of This Book

The logical deduction for a Muslim believing the Qur'an to be the Word of Allah, is that its wording is deliberate, and that another Arabic word having the same meaning cannot replace the original word itself in the Qur'anic text without the meaning being affected. It is because of this that some of the opinions of the Qur'anic exegetes could not be taken for granted when researching this book. Also since the Qur'an itself states in very clear terms that it is the word of Allah, certain questions needed to be raised to consider whether such a claim is true or not. For the believer this kind of investigation can only make one's belief firmer and more well-grounded; for those in doubt, the evidence is there to examine and subject to more investigations.

This study is mainly concerned with the meaning and translation of ten semantically interrelated terms, namely and in Arabic alphabetical order according to their roots: *b-kh-s* بَخَسَ, *th-q-l* ثَقُلَ, *kh-s-r* خَسِرَ, (*kh-f-f* خَفَّفَ), *t-gh-w* طَغَوُ, *t-f-f* طَفَّفَ, *q-s-t* قَسَطَ, *k-y-l* كَيْلَ, *n-q-s* نَقَصَ, *w-z-n* وَزَنَ, and *w-f-y* وَفَى.

Major emphasis is placed on the meaning of these terms individually first then contextually. Considering them out of context alone is indeed a futile effort. At the same time, as far as Arabic is concerned, it is naïve to assume that even in cases when the context dictates the meaning of a word, that its basic meaning has no bearing on the context in which the word is used. And as indicated elsewhere in this work, understanding the meaning of words at the lower level, that is, individually, helps a great deal in determining their meaning contextually and in relation to other words in the same, similar or even different context. In his *Componential Analysis of Meaning*, Nida says: "In most instances, a word seems to have a central meaning from which a number of other meanings are derived. And we can usually recognize or imagine some kind of connection between each of these meanings and the apparent central meaning" (1975:11). This cannot be more true in Arabic.

All the above words and some of their derivations are used in

the Qur'an in the context of measuring and weighing, which is the main focus in this work. Perhaps the only exception is the word *b-kh-s* بَخَسَ. However, the reason for its inclusion is that in three of the seven times in which *b-kh-s* بَخَسَ is used in the Qur'an, it is in a context immediately related to measuring and weighing, namely: Q7:85, Q11:85 and Q26:183. It is in these Ayahs that it is considered a general reference after a particular one, and its existence is important in balancing the references of the Ayahs. Also, as quoted under *b-kh-s* بَخَسَ, a ḥadīth narrated by Ibn Umar uses the verbal noun of بَخَسَ in the same kind of context; similarly exegetes and lexicographers consider *al-bakhs* to mean *al-naqs* النَقْصُ, which is one of the terms under study. Therefore, including it is much more beneficial than excluding it. *B-kh-s* بَخَسَ appears in the above mentioned Ayahs in the same form, that is: ﴿وَلَا تَبْخَسُوا النَّاسَ﴾ (أَشْيَاءَهُمْ). The other four Ayahs are Q2:282, Q11:15, Q12:20 and Q72:13.

The following section elaborates on the divisions of this book and what issues are dealt with in terms of investigation and analysis.

The book falls in an introduction and five chapters.

Chapter One: Faṣāḥah and Balāghah

Here the concepts of Faṣāḥah and Balāghah are introduced and discussed owing to their relevance and major impact on understanding the Qur'anic use of specific language.

Chapter Two: Semantic Analysis

As the way is by now paved for the next chapter, the terms for measuring and weighing are considered both individually and contextually. In this chapter each term is dealt with separately and in alphabetical order. Every effort is made to arrive at the most accurate meaning, or explanation of meaning, possible for each

term. References are made to the meanings given by lexicographers and Qur'anic exegetes alike. Each term is also considered in the Ayahs where it occurs and extreme efforts have been made to restrict the analysis to each particular term when it occurs together with other terms that are also under study. The context is also considered as in many cases this raised questions and provided answers.

References are also made to the Ulemas views and how, sometimes, they arrive at their conclusions. As for my own views and conclusions, these have been based on combining all the possible techniques that may help in establishing the meaning of each term, both individually and in relation to other terms as well. Therefore, cross-references to other Ayahs, hadiths, pieces of poetry, points of grammar, outside reality, etc., are used. Many references have been consulted and cross-checked against one another; this was a painstaking process, but one which proved extremely rewarding.

The longest part of this chapter is that related to *w-z-n* as the meaning of *al-wazn*, *al-mīzān* and *al-mawāzīn* had to be discussed in detail and proved to be more problematic than initially thought.

Chapter Two ends with a Conclusion. This is meant only to relate all the Ayahs that refer to measuring and weighing to one another. The conclusion shows that all the various aspects of the subject are completely covered by the Qur'an, and therefore leaves no room for any addition.

Establishing the meaning of these terms with accuracy proved a difficult and time-consuming task as the English equivalents used from time to time were not as accurate or precise as their Arabic counterparts. However, such equivalents were only used with this in mind and were not meant to be replacements for the Arabic terms. There was no other way to proceed as English is the language of this research, and the translation of the measuring and weighing terms into English is one of the main issues in this work.

Chapter Two is meant to be the basis for that part of the book that deals with the translation of these terms. The meanings established in this chapter are to be contrasted with the translations used in Chapter Four. However, before this could be achieved with any degree of accuracy, some issues influencing the process of translation and related to that discipline in general had to be considered so that our analysis of the translations, judgement and conclusions could be as objective as possible.

A final point is that in Chapter Two, translations of the Ayahs where each term occurs are quoted to make it easy for the reader to get some idea about the subject matter of the Arabic Ayahs. This does not mean that such translations are accepted in any way as better than others; all such issues are dealt with in Chapter Four.

Chapter Three: General Considerations

This chapter, entitled “General Considerations”, deals with those issues that are immediately related to the translation of the terms under study. There are of course many more translational issues that are worthy of investigation and discussion under the above title. However, in our present work such issues would have proven irrelevant.

Chapter Three mainly discusses the views of many authors who wrote about translation and other related disciplines. It also deals with my own views with regard to the subject of translation in general and the translation of the Qur’an in particular. Many of those views I have developed over the years of my study in Al-Alsun and afterwards. Like any academic research, such views could not carry any weight if presented unsubstantiated. Therefore, a great number of references, of a different sort this time, were consulted. It goes without saying that many irrelevant issues had to be investigated to make sure that they were indeed irrelevant and therefore not to be included in this work. In spite of the fact that this part of the book was time-consuming, the writing of Chapter Three was less problematic than all other chapters, and was an enjoyable intellectual experience for me.

The issues dealt with in this chapter vary in nature from one other. Some parts deal with translation in general, others with some features of the Arabic language that have an impact on translation such as the *iltifāt* and repetition, still others deal with cultural differences, etc., as indicated in the table of contents. This chapter, however, helps a great deal in understanding some aspects of the process of translation in general and issues of relevance with regard to the translation of the Qur'an in particular. It also states certain points concerning how the translations of the Qur'an should be viewed and warns against mistranslations and deliberate misrepresentation of the Qur'an.

Also, although the production of Qur'anic translations is so important to the understanding of Islam especially for non-Arabic speakers, we all have to bear in mind that the Qur'an is only the Qur'an when it is in its original Arabic wording, and that no translation can substitute or become a replacement of that Holy Book. Bearing this in mind at all times solves the problem of the untranslatability of the Qur'an which is also one of the issues dealt with briefly in this chapter. Translatability does not mean replacement.

Two issues deserve special mention here as they have always interested me in translation. The first is every translator's dream of achieving the perfect translation. Translators try all sorts of methods and techniques to achieve as accurate a translation as is humanly possible. Yet, languages, regrettably or otherwise, do not function this way. As the existence of absolute synonymy is, in my opinion, no more than an illusion, perfect translation is a myth; it is inconceivable, and I am certain that every practising translator knows this for a fact.

This leads to the second issue, which is translation loss. It is an amazing fact that in spite of the inevitability of translation loss, this rarely proved an obstacle in the way of communication. Yet, it is not enough just to communicate the Qur'an unless one is equipped with what it takes to render its divine message as accurately as the TL allows and in order to be able to do justice to it. The receiver of the translation of the Qur'an, on the other hand,

should take into account that perhaps the only thing that translations guarantee with utmost certainty is the loss of part of the message. Different aspects of most source texts are sacrificed for the sake of other considerations that are not always clear.

Chapter Four: Translation Analysis

In this chapter the translations provided by six English translations for the measuring and weighing terms occurring in thirty seven Ayahs are considered. The order in which the Ayahs appear in this chapter was reached after careful consideration of other options, some of which turned to be extremely problematic and impractical.

Putting the Ayahs in the order of their Surahs as they appear in the Qur'an would have meant that each Ayah would have had to be considered on its own. Comparison with other Ayahs that might include the same terms would have been like jumping forwards and backwards all the time; repetition of same points over and over again would have been inevitable, rendering that part of the book extremely monotonous, in addition to making this chapter too long.

Alphabetical order, as in Chapter Two, would have resulted in a similar situation, and even more confusion because the terms occur together in the great majority of the Ayahs.

Therefore, a different order was chosen based on a very much more simpler and practical idea the Ayahs that have the word *al-mīzān* ﴿المِيزَانُ﴾ on its own are placed first followed by those that refer to both weighing and measuring, then *mithqāl* ﴿مِثْقَالٌ﴾ followed by the Ayahs that mention measuring only, etc., and finally the Ayahs that deal with the Day of Judgement. In spite of its simplicity, this order was still problematic to a degree; however, it rendered comparison and cross-referencing a great deal easier.

As for the choice of the six translations used in this work in particular, the following may be said. First of all, the translations used here are those of Abdullah Yusuf Ali, Mohammed Marmaduke

Pickthall, Arthur J. Arberry, Muhammad Muhsin Khan & Muhammad Taqi-ud-Din Al-Helali, Muhammad M. Khatib, and Muhammad Asad. These translations differ in many aspects; this renders the issue of contrasting them one with the other extremely useful. However, this was not the main reason for choosing them. In simple terms, those were the translations I felt more comfortable with; and with the exception of Arberry, all the translators are Muslims which, to a high degree, rules out any doubts with regard to their intentions or deliberate misinterpretation or misrepresentation of the Qur'anic message. This issue would require a work on its own. Therefore, there was no need to get involved in this contentious area.

As for the order in which these translations appear in this chapter, it is neither alphabetical nor chronological. For a few years, I was using Yusuf Ali's and Pickthall's translations as two of the references consulted with regard to a Qur'anic terms dictionary I was compiling. Then in about 1992, I met Dr. Khatib one day in the Supreme Council for Islamic Affairs in Garden City, Cairo. It was only then that I became aware of his translation. He also informed me that a second edition was being published then. I have not come across that second edition until today. However, I bought his translation a few years before I joined Durham University. That translation was as unfortunate as my dictionary. It got lost in the mail on the way from Wembley to Durham. I then got hold of Arberry's translation in a bookstore in London followed by that of Khan and Helali in Cairo International Book Fair just before finding a copy of Khatib's translation as well as that of Asad in the Durham University Library.

It therefore seemed that this was the order in which these translations were meant to appear in my book. This order however proved easier to deal with especially with regard to two of them: Khatib's whose language differs a great deal from the rest of the translators listed before him, and Asad who prefers abstract to concrete meanings and who makes extensive use of square brackets [--] which are usually reserved for elliptical insertions in contrast with round brackets, which he also uses (sometimes inside the square ones); these are normally used for implied statements. Asad

makes greater use of such devices than any other translator in the list. This is why it was more convenient to have both translators at the bottom of the list.

As stated at the beginning of Chapter Four, Chapter Four has to be read in conjunction with Chapter Two, where the meanings of the words subjected to comparative analysis are discussed.

Where the wider context in which a term appears is important in clarifying its meaning, that context is quoted; where this seemed irrelevant however, it is done away with. The words discussed in the analysis that follows each Ayah and its six translations are always underlined at the beginning.

If the translator uses a footnote with regard to the part of the Ayah under study, it is quoted immediately under the translation in smaller typeface preceded by an asterisk (*).

The translations are quoted exactly as they appear in their originals with regard to capital and small letters, commas, semicolons, full stops, brackets, etc., and in the case of Yusuf Alis and Arberrys translations, where each line ends.

Chapter Five: Conclusion

As much has already been said in the book itself, the conclusion is the shortest part of this work, and it also refers to most of the issues discussed in the previous chapters in more or less general terms. It is the hope of the writer of this book that this work is a step towards a better understanding of the Qur'anic message. This subject of measuring and weighing proved important in many aspects, both linguistically and religiously, and was replete with subtle and precise references to a degree that was beyond my expectations.

If this work prides itself as being the first to tackle this topic in the way described in the previous pages, and in the way it reveals itself in the following ones, it is meant to introduce to the student of translation a method of comparative study, to the linguist a way of analysing the meaning of words and phrases in the Qur'an, to the

average reader a better understanding of one of the important topics dealt with by the Qur'an and to open a window to everybody to see how different and challenging the word of Allah is.

It remains to say that any success, however, in this respect is only from Allah, and any shortcomings are from myself. I pray to Allah to accept my work as it was conducted with no desire of earthly gain and to place it on the *mīzān* of my *ḥasanāt* on the Day of Judgement, and to satisfy the Prophet ﷺ's saying with regard to the useful knowledge that one leaves behind, that is, “**عِلْمٌ يُنْتَفَعُ بِهِ**”.

Faṣāḥah and Balāghah

Arabic linguists consider the Qur'an to be the pinnacle of Arabic rhetoric with matchless eloquence, elegance of style and precision of words use. To understand how these are measured for an Arabic language perspective, it is imperative to introduce the criteria used. The Qur'an is measured according to two concepts, namely: *Faṣāḥah* and *Balāghah*. Many writers are in the habit of using 'eloquence' and 'rhetoric' when referring to these two concepts respectively. In spite of the fact that some aspects of their meaning may be covered by these two later terms, yet, using them as being synonymous to the Arabic concept incurs too much of unjustifiable loss as will be revealed in the following discussion regarding the definitions of both terms and what they precisely refer to.

The Concept of Al-Faṣāḥah

The Qur'an is justifiably believed to be the greatest authority in the Arabic language. This is mainly due to the fact that the most eloquent of Arabic speech falls a long way short when compared to the Qur'anic style and way of expression.

With regard to the meanings of these two terms scholars are divided as follows:⁶

(1) Al-Jurjāni and others see no difference in meaning between *faṣāḥah* and *balāghah*. The two words according to Al-Jawhari are synonyms. Al-Rāzi, confirming this view, also says that most scholars of *balāghah* find no distinction in meaning between them, and therefore they use them alternatively to mean one and the same thing.

(2) Al-Sakkāki, Ibn Al-Athīr and others distinguish between *faṣāḥah* and *balāghah*. They believe that the former is related to the word اللَّفْظ, while the latter has more to do with the meaning الْمَعْنَى and structure التَّرْكِيب.⁷ Therefore, in this sense, *faṣāḥah* is encompassed by or part of *balāghah*.

However, the difference is much more complicated, or rather elaborate, than just the above.

The word *faṣāḥah* is derived from *faṣuḥa* فَصُحَّ. The meaning of this root and its derivations are related to الظُّهُور and الوُضُوح, that is, appearance and clarity.

1. The Arabs say فَصُحَّ اللَّبْنُ meaning that the froth of the milk has been removed and therefore the milk can be clearly seen. Using this meaning, Nadīlah Al-Sulmi says in a poem: “وَتَحْتَ الرَّعْوَةِ اللَّبْنُ” (and under the froth is the clear milk). This has become a saying to refer to something whose reality is different from its appearance.

2. In the morning, when the light of day shows, the Arabs say أَفْصَحَ الصُّبْحُ لَدَى عَيْنَيْنِ, referring to what is revealed after being concealed, that is, the light of day after the darkness of night.

3. يَوْمٌ مُفْصِحٌ is a clear cloudless day.

4. For a non-Arab speaking Arabic without an accent, the Arabs say: أَفْصَحَ الْأَعْجَمِيُّ بِالْعَرَبِيَّةِ. The Qur’an relates that Prophet Moses said about his brother Aaron in Q28:34: ﴿وَأَخِي هَارُونُ هُوَ أَفْصَحُ مِنِّي لِسَانًا﴾ which basically means: And my brother Aaron is clearer in his speech than I. “Clerer in speech” here may mean ‘more eloquent’.

For our purposes, the term *faṣāḥah* accordingly describes:

- 1) **Word,**
- 2) **Discourse,** and
- 3) **Speaker.**⁸

1) The Faṣāḥah of The Word:⁹

For any word to be considered *faṣīḥ* (adjective from *faṣāḥah*) four conditions must be met:

[1] The sounds (phonemes) that form the word must be in harmony with one another: so that it is not difficult to pronounce as a result of disagreement between the places of articulation of each sound (letter), for example. This does not mean that the cause of the difficulty is the nearness of the places of articulation as we find that sounds that form words like *al-jaysh* الجَيْش: ‘the army’, *al-famm* الفَمِّ: ‘the mouth’, *al-shajar* الشَّجَر: ‘the trees’, etc., are harmonious while a word like *malae* مَلَعَ: ‘to hurry’, whose sounds places of articulation are not so near does not sound as good or as easy to pronounce.

Also the length of the word is not one of the main things that decide whether it is *faṣīḥ* or not. Long words like *sahsalaq* صَهْصَلَق: ‘strong loud sound’¹⁰ and *khanshalil* خَنْشَلِيل: ‘sword’ are not *faṣīḥ*, unlike the *faṣīḥ* words of *layastakhlifannahum* ﴿لَيَسْتَخْلِفَنَّاهُمْ﴾: ‘he will, of a surety, grant them succession to’, and *fasayakfīkahum* ﴿فَسَيَكْفِيكَاهُمْ﴾: ‘He will suffice you against them’, which are even longer. The judge then is nothing but good taste that can distinguish the good and bad sounds.

[2] The word in most cases has to be familiar and clear in meaning. Therefore, a word is not considered *faṣīḥ* in case:

a) it proves difficult to know what it means and one has to look hard for its meaning. While words such as *mushanfirah* مُسْحَنْفِرَة: ‘wide’, *buāq* بُعَاق: ‘rain-cloud’, *jardahal* جَرْدَحَل: ‘valley’ and *juhaysh* جُحَيْش: ‘tyrant or dictator’ can be found in some classical dictionaries, *jahlanja* جَحْلَنْجَع is not listed.¹¹ As a result, they have mostly dropped out of use and are not considered *faṣīḥ*.

b) if a meaning has to be coined for it as it might be the meaning it is supposed to convey is far fetched. For example, linguists differed about the word *musarrajan* مُسَرَّرَجَا in the following lines:

أَيَّامٌ أَبَدَتْ وَاصْبَحًا مُفْلَجًا
 أَعْرَبَرًا بَرَّاقًا وَطَرْفًا أَبْرَجًا
 وَمُقَلَّةً وَحَاجِيًا مُرَجَّجًا
 وَفَاحِمًا وَمَرْسِنًا مُسَرَّجًا

ascribed to Ruḳbah ibn Al-ʿajjāj, as they could not understand what is meant by describing his beloved’s nose as *musarrajan*. The meaning is ambiguous.¹²

[3] it is in conformity with the rules of the language and used in its regular form. Al-Farazdaq says:

وَإِذَا الرِّجَالُ رَأَوْا يَرِيدُ رَأَيْتَهُمْ
 خُضِعَ الرِّقَابُ نَوَاكِسَ الأَبْصَارِ

In this example the underlined *nawākis* ‘looking down’ which is feminine plural is used to refer to *al-rijāl* ‘men’ which is obviously masculine. Therefore, the word *nawākis* is not considered *fasīh* in this context because it breaks the rule. The correct form in this context is the masculine *nākisī*.¹³

Abi Al-Najm ibn Qudāmah says:

الْحَمْدُ لِلَّهِ العَلِيِّ الأَجَلِ
 أَنْتَ مَلِيكُ النَّاسِ رَبًّا فَاقْبَلِ

Here the form is broken. The correct form of the underlined *al-Ajlat* ‘Owner of Majesty’ is *al-Ajal* with one *lām* and a *shaddah*, ج, not two *lāms*, ل, as the line says which also changed the way the *jīm* ج is pronounced.¹⁴

Jamīl also used *hamzat al-qatʿ* هَمْزَةُ القَطْعِ where he should have used *hamzat al-waṣl* هَمْزَةُ الوَصْلِ in the word *ithnayn* اثْنَيْنِ ‘two’. He says:

أَلَا لَا أَرَى إِثْنَيْنِ أَحْسَنَ شِيمَةً
 عَلَى حَدَثَانِ الدَّهْرِ مِنِّي وَمِنْ جُمَلِ¹⁵

An exception to this above mentioned rule are the words that the Arabs used in their irregular forms preferring them to their regular forms because they are pronounced with more ease and also flowed and sounded more appealing to the ear, such as *istahwadha*

استَحَادَ: ‘to have control over something’ instead of *istahādha* استَحَادَ, *qatata* قَطَطَ: ‘to cut’ (ones hair) instead of *qatta* قَطَّ, etc.

[4] The way the word as a whole sounds should be acceptable to the ear (nice to hear) and agree with good taste.

A poet said:

وَأَحْمَقُ مِمَّنْ يَلْعَقُ الْمَاءَ قَالَ لِي
دَعِ الْخَمْرَ وَاشْرَبْ مِنْ نُقَاحِ مَبْرَدٍ¹⁶

(A fool from among those who lick the water said to me:

“Do not drink alcohol, and drink cold water instead”.)

Here, the word *nuqākh* نُقَاحِ: ‘sweet water’ is very heavy on the ear, and the listener would realise immediately that the word is out of place. The same is correct when describing a good-looking person as *utbūl* عُتْبُولٍ.¹⁷

2) The Faṣāḥah of The Discourse:¹⁸

For any discourse to be described as *faṣīḥ*, it has to be clear in meaning, easily uttered, well-structured, free of ambiguity and conforming to the rules of the language. For this to be achieved, the discourse has to meet four conditions:

[1] The words that are put together to form a discourse must be harmonious with one another in a way that makes pronunciation of phrases/sentences easy. The lack of harmony and difficulty in pronunciation may be sometimes due to one or more of the following points:

a) Repetition of the same letters:

Al-Jāhiz recited:

وَقَبْرِ حَرْبٍ بِمَكَانٍ قَفْرٍ وَنَيْسٍ قُرْبَ قَبْرِ حَرْبٍ قَبْرٍ¹⁹

Here, the repetition of the letters *qāf* ق, *rā* ر and *bā* ب in the way they appear in this line render the pronunciation of the line as a whole extremely difficult, although taken individually, each word may not show such difficulty.

Al-Ḥarīri also says: “وَعَافَ عَافِي الْعُرْفِ عِرْفَانَهُ”. The repetition of the *ayn* ع and the *fā* ف causes a similar problem. In contrast to these examples, in Q84:8 we have ﴿فَسَوْفَ يُحَاسِبُ حَسَابًا يَسِيرًا﴾, Q68:9 reads

﴿وَدُّوا لَوْ تُدْهِنُ فَيُدْهِنُونَ﴾ and Q11:48 has the sound /m/ repeated eight times successively: ﴿أُمِّ مَمَّنْ مَعَكَ﴾.²⁰ As is clear from these examples, in spite of the difficulty arising from the feature of repeating the same sounds in the above lines of poetry, this is not encountered in the Qur'an!

b) Verbs following one another, whether belonging to different tenses, such as Al-Qādi Al-Arrajāni's line of verse:

بِالنَّارِ فَفَرَّقَتْ الْحَوَادِثُ بَيْنَنَا
وَبِهَا نَذَرْتُ أَعُودُ أَقْتُلُ رُوحِي²¹

(Lit., Fire has caused us to part, and by it I swear I return I kill myself),

or to the same mood as in Al-Mutanabbi's clumsy line where the imperative form is used in all the verbs:

أَقِلْ أَيْلِ أَقْطِعْ أَحْمِلْ عَلَّ سَلَّ أَعِدْ زِدْ هَسَّ بِشَّ تَقْضِلْ أَدْنِ سَرَّ صِلْ²²

(Lit., help, give, give (land), give (horse), raise rank, remove (the cause of my concern), get me back (to my previous place of honour),

give me more (of your bounty), show happiness, smile, give (honour), bring me near (your grace), please, give (always)),

cause the same sort of difficulty like the use of too many adjectives following one another as in Al-Mutanabbi:

دَانٍ بَعِيدٍ مُجِبِّ مُبْغِضٍ بَهْجٍ أَعَزَّ حَلُومٍ مُمِرِّ لَيْنٍ شَرِسٍ
نَدِيٍّ أَبِي غَرٍّ وَافٍ أَخِي ثَقَّةٍ جَعْدٍ سَرِيٍّ نَهْدٍ نَدْبٍ رَضِيٍّ نَدِسٍ²³

(near, far, loving, hateful, rejoicing (happy),

noble in action, sweet, bitter, kind, wild,

giving, proud, do-gooder, loyal, trustworthy,

generous, of noble birth, intelligent, swift in responding to helping others, accepting, knowing.)

A huge difference appears when contrasting these many adjectives to Q68:10-13 ﴿مَنَّاعٍ لِلْخَيْرِ﴾ * هَمَّازٍ مَشَاءٍ بَنِيمٍ * وَلَا تُطِيعُ كُلَّ حَلَافٍ مَهِينٍ * عَتَلٌ بَعْدَ ذَلِكَ زَنِيمٌ (Khān&Helālī “And obey not everyone who swears much, - and is considered worthless, a slanderer, going about with calumnies, hinderer of the good, transgressor, sinful, cruel, - after all that base-born (of illegitimate birth)”), where the successive Arabic adjectives read much more smoothly and do not

sound unnatural like the above two lines. Another example is Q66:5.

[2] Weak composition due to breaking the Arabic grammatical rules render the discourse non-*fasīh*.

Joining the two pronouns together where the latter should have been placed before the former, as in Al-Mutanabbi's:

”خَلَّتِ الْبِلَادُ مِنَ الْعَزَالَةِ لَيْلَهَا فَأَعَاضَهَاكَ اللَّهُ كَيْ لَا تَحْزَنَّا“²⁴

(When the sun disappears in the evening in the land, Allah makes it up to the people through you so that they may not be upset over its setting).

is a good example as *fa^caeāddahāka* فَأَعَاضَهَاكَ should have been *fa^caeāddakaha* فَأَعَاضَكَهَا or *fa^caeādahā iyyāka* إِيَّاكَ. Similarly is Hassān ibn Thābit's:

وَلَوْ أَنَّ مَجْدًا أَخْلَدَ الدَّهْرَ وَاحِدًا
مِنَ النَّاسِ أَبْقَى مَجْدُهُ الدَّهْرَ مُطْعِمًا²⁵

(Lit., If Glory was to cause only one (man) from among the people to live for ever,

Muṭeim's glory would have caused him to live eternally).

While the pronoun in *majduhu* مجدُهُ (his glory) refers to *Muṭim* مُطْعِمًا, the two words are so distant that they render the line too clumsily structured to be considered *fasīh*.

[3] Structural complexity, i.e., putting the words in the wrong order or using an ambiguous word, etc., affect the *faṣāḥah* of the discourse.

Al-Farazdaq says:

إِلَى مَلِكٍ مَا أُمَّهُ مِنْ مُحَارِبٍ
أَبُوهُ وَلَا كَانَتْ كَلَيْبٌ تُصَاهِرُهُ²⁶

(Lit., To a king whose mother is not from *Muhārib*, his father (is), nor was *Kulayb* in a marriage relationship with him)

instead of “أَبُوهُ وَكَانَتْ أُمَّهُ مِنْ مُحَارِبٍ” (Lit., his father, and not his mother, is from *Muhārib*). This leads to ambiguity and clumsiness of style. He also does the same in:

وَمَا مِثْلُهُ فِي النَّاسِ إِلَّا مُمَلِّكًا
أَبُو أُمِّهِ حَيٌّ أَبُوهُ يُقَارِبُهُ²⁷

(Lit., there is no one like him among the people, except *Mumallak*, his mothers father, alive, his father, who is like him (in honour)).
Another poet said:

فَأَصْبَحَتْ بَعْدَ حَطِّ بَهْجَتِهَا
كَأَنَّ قَفْرًا رُسُومَهَا قَلَمًا²⁸

that is, (It became (fell) after, drew, being a happy place as if, (into) ruins, its lines, a pen) instead of “فَأَصْبَحَتْ بَعْدَ بَهْجَتِهَا قَفْرًا كَأَنَّ قَلَمًا حَطَّ رُسُومَهَا” (After being a happy place, it fell into ruins as if a pen had drawn its lines broken and twisted).

[4] Meaning complexity in the sense that the words used are not the right ones to convey the meaning intended especially ambiguous and/or far-fetched metaphors.

The use of *alsun* أَلْسُن ‘tongues’ instead *ayun* أَعْيُن ‘eyes’ in أَرْسَلَ الْحَاكِمُ أَلْسُنَهُ فِي الْمَدِينَةِ (The ruler has sent his *alsun* in the town) to mean *spies* makes the utterance ambiguous and therefore non-*fasīh*. The same applies if a person uses expressions like بَيْتُهُ كَثِيرُ الْجُرْدَانِ ‘His house is full of rats’ or أَبْيَضُ سِرْبَالِ الطَّبَّاحِ ‘Clean-white is the chef’s uniform’ to refer to dirt and cleanliness respectively. This would be considered complicated, if not wrong, as in Arabic these expressions refer to plenty of food for the former, and miserliness in the latter.²⁹

3) The *Faşāhah* of The Speaker:³⁰

A speaker is considered *fasīh* when he is able to express himself properly in different situations and for different puposes using *fasīh* discourse; it is therefore a personal quality.

Muḗāwiyah ibn Abi Sufuān once asked some people in his presence about who the most *fasīh* of the Arabs were. The answer he got was: “Those whose speech is free from the *lakhlakhāniyyah* لَخْلَخَانِيَّة (common feature of a dialect) of Iraq, the *εανεανاه* عَنَّعَانَة of Tamīm, the *kaskasah* كَسْكَسَة of Bakr, the *ghamghamah* غَمْغَمَة of

Qudā'ah and the *tumtumāniyyah* طُمُطُمَانِيَّة of Hīmyar. He asked: “Who are they?” “Quraysh”, was the answer.³¹

The Concept of Al-Balāghah

The word *balāghah* بَلَاغَةٌ is derived from *balagha* بَلَغَ (to reach, arrive at, get to). *Balgha al-ghāyah* بَلَّغَ الْغَايَةَ means to reach the end, that is, to achieve one’s goal. A person described as *balīgh* بَلِيغٌ (adjective from *balāghah*) is one who says/has the ability to say what should be said using *fasīḥ* فَاسِيحٌ words/discourse in conformity with what the given situation requires.

Therefore, what is said when a person is sad, happy, excited, preaching, talking to an adult, a child, a soldier, a thief, etc., differ in many ways according to the situation. The fundamental point in *balāghah* is expressed in the statement of Al-Huṭay‘ah to Umar ibn Al-Khattāb:

تَحَنَّنْ عَلَيَّ هَذَاكَ الْمَلِيكَ
فَإِنَّ لِكُلِّ مَقَامٍ مَقَالًا³²

(Treat me with mercy, may the King (Allah) guide you,
as for every situation there is a particular utterance to suit it).
It is the second half of this line that pinpoints the core of *balāghah*, as it states that every context requires its own distinctive form of speech. Apparently, this is the main reason that there is a consensus that *balāghah* is defined as: “مُطَابَقَةُ الْكَلَامِ لِمُقْتَضَى الْحَالِ (مَعَ فَصَاحَتِهِ)”,³³ that is, the conformity of the utterance to the requirements of the situation using *fasīḥ* discourse.

In a poem praising Hishām ibn Abd Al-Malik, Abu Al-Najm said:

صَفْرَاءُ قَدْ كَادَتْ وَلَمَّا تَفَعَّلِ
كَأَنَّهَا فِي الْأُفُقِ عَيْنُ الْأُحْوَالِ³⁴

((the sun), looking yellow as it was about to set,
looked on the horizon like the eye of a cross-eyed person).
As Hishām was cross-eyed himself, he thought the poet was mocking him, and ordered the poet to be put in prison. Here, the

utterance did not conform to what the situation required. So, although the words, discourse and speaker may be described as *faṣīh*, the speech cannot be described as *balīgh*.

In contrast with this, when inviting the king of Persia to Islam, the Prophet Muhammad (ﷺ), knowing that he was addressing a non-Arabic speaking person, wrote to him in a style that is direct, clear, easy to translate and understand. He ﷺ wrote:

"مِنْ مُحَمَّدٍ رَسُولِ اللَّهِ إِلَى كِسْرَى أَبْرُوَيْزَ عَظِيمِ فَارِسَ، سَلَامٌ عَلَى مَنْ اتَّبَعَ الْهُدَى وَأَمَّنَ بِاللَّهِ وَرَسُولِهِ، فَأَدْعُوكَ بِدَاعِيَةِ الْإِسْلَامِ؛ فَإِنِّي رَسُولُ اللَّهِ إِلَى الْخَلْقِ كَافَّةً؛ لِيُنذِرَ مَنْ كَانَ حَيًّا وَيَحِقُّ الْقَوْلُ عَلَى الْكَافِرِينَ، فَأَسَلِمُ تَسَلَّمَ، فَإِن أَبَيْتَ فَإِثْمُ الْمَجُوسِ عَلَيْكَ".³⁵

On the other hand when the Prophet ﷺ wrote to Wā'il ibn Hujr Al-Hadrami and his people, he ﷺ used a completely different style, choice of words and discourse. This was meant to conform with with the linguistic abilities and nature of his Arab addressees. The message said:

"مِنْ مُحَمَّدٍ رَسُولِ اللَّهِ إِلَى الْأَقْيَالِ الْعَبَاهِلَةِ، وَالْأَرْوَاعِ الْمَشَايِبِ مِنْ أَهْلِ حَضْرَمَوْتَ بِإِقَامَةِ الصَّلَاةِ وَإِتْيَاءِ الرُّكَاةِ، عَلَى التَّبِيعَةِ الشَّائِةِ لِمُقَوَّرَةِ الْأَلْبَابِ، وَلَا صَنَّاكَ، وَأَنْطُوا التَّبَجَّةَ، وَالتَّيْمَةَ لِصَاحِبِهَا، وَفِي السُّيُوبِ الْخُمْسِ، لَا خِلَاطَ وَلَا وِرَاطَ، وَلَا شِنَاقَ وَلَا شِعَارَ، وَمَنْ زَنَى مِنْ بَكْرِ فَاصْتَعُوهُ مَائَةً، وَاسْتَوْفِضُوهُ عَامًا، وَمَنْ زَنَى مِنْ ثِيَبٍ فَصَرَّجُوهُ بِالْأَضَامِيمِ. وَلَا تَوْصِيمَ فِي الدِّينِ، وَلَا عُثْمَةَ فِي فُرَائِضِ اللَّهِ تَعَالَى، وَمَنْ أَجَبَى فَقَدْ أَرَبَى، وَكُلُّ مُسْكِرٍ حَرَامٌ، وَإِن لَبْنُ حَجْرٍ يَتَرَفَّلُ عَلَى الْأَقْيَالِ".³⁶

It is therefore clear that *balāghah* describes both the discourse and the speaker³⁷ but not individual words.³⁸ However, *balāghah* requires extreme care in selecting the words and style that would be used in a given situation. The entire Qur'an is the matchless example of both *faṣāhah* and *balāghah*.

CHAPTER TWO

Semantic Analysis

In this chapter, the meanings of the terms of measuring and weighing are analysed in detail both in and out of context. The terms are arranged alphabetically according to their roots as follows:

b-kh-s بَخَسَ, *th-q-l* ثَقُلَ, *kh-s-r* حَسَرَ, (*kh-f-f* خَفَّفَ), *t-gh-w* طَغَوُ, *t-f-f* طَفَّفَ, *q-s-t* قَسَطَ, *k-y-l* كَيْلَ, *n-q-ṣ* نَقَصَ, *w-z-n* وَزَنَ (*mīzān* مِيزَان, *mawāzīn* مُوَازِين), and *w-f-y* وَفَى.

** * **

b-kh-s

بَخَسَ

Bakhasa بَخَسَ is a word that covers a very wide range of meanings. Lexicographers and exegetes³⁹ agree that the transitive verb *bakhasa* means *naqasha* نَقَصَ which may be rendered provisionally as ‘to diminish.’

The verbal noun *bakhs* بَخْسٌ does not only refer to an act of diminishing what belongs to others, but is also considered as an act of deliberate injustice.⁴⁰ Since *bakhs* indicates withholding from others *part* of what is rightfully due to them, this of course, implies that one of the aspects of *bakhs* is giving others less than is due to them.

When a fair sale takes place, in the sense that neither the seller nor the buyer gets wronged, the Arabs say that the sale involved neither *bakhs* (decrease) nor *shutūt* شَطُوط increase/excess.⁴¹

The fingers of the hands, being the executors of *bakhs* are called in Arabic *al-^cabākhis* الأَبَاخِس.⁴²

The fact that the word *bakhsa* refers to diminution or something becoming less than it should be is stressed by the Arabic expression *bakhsa ^εaynahu* يَخَسُّ عَيْنَهُ,⁴³ that is, to poke someone's eyes out.

Also, as injustice is involved in the act of *bakhs*, the word *bākhis/bākhisah* بَاخِس/بَاخِسَة is used to this effect by the Arabs, as they say in a proverb تَخَسَّبَهَا حَمَقَاءٌ وَهِيَ بَاخِسٌ أَوْ بَاخِسَةٌ 'You take her for a fool, while [in reality] she is unjust'; in other words, she is the one who has done the wrong.

Al-Qurtūbi says that one of the aspects of *bakhs* is the devaluation of a commodity on the part of the buyer in order to pay less for it than one should, and cheating by either adding or diminishing in the interest of one person against the other.⁴⁵

In short, anything that is "taken from its owner unrightfully"⁴⁶ is referred to as *bakhs*. Therefore, withholding the decimal fractions العَشُور when selling or buying is also considered *bakhs*.⁴⁷

The Prophet (ﷺ) is also reported to have said: "مَا أَظْهَرَ قَوْمَ الْبَخْسِ" "فِي الْمِكْيَالِ وَالْمِيزَانِ إِلَّا ابْتَلَاهُمُ اللَّهُ بِالْفَحْطِ وَالْغَلَاءِ"⁴⁸ i.e., when any people practises *bakhs* in the measure and the balance, Allah will punish them by famine and increase in the price (of what they buy).

Zuhayr also said: "وَفِي كُلِّ مَا بَاعَ امْرُؤٌ بَخْسُ دِرْهَمٍ" 'in everything that a person sells there is a dirham diminished.'

It is therefore clear that *bakhs* is an act of diminishing or reducing people's belongings intentionally and unrightfully either openly or secretly, and results in injustice befalling the wronged party.

In the Qur'an, the root *b-kh-s* is mentioned seven times in six Surahs. In the three Ayahs that are of main concern to us here as far

as measuring and weighing is concerned, the reference is made in the general sense. In Q7:85, Q11:85 and Q26:183, the Qur'an says: ﴿النَّاسَ أَشْيَاءَهُمْ وَلَا تَبْخَسُوا﴾ "and defraud not people by reducing their things".⁵⁰

In these Ayahs, the Prophet Shu'ayb addresses his people who were so accustomed to cheating when measuring and/or weighing⁵¹ that they were referred to with the phrase that is most descriptive to their state, that is, people of *bakhs* أَهْلُ بَخْسٍ.⁵² They had various instruments for their measuring of various capacities; the bigger ones were used to receive from people by measure, and the smaller ones were used to measure for people when selling them any and everything, diminishing people's dues. The Meccan and Medinan traders before Islam, according to Al-Zamakhshari,⁵³ used to act in the same way, so that "if a stranger came to their lands, they took his genuine dirhams, cut them into pieces, calling them fake and kept them, and in return gave the stranger their own *fake* money that was less in value and weight".⁵⁴

The Qur'an refers to the fact that the Prophet Shu'ayb commanded his people to exact full measure and weight, and to abstain from cheating people in this way. However, as their ill-deeds involved everything else, cheating became second nature to them. As a result, they "diminished everything they could lay their hands on, whether big or small, dear or cheap; there was nothing left without diminution (being affected by *bakhs*)".⁵⁵ Therefore, the Qur'anic command ﴿وَلَا تَبْخَسُوا النَّاسَ أَشْيَاءَهُمْ﴾ "nor withhold from the people the things that are their due",⁵⁶ is used to generalise after the reference is made to measuring and weighing in particular before.⁵⁷

The rest of the Ayahs where *b-kh-s* still occurs refer more or less to the same meaning. However, their study, if included here, will not be only irrelevant but also will not add much to our understanding of the act of *bakhs* as shown from the Ayahs under study.

The root *th-q-l* 'ثَقُلَ' is used in the Qur'an twenty six times in nineteen Surahs. Of particular interest to this work are: (1) *mithqāl* «مِثْقَالٌ» in Q4:40, Q10:61, Q21:47, Q31:16, Q34:3 & 22 and Q99:7 & 8, and (2) «ثَقُلْتُ مَوَازِينَهُ» in Q7:8, Q23:102 and Q101:6.

Lexicographers⁵⁸ agree that *al-thiqal* 'الثَّقَلُ' is the opposite of 'lightness', i.e., heaviness. As heavy and light bodies alike tend towards the earth's centre due to gravity, the quality that such bodies possess is referred to as *thiqal* 'heaviness'. Everything whether big or small has its share of heaviness, in other words, has weight.

The Qur'an, referring to things having the least weight, makes use of the word *mithqāl* 'مِثْقَالٌ' in relation to both {ذَرَّةٌ} (ant/atom) and «حَبَّةٌ مِّنْ خَرْدَلٍ» (mustard seed). *Al-mithqāl* was originally a specific weight; according to *Al-Munjid* and *Wasf Misr*,⁵⁹ it was equal to approximately one and half dirhams. However, by virtue of its root, it became a referent to "any weight, big or small".⁶⁰ Accordingly, *mithqāl* means 'as heavy as' or 'having the same weight as' or 'in the weight of' (something which is specified after *mithqāl* 'مِثْقَالٌ').

By way of example, the Qur'an refers to the weight of a "small red ant"⁶¹ as the least in weight making use of the word *dharrah* 'ذَرَّةٌ'. Ibn 'Abbās is reported to have had some dust in his hand then blowing the dust in the air, he said: "Everyone of these (particles) is a *dharrah* 'ذَرَّةٌ'".⁶² Also, the specks seen in a column of light coming through a window or a hole are known as *dharrāt* 'ذَرَّاتٌ' (plural of *dharrah* 'ذَرَّةٌ').⁶³ Ibn 'Abbās also said that *dharrah* means "the head of a red ant".⁶⁴

It is also worth mentioning that when an Arabic translation was sought for the modern notion 'atom', the word *dharrah* 'ذَرَّةٌ'

as used. The Qur'an also uses ﴿مِنْ قَلِيلٍ حَبِّ مَسْجِدٍ﴾ 'the weight of a mustard seed'. According to Q21:47 when the scales are set up on the Judgement Day, nothing will escape the balancing even if it is as subtle as the weight of a mustard seed.

However, the Qur'an recognises the fact that there are things that might be lighter than a mustard seed or the head of a red ant or even an atom, therefore, a reference in Q10:61 is made to this effect ﴿وَلَا أَصْغَرَ مِنْ ذَلِكَ وَلَا أَكْبَرَ﴾ "Not what is less than that or what is greater than that".⁶⁵

As is explained under *w-z-n* (*mīzān* & *mawāzīn*), the "deeds"⁶⁶ of man will be put in the Balance for weighing. In three Surahs namely no.7, 23 and 101, the reference is to the actual process; whoever's *mawāzīn*⁶⁷ weigh heavy 'نَقَلَتْ' these will be the ones to deserve the reward.

Related to *thaqula* 'ثَقُلَ' is *khaffa* 'خَفَّفَ'. The Qur'an contrasts what weighs heavy with what weighs light on the Judgement Day in Q 7:8-9, Q23:102-3, and Q101:6-8 ﴿خَفَّفَتْ مَوَازِينَهُ﴾.

Ibn Manzūr says that “*Al-khiffah* ‘الْخِفَّةُ’ (verbal noun of *khaffa*) is the opposite of heaviness”,⁶⁸ i.e., lightness. That is why as one side of the Balance on the Judgement Day proves heavy, the other must weigh light, this being the nature of any act of weighing. The Arabs say *khaffa al-mīzān* ‘خَفَّفَ الْمِيزَانَ’ to mean *shāla* ‘شَالَ’ when one side of the scale (the light one) goes up.⁶⁹

As far as ‘weighing’ on the Day of Judgement is concerned, the reference is made to the *mawāzīn* that will be either heavy or light. The Qur'an does not speak specifically of one side of the scale going up and the other going down. This is only understood from human experience when balancing two objects one heavier than the other, and also from the ‘intrinsic’ meaning of *thaqula* ‘ثَقُلَ’⁷⁰ that necessitates moving down towards the centre of the earth as a result of gravity. Therefore, when one side goes down, the other goes up; this latter action is referred to as *khaffa* ‘خَفَّفَ’, or more precisely, *khaffa* ‘خَفَّفَ’ as a verb refers to the state of the thing involved.

Whether the laws of gravity will be maintained in exactly the same way as we know them in the Hereafter or not, the Qur'an does not tell. Our understanding is derived from what the above mentioned words mean with regard to the process of weighing on the human level.

However, the Qur'an states in Q14:48 ﴿يَوْمَ تُبَدَّلُ الْأَرْضُ غَيْرَ الْأَرْضِ﴾⁷¹ ﴿وَالسَّمَاوَاتُ﴾. A dramatic change will occur and affect both heaven and earth. It is perhaps because of this that Al-Rāzi says: “Some are of the opinion that light will appear on the side of the *hasanahs* while darkness will encompass the side of the *sayyicahs*”.⁷² No

mention is here made to the scales going up or down as a result of balancing objects of different weights.

The above is actually based on the understanding that *mawāzīn* 'مَوَازِين' refers to 'what is weighed' as the plural of *mawzūn* 'مَوْزُون'. On the other hand, the Arabs also refer to the weighing instrument, the *mīzān* 'المِيزَان' as heavy or light depending of course on what is put in the balance to determine its weight, in spite of the fact that, presumably, the actual weight of the balance itself does not matter since it has no effect on the process. Therefore, *thaqula al-mīzān* 'ثَقُلَ المِيزَانُ' (Lit., the balance is heavy), is only used as a *majāz*, referring to the importance of the thing being weighed. Al-Qurtūbi says that the scales become heavy or light as a result of the "records of the deeds being placed (put) there [for weighing]".⁷³ According to this latter view *mawāzīn* is the plural of *mīzān*. Details are found under *mawāzīn* later in this chapter.

Only in three places in the entire Qur'an do we find the root *kh-s-r* 'خَسَرَ' (the relevant past tenses are *khasara* 'خَسَرَ' and *akhsara* 'أَخَسَرَ') related to measuring and weighing, namely in Q26:181, Q55:9 and Q83:3.⁷⁴

Exegetes⁷⁵ agree that the Arabs say *khasara al-mīzān* 'خَسَرَ الْمِيزَانَ' and *akhsara al-mīzān* 'أَخَسَرَ الْمِيزَانَ' to mean 'He has caused the balance to be deficient', in the sense that the giver by weight has cheated the receiver by perhaps manipulating *the balance* so that the receiver gets less than is due to him.

akhsara 'أَخَسَرَ' becomes *yukhsiru* 'يُخَسِرُ' in the present tense in the dialect of Quraysh,⁷⁶ and *yakhsuru* 'يَخْسِرُ' in other dialects. As for *yakhsaru* 'يَخْسِرُ' when related to weighing for example, it should be used in the following context: *yakhsaru fī al-mīzān* 'يَخْسِرُ فِي الْمِيزَانِ' with the insertion of the preposition *fī* 'فِي' (Lit., 'in') between the verb and the word *al-mīzān* (the balance) in the genitive (*majrūr*). However, its omission is a grammatical license that renders the word *al-mīzān* (the *majrūr*) a direct object (accusative). Al-Qurṭubi states that *yakhsaru* as the present of *akhsara* is also an Arabic dialect form.⁷⁷ As for *khasira* 'خَسِرَ', (present *yakhsaru* 'يَخْسِرُ') it means 'to lose' in the sense of losing money in gambling for example.

The person who commits the act of diminishing what is due to others is called *mukhsir* 'مُخْسِرٍ' (plural *mukhsirūn* 'مُخْسِرُونَ'). Q26:181(-3) reads: ﴿وَرِنُوا بِالْقِسْطِ الْمُسْتَقِيمِ وَلَا أَؤْفُوا الْكَيْلَ وَلَا تَكُونُوا مِنَ الْمُخْسِرِينَ﴾ * (تَيْخَسِرُوا النَّاسَ أَشْيَاءَهُمْ) "Give full measure and be not of those who give less (than due)".⁷⁸ Here is actually a statement against the *mukhsirīn*, and a command that a person should not do whichever causes him to fall under their category either when measuring, weighing or doing any act where diminishing what is due to others

is a possibility.

This is clear from the Qur’anic usage of the word *al-mukhsirīn* ﴿المُخْسِرِينَ﴾ which begins with the definite article *al* ‘ال’ meaning ‘the’. Therefore, *al-mukhsirīn* is not restricted to the act of measuring only which is an immediate precedent in this Ayah, but it goes beyond this to apply also to what follows that a person should use ‘the upright and true balance’ ﴿الْقِسْطَ الْمُسْتَقِيمَ﴾ when weighing so that he is not a *mukhsir*, and should not diminish people’s dues for the same reason.

The restriction of application of *al-mukhsirīn* to measuring only could have been achieved through the usage of the word without the definite *al* (the). This would have defeated the Qur’anic purpose if *al* had not been used.

This can be seen clearly when contrasting this Ayah Q26:181 with Q17:35 which reads ﴿وَأَوْفُوا الْكَيْلَ إِذَا كَلْتُمْ وَزِنُوا بِالْقِسْطَاسِ الْمُسْتَقِيمِ ذَلِكَ خَيْرٌ وَأَحْسَنُ تَأْوِيلًا﴾. In this latter Ayah, there is no direct mention of *ikhsār* (verbal noun of *akhsara*).

Looking closely at the context, we find that Q26:181-4 are what the Prophet Shu‘ayb said to his people. He was in almost the same situation as all the other Prophets of Allah who came before or after him and mentioned in the same Surah, namely Muḥammad (ﷺ) who is addressed at the beginning of the Surah, then Moses, Aaron, Abraham, Noah, Hūd, Ṣāliḥ, and Lot. All of them were belied by their respective people on whom the wrath of Allah fell and were all punished for their denial of their Prophets, as it is clear from the Qur’an’s accounts of every people’s story. So the Prophet Shu‘ayb was warning his people and pointing out the bad acts that they should abstain from. Therefore, he had to be quite emphatic, stressing every command, as their most rooted sin was cheating people with measure and weight.

The Qur’an goes on to tell about the Madyanites’ disbelief in their Prophet Shu‘ayb and the message he brought and the punishment that befell them.

As for Q17:35 it is a different case altogether as explained under *w-f-y* ‘وَفِي’.

Q55:9 that reads ﴿وَأَقِيمُوا الْوَزْنَ بِالْقِسْطِ وَلَا تُخْسِرُوا الْمِيزَانَ﴾ is the second mention of *‘ikhsār*, “And establish (observe) the weight with equity, and do not fall short in the balance (do not make the balance deficient)”.⁷⁹

As stated under *t-gh-w* ‘طغَوْا’, the different interpretations of *al-mīzān*, to a degree, dictate the meanings of associated words in the Ayahs Q55:7-9. Also, causing loss to people in what is due to them is not permissible in any way since this is considered an act of injustice that goes against the rules of *al-mīzān*. Q55:7-9 warns against both *tughyān* (transgression), in the sense of giving a great deal less and taking a great deal more than due, and *‘ikhsār*.

The contrast between *tughyān* and *‘ikhsār* demonstrates a very important point: a great deal of *‘ikhsār* is *tughyān*. As it is the case almost all the time that when major acts of injustice are committed, minor acts of injustice are somewhat ignored or not given as much concern, the Qur’an does not want this to be the case; measures must be taken so that any act of injustice, big or small, should not be allowed. Therefore, Q55:9 ends with the command that causing the balance to fall short (*‘ikhsār*) is not permitted.

However, Al-Rāzi says that *al-mīzān* here means *al-mawzūn* (the thing weighed),⁸⁰ and therefore, ﴿وَلَا تُخْسِرُوا الْمِيزَانَ﴾ means diminishing what is weighed or withholding some or part of what is given by weight.

Al-Qurṭubi also refers to a different meaning concerning *al-Mīzān*, that it is the one used on the Day of Judgement to weigh the deeds of the people. He says: “It is said ﴿وَلَا تُخْسِرُوا الْمِيزَانَ﴾ means: and do not cause your Balance of good deeds to be deficient on the Day of Judgement, otherwise this would be an anguish and a cause of regret”.⁸¹ However, if we accept this interpretation, the meaning of the rest of the Ayahs (the wider context) will prove problematic.

It seems to me that the word *al-mīzān* (the Balance) is used here rather than any other word which the Qur'anic exegetes say *al-mīzān* refers to or implies, because the act of *'ikhsār* befalls the B/balance itself (as the direct object), in the sense that the B/balance is not given the chance to weigh or function properly. That is to say, part of what it should be doing is taken away from it. Accordingly, the command ﴿وَلَا تُخْسِرُوا الْمِيزَانَ﴾ should imply, both by virtue of the position and central meaning of the word *al-mīzān* that the B/balance should not be tampered with so that what is weighed is diminished, and should be left to do properly what it is designed for.

Q83:3 is the third and last example in the Qur'an that makes use of *'akhsara* 'أَخْسَرَ' with reference to measuring and weighing. This Ayah is a part of the definition that the Qur'an gives to *al-mutaffifīn*, as is explained under *t-f-f* 'طَفَفَ'.

In Q83:1-3 ﴿وَيْلٌ لِّلْمُطَفِّفِينَ * الَّذِينَ إِذَا أَكْتَالُوا عَلَى النَّاسِ يَسْتَوْفُونَ * وَإِذَا كَالُواهُمْ أَوْ وَزَنُوا لَهُمْ يُخْسِرُونَ﴾ as the word *al-mutaffifīn* is related to both what is *tafīf* (little) and *tifāf* (the rim or edge of the measure), two things may be concluded:

(1) What *al-mutaffifīn* unrightfully and unjustifiably withhold or keep to themselves from what is rightfully due to others is *little*. This implies the meanness of the act.

(2) The *'ikhsār* is related in one way to *mash al-tifāf* 'مَسَحَ الطَّفَافِ' which the Prophet (ﷺ) forbade, according to the report of Ibn Al-Majāshūn. Ibn Al-Majāshūn goes on to say that he was informed that when giving by measure to people, Pharaoh (meaning Pharaoh's agents) used to swipe a metal bar on the edge of the measure so that the small part of what was being measured which came slightly above the measure's rim was withheld; this was *mash al-tifāf* 'مَسَحَ الطَّفَافِ'.⁸² This extremely small amount of the thing measured is in actual fact what distinguishes a measure that is *khāsir* 'خَاسِر' from one that is *wāfīn* 'وَافٍ'. It is therefore clear that the above Ayah contrasts *yastawfūn* ﴿يَسْتَوْفُونَ﴾ with *yukhsirūn* ﴿يُخْسِرُونَ﴾. It remains to say that Q83:3 applies the act of *'ikhsār* to both measuring and weighing.

Q55:7-9 read: وَالسَّمَاءَ رَفَعَهَا وَوَضَعَ الْمِيزَانَ * أَلَّا تَطْغَوْا فِي الْمِيزَانِ * وَأَقِيمُوا ﴿٧﴾ وَالسَّمَاءَ رَفَعَهَا وَوَضَعَ الْمِيزَانَ * أَلَّا تَطْغَوْا فِي الْمِيزَانِ * وَأَقِيمُوا ﴿٨﴾ وَالْوَزْنَ بِالْقِسْطِ وَلَا تُخْسِرُوا الْمِيزَانَ ﴿٩﴾ “And the Heaven he has raised high, and He has set up the Balance. Transgress not in the Balance, and establish weight with justice, and fall not short in the Balance”.⁸³

Our main concern here is Ayah 8 ﴿أَلَّا تَطْغَوْا فِي الْمِيزَانِ﴾ ‘transgress not in the B/balance’.

t-gh-w ‘طَغَو’ is the root of the verb {تَطْغَوْا} in the above Ayah, whose verbal noun is *tughyān* ‘طَغْيَانٌ’. The derivations of this root are used many times in the Qur’an. However, the root is used only once in relation to measuring and weighing, namely with *al-mīzān* ﴿الْمِيزَانَ﴾ above.

Lexicographers and exegetes alike agree that *taghā* ‘طَغَى’ means “to exceed the limit or to transgress”.⁸⁴ However, due to exegetical differences concerning what *al-mīzān* {الْمِيزَانَ} refers to,⁸⁵ ﴿أَلَّا تَطْغَوْا فِي الْمِيزَانِ﴾ is interpreted differently. Nonetheless, the basic intended message remains the same, i.e., doing injustice to people in any way is strictly prohibited.

Firstly, this Ayah begins with ‘*allā* {أَلَّا}. Exegetes⁸⁶ agree on the following:

1. *Allā* ‘أَلَّا’ is underlyingly (في الأصل) *an lā* ‘أَنَّ لَا’, then *an* becomes assimilated into *lā* forming one word. As *an* is an explanatory article known as ‘*an* al-mufṣṣṣa’ ‘أَنَّ الْمُفَصَّصَةَ’ it has the same function as when it is not joined with other articles exactly as it is used in Q38:6 ﴿وَإِنطَلَقَ الْمَلَأُ مِنْهُمْ أَن﴾ “And the leaders among them went about (saying): “Walk ye away ...”.⁸⁷ It, therefore, means ‘*ay* ‘أَيُّ’ (‘i.e.’, or ‘that is to say’ or ‘meaning’).

2. ‘*Allā* ﴿أَلَا﴾ means *li‘allā* ‘لئلا’ (‘lest’ or ‘in order not to’). Therefore, ‘*an* ‘أَنْ’ here functions the same as in Q4:176 ﴿يُبَيِّنُ اللَّهُ لَكُمُ أَنْ تَضِلُّوا﴾ “Allah makes clear to you *lest* you go astray (*in order that* you may not err).⁸⁸

3. According to Al-Qurtūbi those [exegetes] who say that *al-Mīzān* refers to Justice, say its *tughyān* is ‘doing injustice’; those who say *al-Mīzān* is the instrument used for weighing, say that its *tughyān* is *al-bakhs*,⁸⁹ i.e., deliberate unrightful and forceful withholding of (part of or) what belongs to others through manipulating the balance; and those who say that *al-Mīzān* refers to *al-Hukm* ‘الْحُكْمُ’ (the Scripture and its Laws),⁹⁰ say its *tughyān* is *al-tahrīf* ‘التَّحْرِيفُ’ (changing or displacing words from their right places).⁹¹

Ibn ‘Abbās also said: ﴿أَلَا تَطْغَوْا فِي الْمِيزَانِ﴾ means ‘do not cheat whoever you weigh for’.

Here is also a warning against *tughyān* in the sense that diminishing or withholding too much of what is due to others is not allowed. This is because a person would not exceed his limits and transgress unless he is capable of doing so. And it is only with this characteristic of *tughyān* that a person can diminish others’ dues openly. As for a person doing this in secret, the factor of *tughyān* still applies, as that person does this only when he feels too safe to be discovered. This is described as *tughyān* because no one can escape from Allah against whose Laws that person would be transgressing. Also, considered an act of *tughyān* are ‘taking too much more’ than due, ‘giving too much less’ than due, and manipulating the Balance in a way that causes harm to peoples’ dues.

The Ayahs go on to dictate that what a person should do is to weigh properly in such a way that every party gets his due share in a fair transaction, hence, ﴿وَأَقِيمُوا الْوَزْنَ بِالْقِسْطِ﴾.

In most cases, weighing is for the benefit of the weigher either as a giver or receiver by weight since the weigher would assumedly

be in control of conducting the process, and also since each party would be trying to protect his own interest through trying to get more for himself. Accordingly, the Qur'an continues with another command ﴿وَلَا تُخْسِرُوا الْمِيزَانَ﴾ which works for both parties involved in the transaction, as is explained under *kh-s-r* 'خَسَرَ'.

Therefore, transgression (*tughyān*) and skimping (*'ikhsār*) are prohibited and equity (*al-qist*) is what is ordained.

Unlike other terms under study, the root *t-f-f* ‘طَفَفَ’ is mentioned only once in the entire Qur’an in the form of *al-mutaffifin* ‘المُطَفِّفِينَ’ in Q83:1-3 that reads:

﴿وَيْلٌ لِّلْمُطَفِّفِينَ * الَّذِينَ إِذَا أَكْتَالُوا عَلَى النَّاسِ يَسْتَوْفُونَ * وَإِذَا كَالُوهُمْ أَوْ وَزَنُوهُمْ يُخْسِرُونَ﴾

This is also the only term for which the Qur’an gives an explanation of the meaning it is meant to express.

Al-mutaffifin ‘المُطَفِّفِينَ’ is the plural form of *mutaffif* ‘مُطَفِّفٌ’. The root *t-f-f* ‘طَفَفَ’ has many derivations that are of importance as to understanding the exact meaning of the word and how *al-mutaffifin* came to convey the meaning it does.

Taffa al-shay^cu ‘طَفَفَ الشَّيْءُ’ means that the thing involved has “come near [to something]”.⁹² This evidenced by the fact that when the Prophet (ﷺ) got some horses to take part in a horse race, and Ibn ‘Umar who came first said that his mare was so fast that it even brought him very ‘near to (or in the same line with)’ the mosque of Banī Zurayq. In his own words: “طَفَفَ بِي الْفَرَسُ مَسْجِدَ بَنِي زُرَيْقٍ”.⁹³

Taff ‘طَفُ’ and *tafāf* ‘طَفَافٌ’ or *tifāf* ‘طِفَافٌ’ mean the edge or rim ‘طَفُ/طِفَافٌ’⁹⁴ of the jug. The Arabs say *taff* or *tifāf al-mikyāl* ‘المِكْيَالِ’ (*al-mikyāl* being the instrument used for measuring grains, for example) to actually mean that what is measured (*al-makīl* ‘المَكِيلُ’) comes near the edge of *al-mikyāl* but does not fill it completely to the limit it should.⁹⁵

Abdullah ibn Al-Majāshūn⁹⁶ reported that the Prophet (ﷺ) prohibited *mash al-tifāf* ‘مَسَحَ الطَّفَافِ’, i.e., when measuring, making the *makīl* on the same level as the *tifāf* and removing anything that comes above its line. Ibn Al-Majāshūn also said that that procedure was how Pharaoh used to measure.

The Prophet (ﷺ) is reported to have said: “All of you, children of Adam, are *taffu al-sāe* ‘طَفُّ الصَّاعِ’, you do not come near enough to fill it up”,⁹⁷ i.e., you are all equal; none is perfect, none is superior to the other. As regards *al-sāe* ‘الصَّاعِ’, it is an instrument used for measuring (grains); it functions just like *al-mikyāl*, i.e., it is a measure.

A thing that is ‘small in quantity’ or described as ‘little’ is referred to in Arabic as *tafīf* ‘طَفِيفٌ’.⁹⁸

The verbal noun *al-tatfīf* ‘التَطْفِيفُ’, whose verb is *taffafa* ‘طَفَّفَ’, is the act of withholding little of what is given resulting in giving less than is due or what one should, causing the *makīl* ‘المَكِيلُ’ to be *taffān* ‘طَفَّانٌ’.⁹⁹

The person who commits the prohibited act of *tafīf* is called *mutaffif* ‘مُطَفِّفٌ’, either because when measuring he does not fill the *mikyāl* as he should but only gets the *makīl* to come near the *tifāf* of the *mikyāl* and/or what he unjustifiably withholds is *tafīf*.¹⁰⁰ The *mutaffif* is also defined as the person who manipulates the *mikyāl* so that it does not have the right capacity, and then uses this in giving by measure knowing that he gives less than he should.¹⁰¹

The meaning of the verbal noun *tafīf* has then been expanded and thus employed to refer to everything that is not done properly in the sense that it falls short. This actually applies not only to measuring (الكَيلُ), but also to weighing, the devaluation of a commodity or the concealment of its faults, praying, talking, performing ablution, or any other act of worship, etc. Imam Mālik said: “In every thing there is *wafāc* and *tafīf*”,¹⁰² that is, completion and falling short.

Sālim ibn Abi Al-Jaʿd is reported to have said: “*Al-salāh* (prayer) is assessed with a measure (الصَّلَاةُ بِمِكْيَالٍ), whoever fills it up properly (i.e., performs *salāh* as he should), he will be rewarded in full; and whoever does not fill it up (i.e., does not perform the *salāh*

as he should), then you know what Allah has said about the *mutaffifin* ﴿وَيْلٌ لِّلْمُطَفِّفِينَ﴾, “Woe to the *Mutaffifin*”.¹⁰³

Al-Rāzi, in defining *tatfif*, indicates that it means giving less in measure and weight than one should through withholding a little of what is being measured or weighed, secretly, i.e., in a way that the wronged party would not notice that part of what is due to him had been kept from him. He also goes further to explain that if what is unrightfully withheld was not ‘little’ (*tatfif*), it would then be noticed and therefore stopped by the wronged party.¹⁰⁴

In general, a person is called *mutaffif* when he commits the act of *tatfif* either intentionally or unintentionally. As for the application of punishment referred to in Q83 to the unintentional *mutaffif*, or to the person who committed *tatfif* by mistake, this we leave to the Ulema to interpret.¹⁰⁵

With regard to the place of revelation, reports differ about where Q83 was revealed. While some reports indicate that it was revealed between Mecca and Medina, others say it is a Meccan Surah except for the Ayahs about *al-mutaffifin*, which are Medinan.¹⁰⁶ Al-Suyūṭī reports that Ibn ‘Abbās said: “The people of Medina were the worst and most notorious in measuring; so when Allah revealed this Surah, they stopped and gave the exact measure”.¹⁰⁷

Al-Qurtūbi also says that Ibn ‘Abbās said that the people of Medina used to exact full measure for themselves when buying , and give less when selling by measure or weight; so when this Surah ‘هَذِهِ السُّورَةُ’ was revealed, they gave up this ill practice, and they have become, according to Al-Farrā’, the best in measuring until today.¹⁰⁸

Q83:1-3 reads:

﴿وَيْلٌ لِّلْمُطَفِّفِينَ * الَّذِينَ إِذَا أَكْتَالُوا عَلَى النَّاسِ يَسْتَوْفُونَ * وَإِذَا كَالُوهُمْ أَوْ وُزِنُوا لَهُمْ يُخْسِرُونَ﴾,
“Woe to *al-Mutaffifin* * Those who, when they measure against the people, take (exact) full measure * and when they measure for them or weigh for them, do skimp (give less than due)”.¹⁰⁹

From the above mentioned Ayahs, it is clear that:

1. a definition for *al- mutaffifīn* is given.
2. Q83:2 mentions measuring only while Q83:3 mentions both measuring and weighing .
3. Q83:2 says *‘iktālū ʿalā* ﴿اِكْتَالُوا عَلٰى﴾ (Lit., measure against), while the Arabs would normally say: *‘iktālū min* ‘اِكْتَالُوا مِنْ’ (receive by measure from).
4. Q83:3 says: *kālūhum ʿaw wazanūhum* ﴿كَالُوْهُمْ اَوْ وَزَنُوْهُمْ﴾ (Lit., measure them or weigh them), instead of the more common *kālū lahum aw wazanū lahum* ‘كَالُوا لَهُمْ اَوْ وَزَنُوا لَهُمْ’ (measure for them or weigh for them).

With regard to point 2, Al-Rāzi says that Q83:2 does not mention weighing ‘الْوَزْنُ’ as selling and buying are done through either measuring or weighing so the former implies the latter and vice versa, or in other words, the mention of one is enough to imply the other.¹¹⁰ Ibn Manzūr affirms this as he says: “وَإِذَا كَالَهُ فَقَدْ وَزَنَهُ”¹¹¹ (Lit., When he measures it, he will also have weighed it); he also reports that Murrah says: “كَيْلٌ كُلُّ مَا وَزِنَ فَقَدْ”¹¹² (Lit., Everything which is weighed may also be described as measured).

Al-Zamakhshari, on the other hand, gives another plausible explanation indicating that if a thing can be both measured and weighed, the *mutaffifīn* would only take it by measure, and not by weight, because they could easily exact full measure for themselves, and cheat as well, i.e., they could shake the *mikyāl* to increase its capacity to the maximum, and invent all sorts of ways to take more than they should. But when they give people anything by measure or weight, the means does not matter, as they can cheat both ways, being the executors of both processes.¹¹³

Another reason may be that *tatfīf* is related *tifāf* which means that as an act it is more related to measuring than weighing. Therefore, the Qur’an begins with warning against what is of immediate relation, at least linguistically, to the meaning of *tatfīf*, hence, *‘iktālū* ﴿اِكْتَالُوا﴾. Then in order that people should not assume

that the warning is related to measuring only, or in case they wonder: ‘What about weighing?’, the Qur’an goes on to explain, elaborate and include weighing as well. This is a method of helping to focus the attention of the listener on what comes next; then the warning moves gradually from one thing to another.

As for point 3 above, exegetes and linguists agree that *ʿalā* ﴿عَلَى﴾ in this context means *min* ‘مِنْ’; they are interchangeable, they say. Also as the act of receiving by measure in this context harms the interests of people and is considered an act of injustice *against* them, ﴿عَلَى﴾ is more suitable in conveying this meaning and indicating the wrong-doing.¹¹⁴

As for point 4, there is a consensus among the Ulema that *kālūhum* ^{ʿaw} *wazanūhum* ﴿كَالُواهُمْ أَوْ وَزَنُواهُمْ﴾ means *kālū lahum* ^{ʿaw} *wazanū lahum* ‘كَالُوا لَهُمْ أَوْ وَزَنُوا لَهُمْ’ as this is one of the dialect forms in Hijāz and their neighbouring Qays.¹¹⁵ There they say *sidtuka* ‘صِدَّتْكَ’ (I hunted you [something]), and *sidtu laka* ‘صِدَّتْ لَكَ’ (I hunted [something] for you).¹¹⁶ A poet also says using another verb *janaytuka* ‘جَنَيْتَكَ’ (reaped [for] you): “وَلَقَدْ جَنَيْتَكَ أَكْمُوًّا وَعَسَاقِلًا”.¹¹⁷ It may also be that the annex ‘المُضَافِ إِلَيْهِ’ has replaced the annexed term ‘المُضَافِ’; that is, instead of saying *kālū makīlahum* ^{aw} *wazanū mawzūnahum* ‘كَالُوا مَكِيلَهُمْ أَوْ وَزَنُوا مَوْزُونَهُمْ’, (they measured [for themselves] ‘what is measured’ or weighed ‘what is weighed’), the annexed terms *makīlahum* ‘مَكِيلَهُمْ’ and *mawzūnahum* ‘مَوْزُونَهُمْ’ have been replaced by the annex *hum* ‘هُم’.¹¹⁸

The root *q-s-t* and some of its derivations are mentioned in the Qur'an twenty seven times in seventeen Surahs. All the derivations but one, namely, *qāsīt* 'قَاسِطٌ', refer, one way or the other, to the same meaning. Intriguingly, *qāsīt* refers to the opposite. Linguists and exegetes alike agree on the following:¹¹⁹

The verbal noun *qist* 'القِسْطُ' has different forms and it means:

- (1) Share 'الحِصَّةُ وَالتَّصِيبُ' as in 'akhadha qistahu min al-rāḥah' 'أَخَذَ قِسْطَهُ مِنَ الرَّاحَةِ', (Lit., He has had his share of rest).
- (2) 'Iqsāt' 'إِقْسَاطٌ', meaning 'justice in giving people their shares and in judging': 'العَدْلُ فِي الْقِسْمَةِ وَالْحُكْمِ'.
- (3) *Qusūt* 'قُسُوطٌ' and *qasat* 'قَسَطٌ' meaning 'injustice'.¹²⁰
- (4) The Balance. In a ḥadīth referring to Allah and the begining of things, the Prophet (ﷺ) says: "يُخْفِضُ الْقِسْطَ وَيَرْفَعُهُ",¹²¹ that is, Lit., 'He (Allah) causes the Balance to go down and up'.
- (5) *Mikyāl*: a measure (measuring instrument) whose capacity is half a *ṣāʿ*.

The verbs *qasata* 'قَسَطَ' and *ʿaqasata* 'أَقْسَطَ' mean 'to do justice'. Tarafah ibn Al-ʿAbd said: "كَذَاكَ الْحُكْمُ يَقْسِطُ أَوْ يَجُورُ",¹²² (such is the judgement; it does [you] justice or injustice). The hamzah 'ء' in *ʿaqasata* 'أَقْسَطَ' causes the verb to mean stopping, putting an end to or abolishing the injustice occurred. This is due to the fact that *qasata* 'قَسَطَ' also means 'to do injustice'. An Arab poet said:

"قَوْمٌ هُمْ قَتَلُوا ابْنَ هِنْدٍ عُنْوَةً ... وَهُمْ قَسَطُوا عَلَى التُّعْمَانِ"

(A people who not only [deliberately] killed Ibn Hind by force, but also did injustice to Al-Nu'mān).

If the wind causes a tree branch to go dry, stiff and become straight, the Arabs say: *‘aqsatathu al-riyāh* ‘أَقْسَطْتُهُ الرِّيحُ’.

Also, the Arabs say: *qāsattuhu faqasattuh* ‘فَاقَسَطْتُهُ فَاقَسَطْتُهُ’ ‘I had beaten him to his share and took it from him’, to refer to a person doing injustice to another, in the sense that a person would *unjustly* take another person’s *share* of something.

A just or equitable person is called *muqsit* ‘مُقْسِطٌ’ whose verb is *‘aqsata* ‘أَقْسَطَ’. The Prophet Jesus is described in a *ḥadīth* as *ḥakam muqsit* ‘حَكَمًا مُقْسِطًا’, a just judge.¹²³ As for *Al-Muqsit* ‘الْمُقْسِطُ’ with reference to Allah, as it is one of His ninety nine names ‘أَسْمَاؤُهُ’ ‘الْحُسْنَى’, it means, according to Al-Ḥalīmi, the Giver of *Qist* (Justice) to His servants. It possibly also means ‘the Giver, to everyone of His servants, a part of His Goodness’.¹²⁴

Q49:9 reads: ﴿وَأَقْسِطُوا إِنَّ اللَّهَ يُحِبُّ الْمُقْسِطِينَ﴾ “and be just (equitable). Surely, Allah loves the just (those who are equitable)”.¹²⁵

A person who has deviated from the right path and swerved from justice, and hence does injustice both to himself and others is called *qāsīt* ‘فَاقَسِطٌ’. Before executing Saʿīd ibn Jubayr, Al-Ḥajjāj ibn Yūsuf asked him: “What do you say about (think of) me”? Saʿīd said: “(You are) *qāsīt*, ‘ādil’ ‘فَاقَسِطٌ عَادِلٌ’”, which some people understood as ‘fair and just’ due to the meaning of the roots of these words. However, Saʿīd was referring to another aspect of the meaning which is linguistically more correct, at least with regard to *qāsīt* and therefore contextually *ʿādil* follows in the same line. The meanings meant by Saʿīd, and also understood by Al-Ḥajjāj, are found in Q72:14 ﴿وَأَمَّا الْفَاقِسُونَ فَكَانُوا لِحَبَّتِهِمْ حَطَبًا﴾ “And as for the *qāsītūn* (disbelievers who deviated from the right path, or were unjust), they shall be firewood for Hell”,¹²⁶ and Q6:1 ﴿ثُمَّ الَّذِينَ كَفَرُوا بِرَبِّهِمْ يَعْدِلُونَ﴾ “yet those who disbelieve *hold others as equal* with their Lord”.¹²⁷

As for *al-qistās* ‘الْقِسْطُاس’ or *al-qustās*, this is a proper name for the balance or scales.

Out of the twenty seven references in the Qur’an, the root *q-s-t* is mentioned only seven times with reference to measuring and weighing. However, all the Ayahs dealing with *al-qist* ‘الْقِسْطُ’ fall under one of the following categories:

1. **Commanding justice and fair dealing** ‘الْأَمْرُ بِالْقِسْطِ’:
Q3:21, Q7:29, Q6:152, Q49:9, Q60:8, Q11:85, Q 17:35 and Q26:182.
2. **Establishment and continuous observation of justice** ‘الْقِيَامُ بِالْقِسْطِ’:
Q55:9, Q3:18, Q4:127, Q4:135 and 57:25.
3. **To give just testimony** ‘الشَّهَادَةُ بِالْقِسْطِ’:
Q5:8
4. **Decreeing matters and judging justly** ‘الْقَضَاءُ وَالْحُكْمُ بِالْقِسْطِ’:
Q5:42, Q10:47 & 54 and Q21:47.
5. **Punishment and reward with justice** ‘الْجَزَاءُ بِالْقِسْطِ’:
Q10:4

The Ayahs dealing with the terms under study fall under categories: 1, 2 and 4 above, and these are dealt with below.

1. Commanding Justice and Fair Dealing ‘الْأَمْرُ بِالْقِسْطِ’:

- Q6:152: ﴿وَأَوْفُوا الْكَيْلَ وَالْمِيزَانَ بِالْقِسْطِ ...﴾
 Q11:84-5: ﴿وَلَا تَنقُصُوا الْمِكْيَالَ وَالْمِيزَانَ إِنِّي أَرَأَيْكُمْ بِخَيْرٍ وَإِنِّي أَخَافُ عَلَيْكُمْ عَذَابَ يَوْمٍ﴾
 ﴿مُحِيطٌ * وَيَا قَوْمِ أَوْفُوا الْمِكْيَالَ وَالْمِيزَانَ بِالْقِسْطِ ...﴾
 Q17:35: ﴿وَأَوْفُوا الْكَيْلَ إِذَا كَلَّمْتُمْ وَزِنُوا بِالْقِسْطِاسِ الْمُسْتَقِيمِ﴾
 Q26:181-2: ﴿أَوْفُوا الْكَيْلَ وَلَا تَكُونُوا مِنَ الْمُخْسِرِينَ * وَزِنُوا بِالْقِسْطِاسِ الْمُسْتَقِيمِ﴾

Firstly, only the parts related to *al-qist* in the above Ayas are dealt with here. The rest of the words related to measuring and weighing are tackled according to their alphabetical order either previously or later in this chapter. Also, words like ‘justice’,

‘equity’ and their derivations will be used as approximate equivalents to *al-qist* ‘القِسْطُ’, although it is understood that such words are not exact equivalents. This issue will be partly discussed here and partly in Chapter Four with regard to the suitability of such words as equivalents for *al-qist* ‘القِسْطُ’.

With the exception of Q6:152, all the above Ayahs are Meccan and the order of their Surahs in the Qur’an is not given according to their order of revelation. As a matter of fact their order of revelation is the other way round. However, as the order of the Surahs is *tawqīfi*, the above order is the one followed here.¹²⁸

Q6:152 commands that the acts of measuring and weighing must be performed properly and in a *just* way. Q11:85 bears the same message with a slight difference. It is clear from Q6:152 and Q11:85 that the words *kayl* «الْكَيْلُ», *mikyāl* «الْمِكْيَالُ» and *mīzān* «الْمِيزَانُ» form the focus of the Ayahs and that they are all mentioned after the imperative plural verb *‘awfū* «أَوْفُوا» which refers to exacting, giving in full, doing or performing properly, filling up, etc.

According to Q6:152 measuring and weighing should be carried out in a way that each of the two parties involved gets his due share *bilqist* «بِالْقِسْطِ» ‘with justice’. «بِالْقِسْطِ» here serves a very important purpose especially given that it is mentioned after *‘awfū* «أَوْفُوا»; it actually indicates that the first party should avoid or abstain from whatever acts that affect the measuring and weighing processes which might lead to or result in doing injustice to the second party, the receiver. On the other hand, it is also implied that the receiver should “not ask for more than his due share”.¹²⁹ That is why the Ayah goes on to say that ‘no soul is charged except with what it can bear’, that is: «لَا نُكَلِّفُ نَفْسًا إِلَّا وُسْعَهَا».

It has been reported that Ali ibn Abi Tālib was passing by a man weighing saffron and he caused the scale to go all the way down as it was very much heavier than the counterpoise, Ali told him to ‘weigh *bilqist*’, that is, to get the two scales of the balance even, so that he gets used to balancing things equally and justly,

which is the obligatory part in this Ayah and many others. Then, Ali continued: “Then *after that* add more, as much as you please”,¹³⁰ which is by no means compulsory.¹³¹ This is what *bilqist* refers to.

Q11:85 covers another aspect. After the Madyanites had been commanded not to cause any diminishing to what was due to others in Q11:84 as there was no need to do so, the Prophet Shuʿayb said to them: ﴿إِنِّي أُرَآكُمْ بِخَيْرٍ﴾ ‘I see you in prosperity’. Q11:85 goes on to say: ﴿وَيَا قَوْمِ أَوْفُوا الْمِكْيَالَ وَالْمِيزَانَ بِالْقِسْطِ﴾. Here, *al-mikyāl* ﴿الْمِكْيَالَ﴾ and not *al-kayl* ‘الْكَيْل’ is mentioned although the word *al-mīzān* ﴿الْمِيزَانَ﴾ is still the same as in Q11:84. The reference in this Ayah, according to Al-Qurṭubi, is not to what is measured ‘*al-makīl*’ or what is weighed ‘*al-mawzūn*’ as the preposition ‘بِ’ is not attached to ﴿الْمِكْيَالَ﴾ nor ﴿الْمِيزَانَ﴾. Therefore, Q11:85 enjoins that the size or capacity of the measuring instrument ﴿الْمِكْيَالَ﴾ and the counterpoise weights of the balance ﴿الْمِيزَانَ﴾ must not be manipulated to affect people’s rights.¹³²

Accordingly, the size of the measure ‘*al-mikyāl*’ should be correct and the balance ‘*al-mīzān*’ should be adjusted properly so that justice is achieved both for the giver and the receiver.

Q17:35 and Q26:182 refer to weight using the same words. They read ﴿وَزِنُوا بِالْقِسْطِ الْمُسْتَقِيمِ﴾ “And weigh with the *qistās* that is straight (true and upright)”.¹³³ After stating what to do when measuring, the Ayahs go on to point out one very important aspect in the process of weighing, i.e., dictating what kind of instrument should be used.

In these two Ayahs, the Qur’an uses the word *qistās*, and the Ulema agree that ﴿الْقِسْطِ الْمُسْتَقِيمِ﴾ means “أَقْوَمُ الْمَوَازِينِ وَأَعْدَلُهَا”, that is the most upright balance.¹³⁴ The word *al-qistās* is either derived from the Arabic word *al-qist* meaning ‘share/justice’, or it is originally borrowed from the Greek language and means ‘justice’.¹³⁵ However, Al-Suyūṭi says that *al-qistās* according to Mujāhid is

Greek for ‘Justice’, and according to Saʿīd ibn Jubayr is Greek for ‘scales’.¹³⁶

So, here in these two Ayahs we see the extremely accurate usage of the word *al-qistās* to refer to justice, scales and *just* scales. One cannot but also notice the subtle reference to the fact that the balance in itself is meant to be the performer or rather executor of Justice in such a way that every party would get the share that is due to them, no more and no less. If *al-mīzān* had been used instead of *al-qistās* in Q17:35 and Q26:182, this accuracy and subtlety would not have been achieved, affecting the *balāghah* of the discourse. And as justice can sometimes be twisted or manipulated, *al-qistās* as a symbol standing for Justice is described as *al-mustaqīm*, ‘upright’, that is not and does not know how to be biased against anybody.

2. Establishment and Continuous Observation of Justice ‘الْقِيَامُ بِالْقِسْطِ’:

Q55:9 reads ﴿وَأَقِيمُوا الْوَزْنَ بِالْقِسْطِ وَلَا تُخْسِرُوا الْمِيزَانَ﴾ “And establish (observe) weight with justice (equity), and fall not short (skimp not) in the Balance”.¹³⁷

Q57:25 reads: ﴿وَلَقَدْ أَرْسَلْنَا رُسُلَنَا بِالْبَيِّنَاتِ وَأَنْزَلْنَا مَعَهُمُ الْكِتَابَ وَالْمِيزَانَ لِيَقُومَ النَّاسُ بِالْقِسْطِ﴾ “Indeed We have sent Our messengers with Clear Signs, and sent down with them, the Book (Scripture) and the Balance (of right and wrong, justice) that men may stand forth in (keep up, uphold) justice”.¹³⁸

As is evident from the above Ayahs, Allah has provided man with whatever is necessary to achieve *Justice*, in the sense that every person would get his due *share* of things with equity.

Q55:7 indicates that at the beginning of Creation, Allah raised high the heaven¹³⁹ ﴿وَالسَّمَاءَ رَفَعَهَا﴾ and *wada‘a al-Mīzān* {وَوَضَعَ الْمِيزَانَ}¹⁴⁰. He then enjoined¹⁴¹ that transgression in the B/balance (*al-Mīzān*) should not in any way be attempted: ﴿تَطْغَوْا فِي الْمِيزَانِ أَلَا﴾. The prohibition is followed by a command (Q55:9) that as the *Mīzān*

(symbol for Justice) is there and known, *al-wazn* ﴿الْوِزْنَ﴾ (weight) must be performed (established, observed) according to its rules in Justice ﴿بِالْقِسْطِ﴾ which would result in everyone getting what duly belongs to him in fair dealing. If *bilqist* ﴿بِالْقِسْطِ﴾ were not mentioned in this context, bearing in mind that ﴿وَلَا تُخْسِرُوا الْمِيزَانَ﴾ follows, then achieving justice, which is the purpose of weighing in the first place, in the case of the weigher would not be one of the conditions for just weight. This would result in a contradiction. So *bilqist* ﴿بِالْقِسْطِ﴾ is the answer to the natural question about how ‘weighing’ should be done. The giver by weight would not have to suffer the giving of *too much* more than is due to people. On the other hand, *bilqist* ﴿بِالْقِسْطِ﴾ also refers to a more subtle aspect and that is one’s internal intentions.¹⁴² Driven possibly by greed or desire to gain more for oneself, one might try to achieve this through causing diminution to what belongs to others. Thus, *bilqist* ﴿بِالْقِسْطِ﴾ is there to pacify and eradicate one’s secret intentions to cause injustice to others, and at the same time urges one to raise oneself above such an act of meanness. This is also emphasised by the most suitably placed ﴿وَلَا تُخْسِرُوا الْمِيزَانَ﴾ that follows.

With regard to Q57:25, the Ayah relates that (1) messengers have been sent to their people with Clear Signs and evident proofs, (2) they have also been given a Divine Revelation (*al-Kitāb*) containing rules that people should abide by so that true happiness could be achieved, and (3) *al-Mīzān* (the Balance) has also been sent down with *al-Kitāb* (the Book); and through proper application of what have been given to the messengers of Allah *Justice* could be accomplished. Bearing this in mind, we realise that ﴿لِيَقُومَ النَّاسُ بِالْقِسْطِ﴾ serves the following purposes:

1. It justifies or explains why: messengers have been sent, *al-Bayyināt* (Clear Signs) have been revealed, *al-Kitāb* (the Book) and *al-Mīzān* (the Balance) have been sent down with the deliverers of the divine Message.

2. It implies the implimentation of what achieves *justice*.

3. It indicates that the messengers, the Clear Signs, the Book and the Balance are worth recognising and accepting as they guide to, instruct, show, contain and form what achieves and realises *al-qist* among people.

4. The most accurate phraseology is that the three words imply that proper application of the teachings of the messengers of Allah who had been sent with Clear Signs, and the compliance with the principles, regulations and rules of the Book and the Balance mean in actuality Justice *done* and *achieved* at the same time.

5. ﴿لِيَقُومَ النَّاسُ بِالْقِسْطِ﴾ is a statement that has (a) the force and power of a command that should be abided by (obeyed), in other words, the verb *yaqūm* which is in the present tense serves also as an imperative verb, and (b) the subtlety of a warning that failing to abide by the Divine Law incurs punishment.

6. *Al-qist* here also indicates that what is wanted to be achieved is that everybody should get his due, no more and no less, without causing any sort of diminution to others' dues in any way.

By way of conclusion, it is of importance to say that the above mentioned Ayahs, namely, Q55:9 and Q57:25 are integrated, as the latter bears a general reference that involves everything: ﴿لِيَقُومَ النَّاسُ بِالْقِسْطِ﴾ while the former is slightly more specific in its reference to *al-wazn*: ﴿وَأَقِيمُوا الْوَزْنَ بِالْقِسْطِ﴾. However, in both cases *al-qist* (getting one's due share) is their main focus. It should also be noted that *al-wazn* ﴿الْوَزْنَ﴾ also has a wide range of application.

3. Decreeing Matters and Judging Justly ‘الْقَضَاءُ وَالْحُكْمُ بِالْقِسْطِ’:

Q21:47.reads:

﴿وَنَضَعُ الْمَوَازِينَ الْقِسْطَ لِيَوْمِ الْقِيَامَةِ فَلَا تُظْلَمُ نَفْسٌ شَيْئًا
وَإِنْ كَانَ مِثْقَالَ حَبَّةٍ مِّنْ خَرْدَلٍ أَتَيْنَا بِهَا وَكَفَىٰ بِنَا حَاسِبِينَ﴾

“And We shall set up the just balances for the Day of Resurrection, so that not a soul shall be wronged in anything, and if it be the weight of a grain of mustard-seed, We shall bring it, and sufficient are We for reckoners”.¹⁴³

Here, one catches a glimpse of the scenes of the Judgement Day when the Balance¹⁴⁴ is going to be set up for the weighing of the *deeds*¹⁴⁵ of man. The above Ayah is a clear example of the kind of Justice that cannot be matched. The Judge is the Creator Himself who cannot be bribed and does not become biased against any of his creatures. Therefore, He sets up the Balance/s so that everybody would witness Justice done for himself.

According to this Ayah, it is understood that:

1. Allah is the only Judge on the Day of Judgement.
2. The Balance/s¹⁴⁶ will be set up to do Justice to everyone and everything.
3. Nothing, no matter how small or thought insignificant, will escape the weighing.
4. There is no room for injustice.
5. The weighing is meant to show everyone his share of good and bad that he earned in his earthly lifetime.

It is also clear that, on the Judgement Day, people would differ in the amount of good or bad deeds, and that the balance/s would decide which weigh heavier than the other. In this sense, the balance/s are just judges in themselves, if not Justice itself. However, as the final word is for Allah, the balance/s fall somewhat short of being real judges as they have no will of their own.

Also, the balance/s not only stand for and symbolise Justice, but also their mere existence is Justice as well.

However, the Qur'an does not use the word 'Justice' in the sense of '*adl*' 'عَدْلٌ', but rather the word *qist*, which functions as an adjective for *al-mawāzīn* (Lit., the balances). This shows, although according to some scholars the word *qist* means '*adl*' 'عَدْلٌ',¹⁴⁷ it cannot be replaced by this latter word as it would definitely fall short of conveying the meaning intended.

As, in principle, those whose good and bad deeds would be weighed against each other would be rewarded or punished according to the result of the balancing,¹⁴⁸ and as there are different

degrees for reward and punishment, everyone will end getting his *just share* of either, which is exactly the meaning of *al-qist*.

This above discussion may be summed up as follows:

The balance/s are described as *qist* to imply or indicate that they are so in themselves, in the sense that they are there to show everybody his *qist* (*share*) of the good and bad deeds he had done; and after everybody knows about this, he will be given his *qist* (*share*) of reward or punishment.

This reveals that the word *qist*, the verbal noun used as an adjective for emphasis, is the only proper and completely accurate word, in this form and context, for conveying the meaning intended.

Kāla ‘كَالَ’ is the past tense of the present *yakīlu* ‘يَكِيلُ’ which means to measure the quantity of a substance such as grain, liquids, coal, etc.¹⁴⁹ The verbal nouns, according to Ibn Manzūr¹⁵⁰ are *kayl* ‘كَيْلٌ’, *makāl* ‘مَكَالٌ’ and *makīl* ‘مَكِيلٌ’. As for *‘iktāla* ‘اِكْتَالَ’ it means ‘to receive by measure’.

The instrument used for measuring “which is normally a vessel of standard capacity that separates or deals out fixed quantities or various substances”¹⁵¹ has different names in Arabic, namely: “*kayl* ‘كَيْلٌ’, *mikyāl* ‘مِكْيَالٌ’ *mikyāl* ‘مِكْيَالٌ’ and *mikyalah* ‘مِكْيَالَةٌ’”.¹⁵² However, only the following two terms are used in the Qur’an: *kayl* ‘كَيْلٌ’ and *mikyāl* ‘مِكْيَالٌ’.

The act of *kayl* ‘كَيْلٌ’ (measuring), according to Ibn Manzūr, can also refer to weighing (*wazn*).¹⁵³ The Arabs say: *Kil hadhihi al-darāhim* ‘كَيْلُ هَذِهِ الدَّرَاهِمِ’ which literally means ‘measure these dirhams’, while what is actually meant by ‘measure’ is ‘weigh’. The reason for this usage is that through measuring and/or weighing quantities are judged. A poet also says, using measuring in the place of weighing: “قَارُورَةٌ ذَاتُ مِسْكِ عِنْدَ ذِي لَطْفٍ ... مِنَ الدَّنَانِيرِ، كَالُوهَا بِمِثْقَالٍ”. This line refers to a bottle of musk being ‘measured’ by a *mithqāl* of dinars. However, as the *mithqāl* is a unit of weight and the dinars are not measured but weighed, the word *kāluha* ‘كَالُوهَا’ is not used literally but it is used in its wider sense which includes weighing.

Kayl ‘كَيْلٌ’ is also mentioned in the Qur’an in four situations in seven Surahs:

1. In a general context: Q6:152 and Q17:35
2. In relation to the Prophet Shuʿayb and his people: Q11:84-5, Q7:85 and Q26:181.
3. In the story of the Prophet Joseph in Egypt: Q12: 59-60, 63, 65, and 88.
4. In relation to the act of *tatfīf*: Q83:1-3

1. In a General Context

Q6:152 reads ﴿وَأَوْفُوا الْكَيْلَ وَالْمِيزَانَ بِالْقِسْطِ﴾ “Give full measure and full weight with justice”.¹⁵⁴ Also Q17:35 reads: ﴿وَأَوْفُوا الْكَيْلَ إِذَا كَلْتُمْ وَزِنُوا بِالْقِسْطِ الْمُسْتَقِيمِ﴾ “and fill up the measure when you measure and weigh with the straight balance”.¹⁵⁵

Q6:152 above is one of many commands that, according to the wider context, the followers of the Prophet Muḥammad (ﷺ) are enjoined to abide by. Q6:151 begins with: ﴿قُلْ تَعَالَوْا أَتْلُ مَا حَرَّمَ رَبِّي عَلَيْكُمْ﴾ “Say (O Muḥammad): ‘Come, I will recite what your Lord has prohibited you from ...’”,¹⁵⁶ then eleven commands follow; one of them is ﴿وَأَوْفُوا الْكَيْلَ وَالْمِيزَانَ بِالْقِسْطِ﴾.

Surah 17 also gives us twenty-nine commands beginning with Ayah 22 and ending with Ayah 39. Two of these commands are those mentioned in Ayah 35 ﴿وَأَوْفُوا الْكَيْلَ إِذَا كَلْتُمْ وَزِنُوا بِالْقِسْطِ الْمُسْتَقِيمِ﴾ above.

In both of these examples, the Qur’an uses, in a general context, the word *al-kayl* ﴿الْكَيْل﴾ to refer to both the act of measuring and the instrument used for measuring as well, that is the *mikyāl* ‘المكيال’. It is therefore clear that when a command concerns a general matter, the verbal noun is used in its general sense with no specific reference to a particular thing unless necessary, as this may exclude other aspects of the meaning.

However, Q17:35 seems to be an explanation for what is implied in Q6:152 as if it is an answer to a question to the effect that: How does one give full measure and full weight with justice? The answer in this case is that: ‘when you measure fill up the measure (or use a proper *mikyāl* (measure) that has the right capacity): ﴿وَأَوْفُوا الْكَيْلَ إِذَا كَلْتُمْ﴾, and when you weigh, use a straight (true, upright) balance: ﴿وَزِنُوا بِالْقِسْطِ الْمُسْتَقِيمِ﴾.

This actually indicates that *al-kayl* ﴿الْكَيْل﴾ in Q17:35 means *al-mikyāl*. The question that may be raised here is: Why is not the

word *al-mikyāl* used instead of the word *al-kayl*? The answer to this question, it seems to me, is that if the Qur'an were to use *al-mikyāl* in this context, the reference would be restricted to a particular thing, i.e., the measuring instrument only. The act of *kayl* 'measuring' however, involves other things besides *al-mikyāl* which would not be included through use of *al-mikyāl*. The person measuring (*kayyāl* 'كَيَّالٌ') might use a *mikyāl* of the correct capacity, but still manage to cheat when measuring (through *tatfīf*, for example); hence the use of the general term *kayl* that implies both meanings without any restrictions, or rather covers all aspects of the act of measuring.

Therefore, while Q6:152 generalises its reference, Q17:35 points out the particulars. Then the act of *ʿifāʿ*¹⁵⁷ is praised by Allah as being 'good, advantageous, most fitting and better in the final determination' or as the Qur'an puts it: ﴿ذَلِكَ خَيْرٌ وَأَحْسَنُ تَأْوِيلًا﴾.

2. The Prophet Shuʿayb and The Madyanites

The story of the Prophet Shuʿayb and his people is related in the Qur'an in four Surahs, namely Q7, 11, 26 and 29. With the exception of Surah 29 (*al-ʿankabūt* 'the Spider'),¹⁵⁸ the Qur'an tells of the Prophet Shuʿayb's teachings to rectify the crooked behaviour of the Madyanites, as they were professional cheaters in measuring and weighing among other things. Each Surah shows us a different aspect and introduces us to a different phase of the problem with the use of its own terminology.

Q7:85-93 relates the Prophet Shuʿayb's message and his people's argument with him, rejecting his faith, then Allah's punishment befalling them. In Q7:85 we read: ﴿فَأَوْفُوا الْكَيْلَ وَالْمِيزَانَ﴾ "fill up the measure and the balance".¹⁵⁹ After his command to his people to worship none but Allah, the Prophet Shuʿayb goes on to pinpoint what belief in Allah entails and necessitates, therefore he begins with their most obvious sin, which he refers to in general terms signifying his gentle approach.

Exegetes give different interpretations to the words *al-kayl* and *al-mīzān* ﴿الْكَيْلِ وَالْمِيزَانِ﴾ here. Al-Zamakhshari and others agree that *al-kayl* means *al-mikyāl* (the measuring instrument), which then would agree with the Qur’anic usage of *al-mīzān* as the weighing instrument. With reference to *al-mīzān*, the exegetes say that it can also be a verbal noun (just like *al-mīlād* ‘birth’, and *al-mī’ād* ‘appointment’) meaning *al-wazn* (weighing), and in turn agreeing with *al-kayl* which then means ‘measuring’.¹⁶⁰

The word *bilqist* ‘بِالْقِسْطِ’ (with justice) is not mentioned here unlike in many other Ayahs.¹⁶¹ This is due to the fact that *bilqist* requires the immediate involvement of another party that should be given his due share. However, Q7:85 seems to be teaching that disregarding the receiver by measure or weight, as a rule, the Madyanites should perform the acts of measuring and weighing properly, exacting full measure and weight because this is one of the requirements of the faith as the strictest probity is necessary for success.

Q11:84-5 introduce us to another scene. In this Surah, “stress is laid on justice and punishment of sin when all Grace is resisted”.¹⁶² However, the Ayahs here deal with measuring and weighing in a more specific way than Q7:85 where the Prophet Shuʿayb was trying to appeal to that good part in their nature, talking positively and making use of words that have good connotations and do not stimulate resistance or rejection to what was said such as ﴿ذَلِكَ خَيْرٌ﴾ ‘That is good (or best)’, and ﴿إِنْ كُنْتُمْ مُؤْمِنِينَ﴾ ‘If you are believers (or have faith)’.

In Q11:84-5, the Prophet Shuʿayb tries another method to express his extreme concern that their continuing rejection of his divine message would most definitely incur punishment: ﴿إِنِّي أَخَافُ﴾ “I fear for you the torment of a Day encompassing”,¹⁶³ as was the case with the peoples who rejected the teachings of the Prophets of Allah before him, namely Noah, Hūd, Sāliḥ and Lot in Q11:89 ﴿أَنْ يُصِيبَكُمْ مِثْلَ مَا أَصَابَ قَوْمَ نُوحٍ أَوْ قَوْمَ هُودٍ أَوْ قَوْمَ صَالِحٍ﴾ “Lest you suffer a fate similar to that of the

People of Noah, or of Hūd, or of Sāliḥ, nor are the people of Lūṭ far off from you”.¹⁶⁴

Accordingly, as this is the case, the Prophet Shuʿayb had to be very specific. Q11:84 reads ﴿وَلَا تَنْقُصُوا الْمِكْيَالَ وَالْمِيزَانَ﴾ ‘and do not diminish *al-mikyāl* or *al-mīzān*’. The reference here is to the measuring and weighing instruments, namely *al-mikyāl* and *al-mīzān* respectively, that no *naqs* ‘نَقْصٌ’¹⁶⁵ is to be caused to them. A *mikyāl* described as *nāqis* ‘نَاقِصٌ’ (adjective from *naqs* ‘نَقْصٌ’) means either that the size of the *mikyāl* is not right and/or the *makīl* (the thing measured) is not given in full. This is confirmed by Al-Qurtūbi who says that “*kayl (mikyāl) nāqis* ‘كَيْلٌ نَاقِصٌ’ means it is of less capacity than it should be”.¹⁶⁶ In either case the result is the same as the receiver by measure is wronged as the *makīl* itself is short. These two meanings are indicated by and implied in this part of the Ayah: ﴿وَلَا تَنْقُصُوا الْمِكْيَالَ﴾.

The Madyanites were in no position to justify their acts of cheating. As a matter of fact, they had so much that if they even gave a bit more than due to people that would not have affected them. Q11:84 explains: ﴿إِنِّي أَرَأَيْكُمْ بِخَيْرٍ﴾ “I see you in prosperity”.¹⁶⁷ Having laid solid grounds for his next command by ‘I see you in prosperity’, the Prophet Shuʿayb takes another step. He goes on to say in Q11:85 ﴿وَيَا قَوْمِ أَوْفُوا الْمِكْيَالَ وَالْمِيزَانَ بِالْقِسْطِ﴾ “Fill up the measure and the balance justly”.¹⁶⁸ As he has warned against causing *naqs* to *al-mikyāl* and *al-mīzān* before, the Prophet Shuʿayb makes use of the same words here (Q11:85) indicating that ‘what you should do to the *mikyāl* and the *mīzān* is to fill them up properly, to use a *mikyāl* (measure) of the correct capacity and to cause no deficiency to the to the *mīzān* which is understood from the imperative verb ‘*awfū* {أَوْفُوا}, (verbal noun ‘*īfāʿ* ‘إِيفَاءٌ’).

For this act of ‘*īfāʿ* ‘إِيفَاءٌ’ to be fully achieved slightly more than is due by measure or weight is to be given; this is in the case of the giver so that he would not incur the punishment of Allah if he gives less. However, knowing the nature of his people and taking

one step at a time for their moral upbringing and also indicating that what is due to them is not going to be diminished and that the *‘ifā* is not meant to cause them any loss, the Prophet Shuʿayb adds the word *bilqist* ﴿بِالْقِسْطِ﴾ ‘with justice’, i.e., in a way that gives every party their due share. Al-Qurtubi also states that what is meant is the size or rather the capacity of the *mikyāl* and the weight of the counterpoise weights that should be exact.¹⁶⁹ What confirms the opinion of Al-Qurtubi, as it appears to me is that: *al-mikyāl* and *al-mīzān*¹⁷⁰ mentioned in Q11:84 refer to the instruments used when ‘giving’ not ‘taking’ by measure or weight, as it is inconceivable that someone would use an instrument that would do injustice to himself knowingly. On the other hand, the *mikyāl* and the *mīzān* of Q11:85 refer to the instruments used when both giving and receiving by measure or weight, as in both cases the parties involved are ordered not to cause loss to and be just with each other.

As for Q26:181-2 ﴿أَوْفُوا الْكَيْلَ وَلَا تَكُونُوا مِنَ الْمُخْسِرِينَ * وَزِنُوا بِالْقِسْطَاسِ﴾ ﴿الْمُسْتَقِيمِ﴾ “Give full measure and be not among those who diminish (what is due to others), and weigh with the true and straight balance”.¹⁷¹ Here the reference is made to *al-kayl*. The Ulema agree that *al-kayl* here refers to the measuring instrument as it agrees with *al-qistās* that is used for weighing.

3. The Story of The Prophet Joseph

In Surah 12, we are introduced to a number of subtle ways of using the same word, namely *kayl* ‘كَيْل’, by the Prophet Joseph and his brothers indicating different meanings. In five Ayahs, the same word is used six times.

After asking them to bring their missing brother with them the next time they come to Egypt, the Prophet Joseph says in Q12:59: ﴿أَلَا تَرَوْنَ أَنِّي أُوفِي الْكَيْلَ﴾ “See you not that I give full measure”.¹⁷² Here the reference is made with the use of the definite article *al* ‘ال’ (the) in *al-kayl* {الْكَيْل}, indicating that it means something in particular as they were witnesses of the way he had measured for them. Also, the use of the word *al-kayl* as a verbal noun implies everything that is

understood that the word itself refers to. This extends to the way he measures, the *mikyāl* he uses, and whatever he measures (the *makīl*). In other words, the verbal noun being comprehensive in meaning covers all aspects of measuring.

In spite of this the Prophet Joseph in Q12:60 says: ﴿فَلَا كَيْلَ لَكُمْ﴾ “there shall be no measure for you with me”,¹⁷³ using the same word *kayl* in the indefinite form to refer to an even wider range of application than the definite *al-kayl*. The meaning is that *al-kayl* in general is forbidden whether done by him or by others, in his presence or not, whether the measure is full or short, etc. In short, no measure of any sort will be given. Having the storehouses of the land (of Egypt) ﴿خَزَائِنِ الْأَرْضِ﴾ under his control, what he says, goes; it is easily carried out.

Returning to their father, the Prophet Joseph’s brothers tell him in Q12:63 ﴿مُنَعْنَا مِنَ الْكَيْلِ﴾ “the measure was denied to us”.¹⁷⁴ The use of the word *al-kayl* in the definite form relates to the indefinite word *kayl* in Q12:60 ﴿فَلَا كَيْلَ لَكُمْ﴾ as what it refers to has become understood. Therefore, *al-kayl* here means everything that the Prophet Joseph himself implied in the first place. Perhaps this is also the reason that *al-kayl* is used again in Q12:88 ﴿فَأَوْفِ لَنَا الْكَيْلَ﴾ “So, pay us full measure (fill up for us the measure)”¹⁷⁵ meaning ‘Do to us what you used to do before’. Q12:88 is like a reminder to the Prophet Joseph of what he said to them (Q12:59) when they were first in Egypt ﴿أَلَا تَرَوْنَ أَنِّي أُوفِي الْكَيْلَ﴾.

However, Q12:65 uses *kayl* differently. It reads: ﴿وَنَزِدَاكَ كَيْلًا بِعَيْرٍ﴾ “and add one more measure of a camel’s load. This is but a small (measure) quantity”.¹⁷⁶ *Kayl* is used here twice referring to what is measured, i.e., *al-makīl*. The other meanings that *kayl* in general implies seem to have no relevance here due to the above wording which restricts the meaning to *al-makīl*, i.e., the use of the annex ‘المُضَافُ إِلَيْهِ’ *ba‘īr* ﴿بِعَيْرٍ﴾ and the adjective *yasīr* ﴿يَسِيرٍ﴾. Exegetes also say that the latter *kayl* may be understood to refer to: (1) what

they had already got by measure from the Prophet Joseph, (2) what they were hoping to get in the future from him, or (3) the camel's load.¹⁷⁷

As for Q12:63, it is where the Prophet Joseph's brothers say to their father: ﴿فَأَرْسِلْ مَعَنَا أَخَانًا نَكْتَلُ﴾ "So send our brother with us, that we may get our measure".¹⁷⁸ The reference here is clear to their 'receiving by measure' as *naktal* ﴿نَكْتَلُ﴾ is the present form of *iktāla* 'اِكْتَالٌ' which means to receive by measure.¹⁷⁹

It is quite clear that all the Ayahs in Surah 12 refer to *kayl* 'measuring' but not *wazn* 'weighing/weight'. This actually does not mean that giving and receiving by weight was not practised in Egypt as there is ample proof to the contrary. The simple answer is that what the Prophet Joseph's brothers got was by measure not by weight. Also, considering that these were times of famine, measuring is a very much faster way than weighing and does not require as much precision; therefore, it was much more suitable for the urgent needs of the people.

4. In relation to *Tatfif*

Q83:2-3 make use of two verbs derived from the root *k-y-l* 'كَيْلٌ' namely: *iktālū* {اِكْتَالُوا} and *kālūhum* ﴿كَالُوهُمْ﴾. The former in Q83:2 is followed by the preposition *alā* ﴿عَلَى﴾ which, in normal usage, is replaced by *min* 'مِنْ'. Exegetes agree that this is due to the fact that the act of *tatfif* is 'against ﴿عَلَى﴾' the interests of those from whom the *mutaffifīn* take by measure, therefore, it is favoured over *min* 'مِنْ'¹⁸⁰ which would be far from conveying the same message of injustice in an emphatic way. Like *naktal* ﴿نَكْتَلُ﴾ in Q12:63, *iktālū* ﴿اِكْتَالُوا﴾ refers to getting something by measure.¹⁸¹

As for *kālūhum* ﴿كَالُوهُمْ﴾ in Q83:3, this is a usage which carries a similar meaning to the common usage *kālū lahum* 'كَالُوا لَهُمْ' 'they measured for them/gave by measure to them' with the addition of

the preposition *li* ‘ل’ joining ‘هُم’ to mean ‘for/to them’. However, according to Al-Farrā’ and Al-Kisā’i *kālūhum* (*hum* ‘هُم’ being an object) is a Hijāzi dialect form.¹⁸² Other similar examples are found under *t-f-f* ‘طَفَفَ’ (cf. also endnote 60).

It is also of importance to note that in the entire Qur’an, wherever measuring and weighing are mentioned together, the former always precedes the latter. Seven times in the Qur’an we find that this is the case.¹⁸³ Qur’an exegetes do not seem to take notice of this fact although nowhere in the Qur’an do we find an exception, and nowhere in any *Tafsir* have I found a reference to this particular point.

It seems to me, therefore, that perhaps the reason for this order is that the measure was known to man before the balance. It has been reported, according to Al-Zamakhshari, Al-Rāzi and Al-Bayḍāwi that the Archangel Gabriel was sent down to the earth with the balance. Giving it to the Prophet Noah, he said: “مُرُّ قَوْمَكَ يَرْوُوا بِهِ”,¹⁸⁴ ‘Command your people to weigh with it’. This suggests that until the time of the Prophet Noah weighing was not practised, or even known; people must have used another means of measuring quantities when selling and buying, especially grains, liquids, etc.

The Qur’an testifies to the sending down of the *mīzān* (balance) twice in Q42:17 ﴿اللَّهُ الَّذِي أَنْزَلَ الْكِتَابَ بِالْحَقِّ وَالْمِيزَانَ﴾ ‘It is Allah who has sent down the Book in truth and the balance’, and in Q57:25: ﴿وَأَنْزَلْنَا مَعَهُمُ الْكِتَابَ وَالْمِيزَانَ﴾ “and We sent down with them the Book and the balance’.

It is also more likely that the Arabs whom the Qur’an addressed initially were dealing in measures more commonly than in weights as far as selling and buying were concerned; or perhaps the Qur’an is a testimony that this was the case.

Also of equal importance is the fact that the paying of *zakāh* (poor dues) especially that of *al-fitr* is of immediate relation to measuring, as it is given by measure, namely *ṣāʿ* ‘الصَّاع’. Ibn Manzūr

says that *al-mikyāl* is *al-sāʿ* on which *zakāh*, expiation of sins, spendings, etc., are based.¹⁸⁵ The *mikyāl* has to be in accordance with that of Medina and not any other place.¹⁸⁶ As for ‘weight’ in relation to *zakāh*, this has to do with gold and silver, as measuring is not an accurate means with regard to these two metals. Therefore, the application has more to do with measuring than weighing.

The root *n-q-ṣ* 'نَقَصَ' is mentioned in the Qur'an in different forms ten times in nine Surahs. The derivations, in one way or the other, indicate the same basic meaning. However, *n-q-ṣ* is only mentioned once in relation to measuring and weighing namely in Q11:84-5, which read:

{ ... } وَلَا تَنْقُصُوا الْمِكْيَالَ وَالْمِيزَانَ إِنِّي أَرَأَكُم بِخَيْرٍ وَإِنِّي أَخَافُ عَلَيْكُمْ عَذَابَ يَوْمٍ مُّحِيطٍ *
وَيَا قَوْمِ أَوْفُوا الْمِكْيَالَ وَالْمِيزَانَ بِالْقِسْطِ وَلَا تَبْخَسُوا النَّاسَ أَشْيَاءَهُمْ وَلَا تَعْتُوا فِي الْأَرْضِ مُفْسِدِينَ {

“... and diminish not the measure and the balance, I see you in prosperity; and verily I fear for you the torment of a Day encompassing. And O my people! Give full measure and weight justly, and reduce not the things that are due to the people, and do not commit mischief in the land, causing corruption”.¹⁸⁷

Naqṣ 'النَّقْصُ' is the verbal noun which refers to various types of diminishing such as abatement, reduction, decrease, taking away, lessening, shortness and even dearth. Giving a person anything but not in full results in *naqṣ*, disregarding whether this is done deliberately and justly or not, as *naqṣ* is a general term. The Qur'an preaches against causing any *naqṣ* to others' dues. Q11:84 should be studied in this context. In more than one place does the Qur'an relate the story of the Prophet Shuʿayb's people, the Madyanites.¹⁸⁸ The context shows that the Madyanites' most “besetting sin was commercial selfishness and fraudulent dealings in weights and measures”¹⁸⁹ without being in need that might force them to cheat, as the Prophet Shuʿayb stated : { إِنِّي أَرَأَكُم بِخَيْرٍ } ‘I see you in prosperity’. Therefore, after ordering them to dedicate their acts of worship to none but Allah: { يَا قَوْمِ اعْبُدُوا اللَّهَ مَا لَكُمْ مِنْ إِلَهٍ غَيْرُهُ } “O my people! Worship Allah, you have no other God but Him”,¹⁹⁰ the Prophet Shuʿayb goes on to tell them that they should not commit any act of injustice either to people or to themselves, pointing out the issue that would lead to their complete ruin or utter destruction if continued especially as that was part of their daily affairs. He commands them: { وَلَا تَنْقُصُوا الْمِكْيَالَ وَالْمِيزَانَ } “and diminish not the measure and the balance”.¹⁹¹

Here, *n-q-s* 'نَقَصَ' is used in the negative imperative form. It is, however, clear that the motivation for diminishing peoples' dues or giving less than is due results from man's greed or desire to unrightfully gain more for himself than he should at the expense of others. As the Madyanites were professionals in cheating when measuring and weighing, the Prophet Shuʿayb ordered them first to stop this act of causing *naqs* to what is due to people.

To be more specific, Q11:84 sheds some light on one of the things the Madyanites used to do to cheat others. Firstly, the Ayah preaches against causing *naqs* to both *al-mikyāl* {المِكْيَالُ} and *al-mīzān* {المِيزَانُ}, which basically refer to the instruments used for measuring and weighing. Secondly, this Ayah does not use the words *kayl* 'الْكَيْلُ' or *wazn* 'الْوِزْنُ' which, being verbal nouns, refer to the acts of measuring and weighing respectively, nor does it use the words *makīl* 'الْمَكِيلُ' or *mawzūn* 'الْمَوْزُونُ' which mean the things measured or weighed. This shows very clearly that the Madyanites used to manipulate the size or capacity of the *mikyāl* and tamper with the balance (*mīzān*) so that it did not function as it should and/or perhaps tamper with the counterpoise weights. This means that *naqs* has a different form with regard to measuring in comparison to weighing. However, the result of such manipulation to both instruments is the same, that is, what is measured or weighed suffers unrightful reduction (decrease), and at the same time, the receiver by measure or weight is unaware of the trick. In other words, the *naqs* to the *mikyāl* and the *mīzān* results in *naqs* to the *makīl* and the *mawzūn*.

Looking closely at the Qur'anic way of expression, we find that it refers here to one of the most subtle ways of cheating as the receiver by measure or weight is led to believe that his dues are not diminished or reduced in any way as he witnesses the measuring and weighing himself. That is why the Qur'an goes directly to the root of what causes the trouble and then shows what must be done to correct the wrong, hence the Qur'anic reference to rectify one of the most important aspects of the processes of measuring and weighing through the uprooting of what leads to wronging others. If

the instruments are not tampered with, it is most unlikely that people's dues will be diminished, because acts such as *tatfif* or *bakhs*, etc., are not, in most cases, as subtle as manipulating the instruments to look as if they were functioning the way they should.

It is also clear that the use of the words that refer to the instruments used for measuring and weighing also implies what is measured and weighed as well. However, the use of *al-makīl* 'المَكِيل' and *al-mawzūn* 'المَوْزُون' in this Ayah instead of *al-mikyāl* {المِكْيَال} and *al-mīzān* {المِيزَان} would not give the same message as such use would result in a question like: 'How do I cause no *naqs* to what is measured or weighed?', to which the answer would be: 'One of the ways is to cause no *naqs* to the instruments of measuring and weighing'. As is clear by now, this is too long an argument and goes against the aspect of economy in *balāghah* and is very un-Qur'anic. The Qur'an, therefore, does away with such irrelevancies, getting to the point in the shortest and most accurate way.

Also, as stated before, the above Ayah does not use the words *kayl* 'الكَيْل' or *wazn* 'الْوَزْن'. These processes of measuring and weighing, generally speaking, involve or require the following:

1. Something to be measured or weighed, i.e., *makīl* or *mawzūn*.
2. An instrument for measuring or weighing, i.e., *mikyāl* or *mīzān*.
3. A person to do the measuring or weighing, i.e., *kayyāl* or *wazzān*.

Q11:84 refers to only no.2 above which in actual fact implies the other two points as well. The Madyanites were so professional that they made their acts look free of cheating. This shows the extreme accuracy in using the words *al-mikyāl* {المِكْيَال} and *al-mīzān* {المِيزَان} in this context.

Of importance to our full understanding of *naqs* is to consider some points present in Q11:85, which goes on to say: *أَوْفُوا الْمِكْيَالَ وَالْمِيزَانَ بِالْقِسْطِ*. Here, the verb *'awfū* {أَوْفُوا} is in the imperative form

without negation (unlike the negative command found in Ayah Q11:84 {وَلَا تَنفُصُوا}). Generally speaking, the message indicated by this Ayah is actually similar to its precedent's which might be considered by some as 'redundancy' or 'unnecessary repetition'. This is not the case, however, as the acts of *naqs* and *'ifā*^c (verbal noun of *'awfā*) stand quite apart from each other pointing out, perhaps, two distinct stages on the scale of extremes.¹⁹²

Firstly, commanding people to abstain from doing something does not necessarily and automatically mean a command to do another thing, or the opposite.

Secondly, *naqasa* indicates reducing or diminishing, while *'awfā* indicates exacting the thing involved; and in case of what is measured and/or weighed this can only be guaranteed and executed beyond any doubt that no injustice is done when the receiver gets slightly more than is due to him.

Thirdly, as the giving of more than due is not a requirement and exacting may prove extremely difficult, if not impossible, in everyday transactions especially in measuring and weighing, the word *bilqist* {بِالْقِسْطِ} is used to indicate that every party involved should get his due and rightful share in all fairness without causing any harm (injustice or even *naqs*) to the dues of others.

According to this order, the Prophet Shu'ayb was teaching his people by degrees, so that at the end they would reach a higher level of morality. Moving from *naqs* to *'ifā*^c shows that the target was to achieve pure justice to both parties involved in any transaction.

According to Yusuf Ali "Both Plato and Aristotle define justice as the virtue which gives everyone his due. From this point of view Justice becomes the master virtue, and includes most other virtues. It was the lack of this that ruined the Medianites. Their selfishness was "intent in mischief", i.e., spoiling other people's business by not giving them their just dues".¹⁹³

By way of conclusion, it is because the *naqs* that befalls the

mikyāl and the *mīzān* is indicated in Q11:84 that Q11:85 makes use of the same terms as well showing consistency and also because that issue required more elaboration, and in order to achieve moral development. However, it is of importance to say that *naqṣ al-mikyāl wa al-mīzān* (Lit., diminution of the measure and the balance) is also a reference to *naqṣ al-makīl wa al-mawzūn* (Lit., diminution of the thing/s measured and/or weighed). The same applies in the case of *ʿifā* as well.

Wazana 'وَزَنَ' is a verb, whose verbal noun is *al-wazn* 'الْوَزْنُ'. Lexicographers give the following meanings and uses for this entry as follows:

1. *Wazana al-shay'a* 'وَزَنَ الشَّيْءَ' means:

a) to ascertain the heaviness of (the thing involved), and examine it against another object regarded as (a counterpoise) equal in weight to it.¹⁹⁴

b) to hold something in the hand in order to ascertain how heavy or light it is,¹⁹⁵ or to estimate its weight.¹⁹⁶

c) 'قَدَرَهُ بِوَسْاطَةِ الْمِيزَانِ',¹⁹⁷ to measure by a set of scales (*mīzān*).

2. *Wazana al-shay'u* 'وَزَنَ الشَّيْءَ' means to weigh heavily 'رَجَحَ'.

Al-'A 'shā says: "يُضَافُوا إِلَى عَادِلٍ قَدْ وَزَنَ",¹⁹⁸

(They (go/resort) to a just person of great esteem (high rank)).

3. As for *al-wazn* 'الْوَزْنُ', lexicographers say that in addition to being the verbal noun of the verb *wazana* 'وَزَنَ', it means:

a) *Al-taqdīr* 'التَّقْدِير': evaluation.

b) The Arabs say: *laysa lifulān wazn* 'لَيْسَ لِفُلَانٍ وَزْنٌ' meaning literally 'such and such has no weight (or carries no weight), i.e., he is looked down on as being insignificant or of no importance.¹⁹⁹ It is worth noting that the above expression is used metaphorically as no actual weighing is involved. Other examples of metaphorical use are the following:

* Mālik Al-Fazāri said:

"وَحَدِيثٌ أَلَدُّ هُوَ مِمَّا ... يَنْعَتُ النَّاعِتُونَ يُوزَنُ وَزْنًا"²⁰⁰

(A speech, so beautiful to listen to that people praise;
[a speech] that carries weight (or is weighty).)

* *Hadhā waznu hadhā* 'هَذَا وَزْنُ هَذَا',²⁰¹ meaning 'A is of the weight of B', in other words 'A is equal or equivalent to B', disregarding the fact that A and B may be things that cannot be subjected to actual weighing.

* A poet also said: "عِنْدِي لِكُلِّ مُخَاصِمٍ مِيزَانُهُ"²⁰²

(I had for everyone of my opponents a *mīzān*,
i.e., I could answer them back with what equals their speech.)

So, in these examples, the words *wazn* (weight/weighing) and the weighing instrument, the *mīzān*, are used though no actual weighing is involved.

c) *Al-mithqāl* ‘المِثْقَال’,²⁰³ a unit used for weight. The plural form in this case is *awzān* ‘أَوْزَان’, which refers to the “counterpoises of stone or metal”²⁰⁴ that are used in scales for weighing things, i.e., weights. According to Al-Munjid, *al-mithqāl* is a unit of standard weight which is approximately one and half dirhams.²⁰⁵

d) *Al-mawāzīn* ‘المَوَازِين’. According to Ibn Mazūr, Tha‘lab interpreted the Qur’anic *mawāzīnuh* {مَوَازِينُهُ} in {ثَقَلَتْ مَوَازِينُهُ} and {خَفَّتْ خَفَّتْ} {مَوَازِينُهُ} to mean *waznuh* ‘وَزْنُهُ’ (his weight).²⁰⁶ The word *mawāzīn* will be discussed in detail shortly.

e) *Al-kayl* ‘الكَيْل’: ‘measuring’. According to Ibn Manzūr “*kālahu* ‘كَالَهُ’ (to measure something), means *wazanahu* ‘وَزَنَهُ’ (to weigh it). The Arabs say: *kil hadhihi al-darāhim* ‘كَيْلْ هَذِهِ الدَّرَاهِمِ’ (Measure these dirhams) to mean ‘weigh them’”.²⁰⁷ Murrah also said: “كُلُّ مَا وُزِنَ فَقَدْ كِيلَ”,²⁰⁸ (everything that is weighed may also be described as measured). And as explained under *k-y-l* ‘كَيْل’, a poet said:

“قَارُورَةٌ ذَاتُ مِسْكِ عِنْدَ ذِي لَطْفٍ مِنْ الدَّنَانِيرِ، كَالُوهَا بِمِثْقَالٍ”

that the word *kayl* is used for weight as *mithqāl* is a unit of weight and also refers to a counterpoise of a standard or specific weight.

f) *Al-thiqal wa al-khiffah* ‘الثَّقَلُ وَالْخِفَّةُ’, (Lit., heaviness and lightness) that is ‘weight’, the property of being ‘heavy’.²⁰⁹

By way of conclusion to the above, in spite of the various meanings of the word *wazn* ‘وَزْن’, we can say that it refers to an act or a process that results in knowing how heavy or light the thing involved is, in relation to something else that is used as a counterpoise. This is achieved either by hand or, for greater accuracy, by the use of an instrument called a *mīzān* ‘مِيزَان’.

Accordingly, the verb *wazana* ‘وَزَنَ’ may be translated as ‘to weigh’, and *al-wazn* ‘الْوَزْن’ as ‘weighing’; where weighing is taken

to mean a process of balancing two things, one against the other in order to ascertain or find out the weight of one of them in relation to the other. And as is obvious by now, this can only be achieved by using a balance or a pair of scales, a *mīzān*.

With the exclusion of *mīzān* ‘مِيزَانٌ’ and *mawāzīn* ‘مَوَازِينُ’, some of the other derivations of *w-z-n* ‘وَزَنَ’ are found in seven Qur’anic Surahs as follows:

- 1- The verbal noun *wazn*: {الْوَزْنُ} and {وَزْنًا} is mentioned in Q7:8, Q18:105 and Q55:9.
- 2- The word *mawzūn* {مَوْزُونٌ} are used as an adjective in Q15:19.
- 3- As a verb in the imperative form, i.e., {زِنُوا}. This occurs twice in Q17:35 and Q26:182.
- 4- Q83:2 mentions it in the form of a verb in the past tense, namely {وَزَّنُوهُمْ}.

The above Ayahs refer to two types of weighing that are the same in principle. The first takes place on the Day of Judgement as indicated twice in Q7:8 that reads: {وَالْوَزْنُ يَوْمَئِذٍ الْحَقُّ} “the weighing on that Day is the true (weighing)”,²¹⁰ and in Q18:105 {فَلَا نُقِيمُ لَهُمْ يَوْمَ الْقِيَامَةِ وَزْنًا} “We shall not give them, on the Day of Judgement, any weight”.²¹¹

Q7:8-9 form a very clear reference to the result of the weighing which will take place on the Judgement Day and does not involve any form of cheating or manipulation in the least as no benefit is derived from it because it is the Creator Himself, who is not in need of His creatures, who is controlling the weighing and the entire scene in general.

As no weighing can be achieved without the use of a balance, *mīzān*, the Ayahs indicate that:

(1) One side of the balance will go down, proving heavy, while the other side will go up, proving light. This is basically what happens to the two sides of any balance when weighing.

(2) The reference is to only one thing that is either heavy or light which is referred to as *mawāzīn* ‘مَوَازِين’, the meaning of which will be discussed later.

Accordingly, it should be sufficient at this stage to translate {فَمَنْ ثَقَلَتْ مَوَازِينُهُ} provisionally as ‘whose *mawāzīn* are heavy’ and {وَمَنْ خَفَّتْ مَوَازِينُهُ} provisionally as ‘whose *mawāzīn* are light’.

As for Q18:105 ﴿فَلَا نُقِيمُ لَهُمْ يَوْمَ الْقِيَامَةِ وَزْنًا﴾, the Ulema give the following interpretations bearing in mind that the Ayah refers very strictly to the *kāfirs*, the non-believers in Allah who rejected His signs and took his Messengers by way of jest and mockery:

* ﴿فَلَا نُقِيمُ لَهُمْ يَوْمَ الْقِيَامَةِ وَزْنًا﴾ is metaphorical for looking down on them as a result of their disbelief in Allah and their resurrection for reckoning. This is supported by the Arabic expression *laysa lifulān wazn* ‘لَيْسَ لِفُلَانٍ وَزْنٌ’ which has been explained above. Al-Zamakhshari, Al-Rāzi, Al-Qurtubi and Al-Baydāwi say that one of the interpretations is that as if Allah is saying “We Allah despise them, and to Us, they have no weight and are insignificant”.²¹²

Also, Al-Bukhāri, Muslim and Al-Nasā’i on the authority of Abu Hurayrah reported that the Prophet (ﷺ) said:

”إِنَّهُ لِيَأْتِي الرَّجُلَ الْعَظِيمَ السَّمِينِ يَوْمَ الْقِيَامَةِ لَا يَرِنُ عِنْدَ اللَّهِ جَنَاحَ بَعُوضَةٍ. وَقَالَ أَقْرَأُوا ﴿فَلَا نُقِيمُ لَهُمْ يَوْمَ الْقِيَامَةِ وَزْنًا﴾”²¹³

“On the Day of Judgement, excessively big and fat men will come forward, but before Allah they will not even weigh as much as the wing of a mosquito. And he (ﷺ) said: “Read: ﴿فَلَا نُقِيمُ لَهُمْ يَوْمَ الْقِيَامَةِ وَزْنًا﴾”.

* ﴿فَلَا نُقِيمُ لَهُمْ يَوْمَ الْقِيَامَةِ وَزْنًا﴾ means “no balance will be set up for them for the weighing of their deeds”.²¹⁴ Al-Zamakhshari and Al-Rāzi say that no balance will be set up for them because “the balance is only set up for those who believed that Allah is One and Only (*al-muwahhidīn* ‘الْمُوحِدِينَ’) and did good and bad deeds”.²¹⁵ Al-Baydāwi says that this is going to be the case because “their good deeds availed them nothing, proved futile and were not accepted

from them”.²¹⁶ Al-Qurtubi also says: “They have got no *hasanahs* ‘حَسَنَةٌ’ (good deeds/the unit of rewarding good deeds) to be weighed in the balances of the Judgement Day, and whoever has no *hasanah* will be admitted into Hellfire”.²¹⁷

Just for the sake of hypothesis, another interpretation may be provided; this is not that *no balance will be set up* for the weighing of the deeds of the *kāfirs*, but perhaps *no weighing will be performed or conducted*. This, in my view, is the more likely meaning for ‘فَلَا نُقِيمُ ... وَزَنَّا’, by comparison, but only in case that we accept the very literal meaning of the Arabic. According to this interpretation, the balance on the Judgement Day will be set up for the weighing of everyone’s deeds, believers as well as non-believers (*kāfirs*). (It is baffling to me that the above authorities mentioned the view that no balance would be set up without commenting on this particular view as extremely unlikely, if not unsubstantiated or even wrong, in spite of the conclusive evidence stating otherwise.)²¹⁸ As for the *kāfirs* intended in the Ayah concerned there will be no need to weigh their deeds at all as they have come to the Judgement with their bad deeds only as non-believers in Allah. Therefore, there are no good deeds to weigh against their bad deeds, hence, no weighing.

The reason that the *kāfirs* will come to the Judgement with no good deeds even in case they had done good acts in their lifetime is that in Islamic belief, there is no sin greater than not believing in Allah or associating partners to Him, and Allah forgives all sins except this particular one.²¹⁹ In Q4:48 & 116 testify to this: إِنَّ اللَّهَ لَا يُغْفِرُ أَنْ يُشْرَكَ بِهِ وَيَغْفِرُ مَا دُونَ ذَلِكَ لِمَنْ يَشَاءُ ‘Allah forgives not that partners are set up with him, but he forgives other sins than this to whom He pleases’.

Also, there are many *hadīths* stating that the *kāfir*’s good deeds are rewarded in his lifetime so that on the Judgement Day, he comes with his bad deeds only and therefore gets punished for them.²²⁰ And even if the *kāfirs* come to the Judgement thinking they have some good deeds²²¹ and actual weighing takes place, the result

is no different as the Ayah states: ﴿فَحِطَّتْ أَعْمَالُهُمْ﴾ ‘their deeds failed (became invalid)’. As a result, their bad deeds will still weigh heavier or rather the side of their “good deeds”²²² will weigh lighter ﴿حَفَّتْ مَوَازِينُهُ﴾.

Putting this argument aside, the following arguments support my view that the deeds of the *kāfirs* will in fact be weighed on the Balance:

1. Q23:103 reads: ﴿وَمَنْ حَفَّتْ مَوَازِينُهُ فَأُولَئِكَ الَّذِينَ خَسِرُوا أَنفُسَهُمْ فِي جَهَنَّمَ﴾, “And those whose *mawāzīn* are light will be those who have lost their own selves, in Hell will they abide”.²²³

This Ayah speaks strictly of the state of the *kāfirs* only as it is clear from the Ayahs that follow and also from the fact that it states ﴿فِي جَهَنَّمَ خَالِدُونَ﴾ ‘in Hell will they abide’. According to Islamic belief, the Muslim²²⁴ does not abide in Hell. A Muslim might go to Hell to be punished for his bad deeds/sins if they outweigh his good deeds, then he goes to Heaven. This is a very clear fact in Islam as stated by many *ḥadīths* of the Prophet (ﷺ).²²⁵ Therefore, as the *mawāzīn* will be light, actual weighing must be involved.

2. Q21:47 states that the *Mawāzīn* will be set up on the Judgement Day, and ‘no soul shall be wronged in anything’ ﴿فَلَا تُظَلَمُ﴾ ﴿نَفْسٌ شَيْئًا﴾. As is clear, this Ayah does not make any distinction between a Muslim and a *kāfir* as its reference is general.

3. Abu Saʿīd Al-Khudri is reported to have said: “Some people will come on the Day of Judgement with deeds, to them they are as big as the mountains of Tihāmah, but when weighed, they will weigh nothing”.²²⁶ This report is quoted by both Al-Zamakhshari and Al-Qurtubi when giving *tafsir* to Q18:105 which as stated above speaks about the *kāfirs* only. This means that actual weighing will take place for the *kāfirs*’ deeds. On the other hand, I find no reason to restrict the reference of this above report to either believers or *kāfirs* only. So, if we apply it to both, this means the deeds of the *kāfirs* will be weighed as well.²²⁷

Another conclusion also derived from Q18:105 supporting this view is that the word ‘*emāl*’ ‘أَعْمَالٌ’ (deeds) in ﴿أَعْمَالُهُمْ﴾ (their deeds) is treated as feminine (since it is an inanimate plural) and agrees with the verb *habītat* ﴿حَبِطَتْ﴾ “failed, to be vain, in vain, availed naught”²²⁸ which ends with the feminine *tā* ‘تَاءُ التَّائِبِثِ’, while the word *lahum* ﴿لَهُمْ﴾ (to them) in ﴿فَلَا نُقِيمُ لَهُمْ﴾ “We shall not assign to them”²²⁹ is masculine referring to ﴿الَّذِينَ كَفَرُوا﴾ (those who disbelieved). This actually means that the word ﴿وَزَنَانًا﴾ (weighing or weight) refers back to ‘them’ ﴿الَّذِينَ كَفَرُوا﴾.

In addition to the above, it is understood from different Islamic sources that in Heaven ‘الْجَنَّةُ’ and the Fire ‘النَّارُ’ there are places of different degrees²³⁰ allocated to people according to how good or bad they have been in their earthly life. And as the weighing of the deeds ascertains the exact heaviness of the good deeds, it also shows, by implication, the heaviness of the bad deeds. The result then dictates, with the permission of Allah, the degree and place that a person is assigned either in Heaven or the Fire.

Q46:19, for example, states: ﴿وَلِكُلِّ دَرَجَاتٍ مِمَّا عَمِلُوا وَيُوفِّيهِمْ أَعْمَالُهُمْ وَهُمْ﴾ “And for all there will be degrees according to that which they did, that He (Allah) may recompense them in full for their deeds. And they will not be wronged (no injustice will be done to them)”²³¹. As is understood from this Ayah, there is a fine grading in Heaven and the Fire due to the Qur’anic statement that the least act of good or bad is taken into account. This indicates that the result of the weighing will show how much a person is to suffer in the Fire and for how long, which in turn means that the deeds of the *kāfirs* will be weighed as well to allocate them their earned places in the Fire. Therefore, if a person goes to the Balance of the Judgment Day with no good deeds at all, his bad deeds will still be weighed so that he is ‘recompensed in full’ according to how much evil/bad deeds he/she has committed.

Conclusion

We may now be able to conclude that:

(1) The expression ﴿فَلَا نُقِيمُ لَهُمْ يَوْمَ الْقِيَامَةِ وَزْنًا﴾: (a) may indeed be understood metaphorically referring to insignificant and/or unimportant people; (b) may not be understood to mean that no Balance will be set up to weigh the *kāfirs*' deeds. Rather the Balance will be set up in any case and their good deeds, if they come with any, which is most unlikely, and these deeds count and are not deprived of what makes them weighty on the Balance,²³² will be weighed against their bad deeds; (c) refers here to the 'people' (*kāfirs*) due to {لَهُمْ} and not to the 'deeds'.

(2) Q18:105 uses the most accurate ﴿فَلَا نُقِيمُ لَهُمْ ... وَزْنًا﴾, referring to weighing/weight, not ﴿فَلَا نُقِيمُ لَهُمْ ... مِيزَانًا﴾ where the reference is made to the balance.

It may be worth mentioning that the ones for whom no *mīzān* will be set up as their deeds will not be weighed, rather they will be rewarded without even being questioned about their deeds, are not the *kāfirs*. There are several *hadīths* stating that the people that Allah afflicts with different kinds of calamities from among the believers: '*ahl al-balā'*' أهل البلاء' will be admitted into Heaven without having to account for their deeds.²³³

As for **the second** type of weighing, it is related to this worldly life and can be referred to as 'earthly weighing'. This occurs four times as follows:

1. Q17:35 ﴿وَزِنُوا بِالْقِسْطَاسِ الْمُسْتَقِيمِ﴾ "and weigh with the straight balance"²³⁴.

2. Q26:182 ﴿وَزِنُوا بِالْقِسْطَاسِ الْمُسْتَقِيمِ﴾ "and weigh with the straight balance"²³⁵.

3. Q55:9 ﴿وَأَقِيمُوا الْوَزْنَ بِالْقِسْطِ﴾ "and establish weight with justice"²³⁶.

4. Q83:3 ﴿وَإِذَا كَالُوهُمْ أَوْ وَزَنُوهُمْ يُخْسِرُونَ﴾ "but when they measure for

them, or weigh for them, give less than due”.²³⁷

1. and 2. above are in the form of a command that dictates what is to be used when weighing things for people and name the weighing instrument specifically , i.e., *al-qistās* (بِالْقِسْطِ...), and describes it as well as *al-mustaqīm* (الْمُسْتَقِيمِ), rendered “the straight balance”.²³⁸

As for 3. above, here we have one of the most powerful statements of the Qur’an. If we trace the use of *’aqīmū* (أَقِيمُوا) in the Qur’an we find that it is used with matters of the highest importance. Examples are found in abundance in the Qur’an²³⁹ with regard to *salāh* (prayer), *shahādah* (giving evidence/ testifying), etc. What concerns us here is *al-wazn* (الْوِزْنَ) in perhaps both its ‘concrete’ and ‘abstract’ senses. Commenting on Q2:3 (وَيُقِيمُونَ الصَّلَاةَ), M. M. Ali says: “The verb used to indicate the observance of *salāh* is throughout the Holy Qur’an *’aqāma*, from ‘أَقَامَ الْأَمْرَ’ i.e., *he kept a thing or an affair in the right state* (LL), and hence it is not the mere observance of the form that the Qur’an requires, but the keeping of it in a right state, i.e., being true to the spirit of the prayer”.²⁴⁰ This also exactly applies to *al-wazn* (الْوِزْنَ) in this Ayah Q55:8. It is the keeping of *al-wazn* (weighing/weight) in the right state, and the continuation of doing so at all times that is meant here. If the meaning had merely been to weigh (with justice), there would have been no need for (أَقِيمُوا الْوِزْنَ), and ‘زَنُوا’ would have been sufficient.²⁴¹

Also, the reference in this Ayah is to what should be observed when weighing or establishing weight and that is *al-qist* (justice or equity) to the effect that the parties involved get their fair shares. The meanings of (بِالْقِسْطِ) and (بِالْقِسْطِ) referred to in 1., 2. and 3. above are discussed under *q-s-t* ‘قِسْطٌ’ in detail in this chapter and a brief reference to them is found under *w-f-y* ‘وَفَى’ (endnotes 331 and 332).

The Ayah in 4. on the other hand forms part of the explanation that Surah 83 gives for *al-muṭaffifīn*. *Wazanūhum* ﴿وَزَنُوهُمْ﴾ in Q83:3 is discussed under *t-f-f* ‘طَفَفَ’, point (4.), together with Q83:2 that does not mention *al-wazn* unlike Q83:3. See also endnotes 331 and 332.

The last reference that we are left with now is *mawzūn* ﴿مَوْزُونٌ﴾ in Q15:19, which reads ﴿وَأَنْبَتْنَا فِيهَا مِنْ كُلِّ شَيْءٍ مَوْزُونٌ﴾ “and We cause to grow therein all kinds of things justly weighed”.²⁴²

Lexicographers and exegetes give different interpretations for the word *mawzūn* ﴿مَوْزُونٌ﴾ which is in the position of an adjective in this Ayah for *sha*^c ﴿شَيْءٍ﴾ as follows:

- * proportioned and measured according to the need,²⁴³
- * according to the benefit derived (such as food) and suitable for use,²⁴⁴
- * proportioned and measured wisely according to a specific (known) amount,²⁴⁵
- * of particular measure dictated by a wise reason,²⁴⁶
- * of weight and importance, i.e., valuable and useful,²⁴⁷
- * good and suitable (or carries weight) as in the expression: “كَلَامٌ مَوْزُونٌ”, meaning ‘balanced talk’,²⁴⁸
- * weighed in the Scales of Wisdom and proportioned accordingly in a way that makes things only work when they are the way they are (or should be), without any addition or omission,²⁴⁹
- * the things that are weighed such as gold, silver, copper, iron, etc.,²⁵⁰
- * Ibn Manzūr says: “... of so defined and exact a proportion that none can change it by either adding to it or removing from it. Al-Zaggāg says: ... of everything that is weighed such as iron, lead, copper, etc. And in Al-Nihāyah, the author interprets *al-mawzūn* ‘المَوْزُونُ’ in two ways:

(1) All the precious substances such as lead, iron, copper, gold and silver are of the things that are weighed. This means as if He (Allah) wanted to say: of everything that is weighed, but not measured (or goes by weight, not measure) ‘يُوزَنُ وَلَا يُكَالُ’.

(2) It is said: it is the thing whose weight and value are known to Allah”,²⁵¹

* Al-Rāzi elaborates, saying that in this earthly world ‘عالم’، ‘الأسباب’، Allah creates the minerals, fauna and flora according to certain laws that work in particular ways. Therefore, for things to exist, there must be certain amount of each of the components required for their existence or rather coming into existence, such as certain amount of air, water, earth, etc. In other words, of everything needed for this earthly life, Allah has provided the earth with a sufficient amount so that life keeps going on its face.²⁵²

* Yusuf Ali says: “And every kind of thing is produced on the earth in due balance and measure. The mineral kingdom supports the vegetable and they, in their turn, support the animal, and there is a link of mutual dependence between them. Excess is eliminated. The waste of one is made the food of another, and vice versa. And this is an infinite chain of gradation and interdependence”.²⁵³

It is clear from the above that the interpretations are wide-ranging. However, considering the Ayah from a slightly different angle, we find that two literal meanings are implied:

1- The Arabs say *kalām mawzūn* “كلام مؤزون” and/or *shay’ mawzūn* ‘شيء مؤزون’, that is, the speech and/or the thing mentioned in such contexts are described as *mawzūn* which I see as meaning balanced, exact, correct in every detail, free from error, etc. Therefore, *mawzūn* in ﴿وَأَنْبَتْنَا فِيهَا مِنْ كُلِّ شَيْءٍ مَوْزُونٍ﴾ may mean the same as well. In other words, we may be able to say that things that are not balanced or do not follow the Laws that Allah has made for life on the earth do not exist on the earth. For example, Man is incapable of performing miracles as they break ‘natural laws’.

2- *Mawzūn* ‘مؤزون’ is related to *al-wazn* ‘الوزن’ (weighing/weight), and it literally means ‘weighed’ or ‘having weight’. Therefore, ﴿وَأَنْبَتْنَا فِيهَا مِنْ كُلِّ شَيْءٍ مَوْزُونٍ﴾ may be rendered accordingly as ‘and We caused to grow therein of all kinds of things that have weight’. This actually means that only the things that have weight have been ‘caused to grow therein’. This also indicates that

everything, big or small, has its share of weight in this earthly life, i.e., nothing is void of weight. Even, the things that may be impossible to weigh by human means have their share of 'heaviness'. If, for example, we can not physically weigh (that is, weigh with the use of scales) the air, the atom, emotions, intentions, etc., this does not mean that these things have no physical weight, because the balance that will be used to weigh things on the Judgement Day is capable of detecting the weight of the least, finest and subtlest of things. The Qur'an in many Ayahs speaks of ﴿مِثْقَالَ ذَرَّةٍ﴾²⁵⁴ 'the weight of an ant' or as some translators prefer to render it "an atom's weight".²⁵⁵ It also speaks of what is less than that or greater, as in Q34:3 and Q10:61. Q99:7-8 make it very clear that "the subtlest form of good and evil will be brought to account and it will be done openly and convincingly: he "shall see it"²⁵⁶.

Allah's Balance detects the weight of everything whatsoever. However, as Q15:19 is concerned with the earth and what was 'caused to grow therein', therefore, everything that 'grows therein' has weight.

The word *mīzān* ‘مِيزَان’ is one of the many derivations of the root *w-z-n* ‘وَزَنَ’. It is mentioned nine times in six Surahs. Lexicographers and Qur’anic exegetes give many different interpretations for what the word means, both literally and metaphorically.

Mīzān ‘مِيزَان’ is underlyingly *miwzān* ‘مِوَزَان’,²⁵⁷ the *waw* with *sukūn* ‘السُّكُونَةُ’ is changed to *yā* ‘يَاء’ as a result of the *mīm* with *kasrah* ‘الْمِيمُ الْمَكْسُورَةُ’ that precedes it, for ease of pronunciation. The plural form is *mawāzīn* ‘مَوَازِين’.

The following meanings (interpretations) are given:

1. An apparatus with two pans used for weighing²⁵⁸ (balance or scales).

The Arabs say: *shāla al- mīzān* ‘شَالَ المِيزَانُ’, when one of its pans goes up.²⁵⁹ An Arabic saying derived this is: *shāla mīzānu Fulān* ‘شَالَ مِيزَانُ فُلَانٍ’, when two persons boast of their ancestors and one beats the other. Al-‘Akḥṭal says:

‘إِذَا وَصَعْتَ أَبَاكَ فِي مِيزَانِهِمْ رَجَحُوا وَشَالَ أَبُوكَ فِي المِيزَانِ’²⁶⁰

(Lit., If you put your father in their balance (for weight), they weigh heavier, and your father goes up in the balance (proving of no weight).)

Also, *qāma/istaqāma mīzān al-nahār* ‘قَامَ/اسْتَقَامَ مِيزَانُ النَّهَارِ’²⁶¹ is an expression used to mean ‘it is midday’, that is, the sun is in the middle of the sky, through similarity with the tongue of the balance when it is in the middle, not turning to either side.

2. *Al-wazn* ‘الْوَزْنُ’ (weight or weighing): using the noun ‘الاسْمُ’ instead of the verbal noun ‘المَصْدَرُ’.²⁶²

3. *Al-mīzān* and its *’awzān* ‘بِأَوْزَانِهِ’ ‘المِيزَانُ’, that is the balance and its counterpoise weights together which are also known as *mawāzīn* ‘مَوَازِين’.²⁶³ This is also the same word used as the plural of *mīzān* as stated above.

4. Justice:²⁶⁴ as the *mīzān* is the means by which justice is achieved, or because it stands for and symbolises justice.
5. The law that judges between the people stating and giving them their rights and before which they are all equal.²⁶⁵
6. The register that has all the deeds of mankind recorded in it.²⁶⁶
7. *Al-Miqdār* ‘المِقْدَار’: proportion or measure as in “أَعْرِفُ لِكُلِّ” *أَمْرِي مِيزَانَهُ*²⁶⁷ (I know the *mīzān* (measure) of every person), to be understood figuratively.
8. The Qur’an, according to Al-Husayn ibn Al-Faḍl.²⁶⁸
9. A God-given faculty by which man can judge between right and wrong.²⁶⁹
10. Mujāhid said: “*Al-mīzān* is the good deeds ‘الحَسَنَات’ and the bad deeds ‘السَّيِّئَات’ themselves.”²⁷⁰
11. *Al-mawzūn* ‘المَوْزُون’: what is weighed.²⁷¹
12. The Judging.²⁷² The Judgement which is the Straight Balance.²⁷³
13. It “does not signify a pair of scales for weighing things, but a measure, as signifying any standard of comparison, estimation, or judgement, and the term is ... used in this broad sense. ... (It) is that which enables men to be just in their actions”.²⁷⁴
14. Everything that is used for weighing things and measuring amounts²⁷⁵ (both literally and figuratively).

From the nine Ayahs that contain the word *al-mīzān* the following classification may be derived:

- 1- *Al-mīzān* in relation to *Al-Kitāb* (the Book).
- 2- *Al-mīzān* on its own.
- 3- *Al-mīzān* in relation to *Al-Kayl* (measuring).

1- *Al-mīzān* in relation to *Al-Kitāb* (the Book)

Q42:17 reads ﴿اللَّهُ الَّذِي أَنْزَلَ الْكِتَابَ بِالْحَقِّ وَالْمِيزَانَ﴾ “It is Allah who sent down, the Book in truth and the balance”.²⁷⁶

Q57:25 reads: ﴿لَقَدْ أَرْسَلْنَا رُسُلَنَا بِالْبَيِّنَاتِ وَأَنْزَلْنَا مَعَهُمُ الْكِتَابَ وَالْمِيزَانَ لِيَقُومَ النَّاسُ﴾ ﴿بِالْقِسْطِ﴾ “We have sent our Messengers with clear proofs, and sent

down with them the Book and the Balance so that men may uphold (observe) justice”.²⁷⁷

It is clear from these two Ayahs that the verb *anzala* ‘أنزل’ (to send down) is used with both the Book and the Balance. Exegetes give different interpretations for this verb. While they state, on the one hand, that the Book of Allah has been ‘sent down’, i.e., from a higher place to a lower place, or in other words, from heaven to the earth, the same (with regard to the sending down) does not necessarily apply to *al-Mīzān*, the Balance.²⁷⁸

According to one view was not originally a ‘human invention’. Al-Rāzi and Al-Zamakhshari say that it has been reported that “Gabriel (عليه السلام) came down with the *mīzān* with him, gave it to (the Prophet) Noah (عليه السلام) and said to him: Command your people to weigh with it”.²⁷⁹ And although Al-Bayḍāwi indicates that *al-mīzān* means justice, he also says: “And it is said that *al-mīzān* was sent down with Noah (عليه السلام)”.²⁸⁰ It is, however, obvious that the word *mīzān* refers specifically to the instrument that is used for weighing, i.e., scales.

On the other hand, *anzala* is also understood to mean ‘created’. Al-Rāzi says: “The second view is that *al-inzāl* ‘الإنزال’ (sending down) means ‘creation’ as Allah says: ﴿وَأَنْزَلَ لَكُمْ مِنَ الْأَنْعَامِ ثَمَانِيَةَ﴾ (And he sent down for you, of the cattle, eight pairs)”.²⁸¹

Al-Zamakhshari also relates that Al-Ḥasan said the same thing quoting the same Ayah ﴿وَأَنْزَلَ لَكُمْ مِنَ الْأَنْعَامِ﴾; this is due to the fact that “His (Allah’s) commands, judgements and rules come down from heaven”.²⁸² Al-Bayḍāwi says the *anzala* means that Allah “caused the reasons for its (the *mīzān*’s) making to be there and commanded its making”.²⁸³

In spite of the fact that Allah has created everything, I find no particular reason to restrict the meaning of *anzala* to ‘created’ and not ‘sent down’, especially as this is the central meaning of *anzala*

and also as the word *al-mīzān* (وَالْمِيزَانَ) comes as a part of the direct object (مَعطوفٌ عَلَى مَنْصُوبٍ), of which the first part is *Al-Kitāb* (الْكِتَابِ).

On the other hand, if we understand '*anzala*' in both cases to mean 'created' the Q42:17 would mean that Allah had created the Book and the Balance; and if we understand 'the Book' to mean the Word of Allah in general or the Qur'an in particular, this would mean that the Qur'an is 'created' which is contrary to orthodox Islamic belief, or to say the least, not the concern of this work or the belief of the writer of this thesis.

Also, are we to understand Q57:25 to mean 'We have sent Our Messengers with clear proofs, and *created* with them the Book and the Balance'? The Ayah would then make no sense – something which is inconceivable for the Word of Allah.

Therefore, '*anzala*' means 'to send down' and should be understood in this light disregarding how the word *al-mīzān* is understood, i.e., whether literally or metaphorically.

As for *al-mīzān* in Q57:25, it can be taken literally but also may be understood in the wider sense of the word as a result of the range of applications of this word in the Arabic language. In the latter sense, the two above Ayahs would be indicating that Allah has sent down the Book with His Messengers so that things are judged according to the rules of that Book; Man has to balance these things in his mind to see whether what he does is right or wrong accordingly and which path to take in life as he will be held responsible for his actions on the judgement Day when the *Mīzān* of Allah will be set up for the achievement of absolute Justice.

How the *mīzān* (scales) that people use for weighing things in this world looks like gives a clear idea that it is but a small model that does a similar job to that which will be set up on the Judgement Day.

It is absolutely certain from many sources: the Qur'an, the ḥadīth, the sayings of the *Ṣaḥābah*, the Muslim Ulema that the

Mīzān exists and a *Mīzān* will be used on the Judgement Day. Whether it is the same one or not, is beyond the scope of this work.

However, it has been reported that the Prophet (ﷺ) was talking about Allah and the beginning of things when he (ﷺ) said: "... and His Throne (was) on the water, and in His other Hand (was) the *Mīzān*; He causes it to go up and down",²⁸⁴ that is, Allah causes the fortunes of people and things to change. This is also clear from the ḥadīth that Ibn Mājah reported saying: "And the *Mīzān* is in the Hand of Al-Rahmān (Allah); He causes some people to go up and others to go down until the Day of Judgement".²⁸⁵

As for the *Mīzān* of the Judgement Day, there are many ḥadīths that mention it in the singular form.²⁸⁶ Al-Bukhāri and others report on the authority of Abu Hurayrah that the Prophet (ﷺ) said: "Two words (that are) light on the tongue (i.e., easy to say), but heavy in the *Mīzān* (Balance) ...".²⁸⁷

It is agreed almost unanimously among the Muslim Ulema that there will be only one *Mīzān* on the Judgement Day.²⁸⁸ A description of what it looks like has also been provided by many reports. The Prophet (ﷺ) stated that that *Mīzān* has two pans and that it turns to the heavy side as it weighs.²⁸⁹ Abu 'Ishāq Al-Zaggāg is reported to have said: "... the *Mīzān* has a tongue (a pointer) and two pans and it turns with the deeds".²⁹⁰ Salmān said: "The *Mīzān* will be set up, and it has two pans, if the heavens and the earth and what is in them are to be put in one of them, it would house them".²⁹¹ Al-Ḥasan and others also said: "The *Mīzān* has a tongue and two pans".²⁹² Al-Rāzi states that Ibn 'Abbās said: "The *Mīzān* has a tongue and two pans to weigh the deeds", and that Al-Ḥasan said: "The *Mīzān* has a tongue and two pans, and is indescribable".²⁹³ However, Al-Rāzi also says that Al-Ḥasan said: "It (the *Mīzān*) will be in the hand of Gabriel (i.e., held by him)".²⁹⁴ It is also reported that Hudhayfah said the same with regard to Gabriel. Al-Ṭabari and Al-Qurtubi go on to add on the authority of Hudhayfah that Allah will say to Gabriel: "Weigh for them, take from one and give the other",²⁹⁵ i.e., if **A** had wronged **B**, the good deeds of **A** are taken from him and given to **B**, and if **A** had no good deeds left, bad deeds from **B** would be taken and added to **A** until **B**

is compensated in full for the wrong done to him by **A** in the first place.²⁹⁶

It is also reported that ‘Abdullah ibn Salām said: “The *Mīzān* of the Lord of all beings is (to be) set up for men and jinn, facing the Throne (of Allah); one pan is above the Heaven, while the other is above Gehenna (the Fire). And if the heavens and the earth are put in one of them (the pans), it would house them. And Gabriel is holding it (the *Mīzān*) by its handle, looking at its tongue (to see which direction it turns)”.²⁹⁷ It is clear from this report that it actually assimilates all the above reports.

Al-Rāzi and Al-Zamakhshari also say that it is reported that the Prophet “David (ﷺ) asked Allah to show him the *Mīzān* (of the Judgement Day). When he saw it, he fell unconcious, and when he regained conciousness he said: “My Lord, who is there that fills its pan with *hasanahs* ‘حَسَنَات’?”²⁹⁸ Allah said to him: “O David, if I am pleased with my ‘*abd* (slave or servant), I fill it with a (single) date”.²⁹⁹ It is also reported that ‘Ā’ishah narrated: “Allah (ﷻ) created the two pans of the Balance big enough to accomodate (or ‘so big that they can house’) the heavens and the earth. (Seeing the Balance), the angels said: “O our Lord, what are You going to weigh with it?” He (Allah) said: “I weigh with it whatever I will (or please)”.³⁰⁰

As for what this *Mīzān* weighs on the Judgement Day, we have the following views:

a) The books or registers that have the deeds recorded in them.

This is very clear from the hadīth of the Prophet (ﷺ) about the man who would be brought forward to the *Mīzān* with ninety-nine books of bad deeds, each book as big (long) as the eyes could see to be weighed against a small card having in it ‘لَا إِلَهَ إِلَّا اللَّهُ مُحَمَّدٌ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ’ (There is no God but Allah, (and) Muḥammad is the Messenger of Allah) written on. This hadīth is known as ‘حَدِيثُ الْبَطَاقَةِ’ (the hadīth of the card).³⁰¹

b) The deeds themselves:³⁰² this includes everything that man does, says, intends, etc. The Prophet (ﷺ) said: “There is nothing

heavier in the *Mīzān* on the Day of Judgement than good moral behaviour (خُلُقٍ حَسَنٍ).³⁰³ The Prophet (ﷺ) was also asked by a man about his beating two of his slaves as they used to cheat and disobey him. The Prophet (ﷺ) stated that his punishment of them will be weighed in the *Mīzān*.³⁰⁴

The Prophet (ﷺ) also stated that if a man devoted a mare for Jihad in the cause of Allah whatever that mare did, including its eating, drinking, even excreting would show as good deeds in the *Mīzān* of that man.³⁰⁵

Sa‘īd ibn Al-Musayyib and Al-Zuhri also said that “the *wudū’* ‘الْوُضُوءُ’ (abolution before *salāh*) is weighed”.³⁰⁶ The Prophet (ﷺ) also said: “*Al-hamdu lillah* (Praise be to Allah) fills the *Mīzān*”.³⁰⁷ There are also many other *hadīths* referring to similar things.³⁰⁸

However, the question now is: how are the deeds weighed?

According to Al-Rāzi, Ibn ‘Abbās said that the deeds would be given forms or shapes. “The deeds of the *mu’min* would have good shapes”,³⁰⁹ and by implication, the deeds of the *kāfir* ugly shapes. So, these shapes will be weighed. Yet, as is clear from this report, the reference is to the *mu’min* and the *kāfir*. So, what about the good and bad deeds in general?

Al-Zamakhshari and Al-Rāzi say, referring to one of the interpretations of how the deeds are weighed: “White glittering (shining) substances would be placed in the pan of the good deeds while black and dark substances would be placed in the pan of the bad deeds”.³¹⁰

In addition to the above, it has been stated by the Prophet (ﷺ) that the good deeds and the recitation of the Qur’an would appear in actual real forms on the Judgement Day. In one *hadīth*, it is stated that the Surahs of *al-Baqarah* and *Āl ‘Imrān* would come as two clouds,³¹¹ while in another about what the *mu’min* will see in his grave, the Prophet (ﷺ) said that the good deeds would appear like a good looking young man with a nice smell to be the *mu’min*’s companion in his grave and the opposite was reported with regard to the *kāfir* and the hypocrite.³¹² Also in a third *hadīth* the Prophet (ﷺ) stated that the Qur’an would come to its reader in the shape of a “pale-looking young man”.³¹³

c) The people themselves.

It is reported that when some of the *Sahābah* laughed at the smallness of the legs of Ibn Mas‘ūd as he was climbing a tree, the Prophet (ﷺ) said: “Why are you laughing? On the Judgement Day, the leg of ‘Abdullah will be heavier in the *Mīzān* than (the mountain of) ‘Uḥud”.³¹⁴

d) Together with the deeds a ‘thing’ unidentified will be weighed.

Abdul-Rahmān ibn Abi Bakr said that the Prophet (ﷺ) said: “On the Day of Judgement Allah (ﷻ) will call a man who was in debt before Him and say (to him): “My ‘*abd* (servant), what did you do with the people’s money?” He will say: “My Lord, You know I did not waste it; it was lost through a flood or fire or theft or *wadīeah* ‘*وَضِيعة*’”. Allah will then order ‘something’ to be brought and will put it in his (the man’s) *mīzān*, and his *ḥasanahs* ‘*حَسَنَاتُه*’ will weigh heavier”.³¹⁵

e) Both the deeds and people together.

‘Abdullah ibn ‘Amr ibn Al-Ēās said that the Prophet (ﷺ) said: “The scales will be set up on the Judgement Day, and a man will be brought forward to be put on one scale and all the deeds counted against him (on the other scale). The *Mīzān* will then turn (i.e., to the direction of his bad deeds that weigh heavier than his good deeds). So, he is sent to the Fire. He (the Prophet) (ﷺ) said: “So when he is being taken away, a crier calling from Al-Rahmān ‘*إِذَا صَاحَّ يَصِيحُ مِنْ عِنْدِ الرَّحْمَنِ*’ (will be heard): “Do not rush, there is still something to be weighed in his favour”. So, a card will be brought, on which (is written) *La ‘ilaha ‘illa Allah* (There is no God but Allah) and it will then be put with the man on one scale until it turns with him (i.e., to the side of the good deeds where he and the card have been placed, and therefore, he will be sent to Heaven instead)”.³¹⁶

By way of conclusion, this last *ḥadīth* sums up all the above with regard to what will be weighed in actuality on the Day of Judgement. The *ḥadīth* of the card, mentioned in **a)** above is related with an important difference by Al-Ṭabari who states that the man at issue will be placed in the scale as well to be weighed with his deeds.³¹⁷ This actually leads us to conclude that the people with

their deeds that are recorded in the books or registers being given beautiful and ugly shapes will be weighed in the Scales of Justice on the Judgement Day. Therefore, all the above reports do not contradict, but rather complement one another.

2- *Al-Mizān* on Its Own

Q55:7-9 read:

{وَالسَّمَاءَ رَفَعَهَا وَوَضَعَ الْمِيزَانَ * أَلَّا تَطْغَوْا فِي الْمِيزَانِ * وَأَقِيمُوا الْوَزْنَ بِالْقِسْطِ وَلَا تُخْسِرُوا الْمِيزَانَ}

“And the Heaven He has raised high and set the Balance * Transgress not in the Balance * And establish weight with equity and do not make the Balance deficient”.³¹⁸

It is clear that the word *mīzān* is repeated three times in these Ayahs. This suggests that the meaning might be the same for each of them.

In spite of the fact that the Ulema give different interpretations for the word *mīzān*, as mentioned above, the different meanings do not all fit when it comes to applying each one of them individually in the above Ayahs. The word *mīzān* has to be twisted a little from time to time to suit each meaning. However, the Qur’an uses the same word so that one has always to keep in mind the actual basic reference of the word which is its being a weighing instrument. This is the only meaning that can apply without having to manipulate or ‘twist’ the word *mīzān* {المِيزَان} in the above Ayahs.

As stated before, some Ulema say that the word *mīzān* means ‘Justice’; and although the *mīzān* (scales) has always been used to stand for and symbolise Justice, we cannot replace the word *mīzān* by Justice in Q55:7-9 without having to ‘spice’ our explanation with a justification. This is something we do not need do when using the word *mīzān* as it occurs with all its shades of meaning. This actually shows very clearly that the most accurate word for the above context is what has actually been used already, i.e., *al-mīzān* {المِيزَان}.

Trying to understand the word metaphorically without its actual basic meaning as a weighing instrument is extremely

problematic. Therefore, a basic or primary meaning, that can also be the main and possibly the only meaning, has to be stated. However, we have also to bear in mind that rendering *al-mīzān* as ‘balance’ or ‘scales’, which is the basic or surface meaning is by no means accurate as it deprives the Ayahs of both the shades of meaning implied in the Arabic word and a great part of the message intended to be conveyed to the listener or the reader. The problem is that there is no linguistic reason or even an external factor that can guarantee that what is understood from *al-mīzān* is the same as ‘balance’. Using a certain meaning for *al-mīzān* in one Ayah does not only affect the meaning of *al-mīzān* in the others but the entire contexts of the others as well. This is very clear when we read, for example, Al-Qurtubi’s³¹⁹ interpretations of the word *mīzān*. This leads to changing the meaning of *tughyān* in {أَلَّا تَطْغَوْا فِي الْمِيزَانِ} (Q55:8) and forces the reader to understand the Ayah as a whole without stopping at the meaning of each individual word to find out how it affects the context. This is something which is quite safe to do, at least, in this particular Ayah without fearing that understanding the Ayah literally might affect the meaning because, in my view, it does not.

It is understood from Q55:7 that the *mīzān* {الْمِيزَانِ} is actually from the Creator Who raised the Heaven. Q55:8-9 show clearly that it came into the possession of Man. According to Q55:8, Man is commanded not to transgress (exceed his limit) as far as the *mīzān* is concerned. And because the *mīzān* functions as an instrument for weighing, Q55:9 makes use of this stating that weighing should be done in a way that gives each party involved his due share. As it is in the nature of every individual to try to get more for himself at the expense of others, Q55:9 goes on to state that skimping is not allowed because in this way the *mīzān* would not be doing what it is there for and people’s rights are at stake as well.

Understanding *al-mīzān* as referring to a weighing instrument also helps in understanding its wider range of applications. Weighing is also a mental process. Whatever one says or does is actually weighed by one mentally to judge its share of what one intends. In other words, when someone, for example, says

something which is not entirely true, whatever he says is actually weighed against the entire truth of the matter involved to judge how much of its truth is revealed and how much is concealed. This is exactly like ‘giving in full’ and ‘skimping’. Mathematically, if the truth equals **A**, **B**, and **C**, giving only **A** and **B** means that the truth has been affected, which also applies when one’s due is to get **A** and **B** only, so getting **A**, **B**, and unrightfully **C** is considered an act of transgression. This example is more applicable to balancing than weighing in the sense that when one goes to a merchant to buy two pounds of wheat, for example, the process that follows is an actual weighing that ends when the two sides of the scales *balance*, considering that in one pan is a metal counterpoise of two pounds to balance against.

On the other hand, when the wheat is in reality less than two pounds in weight as a result of the weigher withholding some of it, then the buyer wants to know whether he has been wronged or not, he *balances* them against a two-pound counterpoise.

The difference between these two cases is that in the first, the wheat was of no *known* weight. This is why the process of weighing involves adding a bit more or taking away a bit until the two sides get to the same level, i.e., they balance. In the second case, the wheat is *supposed* to be of a known weight and it just requires balancing against a counterpoise of the same weight. Weighing would then be involved in this process when the wheat is found to be less than two pounds and some more wheat is added to *balance* the scales.

The Ayahs above do not contain any words that refer to measuring, in the sense of *kayl*. Perhaps, this is what has led to some metaphoric interpretations for *al-mīzān*. And in spite of the fact that actual weighing is indicated by other words in these Ayahs such as {وَأَقِيمُوا ^{ال}وَزْنَ} and {وَلَا تُخْسِرُوا}, there is no place for *al-kayl*. This is because mentioning *al-kayl* here would most certainly restrict the meaning of *al-mīzān* to one thing and would, therefore, do away with all the other meanings and shades of meanings that *al-mīzān* has, implies or may be referring to. One may use the word ‘weight’

(وَزُنْ) in contexts where ‘measure’ (كَيْلٌ) would make no sense such as in ‘weigh one plan against another’. In this example, the value or importance of one thing is compared to another. Therefore, adding the word *al-kayl* to Q55:7-9 would not fit the intended message.

The Ayahs, accordingly, indicate that whatever is used for weighing should be used *bilqist* {بِالْقِسْطِ}, with justice, equity and fair dealing, which is the main reason for creating *al-mīzān* and giving it to man. This earthly *mīzān* is to be contrasted with the *Mīzān* of the Day of Judgement that no one can manipulate for his own interest in order to get away with things which he might have got away with on the earth.

As Allah has created the *mīzān* and set certain rules for it, man is supposed to abide by these rules as he is commanded to, and not to go to any extreme as far as these rules are concerned, as this may indeed affect people’s rights (and disturb the balance ‘الْإْتِرَان’). This goes in conformity with Q2:143, which reads: وَكَذَلِكَ جَعَلْنَاكُمْ أُمَّةً وَسَطًا “Thus have We made of you an *Ummah* justly balanced”.³²⁰

The Qur’anic {وَضَعَ الْمِيزَانَ} is also of particular interest because the word *wada’a* {وَضَعَ} can be contrasted with *rafa’a* {رَفَعَ} in {وَالسَّمَاءَ رَفَعَهَا} and also with Q42:17 {الَّذِي أَنْزَلَ الْكِتَابَ بِالْحَقِّ وَالْمِيزَانَ} and Q57:25 {وَأَنْزَلْنَا مَعَهُمُ الْكِتَابَ وَالْمِيزَانَ}. As mentioned before *anzala* means ‘sent down’; this reference to placing something in a lower level is implied in {وَضَعَ}. Therefore, the Ayah may be understood to refer to placing the *mīzān* on the earth which also fits with Q55:8-9 that stand as a clear and direct address to Man. In other words, while {وَضَعَ الْمِيزَانَ} stands as a general statement from the Creator, the following Ayahs bear a specific reference to what Man, being the addressee, should do.

3- *Al-Mīzān* in Relation to *Al-Kayl* (Measuring):

The word *al-mīzān* is mentioned with the word *al-kayl* twice and with *al-mikyāl* twice as well, as follows:

Q6:152: { وَأَوْفُوا الْكَيْلَ وَالْمِيزَانَ بِالْقِسْطِ }

Q7:85: { فَأَوْفُوا الْكَيْلَ وَالْمِيزَانَ }

Q11:84: { وَلَا تَنقُصُوا الْمِكْيَالَ وَالْمِيزَانَ }

Q11:85: { وَيَا قَوْمِ أَوْفُوا الْمِكْيَالَ وَالْمِيزَانَ بِالْقِسْطِ }

It is clear from the above Ayahs, as has been discussed under *k-y-l* 'كيل' before, that the reference here is to giving and taking by means of measuring and weighing. Although the Ayahs use the words *al-kayl* and *al-mikyāl* to refer to measuring, we find that only *al-mīzān* is used as referring to weighing.

While anything of a known or even unknown capacity can be used for measuring, the process of weighing is more difficult. It necessitates the use of an instrument of certain specifications, without which the weighing cannot be done. Therefore, the Qur'an uses in the above Ayahs the means by which this is achieved.

It is understood that by virtue of what the word *mīzān* indicates and implies, when the reference with the use of *al-kayl* is general, the same applies to *al-mīzān*. The same also applies to the use of *al-mikyāl* as an instrument used for measuring which reflects the kind of harmony between the words and the particular purpose each one serves. However, it is clear that whether *al-kayl* or *al-mikyāl* is used the word *al-mīzān* does not change.

The Qur'an mentions the word *mawāzīn* مَوَازِين seven times in four Surahs in the following contexts:

1. { ثَقُلَتْ مَوَازِينُهُ } *thaqulat mawāzīnuh* and { خَفَّتْ مَوَازِينُهُ } *khaffat mawāzīnuh* in Q7:8-9, Q23:102-3, Q101:6 & 8, and { وَنَضَعُ الْمَوَازِينَ } *wanaḍa'u al-mawāzīn al-qist* in Q21:47.

Lexicographers and exegetes give the following interpretations for the word *mawāzīn* مَوَازِين:

(1) Plural of *mīzān* مِيزَان which is the instrument used for weighing.³²¹

(2) Plural of *mawzūn* مَوْزُون which is the thing that is weighed.³²²

(3) Abu Manṣūr says that the Arabs call the counterpoise weights 'أوزان' which are made of stone and metal that they use for weighing dates and everything else *mawāzīn* مَوَازِين whose singular form is *mīzān* مِيزَان. However, a *mīzān* (مِيزَان in the singular form) is not used to refer to a counterpoise weight.³²³

(4) The *mīzān* (مِيزَان scales) and its weights or counterpoises together.³²⁴

(5) Other reports also indicate that *al-mawāzīn* means 'the good deeds'. Al-Rāzi quotes Ibn 'Abbās as saying: "Al-mawāzīn is the plural form of *mawzūn* مَوْزُون (what is weighed), and these are the good deeds that have weight and matter before Allah."³²⁵

The above Ayahs state very clearly that on the Judgement Day actual weighing will take place; Q7:8, for example, starts with { وَالْوَزْنُ يَوْمَئِذٍ الْحَقُّ } *وَالْوَزْنُ يَوْمَئِذٍ الْحَقُّ*. Also, as stated before under *mīzān* مِيزَان, no weighing can be achieved without the use of a *mīzān* (balance or scales). The Ayahs also state that in that act of weighing, the *mawāzīn* of some people will prove heavy while those of others will

prove light. As a result, reward would be for those whose *mawāzīn* are heavy and punishment for the other party.

This actually leads us to conclude that: **1.** the word *mawāzīn* that is referred to in both cases means the same thing, and **2.** the word *mawāzīn* does not mean ‘bad or evil deeds’. As a matter of fact, the Qur’an in no place refers to the weight of the bad deeds.

The question that arises now is: Is *mawāzīn* in the above Ayahs the plural form of *mīzān* مِيزَان or *mawzūn* مَوْزُون ?

To answer this question, we have to exclude for a while the *mawāzīn* of Q21:47 {وَنَضَعُ الْمَوَازِينَ الْقِسْطَ}. The rest of the Ayahs, accordingly, tell of *mawāzīn* weighing heavy, and *mawāzīn* weighing light.

The reference, therefore, is always made to one thing and by implication to one side of the scales, and that is the side of the things that are weighed and not to the other side that has the counterpoise ‘weights’, or rather what functions as counterpoise weights, placed, as if the situation is that on one side are the ‘weights’ placed and on the other side there would be placed the things whose weight in comparison wants to be judged. In other words, this means the *mawāzīn* will be placed against some weights.

We can, at this stage, draw a preliminary conclusion that the word *mawāzīn* does indeed mean or rather refer to ‘good deeds’ whose weight is needed to be judged against the ‘weights’ that are the bad deeds. The reference is made to the good deeds only because their weight is what actually matters as the person involved would, I assume, be more interested in finding out how heavy his good deeds would weigh. Also, one side of the scales weighing heavy entails that the other side would be light; in other words, when one scale goes down, the other has to go up.

The fact that the reference is always made to one side only is understood from what the Arabs say in their language. According to all the Arabic dictionaries which I have consulted “*Khaffa al-mīzān* خَفَّ الْمِيزَانُ means ‘*shāla* شَالَ that is when one side of the scales goes up.”³²⁶ By contrast, when the Arabs use the expression *rajaha*

al-mīzān **الْمِيزَانُ** رَجَحَ to refer to the side of the *mīzān* that goes down. This actually means that the word *mīzān* (scales) is used to refer to only one side together with what is put in that side, without including the other, as this is understood by implication.

We can then conclude that as the word *mawāzīn* means the *mīzān* and its ‘weights’, and the word ‘weights’ with regard to the Judgement Day would be most suitable to refer to the bad deeds (being counterpoises) as explained above, this means that the word *mawāzīn* that is described as heavy and light cannot refer to the side of the bad deeds.

Therefore, we can be sure that *mawāzīn* refers to the other side where the good deeds are placed. This actually raises the question: Does *mawāzīn* in fact mean ‘good deeds’?

The word *mawāzīn*, in fact, does refer to the ‘good deeds’, but does not in principle, mean these good deeds specifically.

But, how does it apply to the side of the good deeds without having to contrast it to the other side?

In a ḥadīth, in which the Prophet (ﷺ) was talking about the last person to be taken out of the Fire, to be admitted into Heaven, he (ﷺ) said: “... until He (Allah) gets out (of the Fire) him who said “*Lā ’ilaha ’illa Allah*” (There is no God but Allah), and in his heart is the *mīzān* of a barley seed,”³²⁷ i.e., what weighs as much as a barley seed (of faith). In this ḥadīth the word *mīzān* is used to mean ‘weight **وَزْنٌ**’. This actually indicates that what is weighed against the ‘weights **أَوْزَانٌ**’ may be referred to (at least figuratively) as *mīzān*, whose plural is *mawāzīn*.

On the other hand, the process of weighing, as discussed before, involves and implies balancing; and in this case the good deeds would be balanced against the bad deeds. This means that the good deeds are ‘weights’ as well.

The conclusion from this is that the word *mawāzīn* may apply to *al-mīzān* and its weights, whether the weights be good or bad deeds. And in this case the word *mawāzīn* is in fact the plural of *mīzān*, not *mawzūn*.³²⁸

However, if the word *mawāzīn* is to be as the plural form of *mawzūn*, in this case we can state that the Qur'an uses this word to refer to the 'good deeds' only.

On the other hand, my personal conclusion is that the word *mawāzīn* 'مَوَازِين' simply means *ḥasanāt* 'الْحَسَنَات' which is the plural form of *ḥasanah* 'الْحَسَنَة'. Understanding *mawāzīn* in this way solves the problem of trying to look for evidence to support one point of view against another. This also leads me to conclude that what the *Mīzān* on the Judgement Day would actually be weighing will be the '*ḥasanahs*' not just in the sense of good deeds 'الأعمال الصالحة' as argued before, but in another sense, since the word *ḥasanah* has also another meaning in addition to a 'good deed'.³²⁹

There are so many *ḥadīths* that refer to how much reward is given for specific things said or done. The *ḥasanah* is actually regarded as the unit of reward 'وَحْدَةَ الْجَزَاءِ'. For example, the Prophet (ﷺ) said in a *ḥadīth* "... whoever says "Subḥāna Allāh" a hundred times, that will be written (in his record) as a thousand *ḥasanahs*".³³⁰ According to this *ḥadīth* and many others a specific number of *ḥasanahs* is given for a certain action. And, of course, the Qur'an states that Allah multiplies the *ḥasanahs* for whoever He pleases as in Q2:261 {وَاللَّهُ يُضَاعِفُ لِمَنْ يَشَاءُ}. Q4:40 {وَإِنْ تَكَ حَسَنَةً يُضَاعِفْهَا}. "and if it be a *ḥasanah*, He doubles it, and gives from Himself a great reward (wage)"³³¹ states also this very clearly.

Therefore, if the same principle is applied to all the good deeds, and then to all the bad deeds whose units of counting is *al-sayyi'ah* 'السَّيِّئَة', this means that the *ḥasanahs* are to be weighed against the *sayyi'ahs*, assuming that one *ḥasanah* weighs as much as one *sayyi'ah*.

This conclusion is supported by a ḥadīth reported by Ibn Mas‘ūd with regard to the number of the *ḥasanahs* and the *sayyi’ahs* being weighed against each other. Their weighing is also supported by the ḥadīth recorded in the *Musnad* of Khaythamah ibn Sulaymān on the authority of Jābir ibn ‘Abdullah, which states that the *ḥasanahs* and the *sayyi’ahs* are weighed against each other: “تُوزَنُ *الْحَسَنَاتُ وَالسَّيِّئَاتُ*”.³³² Ibn ‘Abbās is also reported to have said that the *ḥasanahs* and the *sayyi’ahs* are weighed (against each other) in a Balance that has a tongue and two scales”.³³³ Another report states that Ibn ‘Abbās said: “*Mawāzīnuhu* {مَوَازِينُهُ} (is/means) his *ḥasanahs* in his balance *حَسَنَاتُهُ فِي مِيزَانِهِ*”.³³⁴ Also, the Prophet David, in a ḥadīth quoted before, asked Allah about the person who could fill the scale with *ḥasanahs*.³³⁵

In spite of this, the word *ḥasanahs* cannot replace the word *mawāzīn* in the above Ayahs as their range of application is not entirely the same. The word *mawāzīn* indicates the use of a *mīzān* (balance), things weighed, someone to perform the weighing, the presence of the person involved, etc. Also, it is only then that everyone would know for certain that whatever one said, did, etc., actually weighs something and is taken into account.

If we now turn to Q21:47{وَنَضَعُ الْمَوَازِينَ الْقِسْطَ} , we find that in spite of the fact that many ḥadīths talk about **a/the** *Mīzān* (in the singular form),³³⁶ and that many Muslim Ulema agree that there is only one *Mīzān* that will be set up on the Judgement Day,³³⁷ the Ayah here makes use of the word in the plural form.

Different interpretations have been given for the use of the plural in this Ayah:

1. “Every person will have his own *Mīzān*, or there is a *Mīzān* for every type of deed. Therefore, the plural is true”,³³⁸ i.e., there will be more than one Balance (pair of scales) to perform the weighing.

Al-Rāzi also says that Q21:47 “affirms the existence of more than one Balance. Therefore, there will, perhaps, be a *Mīzān* for the deeds of the heart, another for the deeds of the limbs, a third for

what has been said, etc.”³³⁹ He also states that he sees no reason to understand the word *al-Mawāzīn* {المَوَازِينُ} differently as the Qur’an states it in this way and form.³⁴⁰

The answer to this is the fact that numerous hadīths of the Prophet (ﷺ) refer to only one *Mīzān* on the Day of Judgement,³⁴¹ and the word of the Prophet (ﷺ) is certainly more authoritative than that of Al-Rāzi’s especially as the plural word *mawāzīn* may also be accepted in the Arabic language to refer to only one set of scales.

2. “The plural is used as a result of the multiplicity of the deeds and the people involved in the weighing. The Qur’an says: {وَمَنْ خَفَّتْ مَوَازِينُهُ} (and whose *mawāzīn* weigh heavy)”.³⁴² According to the first part of this view there is only one *Mīzān*, and the plural is used for some other reason. In this case we have to understand *mawāzīn* in the Ayah quoted to be referring to the deeds and not to the weighing instrument.

3. The Arabs sometimes use the plural to mean the singular as in the sentence “خَرَجَ فُلَانٌ إِلَى مَكَّةَ عَلَى الْبِعَالِ”³⁴³ (Lit., X has gone to Mecca on the mules) although X was riding only one mule, or “خَرَجَ فُلَانٌ إِلَى الْبَصْرَةَ فِي السُّفُنِ”³⁴⁴ (Lit., X has left to Basra on the ships), although it was only one ship that X was on.

The Qur’an also makes use of this Arabic characteristic in more than one occasion; for example, Q26:105 reads “كَذَّبَتْ قَوْمُ نُوحٍ” {كَذَّبَتْ قَوْمُ نُوحٍ} (The people of Noah belied the Messengers), and in Q26:123 {كَذَّبَتْ عَادُ الْمُرْسَلِينَ} (‘Ād belied the Messengers), although it was only one Messenger sent to each people”.³⁴⁵ Accordingly, *al-Mawāzīn* {المَوَازِينُ} refers to only one *Mīzān*, and the plural is only for *tafkhīm* ‘جَمْعٌ تَفْخِيمٌ’, i.e., to stress the importance, etc., of the object.

Also, another difference, in my view, between {وَنَضَعُ الْمَوَازِينَ} and {وَنَضَعُ الْمِيزَانَ} is as follows: applying human standards, we find out that the reference in the singular might be indicating that people on

the Judgement Day will be taking turns when their deeds are getting weighed and everyone has to wait until the one before him finishes. According to this limited human view, there is also a time factor to take into account. Besides, as the deeds differ in nature and reward, one's intentions and motives are also considered part of every deed. This means that it does not matter how similar any two deeds might look; the reward is going to be different and perhaps the punishment as well. In other words, if a rich man gives a pound in charity and a poor man does exactly the same, this does not mean that one of them is better than the other, because their intentions are taken into consideration. Probably one of them has done this with the intention that people would see his act of charity so that they talk about him as a generous person which is considered as an act of *shirk* in Islam that does not only deserve no reward but incurs punishment as well.

This above argument indicates that as many factors are considered in the weighing of the deeds in different ways, the person whose turn has come might think that the Balance would require some different adjustments to suit his particular circumstances. In other words, the Balance might have to be set up differently.

Although the Qur'an states that the Laws applying on the Judgement Day are different from our human earthly laws as is clear from Q14:48 which reads: {يَوْمَ تُبَدَّلُ الْأَرْضُ غَيْرَ الْأَرْضِ وَالسَّمَاوَاتُ} ³⁴⁶ it also emphasises that fact in a still different way, namely through the use of the plural in the word {المَوَازِينِ}. This word in the plural form indicates that (1) everyone will be having his own *Mīzān* (Balance) just for his own deeds, and that (2) they would not have to wait for their so-called turns in the human sense of the word because Allah is capable of judging them all at the same time. This message can only be conveyed with the use of the extremely accurate and most befitting plural form *Mawāzīn*.

Also, in a *ḥadīth qudsi*, Allah says:

"إِذَا وَجَّهْتُ إِلَى عَبْدِي مُصِيبَةً فِي بَدَنِهِ أَوْ فِي وَدَدِهِ أَوْ فِي مَالِهِ فَاسْتَقْبَلَهَا بِصَبْرٍ جَمِيلٍ اسْتَحَبَّتْ أَنْ
أَنْصِبَ لَهُ مِيزَانًا أَوْ أَنْشُرَ لَهُ دِيْوَانًا"

“If I afflicted a calamity upon (caused misfortune to) My ‘*abd*’ (servant) in his body, children or wealth, and he accepted (endured) it with commendable patience, (it is not befitting of My Majesty) to set up for him a *Mīzān* (a Balance to weigh his deeds), or reveal to him (his) record (of deeds)”.³⁴⁷

According to this ḥadīth, Allah is not going to set up a balance for that type of person; as if the ḥadīth is meant to indicate that every person witnessing the weighing of his own deeds will have the balance for himself only, in other words, the balance will weigh the deeds of one person at a time. So, everyone, in this sense, has his own Balance (*Mīzān*), therefore, all of them have *Mawāzīn*.

Another interpretation can also be provided to the effect that as the word *mawāzīn* refers to the *Mīzān* together with its weights, the plural form must be used; and as the reference when weighing is always to one side of the scales, the Qur’an makes use of the side that is more important.

Even if it is hypothetically said that ‘*al-mīzān* and its weights الميزان بأوزانه’ refers only to the side of the *sayyi’ahs*, the result will still be the same, because the reference is always to one side of the scales which, in the Qur’an, is the side of the *ḥasanahs*, hence, the use of the plural.

The final question now is: If *al-Mawāzīn* refers to the good deeds or the *ḥasanahs*, how does {خَفَّتْ مَوَازِينَهُ} ‘whose *mawāzīn* are light’ apply to the person who comes to the weighing on the Day of Judgement with no *ḥasanahs* at all?

The answer to this question is that, as stated before, since the reference is always made to one side of the scales only, the word *mawāzīn* refers to that side of the *Mīzān* where the *ḥasanahs* were supposed to have been placed, since it is the weight of the *ḥasanahs* which is meant to be determined. And as the weighing results in rewarding one party and punishing another, the Qur’an wants to state that even in the case where a person comes with some *ḥasanahs*, this does not mean that he will be justified. Rather the

ḥasanahs must exceed or outweigh the *sayyi'ahs*. This actually leaves no hope for the person who comes with no *ḥasanahs* at all, hence the plural *mawāzīn*; in other words, it is meant for the *kāfir* to despair, and for the *mu'min* as a motive to do as many good deeds as he possibly can.

The derivations of the root w-f-y 'وَفِي' are mentioned in the Qur'an sixty six times in twenty seven Surahs. Linguists and exegetes agree on the following.³⁴⁸

The Arabs say *wafā* 'وَفِي' and *'awfā* 'أَوْفَى' to mean the same thing, that is *tamma* 'تَمَّ'. The basic meaning of these two verbs is 'to complete' or 'to fulfil'.

Wafā/'awfā *bi'ahdihi* 'وَفِي/أَوْفَى بِعَهْدِهِ' means 'to fulfil one's pledge or covenant'.

Wafā lanā qawlahu 'وَفَى لَنَا قَوْلَهُ' means 'He has fulfilled what he said and did not cheat'.

Wafā al-shay' u 'وَفَى الشَّيْءُ' means (1) that the thing involved is complete: *tamma* 'تَمَّ', (2) that the thing involved has increased (*kathura* 'كَثُرَ').

Also, everything that has reached perfection or completion can be described as *wafā* 'وَفَى' (verb), or *wāfin* 'وَافٍ' (adjective).

Wafā al-dirhamu al-mithqāl 'وَفَى الدَّرْهَمُ الْمِثْقَالَ' means 'the dirham is of the same weight of or equal to *al-mithqāl* (a unit of weight).

Waffā 'وَفَّى' with *shaddah* 'ّ' on the *fā* 'ف' is a more emphatic form of *wafā* 'وَفَى'. Q53:37 reads: {وَابْرَاهِيمَ الَّذِي وَفَّى} "And Ibrahim who fulfilled (his engagements)".³⁴⁹

Waffā 'وَفَّى' also means 'to give in full'. However, it can be said: '*Waffaytuhu shatra haqqihi* 'وَفَيْتُهُ شَطْرَ حَقِّهِ' (I have given him half his due), i.e., nothing of that half has been diminished or withheld, but has been given exactly as it should.

'Awfā 'أَوْفَى' also means 'to complete, fulfil, give in full, etc. The verbal noun is *'ifā* 'إِفَاءٌ'

Al-Tabarsi says that *'ifā* 'إِفَاءٌ' means *'itmām* 'إِتْمَامٌ', that is, the completion (fulfilling, giving in full) of the thing involved until reaching the exact limit; in his own words "إِتْمَامُ الشَّيْءِ إِلَى حَدِّ الْحَقِّ فِيهِ".³⁵⁰

As for *istawfā* ‘استَوْفَى’, it means ‘to take or receive something in full’.

As will be shown in detail shortly, the Qur’an instructs that when measuring or weighing, the *makīl* (what is measured) and the *mawzūn* (what is weighed) must be *wāfin* ‘وَافٍ’, that is, given in full, exactly as it should be, because failing in achieving this is a sinful act that incurs punishment from Allah. Therefore, in order for a person to fulfil this as he should, so that he is on the safe side and to be certain that the other party is not wronged, he should give slightly more of the thing involved. The word ‘أَوْفَى’ implies just this, but does not oblige giving more than due. Al-Rāzi gives an example to this effect; he says that part of the Muslim’s *wudū’* ‘وُضُوءٌ’ is to wash the whole face, which cannot be achieved with certainty unless the water reaches part of the head as well.³⁵¹

Of the sixty six times *w-f-y* ‘وَفَى’ is repeated, only eight relate to measuring and weighing. ‘أَوْفُوا’ {*Awfū*}, a verb in the imperative form suffixed by *waw al-jamā’ah* ‘وَإِوَاءُ الْجَمَاعَةِ’ (being subject), is repeated four times with *al-kayl*,³⁵² and once with *al-mikyāl*,³⁵³ in Q6:152, Q12:59, Q17:35, Q26:181 and Q11:85. The verb is also used in the singular imperative in the form of ‘أَوْفِ...’ {*awfi*}, in Q12:88 with *al-kayl*.

‘أَوْفَى’ {*ūfi*} is also used only once in the present form in Q12:59 with *al-kayl*.

The last time *w-f-y* ‘وَفَى’ is mentioned is in the form *yastawfūn* {يَسْتَوْفُونَ} which is a verb in the present tense, in Q83:2.

‘إِيْفَاءُ الْكَيْلِ’ *Īfā’ Al-Kayl*:

As stated above, *īfā’ al-kayl* is mentioned four times in the Qur’an. In two cases, it appears in a general context, namely Q6:152 {وَأَوْفُوا الْكَيْلَ وَالْمِيزَانَ بِالْقِسْطِ} which basically means “And fill up the measure and the balance with justice”,³⁵⁴ and Q17:35 {وَأَوْفُوا الْكَيْلَ}

إِذَا كَلَّمْتُمْ وَزِنُوا بِالْقِسْطَاسِ الْمُسْتَقِيمِ} “And give full measure when you measure, and weigh with the straight balance”.³⁵⁵

In Q6:152, the act of *ʿifāʿ* falls upon: (1) *al-kayl*, and (2) *al-mīzān*. The reference here is general due to the fact that contextually this command is one of many, as mentioned before under *k-y-l* ‘كيل’ and *mīzān* ‘میزان’. The acts of measuring and weighing should be performed properly so that every party is to get his due share in the transaction involved, no more no less, without harming the interest of the other party.

This is achieved through the application of what is taught in Q17:35. So, while Q6:152 generalises, Q17:35 explains and indicates the steps that should be taken and what to use to fulfil the message of the Ayah. Therefore, Q17:35 says that *al-kayl*, as a measuring instrument should both have the right capacity and be filled up to the limit that is due to the receiver by measure. And when weighing, a *mustaqīm* ‘proper, upright, straight and true’ balance that gives people their due shares is to be used. In other words, the instruments used for measuring and weighing must not be tampered with in favour of one party (most often, the giver) against another party.

As the act of *ʿifāʿ* is in practice extremely hard to achieve, in the sense that giving people exactly what is due to them by measure or weight, no more no less, with certainty, Q6:152 carries on to say {لَا نُكَلِّفُ نَفْسًا إِلَّا وُسْعَهَا} “We burden not any person but that which he can bear”.³⁵⁶ This indicates that as far as the *ʿifāʿ* is concerned, what is mandatory is doing one’s best to achieve that point where no dispute would arise between the giver and receiver by measure or weight; what is beyond that, i.e., going to the extreme in any way to achieve *ʿifāʿ*, is not dictated by Allah, and therefore, incurs no liability.

A similar message which takes man one more step further up in the heirarchy of moral upbringing and development is conveyed by {ذَلِكَ خَيْرٌ وَأَحْسَنُ تَأْوِيلًا} “This is good and better in the end”,³⁵⁷ which

comes at the end of Q17:35. Therefore, it is clear that “giving by measure and weight is not only right in itself but is ultimately to the best spiritual and material advantage of the person who gives it”.³⁵⁸

With regard to Q7:85, which reads {فَأَوْفُوا الْكَيْلَ وَالْمِيزَانَ} “So, give full measure and full weight”,³⁵⁹ and Q26:181 {فَأَوْفُوا الْكَيْلَ وَلَا تَكُونُوا مِنَ الْمُخْسِرِينَ} “Fill up the measure and be not of those who give less than the due”,³⁶⁰ we find that they are parts of the story of the Prophet Shuʿayb, which has been discussed to some degree before.³⁶¹

Q11:85 is also related to the same story. However, this Ayah mentions *al-mikyāl*, not *al-kayl*.

Looking into the story of the Prophet Shuʿayb with his people, we find that he has used every possible expression and reference to get his people to abstain from cheating others when measuring and weighing. In Q7:85 he says: *faʿawfū al-kayla wa al-mīzāna* {فَأَوْفُوا الْكَيْلَ وَالْمِيزَانَ}. Here, he generalises; he is telling them: you are not asked, after the clear signs of Allah had reached you, to do more than just giving full measure and full weight. But he knows that cheating in this field runs like blood in their veins, and that the command of *ʿifāʿ* might be rejected by them on the basis that to be certain that the other party in the transaction with them is not wronged in the least, they should give a bit more of what is measured or weighed just to the limit of certainty that injustice is not done to the other party. So for them, it would be a big jump from what they used to do and liked doing, i.e., diminishing people’s dues, to diminishing their own goods, even if only to the limit of incurring no liability. So, he tries another way, ordering them not to tamper with the *mikyāl* or the *mīzān* as there is no need for that. Therefore, in Q11:85 he says {وَيَا قَوْمِ أَوْفُوا الْمِكْيَالَ وَالْمِيزَانَ بِالْقِسْطِ} ordering them to perform *ʿifāʿ* on their instruments of measuring and weighing.

A *mikyāl* is called *wāfīn* ‘وَافٍ’ when it has the right capacity, and a *mīzān* is described as *wāfīn* when it is not manipulated, in the sense that it functions properly as it should and also when the

counterpoise weights are not tampered with in favour of one party against the other. It is also worth mentioning that this is the only time in the Qur'an that *'awfū al-mikyāl* {أَوْفُوا الْمِكْيَالَ} is used. The Prophet Shueayb adds *bilqist* {بِالْقِسْطِ} to his command, i.e., as long as every party gets their due shares in fairness that is “clearly seen and not disputed”³⁶² by either party, this is what counts.

Then the Prophet Shueayb reaches the apex of his specification and refers to particulars in Q26:181-3 which read:

﴿أَوْفُوا الْكَيْلَ وَلَا تَكُونُوا مِنَ الْمُخْسِرِينَ * وَزِنُوا بِالْقِسْطِاسِ الْمُسْتَقِيمِ *
وَلَا تَبْخَسُوا النَّاسَ أَشْيَاءَهُمْ وَلَا تَعْثَوْا فِي الْأَرْضِ مُفْسِدِينَ﴾

He commands them to apply *'ifā'* to *al-kayl* in general which involves all the aspects of measuring without referring to weighing straight away. He then stresses this point, saying to them that they should not do whatever makes them fall under the category of the *mukhsirīn* as that would be contradictory to the basic principles of *'ifā'*.

When this is made clear, he moves to another point, i.e., weighing. He is also very specific as to what should be used when doing this. He states clearly: {وَزِنُوا بِالْقِسْطِاسِ الْمُسْتَقِيمِ}. This has been dealt with before under *q-s-t* 'قسط'.

As for the rest of his teachings and commands to his people that are related to the subject of this thesis, they have been discussed before as well under *b-kh-s* 'بخس', *kh-s-r* 'خسر', *k-y-l* 'كيل', and *w-z-n* 'وزن' respectively.

In Q12:59, we find the Prophet Joseph talking to his brothers commending his own act of *'ifā'* *al-kayl*; he says: {أَلَا تَرَوْنَ أَنِّي أُوفِي الْكَيْلَ} 'See you not that I give full measure and I am the best of hosts'.³⁶³ Here he uses *'ufī al-kayl* {أُوفِي الْكَيْلَ} and not any other expression. He indicates that his *mikyāl* has the right capacity, and his *makīl* is measured properly and given in full without any diminishing. Disregarding his position in Egypt and his hospitality,

since *ʿifāʿ* requires doing one’s best not to wrong others in their dues, he gives more than due to the extent of being certain that they are not wronged in the least in their dues.

The Prophet Joseph’s brothers, on the other hand, knowing this about him and also counting on his kind generosity, use his exact words when they go back to him for more grain. They say in Q12:88 {فَأَوْفِ لَنَا الْكَيْلَ} “So, pay us full measure”,³⁶⁴ implying everything that he himself had implied and meant before.

Yastawfūn {يَسْتَوْفُونَ} is another derivation of *w-f-y* ‘وَفِي’. This is mentioned only once in the Qur’an in Q83:2 {الَّذِينَ إِذَا أَكْتَالُوا عَلَى النَّاسِ يَسْتَوْفُونَ}. In this Ayah, only measuring is mentioned, as it means: “those who when they measure against the people, take full measure”.³⁶⁵ Why weighing is not mentioned here is discussed under *t-f-f* ‘طَفَفَ’.

However, exegetes agree that *yastawfūn* indicates an act of taking, receiving and demanding from people (something) in full and more, which causes them to do injustice to others.³⁶⁶ Therefore, one of the main features of *al-mutaffifīn* is that: *yastawfūn*, i.e., they make sure that they exact full measure for themselves even if their act leads to causing diminishing to people’s properties, as they insist and ask for more than is due to them.

Exegetes also agree that: “*Al-kayl* is one of three types: *wāfin* ‘وَافٍ’ (full), *tafīf* ‘طَفِيفٌ’ (short), and *zā’id* ‘زَائِدٌ’ (surplus)”.³⁶⁷ Although here the word *kayl* and not *mikyāl* or *makīl* is used, the reference most definitely is to the *makīl* (what is measured). It is the same in English when one says: ‘full measure’ and ‘short measure’; the question that arises is: What does ‘measure’ here mean or refer to? It is however, clear that the word is used either in Arabic *kayl* ‘كَيْلٌ’ or in English ‘measure’ because of its wide range of application, but what is actually meant is another thing, i.e., the *makīl*.

On the other hand, the Qur’anic message is always clear in enjoining *‘ifā* and prohibiting *tatfif*. As for giving *ziyādah* (verbal noun of *zā’id* ‘surplus’), the Qur’an does not make it mandatory, but leaves it open so that if the giver by weight or measure chooses freely to give more than due, it is then entirely up to him, as the matter is left to his discretion.

However, one of the requirements for achieving *‘ifā al-kayl* is through abstaining from *mash al-tifāf* ‘مَسْحُ الطَّفَافِ’ as has been explained under *t-f-f* ‘طَفَفَ’. Abu Al-Qāsim also reports that Mālik read {وَيْلٌ لِّلْمُطَفِّفِينَ} then said referring to how the *‘ifā* may be accomplished when measuring: “ لَا تُطَفِّفْ وَلَا تَخْلِبْ وَلَكِنْ أَرْسِلْ وَصَبَّ عَلَيْهِ صَبًّا “: ³⁶⁸”حَتَّى إِذَا اسْتَوَىٰ (اسْتَوَى) أَرْسِلْ يَدَكَ وَلَا تَمْسِكْ *tatfif*, and do not cheat. Pour (what you measure) in the measure (generously) until it is full then let go and do not skimp’.

The Prophet (ﷺ) also gives very clear instructions as to how *‘ifā* is achieved in one of his *hadīths*. Suwayd ibn Qays said: “Coming from Hajar, Makhrifah Al-ʿAbdi ‘مُخْرِفَةُ الْعَبْدِيِّ’ and I brought some clothes. The Prophet (ﷺ) came and haggled with us for some *sarāwīl* ‘سَرَاوِيلُ’, and I had a weigher who weighs for wages ‘وَرَّانٌ يَرِّنُ’ (i.e., a man whose job is to weigh for people and he does this for living). So, the Prophet (ﷺ) said to the weigher: “رَنَّ وَأَرْجِحْ”,³⁶⁹ i.e., when you weigh make sure that one side of the scales is actually slightly heavier than the other; in other words, the tongue of the scales should turn to the side of the thing weighed. A similar *hadīth* is also reported by Ibn Mājah on the authority of Jābir.³⁷⁰

Conclusion

Considering very carefully all the Ayahs that contain the words under study, and attempting to put them all together to give a complete picture to the subject and how these Ayahs relate to one another, I have come to the following conclusions:

* The Qur'an states that Allah is the Creator of everything. At some stage at the beginning of time, among the things that He created were the heavens and the earth. Q55:7 states that He raised high the heaven and set/laid down the Balance {وَوَضَعَ الْمِيزَانَ}, so that man is to observe the rules of the Balance, and whatever he does should be in conformity with these rules. However, man is greedy by nature.³⁷¹ He tends to transgress and exploit his fellow men. Therefore the Qur'an follows this by ﴿أَلَا تَطَعُوا فِي الْمِيزَانِ﴾ (Q55:8), preaching against transgression and aggression.

It has been Allah's plan, according to the Qur'an, that Man should dwell on the earth. Therefore, the earth had to be made ready for receiving him. So, Allah spread it out and placed thereon firm and immovable mountains to make it stable, and caused to grow thereon all kinds of things well measured, and in due balance ﴿وَأَنْبَتْنَا فِيهَا مِنْ كُلِّ شَيْءٍ مَوْزُونٍ﴾ (Q15:19).

As for the Guidance of Mankind, Allah has sent messengers to the human race with clear proofs. He sent down with them the Book that contained His Law, and showed Man the way to achieve happiness both in this world and the hereafter. Not only were these messengers provided with 'the Book' but also with 'the Balance' that was to weigh man's deeds and thoughts, ﴿وَأَنْزَلْنَا مَعَهُمُ الْكِتَابَ وَالْمِيزَانَ﴾ (Q27:25), so that man could judge between what is good and what is bad. As a result men could get their rights from one another according to a just law and a just procedure that has no grudges or prejudices against anyone, and does not cause one person to wrongly and unjustifiably rise up at the expense of another.

As the Balance has been given to Man to judge everything accordingly, Man should use it wisely. Weight should be established and observed in a way that does not do any injustice to anybody. Everyone's just share of things must be accorded to them ﴿وَأَقِيمُوا الْوَزْنَ بِالْقِسْطِ﴾ (Q55:9). Causing the Balance to be deficient jeopardises peoples' rights and leads to the spread of corruption and all sorts of other social diseases; thus ﴿وَلَا تُخْسِرُوا الْمِيزَانَ﴾ (Q55:9).

* The Qur'an also gives examples of peoples and nations that have chosen to do mischief on the earth after it has been set in order. The Madyanites, for example, went astray. So, Allah sent them His Prophet and 'their brother', Shu'ayb, who invited them to go back to the path of truth and to worship no one but Allah. And as one of their most besetting sins was wronging people as far as measuring and weighing were concerned, Shu'ayb pointed that out, directing them to give full measure and full weight, and not to wrong people in whatever belonged to them ﴿ فَأَوْفُوا الْكَيْلَ وَالْمِيزَانَ وَلَا تَبْخَسُوا ﴾ (Q7:85). ﴿ النَّاسَ أَشْيَاءَهُمْ ﴾ (Q7:85).

Giving full measure and full weight means that whatever is measured or weighed should not be diminished in the least through, for example, manipulating the measuring and weighing instruments ﴿ وَلَا تَنْقُصُوا الْمِكْيَالَ وَالْمِيزَانَ ﴾ (Q11:84).

Giving and taking by means of measuring and weighing should be done in a way that is just and fair to both parties involved in the process ﴿ وَأَوْفُوا الْمِكْيَالَ وَالْمِيزَانَ بِالْقِسْطِ ﴾ (Q11:85).

On another occasion, more details are given. When one measures anything, all the conditions that guarantee that no party would be wronged in the least and that a *full* measure is given, must be met. Also, as giving and receiving by weight can only be achieved through the use of a balance, and that not every balance is suitable for such a job, the balance has to meet a specific and very important requirement: it has to be 'true, right, proper, straight, calibrated, upright, just and equitable', ﴿ وَأَوْفُوا الْكَيْلَ إِذَا كِلْتُمْ وَزِنُوا بِالْقِسْطَاسِ ﴾ (Q17:35). The reason behind this is that fair dealings are both 'right' in themselves and ultimately to the best advantage of the persons involved ﴿ ذَلِكَ خَيْرٌ وَأَحْسَنُ تَأْوِيلًا ﴾ (Q17:35).

Shu'ayb stresses these teachings, yet again advising his people to give full measure as giving less than due is an evil act that puts them on an equal footing with *al-mukhsirīn* ﴿ وَأَوْفُوا الْكَيْلَ وَلَا تَكُونُوا مِنَ الْمُخْسِرِينَ ﴾ (Q26:181), who incur the wrath and punishment of Allah.

He also emphasises the importance of using a suitable balance which is not manipulated, and does what it is meant to do **وَزِنُوا** {بِالْقِسْطِ الْمُسْتَقِيمِ} (Q26:182). The result of doing otherwise is unquestionably grave. However, they believed him not. Therefore, they deserved to be punished, and so “the torment of the day of shadow (a gloomy cloud) seized them”³⁷² **فَكَدَّبُوهُ فَأَخَذَهُمْ عَذَابُ يَوْمِ الظُّلَّةِ** { (Q26:189).

* Being a person who gives full measure, especially in times of distress and hardship, is very rare, but, of course, is a quality that one should be proud of. The Qur’an tells us that in the Surah of Yūsuf, Q12.

Famine has hit many places including the Prophet Joseph’s homeland. Therefore, his brothers come to Egypt seeking provisions. They are foreigners in a foreign land; so, perhaps, denying them any grain, or giving them the minimum amount of provisions would be accepted as they are not the only people suffering from that famine. However, the Prophet Joseph does not only give them ‘full’ measure, but is also hospitable to them. He tells them that giving them full measure is not a mistake even in times like these **{أَلَا تَرَوُنَّ أَنِّي أُوفِي الْكَيْلَ}** (Q12:59). He does not use the famine as an excuse to decrease their measure; therefore, he has a reason to be proud.

However, he also knows how important it is for them to be able to come again to get their provisions from Egypt. So, he uses this in his plan and tells them that unless next time they are accompanied by their brother, they should not bother making the journey as no ‘measure’ will be given to them: neither full, nor short. The Ayah states: **{فَلَا كَيْلَ لَكُمْ عِنْدِي}** (Q12:60).

Back home, the brothers explain to their father that they will no longer be able to go to Egypt because all future measure has been denied to them **{مُنِعَ مِنَّا الْكَيْلُ}** (Q12:63), unless their brother goes with them **{فَأَرْسِلْ مَعَنَا آخَانًا نَكْتَلُ}** (Q12:63). Because they need as much

as they can possibly get, a measure of a camel's load assumedly means a great deal to them {وَنَزَدَادُ كَيْلٍ بَعِيرٍ} (Q12:65). They have already seen the hospitality and generosity of the 'Azīz of Egypt, and so giving them an extra camel's load of grain is an easy thing for him to do; it is so little compared to what he has already got {ذَلِكَ} {كَيْلٍ يَسِيرٍ} ³⁷³ (Q12:65).

Going back to the Prophet Joseph, the brothers ask him to pay them full measure as has been his habit with them from before: {فَأَوْفِ لَنَا الْكَيْلَ} (Q12:88), which also sounds like a reminder of what he has said to them before showing his hospitality and urging them to come again {أَلَا تَرَوْنَ أَنِّي أَوْفَى الْكَيْلَ} (Q12:59). It is a quality that is very much appreciated in the person who has it both by other people and by Allah who enjoined this kind of behaviour in the first place. It involves complete obedience to the Law.

* The Ummah of the Prophet Muḥammad (ﷺ), the nation of Islam, is no exception. That is why in Q42:17 Allah addresses the last of His Messengers telling him that it is He who has sent down the Book and the Balance {اللَّهُ الَّذِي أَنْزَلَ الْكِتَابَ بِالْحَقِّ وَالْمِيزَانَ} exactly as He did with all the other prophets before him. Accordingly the followers of Muḥammad (ﷺ) are also addressed in a similar way to the other nations that preceded them: joining partners to Allah is prohibited, kindness to parents is a duty that must be observed, killing your own children for fear of poverty is not allowed, all sorts of shameful sins whether committed openly or secretly should be avoided, killing anyone except for a just cause and according to the Islamic Law, and taking orphans' property unjustly are extremely abominable deeds that must not be committed.³⁷⁴ In addition to all these, giving full measure and full weight in a fair deal, and taking all the necessary steps to fulfil that, is commended. No one is burdened with more than he can bear {وَأَوْفُوا الْكَيْلَ وَالْمِيزَانَ بِالْقِسْطِ لَا تَكْلَفُ} {نَفْسًا إِلَّا وُسْعَهَا} (Q6:152).

Failure to achieve this puts one with *al-muṭaffifīn* {وَيْلٌ لِّلْمُطَفِّفِينَ} (Q83:1) who make sure to exact full measure and get even more for themselves when they receive by measure from other people {الَّذِينَ إِذَا} (Q83:2). However, when it is their turn to give, they do not treat people in the same way they want to be treated, and therefore, they skimp giving less than due when either measuring or weighing {وَأِذَا كَالُوهُمْ أَوْ وُزِنُوهُمْ يُخْسِرُونَ} (Q83:3). They do this as if that Day when they will be raised from the dead for Judgement will never come ﴿أَلَا يَظُنُّ أُولَٰئِكَ أَنَّهُمْ مَبْعُوثُونَ * لِيَوْمٍ عَظِيمٍ﴾ (Q83:4-5).

* In this earthly world people cheat and wrong one another in regard of their due rights. They fall short in the measure and manipulate the balance. But, on the Judgement Day it is not those ‘manipulated balances’ that will be used; those are different balances that will be set up by the Almighty, Allah Himself {وَنَضَعُ} (Q21:47), so that no one is to be wronged in the least in any way or in anything, even if it is as small as a mustard seed in weight {مِثْقَالَ حَبَّةٍ مِّنْ خَرْدَلٍ} (Q21:47 and Q31:16), or even in the weight of an ant/atom {مِثْقَالَ ذَرَّةٍ} (Q4:40, 10:61, Q34:3&22, and Q99:7-8). Nothing whatsoever does Allah forget, ignore or fail to take into account, and nothing will escape the weighing on the Judgement Day, which, unlike Man’s version of weighing, is the true and exact weighing {وَالْوَزْنَ يَوْمَئِذٍ الْحَقُّ} (Q7:8).

People will come to witness and become part of the process of weighing. Those whose deeds availed them nothing will be disdained, despised and looked on with utter contempt; they will be humiliated due to their insignificance, worthlessness, and accordingly they will be given no weight by Allah {فَلَا نَقِيمُ لَهُمْ يَوْمَ الْقِيَامَةِ} (Q18:105).

However, when the people’s deeds are weighed, they will be divided to two main groups:³⁷⁵ those whose good deeds outweigh

their bad deeds {مَنْ تَقَلَّتْ مَوَازِينُهُ} (Q7:8, Q23:102 & Q101:6), and those whose good deeds do not {مَنْ خَفَّتْ مَوَازِينُهُ} (Q7:9, Q23:103 & Q101:8). The former will be rewarded generously; but for the latter nothing awaits them except severe punishment unless Allah wills to forgive them.

General Considerations

This chapter deals with some different aspects of language that have an impact on the translation process in general and that of Arabic-English-Arabic translation in particular.

Introduction

Language in its written and spoken forms is one of the most important tools of expression and communication. Being what it is, it is also a translation of the final product of a complicated process such as thinking, dreaming, hallucinating, etc. The way things are expressed by means of language depends on many factors such as the level of education, intention, state of mind, etc. The list is actually endless.

Understanding an utterance also depends on another endless list of factors. Also, an utterance being made as a translation of a certain idea is by all means a 'mental process'. This means that the production of an original text is in actuality an act of translation. Similarly, for an utterance to be understood it has to go through a mental process which is nothing but an act of translation, as well. As George Steiner puts it: "To attempt understanding is to attempt translation".³⁷⁶ This second product is not necessarily equivalent to the first product due to the different factors in action in both of these processes. For example, we always find some people expressing themselves better than others; also sometimes one would want to say something but cannot put it into words. So, the first product, which is a translation of certain signals from the brain, which we

may call ‘ideas’ or ‘thoughts’, when translated into words, might become different from the message intended in the first place. By this I do not mean the slips of the tongue that occur from time to time; what I mean is the occasional inability of people to express certain ideas the way they really want or hope for. How the brain actually does that job should not very much be a source of worry to us because “the human brain decodes messages, however imperfectly, at levels of efficacy and of nuance altogether beyond either our analytic grasp or mechanical simulation”.³⁷⁷

Perfect Translation

The above argument also means that there is no such a thing as a perfect translation of anything all the time because the factors involved are always in a state of change. In other words, the mental process that produces an utterance is not the same when another is being produced. So, if this is the case on the level of every individual, it is more so when individuals are in contact. The matter, on the other hand, becomes more difficult when written texts are involved as the reader has to mentally translate the text depending entirely on the ‘limited’ tools he possesses. The gap gets even wider when two languages are involved because the mental processes become divergent and extremely complicated. Accordingly, translation from one language into another is a product of “a complex system of decoding and encoding on the semantic, syntactic and pragmatic levels”.³⁷⁸

Also, if a text in the Source Language (SL) is difficult to understand in the context of that language, it is then bound to lose more than is lost by a normal text, understandable easily. It is true that some texts become clearer when translated, but this is definitely done at the expense of something in the SL because there is no such a thing as ‘absolute synonymy’ or ‘perfect equivalence’. Absolute synonymy does not exist in any language because, to say the least, every single word has got a set of associations or components unique to it. Many words might share some of these associations, but not all of them; otherwise, the second word would not have existed. According to Abu Hilāl Al-ʿAskari: “فَكَذَلِكَ لَا يَجُوزُ أَنْ يَكُونَ اللَّفْظَانِ”³⁷⁹ “يُدْلَانِ عَلَى مَعْنَى وَاحِدٍ لِأَنَّ فِي ذَلِكَ تَكْثِيرًا لِلْغَةِ بِمَا لَا فَائِدَةَ فِيهِ

possible for two words to have the same sense, since this would imply pointless linguistic duplication’. Synonymy and absolute synonymy is discussed in more detail under ‘Synonymy and Translation’.

Accordingly, what might look like absolute synonymy is not exactly so, but rather the word involved shares more associations with the original word than other words do. Therefore it is preferred to other words in *rendering the meaning* and conveying the message. Examples of this type of synonyms exist in abundance in all languages. This is, to a high degree, what happens in translation. A certain word, idiom or expression is favoured over others because the translator believes (*thinks, feels*) that it shares more associations with the SL ‘item’, bearing in mind that this is not the only factor in operation. For example, a word in a Target Language (TL) text might be used as a translation for another in the SL in a certain context, but not in another. Consider the words “طَفَفَ” in Surah 83, Ayah 1 that says ﴿وَيْلٌ لِّلْمُطَفِّفِينَ﴾, “حَسَرَ” in Q55:9 ﴿وَلَا تُحْسِرُوا الْمِيزَانَ﴾, “بَخَسَ” in Q7:85 ﴿وَلَا تَبْخَسُوا النَّاسَ أَشْيَاءَهُمْ﴾, and “نَقَصَ” in Q11:84 ﴿وَلَا تَنْقُصُوا الْمِكْيَالَ﴾. Qur’an exegetes use the above words alternatively to mean the same thing. However, it is easy to realise that in actuality they are not swappable since differences of meaning of various degrees exist between them. This, consequently, creates a problem to the translator which he has to overcome according to the tools of the Target Language.

The problem becomes even more complicated when idioms and expressions particular to a language are used in a SL text as they do not necessarily exist in the same way, form and meaning in the TL; or they might not even exist at all. Consider for example the the translation of the English ‘It is raining CATS and DOGS’ as ‘السماء تمطر قططاً وكلاباً’. While ‘heavily’ ‘بغزارة’ can do the job of ‘cats and dogs’ in this example it deprives the language of a cultural perspective. Also, ‘بنی زيد علی سلمی’ which is a refernce to Zaid marrying Salmā can be totally corrupted if translated as ‘Zaid built on Salmā.

The same argument goes for most Islamic terms and concepts as the words reflecting them developed in terms of their meaning and acquired spheres of application that were totally different from the so-called English equivalents. Consider as well the term *ṣalāh* ‘صلاة’ as an Islamic concept; it has no equivalent in English. ‘Prayer’ which is used freely as an equivalent is perhaps not a bad rendering for the Arabic *duʿāʿ* ‘دعاء’ which interestingly is the denotative meaning of *ṣalāh* ‘صلاة’. The concept of *ṣalāh* developed in Arabic to refer to a specific and strict act of worship in a certain context, while *prayer* did not develop in the same way as the historical and linguistic environments of Arabic and English were not understandably the same. One may also consider other concepts such as *zakāh*, *ṣawm*, *hajj*, etc., from a conceptual-Islamic-cultural point of view. The result will be the same

To put simply, if a certain concept is alien to a specific culture or language, this language will not produce a word for it. There is no need to do so.

Word and Sense in Religious Texts

Although the translator might be more inclined not to translate ‘*word for word*’ as the final product might be something really ridiculous, *as we have just seen*, preferring on the other hand to do a ‘*sense for sense*’ translation, this contributes to creating a serious problem as far as religious texts *in particular* are concerned. The translator has to decide what the SL text ‘actually’ means before even attempting to translate it into another language. And if the SL text is, for example, ambiguous or has more than one meaning, the decision then, is even more difficult because the translator, as an outsider, has to decide what the author, an insider, means.

Also if we accept Fredric Will’s claim that “what any particular word refers to cannot be determined precisely”,³⁸⁰ the matter becomes even much more difficult, if not extremely puzzling.

To begin with, the translator may not be aware of the processes that resulted in the author saying what he said the way he

did. Secondly, as far as the reader of the translation is concerned, he does not even know the decisions the translator had to make when he chose a particular word, idiom, form, etc., as the translation for what was in the Source Text (ST). Maybe the author did not express himself the way he should, or perhaps he did, or probably the way a text is, in both form and content, is deliberate as *should be* the case with ‘the word of God’. However, this is not for the translator to worry about because what really matters, or rather should matter, to the translator is the written text, and he also translates what he understands it to be saying *whether we like it or not*. Therefore, such perplexities do not need to be dwelt on immediately.

However, this is not to deny the fact that in the case of some religious *and also literary* texts, this issue is more problematic than it sounds. Perhaps, that is why, when talking about the Bible, “Emanuel Levinas subtly and astutely makes of Talmudic commentaries the only legitimate process of translation”.³⁸¹ Perhaps also this is the reason that in Nida’s theory which is also related to Bible translation, “the difference between exegesis and translation [begins] to disappear since how the message is rendered and what remains of the original formulation seem to be less important than the explanation itself”.³⁸²

Basic Requirements of The Translator

The ‘basic requirements of the translator’ according to Nida are that “he must understand not only the obvious content of the message, but also the subtleties of meaning, the significant emotive values of words and the stylistic features which determine the ‘flavour and feel’ of the message. ... In other words, in addition to a knowledge of the two or more languages involved in the translational process, the translator must have a thorough acquaintance with the subject matter concerned”.³⁸³

As is clear, Nida is implying that the translator should preferably be a theologian (or at least a missionary) who is able to explain the text as he translates it.

In contrast to Nida’s views, Kharma states: “To master one’s own language and culture is something difficult; to master a foreign

language with its cultural furnishings is much more difficult, however, mastering two languages with their cultural furnishings is something inconceivable”.³⁸⁴

In fact Nida’s theory goes a long way even beyond trusting “the theologian and pray that God will provide the answer”.³⁸⁵ Commenting on Nida’s theory, Gentzler says:

“The text as dense as it may be, and the exegesis, as lucid as it may be, are never complete. There will always be gaps, room for differing interpretation, and variable reception. Therein lies the energy of the text. Nida would deny this as a matter of faith, positing instead the opposite viewpoint, i.e., that the original message can be determined and does not change. However, because he is working with words, even in this case the word of God, and because of the very fact that he is working with language, there will always be present metaphoric indeterminacy and historical change. No text ever explicates its own reception. Nida’s translation theory wants to decipher the text and prepare it for consumption. He wants to explain the text as well as describe it. ... Nida does not trust readers to decode texts for themselves, thus he posits an omnipotent reader, preferably the ideal missionary/translator, who will do the work for the reader. His goal, even with the Bible, is to dispel the mystery, solve the ambiguities, and reduce the complexities for simple consumption”.³⁸⁶

Intentionality of Text

The Qur’an is a good example of the intentionality of the text. *If we could work our way successfully round the Qur’an’s translational problems, we could in all probability overcome many other obstacles that the translator encounters at his job. It goes without saying that the Qur’an is, in fact, a deliberate text. Every letter, word and sense is meant to be the way it appears in this holiest of Books; otherwise it is a contradiction of all the factors of *faṣāḥah* and *balāghah*. The Qur’an, being the way it is, introduces a difficult problem. A solution has to be found to problematic words, structures, concepts, etc. The problems, in fact, being linguistic more than anything else in most cases, form an obstacle for the translator to deal with. The translator can only find solutions according to his own tools, such as his degree of understanding of the text involved, the context in general, etc., in short, the language as a whole, and perhaps the culture of the SL as well.*

In the end, the translator's decision remains 'personal', because it is **he**, and nobody else, who favours one word over another, one expression over another, etc.

The translator on the other hand, also has a set of other considerations to take into account. The most important of these is his obligations towards both the text and the receiver. His textual obligations show in his linguistic competence in both the SL and the TL, and also in his approach to the text itself. His duty towards the receiver lies in the clarity of his style, his faithfulness and the degree of success he achieves in rendering the SL text as it should be rendered considering all the factors involved and the different aspects of the SL text.

In other words, if the SL text is deliberately ambiguous or metaphorical, the translator has an obligation to, at least, try and preserve the ambiguity or metaphor in his translation. He might not always succeed because this mainly depends on (1) his understanding of the SL text, (2) the availability of the tools in the TL that help him to achieve this, and (3) his ability to make proper use of such tools. Yet, the decisions he makes remain a matter of personal choice.

Determining the *sense* in a sacred text, expressed *deliberately* in a certain way is not always an easy thing to do because when the sense is fully recognised, often the final product is no more than an explanation of the original. There are never clear-cuts *all the time* as far as religious texts are concerned. Religious texts often have a share of mystery about them that is not easily conceived or translated; this means that there are many cases where understanding the full sense of a text is an impossibility. The texts that are open for interpretations are examples of the kind of difficulty I am talking about here. The Qur'an itself testifies to the existence of some Ayahs which have very clear, well-established meanings and others that do not. In Q3:7 the former Ayahs are described as '*muḥkamāt* {ءَايَاتٌ مُّحْكَمَاتٌ}', and the latter as '*mutashābihāt* {مُتَشَابِهَاتٌ}' and these latter ones prove even problematic in the context of the Arabic language itself, as finding

exact meanings, with certainty for them, is not an easy task most of the time.³⁸⁷ Such Ayahs are open to interpretation.

The question that arises now is: does an explanation or interpretation that is assumed to be giving the full sense have the potential to replace the original? As far as the Qur'an is concerned, the answer is a definite 'no', because this cannot be even achieved in the context of the Arabic language, let alone in the context of a foreign language. The only way to express fully the sense of a text is perhaps to repeat it as it is in its SL accepting the fact that it means what it means the way it is. It is like searching very hard for a definition for 'water', then saying 'water is water', or as the Arabic saying goes: 'عَرَفَ الْمَاءَ بَعْدَ الْجُهْدِ بِالْمَاءِ'.

Synonymy And Translation

According to D.A. Cruse the starting point for discussing the meaning of synonymy is to consider "two robust semantic intuitions. The first is that certain pairs or groups of lexical items bear a special sort of semantic resemblance to one another. It is customary to call items having this special similarity synonyms; however, the intuitive class of synonyms is by no means exhausted by the notion of cognitive synonymy, as a glance at any dictionary of synonyms will confirm".³⁸⁸

Cruse then quotes examples from the Larousse *Synonymes*, and the *Dictionary of English Synonyms* showing that some lexical items that are taken to be synonymous are not really very much so. He says: "the *Dictionary of English Synonyms* give *kill* as a synonym to *murder* (but interestingly, not vice versa), and *strong* as a synonym of *powerful*: but again, cognitive synonymy is demonstrably absent (an accidental killing is not murder, and a strong car is not necessarily a powerful car)".³⁸⁹ He then goes on to introduce the second intuition which is that: "some pairs of synonyms are 'more synonymous' than other pairs: *settee* and *sofa* are more synonymous than *die* and *kick the bucket*, which in turn are more synonymous than *boundary* and *frontier*, *breaker* and *roller*, or *brainy* and *shrewd*. (The items in each of these pairs occur in close association in *Roget's Thesaurus*, however intuition might

suggest that with the last pair we are approaching the borderline between synonymy and non-synonymy.) These two intuitions seem to point to something like a scale of synonymy”.³⁹⁰

Cruse then defines synonyms as: “lexical items whose senses are identical in respect of ‘central’ semantic traits, but differ, if at all, only in respect of what we may provisionally describe as ‘minor’ or ‘peripheral’ traits. ...

Synonyms also characteristically occur together in certain types of expression. For instance, a synonym is often employed as an explanation or clarification, of the meaning of another word. The relationship between the two words is frequently signaled by something like *that is to say*, or a particular variety of *or*:

He was cashiered, that is to say, dismissed.
This is an ounce, or snow leopard”.³⁹¹

Cruse also accepts the fact that the meanings of synonymous items overlap. This, actually leads us to Nida’s definition of synonymy. In his *Componential Analysis of Meaning*, Nida states: “Terms whose meanings overlap are generally called synonyms. Such terms are usually substitutable one for the other in at least certain contexts; but rarely, if ever, are two terms substitutable for each other in any and all contexts. ... In most discussions of meaning, synonyms are treated as though the terms overlap, while in reality what is involved is the overlapping of particular meanings of such terms”.³⁹²

Nida then goes on to elaborate on this issue by saying that:

“Certain sets of related meanings appear to be so close to one another that one cannot determine whether or not they are complete synonyms. In such instances it may seem impossible to determine just how such meanings may differ from one another. This situation often occurs where the lexical units in question are not in one’s active vocabulary. Compare for example, the related meanings of *stroll*, *meander*, and *saunter*, all types of walking. Even the dictionary definitions of these terms are largely overlapping or indistinct. For most users of English there are no readily describable differences between the meaning of these terms, since they all suggest leisurely pace, an irregular course, and indefinite

goal. Most persons assume that there are differences of meaning but are unable to indicate what they are. If some speakers suggest what appear to them to be distinctive features of meaning, others will disagree. Such a series meanings highlights two important aspects of semantic analysis: (1) there are closely related meanings which cannot be analyzed, largely because they are marginal to everyday usage; not that the diagnostic components of their meanings are identical, but the features are obscure.(2) There is a tendency to regard different forms as necessarily having different meanings. Basically this presupposition is true, for though a number of homophones exist in all languages, it is doubtful whether there are any real synonyms, i.e. different forms with identical meanings”³⁹³.

According to the above quotations, it is easy to conclude that synonymy is a natural feature of probably all languages. On the other hand, I believe that perfect or complete or absolute synonymy is not. ‘Absolute synonymy’ is here used to mean the complete replacement or substitution of one lexical item by another in all contexts and at all times; in other words, everything that one word means is what the other word means no more and no less. As a matter of fact, I believe I am justified in saying that according to this definition absolute synonymy is impossible in any given language.³⁹⁴

Commenting on absolute synonymy, Cruse states that: “two lexical units would be absolute synonyms (i.e. would have identical meanings) if and only if all their contextual relations were identical.”³⁹⁵ It would, of course, be quite impracticable to prove that two items were absolute synonyms by this definition, because that would mean checking their relations in all conceivable contexts (it would also be theoretically impossible, if, as is probably the case, the number of possible contexts were infinite). However the falsification of a claim of absolute synonymy is in principle very straightforward, since a single discrepancy in the pattern of contextual relations constitutes sufficient proof”.³⁹⁶ Put more clearly, “any difference in meaning whatsoever disqualifies a pair of lexical items from being absolute synonyms”.³⁹⁷ This is actually my personal opinion as well and also the reason behind my conviction that every single word in the language is unique as each word has its own identity. However, as Nida said, not everyone can point out

the difference or differences between two supposedly synonymous items.

Cruse then goes on to conclude that:

“One thing becomes clear once we begin a serious quest for absolute synonyms, and that is if they exist at all, they are extremely uncommon. Furthermore, it would seem reasonable to predict that if the relationship were to occur, it would be unstable. There is no obvious motivation for the existence of absolute synonyms in a language, and one would expect either that one of the items would fall into obsolescence, or that a difference in semantic function would develop. ... It seems probable, and many semanticists have maintained, that natural languages abhor absolute synonyms just as nature abhors a vacuum”.³⁹⁸

On the other hand, many scholars have studied synonymy or *tarāduf* ‘التَّرَادُفُ’ in the Arabic language, and, categorically, we have two opposite views. One view supports the claim that absolute synonymy is possible and that it does exist in Arabic, while the other denies this claim completely and tries to explain the differences between the lexical items which the supporters of the former view claim to be synonyms.

M. A. Chaudhary³⁹⁹ dedicates three chapters in his brief book on Synonymy in the Qur’an listing examples from the Arabic language in general and the Qur’an in particular and many names of old and modern linguists who support and oppose the existence of absolute synonymy in Arabic.

Disregarding the fact that I support the view that absolute synonymy is not possible, it seems futile to discuss here, especially after quoting Cruse and Nida above, the different views on this particular issue because the fact of the matter remains, that is, even in modern times, we still have two different views with regard to absolute synonymy. Therefore, supporting one view is as valid as supporting another, especially when we look into the impact of this on translation.

Adopting the view that absolute synonyms exist within a

given language does not mean that this is going to be the case in translation. In the case of Arabic and English, it is my conviction that it is, in principle, possible to find an absolute synonym for an English word in Arabic and vice versa.

This, as a matter of fact, might be a good starting point in the process of translation as it would be ideal if the translator could find synonyms in the target language for every word and context in the source text. Yet, such a situation is too good to be true.

The difficulty of achieving this might arise from the fact that as languages differ from one another, it is not possible to find absolute synonyms for every word in the language. Also not every word in a given text has a synonym in the TL; and even if this happens to be the case the differences between sentence structures, for example, between the SL and the TL might prove problematic. In other words if synonymy in words is extremely difficult to find, contextual synonymy is even more unlikely.

Translation Loss

One thing which can be stated with absolute certainty is the inevitability of translation loss. If one word in Arabic is synonymous with another in English, its neighbour in the same sentence might not be the same. Generally speaking meaning is of problematic nature because “what any particular word refers to cannot be determined precisely”.⁴⁰⁰

Referring to translation loss Hervey and Higgins state that: “Translation is fraught with compromise. Compromise in translation means reconciling oneself to the fact that, while one would like to do full justice to the richness of the SL, one’s final TT inevitably suffers from various translation losses. Often one allows these losses unhesitatingly”.⁴⁰¹ Once this is borne in mind all delusions about absolute synonymy in translation will lose much, if not all, of their force. What the translator has to do then is to endeavour to reduce or minimize translation loss.

One has to bear in mind that in actual fact “translation loss is not loss *of* translation, but a loss *in* the translation process. It is a loss *of* textual effects. Further, since these effects cannot be

quantified, neither can the loss. So, while trying to reduce it, the translator never knows how far there is still to go”.⁴⁰²

Changes of Meaning

As a result of distance in time and cultural changes some words stop being used, they become obsolete, others appear and as far as the meaning is concerned many changes take place. In other words, the number of associations unique to every word in the language gets affected as a result of, for example, cultural changes and also the way a word is being used at a given time. The word-associations become subject to addition and omission.

This can be made very clear when we consider the following example from *King Lear, Act III, sci VII*, “when Gloucester, ... bound, tormented and about to have his eyes gouged out attacks Regan with the phrase ‘Naughty lady’. It ought to be clear that there has been considerable shift in the weight of the adjective, now used to admonish children or to describe some slightly comic (...) peccadillo”.⁴⁰³

Therefore, great care must be taken when studying the meaning of a word that falls under the same category. The changes to the meaning must not affect our understanding because such words have to be considered in their original environment. Translating ‘naughty’ in the modern sense of the word would be entirely ridiculous. The same rule applies to any other type of text. The meaning of a Qur’anic word or term, for example, should not then be determined according to the changes that might have occurred as a result of the time gap since the Qur’an was firstly revealed to the Prophet (ﷺ) until today. The words in general should be understood in the light of what they meant then. This actually does not mean that a great number of words have changed slightly or fully in meaning. This assertion is made just in case the translator comes across words that might be carrying different connotations nowadays. Also, this does not mean that the translator/reader of the Qur’an is going to come across mysteries that are hard to solve or cannot be solved, or even some unexpected surprises. Even in case that this actually happens, this might be a result of the translator’s

lack of knowledge of what those words or expressions actually mean/meant either in or out of context.

We have to bear in mind that when the Qur'an was being revealed, not all the *Sahābah* knew the meaning of every word in the Qur'an. This is why they used to ask the Prophet (ﷺ) about the meaning of what they could not understand. A very well-known example is the Qur'anic usage of the word *ẓulm* 'ظلم' (Literally, going out of the way; also refers to wrong-doing or injustice) in Q6:82 which reads: {الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا وَلَمْ يَلْبِسُوا إِيمَانَهُمْ بِظُلْمٍ}, "those who believe and confuse not their beliefs with wrong".⁴⁰⁴ The Prophet (ﷺ) explained that in this Ayah, *ẓulm* 'ظلم' (translated 'wrong') refers to something different from what the word usually means. He (ﷺ) referred the *Sahābah* to Q31:13 where the Qur'an says: {إِنَّ الشِّرْكَ لَظُلْمٌ عَظِيمٌ} stating that what is meant is the association of partners to Allah, which is known as *shirk*⁴⁰⁵ and will be referred to below.

As is clear, the Qur'anic usage of the word *ẓulm* has given it another dimension and expanded its sphere of meaning to assimilate another word namely *shirk*.

Q2:254 reads {وَالْكَافِرُونَ هُمُ الظَّالِمُونَ}, 'and the *k-afirs* are the *ẓālims*', (*ẓālim* being the person who commits an act of *ẓulm*). First, we have to state that every *kāfir* is *ẓālim*, but not vice versa, and this is by virtue of the meaning of the word *kāfir*. *Kufr*, the verbal noun, is basically related to 'covering';⁴⁰⁶ this means that a *kāfir* is a person who 'covers', 'hides' or 'ignores' knowingly the benefits he has received. Therefore, the person who does not believe in Allah, according to Islam, is called *kāfir*. In other words, all non-Muslims are *kāfirs*. By virtue of its basic meaning, *kāfir*, accordingly, is not an insult but a statement of linguistic fact. The word has not got, therefore, that insulting connotation or even denotation it does have nowadays in South Africa, for example, as it is used there by Muslims and non-Muslims alike with an offensive connotation and has become one of the most extreme swear words to be used there.

The word *kufr* has also become in Islamic terminology the exact antonym of 'belief or *īmān* إيمان'. The Qur'an, referring to this

point, also states in Q5:44 {وَمَنْ لَّمْ يَحْكَمْ بِمَا أَنْزَلَ اللَّهُ فَأُولَئِكَ هُمُ الْكَافِرُونَ}, ‘And whosoever does not judge according to what Allah has sent down, such are the *kāfirs*’.⁴⁰⁷

As for *shirk*, it is basically ‘Polytheism’; strictly speaking, it is “the worship of others along with Allah. It also implies attributing divine attributes to any other besides Allah. It particularly implies associating partners in worship with Allah, or to believe that the source of power, harm or blessings is from others besides Allah”.⁴⁰⁸ This means that a believer in Allah (*mu‘min*) or a Muslim may commit an act of *shirk* and be called *mushrik*. In Q12:106, the Qur’an states {وَمَا يُؤْمِنُ أَكْثَرُهُمْ بِاللَّهِ إِلَّا وَهُمْ مُشْرِكُونَ}, “And most of them believe not in Allah without associating (others as partners) with Him”.⁴⁰⁹ Here we have a clear reference that most people would believe in Allah and at the same time join others as partners to Him. This can be referred to as *shirk khafi* ‘شِرْكٌ خَفِيٌّ’.

To conclude, it can easily be seen now that *zulm*, *shirk* and *kufir* are related to one another and in various ways to *‘īmān* which stands as the other extreme. However, in their own rights, they all stand as separate and distinct terms from one another. The context sometimes dictates the meaning to be understood.

The above argument is meant to reveal that even at the time of revelation the meaning of certain words that were considered unrelated overlapped and expanded while others, if I may say, became more strict in their references.⁴¹⁰

The Impact of the ST on the Translation

From the way the Qur’an was revealed, written, collected and memorised until today we understand that the word order, that is the sequence in which elements occur, in its widest sense, is deliberate. The result is that words put in a certain order lead to the creation of different structures, styles, shifts in emphasis, etc. The words themselves are chosen to fit with one another. All this has resulted in a text that is matchless in every aspect.

What translators normally try to do is to match the source text in as many aspects as possible. In the case of the Qur'an we find that no word can replace another, no word can do the job of another, every word is there for a purpose to convey a certain message and give a certain meaning. On the other hand, the translator may consider the different ways an utterance can be translated. He then chooses what he thinks to be the most suitable. He is not always forced by virtue of what the words mean to choose a certain word.

The translator sometimes changes his translation preferring one word to another. The words in the translation, therefore, do not have the power to be unreplaceable. This is very unlike the Qur'an where the fit of the words is perfect and absolute. This is one of the things that has placed the Qur'an at the pinnacle of *fasāḥah* and *balāghah*, and made many people aspire to achieve in their compositions, whether poetry or prose, something of a similar standard. And although more than 14 centuries have passed since the first revelation of the Qur'an no one has been able to match the Qur'anic style. Therefore, to put it in an Islamic way, what Allah the Creator says cannot be matched by the created. The difference between the Word of Allah and the word of man is like the difference between Allah Himself and man. As the created can never be equal to the Creator, their respective words can never be equal either. We can consider, for example, Q36:82 {إِنَّمَا أَمْرُهُ إِذَا أَرَادَ شَيْئًا}، أن يَقُولَ لَهُ كُنْ فَيَكُونُ} 'Verily, His command, when He intends a thing, is to say to it: "Be" and it is'. This is a clear example from the Islamic point of view which is derived from the Qur'anic concept of God, of the difference between the Word of Allah and the word of man.

Translating the Word of God

George Steiner in his *Foreword to Translating Religious Texts*, (p.xiii) makes a similar remark. He argues: "Here we flounder in deep waters. If a text is 'revealed', if its initial encoding is then transferred into a mundane and fallible sign-system, that of secular and post-Adamic speech, to what truth-functions, to what correspondent faithfulness can any translation aspire?"

Perhaps, this is one of the reasons that made some people say that the Qur'an is untranslatable. However, we should bear in mind the following:

- 1) There are many differences in the ways of expression between all languages.
- 2) There are in practice no absolutes, perfect synonymy or perfect equivalence in translation.
- 3) There is always a translation loss of different degrees as a result of many factors, both linguistic and cultural.
- 4) No translation can substitute the original, even when the translation is better than the original, which is not the case in the Qur'anic translations.
- 5) The translation of the Qur'an serves as no more than an introduction to non-Arabic speaking audience, Muslims and non-Muslims alike.

If we do this, we can be more tolerant in our approach to the translations of the Qur'an. However, it must also be said that there are translations that contain grave errors that most certainly distort the Message and lead to misguidance. Therefore, instead of serving as faithful introductions, such translations become no more than mis-introductions. The Qur'an delivers a certain message, bad translations give the wrong message and defeat the purpose of the translation as an assumedly faithful reflection of the source text. And as the reader might not be able to compare the translation to the original, the translator has not only failed his readers but, albeit inadvertently, betrayed and cheated them as well, let alone doing injustice to the ST.

This is actually a very serious problem in the translation of religious texts because religions are supposed to be for the guidance of people. Among many other things, religious teachings are meant to rectify things, change others, abolish this and introduce that, etc. All the issues that are involved not only affect the human race and our survival on this planet but also every thing else around us as well. As a result, translating texts of such extreme importance that have such an influence on our life here and in the hereafter either justifiably or unjustifiably, requires firstly and above all the translator's awareness of the sensitivity of the issue. A translator

who is not aware of the problems of the translation of religious texts will be making a grave mistake to start with because these books are not meant to be read then put on a shelf next to a novel or a play: people are supposed to abide by the Word of God.

However, in many cases different factors interfere in the process such as the translator's real intentions for embarking on such a task, his religious background, his command of both the Source and Target languages, his knowledge of the Source and Target language cultures, etc. Other factors such as time and funds allocated to finish such a project play an important role as well. Even the size of the translation has to be taken into consideration.

Therefore, I believe I am justified in saying that even in the most ideal of situations where the translator assumedly meets all the requirements, the translations of the Qur'an, many as they are, serve as just a step towards understanding the Word of Allah. And no debate in Islam can be based either solely or fundamentally on a translation of the Qur'an. We have so many translations already and perhaps we still need many more.

Culture and Translation

Newmark is of the opinion that as a translator one has "to study the text not for itself but as something that may have to be reconstituted for a different readership in a different culture".⁴¹¹ In fact this is a very tricky and problematic point because before any attempt is made to render any kind of text into another language, it has got to be understood first in the context of its own language, in other words, it has got to be studied for itself. The next step would, probably, be to consider how the text is to be translated into the TL. It is then that the translator has to summon to consciousness probably all that he knows about the TL and culture in order to make his translation understood by the different readership to whom he is presenting the translation.

Several points have to be taken into account. In spite of the fact that one may find similarities between different cultures, differences of various degrees do exist as well; and sometimes, they exist in abundance. As languages are a means of communication

between people we can expect linguistic differences to exist due to cultural ones. However, in the case of reading a translation, it would be very naïve to assume that such cultural differences would not appear, or that the translator would have to exert some supernormal effort so that his translation is not to read like a translation. (This of course excludes incompetent translators.) More details about this issue are given under ‘Repetition’.

The reader of any translated work is assumed to know that what he is reading is a translation, and not the original. However, he does not dwell on this issue because it is not a necessity that what is lost in the translation affects the ‘text’ a great deal. Even in a case where the ST message is greatly affected by the translation, the reader is only in a position to judge this when he compares the translation to the original.

Cultural Differences

In the case of translating religious and/or sacred texts in general - extreme care has to be taken by the translator because as stated elsewhere with regard to the Qur’an, every letter, word, sentence, form, content, etc., is believed to be deliberate. If this fact is ignored, or not taken into account, then this can create many problems in understanding the divine Message. The translator will then be creating confusion, instead of giving a faithful rendering. The importance of this particular point can be made clear with reference to the fact that, as stated elsewhere, no debate with regard to the Qur’an can be based on a translation of it; on the other hand Qur’anic debates in Arabic can arise around one letter ‘حَرْفٌ’, change to a diacritical sign ‘تَشْكِيلٌ’, or a preposition ‘حَرْفٌ جَرٌّ’.⁴¹²

It is well-known that Zayd ibn Thābit had wanted to write {التَّابُوتُ} with (ه) at the end, instead of the Qurayshite (ت).

The reading and/or writing of Q35:28 {إِنَّمَا يَخْشَى اللَّهَ مِنْ عِبَادِهِ} الْعُلَمَاءُ in the form of {إِنَّمَا يَخْشَى اللَّهَ مِنْ عِبَادِهِ الْعُلَمَاءُ}, is entirely unacceptable in the Islamic faith. The same also applies to Q9:3 {أَنَّ} اللَّهُ بَرِيءٌ مِّنَ الْمُشْرِكِينَ وَرَسُولُهُ, as it is unacceptable to read it or write it as

‘وَرَسُولِهِ’. As is clear by now, the change of the diacritical signs, that is, the *fathah* and *dammah* swapping places in the former Ayah, and the change of the *dammah* to *kasrah* in the latter lead to the wrong message being conveyed.

We may also consider Q83:2 where we find {أَكْتَالُوا عَلَيَّ}; in spite of the fact that linguists say that {عَلَيَّ} in this context means ‘مِنْ’ as this is the normal combination of words, {أَكْتَالُوا عَلَيَّ} is Qur’an while ‘أَكْتَالُوا مِنْ’ is not.

This is why Islam does not accept the concept of ‘the Authorised Version’ of the Qur’an, if it is in any language other than its original. The only authorised Qur’an is what we have in its original wording, and it is not authorised by a human being, but by Allah Himself as is clear from the Qur’anic testimony in Q15:9 where the Qur’an is referred to as *Al-Dhikr* {إِنَّا نَحْنُ نَزَّلْنَا الذِّكْرَ وَإِنَّا لَهُ لَحَافِظُونَ}, i.e. “Verily We: It is We who have sent down the *Dhikr*, and surely We will guard it”.⁴¹³

It is understood from the Islamic claim then that the Qur’an is for all mankind and that it has a universal message that is suitable for all nations at all times. In many Ayahs in the Qur’an we find this stated very clearly; for example, the Prophet Muḥammad (ﷺ) is addressed in Q21:107: {وَمَا أَرْسَلْنَاكَ إِلَّا رَحْمَةً لِّلْعَالَمِينَ}, “We sent thee not, but as a mercy for the *ēalamīn* (mankind, jinns and all that exists)”.⁴¹⁴ A similar message is given in Q34:28, {وَمَا أَرْسَلْنَاكَ إِلَّا كَافَّةً} “We have not sent you except as a (universal messenger), a giver of glad tidings and a warner to all mankind”.⁴¹⁵ There are also many more examples to this effect in the Holy Book. It is in this previous sense that we can say that the Qur’anic *message* is not culture-bound in its entirety. It is a fact that there are several references to things and issues immediately related to the Arabic culture which might not be shared with other cultures, yet, it is also replete with experiences shared by all mankind to whom the message is directed.⁴¹⁶

One must not forget that the Qur'an is an Arabic Book revealed to an Arab and was initially preached to an Arabic audience. It is natural for it therefore to mention things and incidents that are very much related to the culture and history of the Arabs. Also, as stated many times before, that the Qur'anic style, although Arabic, cannot be matched even in Arabic, as the book stands at the pinnacle of *faṣāḥah* and *balāghah*. It always remains unique and inimitable. And therefore, it is no wonder to find that many Arabic men of letters would make use of Qur'anic quotations or endeavour to use a style similar to that of the Qur'an to embellish their writings.⁴¹⁷

On the other hand, as a result of the Qur'an being an Arabic Book, an Arabic sound, tone or stream is naturally expected to exist between its covers.

However, the Qur'an carries a universal message. The references made, as far as the teachings, for example, are concerned, are to experiences shared by all men at all times. This message is conveyed through the means of the language which is, to a high degree, culture-coloured in the sense of using metaphors, ways of expression, structures, etc.

It can also be said that the Qur'an is linguistic-bound in the sense that the translation of the Qur'an into any language is not the Qur'an; in other words, the translation (the production) does not and cannot replace the original, no matter how good the translation is.

Also, the Qur'an is believed by Muslims to be miraculous and inimitable in all aspects. However, it should be clear that the non-Arab cannot always see the miraculous and inimitable nature of the Qur'anic language, no matter how closely related to his culture the issues involved are, due to the simple factor of his lack of knowledge in Arabic. This also means that not all natives of Arabic can determine the miraculous nature of the Qur'anic style as the matter depends in one aspect on their level of knowledge of their native tongue. To put it in simple terms, to an Arab lacking the necessary linguistic knowledge to appreciate the Qur'anic style, the miraculous nature of the Qur'anic language can hardly be

recognised. Perhaps, this shows the reality of the Qur’anic challenge to the Arabs in particular to produce something like it. They had the tools and means to do it, and they still failed, just like everybody else for the last 1435 lunar years.⁴¹⁸

This last point is of particular interest because it sheds some light on the fact that what cannot be matched in the same language is highly unlikely to be representable in exactly the same way in another. Perhaps this is one of the fundamental points with regard to translation loss referred to elsewhere. Yet, translation also sometimes suffers not only from losses but also from additions.

Translation And Addition

In general, the translator resorts to addition when he thinks that the text is made clearer to the reader that way; so he explains it. This, however, does not change the fact that a new element that was not there before, that is, not in the ST, has been added to the TT. If we take, for example one of the most recent English translations of the Qur’an, that of Colin Turner, we find that in his exegetically-led translation, he renders Q1:5 {إِيَّاكَ نَعْبُدُ...} as “5. King of all creation! It is You whom we worship...”.⁴¹⁹ This raises the question, if “King of all creation” is to be considered an exegetical addition, as it is definitely not in the Arabic text, how much addition can be considered legitimate? Also, the usefulness of such an addition, whether it serves as an important explanation or not has to be considered as well.

The Business of the Translator

I totally agree with Longfellow that it is not the business of the translator to explain what the author means, at least not in the body of the text. He states: “The business of a translator is to report what the author says, not to explain what he means; that is the work of the commentator. What an author says and how he says it, that is the problem of the translator”.⁴²⁰ However, sometimes we find that the translator does explain what he *thinks* the author means.⁴²¹ If we consider another example from the translation of Colin Turner⁴²² we find that Q2:2-3: {ذَلِكَ الْكِتَابُ لَا رَيْبَ فِيهِ هُدًى لِّلْمُتَّقِينَ * الَّذِينَ يُؤْمِنُونَ بِالْغَيْبِ وَيَتَّقُونَ وَيَتَّقُونَ} (which are numbered 3-4, as the *Basmalah* is

considered an Ayah), are rendered as: “3. This Quran is a Book in which there is no uncertainty or room for doubt; it is a source of guidance for the God-fearing. In the eyes of the Quran there are three classes of men: 4. The first group consists in those who believe in the realm of the unseen, who perform their prayers and spend from that which God has bestowed upon them in order to meet the needs of those who have little;”.⁴²³ As a matter of fact, the entire translation, being exegetical, goes the same way due to its different nature from ordinary translations.

In my view, there is always the danger that the translator might not only be adding to the original text what it does not say (though might be implied), but also restricting in this way the meaning of the Ayahs to what he says in the translation. Colin Turner’s work, on the other hand, is of a very particular sort and should therefore be read in that light. In his introduction, he states that what his work “does not represent is an attempt at anything approaching full equivalence; as we have already seen, this is impossible in the context of literary translation, and even more so in the context of the Quran”.⁴²⁴ He also says:

“Yet *The Quran: A New Interpretation* is not a straightforward translation, as indeed the title implies. While all translations are at the same time interpretations, what distinguishes the present work from all other English renderings of the Quran is the fact that it is a combination of translation and exegesis - *tafsir* - in which the verses of the Holy Book have been ‘opened out’ to reveal some of the layers of meaning expounded by the Prophet and transmitted through the ages by the Prophet’s family and companions. In this sense, the present work is not only the result of five years of translation on my part; it is also the fruit of some thirty years of research into the principles of *tafsir* and *hadith* interpretations carried out by the illustrious scholar of the Quran, Muhammad Baqir Behbudi, whose seminal work *Ma’ani al-Quran* (The Meanings of the Quran) is the corner-stone on which this translation - or, more correctly, this ‘exegetically-led’ reading - is based”.⁴²⁵ (underlining mine).

Legitimate Additions

On the other hand, one also must admit that there are ‘legitimate additions’ in translation. This actually happens when the translator comes across a feature of the SL that might not exist in

the TL and necessitates explanation. Foreexample, one of the features of the Arabic language is that it sometimes omits words whose meaning is present by implication in the utterance although their actual wording is not except in normal use. In such cases, we find that the translation would be unable to convey the actual meaning or might sound vague without adding the missing words. However, if it happens that this kind of ellipsis ‘الحذف والاختصار’ exist in a particular case in exactly the same way in both the SL and TL, the addition would then be unnecessary.

In Q12:82 we read {وَأَسْأَلُ الْقَرْيَةَ} which literally means ‘and ask the town’. We understand that if asking was to take place that would be directed to ‘(the people of) the town’. But with the omission of ‘the people’ from the Arabic the reference carries a deeper meaning which is: ‘if you even go to the extreme of asking absolutely everything both humans and non-humans in the town...’

Q2:93 reads {وَأُشْرِبُوا فِي قُلُوبِهِمُ الْعِجْلَ}, the reference here is to the Jews when they worshipped the golden calf instead of Allah. The Ayah states that their hearts were made to ‘absorb the calf’ which in fact means that their hearts were saturated with the ‘love and worship’ of the calf. However, it is only ‘the calf’ and not ‘the love and worship of the calf’ that is mentioned in the Ayah; this is because (1) the love and worship of the calf is clearly understood by implication, and (2) the use of {الْعِجْلَ} with the verb {أُشْرِبُوا} makes the reference more emphatic as it was everything related to the calf that saturated their hearts.

Other examples are: Q2:197 {الْحَجُّ أَشْهُرٌ مَّعْلُومَاتٌ}, where the reference in practice is not to Hajj (Pilgrimage) but to the ‘time’ for Hajj.

Q47:13 {فَرَيْتَكَ الَّتِي أَخْرَجْتِكَ} refers to ‘your town (whose people) drove you out’.

Q34:33 {مَكْرُ اللَّيْلِ وَالنَّهَارِ} ‘the scheming of night and day’ which means ‘(your) scheming by night and by day’.

Al-Hudhli says: “يَمْشِي بَيْنَنَا حَانُوتُ خَمْرٍ”⁴²⁶ which literally means ‘Among us walks *an alcohol shop*’. As is clear from this example, if the translator sticks to the actual wording, the result would be meaningless if not entirely ridiculous. What Al-Hudhli is actually saying is: among us walks (or is) ‘the owner of’ a shop where alcohol is being sold [the owner of an ‘off-license’].⁴²⁷ It is in such situations that the term ‘legitimate addition’ may apply as without which the content of the message would be lost. This means that the translation could not keep the form of the original text, nor its musicality, nor could it preserve the *balāghah* of the utterance as a result of the omission in the SL. Finally the meaning is sacrificed or rather lost for the sake of trying to imitate or stick to the SL form, which was lost from the start by virtue of structural differences between the SL and TL. What we end up with in cases like this is translation failure. The translator has to have a clear objective and that is the meaning (with the least addition) is to be given priority. As stated before, translation loss is inevitable, but as the translator has to endeavour to minimize translation loss, he also has to exert as much effort to minimize additions and not to attempt unnecessary ones.

It is also clear from the above that there must be a limit for addition. Uncalled-for additions are not legitimate because there is always the danger of the actual meaning being affected. Additions of different degrees are found in all translations, and it seems that this is prompted by the fact that languages do differ greatly one from the other, and also as a result of the translator’s efforts to clarify or explain the meaning of the ST.

However, it is really hard to decide where the line should be drawn between what we can refer to as ‘translation’ and perhaps ‘interpretation’. It is very common for many translators to refer to their translations of the Qur’an as interpretations.⁴²⁸ In this way, they directly or indirectly admit that there are both losses and additions in their work. It seems, therefore, to me that ‘economy’ is one very important factor in what can be called translation; in other words, the translator is to try to use the least number of words only to the extent that the ST is rendered with enough TL words to convey the message intended.⁴²⁹ This is what we can refer to as

'economy in loss' and *'economy in addition'*. Yet, if both economy and accuracy are combined, it is only then that we can hope to achieve successful translations. In the case of the translation of the Qur'an this is an impossible dream to achieve.

The Qur'an, undoubtedly, uses the right word in the right place with the right structure delivering the exact meaning and message intended by the Divine Speaker all the time without fail, using the least number of words. This is almost, if not absolutely, impossible in human speech and creation. One example should be sufficient here; Q12:80 reads { فَلَمَّا اسْتَيْأَسُوا مِنْهُ خَلَصُوا نَجِيًّا }, its basic meaning being "When they despaired of persuading him to change his mind, they conferred privily apart".⁴³⁰ Here one is astonished at the economy of the Arabic words and intensity of meaning; very few words draw an extremely vivid picture of unsolved crisis.

Decision-Making in Translation

If we turn to the translation now, we find that the translator has to make a decision as to which word and structure to use to render what he personally understands to be the meaning of the SL text and the message intended. In other words, he has to decipher the content of the ST, determine its meaning/s, then decide on the form that is most suitable in conveying the message according to the rules of the TL which he has got no choice but to abide by. He also has to find out the points of emphasis in every Ayah and try to stress their meaning in the translation.

The translator is naturally bound by both the TL culture and rules of the TL. However, this cultural issue is not a big problem for at least the following reasons: (1) the Qur'anic message is universal, (2) the translation is known not to be a replacement of the original, (3) the Qur'an is not culture-bound in its entirety, in the sense explained above, (4) the reader expects to come across issues that are culturally different from his, (5) by way of example, the paying of *zakāh*, in the form of camels, cows, or sheep to a people from a different culture that might not even know what these words refer to does not form a problem because such Qur'anic rules in particular will not apply there.

Cultural Differences: An Obstacle?

Dwelling too much on finding answers to cultural differences to the satisfaction of the TL readership is, I believe, as problematic as trying to imitate the Qur'anic language or style in the translation, because this, in many cases, will be at the expense of the quality of the product in the TL, and it might also lead to ambiguity, and probably to structural 'clumsiness', let alone misguidance.

However, the translator is under obligation to render such words as camels, cows, sheep and the like including terms and concepts that are not part of the TL culture, as they appear in the ST, into the TL. But how can he achieve this if such things are not part of the TL culture and as a result, probably, there are no words for them in the TL?

First of all, if we look at this cultural issue from this particular angle, we will end up with the same conclusion; that is, the translator should not consider cultural differences to be an obstacle in the way of his work because, ultimately, the translation is supposed to reflect these cultural elements of the SL text, and perhaps even keep them as they are, because the SL text might be a production of its own culture which is likely to be different from the TL culture. The earlier the translator makes such a decision the easier it becomes to tackle such problems.

According to Susan Bassnett, "it is clearly the task of the translator to find a solution to even the most daunting of problems".⁴³¹ This, first of all, is naturally restricted by the tools available in the TL; in other words, if a certain concept does not exist in the TL, what can the translator do? That is why in cases like this the translator accepts the fact that the SL text is untranslatable to a very high degree (examples are given below). But, as the translator has to provide for untranslatable texts and find solutions because they may be parts of bigger texts, he, therefore, "resolves for that one of the possible solutions which promises a maximum of effect with a minimum of effort. That is to say, he intuitively resolves for the so-called MINIMAX STRATEGY".⁴³²

As it is a well known fact that every language has its own linguistic system, what the translator attempts to achieve first is a 'meeting point' for those different systems and this serves as a starting point for his translation.

Every sentence has its own unique identity due to the fact that no two sentences are the same because no two words are ever the same. Therefore, the translation of each and every sentence requires its own technique of translation. The context, on the other hand, i.e., the sentences that come before and after a given sentence, implies that more than one system is in action at the same time and they all work together towards the achievement of a common goal which is rendering the author's 'intended' message. Basically, the text and the translation should have the same purpose.

The translator, one way or the other, has to be aware of these systems. Sentences that share the same pattern (for example, Subject+ Verb+ Object), do not necessarily require the application of the same translation system, as other internal or external factors might be involved and therefore have to be considered such as a sentence being a statement of fact, ironic, idiomatic, etc.

Ultimately, the translation remains something personal as far as the choice of vocabulary and, to a degree, structure are concerned. This is due to the fact that the word order in one language is not necessarily the same in another even when both belong to the same family of languages. This actually leads to an acceptance of the fact that if the SL and TL belong to two different families of languages, the gap between them will be rightly expected to be wider and the translation problems or difficulties much greater.

Exoticism: An Answer?

It is perhaps an easier task to 'translate' the Qur'an for non-Arabic-speaking Muslims than for non-Arabic speaking non-Muslims as far as certain terms and concepts are concerned. The concepts of *Ṣalāh*, *Zakāh*, *Ṣawm*, *Hajj*, *ʿIhsān*, *Ṣadaqah*, *Jihād*, etc., do not exist in exactly the same way, if at all, in non-Muslim cultures. In other words what a Muslim understands from the word

ṣalāh 'صلاة' is different from what a non-Muslim understands from the word 'prayer' which is a common rendering for the Arabic word as mentioned before.

What I suggest, therefore, in cases like this is that the translator is to explain the concept only once, preferably in a footnote; and in order to avoid the coinage of a new word in the TL and long explanations as well, I suggest the adoption of the Arabic word referring to the concept involved and the incorporation of such words into the TL. This way the translator will not have to invent a new word or exert any effort in trying to find what he thinks to be the 'nearest' equivalent. There will be no fear then that "the reader may not understand what the 'exoticism' means"⁴³³ because an explanation for it has been provided.

It is a very well known fact that with the contact between different cultures, words get imported and exported and that over time they get incorporated in the language and in many cases their origins are even forgotten. They might still keep their meanings as in their original languages or change slightly as a result of changes in the adopting culture, or even get pronounced with slight changes to appeal to the ear of the adopting language. Many examples can be quoted such as the Hindu and Buddhist *Karma*, the Japanese *Karate*, the Arabic *Sharia*, *Intifada*, *Jihad*, *Mujahideen*, *Imam*, *Sheikh*, *Amir*, *Fatwa*, *Halal*, the Egyptian *Ka*, the Russian *Perestroika*, the Italian *balcony*, etc.

According to Hervey and Higgins "... the extreme options of signaling cultural foreignness in a TT fall into the category of exoticism. A TT translated in an exotic manner is one which constantly resorts to linguistic and cultural features imported from the ST in the TT with minimal adaptation",⁴³⁴ if any at all. They then continue to point out that this way "thereby constantly signals the exotic source culture and its cultural strangeness".⁴³⁵ In other words, as James Dickins puts it: "Widespread use of exoticism can have an alienating effect - the reader feels he is in a foreign environment".⁴³⁶

Hervey and Higgins answer this argument by stating: “Of course, this may be one of the TT’s chief attractions, as with some translations of Icelandic sagas or Arabic poetry that deliberately trade on exoticism”.⁴³⁷

On the other hand, such ‘cultural strangeness’ or ‘alienating effect’ is not really as serious as it sounds. Let us not forget that the reader is dealing first and foremost with a *translation*. He knows from the start, and this is what any and every reader should always bear in mind, that what he is reading is not the original. Therefore, encountering a different culture with its different terms, concepts, beliefs, customs, traditions, ways of expressions, etc., is normal, natural and expected. The reader already knows that he might be entering a foreign environment by virtue of the fact that he is reading a translation. This is even more the case, if the reader happens to know the source language as well. Therefore, if he reads the text in issue in its original language, he then realises that, from the first moment, he might be stepping into a foreign environment. This is probably similar to what the translator himself experiences as he reads a text before translating it.

We also have to bear in mind that it is very far-fetched and extremely rare, if ever, that an author writes anything with translation in mind to avoid cultural strangeness or alienating effects.

It is, however, understood that the result is never guaranteed. The translator is not translating with the purpose of pleasing his readership if what he is translating is not meant to please them. Even if this is the case, cultural differences might not lead to creating the same effect in the TL culture. The translation serves as a window through which the readers can get to see other cultures.

Repetition⁴³⁸

Discussing issues related to the Soviet school of translation, Lauren G. Leighton asserts that: “Few Soviet translators would agree with the dogmatic literalist Vladimir Nabokov’s assertion that “we must dismiss, once and for all, the conventional notion that a translation ‘should read smoothly,’ and ‘should not sound like a

translation.’ ... In point of fact, any translation that does not sound like a translation is bound to be inexact upon inspection” (1958: XII)”.⁴³⁹ We have to state first of all that whether a translation should sound like a translation or not does not mean admitting ‘bad translations’. In other words, a translated text should read well and with no clumsiness of style as a result of being affected by the SL rules, for example. This, as a matter of fact, is a difficult problem to tackle because while a translator’s aim should be to present the given text in good language complying with the rules of the TL, in many cases he finds himself in a situation that results in the impact of the SL showing glaringly.

One of the best examples of this is the feature of repetition⁴⁴⁰ in the Arabic language. “A man may say to another ‘أَعْجَلْ أَعْجَلْ’: ‘Hurry up, hurry up’, and to an archer: ‘ارْمِ ارْمِ’: ‘Shoot, shoot’.⁴⁴¹ A poet says:

كَمْ نِعْمَةٍ كَانَتْ لَكُمْ كَمْ كَمْ وَكَمْ كَانَتْ وَكَمْ⁴⁴²

and another said:

”هَلَا سَأَلْتَ جُمُوعَ كِنْدَ ةَ يَوْمَ وَلَوْ أَيْنَ أَيْنَا؟⁴⁴³

where the underlined words are repeated successively. Muhalhal also repeated “عَلَى أَنْ لَيْسَ عَدْلًا مِنْ كَلِيْبٍ”⁴⁴⁴ more than twenty times in one of his poems, and so did Al-Hārith ibn ʿAbbād with “قَرَّبًا مَرِيْطَ النَّعَامَةِ”⁴⁴⁵ .

The Qur’an being an Arabic book is no exception. To give but a few examples, Q96:1-2 read: {أَفْرَأْ بِاسْمِ رَبِّكَ الَّذِي خَلَقَ * خَلَقَ الْإِنْسَانَ مِنْ عَلَقٍ}, ‘Read in the name of your Lord who created * Created Man of a blood-clot’. In this example, the word {خَلَقَ} (created) is repeated twice; and while ‘Read in the name of your Lord who created Man of a blood-clot’ would read smoothly in English without the reader feeling that something more is needed to make the sentence sound like good English, the result is that the translator has omitted part of the original text. Whether such omission affects the meaning or not does not alter the fact that the translation did not cater for an ‘item’ in the original. The importance of this point arises from my conviction that even, just for the sake of hypothesis, if the meaning

does not suffer as a result of such omission, all texts are words put together and the translator must not forget that he translates on the basis of these words. Newmark states: “Many translators say you should never translate words, you translate sentences or ideas or messages. I think they are fooling themselves. The SL texts consists of words, that is all that is there, on the page. Finally all you have is words to translate, and you have to account for each of them somewhere in your TL text, sometimes by deliberately not translating them ..., or by compensating for them, because if translated could you inevitably over-translate them”.⁴⁴⁶

In the above Qur’anic example, Q96:1 ends with the word {خَلَقَ}, and does not require a complement unlike ‘create’ which requires an object. Also, in Q96:2 due to the Arabic structure and rules of grammar {خَلَقَ الْإِنْسَانَ مِنْ عَلَقٍ} is a complete and meaningful sentence. Yet, if we compare this to English we find that it goes against the rules of English to start a sentence as in the translation of Ayah 2, i.e., ‘created Man of a blood-clot’. While the *fāʿil* ‘فَاعِلٌ’ (subject) position can be filled in Arabic with no other pronoun but ‘He’, seven options are available in English to choose from (i.e. ‘I’, ‘you’, ‘he’, ‘she’, ‘it’, ‘we’, ‘they’). This of course does not ignore the importance of context. Yet, considering the context in Q96:1-2, the translator will have to relate the two Ayahs together in his translation in order to make sense while the difference in Arabic is that each Ayah can also stand (on its own) separately as complete and meaningful.

Repetition here also serves other purposes: the reference to the Creator moves from the general to the particular. ‘Read in the name of your Lord who created man of a blood-clot’ makes the Ayah lose one of its important dimensions, that of generality as the reference is that ‘your Lord’ is the One who created everything known and unknown, seen and unseen, etc. ‘Created man’ is a movement to the particular by way of example pointing out the complexity of the human being. Yet, in spite of such complexity, the basic component with reference to one of the primary stages of creation is ‘a blood-clot’, which although basic still reflects the fact that ‘blood’ is a complex component in itself. This is represented by

the word {عَلَى} which also carries the meaning of ‘hanging’ and/or ‘clinging’ in the sense that that blood-clot sticks to the surface of the womb.

What we end having here is a complexity of meaning with the use of a repeated word which ties all the involved strings together. Also that repeated word ends with a syllable which rhymes with the last word in this short Ayah, number 2. As a result a musical effect is created; it is like the sound of drums at short intervals emerging from a powerful and intense meaningful pattern.

This shows clearly the importance of repeating the word {خَلَقَ} with regard to at least meaning and music. The translator might not be able to achieve such an effect in the translation because of the TL rules of grammar and the sound gap between SL and TL. Therefore, and also by virtue of the fact that the wording of the Qur’an is deliberate and that every word serves a purpose, I believe that I am justified in saying that if a word is repeated in the original it should, if possible, be repeated in the translation, unless of course the context dictates a different rendering for the repeated word. However, in any case, every word must be catered for. It is my conviction that the translator has to ‘account for each and every word in the SL text’ and also consider them in context. This statement is not a defence of ‘literal translation’ which, however, can sometimes be the most effective form of translation. I believe that literal translation should not be devalued; but if adopting such a method results in inaccuracy, it should be abandoned.

According to Mona Baker “text is a meaning unit, not a form unit, but meaning is realised through form and without understanding the meanings of individual forms one cannot interpret the meaning of the text as a whole. Translating words and phrases out of context is certainly a futile exercise, but it is equally unhelpful to expect a student to appreciate translation decisions made at the level of text without a reasonable understanding of how the lower levels, the individual words, phrases, and grammatical structures, control and shape the overall meaning of the text”.⁴⁴⁷

Another example is Q12:4 with relation to the story of the Prophet Joseph; he says: **إِنِّي رَأَيْتُ أَحَدَ عَشَرَ كَوْكَبًا وَالشَّمْسَ وَالْقَمَرَ رَأَيْتُهُمْ لِي سَاجِدِينَ**, ‘I saw eleven planets and the sun and the moon: I saw them prostrating themselves to me’.⁴⁴⁸ It is clear that the verb ‘رَأَى’ (to see) is repeated twice in the Arabic as well as in the translation, although the translation could have done without such repetition. It would have still made perfect sense if it went: ‘I saw eleven planets, the sun and the moon prostrating themselves to me’.⁴⁴⁹ After quoting and analysing many Arabic texts, Barbara Johnstone concludes:

“An arguer presents truths by making them present in discourse: by repeating them, paraphrasing them, doubling them, calling attention to them with external particles. ... Argumentation by presentation has its roots in the history of Arab society... Arabic argumentation is structured by the notion that it is the presentation of an idea -- the linguistic forms and the very words that are used to describe it -- that is persuasive, not the logical structure of proof which Westerners see behind the words”.⁴⁵⁰

I do not totally agree with this last conclusion as it ignores the fact that it is impossible to prove the truth of anything all the time by just presenting it in linguistic forms or repeating certain words or ideas. Nevertheless, this quotation sheds some light on the importance of repetition in Arabic and that as a feature it is deeply rooted in the language itself.

The example in Q12:4 provides another dimension to the argument. It is understood that the Prophet Joseph saw what he saw in a dream although he did not say this himself in the above quotation. This is understood from his father’s answer not to tell his brothers about his ‘dream’ **رُؤْيَاكَ** (Q12:5). The repetition of **رَأَيْتُ** (to see) indicates that there was not the least doubt in the Prophet Joseph’s mind that what he saw was real; it was at least a bit more than just a normal dream. He, of course, could not prove that he saw what he claimed he did due to the very nature of dreams. Therefore,

he resorted to that feature in the language which gave his argument the persuasive force it needed and that was ‘repeating’ the key word {رَأَيْتَ} ‘saw’. This example shows recourse to a feature of the language when concrete proof cannot be provided. On the other hand, what proved the Prophet Joseph’s claim of ‘seeing’ was the physical coming true of his dream near the end of the narrative and not his linguistic presentation “by simply saying it, again and again”.⁴⁵¹

In cases where rational argumentation is needed we find that repetition becomes a means that communicates the truth and supports the proof. Ample examples can be found in Q27:59-65.

Generally speaking, one of the functions of repetition in Arabic is to give force to the point made and add emphasis to the argument; in most cases the repeated words are not redundant or affect the style in a way that makes it clumsy. The same can hardly be said about the English language. Consider, for example, the different translations for Q55:7-9 where the word *al-mīzān* {المِيزَانُ} is repeated three times.⁴⁵²

We can see from such examples that the SL does have a clear impact on the translation. This impact, especially when dealing with religious texts, is inescapable. This shows how important the form is and also the influence it exercises or the effect it has when translating. The difficult problem is that if the translator chooses to deliberately ignore the repeated words, he has actually failed in catering for all the words in the ST. Whether the translator may be justified or not for not translating repeated (or unrepeated) words as long as the meaning is not affected, is of secondary importance because every word in the Qur’an (repeated as well as unrepeated) serves a purpose; and if the translator fails in seeing this, it is not for him to decide that others too will not see what he could not see.⁴⁵³ What the translator should do is ‘his job’ and as stated elsewhere “what an author says and how he says it, that is the problem of the translator”.⁴⁵⁴ This is not to ignore the fact that as the translator might be trying to preserve the stylistic features of the SL text and

hoping to maintain, as much as he possibly could, part of its beauty, as represented by ‘repetition’, there is always the great possibility that he might actually be doomed to fail due to the differences existing between the SL’s and the TL’s systems of functioning.⁴⁵⁵

What the translator could do though, in an attempt to maintain the accuracy and faithfulness, and at the same time, the flow of the translation would be to add a footnote to draw the attention of the reader/critic to the actual wording of the original. In this way, the translator minimises the effect of, at least, the form of the SL on the translation and satisfies the reader/critic by accounting for all the words in the text involved.

Against Nabokov’s above assertion that ‘any translation that does not sound like a translation is bound to be inexact upon inspection’, a counter-argument may be raised: what are the criteria that produce a translation sounding like a translation? How does a translation, ‘sounding like a translation’ sound? According to Nabokov’s view, there must be certain features in the translation itself that makes it sound like one. Does this mean, for example, complete adherence to the SL rules even at the expense of the TL? As a matter of fact, such an argument raises more questions than answers because how ‘a translation should sound like a translation’ is not defined. Perhaps clumsiness of style or the lack of the natural flow of the language is what he means?!

On the other hand, the majority of the translations of the Qur’an actually do sound like translations. The main reason for this, I believe, is because of the impact of the Qur’anic *form* on the TL. The division of the Qur’an to Ayahs, the translator’s clear attempt to adhere to the text’s wording, the importance of the text, the attempts to match the Arabic style in the translation, the existence of terms that are untranslatable unless a detailed explanation is given, etc., are but a few reasons for why many Qur’anic translations sound like translations, or rather, do not sound natural.

This is not to ignore the fact that several attempts have been made to minimize this effect. However, the result is always at the

expense of something else. Arberry, for example, compares the Qur'anic translations prior to his own, saying:

“In making the present attempt to improve on the performance of many of my predecessors, and to produce something which might be accepted as echoing however faintly the sublime rhetoric of the Arabic Koran, I have been at pains to study the intricate and richly varied rhythms which - apart from the message itself - constitute the Koran's undeniable claim to rank amongst the greatest literary masterpieces of mankind. ... This very characteristic feature ... has been almost totally ignored by previous translators; it is therefore not surprising that what they have wrought sounds dull and flat indeed in comparison with the splendidly decorated original. ... I have striven to devise rhythmic patterns and sequence- groupings in correspondence with what the Arabic presents, paragraphing the grouped sequences as they seem to form original units of revelation”.⁴⁵⁶

As is clear from Arberry's comments above as well as in many other places in his 'Introduction', much has been lost in the previous translations and even his own attempt is but a 'faint' echo of the 'sublime rhetoric of the Arabic Koran'.

Other Features

Repetition in the above mentioned form is, of course, not the only feature of Arabic, which has a recognizable impact on the translation. There are many other features that might even be considered extremely odd when the translator tries to represent them in his work. It is quite common to find Western critics referring to what they claim to be incoherence, inconsistency or lack of harmony in the Qur'anic style.⁴⁵⁷ Such views ignore the fact that it is both inconceivable and impossible to judge one language according to the rules of another. Languages do differ immensely one from the other. What might be considered elegant style in Arabic is not necessarily looked upon the same way in English and vice versa.

An excellent example of such a difference is *al-shier al-
eamūdi* 'الشعر العُمُودِي' in Arabic where a whole poem, disregarding how many lines it has, shares the same rhyme, which is alien to

English. Also, In the English language, although ‘rhetoric’ is a common translation for the Arabic word *balāghah* ‘البلاغة’, the meanings of the two concepts are hardly the same. Basing an argument on the wrong premiss results in the wrong conclusions.

Illifāt (Reference Switching)

If we take for example the feature of *Illifāt*⁴⁵⁸ ‘الإلتفات’ in Arabic, we find that it is almost impossible to represent this to an English reader without him finding it odd. Illifat is the change of reference from, for example, addressing first person singular to third person plural, or referring to Allah in different ways such as I, He, We, Me, Us, God, etc. Q65:1 starts with {يَا أَيُّهَا النَّبِيُّ} ‘O Prophet’ which is a direct address to the Prophet (ﷺ), then it continues {إِذَا} ‘when you divorce women’ where ‘you’ is in the plural form indicating that all the believers are addressed and not only the Prophet (ﷺ). Also, the Ayah ends with {لَا تَدْرِي} ‘you know not’ where ‘you’ is in the singular.

As is clear, there was more than one change of addressee in this Ayah. Disregarding the reasons for such changes, which are perfectly acceptable and easily explainable in the context of the Arabic language, to the Western reader they are sometimes incomprehensible. However, the tricky part in this particular example is the fact that the English-speaking reader cannot spot this change of addressee without referring or being referred to the Arabic. There are many other examples of this feature and many others as well which present similar difficulties.⁴⁵⁹

As for the Qur’anic references to Allah in various pronouns, the reader has to bear in mind that that is deliberate and in no way demonstrative of incoherence. Such a way of reference is a “linguistic device meant to stress the idea that God is not a “person”, and cannot, therefore, be circumscribed by the pronouns applicable to finite beings”.⁴⁶⁰ Also, the transfer is made according to the situation and therefore even becomes a linguistic necessity. In my opinion, it is a question of *balāghah*.

If we consider Q2:186 {وَإِذَا سَأَلَكَ عِبَادِي عَنِّي} where the Prophet (ﷺ) is addressed ‘And when My (*‘ibād*) servants ask you about Me’, it is expected that the answer to this conditional phrase will still be an address to the Prophet (ﷺ). Instead what we have is a direct answer {فِيَّي قَرِيبٌ} ‘I am near’ which can be considered an address to both the Prophet (ﷺ) and the inquirers as well. Here, the nearness of Allah is emphasised by the direct answer; the *balāghah* of such an answer is beyond human capabilities.

The Impact of the Translator’s Intentions on the Translation

Gaining a better understanding of the Arabic language definitely diminishes such misperceptions of incoherence. However, it seems that such views do not necessarily result from only ignorance of some aspects or features of Arabic, rather they are sometimes deliberate attacks with the purpose of misrepresenting the Qur’anic message. George Sale starts his translation of the Qur’an with instructions to missionaries and propagators of the Christian religion with regard to the “rules to be observed by those who attempt the conversion of the Mohammedans”.⁴⁶¹ E. M. Wherry who reproduced Sale’s translation with additional notes and commentaries states in his introduction his reasons for doing so. As his work was a missionary among Muslims, Wherry wanted to “promote a better knowledge of Islam among missionaries”,⁴⁶² in order to be able to improve the missionaries techniques in trying to convert Muslims to Christians by refuting their religion. Richard Bell’s translation began with the assumption that the Holy Qur’an is not really ‘Holy’ but was “written by Muhammad himself”.⁴⁶³ J. M. Rodwell⁴⁶⁴ shares the same belief that the Qur’an was the Prophet Muḥammad’s ‘mishmash’.

There are also many other translators who had ulterior motives and were mainly interested in opposing Islam. They were motivated by their sheer hatred of Islam, as is clear from the many unsubstantiated accusations and references made in their introductions against Islam in general, and the Qur’an and the Prophet Muḥammad (ﷺ) in particular.

It is in situations like these that the translation, disregarding its share of accuracy, can never be trusted. No wonder there is a lot of misunderstanding about Islam in general in the West as a result of such translations that people read assuming their accuracy and fidelity, to gain insight into the Qur'an and its teachings and end with misinterpretation and misconceptions. It is because of the existence of translation errors that are beyond belief that I find it extremely hard to believe that the translator was *that* ignorant;⁴⁶⁵ if he was, he should not have embarked on such a task. Therefore, the only option left is that the errors were deliberate aiming at misrepresenting the Qur'an to non-Muslims.

Permissibility of Translating the Qur'an

The issue of the permissibility of translating the Qur'an into a foreign language has been the cause of heated debates among the Muslim Ulema in different parts of the Islamic world. Perhaps one of the reasons for that is the fact that history did not preserve for us any records of Muslims attempting translating any part of the Qur'an to a foreign language for a period of time well over twelve centuries.⁴⁶⁶ Also, there was the fear that the translation might become a replacement of the original, or even recited when performing *ṣalāh* instead of the Arabic text. Such arguments as well as counter-arguments have been reported in many references, perhaps, the most detailed of which that I know of is A. I. Muhanna's book "دِرَاسَةٌ حَوْلَ تَرْجَمَةِ الْقُرْآنِ".⁴⁶⁷

However, it seems that whether it is permissible to translate the Qur'an or not, has become an irrelevant issue, due to the fact that no one can stop the publication of Qur'anic translations. The question in this case should perhaps be: how reliable are such translations?

It is a fact that every translator who attempts such a task believes that he has something 'more' to say. Different translations assumedly reflect different aspects of the Divine Message. Yet, all the translators, both Muslim and non-Muslim, admit that their translations fall a long way short of being exact. For example, the effect of the recitation of the Arabic text on the hearer cannot with

any degree of success be achieved in any translation. This, in Pickthall's words, is the "inimitable symphony, the very sounds of which move men to tears and ecstasy".⁴⁶⁸

Translatability of The Qur'an?

This actually raises the question, if such is the state of the Qur'an, how translatable is it? In spite of the fact that a detailed answer supported by justifications and examples can be provided, as has already been attempted by many writers,⁴⁶⁹ attempting to give a simple answer might sound far-fetched. However, a simple, straightforward and well-justified answer is, in fact, possible.

It is my conviction that *everything* is translatable, otherwise there would be no communication between different languages. This actually means that, like any other text, the Qur'an is translatable. What we must bear in mind though is that "the whole enterprise of translation requires a recognition that black can never be white, male never be female, French can never be English, and the culture of ancient Palestine can never be that of modern Europe or North America".⁴⁷⁰ One must admit the inevitability of translation **LOSS** in any text. Perfect translatability, like absolute synonymy, is an illusion; and therefore, perfect translatability of the Qur'an is no more than a myth and its possibility "would require (only) the confidence of ignorance to claim".⁴⁷¹ The confirmation of this is reflected, perhaps indirectly, in the fact that many translations have the Arabic text side by side with the translation, which is a practice that should be encouraged.

If we actually consider the number of translations of the Qur'an in existence, we realise that:

- (1) the Qur'an is translatable; otherwise what do we call such translations?
- (2) perfect translatability is impossible; otherwise, that number of translations in the same language (English, for example) would not have existed.

As a matter of fact, the Arabic text still carries more meanings and subtle references to justify many more translations than those

we already have. This is actually a clear evidence to the veracity of the Prophetic saying that the wonders of the Qur'an never ends: “ لا

تَنْقُضِي عَجَائِبَهُ”⁴⁷² In Colin Turner's words:

“When one considers the complexities involved in translating a work such as the Quran, one often wonders whether it might not be easier for the whole English-speaking world to learn Arabic in order to read the Quran than for one translator to bring the Quran to the whole of the English-speaking world. As far-fetched as this option might sound, it is the one favoured by most Muslim scholars, whose opinion it is that the Quran is only the Quran if it is in Arabic and that however much it is translated, and into however many languages, the product which emerges on the other side can never be anything more than one man's humble - and, it goes without saying, falliable - interpretation”⁴⁷³.

Translation Analysis

In this chapter our main concern is going to be analysing the six English translations chosen for the purpose of this work with regard to the underlined words in the following Ayahs in the following order; their immediate contexts are also going to be taken into account as long as clarifying the meaning makes this necessary.

It must also be noted though that this chapter, as a whole, should be read in conjunction with Chapter Two where the terms that this work deals with are discussed in much more detail

Q55:7-9

{وَالسَّمَاءَ رَفَعَهَا وَوَضَعَ الْمِيزَانَ}

أَلَّا تَطْغَوْا فِي الْمِيزَانِ

{وَأَقِيمُوا الْوَزْنَ بِالْقِسْطِ وَلَا تُخْسِرُوا الْمِيزَانَ}

Q42:17

{اللَّهُ الَّذِي أَنْزَلَ الْكِتَابَ بِالْحَقِّ وَالْمِيزَانَ}

Q57:25

{وَأَنْزَلْنَا مَعَهُمُ الْكِتَابَ وَالْمِيزَانَ لِيَقُومَ النَّاسُ بِالْقِسْطِ}

Q6:152

{وَأَوْفُوا الْكَيْلَ وَالْمِيزَانَ بِالْقِسْطِ}

Q7:85

{ فَأَوْفُوا الْكَيْلَ وَالْمِيزَانَ وَلَا تَبْخَسُوا النَّاسَ أَشْيَاءَهُمْ }

Q11:84

{ وَلَا تَنْقُصُوا الْمِكْيَالَ وَالْمِيزَانَ إِنِّي أُرَآكُمْ بِخَيْرٍ }

Q11:85

{ وَيَا قَوْمِ أَوْفُوا الْمِكْيَالَ وَالْمِيزَانَ بِالْقِسْطِ وَلَا تَبْخَسُوا النَّاسَ أَشْيَاءَهُمْ }

Q17:35

{ وَأَوْفُوا الْكَيْلَ إِذَا كِلْتُمْ وَزَنُوا بِالْقِسْطِ الْمُسْتَقِيمِ }

Q26:181-3

{ أَوْفُوا الْكَيْلَ وَلَا تَكُونُوا مِنَ الْمُخْسِرِينَ * وَزِنُوا بِالْقِسْطِ الْمُسْتَقِيمِ * }

{ وَلَا تَبْخَسُوا النَّاسَ أَشْيَاءَهُمْ }

Q83:3

{ وَيُنَالُ لِلْمُطَفِّفِينَ * الَّذِينَ إِذَا أَكْتَالُوا عَلَى النَّاسِ يَسْتَوْفُونَ * }

{ وَإِذَا كَالُوهُمْ أَوْ وَزَنُوهُمْ يُخْسِرُونَ }

Q21:47

& Q31:16

{ مِثْقَالَ حَبَّةٍ مِنْ خَرْدَلٍ }

Q4:40, Q10:61,

Q34:3&22, & Q99:7&8

{ مِثْقَالَ ذَرَّةٍ }

Q15:19

{ وَأَنْبَتْنَا فِيهَا مِنْ كُلِّ شَيْءٍ مَوْزُونٍ }

Q12:59

{ أَلَا تَرَوْنَ أَنِّي أَوْفَى الْكَيْلِ }

Q12:60

{ فَلَا كَيْلَ لَكُمْ عِنْدِي }

Q12:63

{ مُنَعٍ مِنَّا الْكَيْلِ }

Q12:63

{ فَأَرْسِلْ مَعَنَا آخَانًا نَكَتَلُ }

Q12:65

{ وَنُرَدِّدْ كَيْلَ بَعِيرٍ }

Q12:65

{ذَلِكَ كَيْلٌ يَسِيرٌ}

Q12:88

{فَأَوْفِ لَنَا الْكَيْلَ}

Q21:47

{وَنَضَعُ الْمَوَازِينَ الْقِسْطَ لِيَوْمِ الْقِيَامَةِ}

Q7:8-9

{وَالْوَزْنَ يَوْمَئِذٍ الْحَقُّ فَمَنْ ثَقُلَتْ مَوَازِينُهُ فَأُولَئِكَ هُمُ الْمُفْلِحُونَ *}

{وَمَنْ خَفَّتْ مَوَازِينُهُ فَأُولَئِكَ الَّذِينَ خَسِرُوا أَنفُسَهُمْ}

Q7:8, Q23:102

& Q101:6

{مَنْ ثَقُلَتْ مَوَازِينُهُ}

Q7:9, Q23:103

& Q101:8

{مَنْ خَفَّتْ مَوَازِينُهُ}

Q18:105

{أُولَئِكَ الَّذِينَ كَفَرُوا بِآيَاتِ رَبِّهِمْ وَلِقَائِهِ فَحَبِطَتْ أَعْمَالُهُمْ فَلَا نُقِيمُ لَهُمْ يَوْمَ الْقِيَامَةِ وَزْنًا}

Q55:7

{وَالسَّمَاءَ رَفَعَهَا وَوَضَعَ الْمِيزَانَ}

- Yusuf Ali And the Firmament has He
Raised high, and He has set up
The Balance (of Justice),*
- * The “balance of justice” in this verse is connected with
“the balance” in the next two verses, that men may act justly
to each other and observe due balance in all their actions,
following the golden mean and not transgressing due
bounds in anything. But the Balance is also connected
figuratively with the heavens above in three symbols: (1)
Justice is a heavenly virtue; (2) the heavens themselves are
sustained by mathematical balance; and (3) the constellation
Libra (the Balance) is entered by the sun at the middle of
the zodiacal year.
- Pickthall And the sky He hath uplifted; and He hath set the
measure,
- Arberry and heaven -He raised it up, and set the Balance.
- Khan&Helali And the heaven He has raised high, and He has
set up the Balance.
- Khatib And the Heaven He lifted it up and set the
measure, *
- * The word measure here does not mean the
method of measuring things, but rather the precision,
perfectness and the exact measure of everything, the
truth or justice.
- Asad And the skies has He raised high, and has
devised [for all things] a measure, *

* The noun *mīzān*, usually denoting a
“balance”, has here the more general connotation

of “measure” or “measuring” by any means whatsoever (Zamakhshari), in both the concrete and abstract senses of the word. (Cf. also the parabolic use of the term *mīzān* in 42:17 and 57:25.)

With the exception of **Asad**'s translation, all the above translations provide “set” and “set up” as equivalents to the Arabic verb *wada'a* {وَضَعَ}. It is, however, clear that one of the main features of the verb 'وَضَعَ' is related to direction. Q55:7 contrasts the two verbs *rafa'a* 'رَفَعَ' and *wada'a* {وَضَعَ} one with the other with reference to direction. The former verb *rafa'a* 'رَفَعَ' refers to the heaven being raised “high”, while the latter verb *wada'a* {وَضَعَ} indicates that the *mīzān* has been placed ‘low’. This way of contrasting the two verbs adds life and unity to the picture the Ayah draws and makes its elements outstanding. There is more than one dimension in this picture. The brain is also activated to draw a comparison between the positions of the things the Ayah refers to and how they are set to fit in the picture.

Such an important feature of position, with regard to direction, is lacking completely in “set” and “set up”.

There are also many other features that are not present in the translation as well, such as the fact that 'رَفَعَ' and 'وَضَعَ' are tri-literal verbs sharing a great deal of musicality because they have the same pattern 'وَزْن': they both have the same vowel sounds following the consonant sounds. Also, both verbs end with the same 'ع' sound. A corresponding form of assonance is obviously difficult, if not impossible, to achieve in the translation due to the differences between the SL and TL.

Asad's translation, on the other hand, uses the word “devised” for {وَضَعَ}, which, as I see it, draws an unacceptable picture of a person thinking out a scheme or a plan, a picture that requires the exertion of some ‘effort’ to ‘devise’, and the consideration of several or different options or alternatives in case one plan falls

through. This is very unlike what the Qur'an states about Allah, the Creator. In the above Ayah, Allah {وَضَعَ الْمِيزَانَ}: an emphatic statement of fact. In Q37:82 Allah states {إِنَّمَا أَمْرُهُ إِذَا أَرَادَ شَيْئًا أَنْ يَقُولَ لَهُ كُنْ فَيَكُونُ}, that is, according to **Khan&Helali**, “Verily, His command, when He intends a thing, is only that He says to it, “Be!” -and it is!”, and in Q50:38 we read:

{وَلَقَدْ خَلَقْنَا السَّمَاوَاتِ وَالْأَرْضَ وَمَا بَيْنَهُمَا فِي سِتَّةِ أَيَّامٍ وَمَا مَسَّنَا مِنْ لُغُوبٍ}, that is, according to **Yusuf Ali**, “We created the heavens and the earth and all between them in Six Days, nor did any sense of weariness touch Us”.

It is in this sense that the word “devised” cannot be seen anywhere near a suitable rendering for {وَضَعَ}. Also, ‘devise’ has sometimes a negative connotation. However, ‘devise’, I believe, has one advantage, which is its reference to the fact that {وَضَعَ} involves many details in the ‘setting up’ of the Balance and many elements put together, and not just the mere placing ‘down’ of {الْمِيزَانَ}, i.e., the directional reference.

As for {الْمِيزَانَ}, each translation has a different way of treating it. While **Arberry** and **Khan&Helali** are content with “the Balance” as an equivalent, with no explanation provided, or any added information between brackets or even in a footnote (for, at least, the capital **B**), the rest of the translations have a bit more to say.

Yusuf Ali does not find “the Balance” on its own, a sufficient translation for {الْمِيزَانَ}. His translation suggests that although he accepts the fact that that *mīzān* is ‘special’, as he uses a capital **B** for it, a reference to what it is meant to achieve needs to be added. Therefore, although “the Balance” on its own is understood to symbolise ‘Justice’, **Yusuf Ali** adds “(of Justice)”, that is, he uses a capital ‘**J**’ for ‘Justice’ and parentheses as well. If **Yusuf Ali** is justified in doing this, then the translations of **Arberry** and **Khan&Helali** are lacking this dimension. However, if he is not justified, then he has definitely added to the original text words that, in my view, have restricted the meaning of the word *mīzān* to

probably one function. This consequently does away with the other physical and metaphorical associations and references of {المِيزَانُ}. (See the meanings of ‘المِيزَانُ’ in Chapter Two.)

Pickthall, Khatib and **Asad** favour “measure” as a translation of {المِيزَانُ}. It is very clear therefore how they have distanced their translations from the original. Applying a back-translation test to this Ayah will, most certainly, not lead back to ‘المِيزَانُ’; and although the same situation may sometimes obtain for any other word, it is more crucial in this context because “measure” is most unlikely to be an equivalent of {المِيزَانُ}.

The above translators must have considered ‘the **B/b**alance’ before deciding on “measure”. However, as most of them give no explanation as to this problem, I am not in a position to argue for them.⁴⁷⁴ Yet, it seems that they might have wanted to say that {المِيزَانُ} in this context is no more than a metaphor and not meant to be taken literally, nor even related to balancing physical things. This is where, I believe, their understanding of the metaphor has distanced them from the fact that there must be a relationship between what the word that is used as a metaphor means, perhaps literally, and what it refers to in a metaphorical way.

If the balance is used to ‘balance’ things or ‘weigh’ one thing against another in order to achieve a certain objective, this feature is missing in the word “measure”.

Khatib tries to shed some light on his choice of “measure” by adding in a footnote what he thinks clarifies the situation. However, his explanation makes his choice of “measure” more difficult to appreciate as he uses the word “**b**alance”, with a small **b**, as a translation of {المِيزَانُ} in the following Ayah (Q55:8) showing inconsistency. One is tempted to think, had **Khatib** used ‘the balance’ in his translation instead of “the measure”, and used his footnote to explain that ‘the balance’ has the other meanings he stated in the footnote, this would have served his purpose better.

Asad justifies his choice in a footnote quoting Al-Zamakhshari. However, Al-Zamakhshari says, with reference to {المِيزَانُ}: “He (Allah) meant everything that is used for weighing things and determining their measures”.⁴⁷⁵ Then, he gives examples of such instruments that are used for measuring and weighing physical substances.⁴⁷⁶ In the same quotation, he also says: “meaning, He (Allah) has created it (the balance) and placed it on the earth”.⁴⁷⁷ It is, therefore, clear that **Asad** uses just part of the quotation which he thinks justifies his choice of words.

Another important point to consider in **Asad**’s translation is that the translation ignores the fact that *mīzān* is preceded by the definite “ال” (*al*), meaning ‘the’ and uses instead the indefinite article “a”. Therefore, while the Arabic text emphasises the fact that the reference is made to a specific thing, the translation fails to cater for this.

Also, “devised for all things a measure” fails on another level: if the objective of {المِيزَانُ} (translated: measure) is to balance things, create balance or achieve balance, this meaning is only achieved in the Arabic word only by virtue of the use of the word *mīzān*, and also as a result of the fact that the *mīzān* is the instrument whose main objective is balancing. However, it would even be possible to interpret **Asad**’s translation as meaning that ‘there are different measures for different things’, which, as an idea, is basically correct. Nonetheless, we find that {المِيزَانُ} is much more subtle than this because the Arabic text refers to a more fundamental issue that is: there is a ‘**master rule**’ for all those ‘measures’ called {المِيزَانُ}. Thus, while the Arabic word is absolutely precise, there is very significant loss in the translation.

Q55:8

{أَلَا تَطْعَمُونَ فِي الْمِيزَانِ}

Yusuf Ali	In order that ye may Not transgress (due) balance.
Pickthall	That ye exceed not the measure,
Arberry	(Transgress not in the Balance,
Khan&Helali	In order that you may not transgress (due) balance.
Khatib	that you should not transgress in the balance,
Asad	so that you [too, O men,] might never transgress the measure [of what is right]:

{وَضَعَ الْمِيزَانَ} is followed by Q55:8 {أَلَا تَطْعَمُونَ فِي الْمِيزَانِ} which is a direct address to mankind. As man lives on the earth and not in heaven, the reference has to be made to something which he knows, otherwise clumsiness in reference would result. This is very clear in the Arabic text because of the use of (1) the verb *wada'a* {وَضَعَ}, and (2) the word *mīzān* {الْمِيزَانَ} for the second time. However, in the translations, with the use of the verbs “set”, “set up” and “devise”, the directional reference is lacking, and to a degree this affects the meaning. In other words, one may ask: if the Creator has set ‘the B/balance’ of ‘the heaven’ when He raised it up, how can man transgress that B/balance? That B/balance is not on earth to be transgressed or for any man to try to manipulate.

The Ayah does not place such a restriction on the meaning. The B/balance that the Ayah refers to is not restricted to the balance of ‘(the) heaven’ only. This is made clear by the use of both the

verb *wada'a* 'وضع', and *al* 'ال', the definite article meaning 'the', in *al-mīzān* {الميزان} 'the Balance' which makes the reference to something definite and not indefinite.

But perhaps because of this, the above translations are forced to understand or rather interpret '*an lā*' 'أَنْ لَا', abbreviated *allā* {ألا}, as a justification of the previous Ayah meaning 'so that', 'in order that' or even just 'that'. This method actually restricts the meaning and function of '*an*' 'أَنْ' to one thing only, unlike Al-Qurtūbi's explanation⁴⁷⁸ which has been quoted under *t-gh-w* 'طغى'.

Now, let us consider the situation in the light of the following possibilities:

(1) '*an*' 'أَنْ' means '*ay*' 'أَي' 'meaning': in spite of the fact that this could be an acceptable explanation supported by many Arabic examples, a problem arises when trying to make sense out of the Ayah with the use of the translation of '*ay*', that is, 'meaning'. The translation will then perhaps read: '... and set the Balance, *meaning* transgress not in the Balance'. The impression that is given accordingly is that the addressee is told: '[I] have set the Balance, and if you do not understand what this [My action] means, it means 'do not transgress in the Balance''. Here one can see that the conclusion is not based on the premises. It is clear that something is missing. This can actually be avoided if we try to understand {ألا} (*allā*) slightly differently, as will be explained shortly. Also even, if '*an*' means '*ay*', and '*ay*' makes sense if used as a replacement, this does not mean that its translation 'meaning' will have the same effect.

(2) '*allā*' 'ألا' means '*li-* *allā*' 'لِيَأْتِي' 'in order not': here we have a similar situation to the above as the meaning will, therefore, be: '... and set the Balance in order that [so that] you do not transgress in it'. With a translation like this, the result is ridiculous because first there are many laws stated by Allah that Man breaks, secondly the following question arises: if Allah has set up the Balance so that humans do not transgress in it, does not this mean

that this is a Divine Statement that we, humans, cannot actually transgress in it? Also, would not this mean that if Allah had not created the Balance, we might have still transgressed in it bearing in mind that the Balance did/does not exist? The whole issue therefore would be quite ambiguous and hard to comprehend: how can one transgress in something which it is beyond one to transgress in? How can one transgress in something which does not exist, and before its existence it is referred to as existing and possibly being transgressed in as well?

It is because of these above two arguments that (a) the meaning of words in certain ways can easily prove problematic, (b) {ألا} (*‘allā*) should not be understood as either an explanation or justification of what precedes it. It should instead be understood as a *direct* command from the Creator of the Balance not to commit any act of transgression in it.

If we now turn to the translations we have, we find that **Pickthall**'s falls under the second category described above. He uses the word “that” which in this context is not in the least different in meaning from ‘so that’ or ‘in order that’, to cater for the Arabic ‘أَنَّ’ (*‘an*). However, as he uses the word “measure” as the translation for {الميزان} again here, the meaning of “measure” seems to be something like ‘limit/s’; in other words: Allah has set the limits so that one does not exceed those limits. The problem here is that by virtue of what the words in the translation mean, the limits (“the measure”) cannot be exceeded, while in actuality the Ayah is stating that such ‘limits’ *can* be exceeded (by virtue of the fact that man has freedom of choice); yet, when such a thing happens, it is a sin and punishable by Allah. Therefore, one is actually shown the limits and what is beyond them as well.

The use of the word “measure” here excludes completely the outcome of exceeding the limits which is the disturbance of *the balance*, the word which is most accurately used in the Ayah in its actual wording (assuming that ‘the Balance’ is synonymous with ‘الميزان’).

The reason for using ‘exceeding the limit’ is that this is what *taghā* ‘طَغَى’ basically means. Bearing this in mind, in the translation part of the meaning, therefore, is not catered for. Perhaps, part of the problem is that ‘exceed’ is a verb that requires an object while ‘طَغَى’ does not; and although in the translation the object is “the measure”, “the measure” is made as ‘a limit’, while the Ayah does not even allow the least act of *tughyān* ‘طُغْيَانٌ’ within the whole process even before reaching those limits. This reference is completely absent in the translation though made clear in the Arabic with the use of ‘حَرْفُ الْجَزْرِ’ the preposition ‘فِي’ (*fī*). It is therefore, clear that the Arabic Ayah has a much wider meaning unlike the translation which also raises more questions than it perhaps should.

With the exception of **Arberry**’s, all the translations say almost exactly the same thing with regard to {أَلَا} (*‘allā*). The negative reference is, of course, preserved, and “in order that”, “so that” and “that” are used.

The only translation which satisfies my preferred understanding is that of **Arberry**, as he does not consider ‘أَنَّ’ (*‘an*) as an explanation or justification for {وَضَعَ الْمِيزَانَ} . It is only here, as in the Arabic that **A** leads to **B**. The one unusual thing in **Arberry**’s translation though, is that he puts Q55:7-8 between parentheses. He probably considers them ‘a side comment’ made by Allah on the matter. Also, as he does not use any footnotes at all, the reader might have the impression that what is between the parentheses is an addition made by the translator and not part of the original wording. However, strangely enough, this is probably the only time where **Arberry** has used parentheses and any additions he makes by way of clarifying the meaning are incorporated in the text and not distinguished by any means.

Both **Arberry** and **Khatib** cater for the Arabic {فِي} (*fī*); **Khatib**’s translation, however, is quite awkward and inconsistent. After using the word “measure” for {الْمِيزَانَ} in Q55:7, he changes this in Q55:8 introducing the word “balance”, which makes the reader wonder how this word came about. The link between the two

Ayahs is thus somewhat broken as a result of one Ayah referring to a particular thing and its justification referring to another. **Khatib** does not even explain how “the balance” came about in a footnote, although he made use of one in the previous Ayah. He seems here to forget that the reader of the translation might not be able to read the Arabic and realise that the same word is repeated in the Ayahs though translated differently for some unstated reasons.

As for “transgress”, it is perhaps a good rendering of {تَطَعَّرَا}. However, using “transgress” on its own with “balance” or “measure” as an object makes the translation fall short of the exact meaning. As ‘transgress’ means ‘to go beyond a limit or bound’, the implication is that one should go beyond the limits of the balance (before being considered a transgressor), that is, he should keep *within* the limits, on this side of the line, because crossing to the other side is ‘transgression’. The problem with this is that the Ayah makes use of the preposition {فِي} (Lit., ‘in’) which indicates that it is also an act of transgression to offend *within* the limits, on this side of the line as well. The line is ‘the balance’; falling short or going beyond is *tughyān* ‘طُغْيَانٌ’. This is referred to in Islam as ‘التَّعَسُّفُ فِي’ ‘اِسْتِخْدَامِ الْحَقِّ’, that is, ‘misuse of one’s right’. The story of the man who sold his house except for a tree which was in the house, in the time of the Prophet Muhammad (ﷺ) is too well known to be narrated here, and is a good example.

In all the translations above, if {فِي} is not translated, then a fundamental item is missing, and when catered for by ‘in’, ‘transgress in’ restricts the meaning to ‘*within*’, and does away with *going beyond*. This actually shows: (1) the limitation of the translation in catering for the exact meaning; (2) if ‘transgress’ is an adequate translation for {تَطَعَّرَا}, and “in” for {فِي}, “transgress in” is not necessarily the perfect fit, though, it is perhaps, less problematic.

In Q55:7 **Yusuf Ali** uses “Balance” with a capital **B**, and states that that Balance is “(of Justice)”. Yet, in Q55:8, he uses “balance” with a small **b**; and although **Khan&Helali** do not

indicate in their translation to Q55:7 that it is “the Balance” (of Justice), it is clear that they are following in **Yusuf Ali**’s footsteps, as they not only change to “balance” with a small **b** in Q55:8, but also borrow “(due) balance” from him.

What we actually have here is either a change in the understanding of the reference of {الميزان}, or perhaps the translators felt that the special reference is no longer needed as the reader would be able to relate “the Balance” of Q55:7 to “the balance” of Q55:8. However, it seems that the translators were aiming at achieving both things. First, they effected a change of reference; the Balance was with Allah, then passed to Man to keep, and secondly, the reader will have no difficulty relating the two occurrences because, to say the least, they sound the same (the ear cannot tell whether the ‘balance’ is with a **B** or a **b**), and share exactly the same central or basic meaning.

Yusuf Ali and **Khan&Helali** put “(due)” before the word “balance”, which is an obvious addition; they were perhaps hoping that it would clarify the meaning. Yet, is there such a thing as ‘a due balance’ and ‘not so due a balance’? one is proper and another improper in the word of God given the above context?

The word {الميزان} in the Ayah is in no need of such clarification, by virtue of the fact that {الميزان} of Q55:7 is ‘set, set up, made, or created’ by Allah in the most perfect manner, and is the same *Mīzān* referred to in the following Ayahs. It does not change and cannot be changed. And if we accept the metaphorical reference of ‘الميزان’, then we may say that no one can change the Law of Allah without his action being considered a *kabīrah* ‘كبيرة’, great sin.

All the translations use the pronoun “you” or the corresponding archaic plural form “ye” as a rendering for the pronoun used in {تَطْعَمُوا} with the exception of **Asad**⁴⁷⁹ who, for some reason, decides that “you” only is not enough, and preferred to spell it out between square brackets, hence “you [too, O men,]” which

makes one also wonder about the use of the added “too”. However, “men” may be an attempt to indicate that {تَطَعُوا} is plural.

Also, {الميزان} in his translation becomes “the measure [of what is right]”, preferring therefore, the metaphorical interpretation of ‘الميزان’, unlike his statement in the footnote related to Q55:7 with regard to {الميزان} “in both the concrete and abstract senses of the word”. As is clear, the concrete sense has no place here, a point which is also emphasised in and by his translation of Q55:9.

Finally, it is worth noting that with the exception of **Arberry** and **Pickthall** we find that **Yusuf Ali** and **Khan&Helali** use “may not”, **Khatib** “should not”, and **Asad** “might never” before the verb “transgress”. It is clear that the Ayah does not make use of similar devices, and that the force of the command springs from (1) the Speaker Himself, and (2) His word {تَطَعُوا} being powerful enough both meaning-wise and sound-wise, and rich with its imagery that it makes the picture vivid as all forms of *tughyān* ‘طُعْيَان’ are utterly condemnable.

Q55:9

{ وَأَقِيمُوا الْوَزْنَ بِالْقِسْطِ وَلَا تُخْسِرُوا الْمِيزَانَ }

Yusuf Ali So establish weight with justice,*
 And fall not short
 In the balance.

* To be taken both literally and figuratively. A man should be honest and straight in every daily matter, such as weighing out things which he is selling: and he should be straight, just and honest, in all the highest dealings, not only with other people, but with himself and in his obedience to Allah's Law. Not many do either the one or the other when they have an opportunity of deceit. Justice is the central virtue, and the avoidance of all excess and defect in conduct keeps the human world balanced just as the heavenly world is kept balanced by mathematical order

Pickthall But observe the measure strictly, nor fall short thereof.

Arberry and weigh with justice, and skimp not in the Balance.)

Khan&Helali And observe the weight with equity and do not make the balance deficient.

Khatib but establish the weight with equity, and do not skimp the balance.

Asad Weigh, therefore, [your deeds] with equity, and cut not the measure short!

Q55:9 starts with the connective ‘حَرْفِ الْعَطْفِ’ *wāw* (و). This *wāw* joins the command {أَلَا تَتَعَوَّذُونَ فِي الْمِيزَانِ} with {أَقِيمُوا الْوَزْنَ بِالْقِسْطِ}, then with {لَا تُخْسِرُوا الْمِيزَانَ}. In other words, we have in Q55:8-9 three commands related to one another in the sense that they cover different aspects of the issue of ‘weighing’. The *wāw* differs greatly in meaning from **Yusuf Ali**’s “so”, and **Pickthall**’s and **Khatib**’s “but”. **Asad**, on the other hand, chooses not to stick to the letter of the Arabic and resorts to a different rendering that makes Q55:9 a result of Q55:8. He adds “therefore”, but as he does not enclose it in brackets, he considers its existence legitimate and represented in the Arabic. **Arberry** and **Khan&Helali** go for the straightforward, less problematic and easy option of “and”.

It has been stated under *w-z-n* ‘وَزَنَ’ that {أَقِيمُوا الْوَزْنَ} is meant to refer to the keeping and continuation of keeping of *al-wazn* {الْوَزْنَ} in a proper state at all times. The matter does not actually end with ‘the mere establishment of weight, with justice’, as the translations suggest. As a rule, it is the keeping of the rule, the abiding by it and the continuous application of it in the strictest and most proper of manners that is referred to in the Ayah.⁴⁸⁰ Perhaps, this can be made clearer when we consider the meaning of the verb ‘*aqāma*’ ‘أَقَامَ’ in Q18:77 that reads {فَوَجَدَا فِيهَا جِدَارًا يُرِيدُ أَنْ يَنْقَضَ فَأَقَامَهُ}, that is, “They found there a wall about to collapse [fall, tumble down] and so he set it up straight”.⁴⁸¹ This example shows that it is not only the mere repairing or building up of the wall that is meant, but also the doing so in the right way; in other words, the wall was set up straight in the right way which is what the word ‘*aqāma*’ ‘أَقَامَ’ means.

Accordingly, **Arberry**’s and **Asad**’s translations resorted to the easy option of “weigh” which does away with a great deal of meaning as the translations show their failure in distinguishing between {أَقِيمُوا الْوَزْنَ} and ‘وَزَنُوا’. According to the above context, when one is told to ‘weigh with justice’, this may imply that the weigher was not conducting the weighing in a just way, while {أَقِيمُوا الْوَزْنَ بِالْقِسْطِ} means that one has to be aware that it is a rule which must be kept

at all times and that breaking it at any time or in any way is not allowed and incurs punishment.

Yusuf Ali and **Khatib** use “establish”, which is to do with putting or setting up something on a firm foundation, in contrast with **Pickthall**’s and **Khan&Helali**’s “observe” which is perhaps more related to the practice, such as observing a law which implies its existence in the first place. In this case, {أَقِيمُوا} accomodates both establish (on right foundations) and observe (in the proper manner).

“Weight” is obviously a straight (direct) translation of {الْوِزْنَ}. Here we come across an interesting point: in spite of the fact that **Yusuf Ali**, **Khan&Helali** and **Khatib** use “weight”, only the first uses the word without the definite ‘the’. **Yusuf Ali**’s “establish weight” sounds more general, applying to any situation that involves weighing, which is basically what the Ayah is concerned with. The two latter translations cater for the Arabic “ال” in {الْوِزْنَ} with “the”; but as a result the phrase sounds incomplete. One is tempted to ask: establish/ observe “the weight” of what?

One is also tempted to think that perhaps this was what was going on in **Asad**’s mind as he was translating this Ayah, as he adds between square brackets “[your deeds]”. **Asad**’s “weigh [your deeds]” is a clear statement that he is sticking to the figurative side all the way. In fact, he is reading too much into the ‘metaphor’. For him, {الْمِيزَانَ} is not a balance, but a measure, and {الْوِزْنَ} is not general, but particular, not concrete but abstract. He is very unlike **Yusuf Ali** who states in a footnote that {وَأَقِيمُوا الْوِزْنَ بِالْقِسْطِ} is to be taken both literally and figuratively; then he explains both references.

Asad’s “weigh [your deeds]” does, undoubtedly, restrict the meaning of the Ayah as he directs the reader’s mind towards metaphorical weighing. He again fails to show the balance between his statement in his footnote for Q55:7 and his actual translation.

Pickthall’s translation of {الْوِزْنَ}, that is “measure”, is perhaps the most problematic. “Measure” preserves the flow of his

translation in relation to what comes before and after {وَأَقِيمُوا الْوَزْنَ}; yet, it seems that he went for the easy option of ignoring the fact that the Source Text utilizes two distinct words, not one. It is extremely doubtful that any person, even with the least degree of knowledge of Arabic would fail to see the difference between ‘المِيزَانُ’ and ‘الْوَزْنُ’. It is also extremely unlikely that **Pickthall** did. However, the problem seems to be caused by the choice of the word “measure” in the first place. **Khatib** had to change his “measure” to “balance”; **Asad** had to ignore {وَأَقِيمُوا الْوَزْنَ}, (as he went for what may be rendered as ‘زُنُوا’), and had to stick to an abstract sense; and then **Pickthall**, here, renders {الْوَزْنَ} and {المِيزَانُ} in exactly the same way, and ends up replacing {المِيزَانُ} in {وَلَا تُخْسِرُوا المِيزَانَ} by an adverb, (“thereof”). **Khatib**, **Asad**, and **Pickthall**, all use the same word, “measure”.

As the rules of {الْوَزْنَ} have to be established and observed, the main element which should be predominant all the time is {بِالْقِسْطِ}. The precision of the word {بِالْقِسْطِ} is rather striking when compared to the words used in the translation. {بِالْقِسْطِ} tells one exactly what should be achieved and how to do it.

As stated before under ‘q-s-t قَسَطَ’, the word *qist* ‘القِسْطُ’ refers to any one getting his rightful ‘share’, no more no less. It is different from the word ‘*adl*’ ‘الْعَدْلُ’ as also explained before. It is this simple, clear, and above all, concrete statement of ‘share’ that distinguishes {بِالْقِسْطِ} from “with justice/equity” which the above translations, except for **Pickthall**’s, employ.

Justice and equity are related to fairness, and right judgement and conduct etc., and therefore, share a great deal of meaning with {بِالْقِسْطِ}. Yet, perhaps, justice and equity are a bit more abstract, and as a result, lack one of the main components (associations) of ‘القِسْطُ’ as shown in the above Ayah.

Pickthall's "strictly" is less explanatory, or rather less clear, than {يَالْقَسِطِ}, yet stronger and more meaningful than "with justice/equity". I believe it would have been more suitable had **Pickthall** used 'transgress' in the previous Ayah instead of the much softer "exceed" for {تَطَعُوا}, to go with "strictly". It is also worth mentioning here that **Yusuf Ali**'s "with justice" in Q55:9 sounds like an echo of his added "(of Justice)" in Q55:7.

The second command in Q55:9 is {وَلَا تُخْسِرُوا الْمِيزَانَ}. Most translators seem to accept the fact that the *wāw* {...و} here just joins the two commands together, hence, their rendering "and". **Pickthall**, on the other hand, joins the two negative commands of Q55:8 and Q55:9 together with the negative connective "nor".

As is clear from the Arabic, the 'ikhsār 'الإخسار' falls upon *al-mīzān* {الْمِيزَانَ}; in other words, {وَلَا تُخْسِرُوا الْمِيزَانَ} describes the state of *al-mīzān*, i.e. being *khāsir* 'خاسر' as a result of the people's act. **Yusuf Ali**'s "fall not short", and **Pickthall**'s "nor fall short" only cover the imperative aspect, and refer directly to the addressees themselves falling short, and not to the *mīzān*. Their reference to {الْمِيزَانَ} is indirect, unlike the Arabic. Their *mīzān* shows the result of the people falling short, while {وَلَا تُخْسِرُوا الْمِيزَانَ} covers another much wider aspect: even if the *mīzān* does not show that it might have been tampered with and still gives what looks like a true reading, the 'ikhsār still applies and is still forbidden.

Yusuf Ali's "in the balance" is dictated by the English structure. "In" is used in the translation although its common Arabic equivalent *fī* 'فِي' is not part of the Ayah {وَلَا تُخْسِرُوا الْمِيزَانَ}. Although structurally correct and acceptable in English, the use of "in" in the translation of this Ayah raises an interesting point. When translating {أَلَا تَطَعُوا فِي الْمِيزَانَ}, **Yusuf Ali**'s choice of words and structure led to the disappearance (absence) of {فِي} from the translation. So, *fī* {فِي} that he absents from Q55:8, he presents in Q55:9, while it should have been the other way round had he wanted to reflect the Arabic.

Pickthall's translation transfers the reference from one thing to another. His "thereof" refers to "the measure" in the same Ayah, which is a translation of {الْوَزْنَ}. The Ayah in its original wording refers to {المِيزَانَ} and not to {الْوَزْنَ}. The matter is still not made any easier to understand when considering that {المِيزَانَ} of Q55:7-8 is rendered "the measure". Q55:9's {وَلَا تُخْسِرُوا الْمِيزَانَ} mentions the instrument used for weighing by name, unlike the translation which ignores this fact, then it moves the reference to somewhere else. As a result, the reader is left in the dark as to where the emphasis of the original text is placed.

Arberry's "skimp" refers to 'giving less than *enough*', which is not exactly what is meant by {وَلَا تُخْسِرُوا الْمِيزَانَ}; it is the act that involves and leads to the giving of less than is *rightfully due* or *should* that is meant. His "in the Balance" only differs from **Yusuf Ali**'s in one aspect, namely the use of the capital **B** in the word "**B**alance". **Arberry** is actually more consistent than all the other translators in his use of this word.

Khatib's "skimp" is rather unusual, as the act of skimping when weighing normally happens to the thing weighed, while "the balance" in his translation is the direct object of "skimp". His translation, I believe, makes it sound as if part of "the balance", as an instrument, is taken away, which is even more literal than the Arabic itself allows.

Khan&Helali have succeeded in capturing that point related to the state of {المِيزَانَ} being *khāsir*. Their "do not make the balance deficient" is a clever way of referring to the fact that any deficiency suffered by "the balance" will be reflected in the injustice done to the people and their rightful dues.

Asad's "cut not the measure short" is similar to the other translations as it refers to the thing measured. Also, "cut short" is burdened with a metaphorical meaning which it might be too weak to carry. The result is a very remote resemblance to the Arabic. Also, **Asad**'s "measure" is that "[of what is right]" and of "[your

deeds]”. As stated above, **Asad** rather sees the metaphor than the concrete reference or anything else in general.

Conclusion

The Ayahs above do not show any signs indicating that their meaning **must** or **should** be restricted to either the physical act of weighing material things or the metaphorical act of balancing things intellectually. What they actually show is an adherence to words of concrete (particular) references from which the metaphor might be derived. The Ayahs in this particular sense are unique in their wording as one does not have to twist the words to get to the metaphorical meaning, as is clear in the additions shown above. The use of the word {المِيزَان} is both central and fundamental as all the other words revolve around it.

With the use of the word ‘B/balance’ perhaps a similar effect may be achieved, while ‘measure’, although it can be justified sometimes, is more distant, at least with regard to the other relations existing between {المِيزَان} and the rest of the words in Q55:7-9.

It is also worth mentioning that in these Ayahs, the Qur’an forbids both transgression {أَلَّا تَطَّعُوا فِي الْمِيزَانِ}, and falling short {وَلَا تُخْسِرُوا} {وَأَقِيمُوا} and enjoins something *in between* that is fair and proper {وَأَقِيمُوا} {وَأَقِيمُوا} *in between* the two Ayahs {أَلَّا تَطَّعُوا فِي الْمِيزَانِ} and {وَلَا} {وَلَا} {وَلَا} {وَلَا}; what can be more balanced than this, one wonders.

Q42:17

{اللَّهُ الَّذِي أَنْزَلَ الْكِتَابَ بِالْحَقِّ وَالْمِيزَانَ ...}

- Yusuf Ali It is Allah who has
Sent down the Book in truth,
And the Balance *
(By which to weigh conduct).
- * Revelation is like a balance, an instrument placed by Allah in our hands, by which we can weigh all moral issues, all questions of right and wrong in conduct. We must do so constantly. For the Judgment in any given case may come at any time: it may be quite near, and we must always be prepared. The Balance may also refer to the God-given faculty by which man can judge between right and wrong.
- Pickthall Allah it is who hath revealed the Scripture with truth, and the Balance.
- Arberry God it is who has sent down the Book with the truth, and also the Balance.
- Khan&Helali It is Allah who has sent down the Book (the Qur'an) in truth, and the Balance (i.e. to act justly).
- Khatib God it is who has sent down the Book with the truth, and with the Balance. *
- * That is, with which rights and obligations are in balance; or, justice.
- Asad [For] it is God [Himself] who has bestowed revelation from on high, setting forth the truth, and [thus given man] a balance

[wherewith to weigh right and wrong].*

* The above two interpolations are based on 57:25, where the idea underlying this verse has been stated clearly. The implication is that since God Himself has given man, through successive revelations, a standard whereby to discern between right and wrong, it is presumptuous and futile to argue about the nature of His Being and His ultimate judgement: hence the reference, in the second half of this and the next verse, to the Last Hour and, thus, the Day of Judgement.

In spite of the non-existence of lexical items related to physical weighing as in Q55:7-9 other than {المِيزَانُ}, several scholars have referred to {المِيزَانُ} in this Ayah as the actual weighing instrument that was initially given to the Prophet Noah , as discussed in detail under *mīzān* 'مِيزَان' in Chapter Two.

We have also argued before that 'anzala 'أَنْزَلَ' is perhaps better understood in the sense of actual 'sending down'. This view is supported by (1) the central (basic) meaning of {أَنْزَلَ}, (2) the fact that {المِيزَانُ} is joined to {الْكِتَابُ} with regard to its being sent down, and (3) the Ulema's reference to the Prophet Noah's *mīzān*. However, it seems to me that the most important reason is: as Allah is the source of all things, all things given to man may be referred to as being 'sent down'. The Creator is Superior to and Greater than the created; therefore, {أَنْزَلَ} is the most appropriate word in referring to Allah's givings.

Yusuf Ali's translation satisfies the above understanding of the 'sending down' of "the Balance". Yet, his "Balance" suggests more than just a simple weighing instrument. He emphasises this in the body of the translation in the form of adding "(by which to weigh conduct)", and in a footnote as well. He accepts, according to

his own explanation in the footnote, that “the Balance” is “an instrument placed by Allah in our hands” -which is a reminder of Noah’s story- but what it weighs are not material things, rather “all moral issues, all questions of right and wrong”, “in conduct”. It is clear, therefore, that he actually, prefers the figurative meaning.

Pickthall’s translation is more direct in its reference to the metaphorical meaning as suggested by his “reveal” for {أُنزِلَ}, and the capital **B** in “the **B**alance”.

Khan&Helali explain what is meant by “the Book” being “(the Qur’an)”, as the Ayah is an address to the Prophet Muḥammad (ﷺ). Their “Balance” is also a bit more than just a physical instrument. It is the ‘Law’ that tells people “(to act justly)”, as they state between parentheses, explaining why “the Balance” has been sent down together with “the Book”.

Arberry’s translation is along the same lines, though he adds “also” in his translation to {وَالْمِيزَانَ}. It is obvious that his reason for adding “also” after “and” to cater for {و} is his use of “with” in “sent down the Book **with** the truth” for fear that {وَالْمِيزَانَ} (with *fathah* on the *nūn* ‘ن’) might be understood as ‘وَالْمِيزَانَ’ (with *kasrah* under the *nūn* ‘ن’) which would lead to the wrong reading and therefore the wrong translation as does **Khatib**.

Khatib’s translation suffers from a grave error as he considers {وَالْمِيزَانَ} related to {بِالْحَقِّ} (“with the truth”) in describing “sent down the Book”. According to his translation, “the Book” has been sent down ‘with the truth and balance’; and although the Ayah refers to two things as being sent down, namely {الْكِتَابَ} and {الْمِيزَانَ}, **Khatib’s** translation commits the error of referring to only one thing, that is {الْكِتَابَ} “the Book”. His footnote does not even help in explaining the reason for such an apparent change to the diacritical sign; it only indicates that he, too, favours the metaphorical ‘*mīzān*’. Actually his committing of such an error makes one wonder about the capital **B** in “the **B**alance”. What use is it? And why is not the initial ‘**t**’ in “truth” capitalized as well?

Asad's translation is perhaps the longest and most complicated of all. He actually loads his translation with unjustified explanations between square brackets and in the body of the translation itself. According to **Asad**, it is *because* "God [Himself]" has given Man "revelation from on high" that He has also given him "a balance", which is, undoubtedly, not what the Ayah says. The translation seems to suggest that "the Book" and "the balance" are one and the same thing! The footnote in part of it also emphasises this, while the rest of it is not directly related to {المِيزَانُ}. Also, {المِيزَانُ} is only "a balance". His addition of "[wherewith to weigh right and wrong]" is another reference to the same abstract 'balance' which the rest of the translations refer to.

Conclusion

Accordingly it is only **Pickthall** that has left the door slightly open for the physical balance that weighs concrete things to creep through. All the translators, with the exception of **Asad** have used a capital '**B**' for "the **B**alance", which makes one wonder: had a small '**b**' been used, would not that have given more room for the true weighing instrument, while still referring subtly to the metaphor by virtue of the secondary meaning of the word 'balance'?

Reading Q42:17 in its wider context, we realise that the Ayahs refer to things placed in one side of the scales, and others on the other side. First Q42:15 shows that the Prophet Muhammad (ﷺ) is commanded to do justice among the people. The Ayah reads {وَأْمُرْتُ} {لَنَا أَعْمَالُنَا} 'we have our deeds', on the other {لَأَعْدِلَ بَيْنَكُمُ} {وَلَكُمْ أَعْمَالُكُمْ} 'and you have your deeds'; there is no contention/argument {حِجَّةٌ} between 'us' {بَيْنَنَا} and 'you' {بَيْنَكُمْ}. And in Q42:16 {وَالَّذِينَ يُجَادِلُونَ فِي اللَّهِ} 'those who dispute concerning Allah' are met with a double sentence {غَضَبٌ} 'wrath/anger' and {عَذَابٌ شَدِيدٌ} 'terrible chastisement'.

It is, therefore, clear that all **things** are weighed against one another to achieve balance.

Q57:25

{... وَأَنْزَلْنَا مَعَهُمُ الْكِتَابَ وَالْمِيزَانَ لِيَقُومَ النَّاسُ بِالْقِسْطِ ...}

- Yusuf Ali And sent down with them
The Book and the Balance*
(Of Right and Wrong), that men
May stand forth in justice;⁴⁸²
- * Three things are mentioned as gifts of Allah. In concrete terms they are the Book, the Balance, and Iron, which stand as emblems of three things which hold society together, viz., Revelation, which commands Good and forbid Evil; Justice, which gives to each person his due; and the strong arm of the Law, which maintains sanctions for evildoers. For Balance, see also 42:17.
- Pickthall and revealed with them the Scripture and the Balance, that mankind may observe right measure;
- Arberry and We sent down
with them the Book and the Balance
so that men might uphold justice.
- Khan&Helali and revealed with them the Scripture and the Balance (justice) that mankind may keep up justice.
- Khatib and We sent down with them the Book and the Balance, that man may uphold equity.
- Asad and through them* We bestowed revelation from on high, and [thus gave you] a balance [wherewith to weigh right and wrong], so that men might behave with equity;

* Lit. “ with them”.

There is obvious similarity between this Ayah and Q42:17, as they both share the ‘sending down’ of {الْكِتَابِ} ‘the Book’ and {الْمِيزَانَ} ‘the Balance’.

Yusuf Ali makes use of explanation between parentheses to indicate, this time clearly and directly, that “the Balance” of this Ayah is that “(of Right and Wrong)”; his footnote also helps in emphasising his preferred understanding.

Arberry’s and **Khatib’s** translations stick to the wording of the Ayah giving equal emphasis to both “the Book” and “the Balance”.

Pickthall’s and **Khan&Helali’s** translations are exactly the same with regard to the ‘revealing’ of “the Scripture” and “the Balance”. The only difference is **Khan&Helali’s** “(justice)” as an explanation to “the Balance”.

Asad’s translation here echoes the problems of his translation to Q42:17. **Asad’s** “a balance” results from the bestowing of “revelation” which is a reference absent from the Ayah, making his addition unjustifiable, if not wrong. However, his most awkward addition is “[thus gave you]” which is nowhere to be found in the Ayah; it is not even implied in any way. This is exactly like saying: ‘I have given Zayd a car, so that ‘Amr can drive to work’.

{لِيُقِيمَ النَّاسُ بِالْقِسْطِ} explains the reason for the sending down of the two things stated in the Ayah, that is, {الْكِتَابِ وَالْمِيزَانَ}. It is a reference to all acts done by man so that everyone gets his due share of things in fairness.

Pickthall’s “observe right measure” shows a degree of remoteness from the Arabic. Perhaps, observing the right measure might lead to achieving *al-qist* ‘القِسْطُ’, that is, people getting their

rightful shares/dues, but in this case, the translation leaves the reader to reach such a conclusion by himself, while the Ayah states this directly. Also, **Pickthall** uses the words “right measure” for {القِسْط...}; it is the same word “measure” which he uses also in Q55:7-9 as a rendering for both {المِيزَان} and {الْوَزْن}. It is looking at all these Ayahs together that can cause some confusion due to the range of application of “measure”.

Asad’s “so that men might behave with equity” refers to people’s behaviour under which many things can be classified. However, it cannot be considered out of context. The Qur’anic usage of {الكِتَاب}, {المِيزَان} and {النَّاس} is in the general sense by virtue of the fact that the Ayah begins with {وَلَقَدْ أَرْسَلْنَا رُسُلَنَا بِالْبَيِّنَاتِ} (We sent Our messengers with clear signs). So, to say the least, the word {النَّاس} (men) applies to all mankind, and cannot be restricted to the people of just one Messenger. **Asad**’s translation, on the other hand, indicates that the Prophet Muhammad (ﷺ) was given “a balance”, so that “men might behave with equity”, thus, excluding all the peoples and Messengers prior to the time of the Prophet (ﷺ).

Khan&Helali’s “keep up” refers to maintaining *al-qist* ‘القِسْط’ in the sense that *al-qist* is already established, and it is the continuation of keeping it up that is meant in the Ayah. As a matter of fact, {لِيُقِيمُوا النَّاسَ بِالْقِسْطِ} does not presuppose the existence of any *qist* that needs only to be maintained, observed or kept up. It actually, goes deeper than this; it covers both the ‘theory’ and the ‘practice’.

Arberry’s and **Khatib**’s “uphold” is more related to approving and supporting, while {لِيُقِيمُوا النَّاسَ} goes much further than just upholding.

Yusuf Ali’s “stand forth” lacks the element of establishing which is clear in the Arabic. “In justice” also lacks the achievement of *al-qist* ‘القِسْط’.

As for {...الْقِسْطُ} being rendered as “justice/equity”, this has been discussed under Q55:9. Also, the meaning of ‘القِسْطُ’ is to be found under *q-s-t* ‘قَسَطَ’ in Chapter Two.

Considering Q57:25 in its wider context, we can catch a glimpse of balancing in the preceding Ayahs. Q57:23 contrasts {تَأْسُوا} {الَّذِينَ يَبْخُلُونَ} with {عَلَىٰ مَا فَاتَكُمْ} {تَنْفَرُوا بِمَا آتَاكُمْ}; Q57:24 does the same with {الَّذِينَ يَبْخُلُونَ} and {وَيَأْمُرُونَ النَّاسَ بِالْبُخْلِ} {وَالْعَنَىٰ الْحَمِيدُ}, and all these aspects seem to be brought together in Q57:25 where {الْمِيزَانَ} is mentioned, being the tool that weighs one thing against another.

Conclusion

Here again, *al-mīzān* may be understood in both its concrete and abstract senses. Perhaps that is why four translations out of the above six render {الْمِيزَانَ} as “the **B**alance” with a capital ‘**B**’, and in Q42:17 five out of six do the same. It seems that the main, and probably the only, reason for this is its association with {الْكِتَابَ} (the Book) being sent down or revealed. The translations, here, in general, attempt, albeit faintly, to keep the options open as in the original.

Q6:152

{... وَأَوْفُوا الْكَيْلَ وَالْمِيزَانَ بِالْقِسْطِ ...}

Yusuf Ali	give measure And weight with (full) justice -
Pickthall	Give full measure and full weight, in justice
Arberry	And fill up the measure and the balance with justice.
Khan&Helali	and give full measure and full weight with justice.
Khatib	and fulfil the measure and the weight with equity.
Asad	And [in all your dealings] give full measure and weight*, with equity

*This refers metonymically to all dealings between men and not only to commercial transactions: hence my interpolation of “in all your dealings”.

As stated under *w-f-y* ‘وَفِي’, the act of ^c*īfā* ‘إِيْفَاءٌ’ requires extreme care to fulfil and awareness of the consequences of failing in achieving it because on the one hand, failure may result in ^c*ikhsār* ‘إِخْسَارٌ’ (giving less), and on the other *tughyān* ‘طُغْيَانٌ’ (giving/taking too much more);⁴⁸³ both of which are not commendable in the Qur’an. Therefore, for one to make sure that other people’s dues are not diminished by him, ^c*īfā* necessitates giving that much more which is enough to guarantee that ^c*ikhsār* does not occur. The importance of ^c*ikhsār* is due to the fact that most people tend to give others less rather than too much.

Yusuf Ali's "give" is far from doing the word {أَوْفُوا} justice, as {أَوْفُوا} is not just mere giving.

Khan&Helali's, **Pickthall**'s and **Asad**'s "give full", on the other hand, is very much nearer to its Arabic counterpart in the above Ayah. The difference between them, is perhaps related to their structure in their respective languages rather than their meaning as individual words.

Arberry's "fill up" falls a bit short of the exact meaning as 'filling up' does not necessarily fulfil all the requirements of *'ifā'*. Also, the way he structured his translation of this Ayah renders it a bit ambiguous as will be pointed out shortly.

Khatib's "fulfil" is rather strange as 'fulfil' is usually used with words like 'duties, obligations, expectations, hopes, etc.'. So, perhaps in this context, it is not exactly the right word to use.

With the exception of **Arberry** who renders {المِيزَانُ} as "the balance", all the translations use the words "measure" and "weight" for {الْكَيْلُ وَالْمِيزَانُ}.

Arberry's "fill up the measure" places the weight of the reference on something which is different from that meant in the Ayah, namely "the measure" in the sense of 'مِكْيَالٌ', the tool used for measuring. As for "the balance" in his translation, the same thing applies. Also, the structure of his translation is rather ambiguous as it leads to another meaning; that is the consideration of "justice" as something to fill the measure and the balance with! The Arabic is more general, agreeing with the wider context and referring to the entire process of measuring and weighing implying all the specifics involved with the use of meaningfully loaded words that though they have a sense of generality, still have the ability to render the reference more specific if need be. By contrast, the translation does not cover the same range of application; it is much more restrictive.

We have a similar situation with all the other translations as well, as they are neither general nor specific enough compared to the Arabic.

The word "weight" is as general as the translations can get with reference to {المِيزَانُ}, but not as specific. However, while the Arabic Ayah places the emphasis on what achieves or determines the weight of something, the translations' way of generalizing is

very different. They emphasise the “weight” for which a different word in Arabic, with a still different connotation may be used. A back-translation test can easily and clearly show this.

Yusuf Ali renders { بِالْقِسْطِ } as “with (full) justice” which raises more questions than answers. Perhaps, the use of the word “(full)” is to make up for its being missing after “give” to cater for { أَوْفُوا }; but obviously in this case, it is put in the wrong place because “(full)” does not refer to “give” in the above context. “(full) justice” makes one wonder about ‘short justice’, ‘half justice’, ‘not so full justice’, etc.? Can things like this be considered legitimate forms of justice? Or rather, can they be called ‘justice’ at all?

The ambiguity of “with (full) justice” cannot be missed; also, its degree of accuracy as a translation for { بِالْقِسْطِ } is very low due to the difference in meaning between ‘justice’ (commonly rendered ‘الْعَدْلُ’) and *al-qist* ‘الْقِسْطُ’. ‘الْقِسْطُ’ leads to the achievement of ‘الْعَدْلُ’, but ‘الْعَدْلُ’ does not necessarily result in achieving ‘الْقِسْطُ’. (The cutting off of the hand of a thief is an act of ‘*adl*’ ‘عَدْلٌ’, not *qist* ‘قِسْطٌ’, while giving people their rightful shares of something is *qist* ‘قِسْطٌ’, and thus ‘*adl*’ ‘عَدْلٌ’.)

The suitability of ‘justice’ and ‘equity’ as translations for *al-qist* ‘الْقِسْطُ’ has been discussed under Q55:9. The continuous use of “justice” and “equity” shows that each covers only certain aspects of the Arabic word. “With/In justice” still, like the whole structure of all the translations, does not read well and is awkward or clumsy English.

A final point is that **Asad** does not consider { الْكَيْلِ وَالْمِيزَانِ } as referring only to commercial transactions, and goes for the wider meaning as he explains in his footnote. He might be justified if we consider that the word *al-mīzān* has, in addition to its basic reference to a specific material instrument, a symbolic meaning as well. Also the Arabs say: “يَكِيلُ بِمَكِيلَيْنِ” (Lit., He measures with two measures) for a person who applies double standards, which also indicates that the word *al-kayl* has a symbolic aspect to it as well. Yet, it is undeniable that the meaning of these words cannot be restricted to the symbolic reference only, and that **Asad**, I believe, is reading too much between the lines.

Q7:85

{... فَأَوْفُوا الْكَيْلَ وَالْمِيزَانَ وَلَا تَبْخَسُوا النَّاسَ أَشْيَاءَهُمْ ...}

Yusuf Ali	Give just Measure and weight, nor withhold From the people the things That are their due;
Pickthall	so give full measure and full weight and wrong not mankind in their goods,
Arberry	So fill up the measure and the balance, and diminish not the goods of the people;
Khan&Helali	so give full measure and full weight and wrong not men in their things,
Khatib	So fulfil the measures and the weights, and do not underrate the goods of the people,
Asad	Give therefore, full measure and weight [in all your dealings], and do not deprive people of what is rightfully theirs.*

*Lit., “do not diminish to people their things” -an expression which applies to physical possessions well as to moral and social rights. Regarding my interpolation of “in all your dealings”, see Surah 6, note 150.

The above Ayah is similar in its wording to Q6:152, and much of the same comments apply here as well. Therefore, only the differences will be pointed out here.

Yusuf Ali's "give just measure" raises the question: Is "just measure" a 'full measure'? Not necessarily! This is where "give just ..." and {أَوْفُوا} reach the first parting of the ways.

Also, **Yusuf Ali**, **Pickthall**, **Khan&Helali** and **Asad** use "full/just" as adjectives that describe "measure and weight". This is not the case in the Arabic as no adjectives are related to either {الْكَيْل} or {الْمِيزَان}. In simple terms, the meaning of 'fullness', if one can say so, is represented in the verb {أَوْفُوا}, but not in "give"; and in the translation, the 'fullness' is related to the "measure" and "weight", but not to {الْكَيْل} or {الْمِيزَان} in their connotation as referents to measuring and weighing in general.

Khatib's way of generalising though, led him to use the plural in "the measures" and "the weights" for the singular {الْكَيْل} and {الْمِيزَان}, while all that **Asad** does is change the place of his addition "[in all your dealings]" in comparison to his translation of Q6:152.

With the absence of 'بِالْقِسْطِ' from the Arabic, and therefore the absence of the commonly used 'with/ in justice/equity', the translations sound less awkward than they do in Q6:152.

As for {وَلَا تَبْخَسُوا}, different translations covering different aspects of *al-bakhs* 'البخس' are provided.

Yusuf Ali's "withhold" differs from *bakhsa* 'بخس' in the sense that the Arabic word does not necessarily refer to complete 'withholding' (to use the same word); it is, instead, in one sense, the keeping of some or part of what rightfully belongs to others, in another it is much stronger than "withhold".

Pickthall's and **Khan&Helali**'s "wrong" is more general than required, as wronging people with regard to their belongings does not necessarily mean or refer to *bakhs* 'بخس'.

Khatib's "underrate" only covers one aspect of *bakhs* 'البخس', namely the placing of too low a value or estimate on the thing involved. The devaluation of a commodity has been referred to in this thesis under *b-kh-s* 'بخس', in Chapter Two. "Underrate", therefore, falls short of the exact meaning. The translation is too specific. The Ayah has a much more wider meaning or range of application than **Khatib**'s translation.

Asad's "deprive" is not perhaps made very much clearer by his footnote in the sense that the reader is informed that what is meant is not really 'deprivation', but diminishing. It would have been better, if he had explained instead what his "diminish" means. However, if we force the meaning a little bit we may still be able to see an echo of *bakhs* in the context of "deprive". "Depriving people of what is rightfully theirs" may also indicate depriving them *unjustly* of *part* of what is rightfully theirs.

Arberry's "diminish" covers that aspect of *bakhs* which is related to the things involved becoming less, but it still fails to convey the aspect of intentional and unrightful reduction or decrease.

It is this last point which all the translations, with the partial exception of **Asad**'s, have failed to cater for when translating the verb *bakhsa* 'بخس'. It is more or less, collectively, all the words used to render {تبخسوا} above that refer to what is actually implied in the Arabic word.

Q11:84

{ وَلَا تَنْقُصُوا الْمِكْيَالَ وَالْمِيزَانَ إِنِّي أَرَأَيْكُمْ بِخَيْرٍ ... }

- Yusuf Ali And give not
Short measure or weight:
I see you in prosperity,*
- * The Midianites were a commercial people, and their besetting sin was commercial selfishness and fraudulent dealings in weights and measures. Their Prophet tells them that that is the surest way to cut short their “prosperity”, both in the material and spiritual sense. When the Day of Judgement comes, it will search out their dealings through and through: “it will compass them all round,” and they will not be able to escape then, however much they may conceal their frauds in this world.
- Pickthall And give not short measure and short weight.
Lo! I see you well-to-do,
- Arberry And diminish not the measure and the
balance. I see you are prospering;
- Khan&Helali and give not short measure or weight, I see
you in prosperity;
- Khatib and do not shorten the measure and the
weight. I see you in prosperity,
- Asad and do not give short measure and weight [in
any of your dealings with men].* Behold, I
see you [now] in a happy state;

* Thus belief in the one God and justice in all dealings between man and

man (see *surah* 6, note 150) are here placed together as the twin postulates of all righteousness. Some commentators assume that the people of Madyan were of a particularly commercial bent of mind, and given to fraudulent dealings. It is obvious, however, that the purport of this passage and of its sequence goes far beyond anything that might be construed by a purely “historical” interpretation. What this version of Shueayb’s story aims at is - as always in the Qur’an - the enunciation of a generally applicable principle of ethics: namely, the impossibility of one’s being righteous with regard to God unless one is righteous - in both moral and social senses of this word - in the realm of human relationships as well. This explains the insistence with which the above prohibition is re-stated in a positive form, as an injunction, in the next verse.

Firstly we have to notice that the above Ayah refers to {المِكْيَالُ} (*al-mikyāl*) and {المِيزَانُ} (*al-mīzān*) which are the instruments used for measuring and weighing.

Yusuf Ali, Pickthall, Asad and **Khan&Helali** render this Ayah {وَلَا تَنْقُصُوا الْمِكْيَالَ وَالْمِيزَانَ} in more or less the same way. They all agree that the Ayah is a command not to give ‘short measure or weight’.

It is, therefore clear that the translations do not acknowledge any difference between *bakhasa* ‘بَخَسَ’ and *naqasa* ‘نَقَصَ’, nor do they actually refer to {المِكْيَالُ} or {المِيزَانُ} as instruments for measuring and weighing; rather what is indicated are ‘what is measured’ and ‘what is weighed’, that is ‘المَكِيلُ’ (*al-makīl*) and ‘المَوْزُونُ’ (*al-mawzūn*) respectively. The Arabic words in the Ayah, though, have the capacity of accommodating ‘the measure’ and ‘the balance’ on the one hand, and ‘the measured’ and ‘the weighed’ on the other, which is a feature that is lacking in the translation.

Asad's translation still does not admit the fact that the reference here is, as I believe, strictly to physical measuring and weighing, as he inserts “[in any of your dealings with men]” in the translation.

In his footnote **Asad** seems to prefer a more general meaning than what he calls the ““historical” interpretation”. He also seems to ignore the fact that the Qur’anic stories in addition to their being narratives of actual events that took place at some stage in human history, are not all the time, as he seems to favour, highly symbolic and rich with indirect references. Rather they are meant as examples, reminders and warnings that what had happened to ordinary human beings in earlier times could easily happen again if the same sins are committed. The stories are related for the purpose of drawing lessons from them. The Qur’an states this in so many Ayahs. Two examples should suffice here. In Q6:10 we read: {وَلَقَدْ اسْتَهْزَؤُا بِرُسُلِ مَنْ قَبْلِكَ فَحَاقَ بِالَّذِينَ سَخِرُوا مِنْهُمْ مَا كَانُوا بِهِ يَسْتَهْزِؤُونَ} that is, as **Arberry** puts it “Messengers indeed were mocked at before thee; but those that scoffed at them were encompassed by that they mocked at”. And in Q24:34 we read: {وَلَقَدْ أَنْزَلْنَا إِلَيْكُمْ آيَاتٍ مُبَيِّنَاتٍ وَمَثَلًا مِّنَ الَّذِينَ خَلَوْا مِن قَبْلِكُمْ وَمَوْعِظَةً لِّلْمُتَّقِينَ} that is “We have sent down to you signs making all clear, and an example of those who passed away before you, and an admonition for the godfearing”. (**Arberry**).

It is because of the authenticity of such stories that the *mufasssirūn* refer to such historical events in their *Tafsirs*; and, I believe, this should be the case in the translation as well, as there is plenty of room in the footnotes for any added commentary or detailed explanations. **Asad**, however, seems to deny the happening of certain historical events. See for example, his commentary on Q3:49, (See endnote no. 484).

Khatib's “shorten the measure and the weight” is rather unusual as (1) “shorten” may be understood to refer to the height of the measure which would be a laughable matter, and (2) “shorten ... the weight” is rather awkward.

Arberry's “diminish” is perhaps a good rendering for {تَنْقُصُوا}; yet, like all the other translations, what is diminished is what is measured. As for ‘diminishing the balance’, how does one diminish a balance - unless the word is understood differently?

Q11:85

{ وَيَا قَوْمِ أَوفُوا الْمِكْيَالَ وَالْمِيزَانَ بِالْقِسْطِ وَلَا تَبْخَسُوا النَّاسَ أَشْيَاءَهُمْ ... }

- Yusuf Ali “And O my people! give
Just measure and weight,
Nor withhold from the people
The things that are their due:*
- * Both Plato and Aristotle define justice as the virtue which gives everyone his due. From this point of view Justice becomes the master virtue, and includes most other virtues. It was the lack of this that ruined the Midianites. Their selfishness was “intent on mischief,” *i.e.*, spoiling other people’s business by not giving them their just dues.
- Pickthall O my people! Give full measure and weight in justice, and wrong not people in respect of their goods.
- Arberry O my people, fill up the measure and the balance justly, and do not diminish the goods of the people,
- Khan&Helali “And O my people! Give full measure and weight in justice and reduce not the things that are due to the people,
- Khatib And O my people, give full measure and full weight with equity, and do not undervalue people’s goods;
- Asad Hence, O my people, [always] give full measure and weight, with equity, and do not

deprive people of what is rightfully theirs,*

* See *Surah 7*, note 68.

Here again, because an exact equivalent for {أَوْفُوا} is lacking, the weight of the reference is laid elsewhere in the translations.

Yusuf Ali's translation is no different from his translation to Q7:85. The same applies to **Pickthall**, **Khan&Helali**, **Asad** and **Arberry**. As for **Khatib**, he only replaced "fulfil" by "give full ...", and "underrate" by "undervalue" which are basically the same.

{أَوْفُوا الْمِكْيَالَ وَالْمِيزَانَ} makes use of the instruments of measuring and weighing; this aspect can only be found in **Arberry**'s "fill up the measure". However, because of "fill up" the meaning of {أَوْفُوا} is missing with regard to the capacity of the measure itself. As for "fill up the balance", the Ayah refers to both the instrument to be adjusted the proper way, not to be manipulated, and also to the weight of what is being weighed, and not to just one thing as in the translation.

As for {وَلَا تَبْخَسُوا} and {بِالْقِسْطِ}, see Q55:9 and Q7:85 respectively. The only difference here, is **Khan&Helali**'s "reduce" for {تَبْخَسُوا} which is much more specific than "wrong".

CONCLUSION:

As is clear none of the above translations is capable of conveying the message as exactly as it appears in the Arabic. They only cover one aspect at the expense of another being uncatered for. Compromise is what the translators are typically forced to accept, and here is a perfect example.

Q17:35

{وَأَوْفُوا الْكَيْلَ إِذَا كِلْتُمْ وَزَنُوا بِالْقِسْطِ الْمُسْتَقِيمِ ...}

Yusuf Ali	Give full measure when ye Measure, and weigh With a balance that is straight:
Pickthall	Fill the measure when ye measure, and weigh with a right balance;
Arberry	And fill up the measure when you measure, and weigh with the straight balance;
Khan&Helali	And give full measure when you measure, and weigh with a balance that is straight.
Khatib	And fulfil the measure when you measure; and weigh with an equitable balance.
Asad	And give full measure whenever you measure, and weigh with a balance that is true:*

* Lit., “straight” (*mustaqīm*) - a term which in the Qur’an has invariably a spiritual or moral connotation. Hence, as in the similar phrase in 6:152, the above injunction applies not merely to commercial transactions but to all dealings between man and man.

It is understood from the discussion of this Ayah under *k-y-l* ‘كَيْلٌ’, *q-s-t* ‘قِسْطٌ’ and *w-z-n* ‘وَزَنَ: الْوِزْنَ’, that {وَأَوْفُوا الْكَيْلَ} can be both a general and a specific reference at the same time. The generality results from the fact that *al-kayl* may be understood to refer to

measuring and all that the act of measuring involves. However, it may also be specific, referring to ‘the measure’, the instrument ‘المِكْيَالُ’ as this is one of the meanings of *al-kayl* as well. The second piece of evidence supporting this latter view is the use of the word {...الْقِسْطَاسُ} which specifically refers to the weighing instrument.

Khatib’s “fulfil the measure” is an awkward a translation for {أَوْفُوا الْكَيْلَ}, as “fulfil” is not the right word to use in this context, and as a result the meaning of the measure is not clear.

Yusuf Ali’s, **Khan&Helali**’s, and **Asad**’s translations for {أَوْفُوا الْكَيْلَ} is “give full measure”. The reference is made to the thing that is measured; it should be given in full. Although “full measure” refers to the exact amount, there is no reference to the state of the instrument itself.

Arberry’s and **Pickthall**’s “fill/up the measure” refers to the measuring instrument that it should be filled/up; and just like the above mentioned translations, the state of the measure being proper and of the right size and capacity is not indicated. Perhaps, the translators assume that the measure (*al-mikyāl*) is not in any way tampered with. In this case, “full measure” comes closer to the message intended in the Ayah, as “fill the measure” does not really imply that the measure is of the right size.

As a result of such translations referring to the measure in the sense of *al-mikyāl*, we realise that the range of application of the word *al-kayl* is very much wider. And although the word ‘measure’ on its own might have a wide range of application as well, it is its context that greatly restricts that range. Also, “Give” as a translation for {أَوْفُوا} is, as stated before, not an exact translation by any means. So, as the translators were trying to solve one problem, they stumbled on another and could not solve either. That is why they had to be content with trying to deliver the message as best as they could without sticking to the letter of the original.

Yet, when translating {وَزَنُوا بِالْقِسْطَاسِ الْمُسْتَقِيمِ}, they had to change their method and go back to their common practice, that is, following the original as it goes. Almost all translators of authoritative texts generally adopt a fairly literal approach where

possible, and only deviate from this when forced by differences between the SL and the TL.

All the translations use “balance” for {القِسْطَاس...}. Whether ‘القِسْطَاس’ is originally Greek for ‘justice’ or ‘balance’, or Arabic derived from ‘قَسَطَ’, as has been discussed under *q-s-t* ‘قَسَطَ’, the word is used in Arabic to refer to the weighing instrument, that is, the balance. In this sense, the translations seem to have used the right rendering. However, this makes one wonder why neither of the above translators used the word ‘scales’.

Yet, {القِسْطَاس...} is not a mere ‘balance’. By virtue of the fact that it shares a great deal phonetically with ‘القِسْطَ’, another element is added to its meaning as a balance, and that, as indicated under *q-s-t*, is the doing (justice) to the parties involved in the transaction in a way that each receives his fair share. This is the advantage that {القِسْطَاس...} has over ‘المِيزَان’ in this context. This ‘sound effect’ indicates that it is the tool of (justice) itself that is used to achieve justice and not just a mere instrument for weighing that is assumed to achieve justice.

It is here that the translations fall short. ‘The balance’ might always be the symbol of justice; but the word itself does not indicate this while {القِسْطَاس...} indicates this clearly and directly, not even by means of implication.

In Arabic {القِسْطَاسِ الْمُسْتَقِيمِ...} makes perfect sense. However, the same cannot be said about the above translations.

Yusuf Ali, and **Khan&Helali** say “a balance that is straight”. **Arberry**’s “the straight balance” is not very different. The translators are trying to cater for {الْمُسْتَقِيمِ} in the wrong manner. “Straight balance” is not particularly good English, and therefore it does not do justice at all to its Arabic counterpart. The reason for such awkwardness may be that ‘straight’ has as its basic meaning ‘not bent’, ‘not crooked’. However, there is no requirement for a balance to be straight in this way - and no guarantee that a straight balance will weigh correctly.

The Arabic describes ‘the balance’ as being fair and calibrated, and meant to achieve, justly, what it is designed for. Although the word “straight” might be a good translation of the

adjective ‘المُسْتَقِيم’ in some contexts, and “the balance” of ‘القِسْطَاس’, it is the combination or collocation of the two together that does not lead to the hoped-for result.

Although **Khatib**’s “equitable balance” might be more acceptable to the reader’s ear than the unusual “straight balance” above, one still has to force the words to get to the meaning. At the end of the day, “straight/equitable balance” only faintly reflect the Arabic message.

Pickthall’s “right balance” might be considered good English in a different context. It may stand against the ‘wrong balance’ to use. However, that “balance” is only “right” in the sense that it is the one to use in a particular situation. For example, for an extremely heavy object, a small balance might not be the “right” one; the balance that weighs liquids or grains might not be adequate for weighing gold or other similar objects, etc. Therefore, the “right balance” is not necessarily {القِسْطَاسِ الْمُسْتَقِيمِ}.

Asad’s “a balance that is true” is by comparison a better option as it implies that the balance used is assumedly properly adjusted to function the way it should, it is not crooked or bent. However, a true balance, though it also indicates that the scales are even, does not guarantee that it will necessarily function as it should. The Arabic {القِسْطَاسِ الْمُسْتَقِيمِ} implies and states that it is a balance that meets all the criteria needed to achieve (justice) that must be used; it is not an option.

Asad’s footnote, though, gives the literal meaning of {المُسْتَقِيمِ}, implying probably that he realises that there is more to {المُسْتَقِيمِ} than is indicated by the word “true”. Here again, he does not like to rule out other dealings that are not related to “commercial transactions”.

Though true balance may sound quite poetic, it is also not a standard collocation.

Q26:181-183

﴿أَوْفُوا الْكَيْلَ وَلَا تَكُونُوا مِنَ الْمُخْسِرِينَ * وَزِنُوا بِالْقِسْطِ الْمُسْتَقِيمِ *
وَلَا تَبْخَسُوا النَّاسَ أَشْيَاءَهُمْ...﴾

Yusuf Ali

- (•) “Give just measure,*
And cause no loss
(To others by fraud).
- (•) “And weigh with scales
True and upright.
- (•) “And withhold not things
Justly due to men, ...

*They were a commercial people, but they were given to fraud, injustice, and wrongful mischief (by intermuddling with others). They are asked to fear Allah and follow His ways: it is He who also created their predecessors among mankind, who never prospered by fraud and violent wrongdoing, but only justice and fair dealing.

Pickthall

- (•) Give full measure, and be not of those who give less (than the due).
- (•) And weigh with the true balance.
- (•) Wrong not mankind in their goods, ...

Arberry

Fill up the measure, and be not cheaters,
And weigh with the straight balance,
and diminish not the goods of the people,

Khan&Helali

- (•) “Give full measure and cause no loss (to others).
- (•) “And weigh with the true and straight balance.

(●) “And defraud not the people by reducing their things, ...

Khatib

(●) And fulfil the measure, and be not among those who short measure.* (●) And weigh with the just balance, (●) and do not diminish the people’s goods, ...

* That is, those who do not give the right weight.

Asad

(●) “[Always] give full measure, and be not among those [unjustly] cause loss [to others]; (●) and [in all your dealings] weigh with a true balance, (●) and do not deprive people of what is rightfully theirs;*

* Cf. *sūrah* 7, note 68.

Here, {أَوْفُوا الْكَيْلَ} refers to (1) the measure: the instrument, being of the right size and capacity, (2) the thing that is measured being given out in accordance to the exact amount that (is due) or should be given, which can only be achieved when the measure (the instrument) is not in any way manipulated.

{وَلَا تَكُونُوا مِنَ الْمُخْسِرِينَ} refers to all the different ways of committing all sorts of acts that result in *‘ikhsār*, such as using a measure that is not correct, and/or giving others less than is due to them, using measures ‘مكاييل’ of different sizes to get more for oneself, and give less to others, etc. *‘ikhsār* in this context is bad practice and an act of meanness and cheating as it is done on purpose.

However, if it is done unintentionally, the term still applies to the act itself as {الْمُخْسِرِينَ} does not by virtue of its meaning distinguish whether the act was deliberate or not. It is in this sense that the *‘ikhsār* ‘الإخسار’ differs from the *bakhs* ‘البخس’ which is an

intentional act and also much stronger in meaning.

The use of the word {المُخْسِرِينَ} then indicates that extreme care is to be taken when measuring so that one is not categorized as *mukhsir* 'مُخْسِر'. Yet, the Ayahs also indicate that the *'ikhsār* committed by the people of the Prophet Shuʿayb was deliberate and that they were obstinate in their rejection of their Prophet's teachings, and persistent in their cheating.

The same, with regard to the *'ikhsār* being a deliberate act, also applies to the other two times where the word is used, namely in Q55:9 {وَلَا تُخْسِرُوا الْمِيزَانَ} and Q83:3 {وَإِذَا كَالُوهُمْ أَوْ وَزَنُوهُمْ يُخْسِرُونَ}. When the act is so, not done by mistake, it becomes punishable and incurs grave consequences as is clear from the story of the Prophet Shuʿayb's people and the Ayahs after Q83:3 with regard to the Judgement Day where people will be held accountable for their deeds.

The above translations for {أَوْفُوا الْكَيْلَ}, that is “give just measure”, and also “give full measure”, “fill up the measure” and “fulfil the measure”, have all been discussed before. Also, although the act of *'ikhsār* has also been discussed with regard to Q55:9 {وَلَا تُخْسِرُوا الْمِيزَانَ}, the context here is different and requires considering in its own right as well.

Bearing all the above in mind , let us consider the following:
Yusuf Ali, Khan&Helali and **Asad** consider {المُخْسِرِينَ} in the sense of “causing loss” to others. It is, of course, obvious that the *'ikhsār* does result in “causing loss” to people, and according to **Yusuf Ali**, this act is done “(by fraud)”, tricking people out of their goods, which is considered criminal deception. Also, according to **Asad** *'ikhsār* is done “[unjustly]”. Yet, although these explanations bear some truth in them, this does not change the fact that ‘to cause loss’ is not a precise translation, as the reference is then made to the result of the act, and not to the act itself which is what {المُخْسِرِينَ} refers to.

As explained in much more detail in Chapter Two under *kh-s-r* ‘خَسِرَ’, the verb ‘خَسِرَ’ (*khasira*) is related to ‘loss’. So, ‘خَسِرَ’ (present: ‘يُخَسِرُ’) and ‘أَخَسِرَ’ (present: ‘يُأَخَسِرُ’) differ in meaning from ‘خَسِرَ’ (present: ‘يُخَسِرُ’). It is this latter verb that is related *immediately* to ‘loss’. Yet it is the former that is used in the above Ayah in the form of *al-mukhsirīn* {المُخَسِرِينَ}. This shows clearly that although the translations, to a degree kept the message of the Ayah, they achieved this through referring to a different verb, albeit still from the same root; and as the meaning of ‘loss’ is part of the root *kh-s-r* ‘خَسِرَ’, the translations did not go too far from the exact meaning.

However, we have to bear in mind that if “cause no loss (to others)” is to be considered on its own, as is possible with regard to **Khan&Helali**’s translation, a serious problem with regard to the range of reference of that command may arise. For example, if Zayd takes a sum of money from ‘Amr to invest for him, then this money, or part of it, is lost due to a market crash, can such a loss be considered *‘ikhsār*, or even an act of “causing loss to others”? Therefore, in spite of the difference between *‘ikhsār* and “causing loss (to others by fraud)”, “cause no loss (to others)” on its own can hardly be accepted as an accurate translation.

Another difference between the ST and the translation is that the ST preaches against ‘being’ one of the *mukhsirīn* {وَلَا تَكُونُوا مِنَ الْمُخَسِرِينَ}; therefore, it is only **Asad**’s translation that refers to this, as it reads: “and **be** not among those who ...”. Yet, the three translations we are dealing with here use “cause them loss”.

Asad says: “those who [unjustly] cause loss [to others]”, explaining what the Arabic word means using a structure that, like the Arabic, refers to the people who commit *‘ikhsār*, while **Yusuf Ali** and **Khan&Helali** take only ‘the command’ part and transform it into “(to others by fraud)”, “and cause no loss (to others)”. Similarly, **Asad** has “... not ...cause loss”.

Pickthall, on the other hand, is content with keeping his reference and his explanation as general as in the Arabic, hence, {وَلَا

{تَكُونُوا مِنَ الْمُخْسِرِينَ} becomes “and be not of those who give less (than the due)”. His addition between parentheses is particularly interesting as it agrees with the context and he does not just stop at the literal meaning.

Arberry’s “cheaters” in “be not cheaters” is probably acceptable if the Arabic is ‘وَلَا تَكُونُوا مُخْسِرِينَ’, with the omission of both the preposition {مِنَ} and the definite article {ال}, although “cheaters” is not particularly accurate. **Arberry’s** translation therefore, ignores an important part of the Arabic. Yet, it seems that by using “cheaters” he was trying to imitate the Arabic structure in the sense that {الْمُخْسِرِينَ} are the ones who commit the act of *‘ikhsār*, and the “cheaters” are the ones who commit the act of cheating. But, as is clear, this ignores the difference between the Arabic word and the word that is used to render it in English. Cheating is much more general than *‘ikhsār* because not every act of cheating is *‘ikhsār* (in measures and weights).

Khatib’s “short measure” is awkward as the word “short” is used as a verb in the imperative which is not in conformity with normal English usage. His footnote is also puzzling as it refers to “weight” and not to ‘measure’ {الْكَيْلِ} as in the Ayah.

As in Q17:35, we have here in Q26:182 {وَزِنُوا بِالْقِسْطَاسِ الْمُسْتَقِيمِ}.

With the exception of **Yusuf Ali** who uses the word “scales” instead of his “balance” of Q17:35, for {...الْقِسْطَاسِ}, all the other translations stick to the word “balance”. Also, {الْمُسْتَقِيمِ} according to **Yusuf Ali** becomes “true and upright”. In spite of the fact that a balance may be described as “true”, it is very unusual to describe it as “upright”, which is normally used in an abstract moral sense. Also, **Yusuf Ali** uses two adjectives for one in the Arabic original. Perhaps, he realises that either of them on its own does not reflect clearly the meanings implied in {...الْقِسْطَاسِ الْمُسْتَقِيمِ}. If this is the case, one wonders why he used only one word, which also happened to be a different word, to render {الْمُسْتَقِيمِ} in Q17:35, although the wording of the Qur’anic original is exactly the same.

The change from “balance” to “scales” is also rather interesting. Perhaps, **Yusuf Ali** wants to draw the reader’s attention to the fact that the act of balancing does not necessarily involve weighing. Yet, objects can also be balanced on scales. As a matter of fact, this argument has no effect on the Ayah, because whether ‘balance’ or ‘scales’ is used to render {الْقِسْطَاسِ...}, they still fall one step short of the exact meaning of {الْقِسْطَاسِ...}. This meaning might be implied in ‘balance’ or ‘scales’, yet it is explicit in {الْقِسْطَاسِ...}. A balance or set of scales might be used to determine the weight of an object, yet does not guarantee the result and therefore implied references are necessary in this aspect; with the use of {الْقِسْطَاسِ...}, due to its similarity to ‘القِسْطُ’, one is given the direct and explicit assurance of the result of the use of such apparatus, and in this case {المُسْتَقِيمِ} makes this more emphatic. The ‘justice’ that will be achieved is not a twisted justice, as its executer, that is {الْقِسْطَاسِ...}, is not twisted either.

If we consider the rest of the translations in this light, we realise that the differences between the Ayah and its translations remain the same.

Pickthall’s “right balance” in Q17:35 here becomes “true balance” which is also **Asad’s** and partly **Khan&Helali’s**. **Khan&Helali’s** addition of “straight” is no different from **Arberry’s** usage. Accordingly, **Arberry’s** and **Asad’s** have been the only entirely consistent translations with regard to the Qur’anic {وَزِنُوا بِالْقِسْطَاسِ الْمُسْتَقِيمِ}.

Khatib’s “just balance” perhaps aims at reflecting the element of ‘قِسْطُ’ in {الْقِسْطَاسِ...}, yet, if this is true one is left to wonder about the word {المُسْتَقِيمِ}? In any case, one has to admit that just as “equitable balance” is not a very common thing to say in English, “the just balance” is the same.

Here again, we see clearly that the translation of individual words, regardless how good it might be, does not mean that their combination will make sense in the TL.

As for {وَلَا تَبْخَسُوا النَّاسَ أَشْيَاءَهُمْ}, this is also found in Q7:85 and Q11:85. **Pickthall's**, **Arberry's** and **Asad's** translations for {تَبْخَسُوا} do not change as they have been consistent in using “wrong”, “diminish” and “deprive” respectively. Therefore, there is no need to repeat what has been discussed before under Q7:85 and Q11:85.

Yusuf Ali's translation is also the same as he is using “withhold” as he has done twice before. The only difference here is that he specifies that what is being withheld is “justly” due to others; therefore, here, he explicitly states that *al-bakhs* is an act of injustice. Also, the change from “the things” in Q7:85 and Q11:85 to only “things” here, is quite interesting as it gets nearer to the meaning of the Ayah.

Khatib's change from “underrate” in Q7:85 and “undervalue” in Q11:85 to “diminish” here perhaps reflects his realisation that *al-bakhs* is not just underrating or undervaluation. However, if this is true, why did he not change his translations in Q7:85 and Q11:85 to “diminish”? Perhaps, **Khatib** is trying to reflect the different phases of *bakhs* through his different translations. The only problem with this is that the Arabic word in the above mentioned Ayahs is not in any way restricted in meaning as to reflect only one phase in each.

Khan&Helali use “defraud ... by reducing” as a translation for {تَبْخَسُوا} which is rather different from “wrong” in Q7:85 and “reduce” in Q11:85. It is the use of the word “defraud” here that led the translators to have to explain in what way the act of defrauding is committed. “Defraud” refers to ‘tricking people out of what is rightfully theirs’ while {تَبْخَسُوا} does not *necessarily* involve ‘tricking’ or ‘deceiving’ as it can be an act of open *tughyān*; perhaps this is where the two words go separate ways.

Q83:1-3

{ وَيْلٌ لِّلْمُطَفِّفِينَ * الَّذِينَ إِذَا أَكْتَالُوا عَلَى النَّاسِ يَسْتَوْفُونَ *
وَإِذَا كَالُوهُمْ أَوْ وَزَنُوهُمْ يُخْسِرُونَ } _

Yusuf Ali

- (•) Woe to those
That deal in fraud -*
- (•) Those who, when they
have to receive by measure
From men, exact full measure.
- (•) But when they have
To give by measure
Or weight to men,
Give less than due.

* "Fraud" must here be taken in a widely general sense. It covers giving short measure or short weight, but it covers much more than that. The next two verses make it clear that it is the spirit of injustice that is condemned - giving too little and asking too much. This may be shown in commercial dealings, where a man exacts a higher standard in his own favour than he is willing to concede as against him. In domestic or social matters an individual or group may ask for honour, or respect, or services which he or they are not willing to give on their side in similar circumstances. It is worse than one-sided selfishness: for it is double injustice. But it is worst of all in religion or spiritual life: with what face can a man ask for Mercy or Love from Allah when he is unwilling to give it to his fellow-men? In one aspect this is a statement of the Golden Rule. 'Do as you would be done by'. But it is more completely expressed. You must give in full what is

due from you, whether you expect or wish to receive full consideration from the other side or not.

Pickthall (•) Woe unto the defrauders:
(•) Those who when they take the measure from mankind demand it full,
(•) But if they measure unto them or weigh for them, they cause them loss.

Arberry Woe to the stinters
who, when they measure against the people,
take full measure
but, when they measure for them or weigh for them, do skimp.

Khan&Helali (•) Woe to *Al-Mutaffifîn* [those who give less in measure and weight (decrease the rights of others)],
(•) Those who, when they have to receive by measure from men, demand full measure,
(•) And when they have to give by measure or weight to men, give less than due.

Khatib Woe betide the skimpers,* (•)
who, when they take a measure from people,
take it in full, (•)
but when they measure for them, or weigh for them, they skimp. (•)

* That is, those who give short measures and weights.

Asad (•) Woe unto those who give short measure:
(•) those who, when they are to receive their due from [other] people, demand that it be given in full - (•) but when they have to measure or weigh whatever they owe to others, give less than what is due!*

* This passage (verses 1-3) does not, of course, refer only to commercial dealings but touches upon every aspect of social relations, both practical and moral, applying to every individual's rights and obligations no less than to his physical possessions.

As explained under *t-f-f* 'طَفَفَ', the word *mutaffifin* 'مُطَفِّفِينَ', in one sense, is related to something 'little' or 'very small amount' being withheld. There are many different ways to achieve that, and as a result the meaning of the word goes beyond its basic meaning. That is why Imam Malik said, as quoted before (see Chapter Two under *t-f-f* 'طَفَفَ'): "يُقَالُ فِي كُلِّ شَيْءٍ وَفَاءً وَتَطْفِيفٌ". However, the second and third Ayahs above go on to specify what the term means.

Yusuf Ali's "those that deal in fraud" for {مُطَفِّفِينَ} cannot be considered an accurate rendering because "dealing in fraud" has different spheres of application from *tatfif* 'تَطْفِيفٌ' and does not necessarily refer to *tatfif* specifically. Therefore, going from "those that deal in fraud" to its so-called explanation "those who when they receive by measure ..." is like a sudden change, very unexpected by the reader because the images drawn in the reader's mind by "fraud" are not related in any way, or at least directly, to measures and weights.

On the other hand, by virtue of what the root *t-f-f* 'طَفَفَ' and its derivations refer to the mentioning of measures and weights by way of explanation is no surprise to the reader. It seems that **Yusuf Ali** was trying to achieve an effect similar to the Arabic by starting with a general reference that makes the listener want to know what is meant by it, then the specific explanation follows. Yet, the result, as is clear, is by no means the same.

In part of his footnote, **Yusuf Ali** attempts to explain that one of the aspects of "fraud" is the *tatfif* in measures and weights. He wants the reader to consider "fraud" "in a widely general sense"; however, it is obvious that the sense of fraud is very much wider

than the sense of *tatfif*. The unusual thing is that he wants the reader to consider the translation, and not the original.

Pickthall's “defrauders” is just a short form of **Yusuf Ali's** “those who deal in fraud”; it only has one advantage over **Yusuf Ali's**, and that it is similar to the Arabic, in the sense that only one word is used; meaning-wise it is different and does not render the Arabic accurately.

Arberry's “stinters” is similar to **Pickthall's** “defrauders” in being just one word, yet different as it is not related to fraud. However, a person that stints is not necessarily a *mutaffif*. It is that act of withholding ‘little’ and therefore, giving less that is lacking in ‘stint’. A man who *stints* himself of food to let his children have enough cannot be called *mutaffif*.

Khatib's “skimpers” is no better. Skimping is more related to supplying, giving or allowing (things) in too small an amount or insufficient quantity, and therefore, lacks the basic meaning of *tatfif*. **Khatib's** footnote refers to only one aspect of *tatfif*, that is ‘giving’ and does not refer to ‘taking’ as explained in the Ayah itself. The footnote does not refer to the Arabic word itself, nor does it refer to how “skimpers” came to refer to that meaning.

Asad's “those who give short measure” covers one aspect of the basic meaning of *tatfif*, that is, giving less. Yet, it restricts the meaning to ‘measuring’ and, therefore, fails to cater for what is actually implied in the Arabic word.

Khan&Helali resort to exoticism as they use the word the Ayah itself uses, that is, “*Al-Mutaffifin*”. In a way they seem to admit that there is no real equivalent to the Arabic word in that form in English, which is correct; in another, they created an effect similar to that of the Arabic, and that is enticing people to either enquire about what is actually meant, or want to listen to the rest, achieving in either way the same result. Their explanation between square and round brackets, I believe, is not really that necessary. It perhaps saves the reader looking for the meaning in a footnote, although the next two Ayahs explain what is meant by “*Al-*

Mutaffifin”. Also, **Khan&Helali** include a more general meaning than just the one related to measures and weights through their additional “(decrease the rights of others)”, which can be considered a reference to a higher level of understanding of what the word implies.

As for {اكتالوا على الناس}, it is understood that {على} serves the purpose of indicating that there is injustice being committed, which is something that would not have been achieved had ‘من’ been used instead.

Such a structural effect, as the translations show, cannot really be achieved in English. **Yusuf Ali**’s and **Khan&Helali**’s “receive by measure from”, **Pickthall**’s “take the measure from”, **Khatib**’s “take a measure from”, and **Asad**’s “receive their due from” in no way indicate any injustice taking place. **Arberry**’s “against” perhaps reflects that element of injustice; yet the combination of words “measure against the people” sounds odd.

As for {إذا اكتالوا} itself, **Yusuf Ali** and **Khan&Helali** say: “when they have to receive by measure”. With the use of “have to” the translation seems to have taken a step farther from the original which is simpler and more direct.

Pickthall’s “when they take the measure” is similar to **Khatib**’s “when they take a measure” as they both refer to the thing that is being measured, which although it is what is implied in the Arabic, is still not the same. The reference of the Arabic is much more general.

Arberry’s “when they measure against the people” has the advantage of economy. Yet, there is a subtle difference between the Arabic and the translation. In “they measure”, it is clear that “they” is the subject, i.e., the doer of the act of measuring is “they”. In {اكتالوا}, the *wāw al-jamā’ah* ‘واو الجماعة’ is the *fā’il* ‘فاعل’, supposedly the doer of the act of measuring. Yet, according to Ibn Manzūr (under ‘كَيْلٌ’), the verb used to refer to the giver by measure is *kāla* ‘كَالَ’ and to the taker (receiver) *iktāla* ‘اكتالَ’: “كَالَ الْمُعْطَى وَاكتالَ الآخِذُ”. The Arabic does not refer specifically to the executer of the act of

measuring. The use of *wāw al-jameah* as the *fāeil* does not necessarily mean that the receiver by measure is the one who does the measuring.

It is in this very restricted sense that “take by measure” may be considered as better translation than just “measure”.

Asad’s “when they are to receive their due” is another example of **Asad**’s method of preferring the more abstract reference to the more concrete. There is no mention in this part of any measuring, though {اَكْتَالُوا} is present in the Arabic, in contrast to his use of “short measure” when translating {مُطَفِّفِينَ...}. So, he transforms the reference from one place to another to help him in widening the sphere of application of {اَكْتَالُوا}. His footnote helps to emphasise this understanding. In spite of the fact that the Ayah may be having a wider meaning than just concrete measuring and weighing, the danger in the translation is the constant exclusion of such concrete references for the sake of metaphorical ones.

Asad seems to prefer such interpretations. In other parts of the Qur’an he refers to concrete acts as being no more than a way of referring to abstract things. For example, he considers the raising of the dead by the Prophet Jesus as being “a metaphorical description of giving new life to people who were spiritually dead”.⁴⁸⁴ He gives similar explanation to Jesus’s other miracles as well. This, I believe, is unjustified.

Yusuf Ali’s “exact full measure” for {يَسْتَوْفُونَ} contradicts the fact that ‘exacting’ is an extremely difficult, if not impossible, thing to achieve; that is why the act of *ci fac* requires the giving of slightly more than due, as what is exactly due is controversial in practice. {يَسْتَوْفُونَ} indicates that beyond doubt what is due is being taken in full to the satisfaction of the taker/receiver, and this, as explicitly indicated in {يَسْتَوْفُونَ}, is achieved through the taking of more than is due.

Also, all the translations refer to the word ‘measure’ either in

this form or using a pronoun (it), which shows the difference between the Arabic verb ‘يَسْتَوْفُونَ’ as used in its own and the other ways used to render it in English necessitating an explicit or direct referent.

Pickthall uses “demand it full”, **Asad** “demand that it be given in full”, while **Khan&Helali** say “demand full measure”. As is clear, {يَسْتَوْفُونَ} is not mere ‘demanding’ that the thing involved be given in full. “Demand” indicates that there is something to be given, that is, it is not taken yet by the person who demands it. {يَسْتَوْفُونَ} is almost the opposite to this; it indicates the actual taking in full of whatever is involved with no doubt that anything is being withheld. It is also this feature of ‘certainty’ that is apparent in {يَسْتَوْفُونَ}.

Khatib’s “take it in full” is similar to **Arberry**’s “take full measure”, and perhaps, in a way, they are nearer to the meaning of {يَسْتَوْفُونَ} than the rest of the other translations as they both refer to the aspect of ‘fullness’ present in the Arabic.

Stopping here at the end of Ayah 2, we realise that there is nothing wrong when people demand/take their measure, or whatever that is their right, in full. Of course, this act cannot be condoned by the Qur’an, as indicated in the first Ayah {وَيْلٌ لِّلْمُطَفِّفِينَ}. That is why the definition of {...مُطَفِّفِينَ} in this context does not end at the end of Ayah 2. The explanation of what {...مُطَفِّفِينَ} refers to goes on to include the second component that results in the formation of *tatfif*, as one component does not and cannot go without the other here. However, although injustice does not appear in the translation until the second component is introduced and included, the Arabic refers to it in Ayah 2, in the form of {عَلَى}.

{كَالْوَهْمِ} and {وَزُنُوهِم} are two verbs that are used here in a slightly different way from what is usual. There are many other examples of such kinds of usage, and many examples have been given under *t-f-f* ‘طَفَّفَ’. {...هُم} here occupies the place of the direct

object, though the acts of measuring and weighing do not really fall upon them directly in the sense that “they” are being measured and/or weighed. Such feature is also found in English, but not necessarily with the same verbs as in Arabic.

“I hunted you a bear” or “I killed you a lamb” does not mean that because “you” is in the place of the object (i.e., where the direct object normally occurs) that the action of hunting and killing was done to “you”. As “I hunted you a bear” means “I hunted a bear for you”, the Arabic {كَالُوهُمْ} (Lit., measured them) and {وَزَنُوهُمْ} (Lit., weighed them) mean “measured for them/ gave by measure to them” and “weighed for them/ gave by weight to them”, respectively. This is the economy of *balāghah*. (It has also to be noted that in the above English examples, the indirect object is indispensable).

I am also tempted to suggest that using {هُم...} as a direct object serves another subtle purpose, which is: even in case that the *Mutaffifīn* do actually measure and weigh people, they would still try to withhold part of the person being measured or weighed and keep it to themselves (committing *ikhsār*). This shows how determined they are in wronging others.

For {وَإِذَا كَالُوهُمْ أَوْ وَزَنُوهُمْ}, **Yusuf Ali** and **Khan&Helali** say: “but when they have to give by measure or weight to men”. Here again, the translators use “have to”, perhaps to match their previous references. “Give by measure or weight” reduces the verbs that carry the meaning of measuring and weighing to mere ‘giving’, and therefore, necessitates the addition of “by measure or weight” to provide the verb “give” with the missing meaning.

Also, while the Arabic uses the pronoun {هُم...} meaning ‘them’, the translations explicitly say “men” preceded by the preposition “to” to cater for the equivalent of that preposition in Arabic which is absent from the Arabic original due to linguistic differences between Arabic and English. This last point with reference to the use of a preposition is clear in all of the other translations.

Arberry's and **Khatib's** “but when they measure for them or weigh for them” are, of course, more economical and very near to the structure of the ST. Yet, they have a sense of ambiguity as “for” might also be understood as ‘in place of’ or ‘on behalf of’, that is, “they were supposed to do the measuring and weighing themselves, but it is somebody else who will be doing that “for” them”.

The same can be said about **Pickthall's** “weigh for them”. However, he precedes this with a different preposition in “measure unto them”, ‘unto’ being an archaic form of ‘to’. Strictly speaking, ‘unto/to’ is perhaps a good rendering for the missing preposition ‘لِ’ in the Arabic (which is not actually missing in the sense that it is needed or dropped by mistake), as it transfers the reference from one direction (the giver) to another (the receiver). Yet, “measure unto them” still sounds odd in this context.

Asad's “but when they have to measure or weigh whatever they owe to others ...” suffers from an addition which is incorporated in the body of the text “whatever they owe”, though implied in the original. Although the translation succeeds in one thing namely the reference to the receiver by “to”, this is only because of the addition of the verb “owe”.

For {يُخْسِرُونَ}, **Yusuf Ali, Khan&Helali** and **Asad** say “give less than due” which is perhaps closer to the meaning than the other translations. (See also Q55:9).

Pickthall's “cause them loss” refers to the result of the act and not to the act itself. He seems to ignore the fact that the Ayah says {يُخْسِرُونَ} not “يُخْسِرُونَهُمْ”, (i.e., يُسَبِّحُونَ لَهُمُ الْخَسَارَةَ), as far as that element of ‘loss’ is concerned. Yet, “cause them loss” does not indicate how the “loss” came about, or as a result of what. The loss ‘خسارة’ is obviously a result of the *ikhsār*, the unrightful and, according to Al-Rāzi under *t-f-f* ‘طَفَّفَ’, secret keeping of part of what is due to others.

Arberry's and **Khatib's** “skimp” again does not render the meaning of {يُخْسِرُونَ} exactly, (see Q55:9, **Arberry's** translation).

Khatib seems to be using it because he renders {مُطَفِّفِينَ...} as “the skimpers”; yet, no elaboration on the meaning of {مُطَفِّفِينَ...} is made in the translation as it is in the Ayah. In other words, **Khatib**’s translation defines “skimpers” as *those who “skimp”* using circular definition which does not illustrate the meaning: (عَرَفَ الْمَاءَ بَعْدَ)! (الْجُهْدِ بِالْمَاءِ

Surat Al-^cAnbiyā^c, Ayah 47

سورة الأنبياء آية 47

Surat Luqmān, Ayah 16

سورة لقمان آية 16

Q21:47

Q31:16

{... مِثْقَالِ حَبَّةٍ مِنْ خَرْدَلٍ ...}

Yusuf Ali Q21:47 ... the weight
Of a mustard seed,*

* Not the smallest action, word, thought, motive, or predilection but must come into the account of Allah. Cf. Browning (in *Rabbi Ben Ezra*): “But all, the world’s coarse thumb and finger failed to plumb, So passed in making up the main account; All instincts immature, All purposes unsure, That weighed not as his work, yet swelled the man’s account; Thoughts hardly to be packed Into a narrow act, Fancies that broke through language and escaped; All could never be, All, men ignored in me, This, I was worth to God, Whose wheel the pitcher shaped.”

Q31:16 ... the weight
Of a mustard seed ...*

* The mustard seed is proverbially a small, minute thing, that people may ordinarily pass by. Not so Allah. Further emphasis is laid by supposing the mustard seed to be hidden beneath a rock or in the cleft of a rock, or to be lost in the spaciousness of the earth or the heavens. To Allah everything is known, and He will bring it forth; *i.e.*, take account of it.

Pickthall	Q21:47	... the weight of a grain of mustard seed, ...
	Q31:16	... the weight of a grain of mustard-seed, ...
Arberry	Q21:47	the weight of one grain of mustard-seed
	Q31:16	... the weight of one grain of mustard-seed, ...
Khan& Helali	Q21:47	... the weight of a mustard seed, ...
	Q31:16	... the weight of a grain of mustard seed, ...
Khatib	Q21:47	... the weight of one grain of mustard-seed, ...
	Q31:16	... the weight of a grain of mustard-seed, ...
Asad	Q21:47	... the weight of a mustard-seed [of good or evil], ...
	Q31:16	... the weight of a mustard-seed, ...

Surat Al-Nisā ^c , Ayah 40	سورة النساء آية 40
Surat Yūnus, Ayah 61	سورة يونس آية 61
Surat Saba ^c , Ayahs 3 & 22	سورة سبأ الآيات 3 و 22
Surat Al-Zalzalah, Ayahs 7 & 8	سورة الزلزلة الآيات 7 و 8

Q4:40
Q10:61
Q34:3 & 22
Q99:7 & 8
{مِثْقَالِ ذَرَّةٍ}

Yusuf Ali	Q4:40	... the least degree:
	Q10:61	The weight of an atom
	Q34:3	The least little atom
	Q34:22	... the weight of an atom-
	Q99:7	... an atom's weight *

* *Dharrah*: the weight of an ant, the smallest living weight an ordinary man can think of. Figuratively the subtlest form of good and evil will then be brought to account, and it will be done openly and convincingly: he "shall see it".

	Q99:8	... an atom's weight
Pickthall	Q4:40	... the weight of an ant; ...
	Q10:61	... an atom's weight
	Q34:3	... an atom's weight, ...
	Q34:22	... an atom's weight ...

	Q99:7	... an atom's weight ...
	Q99:8	... an atom's weight ...
Arberry	Q4:40	... the weight of an ant; ...
	Q10:61	... the weight of an ant ...
	Q34:3	... the weight of an ant ...
	Q34:22	... the weight of an ant ...
	Q99:7	... an atom's weight ...
	Q99:8	... an atom's weight ...
Khan& Helali	Q4:40	... the weight of an atom (or a small ant)*, ...
		* (Khan's and Helali's extremely long footnote is a translation of " <i>Ṣaḥīḥ Al-Bukhārī</i> , Vol.6, <i>Ḥadīth</i> No.105", and of no relevance to the Ayah as it is related to seeing Allah on the Judgement Day).
	Q10:61	... the weight of an atom (or a small ant) ...
	Q34:3	... the weight of an atom (or a small ant) ...
	Q34:22	... the weight of an atom (or a small ant), ...
	Q99:7	... the weight of an atom (or a small ant), ...

	Q99:8	... the weight of an atom (or a small ant), ...
Khatib	Q4:40	... the weight of an atom.*
		* The Koran, for the first time in history, draws man's attention to the fact that the atom has weight.
	Q10:61	... the single weight of an atom ...*
		* For the first time in human history, it was brought to man's attention that atoms can be weighed, and that there are bodies smaller than the atom.
	Q34:3	... the weight of an atom ...
	Q34:22	... an atom's weight ...
	Q99:7	... an atom's weight * ...
		* The first reference in history to the fact that the atom has a weight.
	Q99:8	... an atom's weight ...
Asad	Q4:40	... an atom's weight; ...
	Q10:61	... an atom's weight ...
	Q34:3	... an atom's weight ...
	Q34:22	... an atom's weight ...
	Q99:7	... an atom's weight ...
	Q99:8	... an atom's weight ...

With the exception of **Yusuf Ali**'s translations of {مِثْقَالِ ذَرَّةٍ} in Q4:40 and Q34:3, the rest of the translations use “weight” as a rendering for {مِثْقَالِ}, thus ‘the weight of a mustard seed’ for {مِثْقَالِ حَبَّةٍ} {مِنْ خَرْدَلٍ}, and ‘the weight of an atom’ and/or ‘the weight of an ant’ for {مِثْقَالِ ذَرَّةٍ} as shown above.

It is true that weighing determines the weight of the thing weighed; or, in other words, it shows its share of heaviness which is what is literally stated in the word *mithqāl* {مِثْقَالِ} by virtue of the meaning of its root *th-q-l* ‘ثَقُلَ’. Although the meaning does not seem to be affected at all by the use of the word “weight” for {مِثْقَالِ} and it is probably the best rendering for the Arabic word in this context, there is a subtle difference between {مِثْقَالِ} and its translation, “weight”.

As {حَبَّةٍ مِنْ خَرْدَلٍ} and {ذَرَّةٍ} are used in the Qur’an to refer to things which are lightest in weight, and perhaps with the use of “atom” as a translation for {ذَرَّةٍ}, one might be tempted to say that these things have actually no weight. In spite of the fact that in physics the atom is regarded as having measurable weight, one may ask: what is the weight of an atom of good/bad deeds? And how do you weigh one?

The Qur’an provides an important piece of information to stop such questions at their roots. The Qur’anic way of doing this is revealed in the word {مِثْقَالِ} referring to the fact that everything, whatever its size and nature does have a weight, a share of heaviness, even if it is as small as an atom, and even if that thing cannot be weighed applying human methods. And as discussed under *th-q-l* ‘ثَقُلَ’, the Qur’an also states that what is even smaller than an atom does have a share of heaviness. If we, humans, cannot weigh such small particles by placing one on a balance against another or even a concrete counterpoise, this does not mean that such particles have no weight.

Yusuf Ali's translation for {مِثْقَالٌ ذَرَّةٍ} in Q4:40 shows that his aim was not to stick to the wording of the ST. He gave an 'interpretation' or rather an explanation for {مِثْقَالٌ ذَرَّةٍ} in that context. Although he might be justified in terms of his explanation, no one can say that "in the least degree" is an accurate translation for {مِثْقَالٌ ذَرَّةٍ}. Also, it seems that **Yusuf Ali** himself has realised this as in the other Ayahs where {مِثْقَالٌ ذَرَّةٍ} is found, he uses "the weight of an atom" twice and "an atom's weight" twice as well. This shows the difference in consistency between the ST and the translation. {مِثْقَالٌ ذَرَّةٍ} is the same in the six Ayahs where it occurs, unlike the translation.

Also, {مِثْقَالٌ ذَرَّةٍ} in Q34:3 is translated by **Yusuf Ali** as "the least little atom"; one wonders where the translation of {مِثْقَالٌ} is. One might also be tempted to comment on "the least little atom". However, this is of no concern to this work as it is related to {ذَرَّةٍ} and not to {مِثْقَالٌ}.

Q15:19

{ ... وَأَنْبَتْنَا فِيهَا مِنْ كُلِّ شَيْءٍ مَوْزُونٍ }

- Yusuf Ali And produced therein all kinds
Of things in due balance.*
- * And every kind of thing is produced on the earth in due balance and measure. The mineral kingdom supports the vegetable and they, in their turn, support the animal, and there is a link of mutual dependence between them. Excess is eliminated. The waste of one is made the food of another, and *vice versa*. And this is an infinite chain of gradation and interdependence.
- Pickthall and caused each seemly thing to grow therein,
- Arberry and We caused to grow therein of everything
justly weighed,
- Khan&Helali and caused to grow therein all kinds of things
in due proportion.
- Khatib and We caused to sprout therein of
everything,* well measured.
- * This may mean every
living creature on earth.
- Asad and caused [life] of every kind to grow on it
in a balanced manner,

The meaning of the word {مَوْزُونٍ} has been discussed in great detail under *w-z-n* 'وَزَنَ', and as is clear from that discussion it covers

a wide range of meanings. Strictly speaking, the word {مَوْزُونٌ} here is an adjective that describes {شَيْءٌ}. Some of the translations have succeeded in preserving this feature while others, in an attempt to cover as wide a range of meanings as {مَوْزُونٌ} itself, fell into the trap of transferring the reference from the specified word to another word. On the other hand, it might be argued that these translators felt they had no alternative but to go for this kind of compensation in place.

Yusuf Ali's “in due proportion” although it agrees with some of the *tafsirs* quoted under *w-z-n* ‘وَزَنَ’ in Chapter Two, does not actually describe “things” or “all kinds of things”, rather it describes the verb “produced”. Accordingly, it is the ‘production’ of “all kinds of things” that is “in due balance”, unlike what is stated in the Ayah.

Khan&Helali's translation is exactly the same, as it also says “in due proportion”; the only difference is that instead of **Yusuf Ali's** “produce”, they use a different verb, “grow”.

Asad's “in a balanced manner” is not much different as it also describes the ‘growing’ of every kind of life.

Pickthall succeeds in preserving the adjectival feature, yet, his “seemly” does not do full justice to the word {مَوْزُونٌ} as it bears no reference to the perfection of the action. (See {مَوْزُونٌ}, Chapter Two, under *w-z-n* ‘وَزَنَ’).

Khatib's “everything, well measured” is perhaps the closest to the Arabic. Although a stronger, more accurate word than just “well” might have been better, his translation preserves the structure of the Ayah and also reflects partly the element of “weight” apparent in {مَوْزُونٌ}. At the end of the day “weight” is a measure.

Arberry's “justly weighed” for {مَوْزُونٌ} is another attempt to imitate the Arabic structure as it refers to “everything”. The word

“weighed” is an obvious literal translation of {مُوزُونٌ}. Yet, “justly weighed” is too ambiguous and such ambiguity bears no resemblance to the ST. One has to justify the use of “justly” and what it actually means.

Here again, one may say that a footnote explaining in some detail what the word {مُوزُونٌ} refers to would have been in place. The translations given, good as they may be, do not emphasise the message in the same way or as strongly as it appears in the ST. The word {مُوزُونٌ}, perhaps refers to all the features described by the translations above together.

Q12:59

{... أَنِّي أُوفِي الْكَيْلَ ...}

Yusuf Ali	... I pay out Full measure, ...
Pickthall	... I fill up the measure ...
Arberry	... I fill up the measure,
Khan&Helali	... I give full measure,
Khatib	... I give measure in full,
Asad	... I have given [you] full measure ...

Q12:60

{... فَلَا كَيْلَ لَكُمْ عِنْدِي ...}

Yusuf Ali	... ye shall have No measure (of corn) from me,
Pickthall	... there shall be no measure for you with me, ...
Arberry	... there shall be no measure for you with me,
Khan&Helali	... there shall be no measure (of corn) for you with me,
Khatib	... there shall be no measure for you with me,
Asad	you shall never receive a single measure [of grain] from me,

Q12:63

{... مُنِعَ مِنَّا الْكَيْلُ ...}

Yusuf Ali	... No measure Of grain shall we get
Pickthall	The measure is denied us, ...
Arberry	... the measure was denied to us;
Khan&Helali	No measure of grain shall we get
Khatib	... the measure was forbidden us,
Asad	All grain * is [to be] withheld from us [in the future ...

* Lit., “measure [of grain]”, here used metonymically in an allusion to Joseph’s words (verse 60).

Q12:63

{... نَكْتَلُ ...}

Yusuf Ali	That we may get our measure;
Pickthall	... that we may obtain the measure,
Arberry	... that we may obtain the measure;
Khan&Helali	... we shall get our measure
Khatib	... we may obtain a measure;
Asad	so that we may obtain our measure [of grain];

Q12:65

{... كَيْلٌ بَعِيرٍ ...}

Yusuf Ali	A full camel's load (of grain)
Pickthall	... measure of a camel (load).
Arberry	... camel's load-
Khan&Helali	... one ... measure of a camel's load.
Khatib	... camel's load;
Asad	... camel-load of grain.*

* It would seem that Joseph used to allot to foreign buyers of grain one camel-load per person.

Q12:65

{... ذَلِكَ كَيْلٌ يَسِيرٌ ...}

Yusuf Ali	This is but a small quantity.* * Two meanings are possible - either or perhaps both. 'What we have brought now is nothing compared to what we shall get if we humour the whim of the Egyptian Wazīr. And moreover, Egypt seems to have plenty of grain stored up. What is a camel-load to her Wazīr to give away?'
Pickthall	This (that we bring now) is a light measure.
Arberry	that is an easy measure.
Khan&Helali	This quantity is easy (for the king to give).

Khatib that is an easy measure.

Asad That [which we have brought the first time] was but a scanty measure.

As stated under *k-y-l* 'كَيْلٌ' in the story of the Prophet Joseph, grains were given by measure. The word *kayl* 'كَيْلٌ' was used several times on its own and in relation to other words as well indicating some changes to the meaning depending on the context.

In this part of the thesis it will be extremely difficult, if not impossible to try to separate the Ayahs in Q12 where *k-y-l* occurs from one another and try to consider their translations separately. Some of the reasons are that the English language uses the word 'measure' to refer to different elements in the process of measuring: the measuring instrument is called 'measure', the amount measured is 'a measure', the act of measuring is also referred to as 'measure' as in 'to give/receive by measure'. 'Measure' is also used as a verb: 'to measure'. One can also say with regard to weights that "the kilogram is 'a measure' of weight". In short, the word is used with confusing flexibility. Sometimes, there is no clear-cut reference and one is left to wonder about what is actually meant.

In the Arabic, one sometimes faces a similar problem; yet, at the same time, one can also be definite about what the words related to measuring refer to. In Arabic, we have *kāla* 'كَالٌ', *iktāla* 'اِكْتَالٌ', *kayl* 'كَيْلٌ', *mikyāl* 'مِكْيَالٌ', *makāl* 'مَكْيَالٌ', etc., which are distinct words with distinct meanings. The English language only uses 'measure' for these words and additional words are needed sometimes to render some of them correctly and accurately.

It is, with this in mind and in conjunction with Chapter Two, under *k-y-l* 'كَيْلٌ' that this part should be considered. Also, cross references to Q6:152 and Q7:85 with regard to *al-kayl* {الْكَيْلُ} and *awfū al-kayl* {أَوْفُوا الْكَيْلَ} must be made.

If we now turn to the translations above, we find that {أَوْفُوا الْكَيْلَ} in Q12:59 is dealt with in almost exactly the same way as in Q6:152

{وَأَوْفُوا الْكَيْلَ} and in Q7:85 {فَأَوْفُوا الْكَيْلَ}, that is, {أَوْفَى الْكَيْلَ} is considered as a whole, as one unit. This is clear from the way the translations are structured. The limitations of “fill” or “fill up” for example as references to the act of *‘ifā’*, are obvious and have been referred to before. The same applies to “pay out” and “give”. **Asad**’s translation however “that I have given [you]” restricts the reference of {أَوْفَى الْكَيْلَ} to what the Prophet Joseph’s brothers have received, while the Arabic actually uses the present tense as a statement of fact. The Prophet Joseph does not only do this to his brothers but to everybody else as well.

With regard to *al-kayl*, a reference is made to the thing measured (*al-makīl*) in **Yusuf Ali**’s, **Khan&Helali**’s, **Khatib**’s and **Asad**’s translations, while **Pickthall**’s and **Arberry**’s translations refer to the measuring instrument (*al-mikyāl*).

{فَلَا كَيْلَ لَكُمْ عِنْدِي} in Q12:60 is rendered in all translations as “measure”. **Yusuf Ali** and **Khan&Helali** elaborate on “measure” adding “(of corn)” although the corn is not stated in this particular Ayah. As a matter of fact, “corn” is not specified in any way anywhere in the Surah. The reference is only made to ‘green ears (of grain)’ {سُنْبُلَاتٍ خُضْرٍ} in the king’s dream only, and consequently in the Prophet Joseph’s interpretation.

Asad’s translation though, refers to “[... grain]”. **Asad** also tries to create a similar emphatic tone as in the Ayah; that is why he uses words like “never again” and “a single measure”. Yet, as is clear, his reference is made to the thing measured. As a matter of fact, I find such additions of “corn” and “grain” unjustified as they may be restricting the meaning of the Ayah and doing injustice to the Prophet Joseph’s utterance as he uses {كَيْلَ} in the indefinite form, as is clear in his {فَلَا كَيْلَ لَكُمْ عِنْدِي وَلَا تَقْرَبُونِ} which indicates that no measure of anything whatsoever will be given to them as they would not be even allowed to enter Egypt.

In Q12:63 **Yusuf Ali** changes “measure (of corn)” in Q12:60 to “measure of grain”, where also the parentheses disappear. **Khan&Helali**’s translation is an exact copy of **Yusuf Ali**’s. Also, while **Pickthall**, **Arberry**, and **Khatib** stick to their “measure”,

Asad interprets the situation rather than the actual words. His “all grain” is certainly not a direct translation of {الْكَيْل}. However, in his footnote, he states the literal meaning of *al-kayl* and alludes to the Prophet Joseph’s words in Q12:60. This actually makes one wonder if it would have been more suitable for the translation and the footnote to have swapped places.

{نَكْتَلُ} in Q12:63 has no simple word-for-word translation. Yet, it simply refers to ‘receiving by measure’. That is why “get” as in **Yusuf Ali**’s and **Khan&Helali**’s translations or “obtain” as in the rest of the translations are not that different from each other. However, **Yusuf Ali**’s, **Khan&Helali**’s and **Asad**’s “our measure” sounds more specific than **Pickthall**’s and **Arberry**’s “the measure”. **Khatib**’s “a measure” is a very weak translation, as it is not only one measure that the Prophet Joseph’s brothers are after.

Asad’s addition of “[of grain]” is the same as in the previous Ayahs.

In Q12:65, we read {كَيْلَ بَعِيرٍ}; we therefore realise that the portion given to each one of the brothers was {كَيْلَ بَعِيرٍ}, that is whatever is given is by measure and it is a certain amount carried by a camel: it is a measure of a camel’s load.

Yusuf Ali’s “a full camel’s load (of grain ...)” has the addition of “full” and “(of grain ...)”, and does without the word {كَيْلَ}. First of all, it is not guaranteed and not even specified that when the brothers return to Egypt, they would be given their measures in full. Yet, they can only assume that that will be the case from their previous experience of the Prophet Joseph’s generosity. This means that “full” is unjustified, let alone that it is not between parentheses. Also, “(of grain)” is only added by means of specifying what type of measure they would receive.

Pickthall sticks to the words of the Arabic in his “measure of a camel (load)”. He realises that the word “load” is implied in {كَيْلَ} {بَعِيرٍ}, and although its existence in the body of the translation may easily be justified, he prefers to put it between parentheses, perhaps to draw the attention of the reader that the Arabic does without the word “(load)”.

Khan&Helali's translation differs from **Pickthall**'s in only one aspect and that is the omission of the parentheses and the addition of the perfectly acceptable ('s) in "measure of a camel's load".

Arberry and **Khatib** say just "camel's load". Like **Yusuf Ali**, the translators felt no need to use "measure" as it is understood from the story itself.

Asad's "camel-load of grain" is not very different from **Yusuf Ali**'s "camel's load (of grain ...)".

The translations of Q12:65 {كَيْلٌ يَسِيرٌ} show quite a difference in the translators favourite ways of understanding what {كَيْلٌ يَسِيرٌ} refers to.

Arberry and **Khatib** go for the literal meaning, that is "an easy measure". Though this is justified, it sounds odd in the translation as it is not an easily interpretable phrase in English. No footnotes are provided to shed light on the meaning.

Pickthall's "light measure" is as unusual as "an easy measure". Considering the whole context, whether the load was light or not, has no bearing on the situation. "Light" perhaps might be referring indirectly to the measure being a small quantity, but 'a small quantity' is better understood referentially than "light measure". Also, **Pickthall**'s reference is to what they have brought from Egypt.

Yusuf Ali goes for the tafsir of {كَيْلٌ يَسِيرٌ}, thus "a small quantity". Perhaps, he did not want to keep using the word "measure" every time {كَيْلٌ...} appears in the ST.

Khan&Helali's translation goes for one of the different tafsirs provided for {كَيْلٌ يَسِيرٌ}, by exegetes (see *k-y-l* 'كَيْلٌ', Chapter Two), that is "this quantity is *easy for the king to give*". According to this translation, {ذَلِكَ كَيْلٌ يَسِيرٌ} is said by the brothers. Other interpretations refer to different meanings and a different speaker. Therefore, preferring one interpretation to another limits the translation's ability to make room for the other interpretations as well, bearing in mind that **Khan&Helali** do not provide a footnote to indicate that {ذَلِكَ كَيْلٌ يَسِيرٌ} might be referring to other things as

well. With regard to this particular point all the translations are the same.

Asad's "a scanty measure" is perhaps a good translation for {كَيْلٌ يَسِيرٌ}. Yet, his addition between square brackets leads to a specific understanding of the utterance {ذَلِكَ كَيْلٌ يَسِيرٌ}. {كَيْلٌ} in the translation refers only to what they have brought from Egypt before, and has no relation to any future *kayl*.

It is therefore clear from all the translations that {كَيْلٌ} refers to what is measured.

The Arabic {ذَلِكَ كَيْلٌ يَسِيرٌ} has a range of reference wide enough to accommodate all the above translations. However, it is understood that all the various meanings and the possibility of the change of speaker cannot all be expressed in the translation. Perhaps, a footnote would have been in place if added as in the case of **Yusuf Ali**'s translation.

As for Q12:88 {فَأَوْفِ لَنَا الْكَيْلَ}, there is almost no difference between the translation of this and that of Q12:59 {أَوْفِ الْكَيْلَ} discussed before. The following table shows this.

	Q12:59	Q12:88
Yusuf Ali	pay out full measure	pay us full measure
Pickthall	fill up the measure	fill for us the measure
Arberry	fill up the measure	fill up to us the measure
Khan& Helali	give full measure	pay us full measure
Khatib	measure in full	give us measure in full
Asad	given [you] full measure	give us a full measure [of grain]

Q21:47

{وَنَضَعُ الْمَوَازِينَ الْقِسْطَ لِيَوْمِ الْقِيَامَةِ ...}

Yusuf Ali	We shall set up scales Of justice for the day Of Judgement,
Pickthall	And We set a just balance for the Day of Resurrection
Arberry	And We shall set up the just balances for the Resurrection Day,
Khan&Helali	And We shall set up balances of justice on the Day of Resurrection,
Khatib	And We shall set up the just balances of the Day of Resurrection,
Asad	But We shall set up just balance-scales on Resurrection Day,

It is clear from this Ayah that {المَوَازِينُ} is the plural of 'المِيزَانُ'. We have established in Chapter Two that there is a consensus that on the Judgement Day there is only one *mīzān* (balance), and discussed why in spite of this the plural form is used instead of the singular.

Yusuf Ali's "scales" and **Pickthall's** "balance" seems to agree with the fact that there will be only one balance or one set of scales for the weighing. Also, "scales" lacks the subtle meaning of {المَوَازِينُ} which, if translated literally using **Yusuf Ali's** "scales", may be 'sets of scales'. However, this last translation lacks the most important factor, which is that the reason for using the plural form

in Arabic with whatever implications it has is not the same as in English.

This is why **Arberry's**, **Khan&Helali's** and **Khatib's** “balances” sounds awkward. The plural form {المَوَازِينُ} serves a *balāghi* purpose, while the English refers only to the existence of more than one balance. In other words, if the plural form in Arabic can be understood as referring to two meanings (if taken literally), singular and plural, this feature is lacking in the English “balances”.

Asad's “balance-scales” is rather ambiguous, as it may be referring to the setting up of only *scales* or *pans*, and not a balance.

According to our analysis in Chapter Two, under *q-s-t* ‘قَسَطَ’, several purposes are served by the use of {المَوَازِينُ الْقَسِطُ}, the most important of which is that {المَوَازِينُ} are {...قَسِطُ} in themselves; that is why the verbal noun {الْقَسِطُ} is used as an adjective. Also, {الْقَسِطُ} is not just mere ‘justice’. This means that **Yusuf Ali's** “scales of justice” is not very accurate; these are not “scales of justice”, rather ‘scales that are justice’.

On the other hand, putting {الْقَسِطُ} in the position of the adjective in the translation, as in **Pickthall's**, **Arberry's**, **Khatib's** and **Asad's**, results in what is equivalent to ‘المِيزَانُ العَادِلُ/المُقْسِطُ’ or ‘المَوَازِينُ العَادِلَةُ/المُقْسِطَةُ’ which, disregarding the double meaning of the Arabic, does not have the force and emphasis of the original wording: {المَوَازِينُ الْقَسِطُ}. We cannot separate {الْقَسِطُ} as an adjective from its structure as a verbal noun; in other words {الْقَسِطُ} is not a mere adjective that describes what precedes it, it also adds great emphasis to the meaning.

Although in previous Ayahs where ‘القِسْطُ’ is used, ‘equity’ and ‘equitable’ are sometimes used as renderings, here we meet with neither.

Perhaps the words “just” and “justice” are used in contrast to *zulm* ‘ظلم’ in {فَلَا تُظْلَمُ نَفْسٌ شَيْئًا}, as one of the meanings of *zulm* is injustice.

It is also worth noting that for the sake of preserving the plurality of {المَوَازِينُ} in the translation, **Khan&Helali** end with their unfamiliar and perhaps awkward “balances of justice”.

The rest of the Ayah with regard to the translation of {مِثْقَالَ حَبَّةٍ مِنْ خَرْدَلٍ} has been dealt with before together with {مِثْقَالَ دَرَّةٍ}.

Q7:8-9

{وَالْوِزْنَ يَوْمَئِذٍ الْحَقُّ فَمَنْ ثَقُلَتْ مَوَازِينُهُ فَأُولَئِكَ هُمُ الْمُفْلِحُونَ*
وَمَنْ خَفَّتْ مَوَازِينُهُ فَأُولَئِكَ الَّذِينَ خَسِرُوا أَنفُسَهُمْ ...}

Yusuf Ali	The Balance that day Will be true (to a nicety): Those whose scale (of good) Will be heavy, will prosper:(●) Those whose scale will be light, Will find their souls in perdition ...
Pickthall	The weighing on that day is the true (weighing). As for those whose scale is heavy, they are the successful. (●) And as for those whose scale is light: those are they who lose their souls ...
Arberry	The weighing that day is true; he whose scales are heavy- they are the prosperers, and he whose scales are light- they have lost their souls ...
Khan&Helali	And the weighing on that day (Day of Resurrection) will be the true (weighing)*. So as for those whose scale (of good deeds) will be heavy, they will be the successful (by entering Paradise). (●) As for those whose scale will be light, they are those who will lose their ownselves (by entering Hell)

* The statement of Allah عز وجل -: “And We shall set up Balances of justices on the Day of Resurrection.”.. (21:47). The

deeds and the statement of Adam's offspring will be weighed. Narrated Abu Huraira رضى الله عنه: The Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم said, "(There are) two words (expressions or sayings) which are dear to the most Beneficent (Allah) and very easy for the tongue to say, but very heavy in weight in the balance. They are:

سبحان الله ويحمده سبحان الله العظيم

'Subhan Allah-i-wa-bi hamdihi and Subhan Allah il-'Azim.' ***(sahih Al-Bukhari, Vol.9 No.652).

** 'Glorified be Allah and praised be He, 'Glorified be Allah, the Most Great.' (Or I deem Allah above all those unsuitable things ascribed to Him, and free Him from resembling anything whatsoever, and I glorify His Praises! I deem Allah, the Most Great above all those unsuitable things ascribed to Him and free Him from resembling anything whatsoever).'

- Khatib And the weighing on that day is true.
Hence, he whose scales are heavy, they are the prosperous. (●)
And he whose scales are light, they are those who have lost themselves ...
- Asad And true will be the weighing on that Day: and those whose weight [of good deeds] is heavy in the balance - it is they, they who shall attain to a happy state; (●)
whereas those whose weight is light in the balance - it is they who will have squandered their own selves ...

As stated under *w-z-n* 'وَزَنَ', the verbal noun *wazn* 'وَزْنٌ' refers to the act or process of weighing.

Considering the structure of { وَالْوَزْنُ يَوْمَئِذٍ الْحَقُّ }, we are faced with two distinct grammatical interpretations:

(1) *al-wazn* {الْوَزْنُ} is *mubtada'* 'مُبْتَدَأٌ' (subject),

yawma'idh {يَوْمَئِذٍ} is *khavar* 'خَبَرٌ' (predicate), and

al-haq {الْحَقُّ} is *sifah* 'صِفَةٌ' (adjective).

(2) *al-wazn* {الْوَزْنُ} is *mubtada'* 'مُبْتَدَأٌ' (subject),

yawma'idh {يَوْمَئِذٍ} is *zarf zamān* 'ظَرْفُ زَمَانٍ' (adverb of time),

and

al-haq {الْحَقُّ} is *khavar* 'خَبَرٌ' (predicate).

These two interpretations affect the way this above phrase is translated. According to (1) the meaning is: 'The *true* weighing is (on) that day', while (2) means: 'The weighing (on) that day is *the true* (weighing).'

The Ayah means to indicate that although man might be practising weighing in this life, and can invent all sorts of ways to cheat as he weighs, on the Day of Judgement, the weighing then is deservedly called weighing, as no cheating is involved, no benefit is the weigher going to get, the Balance need not be manipulated as it is actually adjusted to detect the weight of what is even less than an atom in weight, etc. It is in this sense that {الْوَزْنُ} is referred to as {الْحَقُّ}, and not just 'حَقٌّ'.

Accordingly, only one of the above two grammatical interpretations is catered for in the translations. **Pickthall's** and **Khan&Helali's** translations meet our second interpretation. Their addition of "(weighing)" between parentheses is simply justified by the fact that "true" in "the true ..." requires something to describe. If only "true" is used, as in the rest of the translations, the meaning will differ slightly.

Arberry's, **Khatib's** and **Asad's** translations seem to consider {الْحَقُّ} as the predicate of {الْوَزْنُ}, yet their translations also seem to ignore an important fact, that is, the existence of 'ال' attached to 'حَقٌّ'. These translations suggest that the Arabic is saying: 'والْوَزْنُ يَوْمَئِذٍ حَقٌّ', which is not the case.

"The weighing (on) that day is true" also suggests that the weighing is true not false. The Ayah, on the other hand, is more subtle than this as it implies that the weighing in this life is also true in the sense that all that is needed to perform weighing may be available to man, while on the Judgement Day the difference is that

that weighing is not subject to error, it is not *just* true, it most certainly “**the** true weighing”; it is the real thing. Human weighing may be affected by many ulterior motives, but this is not the case when the Controller of the scene is the All-Powerful Himself.

Yusuf Ali’s translation also falls in the same trap of ‘الْوَزْنُ حَقٌّ’, and adds “(to a nicety)”, perhaps to indicate that the least act of good or bad will be considered and will not escape the weighing. This meaning is actually implied in the word {الْحَقُّ} itself. The situation is like saying: “That day you will know/see how weighing should be done, or how the real weighing is carried out/conducted”.

Yusuf Ali also uses “the Balance” as a translation of {الْوَزْنُ}. It seems that his reason is his reference to the “scale/s” later on. Yet, this does not alter the fact that weighing does not mean balancing; the purposes of the two acts are different and the result is different, too. Balancing attempts to achieve a point where the sacs/pan are equal, while weighing aims at determining how heavy/light one side is as compared to the other, as also explained before in Chapter Two under *mīzān* ‘مِيزَان’.

The act of weighing results in a judgement based on how heavy or light the thing weighed is.

As for {ثَقَلَتْ مَوَازِينُهُ} and {خَفَّتْ مَوَازِينُهُ}, the meaning of the three words in these two phrases have been discussed before in Chapter Two. Basically, {ثَقَلَتْ} is related to ‘heaviness’ and {خَفَّتْ} to ‘lightness’, while {مَوَازِينُهُ} is the most complicated meaning-wise, and must be understood according to the analysis provided for ‘مَوَازِينُ’ in Chapter Two.

The translations provided for ‘مَوَازِينُ’ above may be accepted in the sense that they refer to various things involved in the process of weighing, and perhaps only in that restricted sense may they be justified. Yet, at the level of the individual word translation-wise, which I believe can easily fit with the entire context, some aspects of meaning are missing.

Yusuf Ali’s “scale (of good)” is obviously meant to refer to one side of ‘the Balance’ in contrast with the other “scale”. Yet, it is also obvious that “scale” is singular while {مَوَازِينُهُ} is plural; “scale (of good)” refers to the scale/pan itself and what is being placed there;

that is to say, “(of good)” is stated as an addition for fear that the reader might be confused as to what is being placed on that scale, while {ثَقَلَتْ مَوَازِينُهُ} states that specifically and directly (‘مَوَازِينُ’ being the plural of ‘مَوْزُونٌ’). In other words, it is not the “scale” that is weighed, it is what is placed on it that counts. This is very clear in **Yusuf Ali**’s translation for {مَوَازِينُهُ} in {خَفَّتْ مَوَازِينُهُ}, as he ambiguously says: “Those whose *scale* will be light”.

While **Yusuf Ali** refers to the scale of good deeds proving heavy or light, **Pickthall**’s translation does only with “whose scale is heavy” and “whose scale is light”. Here, again, the singular “scale” is used to cater for the plural ‘مَوَازِينُ’ doing away with all the shades of meaning of the Arabic word; besides, as explained under ‘مَوَازِينُ’ in Chapter Two, a scale is never referred to as ‘مَوَازِينُ’.

Even **Arberry**’s and **Khatib**’s “scales” is by no means an accurate translation in spite of the use of the plural form “scales”. ‘Scales’ is one set of instrument, a *mīzān* which is a singular word in Arabic.

This actually means that whether “scale” or “scales” is used, neither can be considered an accurate translation of ‘مَوَازِينُ’. Also, with the use of “scales”, it is indicated that ‘مَوَازِينُ’ is not the plural of ‘مَوْزُونٌ’ (what is weighed), and of course, this does away with one of the possible senses of the Arabic word.

If we adopt the view that what ‘مَوَازِينُ’ refers to is the good deeds, as do **Khan&Helali** in their translation, we first realise that the reference is made to “scales (of good deeds)”, and not to the “good deeds” themselves; secondly, if the “good deeds” are ‘مَوَازِينُ’, ‘مَوَازِينُ’ must be considered as the plural of ‘مَوْزُونٌ’, then the other meaning of ‘مَوَازِينُ’ as the plural of ‘مِيزَانٌ’ is left uncatered for.

In short, both ways of translating ‘مَوَازِينُ’ fall short of catering for all *important* aspects of the meaning of the original. The attempts made in the above translations to capture both meanings in the form of ‘scale/s (مِيزَانٌ/مَوَازِينُ)’ and ‘of/ good/ deeds (مَوْزُونٌ/مَوَازِينُ)’ are far from successful. They have succeeded in conveying the message in its general form, but not as exactly as it appears in the ST with all

its precision and grandeur.

Asad's translation is better described as a paraphrase, rather than a translation; also it is not even a direct paraphrase, as it is not "the weight ... in the Balance" that the Arabs refer to as 'مَوَازِين', it is the balance itself together with its weights.

{ثَقُلْتُ مَوَازِينَهُ} and {حَقَّتْ مَوَازِينُهُ} are used two more times each in Q23:102-3 and Q101:6&8.

Q23:102

{... فَمَنْ ثَقُلَتْ مَوَازِينُهُ}

Yusuf Ali Then those whose balance
(Of good deeds) is heavy- ...*

* Good and evil deeds will be weighed against each other. If the good deeds prevail, the soul will attain *falāḥ*, *i.e.*, prosperity, well-being, bliss, or salvation; if the contrary, there will be the misery and anguish of Hell.

Pickthall Then those whose scales are heavy, ...

Arberry Then he whose scales are heavy- ...

Khan&Helali Then, those whose scales (of good deeds) are heavy- ...

Khatib Then those whose weights* are heavy ...

* Weights of good and righteous deeds.

Asad And they whose weight [of righteousness] is heavy in the balance - ...

Q23:103

{وَمَنْ خَفَّتْ مَوَازِينُهُ ...}

Yusuf Ali	But those whose balance Is light, ...
Pickthall	And those whose scales are light ...
Arberry	and he whose scales are light- ...
Khan&Helali	And those whose scales (of good deeds) are light, ...
Khatib	And those whose weights are light, ...
Asad	whereas they whose weight is light in the balance- ...

Q101:6

{فَأَمَّا مَنْ ثَقُلَتْ مَوَازِينُهُ}

Yusuf Ali	Then, he whose Balance (of good deeds)* Will be found heavy,
-----------	--

* The Good Deeds will be weighed and appraised. This appraisalment will be of the nicest and justest kind: for it will take into account motives, temptations, provocations, surrounding conditions, antecedents, subsequent amends, and all possible connected circumstances. Against them, presumably, will be deeds of the opposite kind, appraised in the same way. If the good predominates, the judgement will be in the man's favour, and he will be ushered into a life of good pleasure and satisfaction. This will of course be on another plane. (R).

Pickthall	Then, as for him whose scales are heavy (with good works)
Arberry	Then he whose deeds weigh heavy in the Balance ...
Khan&Helali	Then as for him whose balance (of good deeds) will be heavy*, ... See F.N. of (V.7:8).
Khatib	So, as for him whose scales weigh heavy*- * That is, the balance of deeds.
Asad	And then, he whose weight [of good deeds] is heavy in the balance ...

Q101:8

{وَأَمَّا مَنْ خَفَّتْ مَوَازِينُهُ}

Yusuf Ali	But he whose Balance (of good deeds) Will be (found) light- ...
Pickthall	But as for him whose scales are light, ...
Arberry	but he whose deeds weigh light in the balance ...
Khan&Helali	But as for him whose balance (of good deeds) will be light, ...
Khatib	And as for him whose scales weigh light- ...

Asad whereas he whose weight is light in the
balance ...

The following table will show the different renderings used in the six translations with regard to ‘مَوَازِين’. In that table, “(1)” refers to where ‘مَوَازِين’ is used with {تَنَقَّلَتْ}, and “(2)” with {خَفَّتْ}.

Translation	Q7:8-9	Q23:102-3	Q101:6&8
Yusuf Ali	(1) scale (of good) (2) scale	balance (of good deeds) balance	balance (of good deeds) balance (of good deeds)
Pickthall	(1) scale (2) scale	scales scales	scales ... (with good works) scales
Arberry	(1) scales (2) scales	scales scales	deeds <i>weigh</i> heavy in the balance deeds <i>weigh</i> light in the balance
Khan & Helali	(1) scales (of good deeds) (2) scales	scales (of good deeds) scales (of good deeds)	balance (of good deeds) balance (of good deeds)
Khatib	(1) scales (2) scales	weights* weights	scales <i>weigh</i> heavy scales <i>weigh</i> light
Asad	(1) weight [of good deeds] in the balance (2) weight	weight [of righteousness] in the balance weight in the balance	weight [of good deeds] in the balance weight <i>is light</i> in the balance

In Q7:8 **Yusuf Ali** gives “the Balance” as a translation for {الْوَزْنُ}, yet, in Q23:102-3 and Q101:6&8 with the addition of “(of good deeds)”, the same word is used for {مَوَازِينُهُ}. (“the Balance” is

also used as a translation of {المِيزَانُ} in other Ayahs as well, see for example Q55:7-9). **Khan&Helali**'s translation for Q101:6&8 is exactly the same as **Yusuf Ali**'s.

Pickthall's and **Arberry**'s "scales" in Q23:102-3 is the same as **Arberry**'s and **Khatib**'s translations of {مَوَازِينُهُ} in Q7:8-9. The word, compared to its Arabic counterpart is ambiguous.

Khan&Helali's addition of "(of good deeds)" to "scales" in Q23:102-3 specifies the side of importance only, yet it still suffers from the same problem, that it is the word "scales" that translates {مَوَازِينُهُ}; and as is clear by now, the Arabic word is much more elaborate than "scales". **Pickthall**'s translation of Q101:6&8 falls under the same category.

Khatib's "scales weigh heavy/light" in Q101:6&8 is no different from all the other translations that use "scales"; the difference between "whose scales *are* heavy/light" and "whose scales *weigh* heavy/light" is negligible. His footnote to Q101:6 does not add much to clarifying the meaning.

In Q23:102-3 **Khatib** uses only "weights" and explains in a footnote that these are the weights of good and righteous deeds. **Asad**'s translations of Q23:102-3 and Q101:6 incorporate the good deeds in the form of "[of righteousness]" for the former and "[of good deeds]" for the latter, in the body of the translation between square brackets. He also adds "in the balance", but this time, no brackets. In spite of these minor differences, what they are basically saying is the same. Although the message may be considered correct, the translations and the additions lack the economy and precision of the word {مَوَازِينُهُ}. 'Weights' cannot be considered an accurate translation of {مَوَازِينُهُ}. This should not be confused with the fact that the Arabs call the 'أَوْزَانُ' (weights) 'مَوَازِينُ' because what they mean is 'counterpoises', not what is being weighed against the 'weights'; see Chapter Two, under 'مَوَازِينُ'.

In all the above translations, the translators seem to be consistent, almost all the time, in using the same word or way of expression when referring to ‘موازن’ in every Surah.

None of the footnotes added refer to the various interpretations and subtleties of the Arabic word ‘موازن’, or how it came to carry its full range of references. They do not even refer to why the plural form is used or its implications.

Q18:105

{أُولَئِكَ الَّذِينَ كَفَرُوا بِآيَاتِ رَبِّهِمْ وَلِقَائِهِ فَحَبِطَتْ أَعْمَالُهُمْ
فَلَا نُقِيمُ لَهُمْ يَوْمَ الْقِيَامَةِ وَزْنًا}

- Yusuf Ali They are those who deny
The signs of their Lord
And the fact of their
Having to meet Him
(In the Hereafter): vain
Will be their works,
Nor shall We, on the Day
Of Judgement, give them
Any weight.*
- * What weight can be attached to works behind which the motives are not pure, or are positively evil? They are either wasted or count against those who seek to pass them off as meritorious!
- Pickthall Those are they who disbelieve in the revelations of their Lord and in the meeting with Him. Therefore their works are vain, and on the Day of Resurrection We assign no weight to them.
- Arberry Those are they that disbelieve in the signs of their Lord and the encounter with Him; their works have failed, and on the Day of Resurrection We shall not assign to them any weight.
- Khan&Helali “They are those who deny the *Ayāt* (proofs, evidences, verses, lessons, signs, revelations, etc.) of their Lord and the meeting with Him (in the Hereafter). So their works are in vain, and on the Day of Resurrection, We shall not give them any weight.

Khatib Such are they who disbelieve in their Lord’s signs, and in their meeting with Him. Hence, their deeds shall fail, and no heed shall We pay them on the Day of Resurrection.

Asad it is they who have chosen to deny their Sustainer’s messages, and the truth that they are destined to meet Him.”

Hence, all their [good] deeds come to nought, and no weight shall We assign to them on Resurrection Day.*

* Although each of their good actions will be taken into account on Judgement Day in accordance with the Qur’anic statement that “he who shall have done an atom’s weight of good, shall behold it” (99:7), the above verse implies that whatever good such sinners may do is far outweighed by their godlessness (al-Qadi Eiyad, as quoted by Rāzi).

In our analysis of this Ayah under *w-z-n* ‘وَزَنَ’, we have established beyond doubt that {فَلَا نُقِيمُ لَهُمْ ... وَزَنًا} may indeed be understood metaphorically as in saying ‘*laysa lifulānin waznun*’ (لَيْسَ لِغُلَّانٍ وَزَنٌ). We have also established that {لَهُمْ} refers to “the people”, and not to “the deeds/works”.

Yet, first of all, if {فَلَا نُقِيمُ لَهُمْ ... وَزَنًا} is to be taken literally, in this case {وَزَنًا} should be rendered as ‘weighing’ and not ‘weight’, because ‘weight’ is the property which makes bodies tend to move downwards. This is obviously not meant in the Ayah; rather it is the act of weighing that is referred to.

All the translations above, with the exception of **Khatib**’s where “heed” is used instead, use the word “weight” for {وَزَنًا}. Therefore, we are led to understand that probably the translators,

generally speaking, agree with the meaning we have established for {فَلَا تُقِيمُ لَهُمْ ... وَزُنًا} with regard to its being a figure of speech.

Yet, this is not always the case as some ambiguity of reference surrounds some of the translations, if not all of them.

In English, one may say that a view/opinion ‘is of no weight’, ‘has no weight’ or ‘a person carries no weight’ to refer to view/opinion/person as being insignificant, exactly as the Arabic example above ‘لَيْسَ لِغُلَانٍ وَزْنٌ’.

Khatib’s “no heed shall We pay them”, although it does not make use of the similarity of the metaphor in English and Arabic, agrees with the fact that no actual weighing is meant. Perhaps **Khatib** does not use the word ‘weight’ as this may lead to changing the verb “pay” to “give” or “assign” as done by the other translators, for fear that ambiguity with regard to “to them” may occur.

This is to a high degree the problem we have with the rest of the translations.

Yusuf Ali says: “nor shall We, ... give **them** any weight”. Although “them” may be understood as referring to the disbelievers, considering the wider context, we find that **Yusuf Ali**’s footnote turns the balance the other way. He states that “weight” is related to “works” which is obviously wrong, or to say the least is not what is referred to in the Ayah.

Pickthall’s “them” is too far from “they who disbelieve” which is in the preceding sentence, and is very much nearer to “works”. The least that can be said is that the position of “them” in the translation makes its reference ambiguous unlike the Arabic. The same applies to **Arberry**’s translation.

Khan&Helali’s “them” although also far from “the disbelievers”, may be understood to be referring to them. Their translation is similar to **Yusuf Ali**’s with the exception that no footnotes are provided here. This might confuse the meaning of the Ayah (although **Yusuf Ali**’s footnote itself did confuse the meaning of the Ayah).

Asad's translation does not differ from the previous translations. His footnote also refers to the deeds being weighed, yet the translation and the footnote leave the door open for the metaphorical reference that assigning no weight to them (the disbelievers) means considering them as having no weight.

Concluding Remarks

Contrasting the translations with which this study is concerned, we find that frequently the translators were confused as to the exact meaning of some terms. Sometimes, perhaps for the sake of stylistic variation or because of the lack of a word or words in the English language specific enough to render the Arabic terms in a way that would distinguish them from one another, they used the same translation for more than one of the Arabic terms.

It is clearly very hard to pinpoint a specific reason for this sort of confusion with certainty. However, this does not change the fact that certain words were used alternatively to render different Arabic words. The following examples show this clearly.

“Skimp” and “give less” were used to render ‘خَسَرَ’ and ‘طَفَّفَ’, “diminish” for ‘بَخَسَ’ and ‘نَقَصَ’, “give short (...)” for ‘خَسَرَ’, ‘طَفَّفَ’ and ‘نَقَصَ’, “measure” for ‘الْكَيْلِ’, ‘الْمِكْيَالِ’, ‘الْوِزْنِ’ and ‘الْمِيزَانِ’, “weight” for ‘مَوَازِينِ’, ‘مَوَازِينِ’ and ‘وِزْنًا’, and “balance” for ‘الْقِسْطَاسِ’, ‘الْمِيزَانِ’ and ‘مَوَازِينِ’; on the other hand, “balance”, “(heed)”, “weighing” and “weight” for ‘الْمِيزَانِ’, and “balance”, “scale/s” and “weight/s” for ‘مَوَازِينِ’. It is also worth mentioning with regard to the word ‘الْمِيزَانِ’, that it is quite surprising that none of the six translations renders it as ‘scales’ at any time even when what is referred to is the concrete meaning: the weighing scales, in spite of the fact that English dictionaries consider ‘scales’ and ‘balance’ to be synonymous.

This illustrates the nature of the difficult decisions the translator has to make when choosing a certain word as a translation. The translation also leads to the emergence of a new text that does not necessarily reflect the original text. Although the translation often conveys some aspects of the original, it is never the case that the message is complete.

Chapter Three of this study considered the issue of translation loss. The examples given above show this clearly, as it is extremely naïve to assume that a particular word used as a translation for several words in a given ST is used in such a way due to its flexibility and with the assurance that its different meanings will not be confused one with the other in different contexts.

Chapter Four has shown that the meaning of words like ‘الكَيْلُ’, ‘مَوَازِينُ’ etc., had to be manipulated to suit the rules of the TL. It is understood that the rules of any language cannot be changed to suit the rules of another language. Yet we have seen that several times the meanings of various words in English (the TL) were manipulated in an attempt to cater for Arabic words that did not have direct equivalents, and also to match the Arabic structure and ways of expression. This has led to odd translations, clumsy style, ambiguity, etc.

People reading a translation of the Qur’an, bearing in mind that they are reading a translation of a ST written in a different language, *might* be open-minded enough to realise that any translated text suffers from different degrees of addition to and omission from the original message. However, only a comparative translator can point out such ‘deviations’. This leaves the average reader completely unaware as to what precisely was added or lost in the process of translating.

Also, if we consider the translations provided for the measuring and weighing terms we are dealing with in this thesis, we find that our six translations rarely succeed in pointing out the lines drawn between words whose meanings overlap. It is understood that this is not always an easy task as in the TL different set of rules apply. However, it is undeniable that sometimes it is fairly simple to do so. For example, Arberry uses “diminish” as a translation for

both 'بَحْسٌ' and 'نَقْصٌ' although the distinguishing factor between them is not that hard to determine. (See also other examples such as Arberry's and Asad's translations for {زُنُوًا} and {أَقِيمُوا الْوَزْنَ}, the use of the word "measure", etc.). This is the time, I believe, when footnotes become very useful. Not all the translators make good use of footnotes, however.

Yusuf Ali uses footnotes extensively; yet, he digresses most of the time. Asad's footnotes refer to the books of *Tafsir* and the literal meaning of some words and phrases which may sound a good thing to do. However, Asad seems to have that conviction that what one reads is not necessarily what the text says; he always opts for the abstract rather than the concrete. This is very clear with regard to the measuring and weighing terms. Khan's and Helali's footnotes are not that helpful in clarifying the meaning of words and phrases that sometimes require explanation. They prefer to add to the body of the translation whatever they believe clarifies the meaning even if such additions obstruct the flow of the translated text. Khatib's footnotes are not particularly useful, as in many cases they do not help towards better understanding of the original text through its translation. His translation in general suffers from great weakness with regard to his command of the English language. Pickthall's footnotes are kept to the minimum in the entire translation, and as this study shows he did not once use a footnote relating to the lexical items dealt with in this thesis. However, it must be noted that although he does make use of additions between parentheses, he also keeps this to the minimum. As for Arberry's translation, this makes use neither of footnotes nor of additions between brackets in the body of the translation, nor of the Arabic text being printed on the opposite page.

The above shows the different techniques of the translators and the aims which they hope their translations will achieve, in addition to the purposes they serve. I personally believe that none of the translators made proper or full use of footnotes. However, one may argue that an important thing to bear in mind is the size of the translation. Khan and Helali, for example, initially produced their translation in nine volumes as they state in their introduction. It is very unlikely that a person with an average interest in the Qur'an

would prefer to read a nine-volume translation when a one-volume translation (also by the same translators for the same book) is available. Perhaps, this was the reason for their production of the abridged version of their translation.

This leads me to suggest that the least that can be done is to place the Arabic text together with the translation on the same page or on the opposite page, as it is extremely hard to assess the usefulness of the footnotes or the additions especially with regard to specific topics and Ayahs with controversial or multiple meanings.

The Ayahs which this work deals with are mainly concerned with the topic of measuring and weighing, in both its physical and metaphorical references. This issue is considered from various angles, predominantly linguistic. By way of example, the phrases that are sometimes repeated in almost exactly the same way serve sometimes a different purpose or emphasise a particular message in each context. The use of different words or even the same ones, which are not so accurate, as translations does not have the same effect or serve the same purposes as the original. This clearly shows how problematic translation issues can be as either way problems arise.

The application of this in a wider context inevitably results in the emergence of new texts which “are neither identical to the original nor to other translations”.⁴⁸⁵ It therefore seems that the translated text has “a life of its own, responding not to the interpreter’s set of rules, but to laws which are unique to the mode of translation itself”.⁴⁸⁶ Determining such laws, I believe, would require extensive and exhaustive study of perhaps an indefinite number of texts and their translations.

This study has also shown that in-depth analysis does pay off with regard to understanding the different levels of meaning that a word might have. Both classical and modern *Tafsirs* deal, to a certain degree, with the meaning of words and their participation in conveying the message. A great number of *Tafsirs* have been consulted in the production of this work and certain points related to measuring and weighing that I thought required explanation were

missing. Such points have been catered for in this work and as a result, it is hoped that this will fill this gap. To select but a small sample, no work consulted ever referred to the fact that in the entire Qur'an whenever the issue of measuring and weighing is referred to, it is always the measuring that precedes the weighing, nor did any mention the reason/s; some explanations were provided for the use of the plural form 'مَوَازِينُ' in {وَنَضَعُ الْمَوَازِينَ الْقَسِطَ}, in spite of the fact that the Muslim Ulema unanimously agree that it is only one 'مِيزَانُ' that will be used on the Judgement Day. However not one work points out the difference between the Qur'anic {وَنَضَعُ الْمَوَازِينَ الْقَسِطَ} in Q21:47, and the non-Qur'anic 'وَنَضَعُ الْمِيزَانَ الْقَسِطَ', and how this might affect the meaning. The point is that if the use of 'المِيزَانُ' in the singular form does not affect the meaning, why does the Qur'an use {المَوَازِينُ}, the plural form, instead? Such points have been catered for in this study. The translations provided for this last point are confused and unquestionably do not have the same effect as the original. In addition, wider explanations for several terms have been developed.

Great efforts have been made by the translators to directly reflect the wording of the ST with varying degrees of success. Such attempts have sometimes resulted in two things: (1) oddity and clumsiness of style, and (2) translating sometimes correctly, individual words and putting them together assuming or rather hoping that this will take care of the meaning and make the translation comprehensible. This last procedure is one which is very hard to rationalise. The result is never guaranteed and rarely works. This shows that in many cases the translation cannot be appreciated on its own without recourse to the ST.

This also shows how wide the gap can be between languages. However, this does not mean that comprehension is made impossible by such confusion (due to lack of explanation), or that the reader will not understand what the translation is saying (at least not most of the times). Strangely enough, oddity and clumsiness of style are not often looked upon as problems that obstruct understanding especially with regard to translations. It also seems that the reader expects this to be the case from time to time. This is

actually unavoidable in any translation of the Qur'an, as is made very clear in this work. This, unfortunately, is a double-edged point: on one hand it shows the matchlessness of the Qur'an and probably suggests to the reader that what he is reading is no more than approximation of the Qur'anic message; on the other hand, there is always the fear of misguidance through inaccuracy of translation and uncertainty as to the exact meaning, especially when the reader does not know Arabic.

This work's method in analysing both the meaning of the terms for measuring and weighing in the Qur'an and their translations is meant to set a precedent for future works in comparative translation in general and the translation of the Qur'an in particular. Understanding the meaning of individual words first then analysing their meanings in context is, I believe, a process most beneficial and rewarding when accuracy in translation is hoped to be achieved. In the case of the Qur'an, I do not think there can be a better way as far as the written Scripture is concerned, especially as the wording is deliberate in every way. One must realise that other factors such as *ʿasbāb al-nuzūl*, awareness of the Ayahs that are *muḥkamāt* or *mutashābihāt*, *nāsikhah* or *mansūkhah*, etc., play a very important role in understanding the Divine Message.

If this study has shown only one thing, I hope that it has provided scientific linguistic proof of the precision of the Qur'anic wording in conveying its intended message. Hundreds of Millions of Muslims believe, with no need for scientific proof or heavenly miracles performed before their eyes, that the Qur'an is the Word of God, Allah. However, few are those who can actually point out words, phrases or whole Ayahs and show others that **linguistically** it is the word of God without having to rely on external aids such as science or outside reality. This work hopes to have achieved just this with the use of nothing but the Qur'anic text, and to have shown that the Word of Allah whose speech is the Truth still stands up to the challenge it made when the following Ayahs were revealed: (Q17:88):

﴿قُلْ لَئِنِ اجْتَمَعَتِ الْإِنْسُ وَالْجِنُّ عَلَىٰ أَنْ يَأْتُوا بِمِثْلِ هَذَا الْقُرْآنِ

لَا يَأْتُونَ بِمِثْلِهِ وَلَوْ كَانَ بَعْضُهُمْ لِبَعْضٍ ظَهِيرًا ﴿٢٣﴾

Say, 'Even if mankind and jinn came together to produce something like this Qur'an, they could not produce anything like it, however much they helped each other.'

and (Q2:23):

﴿وَإِنْ كُنْتُمْ فِي رَيْبٍ مِّمَّا نَزَّلْنَا عَلَىٰ عَبْدِنَا فَأْتُوا بِسُورَةٍ مِّثْلِهِ وَادْعُوا

شُهَدَاءَكُمْ مِّن دُونِ اللَّهِ إِنْ كُنْتُمْ صَادِقِينَ﴾

If you have doubts about the revelation We have sent down to Our Servant, then produce a single sura like it – enlist whatever supporters you have other than God – if you truly [think you can].

﴿وَأَخِرُ دَعْوَاهُمْ أَنِ الْحَمْدُ لِلَّهِ رَبِّ الْعَالَمِينَ﴾

Their last prayer is praise be to Allah, Lord of all beings.

Endnotes

¹ For more elaboration, see Al-Laithy, Ahmed. *What Everyone should Know About the Qur'an*. pp. 22-24.

² See A. I. Muhanna, *Dirāsah Hawla Tarjamat al-Qur'an* (1978) a detailed discussion.

³ The majority of the Māliki, Shāfi'i and Hanbali scholars are in the opinion that reciting the Qur'an in the prayers in a language other than Arabic is prohibited by virtue of the fact that the Qur'an states in Q 73:20 "Recite, then, of the Quran that which is easy for you".

See also, Ibn Qudāmah, *al-Mughnī* where he states:

"ولا تُجْرَتُهُ القراءَةُ بِغَيْرِ العَرَبِيَّةِ وَلَا إِبدالُ لفظِها بلفظِ عَرَبِيٍّ، سواءَ أَحسَنَ قراءَتَها بالعَرَبِيَّةِ أو لم يَحسُنْ، وبِهِ قالَ الشافِعِيُّ وأبو يوسُفَ ومُحمَّدُ. وقالَ أبو حنيفةَ: يَجوزُ ذلكَ. وقالَ بعضُ أَصحابِهِ: إنَّما يَجوزُ لمن لم يَحسُنِ العَرَبِيَّةَ."

Al-Zarkashi in *al-Manthūr* (p.282) states:

"وما يُحكى عَن أبي حنيفةَ (رحمَهُ اللهُ) مِن جَوَازِهِ قِراءَةَ القُرْآنِ بِالفارِسيَّةِ صَحَّ رَجوعُهُ عَنهُ."

See also, Hussain in *Tarjamt-ul-Qur'an al-Karīm*, pp. 133-144. Kano, *Tarjamt-ul-Qur'an al-Karīm*.

⁴ Some scholars reject this story as being unauthentic. For more details, see Kano, *Tarjamat*, pp. 125-128.

⁵ Wahiduddin Khan. *The Quran*. Q4:82, P.66.

⁶ See Suyūti, *Sharḥ Euqūd al-Jamān fi Ilm al-Maāni wa al-Bayān* (1939), pp.3-10. Marāghi, *Eulūm al-Balāghah*, pp.13-4. Karam Al-Bustāni, *al-Bayān* (1956), pp.5-12. Ali Al-Jārim and Mustafa Amīn, *al-Balāghah al-Wāḍiḥah* (1936), pp.5-12. Al-Abshīhi, *al-Mustatraf fi kul Fann Mustatraf* (1954), v.1, p.40. See also, Hatim, Basil, *Arabic Rhetoric* (2010).

⁷ It must be noted that with regard to structure التَّركيب، many scholars consider this an issue of *fasāḥah* as well. See for example, Suyūti, *Sharḥ Euqūd*, p.3 & after. Al-Jārim and Amīn, *al-Balāghah*, pp.6-7.

⁸ See Marāghi, *Eulūm al-Balāghah*, pp.13-43. Al-Bustāni, *al-Bayān*, pp.5-12. See Al-Jārim and Amīn, *al-Balāghah*, pp.5-12. Al-Abshīhi, *al-Mustatraf*, v.1, p.40. Abdel-Fattāḥ Lashīn, *Min Asrār*

al-Taebīr fi al-Qur'an: Ṣafā al-Kalimah (1983), pp.5 & after. Al-Shartūni, *Aqrab al-Mawārid* (1889), under فُصْح.

⁹ In Suyūti, *Sharḥ Euqūd*, p.4, we read the following lines:

فَصَاحَةُ الْمَفْرَدِ أَنْ لَا تَنْفِرَا ... حُرُوفُهُ كَهَجْعٍ وَاسْتَشْرَزَا
وَعَدَمِ الْخُلْفِ لِقَانُونَ جَلِي ... كَالْحَمْدِ لِلَّهِ الْعَلِيِّ الْأَجَلِّ
وَفَقْدُهُ عَرَابَةٌ قَدْ اِرْتَجَا ... كَفَاحًا وَمَرَسْنَا مُسْرَجًا
قِيلَ وَفَقْدُ كُرْهُهُ فِي السَّمْعِ ... نَحْوَ جَرَشَاهُ وَذَا دُو مَنَعِ

¹⁰ According to Suyūti, *al-Muzhir*, v.2, p.136: *ṣahsalaq* صَهْصَلَقْ is the woman who has a strong voice المَرْأَةُ شَدِيدَةُ الصَّوْتِ.

¹¹ Marāghī, *ʿUlūm al-Balāghah*, p.17.

¹² See Marāghī, *ʿUlūm al-Balāghah*, p.17.

This line basically describes his beloved Layla, as the poet remembers her coming smiling “showing beautiful white shining teeth, lovely eyes, thin curved brows, dark hair and a nose that is *musarrajan*”.

Suyūti, *Sharḥ Euqūd*, p.4 comments on *musarrajan* saying:

"وَلِعَرَابَتِهِ لَا يُدْرَى هَلْ مَعْنَاهُ كَالسَّرَاجِ فِي التَّبْرِيقِ وَاللَّمَعَانِ أَوْ كَالسَّيْفِ السَّرِيجِيِّ فِي الدَّقَّةِ وَالِاسْتِوَاءِ".

Due to its ambiguity it is not known whether it means that it (the nose) is like a *sirāj* (lamp) in brightness or like a *surayji* sword in perfection and beauty of form.

Ibn Durayd in, *Jamharat al-Lughah*, under سَرَج says that *musarrajan* is derived from the saying *Suyūf Surayjiyyah* سِيُوفٌ سُرَّيْجِيَّةٌ referring to the swords made by a blacksmith called *Surayj*”.

¹³ According to Abdullah I. Al-Ṣāwī, *Sharḥ Dīwān al-Farazdaq* (1936), v.1, p.376:

"[وَيُرْوَى مُنْكَبِسِي الْأَبْصَارِ. وَنَوَاصِرٍ مَعِيْبٍ رَدِي] وَيُرْوَى نَوَاصِرِي الْأَبْصَارِ. وَرَوَاهُ صَاحِبُ الْكَامِلِ فَإِذَا الرَّجَالُ، وَقَالَ: وَفِي هَذَا الْبَيْتِ شَيْءٌ يَسْتَطْرُقُهُ التَّخْوِيُّونَ، وَهُوَ أَنَّهُمْ لَا يَجْمَعُونَ مَا كَانَ مِنْ فَاعِلٍ نَعْنًا عَلَى فَوَاعِلٍ لِقَلَا يَلْتَبِسُ بِالْمُؤَنَّثِ ... إِلَّا فِي حَرْفَيْنِ. أَحَدُهُمَا فِي جَمْعِ فَارِسٍ لِأَنَّ هَذَا بِمِثْلِ لَا يُسْتَعْمَلُ فِي النِّسَاءِ فَأَمِنُوا مِنَ الْإِلْتِبَاسِ ... فَلَمَّا احتَاجَ الْفَرَزْدَقُ ... أَجْرَاهُ عَنِ أَصْلِهِ فَقَالَ نَوَاصِرِي وَلَا يَكُونُ مِثْلَ هَذَا أَبَدًا إِلَّا فِي ضَرْوَرَةٍ".

This line is also reported as “منكبسي الأبصار”, and “نواكس” is wrong and bad. It is also reported as “نواكسي الأبصار”. The author of *al-*

Kāmil reported it as “فَادَا الرَّجَالُ” and said: “In this line there is something that grammarians find amusing; that is what follows the pattern *fāeil* and is an adjective is not to follow the pattern of *fawāeil* in the plural so as not to be mistaken for the feminine except two words, one of which is the plural of *fāris* (knight) as this is not used for women, therefore no confusion may occur as a result. So when Al-Farazdaq was forced he followed the feminine pattern using the word نَوَاكِسِي and this should never happen except when necessary (there is no other way).

¹⁴ See note 161 above. Suyūti, *Sharḥ ʿUqūd*, p.4. Marāghī, *ʿUlūm al-Balāghah*, p.19.

¹⁵ This line means: (There are no two people better accepting to lifes (times) ups and downs than me and my camel (horse)). See Marāghī, *ʿUlūm al-Balāghah*, p.19.

See also Butrus Al-Bustāni, *Dīwān Jamīl Buthaynah* (1953), p.57. Bashīr Yamūt, *Diwān Jamīl Buthaynah* (1934), p.49. In these two references this line of verse is part of a poem. However, it is recorded individually in Husayn Nassār, *Dīwān Jamīl: Shir al-Ḥubb al-Udhri* (1958), p.181, although Nassār records the former two references in his bibliography.

¹⁶ See Marāghī, *ʿUlūm al-Balāghah*, p.20.

According to *Tāj al-ʿarūs*, p. 6572, under ‘لعق’, the second part of this line is narrated differently as composed by the poet Mālik ibn Asmā^c ibn Khārijah. It says: دَعِ الخُمْرَ واشْرَبْ مِنْ شَرَابِ مُعَسَّلٍ. It is clear that this is from a different poem as the rhyme is different.

¹⁷ According to Suyūti, *al-Muzhir*, v.2, p.136: *utbūl* عَطْبُولُ is the woman with a long neck *المَرْأَةُ طَوِيلَةُ العُنُقِ*.

¹⁸ In Suyūti, *Sharḥ ʿUqūd*, p.4, we have the following lines:

وَفِي الكَلَامِ فَقْدُهُ فِي الظَّاهِرِ ... لِضَعْفِ تَأْلِيْفِ وَلِلتَّنَافُرِ
فِي الكَلِمَاتِ وَكَذَا التَّعْقِيْدُ مَعَ ... فَصَاحَةِ فِي الكَلِمَاتِ تُشْبِعُ
فَالضَّعْفُ نَحْوُ قَدْ جَفَوْنِي وَمَ ... أَجْفُ الأَحْيَاءِ وَمَا كُنْتُ عَمِي
وَوْدُو تَنَافُرِ أَتَاكَ النَّصْرُ ... كَلَيْسَ قُرْبَ قَبْرِ حَرْبِ قَبْرِ
كَذَاكَ أَمْدَحُهُ الَّذِي تَكَرَّرَا ... وَالثَّالِثُ الحَقْفَاءُ فِي قَصْدِ عَرَا

لِحَلِّ فِي التَّظْمِ أَوْ فِي الْإِنْتِقَالِ ... إِلَى الَّذِي يَفْصِدُهُ ذُو الْمَقَالِ

¹⁹ This line is found in several references. See Marāghī, *Eulūm al-Balāghah*, p.26. However, although he reports it as “أُنشِدَهُ” (recited by Al-Jāhiz), he says in a footnote that it is claimed that this line was recited by the Jinns after they had killed Harb ibn Umayyah avenging his killing a serpent from among them. This, however, indicates that the line is not actually that of Al-Jāhiz.

Also, according to Al-Jārim and Amīn, *al-Balāghah al-Wādiḥah*, p.6: the poet is not known and perhaps it is made up مَصْنُوع. Al-Suyūṭi records it without naming the poet in *Sharḥ Euqūd*, p.5, and adds that Al-Rummāni says that this line was said by the Jinns.

²⁰ In Suyūṭi, *Sharḥ Euqūd*, p.4, Suyūṭi says:

"فَأَيْدِي: ذَكَرَ بَعْضُ الْفُضَلَاءِ أَنَّ مِنْ حَصَائِصِ الْقُرْآنِ أَنَّهُ اجْتَمَعَ فِيهِ ثَمَانٌ مِيمَاتٍ مُتَوَالِيَاتٍ وَمَمْ يَحْضُلُ بِسَبَبِهَا نُقْلٌ فِي اللِّسَانِ أَصْلًا بَلِ إِزْدَادَتْ خِفَةً وَذَلِكَ فِي قَوْلِهِ تَعَالَى: ﴿أُمَمٌ مِمَّنْ مَعَكَ﴾ فَإِنَّ التَّنْوِينَ فِي أُمَمٍ وَالنُّونَ مِمَّنْ يُدْعَمَانِ فِي الْمِيمِ بَعْدَهُمَا فَيَصِيرَانِ فِي حُكْمِ مِيمٍ أُخْرَى وَالْمِيمِ الْمُسْتَدَدَةِ فِي مِمَّنْ بِمِيمَيْنِ وَفِيهِ أَرْبَعٌ أُخْرَى فَهَذِهِ ثَمَانِيَةٌ."

²¹ See Marāghī, *Eulūm al-Balāghah*, p.26. In this line the speaker is honeycomb talking about the fire that separated (him) from the honey.

²² According to Abdel-Rahmān Al-Barqūqi, *Sharḥ Dīwān Al-Mutanabbi* (1938), v.3, p.259:

"أَقْلٌ مِنَ الْإِقَالَةِ مِنَ الْعَثْرَةِ ... وَأَنْبِلٌ مِنَ الْإِنَائِلَةِ - الْإِعْطَاءِ - وَأَقْطَعٌ مِنَ قَوْلِهِمْ أَقْطَعُهُ أَرْضَ كَذَا ... وَأَحْمِلٌ مِنَ قَوْلِهِمْ حَمَلَهُ عَلَى فَرَسٍ وَنَحْوِهِ ... وَعَلٌّ أَيْ ارْتَفَعَ جَاهِي مِنَ التَّغْلِيَةِ. وَسَلٌّ: مِنَ التَّسْلِيَةِ، وَهِيَ إِذْهَابُ الْعَمِّ؛ وَأَعَدٌ: أَيْ أَعَدَّنِي إِلَى مَوْضِعِي مِنْ حُسْنِ رَأْيِكَ؛ وَزَدٌ: أَيْ زَدَنِي مِنْ إِحْسَانِكَ؛ وَهَشٌّ: أَمْرٌ مِنْ قَوْلِهِمْ: هَشٌّ إِلَى كَذَا يَهَشُّ - وَيَشُّ: مِنْ قَوْلِهِمْ بَشٌّ بِالرَّجُلِ يَبَشُّ: أَيْ ابْتَسَمَ إِلَيْهِ وَأَنْسَهُ ..."

It is said that Sayf Al-Dawlah signed under every word granting Al-Mutanabbi what he was asking for. But when he wrote “We will please you” under سُرٌّ, Al-Mutanabbi said: “I meant it (as a derivation from) *al-Tasarri* التَّسَرِّي, so Sayf Al-Dawlah gave him a slave woman as a present.

²³ According to Barqūqi, *Al-Mutanabbi*, v.2, pp.356-7:

"يَقُولُ هُوَ دَانَ قَرِيبٍ مِمَّنْ يُحِبُّهُ وَيَقْصُدُهُ، بَعِيدٌ عَمَّنْ يُنَازِعُهُ، مُحِبٌّ لِلْفَضْلِ وَأَهْلِهِ، مُبْغِضٌ لِلنَّقْصِ وَأَهْلِهِ. يَجِيحُ لِلْفُصَادِ، حُلُوٌّ لِأَوْلِيَائِهِ، مُرٌّ عَلَى أَعْدَائِهِ لَيْسَ فِي الرِّضَى. شَرِسٌ -صَعْبٌ- عَلَى الْأَعْدَاءِ. وَرَوَى الْحَوَارِثِيُّ مُحِبٌّ مُبْغِضٌ - بِصِيغَةِ اسْمِ الْمَفْعُولِ. وَيَجِيحُ بِالشَّيْءِ وَلَهُ، بِالْكَسْرِ بِنَهْجَةٍ: أَيْ فَرِحَ بِهِ وَسَرَّ فَهُوَ يَجِيحُ وَيَجِيحُ.

نَدِي: جَوَادٌ نَدِيُّ الْكَفِّ. وَأَبِي أَنْوْفٍ يَأْتِي الدَّنَائِيَا، وَغَرِي: مُغْرَى بِالْفِعْلِ الْجَمِيلِ مُوَلِّعٌ بِهِ. وَافِي: بِالْعَهْدِ وَالْوَعْدِ. أَحْيَى ثِقَةً: صَاحِبٌ ثِقَةً يُوثِقُ بِهِ. وَرَوَى ابْنُ جَنِّي: أَخٌ -مُنَوَّنًا- أَيْ هُوَ مُسْتَحِقٌّ لِإِطْلَاقِ هَذَا الْاسْمِ - الْأَخِ - عَلَيْهِ لِصِحَّةِ مَوَدَّتِهِ لِمَنْ خَالَطَهُ، أَوْ ثِقَةً مُوْتَوِّقٌ بِهِ مَأْمُونٌ عِنْدَ الْعَيْبِ ... وَجَعَدُ: جَوَادٌ. قَالَ الرَّغِشَرِيُّ: وَأَمَّا قَوْلُهُمْ جَعَدُ لِلْجَوَادِ فَمِنْ الْكِنَايَةِ عَنْ كَوْنِهِ عَرَبِيًّا سَخِيًّا، لِأَنَّ الْعَرَبَ مَوْصُوفَةٌ بِالْجَعُودَةِ ... وَسَرِي: شَرِيفٌ. وَنَهِي: ذُو نَهْيَةٍ، وَهِيَ الْعَقْلُ. وَالنَّدَبُ: الْحَقِيفُ فِي الْأُمُورِ يُنْدَبُ لَهَا: أَيْ يُدْعَى فَيُنْتَدَبُ. وَرَضِي: أَيْ مَرْضِيٌّ. وَالنَّدِسُ: بِضَمِّ الدَّالِ وَبِكَسْرِهَا - الْفِطْرُ الْبِحَاثُ عَنِ الْأُمُورِ الْعَارِفُ بِهَا".

Considering the lines of verse quoted here in note 22, we find that "the origin of this method goes as far back as Imruu al-Qays who said once:

أَفَادَ وَجَادَ وَسَادَ وَزَادَ وَدَادَ وَقَادَ وَعَادَ وَأَفْضَلَ

Similarly Abu al-eumaythil said:

يَأْمَنُ يُؤْمَلُ أَنْ تَكُونَ حِصَالُهُ كَحِصَالِ عَبْدِ اللَّهِ أَنْصَتُ وَاسْتَمِعْ
اصْدُقْ وَعِيفْ وَبَرِّ وَاصْبِرْ وَاحْتَمِلْ وَاحْلَمْ وَدَارْ وَكَافْ وَابْذُلْ وَاشْجَعْ

Imru' al-Qays line above is not found in *Dīwān Imriū al-Qays* (1958).

Successive adjectives are also found in other places in the Qur'an. See for example Q66:5.

²⁴ According to Barqūqi, *Al-Mutanabbi*, v.4, pp.429-30:

"الْعَزَالَةُ اسْمُ الشَّمْسِ. يَقُولُ جَعَلَكُ اللَّهُ عَوْضًا مِنَ الشَّمْسِ لِلْبِلَادِ وَأَهْلِهَا عِنْدَ فَقْدِ الشَّمْسِ بِاللَّيْلِ كَيْلًا يَجْزُونَ. هَذَا وَقَدْ قَالَ ابْنُ جَنِّي إِنَّ سَبَبِيَّةَ لَا يُجْبَرُ تَقْدِيمَ ضَمِيرِ الْعَائِبِ الْمُنْتَصِلِ عَلَى الْحَاضِرِ فِي مِثْلِ قَوْلِكَ مَا فَعَلَ الرَّجُلُ الَّذِي أَعْطَاهَاكَ زَيْدٌ عَلَى مَعْنَى الَّذِي أَعْطَاكَ إِيَّاهُ - فَتَأْتِي بِالضَمِيرِ الْمُنْتَصِلِ وَتَدْعُ الْمُنْتَصِلَ، وَأَبُو الْعَبَّاسِ يُجِيزُهُ، فَالضَّوَابُ عِنْدَ سَبَبِيَّةِ: فَأَعَاضُهَا إِيَّاكَ، وَلَكِنَّ الشَّعْرَ مَوْقِفٌ ضَرُورَةٌ، فَيَجُوزُ فِيهِ مَا لَا يَجُوزُ فِي غَيْرِهِ. قَالَ الْعُكْبَرِيُّ: وَالضَّوَابُ عِنْدَ أَهْلِ النَّحْوِ إِذَا اجْتَمَعَ ضَمِيرُ الْمُخَاطَبِ وَالْعَائِبِ، فَالْوَاجِبُ تَقْدِيمَ ضَمِيرِ الْمُخَاطَبِ، فَكَانَ الْوَاجِبُ فَأَعَاضُهَا اللَّهُ. وَيُقَالُ: عَاضَهُ وَأَعَاضَهُ وَعَوَّضَهُ".

See also Al-Ukbari, *Sharh al-Tibyān ala Dīwān Abi al-Tayyib Ahmad ibn Husayn al-Mutanabbi* (n.d) [Durham University stamp (1952)], v.2, p.458.

"قَالَ أَبُو الْفَتْحِ وَنَقَلَهُ الْوَاحِدِيُّ حَرْفًا فَحَرْفٍ: سَبِيؤُهُ لَا يُجِيرُ تَقْلِيمَ ضَمِيرِ الْغَائِبِ الْمُتَّصِلِ عَلَى الْحَاضِرِ وَالصَّوَابِ عِنْدَهُ أَعَاضَهَا إِثَاكَ وَأَبُو الْعَبَّاسِ يُجِيرُهُ. وَالصَّوَابُ عِنْدَ أَهْلِ النَّحْوِ إِذَا اجْتَمَعَ ضَمِيرُ الْمُخَاطَبِ وَالْغَائِبِ، فَالْوَاجِبُ تَقْلِيمَ ضَمِيرِ الْمُخَاطَبِ، فَكَانَ الْوَاجِبُ فَأَعَاضَهَا اللَّهُ. وَعِنْدَ الْأَخْفَشِ يَجِبُ أَنْ يَكُونَ ضَمِيرُ الْغَائِبِ مُنْفَصِلًا، يُرِيدُ إِثَاةً وَإِيَاهَا. (وَالْمَعْنَى) يَقُولُ الْبِلَادُ إِذَا خَلَّتْ مِنَ الشَّمْسِ فِي اللَّيْلِ جَعَلَتْ اللَّهُ عَوْضًا مِنْهَا لِلْبِلَادِ. قَالَ الْخَطِيبُ وَأَبُو الْفَتْحِ: قَالَ مَنْ يُوثِقُ بِهِ إِنَّ أَبَا الطَّيِّبِ أَنْشَدَهُ: "خَلَّتْ الْبِلَادُ مِنَ النَّبِيِّ مُحَمَّدٍ" ثُمَّ غَيَّرَهُ بِقَوْلِهِ "الْغَزَالَةَ لَيْلَهَا" (وَقَالَ وَقَدْ سَأَلَهُ الْجُلُوسُ).

- ²⁵ This wording is found in Al-Jārim and Amīn, *al-Balāghah al-Wādiyah*, p.6. However, in *Dīwān Ḥassān ibn Thābit* (1961), p.239, this line reads:

فَلَوْ كَانَ مُحَمَّدٌ يُخَلِّدُ الْيَوْمَ وَاحِدًا
مِنَ النَّاسِ، أَبْقَى مُحَمَّدُ الْيَوْمَ مُطْعِمًا

Muṭeīm who is praised in this line is Muṭeīm ibn eadiy ibn Nawfal ibn Abd Manāf ibn Quṣay al-Qurashi al-Nawfali. It is said that *Ḥassān ibn Thābit* lived until 120 years old, 60 in the *Jāhiliyyah* and 60 in the time of Islam, and died in 54 A.H. See Al-Jārim and Amīn, *al-Balāghah al-Wādiyah*, p.6

- ²⁶ Al-Sāwi, *al-Farazdaq*, v.1, p.312. The next line is:

وَلَكِنَّ أَبُوهَا مِنْ رِوَاحَةٍ تَرْتَقِي
بِأَيَّامِهِ قَيْسٌ عَلَى مَنْ تُفَاحِرُهُ

- ²⁷ See Al-Sāwi, *al-Farazdaq*, v.1, pp.108.9. This line is recorded with مُمَلِّكَ and not مُمَلِّكَ. The commentator also says: "This line is not found in the original scripts of the *Dīwān* though recorded in several trustworthy references. See the complexity of the reference in the line. Authorities say that this line is part of a poem where Ibrāhīm ibn Hishām ibn Ismā'īl Al-Makhzūmi, the uncle of Hishām ibn Abdel Malik, yet I could not find it in any poem. So, perhaps that poem has been lost or maybe this line was dropped from that poem assuming its existence in the first place. On the other hand, this *Dīwān*s narrators did not report any poem with the *bā'* as a rhyme indicating that the poet composed it to praise this so-called Ibrāhīm ibn Hishām. The line means there is no one among the people who is like him in honour except Hishām who is the father of his mother, the father of Ibrāhīm, and he was Hishām's uncle. This line is also found in

al-Kāmil by Al-Mubarrid, *al-ʿumda* by Ibn Rashīq, *al-Muzhir* by Al-Suyūti, *al-Mathal al-Sāʿir* by Ibn Al-Athīr, and also in *al-Lisān*, *Maʿāhid al-Tanāsīs* and *al-Aghāni*, and they all reported it with this wording except for *al-Aghāni* that reports it as:

وَأَصْبَحَ مَا فِي النَّاسِ إِلَّا مُمَلَّكَاً
أَبُو أُمِّهِ حَتَّىٰ أَبُوهُ يُقَارِنُهُ.

Al-Farazdaq used to put the words in unusual order and that used to amuse the grammarians”.

According to Suyūti, *Sharḥ ʿUqūd*, p.5, what Al-Farazdaq means is: وَمَا مِثْلُ الْمَمْدُوحِ فِي النَّاسِ حَتَّىٰ يُقَارِنُهُ إِلَّا مُمَلَّكَاً أَبُو أُمِّهِ أَبُو الْمَمْدُوحِ: أَي ابْنُ أُخْتِهِ:

(There is no one alive like him (in honour) except Mumallak, his father).

For detailed explanation and other examples, see p.5 & following.

In this line of verse, Al-Farazdaq separated the subject أَبُو أُمِّهِ from its predicate أَبُوهُ by the unrelated word حَتَّىٰ; and the word أَبُوهُ separated the adjective حَتَّىٰ from the *mawsūl* يُقَارِنُهُ, while the *mustathna* مُمَلَّكَاً was placed before the *mustathna minhu* حَتَّىٰ although it should have been otherwise. Also, there is a long distance between the *badal* حَتَّىٰ and the *mubdal minhu* مِثْلُهُ.

²⁸ See Marāghi, *ʿUlūm al-Balāghah*, p.31.

"فَصَلَّ (الشَّاعِرُ) بَيْنَ الْفِعْلِ النَّاقِصِ وَخَبْرِهِ، وَبَيْنَ كَأَنَّ وَاسْمِهَا، وَبَيْنَ الْمُضَافِ وَالْمُضَافِ إِلَيْهِ، وَقَدَّمَ خَبَرَ كَأَنَّ عَلَيْهَا وَعَلَى اسْمِهَا."

²⁹ See Al-Jārim and Amīn, *al-Balāghah*, p.7.

This is similar to Al-Abbās ibn Al-Aḥnaf's

سَأَطْلُبُ بَعْدَ الدَّارِ عَنْكُمْ لِتَقْرَبُوا
وَتَسْكُبَ عَيْنَايَ الدُّمُوعَ لِتَجْمَدَا

In the second half of this line, the poet uses a figure of speech which refers to miserliness, while what he actually means to express is his feeling of happiness. This is where his mistake lies. Suyūti, *Sharḥ ʿUqūd*, p.5 says:

"أَرَادَ أَنْ يُكْتَبَ عَمَّا يُوجِبُهُ التَّلَاقِي مِنَ السُّرُورِ بِجُمُودِ الْعَيْنِ لِظَنِّهِ أَنَّ الْجُمُودَ خُلُوعُ الْعَيْنِ مِنَ الْبُكَاءِ مُطْلَقاً وَأَخْطَأَ إِذِ الْجُمُودُ خُلُوعُهَا مِنْهُ حَالٌ إِزَادَتْهُ فَلَا يَكُونُ كِنَايَةً عَنِ الْمَسْرَةِ بَلْ عَنِ الْبُخْلِ."

In spite of the fact that Al-Suyūti above quotes this line of verse, it is not found in the *Dīwān* of Al-Abbās Ibn Al-Aḥnaf. See Abdel-Majīd Al-Mulla, *Sharḥ Dīwān Al-Abbās ibn Al-Aḥnaf* (1947).

³⁰ Suyūti, *Sharḥ ʿUqūd*, p.6 says:

"وَحَدَّثَهَا فِي مُتَكَلِّمٍ شَهْرٍ
مَلَكَةٌ عَلَى الْفَصِيحِ يَتَّقِدِرُ

الْفَصَاحَةُ فِي الْمُتَكَلِّمِ مَلَكَةٌ يَتَّقِدِرُ بِهَا عَلَى التَّعْبِيرِ عَنِ الْمَقْصُودِ بِلَفْظِ فَصِيحٍ، وَالْمَلَكَةُ رَاسِخَةٌ فِي النَّفْسِ فَمَنْ تَكَلَّمَ بِالْفَصِيحِ وَلَيْسَ لَهُ مَلَكَةٌ فَغَيْرُ فَصِيحٍ، وَقَوْلُنَا يَتَّقِدِرُ إِشَارَةٌ إِلَى أَنَّهُ يُسَمَّى فَصِيحًا حَالَةَ النُّطْقِ وَعَدَمِهِ وَاللَّفْظُ أَعْمٌ مِنَ الْمُفْرَدِ وَالْمَرْكَبِ".

As the *faṣāḥah* of the speaker is a talent/gift that enables him to express what he means using *faṣīḥ* words, whoever speaks in a *faṣīḥ* way without having the talent to produce utterances as such, he is not considered *faṣīḥ*.

³¹ See Al-Jāhiz, *al-Bayān*, v.3, pp.212-3.

"قَالَ مُعَاوِيَةُ يَوْمًا: مَنْ أَفْصَحَ النَّاسِ؟ فَقَالَ قَائِلٌ: قَوْمٌ ارْتَفَعُوا عَنِ لُحْلَخَانِيَّةِ الْفُرَاتِ، وَتَيَامَنُوا عَنْ عَنَعَةِ تَمِيمٍ، وَتَيَاسَرُوا عَنْ كَسْكَسَةِ بَكْرِ، لَيْسَتْ لَهُمْ عَمَعَمَةٌ قُضَاعَةٌ، وَلَا طُمُطُمَانِيَّةٌ حَمِيرٌ. قَالَ: مَنْ هُمْ؟ قَالَ: فُرَيْشٌ. قَالَ: مَنْ أَنْتَ؟ قَالَ: مِنْ جَرْمٍ. قَالَ: اجْلِسْ".

According to Ibn Manzūr, *Lisān al-Arab*, under لُحْلَخَانِيَّةِ الْعِرَاقِ: "لُحْلَخَانِيَّةُ الْعِرَاقِ" of Iraq is the non-clarity of the speech".

In Ibn Fāris, *al-Sāhibi*, p.24, the *ʿananah* of Tamīm is their change of the *hamzah* ء to *ʿayn* ع in some of their speech as in Dhū Al-Rumma's line:

أَعْنُ تَرَسَمَتْ مِنْ خَرْقَاءَ مَنزِلَةً مَاءُ الصَّبَابَةِ مِنْ عَيْنَيْكَ مَسْجُومٌ؟

kaskasah is the change of the *kāf* ك to *sīn* س or adding *sīn* to it, as in عَلَيْكَسْ.

Abdel-Salām M. Hārūn (ed.), *al-Bayān*, Al-Jāhiz, v.3, pp.212-3 says in a footnote: "the *ghamghamah* is unclarity of the speech, and in *al-Lisān* the *tumtumāniyyah* is when the speech sounds like and/or is mixed with foreign words as in the dialect of *Himyar*".

³² This line is found in Marāghi, *ʿulūm al-Balāghah*, p.36. However, it is not found in ʿīsā Sāba, *Shier Al-Huṭayʿah* (1951), nor in Al-Ṭabbā, *Al-Huṭayʿah: Shāʿir min Abqar* (1956).

³³ All books of *balāghah* and other related subjects seem to agree on this definition. See for example, Marāghi, *ʿulūm al-Balāghah*, p.36. Muhammad M. Al-Shaʿrāwī, *Muʿjizat al-Qurʿan* (1981), v.1, p.36. Al-Jārim and Amīn, *al-Balāghah*, p.8. Al-Bustānī, *al-Bayān*, p.12. Al-Abshīhi, *Mustatraf*, v.1, p.40. Abu Hilāl, *al-Sināʿatayn*, pp.27-29. Al-Maḥmūd, *Balāghat al-Badīʿ fi Juzʿ ʿamma*, (2012), p. 19.

Suyūti, *Sharḥ euqūd*, pp.6-8, the author, in p.6, says:

"البلاغة في الكلام مطابقتها لمقتضى الحال مع فصاحتها، والحال هو الأمر الداعي إلى التكلم على وجه مخصوص، ومقتضاها يختلف بحسب اختلاف مقامات الكلام، فإن مقام التنكير يختلف عن مقام التعريف... إلخ"

In verse, he says:

بلاغة الكلام أن يطابقا لمقتضى الحال وقد توافقا
فصاحة والمقتضى مختلف حسب مقامات الكلام يؤلف
فمقتضى تنكيره وذكره والفصل الإيجاز خلاف غيره
كذا خطاب للذكرى والعنى وكلمة لها مقام أجنبي
مع كلمة تصحبها فالفعل ذا إن ليس كالفعل الذي تلا إذا
والارتفاع في الكلام وجبا بأن يطابق اعتبارا ناسبا
وفقدتها الخطأه فالمقتضى مناسب من اعتبار مرتضى.

See also Ibn Khaldūn, *Kitāb al-eibar* (1886), v.1, p.507-8. In p.507, Ibn Khaldūn says: "... ومراعاة التأليف الذي يطبق الكلام على مقتضى الحال"; and in p.508, he says:

"... إلا أن البيان والبلاغة في اللسان المضرب أكثر وأعزف لأن الألفاظ بأعيانها دالة على المعاني بأعيانها، ويبقى ما تقتضيه الأحوال ويسمى بساط الحال محتاجا إلى ما يدل عليه".

The translation provided for the former quotation in Franz Rosenthal (translator), *Ibn Khaldun: The Muqaddimah, An Introduction to History* (1970), p.439, reads: "... who is able to observe the form of composition that makes his speech conform to the requirements of the situation ... This is what is meant by eloquence".

Al-Jāhiz states:

يقول الجاحظ: "لم يفسر البلاغة تفسيرا ابن المقفع أحد قط، سئل ما البلاغة؟ قال: البلاغة اسم جامع لمعان تجري في وجوه كثيرة، فمنها ما يكون في السكوت، ومنها ما يكون في الاستماع، ومنها ما يكون في الإشارة، ومنها ما يكون في الاحتجاج، ومنها ما يكون جوابا، ومنها ما يكون ابتداء، ومنها ما يكون شعرا، ومنها ما يكون سجعاً وخطباً، ومنها ما يكون رسائل، فعامّة ما يكون من هذه الأبواب الوحي فيها، والإشارة إلى المعنى، والإيجاز، هو البلاغة" [البيان والتبيين: 1/115-116].

³⁴ Al-Jārim and Amīn, *al-Balāghah*, p.10.

The poet's name is Abu Al-Najm Al-Fadl ibn Qudāmah.

³⁵ See Marāghi, *Eulūm al-Balāghah*, p.41. Abu Hilāl, *al-Sināeatayn*, p.155

³⁶ Cf. and see other examples Al-Nuwayri, *Nihāyat al-Arab*, v.18, p.115. Marāghi, *Eulūm al-Balāghah*, p.41. Abu Hilāl, *al-Sināeatayn*, p.155. Al-Rāfi'i, *Tārīkh Ādāb*, v.2, pp.319-20. Ibn Fāris, *al-Sāhibi*, p.41.

There are also many other examples of the different styles that the Prophet ﷺ used in his messages, in addition to the fact that his sayings (hadīths) are recorded in many books of hadīth.

³⁷ In Suyūti, *Sharḥ Euqūd*, p.7, the author says:

"وَحَدَّثَهَا فِي مُتَكَلِّمٍ كَمَا ... مَضَى فَمَنْ إِلَى الْبَلَاغَةِ انْتَمَى
فَهُوَ فَصِيحٌ مِنْ كَلِيمٍ أَوْ كَلَامٌ ... وَعَكْسُ ذَلِكَ لَيْسَ يَنَالُهُ التَّزَامُ
الْبَلَاغَةُ فِي الْمُتَكَلِّمِ عَلَى نَسَبِ الْفَصَاحَةِ فِيهِ فَيُقَالُ هِيَ مَلَكَةٌ يُقْتَدَرُ بِهَا عَلَى تَأْلِيْفِ كَلَامٍ بَلِيغٍ فَعُلِمَ بِمَا
ذُكِرَ فِي حَدِّ الْبَلَاغَةِ أَنَّ كُلَّ بَلِيغٍ كَلَامًا كَانَ أَوْ مُتَكَلِّمًا فَصِيحٌ لِجَعْلِ الْفَصَاحَةِ شَرْطًا لِلْبَلَاغَةِ وَلَيْسَ كُلُّ
فَصِيحٍ بَلِيغًا كَلَامًا كَانَ أَوْ مُتَكَلِّمًا لِأَنَّ الْفَصِيحَ قَدْ يُعْرَى عَنِ الْمُطَابَقَةِ لَهُ".

³⁸ In Suyūti, *Sharḥ Euqūd*, p.7, the author states that a word can be described as *balīgh* only in the sense that what is really considered is the structure and the meaning, not the individual word and how it sounds. In his own words:

"وَيُوصَفُ اللَّفْظُ بِتِلْكَ بِاعْتِبَارِ ... إِفَادَةِ الْمَعْنَى بِتَرْكِيْبِ يُصَارُ
وَقَدْ يُسَمَّى ذَلِكَ بِالْفَصَاحَةِ ... وَلِلْبَلَاغَةِ الْكَلَامِ سَاحَةٌ
لَمَّا تَقَرَّرَ أَنَّ الْبَلَاغَةَ هِيَ مُطَابَقَةُ الْكَلَامِ لِمُقْتَضَى الْحَالِ بِحَسَبِ مَا يُنَاسِبُهُ عُرْفُ أَنَّ اللَّفْظَ عِنْدَمَا يُوصَفُ
بِمَا بِاعْتِبَارِ إِفَادَتِهِ الْمَعْنَى بِالتَّرْكِيبِ لَا مِنْ حَيْثُ أَنَّهُ لَفْظٌ وَصَوْتٌ لِأَنَّهُ بِاعْتِبَارِ ذَلِكَ لَا يُوصَفُ بِكَوْنِهِ
مُطَابِقًا أَوْ غَيْرَ مُطَابِقٍ ضَرُورَةً أَنَّ ذَلِكَ إِنَّمَا يَتَحَقَّقُ عِنْدَ تَحَقُّقِ الْمَعَانِي وَالْأَعْرَاضِ الَّتِي يُصَنَعُ لَهَا الْكَلَامُ وَقَدْ

يُسَمَّى هَذَا الْوَصْفُ فَصَاحَةً أَيْضًا كَمَا يُسَمَّى بِلَاغَةً أَمَّا الْفَصَاحَةُ بِحَدِّهَا الْاِعْتِبَارُ فَهِيَ مِنْ صِفَاتِ اللَّفْظِ
دُونَ الْمَعْنَى قَطْعًا".

³⁹ See for example, Ibn Manzūr, *Lisān al-ʿarab* (1955), under ‘بَحْسٌ’.

Al-Rāzi, *Mafātīḥ al-Ghayb (known as): al-Tafsir al-Kabīr* (1327 A.H), v.2, p.364. Al-Baydāwi, *Anwār al-Tanzīl wa ‘Asrār al-Ta’wīl* (1344 A.H), p.57. Al-Ṭabari, *Jāmi‘ al-Bayān fi Tafsir al-Qur’an* (1323 A.H), v.3, p.79 & v.8, p.166. Al-Ṭabarsi, *Majma‘ al-Bayān fi Tafsir al-Qur’an* (1961), v.8, p.112. Zamakhshari, *Kashshāf*, v.1, p.325 & v.2, p.127. Qurtūbi, *al-Jāmi‘*, v.3, p.384.

⁴⁰ See Ibn Manzūr, *Lisān al-ʿarab*, under ‘بَحْسٌ’. Ṭabari, *Tafsir*, v.3, p.79. Ṭabarsi, *Tafsir*, v.8, pp.113-4.

⁴¹ Ibn Manzūr, *Lisān al-ʿarab*, under ‘بَحْسٌ’.

⁴² Ibn Manzūr, *Lisān al-ʿarab*, under ‘بَحْسٌ’.

⁴³ Ibn Manzūr, *Lisān al-ʿarab*, under ‘بَحْسٌ’.

⁴⁴ Ibn Manzūr, *Lisān al-ʿarab*, under ‘بَحْسٌ’. Ṭabari, *Tafsir*, v.8, p.166.

⁴⁵ Qurtūbi, *al-Jāmi‘*, v.7, p.246.

⁴⁶ See Zamakhshari, *Kashshāf*, v.3, p.332. Rāzi, *Tafsir*, v.6, p.388.

⁴⁷ Baydāwi, *Anwār*, p.232.

⁴⁸ See Qurtūbi, *al-Jāmi‘*, v.9, pp.85-6 & in v.20, p.251, Qurtūbi says about this ḥadīth “أَخْرَجَهُ الْبَيْزَارُ بِمَعْنَاهُ وَمَالِكُ بْنُ أَنَسٍ أَيْضًا مِنْ حَدِيثِ ابْنِ عُمَرَ”.

In Ibn Hishām, *Sīrat al-Nabi* (1937), p.308, this part of the ḥadīth reads: “وَمَنْ يَنْقُصُوا الْمِكْيَالَ وَالْمِيزَانَ إِلَّا أَخَذُوا بِالسِّنِينَ وَشِدَّةِ الْمُؤْنَةِ وَجَوْرِ السُّلْطَانِ”.

In Ṣakhr, *Mawsūʿah*, Ibn Mājah, ḥadīth no.4009, the word ‘المؤنة’ is replaced by ‘المؤنة’.

See also Zamakhshari, *Kashshāf*, v.4, p.718. Rāzi, *Tafsir*, v.8, p.530.

⁴⁹ The poet is Zuhayr ibn Abi Sulmā. It is also said that the poet is Jābir ibn Huyay Al-Taghlibi. This part of the poem reads also slightly differently according to Zamakhshari, *Kashshāf*, v.2, p.418, footnote no.1:

أَبَى كُلِّ أَسْوَاقِ الْعِرَاقِ إِتَاوَةٌ ... وَمَا كُلُّ مَا بَاعَ امْرُؤٌ مَكْسٌ دِرْهَمٍ
أَلَا تَسْتَجِي مِنَّا مُلُوكٌ وَتَتَّقِي ... مَخَارِمَنَا لَا تَتَّقِي الدَّمَ بِالدَّمِ

- The lines are also reported with ‘مَكْسُ دِرْهَمٍ’ instead of ‘بَحْسُ دِرْهَمٍ’, and with ‘أَلَا تَسْتَحِي مِنَّا مُلُوكٌ وَتَنْتَفِي’ instead of ‘أَلَا يَسْتَحِي مِنَّا الْمَلِكُ وَتَنْتَفِي’.
- ⁵⁰ Khan and Helali, *Qur’an*.
- ⁵¹ See this book under *k-y-l* ‘كَيْلٌ’ and *w-f-y* ‘وَيْفٌ’.
- ⁵² See Qurtubi, *al-Jāmi‘*, v.9, pp.85-6.
- ⁵³ Zamakhshari, *Kashshāf*, v.4, p.718.
- ⁵⁴ Zamakhshari, *Kashshāf*, v.2, p.127.
- ⁵⁵ According to Baydāwī, *Anwār*, p.162: “وَكَانُوا مَكَّاسِينَ لَا يَدْعُونَ شَيْئًا إِلَّا “
”مَكْسُوهُ”.
- ⁵⁶ Yusuf Ali, *Qur’an*.
- ⁵⁷ See Baydāwī, *Anwār*, p.232.
- ⁵⁸ See for example *Lisān al-‘arab*, *al-Sihāh*, etc., under ‘نُقْلٌ’.
- ⁵⁹ See Al-Munjid, under ‘نُقْلٌ’.
- See also Zuhayr Al-Shāyib (trans.), *Wasf Misr*, v.6, pp.15-31 for a long discussion on the different views with regard to the weight of *al-mithqāl* ‘الْمِثْقَالُ’. According to *Lisān al-‘arab*, under ‘نُقْلٌ’, the *mithqāl* weighs one dirham and three seventh of a dirham; and compared to the Egyptian pound, it weighs one tenth of one tenth of a pound.
- ⁶⁰ See *Lisān al-‘arab*, under ‘نُقْلٌ’:
- الْمِثْقَالُ فِي الْأَصْلِ: مِقْدَارٌ مِنَ الْوِزْنِ، أَيْ شَيْءٌ كَانَ مِنْ قَلِيلٍ أَوْ كَثِيرٍ فَمَعْنَى مِثْقَالٍ ذَرَّةٌ وَزَنَ ذَرَّةٌ.
- ⁶¹ See for example, *Lisān al-‘arab*, under ‘نُقْلٌ’. Al-Mufaddal Al-Dabbi, *al-Amthāl* (1300 A.H), p.75. Zamakhshari, *Kashshāf*, v.3, p.568. Tabari, *Tafsir*, v.5, p.57.
- ⁶² Zamakhshari, *Kashshāf*, v.1, p.511
- ⁶³ See Zamakhshari, *Kashshāf*, v.1, p.511. *Lisān al-‘arab*, under ‘ذَرَّةٌ’.
- ⁶⁴ Tabari, *Tafsir*, v.5, p.57.
- ⁶⁵ Khān and Helālī, *Qur’an*.
- ⁶⁶ See the different views on what is actually weighed later in this chapter under *mīzān* and *mawāzīn*.
- ⁶⁷ See the meaning of *mawāzīn* later in this chapter under this title.
- ⁶⁸ *Lisān al-‘arab*, under ‘خَفَفٌ’.

⁶⁹ See this book under *mīzān* and *mawāzīn*.

According to *Lisān al-ʿarab* and *ʿAsās al-Balāghah* under ‘شَوْل’, Al-ʿAkḥṭal says: “إِذَا وَضَعْتَ أَبَاكَ فِي مِيزَانِهِمْ ... رَجَحُوا، وَشَالَ أَبُوكَ فِي الْمِيزَانِ”. Another variation of the second part of this line reads: “فَقَزَتْ حَدِيدَتُهُ إِلَيْكَ فَشَالَ”.

⁷⁰ See Al-Ṭabarsī, *Tafsīr*, v.8, p.15; he says: “التَّقَلُّ: الاعْتِمَادُ سَفَلًا ... الحِفَّةُ: ”. “الاعْتِمَادُ عَلْوًا”.

⁷¹ Yusuf Alī “One day the earth will be changed to a different Earth, and so will be the Heavens”.
Khan&Helalī “On the day when the earth will be changed to other than the earth and so will the heavens”.
Pickthall: “On the day when the earth will be changed to other than the earth, and the heavens (also will be changed)”.
Arberry: “Upon the day the earth shall be changed to other than the [earth, and the heavens...]”.

⁷² Rāzi, *Tafsīr*, v.4, p.183.

⁷³ See Qurṭubī, *al-Jāmiʿ*, v.7, p.165; in his own words:

“وَالصَّحِيحُ أَنَّ الْمَوَازِينَ تَتَقَلُّ بِالْكُتْبِ الَّتِي فِيهَا الْأَعْمَالُ مَكْتُوبَةٌ وَبِهَا تَخْفُ”.

See also, Zamakhshari, *Kashshāf*, v.2, pp.88-9 & v.4, p.790 where Zamakhshari records that Abu Bakr said to ‘Umar on his deathbed:

“وَإِنَّمَا تَقَلَّتْ مَوَازِينُ مَنْ تَقَلَّتْ مَوَازِينُهُمْ يَوْمَ الْقِيَامَةِ بِاتِّبَاعِهِمْ الْحَقَّ وَتَقَلَّتْ فِي الدُّنْيَا وَحَقَّ لِمِيزَانٍ لَا تُوضَعُ فِيهِ إِلَّا الْحَسَنَاتُ أَنْ يَتَقَلُّ؛ وَإِنَّمَا خَفَّتْ مَوَازِينُ مَنْ خَفَّتْ مَوَازِينُهُ لِاتِّبَاعِهِمُ الْبَاطِلَ وَخَفَّتْ فِي الدُّنْيَا، وَحَقَّ لِمِيزَانٍ لَا تُوضَعُ فِيهِ إِلَّا السَّيِّئَاتُ أَنْ يَخْفَ”.

⁷⁴ *khasira* ‘خَسِرَ’ *yakhsaru* ‘يَخْسِرُ’ may be found in Q7:9 and Q23:103 that read {وَمَنْ خَفَّتْ مَوَازِينُهُ فَأُولَئِكَ الَّذِينَ خَسِرُوا أَنْفُسَهُمْ} mentioned with *mawāzīn* but not related to measuring and weighing.

⁷⁵ Ibn Manzūr, *Lisān al-ʿarab* under ‘خَسِرَ’. Zamakhshari, *Kashshāf*, v.4, pp.444 & 718. Rāzi, *Tafsīr*, v.8, p.530. Qurṭubī, *al-Jāmiʿ*, v.20, p.250 & v.17, pp.154-5.

⁷⁶ See Rāzi, *Tafsīr*, v.8, p.530.

⁷⁷ Qurṭubī, *al-Jāmiʿ*, v.17, pp.154-5.

- ⁷⁸ See Yusuf Ali, *Qur'an*. Khan and Helali, *Qur'an*. Arberry, *Koran*. Pickthall, *Koran*.
- ⁷⁹ See Yusuf Ali, *Qur'an*. Khan and Helali, *Qur'an*. Arberry, *Koran*. Pickthall, *Koran*.
- ⁸⁰ See Rāzi, *Tafsir*, v.8, p.7.
- ⁸¹ Qurtubi, *al-Jāmiʿ*, v.17, pp.154-5.
- ⁸² Qurtubi, *al-Jāmiʿ*, v.19, p.249.
- ⁸³ See Yusuf Ali, *Qur'an*. Khan and Helali, *Qur'an*. Arberry, *Koran*.
- ⁸⁴ See Al-Jawhari, *al-Sihāh*, under 'طَعُو'. Al-Shartūni, 'Aqrab al-Mawārid, under 'طَعُو'. Zamakhshari, 'Asās al-Balāghah, under 'طَعُو'. Ibn Manzūr, *Lisān al-ʿarab*, under 'طَعُو': "طَعَى: جَاوَزَ الْقَدْرَ وَغَلَا " : 'طَعُو' : "وَازْتَفَعَ". Qurtubi, *al-Jāmiʿ*, v.17, pp.154-5. Zamakhshari, *Kashshāf*, v.4, p.444. Baydāwi, *Anwār*, p.532. Marāghi, *Tafsir*, v.26-30, pp.107-8.
- ⁸⁵ See this chapter under *mīzān*.
- ⁸⁶ See Qurtubi, *al-Jāmiʿ*, v.17, pp.154-5. Zamakhshari, *Kashshāf*, v.4, p.444. Baydāwi, *Anwār*, p.532. Marāghi, *Tafsir*, v.26-30, pp.107-8.
- ⁸⁷ See Yusuf Ali, *Qur'an*. Khan and Helali, *Qur'an*. Arberry, *Koran*.
- ⁸⁸ See Yusuf Ali, *Qur'an*. Khan and Helali, *Qur'an*. Arberry, *Koran*.
- ⁸⁹ See this chapter under *b-kh-s*.
- ⁹⁰ Cf. Q45:16 ﴿وَلَقَدْ ءَاتَيْنَا بَنِي إِسْرَائِيلَ الْكِتَابَ وَالْحُكْمَ وَالنَّبِيَّةَ﴾. Although *al-Hukm* ﴿الْحُكْمَ﴾ here is evidently different from *al-Kitāb* ﴿الْكِتَابَ﴾, what Al-Qurtubi actually means is the Scripture or the Qur'an.
- ⁹¹ Q2:75 ﴿وَقَدْ كَانَ فَرِيقٌ مِّنْهُمْ يَسْمَعُونَ كَلَامَ اللَّهِ ثُمَّ يُحَرِّفُونَهُ مِن بَعْدِ مَا عَقَلُوهُ وَهُمْ يَعْلَمُونَ﴾
Q4:46 ﴿مِنَ الَّذِينَ هَادُوا يُحَرِّفُونَ الْكَلِمَ عَن مَّوَاضِعِهِ﴾
Q5:13 ﴿فِيمَا نَقَضِهِمْ مِّيثَاقَهُمْ لَعْنَاهُمْ وَجَعَلْنَا قُلُوبَهُمْ قَاسِيَةً يُحَرِّفُونَ الْكَلِمَ عَن مَّوَاضِعِهِ﴾

وَمِنَ الَّذِينَ هَادُوا سَمَاعُونَ لِلْكَذِبِ سَمَاعُونَ لِقَوْمٍ ءَاخِرِينَ لَمْ يَأْتُوكَ يُحَرِّفُونَ الْكَلِمَ مِنْ بَعْدِ ﴿٤١:٥٥﴾
﴿مَوَاضِعِهِ﴾

⁹² Ibn Manzūr in *Lisān al-ʿarab* under ‘طَفَفَ’ says:

”طَفَفَ الشَّيْءُ يُطَفُّ طَفًّا: دَنَا وَتَهَيَّبًا وَأَمَكَنَ وَقِيلَ أَشْرَفَ وَبَدَأَ لِيُؤْخَذَ وَالْمَعْنَى أَنْ مَتَجَاوَزَانَ“.

⁹³ See Qurtūbi, *al-Jāmiʿ*, v.20, p.249. Ṣakhr, *Mawsūʿah*, Aḥmad, ḥadīth no.4257. Muslim, ḥadīth no. 3477 “ قَالَ عَبْدُ اللَّهِ فَجِئْتُ سَابِقًا فَطَفَّفْتُ “
”بِي الْفَرَسِ الْمَسْجِدَ“.

⁹⁴ See for example, Ibn Manzūr, *Lisān al-ʿarab* under ‘طَفَفَ’.
Qurtūbi, *al-Jāmiʿ*, v.2, p.249. Rāzi, *Tafsir*, v.8, p.530.

⁹⁵ Rāzi, *Tafsir*, v.8, p.530.

⁹⁶ Qurtūbi, *al-Jāmiʿ*, v.2, p.249

⁹⁷ See Ibn Manzūr, *Lisān al-ʿarab* under ‘طَفَفَ’. Qurtūbi, *al-Jāmiʿ*,
v.20, p.249. Ibn Kathīr, *Tafsir al-Qurʿan al-ʿaẓīm* (1988), v.4,
p.335. Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal, *Al-Musnad* (1949), v.4, p.158. Ṣakhr,
Mawsūʿah, Aḥmad, ḥadīths no. 16675 and 16804. The wording
of the former ḥadīth is:

”عَنْ عُقْبَةَ بْنِ عَامِرٍ أَنَّ رَسُولَ اللَّهِ (ﷺ) قَالَ: إِنَّ أَنْسَابَكُمْ هَذِهِ لَيْسَتْ بِسَبَابٍ عَلَى أَحَدٍ وَإِنَّمَا أَنْتُمْ وَوَلَدُ
آدَمَ طَفُّ الصَّاعِ لَمْ تَمْلُؤْهُ لَيْسَ لِأَحَدٍ فَضْلٌ إِلَّا بِالدِّينِ أَوْ عَمَلٍ صَالِحٍ حَسَبَ الرَّجُلِ أَنْ يَكُونَ بَدِيًّا بَحِيلاً
جَبَانًا“.

⁹⁸ See Ṣābūni, *Mukhtaṣar*, v.4, p.760. Zamakhshari, *Kashshāf*, v.4,
p.718. Baydāwi, *Anwār*, p.591. Qurtūbi, *al-Jāmiʿ*, v.20, p.249.

⁹⁹ See Ibn Manzūr, *Lisān al-ʿarab* under ‘طَفَفَ’.

¹⁰⁰ See Ibn Manzūr, *Lisān al-ʿarab* under ‘طَفَفَ’. Rāzi, *Tafsir*, v.8,
p.530. Qurtūbi, *al-Jāmiʿ*, v.20, p.249. In Ṣakhr, *Mawsūʿah*,
Bukhārī *Kitāb Tafsir al-Qurʿan: Surat* ‘وَيْلٌ لِلْمُطَفِّفِينَ’ says: “ وَقَالَ غَيْرُهُ “
” (أَيُّ غَيْرٍ مُجَاهِدٍ) الْمُطَفِّفُ لَا يُؤَوِّي غَيْرَهُ“

¹⁰¹ Qurtūbi, *al-Jāmiʿ*, v.20, pp.248-9 reports that Ibn ‘Umar said:
”الْمُطَفِّفُ: الرَّجُلُ يَسْتَأْجِرُ الْمُكْتِبَالَ وَهُوَ يَعْلَمُ أَنَّهُ يَجِيفُ فِي كَيْلِهِ فَوَزُرُهُ عَلَيْهِ“.

¹⁰² See for example Qurtūbi, *al-Jāmiʿ*, v.20, pp.249. Rāzi, *Tafsir*,
v.8, p.532. Ṣakhr, *Mawsūʿah*, Al-Nasā’i, ḥadīth no. 1295:
classified as:

أثر موقوف على صحابي: "عن حذيفة أنه رأى رجلاً يصلي فطَفَفَ، فقال له حذيفة: منذ كم تصلي هذه الصلاة؟ قال: منذ أربعين عاماً قال: ما صليت ولو مت وأنت تصلي هذه الصلاة لمت على غير فطرة محمد (ﷺ)، ثم قال: إن الرجل ليخفف ويتم ويحسن".

Also classified as such is Mālik, hadīth no.19:

"عن مالك عن يحيى بن سعيد أن عمر بن الخطاب انصرف من صلاة العصر، فلقي رجلاً لم يشهد العصر، فقال عمر: ما حبسك عن صلاة العصر؟ فذكر له الرجل عُذْرًا، فقال عمر: طَفَفْتَ. قال يحيى: قال مالك: ويُقال في كل شيء وفاء وتطفيف".

¹⁰³ Qurtubi, *al-Jāmiʿ*, v.20, pp.249.

¹⁰⁴ Rāzi, *Tafsir*, v.8, p.530.

¹⁰⁵ In Sakhr, *Mawsūeah*, Bukhāri, *Kitāb al- eitq*:

"قال النبي (ﷺ) لكل امرئ ما نوى ولا نية للناسي والمخطئ".

Ibn Mājah, hadīth no. 2035:

"عن ابن عباس عن النبي (ﷺ) قال: إن الله وضع عن أمتي الخطأ والنسيان وما استكروها عليه".

and hadīth no.2033 reads:

"عن أبي ذر الغفاري قال: قال رسول الله (ﷺ) إن الله تجاوز عن أمتي الخطأ والنسيان وما استكروها عليه.

¹⁰⁶ See Suyūṭi, *Itqān*, v.1, pp.26-7 & 34. Zamakhshari, *Kashshāf*, v.4, p.718.

¹⁰⁷ Suyūṭi, *Itqān*, v.1, p.34.

See also Zamakhshari, *Kashshāf*, v.4, p.718. Qurtubi, *al-Jāmiʿ*, v.20, pp.248. Rāzi, *Tafsir*, v.8, p.530. Baydāwi, *Anwār*, p.591. Sakhr, *Mawsūeah*, Ibn Mājah, hadīth no.2214. The report reads:

"عن ابن عباس قال لما قدم النبي (ﷺ) المدينة كانوا من أحبب الناس شيئاً فأنزل الله سبحانه ﴿وَوَيْلٌ لِلْمُطَفِّفِينَ﴾ فَأَحْسِنُوا الْكَيْلَ بَعْدَ ذَلِكَ".

¹⁰⁸ Qurtubi, *al-Jāmiʿ*, v.20, p.248.

¹⁰⁹ Cf. Yusuf Ali, *Qur'an*. Khan and Helali, *Qur'an*. Arberry, *Koran*.

¹¹⁰ Rāzi, *Tafsir*, v.8, p.530.

¹¹¹ Ibn Manzūr, *Lisān al-ʿarab* under 'وَرَن'.

¹¹² Ibn Manzūr, *Lisān al-ʿarab* under 'كَيْل'.

¹¹³ Zamakhshari, *Kashshāf*, v.4, p.718.

¹¹⁴ See Zamakhshari, *Kashshāf*, v.4, p.718. Rāzi, *Tafsir*, v.8, p.530. Sābūni, *Mukhtaṣar*, v.4, p.760. Qurtubi, *al-Jāmiʿ*, v.20, p.250. Baydāwi, *Anwār*, p.591.

¹¹⁵ Qurtubi, *al-Jāmiʿ*, v.20, pp.250-1. Rāzi, *Tafsir*, v.8, p.530. Zamakhshari, *Kashshāf*, v.4, p.718. Baydāwi, *Anwār*, p.591.

¹¹⁶ This feature is common in the Arabic language with many verbs: "أَبْعَثْتُكَ وَأَجَّحْتُ لَكَ، كَسَبْتُكَ وَكَسَبْتُ لَكَ، نَصَحْتُكَ وَنَصَحْتُ لَكَ، شَكَرْتُكَ وَشَكَرْتُ لَكَ، أَمَرْتُكَ وَأَمَرْتُ لَكَ، سَرَفْتُكَ وَسَرَفْتُ لَكَ، اسْتَجَبْتُكَ وَاسْتَجَبْتُ لَكَ، عَدَدْتُكَ وَعَدَدْتُ لَكَ".

Also in Q22:41 we read: {الَّذِينَ إِنْ مَكَانَهُمْ فِي الْأَرْضِ}، in stead of 'مَكَانًا لَهُمْ'.

¹¹⁷ Zamakhshari, *Kashshāf*, v.4, p.719; the rest of this line is

"وَلَقَدْ نَهَيْتُكَ عَنْ نَبَاتِ الْأَوْبَرِ"

¹¹⁸ See Rāzi, *Tafsir*, v.8, p.530. Zamakhshari, *Kashshāf*, v.4, p.718. Qurtubi, *al-Jāmiʿ*, v.20, pp.250-1. Baydāwi, *Anwār*, p.591. Ibn Qutaybah, *Mushkil*, pp.177-8.

¹¹⁹ See Ibn Manzūr, *Lisān al-ʿarab*, under 'قَسَطَ'. Sayyid Qutb, *Fi Zilāl al-Qurʿan* (1985), v.5, p.2614. Tabari, *Tafsir*, v.15, p.61 & v.19, p.66. Ibn Hajar, *Fath*, v.1, pp.547-9. Kishk, *Rihāb*, v.15, p.2153. Baydāwi, *Anwār*, pp.280, 375 & 419. Qurtubi, *al-Jāmiʿ*, v.17, pp.154-5 & v.19, p.16. Rāzi, *Tafsir*, v.5, pp.81-2 & 398; v.6, pp.107-8 & 388; v.7, pp.569 & 574; v.8, p.228. Zamakhshari, *Kashshāf*, v.2, p.665; v.3, p.332; v.4, pp.365-6 & 628.

¹²⁰ Ibn Manzūr, *Lisān al-ʿarab*, under 'قَسَطَ' quotes:

"يَشْفِي مِنَ الصَّغَنِ قُسُوطَ الْقَاسِطِ"

¹²¹ This wording is also found in Sakhr, *Mawsūʿah*, Muslim, hadīth no.263. Ibn Mājah, hadīth no.191-2; Aḥmad, hadīth no.18709, 18765 & 18806. Muslim, hadīth no.264 reads: "يَرْفَعُ الْقِسْطَ وَيُخَفِّضُهُ"، while this part in Ibn Mājah, hadīth no.193 reads: "وَيَبْدِئُ الْأُخْرَى الْمِيزَانَ" "يَرْفَعُ الْقِسْطَ وَيُخَفِّضُ".

¹²² Al-Dabbi, *Amthāl*, p.83. The first half of this line is:

"قَسَمْتُ الدَّهْرَ فِي زَمَنِ رَجِيٍّ"

This line appears in Al-'A'lam Al-Shantamari, *Sharḥ Dīwān Tarafah ibn Al-εabd* (1975), p.102 and Al-Bustāni, *Dīwān Tarafah ibn Al-εabd* (1953), p.66 as:

قَسَمْتُ الدَّهْرَ فِي زَمَنِ رَحِيٍّ كَذَاكَ الْحُكْمُ يَقْصِدُ أَوْ يَجُورُ

¹²³ This hadīth is narrated by Abu Hurayrah who said that the Prophet (ﷺ) said:

“وَالَّذِي نَفْسِي بِيَدِهِ لَيُوشِكَنَّ أَنْ يَنْزَلَ فِيكُمْ ابْنُ مَرْثَمٍ حَكَمًا مُقْسَطًا فَيَكْسِرَ الصَّلِيبَ وَيَقْتُلَ الْخَنَزِيرَ وَيَضَعَ الْجُزْيَةَ وَيَبْيِضَ الْمَالَ حَتَّى لَا يَقْبَلَهُ أَحَدٌ.”

See Ṣakhr, *Mawsūeah*, Bukhāri, hadīth no.2070. This hadīth is also narrated with both the same wording and a slightly different one as well in: Bukhāri, hadīth no.2296; Muslim, hadīth no.220; Tirmidhi, hadīth no.2159; Ibn Mājah, hadīths no.4067 & 4068; Aḥmad, hadīths no. 6971, 7354, 9871, 10522 & 23327.

¹²⁴ Ibn Hajar, *Fath*, v.13, p.549.

¹²⁵ Cf. Yusuf Ali, *Qur'an*. Khan and Helali, *Qur'an*. Arberry, *Koran*

¹²⁶ Cf. Yusuf Ali, *Qur'an*. Khan and Helali, *Qur'an*. Arberry, *Koran*

¹²⁷ Cf. Yusuf Ali, *Qur'an*. Khan and Helali, *Qur'an*. Arberry, *Koran*

¹²⁸ See Suyūṭi, *Itqān*, v.1, pp.26-27.

¹²⁹ See Rāzi, *Tafsir*, v.4, p.171.

¹³⁰ See Zamakhshari, *Kashshāf*, v.4, p.718. Qurtubi, *al-Jāmiε*, v.20, p.251.

¹³¹ See Qurtubi, *al-Jāmiε*, v.9, pp.85-6. Rāzi, *Tafsir*, v.5, pp.81-2.

¹³² Qurtubi, *al-Jāmiε*, v.9, pp.85-6.

¹³³ Cf. Yusuf Ali, *Qur'an*. Khan and Helali, *Qur'an*. Arberry, *Koran*.

“*al-qistās*” is my own addition.

¹³⁴ See Tabari, *Tafsir*, v.15, p.61. Zamakhshari, *Kashshāf*, v.2, p. 332 & v.3, p. 665. Rāzi, *Tafsir*, v.5, p.398 & v.6, p.388. Baydāwi, *Anwār*, p.286 & 375. Ibn Hajar, *Fath*, v.13, p.549. Abu Hāmid Al-Ghazāli, *al-Qistās al-Mustaqīm* (1900), p.20.

¹³⁵ See Tabari, *Tafsir*, v.15, p.61. Zamakhshari, *Kashshāf*, v.2, p. 332 & v.3, p. 665. Rāzi, *Tafsir*, v.5, p.398 & v.6, p.388.

Baydāwi, *Anwār*, p.286 & 375. Ibn Hajar, *Fath*, v.13, p.549. Abu Hāmid Al-Ghazālī, *al-Qistās*, p.20.

According to Suyūṭi, *Muzhir*, v.1, p.158:

"(قَالَ ابْنُ فَارِسٍ فِي فِقْهِ اللَّغَةِ وَهَذَا كَمَا قَالَ أَبُو عُبَيْدَةَ) وَقَالَ الْإِمَامُ فَخْرُ الدِّينِ الرَّازِي وَأَتْبَاعُهُ مَا وَقَعَ مِنَ الْقُرْآنِ مِنْ نَحْوِ الْمَشْكَاةِ وَالْقِسْطَاسِ وَالْإِسْتَبْرَقِ وَالسَّجِيلِ لَا نُسَلِّمُ أَنَّهَا غَيْرُ عَرَبِيَّةٍ بَلْ غَائِبَةٌ أَنْ وَضَعَ

العَرَبِ فِيهَا وَافَقَ لُغَةً أُخْرَى كَالصَّابُونِ وَالتَّنُورِ فَإِنَّ اللَّغَاتَ فِيهَا مُتَّفِقَةٌ". On p.159, he says: "فَرُوِي عَنْ ابْنِ عَبَّاسٍ وَمُجَاهِدٍ وَابْنِ جُبَيْرٍ وَعِكْرَمَةَ وَعَطَاءٍ وَعَبْدِ اللَّهِ بْنِ أَبِي رَجَاءٍ أَنَّهَا بِلُغَةِ الرُّومِيِّينَ كَثِيرَةٌ إِنَّهَا بِلُغَاتِ الْعَجَمِ ... وَالصَّرَاطُ وَالْقِسْطَاسُ وَالْفَرْدُوسُ يُقَالُ أَنَّهَا بِالرُّومِيِّينَ".

On p.163 he says: "قَالَ التَّعَالِي ... وَمِنَ اللَّغَةِ الرُّومِيَّةِ الْقِسْطَاسُ وَهُوَ الْمِيزَانُ".

¹³⁶ Suyūṭi, *Itqān*, v.12, p.115. In Suyūṭi, *al-Mutawakkili* (1924), translated by William Y. Bell, pp.23 & 49, the author says: "Al-Firyāni and Ibn Abi Shaybah, on the authority of Mujāhid: al-Qistās in the Greek language means 'scales'".

See also Arthur Jeffery, *The Foreign Vocabulary of the Qur'an* (1938), pp.237-9.

¹³⁷ Cf. Yusuf Ali, *Qur'an*. Khan and Helali, *Qur'an*. Arberry, *Koran*. Asad, *Qur'an*.

¹³⁸ Cf. Yusuf Ali, *Qur'an*. Khan and Helali, *Qur'an*. Arberry, *Koran*. Asad, *Qur'an*.

¹³⁹ Q41:9-12 refer to the Creation in the following terms:

﴿قُلْ أَتَيْتُكُمْ لِتَكْفُرُونَ بِالَّذِي خَلَقَ الْأَرْضَ فِي يَوْمَيْنِ وَتَجْعَلُونَ لَهُ أَنْدَادًا ذَلِكَ رَبُّ الْعَالَمِينَ * وَجَعَلَ فِيهَا رَوَاسِيَ مِنْ فَوْقِهَا وَبَارَكَ فِيهَا وَقَدَّرَ فِيهَا أَقْوَاتَهَا فِي أَرْبَعَةِ أَيَّامٍ سَوَاءً لِّلنَّاسِ لِيُنَبِّئَهُمْ فِي أَيَّامٍ مَّوَدَّعَاتٍ * ثُمَّ اسْتَوَى إِلَى السَّمَاءِ وَهِيَ دُخَانٌ فَقَالَ لَهَا وَلِلْأَرْضِ ائْتِيَا طَوْعًا أَوْ كَرْهًا قَالَتَا أَتَيْنَا طَائِعِينَ * فَقَضَاهُنَّ سَبْعَ سَمَاوَاتٍ فِي يَوْمَيْنِ وَأَوْحَى فِي كُلِّ سَمَاءٍ أَمْرَهَا وَزَيْنَا السَّمَاءِ الدُّنْيَا بِمَصَابِيحٍ وَحِفْظًا ذَلِكَ تَقْدِيرُ الْعَزِيزِ الْعَلِيمِ﴾.

¹⁴⁰ See this chapter under *mīzān*.

¹⁴¹ See this chapter under *mīzān*.

Some Ulema say that *allā* ﴿أَلَا﴾ is not a command, but it means *li'allā* 'لَيْلَا' (so that, in order that) indicating negation.

See Qurtubi, *al-Jāmi*, v.17, pp.154-5. Zamakhshari, *Kashshāf*, v.4, p.444. Baydāwi, *Anwār*, p.532. Ahmad M. Al-Marāghi, *Tafsir Al-Marāghi* (1946), v.26-30, pp.107-8.

¹⁴² Ibn ‘Ubaydah is reported to have said: “الإقامة باليد والقسط بالقلب”, i.e., weighing is a manual act and *al-qist* is achieved by heart. See Qurṭubī, *al-Jāmi‘*, v.17, pp.154-5.

¹⁴³ See Yusuf Ali, *Qur’an*. Khan and Helali, *Qur’an*. Arberry, *Koran*.

¹⁴⁴ See this chapter under *mīzān* and *mawāzīn*.

¹⁴⁵ See this chapter under *mīzān* and *mawāzīn*.

¹⁴⁶ See this chapter under *mawāzīn*.

¹⁴⁷ See for example some of the exegetes views on the meaning of *al-qist* in: Ibn Hajar, *Fath*, v.13, p.547 & after. Baydāwī, *Anwār*, p.327. Kishk, *Rihāb*, v.17, p.2482. Zamakhshari, *Kashshāf*, v.3, p.120. Rāzi, *Tafsir*, v.6, p.107.

¹⁴⁸ It is understood from many *ḥadīths* that one is only admitted in Heaven as a result of Allah’s Mercy and not one’s good deeds. See Ṣakhr, *Mawsū‘ah*, Bukhāri, *ḥadīth* no.5241 narrated by Abu Hurayrah; he said:

"سَمِعْتُ رَسُولَ اللَّهِ (ﷺ) يَقُولُ: لَنْ يُدْخَلَ أَحَدًا عَمَلُهُ الْجَنَّةَ. قَالُوا: وَلَا أَنْتَ يَا رَسُولَ اللَّهِ؟ قَالَ: لَا وَلَا أَنَا، إِلَّا أَنْ يَتَّعَمِدَ عَلَى اللَّهِ بِفَضْلِ وَرَحْمَةٍ فَسَدُّوا وَقَارِبُوا وَلَا يَتَمَنَّيَنَّ أَحَدُكُمْ الْمَوْتَ، إِمَّا مُحْسِنًا فَلَعَلَّهُ أَنْ يَزِدَّ خَيْرًا وَإِمَّا مُسِيئًا فَلَعَلَّهُ أَنْ يَسْتَعْتَبَ".

See also the following *ḥadīths* for different wordings: Bukhāri, *ḥadīths* no.5982 & 5986. Muslim, *ḥadīths* no.5036, 5037, 5038, 5040, 5041 & 5043. Ibn Mājah, *ḥadīth* no.4191. Aḥmad, *ḥadīths* no.6905, 7167, 7271, 7902, 7980, 8137, 8641, 8703, 9455, 9629, 9681, 9740, 9866, 9938, 10022, 10130, 10205, 10261, 10370, 10517, 11062, 14100, 14373, & 23793. Dārimi, *ḥadīth* no.2617.

¹⁴⁹ See Ibn Manzūr, *Lisān al-‘arab* and Al-Ḥusayni, *Sharḥ al-Qāmūs al-Musamma Taj al-‘arūs min Jawāhir al-Qāmūs* (1306 A.H), under ‘كَيْلٌ’. See also, Lesley Brown (ed.), *The New Shorter Oxford English Dictionary on Historical Principles* (1993), under ‘measure’.

¹⁵⁰ Ibn Manzūr, *Lisān al-‘arab*, under ‘كَيْلٌ’.

¹⁵¹ Brown (ed.), *The New Shorter Oxford English Dictionary on Historical Principles*, under ‘measure’.

¹⁵² See Ibn Manzūr, *Lisān al-ʿarab* and Al-Husayni, *Sharḥ al-Qāmūs*, under ‘كَيْلٌ’.

¹⁵³ Ibn Manzūr, *Lisān al-ʿarab*, under ‘كَيْلٌ’.

¹⁵⁴ Khan and Helali, *Qur’an*.

¹⁵⁵ Arberry, *Koran*.

¹⁵⁶ See Yusuf Ali, *Qur’an*. Khan and Helali, *Qur’an*.

¹⁵⁷ For the meaning of ‘إِفَاءٌ’ ^c‘ifā’, see this chapter under w-f-y.

¹⁵⁸ Q29:36-37 reads:

﴿وَأِلَىٰ مَدْيَنَ أَخَاهُمْ شُعَيْبًا فَقَالَ يَا قَوْمِ اعْبُدُوا اللَّهَ وَارْجُوا الْيَوْمَ الْآخِرَ وَلَا تَعْتُوا فِي الْأَرْضِ مُفْسِدِينَ * فَكَذَّبُوهُ فَأَخَذَتْهُمُ الرَّجْفَةُ فَأَصْبَحُوا فِي دِيَارِهِمْ جَاثِمِينَ﴾

According to Yusuf Ali, *Qur’an*: “To the Madyan (people) (We sent) their brother Shuʿayb. Then he said: “O my people! Serve Allah, and fear, the Last Day: nor commit evil on the earth, with intent to do mischief”. But they rejected him: then the mighty Blast seized them, and they lay prostrate in their homes by the morning”.

In p.995, note 3458, Yusuf Ali says: “The story of Shuʿayb and the Madyan people is only referred to here. It is told in 11:84-95. Their besetting sin was fraud and commercial immorality. Their punishment was a mighty Blast, such as accompanies volcanic eruptions. The point of the reference here, is that they went about doing mischief on the earth, and never thought of the Maʿād or the Hereafter, the particular theme of this Surah. The same point is made by the brief references in the following two verses to the ‘Ād and the Thamūd, and to Qārūn, Pharaoh and Hāmān, though the besetting sin in each case was different. The Madyanites were a commercial people and trafficked from land to land; their frauds are well described as spreading “mischief on the earth”.

¹⁵⁹ Arberry, *Koran*.

- ¹⁶⁰ See Zamakhshari, *Kashshāf*, v.2, p.127. Rāzi, *Tafsir*, v.4, p.258. Tabari, *Tafsir*, v.8, p.166. Tabarsi, *Tafsir*, v.8, p.113. Baydāwi, *Anwār*, p.162.
- ¹⁶¹ See Q6:152, Q11:85, Q55:9, Q57:25, etc.
- ¹⁶² Yusuf Ali, *Qur'an*, p.509.
- ¹⁶³ See Yusuf Ali, *Qur'an*. Khan and Helali, *Qur'an*.
- ¹⁶⁴ See Yusuf Ali, *Qur'an*. Khan and Helali, *Qur'an*. Arberry, *Koran*.
- ¹⁶⁵ See the meaning of *n-q-s* 'نَقَصَ' in this chapter.
- ¹⁶⁶ Qurṭubi, *al-Jāmiʿ*, v.9, p.85-6.
- ¹⁶⁷ Yusuf Ali, *Qur'an*.
- ¹⁶⁸ Arberry, *Koran*.
- ¹⁶⁹ Qurṭubi, *al-Jāmiʿ*, v.9, p.85-6.
- ¹⁷⁰ See this chapter under *mīzān*.
- ¹⁷¹ Khan and Helali, *Qur'an*.
- ¹⁷² See Yusuf Ali, *Qur'an*. Khan and Helali, *Qur'an*.
- ¹⁷³ See Yusuf Ali, *Qur'an*. Khan and Helali, *Qur'an*. Arberry, *Koran*.
- ¹⁷⁴ Arberry, *Koran*.
- ¹⁷⁵ See Yusuf Ali, *Qur'an*. Khan and Helali, *Qur'an*. Arberry, *Koran*.
- ¹⁷⁶ See Yusuf Ali, *Qur'an*. Khan and Helali, *Qur'an*. Arberry, *Koran*.
- ¹⁷⁷ Zamakhshari, *Kashshāf*, v.2, pp.486-487. Baydāwi, *Anwār*, p.244.
- ¹⁷⁸ See Yusuf Ali, *Qur'an*. Khan and Helali, *Qur'an*. Arberry, *Koran*.
- ¹⁷⁹ Ibn Manzūr, *Lisān al-ʿarab*, under 'كَيْلٌ': "كَالَ الْمُعْطَى وَآكْتَالَ الْأَجْدُ", that is 'kāla refers to the giver (by measure), and iktāla to the receiver (by measure)'.
¹⁸⁰ See Zamakhshari, *Kashshāf*, v.4, pp.718-20. Ibn Manzūr, *Lisān al-ʿarab*, under 'كَيْلٌ'. Baydāwi, *Anwār*, p.591. Rāzi, *Tafsir*, v.8,

p.530. Qurṭubi, *al-Jāmiʿ*, v.20, p.520. See also, this chapter under *t-f-f*.

Also, Cf. Ibn Kathīr, *Tafsir*, v.4, p.760.

¹⁸¹ See note 141 above.

¹⁸² See Rāzi, *Tafsir*, v.8, p.530. Qurṭubi, *al-Jāmiʿ*, v.20, p.520.

¹⁸³ Q6:152 { وَأَوْفُوا الْكَيْلَ وَالْمِيزَانَ بِالْقِسْطِ }

Q7:85 { فَأَوْفُوا الْكَيْلَ وَالْمِيزَانَ وَلَا تَبْخَسُوا النَّاسَ أَشْيَاءَهُمْ }

Q11:84 { وَلَا تَنْقُصُوا الْمِكْيَالَ وَالْمِيزَانَ إِنِّي أُرَآكُمْ بِخَيْرٍ }

Q11:85 { وَيَا قَوْمِ أَوْفُوا الْمِكْيَالَ وَالْمِيزَانَ بِالْقِسْطِ وَلَا تَبْخَسُوا النَّاسَ أَشْيَاءَهُمْ }

Q17:35 { وَأَوْفُوا الْكَيْلَ إِذَا كَلَّمْتُمْ وَزِنُوا بِالْقِسْطِ الْمُسْتَقِيمِ }

Q26:181-2 { أَوْفُوا الْكَيْلَ وَلَا تَكُونُوا مِنَ الْمُخْسِرِينَ * وَزِنُوا بِالْقِسْطِ الْمُسْتَقِيمِ }

Q83:2-3 { الَّذِينَ إِذَا أَكْتَالُوا عَلَى النَّاسِ يَسْتَوْفُونَ * وَإِذَا كَالَهُمْ أَوْ وَزَنُوهُمْ يُخْسِرُونَ }

¹⁸⁴ Zamakhshari, *Kashshāf*, v.4, p.480. Baydāwi, *Anwār*, p.542.

Rāzi, *Tafsir*, v.8, p.101.

¹⁸⁵ Ibn Manzūr, *Lisān al-ʿarab*, under 'كَيْل'.

With regard to the payment of *zakāh*, there are many *ḥadīths* referring to the *ṣā'*. Ṣakhr, *Mawsūʿah*, Bukhāri, *ḥadīth* no.1408 reads:

"عَنْ ابْنِ عُمَرَ رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمَا أَنَّ رَسُولَ اللَّهِ (ﷺ) فَرَضَ زَكَاةَ الْفِطْرِ صَاعًا مِنْ تَمْرٍ أَوْ صَاعًا مِنْ شَعِيرٍ عَلَى كُلِّ حُرٍّ وَعَبْدٍ ذَكَرٍ أَوْ أَنْثَى مِنَ الْمُسْلِمِينَ."

See also, with regard to *zakāh*, Bukhāri, *ḥadīths* no.1407, 1409-12, 1414-16. Muslim, *ḥadīths* no.1635-42 and 1644. Tirmidhi, *ḥadīths* no.609-612. Nasā'i, *ḥadīths* no.1562, 2453-58, 2461-71. Abu Dāwud, *ḥadīths* no.1373-79 and 1381. Ibn Mājah, *ḥadīths* no.1815-16, 1819-20. Aḥmad, *ḥadīths* no.3121, 4927, 5051, 5087, 5520, 5672, 5937, 10753, 11273, 11496, 22552-3. Mālik, *ḥadīths* no.553-4. Dārimi, *ḥadīths* no.1602-5.

For the expiation of sins, see Bukhāri, *ḥadīth* no.4155. Abu Dāwud, *ḥadīth* no.1895. Ibn Mājah, *ḥadīths* no.2103 and 3070. Aḥmad, *ḥadīths* no.17413 and 17422.

¹⁸⁶ See Ibn Manzūr, *Lisān al-ʿarab*, under 'كَيْل'. Ṣakhr, *Mawsūʿah*, Nasā'i, *ḥadīth* no.2473:

"عَنْ ابْنِ عُمَرَ عَنِ النَّبِيِّ (ﷺ) قَالَ الْمِكْيَالُ مِكْيَالُ أَهْلِ الْمَدِينَةِ وَالْوَزْنُ وَزْنُ أَهْلِ مَكَّةَ."

Abu Dāwud, *ḥadīth* no.2899.

¹⁸⁷ See Yusuf Ali, *Qur'an*. Khan and Helali, *Qur'an*. Arberry, *Koran*.

¹⁸⁸ See Q26:176-90 and Q7:85-92.

¹⁸⁹ Yusuf Ali, *Qur'an*, p.535.

¹⁹⁰ See Yusuf Ali, *Qur'an*. Khan and Helali, *Qur'an*. Arberry, *Koran*.

¹⁹¹ Arberry, *Koran*.

¹⁹² The contrast between *naqs* and *'ifā'* is also emphasised in Q11:108 which reads: { وَإِنَّا لَمُوفُونَ نَصِيْبُهُمْ غَيْرِ مَنْقُوصٍ } “And verily, We shall *repay* them *in full* their portion without *diminution* (*abatement*)”. See Yusuf Ali, *Qur'an*. Khan and Helali, *Qur'an*.

¹⁹³ Yusuf Ali, *Qur'an*, p.533, footnote no.1584.

¹⁹⁴ See Ibn Manzūr, *Lisān al-ʿarab*, under *'وزن'*. Butrus Al-Bustāni, *Muḥīt al-Muḥīt* (1867), under *'وزن'*. 'Abdullah Al-Bustāni, *Fākihah al-Bustān* (1930), under *'وزن'*.

¹⁹⁵ Majma' al-Lughah al-'Arabiyyah, *al-Mu'jam al-Wasīt* (1960), under *'وزن'*. Al-Husayni, *Sharḥ al-Qāmūs*, under *'وزن'*.

¹⁹⁶ Ibn Manzūr, *Lisān al-ʿarab*, under *'وزن'*. Al-Bustāni, *Fākihah*, under *'وزن'*.

¹⁹⁷ Majma', *al-Wasīt*, under *'وزن'*.

¹⁹⁸ Al-Bustāni, *Fākihah*, under *'وزن'*. The first part of this line is

”وَإِن يُسْتَضَافُوا إِلَىٰ حُكْمِهِ“

In R. Geyer (ed.), *al-Subḥ al-Munīr fī Shi'r Abi Baṣīr: Maymūn ibn Qays ibn Jandal: Al-'A'shā and Al-'A'shayn al-'Ākharayn* (1927), p.17, this line reads:

وَإِن يُسْتَضَافُوا إِلَىٰ حُكْمِهِ يُضَافُوا إِلَىٰ هَادِنٍ قَدْ رَزَّنَ

أَبُو عَبِيدَةَ: إِلَىٰ رَاجِحٍ قَدْ عَدَنَ. وَالرَّاجِحُ: الْوَازِنُ. وَرَزَّىٰ غَيْرُهُ: إِلَىٰ عَادِنٍ. عَادِنٌ: ثَابِتٌ، يُقَالُ: عَدَنْتُ بِأَرْضٍ: أَيْ ثَبَتْتُ بِهَا. يُقَوْلُ: قَدْ رَزَّنَ أَمْرَهُمْ، وَالرَّازِنُ: الْحَلِيمُ.

¹⁹⁹ Ibn Manzūr, *Lisān al-ʿarab*, under *'وزن'*. Al-Bustāni, *Fākihah*, under *'وزن'*. Al-Bustāni, *Muḥīt*, under *'وزن'*.

²⁰⁰ Ṭabarsi, *Tafsir*, v.8, p.16.

²⁰¹ Rāzi, *Tafsir*, v.4, pp.182-3.

²⁰² Rāzi, *Tafsir*, v.4, pp.182-3. The first part of this line is

“قَدْ كُنْتُ قَبْلَ لِقَائِكُمْ ذَا قُوَّةٍ”

In *Majma‘*, *al-Wasīt*, under ‘وَزْنٌ’, the second part reads:

“أَعْرِفْ لِكُلِّ امْرِئٍ مِيزَانَهُ”

²⁰³ See Ibn Manzūr, *Lisān al-‘arab*, under ‘وَزْنٌ’. Al-Bustāni, *Fākihah*, under ‘وَزْنٌ’. Al-Bustāni, *Muhīt*, under ‘وَزْنٌ’. Al-Shartūni, *‘Aqrab al-Mawārid*, under ‘وَزْنٌ’. Al-Husayni, *Sharḥ al-Qāmūs*, under ‘وَزْنٌ’ also says that according to Abu Ḥanīfah *al-wazn* ‘الْوَزْنُ’ is a sackful of dates that a man cannot lift it up with his hands; it weighs half or a third of one of the *Jullahs* from Hajar (حَلَّةٌ مِنْ جَلَالٍ (هَجَرَ); the plural is *wuzūn* ‘وُزُونٌ’. Abu Ḥanīfah then recited:

“وَكُنَّا تَزُودُنَا وَزُونًا كَثِيرَةً فَأَفْنَيْنَهَا لَمَّا عَلَوْنَا سَبَسَبَا”

(We had been provided with a great deal of supplies, yet we finished them when we got to Sabansab.)

²⁰⁴ See Ibn Manzūr, *Lisān al-‘arab*, under ‘وَزْنٌ’. Al-Bustāni, *Fākihah*, under ‘وَزْنٌ’. Husayni, *Sharḥ al-Qāmūs*, under ‘وَزْنٌ’.

²⁰⁵ See Louis Ma‘lūf, *al-Munjid* (1951), under ‘نَقْلٌ’. See also this chapter under *th-q-l* ‘نَقْلٌ’.

²⁰⁶ Ibn Manzūr, *Lisān al-‘arab*, under ‘وَزْنٌ’.

²⁰⁷ Ibn Manzūr, *Lisān al-‘arab*, under ‘وَزْنٌ’.

²⁰⁸ Ibn Manzūr, *Lisān al-‘arab*, under ‘كَيْلٌ’.

²⁰⁹ Al-Husayni, *Sharḥ al-Qāmūs*, under ‘وَزْنٌ’.

²¹⁰ See Khan and Helali, *Qur’an*. Pickthall, *Koran*.

²¹¹ See Yusuf Ali, *Qur’an*. Khan and Helali, *Qur’an*. Arberry, *Koran*.

²¹² See Zamakhshari, *Kashshāf*, v.2, p.749. Rāzi, *Tafsir*, v.5, p.515. Qurtubi, *al-Jāmi‘*, v.11, pp.66-7. Baydāwi, *Anwār*, p.305.

²¹³ See Qurtubi, *al-Jāmi‘*, v.11, pp.66-7. Ṣakhr, *Mawsū‘ah*, Bukhāri, *ḥadīth* no.4360. Muslim, *ḥadīth* no.4991. Nasā’i, *ḥadīth* no.5204.

In Rāzi, *Tafsir*, v.4, p.182, ‘Ubayd ibn ‘Umayr reported: “Big men that eat and drink abundantly will be brought forward (to witness the weighing of their deeds) but they will not weigh as much as a mosquito”. In Tabari, *Tafsir*, v.8, p.91: “... as much as a fly”.

²¹⁴ See Baydāwi, *Anwār*, p.305. Rāzi, *Tafsir*, v.5, p.515. Zamakhshari, *Kashshāf*, v.2, p.749.

²¹⁵ Zamakhshari, *Kashshāf*, v.2, p.749: (“It is said”). Rāzi, *Tafsir*, v.5, p.515: (“second view”).

²¹⁶ Baydāwi, *Anwār*, p.305 says: “وَلَا تَضَعُ لَهُمْ مِيزَانًا يُوزَنُ بِهِ أَعْمَالُهُمْ لِأَنَّهُمْ بِهَا كَانُوا يُوزَنُونَ”.

²¹⁷ Qurṭubi, *al-Jāmi‘*, v.11, pp.66-7.

²¹⁸ The view that the Balance is only set up for the weighing of the deeds of the believers only, or that the deeds (in this case bad deeds) of those who had not done any good deeds will not have to be weighed is, in my opinion, no more than an intellectual speculation as it is unsubstantiated by any religious tradition. No Qur’an or ḥadīth, etc., is quoted to support this view.

²¹⁹ See Q3:85-91

See also Sakhr, *Mawsū‘ah*, Aḥmad, ḥadīth no.24838:

“عَنْ عَائِشَةَ قَالَتْ قَالَ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ (ﷺ): “... فَأَمَّا الدِّيْوَانُ الَّذِي لَا يَغْفِرُهُ اللَّهُ فَالشِّرْكَ بِاللَّهِ، قَالَ اللَّهُ (ﷻ): (إِنَّهُ مَنْ يُشْرِكْ بِاللَّهِ فَقَدْ حَرَّمَ اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ الْجَنَّةَ).”

and ḥadīth no.8382:

“عَنْ أَبِي هُرَيْرَةَ قَالَ قَالَ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ (ﷺ): “... وَتَمَسَّ لَيْسَ هُنَّ كَفَّارَةُ الشِّرْكَ بِاللَّهِ (ﷻ) وَقَتْلُ النَّفْسِ بِغَيْرِ حَقٍّ أَوْ تَهْبِئَةٌ مُؤْمِنٍ أَوْ الْفِرَارُ يَوْمَ الرَّحْفِ أَوْ يَمِينٌ صَابِرَةٌ يَمْتَنِعُ بِهَا مَالًا بِغَيْرِ حَقٍّ”.

According to Bukhāri, ḥadīths no.4117, 4389 and 5542, and Muslim, ḥadīths no.124 and 125: ‘Abdullah asked the Prophet (ﷺ) about the gravest sin to Allah, the Prophet (ﷺ) said: “To join rivals (partners) to Allah, (although) He created you”.

“عَنْ عَبْدِ اللَّهِ قَالَ سَأَلْتُ رَسُولَ اللَّهِ (ﷺ): أَيُّ الذَّنْبِ أَعْظَمُ عِنْدَ اللَّهِ؟ قَالَ: أَنْ تَجْعَلَ لِلَّهِ نِدًّا وَهُوَ خَلْقَكَ”.

²²⁰ According to Sakhr, *Mawsū‘ah*, Muslim, ḥadīth no.5022:

"عَنْ أَنَسِ بْنِ مَالِكٍ قَالَ قَالَ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ (ﷺ): إِنَّ اللَّهَ لَا يَظْلِمُ مُؤْمِنًا حَسَنَةً يُعْطَى بِهَا فِي الدُّنْيَا وَيُجْزَى بِهَا فِي الْآخِرَةِ وَأَمَّا الْكَافِرُ فَيُطْعَمُ بِحَسَنَاتٍ مَا عَمِلَ بِهَا لِلَّهِ فِي الدُّنْيَا حَتَّى إِذَا أَفْضَى إِلَى الْآخِرَةِ لَمْ تَكُنْ حَسَنَةً يُجْزَى بِهَا".

and hadīth no.5023:

"عَنْ أَنَسِ بْنِ مَالِكٍ أَنَّهُ حَدَّثَ عَنْ رَسُولِ اللَّهِ (ﷺ): إِنَّ الْكَافِرَ إِذَا عَمِلَ حَسَنَةً أُطْعِمَ بِهَا طُعْمَةً فِي الدُّنْيَا وَأَمَّا الْمُؤْمِنُ فَإِنَّ اللَّهَ يَدْخُرُ لَهُ حَسَنَاتِهِ فِي الْآخِرَةِ وَيُعْقِبُهُ رِزْقًا فِي الدُّنْيَا عَلَى طَاعَتِهِ".

and the wording in Aḥmad, hadīth no.11790 is:

"عَنْ أَنَسِ بْنِ مَالِكٍ قَالَ قَالَ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ (ﷺ): إِنَّ اللَّهَ لَا يَظْلِمُ الْمُؤْمِنَ حَسَنَةً يُعْطَى بِهَا فِي الدُّنْيَا وَيُنَابَ عَلَيْهَا فِي الْآخِرَةِ وَأَمَّا الْكَافِرُ فَيُعْطِيهِ حَسَنَاتِهِ فِي الدُّنْيَا حَتَّى إِذَا أَفْضَى إِلَى الْآخِرَةِ لَمْ يَكُنْ لَهُ بِهَا حَسَنَةٌ يُعْطَى بِهَا خَيْرًا".

²²¹ This point is made only for the sake of argument as Q18:105 and many hadīths state that the *kāfir* comes to the Judgement with no *hasanahs*. See note 182 above.

However, Al-Qurtūbi, in *al-Tadhkirah*, p.363 commenting on {حَفَّتْ مَوَازِينُهُ} says that on the Judgement Day when the *kāfir* comes with no *hasanahs* both his *kufir* and his *sayyi'ahs* are placed on one side of the Balance against nothing on the other scale where his *hasanahs* are supposed to be put. As a result, the light scale goes up and the heavy scale down. He then says that this is the reference to the *mīzān* (balance) being light as the Ayah describes the *mīzān*, not the thing weighed (*mawzūn*), as light.

As is clear, this explanation considers *mawāzīn* as the plural of *mīzān*. In fact, I find this point quite problematic as Al-Qurtūbi says that the balance is light because the side of the good deeds is light. Then what about the bad deeds, do they not make the balance heavy? The way out of this problem is to consider the word *mawāzīn* as referring to the *hasanahs* in general.

On the other hand, if the *kāfir* comes to the Judgement with some *hasanahs* they are weighed against his *sayyi'ahs* and his reward would be getting less punishment in spite of the fact that he will still abide in the Fire. This is supported by several hadīths related to Abu Ṭālib, 'Abdullah ibn Jud'ān and Abi 'Adiy. See Qurtūbi, *al-Tadhkirah*, p.363.

-
- ²²² See the discussion concerning the reference of *mawāzīn* to the good deeds only under *mawāzīn* ‘موازن’ in this chapter. See also, note 183 above.
- ²²³ See this chapter under *mawāzīn* ‘موازن’.
See also Yusuf Ali, *Qur’an*. Khan and Helali, *Qur’an*.
- ²²⁴ Basically, people are either Muslims or non-Muslims, in other words, they are either Muslims or *kāfirs*. All the Prophets and Messengers of Allah (from Adam (ﷺ) to Muḥammad (ﷺ)) are considered Muslims and their religion is Islam, and accordingly their followers are called Muslims as well. There are many Ayahs in the Qur’an that state this in very clear terms. See for example: Q2:112, 128, 131, 132-3, 136, Q3:19, 20, 52, 64, 67, 80, 83-5, 102, Q4:125, Q5:3, 44, 111, Q6:14, 71, 125, 163, Q7:126, Q9:74, Q10:72, 84, 90, Q11:14, Q12:101, Q15:2, Q16:81, 89, 102, Q21:108, Q22:34, 78, Q27:31, 38, 42, 44, 81, 91, Q28:53, Q29:46, Q30:53, Q31:22, Q33:35, Q39:12, 22, 54, Q40:66, Q41:33, Q43:69, Q46:15, Q48:16, Q49:14, 17, Q51:36, Q61:7, Q61:35, Q66:5, Q72:14.
- ²²⁵ See Ṣakhr, *Mawsūeah*, Bukhāri, ḥadīths no.42, 125, 278, 285, 186, 407, 1052, 1113, 4982, 6861. Tirmidhi, ḥadīths no.2518, 2562. Ibn Mājah, ḥadīth no.4303. Aḥmad, ḥadīths no.11710, 12310, 13419, 14194, 14583, 15279, 17803, 17872, 18858, 26219.
- ²²⁶ See Zamakhshari, *Kashshāf*, v.2, p.749. Qurtubi, *al-Jāmiʿ*, v.11, pp.66-7.
(The word ‘deeds’ in this report must be referring to ‘good deeds’ otherwise the bad deeds would not weigh anything and the evil-doers would get rewarded!).
- ²²⁷ See note no.183 above.
- ²²⁸ See Yusuf Ali, *Qur’an*. Khan and Helali, *Qur’an*. Arberry, *Koran*. Pickthall, *Koran*.
- ²²⁹ See Arberry, *Koran*. Pickthall, *Koran*.
- ²³⁰ See Q4:145. See also Ṣakhr, *Mawsūeah*, Bukhāri, ḥadīths no.2598, 5740. Muslim, ḥadīths no.308. Aḥmad, ḥadīths no.1671, 1674, 1778, 1693, 6508, 9706, 12723. Tirmidhi, ḥadīths

-
- no.2838, 3098. Abu Dāwud, ḥadīth no.1252. Ibn Mājah, ḥadīth no.3770.
- ²³¹ See Yusuf Ali, *Qur'an*. Khan and Helali, *Qur'an*.
- ²³² See note 182 above.
- ²³³ See Qurtubi, *al-Tadhkirah*, pp.361-2. See also this thesis under 'mawāzīn' and the ḥadīth quoted in note 309 below.
- ²³⁴ See Yusuf Ali, *Qur'an*. Khan and Helali, *Qur'an*. Arberry, *Koran*. Pickthall, *Koran*.
- ²³⁵ See Yusuf Ali, *Qur'an*. Khan and Helali, *Qur'an*. Arberry, *Koran*. Pickthall, *Koran*.
- ²³⁶ Yusuf Ali, *Qur'an*.
- ²³⁷ See Yusuf Ali, *Qur'an*. Khan and Helali, *Qur'an*. Arberry, *Koran*. Pickthall, *Koran*.
- ²³⁸ Cf. Yusuf Ali, *Qur'an*. Khan and Helali, *Qur'an*. Arberry, *Koran*. Pickthall, *Koran*.
- ²³⁹ See Muḥammad F. Abdel-Bāqi, *al-Mu'jam al-Mufahras li-'Alfāz al-Qur'an al-Karīm* (1987), under 'قَوْمٌ', pp.578-87.
- ²⁴⁰ Maulvi Muhammad Ali, *The Holy Qur'an: Containing the Arabic Text with English Translation and Commentary* (1920), p.13.
In the original quotation the author transliterates *salāh* as *salat* and 'aqāma as *aqama*. Also, (LL) is an abbreviation for Arabic-English Lexicon by Lane.
- ²⁴¹ See the analysis of the different translations of this Ayah and the related ones in Chapter Four.
- ²⁴² See Yusuf Ali, *Qur'an*. Khan and Helali, *Qur'an*. Arberry, *Koran*. Pickthall, *Koran*.
- ²⁴³ Rāzi, *Tafsir*, v.5, p.362: "مَتَّعَدَّرٌ بِقَدْرِ الْحَاجَةِ".
- ²⁴⁴ Rāzi, *Tafsir*, v.5, p.362: "بِحَسَبِ الْأَحْمَلِ وَالْإِنْتِفَاعِ بِعَيْنِهِ".
- ²⁴⁵ Ḥusayni, *Sharḥ al-Qāmūs*, under 'وَزَنٌ': "جَزَى عَلَى وَزْنٍ أَوْ مَقْدَارٍ مَعْلُومٍ".
- ²⁴⁶ Baydāwi, *Anwār*, p.264.
- ²⁴⁷ See Zamakhshari, *Kashshāf*, v.2, p.574. Baydāwi, *Anwār*, p.264.
- ²⁴⁸ Baydāwi, *Anwār*, p.264.

- ²⁴⁹ Zamakhshari, *Kashshāf*, v.2, p.574:
 ”وَزْنَ بِمِيزَانِ الْحِكْمَةِ، وَقَدَّرَ بِمِقْدَارِ تَقْتَضِيهِ، لَا يَصْلُحُ فِيهِ زِيَادَةٌ وَلَا نَقْصَانٌ“.
- ²⁵⁰ Zamakhshari, *Kashshāf*, v.2, p.574:
 ”وَقِيلَ مَا يُوزَنُ مِنْ نَحْوِ الذَّهَبِ وَالْفِضَّةِ وَالتَّحَاسِ وَالْحَدِيدِ وَغَيْرِهَا“.
- ²⁵¹ Ibn Manzūr, *Lisān al-ʿarab*, under ‘وَزْنٌ’. See also Al-Bustāni, *Fākihah*, under ‘وَزْنٌ’. Majma‘, *al-Wasīl*, under ‘وَزْنٌ’.
- ²⁵² Rāzi, *Tafsir*, v.5, p.362.
- ²⁵³ Yusuf Ali, *Qur’an*, p.623, footnote no.1956 commenting on Q15:19.
- ²⁵⁴ See Q4:40, Q10:61, Q34:3 & 22, Q99:7-8.
- ²⁵⁵ See the translations of the Ayahs mentioned in the preceding note and their analysis in Chapter Four.
- ²⁵⁶ Yusuf Ali, *Qur’an*, p.1682, footnote no.6240 commenting on Q99:7.
 See also Sayyid Qutb, *In the Shade of the Qur’an* (1979), translated by M. A. Salihi, and A. A. Shamis, v.30, p.256 bearing in mind that the author’s explanation for *dharrah* {ذَرَّةٌ} is not the only one.
- ²⁵⁷ See Ibn Manzūr, *Lisān al-ʿarab*, under ‘وَزْنٌ’. Al-Bustāni, *Fākihah*, under ‘وَزْنٌ’. Shartūni, *ʿAqrab al-Mawārid*, under ‘وَزْنٌ’. Qurtubi, *al-Jāmiʿ*, v.7, p.166 & v.17, p.155. Jawhari, *al-Ṣihāh*, under ‘وَزْنٌ’. Ibn Hajar, *Fath*, v.13, p.547.
- ²⁵⁸ See Bustāni, *Muhīt*, under ‘وَزْنٌ’. Majma‘, *al-Wasīl*, under ‘وَزْنٌ’. Husayni, *Sharḥ al-Qāmūs*, under ‘وَزْنٌ’. Al-Bustāni, *Fākihah*, under ‘وَزْنٌ’. Shartūni, *ʿAqrab al-Mawārid*, under ‘وَزْنٌ’. Ibn Manzūr, *Lisān al-ʿarab*, under ‘وَزْنٌ’. Jawhari, *al-Ṣihāh*, under ‘وَزْنٌ’. Zamakhshari, *ʿAsās al-Balāghah* (1953), under ‘وَزْنٌ’. Qurtubi, *al-Jāmiʿ*, v.17, pp.154-5. Baydāwi, *Anwār*, p.486.
- ²⁵⁹ See Ibn Manzūr, *Lisān al-ʿarab*, under ‘شَوْلٌ’. Zamakhshari, *ʿAsās al-Balāghah*, under ‘شَوْلٌ’. Shartūni, *ʿAqrab al-Mawārid*, under ‘شَوْلٌ’.

²⁶⁰ See Ibn Manzūr, *Lisān al-ʿarab*, under ‘شَوْل’. Zamakhshari, *ʿAsās al-Balāghah*, under ‘شَوْل’ says: Al-ʿAkḥṭal says:

”إِذَا وَضَعْتَ أَبَاكَ فِي مِيزَانِهِمْ قَفَزَتْ حَدِيدَتُهُ إِلَيْكَ فَشَالَا“.

²⁶¹ See Ibn Manzūr, *Lisān al-ʿarab*, under ‘وَزَنَ’. Al-Bustāni, *Fākihah*, under ‘وَزَنَ’. Majma‘, *al-Wasīṭ*, under ‘وَزَنَ’. Ibn Al-ʿAthīr, *al-Nihāyah fī Gharīb al-Ḥadīth wa al-ʿAthar* (1322 A.H), v.4, p.222, under ‘وَزَنَ’.

²⁶² See Rāzi, *Tafsīr*, v.8, p.7. Ṣakhr, *Mawsūʿah*, Aḥmad, ḥadīth no.14194:

”... حَتَّى يُخْرَجَ مِنْ قَالٍ لَا إِلَهَ إِلَّا اللَّهُ مَمَّنْ فِي قَلْبِهِ مِيزَانٌ شَعِيرَةٌ“.

‘... until he who said: “There is no God but Allah and in his heart (is *ʿīmān*) (as much as) the weight of a barely seed, comes out”.

²⁶³ See Ibn Manzūr, *Lisān al-ʿarab*, under ‘وَزَنَ’. Majma‘, *al-Wasīṭ*, under ‘وَزَنَ’. Ḥusayni, *Sharḥ al-Qāmūs*, under ‘وَزَنَ’. Tabari, *Tafsīr*, v.8, p.91.

²⁶⁴ See Ibn Manzūr, *Lisān al-ʿarab*, under ‘وَزَنَ’. Majma‘, *al-Wasīṭ*, under ‘وَزَنَ’. Ḥusayni, *Sharḥ al-Qāmūs*, under ‘وَزَنَ’. Al-Bustāni, *Fākihah*, under ‘وَزَنَ’. Bustāni, *Muḥīṭ*, under ‘وَزَنَ’. Ibn Ḥajar, *Fath*, v.13, p.548. Rāzi, *Tafsīr*, v.4, p.182 (According to Mujāhid, Al-Daḥḥāk and Al-ʿAʿmash); v.6, p.107. v.7, p.385; v.8, p.7. Qurtubi, *al-Jāmiʿ*, v.17, pp.154-5 (According to Mujāhid and Qatādah); v.7, p.165. Baydāwi, *Anwār*, pp.152, 486, 532 & 542. Marāghī, *Tafsīr*, v.26-30, pp.107-108. Zamakhshari, *Kashshāf*, v.4, p.217. Ibn Kathīr, *Tafsīr*, v.4, pp.166, 421 & 490.

²⁶⁵ Baydāwi, *Anwār*, p.486.

²⁶⁶ Qurtubi, *al-Jāmiʿ*, v.7, p.165. Ḥusayni, *Sharḥ al-Qāmūs*, under ‘وَزَنَ’.

²⁶⁷ See Ibn Manzūr, *Lisān al-ʿarab*, under ‘وَزَنَ’. Majma‘, *al-Wasīṭ*, under ‘وَزَنَ’. Al-Bustāni, *Fākihah*, under ‘وَزَنَ’.

²⁶⁸ Qurtubi, *al-Jāmiʿ*, v.17, p.155.

²⁶⁹ Yusuf Ali, *Qurʿan*, p.1251.

²⁷⁰ Qurtubi, *al-Jāmiʿ*, v.7, p.542.

The word *hasanah* 'حَسَنَةٌ' refers to a good deed and it is also the unit of rewarding good deeds. The opposite applies to the word *sayyi'ah* 'سَيِّئَةٌ'.

²⁷¹ Rāzi, *Tafsir*, v.8, p.7.

²⁷² Ibn Hajar, *Fath*, v.14, p.548. Qurtubi, *al-Jāmi*, v.7, p.165 & v.17, pp.154-5. Rāzi, *Tafsir*, v.4, p.182.

²⁷³ Rāzi, *Tafsir*, v.7, p.385: "وَهُوَ الْفَضْلُ الَّذِي هُوَ الْقِسْطُ الْمُسْتَقِيمُ".

²⁷⁴ Yusuf Ali, *Qur'an*, p.1029, footnote no. 2407.

²⁷⁵ See Baydāwi, *Anwār*, p.532. Zamakhshari, *Kashshāf*, v.4, p.444.

²⁷⁶ See Yusuf Ali, *Qur'an*. Khan and Helali, *Qur'an*. Arberry, *Koran*. Pickthall, *Koran*.

The word {الْكِتَابِ} is rendered as "the Qur'an", in Gätje, *Exegesis*.

²⁷⁷ See Yusuf Ali, *Qur'an*. Khan and Helali, *Qur'an*. Arberry, *Koran*. Pickthall, *Koran*.

Yusuf Ali in footnote no.5313, p.1428 explains that "the Balance" is "Justice which gives every person his due".

Khan and Helali says that "the Balance" means "Justice".

²⁷⁸ See Zamakhshari, *Kashshāf*, v.4, pp.217 & 480. Baydāwi, *Anwār*, p.542. Rāzi, *Tafsir*, v.8, p.101.

²⁷⁹ See Zamakhshari, *Kashshāf*, v.4, p.480. Rāzi, *Tafsir*, v.8, p.101. The wording is "مَنْ قَوْمَكَ يَرْتَوِي بِهِ".

See also Baydāwi, *Anwār*, p.542. Ibn Manzūr, *Lisān al-ʿarab*, under 'وَزَنٌ'.

²⁸⁰ See Baydāwi, *Anwār*, p.542.

²⁸¹ See Rāzi, *Tafsir*, v.8, p.101.

²⁸² See Zamakhshari, *Kashshāf*, v.4, p.480.

²⁸³ See Baydāwi, *Anwār*, p.542.

²⁸⁴ See Ṣakhr, *Mawsūʿah*, Bukhāri, ḥadīths no.6862, 6869, 4316; Ibn Mājah, ḥadīth no.193; Aḥmad, ḥadīths no.7793, 10096, 16972. Tirmidhi, ḥadīth no.2971:

"عَنْ أَبِي هُرَيْرَةَ قَالَ قَالَ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ ﷺ: ... وَعَرْشُهُ عَلَى الْمَاءِ وَيَبْدِيهِ الْأُخْرَى الْمِيزَانُ يَرْفَعُ وَيَخْفِضُ".

²⁸⁵ Ṣakhr, *Mawsūʿah*, Ibn Mājah, ḥadīth no.195:

"وَالْمِيزَانُ يَبْدِي الرَّحْمَنُ يَرْفَعُ أَقْوَامًا وَيَخْفِضُ آخَرِينَ إِلَى يَوْمِ الْقِيَامَةِ"

²⁸⁶ See Ṣakhr, *Mawsūʿah*, Aḥmad, ḥadīths no.2775, 16541, 16851: "... وَتُؤْمَنُ بِالْجَنَّةِ وَالنَّارِ وَالْحِسَابِ وَالْمِيزَانِ".

- Muslim, ḥadīth no.328. Tirmidhi, ḥadīth no.3439. Ibn Mājah, ḥadīth no.276. Aḥmad, ḥadīths no.21828, 21834. Dārimi, ḥadīth no.651. Nasā'i, ḥadīth no.2394: "... وَالْحَمْدُ لِلَّهِ تَمَلُّا الْمِيزَانَ".
- Tirmidhi, ḥadīth no.3332. Ibn Mājah, ḥadīth no.916. Nasā'i, ḥadīth no.331. Abi Dāwud, ḥadīth no.4404. Aḥmad, ḥadīths no.6462, 6804, 6210 & 6616: "... وَأَلْفٌ وَخَمْسٌ مِائَةٌ فِي الْمِيزَانَ".
- ²⁸⁷ See Ṣakhr, *Mawsūeah*, Bukhāri, ḥadīths no.5927, 6188, 7008. Muslim, ḥadīth no.4860. Tirmidhi, ḥadīth no.3389. Ibn Mājah, ḥadīth no.3796. Aḥmad, ḥadīth no.6870:
 "... كَلِمَتَانِ خَفِيفَتَانِ عَلَى اللِّسَانِ ثَقِيلَتَانِ فِي الْمِيزَانِ ...".
- ²⁸⁸ According to Ibn Hajar, *Fath*, v.13, p.548, the *Mu'tazilah* denied the *Mīzān* all together. Also Al-Rāzi, *Tafsir*, v.4, p.183, expresses his view that it is possible that on the Judgement Day there will be more than one *Mīzān* for the weighing of the different kinds of deeds.
- ²⁸⁹ See Ṣakhr, *Mawsūeah*, Aḥmad, ḥadīths no.6462, 6699, 6769,7804. Tirmidhi, ḥadīth no.2563. Ibn Mājah, ḥadīth no.4290. Rāzi, *Tafsir*, v.4, p.182. Qurṭubi, *al-Jāmi*, v.7, pp.166-7.
- ²⁹⁰ Ibn Hajar, *Fath*, v.13, p.548.
- ²⁹¹ Ibn Hajar, *Fath*, v.13, p.548. Cf. Qurṭubi, *al-Tadhkirah*, p.364.
- ²⁹² Ibn Hajar, *Fath*, v.13, p.548. Zamakhshari, *Kashshāf*, v.3, p.120. Rāzi, *Tafsir*, v.6, p.107-8 & v.8, p.7. Baydāwi, *Anwār*, p.152. Tabari, *Tafsir*, v.8, p.91.
- ²⁹³ Rāzi, *Tafsir*, v.6, pp.208-9 & v.8, p.7.
- ²⁹⁴ Rāzi, *Tafsir*, v.6, pp.106-7.
 A similar report is found in Qurṭubi, *al-Tadhkirah*, p.372:
 "وَحَرَجَ الْأَلَكَائِيُّ فِي سُنَنِهِ ... عَنْ حُدَيْفَةَ قَالَ: "صَاحِبُ الْمِيزَانِ يَوْمَ الْقِيَامَةِ جَبْرِيلُ (عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام)"."
- ²⁹⁵ Tabari, *Tafsir*, v.8, p.91. Qurṭubi, *al-Jāmi*, v.7, p.167.
- ²⁹⁶ See Ṣakhr, *Mawsūeah*, Bukhāri, ḥadīths no.2269, 6053. Muslim, ḥadīth no.4678. Tirmidhi, ḥadīths no.2342, 2343.
- ²⁹⁷ See Rāzi, *Tafsir*, v.4, p.182 & v.6, pp.107-8. Naysābūri, *Tafsir*, v.8, pp.61-2 in the margins of Tabari, *Tafsir*.

- According to Qurtūbi, *al-Tadhkirah*, p.364, Al-Tirmidhi reported in *Nawādir al-'Usūl* that “one pan will be facing (*not above*) Heaven, and the other will be facing the Fire”.
- ²⁹⁸ I do not find the common ‘good deeds’ a good translation of ‘*حَسَنَات*’ at all times, as the word has another meaning as well as explained above, and as discussed under *mawāzīn* ‘*موازن*’ later.
- ²⁹⁹ See Rāzi, *Tafsir*, v.6, pp.107-8. Zamakhshari, *Kashshāf*, v.3, p.120.
- ³⁰⁰ Muḥammad Al-Madani, *Al-Ithāfāt al-Saniyyah fī al-'Aḥādīth al-Qudsiyyah* (1939), p.120.
A similar report is found in Qurtūbi, *al-Tadhkirah*, p.364 on the authority of Salmān Al-Fārisi.
- ³⁰¹ See Ṣakhr, *Mawsū'eah*, Tirmidhi, ḥadīth no.2563. Ibn Mājah, ḥadīth no.4290. Aḥmad, ḥadīth no.6699. Rāzi, *Tafsir*, v.4, p.182. Zamakhshari, *Kashshāf*, v.2, pp.88-89. Qurtūbi, *al-Jāmi'e*, v.7, pp.165-6. Ibn Ḥajar, *Fath*, v.13, p.548. Baydāwi, *Anwār*, p.152.
- ³⁰² See Zamakhshari, *Kashshāf*, v.3, p.120. Rāzi, *Tafsir*, v.6, p.108 & v.8, p.7.
- ³⁰³ See Ṣakhr, *Mawsū'eah*, Tirmidhi, ḥadīths no.1925, 1926. Abu Dāwud, ḥadīth no.4166. Aḥmad, ḥadīths no.6245, 26224, 26273, 26256, 26275. Al-'Abshīhi, *al-Mustatraf*, p.116. Ibn Ḥajar, *Fath*, v.13, p.548. Qurtūbi, *al-Tadhkirah*, p.368.
- ³⁰⁴ See Ṣakhr, *Mawsū'eah*, Tirmidhi, ḥadīth no.3089. Aḥmad, ḥadīths no.25197. Qurtūbi, *al-Tadhkirah*, pp.369-70.
- ³⁰⁵ See Ṣakhr, *Mawsū'eah*, Bukhāri, ḥadīth no.2641. Aḥmad, ḥadīth no.8511. Nasā'i, ḥadīth no.3526.
- ³⁰⁶ See Ṣakhr, *Mawsū'eah*, Tirmidhi, ḥadīth no.49.
- ³⁰⁷ See Qurtūbi, *al-Jāmi'e*, v.1, p.115. Ṣakhr, *Mawsū'eah*, Muslim, ḥadīth no.328. Tirmidhi, ḥadīth no.3439. Ibn Mājah, ḥadīth no.276. Dārimi, ḥadīth no.651. Aḥmad, ḥadīths no.21828, 21834. Nasā'i, ḥadīth no.2394.
- ³⁰⁸ See for example Ṣakhr, *Mawsū'eah*, Tirmidhi, ḥadīth no.3332. Ibn Mājah, ḥadīth no.916. Nasā'i, ḥadīth no.1331. Abu Dāwud, ḥadīth no.4404. Aḥmad, ḥadīths no.6210, 6616.
See also note 248 above.

- ³⁰⁹ See Rāzi, *Tafsir*, v.4, p.182. Also according to Ibn Hajar, *Fath*, v.13, p.548, Al-Ṭībi said a similar thing. See also, Kishk, *Rihāb*, v.8, pp.1302-3.
It is obvious that ‘the deeds of the *mu’min*’ here means his ‘good deeds’; and ‘the deeds of the *kāfir*’ refers to his ‘bad deeds’.
- ³¹⁰ See Rāzi, *Tafsir*, v.6, p.108. Zamakhshari, *Kashshāf*, v.3, p.120.
- ³¹¹ See Kishk, *Rihāb*, v.8, pp.1302-3. The author quotes hadīths from Muslim, Tirmidhi, Dārimi and Aḥmad.
See also Ṣakhr, *Mawsūeah*, Tirmidhi, hadīth no.2808. Muslim, hadīth no.1338.
- ³¹² See Kishk, *Rihāb*, v.8, pp.1302-3. Ṣakhr, *Mawsūeah*, Aḥmad, hadīths no.17803, 17872.
- ³¹³ See Kishk, *Rihāb*, v.8, pp.1302-3. Ṣakhr, *Mawsūeah*, Ibn Mājah, hadīth no.3771.
- ³¹⁴ "ما تَضْحَكُونَ؟ لِرَجُلٍ عَبْدَ اللَّهِ أَنْقَلَ فِي الْمَيْزَانِ مِنْ أُخْدٍ."
See Ṣakhr, *Mawsūeah*, Aḥmad, hadīths no.876, 3792. Kishk, *Rihāb*, v.8, pp.1302-3. Qurtubi, *al-Jāmiʿ*, v.11, pp.66-7. See also note 175 above.
- ³¹⁵ See Ṣakhr, *Mawsūeah*, Aḥmad, hadīths no.1614-5.
- ³¹⁶ See Ṣakhr, *Mawsūeah*, Aḥmad, hadīth no.6769.
- ³¹⁷ Ṭabari, *Tafsir*, v.8, p.92.
- ³¹⁸ See Yusuf Ali, *Qur’an*. Khan and Helali, *Qur’an*. Arberry, *Koran*. Pickthall, *Koran*.
- ³¹⁹ See Qurtubi, *al-Jāmiʿ*, v.17, p.154-5. See also *t-gh-w* in this chapter.
- ³²⁰ Yusuf Ali, *Qur’an*.
- ³²¹ See Ibn Manzūr, *Lisān al-ʿarab*, under ‘وَرَى’. and Husayni, *Sharḥ al-Qāmūs*, under ‘وَرَى’. Bustāni, *Muḥīt*, under ‘وَرَى’. Al-Bustāni, *Fākihah*, under ‘وَرَى’. Majma‘, *al-Wasīt*, under ‘وَرَى’. Rāzi, *Tafsir*, v.4, p.183 & v.8, p.7. Zamakhshari, *Kashshāf*, v.3, p.120 & v.4, p.790. Qurtubi, *al-Jāmiʿ*, v.7, p.166. Ibn Hajar, *Fath*, v.13, p.461.
- ³²² Qurtubi, *al-Jāmiʿ*, v.7, p.166. Zamakhshari, *Kashshāf*, v.3, p.204 & v.4, p.790. Rāzi, *Tafsir*, v.4, p.183, v.6, pp.208-9 & v.8, p.7.

- ³²³ See Ibn Manzūr, *Lisān al-ʿarab*, under ‘وَزَنَ’. and Ḥusayni, *Sharḥ al-Qāmūs*, under ‘وَزَنَ’. See also *th-q-l* and *w-z-n* in this chapter.
- ³²⁴ See Ibn Manzūr, *Lisān al-ʿarab*, under ‘وَزَنَ’. Ḥusayni, *Sharḥ al-Qāmūs*, under ‘وَزَنَ’. Majma‘, *al-Wasīṭ*, under ‘وَزَنَ’.
- ³²⁵ Rāzi, *Tafsir*, v.6, pp.208-9.
- ³²⁶ See Ibn Manzūr, *Lisān al-ʿarab*, under ‘حَفَفَ/شَوَّلَ’. and Ḥusayni, *Sharḥ al-Qāmūs*, under ‘حَفَفَ/شَوَّلَ’. Bustāni, *Muḥīṭ*, under ‘حَفَفَ/شَوَّلَ’. Al-Bustāni, *Fākihah*, under ‘حَفَفَ/شَوَّلَ’. Majma‘, *al-Wasīṭ*, under ‘حَفَفَ/شَوَّلَ’. Jawhari, *al-Sihāḥ*, under ‘حَفَفَ/شَوَّلَ’. Zamakhshari, *ʿAsās al-Balāghah*, under ‘حَفَفَ/شَوَّلَ’. Ibn Durayd, *Jamharat al-Lughah*, ‘حَفَفَ/شَوَّلَ’. Shartūni, *ʿAqrab al-Mawārid*, ‘حَفَفَ/شَوَّلَ’. See also, Al-Dabbi, *Amthāl*, p.16.
- ³²⁷ See Ṣakhr, *Mawsūʿah*, Aḥmad, ḥadīth no.14194: “مِيزَانٌ شَعْبِيَّةٌ”. Aḥmad, ḥadīth no.14583 and Muslim, ḥadīth no.278: “مَا يَزُنُ شَعْبِيَّةٌ”.
- ³²⁸ I am tempted to also rationalise this particular point, to clarify it a bit more as follows: if we imagine a person weighing something on a modern balance that has only one scale, the weight of what he weighs will be determined according to the reading (of the pointer) although no counterpoises are placed against what is being weighed. However, the reading tells of the units of weight as if the thing weighed was actually placed against counterpoise weights. This means we have a *mīzān* (balance), and an indicator for the implied weights as part of the instrument itself. In this case the definition of *mawāzīn* as the *mīzān* and its weights ‘المِيزَانُ بِأَوْزَانِهِ’ is being implicitly satisfied even when no weighing is involved. This means that a *mīzān* (in the singular form) may be referred to as *mawāzīn* in the plural. Similarly, if a person comes to the Judgement weighing with no good deeds, his evil deeds are placed on one side of the Balance (*mīzān*), and on the other side, there would be nothing to weigh the bad deeds against. When the side of the bad deeds goes down, the Balance pointer will be indicating how heavy the side of the bad deeds is getting, that is in units of weight. This means

we have a balance and its weights, which is what the Arabs refer to as *mawāzīn*.

³²⁹ According to Al-Madani, *al-Ithāfāt*, pp.80-1, ḥadīth no.444:

"إِنَّ الْعَبْدَ لَيَلْقَى كِتَابَهُ يَوْمَ الْقِيَامَةِ مَنْشُورًا فَيَنْظُرُ فِيهِ فَيَرَى حَسَنَاتٍ لَمْ يَعْمَلْهَا، فَيَقُولُ: يَا رَبِّ أَيْ هَذَا لِي وَلَمْ أَعْمَلْهَا. فَيَقُولُ: هَذَا مَا اغْتَابَكَ النَّاسُ وَأَنْتَ لَا تَشْعُرُ". أَخْرَجَهُ أَبُو نَعِيمٍ فِي الْمَعْرِفَةِ عَنْ شَيْبِ بْنِ سَعْدِ الْبَلَوِيِّ."

“on the Judgement Day the ‘*abd* (servant/slave) receives his record (of deeds). There, he sees *hasanahs* that he did not do. He says: “My Lord, where from are these *hasanahs*, I did not do them? Allah says: “These are for what the people said about you behind your back and you did not know”.

See also ḥadīth no.447, p.81.

³³⁰ See Ṣakhr, *Mawsū‘ah*, Aḥmad, ḥadīth no.1480. Muslim, ḥadīth no.4866:

”قَالَ يُسَبِّحُ مِائَةَ تَسْبِيحَةٍ فَيُكْتَبُ لَهُ أَلْفُ حَسَنَةٍ أَوْ يُحِطُّ عَنْهُ أَلْفُ خَطِيئَةٍ“.

See also Bukhāri, ḥadīths no.3050, 5924. Muslim, ḥadīths no.1046, 4156, 4669, 4857. Tirmidhi, ḥadīths no.1413, 2817, 2839, 3350, 3351, 3385, 3390. 7670, 7746, 10878, 10899. Al-Nasā’i, ḥadīths no.698, 840, 4912. Ibn Mājah, ḥadīths no.716, 720, 1414, 2226, 2781, 3108, 3118, 3220, 3788, 4290. Abu Dāwud, ḥadīths no.476, 3670, 4579, 4580. Aḥmad, ḥadīths no.309, 1414, 1480, 1608, 1527, 1608, 3740, 3787, 5443, 6311, 6385, 6388, 6642, 6668, 6704, 7746, 7909, 8138, 8305, 8362, 8518, 8960, 9176, 9206, 9256, 9813, 16340, 16343, 17157, 20746, 26206, 26207. Mālik, ḥadīths no.58, 437. Dārimi, ḥadīths no.2576, 3274, 3275, 3278.

See also the ḥadīths numbers in note no.298 below.

³³¹ Cf. Yusuf Ali, *Qur’an*. Khan and Helali, *Qur’an*. Arberry, *Koran*.

³³² According to Qurtūbi, *al-Tadhkirah*, p.370, Ibn Mas‘ūd’s ḥadīth is: “Whoever’s *hasanahs* is more than his *sayyi’ahs* by one, he will enter Heaven; and Whoever’s *sayyi’ahs* is more than his *hasanahs* by one, he will enter the Fire ...”. Its actual wording is:

"وَذَكَرَ ابْنُ الْمُبَارَكِ قَالَ، أَخْبَرَنَا أَبُو بَكْرِ الْأَعْدَلِيُّ، عَنْ سَعِيدِ بْنِ جُبَيْرٍ، عَنْ عَبْدِ اللَّهِ بْنِ مَسْعُودٍ قَالَ: "مُجَاسَبَ النَّاسِ يَوْمَ الْقِيَامَةِ فَمَنْ كَانَتْ حَسَنَاتُهُ أَكْثَرَ مِنْ سَيِّئَاتِهِ بِوَاحِدَةٍ دَخَلَ الْجَنَّةَ، وَمَنْ كَانَتْ سَيِّئَاتُهُ"

أَكْثَرَ مِنْ حَسَنَاتِهِ بِوَاحِدَةٍ دَخَلَ النَّارَ". ثُمَّ قَرَأَ: ﴿ وَمَنْ ثَقَلَتْ مَوَازِينُهُ فَأُولَئِكَ هُمُ الْمُفْلِحُونَ * وَمَنْ خَفَّتْ مَوَازِينُهُ فَأُولَئِكَ الَّذِينَ خَسِرُوا أَنفُسَهُمْ ﴾. ثُمَّ قَالَ: "إِنَّ الْمِيزَانَ يَخْفُ بِمِثْقَالِ حَبَّةٍ أَوْ تَرَجَحَ". قَالَ: "وَمَنْ اسْتَوَتْ حَسَنَاتُهُ وَسَيِّئَاتُهُ كَانَ مِنْ أَصْحَابِ الْأَعْرَافِ". وَذَكَرَ الْحَدِيثَ.

Khaythamah's *ḥadīth* is found in Ibn Hajar, *Fath*, v.13, p.462-3. See also, Qurtubi, *al-Tadhkirah*, p.370:

"ذَكَرَ خَيْثَمَةُ بْنُ سَلِيمَانَ فِي مُسْنَدِهِ عَنْ حَابِرِ بْنِ عَبْدِ اللَّهِ قَالَ: قَالَ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ (ﷺ) "تَوَضَّعَ الْمَوَازِينُ يَوْمَ الْقِيَامَةِ فَتَوَزَّنَ السَّيِّئَاتُ وَالْحَسَنَاتُ، فَمَنْ رَجَحَتْ حَسَنَاتُهُ عَلَى سَيِّئَاتِهِ مِثْقَالَ صَوَابَةٍ دَخَلَ الْجَنَّةَ، وَمَنْ رَجَحَتْ سَيِّئَاتُهُ عَلَى حَسَنَاتِهِ مِثْقَالَ صَوَابَةٍ دَخَلَ النَّارَ". قِيلَ يَا رَسُولَ اللَّهِ: "فَمَنْ اسْتَوَتْ حَسَنَاتُهُ وَسَيِّئَاتُهُ؟" قَالَ: "أُولَئِكَ أَصْحَابُ الْأَعْرَافِ".

³³³ The wording is: "تَوَزَّنَ الْحَسَنَاتُ وَالسَّيِّئَاتُ فِي مِيزَانٍ لَهُ لِسَانٌ وَكَفَّتَانِ".

Qurtubi, *al-Jāmi*, v.7, p.166. Qurtubi, *al-Tadhkirah*, p.364. See also Rāzi, *Tafsir*, v.6, p.107. Tabari, *Tafsir*, v.8, p.91.

³³⁴ This *tafsir* is given by Ibn 'Abbās with regard to {مَوَازِينُهُ} in Q101:6 & 8. See Ibn 'Abbās, *Tanwīr al-Iqtibās min Tafsir Ibn 'Abbās* (1132 A.H), p.518.

As for {مَوَازِينُهُ} in Q7:8 & 9, he says: "حَسَنَاتُهُ فِي الْمِيزَانِ" (his *hasanahs* in the Balance), p.130, and in Q23:103 & 103 "مِيزَانُهُ مِنَ الْحَسَنَاتِ" (his Balance of *hasanahs*), p.293.

³³⁵ See the *ḥadīth* and the note related to it: no. 260 above. Many Ulema also says the same thing about the interpretation of *mawāzīn*. See for example, Rāzi, *Tafsir*, v.4, p.183. Baydāwi, *Anwār*, p.605. Zamakhshari, *Kashshāf*, v.3, p.120 & v.4, p.790. Ibn Kathīr, *Tafsir*, v.4, p.862.

³³⁶ See Sakhr, *Mawsūeah*, Bukhāri, *ḥadīths* no.2927, 6188, 7008. Muslim, *ḥadīths* no.328, 4860. Tirmidhi, *ḥadīths* no.1629, 2357, 3332, 3389, 3439, 3440, 3441. Abu Dāwud, *ḥadīths* no.4128, 4160, 4404. Ibn Mājah, *ḥadīths* no.276, 916, 3796. Al-Nasā'i, *ḥadīths* no.1331, 1394. Ahmad, *ḥadīths* no.876, 1185, 2775, 3792, 6210, 6402, 6616, 6769, 6804, 6870, 12360, 15107, 15280, 16541, 16851, 17382, 17571, 21828, 21834, 21995, 22020, 22021, 22058, 22078, 23555, 23649, 26224-5, 26256, 26273. Dārimi, *ḥadīths* no.651-2. Al-'Abshīhi, *al-Mustatraf*, p.113.

³³⁷ See for example, Ibn Hajar, *Fath*, v.13, p.461. Rāzi, *Tafsir*, v.4, p.182. Zamakhshari, *Kashshāf*, v.3, p.120. Kishk, *Tafsir*, v.17, p.2482.

³³⁸ See Ibn Hajar, *Fath*, v.13, p.461. Qurtubi, *al-Jāmiʿ*, v.7, p.166. Qurtubi, *al-Tadhkirah*, p.371. Al-Qurtubi in this last reference also quotes a line of Arabic poetry:

"مَلِكٌ تَعُومُ الْحَادِثَاتُ لِعَدْلِهِ فَلَكَ كُلُّ حَادِثَةٍ هُنَا مِيزَانٌ"

³³⁹ Rāzi, *Tafsir*, v.4, p.183. See also . Qurtubi, *al-Tadhkirah*, p.371.

³⁴⁰ Rāzi, *Tafsir*, v.4, p.183.

³⁴¹ See note no.298 above.

³⁴² See Ibn Hajar, *Fath*, v.13, p.461. Kishk, *Rihāb*, v.17, p.2482.

³⁴³ See Rāzi, *Tafsir*, v.4, p.183. Qurtubi, *al-Jāmiʿ*, v.7, p.166.

³⁴⁴ Qurtubi, *al-Jāmiʿ*, v.7, p.166.

³⁴⁵ See Ibn Hajar, *Fath*, v.13, p.461. Qurtubi, *al-Jāmiʿ*, v.7, p.166. Qurtubi, *al-Tadhkirah*, pp.371-2.

³⁴⁶ See the different translations in note no.33 above.

³⁴⁷ Al-Madani, *Ithafāt*, p.9: “أَخْرَجَهُ الْحَكِيمُ التَّرْمِذِيُّ عَنْ أَنَسِ بْنِ مَالِكٍ”، & p.15: “أَخْرَجَهُ الدَّيْلَمِيُّ عَنْ أَنَسِ بْنِ مَالِكٍ”.

The word translated as “(it is not befitting of My Majesty)” is ‘استحجيت’ which literally refers to shyness or a sense of shame.

There are also several other *hadīths* that state the same with regard to setting no *Mīzān* to weigh the deeds of the people that Allah afflict with calamities. Also, other *hadīths* indicate that there will be some type of people that will be admitted into Heaven without being asked about their deeds, let alone weighing them. See, Q39:10 ﴿إِنَّمَا يُؤْتَى الصَّابِرُونَ أَجْرَهُمْ بِغَيْرِ حِسَابٍ﴾. See also, Qurtubi, *al-Tadhkirah*, pp.361-2.

³⁴⁸ See Ibn Manzūr, *Lisān al-ʿarab*, under ‘وَقِي’. Jawhari, *al-Sihāh*, under ‘وَقِي’. Rāzi, *Tafsir*, v.4, p.171, v.5, p.398 & v.6, p.388. Tabarsi, *Tafsir*, v.7, p.234 & v.8, pp.112-4. Zamakhshari, *Kashshāf*, v.2, p.432 & v.3, p.332. Baydāwi, *Anwār*, pp.243, 246 & 375. Kishk, *Rihāb*, v.15, p.2153. Ibn Kathīr, *Tafsir*, v.4, p.760.

-
- ³⁴⁹ Yusuf Ali, *Qur'an*. The parentheses are mine.
- ³⁵⁰ Tabarsi, *Tafsir*, v.3, p.113.
- ³⁵¹ Rāzi, *Tafsir*, v.5, pp.81-2
- ³⁵² See *k-y-l* in this chapter.
- ³⁵³ See *k-y-l* in this chapter.
- ³⁵⁴ Arberry, *Koran*.
- ³⁵⁵ See Yusuf Ali, *Qur'an*. Khan and Helali, *Qur'an*. Arberry, *Koran*.
- ³⁵⁶ See Yusuf Ali, *Qur'an*. Khan and Helali, *Qur'an*. Arberry, *Koran*.
- ³⁵⁷ Khan and Helali, *Qur'an*.
- ³⁵⁸ Yusuf Ali, *Qur'an*, p.684, footnote no.2221.
- ³⁵⁹ Khan and Helali, *Qur'an*.
- ³⁶⁰ See Khan and Helali, *Qur'an*. Arberry, *Koran*.
- ³⁶¹ See for example, under *k-y-l* in this chapter.
- ³⁶² Abu Hilāl Al-‘Askari, *al-Furuq fī al-Lughah* (1983), p.229. He says that “the difference between *al-‘Adl* and *al-Qist* is that *al-Qist* is *al-‘Adl* (justice) that is obvious and clearly seen. That is why the *mikyāl* and the *mīzān* are described as *qist* as one can see clearly the weighing being done in fairness. This is also due to the fact that *al-‘Adl* may be done and not being obvious. Therefore, we say that *al-Qist* is the share which is entirely known from all its aspects. To say ‘وتقسط القوم الشيء’ means that (each one of) the people (involved) has got his rightful due share (of the thing involved) in fairness”.
- الفرق بين العدل والقسط أن القسط هو العدل البين الظاهر ومنه سمى المكيال قسطا والميزان قسطا لأنه يصور لك العدل في الوزن حتى تراه ظاهرا، وقد يكون من العدل ما يخفى ولهذا قلنا إن القسط هو النصيب الذي بينت وجوهه، وتقسط القوم الشيء: تقاسموا بالقسط.”
- ³⁶³ My translation. See Yusuf Ali, *Qur'an*. Khan and Helali, *Qur'an*. Arberry, *Koran*.
- ³⁶⁴ Yusuf Ali, *Qur'an*.
- ³⁶⁵ Arberry, *Koran*.

³⁶⁶ Rāzi, *Tafsir*, v.5, p.81 & v.8, pp.529-30. Zamakhshari, *Kashshāf*, v.4, pp.718-720. Baydāwi, *Anwār*, p.591. Ibn Kathīr, *Tafsir*, v.4, p.760.

³⁶⁷ Rāzi, *Tafsir*, v.6, p.388. Zamakhshari, *Kashshāf*, v.3, p.332.

³⁶⁸ Qurṭubi, *al-Jāmiʿ*, v.20, p.249.

³⁶⁹ See Sakhr, *Mawaū'ah*, Tirmidhi, hadīth no.1226. Ibn Mājah, hadīth no.2211. Aḥmad, hadīth no.18311(he reports the name as مُخْرَمَة instead of مُخْرَفَة). Abu Dawūd, hadīth no.2898. Al-Nasā'i, hadīth no.4515. Dārimi, hadīth no.2472.

"عن سويد بن قيس قال: جلبت أنا ومُخْرَفَة العبدى بئراً من هجر، فجاءنا رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم فساومنا في سراويل، وعندى وَأَزِنُ يَزْنُ بِالْأَجْرِ فقال النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم للوازن: زن وأرجح. قال وفي الباب عن جابر وأبي هريرة، قال أبو عيسى: حديث سويد حسن صحيح، وأهل العلم يستحبون الرجحان في الوزن. وروى شعبة هذا الحديث عن سَمَاكٍ فقال عن أبي صفوان وذكر الحديث".

³⁷⁰ See Sakhr, *Mawaū'ah*, Ibn Mājah, hadīth no.2213 "إِذَا وَزَنْتُمْ فَأَرْجِحُوا". Al-Nasā'i, hadīths no.4513-4: "عن جابر قال لما قدم النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم: "المدينة دعا بميزان فوزن لى وزادني قال: يا بلال زن له أوقية وزده"، and in hadīth no.4560, "يا بلال زن له أوقية وزده"، and in hadīth no.4560, "يا بلال زن له أوقية وزده".

³⁷¹ See Sakhr, *Mawsū'eah*, Muslim, hadīth no.1738. Aḥmad, hadīths no.12256, 13097. Bukhāri, hadīth no.5959: (Lit.) "If the son of Adam possesses a valley of gold, he would love to have had two ...".

"عَنْ أَبِي شَهَابٍ قَالَ: أَخْبَرَنِي أَنَسُ بْنُ مَالِكٍ أَنَّ رَسُولَ اللَّهِ (ﷺ) قَالَ لَوْ أَنَّ لَابْنَ آدَمَ وَاِدِيًا مِنْ ذَهَبٍ أَحَبُّ أَنْ يَكُونَ لَهُ وَاِدِيَانِ ...".

Aḥmad, hadīths no.12291, 20194. Tirmidhi, hadīth no.2259:

"لَوْ كَانَ لِابْنِ آدَمَ وَاِدِيَانِ مِنْ ذَهَبٍ أَحَبُّ أَنْ يَكُونَ لَهُ ثَالِثٌ ..". وفي الباب عن أبي بن كعب وأبي سعيد وعائشة وابن الزبير وأبي واقد وجابر وابن عباس وأبي هريرة، قال أبو عيسى هذا حديث حسن صحيح عريب من هذا الوجه"

Aḥmad, hadīth no.18477:

"عَنْ زَيْدِ بْنِ أَرْقَمٍ قَالَ: ... لَوْ كَانَ لِابْنِ آدَمَ وَاِدِيَانِ مِنْ ذَهَبٍ وَفِضَّةٍ لَابْتَغَى إِلَيْهِمَا آخَرَ ...".

See also, Al-Madani, *'Ithāfāt*, p.67, hadīth no. 358:

"لَوْ كَانَ لِابْنِ آدَمَ وَاِدٍ لِأَحَبُّ أَنْ يَكُونَ لَهُ اثْنَانِ ...". أَخْرَجَهُ أَحْمَدُ وَالطَّبْرَانِيُّ فِي الْكَبِيرِ عَنْ أَبِي وَاقِدِ اللَّيْثِيِّ.

³⁷² Khan and Helali, *Qur'an*.

³⁷³ Some scholars are of the opinion that {ذَلِكَ كَيْلٌ يَسِيرٌ*} might have been said by Jacob (عليه السلام) as an answer to his sons' argument. However, it seems to me that it is more likely to have been part of what the sons have said considering the fact that they were in a state of famine, and every little help did actually count.

³⁷⁴ Q6:151-2

{قُلْ تَعَالَوْا أَتْلُ مَا حَرَّمَ رَبِّيَ عَلَيْكُمْ أَلَّا تُشْرِكُوا بِهِ شَيْئًا وَبِالْوَالِدَيْنِ إِحْسَانًا وَلَا تَقْتُلُوا أَوْلَادَكُمْ مِمَّنْ إِهْلَاقٍ
تَحْنُ نَزْرُؤُكُمْ وَإِيَّاهُمْ وَلَا تَقْرَبُوا الْفَوَاحِشَ مَا ظَهَرَ مِنْهَا وَمَا بَطَّنَ وَلَا تَقْتُلُوا النَّفْسَ الَّتِي حَرَّمَ اللَّهُ إِلَّا بِالْحَقِّ
ذَلِكُمْ وَصَّاكُمْ بِهِ لَعَلَّكُمْ تَتَّقُونَ*} وَلَا تَقْرَبُوا مَالَ الْيَتِيمِ إِلَّا بِالَّتِي هِيَ أَحْسَنُ حَتَّىٰ يَبْلُغَ أَشُدَّهُ وَأَوْفُوا الْكَيْلَ
وَالْمِيزَانَ بِالْقِسْطِ لَا تُكَلِّفُ نَفْسًا إِلَّا وُسْعَهَا وَإِذَا قُلْتُمْ فَاعْدِلُوا وَلَوْ كَانَ ذَا قُرْبَىٰ وَبِعَهْدِ اللَّهِ أَوْفُوا ذَلِكُمْ
وَصَّاكُمْ بِهِ لَعَلَّكُمْ تَتَذَكَّرُونَ}

³⁷⁵ ^c *Ashāb Al-'A'rāf*, whose good deeds equal their bad deeds are of no concern to this work.

³⁷⁶ David Jasper (ed.), *Translating Religious Texts* (1993), p.xi.

³⁷⁷ Jasper, *Translating Religious Texts*, p.xi.

³⁷⁸ Susan Bassnett, *Translation Studies* (1996), p.38.

³⁷⁹ Abu Hilāl Al-'Askari, *al-Furūq al-Lughawiyah* (1353 A.H.), p.12.

S. A. Al-Mulla, *The Question of The Translatability of The Qur'an* (Ph.D 1989), p.26, says: "According to Abi Hilāl synonymy does not occur in the Arabic language except when two (or more) synonymous words come from different dialects. In his words:

”لا يجوز أن يكون اللفظان يدلان على معنى واحد... إلا أن يجيء في لغتين“.

In p.27 Al-Mulla says again: "Abi Hilāl's view that synonymy cannot occur in one dialect is based on the notion that two or more words cannot be devised for the same meaning in one linguistic unit/grouping, as the presence of two or more words with one meaning would cause useless proliferation in it".

³⁸⁰ Edwin Gentzler, *Contemporary Translation Theories* (1993), p.29.

Gentzler comments on Fredric Will's first essay 'From Naming to Fiction Making' in *Literature inside out*. He says that Will

“appears to agree with a theory of cultural relativism. Holding that different languages construct separate realities and that what any particular word refers to cannot be determined precisely, Will calls into question translation theories based on reference to a universal objective reality”.

³⁸¹ Jasper, *Translating Religious Texts* (1993), p. xiii.

³⁸² Gentzler, *Contemporary Translation Theories*, p.57.

³⁸³ Eugene A. Nida, *Towards a Science of Translating* (1964), pp.150-1.

³⁸⁴ Al-Mulla, *The Question of The Translatability of The Qur'an*, p.116: quoted from N. Kharma, *Tabī'at al-Tarjamah* (1984), pp.63-4.

³⁸⁵ Gentzler, *Contemporary Translation Theories*, p.58.

³⁸⁶ Gentzler, *Contemporary Translation Theories*, p.58.

³⁸⁷ Q3:7 reads:

﴿هُوَ الَّذِي أَنْزَلَ عَلَيْكَ الْكِتَابَ مِنْهُ آيَاتٌ مُحْكَمَاتٌ هُنَّ أُمُّ الْكِتَابِ وَأُخَرُ مُتَشَابِهَاتٌ فَأَمَّا الَّذِينَ فِي
فُلُوجِهِمْ رَزَقَ فَيَتَّبِعُونَ مَا تَشَابَهَ مِنْهُ ابْتِغَاءَ الْفِتْنَةِ وَابْتِغَاءَ تَأْوِيلِهِ وَمَا يَعْلَمُ تَأْوِيلَهُ إِلَّا اللَّهُ وَالرَّاسِخُونَ فِي الْعِلْمِ
يَقُولُونَ ءَأَمَّنَّا بِهِ كُلٌّ مِنْ عِنْدِ رَبِّنَا وَمَا يَذَّكَّرُ إِلَّا أُولُو الْأَلْبَابِ﴾

Yusuf Ali in *Qur'an*, p.127, comments on this Ayah saying: “This passage gives us an important clue to the interpretation of the Holy Qur’an. Broadly speaking it may be divided into two portions, not given separately, but intermingled: viz. (1) the nucleus or foundation of the Book, literally “the mother of the Book”, (2) the part which is not of well-established meaning. It is very fascinating to take up the latter, and exercise our ingenuity about its inner meaning, but it refers to such profound spiritual matters that human language is inadequate to it, and though people of wisdom may get some light from it, no one should be dogmatic, as the final meaning is known to Allah alone. The commentators usually understand the verses “of established meaning” (muḥkam) to refer to the categorical orders of the *Shari‘ah* (or the Law), which are plain to everyone’s understanding. But perhaps the meaning is wider: the “mother of the Book” must include the very foundation on which all law rests, the essence of Allah’s message as distinguished from the various illustrative parables, allegories, and ordinances.(R)”.

M. M. Khatib in *The Bounteous Koran, A Translation of Meaning and Commentary* (1986), p.63 comments: “The Arabic word for figurative is *mutashabbihah*, which literally means metaphorical and allegorical. Commentators have clarified the figurative verses into three types: (a) that which human knowledge cannot grasp, like having real knowledge of God and His attributes; (b) that which man’s knowledge can reach only through extensive study to clarify the seemingly incomprehensible meaning of the figurative words; (c) that which can be known only by a special group of learned men who have reached a true understanding of the meaning and are committed to God’s ordinance. However, common people usually believe in only what is tangible unless they are true adherents to their religion. There are many figurative words in the Koran. Nevertheless, all Moslem scholars agree that their literal meaning is not the true one since, although it is said that God has a countenance, hands, eyes, and that He is ‘above’, He has also said that there is nothing that resembles Him. These words are simply used to bring close to the human mind things expressed in material terms that he understands”.

M. Asad in *The Message of The Qur’an* (1980), pp.66-7 also says: “The above passage may be regarded as a key to the understanding of the Qur’an. Tabari identifies the *ayat muhkamat* (“messages that are clear in and by themselves”) with what the philologists and jurists describe as *nass* - namely, ordinances or statements which are self-evident (*zahir*) by virtue of their wording (cf. *Lisan al-‘Arab*, art. *nass*). Consequently, Tabari regards as *ayat muhkamat* only those statements or ordinances of the Qur’an which do not admit of more than one interpretation (which does not, of course, preclude differences of opinion regarding the *implications* of a particular *ayah muhkamah*). In my opinion, however, it would be too dogmatic to regard any passage of the Qur’an which does not conform to the above definition as *mutashabih* (“allegorical”): for there are many statements in the Qur’an which are liable to more than one interpretation but are, nevertheless, not allegorical - just as there are many expressions and passages which, despite their allegorical formulation, reveal to the searching intellect only one

possible meaning. For this reason, the *ayat mutashabihat* may be defined as those passages of the Qur'an which are expressed in a figurative manner, with a meaning that is metaphorically implied but not directly, in so many words, stated. The *ayat muhkamat* are described as the "essence of the divine writ" (*umm al-kitab*) because they comprise the fundamental principles underlying its message and, in particular, its ethical and social teachings: and it is only on the basis of these clearly enunciated principles that the allegorical passages can be correctly interpreted"

³⁸⁸ D. A. Cruse, *Lexical Semantics* (1995), p.265.

³⁸⁹ Cruse, *Lexical Semantics*, p.265.

³⁹⁰ Cruse, *Lexical Semantics*, p.265

³⁹¹ Cruse, *Lexical Semantics*, p.267.

³⁹² E. A. Nida, *Componential Analysis of Meaning* (1975), p.98.

³⁹³ Nida, *Componential Analysis of Meaning*, pp.102-3.

³⁹⁴ This view does not extend to the language of science; in other words it is restricted to general areas of language.

³⁹⁵ Cruse, *Lexical Semantics*, p.292, includes the following in an endnote:

"I owe this definition to Haas.. Lyons (1981:50-1) proposes a different classification of synonymy:

i. synonyms are *fully* synonymous if, and only if, *all their meanings* are identical.

ii. synonyms are *totally* synonymous if, and only if, they are synonymous *in all contexts*;

iii. synonyms are *completely* synonymous if, and only if, they are identical *on all (relevant) dimensions of meaning*.

Lyons defines absolute synonyms as expressions that are fully, totally and completely synonymous, and partial synonyms as expressions which (if I understand correctly) satisfy at least one, but not all three, of the above criteria. He also has a category of near synonymy and partial synonymy.

Presumably *identical* in (i) and *synonymous* in (ii) are to be understood in the sense of *completely synonymous* as in (iii).

Although Lyons insists that near-synonymy is not the same as partial synonymy, it should be noted that by his definition near-synonyms qualify as incomplete synonyms, and therefore as

partial synonyms (though, of course, they represent only one variety). Definition (ii) appears, in practice, to make unacknowledged use of the notion of normality: otherwise Lyons's statement (p.52) that *large* 'cannot be substituted for *big* in *You are making a big mistake*' is difficult to interpret.

The definition of absolute synonymy suggested here is effectively not very different from a conflation of Lyons's (ii) and (iii), except that:

(a) Lyons's definition (iii) leaves open the question of how many dimensions of meaning there are, and how to determine whether two words are identical on any particular dimension. The Haasian definition does not require prior identification of dimensions of meaning, and points to a method of testing potential candidates for absolute synonymy which relies on a single basic intuition.

(b) Lyons's separation of total and complete synonymy is to allow for the possibility that two words might be completely synonymous, but not have identical distributions, due to differences in collocational restrictions. Although it is not immediately obvious, this is allowed for in the definition adopted here, since differences in normality not having a semantic origin are to be discounted. (Lyons defines synonymy in terms of lexemes: his definition (I) is therefore not applicable to lexical units.)

³⁹⁶ Cruse, *Lexical Semantics*, p.268.

³⁹⁷ Cruse, *Lexical Semantics*, p.291.

³⁹⁸ Cruse, *Lexical Semantics*, p.270.

What Cruse is saying is similar to Abu Hilāl's views; see note 4 above.

³⁹⁹ M. A. Chaudhary, *Hal Yaqā' al-Tarāduf al-Lughawi fī al-Qur'an al-Karīm*, pp.28-44.

⁴⁰⁰ Gentzler, *Contemporary Translation Theories*, p.29.

⁴⁰¹ Sandor Hervey and Ian Higgins, *Thinking Translation: A Course in Translation Method: French to English* (1992), p.34.

⁴⁰² Dickins, James, Sandor Hervey and Ian Higgins, *Thinking Arabic Translation: A course in translation method: Arabic to English* (2002), p. 21.

⁴⁰³ Bassnett, *Translation Studies*, p.78.

⁴⁰⁴ Yusuf Ali, *Qur'an*. Cf. all the other translations.

⁴⁰⁵ The story is found in many references.

See for example, Zamakhshari, *Kashshāf*, v.2, p.43.

⁴⁰⁶ The Qur'an uses the word *kāfir* in the plural (Arabic: *kuffār*) to mean 'tillers' because they sow the seed and *cover* it up with soil maintaining the basic meaning of the act of *kufr*. This is found in Q57:20 {أَعْجَبَ الْكُفَّارَ نَبَاتُهُ} 'its growth is pleasing to the tillers'.

The Arabs say: “*Takaffara Fulān fi al-silāh* فِي السَّلَاحِ” to mean 'X is covered with arms'. As the darkness of night covers (envelopes) everything, the Arabs describe the night as *kāfir* 'كَافِرٌ'. In his *Muʿallaqah*, Labīd said: 'فِي لَيْلَةٍ كَفَرَ النُّجُومَ غَمَامِهَا', that is 'On a night whose clouds have covered (or hidden) its stars'.

See also Ibn Qutaybah, *Taʿwīl Mushkil*, p.54. Yusuf Ali, *Qur'an*, p.1426.

⁴⁰⁷ My translation. Cf., all the other translations.

⁴⁰⁸ Khan and Helali, *Qur'an*, Appendix II, p.1018. *Shirk* is also of different types. For detailed explanation, see same reference.

⁴⁰⁹ Yusuf Ali, *Qur'an*.

He also comments in p.582, note 1789: “Even if people profess a nominal faith in Allah, they corrupt it by believing in other things as if they were Allah's partners, or had some share in the shaping of the World's destinies! In some circles it is idolatry, the worship of stocks and stones. In others, it is Christolatry and Mariolatry, or the deification of Heroes and men of renown. In others it is the powers of Nature or of Life, or of the human intellect personified in science or Art or invention, and this is the more common form of modern idolatry. Others again worship mystery, or imaginary powers of good or even evil: good and fear are mixed up with these forms of worship. Islam calls us to worship Allah, the One True God, and Him only. (R)”.

⁴¹⁰ For a more detailed study on the meaning of *kufr* and *'īmān* and other related terms, see Toshihiko Izutsu, *The Structure of The Ethical Terms in The Koran: A Study in Semantics* (1959), v.ii, Chapter ix.

⁴¹¹ Peter Newmark, *A Textbook of Translation* (1988), p.18.

⁴¹² This was in accordance to Zaid's way of writing and pronunciation.

⁴¹³ Cf. Khan and Helali, *Qur'an*.

They also comment in p.394 saying: “[This verse is a challenge to mankind and everyone is obliged to believe in the miracles of the Qur’an. It is a clear fact that more than 1400 years have elapsed and not a single word of this Qur’an has been changed, although the disbelievers tried their utmost to change it in each and every way, but they failed miserably in their efforts. As it is mentioned in this holy verse: “We will guard it.” He has guarded it. On the contrary, all the other holy Books (the Torah, the Gospel, etc.) have been corrupted in the form of additions or subtractions or alterations in the original text]”.

⁴¹⁴ Cf. all the translations used in this work.

Yusuf Ali says commenting on this Ayah: “There is no question now of race or nation, of a ‘chosen people’ or the ‘seed of Abraham’; or the ‘seed of David’; or Hindu *Arya-varta*; of Jew or Gentile, Arab or ‘*Ajam* (Persian), Turk or *Tajik*, European or Asiatic, White or Coloured, Aryan, Semitic, Mongolian, or African; or American, Australian, or Polynesian. To all men and creatures other than men who have any spiritual responsibility, the principles universally apply”. p.818, footnote no.2762.

⁴¹⁵ Cf. Yusuf Ali, *Qur'an*, and Khan and Helali, *Qur'an*.

Yusuf Ali comments saying: “Allah’s revelation, through the Holy Prophet, was not meant for one faith or tribe, one race or set of people. It was meant for all mankind...”. p.1092, note no. 3832.

⁴¹⁶ It is understood that the Prophet (ﷺ) was sent to both men and jinns, however we cannot extend our conclusion to the jinns because we know very little about them.

⁴¹⁷ See, for example, Al-Rāfi‘i, *Tārīkh Ādāb*, pp.114-65.

Muhammad Z. Salām, *’Athar al-Qur’an fi Taṭawwur al-Naqd al-’Arabi ila Ākhir al-Qarn al-Rābi’ al-Hijri* (1961).

See, for example, Ahmed Deedat, *The Choice: Islam and Christianity* (1993), v.1, p.227-8.

⁴¹⁹ Colin Turner, *The Quran: A New Interpretation* (1997), p.1.

⁴²⁰ According to Bassnett, *Translation Studies*, p.70:

“Discussing his translation of Dante’s *Divina Comedia*, and defending his decision to translate into blank verse, Henry Wadsworth Longfellow (1807- 81) declared:

The only merit my book has is that it is exactly what Dante says, and not what the translator imagines he might have said if he had been an Englishman. In other words, while making it rhythmic, I have endeavoured to make it also as literal as a prose translation. ... In translating Dante, something must be relinquished. Shall it be the beautiful rhyme that blossoms all along the line like a honeysuckle on the hedge? It must be, in order to retain something more precious than rhyme, namely, fidelity, truth, -the life of the hedge itself. ... *The business of a translator is to report what the author says, not to explain what he means; that is the work of the commentator. What an author says and how he says it, that is the problem of the translator.*

Longfellow’s extraordinary views on translation take the literalist position to extremes. ... The translator is relegated to the position of a technician, neither poet nor commentator, with a clearly defined but severely limited task”. (Italics mine).

⁴²¹ Comparing what might be termed as ‘exegetical interpretations’ of the Qur’an to the great majority of Qur’anic *Tafsirs*, one sees huge differences between the two. While the *Tafsirs* try to give more than just one possibility of interpretation, ‘exegetical translations/interpretations’ do not necessarily make room for that all the time. This does not mean that the same is not to be found in some *Tafsirs*, but at least we do know with certainty that all *Tafsirs* are more detailed than ‘exegetical translations/interpretations’.

⁴²² Colin Turner does not call his work ‘translation’, although the word appears in the front page. However, he states his correctly justifiable view that “all translations are at the same time interpretations”. His work is, he says: “a combination of translation and exegesis”, as quoted before. p.xvi.

⁴²³ Turner, *The Quran*, p.1.

⁴²⁴ Turner, *The Quran*, p.xvi.

⁴²⁵ Turner, *The Quran*, p.xvi.

⁴²⁶ According to *Dīwān Al-Hudhliyyīn* (1369 A.H.), p.21, the poet is Al-Mutanakhkhil Al-Hudhli. The completion of the line is: “ مِنْ
الحُرْسِ الصَّرَاصِرَةِ الْقَطَاطِ”

and the reference here is to an off-licence shop owner who belongs to the *Ṣarāṣirah* who were Nabateans living in Greater Syria and had very curly hair.

This line of verse is also found in *Lisān al-ʿarab* and in Abu Hilāl, *al-Ṣinaʿatayn: al-Kitābah wa al-Shiʿr* (1952), p.181, where Abu Hilāl adds “يَعْنِي صَاحِبَ حَانُوتٍ فَأَقَامَ الْحَانُوتَ مَقَامَهُ”.

For more examples, see also, Ibn Qutaybah, *Taʿwīl Mushkil al-Qurʿan* (1954), pp.162-179

⁴²⁷ According to James Dickins (personal communication): “An ‘off-licence’ technically denotes a business which has a licence to sell Alcohol to be consumed away from (or: off) the premises, unlike a pub (Public House), where people can drink on the premises”.

The reason, however, for using the term ‘off-licence’ is because it is a more familiar term to British readers.

⁴²⁸ According to James Dickins (personal communication): “This may be for two reasons: (1) Because they accept the orthodox view that the Qurʿan is in fact untranslatable; and/or (2) that they accept that in a text which has various layers of meaning (including perhaps highly symbolic ones) any translation will necessarily omit or downplay some aspects of these meanings and emphasise other aspects”.

According to my understanding ‘interpretation’ is a bit more wordy than ‘translation’, while *Tafsir* is much more detailed and gives more than just one explanation for the Ayahs that allow such a thing

⁴²⁹ According to James Dickins (personal communication): “It is probably impossible to define what ‘economy’ means in any precise way. Also some languages (or cultures) seem to be more economical than others”. Cf. Mona Baker, *In Other Words, a Coursebook on Translation* (1992), pp.232-8.

⁴³⁰ Cf. Arberry, *Qurʿan*.

⁴³¹ Bassnett, *Translation Studies*, p.36.

-
- ⁴³² Bassnett, *Translation Studies*, p.37. See also Bassnett's note.25, p.141.
- ⁴³³ A point raised by James Dickins (personal communication).
- ⁴³⁴ Hervey and Higgins, *Thinking Translation*, p.30.
- ⁴³⁵ Hervey and Higgins, *Thinking Translation*, p.30.
- ⁴³⁶ A point raised by James Dickins (personal communication).
- ⁴³⁷ Hervey and Higgins, *Thinking Translation*, p.30.
- ⁴³⁸ For a detailed discussion see Ali, Ahmed *Word Repetition in the Qur'an: Translating Form or Meaning?* In King Saud University Journal: Language and Translation 19, no. 1, pp. 17-34.
- ⁴³⁹ Lauren G. Leighton, *Two Worlds, One Art: Literary Translation in Russia and America* (1991), p.17.
- ⁴⁴⁰ For more details about 'Repetition', see Clive Holes, *Modern Arabic: Structures, Functions and Varieties* (1995), pp.269-74; Mustafa Nāsif, *Nazariyyat al-Ma'nā fi al-Naqd al-'Arabi* (1965), p.21; Ibn Qutaybah, *Mushkil*, p.10; Ibn Fāris, *al-Ṣāhibi* (1910), pp.177-8; Adnan J. R. Al-Jubouri, 'The Role of Repetition in Arabic Argumentative Discourse' in *English for Specific Purposes in the Arab World*, ed. J. Swales and H. Mustafa, (1984), pp.99-117; B. J. Koch, *Repetition in Cohesion and Persuasion in Arabic* (Ph.D 1981); and Alexander F. Tytler, *Essay on The Principles of Translation* (1907). According to Al-Mulla, *The Question of The Translatability of The Qur'an*, p.232, quoted from al-Maydani, pp.99-108 on Ibn Qayyim, pp.159-167: "Ibn Qayyim identifies three types of Repetition in the Qur'an:
- a) Repetition with similarity of meaning eg.74:19-20.
 - b) Repetition with difference of meaning eg. 3:7.
 - c) Repetition of meaning with different wording eg.55:68".
- Ibn Qutaybah, *Mushkil*, p.183. Abu Hilāl, *al-Ṣinā'atayn*, p.193.
- ⁴⁴² Abu Hilāl, *al-Ṣinā'atayn*, p.193; the poet is not named. This line is also found in Al-Murtada, *'Amāli al-Murtada* (1954), v.1, p.84. 'كَانَتْ وَكَمْ' is however, missing from this line in Ibn Qutaybah, *Mushkil*, p.183, and Ibn Fāris, *al-Ṣāhibi*, p.177

⁴⁴³ This line is ascribed to ‘Abīd ibn Al-’Abras Al-’Asadi according to Ibn Qutaybah, *al-Shi‘r wa al-Shu‘arā’* (1364 A.H.) v.1, p.224. The next line is:

‘أَيَّامٌ نَضْرِبُ هَامَهُمْ...بِيَوَاتِرٍ حَتَّى الْمَحْتَبِنَا’

The line is also found in Abu Hilāl, *al-Ṣinā‘atayn*, p.194, and in Al-Bāqillāni, *’Ijāz al-Qur’an* b (n.d.), p.160, without the name of the poet, [or Bāqillāni, *’Ijāz al-Qur’an* c (1951), pp.136-7]. However the poet is named again in Ibn Qutaybah, *Mushkil*, p.143 but not in p.183, where the following line by ‘Auf ibn Al-khari’ is quoted:

‘وَكَادَتْ فِرَارَةٌ تَصَلِّي بِنَا فَأَوْلَى فِرَارَةٌ أَوْلَى فِرَارًا’

This latter line is also found in Ibn Fāris, *al-Ṣāhibi*, p.194, where we have instead ‘تَشْفَى بِنَا’ and the poet’s name is not mentioned, while Bāqillāni, *’Ijāz al-Qur’an* b, p.160 quotes it as ‘فَكَادَتْ فِرَارَةٌ’.

⁴⁴⁴ Abu Hilāl, *al-Ṣinā‘atayn*, p.194.

⁴⁴⁵ Abu Hilāl, *al-Ṣinā‘atayn*, p.194.

⁴⁴⁶ Newmark, *A Textbook of Translation*, pp.36-7.

⁴⁴⁷ Mona Baker, *In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation* (1992), p.6.

⁴⁴⁸ Many translations, such as most of the ones used in this work render {كَوْكَبًا} as ‘star’ not ‘planet’ (see Pickthall, *Koran*); perhaps the translators have been influenced by Genesis 37:9 where the Prophet Joseph told his brothers and father about his dream: “... the sun and the moon and the eleven stars made obeisance to me”.

On the other hand, Al-Nuwayri, *Nihāhat al-’Arab* (1923), v.1, pp.38-9 & 61-70 talks about and quotes lines of Arabic poetry where the word *kawkab* ‘كَوْكَب’ is used to refer to both planets and stars.

The Qur’an uses the word *kawkab* to refer to a shining body as in Q6:76, Q24:35. See also, the plural form *kawākib* in Q37:6 and Q82:2.

⁴⁴⁹ It is clear that the connective ‘حَرْفُ الْعَطْفِ’ *waw* (و) is also repeated which is one of the features of Arabic.

For details about the uses and functions of the *waw*, see Holes, *Modern Arabic*, pp.217-20.

⁴⁵⁰ Barbara Johnstone, *Repetition in Arabic Discourse* (1991), p.117.

⁴⁵¹ Johnstone, *Repetition in Arabic Discourse*, p.115.

⁴⁵² Other examples are also found in Q55 where {فَبِأَيِّ آيَاتِ رَبِّكُمَا تُكَذِّبَانِ} is repeated thirty one times, Q30:20-25 where {وَمِنْ آيَاتِهِ} is repeated six times in six successive Ayahs. See also Q54:15,17, 22, 32, 40 and 51 {فَهَلْ مِنْ مُدْكِرٍ}, Q69:1-3 {الْحَاقَّةُ}, Q74:19-20 {قَبْلِ كَيْفَ} {مَا أَدْرَاكَ} Q82:17-18 {قَوَارِيرًا}, Q76:15-16 {أَوَلَىٰ لَكَ فَأُوقَىٰ}, Q75:34-35 {قَدَّرَ} {مَا يَوْمَ الدِّينِ} Q95:5-6 {إِنَّ مَعَ الْعُسْرِ يُسْرًا}, Q101:1-3 {الْقَارِعَةُ}, Q102:3-4 {كَلَّا} {سَوْفَ تَعْلَمُونَ}, Q109, etc.

⁴⁵³ This is explained clearly in the Arabic saying “ رَبِّ حَامِلٍ فِقْهٍ لِمَنْ هُوَ أَفْقَهُ ” “ مِنْهُ ”.

⁴⁵⁴ See Bassnett, *Translation Studies*, p.70.

⁴⁵⁵ According to Nāsif, *Nazariyyah*, p.22, Sībawayh says: “The Arabs say ‘حَمْدًا لِلَّهِ وَتَسْنَاءً عَلَيْهِ’ and ‘حَمْدٌ لِلَّهِ وَتَسْنَاءٌ عَلَيْهِ’. The former is used when something good happens and as a result one praises Allah, while the latter is used when one expresses how he is”. In his own words: “الأولُ تَقْوِيلُهُ وَقَدْ وَقَعَ لَكَ مَا يُوجِبُ الْحَمْدَ وَالثَّانِي لِلِإِبَانَةِ عَنِ حَالِكَ الَّتِي أَنْتَ عَلَيْهِا”.

By way of example, James Dickins also suggests comparing ‘هَذَا الرَّجُلُ عَظِيمٌ’ with ‘إِنَّ هَذَا الرَّجُلَ لَعَظِيمٌ’. He says: “Clearly, these two are distinct in Arabic, and in some contexts it might be possible in English to translate ‘إِنَّ هَذَا الرَّجُلَ لَعَظِيمٌ’ as ‘This man is indeed great’. In many contexts, however, both ‘هَذَا الرَّجُلُ عَظِيمٌ’ and ‘إِنَّ هَذَا الرَّجُلَ لَعَظِيمٌ’ would have to be translated as ‘This man is great’ (etc.); the very real difference between the two sentences simply cannot be relayed in English”.

⁴⁵⁶ Arberry, *Qur’an*, p.x.

⁴⁵⁷ See the *Internet* at:

<http://debate.domini.org/newton/grammar.html>.

See also Lewis Marracci’s translation. His introductory volume is even titled *A Refutation of the Quran*. E. M. Wherry, *A Comprehensive Commentary on The Qur’an* (1896), p.8, says: “On Marracci’s translation Savary says, “Marracci, that learned

monk, who spent forty years in translating and *refuting* the Koran ...”. (Italics mine).

Other examples of the same type are the translations of George Sale, *The Koran* (n.d.), J. M. Rodwell, *The Qur’an* (1937), and the like who were motivated and blinded by their hostility to Islam.

⁴⁵⁸ According to M. S. M Saifullah, the *Internet*, at:

<http://www-hrem.msm.cam.ac.uk/~msms/contrad.html>:

“*Iltifat* means to ‘turn/turn one’s face to’. It is an important part of *balaghah* (Arabic rhetoric) where there is a sudden shift in the pronoun of the speaker or the person spoken about. Muslim Literary critics over the centuries have greatly admired this technique. *Iltifat* has been called by rhetoricians *shaja‘at al-arabiyya* as it shows in their opinion, the daring nature of the Arabic language. If any ‘daring’ is to be attached to it, it should above all be the daring of the language of the Qur’an since it employs this feature far more extensively and in more variations than does Arabic poetry. Most of the authors who talk about *Iltifat* use the examples from the Qur’an. No one seems to quote references in prose other than from the Qur’an: and indeed a sampling of hadith material found not a single instance.

The types of *iltifat* and related features are of following type:

1. Change in person, between 1st, 2nd and 3rd person, which is the most common and is usually divided into six kinds. The four important examples that are found in the Qur’an are:

* Transition from the 3rd to 1st person. This is the most common type. Over 140 instances can be found in the Qur’an.

* From 1st to 3rd person - nearly 100 such instances can be found in the Qur’an.

* From 3rd to 2nd - nearly 60 instances.

* From 2nd to 3rd person - under 30 instances.

2. Change in number, between singular, dual and plural.

3. Change in the addressee.

4. Change in the tense of the verb.

5. Change in the case marker.

6. Using a noun in the place of a pronoun.

-
- Examples of the above mentioned cases can be seen in M A S Abdel Haleem's paper, called 'Grammatical Shift For Rhetorical Purposes: *Itifat* And Related Features In The Qur'an'.
- ⁴⁵⁹ See *Internet*, under *Qur'an*.
- ⁴⁶⁰ Asad, *Qur'an*, p.ii.
- ⁴⁶¹ Sale, *The Koran*, p.v.
- ⁴⁶² Wherry, *A Comprehensive Commentary*, p.v.
- ⁴⁶³ Richard Bell, *The Qur'an* (1937), p.vi.
- ⁴⁶⁴ See Rodwell, *The Koran*, pp.1-18.
- ⁴⁶⁵ According to James Dickins, "... it is quite likely that early translators in particular were extremely ignorant. It also seems to me difficult to draw the line between deliberate misrepresentation and ignorance; and when someone is hostile to a particular belief (e.g. Christian missionaries hostile to Islam), they often select the most negative interpretation available of that belief. My personal position would be to ignore translators who are obviously hostile to Islam -their very hostility would rule them out as acceptable interpreters in the eyes of the open-minded people. Also, I feel that the more recent translations -while they may still show some ignorance- do not typically suggest the hostility of the translators".
- ⁴⁶⁶ See A. I. Muhanna, *Dirāsah Ḥawla Tarjamat al-Qur'an* (1978), p.12 where the author states that the only exception according to Abu Ḥanīfah was Salmān Al-Fārisi's translation of Surat *Al-Fātiḥah* into Persian for some of his people who did not know Arabic, so that they could recite it when performing *ṣalāh*.
- ⁴⁶⁷ See Muhanna, *Dirāsah*, pp.13-78.
- ⁴⁶⁸ Pickthall, *Koran*, p.vii.
- ⁴⁶⁹ See, for example, Al-Mulla, *The Question of The Translatability of The Qur'an*.
- ⁴⁷⁰ Jasper, *Translating Religious Texts*, p.2.
- ⁴⁷¹ Bell, *The Qur'an*, p.v.
- ⁴⁷² Cf. Ṣakhr, *Mawsū'eah*, Tirmidhi, ḥadīth no.2831; Dārimi, ḥadīths no.3181 and 3197: (أَثَرٌ مَوْثُوفٌ عَلَى صَحَابِيٍّ). See also Aḥmad, ḥadīth no. 666: its wording is: "وَلَا تَقْنَىٰ أَعَاجِيْبُهُ".
- ⁴⁷³ Turner, *The Quran*, p.xiii.

⁴⁷⁴ According to James Dickins, “This illustrates the general point that unless the translators explain how they arrived at a particular translation, it is only possible to consider translation as product not process”.

⁴⁷⁵ Zamakhshari, *Kashshāf*, v.4, p.444.

⁴⁷⁶ In Zamakhshari, *Kashshāf*, v.4, p.444, he says: “such as *مِيرَان* *وَقَرَسْطُون* *وَمَكْبَال* *وَمَقْبِاس*”.

⁴⁷⁷ Zamakhshari, *Kashshāf*, v.4, p.444.

⁴⁷⁸ The second explanation that Al- Qurtūbi gives is:

"وَيَجُوزُ أَلَّا يَكُونَ لِأَنَّ مَوْضِعَ مِنَ الإِعْرَابِ فَتَكُونُ بِمَعْنَى أَيْ، وَتَطْعَمُوا عَلَيَّ هَذَا التَّفْدِيرِ بِجُزْؤِ مَا كَقَوْلِهِ تَعَالَى: {وَانطَلَقَ الْمَلَأُ مِنْهُمْ أَنْ امشُوا}."

that is, “And it is possible that ‘an’ ‘أَنَّ’ does not affect the mood of the verb, and therefore it means ‘ay’ ‘أَيْ’: ‘that is to say’ (or ‘meaning’) such as in the Ayah: {وَانطَلَقَ الْمَلَأُ مِنْهُمْ أَنْ امشُوا}”. See Qurtūbi, *al-Jāmi‘*, v.17, pp.154-5. This is also repeated in Ibn Fāris, *Sāhibi*, p.104.

See also, Abu Al-Fath ‘Uthmān ibn Jinni, *al-Khasā’is* (1913), p.152.

⁴⁷⁹ As for Arberrry, as stated before, he considers the Ayah a direct command; therefore no pronoun is needed.

⁴⁸⁰ Ibn Manzūr, *Lisān al-‘arab*, under (قَوْمَ). Ibn Manzūr says:

"أَقَامَ الشَّيْءَ: أَدَامَهُ، مِنْ قَوْلِهِ تَعَالَى: {وَيُتِيمُونَ الصَّلَاةَ}. وَقَامَ الشَّيْءُ وَاسْتَقَامَ: اعْتَدَلَ وَاسْتَوَى."

⁴⁸¹ Cf. All the translations used in this book.

⁴⁸² Yusuf Ali comments on ‘أَنْزَلَ’ in {وَأَنْزَلْنَا الْحَدِيدَ} saying: “sent down: *anzala*; in the sense of revealed to man the use of certain things, created in him the capacity of understanding and using them: cf. Q39:6: “sent down for you eight head of cattle in pairs”.

⁴⁸³ *Tughyān* has other forms as well; see this thesis under *t-gh-w* طَعَوَ.

⁴⁸⁴ On Q3:49, Asad, *Qur’an*, comments: “Lit., “[something] like the shape of a bird (*tayr*); and then I shall breathe into it, so that it might [or “whereupon it will”] become a bird ...”. The noun *tayr* is a plural of *ta’ir* (“flying creature” or “bird”), or an infinitive noun (“flying”) derived from the verb *tara* (“he flew”). In pre-Islamic usage, as well as in the Qur’an, the words *ta’ir* and *tayr*

often denote “fortune” or “destiny”, whether good or evil (as, for instance. In 7:131, 27:47 or 36:19, and still more clearly in 17:13). Many instances of this idiomatic use of *tayr* are given in all the authoritative Arabic dictionaries; see also Lane V, 1904 f. Thus, in the parabolic manner so beloved by him, Jesus intimated to the children of Israel that out of the humble clay of their lives he would fashion for them the vision of a soaring destiny, and that this vision, brought to life by his God-given inspiration, would become their real destiny by God’s leave and by the strength of their faith (as pointed out at the end of this verse). He also goes on to say: “It is probable that the “raising of the dead” by Jesus is a metaphorical description of his giving new life to people who were spiritually dead; cf.6:122- “Is then he who was dead [in spirit], and whom We thereupon gave life, and for whom We set up a light whereby he can see his way among men - [is then he] like unto one [who is lost] in darkness deep, out of which he cannot emerge?” If this interpretation is -as I believe - correct, then the “healing of the blind and the leper” has a similar significance: namely, an inner regeneration of people who were spiritually diseased and blind to the truth”.

⁴⁸⁵ Gentzler, *Contemporary Translation Theories*, p.18.

⁴⁸⁶ Gentzler, *Contemporary Translation Theories*, p.18.

Appendix (1)

Some English Translations of the Qur'an

1649	Alexander Ross.
1734	George Sale.
1861	John Medows Rodwell.
1880	Edward Henry Palmer.
1905	Mohammad Abdul Hakim Khan.
1910	Mirza Abul Fazl.
1912	Hairat Dehlawi.
1917	Maulvi Muhammad Ali.
1920	Al-Hajj Hafiz Ghulam Sarwar.
1930	Mohammad Marmaduke Pickthall.
1934	'Abdullah Yusuf 'Ali.
1936	Maulvi Sher Ali.
1937	Richard Bell.
1941	Abdul Majid Daryabadi.
1947	Mirza Bashir Ud-Din Mahmud Ahmad.
1955	Arthur Jeffery Arberry.
1956	N. J. Dawood.
1957	A. M. Daryabadi.
1964	Khadim Rahmani Nuri.
1967	Abu Al-A'la Mawdudi.
1969	M. G. Farid.
1970	Zafrulla Khan.
1971	M. Muhsin Khan & M. Taqi-ud-Din Al-Helali.
1974	Hashim Amir Ali.
1980	Muhammad Asad.
1981	Sayyid Imam Isa Al Haadi Al Mahdi
1981	Mahomodali Habib Shakir.
1984	Mohamed. M. Khatib.
1984	Ahmed Ali.
1985	T. B. Irving.
1988	Zafar Ishaq Ansari.
1990	Rashad Khalifa.

- 1990 Shah faridul Haque.
1991 Muhammad Khalilur Rahman.
1992 Q. Arafat.
1993 Dr. Mir Aneesuddin.
1996 Malachi Z. York.
1996 Abdul Majeed Auolakh.
1997 Colin Turner.
1998 Thomas Cleary.
1998 Abdalhaqq Bewley and Aisha Bewley.
2000 Dr. Zohurul Hoque.
2001 Dr. S.M. Afzal-ur-Rahman.
2001 Mohammed S. Shakir.
2001 Tahereh Saffarzadeh.
2003 Shabbir Ahmed.
2004 Muhammad Abdel-Haleem.
2004 'Ali Quli Qara'i.
2006 Ali Ünal.
2007 Alan Jones.
2007 Mufti Afzal Hoosen Elias.
2007 Edip Yüksel, Layth al-Shaiban, Martha Schulte-Nafeh
2007 Alan Jones.
2007 Tahereh Saffarzadeh.
2007 Laleh Bakhtiar.
2007 Syed Vickar Ahamed.
2008 Justice Mufti Taqi Usmani.
2008 Muhammad Mahmud Ghali.
2009 Usama Dakdok.
2009 Tarif Khalidi.
2010 P. JainulAbideen.
2011 Muhammad Tahrir-ul-Qadri.
2012 Talal Itani.

APPENDIX (2)

The Qur'anic Ayahs Quoted in This Work

Q	الآية
1:1	{ بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ }
1:5	{ إِنَّا كُنَّا نَعْبُدُ }
2:2-3	{ ذَلِكَ الْكِتَابُ لَا رَيْبَ فِيهِ هُدًى لِّلْمُتَّقِينَ * الَّذِينَ يُؤْمِنُونَ بِالْغَيْبِ وَيُقِيمُونَ الصَّلَاةَ وَمِمَّا رَزَقْنَاهُمْ يُنْفِقُونَ }
2:23	{ وَإِن كُنْتُمْ فِي رَيْبٍ مِّمَّا نَزَّلْنَا عَلَىٰ عَبْدِنَا فَأْتُوا بِسُورَةٍ مِّثْلِهِ وَادْعُوا شُهَدَاءَكُمْ مِّن دُونِ اللَّهِ إِنْ كُنْتُمْ صَادِقِينَ * فَإِن لَّمْ تَفْعَلُوا وَلَٰن تَفْعَلُوا فَاتَّقُوا النَّارَ }
2:63	{ وَإِذْ أَخَذْنَا مِيثَاقَكُمْ وَرَفَعْنَا فَوْقَكُمُ الطُّورَ }
2:75	{ وَقَدْ كَانَ فَرِيقٌ مِّنْهُمْ يَسْمَعُونَ كَلَامَ اللَّهِ ثُمَّ يُحَرِّفُونَهُ مِن بَعْدِ مَا عَقَلُوهُ وَهُمْ يَعْلَمُونَ }
2:93	{ وَأُشْرِيُوا فِي قُلُوبِهِمُ الْعِجْلَ }
2:97	{ قُلْ مَنْ كَانَ عَدُوًّا لِّجِبْرِيلَ فَإِنَّهُ نَزَّلَهُ عَلَىٰ قَلْبِكَ بِإِذْنِ اللَّهِ }
2:104	{ يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ ءَامَنُوا لَا تَقُولُوا زَاعِنًا }
2:137	{ فَسَيَكْفِيكَهُمْ }
2:143	{ وَكَذَلِكَ جَعَلْنَاكُمْ أُمَّةً وَسَطًا }
2:185	{ شَهْرَ رَمَضَانَ الَّذِي أُنزِلَ فِيهِ الْقُرْءَانُ }
2:186	{ وَإِذَا سَأَلَكَ عِبَادِي عَنِّي فَإِنِّي قَرِيبٌ }
2:189	{ وَيَسْأَلُونَكَ عَنِ الْأَهْلِ }
2:197	{ الْحُجُّ أَشْهُرٌ مَّعْلُومَاتٍ }
2:201	{ رَبَّنَا ءَاتِنَا فِي الدُّنْيَا حَسَنَةً وَفِي الْآخِرَةِ حَسَنَةً وَقِنَا عَذَابَ النَّارِ }
2:215	{ يَسْأَلُونَكَ مَاذَا يُنْفِقُونَ }
2:217	{ يَسْأَلُونَكَ عَنِ الشَّهْرِ الْحَرَامِ }
	{ يَرْتَدِدُ }
2:219	{ يَسْأَلُونَكَ عَنِ الْخَمْرِ وَالْمَيْسِرِ }

- { وَيَسْأَلُونَكَ مَاذَا يُنْفِقُونَ }
- 2:220 { وَيَسْأَلُونَكَ عَنِ الْيَتَامَى }
- 2:222 { وَيَسْأَلُونَكَ عَنِ الْمَحِيضِ }
- 2:248 { إِنَّ آيَةَ مُلْكِهِ أَنْ يَأْتِيَكُمُ التَّابُوتُ }
- 2:254 { وَالْكَافِرُونَ هُمُ الظَّالِمُونَ }
- 2:261 { وَاللَّهُ يُضَاعِفُ لِمَنْ يَشَاءُ }
- 2:272 { لَيْسَ عَلَيْكَ هُدَاهُمْ وَلَكِنَّ اللَّهَ يَهْدِي مَنْ يَشَاءُ }
- 2:281 { وَاتَّقُوا يَوْمًا تُرْجَعُونَ فِيهِ إِلَى اللَّهِ ثُمَّ تُوَفَّى كُلُّ نَفْسٍ مَا كَسَبَتْ وَهُمْ لَا يُظْلَمُونَ }
- 3:7 { هُوَ الَّذِي أَنْزَلَ عَلَيْكَ الْكِتَابَ مِنْهُ آيَاتٌ مُحْكَمَاتٌ هُنَّ أُمُّ الْكِتَابِ وَأُخْرَى مُتَشَابِهَاتٌ فَأَمَّا الَّذِينَ فِي قُلُوبِهِمْ زَيْغٌ فَيَتَّبِعُونَ مَا تَشَابَهَ مِنْهُ ابْتِغَاءَ الْفِتْنَةِ وَابْتِغَاءَ تَأْوِيلِهِ وَمَا يَعْلَمُ تَأْوِيلَهُ إِلَّا اللَّهُ وَالرَّاسِخُونَ فِي الْعِلْمِ يَقُولُونَ ءَأَمَّنَّا بِهِ كُلٌّ مِنْ عِنْدِ رَبِّنَا وَمَا يَذَّكَّرُ إِلَّا أُولُو الْأَلْبَابِ }
- 3:49 { أَلَمْ يَكُنْ لَهُ الْبَنَاتُ عَلَى الْبَنَاتِ بِآيَةٍ مَنْ رَبُّكُمْ أَنْى أَخْلَقَ لَكُمْ مِنَ الطِّينِ كَهَيْئَةِ الطَّيْرِ فَأَنْفُخُ فِيهِ فَيُصِيرُ طَيْرًا يَأْذُنُ اللَّهُ وَأُبْرِئُ الْأَكْمَهَ وَالْأَبْرَصَ وَأُحْيِي الْمَوْتَى يَأْذُنُ اللَّهُ وَأَنْتُمْ كُمْ بِمَا تَكْفُرُونَ وَمَا تَدَّخِرُونَ فِي بُيُوتِكُمْ }
- 4:40 { إِنَّ اللَّهَ لَا يَظْلِمُ مِثْقَالَ ذَرَّةٍ وَإِنْ تَكَ حَسَنَةً يضاعفها وَيؤت من لدنه أَجْرًا عَظِيمًا }
- 4:48 { إِنَّ اللَّهَ لَا يَغْفِرُ أَنْ يُشْرَكَ بِهِ وَيَغْفِرُ مَا دُونَ ذَلِكَ لِمَنْ يَشَاءُ }
- 4:46 { مِنَ الَّذِينَ هَادُوا يُحَرِّفُونَ الْكَلِمَ عَنْ مَوَاضِعِهِ }
- 4:51 { الْجِيَّتِ }
- 4:82 { أَفَلَا يَتَذَكَّرُونَ الَّذِينَ قُرْءَانَ وَلَوْ كَانَ مِنْ عِنْدِ غَيْرِ اللَّهِ لَوَجَدُوا فِيهِ اخْتِلَافًا كَثِيرًا }
- 4:115 { يُشَاقِقِ }
- 4:176 { يُبَيِّنُ اللَّهُ لَكُمْ أَنْ تَضِلُّوا }
- 5:4 { يَسْأَلُونَكَ مَاذَا أُحِلَّ لَهُمْ }
- 5:13 { فِيمَا نَقَضِهِمْ مِيثَاقَهُمْ لَعْنَاهُمْ وَجَعَلْنَا قُلُوبَهُمْ قَاسِيَةً يُحَرِّفُونَ الْكَلِمَ عَنْ مَوَاضِعِهِ }
- 5:41 { وَمِنَ الَّذِينَ هَادُوا سَمَّاعُونَ لِلْكَذِبِ سَمَّاعُونَ لِقَوْمٍ آخَرِينَ لَمْ يَأْتُوكَ يُحَرِّفُونَ الْكَلِمَ مِنْ بَعْدِ مَوَاضِعِهِ }

- 5:44 { وَمَنْ لَمْ يَحْكَمْ بِمَا أَنْزَلَ اللَّهُ فَأُولَئِكَ هُمُ الْكَافِرُونَ }
- 5:54 { يَزِيدُ }
- 6:1 { ثُمَّ الَّذِينَ كَفَرُوا بِرَبِّهِمْ يَعْدِلُونَ }
- 6:10 { وَأَلْقَدِ اسْتَهْزِئْ بِرُسُلٍ مِّن قَبْلِكَ فَحَاقَ بِالَّذِينَ سَخِرُوا مِنْهُمْ مَا كَانُوا بِهِ يَسْتَهْزِئُونَ }
- 6:75 { مَلَكُوتِ }
- 6:82 { الَّذِينَ ءَامَنُوا وَمَنْ يَلْبِسُوا إِيمَانَهُمْ بِظُلْمٍ }
- 6:151-2 { قُلْ تَعَالَوْا أَتْلُ مَا حَرَّمَ رَبِّيَ عَلَيْكُمْ أَلَّا تُشْرِكُوا بِهِ شَيْئًا وَبِالْوَالِدَيْنِ إِحْسَانًا وَلَا تَقْتُلُوا أَوْلَادَكُمْ مِّنْ إِمْلَاقٍ نَّحْنُ نَنْزِعُكُمْ وَإِيَّاهُمْ وَلَا تَقْرَبُوا الْفَوَاحِشَ مَا ظَهَرَ مِنْهَا وَمَا بَطَّنَ وَلَا تَقْتُلُوا النَّفْسَ الَّتِي حَرَّمَ اللَّهُ إِلَّا بِالْحَقِّ ذَلِكَمُ وَصَّاكُم بِهِ لَعَلَّكُمْ تَعْقِلُونَ * وَلَا تَقْرَبُوا مَالَ الْيَتِيمِ إِلَّا بِالَّتِي هِيَ أَحْسَنُ حَتَّىٰ يَبْلُغَ أَشُدَّهُ وَأَوْفُوا الْكَيْلَ وَالْمِيزَانَ بِالْقِسْطِ لَا تُكَلِّفُ نَفْسًا إِلَّا وُسْعَهَا وَإِذَا قُلْتُمْ فَاعْدِلُوا وَلَوْ كَانَ ذَا قُرْبَىٰ وَبِعَهْدِ اللَّهِ أَوْفُوا ذَلِكَمُ وَصَّاكُم بِهِ لَعَلَّكُمْ تَتَذَكَّرُونَ }
- 7:8-9 { وَالْوَزْنَ بِوِزْمَةِ الْحَقِّ فَمَنْ تَقَلَّتْ مَوَازِينُهُ فَأُولَئِكَ هُمُ الْمُفْلِحُونَ * وَمَنْ خَفَّتْ مَوَازِينُهُ فَأُولَئِكَ الَّذِينَ خَسِرُوا أَنفُسَهُمْ }
- 7:26 { يَا بَنِي آدَمَ }
- 7:27 { يَا بَنِي آدَمَ }
- 7:31 { يَا بَنِي آدَمَ }
- 7:35 { يَا بَنِي آدَمَ }
- 7:85 { فَأَوْفُوا الْكَيْلَ وَالْمِيزَانَ وَلَا تَبْخَسُوا النَّاسَ أَشْيَاءَهُمْ وَلَا تُفْسِدُوا فِي الْأَرْضِ بَعْدَ إِصْلَاحِهَا ذَلِكَ خَيْرٌ لَّكُمْ إِنْ كُنْتُمْ مُؤْمِنِينَ }
- 7:89 { افْتَحْ }
- 7:144-5 { قَالَ يَا مُوسَىٰ إِنِّي اصْطَفَيْتُكَ عَلَى النَّاسِ بِرِسَالَاتِي وَبِكَلامِي فَخُذْ مَا آتَيْنَاكَ وَكُن مِّنَ الشَّاكِرِينَ * وَكَتَبْنَا لَهُ فِي الْأَلْوَابِ مِن كُلِّ شَيْءٍ مَّوْعِظَةً وَتَفْصِيلًا لِّكُلِّ شَيْءٍ فَخُذْهَا بِقُوَّةٍ وَأْمُرْ قَوْمَكَ يَأْخُذُوا بِأَحْسَنِهَا سَأُرِيكُمْ دَارَ الْفَاسِقِينَ }
- 7:150 { وَأَلْقَى الْأَلْوَابِ }
- 7:154 { وَلَمَّا سَكَتَ عَن مُّوسَى الْغَضَبَ أَخَذَ الْأَلْوَابِ وَفِي نُسُخَتِهَا هُدًى وَرَحْمَةٌ لِّلَّذِينَ هُمْ لِرَبِّهِمْ يَرْتَدُّونَ }

- 7:171 { وَإِذْ نَتَقْنَا الْجَبَلَ فَوَّطَهُمْ كَآئِهِ ظَلَّةٌ وَظَنُّوا أَنَّهُ وَاقِعٌ بِهِمْ خُذُوا مَا آتَيْنَاكُمْ
بِقُوَّةٍ وَادْكُرُوا مَا فِيهِ لَعَلَّكُمْ تَتَّقُونَ }
- 7:187 { يَسْأَلُونَكَ كَأَنَّكَ خَفِيٌّ عَنْهَا }
- 8:1 { يَسْأَلُونَكَ عَنِ الْأَنْفَالِ }
- 8:13 { يُشَاقِقِي }
- 8:31 { وَإِذَا تَنَلَىٰ عَلَيْهِمْ آيَاتُنَا قَالُوا قَدْ سَمِعْنَا لَوْ نَشَاءُ لَقُلْنَا مِثْلَ هَذَا إِنْ هَذَا
إِلَّا أَصَاطِيرُ الْأَوَّلِينَ }
- 9:3 { أَنَّ اللَّهَ بَرِيءٌ مِنَ الْمُشْرِكِينَ وَرَسُولُهُ }
- 9:122 { وَمَا كَانَ الْمُؤْمِنُونَ لِيَنْفِرُوا كَآفَّةً فَلَوْلَا نَفَرَ مِن كُلِّ فِرْقَةٍ مِّنْهُمْ طَائِفَةٌ
لِّيَتَفَقَّهُوا فِي الدِّينِ وَلِيُنذِرُوا قَوْمَهُمْ إِذَا رَجَعُوا إِلَيْهِمْ لَعَلَّهُمْ يَحْذَرُونَ }
- 10:10 { وَأٰخِرُ دَعْوَاهُمْ أَنِ الْحَمْدُ لِلَّهِ رَبِّ الْعَالَمِينَ }
- 10:15-6 { وَإِذَا تَنَلَىٰ عَلَيْهِمْ آيَاتُنَا بَيَّاتٍ قَالَ الَّذِينَ لَا يَرْجُونَ لِقَاءَنَا آتِ بِمُرْءَانٍ
غَيْرِ هَذَا أَوْ بَدِّلْهُ قُلْ مَا يَكُونُ لِي أَنْ أُبَدِّلَهُ مِن تِلْقَاءِ نَفْسِي إِنْ أُتْبِعَ
إِلَّا مَا يُوْحَىٰ إِلَيَّ إِنِّي أَخَافُ إِنْ عَصَيْتُ رَبِّي عَذَابٌ يَّوْمٍ عَظِيمٍ * قُلْ لَوْ
شَاءَ اللَّهُ مَا تَلَوْتُهُ عَلَيْكُمْ وَلَا أَدْرَاكُمْ بِهِ فَقَدْ لَبِثْتُ فِيكُمْ عُمُرًا مِّن قَبْلِهِ
أَفَلَا تَعْقِلُونَ }
- 10:38-9 { أَمْ يَقُولُونَ افْتَرَاهُ قُلْ فَأْتُوا بِسُورَةٍ مِّثْلِهِ وَادْعُوا مَنِ اسْتَدْعَيْتُمْ مِّن دُونِ
اللَّهِ إِن كُنْتُمْ صَادِقِينَ }
- 10:61 { وَمَا يَعُزِّبُ عَن رَّبِّكَ مِن مَّثَقَالٍ ذَرَّةٍ فِي الْأَرْضِ وَلَا فِي السَّمَاءِ وَلَا أَصْغَرَ
مِن ذَلِكَ وَلَا أَكْبَرَ }
- 11:1 { الرِّكَابِ أَحْكَمَتْ آيَاتُهُ ثُمَّ فُصِّلَتْ مِن لَّدُنْ حَكِيمٍ خَبِيرٍ }
- 11:13-4 { أَمْ يَقُولُونَ افْتَرَاهُ قُلْ فَأْتُوا بِعَشْرِ سُورٍ مُّتَنَزَّاتٍ وَادْعُوا مَنِ اسْتَدْعَيْتُمْ مِّن
دُونِ اللَّهِ إِنْ كُنْتُمْ صَادِقِينَ * فَإِن لَّمْ يَسْتَجِيبُوا لَكُمْ فَاعْلَمُوا أَنَّمَا أُنزِلَ
بِعِلْمِ اللَّهِ }
- 11:15 { وَأَصْبِرْ فَإِنَّ اللَّهَ لَا يُضَيِّعُ أَجْرَ الْمُحْسِنِينَ }
- 11:48 { أَمِّم مِّن مَّعَكَ }
- 11:84-5 { يَا قَوْمِ اعْبُدُوا اللَّهَ مَا لَكُمْ مِن إِلَهٍ غَيْرُهُ وَلَا تَنْقُصُوا الْمِكْيَالَ وَالْمِيزَانَ إِنِّي
أَرَاكُمْ بِخَيْرٍ وَإِنِّي أَخَافُ عَلَيْكُمْ عَذَابَ يَوْمٍ مُّحِيطٍ * وَيَا قَوْمِ أَوْفُوا
بِالْمِكْيَالَ وَالْمِيزَانَ بِالْقِسْطِ وَلَا تَبْخَسُوا النَّاسَ أَشْيَاءَهُمْ وَلَا تَعْتُوا فِي
الْأَرْضِ مُفْسِدِينَ }

- 11:89 {أَنْ يُصِيبَكُمْ مِثْلَ مَا أَصَابَ قَوْمَ نُوحٍ أَوْ قَوْمَ هُودٍ أَوْ قَوْمَ صَالِحٍ وَمَا قَوْمٌ لَوْطٍ مِّنْكُمْ بَعِيدٍ}
- 11:108 {وَإِنَّا لَمُوقِفُوهُمْ نَصِيبُهُمْ غَيْرَ مَنْقُوصٍ}
- 12:2 {إِنَّا أَنْزَلْنَاهُ قُرْآنًا عَرَبِيًّا لَعَلَّكُمْ تَعْمَلُونَ}
- 12:4 {إِنِّي رَأَيْتُ أَحَدَ عَشَرَ كَوْكَبًا وَالشَّمْسَ وَالْقَمَرَ رَأَيْتُهُمْ لِي سَاجِدِينَ}
- 12:5 {رُءْيَاكَ}
- 12:23 {هَيْتَ لَكَ}
- 12:35 {حَتَّىٰ حِينٍ}
- 12:55 {قَالَ اجْعَلْنِي عَلَىٰ خَزَائِنِ الْأَرْضِ}
- 12:59 {أَلَا تَرَوْنَ أَنِّي أُوفِي الْكَيْلَ وَأَنَا خَيْرُ الْمُنزِلِينَ}
- 12:60 {فَلَا كَيْلَ لَكُمْ عِنْدِي}
- 12:63 {مُنِعَ مِنَّا الْكَيْلَ فَأَرْسَلْنَا مَعَهَا آخَانَ تَأْخُلُ}
- 12:65 {وَتَزِدَادُ كَيْلٍ بَعِيرٍ ذَلِكَ كَيْلٌ يَسِيرٌ}
- 12:80 {فَلَمَّا اسْتَيْأَسُوا مِنْهُ خَلَصُوا نَجِيًّا}
- 12:82 {وَأَسْأَلُ الْقَرْيَةَ}
- 12:88 {فَأَوْفَ لَنَا الْكَيْلَ}
- 12:106 {وَمَا يُؤْمِنُ أَكْثَرُهُمْ بِاللَّهِ إِلَّا وَهُمْ مُشْرِكُونَ}
- 13:37 {وَكَذَلِكَ أَنْزَلْنَاهُ حُكْمًا عَرَبِيًّا}
- 13:40 {فَإِنَّمَا عَلَيْكَ الْبَلَاغُ وَعَلَيْنَا الْحِسَابُ}
- 14:4 {وَمَا أَرْسَلْنَا مِنْ رَّسُولٍ إِلَّا بِلِسَانٍ قَوْمِهِ}
- 14:43 {يَتَرَدَّدُ}
- 14:48 {يَوْمَ تُبَدَّلُ الْأَرْضُ غَيْرَ الْأَرْضِ وَالسَّمَاوَاتُ}
- 15:1 {تِلْكَ آيَاتُ الْكِتَابِ}
- 15:9 {إِنَّا نَحْنُ نَزَّلْنَا الذِّكْرَ وَإِنَّا لَهُ لَحَافِظُونَ}
- 15:19 {وَأَنْبَتْنَا فِيهَا مِنْ كُلِّ شَيْءٍ مَّوْرُوثٍ}
- 16:102 {قُلْ نَزَّلَهُ رُوحُ الْقُدُسِ مِنْ رَبِّكَ بِالْحَقِّ}
- 16:103 {وَلَقَدْ نَعَلِمُ أَنَّهُمْ يَقُولُونَ إِنَّمَا يُعَلِّمُهُ بَشَرٌ لِّسَانُ الَّذِينَ يُلْحِدُونَ إِلَيْهِ أَعْجَمِيٌّ وَهَذَا لِسَانٌ عَرَبِيٌّ مُبِينٌ}
- 16:127 {وَاصْبِرْ وَمَا صَبْرُكَ إِلَّا بِاللَّهِ وَلَا تَحْزَنْ عَلَيْهِمْ وَلَا تَكُ فِي ضَيْقٍ مِّمَّا يَمْكُرُونَ}
- 16:128 {إِنَّ اللَّهَ مَعَ الَّذِينَ اتَّقَوْا وَالَّذِينَ هُمْ مُحْسِنُونَ}

- 17:35 {وَأَوْفُوا الْكَيْلَ إِذَا كِلْتُمْ وَزِنُوا بِالْقِسْطَاسِ الْمُسْتَقِيمِ ذَلِكَ خَيْرٌ وَأَحْسَنُ تَأْوِيلًا}
- 17:85 {وَيَسْأَلُونَكَ عَنِ الرُّوحِ}
- 17:88 {قُلْ لِّغَيْنِ اجْتَمَعَتِ الْإِنْسُ وَالْجِنُّ عَلَىٰ أَنْ يَأْتُوا بِمِثْلِ هَذَا الْقُرْآنِ لَا يَأْتُونَ بِمِثْلِهِ وَلَوْ كَانَ بَعْضُهُمْ لِبَعْضٍ ظَهِيرًا}
- 17:93 {قُلْ سُبْحَانَ رَبِّيَ هَلْ كُنْتُ إِلَّا بَشَرًا رَسُولًا}
- 17:106 {وَقُرْآنًا فَرَقْنَاهُ لِتَقْرَأَهُ عَلَى النَّاسِ عَلَىٰ مَكْثٍ وَنَزَّلْنَاهُ تَنْزِيلًا}
- 18:6 {فَلَعَلَّكَ بَاحِعٌ تَفْسِكَ عَلَىٰ آثَارِهِمْ إِنْ لَمْ يُؤْمِنُوا بِهَذَا الْحَدِيثِ أَسَفًا}
- 18:83 {وَيَسْأَلُونَكَ عَنِ ذِي الْقُرْنَيْنِ}
- 18:105 {أُولَئِكَ الَّذِينَ كَفَرُوا بِآيَاتِ رَبِّهِمْ وَلِقَائِهِ فَحَبِطَتْ أَعْمَالُهُمْ فَلَا تُعْجِبُهُمْ يَوْمَ الْقِيَامَةِ وَزُنَّا}
- 20:105 {وَيَسْأَلُونَكَ عَنِ الْجِبَالِ}
- 20:113 {وَكَذَلِكَ أَنْزَلْنَاهُ قُرْآنًا عَرَبِيًّا وَصَرَّفْنَا فِيهِ مِنَ الْوَعِيدِ}
- 20:114 {وَلَا تَعْجَلْ بِالْقُرْآنِ مِنْ قَبْلِ أَنْ يُقْضَىٰ إِلَيْكَ وَحْيُهُ وَقُلْ رَبِّي زِدْنِي عِلْمًا}
- 21:47 {وَنَضَعُ الْمَوَازِينَ الْقِسْطَ لِيَوْمِ الْقِيَامَةِ فَلَا تُظْلَمُ نَفْسٌ شَيْئًا وَإِنْ كَانَ مِثْقَالَ حَبَّةٍ مِنْ خَزْدَلٍ أَتَيْنَا بِهَا وَكَفَىٰ بِنَا حَاسِبِينَ}
- 21:98 {حَصْبٌ}
- 21:107 {وَمَا أَرْسَلْنَاكَ إِلَّا رَحْمَةً لِّلْعَالَمِينَ}
- 22:41 {الَّذِينَ إِنْ مَكَّنَّاهُمْ فِي الْأَرْضِ}
- 23:20 {تُنَبِّئُ بِالذُّهْنِ}
- 23:102 {فَمَنْ ثَقُلَتْ مَوَازِينُهُ}
- 23:103 {وَمَنْ خَفَّتْ مَوَازِينُهُ فَأُولَئِكَ الَّذِينَ خَسِرُوا أَنفُسَهُمْ فِي جَهَنَّمَ خَالِدُونَ}
- 24:1 {سُورَةٌ أَنْزَلْنَاهَا}
- 24:34 {وَلَقَدْ أَنْزَلْنَا إِلَيْكُمْ آيَاتٍ مُّبِينَاتٍ وَمَثَلًا مِّنَ الَّذِينَ خَلَوْا مِن قَبْلِكُمْ وَمَوْعِظَةً لِّلْمُتَّقِينَ}
- 24:43 {يَكَادُ سَمَىٰ يَرْقُبُهُ يَدُهُ بِالْأَبْصَارِ}
- 24:55 {لَيْسَتْ خَلْقُهُمْ}
- 25:1 {تَبَارَكَ الَّذِي نَزَّلَ الْفُرْقَانَ}
- 25:32-3 {وَقَالَ الَّذِينَ كَفَرُوا لَوْلَا نُزِّلَ عَلَيْهِ الْقُرْآنُ جُمْلَةً وَاحِدَةً كَذَلِكَ لِنُثَبِّتَ بِهِ فُؤَادَكَ وَرَتَّلْنَاهُ تَرْتِيلًا * وَلَا يَأْتُونَكَ بِمِثْلِ إِجْتِنَاكَ بِالْحَقِّ وَأَحْسَنَ

	تفسيراً {
26:105	{ كَذَّبَتْ قَوْمُ نُوحٍ الْمُرْسَلِينَ }
26:123	{ كَذَّبَتْ عَادَ الْمُرْسَلِينَ }
26:181-3	{ أَوْفُوا الْكَيْلَ وَلَا تَكُونُوا مِنَ الْمُخْسِرِينَ * وَزِنُوا بِالْقِسْطَاسِ الْمُسْتَقِيمِ * وَلَا تَبْخَسُوا النَّاسَ أَشْيَاءَهُمْ وَلَا تَعْتُوا فِي الْأَرْضِ مُفْسِدِينَ }
26:189	{ فَكَذَّبُوهُ فَأَخَذَهُمْ عَذَابُ يَوْمِ الظُّلَّةِ }
26:192-5	{ وَإِنَّهُ لَنَزِيلُ رَبِّ الْعَالَمِينَ * نَزَلَ بِهِ الرُّوحُ الْأَمِينُ * عَلَى قَلْبِكَ لِتَكُونَ مِنَ الْمُنذِرِينَ * بِلِسَانٍ عَرَبِيٍّ مُبِينٍ }
26:193	{ نَزَلَ بِهِ الرُّوحُ الْأَمِينُ }
26:189-9	{ وَلَوْ نَزَّلْنَاهُ عَلَى بَعْضِ الْأَعْجَمِينَ * فَقَرَأَهُ عَلَيْهِمْ مَا كَانُوا بِهِ مُؤْمِنِينَ }
27:40	{ يَزِيدُ }
28:34	{ وَأَجْحَى هَارُونَ هُوَ أَفْصَحُ مِنِّي لِسَانًا }
28:56	{ إِنَّكَ لَا تَهْدِي مَنْ أَحْبَبْتَ وَلَكِنَّ اللَّهَ يَهْدِي مَنْ يَشَاءُ وَهُوَ أَعْلَمُ بِالْمُهْتَدِينَ }
29:36-7	{ وَإِلَى مَدْيَنَ أَخَاهُمْ شُعَيْبًا فَقَالَ يَا قَوْمِ اعْبُدُوا اللَّهَ وَارْجُوا الْيَوْمَ الْأَخْرَ وَلَا تَعْتُوا فِي الْأَرْضِ مُفْسِدِينَ * فَكَذَّبُوهُ فَأَخَذَتْهُمُ الرَّجْفَةُ فَأَصْبَحُوا فِي دِيَارِهِمْ جاثين }
30:20	{ وَمِنْ آيَاتِهِ }
30:22	{ وَمِنْ آيَاتِهِ خَلْقُ السَّمَاوَاتِ وَالْأَرْضِ وَاخْتِلَافُ أَلْسِنَتِكُمْ وَأَلْوَانِكُمْ }
31:13	{ إِنَّ الشَّرْكَ لَظُلْمٌ عَظِيمٌ }
31:16	{ مِثْقَالَ حَبَّةٍ مِنْ خَرْدَلٍ }
32:16	{ تَتَخَفَى جُنُوبُهُمْ عَنِ الْمَضَاجِعِ يَدْعُونَ رَبَّهُمْ خَوْفًا وَطَمَعًا وَمِمَّا رَزَقْنَاهُمْ يُنفِقُونَ }
33:63	{ يَسْأَلُكَ النَّاسُ عَنِ السَّاعَةِ }
34:3	{ لَا يَعْزُبُ عَنْهُ مِثْقَالُ ذَرَّةٍ }
34:22	{ لَا يَمْلِكُونَ مِثْقَالَ ذَرَّةٍ }
34:28	{ وَمَا أَرْسَلْنَاكَ إِلَّا كَافَّةً لِّلنَّاسِ بَشِيرًا وَنَذِيرًا }
34:33	{ بَلْ مَكْرُ اللَّيْلِ وَالنَّهَارِ }
35:1	{ فَاطِرِ }
35:3	{ يَا أَيُّهَا النَّاسُ }

- 35:8 {فَلَا تَذْهَبْ نَفْسُكَ عَلَيْهِمْ حَسْرَاتٍ إِنَّ اللَّهَ عَلِيمٌ بِمَا يَصْنَعُونَ}
- 35:28 {إِنَّمَا يَخْشَى اللَّهَ مِنْ عِبَادِهِ الْعُلَمَاءُ}
- 36:60 {يَا بَنِي آدَمَ}
- 36:70 {لِيُنذِرَ مَنْ كَانَ حَيًّا وَيَحِقَّ الْقَوْلُ عَلَى الْكَافِرِينَ}
- 36:82 {إِنَّمَا أَمْرُهُ إِذَا أَرَادَ شَيْئًا أَنْ يَقُولَ لَهُ كُنْ فَيَكُونُ}
- 37:82 {إِنَّمَا أَمْرُهُ إِذَا أَرَادَ شَيْئًا أَنْ يَقُولَ لَهُ كُنْ فَيَكُونُ}
- 38:6 {وَانطَلَقَ الْمَلَأُ مِنْهُمْ أَنْ آمسُوا}
- 38:21 {إِذْ تَسَوَّرُوا الْمِحْرَابَ}
- 39:6 {وَأَنْزَلَ لَكُمْ مِنَ الْأَنْعَامِ ثَمَانِيَةَ أَزْوَاجٍ}
- 39:28 {فُرُوعًا وَغَرَابِيبًا غَيْرَ ذِي عِوَجٍ لَعَلَّهُمْ يَتَّقُونَ}
- 41:3 {كِتَابٌ فُصِّلَتْ آيَاتُهُ فُرُوعًا غَرِيبًا لِقَوْمٍ يَعْلَمُونَ}
- 41:6 {قُلْ إِنَّمَا أَنَا بَشَرٌ مِثْلُكُمْ يُوحَى إِلَيَّ}
- 41:9-12 {قُلْ أَنْتُمْ لَتَكْفُرُونَ بِالَّذِي خَلَقَ الْأَرْضَ فِي يَوْمَيْنِ وَتَجْعَلُونَ لَهُ أَنْدَادًا ذَلِكَ رَبُّ الْعَالَمِينَ * وَجَعَلَ فِيهَا رَوَاسِيَ مِنْ فَوْقِهَا وَبَارَكَ فِيهَا وَقَدَّرَ فِيهَا أَقْوَاتَهَا فِي أَرْبَعَةِ أَيَّامٍ سَوَاءً لِّلسَّائِلِينَ * ثُمَّ اسْتَوَى إِلَى السَّمَاءِ وَهِيَ دُخَانٌ فَقَالَ لَهَا وَلِلْأَرْضِ ائْتِيَا طَوْعًا أَوْ كَرْهًا قَالَتَا أَتَيْنَا طَائِعِينَ * فَقَضَاهُنَّ سَبْعَ سَمَاوَاتٍ فِي يَوْمَيْنِ وَأَوْحَى فِي كُلِّ سَمَاءٍ أَمْرَهَا وَزَيْنَا السَّمَاءَ الدُّنْيَا بِمَصَابِيحٍ وَحِفْظًا ذَلِكَ تَقْدِيرُ الْعَزِيزِ الْعَلِيمِ}
- 41:44 {وَلَوْ جَعَلْنَاهُ فُرُوعًا أَعْجَمِيًّا لَقَالُوا لَوْلَا فُصِّلَتْ آيَاتُهُ أَأَعْجَمِيٌّ وَعَرَبِيٌّ}
- 42:7 {وَكَذَلِكَ أَوْحَيْنَا إِلَيْكَ فُرُوعًا غَرِيبًا}
- {يَوْمَ الْجُمُعِ}
- 42:15 {وَأَمْرٌ لِأَعْدِلَ بَيْنَكُمُ اللَّهُ رَبُّنَا وَرَبُّكُمْ لَنَا أَعْمَالُنَا وَلَكُمْ أَعْمَالُكُمْ لَا حِجَّةَ بَيْنَنَا وَبَيْنَكُمُ}
- 42:16 {وَالَّذِينَ يُجَاهِدُونَ فِي اللَّهِ مِنْ بَعْدِ مَا اسْتُجِيبَ لَهُ حُجَّتُهُمْ دَاحِضَةً عِندَ رَبِّهِمْ وَعَلَيْهِمْ غَضَبٌ وَهُمْ عَذَابٌ شَدِيدٌ}
- 42:17 {اللَّهُ الَّذِي أَنْزَلَ الْكِتَابَ بِالْحَقِّ وَالْمِيزَانَ}
- 43:3 {إِنَّا جَعَلْنَاهُ فُرُوعًا غَرِيبًا لَعَلَّكُمْ تَتَّقُونَ}
- 44:3 {إِنَّا أَنْزَلْنَاهُ فِي لَيْلَةٍ مُبَارَكَةٍ}
- 45:16 {وَلَقَدْ آتَيْنَا بَنِي إِسْرَائِيلَ الْكِتَابَ وَالْحُكْمَ وَالنُّبُوَّةَ}
- 46:12 {وَهَذَا كِتَابٌ مُصَدِّقٌ لِسَانًا غَرِيبًا لِيُنذِرَ الَّذِينَ ظَلَمُوا}

- 46:19 {وَلِكُلِّ دَرَجَاتٍ بِمَا عَمِلُوا وَلِيُوقِيَهُمْ أَعْمَالَهُمْ وَهُمْ لَا يُظْلَمُونَ}
- 46:35 {فَاصْبِرْ كَمَا صَبَرَ أُولُو الْعَزْمِ مِنَ الرُّسُلِ}
- 47:13 {قَرَيْتِكَ الَّتِي أَخْرَجْنَاكَ}
- 49:9 {وَأَقْسَطُوا إِنَّ اللَّهَ يُحِبُّ الْمُقْسِطِينَ}
- 50:1 {ق}
- 50:38 {وَلَقَدْ خَلَقْنَا السَّمَاوَاتِ وَالْأَرْضَ وَمَا بَيْنَهُمَا فِي سِتَّةِ أَيَّامٍ وَمَا مَسَّنَا مِنْ لُغُوبٍ}
- 51:17-8 {كَانُوا قَلِيلًا مِّنَ النَّاسِ مَا يَهْتَجُونَ * وَإِلَّا سَحَابٌ هُمْ يُسْتَعْفِفُونَ}
- 52:33-4 {أَمْ يَقُولُونَ تَقْوَاهُ بَلْ لَا يُؤْمِنُونَ * فَلْيَأْتُوا بِحَدِيثٍ مِّثْلِهِ إِنْ كَانُوا صَادِقِينَ}
- 53:4-7 {إِنْ هُوَ إِلَّا وَحْيٌ يُوحَى * عَلَّمَهُ شَدِيدُ الْقُوَى * ذُو مِرَّةٍ فَاسْتَوَى * وَهُوَ بِالْأُفُقِ الْأَعْلَى}
- 53:37 {وَإِبْرَاهِيمَ الَّذِي وَفَّى}
- 54:15 {فَهَلْ مِنْ مُدَكِّرٍ}
- 55:7-9 {وَالسَّمَاءَ رَفَعَهَا وَوَضَعَ الْمِيزَانَ * أَلَّا تَطْغَوْا فِي الْمِيزَانِ * وَأَقِيمُوا الْوَزْنَ بِالْقِسْطِ وَلَا تُخْسِرُوا الْمِيزَانَ}
- 55: {فَبِأَيِّ آءِ الْآءِ رَبُّكُمَا تُكَذِّبَانِ}
- 56:77-80 {إِنَّهُ لَقُرْءَانٌ كَرِيمٌ * فِي كِتَابٍ مَّكْنُونٍ * لَا يَمَسُّهُ إِلَّا الْمُطَهَّرُونَ * تَنْزِيلٌ مِنْ رَبِّ الْعَالَمِينَ}
- 57:13 {فَضْرِبَ بَيْنَهُمْ بِسُورٍ}
- 57:20 {أَعَجَبَ الْكُفَّارَ نَبَاتُهُ}
- 57:23 {لِكَيْلًا تَأْسَوْا عَلَى مَا فَاتَكُمْ وَلَا تَفْرَحُوا بِمَا آتَاكُمْ}
- 57:24 {الَّذِينَ يَبْخُلُونَ وَيَأْمُرُونَ النَّاسَ بِالْبُخْلِ وَمَنْ يَتَوَلَّ فَإِنَّ اللَّهَ هُوَ الْعَنِيُّ الْحَمِيدُ}
- 57:25 {وَلَقَدْ أَرْسَلْنَا رُسُلَنَا بِالْبَيِّنَاتِ وَأَنْزَلْنَا مَعَهُمُ الْكِتَابَ وَالْمِيزَانَ لِيَقُومَ النَّاسُ بِالْقِسْطِ وَأَنْزَلْنَا الْحَدِيدَ}
- 59:4 {يُشَاقِّ}
- 64:9 {لِيَوْمِ الْجَمْعِ}
- 65:1 {يَأْتِيهَا النَّبِيُّ إِذَا طَلَّقْتُمُ النِّسَاءَ}
- { لَا تَدْرِي}
- 68:9 {وَدُّوا لَوْ تُدْهِنُ فَيُدْهِنُونَ}

- 68:10-3 {وَلَا تَطْعُ كُلَّ حَلَاظٍ مَّهِينٍ * هَمَّازٍ مَشَاءٍ بِنَبِيٍّ * مَنَاعٍ لِلْخَيْرِ مُعْتَدٍ أَثِيمٍ * عَتَلٌ بَعْدَ ذَلِكَ زَنِيمٍ}
- 69:1 {الْحَاقَّةُ}
- 72:14 {وَأَمَّا الْفَاسِقُونَ فَكَانُوا لِحَبَّتِهِمْ حَطَبًا}
- 74:19 {فَقَتِلْ كَيْفَ قَدَّرَ}
- 75:17-8 {إِنَّ عَلَيْنَا جَمْعَهُ وَقُرْآنَهُ * فَإِذَا قَرَأْنَاهُ فَاتَّبِعْ قُرْآنَهُ}
- 75:34 {أَوَّلَى لَكَ فَأُورَى}
- 76:15 {قَوَارِيرًا}
- 78:1 {عَمَّ}
- 79:42 {يَسْأَلُونَكَ عَنِ السَّاعَةِ أَيَّانَ مُرْسَاهَا}
- 80:15-6 {بِأَيْدِي سَفَرَةٍ * كِرَامٍ بَرَرَةٍ}
- 80:31 {أَبَا}
- 81:19-21 {إِنَّهُ لَقَوْلُ رَسُولٍ كَرِيمٍ * ذِي قُوَّةٍ عِنْدَ ذِي الْعَرْشِ مَكِينٍ * مُطَاعٍ ثَمَّ أَمِينٍ}
- 82:17 {وَمَا أَدْرَاكَ مَا يَوْمَ الدِّينِ}
- 83:1-5 {وَيَلِ لِلْمُظَلَّفِينَ * الَّذِينَ إِذَا أَكْتَالُوا عَلَى النَّاسِ يَسْتَوْفُونَ * وَإِذَا كَالُوهُمْ أَوْ وَزَنُوهُمْ يُخْسِرُونَ * أَلَا يَظُنُّ أُولَئِكَ أَنَّهُمْ مَبْعُوثُونَ * لِيَوْمٍ عَظِيمٍ}
- 84:8 {فَسَوْفَ يَحْسَبُ حِسَابًا يَسِيرًا}
- 85:21-2 {بَلْ هُوَ قُرْآنٌ كَرِيمٌ * فِي لَوْحٍ مَحْفُوظٍ}
- 93:1 {وَالضُّحَى}
- 95:5 {فَإِنَّ مَعَ الْعُسْرِ يُسْرًا}
- 96:1-2 {اقْرَأْ بِاسْمِ رَبِّكَ الَّذِي خَلَقَ * خَلَقَ الْإِنْسَانَ مِنْ عَلَقٍ * اقْرَأْ وَرَبُّكَ الْأَكْرَمُ * الَّذِي عَلَّمَ بِالْقَلَمِ}
- 97:1 {إِنَّا أَنْزَلْنَاهُ فِي لَيْلَةِ الْقَدْرِ}
- 99:7&8 {مِثْقَالَ ذَرَّةٍ}
- 101:1 {الْقَارِعَةُ}
- 101:6 {فَأَمَّا مَنْ ثَقُلَتْ مَوَازِينُهُ}
- 101:8 {وَأَمَّا مَنْ خَفَّتْ مَوَازِينُهُ}
- 102:3 {كَلَّا سَوْفَ تَعْلَمُونَ}

APPENDIX (3)

The Lines of poetry quoted in this work
arranged alphabetically according to the rhyme

Rhyme	Line
ب	Al-Nābighah أَلَمْ تَرَ أَنَّ اللَّهَ أَعْطَاكَ سُورَةً تَرَى كُلَّ مَلِكٍ دُونَهَا يَتَذَبَّدُ وَكُنَّا تَرَوَدُّنَا وَرُونًا كَثِيرَةً فَأَفْنَيْنَهَا لَمَّا عَلَوْنَا سَبَنَسَبَا
ج	Anonymous Ru ^c bah ibn Al-ʿajāj أَيَّامٌ أَبَدَتْ وَاضِحًا مُفْلَجًا أَعْرَبَرًا وَطَرَفًا أَبْرَجًا وَمُقَلَّةً وَحَاجِبًا مُرَجَّحًا وَفَاحًا وَمَرْسِنًا مُسْرَجًا
ح	Al-Qādi Al-ʿArjājī بِالنَّارِ فَرَّقَتْ الْحَوَادِثُ بَيْنَنَا وَبِهَا نَذَرْتُ أَعْوُدُ أَقْتُلُ رُوحِي
د	Anonymous وَأَحْمَقُ مِمَّنْ يَلْعَقُ الْمَاءَ قَالَ لِي دَعِ الْحَمْرَ وَاشْرَبْ مِنْ نِقَاحِ مُبَرِّدِ Al-ʿabbās ibn Al-ʿAḥnaf سَأَطْلُبُ بَعْدَ الدَّارِ عَنْكُمْ لِتَقْرُبُوا وَتَسْكُبَ عَيْنَايَ الدُّمُوعَ لِتَجْمَدَا
ر	ʿawf ibn Al-kharīe وَكَادَتْ فِرَارُهُ تَصَلِّيَ (تَشَقَّى) بِنَا فَأَوْلَى فِرَارُهُ أَوْلَى فِرَارًا Anonymous وَقَبْرِ حَرْبٍ بِمَكَانٍ قَفْرِ وَلَيْسَ قُرْبَ قَبْرِ حَرْبٍ قَبْرِ Anonymous وَلَقَدْ جَنَيْتُكَ أَكْمَمًا وَعَسَاقِلًا وَلَقَدْ نَهَيْتُكَ عَنِ نَبَاتِ الْأَوْبَرِ Tarafah ibn Al-ʿabd قَسَمْتُ الدَّهْرَ فِي زَمَنِ رَحِي كَذَاكَ الْحُكْمُ (يُقْسِطُ) يَقْصِدُ أَوْ يَجُورُ Al-Rāʿi هِنَّ الْحَرَائِرُ لَا رَبَاتٍ أَحْمَرَةَ سُودُ الْمَحَاجِرِ لَا يَقْرَأَنَّ بِالسُّورِ

Al-^cAeshā

فَبَانَتْ وَقَدْ أَسَارَتْ فِي الْفُؤَادِ صَدْعًا عَلَى نَائِبِهَا مُسْتَطِيرًا

Al-Farazdaq

وَإِذَا الرَّجَالُ رَأَوْا يَزِيدَ رَأَيْتَهُمْ خُضْعَ الرَّقَابِ نَوَاسِ الْأَبْصَارِ

Al-Mutanabbi

دَانَ بَعِيدٍ مُحِبِّ مَبْعُوضٍ بِهَجِّ أَغْرَ حُلُوِّ مُرِّ لَيْلٍ شَرِسِ

نَدَى أَبِي غَرٍّ وَافٍ أَحْيَى ثِقَّةً جَعَدَ سِرِّي نَهْ نَدْبٍ رَضِيَ نَدِسِ

Al-Hudhli

يُمَشِّي بَيْنَنَا حَانُوثُ خَمْرٍ مِنَ الْخُرْسِ الصَّرَاصِرَةِ الْقِطَاطِ

Anonymous

يَشْفِي مِنَ الضَّعْنِ قُسُوطَ الْقَاسِطِ

Al-Nābighah

تَوَهَّمَتْ آيَاتٍ لَهَا فَعَرَفْتُهَا لِسِتَّةِ أَعْوَامٍ وَذَا الْعَامِ سَابِعِ

Abu al-ʿUmaythil

يَأْمَنُ يُؤْمَلُ أَنْ تَكُونَ خِصَالُهُ كَخِصَالِ عَبْدِ اللَّهِ أَنْصَبَتْ وَاسْمِعِ

اصْدُقْ وَعِفْ وَبَرِّ وَاصْبِرْ وَاحْتَمِلْ

وَاحْلَمْ وَدَارِ وَكَافِ وَابْذُلْ وَاشْجِعِ

Al-^cAkhtal

إِذَا وَضَعْتَ أَبَاكَ فِي مِيزَانِهِمْ فَفَزَتْ حَدِيدُهُ إِلَيْكَ فَشَلَا

Anonymous

قَارُورَةٌ ذَاتُ مِسْكِ عِنْدَ ذِي لَطْفٍ مِنَ الدَّنَانِيرِ كَالْوَهَا بِمِثْقَالِ

Al-Huṭay^cah

تَحْتَنُّ عَلَيَّ هَذَاكَ الْمَلِيكَ فَإِنَّ لِكُلِّ مَقَامٍ مَقَالًا

Abu Al-Najm ibn Qudāmah

الْحَمْدُ لِلَّهِ الْعَلِيِّ الْأَجَلِّ أَنْتَ مَلِيكَ النَّاسِ رَبًّا فَاقْبَلِ

Al-Mutanabbi

أَقْلُ أَنْلِ أَقْطَعِ احْمَلْ عَلَّ سَلِّ أَعِدْ

زِدْ هَشَّ بَشَّ تَفْضَلْ أَدِنْ سُرَّ صِلْ

Imri'u al-Qays

أَفَادَ وَجَادَ وَسَادَ وَزَادَ وَدَادَ وَقَادَ وَعَادَ وَأَفْضَلَ

Burj ibn Musheir Al-Tā'i

خَرَجْنَا مِنَ النَّعْبَيْنِ لَا حَيَّ مِثْلَنَا بِأَيْتِنَا نُزَجِي اللَّفَّاحَ الْمَطَافِلَا

Jamīl

أَلَا لَا أَرَى إِنْ تَيْنِ أَحْسَنَ شِيمَةً

عَلَى حَدَثَانِ الدَّهْرِ مَنِيٍّ وَمِنْ جَمَلٍ

Abu Al-Najm

صَفْرَاءُ قَدْ كَادَتْ وَلَمَّا تَفْعَلْ كَأَنَّهَا فِي الْأَفْقِ عَيْنُ الْأُخُولِ

Hassān ibn Thābit

وَلَوْ أَنَّ جَدًّا أَخْلَدَ الدَّهْرَ وَاحِدًا

مِنَ النَّاسِ أَبْقَى بَحْدَهُ الدَّهْرَ مُطْعِمًا

Anonymous

كَمْ نِعْمَةٍ كَانَتْ لَكُمْ كَمْ كَمْ وَكَمْ كَانَتْ وَكَمْ

Anonymous

فَأَصْبَحَتْ بَعْدَ خَطِّ بَهْجَتِهَا كَأَنَّ فُقْرًا رُسُومَهَا قَلَمًا

Zuhayr ibn Abi Sulmā

أَفِي كُلِّ أَسْوَاقِ الْعِرَاقِ إِتَاوَةٌ

وَمَا كُلُّ مَا بَاعَ امْرُؤٌ مَكْسُ (بِحَسَنِ) دِرْهَمٍ

أَلَا تَسْتَجِي مِنَّا مُلُوكٌ وَتَتَّقِي

مَحَارِمَنَا لَا تَتَّقِي الدَّمَ بِالدَّمِ

Dhū Al-Rummah

أَعَنْ تَرَسَّمَتْ مِنْ خَرْقَاءَ مَنْزِلَةً مَاءَ الصَّبَابَةِ مِنْ عَيْنَيْكَ مَسْجُومٌ؟

Hassān ibn Thābit

ضَحُّوْا بِأَشْمَطِ عُنْوَانِ السُّجُودِ بِهِ يُقَطِّعُ اللَّيْلَ تَسْبِيحًا وَقُرْآنًا

Al-^cAkhtal

إِذَا وَضَعْتَ أَبَاكَ فِي مِيزَانِهِمْ رَجَحُوا وَشَالَ أَبُوكَ فِي الْمِيزَانِ

Anonymous

قَوْمٌ هُمْ قَتَلُوا ابْنَ هِنْدٍ غُنُوءَةً وَهُمْ قَسَطُوا عَلَى التُّعْمَانِ

Al-Mutanabbi

خَلَّتِ الْبِلَادُ مِنَ الْعُرَالَةِ لَيْلَهَا فَأَعَاضَهَاكَ اللَّهُ كَيْ لَا تَحْزَنَا

Al-^cAeshā

وَإِنْ يُسْتَضَافُوا إِلَى حُكْمِهِ يُضَافُوا إِلَى عَادِلٍ قَدْ وَزَنَ

(يُضَافُوا إِلَى هَادِيٍّ قَدْ رَزَنَ)

Mālik Al-Fazāri

وَحَدِيثُ أَلَدُ هُوَ مِمَّا يَنْعَتُ النَّاعِتُونَ يُوزَنُ وَزْنَا

ʿabīd ibn Al-^cAbraṣ Al-^cAsadi

هَلَا سَأَلْتُ جُمُوعَ كِنْدَةَ يَوْمَ وَلَوْ أَيْنَ أَيْنَا؟

أَيَّامَ نَضْرِبُ هَامَهُمْ بِيَوَاتِرٍ حَتَّى انْحَنَيْنَا

ʿAmr ibn Kulthūm.

ذِرَاعِي عَيْطِلٌ أَدْمَاءُ بَكْرِ هِجَانِ اللَّوْنِ لَمْ تَقْرَأْ جَنِينَا

(ذِرَاعِي بَكْرَةٍ إِذْ مَاءُ بَكْرِ)

Al-Farazdaq

وَمَا مِثْلُهُ فِي النَّاسِ إِلَّا مَمْلُكًا أَبُو أُمِّهِ حَتَّى أَبُوهُ يُقَارِبُهُ

(وَأَصْبَحَ مَا فِي النَّاسِ إِلَّا مَمْلُكًا)

Al-Farazdaq

إِلَى مَلِكٍ مَا أُمُّهُ مِنْ مُحَارِبٍ أَبُوهُ وَلَا كَانَتْ كُتَيْبٌ تُصَاهِرُهُ

وَلَكِنْ أَبُوهَا مِنْ رَوَاحَةٍ تَرْتَقِي بِأَيَّامِهِ فَيَسُّ عَلَى مَنْ تُفَاحِرُهُ

Anonymous

قَدْ كُنْتُ قَبْلَ لِقَائِكُمْ ذَا قُوَّةٍ عِنْدِي لِكُلِّ مُحَاصِمٍ مِيزَانُهُ

Al-Harīri

وَعَافَ عَافِيِ الْعُرْفِ عِرْفَانُهُ

The first Part of the Line

Muhalhal

عَلَى أَنْ لَيْسَ عَدْلًا مِنْ كُتَيْبٍ

Al-Hārith ibn ʿabbād

قَرَّبًا مَرِيطَ النَّعَامَةِ مَنِي

BIBLIOGRAPHY (ARABIC)

ثبته المراجع العربية

القرآن الكريم.

الأبياري، إبراهيم (تحقيق ودراسة). إعراب القرآن المنسوب إلى الزجاج. المؤسسة المصرية العامة للتأليف والترجمة والطباعة والنشر، القاهرة. 1963.
ابن الأثير، مجد الدين أبي السعادات المبارك بن محمد بن محمد الجزري. النهاية في غريب الحديث والأثر: وبالهامش كتاب مفردات الراغب الأصفهاني في غريب القرآن. المطبعة الخيرية، القاهرة. 1322 هجرية.
أمين، بكرى شيخ. التعبير الفني في القرآن. دار الشروق، القاهرة، ط2. 1976.

المحمود، عمر بن عبد العزيز. بلاغة البديع في جزء عم. عمادة البحث العلمي، جامعة الإمام محمد بن سعود الإسلامية، الرياض، ط1. 2012.
الباقلاني، أبو بكر محمد بن الطيب. إعجاز القرآن.

(a) شرح وتعليق محمد عبد المنعم خفاجي. دار الجيل، بيروت، ط1. 1991.

(b) تحقيق السيد أحمد صخر. (سلسلة ذخائر العرب رقم 12). دار المعارف، مصر. بدون تاريخ.

(c) شرح وتعليق محمد عبد المنعم خفاجي. مكتبة ومطبعة محمد علي صبيح وأولاده، مصر، ط1. 1951.

بدون اسم. ديوان امرئ القيس. دار صادر-دار بيروت. 1958.

ديوان عبيد بن الأبرص. دار صادر-دار بيروت. 1958.

البرقوقى، عبد الرحمن. شرح ديوان المتنبي. مطبعة الاستقامة، القاهرة، ط2.
1938.

البيستانى، كرم. البيان. دار صادر- دار بيروت، ط2. 1956.
(تحقيق وشرح). ديوان طرفة بن العبد. مكتبة صادر، بيروت. 1953.
(شرح وتحقيق). ديوان النابغة الذبياني. مكتبة صادر، بيروت. 1953.
البيستانى، المعلم بطرس (شرح وتحقيق). ديوان جميل بثينة. مكتبة صادر، بيروت.
1953.

محيط المحيط: أى قاموس مطول للغة العربية. اسطنبول. 1867.
البيستانى اللبناى، عبد الله. فاكهة البستان: وهو معجم لغوى لطلبة المدارس
مختصر من البستان. المطبعة الأميركية، بيروت. 1930.
البيضاوى، أبو سعيد عبد الله بن عمر بن محمد الشيرازى. أنوار التنزيل وأسرار
التأويل. مطبعة مصطفى البابى الحلبي بمصر. 1344 هجرية.
الجاحظ، أبو عثمان عمرو بن بحر. البيان والتبيين. تحقيق وشرح عبد السلام
محمد هارون. مطبعة لجنة التأليف والترجمة والنشر، القاهرة. 1949.
الجارم، على. أمين مصطفى. البلاغة الواضحة: البيان والمعاني والبديع. مطبعة
المعارف ومكبتها بمصر، ط4. 1936.
جاير، ر (جمعة). الصبح المنير فى شعر أبى بصير: ميمون بن قيس بن
جندل: الأعشى والأعشى الآخرى مع شرح أبى العباس ثعلب. طبع
أذلف هلز هوسن، بيانة. 1927.
الجرجاني، عبد القاهر. المدخل فى دلائل الإعجاز. صحح أصله الشيخ محمد عبده
و الشيخ محمد محمود التركزى الشنقيطى. دار المنار، القاهرة.
أسرار البلاغة فى علم البيان. صححه محمد رشيد رضا. دار المنار،
القاهرة، ط4. 1947.
الجزائرى، أبو بكر. هذا الحبيب محمد صلى الله عليه وسلم يامحب. دار
الشروق، ط2. 1989.

جفرى، ارثر (وقف على التصحيح والطبع). مقدمتان فى علوم القرآن: وهما مقدمة كتاب المبانى ومقدمة ابن عطية. مكتبة الخانجي، القاهرة.

1954.

جماعة من العلماء. ديوان الأعشى وهو أعشى قيس الملقب بالأعشى الأكبر من شعراء الجاهلية المجيدين. مطبعة التقدم بمصر. بدون تاريخ. جمال، أحمد محمد. القرآن: كتاب أحكمت آياته "2". (سلسلة دعوة الحق، العدد 31). رابطة العالم الإسلامى، مكة، 1404 هجرية.

ابن جنى، أبى الفتح عثمان. الخصائص. مطبعة الهلال، القاهرة. 1913. الجواليقي، أبى منصور موهوب بن أحمد بن محمد بن الخضر. المعرب من الكلام الأعجمى على حروف المعجم. تحقيق وشرح احمد محمد شاكرو. دار الكتب المصرية، القاهرة، ط1. 1361 هجرية.

الجوهري، إسماعيل بن حماد. الصحاح: تاج اللغة وصحاح العربية. تحقيق أحمد عبد الغفور عطا. دار الكتاب العربى، مصر. 1956 جوهرى، طنطاوى. الجواهر فى تفسير القرآن الكريم: المشتمل على عجائب بدائع المكونات وغرائب الآيات الباهرات. مطبعة البابى الحلبي وأولاده بمصر، ط2. 1350 هجرية.

حجازى، محمد محمود. التفسير الواضح. دار الكتاب العربى، مصر. 1952. الحداد، الأستاذ. القرآن والكتاب. سلسلة دروس قرآنية. الحسنى، فيض الله. فتح الرحمن لطالب آيات القرآن. المطبعة الأهلية، بيروت، 1322 هجرية.

حسين، محمد بهاء الدين. ترجمة القرآن الكريم: حكمها وآراء العلماء فيها. بحث منشور بمجلة دراسات، الجامعة الإسلامية العالمية شيتاغونغ، المجلد 3، ص 133-144. بنغلاديش، ديسمبر 2006.

حسين، مساعد محمد (شرح وتعليق). ديوان الأعشى الكبير ميمون بن قيس. مكتبة الآداب، الجماميز، القاهرة. ط2 1950.

- الحسينى الواسطى الزبيدى الحنفى، محب الدين أبو الفيض السيد محمد. تاج العروس من جواهر القاموس. تحقيق عبد الستار أحمد فراج. سلسلة التراث العربى بالكويت. مطبعة حكومة الكويت. 1965.
- شرح القاموس المسمى تاج العروس من جواهر القاموس. المطبعة الخيرية، الجمالية بمصر. 1306 هجرية.
- ابن حنبل، أحمد بن محمد. المسند. شرحه وصنع فهارسه أحمد محمد شاکر. دار المعارف بمصر، ط3. 1949.
- ابن حيان، أنير الدين أبى عبد الله محمد بن يوسف بن على بن يوسف. التفسير الكبير المسمى بالبحر المحيط. مطبعة السعادة بمصر، ط1. 1328 هجرية.
- ابن خالويه، أبى عبد الله الحسين بن أحمد. إعراب ثلاثين سورة من القرآن الكريم. مطبعة دار الكتب المصرية، القاهرة. 1941.
- ليس فى كلام العرب. (تصحيح وضبط وشرح) أحمد بن الأمين الشنقيطى. مطبعة السعادة، القاهرة، ط1. 1327 هجرية.
- خان، محمد محسن. الهلالى، محمد تقى الدين. تفسير معانى القرآن الكريم باللغة الانجليزية: مقتبس من تفسير الطبرى والقرطبى وابن كثير وصحيح البخارى. مكتبة دار السلام، الرياض، ط4. 1994.
- خرما، نايف. طبعة الترجمة. البيان العدد 219. رابطة الأدباء، الكويت. يونيو 1984.
- ابن خلدون. (المقدمة) كتاب العبر وديوان المبتدأ والخبر فى أيام العرب والعجم والبربر ومن عاصرهم من ذوى السلطان الأكبر. المطبعة الأدبية، بيروت، ط2. 1886.
- الدانى، أبو عمرو عثمان بن سعيد. المحكم فى نقط المصاحف. تحقيق عزة حسن. مطبوعات مديرية إحياء التراث القديم، دمشق. 1960.

دروزة، محمد عزة. التفسير الحديث: السور مرتبة حسب النزول. دار إحياء الكتب العربية، القاهرة. 1962.

ابن دريد، أبو بكر محمد بن الحسن. جمهرة اللغة. دار المعارف، حيدر آباد الدكن، ط1. 1344 هجرية.

الرازي، فخر الدين. مفاتيح الغيب: المشتهر بالتفسير الكبير، وبهامشه تفسير العلامة أبو السعود. المطبعة الحسينية المصرية، القاهرة. 1327 هجرية.

رضا، محمد رشيد. تفسير القرآن الحكيم المشتهر باسم تفسير المنار. دار المنار، القاهرة، ط2. 1947.

الرافعي، مصطفى صادق. تاريخ آداب العرب. دار الكتاب العربي، بيروت، ط2. 1974.

الزركشي، بدر الدين محمد بن عبد الله. البرهان في علوم القرآن. خرج أحاديثه وقدم له وعلق عليه مصطفى عبد القادر عطا. دار الكتب العلمية، بيروت، ط1. 1988.

المنثور في القواعد. حققه تيسير فائق أحمد محمود، وراجعه عبد الستار أبو غدة. طبعة وزارة الأوقاف والشؤون الإسلامية سلسلة أعمال موسوعية مساعدة: تحقيق التراث الفقهي (1). الكويت، مصور عن ط1 1982.

كذا من موقع

<http://www.islamicbook.ws/asol/almnthwr-fi-alqwaad 001.html>

الزمخشري، محمود بن عمر. الكشاف عن حقائق غوامض التنزيل وعيون الأقاويل في وجوه التأويل. رتبته وضيطة وصححه مصطفى حسين أحمد. دار الكتاب العربي، بيروت، ط3. 1987.

ويذيله أربعة كتب:

الأول: الانتصاف: للإمام أحمد بن منير الاسكندري.

الثاني: الكافي الشاف في تخريج أحاديث الكشاف: للحافظ ابن حجر العسقلاني.

الثالث: حاشية الشيخ محمد عليان المرزوقي على تفسير الكشاف.

الرابع: مشاهد الإنصاف على شواهد الكشاف للشيخ محمد عليان.

- أساس البلاغة. تحقيق عبد الرحيم محمود. دار الكتب المصرية. 1953.
- سابا، عيسى (تحقيق وشرح). شعر الحطيئة. مكتبة صادر، بيروت. 1951.
- السجستاني، أبو بكر محمد بن عزيز. غريب القرآن. صححه السيد محمد بدر الدين العسائي. مطبعة السعادة، القاهرة، ط1. 1325 هجرية.
- ابن سعد. الطبقات الكبرى. لجنة نشر الثقافة الإسلامية، القاهرة. 1358 هجرية.
- سلام، محمد زغلول. أثر القرآن في تطور النقد العربي إلى آخر القرن الرابع الهجري. دار المعارف بمصر. ط2. 1962.
- سلطان، منير. الفصل والوصل في القرآن الكريم. دار المعارف، القاهرة. 1983.
- السندوبي، حسن. شرح ديوان امرئ القيس ومعه أخبار المراقسة وأشعارهم في الجاهلية وصدر الإسلام. مطبعة الاستقامة، القاهرة. 1939.
- السيوطي، جلال الدين عبد الرحمن. الإتقان في علوم القرآن. تحقيق محمد أبو الفضل إبراهيم. مكتبة دار التراث، 1967.
- شرح عقود الجمان في علم المعاني والبيان، وبهامشه حلية اللب المصون على الجوهر المكنون للشيخ أحمد الدمنهوري. مطبعة مصطفى البابي الحلبي وأولاده بمصر. 1939.
- المزهر في علوم اللغة وأنواعها. مطبعة محمد علي صبيح وأولاده، مصر. بدون تاريخ.
- الشافعي، أبو عبد الله محمد بن إدريس. الرسالة. المطبعة العلمية، القاهرة، ط1. 1312 هجرية.
- شاکر، أحمد محمد. عبد السلام محمد هارون (تحقيق وشرح). المفضليات. سلسلة ديوان العرب: مجموعات من الشعر. دار المعارف بمصر. 1952.
- ابن الشجري، ضياء الدين أبي السعادات هبة الله بن علي بن حمزة. الأمالي الشجرية. مطبعة دائرة المعارف العثمانية، حيدر آباد الدكن. 1349 هجرية.
- الشرطوني اللبناني، أقرب الموارد في فصح العربية والشوارد. مطبعة مرسلی اليسوعية، بيروت. 1889.

- الشعراوي، محمد متولى. معجزة القرآن. كتاب اليوم، العدد 187. 1981. شلتوت، محمود. تفسير القرآن الكريم: الأجزاء العشرة الأخيرة. دار الشروق، القاهرة، ط11. 1988.
- أبو شهبة، محمد بن محمد. المدخل لدراسة القرآن الكريم. مكتبة السنة، القاهرة، ط1 الجديدة. 1992.
- شودرى، محمد أكرم. هل يقع الترادف اللغوى فى القرآن الكريم. المكتبة الفيصلية، مكة المكرمة. 1985.
- الصابونى، محمد على (اختصار وتحقيق). مختصر تفسير ابن كثير. دار القرآن الكريم، المانيا الغربية، ط2. 1396 هجرية.
- الصاوى، عبد الله إسماعيل (عنى بجمعه وطبعه والتعليق عليه). شرح ديوان الفرزدق. مطبعة الصاوى، القاهرة، ط1. 1936.
- صخر ليرامج الحاسب. موسوعة الحديث الشريف. الإصدار 2، 1. هليوبوليس. 1997-1995.
- الصقال، لطفى. الخطيب، درية (تحقيق). ديوان طرفة بن العبد: شرح الأعلم الشنتمرى. مطبوعات مجمع اللغة العربية، دمشق. 1975.
- الضبي، المفضل. الأمثال. مطبعة الجوائب، قسطنطينية، ط1. 1300 هجرية.
- الطباع، عبد الله أنيس. الحطيئة: شاعر من عبقر. مكتبة المعارف، بيروت. 1956.
- الطبرسى، أبو على الفضل بن الحسن. مجمع البيان فى تفسير القرآن. دار مكتبة الحياة، بيروت، 1961.
- الطبرى، أبو جعفر محمد بن جرير. جامع البيان فى تفسير القرآن، وبهامشه تفسير غرائب القرآن ورغائب الفرقان للعلامة نظام الدين بن محمد النيسابورى. المطبعة الكبرى الأميرية، بولاق. 1323 هجرية.

ابن عباس، عبد الله. تنوير الاقتباس من تفسير عبد الله بن عباس. بخط يد شيخ محمود بن شيخ آدم مقدم الكوكنى. مطبعة القاضى فتح محمد والقاضى عبد الكريم. 1132 هجرية.

عبد الباقي، محمد فؤاد. المعجم المفهرس لألفاظ القرآن الكريم. دار الريان للتراث، القاهرة، 1987.

عبد التواب، رمضان. فصول فى فقه اللغة العربية. مكتبة الخانجى، القاهرة، ط2. 1983.

عبد الجبار بن أحمد، عماد الدين أبى الحسن. تنزيه القرآن عن المطاعن. المطبعة الجمالية بمصر. 1329 هجرية.

عبد العال، محمد قطب. من جماليات التصوير فى القرآن الكريم. (سلسلة دعوة الحق، العدد 99). رابطة العالم الإسلامى، مكة، 1410 هجرية. عبد العزيز، زينب. ترجمات القرآن: إلى أين؟ وجهان لجاك بيرك.

العسقلانى، شهاب الدين أبى الفضل أحمد بن على بن محمد بن محمد بن على الكنانى (المعروف بابن حجر). فتح البارى بشرح صحيح الإمام أبى عبد الله محمد بن اسماعيل البخارى. دار الريان للتراث، القاهرة، ط1. 1986.

الإصابة فى تمييز الصحابة. المطبعة الشرفية. 1907.

العسكرى، أبو هلال الحسن بن عبد الله بن سهل. الصناعتين: الكتابة والشعر. تحقيق على محمد البجاوى ومحمد أبو الفضل إبراهيم. دار إحياء الكتب العربية، القاهرة، ط1. 1952.

الفروق فى اللغة. الدار العربية للكتاب، ط2. 1983.

الفروق اللغوية. (نفس المرجع السابق). مكتبة القدسى، القاهرة. 1353 هجرية.

العقاد، عباس محمود. أشتات مجتمعات فى اللغة والأدب. دار المعارف، القاهرة. بدون تاريخ.

- العكبري. شرح التبيان على ديوان أبي الطيب أحمد بن الحسين المتنبي.
بدون بيانات أخرى.
- علماء الحملة الفرنسية. وصف مصر: الموازين والنقود. الجزء السادس. ترجمة
زهير الشايب. دار الشايب للنشر، القاهرة. 1980.
- ابن علي، أبي الطيب عبد الواحد. الأضداد في كلام العرب. تحقيق عزة حسن.
المجمع العلمي العربي، دمشق. 1963.
- عمر، أحمد مختار. لغة القرآن: دراسة توثيقية فنية. مؤسسة الكويت للتقدم
العلمي: مشروع قاموس القرآن، الكويت، ط1. 1993.
- عياد، جمال الدين. بحوث في تفسير القرآن. مطبعة المعرفة، القاهرة. 1968.
- الغزالي، أبو حامد. القسطاس المستقيم. صححه مصطفى القباني الدمشقي. مطبعة
الترقي، مصر، ط1. 1900.
- ابن فارس، أبي الحسين أحمد. الصحابي في فقه اللغة وسنن العرب في كلامها.
المكتبة السلفية، القاهرة. 1910.
- معجم مقاييس اللغة. تحقيق وضبط عبد السلام محمد هارون. دار إحياء
الكتب العربية، القاهرة، ط1. 1366.
- أبو الفتح الأبيهي، شهاب الدين محمد بن أحمد. المستطرف في كل فن
مستطرف. طبع عبد الحميد أحمد حنفي، القاهرة. 1954.
- الفرآء، أبي زكريا يحيى بن زياد. معاني القرآن. تحقيق أحمد يوسف نجاتي ومحمد
علي النجار. مطبعة دار الكتب المصرية، القاهرة. 1955.
- الفيروزبادي، مجد الدين بن يعقوب. القاموس المحيط. المطبعة الحسينية، الأزهر،
القاهرة، ط1. 1320 هجرية.
- القاسمي، محمد جمال الدين. تفسير القاسمي المسمى محاسن التأويل. دار
إحياء الكتب العربية، القاهرة، ط1. 1957.
- القالبي، أبو علي إسماعيل بن القاسم. الأمالي. دار الكتب المصرية، القاهرة، ط2.
1926.

- ابن قتيبة، أبي محمد عبد الله بن مسلم. تأويل مشكل القرآن. بشرح السيد أحمد صقر. دار إحياء الكتب العربية، القاهرة. 1954.
- تفسير غريب القرآن. تحقيق السيد أحمد صقر. دار إحياء الكتب العربية، القاهرة. 1958.
- الشعر والشعراء. تحقيق أحمد محمد شاكر. دار إحياء الكتب العربية، القاهرة. 1364 هجرية.
- القرطبي، شمس الدين أبي عبد الله محمد بن أحمد بن أبي بكر بن فرح الأنصاري. الجامع لأحكام القرآن. دار الكتب المصرية، القاهرة، ط1. 1933.
- التذكرة في أحوال الموتى وأمور الآخرة. دار الكتب العلمية، بيروت، ط2. 1987.
- قطب، سيد. التصوير الفني في القرآن. دار المعارف، القاهرة. 1966.
- في ظلال القرآن. دار الشروق، القاهرة، ط11. 1985.
- ابن القوطية. كتاب الأفعال. إشراف وتوجيه السيد علي راتب، تحقيق علي فودة. مطبعة مصر، ط1. 1952.
- كانو، محمد محمود. ترجمة القرآن الكريم بين الحظر والإباحة. سلسلة جمعية دار البر للرسائل الجامعية (6). جمعية دار البر. الإمارات، دبي، 2011.
- ابن كثير الدمشقي، أبو الفداء إسماعيل. تفسير القرآن العظيم. كتب هوامشه وضبطه حسين بن إبراهيم زهران. دار الكتب العلمية، بيروت. 1988.
- السيرة النبوية في التاريخ. دار الوحي المحمدي، القاهرة، بدون تاريخ.
- فضائل القرآن. صححه السيد محمد رشيد رضا. مطبعة المنار، القاهرة، ط1. 1348 هجرية.
- كشك، عبد الحميد. في رحاب التفسير. المكتب المصري الحديث، ط1. 1987.
- لاشين، عبد الفتاح. من أسرار التعبير في القرآن - صفاء الكلمة. دار المريخ، الرياض. 1983.

- مجمع اللغة العربية. معجم ألفاظ القرآن الكريم. المطبعة الأميرية، القاهرة، 1953.
- المعجم الوسيط. مطبعة مصر. 1960.
- محيسن، محمد سالم. تاريخ القرآن الكريم. (سلسلة دعوة الحق، العدد 15).
رابطة العالم الإسلامي، مكة، ط2. 1402 هجرية.
- المدني، محمد. الإتحافات السننية في الأحاديث القدسية. دار المعارف
العثمانية، حيدر آباد، ط2. 1939.
- المراغي، أحمد مصطفى. علوم البلاغة: البيان والمعاني والبديع. راجعه وأشرف
على تصحيحه أبو الوفا مصطفى المراغي. المكتبة العربية ومطبعتها، القاهرة، ط3.
1962.
- تفسير المراغي. شركة مكتبة ومطبعة البابي الحلبي وأولاده بمصر، ط1.
1946.
- المراغي، محمد مصطفى. بحث في ترجمة القرآن الكريم. مطبعة الرغائب، مصر.
1936.
- المرتضى، علي بن الحسين الموسوي العلوي. أمالي المرتضى: غرر الفوائد
ودرر القلائد. تحقيق محمد أبو الفضل إبراهيم. دار إحياء الكتب العربية،
ط1. 1954.
- معلوف، لويس. المنجد: معجم مدرسي للغة العربية. المطبعة الكاثوليكية، ط12.
1951.
- مهنا، أحمد إبراهيم. دراسة حول ترجمة القرآن الكريم. دار الشعب، القاهرة.
1978.
- الملا، عبد المجيد (شرحه وحققه وعلق عليه). شرح ديوان العباس بن الأحنف:
شاعر الحب والفتنة والجمال. المكتبة العربية، بغداد. 1947.
- ابن منظور الإفريقي المصري، أبو الفضل جمال الدين محمد بن مكرم. لسان العرب.
دار صادر- دار بيروت. 1955.
- ناصر، مصطفى. نظرية المعنى في النقد العربي. دار القلم، القاهرة. 1965.

نصار، حسين (تحقيق وشرح). ديوان جميل: شعر الحب العذرى. مكتبة مصر.
1958.

النويرى، شهاب الدين أحمد بن عبد الوهاب. نهاية الأرب فى فنون الأدب. السفر
18. مطبعة دار الكتب المصرية، القاهرة، ط1. 1955.

الهدليين. شعراء الهدليين. دار المعارف المصرية. 1369 هجرية.
ابن هشام، أبو محمد عبد الملك. سيرة النبى. راجع أصولها محمد محى الدين عبد
الحميد. المكتبة التجارية الكبرى، القاهرة. 1937.

يموت، بشير (جمعه وصنعه). ديوان جميل بثينة. المطبعة الوطنية، بيروت. 1934.

Bibliography (ENGLISH)

- ABDEL-HALEEM, M. A. S., 'Grammatical Shifts for Rhetorical Purposes: Itifat and Related Features in the Qur'an' in *Bulletin of School of Oriental Studies* Volume LV, part 3, 1992.
Understanding The Qur'an (1996).
- ABU DEEB, KAMAL, *Al-Jurjani's Theory of Poetic Imagery* in 'Approaches to Arabic Literature', (Warminster: Aris & Phillips, 1979).
- ABU SHAHBA, M. M., *Collection of the Kuran, and Refutation of Suspicions Cast Upon it*, in 'The Seventh Conference of the Academy of Islamic Research, 1972', (Cairo: General Organisation for Government Printing Office, 1973).
- ALI, ABDULLAH YUSUF, *The Meaning of The Holy Qur'an: Revised Translation And Commentary*, (Maryland: Amana Corporation, 1992).
- ALI, AHMED, *Word Repetition in the Qur'an: Translating Form or Meaning?* in (King Saud University Journal: Language and Translation 19, no. 1, pp. 17-34, 2006).
- ALI, MAULVI MUHAMMAD, *The Holy Qur'an: Containing the Arabic Text with English Translation and Commentary* Second Edition (Lahore, Punjab, India: Ahmadiyya Anjuman-I-Ishaat-I-Islam, 1920).
- Al-LAITHY, AHMED. *What Everyone Should Know About The Qur'an* (Antwerp, Garant, 2005).
- ARBERRY, ARTHUR J., *The Koran Interpreted* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991).
Aspects of Islamic Civilization: As Depicted in the Original Texts (London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd, 1964).
- ASAD, MUHAMMAD, *The Message of the Qur'an* (Gibraltar: Dar Al-Andalus, 1980).
- AS-SAID, LABIB, *The Recited Qur'an: A History of the First Recorded Version*, Bernard Weiss, M. A. Ruaf & Morroe Berger (trans. & adapted) (New Jersey: The Darwin Press, 1975).

- BAAGIL, H. M., *Christian-Muslim Dialogue* (Birmingham: Islamic Propagation Centre International, n.d).
- BAKER, MONA, *In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation* (London: Routledge, 1992).
- BASSNETT, SUSAN, *Translation Studies* (London: Routledge, 1996).
- BASSNETT, SUSAN, and LEFEVERE, ANDR , (eds.), *Translation History and Culture* (London: Pinter, 1990).
- BEAUGRANDE, ROBERT DE, *Text, Discourse and Process* (London: Longman, 1980).
- BEAUGRANDE, ROBERT DE, *Factors in a Theory of Poetic Translating* (Amsterdam and Assen: Van Gorcum, 1978).
- BEESTON, A. F. L. (trans.), *Baidawi's Commentary on Surah 12 of the Qur'an: Text, Accompanied by an Interpretative Rendering and Notes* (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1978).
- BELL, RICHARD, *The Qur'an: Translated with a Critical Re-arrangement of the Surahs* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1937).
- BELL, WILLIAM Y. (trans.), *The Mutawakkili of As-Suyuti* (Cairo: Nile Mission Press, 1924).
- BELLOC, HILAIRE, *On Translation* (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1931).
- BISHOP, ERIC F. F. & KADDAL, MOHAMED (trans.), '*The Light of Inspiration and Secret of Interpretation*': *Being a Translation of the Chapter of Joseph (Surat Yusuf) With the Commentary of Nasir Id-Din Al-Baidawi* (Glasgow: Jackson, Son & Company, 1957).
- BLY, ROBERT, *The Eight Stages of Translation* (Boston: Rowan Tree Press, 1983).
- BROWN, LESLEY (ed.), *The New Shorter Oxford English Dictionary on Historical Principles* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993).
- BURTON, JOHN, *The Collection of The Qur'an* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977).
- CAMBRIDGE, *The Cambridge History of Arabic Literature: Arabic Literature to the end of the Umayyad Period* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983).
- CATFORD, J. C., *A Linguistic Theory of Translation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1915).

- CHAUDHARY, MOHAMMAD AKRAM, *al-Furuq fi al-Lughah, by Abu Hilal al-ʿaskari for Distinction of Meaning Between Assumed Synonyms in Arabic* Ph.D Thesis no. 7317, Faculty of Arts, Glasgow University, 1985.
- CHUKOVSKY, K., *A High Art: The Art of Translation*, L. G. Leighton (trans.) (Knoxville: University of Tennessee, 1984).
- CRUSE, D. A., *Lexical Semantics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986).
- DAYLEWIS, C., *On Translating Poetry* (Abingdon-on-Thames: Abbey Press, 1970).
- DEEDAT, AHMED, *The Choice: Islam and Christianity* 8th Print (Doha: The Qatar Centre for the Preservation of Islam, 1993).
- DELISLE, JEAN, *Translation: An Interpretative Approach*, Patricia Logan and Monica Creery, (trans.) (Ottawa and London: University of Ottawa Press, 1988).
- DENFFER, AHMED VON, *Ulum Al-Qur'an, An Introduction to the Science of the Qur'an* (Leicester: The Islamic Foundation, 1989).
- DI, JIN and NIDA, E., *On Translation* (Beijing: China Translation and Publishing Corporation, 1984).
- DICKINS, JAMES, Hervey SANDOR and HIGGINS IAN, *Thinking Arabic Translation: A course in translation method: Arabic to English* (Routledge: London, 2002).
- DICKINS, JAMES and WATSON J. C.E., *Standard Arabic: An Advanced Course* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, forthcoming).
- EL-SAYED, ABDEL-SATTAR, *The Miraculous Character of the Koran and Development of its Miraculous Aspects with the Development of Cultures*, in 'The Seventh Conference of the Academy of Islamic Research, 1972', (Cairo: General Organisation for Government Printing Office, 1973).
- FRAWLEY, WILLIAM, (ed.), *Translation: Literary, Linguistic and Philosophical Perspectives* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1984).
- GÄTJE, HELMUT, *The Qur'an and its Exegesis: Selected texts with Classical and Modern Muslim Interpretations*, Alford T. Welch (trans. & eds.) (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1976).

- GENTZLER, EDWIN, *Contemporary Translation Theories* First Edition (London, New York: Routledge, 1993).
- GRAHAM, J. (ed.), *Difference in Translation* (Ithaca : Cornell University Press, 1985)
- GUENTHNER, F. and GUENTHNER-REUTTER, M. (eds.), *Meaning and Translation. Philosophical and Linguistic Approaches* (London: Duckworth, 1978).
- HAAS, W., 'The Theory of Translation', in G. R. H. Parkinson. *The Theory of Meaning* (London: Oxford University Press, 1968).
- HATIM, BASIL *Arabic Rhetoric: The Pragmatics of Deviation from Linguistic Norm* (Muenchen: Lincom, 2010).
- HAWTING, G. R. and SHAREEF, ABDUL-KADER A. (eds.), *Approaches to the Qur'an* (London: 1993
- HERMANS, THEO (ed.), 'Literary Translation and Literary System', *New Comparison*, 1, 1986.
- HERVEY, SANDOR and HIGGINS, IAN, *Thinking Translation: A Course in Translation Method: French to English* (London: Routledge, 1992).
- HIRSCHFELD, HARTWIG, *New Researches into the Composition and Exegesis of the Qoran* in 'Asiatic Monographs, Vol. III', (London: Royal Asiatic Society, 1902).
- HOLMES, CLIVE, *Modern Arabic: Structures, Functions and Varieties* (London & New York: Longman, 1995).
- HOLMES, JAMES, *Translated Papers on Literary Translation and Translation Studies* (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1988).
- HOLMES, JAMES (ed.), *The Nature of Translation : Essays on the Theory and Practice of Literary Translation* (The Hague: Mouton, 1970).
- HOLMES, J., LAMBERT, J. and LEFEVERE, A. (ed.), *Literature and Translation* (Louvain: ACCO, 1978).
- HORNBY, A. S. with COWIE A. P. and GIMSON, A. C., *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1984).
- HOUSE, J., *A Model for Translation Quality Assessment* (Tübingen: Narr, 1977).
- ILYAS, ASIM ISMAIL, *Theories of Translation: Critical Issues and Practical Implications* (Mosul: University of Mosul, 1989).

- IZUTSU, TOSHIHIKO, *The Structure of the Ethical Terms in the Koran: A Study in Semantics* First Edition (Tokyo: The Keio Institute Of Philological Studies, 1959).
- JAKOBSON, R., 'On Linguistic Aspects of Translation', in *On Translation*, R. A. Brower (ed.) (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1967).
- JANSEN, J. J., *The Interpretations of The Koran in Modern Egypt* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1974).
- JASPER, DAVID (ed.), *Translating Religious Texts: Translation, Transgression and Interpretation* (St. Martin's Press, 1993).
- JEFFERY, ARTHUR (ed.), *A Reader On Islam: Passages From Standard Arabic Writings Illustrative of the Beliefs and Practices of Muslims* (The Hague: Mouton & Co. Publishers, 1962).
- The Foreign Vocabulary of the Qur'an* (Baroda: Oriental Institute, 1938).
- JOHNSTONE, BARBARA, *Repetition in Arabic Discourse, Paradigms, Syntagms, and the Ecology of Language* (Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1991).
- AL-JUBOURI, ADNAN J. R., 'The Role of Repetition in Arabic Argumentative Discourse', in *English for Specific Purposes in the Arab World* Swales J., and Mustafa H., (eds.), (Language Studies, Aston University, 1984).
- KHAN, WAHIDUDDIN, *The Quran* (New Delhi: Goodword Books, 2009).
- KEMPSON, RUTH M., *Semantic Theory* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977).
- IBN KHALDUN, *The Muqaddimah: An Introduction to History*, Second Printing, Rosenhall, Fanz (trans.) and Dawood, N. J. (ed., & abrid.,) (New York: Princeton University Press, 1970).
- KHALIFA, MOHAMMAD, *The Sublime Qur'an and Orientalism* (London & New York: Longman, 1983).
- KHAN, MUHAMMAD MUHSIN and AL-HELALI, MUHAMMAD TAQI-UD-DIN, *Interpretation of the Meanings of The Noble Qur'an in the English Language: A summarized Version of Al-Tabari, Al-Qurtubi and Ibn Kathir with Comments From Sahih Al-Bukhari: Summarized in One Volume* (Riyadh: Dar-us-Salam, 1994).

- KHATIB, M. M., *The Bounteous Koran: A Translation of Meaning and Commentary* (London: Macmillan Press, 1986).
- KIRK, ROBERT, *Translation Determined* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986).
- KRAMSKY, JIRI, *The Word as a Linguistic Unit* (The Hague: Mouton, 1969).
- LANE, WILLIAM EDWARD, *Selections From the Kur-an* (London: Trübner & Co., Ludgate Hill, 1879).
- LEFEVERE, A., *Translating Poetry: Seven Strategies and a Blueprint* (Assen and Amsterdam: Van Gorcum, 1975).
- LEIGHTON, LAUREN G., *Two Worlds, One Art: Literary Translation in Russia and America* (Dekalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 1991).
- LEVINSON, STEPHEN C., *Pragmatics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995).
- AL-MALIK, FAHD M., *Performative Utterances: Their Basic and Secondary Meanings With Reference to Five English Translations of The Meanings of The Qur'an* (Durham: Ph.D thesis, 1995).
- MARGOLIOUTH, D. S. (trans.), *The Commentary of El-Baidawi on Sura III* (London: Luzac & Co., 1894).
- MAWDUDI, SAYYID ABUL A'LA, *Towards Understanding The Qur'an: English Version of Tafhim al-Qur'an*, Zafar Ishaq Ansari (trans.) (Leicester: The Islamic Foundation, 1989).
- AL-MULLA, S. A., *The Question of the Translatability of the Qur'an with Particular Reference to Some English Versions*, Ph.D, (University of Glasgow, 1989).
- NEWMARK, PETER, *A Textbook of Translation* (Exeter: Prentice Hall International (UK) Ltd, 1988).
- Approaches to Translation* (London: Pergamon, 1981).
- NIDA, EUGENE A., *Componential Analysis of Meaning* (The Hague, Paris: Mouton, 1975).
- Exploring Semantic Structures* (Munich: Fink, 1975).
- Toward a Science of Translating: With Special Reference to Principles and Procedures Involved in Bible Translating* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1964).
- OSGOOD, C. E., SUCI, G. and TANNENBAUM, P. H. *The Measurement of Meaning* (Illinois: Illinois University Press, 1967).

- OXFORD, *The Oxford English Dictionary* Second Edition (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991).
- PENRICE, JOHN, *A Dictionary and Glossary of the Qur'an: With Copious Grammatical References and Explanations of the Text* (London and Dublin: Curzon Press, 1976).
- PICKTHALL, MOHAMMAD MARMADUKE, *The Meaning of the Glorious Koran* (New York: New American Library, n.d).
- PALMER, E. H., *The Qur'an*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1880).
- POUND, EZRA, *Literary Essays* (London: Faber, 1954).
- QUINE, W. V. O., 'Meaning and Translation', in *On Translation*, R. A. Brower (ed.) (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard, 1959).
- QUTB, SAYYID, *In The Shade of The Qur'an*, Salahi, M. A. and Shamis A. A. (trans.) (London: MWH London Publishers, 1979).
- RAFFEL, BURTON, *The Art of Translating Poetry* (Pittsburgh: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1988).
- ROBINSON, NEAL, *Discovering the Qur'an: A Contemporary Approach to a Veiled Text* (London: SCM Press Ltd, 1996).
- RODWELL, J. M., *The Koran Translated From the Arabic* (London: J. M. Dent & Sons, 1915).
- SALE, GEORGE, *The Koran: Commonly Called the AlKoran of Mohammed: With Explanatory Notes taken from the Most Approved Commentaries to Which is Prefixed a Preliminary Discourse* (Frederic Warne and Co.'s, n.d)
- SHERIF, FARUQ, *A Guide to The Contents of The Qur'an* (London: Ithaca Press, 1985).
- SILVER, PAUL, *The Art of Translating Poetry* (London: Jon Baker, 1966).
- SINCLAIR, J. McH. and COULTHARD, R. M. *Towards an Analysis of Discourse* (1975).
- SNELL-HORNBY, MARY, *Translation Studies: An Integrated Approach* (Amsterdam: John Benjamin, 1988).
- STETKEVYCH, J., *The Modern Arabic Literary language* (Chicago & London: University of Chicago Press, 1970).
- STIRLING, JOHN (ed.), *The Bible: Authorized Version* 15th Impression (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1960).

- TALGERI, PRAMOD and VERMA, S. B. (eds.), *Literature in Translation: from Cultural Transference to Metonymic Displacement* (London: Sangam, 1988).
- THACKSTON, W. M., *An Introduction to Koranic and Classical Arabic* (Maryland: Iranbooks, 1994).
- THE INTERNET,
[http://www.angelfire.com/mo/Alborhaan/ Gram.html](http://www.angelfire.com/mo/Alborhaan/Gram.html)
<http://www.herm.msm.cam.ac.uk>
<http://www.idt.net/~balboa19/newton/grammar2.htm>
<http://www.islamic.org.uk/grammar.html>
- TORREY, CHARLES C., *The Commercial-Theological Terms in The Koran* (Leyden. - E. J. Brill, 1892).
- TURNER, COLIN (trans.) and BAHBUDI, MUHAMMAD BAQIR (textual Exegesis), *The Quran: A New Interpretation* First Edition (Surrey: Curzon Press, 1997).
- TYTLER, ALEXANDER FRASER, *Essay on the Principles of Translation* (London: J. M. Dent and Sons Ltd., 1907).
- VERSTEEGH, C. H. M., *Arabic Grammar and Qur'anic Exegesis in Early Islam* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1993).
- DI WAARD, JAN and NIDA E., *From One Language to Another* (Nashville, Tennessee: Thomas Nelson, 1986).
- WANSBROUGH, JOHN, *Quranic Studies: Sources and Methods of Scriptural Interpretation* in 'London Oriental Series, Vol.31', (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977).
- WARREN, ROSANNA (ed.), *The Art of Translation: Voices from the Field* (Boston: Northeastern University Press, 1989).
- WATT, WILLIAM MONTGOMERY, *Bell's Introduction to The Qur'an* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1970).
Companion to The Qur'an (Oxford: Oneworld, 1994).
- WEBSTER, A. MIRRIAM, *Webster's Third New International Dictionary of the English Language: Unabridged* (USA, 1969).
- WHERRY, E. M., *A Comprehensive Commentary on the Qur'an: Comprising Sale's Translation and preliminary Discourse with Additional Notes and Emendations Together with a Complete Index to the Text, preliminary Discourse and Notes* (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Turbener & Co., Ltd, 1896).
- WILSS, W., *The Science of Translation* (Tübingen: Narr, 1982).

Translation Theory and Its Implementation (Tübingen: Narr, 1984).
WYLD, HENRY CECIL, *The Universal Dictionary of the English Language* (London: George Routledge & Sons Ltd, 1932).

ISBS is pleased to welcome this new publisher:

Garant Publishers

Garant Publishers (Belgium) was founded in 1990 with the purpose of publishing academic books for study, practice, and research. Garant Publishers' broad focus covers texts for higher education and training; informative books for professional groups and organizations; publications for purely scientific purposes; and books for a wider audience interested in philosophy, history, environmental studies, politics, literary translation, sociology, psychology, etc. The range covers the entire realm of disciplines and areas of interest.

By Patrick Cattrysse (*Free U. of Brussels*)



Subject: Adaptation Studies, Textual Analysis, Film, Theater, Literature

**ISBN 978 90 441 3129 1, Paper, \$64.00
363pp, April 2014
Garant Publishers (Belgium)**

DESCRIPTIVE ADAPTATION STUDIES

Epistemological and Methodological Issues

It is common practice nowadays for adaptation critics to denounce the lack of meta-theoretical thinking in adaptation studies and to plead for a study of 'adaptation-as-adaptation;' one that eschews value judgments, steps beyond normative fidelity-based discourse, examines adaptation from an intertextual perspective, and abandons the single-source model for a multiple-source model. This book examines a research program that does all that and more. It was developed in the late 1980s and presented in the early 1990s as a 'polysystem' (PS) study of adaptations. Since then, the PS label has been replaced with 'descriptive.'

The book studies the question of whether and how a PS approach could evolve into a descriptive adaptation studies (DAS) approach. Although not perfect (no method is), DAS offers a number of assets. Apart from dealing with the above-mentioned issues, DAS transcends an Auteurist approach and looks at explanation beyond the level of individual agency (even if contextualized). As an alternative to the endless accumulation of *ad hoc* case studies, it suggests corpus-based research into wider trends of adaptational behavior and the roles and functions of sets of adaptations.

DAS also allows reflection upon its own epistemic values. It sheds new light on some old issues: How can one define adaptation? What does it mean to study adaptation-as-adaptation? Is equivalence still possible and is the concept still relevant? DAS also tackles some deeper epistemological issues: How can phenomena be compared? Why would difference be more real than sameness or change more real than stasis? How does description relate to evaluation, explanation, prediction, etc.?

The book addresses both theory-minded scholars who are interested in epistemological reflection and practice-oriented adaptation students who want to get started. From a theoretical point of view, it discusses arguments that could support the legitimacy of adaptation studies as an academic discipline. And, from a practical point of view, it explains in general terms the ways of conducting an adaptation study.

QUR'ANIC TERM TRANSLATION

A Semantic Study from Arabic Perspective

This book focuses on the meanings and English translations of Qur'anic terms, both in and out of context. The book establishes a method of investigation that linguists and translators can adopt when embarking on the analysis of lexical items of the Qur'an and/or when translating it.

Owing to the intrinsic difficulties inherent in the translation of the Qur'an, a detailed study of Qur'anic terms is almost unheard of, in spite of the fact that there are many works that deal with the Qur'an in all languages.

Bearing in mind that a 'perfect' translation is no more than an illusion, and that absolute synonymy is nothing but a myth, establishing the meaning of specialized Qur'anic terms with any degree of accuracy is an extremely daunting task, especially when addressing this issue in a language that is not that of the Qur'an.

The book helps to bring the Qur'an a step closer to both the general reader as well as the specialized researcher. In addition to the semantic study of the Qur'anic terms and investigating their translations in six other renowned works, the book also addresses a number of important linguistic and cultural issues that no serious researcher of the Qur'an can afford to miss. Its depth of analysis and extensive notes are meant to save the reader the extraordinary effort generally required in checking a multitude of works necessary to understand the topic.

By Ahmed Allaithy
(*President, Arabic Translators International*)



Subject: Language, Linguistics, Translation Studies, Islamic Studies, Religious Studies

**ISBN 978 90 441 3118 5, Paper, \$64.00
359pp, April 2014
Garant Publishers (Belgium)**



ISBS

International Specialized Book Services

920 NE 58th Ave. Suite 300 Portland, OR 97213-3786

Phone: 1-800-944-6190, Fax: 1-503-280-8832, Email: orders@isbs.com, Web: www.isbs.com

Distributed exclusively in North America by International Specialized Book Services. Prices are subject to change without notice.