

IS SALE'S KORAN RELIABLE?

The Koran is an extremely difficult book to translate. That is universally conceded by those who know anything of the subject matter of the book or of the language in which it is written. The immense number of different commentaries written in the Arabic language for the purpose of explaining the meaning of the text are themselves an indication that even the Arabs from the earliest times have been very far from being agreed as to what the words mean. Marracci's *Refutatio Alcorani*, published in 1698, contains a complete and astonishingly accurate translation of the Koran into Latin, and Sale's English translation, published in 1734, is based very largely on the Latin version of Marracci, relying also frequently upon Marracci's notes. The subsequent English translations, by Rodwell in 1861, and by Palmer in 1880, were undoubtedly influenced to some extent by Sale's work, and both these later translators admit that Sale deserves the high reputation which his translation has always borne.

Ten years ago there appeared the first English translation of the Koran made by a Moslem, the work of Maulvi Muhammad Ali of Lahore, India, with a long Preface occupying ninety-five pages, and 2822 foot-notes explaining the text, the Arabic original being printed alongside of the English translation. In the year 1930 two other English translations by followers of the Arabian prophet appeared, the first of these being the work of another Indian Mohammedan, Mr. H. G. Sarwar, whose work was reviewed in the last issue of this Quarterly; and the second being entitled "The Meaning of the Glorious Koran: an explanatory translation," by an

English Moslem named Mr. Marmaduke Pickthall, who has had the help of Prof. M. A. Ghamrawi and Fuad Salim Bey during his final revision in Egypt. In the translation of Maulvi Muhammad Ali no attempt has been made to detract from the value of previous translations, but Mr. Sarwar, in the introduction to his work, has written quite a violent tirade against the translations of Sale, Rodwell and Palmer, and seems to wish to give the impression that none but a follower of the Arabian prophet is capable of making a fair or unbiased rendering of the words of the Koran. He says, "Sale had the prosecuting lawyer's bias, Rodwell had the missionary's bias, and Palmer had the author's bias." Sale has to bear most of his vituperations, and is said to be "an imposter. God save us from the consequences of his lying." Sale is said to add certain words "with the positive intention of distorting the sense." In another place "he purposely mistranslates." Again—"There is no doubt that Sale knew Arabic, because if he did not, he would not have been able to choose the worst translation in most cases as he does." Again—"He has purposely chosen the wrong meaning in the verse under discussion to confuse the sense of the original, because his psychology led him to choose such equivalents as would enable him to overthrow the Qur-ân. The Qur-ân overthrows him." There are many such expressions. Towards the end of his remarks on Sale, Mr. Sarwar writes: "Sale has left no stone unturned to represent the Holy Qur-ân as preaching the very opposite of what it does. But he has not succeeded in his attempt. All scholars have now recognized his limitations and his bias. His translation is biased, wrong and antiquated. As to his notes, they are a mixture of honey and filth. There is no other way of describing them. He has distorted his authorities (the commentaries mentioned in his notes) far more extensively in the foot-notes than he has done in his translation. His account is with God."

As to Rodwell's translation, Mr. Sarwar's main ob-

jection is that "He has taken the 114 chapters of the Holy Qur-ân, disrupted their order and rearranged them according to what he calls the chronological order." As to the work itself, he says, "Rodwell's translation is a most careful piece of work done in an extremely scholarly way, and although there are many mistakes, they are not of such a nature as to call for adverse criticism. Anyone may make a mistake. But the man who purposely introduces forgeries into God's word is an intolerable beast." Later on, however, he says, in regard to Rodwell, "I feel as if my bias in his favor has not allowed me to expose him as I should have done. May Allah help me."

Against Palmer's translation the chief complaint seems to be that "Palmer took it into his head that the language of the Qur-ân was like the talk of the ignorant Bedouins of to-day and was to be translated as such. He says, 'The language is noble and forcible, but it is not elegant in the sense of literary refinement.'" Another complaint is that "The work seems to have been done with such haste and hurry that it is almost beyond my power to narrate its defects. . . . Palmer had not the decency to treat the original with the respect due to it." On the other hand Mr. Sarwar recognizes some merit in Palmer's translation, for he says, "As for Palmer, in spite of all that I have said against him, there is this merit in his work, that it is, *so far as it goes*, very nearly word for word the Holy Qur-ân in the English language. . . . Whenever Palmer happens to be in a serious mood, and when he does not make any omissions, his translation rises to a great height. Occasionally it is almost sublime. But it has its falls."

Some of our readers will probably feel that any author who uses such intemperate language in regard to other writers who have undertaken the same task which he himself has just completed has thereby weakened his own case, and has shown that he himself is as much biased in favor of his own views as he complains that his

predecessors have been on the other side. But although Mr. Sarwar has spent some years at Cambridge University, we can hardly expect from him the same literary standards that we would look for in these days from those who engage in religious discussions in countries where we strive to maintain an impartial attitude and to make use of historical criticism even in the most sacred questions of our faith. Our Mohammedan brethren, even those of the most highly educated races, have evidently not yet acquired the habit of putting on one side for a time their religious convictions in order to see and understand their opponent's point of view and to make a thoroughly impartial investigation. We cannot blame those who have such strong religious convictions for using strong language, even though we regret that they seem to be unable dispassionately to consider the other side. We shall try to show that Mr. Sarwar is mistaken as to his opinion that Sale was *intentionally dishonest*, not in order to convince him of his somewhat uncharitable judgment, but in order to show to those who are prepared to look at both sides of the question that it is quite possible that Sale, when he did make a mistake (as Mr. Sarwar justly says we are all liable to do) had probably no such dishonest intention as has been imputed to him; and also we desire to show that in general Sale's translation is not so far from being correct as Mr. Sarwar would have his readers believe.

We will now proceed to take up the most important passages in Sale which Mr. Sarwar has selected for criticism, giving in each case for comparison the translations of Sale and Marracci, the Arabic text, and Mr. Sarwar's version, in parallel columns.

PASSAGES QUOTED FROM THE KORAN

Bi'smi'llāhi'r - Raḥmāni'r - Raḥim (1:1).	In nomine Dei Misericordis.
(We commence) with the name of God, the most merciful (to begin with), the most merciful (to the end) (Sarwar).	In the name of the most merciful God (Sale).

Mr. Sarwar says, "Sale has intentionally left out a part of the Bismillah . . . the mistake is repeated at least 114 times." In this instance Sale did not follow Mar-racci, who seems to have understood *ar-Rahmān* as a noun, and *ar-Rahim* as a qualifying epithet, which is perhaps more correct than Mr. Sarwar's two epithets.

Al-hamdu li'llāhi Rabbi'l-'ālamīn Laus Deo, Domino Mundorum.
(1:2).

All praise belongs to God, Lord of Praise be to God, the Lord of all
all the worlds (Sarwar). creatures (Sale).

Mr. Sarwar complains that Sale has not translated the definite article in *al-hamdu*; but some will think that the author goes too far in translating the definite article by the word "all."

Iyyāka na'budu wa iyyāka nasta'in Te colimus: & te in auxilium im-
(1:4). ploramus.

Thee alone do we serve, and thee Thee do we worship, and of thee
alone do we ask for help (Sar- do we beg assistance (Sale).
war).

The criticism here is, "The force of *Iyyaka* (thee alone) is left out by both Sale and Palmer. Rodwell has put it in." (Rodwell has, "Thee *only* do we worship.") The word *iyyā*, however, does not mean "only" or "alone," and is used here merely because the object pronoun is placed before the verb for the sake of emphasis, for in Arabic an object pronoun cannot stand alone, as it can in English. This emphasis is *fully* expressed in English by placing the pronoun before the verb, as Sale has done.

Alladhina yu'minūna bi'l-ghaib Qui credunt in Arcanum.

(2:3).

Who believe in the (Great) un- Who believe in the mysteries of
seen (Sarwar). faith (Sale).

Mr. Sarwar says, "He translates *al-ghaib* as 'mysteries of faith.' This is utterly wrong. The words 'of faith' are unnecessary, and *al-ghaib* means the unseen, not 'the mysteries,' . . . and Sale knows that, for in his foot-note he has got the correct version, but in the text he has distorted it." Sale's foot-note is, "The Arabic word *gheib*, which properly means a thing that is *absent*, at a

great distance, or invisible, such as the resurrection, paradise and hell. And this is agreeable to the language of scripture, which defines faith to be *the evidence of things not seen*." Sale followed Marracci's Note: Arabici (al-ghaib) proprie significat id, quod abest, nec videtur, sed creditur, qualia sunt Fidei mysteria. Exponit hic Gelale-dinus: . . . id, quod longe remotum est ab eis, nempe resurrectio mortuorum, paradus et ignis Gehennæ.

Mathaluhum kamathali 'l-ladhi' stauqada nār^{an}, falamā adā'at mā haulahu dhahaba'llāhu bi-nūrihim wa tarakahum fi zulumātⁱⁿ lā yubsirūn (2: 17).

Similitudo eorum *est* sicut similitudo illius, qui studuerit accendere ignem postquam autem *ignis* illuminaverit, quod est circa eum, auferat Deus lumen eorum, & relinquat eos in tenebris: non videbunt.

Their case is like this:—There is one who kindles a fire, but when the fire has lit up all around him, God takes away their light, and leaves them in utter darkness—they cannot see (Sarwar).

They are like unto one who kindleth a fire, and when it hath encircled all around him, God taketh away their light and leaveth them in darkness, they shall not see (Sale).

Marracci refers in his note to the change in number of the pronouns in this simile, which he does not profess to be able to understand. Mr. Sarwar explains by saying that he who kindles the fire is Mohammed, and those left in darkness are unbelievers; in this he follows Muhammad Ali; but this is comment rather than translation.

Yā ayyuhā'n-nāsu 'budū Rabba-kumu'l-ladhi khalaqakum wa'l-ladhina min qablikum la'allakum tattaqūn (2: 21).

O homines servite Domino vestra, qui creavit vos, et eos, qui *fuerunt* ante vos; ut vos timeatis *eum*.

O ye men! in order that you may practice reverence, serve your Lord, who made you and those before you (Sarwar).

O men of Meccal serve your Lord who hath created you, and those who have been before you: Per-adventure ye will fear *him* (Sale).

In the addition of the words "*of Mecca*" to which Mr. Sarwar objects most strenuously, Sale was following Marracci's note on verse 21, in which he says that in his introduction to the Koran he has shown from the teachings of the Mohammedans themselves that these words must be addressed to the idolatrous Meccans, and that therefore this *sura* must have been revealed at Mecca. It seems to be quite unnecessary and unfair for Mr. Sarwar

to say of Sale, "Wherever he does put in his addition of the words 'of Mecca' it is with the positive intention of distorting the sense."

Inna'llāha lā yastahyī an yaḍriba mathal^{an} mā ba'ūdat^{an} famā fauqahā (2: 26).

Indeed! God is not ashamed to set forth any parables—that of a gnat, or of something superior thereto (Sarwar).

Porro Deus non erubescet, ut proponat in parabolam aliquid vile, velut culicem: atque etiam aliquid, quod sit supra illam.

Moreover God will not be ashamed to propound in a parable a gnat, or even a more despicable thing (Sale).

Here again Sale is following Marracci's note on verse 26, which says, non dedignabitur proponere parabolas etiam in rebus vilioribus, qualis est culex; and Sale's note on Yahya is also from the same note of Marracci.

As it would make this article too long if all the passages criticised by Mr. Sarwar were to be dealt with, we will now select those with which he finds the most serious objections.

Wa ātainā 'Isā'bna Maryama'l-baiyyināti, wa aiyyadnāhu bi rūhi'l-quḍus (2: 87).

And we gave Jesus, son of Mary, clear proofs, and we helped him with the Holy Spirit (Sarwar).

Et attulimus Jesu filio Mariæ demonstrationes (*idest virtutem miraculorum*) & roboravimus cum Spiritu Sanctitatis.

And gave evident miracles to Jesus the son of Mary, and strengthened him with the holy spirit (Sale).

Mr. Sarwar objects that Sale should use the word miracles here in connection with Jesus, whereas in verse 92 he translates the same word (*baiyyināt*) "evident signs" in the case of Moses. Sale got the word miracles from Marracci, who has *miraculorum* in brackets; but in verse 92 Marracci has, cum demonstrationibus *miraculorum*. Therefore in this case Mr. Sarwar may be justified in his complaint that Sale was not impartial; but in English the distinction between miracles and signs is so slight that the question is of little importance.

Wa'qtulūhum haithu thaqiftumūhum, wa akhrijūhum min haithu akhrajūkum; wa'l-fitnatu as-haddu mina'l-qatl (2: 191).

192. Et occidite eos, ubi inveneritis eos: & ejicite eos, unde ejecerint vos: nam tentatio (*idest periculum perversionis vestrae ab illis*) gravior est, quam cædes à vobis illis inflictæ..

And kill them where you find them, and turn them out from whence they have turned you out, for persecution (in faith) is worse than war (Sarwar).	And kill them wherever ye find them, and turn them out of that whereof they have dispossessed you; for temptation (<i>to idolatry</i>) is more grievous than slaughter (Sale).
---	---

Mr. Sarwar's comment on this is as follows—"The interpolation of the words '*to idolatry*' being intended by Sale to insinuate the intolerance of Islam to other religions, whilst God says, 'Let there be no compulsion in religion' (v. 256, ch. 20). It is these poisonous interpolations and still more poisonous notes which make Sale's translation a most mischievous book to be placed in the hands of people who are ignorant of Islam, as most Europeans are." That he should quote this text "Let there be no compulsion in religion" immediately after referring to verse 191, in which we have the terrible words "kill them wherever ye find them," seems to indicate that Mr. Sarwar has a "blind spot" in regard to the "holy war," which will be still more evident later on. Our readers who know Arabic can judge for themselves whether Mr. Sarwar's translation of *fitnah* is any better than Maracci's. It is doubtful whether it can mean "persecution." (Cf. Muhammad Ali, Note 241.)

Fa qātil fi sabili'llāhi, lā tukallafu illā nafsaka (4: 84). Fight thou then in God's way, thou art not burdened except with regard to thyself (Sarwar).	83. Pugna ergo pro via Dei: non laborabis nisi pro anima tua. Fight therefore for the religion of God, and oblige not any to what is difficult, except thyself (Sale).
--	--

Mr. Sarwar says, "The sense of verse 84 is utterly destroyed by Sale . . . throughout this chapter (4) and elsewhere where the Holy Qur-ân mentions the words *fi-sabilillahi* (in the way of God), Sale renders them 'for the religion of God.' I can only suppose that his idea is to show the Western world that fighting is made compulsory in the Holy Qur-ân for the sake of religion, whereas the truth is that prayer, fasting and almsgiving are included in the words 'in the way of God,' and fighting may, in many cases, mean nothing but a struggle with one's self in God's way. Sale's translation, however,

would make it a religious war with the unbelievers in every single instance where 'God's way' and 'fighting' are mentioned together."

This is another example of Mr. Sarwar's "blind spot." It is interesting to read the context, beginning verse 71, in Mr. Sarwar's own translation, or in that of Maulvi Muhammad Ali, who also holds the Ahmadiya views on the "holy war." Even in these two Ahmadiya translations the whole passage is obviously concerned with fighting and being killed (verse 74); and Muhammad Ali in his headlines summarizes the verses thus, "77-80. Hypocrites refusal to fight . . . 84. Prophet commanded to fight even alone." Moreover Baiḍāwī's commentary on this passage fully justifies Sale in his translation; these are Baiḍāwī's words—(fa qātil fī sabīli'llāh) in tathbutṭu wa tarakūka wahdaka (lā tukallafu illā nafsaka) illā fī'la nafsika, lā yaḍurruka mukhālafatuhum wa taqā'uduhum, fa taqaddam ilā'l-jihād wa in lam yuṣā'iduka aḥad^{un}, fa'inna'llāha nāṣiruka, lā'l-junūd; which may be translated, "(So fight in the way of God)—if they delay and leave thee alone—(no responsibility is laid on thee except for thyself)—except for thine own action, their contradiction and their delay do thee no harm, so advance to the holy war, even though no one aids thee, for Allah is thy helper, and not the armies."

Qul, Lā yastawā'l-khabīthu wa't-ṭayyibu wa lau a'jabaka kath-ratu'l-khabīthi (5: 100).

Say: Equal are not the impure and the pure, even though the abundance of the impure may surprise thee (Sarwar).

109. Dic, Non adæquabitur malum, & bonum, etiamsi placuerit tibi multitudo mali.

Say, Evil and good shall not be equally esteemed of, though the abundance of evil pleases thee (Sale).

Mr. Sarwar complains of Sale that "this translation, which is followed by others, makes Muhammad (peace be with him) pleased with the abundance of evil." The reader will see that Sale follows Marracci, and the same word "please" is used by Rodwell, Palmer and Muhammad Ali; the new English translation by Pickthall has "attract thee"; in fact Mr. Sarwar's is the only English

translation which gives the rendering of "surprise" for this word *a'jaba*, which is the 4th stem perfect from the root *'ajaba*, and may mean (Lane's Lexicon) "to excite to wonder, admiration, pleasure or joy." In explanation of this verse, the commentary of Zamakhsharī (al-Kash-shāf) has as follows—Fa lā tu'jibū bi kathrati'l-khabithi, ḥattā tu'thirūhu li kathratihi 'alā't-tayyibi'l-qalil, "So do not be pleased with the abundance of evil, so as to prefer it on account of its abundance to the good which is few." The Malay translation of 'Abdu'r-Ra'ūf has a word which means to be pleased with. So as far as I have investigated, this leaves Mr. Sarwar in a minority of one.

Wa mā kāna'l-mu'minūna li yan-firū kāffat^{an}, fa lau lā nafara min kulli firqatiⁿ minhum ṭa'i-fat^{un} li yatafaqqahū fi'd-din wa li yundhirū qaumahum, idhā raja'ū ilaihim, la'allahum yaḥ-dharūn (9: 122).

124. Et non est *conveniens* fidelibus, ut egrediantur *ad pugnam* omnes simul. Quod si non egressa fuerit *ad prælium* ex omni agmine ex ipsis *una tantum* pars, *remanentibus reliquis*, ut instruantur, *qui remanent* in religione & ut commoneant gentem suam, quandò redierint ad eos à *prælio*, *de, eo in quo ipsi instructi fuerint*, ut ipsi sibi caveant à *divina ultione*: non erit *rectè factum*.

And it is not possible for the faithful to come out altogether; then why should not a party from each tribe set out to get an understanding of the faith, and in order that they should warn their people when they return to them that they might be cautioned (Sarwar).

The believers are not *obliged* to go forth *to war* all together: if a part of every band of them do not go forth, *it is* that they may diligently instruct themselves in *their* religion; and may admonish their people, when they return unto them that they may take heed to themselves (Sale).

Here we have another example of Mr. Sarwar's "bias" on the subject of the "holy war," for he objects to "the interpolation of the word *war*," and says that Sale "would make those who stay behind teach those who go out to war, thus making war the occupation of the majority of the Muslims, a people who, by their name and profession, are 'The Peaceful.'" Now as Mr. Sarwar is a *Hafiz*, he must know perfectly well that the very next verse to the one quoted above reads, as he himself trans-

lates it, "O ye who believe! fight those of the unbelievers who are near you." Maulvi Muhammad Ali also (in his foot-notes) makes desperate efforts to eliminate as far as possible from the Koran the idea of aggressive warfare; and in this case (Note 1105) he says, "Here there is a plain injunction to fight only against those unbelievers who are *near to you*, because it was they who persecuted the Muslims." Believing, as they do, that these "injunctions" are not merely the prophet's directions to his followers, but actually the very words of God himself, we can not wonder that in these days when aggressive war is discredited there is a movement to explain away *jihād*; but non-Moslems are more concerned with the verdict of history as to the effect on his followers of Mohammed's teachings and practice in the matter of aggressive warfare than they are with the actual words of the Koran, and we see no adequate reason to put a new interpretation on Koranic expressions which have hitherto been understood in a militant sense by all Mohammedan commentators. In this instance Baiḍāwī shows clearly the usual interpretation, as follows—(Wa mā kāna'l-mu'minūna li yanfirū kāffat^{an}) wa mā'staqāma lahum an yanfirū jamī'^{an} li naḥwi ghazwⁱⁿ; which means, "(The believers should not go forth all together)—it is not well for them to go forth all together for such a purpose as a raid."

Qul, Allāhu a'lamu bi mā labithū, lahu ghaibu's-samāwāti wa'l-ardī; aḥsir bihi wa asmi' (18:26).

Say: God knows best how long they tarried. To Him belongs the secret of the heavens and the earth. How excellent his sight and how excellent his hearing (Sarwar).

27. Dic: Deus scientissimus est, quantum commorati sint. Ipsius est arcanum Cœlorum, & terræ. Fac videre in eo, & fac audire.

Say, God best knoweth how long they continued there: unto him are the secrets of heaven and earth known; do thou make him to see and to hear (Sale).

In regard to this passage Mr. Sarwar says, "But I now come to a real gem in Sale's translation. Sale has been caught in his own net of imposture. . . ." Then he quotes Sale's translation, and gives Sale's foot-note as fol-

lows, "This is an ironical expression, intimating the folly and madness of man's presuming to instruct God. (Al Beidawi, Jallalo'ddin.)" Mr. Sarwar then says, "Now the irony in this case consists in the fact that Sale did not understand, or would not understand, the meaning of the Arabic idiom, and has translated it wrongly and supported himself by a forged authority, because Beidawi and Jalalain give the correct meaning and the meaning given by Sale is not theirs, but his own forgery." Mr. Sarwar then quotes Palmer's foot-note on this passage, which says that both Sale and Rodwell missed the force of the idiom and the explanation given by the commentators to whom Sale refers; and Mr. Sarwar then quotes from Lane's Lexicon (vol. i, p. 210) where this peculiar idiom is explained, and adds, "God be praised! In this way does he permanently nail the lie on the head of George Sale, who imposed on former generations but has now been found out by his own people. God be praised for all that, and peace be with his own noble messenger!"

After reading this violent denunciation of Sale, the reader will be surprised to find that Marracci's Note on verse 27 shows very clearly that Marracci understood the idiom correctly and gives the very words of Jalālain, although (for some unexplained reason) he has made his translation so literally word for word as to obscure the actual sense intended, and in this respect Sale followed Marracci; and he added the authority of Baiḍāwī probably because he saw that Baiḍāwī's interpretation of the meaning of the passage is the same as that of Jalālain. Here is the entire Note from Marracci. The words in square brackets, having been omitted by Marracci, are supplied from my copy of Jalālain.

XXVII. *Fac videre in eo, et fac audire.*] Idest, effice, ut ille videat, et audeat. Arabice abṣir bihi wa'smi': Explicat Gelal: [Abṣir bihi, ai bi'llāhi] hiya siġhatu ta'ajjubin [wa asmi' bihi kadhālīka] bi ma'nā mā abṣarahu wa mā asma'ahu, wa humā 'alā jihatī'l-majāzi, wa'l-murādu annahu ta'ālā lā yaghību 'an basarihi wa sam'ihi shai'un: *Hæc*

est formula admirationis significans: O quantum videt: O quantum audit; Et utraque loquutio est metaphorica, seu ironica; & significat, nihil abscondi ab oculis, & auribus Dei. Eo scilicet modo quo quis diceret alicui: Doce tu Deum: vel adjuva Deum: ut ostenderet, Deum non egere, ut ab aliquo doceatur. (The Arabic in Marracci is printed in the Arabic character.)

Now it is quite obvious that if Palmer had had access to Marracci, and if he had understood the extent to which Sale was dependent upon Marracci, then he would not have written as he did in his foot-note to this verse. It is also obvious that Mr. Sarwar is incorrect in his statement that Sale "supported himself by a forged authority," for his authority from Jalālain is there in black and white on the pages of Marracci; and by comparison with my own copy (which is a Cairo edition of 1345 A. H.) it is evident that the quotation is essentially correct. It is unfortunate that Mr. Sarwar's accusation of lying and forgery against Sale, and his statement that "The Christians know the truth but go on repeating a lie in the hope that it may take the place of the truth" (page xvi), should go forth among Moslems, who are already strongly prejudiced against Christians, and are for the most part unwilling to accept the results of European scholarship even if it is not distinctly Christian. Mr. Sarwar's violent and unjustifiable condemnation of Christians in general and of Sale in particular is not the best means of producing better relations between the followers of these two great religions. If Mr. Sarwar's translation of the Koran runs to a second edition, we would strongly urge upon him that he should correct his unfair criticisms, and modify his violent abuse.

Wa mā arsalnāka illā rahmat^{an} lil-
'ālamīn. Qul, innamā yūhā
ilāiya annamā ilāhukum ilāh^{un}
wāhid^{un}, fa hal antum musli-
mūn? Fa in tawallau, fa qul,
ādhantukum 'alā sawā'ⁱⁿ (21:
107-109).

107. Et non misimus te, nisi ad
misericordiam omnibus creaturis.

108. Dic: Certè revelatum fuit
mihi, quòd Deus vester Deus
unus est: an ergo vos eritis Mos-
lemi? 109. Quod si tergiver-
sati fuerint, dic illis: Notificavi
vobis æqualiter bellum (idest in-
dixi illud vobis omnibus).

And we have not sent thee (O Muhammad) save as a mercy for the people of the world. 108 Say: "What I have been ordered is that your God is only one God. Will you then obey (be Muslims)?" 109 But if they turn back, then say: "I have informed you all equally" (Sarwar).

We have not sent thee, O Mohammed, but as a mercy unto all creatures. Say, No other hath been revealed unto me, than that your God is one God: *will ye therefore be resigned unto him?* But if they turn their backs to the confession of God's unity, say, I proclaim *war* against you all equally (Sale).

Mr. Sarwar calls this passage "another forgery of Sale's," but what he says subsequently does not justify the use of the word "forgery." He says, "There is no justification whatever for the insertion of the word *war*, and the translation of '*ala sawa*' (against you all equally) is an absolute lie. The preposition '*ala*' (which has been translated as 'against') does not govern *you*, but *sawa* ('equality'). The '*you*' in the sentence is the object of the verb *azantokum* ('I have informed you'): '*ala sawai*' = equally or with justice (vide Lane's Lexicon, p. 1479). In the days when few Arabic-knowing Muslims knew English, such forgeries as are perpetrated in Sale's translation, notes, and Preliminary Discourse might have passed unnoticed, but the attempt to repeat them is much to be regretted."

In this passage it is quite clear that Sale copied Marracci's interpolation of the word *bellum*; but the question naturally arises, why should Marracci have put this word in, unless there was some reason for doing so. In view of his frequent references to Jalālāin, one naturally turns to that commentary, and we find—Fa qul ādhantukum, a'lamtukum bi'l-harb; the Latin—Notificavi vobis bellum, is therefore a faithful translation of Jalālāin. Mr. Sarwar does not mention that Sale has also a foot-note, as follows: "Or, *I have publicly declared unto you* what I was commanded;" this is a translation from Baiḍāwī's commentary, in which "war" is also mentioned as an alternative meaning. This passage is therefore another example of Mr. Sarwar's desire to eliminate, as far as he can, any references to war and fighting, and his accusation of forgery on the part of Sale falls to the ground.

Wa mā arsalnā min qablika min rasūlⁱⁿ wa lā nabiyyⁱⁿ illā idhā tamannā alqā'sh-shaitānu fi umniyyatihi (22: 52).

And we have not sent before thee, (O Muhammad) any messenger or prophet but when he had any longings, the evil-one mixed (something) in his longings (Sarwar).

53. Et non misimus ante te ullum legatum, neque prophetam, quin, cū legeret, conjecerit satanas aliquem errorem in lectione ejus.

We have sent no apostle, or prophet, before thee, but, when he read, Satan suggested some error in his reading (Sale).

Here Mr. Sarwar says, "Let all the readers of the Holy Qur-ân be aware of Sale's forgeries. The following is a most wilful mistranslation of Sale's. . . . All Christian writers have harped upon this verse and the fancied occasion on which it is said to have been revealed, but I have no space to enter into a discussion of that subject. What I say is that the translation given above is entirely wrong, for the words 'read' and 'reading' are not in the original text."

Now this looks like a serious charge, until we come to examine into it, and then we see at once that in this instance, as in the previous one, Marracci followed the commentary of Jalālain, and Sale followed Marracci. Jalālain gives *qara'a* (recite, read) as the equivalent of *tamannā*, which Mr. Sarwar has translated "had longings," and gives *qirā'atihi* as the equivalent of *umniyyatihi*, which Mr. Sarwar translates "his longings." In a Note on this verse, Marracci gives the entire passage from Jalālain in regard to the words in *Surat an-Najm* (53:20) which Ṭabari (i.1195) and Ibn Sa'ad (p. 137) both state to have been suggested to Mohammed by the devil and given out by the prophet as a revelation, but afterwards disowned by him, other words being substituted in their place. The words, as they are given in Jalālain, are as follows—"after verses 19 and 20 of Sura 53, namely, Afara'aitumu'l-Lāta wa'l-'Uzzā, wa Manāta'th-thālithata'l-ukhrā, Satan put on his tongue without his knowledge—tilka'l-gharāniqu'l-'ulā, wa inna shafā'atahunna latartaji." The whole passage may be translated, following Rodwell in part, "Do you see Al-Lat and Al-Ozza, and Manāt, the third idol besides? These are ex-

alted females, and verily their intercession is to be hoped for." The words after "besides?" were afterwards cancelled, and the following words substituted (Rodwell) "What? shall ye have male progeny and God female? This were indeed an unfair partition."

We have quoted Mr. Sarwar just above as saying that "All Christian writers have harped upon this verse and the fancied occasion on which it is said to have been revealed, but I have no space to enter into a discussion of that subject." We therefore desire to refer our readers to what another Muslim translator, Maulvi Muhammad Ali, says on the subject in his note on Sura 22, verse 52 (No. 1701)—"The story which is suggested as explaining this verse is absurd and altogether baseless. That the story of praising idols and of according recognition to any power or privilege of intercession in their behalf is a pure forgery is shown in 2382. Here I may only note that all learned commentators have always rejected it." Now this last statement that "all learned commentators have always rejected it" is obviously not correct. The commentary of Jalālain is recognized by all orthodox Moslems as an authoritative and learned work, and we have shown above that the story is given without questioning its truth; it is also given in the commentary of Zamakhshari, which formed the basis of Baiḍāwī's popular work; and Ṭabari, to whom we have referred above with Ibn Sa'ad as giving the story, was himself a learned commentator on the Koran. It is therefore not quite honest for Maulvi Muhammad Ali to say that "all learned commentators have always rejected it." As a discreditable story, there was every reason for the commentators to suppress it, and if there were not some truth in the story it is very difficult to account for the fact that it has been mentioned by so many Mohammedan writers whose general reliability is not questioned. But in any case, whether the story be true or false, Sale and Maracci should not be blamed for having followed the commentary of Jalālain.

We have now given enough examples from among the Koran passages in Sale's translation which are so severely criticized by Mr. Sarwar to convince any fair-minded and unprejudiced person, be he Christian or Moslem, that for the most part Sale's translation fairly represents the meaning of the language of the Koran as it is interpreted by such commentators as Baiḍāwī and the two Jalāls. The meanings attached to many passages in the Koran by such translators as Maulvi Muhammad Ali and Mr. Sarwar, both of whom are connected with the Ahmadiya Movement, are different from the interpretations to be found in the orthodox commentaries, especially with reference to the "holy war" and the exhortations to fight in the Way of Allah. When Sale's translation was made and first published, the doctrines held by the above-mentioned gentlemen were unknown in Islam, for the Movement which they represent had not yet begun.

Incidentally, our examination of these extracts from Sale's translation and the comparison of them with the Latin translation of Marracci have shown what a very careful and accurate piece of work was done more than two hundred years ago, at a time when students of the Arabic language had practically none of the equipment in the way of dictionaries and grammars which are available in the languages of Europe to-day. The writer of this article has found the study of the above passages and the comparison of the translations of Marracci and Sale with the Arabic of the Koran and the comments of the orthodox writers thereon intensely interesting, and his admiration for the work of the translators of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries has been greatly increased.

Kennedy School of Missions, W. G. SHELLABEAR.
Hartford, Conn.