Introduction

We have sent no Messenger save with the tongue of his people, that he might make all clear to them.

Q. 14:4

If the Prophet had come to this realm, he would have spoken Turkish.

Abdurrahman el-Aksarayi (d. 800/1397)

Several reciters of the Qur'an were summoned to the Dolmabahçe Palace in Istanbul one evening in 1932, and given the nature of the invitation they were rather nervous. The most powerful man in the land, the president of the Turkish Republic, Mustafa Kemal Atatürk (fl. 1923–38), had called them to his salon for a most unusual assignment. He wanted them to recite the Qur'an in Turkish, something that none of these men had ever done or even imagined doing. Like Muslims around the globe, they had memorised and learned to recite the 'Arabic recitation' (*qur'ānan 'arabiyyan*, Q. 43:3–4), a text believed to be divine and composed of inimitable language (See Figure 1, two men reciting the Qur'an). Regardless of any reservations they might have had, they obliged the president and did their best to give a suitable rendition. He listened, directed and even provided feedback. In the following weeks and months, these men went to mosques dressed not in the traditional turbans and robes, but wearing Western suits and without any headgear whatsoever. They recited Turkish renderings of the Qur'an around the country as

part of a government campaign to promote worship in the national language.

In another part of town, the brilliant, heavy-smoking Islamic scholar Elmalılı Muhammed Hamdi Yazır (1878–1942) looked on with horror; he did not endorse many policies of the new Turkish state and, like many Muslims, he considered Qur'anic translation impossible. After the fall of the Ottoman Empire, he had faced difficult times, spending a brief period in jail due to his political involvement, and then retreated from public life, passing his days at home. The madrasas where he taught had been closed by the government, leaving him without a job. In the early 1930s, he was offered a contract to compose a Turkish translation of the Qur'an, in addition to the Turkish-language commentary on which he had laboured for years. Considering his views on translation, the down-and-out scholar might have appeared an odd choice for the job. Nevertheless, he accepted the contract and composed a translation (though he did not call it a translation) that became influential and remains widely read in the present day.[1] His behaviour may seem contradictory, but, in fact, it epitomises an approach to translating the Qur'an that pervades modern Muslim societies, whereby writers produce renderings of the text for study (not ritual) while defining them as something other than translations.

Both stories illustrate the changing times during which Islam and the Qur'an were reimagined simultaneously with the creation of a modern nation state. They also reflect major changes that were wrought in the book culture of the Qur'an by the adoption of print technology in various Islamicate societies. Over the course of the past two centuries, Muslims across the globe have embraced printed editions and vernacular renderings of the Qur'an, transforming the scribal text into a modern book which can be read in virtually any language. What began with the sparse and often contentious publication of vernacular commentaries and translations in South Asia and the Ottoman Empire evolved, by the late twentieth century, into widespread Qur'anic translation and publishing efforts in all quarters of the Muslim world, including Arabic-speaking countries such as Egypt and Saudi Arabia.

This is remarkable given that, at the dawn of the twentieth century, the vast majority of Muslim scholars considered Qur'an translations to be impossible, impermissible and even impious. Renderings of the Qur'an have since gained wide acceptance in Muslim communities and play a central, and in some quarters, a leading role in how the Qur'an is read and understood in the modern world. Large-scale publishing ventures sponsored by Muslim-majority states and by Islamic institutions have not only made renderings of the Qur'an widely available but also have given them official sanction. There are now hundreds of translations in major Islamicate languages, and the King Fahd Complex for Printing the Holy Qur'an in Medina, Saudi Arabia, publishes translations in over fifty languages.

This book attempts to answer the question of how this transformation in Qur'anic book culture occurred by considering both the intellectual history surrounding the issue of translation, including the seminal debates, and the processes by which the Qur'an became a modern book that could be mechanically reproduced and widely owned. The rise of modern translations – free-standing, printed renderings that could be read on their own without glosses – requires careful consideration of the evolution of print culture and the ways in which it reshaped approaches to producing and understanding the Qur'an.

Keeping in view these broader shifts, this book explores the emergence of the modern Qur'an in the context of the late Ottoman Empire and the Republic of Turkey from roughly 1840 to 1940. Turkey was not the origin of modern Qur'anic translation and publishing efforts: Muslims in Russia, India and Iran had been printing Arabic editions of the Qur'an well before the Ottomans. In South Asia, the publication of translations had begun in the 1820s, and the efforts of South Asian Muslims were observed and admired by Turkish intellectuals. A case in point is that of the well-known South Asian scholar, Shāh Walī Allāh, who penned an important Persian translation of the Qur'an in the early 1700s (first published in 1866). A well-known but fictitious story circulates that those who disapproved of his efforts attacked him in a mosque in Delhi and dislocated his shoulder in what may have been an assassination

attempt. Proponents of vernacularisation and Islamic reform in the late Ottoman Empire and Turkey held him up as a persecuted pioneer of Qur'anic translation and a model for emulation.[2]

Ottoman-Turkish history is crucial for understanding the development of modern printed copies of the Qur'an and vernacular renderings, particularly for the Middle East and North Africa. Encompassing the heartlands of Islam, including the sacred cities of Mecca and Medina, and much of the eastern Mediterranean and the Balkans, the Ottoman Empire had a privileged geographic position and was the most powerful Muslim state in the world for much of its existence. The Ottoman sultans claimed the title of caliph, the leader of the global Muslim community, and in the eyes of many (but certainly not all) Muslims around the globe, the Ottoman sultan was a symbol of Muslim political sovereignty in an age of European colonialism. As part of the late nineteenth-century Islamic Unity (or 'Pan-Islamic') campaign to rally the support of Muslims worldwide for the empire (see Chapter Two), Ottoman Qur'an printing initiatives had far-reaching effects and set new precedents for mass producing the text. After the fall of the empire, the use of Turkish translations in Muslim rituals and nation building within the Turkish Republic shaped modern debates in important ways, pushing the boundaries of how the Qur'an could be conceived as a vernacular scripture and used in the context of the nation state. Reactions to and imitations of events in the Ottoman Empire and Turkey have played a decisive role in the evolution of Qur'an translations and in determining their place in the modern world: Turkish debates on Qur'anic translation in the 1920s (see Chapter Five) sparked debates around the Muslim world (Chapter Six) about the role that renderings of the Qur'an would play in an emerging age of nationalism.

Approaching Qur'anic Translation

One approach to the study of Qur'anic translation has focused on the word choices, styles and inadequacies of existing translations. Finding 'mistakes' and demonstrating that perfect translation is impossible are activities that have become hallmarks of this type of

literature.[3] However, in some cases, revealing the imperfections of translations can all too easily slide into serving a theological argument, namely, that the Qur'an is impossible to translate because it is divinely eloquent and therefore inimitable.

An outcome of this tendency is that the interesting choices made by translators are often lost amid compulsive evaluations of accuracy, which is an elusive concept. Additionally, it is rare to find studies that appreciate the beautiful and successful aspects of Qur'anic translations or examine the cases in which translations have been embraced by communities.[4] As the field has been skewed in such a direction, the consequence is that the history of Qur'anic translation has been written as a tragic series of failures rather than as a dynamic and crucial chapter in the history of the Qur'an and Muslim intellectual life. The book in your hands makes no judgement on whether the Qur'an can or should be translated. Instead, it takes a central interest in how and why Muslims viewed translations as vital for coping with the circumstances in which they lived. Indeed, Turkish Muslims debated whether or not certain translations were accurate, but this was a second-order issue that emerged after a critical mass of people had decided that translations were crucial for the modernisation of the Muslim community. To gain insight into this decision, it is imperative to explore the development of the printed Qur'an, the debates about translations, as well as the links between processes related to modernisation and the crystallisation of new nations and nationalisms.

Within the field of Islamic Studies, relatively little attention has been paid to the development of modern versions of the Qur'an. For instance, articles written in the 1930s on the creation of the modern Egyptian recension of the Qur'an, the most widely used Arabic edition of the twentieth and twenty-first centuries, still hold sway as the main sources on the subject.[5] The book history of the Qur'an is a crucial area for understanding modern Islam, given that contemporary piety is increasingly biblio-centric and Qur'an-focused. Drawing upon print history and approaches developed in Translation Studies, this book highlights the fact that the Qur'an as we know it has a modern history. The content and form of translations are products of new technologies as well as political battles

and intellectual debates, not simply the word choices and stylistic decisions made by translators.

Looking carefully at the contexts in which modern copies of the Qur'an emerged and flourished, we can gain a sense of why translations were important and why, despite some disenchanted readers, Muslims have continually composed and published renderings of the Qur'an. While focusing on what we might call the cultural history of the Qur'an, this book also explores the actual texts of translations with attention to instances in which specific verses sparked a public controversy or led to reflections on what a translation could or should do. I give special attention to the renderings that mattered to contemporary readers, and on what their concerns can teach us about the social import of Qur'anic translations in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

Additionally, this book is intended as an indication of the new directions for research made possible by cross-fertilising Ottoman-Turkish History and Islamic Studies, two fields that have had little intercourse until recently. The scholarship emerging in both fields has much to gain from mutual engagement. At present, the lack of interaction between the two has resulted in a state of affairs in which the basic facts about Islamic reform, the most important intellectuals, and the formative Islamic texts of the Ottoman Empire and Turkey largely remain unknown or poorly understood in the broader fields of Middle Eastern History and Islamic Studies. Meanwhile, scholars of Islam often leave unexplored the wider intellectual, institutional, and technological developments that characterised this period of Ottoman-Turkish history and that of the broader region. Drawing upon Ottoman archival sources, seminal Islamic texts as well as newspapers, memoirs and journals in both Turkish and Arabic, I explore the material and intellectual developments related to the most important Islamic text, and, from this vantage point, attempt to provide a fresh perspective on religious modernisation during the empire-to-republic transition.

The narrative of progress towards nationhood and secularism runs deep in Ottoman-Turkish historiography, and this perspective has included Turkish translations of the Qur'an as a milestone on the path to modernity, enlightenment and civilisation. While this

book chronicles the idea of a modern and national Qur'an, it does not intend to replicate the narrative of progress or make value judgements on the emergence of translations. What it does do is show how Ottoman-Turkish narratives of progress aligned themselves with translations and attempted to emplot them on a path of historical evolution that took Europe as a model and considered the Protestant Reformation and its vernacularisation of the Bible exemplars of religious reform. Many Turkish intellectuals and politicians understood religious reform to be the lynchpin of modernisation, and viewed Martin Luther's German translation of the Bible as a defining moment in the rationalisation of religion and the birth of national consciousness. Yet, as we shall see throughout the book, despite attempts to emulate the Reformation, the history of Qur'anic translations developed along a trajectory distinct from that of Biblical translations, playing a different sociopolitical role and adapting to the concerns of existing Islamic institutions and authorities.

'Veiled from the Masses'

Towards the end of the nineteenth century, an Ottoman author named Muallim Naci wrote that commentaries of the Qur'an were 'seen by the elites in the umma' but remained 'veiled from the masses'.[6] For a society in which the memorisation of the Qur'an and the inculcation of Islamic values through Qur'anic precepts and stories formed the cornerstone of Muslim education, what did it mean to claim that the Qur'an was 'veiled from the masses' and, equally importantly, what was at stake in the bombastic claim to unveil it to the people? The aspiration to make the Qur'an accessible reverberates through various kinds of Anatolian-Turkish Islamic literature stretching back as far the 1400s. Writers expressed this intention both for works that were potentially easy to understand and for difficult texts that required substantial erudition and knowledge of multiple languages.[7] Yet when Muallim Naci voiced this refrain in the late nineteenth century it resonated with a different meaning. With the development of print culture and the blooming of national identity in the late Ottoman Empire,

intellectuals conceived a new idea of access to the Qur'an, one that favoured individual ownership of the book and valued the direct understanding of the text. This idea combined a pious educational ethos – the imperative to spread the Qur'anic message – with a modern notion of equality that valued broad access, education and enlightenment throughout society. By making the Qur'an accessible, supporters of translation and Qur'anic printing understood their efforts as attempts to challenge the traditional hierarchies of knowledge and provide a more direct way of communicating the central text of Islam. Proponents understood translation as a necessary tool for making the central text of Islam meaningful for non-Arab Muslims in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Crucially, as will be discussed in later chapters, they considered increased access to the Qur'an as an integral part of becoming modern and bringing about progress for the Muslim world. In the sphere of religious reform, translating the Qur'an was held to be an indispensable means of imagining and constructing an Islamic modernity that could survive and thrive in the rapidly changing world.

A critical number of intellectuals in the late Ottoman Empire and Turkey came to view direct engagement with, and individual comprehension of, the Qur'an as a necessity for Muslim societies. This view came to hold new power and potential in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, bolstered as it was by the spread of literacy via state schools, the emergence of nationalism, efforts at constitutional government, print technology as well as increased knowledge of European history and intellectual currents. In conjunction, these factors made possible the view that disseminating the Qur'an via print and in the language of the people was necessary and even natural.

Ottoman and Turkish reformers – including Haşim Nahid and Hüseyin Kâzım Kadri, both of whom we will come across in later chapters – felt the absence of translations had contributed to the multiple difficulties faced by many Muslim societies from the eighteenth century onwards, including political and economic distress, poverty and illiteracy. Muslim modernists around the globe – such as Musa Carullah Bigiyev – came to view the limited use of Qur'anic translation as a major impediment to the modernisation of Muslim

societies. Within this intellectual current, translations of the Qur'an constituted an ideal genre for literate modern citizens who embraced the egalitarian notion that Islamic knowledge should be accessible to every believer. While this approach to Qur'anic translation appeared radical to many Muslims in the Ottoman Empire and Turkey, it gradually moved into the mainstream with rising literacy rates, cheaper books and the spread of public schooling.

It is imperative to explore the connections between the Ottoman-Turkish case and the Qur'anic translation debates in the larger Muslim world during the modern period. The modern history of translating the Qur'an has rarely been approached as an international phenomenon, and the larger story of how modern Qur'an translations emerged remains untold. This calls for a broad historical lens that takes into consideration the overlapping histories of translations in diverse languages. Modern thinking on translation developed on various continents among Muslims who were cosmopolitan and interconnected through travel and print publications. Writers like Muḥammad Rashīd Riḍā and Marmaduke Pickthall followed the same international news, lived either directly or vicariously through World War I (1914–18), and knew each other personally. Given these linkages, it is a story that coheres better in its entirety rather than in its isolated texts and controversial incidents. While exploring this topic will require the work of multiple scholars, the present volume hopes to make a modest contribution in this direction by illuminating the intersections between Qur'anic printing, 'Turkish Qur'an' debates and the conversations about translating the Qur'an into English that occurred in Egypt and on various continents after the abolition of the caliphate.

Despite the challenge to authority implicit in 'revealing' the Qur'an to the masses, over the course of the twentieth century even traditional Islamic authorities – the ulama – gradually came to view renderings of the Qur'an as not only permissible but also necessary and beneficial for modern Muslim societies. Despite initial resistance from many quarters, by and large, the modern ulama have embraced renderings of the Qur'an as an opportunity to heighten Muslims' understanding of the book and to spread its message to non-Muslims. For example, the Turkish Directorate of

Religious Affairs, the Iranian Centre for the Translation of the Holy Qur'an, al-Azhar University in Cairo and the King Fahd Complex for the Printing of the Holy Qur'an are ulama institutions that engage in the production and distribution of translations. While some scholars – such as Elmalılı – abstain from calling any work a 'translation' of the text, vernacular re-writings of the Qur'an under the guise of other genres are considered acceptable by them and are a pervasive type of Qur'anic literature in modern Turkey and beyond. This shift in favour of translations has its roots in the intellectual and technological transformations of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

Any exploration of Qur'anic translation in modern Turkey must take nationalism into consideration, and much has been made of the role of nationalism in the emergence of Turkish translations. A plethora of narratives about the Turkish reforms in the 1920s and 1930s present translations of the Qur'an as a consequence of nationalism and often portray President Mustafa Kemal as the patron and instigator of these texts.[8] However, the role of nationalism has been somewhat misconstrued because these prevalent understandings suffer from anachronism. Whereas most observers point to the 1920s as the beginnings of translation, the perceived need for translations arose from the intellectual milieu of the late Ottoman period, well before the appearance of Turkish nationalism.

The initial impetus for Turkish commentaries and translations emerged from the conviction that the meaning of the Qur'an ought to accessible to those unversed in Arabic. In the Anatolian context, this idea has roots going back to the fourteenth century and attained modern expression, mixed with an Enlightenment ethos, in the Qur'anic commentaries published in the first half of the nineteenth century. This sentiment may have gained support from the proto-nationalist discourses in circulation in the latter half of that century, but vernacular renderings of the Qur'an were rarely construed as nationalist symbols prior to 1918, when Ziya Gökalp (1876–1924) penned a poem that proclaimed the 'Turkish Qur'an' (*Türkçe Kur'an*) to be an essential text for the nation.[9] The need to disseminate and understand its meaning propelled the argument for Turkish-language renderings, and this argument was largely devoid

of nationalism until World War I. Even then, this nationalist vision of Qur'an translation was seldom expressed prior to the founding of the Turkish Republic in 1923.

Thus, nationalism was not the initial impetus for Turkish translations of the Qur'an. However, the idea of making the Qur'an accessible – translating it for the 'villager' – meshed seamlessly with the populist message of Turkish nationalism and became a key part of the Kemalist agenda for religious reform.[10] The 1920s and especially the 1930s were periods of intense and experimental nationalism in the Turkish Republic during which identity, language and history were redefined in an attempt to construct a secular nation state upon the ruins of the diverse and polyglot Ottoman Empire. Religious reform played a central role in this effort, and the state attempted to both marginalise and vernacularise Islam in order to create a 'Turkish Islam' that bolstered national solidarity and did not pose a threat to the political stability of the new regime or impede its agenda of cultural reform.

Within this context, modern translations of the Qur'an formed a cornerstone of the new national Islam envisioned by Turkey's leaders. During the rule of Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, the Turkish state experimented with the recitation of translations in mosques and forced imams in certain locations to issue the call to prayer in Turkish. The promotion of translations was central to the attempt to cultivate a national Muslim community that had little connection to the transnational Islamic community. To many Muslims in the region and around the world, it appeared that the Turkish state was attempting to replace the Arabic Qur'an with a translation.

Historical Discourses on Qur'anic Translatability

Circa 1930, the first native English-speaking Muslim to translate the Qur'an, Muhammad Marmaduke Pickthall (1875–1936), summarised an opinion about Qur'anic translation that has been widespread since the eighth century:

> The Koran cannot be translated. That is the belief of old-fashioned Sheykhs and the view of the present writer. The Book is here

> rendered almost literally and every effort has been made to choose befitting language. But the result is not the Glorious Koran, that inimitable symphony, the very sounds of which move men to tears and ecstasy. It is only an attempt to present the meaning of the Koran – and peradventure something of the charm – in English. It can never take the place of the Koran in Arabic, nor is it meant to do so.[11]

Given the fact that Pickthall had translated the Qur'an, it is clear that in the passage above he is defining 'translation' in an unconventional manner. In the language of Islamic scholarship, 'translation' (Ar. *tarjama* or Tr. *tercüme*) has a particular meaning when used in relation to the Qur'an. Most scholars understand translation to mean an exact or equivalent reproduction of the text in another language, and, because of its equivalence, theoretically a translation could replace the original text and supplant its functions in ritual and legal matters. Alternatively, translation in the Islamic lexicon can mean a necessarily imperfect representation of a text that would, by definition, be inappropriate for the Holy Book.

According to the Qur'an and centuries of Muslim scholarship, Qur'anic language is not only divine but also unique; the Qur'an is a linguistic miracle, an instantiation of God's speech wrought in the Arabic language. Numerous passages underline the uniqueness of Qur'anic eloquence, for example, Q. 17:88, which states that even if humankind and the spirit world were to collaborate, they could not produce anything to rival its grandeur. Therefore, to translate, to tamper with the language, runs the risk of undermining the very miracle of the text, and Muslim legal thought, by and large, has deemed the attempt to translate or rival divine language doomed to failure. In this line of thinking, since perfect equivalency cannot be achieved, Qur'anic 'translation' is theoretically and practically impossible.[12] While never universal, this approach to the (im)possibility of translating the Qur'an has been dominant in most historical contexts.

A second factor that colours the discourse on Qur'anic translation is the self-conscious 'Arabicity' of the text. Distinctively, the Qur'an speaks repeatedly about itself as an Arabic revelation.

Unlike the Hebrew Bible or the Greek New Testament, the Qur'an is markedly self-conscious about its own language of communication, mentioning its relationship to Arabic or Arabness on numerous occasions[13] as seen, for instance, in Q. 12:2: *We revealed it as an Arabic recitation so that you might understand* and Q. 20:113: *Even so We have sent it down as an Arabic recitation*.[14] Important scholars such as Abū ʿAbdullāh Muḥammad al-Shāfiʿī (d. 204/820), the eponym of the Shāfiʿī school, argue that these passages and others like them define the text as something that can only exist in Arabic, and contend that its meaning is inextricably bound up with the language. In this view, a common one among legal scholars, the Qur'an is Arabic by definition and no text in another language can be called 'Qur'an'.[15] A Turkish Qur'an, for instance, would be seen as a contradiction in terms.

However, scepticism about Qur'anic translation has never been unanimous. The earliest recorded discussions on translating the Qur'an stemmed from the practical question of how non-Arab converts should perform their obligatory daily prayers (Ar. *ṣalāt*, Tr. *namāz*). Since Muslims are required to pray and those prayers involve the recitation of the Qur'an, how were new converts to perform these prayers if they could not pronounce Arabic correctly and could not understand what they were saying? Would it be preferable to pray in Arabic but mispronounce the words, or would it be better to express the meaning in a language which one could pronounce as well as understand? An important legal thinker of Persian background, Abū Ḥanīfa Nuʿmān b. Thābit (d. 150/767), reasoned that the most important aspect of the Qur'an resided in the meaning it contained, not the language in which it was transmitted. There is potentially support for this view in Qur'anic passages that portray the Qur'an as a message that had been communicated via prophets since time immemorial, for instance, Q. 26:196–7: *Truly it is in the Scriptures of the ancients. Was it not a sign for them, that it is known to the learned of the Children of Israel?* According to one interpretation, the message to the Jewish people was not an Arabic text, therefore, the verse must be referring to a message or meaning that is not determined by any single language.[16] Another verse commonly discussed in this regard is

Q. 14:4: *We have sent no Messenger save with the tongue of his people, that he might make all clear to them.* Abū Ḥanīfa placed emphasis on the importance of meaning for Muslim ritual, granting permission for Persian language prayer, even if the devotees knew Arabic.[17] His approach asserts both the translatability of the Qur'an as well as the legality of ritual prayer in non-Arabic languages.

Though Abū Ḥanīfa's opinion is one of the first recorded meditations on Qur'anic translation in the history of Muslim thought, in retrospect it appears unconventional in its approach to the ritual use of translations. The bulk of subsequent legal thought moved in the opposite direction, defining the Qur'an as intrinsically Arabic and limiting obligatory prayer to Arabic. Even many Ḥanafī scholars came to disagree with the master's opinion, including important members of the late Ottoman ulama and modern Turkish ulama, such as Mustafa Sabri (1869–1954). A controversy rages over whether Abū Ḥanīfa maintained this opinion throughout his lifetime or came to agree with the opinion of his successors. Neither of Abū Ḥanīfa's chief disciples, Muḥammad al-Shaybānī (132–89/750–805) and Abū Yūsuf (113–82/731–98), mentioned that he had second thoughts about this subject. Rather, they modified his opinion, allowing non-Arabs to say their prayers in Persian only if they were incapable of reciting the *Fātiḥa* accurately; this permission to pray in Persian would expire once the person had learned to recite properly in Arabic.[18] Granting conditional, temporary permission for non-Arabic prayer became the dominant position for subsequent generations of the Ḥanafī school, and various writers attempted to harmonise Abū Ḥanīfa's position with that of his disciples.[19] While this may seem only a slight alteration to the opinion of the founder, it in fact posits a radically different hierarchy of language in Muslim ritual. Abū Ḥanīfa had granted equal validity to Persian and, theoretically, to all languages for performing ritual acts, while his disciples' position assumed that Arabic was the exclusively appropriate medium for prayer and that other languages could only serve as a temporary means of attaining proper Arabic ritual.

Other legal schools displayed even less flexibility than the early Ḥanafīs and insisted on rituals being performed exclusively in the

Arabic language. Their position was undergirded by the idea that the Qur'an was uncreated and that Arabic was an essential, not an accidental, aspect of the text. The prevalent view held that Arabic was a sacred language characterised by what Benedict Anderson calls the 'non-arbitrariness of the sign', the notion that a particular language not only conveyed a divine message but also embodied it and was inseparable from its meaning.[20] Broadly speaking, Muslim thought came to regard the Arabic arrangement of the Qur'an as intrinsic, not incidental, to revelation.[21] Mālik b. Anas (d. 179/795), the eponym of the Mālikī school, 'detested' prayer in languages other than Arabic and even loathed it when anyone took an oath using God's name in another tongue.[22] Mālikī scholars often held up Arabic as an example of a unique and superior language, arguing that no language other than Arabic could produce elucidation (*bayān*) or inimitability (*iʿjāz*) and, therefore, prayer in other languages could not be permitted.[23] The Ḥanbalī scholar Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Qudāma al-Maqdisī (d. 682/1283) regarded those of his contemporaries who supported translation as apostates, and believed they were attempting to lead Muslims astray. He lamented that

> some apostatizing non-Arabs in our time began to call for the translation of the Qur'an and other devotions of the prayers, and for the use of such translations in their daily worship. Their true aim is, however, to use this as a means of facilitating apostasy for the rest of their people, and 'the casting of the Qur'an which was sent down from God behind their backs (2:101)'.[24]

The important legal thinker and advocate of the superiority of the Arabic language, Shāfiʿī, argued that reciting the Qur'an in Persian or any other non-Arabic language would invalidate prayer: if a Muslim could not recite in Arabic, he or she should perform the prayers without recitation of the Qur'an and instead recite formulaic praises (for example, *Allāhu akbar, al-ḥamdu li'llāh*). His reasoning is based on the idea that the Qur'an is Arabic and anything non-Arabic is, by definition, not the Qur'an. Therefore, translations are mere human speech and, if recited, they invalidate

ritual prayer.[25] Even later Ḥanafīs adopted a more rigid orientation towards the ritual use of translations, and most – including some very prominent thinkers in the Ottoman Empire and Turkey – accepted the idea that Abū Ḥanīfa had changed his opinion and taken a more restrictive view of prayer in the vernacular.

There is substantial agreement between Sunni non-Ḥanafī and Twelver Shiʿi legal scholars on reciting translations during prayer and in viewing Qur'anic inimitability as dependent on the Arabic language. While there are reports of ritual use of Berber translations among Shiʿi groups in North Africa, Twelver Shiʿis largely forbid the reciting of translations during prayer because they view Qur'anic inimitability as inextricably tied to its Arabic form. Travis Zadeh has demonstrated a close correspondence between Twelver and Shāfiʿī positions due to the educational trajectories of some influential Shiʿi scholars who studied with those in Shāfiʿī circles. While most early Shiʿi scholars agreed with the Muʿtazilīs and some early Ḥanafīs that the Qur'an was created in time, the dominant Twelver position went against the Ḥanafīs in regard to praying with translations.[26]

Within the Ottoman context, the most important Shiʿi-affiliated groups were the Bektashi Sufi order and the diverse Alevi communities (often called Kızılbaşlar, 'redheads'), which were and are widespread throughout Anatolia and the Balkans.[27] However, these communities did not enter public debates on translating the Qur'an. Both groups had ritual and legal trajectories distinct from those of the neighbouring Twelver Shiʿis and Sunnis, and they developed a thoroughly vernacular use of the Qur'an within their literature and ritual life. They used Turkish or Kurdish as the primary language of ceremonies and prayers, incorporating phrases and untranslated verses from the Qur'an into rituals and into their rich body of poetry and song. Alevi-Bektashi literature approaches the Qur'an through an esoteric lens, as seen, for example, in this poem that appears to address the reader, '*You* are the meeting place of the two seas (*majmaʿ al-baḥrayn*), both essence and attribute reside in you [. . .] Did you ever realise that you are the one who speaks the Book of God?'[28] The idea that the human being is a locus of divinity and potential producer of Qur'an-like revelation would be viewed as

blasphemy (*kufr*) by many Muslim scholars, but for Alevi-Bektashis it is a common trope. These communities interpreted and used the Qur'an very differently from neighbouring Sunnis and Twelver Shi'is. For many such groups, the poetry of their saints and bards held a more prominent place than the Qur'an in shaping their worldview and ritual life. Additionally, the Bektashi order was banned in 1826, making it difficult to publicly express Bektashi views for most of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.[29] Because of this combination of factors, they did not play a visible role in the debates on Qur'anic translation in the late Ottoman Empire and early Turkish Republic.

All things considered, it is important to keep in mind that the views of the jurists have never been homogenous or hegemonic. There have always been jurists of various legal schools who supported translations as well as a range of different approaches to vernacular renderings and conceptions of the Qur'an by Sufis, litterateurs and non-jurists. For instance, the Islamicate literary world has often called the *Mathnawī* of Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī 'The Persian Qur'an', though it is not a translation of the Qur'an but rather a massive work of rhymed verse that takes a great deal of inspiration from the Qur'an. It is a 'Qur'an' in the sense that it is thought by some to be the most eloquent piece of literature in the Persian language, much as the Qur'an is for the Arabic language, and perhaps also divinely inspired.[30]

Muslim scholars were not unique in considering scriptural language sacred language. Given the ties between politics, religious authorities and holy writ, changing the medium of religious texts by altering either their mode of production or their language has proven to be a sensitive matter in diverse societies and traditions. From the translation of the Jewish scriptures into Greek to the vernacular renderings of the Bible in early modern Europe, the history of scriptural translation has been fraught with controversy and, at times, even violence. For instance, because the Catholic Church considered Latin a sacred language and the idiom of its religio-political authority, it severely punished those who translated the official Latin version of the Bible (itself a translation) into European vernaculars. To translate was to challenge church

authority and reject the dominance of Latin scripture. During the sixteenth century, Biblical translators like the English scholar William Tyndale (1494–1536) were excommunicated, imprisoned and even executed because they were considered opponents of Catholic authority.[31]

While Islamic legal opinion often rejects Qur'anic translation, there is not a similar history of violent suppression of such works and, in fact, Islamic societies have often used other forms of rewriting the text or of 'bringing it to understanding'.[32] The term *tafsīr* plays an important role in Arabic and in Islamic discourse for genres that explain and communicate the meaning of the Qur'an. The most basic, pre-technical meaning of *tafsīr* is to make plain what is concealed or to open up what is closed. As a genre, the word *tafsīr* is usually translated in English as commentary, interpretation or exegesis. Jews and Christians writing in Arabic use *tafsīr* to refer to translations of, as well as commentaries on, the Bible.[33] In Islamic literature, it suggests a range of explanations and expansions on the Qur'anic text. Some texts with the name *tafsīr* include multiple types of explanation which involves applying etymology, commenting on the text, expanding at length on individual words, citing relevant narrative material and, in other places, translating or paraphrasing.

Similar to the relationship between *translation* and *interpretation* in English, the boundary between *tarjama* and *tafsīr* is sometimes clear and other times blurred in traditions of Islamicate letters. The Arabic dictionary *Lisān al-ʿArab* by Ibn Manẓūr (d. 711/1312) defines 'translator' (*tarjumān*) as 'an interpreter of language' (*al-mufassir li'l-lisān*), that is, one who performs *tafsīr* on language.[34] In similar fashion, the late Ottoman dictionary *Lûgat-i Ebüzziya* defines translation as 'explaining (*tefsir*) and clarifying one language with another'.[35] The fact that Islamicate linguistic traditions often use these terms to define one another underlines the idea that the activities of translation (*tarjama*) and interpretation (*tafsīr*) are closely linked and difficult to distinguish, thereby reflecting the contemporary truism that *every translation is an interpretation*.

The Shāfiʿī jurist Muḥammad b. Bahādur al-Zarkashī (d. 794/1392) reports a conversation in which a teacher tells his students that

translating (*tarjama*) the Qur'an is forbidden. A student then asks him if that means that no one is permitted to interpret (*tafsīr*) the Qur'an. This astute question points to the heart of the matter: the distinction between *tafsīr* and *tarjama* is often hazy. The teacher responds by attempting to distinguish between the two: translation can potentially replace the original text, whereas interpretation merely informs the hearer of what the interpreter understands.[36] The distinction between replacement and explanatory supplement is crucial. For renderings of the Qur'an, Muslim scholars almost unanimously rejected the former and embraced the latter. Unlike the case of the canonised Christian Bibles, which were replaced by translations in Syriac, Latin and Coptic, and later German, Dutch and English, the Qur'an in its original language has been defended vigorously as a central component of Islamic ritual and scholarship.

Despite the formal prohibitions of translations in legal compendia, oral and written translations have played an important role in the propagation and teaching of Islam. The social realities of Muslim ritual often departed dramatically from the letter of Islamic legal manuals. The ritual use of translations in Bukhara and along the Volga is well attested, and it is likely that similar uses occurred in other regions as well. Zadeh argues that Abū Ḥanīfa's pro-translation fatwa probably granted *post factum* legitimacy to an already existing phenomenon of the performance of ritual in the Persian language.[37] Moreover, some jurists like the Shāfiʿī scholar al-Isfarāʾīnī (d. 471/1078–9) broke ranks with their legal schools and argued that translation (*tarjama*) was crucial for propagating and teaching Islam among non-Arabs.[38] He wrote that the necessity of translation was clear, given that 'the Arabs and those who know Arabic are fewer in number than those who do not know [Arabic]', a refrain that would often be heard in the debates on the subject in the Ottoman era as well.[39] Evidence suggests that non-Arab Muslims in Transoxiana and Khurasan had 'fully integrated' the Persian language as a means of interpreting and transmitting the Qur'an by the eleventh century.[40]

Turkish-speaking Muslims in Anatolia and the Balkans made similar arguments in favour of Qur'anic translation. For the

predominately Ḥanafī Muslims in these regions, the (for some) controversial opinion of Abū Ḥanīfa was the paradigmatic reference for validating Turkish language as a medium of ritual, scripture and religious knowledge. For instance, the rhyming Ottoman legal manual *Vikaye-i Manzume* invokes his views:

> He saw the Persian Qur'an as valid no less
> Whoever reads it in prayer may he do it with zest
> In whatever language, in whatever tongue it may be,
> words are mere tools, meaning is the key[41]

The verses diminish the importance of Qur'anic Arabic, claiming that any idiom, even Turkish – a language often viewed as coarse, even barbaric, by Arabs and Persians – could convey divine meaning. As in the Persianate world, the ghost of Abū Ḥanīfa would loom large in the Ottoman-Turkish debates of the coming centuries.

Turkish Translations of the Qur'an

The earliest known translations in Old Anatolian Turkish, the most direct predecessor of Ottoman and modern Turkish, date back to the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, the oldest dated copy bearing the year 827/1424.[42] Building on a Central Asian tradition of multilingual interlinear Qur'anic translations, these interlinear texts are either bilingual (Arabic–Turkish) or trilingual (Arabic–Persian–Turkish), and they began to appear in the fourteenth century following the break-up of the Anatolian Seljuk state into territories governed by Turkish-speaking rulers.[43] Some works provide word-for-word Turkish equivalents underneath Arabic terms, forming a running glossary for the Arabic.[44] However, many translations from this period translate and paraphrase complete verses or chapters.[45]

Manuscripts of interlinear Qur'an translations were supplementary texts that did not threaten to replace the Arabic Qur'an. The translation is subordinated graphically on the page, written or scribbled in smaller script underneath the Arabic original in a

different colour. This format stands in sharp contrast to modern bilingual translations where the translations are found in columns parallel to the Arabic, suggesting equivalence in meaning and prestige. The earliest Turkic and Turkish translations do not rhyme, nor are they written in metre as were some early Persian translations. This suggests that they did not function as texts to be recited ritually. Moreover, reports of Turkish-language prayer and the use of translations in ritual are notably lacking in historical accounts from the early Ottoman and pre-Ottoman periods. While the evidence for constructing a social history of how such texts were used is fragmentary, it seems that literate elites and the ulama used interlinear translations to aid their reading of the Arabic text and in educational settings.

Additionally, interlinear texts occasioned no controversies in the early Ottoman context and seem to have been composed and used by the ulama. The uncontroversial nature of these books underscores the importance of historical context in determining what was at stake when controversies over the translation of the Qur'an did erupt in later centuries. It was only with the coming of print that translations of the Qur'an began to appear threatening in the Ottoman Empire, causing Muslim scholars to reopen the classical debates on translation and acceptable genres of interpretation. In the modern period, the question of access to books and control of interpretation hinged largely on print technology and its ability to amplify the dissemination of texts, transform written culture and give voice to competing ideas.

Modern Factors, New Conversations

To make sense of Qur'anic translation debates in the modern period, we must not only understand the classical positions but also consider the new factors that reshaped conversations among intellectuals and enabled vernacular renderings to blossom. When late Ottoman and Turkish thinkers discussed translation they did so in a print-based public sphere, within the context of a centralised modern state that had steadily diminished the power of the ulama, and at a time when Muslims had intimate knowledge of European

history, intellectual currents and Christian missionary activities. These contexts were radically different from that of Abū Ḥanīfa or any other scholar of the premodern period, and the evolving opinions on Qur'anic translation sought to meet the needs of the modern period, not to rehash theoretical debates from centuries before. Qur'anic translations re-emerged as controversial books in the modern period because they were consequential for the modernisation of Ottoman and Turkish societies during a period of political and intellectual crisis. Far from being a subject of scholastic debate, translation involved actual dramatic shifts in political authority and the economy of knowledge production.

One issue to take into consideration is the unequal balance of power between the Ottoman Empire and Europe during the nineteenth century. European states exerted immense political and cultural influence on the late Ottoman Empire, and, as a result, European historical trajectories provided the empire with models for imitation, adaptation or rejection. Many Ottoman intellectuals envisioned Islamic reform along the lines of European developments and presented the Reformation, nationalism and liberalism as viable sources of inspiration. Additionally, the ascent of Euro-American power enabled widespread Christian missionary activities across the eastern Mediterranean which included translating and refuting the Qur'an.[46] These attacks on the Qur'an created a sense of urgency among Muslims to defend their sacred book. The power disparity between the Ottomans and the European empires coloured the way in which Turkish Muslims weighed the pros and cons of Qur'anic translation and charted new courses for reform and renewal.

Translation itself meant something distinct in this period. The concept had new connotations and layers of meaning shaped by modern history. In addition to the traditional understanding of the Arabic terms *tarjama* and *tafsīr*, Turkish and European notions of translation influenced the debates about rendering the Qur'an into the vernacular. The translation of European, especially French, literary works led to vibrant discussions on the role and meaning of translation in Ottoman society,[47] and the transfer of scientific and technical knowledge via translation played a prominent role

in the process of Ottoman-Turkish modernisation. Şehnaz Tahir-Gürçağlar writes that, 'Translation came to be regarded as an instrument of enlightenment and modernization in the late Ottoman Empire and early Republican period both by the ruling elite and the intellectuals of the country.'[48] In other words, translation was no mere linguistic endeavour; it was seen as a tool of progress.

Within late Ottoman society, the decline of the ulama's institutional power and the development of a print-based public sphere granted new opportunities for non-ulama intellectuals to influence public opinion on Islamic issues. Muhammad Qasim Zaman has shown that the ulama in South Asia were successful in competing with the new intellectuals via print media. In the late Ottoman Empire, this was true to a certain extent, but devout non-ulama intellectuals were far more successful. The ulama progressively lost authority and public influence as the state curtailed their political power and social standing during the last decades of the empire and in the early years of the Turkish Republic.[49] For non-ulama intellectuals, the assertion of *tarjama* was metonymic for a new vision of Islamic authority that demanded more democratic access to Qur'anic knowledge and asserted the right of the non-ulama to weigh in on Islamic matters. The modern genre of Qur'anic translation emerged simultaneously with these new intellectuals and challenged the authority of the ulama to act as the official interpreters of the Qur'an. Supporters of Qur'anic translation in the late Ottoman Empire and Turkey argued for a revival of the opinion of Abū Ḥanīfa and for an imitation of Martin Luther's German Bible in the form of a Turkish Qur'an in order to challenge the ulama's monopoly of Qur'anic interpretation and reveal the meaning of the sacred book to larger swathes of Ottoman society.

Given the threat to ulama authority, many late Ottoman and early republican ulama strongly opposed translation in order to protect the community from what they believed were the insufficiencies and excesses of the new intellectuals and, moreover, to safeguard their position as the custodians of Islamic knowledge. In the eyes of many ulama, the Qur'an needed to be protected and preserved during these difficult times, not opened up to potentially

radical reinterpretation by self-styled intellectuals influenced by European literature and learning. For them, *tarjama* of the Qur'an amounted to a breakdown in Islamic authority that could very well lead to chaos.

Despite these fears, even during the heyday of Turkish nationalism in the 1920s and 1930s, Turkish translators encountered an immense 'intervening body of commentary' that limited the range of licit translations they could make.[50] Devout intellectuals and the ulama expected translations of the Qur'an to be informed by, and to agree with, the commentaries, so to varying degrees translators practised *tarjama* through *tafsīr*, consulting works of Qur'anic commentary to guarantee the correctness of their translations. Print media enabled translators to disseminate new renderings of the Qur'an far and wide, but it also made their task more difficult. Because of this new media, modern translators faced a great deal of scrutiny and criticism since their audience – which included those who had spent their entire life reciting, studying and revering the text – could attack their renderings publicly in newspapers, journals and pamphlets. This context made radical reinterpretations of the text unfeasible and gave traditional commentaries significant influence in shaping modern translations.

The influence of Europe, an expanding print culture and the crisis of ulama authority added new dynamics to the traditional scholarly debates on Qur'anic translation. Throughout this book, these factors will be considered while tracing the emergence of Qur'anic translation from the earliest printed Turkish commentaries on the Qur'an in the mid-nineteenth century to those produced shortly before World War II. This period, from roughly 1840–1940, marks the crucial transition in which translations of the Qur'an broke through scholarly and legal taboos and became mainstream Islamic literature, both in Turkey and in the larger Muslim world.

Structure of the Book

Since print media is crucial to the popularisation of Qur'an translations, examining print history and attitudes towards print

technology figure prominently in this exploration. The history of the printing of the Qur'an in the late Ottoman Empire will be dealt with in Chapter One and Chapter Two; both use materials from the Ottoman archives to provide an account of how the Ottomans came to print the Qur'an and how printed copies helped to bring about the broader shift towards Qur'anic accessibility. Next follows an examination, in Chapter Three, of the rise of Turkish as an Islamic language via the Turkish-language Qur'anic commentaries that became prevalent in the latter half of the nineteenth century. Additionally, it probes the ethos of vernacular access – the notion that Muslims should have access to renderings in their own language – that crystallised at the turn of the century.

Chapter Four examines the translation debates from 1908 to 1918 through the perspectives of the prominent Egyptian writer Muḥammad Rashīd Riḍā (1865–1935), Christian missionaries and the Russian Tatar reformist Musa Carullah Bigiyev (1875–1949). Moreover, it considers the relationship between translation, narratives of progress and emerging discourses of Turkish nationalism. Chapter Five explores the controversial translations published during the early years of the Republic of Turkey that dismayed the public and instigated the state to sponsor an official translation project in response. Following on from this, Chapter Six will demonstrate how Arab, South Asian and English Muslims wrestled with the question of translation in the period following the Turkish Qur'an controversy; it will also examine the emergence of seminal English-language translations in the light of Turkish debates. On the heels of the developments in Turkey, Egyptian scholars reignited the debate about the necessity of translations to properly represent and spread Islam to the rest of the world. Chapter Seven examines the state-sponsored translation project in Turkey, the experiments with Turkish-language ritual and the difficulties that were encountered in attempting to create an official translation. Chapter Eight provides a summation of the discussions of previous chapters.

NOTES

1 Elmalılı Muhammed Hamdi Yazır, *Hak Dini Kur'an Dili: Yeni Mealli Türkçe Tefsir* (Istanbul, Matbaa-i Ebüzziya, 1935–9).

2 Ömer Rıza [Doğrul], *Kur'an Nedir?* (Istanbul, Amedi Matbaası, 1927), pp. 88–9.
3 For example, Hussein Abdul-Raof, *Qur'an Translation: Discourse, Texture and Exegesis* (Richmond, Curzon, 2001); idem, 'The Qur'an: Limits of Translatability', in Said Faiq, ed., *Cultural Encounters in Translation from Arabic* (Clevedon, Multilingual Matters, 2004), pp. 91–106; A.R. Kidawi, 'Translating the Untranslatable: A Survey of English Translations of the Quran', *Muslim World Book Review* 7, no. 4 (1987), pp. 66–71.
4 Notable exceptions to this trend include Travis Zadeh, *The Vernacular Qur'an: Translation and the Rise of Persian Exegesis* (Oxford, Oxford University Press in association with The Institute of Ismaili Studies, 2012) and Sufia Uddin, *Constructing Bangladesh* (Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina Press, 2006).
5 Gotthelf Bergsträsser, 'Koranlesung in Kairo', *Der Islam* 20 (1932), pp. 1–42; idem, 'Koranlesung in Kairo', *Der Islam* 21 (1933), pp. 110–34.
6 Muallim Ömer Naci, *Hülasatü'l-İhlas*, ed. Ahmed Sabri (Istanbul, Matbaa-i Ebüzziya, 1304/1886–7), p. 4.
7 Gottfried Hagen, 'Translations and Translators in a Multilingual Society: A Case Study of Persian–Ottoman Translations, Late Fifteenth to Early Seventeenth Century', *Eurasian Studies* 2, no. 1 (2003), p. 131.
8 Niyazi Berkes, *The Development of Secularism in Turkey* (New York, Routledge, 1998), p. 487; Mahmut Esat Bozkurt, *Atatürk İhtilâli* (Istanbul, Burhaneddin Matbaası, 1940), p. 313; Charles H. Sherrill, *A Year's Embassy to Mustafa Kemal* (New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1934), pp. 193–6.
9 Ziya Gökalp, *Ziya Gökalp Külliyatı*, vol. I: *Şiirler ve Halk Masalları*, ed. Fevziye Abdullah Tansel (Ankara, Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1952), p. 113.
10 Ibid.
11 Marmaduke Pickthall, *The Meaning of the Glorious Koran* (New York, Dorset, 1985), p. vii.
12 Richard C. Martin, 'Inimitability', *EQ*, vol. II, pp. 526–36.
13 On the topic of Qur'anic self-consciousness, see Daniel A. Madigan, *The Qur'ân's Self Image: Writing and Authority in Islam's Scripture* (Princeton, NJ, Princeton University Press, 2001); Stefan Wild, *Self-Referentiality in the Qur'ān* (Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz, 2006); idem, ed., *The Qur'an as Text* (Leiden, Brill, 1996).
14 Q. 12:2 and Q. 20:113 have been modified by the author.
15 A. Kevin Reinhart, 'Jurisprudence', in Andrew Rippin, ed., *The Blackwell Companion to the Qur'ān* (Malden, MA, Blackwell, 2006), p. 439.
16 Zadeh, *Vernacular Qur'an*, p. 114.
17 Zadeh, *Vernacular Qur'an*, pp. 60–61; Mahmoud Ayoub, 'Translating the Meanings of the Qur'an: Traditional Opinions and Modern Debates', *Afkar/Inquiry* 3, no. 5 (1986), p. 35.
18 Reinhart, 'Jurisprudence', p. 437.
19 Zadeh, *Vernacular Qur'an*, p. 118.
20 Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (New York, Verso, 1991), p. 14.
21 Ibid., p. 41.
22 Zadeh, *Vernacular Qur'an*, p. 73.

23 Ayoub, 'Translating', p. 35.
24 Ibid, p. 36.
25 Zadeh, *Vernacular Qu'ran*, pp. 75–7.
26 Ibid., pp. 126–9.
27 See John Kingsley Birge, *The Bektashi Order of Dervishes* (London, Luzac, 1937); Markus Dressler, *Writing Religion: The Making of Turkish Alevi Islam* (Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2013).
28 A favourite concept for mystical contemplation, 'the confluence of the two seas' is mentioned in Q. 18:60; see Bedri Noyan, *Bektaşilik Alevilik Nedir?* (Ankara, Doğuş Matbaacılık, 1985), p. 249.
29 Birge, *The Bektashi Order*, p. 16.
30 It was the poet Nūr al-Dīn ʿAbd al-Raḥmān Jāmī (817/1414–898/1492) who originally called Rūmī's work the Persian Qur'an (*Qur'ān dar zabān-e pahlawī*); Nile Green, *Bombay Islam: The Religious Economy of the West Indian Ocean, 1840–1915* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2011), p. 100.
31 'Tyndale, William', *Oxford Encyclopedia of the Reformation* (Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1996).
32 Richard E. Palmer, *Hermeneutics* (Evanston, IL, Northwestern University Press, 1969), p. 13.
33 Andrew Rippin, 'Tafsīr', *EI*^{2}, vol. X, pp. 85–8.
34 Muḥammad b. Mukarram Ibn Manẓūr, *Lisān al-ʿarab* (Beirut, Dār Iḥyāʾ Turāth al-ʿArabī, 1997), II, p. 26.
35 Ebüzziya Tevfik, *Lûgat-i Ebüzziya* (Istanbul, Matbaa-i Ebüzziya, 1306/1888–9), p. 319.
36 Muḥammad b. Bahādur al-Zarkashī, *Baḥr al-muḥīṭ fī uṣūl al-fiqh* (Beirut, Dār al-Kutub al-ʿIlmiyya, 2000), p. 361.
37 Travis Zadeh, 'Translation, Geography, and the Divine Word: Mediating Frontiers in Pre-Modern Islam' (PhD Dissertation, Harvard University, 2006), pp. 477–8. On Bukharan translations, see Ashirbek Muminov, 'Disputes in Bukhara on the Persian Translation of the Qur'ān', *Mélanges de l'Université Saint-Joseph* 59 (2006), pp. 301–8.
38 Zadeh, 'Translation', pp. 518–21.
39 Ibid., p. 520.
40 Ibid., p. 522.
41 Balıkesirli Devletoğlu Yusuf, *Vikaye-i Manzume*, MS İzmir 762 (Süleymaniye Library, Istanbul), p. 3.
42 Türk-İslam Eserler Müzesi no. 40 (827/1424), Istanbul, Turkey.
43 Mehmet bin Hamza and Ahmet Topaloğlu, *XV. Yüzyıl Başlarında Yapılmış Satır-Arası Kur'an Tercümesi* (Istanbul, Devlet Kitapları, 1976), p. xvii. On Central Asian Turkic translations, see János Eckmann, *Middle Turkic Glosses of the Rylands Interlinear Koran Translation* (Budapest, Akadémiai Kiadó, 1976); Gülden Sağol, ed., *An Interlinear Translation of the Qur'an into Khwarzm Turkish* (Cambridge, MA, Harvard University – Department of Near Eastern Languages and Civilizations, 1993); Zeki Velidi Togan, 'The Earliest Translation of the Qur'an into Turkish', *İslam Tetkikleri Enstitüsü Dergisi* 4 (1964), pp. 1–19.
44 Hamza and Topaloğlu, *XV. Yüzyıl Başlarında Yapılmış Satır-Arası Kur'an Tercümesi*, p. 3.

45 Ibid., p. xviii. See, for example, Esra Karabacak, *An Inter-Linear Translation of the Qur'an into Old Anatolian Turkish* (Cambridge, MA, Harvard University – Department of Near Eastern Languages and Civilizations, 1994).
46 See Chapter Four in this book.
47 Cemal Demircioğlu, 'From Discourse to Practice: Rethinking "Translation" (*Terceme*) and Related Practices of Text Production in the Late Ottoman Literary Tradition' (PhD Thesis, Boğaziçi University, 2005), pp. 3–14.
48 Şehnaz Tahir-Gürçağlar, 'The Translation Bureau Revisited', in María Calzada Pérez, ed., *Apropos of Ideology: Translation Studies on Ideology – Ideologies in Translation Studies* (Manchester, St Jerome Publishing, 2003), p. 114.
49 Muhammad Qasim Zaman, 'Commentaries, Print and Patronage: "Ḥadīth" and the Madrasas in Modern South Asia', *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 62, no. 1 (1999), pp. 60–81.
50 George Steiner, *After Babel: Aspects of Language and Translation*, 2nd edn (Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1992), p. 262.