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Abstract: The Holy Qur'ān is the Word of Allah, and its interpretation is divine; with this belief, Muslim scholars have approached the Qur'ānic text. Nevertheless, the translation and tafsīr (exegesis) of the Holy Qur'ān have remained a significant contribution of Muslim scholars for ages. On the other hand, Western scholars, particularly Orientalists, have also attempted to translate the Qur'ānic text into different European languages. Similarly, George Sale was the first Orientalist scholar to translate the Holy Qur'ān into English directly from Arabic. This paper attempted to evaluate, examine and analyze the translation of George Sale critically. This paper focused on the objectives of Sale's preliminary discourse, which he has prefixed to his translation and commentary. This paper has analyzed and critically examined the aims and objectives behind the translation and Commentary of Sale and his missionary affiliations. This paper argues that Sale’s methodology in translation and tafsīr has remained far from the approach of Muslim scholars. The purpose of his translation into the English language has fulfilled the aims of the Orientalist movement. This paper is qualitative and analytical. The study recommends that George Sale’s omission, additions, interpolation, and misquotations from the sources he had claimed to use are biased on methodological principles. Finally, the results are based on the available English translations of the Muslims and the methodology of principles of tafsīr recommended by Islamic traditions.
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Introduction: As far as the interpretation of the Holy Qur’ān is concerned, Islamic traditions hold that the interpretation of the Holy Qur’ān can be made primarily through ‘Usūl al-tafsīr (principles of exegesis). The major methods of interpretation of the Qur’ānic text are tafsīr and tāw’īl (Exegesis or Interpretation). According to the traditions, the roots of ‘Usūl al-tafsīr are deep into the era of nuzūl al-Qur’ān (period of descent of revelation). The interpretation and explanation of āyāt (pl. of āyat) (verses) by Ḥadrat Muḥammad Rasūllallāh Khātam un Nabiyyīn (Ṣallallahu ‘alaihi wa ‘alā Ālihi wa Aṣḥābihi wa Sallam) gave rise to the science of tafsīr. The Arabic word tafsīr is derived from the root word fassar, used in the sense of tāw’īl, which means ‘to interpret’ or ‘to explain.’ Some Islamic scholars are of the opinion that the word fassar also means “al-bayān wa al-kashaf (the explanation and revelation).”1 Thus, interpreting the Qur’ānic text depends on the principles of tafsīr. According to traditional Islamic scholarship, the standard of ‘Usūl al-tafsīr is the primary criterion for the commentary of the Holy Qur’ānic text. George Sale was the first to translate the Holy Qur’ān into English and added notes on āyāt of the Holy Qur’ānic text. A critical examination of his methodology of translation and commentary is conducted in this study.
Background: The *tafsir* is generally considered an interpretation and explanation of the *āyāt* by Ḥadrat Muḥammad Rasūllah Khātam un Nabīyyīn (Ṣallallahu 'alaihi wa 'alā Alihi wa Aṣḥābihi wa Sallam). According to al-Zarkashi, “*tafsir* is known for understanding the book of Allah revealed to His Nabi [Ḥadrat Muḥammad Rasūllah Khātam un Nabīyyīn (Ṣallallahu ‘alaihi wa ‘alā Alihi wa Aṣḥābihi wa Sallam)] stating its meanings, extracting its commandments, and wisdom.”⁰⁰ Abū Hayyān (d. 745/1344) states that *tafsir* is “a science in which the method of recitation of the words of the Holy Qur’ān, their connotations, individual or syntactic rulings, and their meanings that carry the state of composition and its complements are explained.”⁰¹ There is a customary agreement of Islamic scholars that the *tafsir* is revealed. Similarly, an equivalent method of explanation of the Holy Qur’ān, prominent during the lifetime of Ḥadrat Muḥammad Rasūllah Khātam un Nabīyyīn (Ṣallallahu ‘alaihi wa ‘alā Alihi wa Aṣḥābihi wa Sallam) is called *tāwil*. The Holy Qur’ān uses the term *tāwil* itself, “But no one knows its true meanings [*tāwil*] except Allah (Q. 3:7).”⁰² However, some scholars are of the view that the *tafsir* and the *tāwil* are synonymous terms. Nevertheless, both terms have some disparities in their meaning and contextualization. Some scholars are of the opinion that both carry different meanings.⁰³ According to Qāzī ibn al-‘Arabī (d. 543), the second meaning of *tāwil* is “al-*tafsir* wa al-ٛbayān (the interpretation and the explanation)”⁰⁴ Thus, *tāwil* and *tafsir* are two authentic interpretative methods of *tafsir*. Al-Zarkhshī states that “*tafsir* is the explanation of *al-Riwayah* [narration, text, and or tradition], and *tāwil* is the explanation of *al-Dirayah* [reason, understanding, and or viewpoint].”⁰⁵ Thus, these two prominent methods of interpretation of the Holy Qur’ān are generally accepted by the *Ummah* (Muslim community), and their impact is visible in the translation works of Muslim scholars as well.

This is imperative to mention that Muslim scholars have translated and interpreted the Qur’ānic text in line with *Usul al-*tafsir*. There is a clear distinction between the text of the Holy Qur’ān, the translation, and the commentary or exegetical notes. Muslim Scholars are of the view that “the divine word assumed a specific Arabic form, and that form is as essential as the meaning that the words convey. Hence the Arabic Qur’ānic text is the [Holy] Qur’ān, and translations are simply interpretations.”⁰⁶ However, the disparity can be seen in the translations of non-Muslim scholars, especially Orientalists.⁰⁷ Orientalists translated the Holy Qur’ān into various European languages, mostly in Latin, French, and English. For a few centuries, Latin and French translations served as the basic sources for Western English translations of the Qur’ān. For instance, before George Sale’s English translation of the Qur’ān, the first indirect English translation was just a plagiarized work of the French version of Du Ryer (d. 1660).⁰⁸ Abdur Raof states that “the first English translation by Ross was virtually nothing more than a crib on Du Ryer’s French translation of 1647.”⁰⁹ Similarly, He further adds that “Sale’s translation of the Qur’ān was a replica of Maracci’s French translation.”¹⁰ Since George Sale claimed his translation to be the first original English translation directly translated from Arabic, this paper attempts to study his approach to the translation and exegetical notes of the Holy Qur’ān.

Research Methodology: This study is primarily qualitative. Therefore, historical, descriptive, analytical, and mixed research approaches have been used. Initially, there is a brief discussion on the traditional Islamic methods of interpretation called principles of *tafsir*. Secondly, it focuses on the life and works of George Sale. Thirdly, it elucidates the objectives of the translation and commentary of Sale. It also analyses Sale’s sources in his translation and commentary. Thus, a critical research approach has been used to evaluate the sources of Sale’s translation and commentary. This paper also examines Sale’s *Preliminary Discourses*. Lastly, a critical evaluation of Sale’s translation has been conducted.
to examine his mistranslations, interpolations, additions, and omissions made throughout his work. Finally, a conclusion summarizes the findings of the paper.

**Review of Literature:** Several works have been written in response to the approach of Orientalists, especially in terms of their translation methodology. However, a Muslim response to George Sale's translation and commentary has been limited to some of his misinterpretations. However, his work remains a standard translation, particularly in the 18th century. This is due to the lack of English translations available in Europe then. Subsequently, in the 19th century, a Muslim response to Orientalist English translations started to emerge.

In the 19th century, several works were written in response to the assumptions and theories of Orientalists. However, Muslim response to such theories was not specific to the translation of the Qur’ān but several other principles of Islam. The misrepresentation of Islamic principles had grown to a large extent. As E. Denson Ross says:

> For many centuries, the acquaintance which most Europeans possessed of Muhammadanism [sic] was based almost entirely on distorted reports of fanatical Christians, which led to the dissemination of a multitude of gross calumnies. What was good in Muhammadanism [sic] was entirely ignored, and what was not good, in the eyes of Europe, was exaggerated or misinterpreted.¹³

Consequently, several works have been put forth to evaluate Sale's approach to translating the Holy Qur’ān. Such as Muhammad Mustfa Al-A'zmi's work, *The History of the Qur’ānic Text: From Revelation to Compilation a Comparative Study with the Old and the New Testament*.¹⁴ This study has briefly discussed Sale’s approach and the purpose behind the translation. Zaid Elmarsafy has purposefully elucidated the objectives of translation and the role of politics in the translation of the Holy Qur’ān. His work is *The Enlightenment Qur'an: The Politics of Translation and the Construction of Islam*.¹⁵ In his work, Elmarsafy has discussed in detail the history of the translation movement of the Holy Qur’ān. He is of the view that the translation movement of the Islamic sources in the West enjoyed royal patronage, due to which it flourished throughout the centuries, especially from the 16th century onwards.¹⁶

> Perhaps inevitably, the earliest serious attempt at translating the Qur’ān has conceived at a key geographic and cultural interface between the Muslim and non-Muslim worlds; namely the Iberian Peninsula. In 1142 Peter the Venerable, the hyperactive Abbot of Cluny, was invited to Spain by Emperor Alfonso VII in order to discuss certain financial and diplomatic matters. While in Spain, he commissioned a translation of the Holy Qur’ān and several auxiliary texts aimed at providing the reader with a solid source of information about Islamic history and Muslim doctrine.¹⁷

Scholars are of the view that English translations of the Holy Qur’ān from Muslim scholarship have been written in defense of the Orientalist translation. According to Kidwai, “Muslims engaged in this activity initially in order to counter the Orientalist and Christian missionary by offensive aimed at prejudiced unsuspecting readers against the [Holy] Qur’ān (Kidwai 2011, xviii).” In this regard, a few notable English translations of the Holy Qur’ān are; Abul Fadl’s (1911), *The Holy Qur’ān*,¹⁸ Hairat Dihlavi’s (1916), *The Quran*¹⁹ and Ghulam Sarwar’s (1920) *The Holy Qur’ān*²⁰ respectively.

**George Sale: Life and Works:** George Sale was born²¹ in a London merchant family in 1697 (G. Sale 1921, ix). He pursued his primary education at the King's School, Canterbury, and
joined Inner Temple in 1720. In England, he became a practicing solicitor and studied the Arabic language. Sale worked with the Society to Promote Christian Knowledge (SPCK). Simultaneously, he became a reader of the Arabic edition of the New Testament in 1720. Sale gained proficiencies in Hebrew, Latin, and post-Biblical languages. In 1736 he was one of the pioneers of the Society to Promote Christian Knowledge. On the 13th of November 1736, he died at his residence in Surrey Street and was buried at St. Clement Danes. However, he left behind his library, which contained Turkish, Arabic, [and] Persian manuscripts.22

George Sale’s translation is entitled, _The Koran: Commonly called; The Alcoran of Mohammed, Translated into English Immediately from the Original Arabic; with Explanatory Notes, taken from the Approved Commentators; To which is Prefixed, A Preliminary Discourse_23 was published in London in MDCCXXXIV [1734].24 In his translation, he followed his Orientalist predecessor Marracci (d. 1700), who had also prefixed his translation a *preliminary discourse*. However, Sale has argued that he translated the Holy Qur’ān directly from Arabic to English (G. Sale 1921, vii). Ironically, J. Rodwell says, “Sale depended on Marracci’s Latin version of the Qur’ān.”25 According to Sale:

> I imagine it most needless either to make an apology for publishing the following translation or to go about to prove it a Work of use well as curiosity. They must have a mean opinion if the Christian Religion, or be but ill-grounded therein, who can apprehend any changing from so manifest a forgery. But whatever use an impartial version of the Koran [sic] may be off, in other respects, it is necessary to undeceive those who, from the ignorant or unfair translations which have appeared, have entertained too favourable an opinion of the original, and also to enable us effectually to expose the imposture.26

Despite the principal edition published in 1734, Sale’s translation was more prevalent in European native English speakers. Several editions and reprints were made, mainly in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. These editions were mainly published in 1764, 1774, 1795, 1801, 1812, 1824, 1825, 1826, 1836, and 1844 respectively.27 Besides the revised editions, some works emerged based on Sale’s method and translation approach in Europe. For instance, its 1844 edition contains _a memoir of the translator_, compiled by R.A. Davenport, and its commentary was from Savary’s French translation.28 From Sale’s work, E.M. Wherry29 produced his commentary on the Holy Qur’ān.

George Sale’s translation and commentary was then reprinted in 1896, 1900, and 1917 respectively.30 However, an introduction by Sir Denson Ross was added to the _Preliminary Discourse_ in 1921 and remained in print till 1923.31 Similarly, his work was translated into several European languages.32 Moreover, its _preliminary discourse_ got translated into Arabic _Maqālāt fī al-Islām_.33 Arnold translated Sale’s commentary into German.34 Its second French reprint came in 1875 in Paris.35 Besides several prints and reprints, this translation became the foundational source for translations of the Holy Qur’ān in different European languages, mainly Spanish and Dutch. Its first Spanish translation came in 1844 by Garber de Robles,36 and L.J.A. Tollens did a Dutch translation in 1859.37 A.R. Kidwai states:

> Despite serious defects in conception and the execution of Sale’s translation, it had phenomenal reception in the West. Its more than one hundred and sixty editions make it the most popular and oft-printed English translation in both UK and the US. Its sixty-seven American editions have been set as a record in publication history.
Almost every library in the West has its copy on the shelf. Only later Nineties has its popularity declined due to the emergence of other translations in the market.38

Sale’s translation is considered a breakthrough in presenting the commentary of the Holy Qur’an in English, especially in Europe. However, it seems not exaggerated that compared to his predecessors, his translation is better in the eyes of scholars regarding the presentation and straightforwardness. Zaki Hamad points out that:

Sale’s work is a breakthrough in their efforts to fairly represent the Quran, which is not entirely untrue, for its presentation is more straightforward than its hunchbacked forebears. Their claims, however, of his Arabic prowess, or more faithful hand, are at best exaggerated and, at least in many places, disingenuous.39

Muhammad Mohar, in his critical statement, argues:

Sale’s stark hostility to the Holy Qur’an and Islam in which he surpassed even his predecessors, including Peter the Venerable, the bishop of Cluny, who had sponsored the first translation of the Holy Qur’an in the Latin language to refute it.40

Gorge Sale acknowledged that the translation he had produced aimed to promote Christian knowledge, and his affiliation with the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge prompted him to undertake this work.41 G. Sale adds that “it is necessary to undeceive those who, from the ignorant or unfair, translations which have appeared, have entertained too favourable an opinion of the original, and also to enable us effectually to expose the imposture.”42

In his preference, George Sale pointed out the disabilities of his predecessors, and argued that they could not produce a sound argument against the Holy Qur’an. However, he had full regard for the Protestants; he states, “the Protestants alone can attack the Koran [sic] with success, and for them, I trust providence has reserved the glory of its overthrow.”43

Sale’s objectives were clear; he wanted to make an impression that his translation of the Holy Qur’an, besides being not a work of worth, curiosity, and impartiality. For this reason, he not only discredited his predecessors who have translated the Holy Qur’an but rejected their impartiality. Thus, Sale was sure that his translation would fulfil his aims and objectives to dislodge the Holy Qur’an, particularly in the eyes of Europe. Therefore, he argued that his translation would expose the Holy Qur’an as (he calls) imposture.44 Sale’s claim regarding his impartial translation is grounded in his faith in the sources he claimed to have made use of. He states that:

As I have had no opportunity of consulting public libraries, the manuscripts of which I have made use throughout the whole work have been such as I had in my study, except only the commentary of al-Baydawi, and the Gospel of St. Barnabas.45

However, Muslim scholars have disagreements with the above assertion. Ghulam Sarwar pointed out, “Sale published his translation in 1734 and died in 1736. There is not much gap between his statement and death, so his library may be supposed to be, and was, intact at the time of his death.”46 Thus, the sources referred to on every page of the translation work must be either in his library or he might have visited public libraries. On the other hand, his library catalogue had different entry lists that he cited.
Edward Denison Ross, whose edition is the latest one of George Sale’s translation of the Holy Qur’an, has also responded to this statement concerning his manuscripts. He comments:

We happen to have possessed first-hand information, for a list of them [manuscripts] was printed by the executor of his will under the title, ‘A choice collection of most curious and inestimable manuscripts in the Turkish, Arabic and Persian Languages from the library of the late learned and ingenious Mr. George Sale.47

Sale’s library collection remained with a Lathbury Merchant, where these books were kept for the public on Wednesdays and Fridays until they were sold. Later, this collection was purchased by Thomas Hund, of Oxford, for the Radcliffe Library unless they were permanently kept in the Bodleian Library.48 The Sale’s collection of manuscripts is also available in the British Museum.49 This list is available in French and English on opposite pages and contains eighty-six works. However, only a few are in Arabic; instead, they are rich in Persian and Turkish histories.50

Ross says that “What is most significant is the fact the list of manuscripts of Sale contains hardly any of the Arabic works and none of the commentaries which are referred to on every page of Sale’s translation of the Koran [sic]”51 Thus, it is evident that the manuscripts referred to on every page of Sale’s translations of the Holy Qur’an were not in his library. Therefore, this is certain that his contributions were translating the works of Marracci and other predecessors.52 Rodwell, who translated the Holy Qur’an while passing judgment on George Sale’s translation of the Holy Qur’an, says, “Sale has, however, followed Marracci too closely, especially by introducing his paraphrastic comments into the body of the text, as well as by his constant use of Latinised instead of Saxon words.”53

According to Arthur Jeffery (d. 1959), “Sale has mainly depended on Marracci’s Latin version of the translation of the Holy Qur’an.”54 Muhammad Khalifa states that “the reason being that he could not completely grasp the Arabic language. The king’s interpreter of that time was his tutor, who was an Italian, namely Dadichi.”55

According to Voltaire (d. 1778), “he [Sale] spent twenty-five years in Arabia.”56 However, many scholars have disproved this claim, especially his biographer Davenport. He states, “the story of his having, during a quarter of a century, resided in Arabia, becomes, therefore, an obvious impossibility, and must be dismissed to take its place among those fictions by which biography has often been encumbered and disgraced.”57

George Sale’s competencies and proficiencies in Arabic have been questioned widely. His inability to not be the master of the Arabic language put a question mark on his claims to access the Arabic sources for his translation, especially Commentary of the Holy Qur’an by al-Bayḍāwī. According to Zaki Hamad:

The Sale had access to the German-produced Text of the Sacred Book he set out to translate seems hardly a thing to brag about, save that it is a confession of the extraordinary liberties taken by all his predecessors. Nor does it prove his Arabic competencies, although he did employ the intrusive Bible-printing device of italicizing words of his insertion to offset them from the text. What is sure and closer to the truth is that Sale [contrary to claims that he depended on Muslim Qur’an commentaries, especially that of al-Bayḍāwī] had no access to original
Arabic sources, a fact that others have now established-and had he, it is not at all clear that he could have benefited, in any case.\textsuperscript{58}

Thus, Sale has been questioned from two fronts for his translation. First about his inabilities with Arabic and, second, his use of secondary sources to translate the Holy Qur’ān. However, he tried acknowledging the various fundamental doctrines, principles, social and legal, and Islamic beliefs and practices. Notwithstanding, Sale had missed the spirit of interpreting what he called “Positive Precepts of the Koran [sic]”\textsuperscript{59} However, he dedicated a separate chapter titled, Negative Precepts of the Koran [sic]. Although his claims of positive precepts are also interpreted in such a way that it seems either exaggeration or misinterpretation of the doctrines of the Holy Qur’ān.

Preliminary Discourse: An Overview: George Sale prefixed his translation and commentary of the Holy Qur’ān, \textit{A Preliminary Discourse}, in which he tried to deal with the history of the Arabs, their origin, tribes, and religion. Besides that, he had himself disclosed his ideological objectives in his preface. Sale, in the objectives of his translation, discusses a complete scheme of his missionary ideology which fulfills the aim of impressing the European reader of Islam. He explained how his rules were to be implemented to get the desired results from his work. He is critical in acknowledging his predecessors and expressing their disappointments to challenge the primary sources of Islam. Sale says that “the Protestants alone are able to challenge the Koran [sic] with success; and for them, I trust, Providence has reserved the glory of its overthrow.”\textsuperscript{60}

George Sale’s affiliation with the Society for Promotion of Christian Knowledge becomes more evident from his preliminary discourse in which he mentioned that the aim is to convert Muslims to Christianity. It is imperative to mention that Sale had impressed upon his followers that they should adopt a humble way instead of harshly debating with Muslims. He says, “It is certain that many Christians who have written against them [Muslims] have been very defective this way: many have used arguments that have no force and advanced propositions that are void of truth.”\textsuperscript{61} Sale acknowledges that his early Christians failed to challenge Islam because of their weak arguments.

Sale is of the view that the failure of Christian missionaries to convert Muslims is that they used impolite language. Here, he focuses on the linguistic tools to debate with Muslims to get them converted. As is evident from the following passage of his preface, which he entitled ‘To the Reader.’ He says:

\begin{quote}
I believe nobody will deny but that the rules here laid down are just: the later part of the third, i.e., to avoid weak arguments, which alone my design has given me occasion to practice, I think so reasonably, that I have not, in speaking of Muhammad or his Koran [sic], allowed myself to use those opprobrious appellations, and unmannerly expressions, which seem to be the strongest arguments of several who have written against them.\textsuperscript{62}
\end{quote}

Sale’s believes that the Holy Qur’ān is the Word of the prophet \textit{Hadrat Muhammad Rasūłlah Khātam un Nabīyīn (Ṣallallahu ‘alaihi wa ‘alā Ālihi wa Aṣḥābihi wa Sallam)} like other European Orientalist scholars. However, he thinks that his attempt to translate the Holy Qur’ān would fulfill the objective to undeceive those deceived through the numerous translations of the Holy Qur’ān before him.
Whatever use an impartial version of the Qur’an [sic] may be off in other respects, it is absolutely necessary to undeceive those who, from the ignorant or unfair translations which have appeared, have entertained too favourable an opinion of the original, and also to enable us effectually to expose the imposture; none of those who have hitherto undertaken.\(^{63}\)

In his *Preliminary Discourse*, Sale attempted to give a broader overview of the doctrines, principles, beliefs, ceremonies, customs, and intuitions for the European reader of Islam. However, his interpretation of the doctrines of Islam is objectionable on some grounds. As Ross argues:

> Whilst regarding the *Preliminary Discourse* as a most masterly, and on the whole reliable, presentation of the peculiar doctrines, rites, ceremonies, customs, and institutions of Islam, we recognize the fact that modern research has brought to light many things concerning the history of the ancient Arabs which greatly modify the statements made in the early paragraphs.\(^{64}\)

Certainly, Sale’s attempt to not be fair and produce what he called an *impartial* translation before the European reader is evident from the following paragraph of Denison Ross:

> For many centuries the acquaintance which the majority of Europeans possessed of Muhammadanism [sic] was based almost entirely on distorted reports of fanatical Christians which led to the dissemination of a multitude of gross calumnies. What was good in Muhammadanism [sic] was entirely ignored, and what was not good, in the eyes of Europe, was exaggerated or misinterpreted.\(^{65}\)

Similarly, Scholars are of the opinion that in his *preliminary discourse*, Sale has exaggerated the principles of Islam and misrepresented the message of Islam. Ghulam Sarwar comments:

> Sale in his *Preliminary Discourse* and footnotes of his translation and commentary of the Holy Qur’an had just followed his Christian predecessors and tried to comprehend the Holy Qur’an under their authority. He does not even bother to have access whatsoever to the original manuscripts and his mischief surpasses his predecessors as well.\(^{66}\)

Thus, Sale’s *preliminary discourse* has tried to sum up the message of different doctrines of Islam to the European reader. However, the lack of original sources misinformed the reader of Islam. On the one hand, it had contributed to bringing the principles of Islam before the Western reader, but on the other, it had deceived the reader by misinterpreting the message it conveys in the original. Sale’s *preliminary discourse* is summarised by E. Denison Ross:

> It is regarded as masterly and whole reliable, presentation of the peculiar doctrines, rituals, ceremonies and institutions of Islam, we recognise the fact that modern research has brought to many light things concerning the history of the ancient Arabs which greatly modify the statements made in the early paragraphs.\(^{67}\)

George Sale focuses on translating the Qur’anic text into English and interpreting its message. A brief overview of his translation and commentary will help us to understand the motives of his translation.
Translation and Commentary: An Appraisal: There is a unanimous agreement among Muslim *mufassirūn* (exegetes) that the interpretation of the Holy Qur’ān irrespective of the language, shall primarily follow *’Usūl al-tafsīr* (principles of exegesis). Almost all the traditional and Modern Islamic scholars have followed the basic methods of interpretation of the Holy Qur’ān in their translation and commentaries. Some of the scholars are of the view that George Sale was well acquainted with the Arabic language and *tafsīr* corpus (Kidwai 2011, 242). Nonetheless, this claim hardly stands valid throughout his translation and commentary, for instance, he does not discuss the name, period of revelation, or place of revelation before translating any *Sūra* of the Holy Qur’ān, which are considered of primary importance for translation and commentaries among Muslim scholars. Similarly, there is no numbering system of *āyāt* of *Suwar* (pl. of *Sūrah*) in his translation. However, E.M. Wherry’s edition, published in 1882, carries the numbering of *āyāt*.

George Sale prefixed the preface to his translation which he titled ‘To the Reader.’ In which he discusses in detail the purpose of his translation. He acknowledges the Christian missionaries who were successful, according to him, either in deprecating the image of Islam in Europe or able to distort its message. Ghulam Sarwar gives the reason that E. D. Ross has not included Sale’s preface in his version of the translation; he sums up:

Denison Ross wisely omits to publish George Sale’s original address ‘To the Reader’ because if he did so it would immediately show Sale’s purpose in attempting to translate the Holy Qur’ān. It was neither more nor less than to distort the Holy Qur’ān, so as to attack the Holy Prophet Muhammad, his followers, and Islam.  

Sale’s argues that the objective is to produce impartial and fair translation of the Holy Qur’ān. However, E. D. Ross disagrees with the methodology of Sale and his proficiency in Arabic. He considers it futile to give an impression that Sale had produced any impartial translation to the extent he claimed but could not fulfill. Nevertheless, his translation suffers from every conceivable type of defect-omissions and mistranslation.

This is evident that the distortions of the meanings of the Qur’ānic text proves Sale’s unfamiliarity with the Arabic language. The possible distortions are caused due to unreasonable comparison of the Arabic language with the traditions of other Semitic languages, especially Syriac, Aramaic, and Hebrew. Muhammad Khalifa points out some of the reasons for the distortion:

This could have resulted for several reasons: nascence of the Arabic word’s exact meaning, knowing only one shade of the meaning, confusion between different Arabic words, limited knowledge of Arabic eked out with figments of imagination, mistaking Arabic for Hebrew or Syriac, some confusion with Hebrew traditions.

Therefore, Sale’s approach of interpretation seems to be preconceived, which results in a misrepresentation of the message of the Holy Qur’ān. Muhammad Mohar Ali states:

Sale made distortion in many ways, such as paraphrasing, deliberate mistranslations, omission of words or expressions in the text from the meaning, lack of understanding of the correct meaning of some Arabic expressions, and use of Christian theological terms and concepts. Interpolations of words and expressions are extraneous to the text, and faulty notes and comments.
Sale’s translation and commentary of the Holy Qur’ān is considered a scholarly work in the West concerning the English language. According to Chambers Encyclopaedia, “Sale’s translation of the Koran [sic], as a first scholarly tribute to the society [Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge], was published in 1934.”

Notwithstanding, his translation and commentary of the Holy Qur’ān remains a masterwork in the eyes of European readers. However, in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, its familiarity was lost due to the emergence of new English translations by Muslims and non-Muslims. The reason is its prejudiced approach, hostility toward Islam, and sympathy for society’s mission to promote Christian knowledge. According to The Columbia Encyclopaedia, “Sale’s translation of the Koran [sic] was long-standing but has been outdated. The notes showed much prejudice.”

George Sale approached the Holy Qur’ān, with his missionary objectives, which resulted in numerous omissions, distortions, and mistranslations of the text. Besides omissions, interpolation, mistranslations, distortions are common in his work. Some of the significant instances are critically evaluated henceforth. For instance, Sale translates the first āyāt of Sūrah al-fātiḥah (Q. 1:1) as:

\[
\text{Bismillah Allāh al-Rahmān al-Rahīm; In the name of the most merciful God.}^{74}
\]

Sale has left the translation of the above āyāt incomplete, and has not translate Ar-Rahmān nor Ar-Rahīm completely. According to Ṣahih International English translation of the Holy Qur’ān, the āyāt is translated as “the Entirely Merciful, the Especially Merciful” and “The Most Gracious and the Most Merciful.” In this way Sale’s first mistranslation and omission has committed repeated errors one hundred and thirteen times because this āyāt is repeated one hundred and thirteen times in the Qur’ānic text. It is imperative to mention that by mistranslating such phrases Sale has mistranslated both the attributes of Allah throughout the translation. Although, these two attributes of Allah have been discussed by Islamic scholars in comprehensive manner and carries explicit importance. For Instance, Ar-Rahmān or Ar-Rahīm are two attributes of Allah derived from the word Rahmah (mercy). In Arabic grammar, both are intensive forms of merciful. A complimentary and comprehensive meaning is intended by using both together. Al-Rahmān is used only to describe Allah, while Rahim might be used to describe a person as well. The Prophet (Ṣallallahu ‘alayhi wa Sallam) was described in the Holy Qur’ān as al-Rahīm. Whereas al-Rahmān is above the human level. Since one usually understands intensity to be something of short duration, Allah describes Himself as al-Rahīm. Abu ’Ubayd has stated that Abū ‘Alī al-Fārisi said, al-Rahmān which is exclusively for Allah, is a name that encompasses every type of mercy that Allah has, and al-Rahīm is what affects the believers. The Holy Qur’ān says that He is ever merciful to the believers (83:43).

There are several other occasions where the Holy Qur’ān has discussed both attributes, either al-Rahmān or al-Rahīm. Furthermore, a majority of the Muslim English translators of the Holy Qur’ān who have either directly translated the Holy Qur’ān from Arabic or translated the already Arabic commentaries of various classical scholars have translated the words al-Rahmān and al-Rahīm as “the All-Merciful or Most Merciful.” or “Most Gracious, Most Merciful.” or “The Compassionate the Merciful.” Thus, it is evident from the above discussion that Sale has left the complete āyāt untranslated and rather paraphrased the word meanings.
Similarly, the first part of the second āyat of the Sūrah al-fātiḥah (Q. 1:2) is translated by Sale as, “Praise be to God.” Sale does not pay any attention to the article alif and lām in this āyat. Almost all Muslim exegetes, including al-Baydawī, have translated the said āyat as, “All praise is [due] to Allāh.” Ibn Kathīr’s translator has translated the same āyat as, “All praise and thanks be to Allāh.” Therefore, Muslim scholars are of the opinion that the use of ‘al’ refutes the existence of the other gods or deities associated with Allāh (God). Muhammad Shafi, in his tafsīr, states that the Arabic article al (alif and lām) as:

Al-Hamdulillāh has been used to signify praise, yet, by implication, it cuts the very root of polytheism or the worship of created beings, and at the same time brings out in a self-evident manner the first and the basic principle of the Islamic creed, Oneness of God [Allāh].

Sale’s omission of a definite article in the above mentioned āyat obscures the spirit of the text through a linguistic perspective and dropped the definite article alif and lām negates the concept of monotheism which is central to the message of the Holy Qur’ān.

Similarly, the āyat four of Sūrah al-fātiḥah (Q. 1:4) is translated as, “Thee do we worship, and of thee do we beg assistance.” George Sale’s omissions reflects here his ideological aspects and belief. According to Ibn ‘Abbās, the Phrase Īyāka Na’budu ‘You alone we worship’ means that “It is You whom we single out, Whom we fear and Whom we hope in, You alone, our Lord, and none else.” Thus, the complete āyat is translated as “You alone we worship, and You alone we pray for help.” Therefore, Sale’s translation of the āyat not only distorts the meaning of the phrases grammatically but its broader context is also misleading.

Sale’s translation suffers at many fronts in the beginning, as is apparent from the āyat number three of the Sūrah al-Baqarah (Q. 2:3). Sale’s translation of the said āyat is “It is a direction to the pious, who believe in the mysteries [italics mine] of faith, who observe the appointed times of prayer and distribute alms out of what we [We] have bestowed on them.” In this āyat-al-Ghayb has been translated as mysteries of faith, whereas the same word is translated as unseen by almost all the Muslim exegetes. Ghulam Sarwar states, “No Muslim commentator or translator has ever dreamed of translating al-Ghayb as mysteries of faith.” However, in his footnotes, Sale mentioned the same word “Ghayb, properly signifies an absent thing, at a great distance, or invisible, such as the resurrection, paradise, and hell.” While as Mohar ‘Ali tries to point the purpose of the mistranslation and suggests that Sale wants to introduce methodology of Christian theology, he argues:

The word al-ghayb is purposely translated as mysteries of faith, thus introducing a phrase of Christian theology and also interpolating the expression ‘of the faith.’ There is no word in the text to stand for the expression ‘of the faith,’ and the meaning of al-ghayb is ‘unseen,’ not mysterious.

Similarly, in the same āyat, the phrase yuqīmūnassalāh has been mistranslated as ‘observe the appointed times of prayer,’ which is generally translated as “establish Salāh [prayer].” Besides omissions and distortions, Sale is very evident in altering the meaning of the text. For instance, he translates the following āyat of Sūrah al-Baqarah (Q. 2:10) as:

There is an infirmity in their hearts, and God hath increased that infirmity, and they shall suffer a most painful punishment because they have disbelieved.

There are several other occasions where interpolation has been done in such a way that fundamental tenets of Islam have been misrepresented. For instance, the core belief of
Limitless occasions in the translation and commentary of Sale shows the preference for Jewish and Christian terminology. Since, considering the study’s limitations, most of the instances cannot be cited. However, the following example will clarify that Sale’s objective was to mislead the Europeans and criticize Islamic doctrines. Sale asserts that “Jews are frequently reflected in the Koran [sic] falsifying and corrupting their copies of their law.” He adds that “it is the prejudices and fabulous accounts of spurious legends.”

He concludes this discussion with the argument that “if any argue with the corruption which they [Muslims] has happened to the Pentateuch and Gospel, that the Koran [sic] may also be corrupted.” Ironically, Sale has no justification for this argument but to reject the āyat, which talks about preservation of the Holy Qurān. Concerning the āyat number nine of Sūrah al-Hijir, which talks about the divine preservation of the Holy Qurān, Sale asserts that “besides this promised God left the Koran [sic] to the other two men [probably Khalīfah Abū Bakr and ‘Uthmān raḍi Allahū ‘anhu].”

Conclusion: This paper has established that George Sale’s translation of the Holy Qurān had different motives besides the purpose of fair translation. It has elucidated that Sale’s translation has not fulfilled the claim to undeceive the European reader of Islam in general and the Holy Qurān in particular. This paper argues that the translation of the Holy Qurān must be according to the standards of the Arabic language rather than any other language. Firstly, this paper highlighted that the objectives with which Sale had approached the Holy Qurān are biased and polemical. This study raises concerns about sources which the author claimed to have made use of during the translation of the Holy Qurān. Because a thorough examination of the work reveals that only Orientalist sources have been consulted and Muslim sources have been either exaggerated or misquoted. Therefore, the methodology of the translation is questionable. Secondly, the significant contribution of this paper is that George Sale’s preliminary discourse and translation have been evaluated comparatively. It also resolves the myth that George Sale’s proficiency in Arabic was due to his stay in Arabia. Thirdly, this paper attempted to establish that Sale’s preliminary discourse has not presented the image of Islam in line with the traditional Islamic sources. This is because his arguments are based on the Orientalist sources of Islam. This paper concludes that the post-Orientalist trend has grown in the West. In the 21st century, revisionism, in which Orientalist works have served as primary sources, follows this trend. Therefore, the
need is to critically evaluate, assess and respond to clear the ambiguities of the present-day reader of Islam in the West. However, this paper could not thoroughly review the complete translation of the Holy Qur'ān, which demands a broader space.
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