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**Abstract**

This study examines the interpersonal metafunction of the paratactic projections in the Quranic verses (27-30) of *Al-Mä'idah Sura* from a systemic functional perspective. The study also attempts to evaluate the translations of these verses into English. There are about 73 translations of the Qur'an into English. In this study, Talal Itani's (2015) translation is selected because the translator has researched and studied the Qur'an for about 15 years before translating it and he adopted both Sunni and Shiite exegeses. The analytic framework used is Halliday and Matthiessenn's (2004)**.** The findings showed that the mood and modality categories were quite complex and more varied in Arabic than English. The translation under investigation could not cope with the interpersonal metafunction of the paratactic projections of these Quranic verses. It is argued that Arabic mood and modality system is richer than English. For instance, different particles that introduce Arabic clauses result in different propositions and proposals. The researcher recommended that translators should be well acquainted with the components of the interpersonal metafunction of the incipient text.
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1. **Introduction**

This study is an attempt to analyze the interpersonal meaning of some of the Quranic verses that involve verbal processes from a systemic functional grammar perspective. It also attempts to compare these verses with their translations into English by applying the functional linguistics and the findings of complexity theory in translation. Direct speech in functional linguistics is set within the territory of paratactic projections. Bloor and Bloor (2004, p. 205) summarized the whole issue in that

Paratactic projection clauses are typically 'direct speech' [ …. ] Projecting and projected clauses may occur in any order, or projecting clauses may interrupt projected clauses. Paratactic clauses are labelled 1 , 2, and so on, in sequential order of occurrence, regardless of whether the projecting clause or the projected clause comes first. The most important aspect in paratactic projections is that they "can represent any dialogic features of what was said…." (Halliday and Matthiessen, 2004, p. 453).

Because paratactic projections can probe into a variety of 'dialogic features', the researcher selected some of the projections of Quranic verses (27-30) of *Al-Mä'idah Sura.* It is important to note that modality system can express speech functions through projecting clause complexes consisting of mental and idea clauses, e.g., I think …. , I believe …. " (explicit subjective) or objectively, e.g. "it is possible to argue that …" (explicit objective). (p.3) (for more information, see section 2). Sometimes, these meanings are realized through the adoption of modal auxiliary verbs in English. In fact, texts are "configurations of multifunctional meanings, rather than [ …] **containers of content**" (Steiner & Yallop, 2001, p. 3, emphasis in the original).

Halliday (2001, p. 16) defines translation equivalence in terms of the ideational meaning in that " … if a text does not match its source text ideationally, it does not qualify as a translation […]. For precisely this reason, one of the commonest criticisms made of translated texts is that, while they are equivalent ideationally they are not equivalent in respect of the other metafunctions – interpersonally, or textually or both". This account will be tackled in the translation of the verbal clauses of the Quranic verses (27-30) of *Al-Mä'idah Sura*. Ideationally, they seem equivalent, but to a large extent such texts do not match on the interpersonal and the textual levels. Little research has been done to examine the interpersonal metafunction in an Arabic context especially in the Quranic verses (Aziz, 1988; Bardi, 2008; Al-Hindawi & Al-Ebadi, 2016). The present study is done to fulfill part of this account.

Thompson (2004, p. 58) defines Mood as "the property of the clause" (p.128). The clause can be either in the indicative mood or in the imperative one. The indicative is further divided into declarative or interrogative; whereas the imperative is either suggestive or regular imperative. In Arabic*,* there are three moods which an imperfect verb can take: *rafʿ, naṣb* and *jazm* (for more details about mood system in Arabic, see Al-Ĝaläyïnï, 2004, pp. 286 -304). These categories of mood " are often translated into English as indicative, subjunctive and jussive, respectively" (Sadan, 2012, p. xi). In the last two moods, there are particles that are used with the Arabic imperfective verbs that induce either a subjunctive (*manṣṻb*) or jussive (*majzṻm*) verb. These particles (*'awẚmil*) are either preceding the verb or attached as a prefix to the verb. In the Quranic verses that are used as data to be analyzed, what is prevalent is the subjunctive (*naṣb*) mood. Out of examining the influential figures in Arabic grammar, Sadan (2012, p. xi) points out that "The naṣb mood [ … ] is used to denote a hypothetical action or event whose occurrence is dependent on another, such as desire and fear". To him, these are "certain *'awẚmil* factors which affect and determine the form of the verb, under certain conditions".

As far as the Arabic mood system is concerned, by referring to al-Farrẚ, Sadan (2012, p. 5) shows that the particle (أنْ) (*'an)*, which makes the Arabic imperfective verb subjunctive, makes a tense shift: it turns the verb into future because the mood is *naṣb* (subjunctive). He further shows that the important thing in this mood is that the use of (أن) (*'an*) depends on the main clause to decide whether what is conveyed is " a real fact or unrealized action" (p. 14). It is interesting to note that the modality of uncertainty can be conveyed in Arabic when the particle (*'an)* is followed by a subjunctive (*manṣṻb*) verb; in such a case the speaker is uncertain of what he is saying (p. 22). Verbs that are used to denote uncertainty in such a context include verbs of fear and desire with the insertion of the particle (*'an*); on the other hand, the particle (*'anna*) "followed by a noun in (*naṣb*) is used after verbs indicating that the speaker is certain that the relevant action has occurred or will occur in reality, such as verbs denoting certain knowledge" (p. 28). The type of the verb in Arabic has a role to play; for example, if the particle (*'an)* is preceded by a verb denoting fear or desire, the verb following it is in the subjunctive mood; if it is preceded by a verb denoting certain knowledge, the verb after it is in the indicative mood (*raf'*) (p. 29).

Another important particle that can induce different types of mood in Arabic is the particle (*fa*-) which is attached as a prefix to the word following it. One of its important uses is that it "introduces a new sentence, unconnected to the preceding one, and therefore the verb following fa- takes *raf'* [indicative mood]'". This is called ['isti'näf] in Arabic (Sadan, 2012, p. 132) which means introducing a new clause. This particle can occur in the naṣb mood in the context of an (*'an muᶁmara*) (p. 170). These points are highly significant in the teaching of Arabic and in making contrastive studies with other languages especially English (for more details about the relevance of functional grammar and the teaching of second language, see Lock, 1996).

In studying the religious identities and ideologies in literary texts, Kamalu and Tamunobelema (2013) found that adopting the mood analysis from a systemic functional perspective has been effective in examining the interpersonal relationships in which participants are involved. The system of mood together with transitivity can provide the potential to penetrate the individual and group experiences and probe into the social interactions. In their study, they showed how discourse can represent these negative act of hatred and the choice of lexical items and their underlying images. One of their interesting findings is that using interrogative structures is one of the ways to reflect identity, ideology, power relations and social space. The latter can be a social gathering or online social media or a social institution and the like. Such findings go in line with the procedure of the present study.

Attempting to explore the pragmaticalization of the if-constructions interpersonally, Lasters-Lỏpez (2020) proposes a functional – pragmatic approach to analyze the uses and functions of the constructions of English conditional clauses. In her study, the findings show that "certain morphosyntactic features traditionally associated with conditionals, such as the presence of a modal verb in the apodosis [main clause] or the occurrence of the if – clause [protasis] in a sentence" (p.68). In the Quranic verses of the present study, there are conditional clauses that give shades of mood and modality. The interpersonal component in if-constructions reveals the realizations of the pragmatic stance and engagement (for a rich account of Stance and Engagement in pragmatics, see Nir and Zima, 2017). On a par with this line of thinking, and building on Systemic Functional Grammar, Kitis (2004) examined English conditional clauses as rhetorical structures. Interestingly, she referred to Comrie's (1986) account of conditional constructions used to reflect unassertability, but she refuted this claim. She proved that conditional clauses are used to "enhance the assertability of the apodosic proposition of the construction, and fuse in the if-clause a pluralization of voices" (p. 30). In the present paper, the assertability of some conditional structures in Arabic is highlighted.

As shown above, little has been done to examine Arabic texts on the interpersonal level. This study is meant to fill part of this gap in this aspect. It attempts to answer the following questions:

1. How do the Quranic paratactic clauses employ mood and modality?
2. To what extent does the translation of the Quran into English adopt the incipient mood and modality?
3. Is the interpersonal metafunction influential in the meaning potential of paratactic clauses?

These questions will be highlighted and examined in the following sections. First, mood and modality together with parataxis in Arabic will be explained. Then, the methodological side is presented to go into the details of the analyses in question.

1. **Parataxis and Modality in Arabic**

Parataxis is defined as "Placing together phrases, clauses, and sentences, often without conjunctions, often with *and, but, so*, and minimal or no use of subordination" (McArthur, 1992, p. 750). In parataxis, groups and phrases, which are of equal status, "can be linked [ … ] by apposition and by co-ordination" (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004, p. 489). Groups function as elaborating, but phrases function as extending. In Arabic, parataxis is set within the notion of (*'Atf*) co-ordination. In Arabic, co-ordination is a Follower used either to explain the Followed if it is definite or to identify it if the Followed is indefinite (Al-Ĝaläyïnï, 2004, p. 574). An example given by Al-Ĝaläyïnï is the following: (إشتريت كتاباً: روايةً ) / iŝtaraytu kitäban riwäytan/ (I bought a book: a novel). The nominal group (كتابا) (a book) is indefinite, so the Following item is used to identify it. In Hallidayan terminology, it is the Identified and the Following nominal group (رواية) ( a novel) is the Identifier. One of the characteristic of Arabic parataxis is that the second group or phrase is in concord with the first one in parsing, number, gender, and (in) definiteness. There are two important paratactic coordinators: (أيّ) (*'ayya)*, which is used to join lexical items and clauses, and (أنْ) (*an)*, which joins clauses of saying. Al-Ĝaläyïnï provides the following example:

(كتبتُ إليه , أنْ: عجَل بالحضور) / katabtu 'ilayhi 'an 'aĝil bilĥiᶁoor/ (I wrote to him that he should come quickly)

In the above example, there is an instance of paratactic projection. The clause (عجَل بالحضور) / 'aĝil bilĥiᶁoor / ( he should come quickly) is a representation of what is written. The particle (أن) (*an*) occurs in the middle between the verbal clause, which represents the saying or wording, and the Quote (For more information about parataxis and hypotaxis in Arabic, see (Khalil, 2011); on parataxis (Johnstone, 1987); on paratactic conditionals (Al-Hilal, 2017).

Regarding Arabic modality, in all Arabic grammar books there is no separate mention for the system of modality. However, Arabic does express the two basic types of modality, viz. epistemic and deontic, via the use of certain lexical items that show degrees of obligation, necessity, usuality, inclination and what is related to them (El – Hassan, 1990, p. 164 cited in Boudemagh, 2010, p. 23). She also pointed to the fact that "Arabic does not seem to have grammaticalised modality; hence a variety of lexical items are used to express the meaning of a single English modal auxiliary" (p. 24). But, this is not the case because there are grammatical categories through which the concept of modality can be expressed such as the use of the particles (إنّ) ('*inna)* and its sisters, ( (كان(*käna*) and its sisters, negative particles (لا ) (*lä)* and (لم ) (*lam*) (Firanescu, 2008, pp. 234 – 235 cited in Matskevych, 2016, p. 57). El-Hassan (1990) used the term (الموقفية ) (mawqifiyya) as an equivalent to the English term modality (p. 58). He also subcategorized Arabic modality into epistemic and deontic, which is mapped onto the English modality as a semantic domain in which propositions are related to epistemic modality; whereas proposals including offers and commands are set within the deontic modality. The latter involves obligation and inclination.

Modalities in Arabic are adequately studied and historically traced in Grigori and Sitaru (2016). In the same volume, Matskevych, 2016) examined the notion of modality in Arabic linguistics stating that the concept of modality began to appear in medieval Arabic culture dominated by Aristotle's logical thinking of modality. This notion of modality "reveals the nature of attitudes between subject and predicate in the premiss through examining the logical operators (i.e. modalities) that are commonly stating necessity or possibility of being or action and indicating the way (i.e. mode) of understanding the premiss" (p. 56). In this case, the notion of (الجهة ) (ĝiha) is connected to Aristotle's logic. Regarding the notion of (ĝiha), Arabic utilizes certain modal lexical items such as "*mumkin* 'possible', *ᶁaruri* 'necessary', *muhtamal* 'probable', *mumtani،* 'impossible', *waĝib* 'obligatory', *qabih* 'disgusting', *ĝamil* 'beautiful', *yanbaġi* 'to be necessary', *yaĝibu* 'to be obligatory', *yuĥtamalu* 'to be probable', *yumkinu* 'to be possible', *yamtani،u* 'to be impossible', etc. " (Al-Färäbi, 1976, p. 42, cited in Matskevych, 2016, p. 56).

From another perspective, 'al-Haĝĝ Musa Ţaliţ (cited in Matskevych, 2016, p. 58 – 59) used the term (*mawqif*) for modality which "may be expressed by 'verb form' [ … ] and various 'grammatical particles' [ … ]". These function as follows:

1. 'confirmation of the utterance' [ …], e.g. particle [إنّ ] *'inna* […], particle [قد] *qad* with perfect verb form [past verb]
2. 'negation of the utterance' […], particle [لا] *lä* with imperfect verb form [non-past] [ … ], particle [ لم] *lam* with imperfect jussive verb form […]
3. indication of 'doubt' […], 'probability' […] and 'request' […], e.g. particle [لعّل ] *la'alla* […], particle [قد] *qad* with imperfect verb form […].

From a semantic – pragmatic point of view, 'al-Habaŝa (2008, cited in Matskevych, 2016, p. 60) adopted the term (ĝiha) influenced by Anne Reboul and Jacques Moschler. To him, the term modality refers to the speaker's attitudes developed towards " a content of his speech (i.e. proposition) [ … ] and has such meanings as: 10 'modality related to possibility' […]; 20 'modality related to necessity' […]; 30 'modality related to duration' […]" (Matskevych, 2016, p. 60). According to 'al-Habaŝa (2008), Arabic modality can be realized by using certain lexical items such as denoting possibility and wishes, and can also be realized by particles such as (قد ) (*qad*) and (ربّ – ما ) (*rubba – ma*) (Matskevych, 2016, p. 60) (for an account of Arabic modalities and modalization, see Anghelescu, 2016; for an account of agent and speaker-oriented modality in one of the Arabic dialects, see D' Anna, 2016; for the relationship holding between grammaticalization and modality, see Hassan, 2016).

1. **The Analytic Framework**

This paper addresses the mood system of the paratactic projections of Adam's two sons in the Quran. The mood system of these Quranic verses and their English translation are analyzed by adopting the interpretation of the clause as an Exchange according to Halliday and Matthiessen (2004). Because what is signaled for analysis is the verbal clause domain, the exchange being analyzed is information. In such encounters, "the listener has considerable discretion" ( p. 109), i.e. freedom to express himself and interpret the proposition entailed. Again, because it is a matter of exchanging information, the clause functions as a proposition, which denotes "an interactive event" because statements and questions can be either confirmed or denied. However, in the analysis of the projections of the selected Quranic verses, it has been found that even proposals can prevail in interactive events.

Mood consists of two components: Mood and Residue. The former is the one which encapsulates the argument of a given clause; this Mood component is further divided into Subject and Finite (Halliday and Matthiessen, 2004, p. 111). The Finite is part of the verbal group. This Finite carries Tense polarity and Modality values. It is important to hold that the two parts of the mood, subject and finite, are "closely linked together…." (p. 113). In Functional linguistics, the English Mood system can be either indicative or imperative. The indicative can be subcategorized into declarative or interrogative. The indicative mood is "the grammatical category that is characteristically used to exchange information …." (p. 114), a category which encapsulates statements and questions. The finite element is the part which "relates the proposition to its context in the speech event" (p. 115). This element refers to the time of an action or event and the speaker's attitude, i.e. the modality of the clause. Thus, the verbal operator has two functions: temporal and modal, a case which represents the "interpersonal deixis"(p. 116). In a proposition, polarity is also important, and this is also achieved through the finite element.

The Residue consists of Predicator, Complement and Adjunct. A predicator consists of the non-finite element of the clause. There are four functions accomplished by Residue (Halliday and Matthiessen (2004, p. 122). It can specify the secondary tense as the primary tense is manifested via the finite element, aspect , voice, and the type of process. A complement, like a subject, is a nominal group. A circumstantial adjunct is represented by an adverbial group or a prepositional phrase, having an experiential function. In addition, there are modal Adjuncts and conjunctive ones, which "do not fall within the Residue at all" (p.125). These two types are interpersonal and textual in function. Modal adjuncts are of two types: mood and comment. The former can give three types of modal assessment: **temporality, modality,** and **intensity.** As for comment Adjuncts, they are either propositional or speech-functional (p. 126) (for more details on Adjuncts in English, see Bloor & Bloor, 2004, p. 55). Modality adjuncts can work as modalization or modulation adverbs. It is stated that "Modality is a rich resource for speakers to intrude their own views into the discourse: their assessments of what is likely or typical, their judgments of the rights and wrongs of the situation and of where other people stand in this regard" (p.10):

Modalization: **probability + usuality** =

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| certainly | Probably | Possibly |
| Always | Usually | Sometimes |
| must be | will be | may be |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| required | supposed, | Allowed |
| Determined | Keen | Willing |
| must do | will do | may do |

Modulation: **obligation + inclination** =

According to Fontaine (2013, p. 121), *modalization* is represented via epistemic modality which is "a kind of connotative meaning relating to the degree of certainty the speaker wants to express about what he or she is saying or the estimation of the probability associated to what is being said". On the other hand, modulation is realized through deontic modality which is also connotative but it relates to obligation or permission, including willingness and ability. In the same vein, Salkie (2008) discussed the relationship between modality and typology(for more details about the relationship between language typology and functional theory, see Caffarel, Martin and Matthiessen, 2004). He raised four criteria for the sake of contrasting modals across languages (pp., 86 – 91). These are (1) possibility and necessity, (2) epistemic and deontic, (3) subjectivity, and (4) extremes of the modality scale. As for subjectivity, it is further divided into three components: commitment by the speaker, primary pragmatic processes including personal pronouns as well as tenses and the sharp distinction between the modal expression and the propositional content. Regarding extremes of the modality scale, there are three degrees: **possibly, probably** and **almost certainly**. These three are **'degrees of probability'** according to Halliday and Matthiessen (2004, p.147) while talking about the relationship holding between propositions and polarity. These are equivalent to "'either yes or no', that is, maybe yes, maybe no, with different degrees of likelihood attached" (p. 147). Together with degrees of usuality, these two represent what is called *modalization* referred to above. On the other hand, scales of obligation and inclination are set within the scope of modulation (p. 147).

A projection entails the representation of speech or thought; this representation can be a Quote or Report. The former is within the territory of paratactic representation while the latter is hypotactic one. According to Halliday and Matthiessen (2004, pp. 443 – 444), there are three points related to a projection. These are (1) **level of projection**, (2) **mode of projection**, and (3) **speech function of the projection.** The level of projection concerns the representation of a given clause. In this respect, there are two categories of a given projection: either to represent 'ideas' within the realm of mental clause or to represent 'locutions' construing 'what is said' in a verbal clause. In the representation of ideas, the projection represents 'meaning' whereas in locutions the representation is that of 'wording' (p. 443). In the mode of projection, there are two components to be considered: either a paratactic projection where what is represented is a Quote or a hypotactic projection in which a Report is projected (p. 443). Concerning the speech function of the projection, in a paratactic projection, a speaker/ writer can quote both propositions and proposals; the same holds true in the hypotactic projections (p. 444). The relationship between the two parts of a projection is that of dependency parataxis where the "the two parts have equal status [ in the sense that] The projected clause retains all the interactive features of the clause as exchange [ ….]" (p. 447).

In light of the above thinking, the researcher will analyze the verbal clauses in the Quranic verses ( 27 – 30) in *Al-Mä'idah Sura*. The translations of the targeted verses are of Talal Itani (2015), which will be examined in light of systemic functional grammar perspectives.

1. **Data Analysis**

According to Al-Ṭabāṭabāʾī's (2004) Exegesis Al-Mizan (The Scale), these verses narrate the story of Adam's two sons. Both sons provided an offering to Allah who looked with favour on Abel but not on Cain. The approval of Abel's offering ignites the fire of envy inside Cain, a case which lets sin crouches at his soul. Then, he killed his brother (p.330).

The grammatical parsing of these Quranic verses are taken from Al-Darweesh (1992, vol. 2, pp. 449-454), which also provides some of the rhetorical nuances related. As mentioned in the introduction, this paper examines the paratactic verbal clauses and their English renderings in the Quranic story of Adam's two sons on the interpersonal level. The first verbal clause is:

**قَالَ لَأَقْتُلَنَّكَ ۖ قَالَ إِنَّمَا يَتَقَبَّلُ اللَّهُ مِنَ الْمُتَّقِينَ (المائدة: 27**)

/ qäla la'qtulannaka – qäl 'innama yataqbalu illaha minal-mutaqïn /

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Metaphenomenon** | **Phenomenon** |
| **لاقتلنّك (I will kill you)** | **قال (He said)** |
| **2** | **1** |
| **Quote** | **Verbal clause** |
| **Residue** | **Mood** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Metaphenomenon** | **Phenomenon** |
| **إنّما يتقبّل الله من المتقين**  **)God accepts only from the righteous)** | **قال (He said)** |
| **2** | **1** |
| **Quote** | **Verbal clause** |
| **Residue** | **Mood** |

(27). He said, “I will kill you.” He Said, “God accepts only from the righteous.”)

The verb (قال ) / qäla / (said) is the verb of saying which represents the projecting clause; the mode of projection here is a Quote, which indicates that what is said is projected paratactically (Halliday and Matthiessen, 2004, p. 443). The verb of saying also represents the phenomenon and the content of what is said is the metaphenomenon. The former is the projecting clause, i.e. the verb of saying, and the latter is the projected clause (p. 447). In the above verse, there are two verbal clauses: the first is said by the killer, Cain, and the response is said by the victim, Abel. In Arabic grammar, the metaphenomenon functions as an accusative projected clause. The first metaphenomenon (لآقتلنّكَ) / la'qtulannaka/ (lit. I will kill you) is parsed as follows: the first morpheme (اللام ) /la-/ is a result of an omitted oath; (أقتلنّك ) is an Energetic mood present verb due to the attached emphatic morpheme (- nun). The second projected clause said by the second son is parsed as follows: (إنّما ) /'innima /is a restrictive emphatic particle; (يتقبّل) /yataqabalu/ (accept) is a present verb in the indicative mood; (الله ) (Allah) is the subject. Through the use of an oath and Energetic form of the verb, the speaker is trying to impose his power and authority. In this regard, Bartlett (2014, p. 358) shows that "Authority can derive from either a speaker's social position or their knowledge [ ….]". He shows his stance through the choice of his locutions. Out of the implications gained from this verse, one can add to these two factors, i.e. social position and knowledge**,** the inner motifs that force an individual to do something. Moreover, the killer is older than the killed son. Through his language, the first son is exerting his power ( for a good treatment of the relationship of language and power, see Andersen, 1988; Clark and Fairclough, 1990).

Regarding the three components of analyzing the projection in a verbal clause, Halliday and Matthiessen (2004, p.443-444) refer to: level of projection, mode of projection, and the speech function of the projection. In this verse and the subsequent one, they are analyzed as follows: (1) *level of projection* as locutions, (2) *mode of projection* as paratactic , and (3) *the speech function* of the projection as either a proposition or a proposal.

Concerning mood as a system, the phenomenon clauses (projecting clauses) in both the incipient text (original) and the subsequent text (target) are equivalent. This is clarified below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Subject (implicit) | Verb |
| (هو) | قال |
| He | said |
| Subject | Finite / Predicator |
| Mood | |

As for modality of the projected clause of this Quranic verse, in the first Quote (wording) which is the threat of the first son (لأقتلنّك) / la'qtulannaka/ (lit. I will kill you), there is an intent and a determination to fulfil the action of killing. This is evident through the use of ( اللام) (*lam*) subsequent to an implied oath together with the suffixation of the Energetic morpheme (-*nun*), which is used to emphasize the Arabic verb. Because there is an inclination of killing here, the Quote represents a proposal, which is part of *modulation* in the modality system. Thus, it has its own mood system where the verb and its attached subject represent the mood part and the Complement is the Residue.

Now, we turn to the response of the second son, which is shown below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Quote (Metaphenomenon) | Phenomenon (Verb+subject) |
| إنّما يتقبل الله من المتقين  ) God accepts only from the righteous) | قال  ) He said) |
| Residue | Mood |

The mood part of the two texts are parallel. The Residue itself consists of mood and residue as clarified in the figure below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Metaphenomenon Continued | |
| من المتقين  only from the righteous | انَما يتقبل الله  God accepts |
| Residue | Mood |

The Arabic text is introduced by an emphatic particle annexed to a restrictive one, having (إنَما) (*'innama*), where the mood part consists of a nominal group complex. The Energetic / emphatic part in Arabic is considered one of the mood types of the verb. The translator neither emphasizes the mood part nor includes an equivalent to this restrictive emphatic particle. What he does is that he moves the restrictive adverb (only) to the Residue part. The meaning of the whole clause is that God does not accept except from those who are righteous. In fact, in the semantic domain of projection, this is considered as a type of assessment and it can be included within the mood adjuncts in a given proposition. The Adjunct (only) is an adverb of *intensity* used to show *counterexpectancy*of the type *limiting* (see Halliday and Matthiessen, 2004, p.128). The two annexed particles (انّما) can indicate modality as referred to by Campbell (2015, p. 27) in the sense that "modality is indicated by a modal system (e.g., modal particles, modal verbs) or by mood, which is marked directly on the verb itself, or by a combination of the two". This notion is supported by Palmer (2001). The clause (إنمّا يتقبلُ اللهُ من المتقين) /'innama yataqabalu allahu minal- mutaqïn/ (Truly, God does accept from the righteous) is in the indicative Energetic mood of the declarative type.

As for the modality of this projection, it is a proposition of a positive polarity. It is a statement in which the speaker expresses an epistemic meaning of the paradigm **'high certain'** with an **'outer value'** (Halliday and Matthiessen , p. 149). The verbal form (يتقبلُ) /yataqabalu/ (accept) "carries a subjective loading – it is the speaker's own judgement on which the validity of the proposition is made to rest" (p. 150).

**لَئِن بَسَطتَ إِلَيَّ يَدَكَ لِتَقْتُلَنِي مَا أَنَا بِبَاسِطٍ يَدِيَ إِلَيْكَ لِأَقْتُلَكَ ۖ إِنِّي أَخَافُ اللَّهَ رَبَّ الْعَالَمِينَ (28**

/la'in baṣata ilyya yadaka li-taqtulani mä 'anä bi-bäṣiï yadi li-'qtulaka – 'inni 'xäfulul-läha rabbal-'aälamïn/

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Metaphenomenon** | **Metaphenomenon** |
| **إنيّ أخاف الله رب العالمين**  **(for I fear God, Lord of the Worlds)** | **لئن بسطت اليّ يدك لتقتلني ما أنا بباسط يديّ لأقتلك**  **(If you extend your hand to kill me, I will not extend my hand to kill you** |
| **2 continued** | **2 continued < α , β >** |
| **Quote** | **Quote** |
| **Residue** | **Residue** |

(28) “If you extend your hand to kill me, I will not extend my hand to kill you; for I fear God, Lord of the Worlds.”

These two verbal clauses are uttered by the second son, the victim. They are in continuation of the previous projection. The first morpheme (اللام) (la-) is a particle introducing the result of an implied oath; the particle (إنْ) /in/ is a jussive conditional particle; (بسطْ) /baṣaţa/ is jussive present verb with the attached (تاء ) /ta-/ as the subject. The verbal clause (لتقتلني) /li-taqtulani/ (to kill me) starts with the morpheme (اللام) /la-/ which is a particle of purpose resulting in subjunctive present verb. In the result clause, there is also a verbal clause which is  **(**لآاقتلك **) /li-'qtulaka/** whose first morpheme is of purpose and the present verb is subjunctive and the attached pronoun (الكاف) /kaf-/ is an object.

The next verse is purposive having an emphatic particle (إن) /'inna/ whose noun is the pronominal enclitic (الياء) /-ya/; the verbal clause (أخاف الله) /'axäfu 'allaha/ (I fear God) is the Rheme of the emphatic particle. Functionally speaking, this continued projection is a conditional clause whose Result clause is negative, labelled as (**< α , β > )** . This is a hypotactic enhancement, expressing a dependency relationship which is one of the circumstantial relationships. The Arabic conditional clause starting with (إن) (*in*) expresses an expected action to happen, and this expectation is enhanced in the Result clause due to the use of the negative particle. The most suitable modal auxiliary that expresses expectation in English is (should). The past verb (بسطت) /baṣata/ (lit. extend) is in the jussive mood in Arabic. The jussive is one of the semantic components in the semantic domain of modality (Bybee and Fleischman, 1995, p. 2). The mood system of hypotactic conditional clauses can be analyzed in the following figure:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Metaphenomenon Continued | |
| **اليّ يدك لتقتلني**  **)your hand to kill me)** | **لئن بسطتَ**  **)If you extend)** |
| **Residue** | **Mood** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Metaphenomenon Continued | |
| **يدي إليك لأقتلك**  **)my hand to kill you)** | **ما أنا بباسط**  **)I will not extend )** |
| **Residue** | **Mood** |

It is quite clear that the translator tried to match the two texts literally, but he missed the point in recognizing the metaphoric meaning of the verbal group with its Complement (بسطتُ يدي) / baṣaţu yadi / and its equivalent part in the Result clause (باسط يدي) /bäṣiţu yadi/.

The second part of this verse (إني أخاف الله رب العالمين) /'inni 'xäfu illaha rabu il-'älamïn/ (Truly, I fear God, Lord of the Worlds). This is a justification or a reason for the speaker (the second son) for not endeavoring to kill his brother. This clause shows an indicative Energetic mood. The deictic element of the tense is the present simple because the speaker is conveying something true of his intention and attitude as an adequate equivalent for the Arabic nominal clause which serves the same function. However, the translator does not successfully represent the emphatic part of (إنّ) (*inna)* which is a particle used to emphasize a nominal clause in Arabic.

**إِنِّي أُرِيدُ أَن تَبُوءَ بِإِثْمِي وَإِثْمِكَ فَتَكُونَ مِنْ أَصْحَابِ النَّارِ ۚ وَذَٰلِكَ جَزَاءُ الظَّالِمِينَ (29)**

**/'inni 'urïdu 'an tabü'a bi-'iӨmi wa 'iӨmika fa-taküna min 'ṣĥäbil-när- wa ðälika ĝazä'ul-ᶁälimïn/**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Metaphenomenon** | **Metaphenomenon** |
| **و ذلك جزاء الظالمين**  **) Such is the reward for the evildoers)** | **إني أريد أن تبوء بإثمي و إثمك فتكون من أصحاب النار**  **(I would rather you bear my sin and your sin, and you become among the inmates of the Fire.** |
| **2 continued** | **2 continued** |
| **Quote** | **Quote** |
| **Residue** | **Residue** |

(29). “I would rather you bear my sin and your sin, and you become among the inmates of the Fire. Such is the reward for the evildoers.”

This metaphenomenon is also a verbal clause which is a continuation of the projections said by the second son. This clause is also in the indicative Energetic mood. The verb (تكون) /takün/ ( to be) is a subjunctive relational present verb whose noun is an implicit pronoun (أنت) /'anta/ (you).

From a rhetorical point of view, according to Al-Darweesh (1992, vol. 2, p. 454), these verses are clear except the last one which needs an explanation. The meaning of (أني أريد أن تبوء باثمي و إثمك ) /'inni 'urïdu 'an tabṻ'a bi-'iӨmi wa 'iӨmika/ (you will bear my sin and yours) is that the second son has no intention to kill his brother. At that time, you are not allowed to defend yourself by killing another one even if the latter intends to kill you. When he says (باثمي) /bi- 'iӨmi/ (my sin), he means he is not going to give his brother the opportunity to drive him to commit murder even to defend himself. So, he is going to sacrifice himself so that he can die as a martyr by letting his brother kill him. This is because he already knows that his brother is a disbeliever. When he is killed, the murderer for sure will be in hell and his sacrifice lavishes martyrdom upon himself. So, the reading of this phrase (باثمي) /bi- 'iӨmi / does not signify that the second son is sinful by being killed at the hands of his brother, viz. Cain. The above grammatical and rhetorical analyses testify to the findings of complexity theory in translation as proved by Marais and Meylaerts (2019) referred to previously.

The mood of this projection is an indicative declarative mood with a positive polarity. There is also an emphatic particle introducing this projection. The mood division of this projection is shown in the following figure:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| أن تبوء بإثمي و إثمك فتكون من أصحاب النار  ) you bear my sin and your sin, and you become among the inmates of the Fire) | اني أريد  ) I would rather) |
| Residue | Mood |

In the incipient text, there is a mental process (أريد) /'urïdu/ (I want) whose semantic scope is choosing one path, but the translator uses (would rather) which is used to show preference (Leech and Svartvik, p. 159) where there are at least two alternatives and you select one of them. This is not the case in this proposition: the speaker has made up his mind, i.e. there are no options to choose from. From a philosophical point of view, Weissman (2006, p. 176) put it that "people who participate in a core system typically accept their responsibility to it". As mentioned above, the core system at that time did not allow killing others for the sake of defending yourself. The second son truly accepts his responsibility in sacrificing himself for the sake of God's obedience and decided not to kill his brother. The mental process (أريد) /'urïdu / (I want ) is in the present simple tense, which represents the Phenomenon and the Subject is implied in the verb group which is " I ", which represents the Sensor. The Complement is the verbal noun (أن تبوء) /'an tabṻ'a/ (you bear) which means to confess and bear something which is the guilt here. In Merriam-Webster, the entry of (guilt) as a noun means "the fact of having committed a breach of conduct especially violating law and involving a penalty", and as a verb, it means "to cause someone to feel guilty [and] often followed by (into)".

This projection has two parts which are both in a paratactic relationship because they are coordinated by the particle (*fa-*). The second part of this proposition can be shown in the following figure:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Metaphenomenon Continued | |
| من أصحاب النار | فتكون |
| Residue | Mood |

The mood part consists of the defective verb (تكون) /takṻna / (to be) and an implied Subject (أنت) /'anta / (you). Thus, the verb group here represents a Relational process in which the Identified is the implied Subject (أنت ) /anta / and the Identifier is (من أصحاب النار ) /min 'aṣĥäbil- när/ (from the dwellers of fire). This is an intensive Relational clause.

As for the modality of this proposition, the category represented here is of 'high probability' where we have expressions such as ' I am certain that … ' or 'it is certain that …'. The use of the adverb 'certainly' "is a way of objectifying the speaker's evaluation, […] – it is the speaker's own judgment on which the validity of the proposition is made to rest" (Halliday and Matthiessen, 2004, p. 149-150). Because this projection is introduced with (أنّ) (*inna*), the speaker is certain of what he is conveying.).

  The last metaphenomenon is (و ذلك جزاء الظالمين) /wa ðälika ĝazä'uil- Ţälimïn/ (This is the penalty of wrongdoers) . The nominal group (ذلك ) /ðälika/ (that) is a substitute for the preceding clause (فتكون من اصحاب النار) /fa takṻna min 'ṣĥäbil- när/. That is, there is an anaphoric reference here. Its function is cohesive. Thus, we can figure out the mood system of tis nominal clause as follows:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Metaphenomenon Continued | |
| جزاء الظالمين | و ذلك |
| Residue | Mood |
| Identifier | Identified |

This is an intensive Relational process with an attributive function. It is a positive declarative clause. It represents a fact the penalty of wrongdoers is to be a dweller of fire. Again, it is a paratactic relationship of the exposition type where the speaker is reinforcing his message in his secondary clause (Halliday and Matthiessen, 2004, p. 397).

1. **Results and Discussion**

This study examines the characteristics of the projection clauses in Arabic and the effect of understanding the interpersonal meaning on rendering into English. Halliday and Matthiessen's (2004) account is adopted in analyzing the mood and modality categories in the paratactic projections of the Quranic verses (27-30) of Al-Mä'idah Sura. Let's start with the first paratactic verse which says:

قالَ لآقتلنّكَ © قالَ إنّما يَتَقبَلُ اللهُ من المتّقين) )

In this verse, there are two Quotes: the first represents the wording of the first son (Cain), the killer and the second is for the second son (Abel), the victim. In the first projection, we have the clause (لأقتلنّكَ) /la-a'qtulannaka/ (lit. I will kill you) wherein the present verb is in the Energetic mood, and it exemplifies an instance of 'Event Modality' which manifests 'potential events' according to Palmer (2001, p. 70). These meanings are set within the scope of Deontic and Dynamic modality. This son is in a position to entitle himself as having the power to kill his brother through the use of (*lam-)* of oath and the Emphatic (-nun). According to (Kamalu and Tamunobelema, 2013), religious identity and ideology can be reflected through the choice of lexical items. Hence, this selection of (لأقتلنّكَ) reflects the evil identity of the first son and his aggressive ideology. However, in Talal Itan's translation of this Quote, viz. (I will kill you), we find the finite modal (will) which conveys lack of determinacy. That is, by using (will), "the speaker is less determinate" (Halliday and Matthiessen, 2004, p. 147). Because this is a proposal in which the speaker is expressing his threat and inclination to kill his brother, the following rendition is suggested (I should kill you), supporting himself with Halliday and Matthiessen's (p. 147) claim that there are ways to express inclination, and one of these ways is achieved through the use of the finite modal (should) which expresses the willingness and determination to fulfill the action intended. Thus, the mismatching between the incipient text and the subsequent (translated) text is clear in that the original text expresses **modulation** but the target one shows **modalization**. The second projection reads as follows:

(إنّما يتقبّلُ اللهُ من المتقين ) /'innama yatqabalu 'allahu minal- mutaqïn/

This projection can be considered as a **clarification** that is **evaluative comment** on the previous projection of the first speaker (Halliday and Matthiessen, 2004, p. 399). The mood of this projected clause is indicative; thus, what is indicated is epistemic modality in which the speaker explains his certainty of the mental process of God's acceptance and approval of his actions and sacrifice. Thus, it is best to render it into English as **(In fact, God does only accept from the righteous)**. The adverb (in fact) is a factual type of speech-functional comment Adjunct (p. 130). The use of the operator (does) is to give emphasis to the verb (Quirk, Greenbaum, Leech and Svartvik, 1972, p. 79). Thus, it is included within the interpersonal component realizing the clause as an Exchange.

The second verse reads as follows:

( لَئن بسطْتَ إليّ يدكَ لِتقتلني ما أنا بباسط يدي لأِقتلك © أنّي أخافٌ اللهَ ربّ العالمين )

In this verse, there are two projection: the first one is a hypotactic projection because we have a conditional sentence. The past verb (بسطْ) is in the jussive mood because it is preceded by the conditional particle (*in*) (إن). According to Jones (2005, p. 227), the particle "*in* [ إنْ] indicates that the conditional proposition is expected to happen or has happened: a future or past real condition". In this Quranic verse, the proposition of killing is expected to happen. Jones adds that when "*in* [إنْ] is preceded by the particle *la*-, indicating the *jawẚb* [result clause] will be an oath or a strong statement. Most of these have a *jawẚb* beginning with *la-,* usually with the Energetic, but occasionally, without it. In a few cases the *jawẚb* begins with *inna* … *la-,* or with *idhan*, or with a negative". In this verse, there is a negative particle which is (ما). This indicates that the other brother was determined to kill his brother. There are two other present verbs in the same projection (تقتلَ ) /taqtul/ (you should kill) and (أقتل) /'aqtul/ (I would kill). Both are in the subjunctive mood because they are annexed to the particle (*lam-*) of purpose. The nominal group (باسط) /bäṣiţ/ , which is an active participle, is taken from the verb (بسط) /baṣaţa/. The difference is that the active participle shows that the action is changing, i.e. not constant, unlike the verb (بسط) /baṣaţa/ which is in the jussive mood, i.e. the action is to be done. The emphasis on not doing the action of killing by the second son is achieved by the annexation of the particle (( الباء *(ba-)*with the active participle (باسط) /bäṣiţ/. Now, let's have a look at the translation:

**(If you extend your hand to kill me, I will not extend my hand to kill you)**

It is a literal translation in which the translator conveys only the semanto-syntactic equivalence. According to James (1980, p. 178), achieving translation equivalents should require both the semantic and the pragmatic equivalents. This is also asserted by Krzeszowski (1990, pp. 18-19) who highlighted the significance of the functional aspects in translating a text. The use of the finite modal auxiliary (will) indicates probability within the epistemic modality system, reflecting indeterminacy, unlike what is expressed in the incipient Quranic text. The verb (extend) is not appropriate here because the intended meaning is metaphoric. It is not adequate to render it literally. The meaning of (بسطت يدك) is an endeavor to do something. Now, the researcher is in a position to rephrase the above translation of the above verse as follows:

**(If you endeavor to kill me, I should not do the same)**

What we get here is a non-congruent element resulting in a grammatical metaphor whose "general effect [ is that] it construes additional layers of meaning and wording" (Halliday and Matthiessen, 2004, p. 626). In the incipient text, there is a verb with its Complement, but in the subsequent text we have only a verbal group (endeavor). This expansion of meaning is realized "by creating new patterns of structural realization" (p. 626). Now, we turn to the second part of this verse:

**(إني أخافُ اللهَ رب العالمين** )

The reason which prevents the second son from defending himself by killing his older brother is the fear of God. This fact is realized by the indicative declarative mood of this projection. This proposition is also asserted by the introduction of the Energetic particle (إنّ) (*'inna*). In systemic grammar, this is considered as a **paratactic elaboration** of the **exposition** type (p. 397). In this type of elaboration, "the secondary clause restates the thesis of the primary clause in different words, to present it from another point of view, or perhaps just to reinforce the message" (p. 397). Thus, the speaker here is enhancing his position through his attitude that he fears God. In the translation of this part, the translator adequately uses the enhancing circumstantial element (for) which indicates reason (p. 262) and then he uses an indicative mood of the declarative type. The translator of this verse uses the following:

**(for I fear God, Lord of the Worlds)**

The present researcher suggests the following attempt: **(for I totally fear God the Lord of the Worlds)**. The Adjunct (totally) is of degree of high type within the mood Adjuncts (p. 129). This is to cope with the intensity particle in Arabic.

The third Quranic verse is also a continuation of the projections said by the second son. It reads as follows:

(**إني أريدُ أن تبوءَ بإثمي و إثمكَ فتكونَ من أصحاب النار © و ذلك جزاءُ الظالمين )**

These projections were translated as follows:

**(I would rather you bear my sin and your sin, and you become among the inmates of the Fire. Such is the reward for the evildoers)**

The two parts are paratactic projections. The first one is coordinated by the conjunction (الفاء) /*fa*-/ (and). Both are declarative indicative in their mood system. The first projection is emphasized by the Energetic particle (إنّ) (inna); the mental process is represented by the verbal group (أريد) (want); the verb (تبوء) is in the subjunctive mood due to the particle (أنْ) (*an*), showing a hypothetical action or event which may or may not happen. Sadan (2012) refers to this fact in Arabic where such actions to be fulfilled depend on other ones especially with verbs of fear and desire. This mental process of (أريد ) /'urïdu/ (I want) is a process of desire. However, introducing the projection by the Energetic particle shifts the balance towards the occurrence of the action indicated. The verb (تكون) /takün/ (to be) is also subjunctive due to the coordinating particle annexed to it, realizing an intensive relational process. The last projection is a nominal clause, indicating that what is referred to is not a bone of contention; it should happen. That is, the penalty of wrongdoers is to be in hell. This projection is also an intensive relational clause. It is a proposition in which the speaker expresses his certainty. Thus, it is best to avoid the auxiliary (would rather) weakens this certainty. Out of the above account, the present researcher suggests the following attempt: ( **Truly I want to guilt you into bearing my guilt and you become a dweller of fire;** **This is truly the penalty of wrongdoers**).). The nominal group (inmates) used by the translator is defined in most of the dictionaries as " a person who is [confined](https://www.collinsdictionary.com/dictionary/english/confine) to an [institution](https://www.collinsdictionary.com/dictionary/english/institution) such as a [prison](https://www.collinsdictionary.com/dictionary/english/prison) or [hospital](https://www.collinsdictionary.com/dictionary/english/hospital)" (Cobuild Dictionary). The present researcher has changed the nominal group (reward) into (penalty) because (evildoers or wrongdoers) cannot be rewarded but punished. In Hallidayan linguistics, the lexicogrammatical relationships are important. In Oxford Advanced Learner Dictionary, a reward is defined as "a thing that you are given because you have done something good, worked hard, etc.". Thus, the contradiction can be easily recognized in the translation of the Quranic verses under investigation.

1. **Conclusion**

In this section, the research questions will be answered. To recapitulate, the first question reads as follows:

1. How does the Quranic paratactic clauses employ mood and modality?

As stated above, this study is confined with the projection clauses in the Quranic verses (27-30) of Al-Maa'idah Sura. It has been found out that there are several types of Mood such as the indicative, the subjunctive, the jussive and the Energetic. For example, the first projected verse starts with the Energetic mood, but the translator inadequately rendered it as a simple declarative indicative mood, i.e. he did not render the intended message of the killer. As for its modality, in the incipient text what is expressed is modulation but in the subsequent text there is modalization. That is to say, deontic modality has been rendered as epistemic. Another instance of the incompatibility of the mood and modality categories between the incipient text and the subsequent one is the following rendering:

**(If you extend your hand to kill me, I will not extend my hand to kill you)**

This is a hypotactic projection. Again, we have an epistemic modality with a subjunctive mood represented by the if-construction. Pragmatically, the conditional clause refers to the stance of the first son, and the second refers to the stance of the second son. This modalization meaning has been rendered into a modulation one. In the Arabic version, there is a jussive mood in which the speaker is certain of what he is saying. Thus, translators should be aware of the mood and modality categories in the original text so as to give adequate equivalent translations. It can be deduced that particles introducing Arabic clauses play a significant role in deciding upon the mood and modality categories. For example, different conditional particles lead to different propositions and proposals. Now, we turn into the second research question:

1. To what extent does the translation of the Quran into English adopt the incipient mood and modality?

This question is highly related to the first one, and out of the analyses and discussions, it can be easily recognized that the translation of the Quran in question did not adopt the incipient mood and modality, That is, what is conveyed seems that the focus was on the literal meaning of the texts. This leads to inadequacy in rendering the intended message especially in religious texts. One of the idiosyncrasies of Arabic is the type of nominal clauses. In Arabic, nominal clauses are in the indicative mood because they express a fact or something constant: something which does not undergo change. However, if such nominal clauses are introduced by emphatic particles such as (*inna*) (إنّ ), the mood shifts into the Energetic. This Energetic mood should be attended to in the translated texts. Mood is a system which is the representation of the clause as an Exchange, which is a set of choices. Thus, rendering a given choice into a wrong one results in misunderstanding on the interpersonal level. That is, there will be a breakdown in the communicative interactions. These communicative interactions are realized basically via the interpersonal component in systemic functional linguistics, which is the scope of the third question below.

1. Is the interpersonal metafunction influential in meaning potential of paratactic clauses?

The interpersonal meaning basically involves the mood and modality realizations. It involves the representation of the speaker's attitudes and commitment towards the propositional content of the clause and the intentions of the proposals incurred in the communicative interactions among interlocutors. It is a perspective targeting the particular stance and engagement of speakers and listeners. There are different scales in the modality component; to Halliday they are degrees of probability ranging from extreme certainty up to low probability or no certainty. These criteria should be examined carefully in order to analyze chunks of language. On a par with this, translators should be aware of the effectiveness of the interpersonal level in tailoring a complete picture of the propositional content of a given utterance. As shown in the projections analyzed in this study, ignoring the interpersonal component brings about a distorted picture of the overall meaning potential of a given text.

It is significant to highlight the importance of examining the pragmatic equivalence together with the semanto-syntactic equivalence. This study proves the significance of this finding. As far as limitation is concerned, this study is limited to examine the interpersonal function because it involves mood and modality systems of the paratactic projections under investigation. Further studies can be conducted upon analyzing the hypotactic projections via examining the three metafunctions advocated by Halliday. This study is of significance to contrastive studies and translation across Arabic and English.
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المستخلص

تتفحص هذه الدراسة الوظيفة الواصفة للعلاقات الشخصية التبادلية الموجودة في التراكيب المتناظرة في الايات القرانية (27 – 30) من سوةرة المائدة من منظور وظيفي نظامي. و تحاول هذه الدراسة ايضا بتقييم ترجمات هذه الايات الى اللغة الانكليزية. و ثمة ما يقارب 73 ترجمة للقران الى اللغة الانكليزية و في هذه الدراسة تم إنتقاء ترجمة طلال عيتاني (2015) لان المترجم قد بحث و درس القران لمايقارب 15 سنة قبل القيام بترجمته و لانه ايضا قد تبنى التفاسير السنية و الشيعية. أما الاطار التحليلي المتبع في هذه الدراسة فهو هاليدي و ماثيسين (2004) و قد بيّنت النتائج أن صيغة الفعل و الموقفية كانتا اكثر تعقيدا و تنوعا من تلك الموجودة في اللغة الانكليزية و فيما يتعلق بالترجمة قيد البحث فهي لا تتلائم و الوظيفة الشخصية المتبادلة في التراكيب المتناظرة لهذه الايات القرانية و تداولنا ايضا ان نظام الفعل و الموقفية العربي أغنى من اللغة الانكليزية فعلى سبيل المثال ثمة أدوات مختلفة تستهل بها الجمل العربية و التي بدورها تنتج قضايا و مقترحات محتلفة و يوصي الباحث باهمية إحاطة المترجم بعناصر الوظيفة الوصفية الشخصية المتبادلة الموجودة في النص الاصل.

الكلمات الاساسية

الوظيفة الوصفية الشخصية المتبادلة , التراكيب المتناظرة . النحو الوظيفي التنظيمي , الترجمة الوظيفية