

## A Pragmatic Analysis of the Translation of the Quranic Discourse Marker *Thumma* in Kurdish and Persian Parallel Corpora

Ali Mohammad Mohammadi<sup>1</sup>, Ali Hemmati<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Corresponding author, Assistant Professor, Department of English, Faculty of Literature and Languages, Arak University, Arak, Iran, Email: [a-mohammadi@araku.ac.ir](mailto:a-mohammadi@araku.ac.ir)

<sup>2</sup>Assistant Professor, Department of English Language Teaching, Farhagian University, Tehran, Iran, Email: [a.hemmati@cfu.ac.ir](mailto:a.hemmati@cfu.ac.ir)

### Abstract

Communicative and natural processing of language in the world of translation is substantiated through simultaneous decoding and encoding of information in the source and target languages. The researchers analyzed pragmatic strategies and approaches undertaken by the Persian and Kurdish translators of the Quranic discourse marker *thumma*. The source text corpus was selected randomly and the target text parallel corpora were selected based on purposive sampling. Theoretical perspectives in pragmatics and translation were employed in the analysis of parallel corpora in this investigation. The results revealed that various types and combinations of the Kurdish and Persian temporal discourse markers were utilized by these translators. Moreover, other Kurdish and Persian elaborative, contrastive, and inferential discourse markers were also used in rendering the discourse marker *thumma* in the Quran. This dynamic approach to the construction of discourse was substantiated based on the realization of different conventions in the construction of discourse in different languages and cultures. This dynamic system in the construction of a proper discourse for the readers is verified based on the application of different theories in discourse analysis and pragmatics and the application of context and text-sensitive strategies in the process of translation. The characteristics, bases, and resources of these dynamic translation strategies are discussed based on pragmatic awareness rising in various aspects of translation education and some suggestions were offered in the application of the findings in syllabus design, translation evaluation, and rethinking of approaches in lexicography.

**Keywords:** the Quran, Kurdish, Persian, translation, discourse markers

Received: June 10, 2022

Revised: October 21, 2022

Accepted: January 10, 2023

Article type: Research Article

DOI:10.22111/ijals.2023.45545.2353

Publisher: University of Sistan and Baluchestan

© The Author(s).



How to cite: Mohammadi, A. M., & Hemmati, A. (2023). A pragmatic analysis of the translation of the Quranic discourse marker *Thumma* in Kurdish and Persian Parallel corpora. *Iranian Journal of Applied Language Studies*, 15(1), 65-82.

<https://doi.org/10.22111/ijals.2023.45545.2353>

## 1. Introduction

The examination of the efforts in the establishment of social relations with the creation of an appropriate text is referred to as pragmatics. Researchers in the world of pragmatics analyze the writers'/speakers' implied lines of work in the manifestation and communication of their thoughts on the one hand and the recipients' lines of action in inferring the interlocutors' implied purposes and objectives on the other hand. That is, in what way words and expressions are manipulated to undertake various functions in human communication (Jones, 2012). Furthermore, pragmatic investigations focus on the characteristics of cross-cultural communication (Ishihara & Cohen, 2010). The operational, practical, and pragmatic aspects of translation engross the immediate decoding and encoding of information on the basis of sociocultural, linguistic, and metalinguistic standards stimulated by the natural processing of language (Chesterman, 2016).

From a meta-communicative and meta-comment viewpoint, language components such as conjunctions, adverbs, coordinators, filler words, fixed expressions, short sentences, and prepositional phrases are called discourse markers (DMs). DMs are the most important variables in the monitoring, construction, and interpretation of discourse (Aijmer, 2002; Hyland, 2005). That is, DMs merge units of discourse, display discourse boundary, simplify discourse interpretation, perform multiple functions, convey interlocutors' feelings in the discourse, create more relevant texts, and help interlocutors analyze discourse (Mohammadi et al., 2015). Despite the central part played by DMs in denoting what to focus on in discourse and how to decode and encode messages, their manipulation, treatment, equivalents, and functions have not been fully analyzed in former investigations in the analyses of translations in different languages comparatively. Consequently, scientific, research, and educational situations and contexts are deprived of translators' professional and pragmatic manipulation of discourse construction and discourse monitoring strategies and are not aware of the pragmatic principles governing the manipulation of DMs in the process of translation. But this line of neglecting the professional translators' pragmatic approaches in this area is not logical, particularly for translation instructors, students, and material developers. Also developing awareness of this professional line of pragmatic work without awareness raising through the analysis of parallel corpora and data analysis is impossible. Because of the fundamental pragmatic functions of DMs in creation, interpretation, and monitoring of discourse, this study extends the picture by investigating the translators' patterns of the manipulation of the uses and functions of DMs by Iranian professional translators in the construction of discourse in the translation process.

## 2. Review of Literature

This part provides an analysis of different groups of empirical studies. They consist of figurative language, discourse-oriented approaches, lexical systems, syntactic structures, translation strategies, and ideological perspectives. Analysis of the figurative language of the Quran in translation is the focus of the first group of empirical investigations. One group of researchers (Akbari et al., 2012) analyzed the Quranic simile in Persian and English translations. They discovered that in the process of the translation from Arabic into Persian and English, some changes were observed in transferring different components of simile.

Other investigators (Afrouz & Mollanazar, 2017) analyzed 14 English translations of the Holy Quran in terms of the beauty of the form and concluded that only one Iranian translator preserved the aesthetics of the Holy Quran in his translation and approached the process of the translation from a poetic approach. Two other researchers (Manafi Anari & Mostafaei, 2017) investigated translators' treatment of the form-meaning interactions in translations of this Holy book. The interaction between form-meaning is analyzed from two perspectives: poetic translation and prose translation. Expression of form was more successful in prose translation and conveying the meaning was effectively done in poetic translation. Manipulation of the figurative language of the Holy Quran was analyzed by another researcher (Mosaffa Jahromi, 2012) through the investigation of information structure by analyzing verb-initial and noun-initial constructions in the Quranic text. The findings revealed that translators were not successful in rendering these rhetorical aspects of discourse.

The second category of empirical studies focused on discourse-oriented approaches to the translation of the Holy Quran. A group of investigators analyzed cohesive tools within the framework of the natural processing of language in the translation process (Karimnia & Gharekhani, 2016; Najafi et al., 2009). These researchers discovered that in the normal and conventional use of language in the context of translation, translators resorted to explicitation of the cohesive devices in the process of translation with different degrees and instances. And other researchers (Yazdani & Ghamkhah, 2015) focused on the translators' approach to the referential systems in the Holy Quran in the construction of discourse in the process of translation. These investigators discovered two discourse-oriented techniques of explicitation and implicitation in the construction and creation of discourse in the target language.

The metaphorical aspect of discourse in Persian translations of the Holy Quran was analyzed by other investigators (Eghbaly & Rahimi, 2010). These investigators found out that metaphors in the Holy Quran were rendered differently by constructing discourse semantically and communicatively. Other researchers (Valavi & Hassani, 2016) analyzed four Persian translations of the Holy Quran by concentrating on metonymies as a rhetorical aspect of discourse and discovered that the implicit concepts were rendered occasionally.

Discourse production elements such as elliptical and excessive metonymy were analyzed by investigators (Mohammadi & Valavi, 2018) and their results revealed that some translators approached their translation pragmatically and others resorted to word-by-word construction of discourse in the process of translation. Rendering of the extended metaphors was investigated by another group of researchers (Movahhedian & Yazdani, 2020). These researchers discovered that recreation of the same and similar image was the most frequent discourse construction strategy in the process of translation and translators resorted to similar metaphors and similes. The analysis of the lexical system of language was focused by the third category of empirical studies. A group of researchers (Ghoreishi et al., 2010) analyzed manipulation of the Quranic vocabulary and their collocations in the process of the construction of discourse in translation by the analysis of two English translations, Arbury and Yusuf Ali. The findings revealed that these two English translators of the Holy Quran resorted to description and explanation and applied fewer equivalents in the process of translating the vocabulary and the collocations. Another group of investigations (Mohammadi, 2022a, 2022b) investigated the manipulation of the Quranic discourse markers in the creation of discourse in the process of translation. These investigations revealed that these metalinguistic variables were not approached literally or on a word-by-word procedure. These elements are employed to monitor discourse innovatively and dynamically by the professional translators based on an awareness of linguistic, cultural, metalinguistic, and pragmatic orientations by different groups and combinations of Persian discourse markers to express four different types of logical contrastive, elaborative, inferential, and temporal discourse markers in the Persian language. In another study (Ashrafi & Seyedalangi, 2010) some keywords from one chapter of the Quran were elected from four English translations. These researchers concluded that some of those keywords were not rendered properly.

Rendering of the syntactic structures of the Holy Quran was analyzed by the fourth category of empirical investigations. One of the researchers (Mansouri, 2010) analyzed the manipulation of word order in English translations of the Holy Quran. The researcher believes that word order influences the process of communicating meaning and any change in the ordering of the syntactic elements of this language results in a variation of the meaning transferred. And English translations modified the order and applied the English syntactic system and as a result, some modifications were observed in transferring the meaning of the Quran. In another study (Mansouri, 2015) the passive voice of the Quran was analyzed in Persian translations of the Quran. It was revealed that in the process of translating from Arabic into Persian, the passive voice was modified because of approaching translation from an interpretation-oriented perspective and based on a context-sensitive perspective.

The fifth category of empirical studies on the translations of the Holy Quran focused on the analysis of translation strategies applied by professional translators. One of the researchers (Poshtdar, 2016) analyzed an old rendering of the Holy Quran which was published 400 years ago, and discovered that the translators approached the translation of the Quran on a word-by-word

basis. Also, Islamic concepts and their translations in 14 English translations were analyzed by two investigators (Ordudari & Mollanazar, 2016). These researchers discovered that different subdivisions of substitution where are applied in the translations by English translators. And other investigators (Afrouz & Mollanazar, 2017) examined the rendering of technical terms and their equivalence in different Persian translations. These investigators discovered the following strategies to solve their problems in these Persian translations: synonymy, linguistic translation, autonomous creation, deletion, repetition, and intertextual gloss. Other researchers (Ghazizadeh et al., 2015) investigated the translation of the Holy Quran for a specific purpose based on the Scopus theory, that is, for children. They discovered the following strategies: semantic strategies, syntactic and pragmatic strategies.

The sixth category of empirical investigations examined the translations of the Quran from an ideological perspective. One of the researchers analyzed the manipulation of metaphorical expressions of the Holy Quran in the Persian translations (Mosaffa Jahromi, 2010). This researcher discovered that Persian translators approached the translation from an interpretation-oriented perspective and their interpretations were shaped by their ideological directions and metaphorical expressions were influenced by the translators' ideological orientations. Other researchers (Poostforoush & Mollanazar, 2010) focused on the religious backgrounds of the translators and concluded that Christian and Muslim translators' approaches to translation were under the influence of their religious ideological patterns and they were reflected in their translation strategies fluctuations.

The analysis of the emphatic devices of the holy Quran in translation was conducted by other researchers (Vaezi et al., 2018). They found out that ideological directions and orientations influenced the process of translating this pragmatic strategy in the construction of discourse. Gender and ideology interaction was investigated by two researchers (Eriss & Hashemi, 2018). They analyzed two translations conducted by male and female translators. The findings of this research revealed that discourse construction in the process of translation was under influence by the translators' gender and ideological perspectives.

### 3. Research Questions

Accordingly, these questions are directed in this study:

1. How is discourse monitored in the process of rendering the Quranic DM *Thumma* by these Kurdish and Persian translators?
2. Which categories of the Kurdish and Persian DMs are utilized in the construction of discourse in the process of translation?
3. What functions are accomplished by these Kurdish and Persian DMs in rendering this Quranic DM?
4. How discourse construction can be justified in the process of translation?

## 4. Methodology

### 4.1. Research Method

In line with the fact that this investigation contains theoretical standpoints, examines data stemming from the natural, ordinary, and genuine use of language in professional environments, and poses research questions, it is equally descriptive -gathering information to scientifically describe and explain a phenomenon, state of affairs, or population, and qualitative- focusing on gaining an understanding of an individual's assessment and experience of events and circumstances and his relevant reactions. Pragmatic researchers study the interlocutors' indirect lines of actions in the construction of sociocultural relations in cross-lingual and cross-cultural communication by producing and analyzing discourse. They study in what way words are utilized to express different functions in communication and form cross-lingual and cross-cultural interaction appropriately, spontaneously, and systematically (Ishihara & Cohen, 2010; Jones, 2012). This exploratory study analyzed Kurdish and Persian translations of the Quranic DM *Thumma* in the creation of discourse in professional translation contexts.

### 4.2. Theoretical Perspectives

Theoretically, pragmatics acted as the guideline for the present study. In such studies, the nature of interaction and cross-cultural communication is the main point to be investigated by researchers (Jones, 2012; Richards, 2015). Pragmatics researchers analyze:

1. The procedures in handling and manipulating the different pragmatic conventions in different cultures, discourses, and languages,
2. The methods of handling functions and speech acts in cross-cultural interactions by interlocutors,
3. The system of transferring conventions and costumes from one language to another,
4. The structure of exposing pragmatic patterns and norms in interactions,
5. The approaches in the construction of a discourse which is relevant, logical, and fluent,

Moreover, the Translation Spotting Theory was applied to perform the analysis of problem-solving strategies in translation. According to this theory, translators' procedures, strategies, and approaches concerning their practical, functional, and pragmatic orientation in simultaneous decoding and encoding of information based on cultural, linguistic, and metalinguistic principles through the natural processing of language were taken into account (Cartoni & Zuferry, 2013).

### 4.3. Corpus and Procedure

The corpus of this study consisted of the source and target texts: The Quran and the Persian and Kurdish translations. 6 sections of the Quran including 20% of the whole book were

randomly selected as the source text corpus. These randomly-selected sections included sections 1, 2, 14, 17, 28, and 29 (Table 1). The parallel corpora (target text) comprised the Persian translation of the Holy Quran by Maleki (2017) and the Kurdish translation by Ebrahimi (2000). The purposive sampling basis was applied for the selection of these translations since both translators followed a common approach (an interpretation-oriented approach). That is, they used the interpretation of the Holy Quran by Allameh Tabatabaee (i.e., Almizan) as a guide for their translations.

**Table 1**

*Frequency of Selected Sections, Words, and DMs in the Corpus*

Number	Components Analyzed	Frequency	Percentage
1	Sections	6	20%
2	Total words	77,807	100%
3	Words in the corpus	16,906	22%
4	DMs in the corpus	2535	15%
5	TDM <i>Thumma</i>	188	5%

In the second step, the examples of the DM ‘thumma’ were spotted in the above-mentioned sections in the source text. Then these examples and their equivalents in the Persian and the Kurdish translations were compared with one another. In the next phase, the translators’ equivalents detected for this DM were classified for analysis. And finally, the exploited extracts of the Persian (N=55) and Kurdish (N=55) equivalents were evaluated by four raters.

#### ***4.4. Scientific Reliability***

To meet the reliability of the obtained results, four raters were invited to confirm the researchers’ recognition of equivalents in the Persian and Kurdish translations for the Quranic DM ‘*Thumma*’. The raters who investigated the Persian translations were a translation studies university lecturer and a linguist respectively. Similarly, the two raters for confirming the Kurdish equivalents were native speakers of the Kurdish language (Sorani branch) and one of them was a university lecturer and the other was a linguist. The researchers’ documentation of the instances of the Persian and Kurdish equivalents for the DM ‘*Thumma*’ was confirmed by the Persian and Kurdish raters. That is, there was complete consistency between the raters and the researchers.

## **5. Results and Discussion**

### ***5.1. Results***

The questions focused on monitoring discourse in rendering the Quranic DM *Thumma* by the Kurdish and Persian translators, categories of the Kurdish and Persian DMs utilized in the construction of discourse in the process of translation, the functions of DMs in the parallel corpora, and the theoretical foundations of discourse construction in the process of translation.



The analysis of the Kurdish and the Persian parallel corpora revealed that the encoding of this Quranic DM was not approached literally or even semantically. Rather, they encoded it differently, creatively, innovatively, as well as pragmatically. And various categories, combinations, and sequences of the Kurdish and the Persian discourse markers were applied by these translators in rendering the Quranic DM *Thumma* into these Indo-European languages (questions 1 and 2). These different categories and combinations of discourse markers express four different logical, communicative, meta-discursive, and socio-pragmatic relations of contrast, elaboration, inference, and temporality between the units of discourse (question 3). As the extracts derived from the parallel corpora cannot be isolated, i.e., they are combined, integrated, and inter-dependent. And different DMs are used in a single sentence in Kurdish or Persian translations, then a single Table (Table 2) displays all the extracts in an integrated framework.

### ***5.1.1. The Metadiscursive Relation of Temporality:***

It expresses a time-oriented system in the construction of discourse through a linear or hierarchical temporal structure, which is established and created by time features, time spans, and their interrelations (Becker & Egetenmeyer, 2018). All of the above strategies in the construction, distribution, and comprehension of discourse, i.e., discursive practices, are substantiated through the professional application and manipulation of temporal discourse markers (TDMs) in the creation of discourse. In the process of translation, these metacommunication components are manipulated professionally in the structuration of discourse. The highest frequency of distribution belongs to TDMs in the process of rendering the Quranic DM *Thumma* into the Kurdish language. They include after that (extracts, 1, 13, 16), then (extracts, 1, 8, 21, 24), afterward (extracts, 2, 4, 5, 7, 10, 11, 18), later on (extracts 15, 22), another time (extract 18), and thereafter (extract 9), accounting for 40% of the distribution. In Persian translation, the first rank with 37.5% of the distribution belongs to temporal DMs too. The discourse markers applied in the process of encoding information in Persian translation include after that (extracts 1, 13, 27), then (extracts 1, 2, 7, 9, 11, 14, 15, 16, 18), at the end (extract 1), afterward (extract 4), later on (extract 18), and finally (extract 31). That is natural, because the Quranic DM in question also has got a temporal function in the source text itself. This process of discourse construction represents variety, creativity, and innovation.

### ***5.1.2. The Metadiscursive Relation of Elaboration:***

The logical and meta-discursive relation of elaboration is applied for the expression of positive supporting of ideas, the addition of new units to discourse, and explanation and expansion of the evidence and knowledge represented by previous units of discourse. That is, in the first unit of discourse a topic is introduced, and in the second unit it is expanded and developed from different perspectives. The interlocutors express the confirmation and agreement between the



units of discourse, favor, support, and strengthen the ideas in the previous statements and emphasize the message in the former unit of discourse. All of the above discursive practices are substantiated through the competent use and manipulation of elaborative discourse markers (EDMs) in the construction of discourse. These Kurdish and Persian translators have appealed to Kurdish and Persian EDMs in the process of encoding the Quranic DM *Thumma* into these Indo-European languages. The second rank in the corpus with 33% of the distribution belongs to elaborative discourse markers in the construction of discourse in the encoding of this Qur'anic DM into the Kurdish language. And they consist of also (extracts 1, 5, 9, 19, 21, 22, 23), again (extracts 1, 17, 19, 20), and or like (extract 6). In addition, the second rank in the Persian parallel corpus in encoding this discourse marker in the Quran belongs to elaborative DMs with 31% of the distribution. The Persian DMs utilized in the process of rendering include and (extracts 1, 7, 8, 25, 26, 27, 32), also (extracts 8, 20, 23, 24), again (extracts 9, 20, 23, 28, 30), that (extract 17), essentially (extract 19), and moreover (extract 22).

### ***5.1.3. The Metadiscursive Relation of Contrast:***

It expresses the descriptive relationship of negative polarity between units of discourse. In this logical relation interlocutors try to introduce another option, analyze and evaluate a proposition, move in the direction of disambiguation of interaction, express the contradiction between the units of discourse, oppose and weaken the ideas in the former utterances and repair the message in the former unit of discourse (Anderson, 1998). That is, the speaker/writer tries to convince the hearer or reader, prevent and stop false implicatures, and establish awareness rising about the outcome of some disrupting events. In this context of the construction of the discourse, the speaker or writer intends to make a remarkable discrepancy between a particular component of an utterance and other concepts or entities in other units of discourse. The lowest rank with 7% of distribution belongs to contrastive DMs in the encoding the information in the Kurdish translation and that is although (extract 12). The third rank in the Persian parallel corpora belongs to contrastive DMs with 19% of the distribution and three different contrastive DMs are applied in the process of rendering this DM in the Quran into the Persian language. They include but (extracts 3, 5, 12, 25), although (extract 6), and however (extracts 9, 21, 30).

### ***5.1.4. The Metadiscursive Relation of Inference:***

Textual coherence in interactions is established by implying significant results, consequences, and outcomes between units of discourse. That is, this logical relation between the units of discourse signals that the present utterance communicates ideas that are consequent to some features of the foregoing discourse or discourses. And the above discursive practices are demonstrated through the skillful utilization and manipulation of inferential discourse markers (IDMs) in discourse production and comprehension in human communication processes such as

translation. The third rank with 20% belongs to the inferential DMs in the Kurdish rendering of this Quranic DM. And they show the argumentation (must, extract, 14), and consequence (so, extract 20). The lowest rank in the Persian parallel corpora belongs to inferential DMs, accounting for 12.5% of the distribution and they include well (extract, 24) and consequently (extract, 29), expressing the inference and the outcome.

Table 2

Kurdish and Persian Equivalent DMs for the Quranic DM *Thumma* in the Parallel Data

Translator	Equivalent	Types of DMs	Extracts	Reference
1			<b>كَيْفَ تَكْفُرُونَ بِاللَّهِ وَكُنْتُمْ أَمْوَاتًا فَأَحْيَاكُمْ ثُمَّ يُمَيِّتُكُمْ ثُمَّ يُحْيِيكُمْ ثُمَّ إِلَيْهِ تُرْجَعُونَ</b>	Al-Baqarah, 28
Maleki	After that... then... and at the end	TT ET	چطور خدا را قبول ندارید در حالی که بی جان بودید و خدا به شما زندگی بخشید <b>بعد از آن</b> شما را میمیراند <b>آن وقت</b> شما را به عالم برزخ میبرد و <b>دست آخر</b> روز قیامت فقط به سوی او برگردانده می شوید	
Ebrahimi	After that also ... again... then	TE ET	جا چلون له خوا حاشا دمکهن؟ کمچی ئیوه لهشیکی بئ گیان بوون و خوا گیانی کرد بهیترتا، <b>له دوايشدا</b> نختانمریننی <b>جاری تر</b> (لهردنیا) زیندووتان نەکاتمهوه، <b>نهمسا</b> نەگەر ئینەوه بۆ لای خوا.	
2			<b>هُوَ الَّذِي خَلَقَ لَكُمْ مَا فِي الْأَرْضِ جَمِيعًا ثُمَّ اسْتَوَى إِلَى السَّمَاءِ فَسَوَّاهُنَّ سَبْعَ سَمَاوَاتٍ وَهُوَ بِكُلِّ شَيْءٍ عَلِيمٌ</b>	Al-Baqarah, 29
Maleki	Then	T	هرچه که در زمین است برای شما آفریده <b>سپس</b> آسمان را برپا کرده و به صورت هفت آسمان نظم و ترتیب اش داده است او هر چیزی را میداند.	
Ebrahimi	Afterwards	T	هەر ئەر خوایشه که نهمی له زهویدایه بۆ ئیوهی بهدیپهناوه، <b>لهپاشان</b> خهریکی بهرزانی و ئاسمانهکان بوو، نهمانی بهوینهی ههوت نهمۆم ئاسمان ههلهدا (و سازیدان)، خوا ناگای له ههموو شتیگ ههیه	
3			<b>وَإِذْ وَعَدْنَا مُوسَىٰ أَرْبَعِينَ لَيْلَةً ثُمَّ اتَّخَذْتُمُ الْعِجْلَ مِنْ بَعْدِهِ وَأَنْتُمْ ظَالِمُونَ</b>	Al-Baqarah, 51
Maleki	But	C	بادتان باشد که برای نزول تورات با موسی مدت ۴۰ شب را قرار گذاشتیم. <b>اما</b> در نبود او مشغول گوساله پرستی شدید واقعاً که بد کاری کردید.	
4			<b>ثُمَّ عَفَوْنَا عَنْكُمْ مِنْ بَعْدِ ذَلِكَ لَعَلَّكُمْ تَشْكُرُونَ</b>	Al-Baqarah, 52
Maleki	Afterwards	T	<b>سپس</b> بعد از آن کار زشت از سر تقصیراتان گذشتیم تا شکر کنید	
Ebrahimi	Afterwards	T	<b>له دواي</b> نهم کاره (ناشیاوه) ئیومان بهخشی، تا بهلگوو (بیر بکههوه و) شوکری نهم نهمهته بهجی بیژن	
5			<b>ثُمَّ قَسَتْ قُلُوبُكُمْ مِنْ بَعْدِ ذَلِكَ فَهِيَ كَالْحِجَارَةِ</b>	Al-Baqarah, 74
Maleki	But	C	<b>ولی</b> به جای اینکه عبرت بگیرید دلهايتان مثل سنگ شد	
Ebrahimi	Afterwards also	TE	<b>لهپاشانیش</b> بوونه دلرقتیکی وا له چهنی بهرد	
6			<b>وَقَدْ كَانُوا فَرِيقًا مِّنْهُمْ يَسْمَعُونَ كَلَامَ اللَّهِ ثُمَّ يَحْرَفُونَهُ مِنْ بَعْدِ مَا عَقَلُوهُ وَهُمْ يَعْلَمُونَ</b>	Al-Baqarah, 75
Maleki	Although	C	با وجود این آیا شما مسلمانان انتظار دارید چنین مردمی به حقانیت شما اعتراف کنند <b>با آنکه</b> عده‌ای از آنها سخنان خدا را می شنیدند و بعد از فهمیدنش تغییر می دادند در حالی که زشتی کارشان را می دانستند	
Ebrahimi	Or like	EE	(نهی موسلمانان) ئایا چاورانی نهمکن (ئاوا گهلنی) به ئیوه بروا بهینن، <b>یا و مکوو</b> ههندی لهوانه قسهی خوا نهیبسن و دواي تیگهپشتن، نهیانگوری که چی نهشیانزانی که دهیگورن	
7			<b>فَوَيْلٌ لِلَّذِينَ يَكْتُمُونَ الْكِتَابَ بِأَيِّدِهِمْ ثُمَّ يَقُولُونَ هَذَا مِنْ عِنْدِ اللَّهِ</b>	Al-Baqarah, 79
Maleki	And then	ET	ولی وای بر عالمان شان که دست نوشته‌هایی آماده می کنند <b>و آن وقت</b> می گویند این نوشته ها از طرف خداست.	
Ebrahimi	Afterwards	T	وای هاوار بۆ نهوانه که به دهستی خویان کتیب نهموسنهوه! <b>لهدوايشدا</b> ئهلین: نهمه لهلاپهن خواوهیه، تا نهمه به نرخی کم بفرۆشن، جا هاوار بۆ نهوان لهیسن نهمهه که به دهستی خویان نووسیویه! وای بۆ نهوانه لهوهی که بهدهستی دینن!	
8			<b>وَإِذْ أَخَذْنَا مِيثَاقَكُمْ لَا تَسْفِكُونَ دِمَاءَكُمْ وَلَا تُخْرَجُونَ أَنْفُسَكُمْ مِنْ دِيَارِكُمْ ثُمَّ</b>	Al-Baqarah, 84

			<b>أَقْرَبْتُمْ وَأَنْتُمْ تَسْهَدُونَ</b>
Maleki	And...also	EE	یادتان باشد که از شما بنی اسرائیل تعهد گرفتیم خون هم را نریزید و همدیگر را از سرزمین خودتان بیرون نکنید و شما هم بر این تعهد گرفتن اعتراف کردید
Ebrahimi	Then	T	پیمانانیشان لیتان و هرگرت که خوینی یکتر نریزن و یکتر له سمر زید و سمرزوی و نیشتمانی خوتان دهر نهکن، <b>نوسا</b> بریارتان دا و نیشتمایش همووتان (لسسر نوسا پیمانان) شایمین
9			<b>ثُمَّ أَنْتُمْ هَؤُلَاءِ تَقْتُلُونَ أَنْفُسَكُمْ وَتُخْرَجُونَ فَرِيقًا مِنْكُمْ مِنْ دِيَارِهِمْ</b>
Maleki	However again	CE	<b>ولی باز همین شما</b> ید که به کشتن همدیگر ادامه می‌دهید عده‌ای از خودتان را از خانه هایشان آواره می‌کنید
Ebrahimi	Thereafter also	TE	<b>لعدوای نوسا</b> هر خوتان کموتونعته گیانی یکتر و یکتر نهکورن و ناقمی له خوتان له ولاتمکیمان دهر نهکن
10			<b>ثُمَّ أَفِيضُوا مِنْ حَيْثُ أَفَاضَ النَّاسُ وَاسْتَغْفِرُوا اللَّهَ إِنَّ اللَّهَ غَفُورٌ رَحِيمٌ</b>
Maleki	Then	T	<b>بعد</b> از همان جایی که مردم به طرف منا سرازیر می‌شوند شما هم سرازیر بشوید و از خدا آمرزش بخواهید که خدا آمرزنده مهربان است.
Ebrahimi	Afterwards	T	<b>لپاشا</b> لهو جیگهی وا خلطک نهگرنهوه (بؤ منا) بگرنهوه و داوای لیخوشبوون له خوا بکن، خوا لیبور و دل لاوتنه
11			<b>فَقَالَ لَهُمُ اللَّهُ مُوتُوا ثُمَّ أَحْيَاهُمْ</b>
Maleki	Then	T	پس خدا فرمان مرگشان را صادر کرد بمیرید <b>بعد</b> زندگی دوباره به آنها داد
Ebrahimi	Afterwards	T	نایا نهروانیه کسانتی که له ترسی مهرگ به هزاران کس له دیاری خویان رایانکرد و زیدی خویان بهجیپشت (به بیانوی نازاره تاعوون خویان له خمز دور خستهوه)، خوا پنی وتن: بمرن (هرس بهو نهخوشیه مردن)، <b>له دوایدا</b> خوا زیندوی کردنهوه، دیاره خوا لگمل بهرهی مرؤ خاوهن چاکیه
12			<b>يَعْرِفُونَ نِعْمَتَ اللَّهِ ثُمَّ يُنْكِرُونَهَا وَأَكْثَرُهُمُ الْكَافِرُونَ</b>
Maleki	But	C	نعمت های خدا را می‌شناسند <b>اما</b> نادیده اش می‌گیرند و بیشترشان ناشکرند
Ebrahimi	Although after that	CT	نهوانه نیعمتی خوا دهناسن، <b>کچی لپاشان</b> نینکاری دمکن، زوربعیان بیمگ و خوانناسن
13			<b>ثُمَّ نَكَّسُوا عَلَى رُءُوسِهِمْ لَقَدْ عَلِمْتُمْ مَا هَؤُلَاءِ يَنْطُقُونَ</b>
Maleki	After that	T	<b>آن وقت</b> با سرافکندگی جواب دادن تو خودت خوب می‌دانی که این بت‌ها حرف نمی‌زنند
Ebrahimi	After that	T	<b>نوسا</b> سمریان شور کردهوه (و وتیان): تو که دهرانی نهوانه قسه ناکمن!
14			<b>مَنْ كَانَ يَظُنْ أَنْ لَنْ يَنْصُرَهُ اللَّهُ فِي الدُّنْيَا وَالْآخِرَةِ فَلْيَمْدُدْ بِسَبَبٍ إِلَى السَّمَاءِ ثُمَّ لِيَقْطَعْ فَلْيَنْظُرْ هَلْ يُذْهِبَ كَيْدَهُ مَا يَغِيظُ</b>
Maleki	Then	T	هر که خیال می‌کند خدا پیامبرش را در دنیا و آخرت یاری نمی‌کند و حالا از دیدن خلافت آن دارد حسابی میسوزد طنابی به سقف ببندد به خودش را حلق آویز کند <b>بعد</b> ببیند این ترفند عصبانیتش را می‌خواباند یا نه
Ebrahimi	Must	I	هرس کس گومان بکا که خوا له دنیا و ناخیرتندا یارمیتی (پیغمبری خوی) نادا، جا به پتی خوی هملواسی تا دمکنکی <b>دیا</b> بروانی که نایا رق و توورهیی نهو دادهرکننی؟
15			<b>ثُمَّ لِيَقْضُوا تَفْتَهُمْ وَلِيُوفُوا نُذُورَهُمْ وَلِيُتُوفُوا بِالْبَيْتِ الْعَتِيقِ</b>
Maleki	Then	T	<b>بعد</b> با تراشیدن سر یا کوتاه کردن مو و ناخن از احرام خارج بشوند و بقیه اعمال حج شان را به جا بیاورند تا این که دست آخر دور خانه تاریخی کعبه طواف کنند
Ebrahimi	Later on	T	<b>دوای نهوه</b> نهعی چلک و پیسی له خویان لایمن و نهزری خویان جیبهجی بکن و به دهوری مالی کهنارا و بهبابهخ (کلبه) خول بخون و تمواف بکن
16			<b>وَالَّذِينَ هَاجَرُوا فِي سَبِيلِ اللَّهِ ثُمَّ قَاتَلُوا أَوْ مَاتُوا لِيُرْزَقَهُمُ اللَّهُ رِزْقًا حَسَنًا وَإِنَّ اللَّهَ لَهُوَ خَيْرُ الرَّازِقِينَ</b>
Maleki	Then	T	خدا به آنان که در راه خدا مهاجرت کرده‌اند <b>آن وقت</b> یا شهید شده یا به مرگ طبیعی مرده اند رزق و روزی چشم گیر می‌دهد زیرا تنها خدا بهترین روزی دهنده هاست
Ebrahimi	After that	T	کسانتی که له ریگای خوا کوچیان کرد، <b>پاشان</b> کوژران (شهید بوون) یا مردن، خوا بهوان رسق و روزییکی گلمک رند و فره باش و چاکیان نعداتی، بهراستی هر نهو باشتریی روزیدهرانه
17			<b>ذَلِكَ وَمَنْ عَاقَبَ بِمِثْلِ مَا عُوقِبَ بِهِ ثُمَّ بُعِيَ عَلَيْهِ لِيَنْصُرَهُ اللَّهُ إِنَّ اللَّهَ لَعَفُوفٌ</b>
			Al-Hajj, 60

			<b>غَفُورٌ</b>
Maleki	That	E	درستش هم همین است خدا مظلومان را این طور یاری کرده است که اجازه داشته باشند به همان اندازه ای، انتقام بگیرند که به ناحق اذیت و آزار شده‌اند چون خدا خطابش با گذشت است
Ebrahimi	Again	E	مهربست و ایه هر کس بهی نغنداز هی که ناحقی لیکر اوه دس بکاتوه و دیسایش ناحقی لیکرئ بیگومان خوا یارمعی نهدا، خوا لیبور و تاوانیمخسه
18			<b>وَهُوَ الَّذِي أَحْيَاكُمْ ثُمَّ يُمِيتُكُمْ ثُمَّ يُحْيِيكُمْ إِنَّ الْإِنْسَانَ لَكَفُورٌ</b>
Maleki	Then ... later on	TT	اوست که به شما زندگی می بخشد بعد شما را میمیراند آن وقت شما را روز قیامت زنده می کند ولی انسان در برابر این همه نعمت ناشکر است.
Ebrahimi	Afterwards ... another time	TT	وه نسی (خوا) کسبیکه ژیانی پیداون، له پاشان دفتانمرینی، جارئ تر زیندوتان دمکاتوه، بهلام به همقیقت مرؤف سیله و ناسپاسه
19			<b>ثُمَّ ارْجِعِ الْبَصَرَ كَرَّتَيْنِ يَنْقَلِبْ إِلَيْكَ الْبَصَرُ خَاسِئًا وَهُوَ حَسِيرٌ</b>
Maleki	Essentially	E	املاً چندباره نگاه کن آنقدر که خستگی و واماندگی در چشمهایت موج بزند
Ebrahimi	Again also	EE	دیسانوه چاوی پیدا بگیرموه سومای چاوت به داماوی و به راماو، بهرو خوت دمگبریتوه
20			<b>ثُمَّ قَاتِلْ كَيْفَ قَدَرٌ</b>
Maleki	Again also	EE	باز هم مرگ بر او! چه موزبانه عمل کرد!
Ebrahimi	So again	IE	دسا بکوزرئ چلون نمخشمی کیشا
21			<b>ثُمَّ يَطْمَعُ أَنْ أَزِيدَ</b>
Maleki	However	C	تازه طمع دارد که باز هم بدهم
Ebrahimi	Then also	TE	له پاشانیش نارمزوبیعی بوی زیاتر بکم
22			<b>ثُمَّ إِنَّ عَلَيْنَا بَيِّنَاتٍ</b>
Maleki	Moreover	E	در ضمن توضیح دادنش هم با ماست
Ebrahimi	Later on also	TE	له پاشانیش روونکردنوه و شیکردنوهیشی هر لسمسر نئمیه
23			<b>ثُمَّ أُولَىٰ لَكَ فَأَوَىٰ</b>
Maleki	Again also	EE	باز هم می گویم حق توست بله حق توست
Ebrahimi	Again also	EE	جارئ تریش نسه بو تو شیواتر و لبارتره
24			<b>ثُمَّ تَتَّبِعُهُمُ الْآخَرِينَ</b>
Maleki	Well ... also	IE	خب آیندگان را هم به دنبالشان می فرستیم
Ebrahimi	Then	T	له دواى نهمان، نهمانی دواایش له ناو نهمین
25			<b>ثُمَّ إِنَّ رَبَّكَ لِلَّذِينَ هَاجَرُوا مِنْ بَعْدِ مَا قُتِلُوا مِنْ جَاهِدُوا وَمَنْ يَرُوا</b>
Maleki	But ... and	CE	اما برخی از افراد که بعد از تحمل آن همه رنج و شکنجه مهاجرت کردند و در راه خدا جنگیدند و صبوری ورزیدند
26			<b>ثُمَّ لِنَقُطَعَنَّ مِنْهُ الْوَتِينَ</b>
Maleki	And	E	و شاهرگ حیاطش را میزدیم
27			<b>وَالَّذِينَ يُظَاهِرُونَ مِنْ نِسَائِهِمْ ثُمَّ يَعُودُونَ لِمَا قَالُوا فَتَحْرِيرُ رَقَبَةٍ مِنْ قَبْلِ أَنْ يَتَمَاسَا</b>
Maleki	And after that	ET	البته کسانی که زنانشان را ظهار کنند و بعدش از حرف خودشان برگردند باید قبل از اینکه با هم همبستر شوند یک برده آزاد کنند
28			<b>أَلَمْ تَرَ إِلَى الَّذِينَ نَهَوْنَا عَنِ التَّجْوَىٰ ثُمَّ يَعُودُونَ لِمَا نَهَوْنَا عَنْهُ</b>
Maleki	Again	E	مگر ندیدی که کسانی که از درگوشی حرف زدن نهی شده اند دوباره همان کاری را می‌کنند که از آن نهی شده اند
29			<b>وَمَنْ فِي الْأَرْضِ جَمِيعًا ثُمَّ يُنْجِيهِ</b>
Maleki	Consequently	I	و نیز هرکه را روی زمین است با این کار نجاتش بدهد
30			<b>ثُمَّ إِنِّي دَعَوْتُهُمْ جَهَارًا</b>
Maleki	However again		با وجود این باز هم با صدای بلند به سویت دعوتشان کردم
31			<b>ثُمَّ يَعِيدُكُمْ فِيهَا وَيَخْرُجُكُمْ إِخْرَاجًا</b>
Maleki	And finally	ET	و در آخر به درون زمین بر تان می گرداند و در قیامت به طرز عجیبی بیرون تان می آورد

## 6. Discussion

In translating the Quranic DM “*Thumma*” into Kurdish and Persian languages miscellaneous types of Persian and Kurdish DMs were used. These types and combinations consisted of four different branches of DMs indicating discursive and pragmatic relations of elaboration, contrast, inference, and temporality between units of discourse. According to the obtained results flexibility, creativity, dynamism, logical, pragmatic, and social adjustment are substantiated in the construction of discourse. So regarding the point that no literal translation is observed in rendering these discourse-monitoring components, two questions come to mind: In which way can this innovative approach in translating the Quranic DM “*Thumma*” be interpreted and substantiated? How can this pragmatic enrichment be justified and interpreted?

In the Introduction section it was assumed that as a general rule, translators use some kind of improvement and adjustment in the encoding of information in translation. This suitability and productivity are sprung from the dynamism of human communication regarding the structural, contextual, and social factors. Therefore, it is supposed that in dealing with the encoding of information, translators consider the necessities of different discourses, languages, and cultures to furnish their interlocutors with a pragmatically, culturally, and rhetorically coherent and understandable text. The investigation of strategies used by these Iranian translators of Persian and Kurdish languages verifies that this assumption about their methodologies is documented.

The different types of innovations and adjustments in terms of the creative approach to the construction of the discourse in translation are supported by various studies. The first type of explanation analyzes and considers the role of natural language use in the encoding of information in the communicative process of translation. Frisson (2009) found that the main consideration of translators was the natural use of language in translation. So, relying on the flexible conditions of different social contexts in human communication new kinds of inferences, interpretations, and functions were created for DMs. Likewise, Furko (2014) and Mohammadi (2021) concluded that translators supposed a context-sensitive procedure in discourse construction in the process of translation of DMs and, as a result, communicatively rendered DMs in terms of context and situation. In other words, literal translation was not the only substantiated approach in the analysis of the Persian and Kurdish parallel corpora.

Another type of support springs from speakers’ and writers’ manipulative approaches in social settings. The results of some studies showed that communicators use and make sense of DMs miscellaneously during discourse construction (Aijmer, 2002; Egg & Redeker, 2008; Frisson & Pickering, 2001). It means that DMs are context-dependent, are substituted dynamically by professional people, and, consequently, embark various classifications of functions, uses, and senses. Then various interpretations in decoding and encoding of DMs become more prevailing in translation and DMs are commonly substituted by various sorts and combinations of DMs during the process of translation (Crible et al., 2018). Another study done by Egg and Redeker (2008)

relies on Underspecification Theory- a theory in discourse defending and supporting the modifications of DMs in translation. Within the realm of underspecification theory, the analyses and explorations are done in terms of the discrepancy between the meaning and the pragmatic functions of linguistic components in contexts of use. Accordingly, different kinds of modifications, adaptations, and substitutions are taken into account as the various evidence, demonstrations, and indexes of this theory in translation (Frisson & Pickering, 2001; Mohammadi, 2021). Mohammadi's (2021) study lends special support to the present one in which the interpretation of DMs in Persian and English parallel corpora was investigated. This researcher reported various kinds of adaptations and changes in translation and concluded that these modifications and adaptations can be plausible based on Grice's Cooperative Principles, i.e. translators try to construct a more comprehensible discourse for their readership. He argues that the requirements of different languages, cultures, and discourses are primary factors based on which translators attempt to encode the information in the translation process and try to pave the way for their target audience for the comprehension of text.

The final source of support and justification regarding these changes in DMs translation may be extracted from the theory of pragmatic enrichment. According to this theory, words, statements, and expressions adopt new meanings and functions different from literal and semantic content, or these innovations are established in the process of communication. That is, these components of an utterance, i.e., phrases, expressions, words, terms, and statements are enriched by the social, cultural, and contextual variables influencing the construction of discourse in real-life interlocutions such as speaking, writing, and translation (Cummins & Rohde, 2015).

## 7. Conclusion and Pedagogical Implications

The accomplishments that are expected to be achieved by translators are the adaptation of their approaches, strategies, practical work, and equivalents to different ranges of structural, terminological, semantic, and pragmatic components in other languages, discourses, and cultures. The characteristics of the creativity, flexibility, and dynamic approaches perceived in the translation of the DM "*Thumma*" showed that translation is a creative process, the creation of discourse is substantiated in the process of the use of language in different social environments, and different pragmatic theories are appealed to in the process of communication in different contexts and situations. For rendering the Quranic DM "Thumma" into Persian and Kurdish the following theoretical perspectives were applied: Pragmatic Enrichment, Underspecification Theory, and Cooperative Principles. In other words, the amendments, modifications, and adjustments which cause pragmatically enriched relationships between discourse fragments in the translation process are rooted in the exploitation of these theoretical perspectives in using language in the professional walks of human life such as translation. The present study investigated the translation of the third most frequent, effective, and somehow ambiguous DM

---

“*Thumma*” in the Quranic texts into Persian and Kurdish languages. Some other comparative studies may need to be done regarding the translation of this DM into different Asian, African, and American languages. The results of these investigations may act as the guidelines for different research, educational, and scientific components of curriculum planning by use of putting forward new programs and courses in these pragmatic and discourse-oriented areas, reviewing material preparation systems, and modifying translation evaluation methods. Likewise, regarding the fact that parallel corpora and data analytic studies have recently commenced, translators generally use language in ways that are creative, innovative, and professional, and exploit novel functions, synonyms, and usages for the words, phrases, and expressions (Hauge, 2014), however, the obtained results and new findings regarding the investigations of the translators’ professional language use are not practically used in the related fields such as lexicography, translation quality assessment, and development of material. Concerning these points, therefore, these findings would provide possible solutions to the problems and answers to the questions put forward in the above realms.



## References

- Akbari, O., Yazdani, M., & Ghamkhah, A. (2012). A study of the transference of simile components in Persian and English translations of the Qur'an. *Translation Studies Quarterly*, 9(35), 67-81.
- Afrouz, M., & Mollanazar, H. (2017). Strategies opted for in translating twelve categories of Quranic terms. *Translation Studies Quarterly*, 14(55), 14-30.
- Aijmir, K. (2002). *English discourse particles. Evidence from a corpus*. Johan Benjamins.
- Anderson, G. (1998). The pragmatic marker like from a relevance-theoretic perspective. In A. A. Jucker, *Discourse markers* (pp. 147-171). John Benjamins.
- Ashrafi, A., & Seyedalangi, E. (2010). Polysemic words in English translations of the Qur'an: A comparative study of translation by Saffarzadeh, Pickthall, Shakir, and Arberry. *Translation Studies Quarterly*, 13(49), 14-31.
- Becker, M., & Egetenmeyer, J. (2018). A prominence-based account of temporal discourse structure. *Lingua*, 214(23), 28-58.
- Cartoni, L., & Zuferry, S. (2013). Annotating the meaning of discourse connectives by looking at their translation: The translation spotting. *Dialogue and Discourse*, 4(8), 65-86.
- Chesterman, A. (2016). *Memes of translation*. John Benjamins.
- Crible, L., Abuczki, A., Burksaitiene, N., Furko, P., & Nedoluzhko, A. (2019). Functions and translations of discourse markers in TED talks: A parallel corpus study of underspecification in five languages. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 4(142), 139-155.
- Cummins, C., & Rohde, H. (2015). Evoking context with contrastive stress: Effects on pragmatic enrichment. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 6(7), 22-43.
- Ebrahimi, (2000). The Quran, Kurdish translation. Adab.
- Eghbaly, A. (2010). A study of the Persian translations of metaphors in the Quranic chapters. *Translation Studies Quarterly*, 13(49), 7-25.
- Eriss, A., & Hashemi, M. R. (2018). The impact of gender-based ideological perspective of translators on translations of the Holy Qur'an. *Translation Studies Quarterly*, 15(59).
- Egg, M., & Redeker, G. (2008). Underspecified discourse representation. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication>.
- Frank-Job, B. (2006). A dynamic-interactional approach to discourse markers. In K. Fischer (Ed), *Approaches to discourse particles* (pp. 359-375). Elsevier.
- Frisson, S., & Pickering, M. (2001). Obtaining a figurative interpretation of a word: Support for underspecification. *Metaphor and Symbol*, 16(4), 149-171.
- Frisson, S. (2009). Semantic underspecification in language processing. *Language and Linguistics Compass*, 3(1), 111-127.
- Furko, P. (2014). Perspectives on the translation of discourse markers. *Acta Universitatis Sapientiae, Philologica*, 6(2), 181-196.

- Ghazizadeh, K., Safi Keikaleh, E., & Esmacili, Z. (2015). Evaluating translations of the Holy Qur'an for children within the framework of Skopos Theory. *Translation Studies Quarterly*, 12(47), 32-51.
- Ghoreishi, S. M. H., Baghaei, H., & Alizadeh, A. (2010). The relation between repetition of Quranic words and collocations, and their translations. *Translation Studies Quarterly*, 13(49), 71-89.
- Haugh, S. (2014). Corpus-based studies in contrastive linguistics. *Oslo Studies in Language*, 6(1), 43-52.
- Hyland, K. (2005). *Metadiscourse: Exploring interaction in writing*. Continuum.
- Ishihara, N., & Cohen, A. D. (2010). *Teaching and learning pragmatics*. Pearson International.
- Jones, R. (2012). *Discourse analysis: A resource book for students*. Routledge.
- Karimnia, A., & Gharekhani, R. (2016). A polygenetic investigation of explicitation in English and Persian Translations of the Holy Qur'an. *Translation Studies Quarterly*, 14(54), 26-41.
- Maleki, A. (2017). *The Quran, translation*. Setareh Sabz.
- Manafi Anari, S., & Mostafaei, Y. (2017). Loss and gain in poetic, prose, & explanatory translations of the Holy Qur'an. *Translation Studies Quarterly*, 14(56), 15-34.
- Mansouri, M. (2010). An investigation of word order in Persian and English translations of the Holy Qur'an. *Translation Studies Quarterly*, 8(30), 41-58.
- Mansouri, M. (2015). A study of the translation of passive voice in Persian translations of the Holy Qur'an. *Translation Studies Quarterly*, 12(47), 14-28.
- Mohammadi, A. M., Nejadansari, D. & Yuhanaee, M. (2015). The index of pragmatic uses and functions of well in university EFL classroom discourse: A case study in Iran. *Taiwan Journal of TESOL*, 12(2), 86-116.
- Mohammadi, A. M. (2021). An analysis of the underspecifications of "AND" in parallel corpora. *Journal of Foreign Language Research*, 11(1), 67-80.
- Mohammadi, A. M. (2022a). A pragmatic exploration of the temporal discourse marker *Thumma* in parallel corpora of two Persian translations of the Quran. *Journal of Foreign Language Teaching and Translation Studies*, 7(3), 1-22.
- Mohammadi, A. M. (2022b). A pragmatic analysis of the Quranic temporal discourse markers in parallel corpora: A study of two Persian translations. *Translation Studies*, 20(78), 43-60.
- Mohammadi, Z., & Valavi, S. (2018). Word-selection methods in the translation of elliptical and excessive metonymy in the Holy Quran verses. *Translation Studies Quarterly*, 15(60), 34-47.
- Mosaffa Jahromi, A. (2010). Ideological conflict and translating metaphors in the Holy Qur'an: cognitive view. *Translation Studies Quarterly*, 13(49), 51-69.
- Mosaffa Jahromi, A. (2012). Information structure and translation in Quranic texts. *Translation Studies Quarterly*, 9(35), 41-59.

- Movahhedian, M., & Yazdani, M. (2020). Extended metaphor in the Glorious Qur'an through translation: A case study. *Translation Studies Quarterly*, 18(69), 43-60.
- Najafi, A., Asadpour, H., & Yazdani, M. (2009). Transformation of cohesive tools and explication in English translations of the Holy Quran: A case study of surah Yusuf. *Translation Studies Quarterly*, 6(24), 24-41.
- Ordudari, M., & Mollanazar, H. (2016). Rendering the Islamic concepts of the Holy Qur'an: Towards a more comprehensive model. *Translation Studies Quarterly*, 13(52), 16-36.
- Poostforoush, M., & Mollanazar, H. (2010). Toward translator's agency: A Bourdieusian insight on translating the glorious Qur'an into English. *Translation Studies Quarterly*, 13(49), 42-57.
- Poshtdar, A. M. (2016). Techniques of translation in an old translation of the Qur'an in the manuscript of Jame' al-Qisas. *Translation Studies Quarterly*, 14(53), 21-39.
- Richards, J. C. (2015). Key issues in language teaching. Cambridge University Press.
- Vaezi, M., Rasuli Ravandi, M. R., & Moseli, M. (2018). Translation analysis of emphasis devices of Qasr by negative (Lā) and exception (Illā) in some English translations of the Holy Qur'an: A case study of Shakir, al-Hilālī-Muhsin Khān, and Irving translations. *Translation Studies Quarterly*, 15(60), 21-38.
- Valavi, S., & Hassani, M. (2016). Translation of some types of singular metonymies in the last ten units of the Qur'an: A case study of the translations done by Elahi Ghomshei, Makarem, Moezzi, and Fouladvand. *Translation Studies Quarterly*, 13(52), 19-33.
- Yazdani, M., & Ghamkhah, A. (2015). The Qur'an's language through translation: An inquiry into the manner of reflection, in translation, of Qur'anic references & its relationship with the Qur'an-specific language. *Translation Studies Quarterly*, 13(51), 8-25.