

An analysis of Ross's *The Alcoran of Mahomet*: A translation and its potential impact on thought

İlknur SAVAŞKAN¹

APA: Savaşkan, İ. (2019). An analysis of Ross's *The Alcoran of Mahomet*: A translation and its potential impact on thought. *RumeliDE Dil ve Edebiyat Arařtırmaları Dergisi*, (16), 577-586. DOI: 10.29000/rumelide.619065

Abstract

For centuries translation has acted as a bridge between differing societies and from time to time these types of linguistic interactions among social groups paved the way for the emergence of bias and prejudice language. At present, linguistic research based on investigating prejudice has displayed that language has various roles on prejudice because language is the major tool for communicating and maintaining prejudice. While prejudice through language can bring change by forming group boundaries, effecting perceptions and having an impact on norms, the vice versa is also possible. In short, language itself can result in prejudice and trigger inequalities among speakers of the language. *The Alcoran of Mahomet* is the title of Alexander Ross's (1649) English translation of the Holy Quran, the sacred book of Islam. Although Ross's translation was highly influential in its era, it embeds biased expressions and is found to be an unfaithful translation. The present research attempts to explore the power of language and prejudice reflected in *The Alcoran of Mahomet*. The major aim is to investigate the prejudice language adopted in the commentary section, a type of translator's notes written for the Christian reader by Alexander Ross. The analysis of the language employed by Alexander Ross is conducted by using a taxonomy used for investigating language within groups. This taxonomy is a conceptualizing of language relations through a model involving the four metaphors, vessel, lens, barometer, and sign. As the study reveals prejudice language is negative when it is in the form of a judgement or opinion conceived beforehand with immature information.

Keywords: Language, translation, thought, prejudice, religion, Islam.

Ross'un "The Alcoran of Mahomet" adlı eserinin incelenmesi: Bir çeviri ve düşünme üzerindeki potansiyel etkisi

Öz

Yüzyıllar boyunca çeviri, farklı toplumlar arasında bir köprü görevi görmüş ve zaman zaman çeşitli sosyal gruplar arasında yaşanan dilsel etkileşimler insanların taraflara ayrılmasına ve kullanılan dilde önyargı yansımalarına yol açmıştır. Günümüzde, önyargıyı arařtırmaya dayanan dilbilimsel arařtırmalar, dilin önyargıda çeşitli rollere sahip olduğunu göstermiştir. Bunun nedenleri arasında dilin önyargıyı iletmesi ve sürdürmesi için temel bir araç olmasıdır. Dil aracılığıyla önyargı, gruplar arasında sınırları oluşturarak, algıları ve normları etkileyerek değişime yol açsa da, bunun tam tersi durumlar da mümkündür. Özetlemek gerekirse, dilin kendisi önyargıya neden olabilir ve o dili kullanan kişiler arasında bir eşitsizlik durumunu tetikleyebilir. *The Alcoran of Mahomet*, Alexander Ross'un (1649) İslam'ın kutsal kitabı olan Kur'an-ı Kerim'in İngilizce çevirisidir. Ross'un çevirisi

¹ Doç. Dr., Bursa Uludağ Üniversitesi, Eğitim Fakültesi, Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Bölümü (Bursa, Türkiye), ilknu@uludag.edu.tr, ORCID ID: 0000-0003-4537-0358 [Makale kayıt tarihi: 13.08.2019-kabul tarihi: 20.09.2019; DOI: 10.29000/rumelide.619065]

kendi döneminde oldukça etkili olmasına rağmen, özgün metne sadık kalınmadığı ve de önyargılı ifadeler içerdiği görülmüştür. Bu çalışmada, *The Alcoran of Mahomet* adlı eserin yansıtmış olduğu önyargı ve dilin gücü irdelenmektedir. Araştırmanın temel amacı *The Alcoran of Mahomet* çevirisinde Ross'un Hristiyan okuyucu kitlesi için eklemiş olduğu çevirmenin notuna benzer yorum bölümünün dilini incelemektir. Alexander Ross'un kullanmış olduğu dili analiz etmek için dili gruplar içinde incelemeye yarayan bir taksonomi uygulandı. Bu taksonomi, dil ilişkilerini mecazi açıdan kap, mercek, barometre ve işaret sözcükleriyle kavramlaştıran bir modeldir. Çalışmada görüldüğü üzere, olgunlaşmamış bilgilerle tasarlanan bir yargı ya da görüş sonucunda oluşan önyargılı dil olumsuzdur.

Anahtar kelimeler: Dil, çeviri, düşünce, önyargı, din, İslam.

1. Introduction

Centuries ago, on the contrary to the present, people were overtly able to express their thoughts and views on religions. These personal and rather subjective issues were handled by people and even states so seriously that these issues resulted in severe outcomes. For example, history has witnessed wars and clashes among civilizations, e.g. the Crusades which were religious wars between Muslims and Christians. The religion adopted by these civilizations was so important that it was of their major constituents and that even their race was linked synonymously to their religion (e.g. Arab-Moslem, European-Christian). This being the situation, language against religion was disrespectfully used in order to explicitly convey their own group's beliefs and incite prejudices against the so-called other group.

In the contemporary period, due to certain laws and rights explicit expression of prejudice attitude and language against religions are suppressed. Therefore, it may be quite difficult to find written or published work embedding such language. According to Collins & Clement (2012; 380) "explicit expressions of prejudice are relatively rare given the social norms condemning them, which might explain the lack of research in this field." Along these lines, an investigation on the work based on anti-Islamic views reveals that despite the point that there are various studies conducted on prejudice against-Islam and the stereotyping of Muslims, lacking are the studies which investigate the prejudice language used when addressing the Muslims. The present research attempts to address this field of research by focusing on investigating the effect of overtly expressed prejudice discourse in the language of Alexander Ross (1649), a language which dates back to a time when social norms condemning this type of expression had not distinctively emerged.

Alexander Ross has added commentaries to his translation *The Alcoran of Mahomet*. In Ross's translation, before the Quran translation, the translator's commentary, which acts like a preface, is presented to the reader at the first end of the book. The present study attempts to investigate the language of Ross, by focusing on the first commentary 'The Translator to the Christian Reader' and to display how language can manipulate the cognition of the reader.

The taxonomy employed for the analysis of Ross's language is the current conceptualizing of language relations model which was presented by Sutton (2010), and further expanded by Collins and Clement (2012). Sutton (2010), specifically examines the implications of the ability of language within the three metaphors; to contain thought (like a vessel), to focus thought (like a lens), and to reveal thought (like a barometer). Within this dimension, Collins and Clement (2012) add to Sutton's (2010) model, the fourth metaphor (like a sign). Collins and Clement (2012; 379) claim that "language can also be conceptualized

as a sign that focuses cognition: Language can be a factor itself, as a form of communication, an attribute of identity, or a signal that draws that attention or makes salient certain aspects of the social context.”

2. Background of ‘The Alcoran of Mahomet’

Anti-Islam sentiments can be traced back to the time of its formation, namely the period of Prophet Mohammed’s life because the founding periods of religions are perhaps one of the most agonizing times of expressing and spreading the religion since there will be the heralders on one side and the rival supporters, the prejudice on the other. The Holy Quran received much scrutiny and criticism from non-Muslims ever since it’s revelation (the words of Allah transmitted through the Angel Gabriel) to the Prophet Mohammed, living in Mecca at the time in the early 7th century.

The Holy Quran is in Arabic and “being the Arab Word of God verbatim, the Holy Quran constitutes the most important source of authority for Muslims (Farghal and Bloushi: 2012; 2).” The first Arabic-Latin translation of the Quran dates back to 1143, it was after the Latin translation that the Quran was translated to many other Western languages (Inalcık: 2016; 157).

In the seventeenth century people were curious about Islam. The French, early allies of the Ottoman government, planned crusades and dispatched missionaries to Ottoman territory with the object of crushing the Muslims (Hamilton and Richard: 2004). Around this period, André du Ryer produced various studies and work which had surely reflected these tensions and contradictions (ibid.). Du Ryer had served as the French vice-consul in Egypt, and then he worked in Istanbul as the interpreter to the French ambassador and “as ambassador extraordinary to the Sultan (ibid)”. He was competent in Arabic and Turkish. Among his works the most notable and influential is that of the translation of the Quran, which he published under the title *L’Alcoran de Mahomet* (1647) and was presented in the Catholic Europe of the 17th century. According to Hamilton & Richard (2004):

“Du Ryer had to present his works—above all his Turkish grammar and his translation of the Quran—as having been composed for the benefit of the missionaries in the Levant. He would seem to have had to attack Islam and to perpetuate anti-Islamic myths even when the many years he had spent in the Islamic world, the sources he used, and his friends both in France and in the East, suggest a genuine knowledge of, if not sympathy with, the teaching of the Quran.”

Du Ryer’s translation of the Quran was “the first vernacular version made directly from the Arabic ever to be published, he produced a best-seller which would be translated into English, Dutch, German and Russian and would affect the view of Islam all over Europe and even in America (ibid).” Alexander Ross translated the ‘Quran’ from Du Ryer’s French translation into English in 1649 in London. Among the problems of Du Ryer’s translation of the Quran was that it was highly subjective and as a result it was criticized in the 18th century by Gregory Sale who had the duty to assist in the Arabic translation of the New Testament for the use of Syrian Christians (Haleem: 2017). Among Sale’s mission for the Christians, Sale also translated the Quran from its’s original language, Arabic. In his translator notes, Sale claims that Du Ryer’s translation is far from being a translation because “there being mistakes in every page, besides frequent transpositions, omissions and additions, faults unpardonable in a work of this nature (Sale: 1795; viii).” In addition, Sale stresses the point that Ross who was “utterly unacquainted with the Arabic, and no greater master of the French, has added a number of fresh mistakes of his own to that of Du Ryer: not to mention the meanness of his language, which would make a better book ridiculous (Sale: 1795; viii).”

Approximately ten centuries after the revelation of the Quran, in the 17th century, Alexander Ross translated the holy book of Islam the 'Quran' from the French translation to English. On the cover of this translation, published in 1649 in London, the complete title is: "*The Alcoran of Mahomet, Translated out of Arabique into French; By the Sieur Du Ryer, Lord of Malezair, and Resident for the King of France, at Alexandria. And newly Englished, for the satisfaction of all that desire to look into the Turkish vanities.*"

As from now on, this book will be shortly referred to as '*The Alcoran of Mahomet.*' Although, Hamilton and Richard (2004) claim that in 1649, this Quran translation was an anonymous English version and that often and wrongly this translation is attributed to Alexander Ross, and whether the translator's name is pseudo or not, the present research accepts the name Alexander Ross.

3. Analysis of 'The Translator to the Christian Reader'

As previously stated, Ross has added commentaries to his translation '*The Alcoran of Mahomet.*' The first and third commentaries belong to himself, the second to Du Ryer and again were translated from French to English by Ross. These commentaries are presented in the following three sections under the subtitles:

1. The Translator to the Christian Reader
2. The French Epistle to the Reader
3. A Summary of the Religion of the Turks

In this study, the total commentary 'The Translator to the Christian Reader' is investigated and is presented in this section, in sentences in the form of original quotes. Throughout the study, the original writing, old English and style of the translator author Ross will be preserved.

Before starting with the commentary, it is worthwhile to also investigate the title of Ross's translation. The complete title of Ross's translation of the Quran is:

The Alcoran of Mahomet, Translated out of Arabique into French; By the Sieur Du Ryer, Lord of Malezair, and Resident for the King of France, at Alexandria. And newly Englished, for the satisfaction of all that desire to look into the Turkish vanities.

The English shorter version or commonly known title of Ross's translation is *The Alcoran of Mahomet* (1649) and it is a verbatim translation from Du Ryer's French translation *L'Alcoran de Mahomet*. According to Islamic belief, the Quran is a product of divine origination, the Quran was a revelation to Muhammed (Mahomet as written by Ross), as the messenger of Allah. However, in these translations 'of Mahomet' has been added to the original title of this holy book. The preposition 'of' is used as a function word to indicate belongingness and it can also function having the meaning through the agency. Considering the conditions and the purposes for which these translations were carried out, 'of Mahomet' was added to the title due to the misconception or misbelief of the Quran being accepted as Muhammed's words, instead of God (Allah). Based on the fact the Ross's translation is based on the translation of Du Ryer, Ross in his translation following his own commentary has also added the translation of Du Ryer's commentary 'The French Epistle to the Reader'. In this section Du Ryer explicitly explains his disbelief that the Quran is the word of God (Allah):

"The Book is a long conference of God, the Angels, and Mahomet, which that false Prophet very grosly invented; sometimes he introduceth God, who speaketh to him, and teacheth him his Law, then an

Angel, anon the Prophets, and frequently maketh God to speak in the plural, a stile that is not ordinary (Du Ryer)."

The above explanation of Du Ryer, shows that Ross has fed on Du Ryer's negative attitude expressed in *L'Alcoran de Mahomet*. This is perhaps the key to providing an understanding of Ross's prejudice attitude and discriminatory discourse in his translation.

The long version of the title of Ross's translation includes: '*And newly Englished, for the satisfaction of all that desire to look into the Turkish vanities.*' Since the Quran was *newly Englished*- as in the wording of Ross (1649) and published in England in the mid-17th century, the situation of England and the conditions of the era that Ross had translated the Quran needs to be considered also. At that time, there was a non-harmonious picture in the background of the period in which Ross was translating the Quran because in the 17th C. religious conflict had emerged. This was the time when there was not only political but also religious chaos in the country, a period when the church had dealt harshly with its rival supporters and Ross had taken full advantage of this attitude.

This being the background setting, Ross's title of the Quran translation that continues with: *for the satisfaction of all that desire to look into the Turkish vanities*, is a clear representation of racism because here, the Quran is presented to the English reader so that they learn about the Turkish vanities. The word 'vanities' although it has the meaning of 'excessive pride' it also has the meaning of 'nonsense or to be in vain' In this respect, considering the religious background and period of the translator, one must also consider the biblical usage of 'vanity' which has the meaning of "idolatrous religions and philosophies as useless (McKenzie: 1965; 421)," which most supposedly is the meaning adopted by Ross. The title of the book openly displays the translator's thought and attitude of prejudice towards the Turks and the strategic use of language in this title clearly explains the purpose of this book and why it was written. Here, the translator has used language as a vessel because he claims that he has presented this information for a certain purpose. In the long title, the 'newly Englished' phrase can be conceptualized as a sign which focuses on the cognition by forming a type of communication which attributes the identity of the translator and at the same time signals the certain aspect of his social group (English-Christian) that he has translated for.

The first section of "*The Alcoran of Mahomet*" can be considered as a commentary comprised of the translator's notes. In the first commentary, Ross addresses his audience under the heading: 'The Translator to the Christian Reader.' This heading itself portrays the prejudice attitude of the translator Ross because he addresses social identity by specifying the two separate groups, he has translated the Quran and added these notes for the benefit of his own group- the Christian reader. The implication of language in this heading is like a sign because it focuses cognition in the sense that it is an attribute of identity. The translator claims that he has written this section for Christians, he is drawing attention to make the social context clear to his reader. The first sentence is as follows:

"There being so many Sects and Heresies banded together against the Truth, finding that of *Mahomet* wanting to the Muster, I thought good to bring it to their Colours, that so viewing; thine enemies in their full body, thou mayst the better prepare to encounter, and I hope overcome them."

As can be seen from Ross's first sentence he is perpetuating his discourse with explicit prejudice against both the religion Islam and the Turks. According to Ross, the Turks who are their enemies believe in Muhammed's religion which is formed of beliefs and doctrines that are contrary to that of the Church doctrine which is based on the Holy Bible and is against the Truth- the word of God in Christianity. Here, Ross's xenophobic sentiment is displayed in his racist word labelling the Turks as the enemy. As Ross

explains, he has decisively translated the Quran so that his group can better understand who the Turks really are (in their colors) so that they can prepare, encounter and hopefully overcome them at war.

From a stylistic point of view, Ross sentences are eminently sequacious brought together with connectives, mostly commas and semi-colons. The second sentence in Ross's commentary is about the length of a paragraph (roughly 149 words) and provides a descriptive account of how the 'Turkish Religion' was disseminated by the Turks.

It may happily startle thee, to find him so to speak English, as if he had made some Conquest on the Nation, but thou wilt soon reject that fear, if thou consider that this his Alcoran, (the Ground-work of the Turkish Religion) hath been already translated into almost all Languages in Christendome, (at least, the most generall, as the *Latin, Italian, French, etc.*) yet never gained any Proselyte, where the Sword, its most forcible, and strongest argument hath not prevailed: And indeed the greatest Doctors of their Religion have never alledged any thing for the truth thereof; but the success of their wars, and greatness of their Empire, then which nothing is more fallacious: for that which both in former, and these latter Ages hath been common to the bad with the good, cannot be a certain evidence of the justice of a Cause, or the truth of Religion.

Note how the above sentence works up to the rational on how the Quran was forced upon people but 'never gained any Proselyte' even by force of the sword. Here, it must be kept in mind that in the mid-17th Century, there was also issues of religious toleration and surely Ross was on the side of non-toleration. However, considering the toleration practices of the English with that of Turks it is claimed by Pepperney (2007) that "As far back as the reign of Edward VI, the Protestant William Thomas noted how 'The Turk' practices toleration of other religions within the Islamic world, and this is one of the reasons for its successful expansion of empire 'by reason whereof he is the more able peaceably to enjoy so large an empire' (as quoted by Pepperney: 2007; 151)." As can be seen from the former quote, the Turks who are known to have respect to those of other religions were successfully expanding their empire and not interfering with the other peoples religions. The anti-Turk prejudice of Ross triggered by the fear of defeat, from the standpoint of a patriotic citizen argues that the success of the Turks 'cannot be a certain evidence of the justice of a Cause, or the truth of Religion.'

The third sentence in the commentary begins with a multiple account of derogatory adjectives used by Ross for describing the Quran. The sentence is as follows:

Thou shalt finde it of so rude, and incongruous a composure, so farced with contradictions, blasphemies, obscene speeches, and ridiculous fables, that some modest, and more rationall *Mahometans* have thus excused it; that their Prophet wrote an hundred and twenty thousand sayings, whereof three thousand only are good, the residue (as the impossibility of the Moones falling into his sleeve, the Conversion and Salvation of the Devils, and the like) are false and ridiculous.

In the above sentence Ross claims the attributes of the Quran to be a 'rude and incongruous composure... forced with contradictions, blasphemies, obscene speeches, and ridiculous fables.' In this sentence, "power is the master and language is its servant to serve or reflect the master's power (Ng: 2007; 118)." In this case Ross the master has used language so powerfully that his language becomes hate speech, full of degrading statements and above all he reaches the verdict that only three thousand of the one hundred and twenty thousand sayings are 'good', the rest being the 'residue are false and ridiculous.'

The above sentence also refers to the Prophet Muhammed in a belittling manner and makes the Prophet seem insane in the words 'the impossibility of the Moones falling into his sleeve.' Ross misleads his readers by distorting the events because the incident of the moon which he is describing here was actually a reply that the Prophet had given after the denunciations of the enemy threats of the Koreishites

when he had said to his uncle Abu Taleb, "Though the Koreishites should arm against me the sun and the moon, the one on my right hand and the other on my left, I would not be shaken from my resolution (Abulfeda, p. 21, as cited in Hales: 1810)." Here, what the Prophet Muhammed meant as explained by Upham (1828) is; "in this taunt Muhammed thus energetically expresses himself that if the Koreishites were even assisted by the planets they so ignorantly worshipped, yet he would not shrink from his doctrine of the unity of the Divine Being, as opposed to their idolatrous divinities (ibid., p. 13)."

Linguistically, "recipients are able to gauge a speaker's attitude and beliefs based on the types of words and phrasing they use (Collins and Clement: 2012; 379)." Throughout the above sentence Ross has openly signified his anti-Muhammed prejudice and the language that he has used can be conceptualized with the metaphor barometer because it reveals cognition, the explicit phrasings and word choices are used intentionally to incite prejudice in the receiver.

The fourth and fifth sentences of the commentary are as follows:

Yet is the whole esteemed so sacred, that upon the Cover thereof is inscribed— *Let none touch it but he who is clean*. Nor are the vulgar permitted to read it, but live and die in an implicate faith of what their Priests deliver; which indeed (as faith the learned Grotius) is a manifest argument of its iniquity: For that merchandise may justly be suspected, which will not be fold unless unseen: and though all men are not alike perspicacious in the knowledg, and discerning of things, some by arrogancy, and vain conceit of themselves, others by affection; Some by costume, being drawn into error: yet should we believe that the way to eternall life cannot be understood by them, who without any respect of profit or preferment, seek it, submitting themselves, withall they have, to God, imploring his assistance, we should sin against his infinite goodness.

In the above sentence Ross begins with the correct interpretation that the Quran, being regarded as the Word of God, Muslims should as a token of respect or reverence when handling or reading from the Quran follow certain rules such as performing ablutions so as to become clean and purified physically. However, Ross continues with counter arguments and the expression that the 'vulgar' are not permitted to read it and are to die in 'implicit faith of what their Priests deliver', which is indeed an open argument.

While explaining this feature of Islam, Ross in parentheses has referenced Hugo Grotius, a Dutch legal scholar and philosopher of the early 17th century. Grotius had published politico-theological works and "in 1617 was published Grotius's *De satisfactione Christi*, a defence of the 'catholic' creed against Faustus Socinus from Siena (Blom: 2005; 127)." This work saw "him use the language and semantics of government acquired during his training of law, to articulate an atonement standpoint that was founded on an understanding of God as moral governor (Pollard: 2018; 81)." In this work "Grotius was happy to argue reasonably against Socinus' idea that the whole idea of Christ suffering to satisfy for our sins is against reason: as a wise Rector He has both accepted Christ's satisfaction and dispensed the believers from the punishment by eternal death, precisely because He wanted to impress upon man the need to follow Christ (Blom: 2005; 146)."

The sixth sentence is a warning that Ross sends to the Christian reader:

Therefore (Christian Reader) though some, conscious of their own instability in Religion, and of theirs (too like Turks in this) whose prosperity and opinions they follow, were unwilling this should see the Press, yet am I confident, if thou hast been so true a votary to orthodox Religion, as to keep thy selfe untainted of their follies, this shall not hurt thee: And as for those of that Batch, having once abandoned the Sun of the Gospel, I believe they will wander as farre into utter darkness, by following strange lights, as by this *Ignis Fatuus* of the *Alcoran*.

While Ross is confident and secure in his own religion, he is extremely defensive to the Turks, the proselytizers. He is so defensive that he calls the *Alcoran* an Ignis Fatuus- the Latin term meaning 'foolish fire'. Similarly, Du Ryer in 'The French Epistle to the Reader' had claimed the Prohphet to be a hoax in the following sentence "They fear to utter things that may displease their false Prophet."

Ross concludes his commentary with the final sentence:

Such as it is, I present to thee, having taken the pains only to translate it out of French, not doubting, though it hath been a poison, that hath infected a very great, but most unsound part of the universe, it may prove an Anti-dote, to confirm in thee the health of Christianity.

Ross's last sentence highly resembles the concluding statement in 'The French Epistle to the Reader' written by Du Ryer:

"Thou shalt finde the exposition in this version; Thou wilt wonder that such absurdities have infected the best part of the world, and wilt avouch, that the knowledg of what is contained in this Book, will render that Law contemptible."

Upon comparison the two quotes show a similarity with both translators metaphorically speaking of the Islamic religion as a poison which has infected a great part of the world. Both translators have attributed negative traits to the Turks and their religion; through this strategy have attempted to create in memory an association between the trait for e.g. poison and the group, e.g. Turks. According to Sutton (2010), negative words are remembered and they contribute to negative feeling one has for the other group. Here language is conceptualized as a lens that distorts cognition. Sutton (2010) suggests that consistent with the lens metaphor, intergroup relations can also be affected by the saying-is-believing effect because "the lens of language brings about a joint focus of attention, helping to create a reality that is shared by senders and receivers alike. In keeping with this idea, the saying-is-believing effect seems to work better when communicators believe their description has reached an audience, and to work best when the audience is ingroup (p. 110)." The audience of du Ryer was Ross and they were both in the same group.

4. Conclusion

The translation of sacred texts necessitates cautiousness and full comprehension of the meaning of the source text because the target text is the product of this interpretation and is disseminated in this case as the divine word of the other group. Ross with his Quran translation has disrespectfully distorted the original meaning. However, considering the cultural context of the 17th century, it is possible to claim that the prejudice language of Ross based on his religious bigotry was not a product of individual motivation but could have been a representation based on the ideology and social categorization of his group.

Although Ross had serviced the religious community with his translation of the Quran, Ross was not faithful at all to the source text and had actually presented a free translation so that with his work he could use language as a powerful instrument for inciting prejudice against the Turks. Ross has used language strategically; by explicitly reflecting his thoughts, for he knew that he would be able to influence the cognition of his audience. The prejudice language that was employed by Ross in that era was perhaps applauded by his group because his book was influential for decades. It was not until the 18th century that a more faithful translation of the Quran had emerged.

Sutton (2010), who based on following the advances in social psychology, posits the idea that language is not only a medium for the transmission of prejudices and stereotypes, argues that language has the power to create, augment, and also transform prejudice and stereotypes. As the present study has portrayed, Ross has transmitted prejudice, he has used the power behind language by reflecting a religious and racist positive self-presentation to gain support and to present himself as a protector of his own group.

He has used language as a vessel to explicitly send information about the Turks and their Religion through baldly asserting discriminatory phrases. Being a member of the Christian community, in order to reach his community members Ross used language as a lens to display his shared or joint focus. At times, Ross used the barometric property of language, he had reached the peak with hatred words and this as Sutton (2010) claims may make people "infer that prejudice is normative when they hear others using hate terms. In such cases, the barometer plays a vital role in a self-perpetuating cycle of prejudice (p.111)." Because language itself is a form of communication Ross also used language conceptually as a sign that focuses cognition, he had portrayed his identity to the reader on the cover of his book *The Alcoran of Mahomet*, through the second half of his long title "And newly Englished, for the satisfaction of all that desire to look into the Turkish vanities."

This study has illustrated that language is a powerful product for communication and shaping thought because as can be seen from the study at a time when prejudice attitude was not condemned by social norms, Ross clearly expressed a harsh resistance to change in the religious status quo. Ross used language strategically in the selection of lexical items to reflect his own sentiment and prejudice which in return can influence the cognition of his reader who has no background knowledge of Islam. Here it must be highlighted that all language users, including those whether learning or teaching a native or foreign language must realize the great power embedded in language and be aware of the potential impact it has in shaping thought. This is an important issue because language users need to realize that during communication one has to be careful when using language if they do not want to purposefully ignite or transmit prejudice. Or vice versa, one must be aware of what type of language is being transmitted to them.

A final note, if the era of Ross and the present era was compared, perhaps Ross would not have dared to employ such explicit prejudice language, and if he had published *The Alcoran of Mahomet* in the 21st century he may have received much harsher revulsion than that of Salman Rushdie's novel 'The Satanic Verses' (1988), a galvanizing work published in the United Kingdom but is prohibited for translation and marketing in most Islamic countries. Nevertheless, even in the contemporary period despite the precautions and norms, this anti-Islam attitude can still be felt in subtle forms when language is used strategically in a veiled or implicit manner. Thus as the study has shown, no matter which century, as long as there are existing differences of religion and race, the language of prejudice will be ubiquitous.

References

- Blom, H. W. (2005). Grotius and socinianism. In M. Mulsow & J. Rohls (Eds.), *Socinianism and arminianism: Antitrinitarians, calvinists, and cultural exchange in seventeenth-century Europe*, 121-147. Leiden: Brill.
- Burman, T. E. (2010) Riccolodo da Monte di Croce. In D. Thomas (Ed.) *Christian-Muslim relations 600-1500*. Consulted online on 13 July 2018 at: http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1877-8054_cmri_COM_24694

- Collins, K. A., & Clement, R. (2012). Language and prejudice: direct and moderated effects. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, vol. 31, no. 4, 376-396.
- Farghal, M. & N. Bloushi (2012). Shifts of coherence in Quran translation. *Sayyab Translation Journal (STJ)*, vol. (4), 1-18.
- Grafton, D. D. (2017). Martin Luther's sources on the Turk and Islam in the midst of the fear of Ottoman imperialism. *The Muslim World*, vol. 107, no. 4, 665-683.
- Haleem, M. A. (2017). *Exploring the Qur'an: context and impact*. London: I. B. Taurus.
- Hales, W. (1830). *A new analysis of chronology and geography, history and prophecy: in which their elements are attempted to be explained, harmonized and vindicated, upon scriptural and scientific principles*. London: Rivington.
- Hamilton, A. & Richard, F. (2004) *André du Ryer and oriental studies in seventeenth-century France*. London: Oxford Uni. Press. Consulted online on 10 July 2018 at: <http://www.arcadian-library.com/study-series-no-1.php>
- Inalcık, H. (2017). *Osmanlı ve Avrupa- Osmanlı Devleti'nin Avrupa tarihindeki yeri*. Istanbul: Kronik Kitap.
- McKenzie, J. L. (1965). *Dictionary of the Bible*. New York: MacMillan Pub.
- McLeod, S. (2008). Prejudice and discrimination in psychology. *Simply Psychology*. Consulted online on 13 July 2018 at: <http://www.simplypsychology.org/prejudice.html>
- Ng, S. H. (2007). Language-based discrimination: Blatant and subtle forms. *Journal of Language. and Social Psychology*, vol. 26, 106-122.
- Pollard, R. T. (2008). *Dan Taylor (1738-1816), Baptist leader and pioneering Evangelical*. Eugene: Pickwick Pub.
- Pepperney, J. (2007). The Elizabethan Jesuits and religious toleration. *Reformation*, 12:1, 139-168.
- Ross, A. (1649). *The Alcoran of Mahomet, Translated out of Arabique into French; By the Sieur Du Ryer, Lord of Malezair, and Resident for the King of France, at Alexandria. And newly Englished, for the satisfaction of all that desire to look into the Turkish vanities*. London. U.K. Also available at: <https://quod.lib.umich.edu/e/eebo/B25542.0001.001?view=toc>
- Rushdie, S. (1988). *The Satanic Verses*. London: Viking.
- Sale, G. (1734). *The Koran; commonly called the Alcoran of Mohammed: translated from the original Arabic. With explanatory notes, taken from the most approved commentators. To which is prefixed a preliminary discourse by George Sale*. London: Ackers
- Sutton, R. M. (2010). The creative power of language in social cognition and intergroup relations. In H. Giles, S. Reid, & J. Harwood (Eds.), *Language as social action*: Vol. 8. The dynamics of intergroup communication, 105-115. New York: Peter Lang Pub.
- Upham, E. (1828). *History of the Ottoman Empire: from its establishment, till the year 1828*. Edinburgh: Printed for Constable and Co. Consulted online on 15 July 2018 at: https://books.google.co.mz/books?id=cUUPAQAAAJ&pg=PA3&hl=tr&source=gbs_toc_r&ad=3#v=onepage&q&f=false