William Chittick's Translation of *Kašf al-Asrār wa ʿOddat al-Abrār*: Perpetuating Orientalist Paradigms[1]

_____ **Marzieh Malekshahi[2] & Seyyed Mohammad Reza Mirseyyed[3]**

Abstract

This article provides a postcolonial analysis of William Chittick's English translation of *Kašf al-asrār wa ʿoddat al-abrār*, a monumental Qurʾānic commentary by the 12th-century Persian scholar Abu'l-Fażl Rašid-al-Din Meybodi. The study investigates how Chittick's positionality as a contemporary Western academic shaped his translation approach, arguing that it reflects certain Orientalist leanings inherited from colonialist discourses. The analysis focuses on framing devices, selectivity, and translation choices that exoticize Islamic culture as mystical and inferior. Strategies like framing Meybodi's text specifically as "Sufi" commentary, excluding biographical content, and selectively emphasizing passages related to "love" cater to Orientalist paradigms that bifurcate between an emotional, mystical Sufism and legalistic, orthodox Islam. This reductionist filtering tailored for Western expectations fragments Meybodi's integrated exegetical methodology which interweaves linguistic, legal, and spiritual dimensions. Chittick's omission of extensive Arabic sections and hadiths diminishes the centrality of Prophetic narrations in Qurʾānic interpretation. Overall, the study argues that Chittick's decontextualization and homogenization of this profoundly diverse text severely compromises its integrity. It calls for greater reflexivity regarding translators' inherited ideological assumptions and respect for the cultural context and polyvalent nature of source texts.

Keywords: *Kašf al-asrār*, Orientalism, Postcolonialism, Qurʾānic exegesis, Sufism, Translation

---

2. Corresponding Author: Assistant Professor, English Language Department, Faculty of Humanities, Damghan University, Damghan, Iran; email: m.malekshahi@du.ac.ir

3. Assistant Professor, Department of Islamic Sciences, Faculty of Humanities, Damghan University, Damghan, Iran; email: mirsayyed@du.ac.ir

Introduction

Translation plays a vital role in intercultural communication, yet it can also perpetuate imbalances of power and the enduring effects of colonialism (Bassnett & Trivedi, 1999). As Edward Said (1979) demonstrated in his pioneering book *Orientalism*, Western scholars have frequently approached non-Western cultures from an ideological stance of exoticization and supremacy. Building on Said's insights, postcolonial translation studies critically examine how translation practices have often reinforced colonialist perspectives while marginalizing non-Western voices (Niranjana, 1992). This article provides a postcolonial analysis of William Chittick's translation of *Kašf al-asrār wa ʿoddat al-abrār* (*The Unveiling of the Mysteries and the Provision of the Pious*) by Rašid-al-Din Meybodi. Meybodi (d. after 1126) was a Persian scholar whose Qurʾānic commentary integrates legal, linguistic, and spiritual dimensions. Chittick, a contemporary American academic, produced an English translation of selections from this multifaceted text. Applying postcolonial theory enables a critical investigation of how Chittick's positionality as a Western scholar who has inherited orientalist tendencies shaped his translation approach.

The analysis examines how certain translation choices in Chittick's work reflect Orientalist attitudes that portray Islamic culture as exotic, mystical, and inferior. Specifically, it points out how Chittick's prioritization of Sufi aspects promotes Orientalist notions of a dichotomy between mainstream Islam and esoteric Sufism. The analysis also critiques the omission of certain content and the imposition of Western literary expectations, arguing these misrepresent the complex nature of Meybodi's Qur'anic commentary. Further, it identifies Orientalist strategies like fluency, domestication, and decontextualization that assimilate the text into familiar Western tropes. Overall, the reductionist approach fragments Meybodi's nuanced work to fit Western preconceptions, undermining the integrity of his contribution. The analysis serves as a template for critically examining how translations can continue to overshadow postcolonial voices unless translators adopt more reflexive, dialogical techniques.

The next section delves further into foundational concepts in postcolonial theory including colonialist discourse, Orientalism, and postcolonial translation studies. This background establishes the framework for the subsequent analytical scrutiny of Chittick's approach to translating excerpts of *Kašf al-asrār.*

Colonialist Discourse and Post-colonial Studies

Colonialist discourse asserted the inherent superiority of the colonizers' Anglo-European culture over indigenous populations, deeming native cultures as savage, primitive, and underdeveloped compared to the colonizers' technological advancements. Indigenous peoples were approached as either the demonic/evil or exotic/noble other, but in both cases regarded as less than fully human (Tyson, 2006). This Eurocentric attitude, wherein European ideals hold universal applicability, allowed colonizers to judge all other cultures against Western standards. As Selden and Widdowson (2005) state, Western thought and literary models have marginalized non-Western traditions. Overall, colonialist discourse was premised on the belief that only Anglo-European culture was civilized.

The term "postcolonial" refers to the present-day political, social, cultural, and literary landscapes in former European colonies. Although the colonial era has ended politically, economic and cultural colonialism persists through neocolonialism (Moore, 2001). Postcolonialism challenges colonialist assumptions and provides a platform to critically examine colonialist ideologies Dissanayake, 2006). Postcolonial studies encompass the historical movements towards independence, the extensive period of European expansionism, and examination of all forms of foreign domination (Schwarz, 2005). However, the lessons from resisting European imperialism in the past fifty years have created a distinct contemporary context (Schwarz, 2005). Ashcroft, Griffiths, and Tiffin (2004) use 'post-colonial' to refer to all cultures affected by imperialism from initial colonization to the present day, arguing that a continuity of concerns stems from European aggression.

Postcolonial literature challenges prevailing perspectives on interactions between Western and non-Western societies. It provides an alternative worldview and ideology prioritizing marginalized interests (Young, 2003). Edward Said, Gayatri Spivak, and Homi Bhabha have significantly impacted postcolonial theory. Said's *Orientalism* (1979) analyzes how European discourse politically and ideologically constructed the Orient. Spivak critiques Western feminists expecting non-Western works to be translated into English, arguing this distorts meanings (Munday, 2001). She urges mindfulness of rhetoricality in languages. Bhabha focuses on cultural hybridity and translation as cultural creation rather than a bridge between cultures (Simon, 1997).

In summary, postcolonialism examines the complex political, social, cultural and literary dimensions stemming from imperialism and colonialism. Pioneers like

Said, Spivak and Bhabha have critiqued representations and translations of non-Western cultures and provided alternative frameworks prioritizing marginalized voices. Postcolonial studies continue to evolve perspectives on interactions between cultures in the aftermath of colonialism.

Perspectives on the Function of Translation within the Colonialist Discourse

Translation played a pivotal role in colonialism, serving as a tool for acquiring essential knowledge about local populations. It also facilitated the indoctrination of colonized individuals into the linguistic and cultural conventions of the colonizers (Shamma, 2009).

Colonial translation practices often resulted in the rewriting and ideologically-driven portrayal of the colonized population. This process led to the reinforcement of stereotypes through two distinct strategies: exoticization and naturalization. Both strategies stemmed from the projection of an idealized self onto the other, ultimately distorting the representation of the colonized (Carbonell, 1996).

Sengupta (1990) highlights the importance of translators refraining from imposing the value system of the source language onto the target language culture. She argues for a moral responsibility towards the target language readers. In this context, she examines how Rabindranath Tagore's auto-translations of his work "Gitajali: Song Offerings" into English demonstrated a fidelity to the target audience, emphasizing the quality of the translated material. Tagore's ability to convey Eastern wisdom in a manner that resonated with the colonizer's psyche contributed to his popularity in the Western literary scene (Sengupta, 1990).

Bassnett and Trividi (1999) point out that in the nineteenth century, a translation tradition emerged where English translations of Arabic or Indian texts underwent substantial cutting, editing, and publication accompanied by extensive anthropological footnotes. This practice established a hierarchical relationship between the translated text and its originating culture. For example, Edward Lane's translation of the *Thousand and One Nights* included notes that portrayed Arabs as gullible individuals incapable of distinguishing between rationality and fiction.

Richard (1992) explores the dynamics of translation between French and Arabic, proposing two distinct translation paradigms during different cultural encounters: the colonial moment and the post-colonial moment. These paradigms are shaped by whether translation occurs from a dominant culture into a subordinate one or vice versa. In the post-colonial moment, these paradigms have been challenged by intellectuals who belong to cultural minorities.

Theory and Practice of Translation in a Post-colonial Context

In the 1990s, there was growing scholarly interest in exploring the interconnected nature of colonialism, language, and translation (Snell-Hornby, 2006). Niranjana (1992) argues that in postcolonial contexts, translation emerged as a significant arena for examining issues of representation, power, and history. According to Niranjana, the processes of subjection and subjectification inherent in colonialism infiltrated diverse domains like philosophy, anthropology, linguistics, and literary studies. Thus, the colonial subject was shaped through various discourses across multiple spheres, with translation playing a crucial role. Translation practices were not only influenced by but also reinforced the unequal colonial power dynamics. The strategic portrayal of colonized subjects helped legitimize domination.

In the postcolonial period, significant attention focused on examining ideology's influence on translation practices. Yousef (2004) categorizes postcolonial translation theorists into two groups. The first group (Bassnett, Toury, Lefevere) examined how the target language shaped text selection. The second group (Venuti, Richard, Robinson, Lefevere) studied the effects of Western dominance on cultural transfers. They argued translation was controlled by Britain, America and the West.

Postcolonial translation studies employ diverse approaches. Many examine theory/practice from an Asian or Indian perspective. However, some scholars approach this subject from a European standpoint (Munday 2001). Chan (2000) investigated postcolonial theory's applicability to China, which did not undergo direct colonialism. He argues Chinese scholars' interest indicates the theory's emerging relevance. Chan employs "postcolonial" broadly, contending China experienced cultural/linguistic colonization since the 20th century.

In the realm of post-colonialism, scholars have proposed various translation strategies as a response to the historical misuse of translation by colonizers (Bassnett & Trividi, 1999). Some advocate limiting or avoiding translation into European languages to counteract the perpetuation of colonization processes (Bassnett & Trividi, 1999). Alternatively, Tymoczko suggests incorporating words from subjugated cultures into works and translations to emphasize hybridity, making the language unfamiliar and challenging standardized language supremacy (Bassnett & Trividi, 1999).

Niranjana supports re-translation as a practice to highlight cultural differences and challenge Westernized translation discourse and power structures

(Hatim & Munday, 2004). In Africa, addressing the representation of oral culture in English, French, or Portuguese literary works involves techniques such as "cushioning" and "contextualization" (Bassnett, 2010). "Cushioning" includes adding explanatory words, while "contextualization" establishes a framework for understanding African words and phrases (Bassnett, 2010).

In Brazilian and Latin American contexts, writers and translators aim to reclaim and recreate the European literary canon through a cannibalist tradition of translation. This approach views translation as a creative act, allowing the introduction of local references into the text (Bassnett, 2010). Tymoczko's work on early Irish literature in English translation categorizes translations into literary and scholarly lineages, with the latter closely reflecting the linguistic characteristics of the Irish texts. The strategies employed in these translations are influenced by cultural and ideological imperatives (Tymoczko, 1999).

Despite these strategies, postcolonial translation studies face criticism. Shamma (2009) points out a tendency to overlook differences among postcolonial contexts, potentially perpetuating Eurocentric stereotypes. Some approaches, while aiming to respect cultural uniqueness, may inadvertently reinforce essentialist attitudes (Tymoczko, 2010). Translators in postcolonial contexts choose strategies aligned with specific ideological goals, making postcolonial translations complex, fragmentary, and self-contradictory (Tymoczko, 2010).

In the subsequent sections of this article, I will delve into a specific case study to examine William Chittick's translation of *Kašf al-asrār wa ʿoddat al-abrār* (*The Unveiling of the Mysteries and the Provision of the Pious*) by Rašid-al-Din Meybodi through a postcolonial lens. Meybodi (d. after 1126) was a Persian scholar who wrote an extensive commentary on the Qurʾān. *Kašf al-asrār* offers spiritual insights into the inner meanings of the Islamic holy text. Chittick, a contemporary American scholar of Sufism, produced an English translation of excerpts from this text. Applying postcolonial theory enables a critical examination of how Chittick's ideological assumptions and positionality as a Western academic shaped his translation approach. The analysis focuses on framing devices, selectivity, and translation choices reflecting Orientalist attitudes—the perception of Islamic culture as exotic, mystical, and inferior promoted by Western imperialists.

This analysis aims to explore the primary translation strategies at the macro level that Chittick employed. The examination of these overarching techniques offers insights into how Chittick's translation choices contribute to Orientalist perspectives,

perpetuating imbalances in cultural power dynamics. It's important to note that this paper will not delve into the micro-level translation techniques encompassing word choice, syntax, metaphor, and the like. Although analyzing these micro-level techniques can be enlightening, it falls beyond the scope of this study and could be the focus of a separate investigation dedicated to textual and stylistic analysis. There exists significant potential for further unpacking how Chittick's ideological stance is manifested through both macro and micro translation decisions. This paper serves as a foundation by establishing the high-level strategic maneuvers employed by Chittick in reshaping Meybodi's text through an Orientalist lens.

Kašf al-Asrār and Its Importance in Literary and Cultural Contexts

Kašf al-asrār wa ʿoddat al-abrār is a ten-volume Persian commentary on the Qurʾān, making it one of the most extensive in Persian, second only to Abu'l-Fotuḥ Rāzi's Shiʿi commentary. It is arguably the earliest complete Persian Qurʾān commentary with significant mystical content, establishing the genre of Sufi tafsir in Persian.

The *Kašf al-asrār* is distinguished by its unique threefold structure, where the Qurʾān is organized into Nawbats (lit., turns), each containing five to fifty verses. The first Nawbat involves concise Persian renderings, deviating from literal translations and often providing interpretive insights. Moving on to Nawbat II, this Nawbat resembles a conventional Qurʾān commentary, covering various components such as discussions on traditions, circumstances of revelation, legal rulings, abrogating and abrogated verses, grammar, lexicography, and stories of the prophets. Despite being described as a Persian commentary, Nawbat II contains a significant amount of Arabic content, indicating that it wasn't exclusively intended for an audience lacking in Arabic literacy. Notably, the proportion of Arabic in Nawbat II gradually increases throughout the work, reaching around 80 percent or more towards the end of the commentary. The third Nawbat, is described by Meybodi as comprising allegories of mystics, Sufi allusions, and subtle associations of preachers (Keeler, 2009; Meybodi, 1952–1960). This part provides a diverse range of content, including esoteric interpretations of selected verses, passages of encomium to God, the Prophet, or the Qurʾān, explanations of different aspects of Sufi doctrine, sayings and anecdotes about mystics, aphorisms, poetry, prayers, invocations, and narrative passages that present mystical perspectives on events in the lives of the prophets. Unlike Nawbat II, Nawbat III is composed almost entirely in Persian, showcasing a poetic and artistic prose style, enriched with imagery,

metaphors, and integrated Qurʾānic quotations. (Keeler, 2009; Meybodi, 1952–1960).

Possible Orientalist Leanings in Chittick's Decisions Regarding Translation

William Chittick's translation of excerpts from *Kašf al-asrār wa ʿoddat al-abrār* reflects certain Orientalist leanings through the macro-level choices he makes in presenting and rendering Rašid-al-Din Meybodi's text (See Meybodi, 2015). Chittick's positioning as a Western academic decoding an Islamic text for English readers orients his strategies toward familiarizing Meybodi's multidimensional Qurʾānic exegesis within Orientalist expectations. The main macro-level techniques Chittick employs that perpetuate imbalanced power dynamics and colonialist perspectives include: selectivity and exclusion, framing through paratextual material, fluency, literalism, and decontextualization.

Selectivity and exclusion

Chittick excluded the translation of Nawbats I and II, covering just half of Nawbat III, based on personal criteria. His selection focused on passages that discuss love, whether directly or indirectly, disregarding various Arabic-dominant sections containing extensive hadiths and reports about prophets and revered figures. Moreover, biographical narratives detailing the behaviors of the Prophet and his Companions were left out. Chittick's approach raises significant concerns about the preservation of the original text's integrity. By selectively focusing on mystical passages from Nawbat III, Chittick distorts the comprehensive nature of Meybodi's commentary, divorcing Sufi interpretations from their integrated context. This selective translation caters to Orientalist desires for exotic wisdom but at the cost of decontextualizing and fragmenting Meybodi's methodology.

The omission of biographical passages, Arabic sections, and repetitive content by Chittick may be seen as an attempt to extract the supposed "essence" for Western readers. However, this subjective criterion compromises the work's integrity, as it tailors the translation to fit Western expectations, thereby filtering the multilayered exegesis into esoteric passages reflective of Chittick's biases. Such an approach fails to convey the fullness of Meybodi's analysis and deprives readers of the comprehensive nature of his work.

In translating selectively, Chittick not only separates Sufism from Qurʾānic exegesis but also misrepresents the embedded relationship between exoteric and esoteric analysis in Meybodi's work. Meybodi's holistic approach, as evidenced in *Kašf al-asrār*, emphasizes the interconnectedness of mystical insights with the

broader context of Qurʾānic interpretation. Faithfulness to this integrated approach demands a translation that captures the entirety of Meybodi's work, not just the decontextualized mystical passages tailored for Western expectations.

The significance of *Kašf al-asrār* in Persian literature adds another layer to the argument against Chittick's selective translation. Meybodi's commentary is not merely a mystical exploration; it is a comprehensive work that encompasses various aspects of Qurʾānic commentary. The unique threefold structure, with sessions ranging from concise Persian renderings to conventional Qurʾānic commentary and culminating in allegories of mystics, showcases the depth and richness of Meybodi's approach.

Chittick's translation choices risk diminishing the impact of Meybodi's contribution to the genre of Sufi *tafsir* in Persian. *Kašf al-asrār* stands as a testament to the fusion of linguistic, legal, and mystical elements, and any translation that disregards this integral unity does a disservice to Meybodi's legacy. To truly appreciate the profound insights and literary significance *of Kašf al-asrār*, a translation must mirror the holistic nature of the original work, encompassing its diverse sessions and maintaining the interconnectedness of exoteric and esoteric dimensions.

Framing through paratextual material

Chittick adds a 9-page introduction to his translation discussing the background, sources, themes, terminology, translation approach, and suggested reading method for Meybodi's commentary *Kašf al-asrār*. Authorial intrusion through introductions and prefaces frames the text based on the translator's agenda. While providing valuable context about Meybodi and his commentary on the Qurʾān, Chittick's introduction reveals an implicit orientalism. For example, he states that the text will be of interest for readers of Sufi texts (Chittick, 2015). Chittick's categorization of the text as an example of "Sufi" commentary reveals an Orientalist impulse to impose classifications on Islamic intellectual history. This diminishes its standing as commentary engaging with the full range of Qurʾānic meanings.

The detailed introduction Chittick (2015) provides emphasizes his long-standing fascination with the profound insights found in Nawbat III. Chittick frames this work specifically as a translation of Nawbat III of *Kašf al-asrār*, the Nawbat containing mystical and esoteric interpretations. This foregrounds the "Sufi" dimensions while backgrounding the legal, linguistic, and literal exegesis in other

Nawbats. This frames the text as containing esoteric wisdom to be uncovered by the Western academic, reflecting Orientalist notions of Sufism as the inner spiritual truth in contrast to exoteric orthodox Islam.

He justifies omitting sections with long hadiths or biographical content as not contributing "any profundity of insight" (Chittick, 2015, xv). This implies a bias that spiritual teachings must be complex or abstract to offer value. In contrast, postcolonial scholars would argue that lived experiences and practices are equally vital in elucidating a tradition. Declaring passages with lengthy hadiths unworthy of translation devalues the centrality of hadiths for Qurʾānic exegesis. It caters to modernist skepticism toward hadiths instead of recognizing their integral role within the classical Islamic exegetical tradition.

Chittick's frequent use of the term "Folk of Recognition" (Chittick, 2015, xii) to denote Sufi adherents reflects an Orientalist tendency to label Islamic phenomena through Western concepts. This term homogenizes diverse historical figures and perspectives into a singular "folk," oversimplifying the Sufi tradition. Moreover, his use of specialized terms like "Folk of Recognition" and "recognizers" (Chittick, 2015, xi, xiii, xiv) to refer to Sufis creates an aura of exclusivity not present in the original Arabic terminology of ʿarif and maʿrifa. This echoes Orientalist fascination with Sufism as a gateway to secret wisdom, overshadowing Islamic exoteric dimensions.

Chittick's framing of Sufism as focused on "bestowal" (Chittick, 2015, ix, x, xi) and "personal desire" (Chittick, 2015, x) for God's proximity risks perpetuating Orientalist tropes that bifurcate between a rational, legalistic Islam and an emotional, mystical Sufism. However, as Nicholson (1914) highlights, the earliest Sufis were more ascetic and quietist than mystical. The Arabic term "Sufi" originally denoted pious Muslims driven by an overwhelming fear of sin and judgment to seek salvation through world renunciation. It only later accrued connotations of rapturous mysticism. This evolution challenges binaries between ascetic, legalistic piety and ecstatic mysticism. For most premodern Muslims, exoteric and esoteric dimensions were integrated in a holistic pursuit of knowledge of God. Reducing Sufism to an inward, mystical core occludes its grounding in Islamic ritual and law. His selection of passages related to "love" risks foregrounding a theme that resonates with Western preconceptions of Sufism. Love is overemphasized due to Rumi and Ibn Arabi's popularity. Omitting biographical passages risks diminishing the role of veneration of saints and Muhammad in lived Islam. Orientalists have historically

been skeptical of such devotion, preferring an abstracted, mystical Sufism detached from ritual and community. Thus, the association of Sufism with mysticism reflects later developments and Western projections. Identifying Sufism solely with an inward, emotional mysticism divorces it from the jurisprudence, ritual, and community which shaped its medieval expression. Chittick's account perpetuates Orientalist notions of Sufism as irrational and detached from mainstream Islam.

Moreover, entitling his translation "The Unveiling of Mysteries" evokes the Orientalist trope of mystics piercing the veils shrouding esoteric knowledge, playing into Western notions of Eastern exoticism and obsession with mysticism.

Overall, Chittick's framing cannot escape inherited Orientalist paradigms despite his extensive knowledge. Postcolonial translation requires reflexivity regarding the translator's assumptions and respect for the Islamic text's layered intra-traditional resonances.

Fluency

In addition to the framing devices and selectivity, Chittick's specific translation choices, as explained in his introduction, frequently cater to Western literary ideals in ways that distort Meybodi's text.

Chittick (2015) declares that he has employed a highly fluent, transparent translation style that domesticates the source text for English readers. His renderings use natural-sounding idiomatic phrases rather than foreignizing or literal translations. However, this fluency masks the cultural distance and stylistic features of Meybodi's Persian prose. As Venuti (2017) argues, fluent translation strategies propagate the hegemony of English and erase cultural differences.

Chittick's fluent phrasing caters to Orientalist desires for mystical texts easily consumed in English. However, it occludes the creative rhetorical techniques Meybodi employs to convey meaning indirectly through symbolic language. The discursive style of Nawbat III encompasses wordplay, puns, imagery and figurative language which resist fluent English translation. Chittick's fluency domesticates the ornate Persian rhetoric into familiar English, overlooking untranslatable nuances.

Literalism

In contrast, Chittick frequently translates Arabic terminologies and passages with extreme literalism. This imposes a foreignizing effect on sections originally composed in Persian. The disjointed, abstract renderings of Arabic terms using Latinate vocabulary disrupts the literary flow of surrounding Persian prose.

While foreignizing translation can be a postcolonial strategy to challenge hegemonic English standards, Chittick's inconsistent literalism exoticizes the Arabic sections. This disjunction between fluency and literalism caters to Orientalist notions of a duality between emotional Sufi mysticism and legalistic Islam.

Decontextualization

Chittick decontextualizes the verses and passages he translates, excluding the surrounding Qurʾānic exegesis. Extracting allegorical interpretations as stand-alone excerpts misrepresents their embedded nature within Meybodi's integrated analysis encompassing literal, legal and spiritual meanings.

Presenting esoteric insights in isolation perpetuates Orientalist paradigms separating Sufism from Qurʾānic commentary. However, Meybodi seamlessly interweaves mystical perspectives within the broader exegetical framework. Fragmenting his bricolage into decontextualized passages fails to convey the interconnected methodology underpinning his commentary.

Conclusion

This examination of William Chittick's translation of selections from Rašid-al-Din Meybodi's monumental Qurʾānic tafsir *Kašf al-asrār* demonstrates how translation practices can perpetuate inherited ideological biases and colonialist perspectives. The postcolonial analysis reveals Orientalizing tendencies in Chittick's framing, selectivity, and overall reshaping of this multilayered text. Imposing spiritual exceptionalism, fragmenting integrated analysis, and catering to exoticizing paradigms risks significantly distorting Meybodi's intricate methodology and comprehensive exegesis.

Chittick's approach bifurcates exoteric and esoteric dimensions by foregrounding mystical passages, excluding biographical content, and diminishing the centrality of hadiths in Qurʾānic interpretation. This reductionist filtering tailored for Western expectations severely compromises the original work, overshadowing the intra-traditional plurality encompassed within. As Tymoczko (2010) argues, failure to fully engage cultural context in translation erases difference and perpetuates hegemony.

The study highlights the enduring need for reflexivity regarding the translator's positionality, assumptions, and inherited ideological leanings. Translation must be recognized as an inherently political act with the potential to either challenge or reinforce imbalances in power relations. This demands mindful,

dialogical techniques that respect untranslated difference and the integrity of multiplicity within the original text and culture.

As global interconnectivity expands, translation facilitates essential cross-cultural communication but also carries risks of perpetuating domination. The postcolonial perspective developed here provides a conceptual framework to critically analyze translation practices across contemporary cultural encounters and postimperial contexts. Respecting diversity while building meaningful bridges remains an ever-relevant challenge. Further evolving methodological reflexivity, cultural self-awareness and resisting inherited biases is imperative for translation to play a constructive, ethical role in our globalizing world.

Works Cited:

Aschcroft, B., Griffiths, G., & Tiffin, H. (2004). *The Empire Writes Back: Theory and Practice in Postcolonial Literatures*. London & New York: Routledge.

Basnett, S, & Trividi, H. (1999). Of Colonies, Cannibals and Vernaculars. In S. Bassnett & H. Trividi (Eds.), *Post-colonial Translation: Theory and Practice* (pp.1–18). London: Routledge.

Bassnett, S. (2010). Postcolonial Translations. In Sh. Chew & D. Richards (Eds), *A Concise Companion to Postcolonial Literature* (pp. 78–96). Wiley-Blackwell.

Carbonell, O. (1996). The Exotic Space of Cultural Translation. In R. Alvarez (Ed), *Translation, Power and Subversion* (pp. 69–98). Multilingual Matters.

Chan, L.T.H (2000). Colonization, Resistance and the Uses of Postcolonial Translation Theory in Twentieth-century China. In Sh. Simon & P. St-Pierre (Eds), *Changing the Terms: Translating in the Postcolonial Era* (pp. 53–70). Canada: University of Ottawa Press.

Chittick, W. C. (2015). Introduction. In R.A.D. Meybodi, The unveiling of the mysteries and the provision of the pious: Kashf al-asrār wa ʿuddat al-abrār (pp. 1–9). (W.C. Chittick, Trans.). Amman, Jordan: Fons Vitae.

Dissanayake, W (2006). Post-colonial Theory and Asian Communication Theory: Toward a Creative Dialogue. *China Media Research*. 2(4).

Keeler, A. (2009). Meybodi, Abu'l-Fazl Rashid-al-Din. *Encyclopedia Iranica*. Retrieved November 17, 2023, from https://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/meybodi-abul-fazl-rasid-al-din

Meybodi, R. A. D. (2015). The unveiling of the mysteries and the provision of the pious: Kashf al-asrār wa ʿuddat al-abrār (W. C. Chittick, Trans.). Amman, Jordan: Fons Vitae.

Meybodi, R. A. D. (1952–1960*). Kašf al-asrār wa ʿoddat al-abrār* (Vols. 1–10). (ʿA.-A. Ḥekmat, Ed.). Tehran.

Moore, D.C. (2001). Is the Post- in Postcolonial the Post- in Post-Soviet? *PLAMA*, 116(1), 111–126. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/463645

Munday, J. (2001). *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Application*. London: Rutledge.

Nicholson, R. A. (1914). *The mystics of Islam* (Vol. 5). G. Bell and sons, Limited.

Niranjana, T. (1992). *Siting Translation: History, Post-colonialism, and the Colonial Context*. Berkley, Los Angeles and Oxford: University of California Press.

Richard, J. (1992). Translation and Cultural Hegemony: the Case of the French-Arabic Translation. In L. Venuti (Ed.), *Rethinking Translation: Discourse/ Subjectivity and Ideology* (pp. 139–159). London: Rutledge.

Said, E.W. (1979). *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage Books.

Schwarz, H. (2005). Mission Impossible: Introducing Postcolonial Studies in the US Academy. In H. Schwarz & S. Ray (Eds), *A Companion to Postcolonial Studies* (pp. 1–20). Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Sengupta, M (1990). Translation, Colonialism and Poetics: Rabindranath Tagore in Two Worlds. In S. Bassnett & A. Lefevere (Eds.), *Translation, History and Culture*. London: Pinter Publisher.

Shamma, T. (2009). Postcolonial Studies and Translation Theory. *MonTI*. 1, 183–196. Retrieved from http://www.redalyc.org/articulo.oa?id=265119728014

Simon, Sh. (1997). Translation, Post-colonialism, and Cultural Studies. *Meta*. XIII (2), 462–477.

Snell-Hornby, M. (2006). *The Turns of Translation Studies: New paradigms or shifting viewpoints?*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Tymoczko, M. (1999). *Translation in a Post-colonial Context: Early Irish Literature in English Translation*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.

Tymoczko, M. (2010). Translation, Resistance, Activism: An Overview. In M. Tymoczko (Ed.), *Translation, Resistance, Activism* (pp. 1–22). University of Massachusetts Press.

Tyson, L. (2006). *Critical Theory Today: A User-Friendly Guide*. New York & London: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.

Venuti, L. (2017). *The translator's invisibility: A history of translation*. Routledge.

Young, R. J. C. (2003). *Postcolonialism: A Very Short Introduction*. New York: Oxford University Press Inc.

Yousef, T (2004). Translation and the Cultural Dimension: A Postcolonial –Poststructuralist Approach. *Damascus University Journal*, 2 (3+4), 43–56.