

# **Affective Social Distance in Quranic Discourse: A Sociolinguistic Study with Special Reference to Translation**

**Asst. Prof. Amthal Mohammed Abbas**  
**(Ph.D.)**  
University of Diyala  
College of Education for Human Sciences  
Department of English Language  
[amthaljumaily@yahoo.com](mailto:amthaljumaily@yahoo.com)

**Asst. Ins. Shawqi Khudhayir Ismail**  
**(M.A.)**  
University of Diyala  
College of Education for Human Sciences  
Department of English Language  
[shawqi983@gmail.com](mailto:shawqi983@gmail.com)

## **Abstract**

Distance in sociolinguistics is a term often used to cover social relations among groups of participants. It tackles different types of conceptualizations. This study will confine itself to investigate the phenomenon of affective social distance which associates the social distance with the affective one which discloses how much or little sympathy the members of a party feel for another party. Besides, one of the objectives of sociolinguistics is to obtain a better understanding of language by analyzing it in the social context.

The study aims at focusing and perusing the affective social distance in Quranic verses that embody God-Prophets relationships. Verses that show such discourse would be highlighted and , then , the last aim is comparing different translations to find out how well the translators did their best to render these relationships in the targeted discourses.

The study includes two chapters preceded by an introduction. Chapter one deals with the theoretical backbone of the study while chapter two is dedicated to the practice ( analysis and translation ). It ends with a number of conclusions.

## 1. Introduction

The term distance is used in numerous branches of science, such as linguistics, sociology, psychology, anthropology, intercultural communication, etc. and is applied to diverse phenomena. The concept of "distance", as applied to human and distinguished from spatial relations, is an attempt to reduce to something like measurable terms the grades and degrees of understanding and intimacy which characterize personal and social relations (Park,1924:339).

'Social distance' was popularized by Emory Bogardus (1926). Bogardus suggested a social distance model which empirically measures people's willingness to participate in social contact of varying degrees. The model covers several interlocutionary relationships which are : relatives, close friends , neighbors , co-workers, citizens , and visitors.

According to Bogardus (1926: 46), social distance is a function of affective distance between the members of two groups. In social distance studies, the center of attention is on the feeling reactions of persons toward other persons and toward groups of people. Thus, for him, social distance is essentially a measure of how much or little sympathy the members of a group feel for another group. To put it very clearly, Park (1924:339) simply refers to social distance phenomenon when he says that A who is very "close" to B, but that C is distant, but that D, on the other hand, is open-minded, sympathetic, understanding, and generally "easy to meet." All these expressions describe and, to some extent, measure "social distance." Social distance describes the distance between different groups of society and is opposed to locational / spatial distance. The notion includes all differences such as social class, race/ethnicity or sexuality. Furthermore, Sharlamanov and Jovanoski (2013: 34) argue that Social distance is the extent of acceptance or refusal of social relations between individuals who belong to

different ethnic, racial or social groups. However, they add that it would be unacceptable to expect that all individuals feel equal extent of affection to the members of their own group (Ibid).

Since the use of language to convey discourse is the ultimate device of communicating social activities, the following study tries to track this social phenomena (i.e. affective social distance) by means of discourse. Moreover, it will discuss a new horizon of affective social distance which is the discourse of holy scripts. This type of discourse conveys the message of The Almighty God to human beings by means of His Messengers. The study will focus on how affective social distance is configured through the relation between The Almighty God and His Messengers in the Glorious Quran.

## **2. Overview**

Social distance may be experienced by participants in conversation as a result of their mismatched frames of cultural reference, i.e., their differing cultural orientations toward a number of dimensions that have been identified as crucial for understanding human behavior all over the world. In reference to Bogardus' historical and social context, the distance between ethnicities was one of the distinct and problematic characteristics of social life because of its centrality. In the case of contemporary social life, and specifically that produced in big cities, as Bogardus (1925:216) states, identifying the objects of distance, the categories that mark the differences, the elements that can be seen as indicators of social distance, is not simple nor immediate, and even less when seeking for only a prevalent one. Certainly, for example, nationality is a category that is able to mark distance (and generate conflicts); the lifestyles, with its multiple declinations, among which, obviously, consumption; culture, thought of as the set of knowledge and beliefs on the world; and, still efficient, all the traditional status markers,

like wealth, profession, education, taken here as indicators of objective social distance.

Likewise , Social distance may also emerge between those who share the same language. As it is already mentioned , people often assume that sharing a language involves sharing , to an extent , the same beliefs, thoughts and attitudes toward life. When people speak the same language, they may get the wrong impression that they share the same problems, aspirations, and values. People expect to be readily understood, even when discussing complex topics of conversation. Later on when they find out that this was not the case, they may feel hurt, cheated and frustrated. Because of the outward appearance of similarity based on common perceptions which they share. (Singer 1998: 105).

Bichi (2008 :499) makes a mention for a number of quotes that are derived from interviews conducted in her study on " approaches to measuring social distance": She quotes :

“I feel distant to the other part made by persons that do not work at all or that have humble jobs, but only for a matter of distance, let’s say of behaviors, of choices.”

“Because you go to the same supermarket and you buy various things, one the fillet, the other the minced, and this can increase the perception of distance, for the fact that the spaces are common. I think that basically the economical conception of distance remains important.”

“The street, the school, the church put all of us together, but these are all non-permanent areas, what only interfere up to a point in the relationship, but then everyone goes at home and has its own language, relationships, friends.”

“I do not go to their places, entertainments, circles, because I can’t find myself, they are too important persons. I don’t go to these places with these persons, that in the end I consider as very distant, for their way of thinking and of doing.”

“I feel distant to my colleagues that record “Men and Women” by de Filippi in order to have something to talk about the day after in office. There, I feel them as distant, even if they have my own degree, more or less my age and so on. On the contrary, I feel very close, sometimes, to my head. She is 30, has a degree and a lot of money, but when we eat lunch together we talk about books or politics I feel closer to her than to my colleagues. But then, of course, it doesn’t always happen.”

“I think that the things that put barriers between persons are money, school and work. Yes, have you ever seen a worker married to an actress? Or have you ever seen a lawyer marrying his cleaning lady? Maybe in films...but in real life, no...because they are too different, from too distant worlds.”

“Social distance exists because people are different, they have different experiences, different life styles, they come from different families that transmit them different values, they live in different places...it is normal that if I grow up in Barona, go to school in Barona, maybe I stop going to school early because my parents keep telling me that they need money at home, I spend my time smoking outside, listening to the guys talking about soccer, I see my mother doing the housewife and it seems to be the only perspective, I get married, I make 4 kids, I stay at home and watch TV all day long...”

Illustrating the idea of distance, Park (1924:340) adds that the point is that we are clearly conscious, in all our personal relationships, of degree of intimacy. A is closer to B than C and the degree of this intimacy measures the influence which each has over the other. The fact that we can so easily distinguish degrees of intimacy suggests that we may be able eventually to measure "distance" in the sense in which that word is here used, quite as accurately as we now measure intelligence, since we do not know all the factors that determine intelligence any more than we know all the factors that determine intimacy.

The idea of communicating with other people presupposes that we, Park adds, enter into their minds, to share their experience and sympathize with their pains and pleasures, joys and sorrows, hopes and fears, may be blocked by self-consciousness, by vague fears, by positive self-interest, etc.,

and all these are matters that need to be reckoned with in seeking to measure "distances"(Ibid:341).

Bogardus and Park agree to the importance of race and class. The terms "race consciousness" and "class consciousness," with which most of us are familiar, describe a state of mind in which we become, often suddenly and unexpectedly conscious of the distances that separate us from classes and races whom we do not fully understand. It is natural that "race" and "class" consciousness frequently interferes with, modifies and qualifies personal relations ; relations which, under other circumstances, might become of the most intimate and understanding sort. The lady of the house , as Park (Ibid) exemplifies, may be on the most intimate personal relations with her cook, but these intimate relations will be maintained only so long as the cook retains her "proper distance." There is always some sort of social ritual that keeps the cook in her place, particularly when there are guests. This is one of the things that every woman knows.

Furthermore, meaning is embodied, i.e., grounded in human bodily experience. This experience is to a certain degree common to all speakers because they are human beings. All human beings have similar bodily and cognitive capacities (Johnson 1992:357) which enable them to construe meaning. In this sense, meaning is partly universal. For example, people all over the world conceptualize anger in terms of a hot fluid in the container (Lakoff 1987:63). However, each language user is an individual with unique experiences, personal history and special relations with other people (unique communicative competence, social skills, emotional intelligence).. In this sense, meaning is subjective and idiosyncratic.

In face-to-face conversation and before the speaker decides how to greet the interlocutor and which expression to choose from the inventory of conventional linguistic units, i.e. whether to say "good morning", "hello" or

“hi”, he/she has to activate relational domains which contain knowledge about his/her previous encounters with a given interlocutor and about relationships in general.

Depending on this and to agree with the above statement, language is naturally a tool of interaction, and of interpreting and understanding the world. It is used to communicate ideas and to establish, maintain and strengthen social relations. However, when using language, the speaker inevitably shows his/her social, regional and educational background. Thus, speech always occurs in the social and cultural context and language is “indexical of one's social class, status, region of origin, gender, age group and so on” (Mesthrie et al. 2000:5).

Human beings are irreducibly social creatures. The self is formed in and through an ongoing social process. Since the self develops as a process in which meaning develops, and since meaning is primarily a social phenomenon (Johnson 1992:357). The meaning is construed with the use of frames/knowledge structures shared with others. The interactional and pragmatic character of embodiment has often been emphasized : “the body does not exist by itself, in isolation from the world, but instead develops in contact and through experimentation with it” (Rohrer 2000:9).

In reference to speaker-hearer relationship, the conventional model of communication is that people talk and think about linguistic communication as about the sending and receiving of parcels filled with thoughts (Ungerer and Schmid , 1996:119). Ideas, thoughts, emotions are taken out of the mind and put into words by the speaker; next they are sent along a conduit to the receiver, who unpacks the ideas from words.

In the same tone , Langacker (2001:144) claims that during conversation, interlocutors not only conceptualize the referential content but

also “ their interactive circumstances and the very discourse they are engaged in”. Thus, conceptualization includes both the ground and the current discourse space which are cognitive domains activated as the base in meaning construction. The ground covers the speech event, interlocutors (the speaker and the hearer), and its setting. (Langacker, 1991:495). The ground may also become salient. For example, when the usage event focuses on the phatic function of language, the referential content is not as important as the relationship between the interlocutors.

Langacker, again , stresses the importance of paying more attention to the studying the ground that covers speaker-hearer relationship. He notes:

The ground subsumes the psychological status of its participants, including such factors as the speaker's desires and communicative intent, the hearer's expectations, their knowledge of the current discourse space, as well as their feelings and social relationship vis-à-vis one another. A conception of how the speaker intends his utterance, and how he expects the hearer to interpret and respond to it, provides a background in terms of which the relationship profiled by a sentence is construed and into which it must somehow fit"( Ibid).

Consequently, among the types of social distance, the current study is concerned with the affective one which is widespread conception of social distance that focuses on affectivity. According to this approach, social distance is associated with affective distance, i.e., how much or little sympathy the members of a group feel for another group. Emory Bogardus, the creator of "Bogardus social distance scale" , as is mentioned before , was typically basing his scale on this subjective-affective conception of social distance: “in social distance studies the center of attention is on the feeling reactions of persons toward other persons and toward groups of people.”

### **3. Model of Analysis**



The only model developed for social distance measure is that , as is mentioned earlier, of ' Bogardus' (1925). It is the first and most important effort to operationalize the perceived social distance concept. His famous scale had the purpose of measuring the distance between social or ethnic groups by a series of indicators that measure levels of acceptability of various and gradual types of social relationships (as its items are mentioned before). It came out that the social dimension of the group prevailed, based on physical distance too, and relational distance seems to depend on it. Thought by Bogardus in a historical and social reality marked by ethnic conflicts, this scale addressed the affective component of the attitudes, seen as connected to the drive: if the individual is willing to accept a higher social proximity with a specific group, then he will have an attitude that is more positive towards that group and vice versa (Bichi,2008:297).

Along with, studies carried out in this respect to show how social distance items can be measured or described. Nix (1993:7) found that:

1. Individual who have had close contact with persons of a different ethnic background should place less social distance between themselves and the out-group than persons who have had limited or no cross-cultural experience.
2. Persons from suburban background should have had more opportunities to interact with other groups.
3. Females are socialized to be more caring and nurturing than male are. Women have traditionally been discriminated against and should be more empathic to minority group than men are. This should effect less social distance than men place between themselves and out-groups.
4. Individuals who are highly educated have had greater chance to associate with other ethnic groups. They should have less social

distance than less-educated persons. Furthermore, since parents constitute powerful role models respondents with higher educated parents should also place less social distance between themselves and out-groups.

5. Members of the majority make powerful role models for minority groups. Following from this, prejudice should be a modeled behavior. Minority groups should place more social distance between themselves and other minorities than between themselves and whites.
6. Religious people are usually in close contact with people who share the same beliefs. Religions are not noted for being overtly accepting of other religious groups. Religious organizations are generally satisfied along racial lines. Persons who attend religious services frequently should place more social distance between themselves and out-groups.

Putting into consideration that the focused relationship ,i.e., God-Prophet, does not exist in the models surveyed ( whether in Bogardus' or in Nix's model-like findings). So, the current study adapts the model specifically built for this relationship. This model consists of the following items:

1. Superiority: God, the only one, practices superiority in the whole universe. In discourse, it is construed through commands, prohibition, authorization, sanctioning, forgiveness, generosity, etc.
2. Intimacy: It is done on the part of two parties, but especially it can be construed more by God towards Prophets as they are His Messengers. He shows His compassion and kindness to them.

3. Respect: Both parties show absolute and out-and-out respect but more likely Prophets do to their Creator. This can be revealed through the use of verbal and non-verbal behaviors that show mightiness and magnificence of the Al-Mighty.
4. Closeness: Both parties are so , to absolute extent , close to each other. God practices His Being close to His Messengers by demonstrating His protection and caring to them. On the other hand , Messengers bring this to light when they ask for help and support. It can also be elucidated by behaving as that God listens and sees everything done not only on earth but in the whole universe.
5. Sanctity: Everything that is related to the Al-Mighty is scared and beyond discussion. In discourse, it can be shown by keeping off and avoiding the utterances that denote suspect and disbelieving.
6. Forbiddance : There are certain limits that cannot be passed by the Prophets as all other people. Utterances which designate creation , spirit , judgment , etc. should be avoided.
7. Submissiveness : The Prophets and all people should submit and obey the Almighty. This is done through taking commands as an unquestionable issue. Utterances that signify acceptance , admissibility , consent , etc. are clearly revealed.
8. Devotion : Prophets , as all people do , should show complete loyalty for the message of God. In discourse , This characteristic is manifested through keeping calling people for the message of God as being commanded to do so.

9. Disclosure : This can only be done by Prophets when they reveal and disclose their sufferings to their Creator. Suffering might imply feelings of fear , hunger , pain , loneliness , torture , sorrow , etc.

#### 4. Translation

This is the analytical part of the study in which the theoretical background dealt with in the theoretical part so far is implemented. The procedure is that verses from the Glorious Quran are mentioned and translated then to be analyzed accordingly.

Actually , the process of analysis should be tackled in terms of a model. The only model that is focused and dealt with is of Bogardus' (1926). Unfortunately, this model , as is mentioned earlier , lacks for the relationship focused in this study ,i.e., God-Prophet relationship.

In this section, the analysis has two-fold function ; one is to show the interlocutors' roles and relationship and , the other is the process of comparison between more than one translation for the same extract in order to focus on how the translators did manifest this relationship in translation. Since the Glorious Quran is originally Arabic, the text is mentioned in Arabic first then translations are mentioned respectively.

##### Extract 1

وَإِذْ قَالَ اللَّهُ يَا عِيسَى ابْنَ مَرْيَمَ اأَنْتَ قُلْتَ لِلنَّاسِ اتَّخِذُونِي وَأُمِّي إِلهَيْنِ مِنْ دُونِ اللَّهِ قَالَ سُبْحَانَكَ مَا يَكُونُ لِي أَنْ أَقُولَ مَا لَيْسَ لِي بِحَقِّ إِنْ كُنْتُ قُلْتُهُ فَقَدْ عَلِمْتَهُ تَعَلَّمَ مَا فِي نَفْسِي وَلَا أَعْلَمُ مَا فِي نَفْسِكَ إِنَّكَ أَنْتَ عَلَّامُ الْغُيُوبِ (١١٦) مَا قُلْتُ لَهُمْ إِلَّا مَا أَمَرْتَنِي بِهِ أَنْ ااعْبُدُوا اللَّهَ رَبِّي وَرَبَّكُمْ وَكُنْتُ عَلَيْهِمْ شَهِيدًا مَا دُمْتُ فِيهِمْ فَلَمَّا تَوَفَّيْتَنِي كُنْتُ أَنْتَ الرَّقِيبَ عَلَيْهِمْ وَأَنْتَ عَلَى كُلِّ شَيْءٍ شَهِيدٌ (١١٧) إِنْ تُعَذِّبُهُمْ فَإِنَّهُمْ عِبَادُكَ وَإِنْ تَغْفِرَ لَهُمْ فَإِنَّكَ أَنْتَ الْعَزِيزُ الْحَكِيمُ (١١٨)سورة المائدة

##### Translation 1

*And when God said , ' O Jesus son of Mary, didst thou say unto men, Take me and my mother as gods, apart from God? He said, To Thee be glory! It is not mine to say what I have no right to. If indeed said it , Thou knowest it. Knowing what is within my soul, and I know not what is within Thy soul Thou knowest the things unseen(116). I only said to them what Thou didst command me:" Serve God, my Lord and your Lord" And I was a witness over them, while I remained among them but when Thou didst take me to Thyself, Thou was Thyself the watcher over them, Thou thyself art witness of everything (117) If Thou chastisest them, they are Thy servants , If Thou forgives them, they art the All-mighty (118) ( Arberry ,2003:412 ).*

### **Translation 2**

*And behold! God will say: "O Jesus the son of Mary! Didst thou say unto men, Worship me and my mother as gods in derogation of God?" He will say: "Glory to Thee! Never could I say what I had no right (to say). Had I said such a thing, Thou wouldst indeed have known it. Thou knowest what is in my heart, though I know not what is in Thine. For thou knowest in full all that is hidden(116)."Never said I to them aught except what Thou didst command me to say, to wit, 'Worship God, my Lord and your Lord'; And I was witness over them whilst I dwelt amongst them; when Thou didst take me up Thou wast the Watcher over them, and Thou art a witness to all things(117). If Thou dost punish them, they are Thy servants: If Thou dost forgive them, Thou art the Exalted in power , The Wise(118).*

(Ali,1989:280).

### **Extract 2**

أَذْهَبًا إِلَىٰ فِرْعَوْنَ إِنَّهُ طَغَىٰ (٤٣) فَقَوْلًا لَهُ قَوْلًا لَيْسَ لَعَلَّهُ يَتَذَكَّرُ أَوْ يَخْشَىٰ (٤٤) قَالَ رَبَّنَا إِنَّا نَخَافُ أَنْ يُفْرِطَ عَلَيْنَا

أَوْ أَنْ يَطْغَىٰ (٤٥) قَالَ لَا تَخَافَا إِنِّي مَعَكُمَا أَسْمَعُ وَأَرَىٰ (٤٦) سورة طه

### **Translation 1**

*Go to Pharaoh , for he has waxed insolent (43). Yet speak gently to him, that haply he may be mindful, or perchance fear (44). O our Lord, said Moses and Aaron , truly we fear he may exceed against us, or wax insolent (45). Fear not, said He ; surely I shall be with you , hearing and seeing (46).*

(Arberry ,2003:412 ).

## **Translation 2**

*"Go, both of you, to Pharaoh, for he has indeed transgressed all bounds; (43) "But speak to him mildly; perchance he may take warning or fear (God).(44) They (Moses and Aaron) said: "Our Lord! We fear lest he hasten with insolence against us, or lest he transgress all bounds."(45) He said: " Fear not : for I am with you: I hear and see (everything) (46)*

(Ali,1989: 798).

## **Analysis**

In this item , the extracts and their translations are analyzed for the purpose of meeting the study aims and hypotheses ,i.e., uncovering the relationship investigated.

In the first extract, the superiority of the Al-Might God is assumed and incorporated through the use of questioning mode." Didst thou say unto men".

Later, in the response , both respect and disclosure are embodied and designated. Then, When, Jesus says " If indeed said it, Thou knowest it. Knowing what is within my soul." The characteristic of forbiddance and submissiveness are clearly characterized. Superiority is manifested when saying " Knowing within my soul" and " Thou knowest the things unseen". When saying " I only said to them what Thou didst command me " , it reveals the devotion and submissiveness. Again, the same thing can be said to " Thou was Thyself the watcher over them, Thou Thyself art witness of everything. Intimacy can be felt in " If Thou chastisest them they are Thy servants, if Thou forgive them , they art the Al-Mighty."

In a word, the relationship between the Al-Mighty God and Jesus is characterized in terms of all the items of the model. One can feel the closeness and respect. The perfect and absolute submission to the Al-Mighty covers the parts of discourse and then , in turn , their relationship. The distance is noticeable in terms of the items of the model. Affective distance is denoted in the lines of the discourse and is felt through the polite utterances manipulated.

In the second extract, the Al-Mighty God commands His messenger (Moses) and his brother (Aaron) to go to Pharaoh. Moses finds the mission a hard one and framed with a bunch of fear. He (Moses) doesn't reply negatively but say "truly we fear he may exceed against us or wax insolent". His answer implies the need for help as they know how much insolent Pharaoh is. Here, commandment means superiority while the need of help refers to closeness as the Al-Mighty knows everything about the situation. Then the Al-Mighty gives relieve to Moses' and his brother's fear when saying " fear not , surely I shall be with you , hearing and seeing" which denotes superiority and closeness. Intimacy can be easily felt with by the verse " but speak to him mildly; perchance he may take warning or fear". This utterance shows how intimate the Al-Mighty God is with his creatures. He , the Al-Mighty can do anything to Pharaoh , but He reveals mercy and kindness before being angry and chastising.

One can feel through the parts of the discourse that items of the model are clearly manifested as the Al-Mighty gives commands and then gets intimate with people . After that , He sets Moses' and Aaron's minds at rest and confidence for the mission by being so close to them as He hears and sees closely. All of that means that there is a close relation between the Al-mighty and His messengers as intimacy and kindness cover them and characterize their discourse.

As is mentioned that religious people leave distance between them and the out-group , this can be demonstrated through respect they show to Al-Mighty . The more intimate the relation is the more respect can be shown. It can be said that distance is left by the participants of the discourse as the type of discourse force them to do so.

To sum up, as a matter of typology, whether the kind of relation or the type of text , both motivate and incite the participants , especially the lower class ( messengers ) party to leave distance in between despite the intimacy and closeness manifested.

In regard to translation which is the last part of the study, and in order to achieve highly objective outcomes , the model developed by Riess (2000) is adopted here to judge whether or not the translators have , in a way or another , rendered the meaning of the verses into the target language. This model consists of three main parts: linguistic , extra-linguistic , and text typology. The first includes the semantics , lexical , grammatical , and stylistic components. The second includes seven determinants . They are : immediate situation , subject matter , time factor, place factor , speaker factor , audience factor , and affective factor.

The last component, text typology, falls in three text types which are content-focused , form-focused , and appeal-focused.

In reference to the linguistic components, both the translators have conveyed the intended meaning in the best way possible. In the semantic component , both use the old language referring to the type of text , the religious or sacred one. They (the translators) both think that the old expressions suit much for such type of texts. Grammatically , the first translator committed a mistake in the first extract when he conveyed the first verse " And when God said " which reveals past time. This action is to take place in the future (in the Judgment day) as the Al-Mighty will ask Jesus. The second translation shows that the tense of this utterance is in the future



which moves in accordance with all elucidators' views of the Glorious Quran.

As for the subject matter , an extra-linguistic determinant , is an influential factor affecting the linguistic form of not only the original form but also its translation. Every text requires that the translator be sufficiently familiar with the field he is translating to be able to construct a lexically adequate version of the target language. Here, in the first extract , it seems that the first translator has not sufficient idea about the language and its structure of the Glorious Quran as it needs special understanding due to its syntactical and semantic components.

Time factor is treated well by the two translators as they use the suitable words and old expressions that brings into sight the high prestige and exaltedness of the language of the Glorious Quran.

As regards the affective implication , the last of the extra-linguistic determinants , it is known that emotional determinants affect primarily lexical and stylistic matters but they extend also to the grammatical level of the source language version. According to this determinant, affective values and elements are echoed in the target text for the two translators did their best.

Finally , the type of the texts translated here is called 'appeal-focused' text. The appeal-focused text includes all texts in which the elements of appeal is dominant. Both the form and content are at one in their overall goal of provoking reaction on the part of the receiver of the target text. In the two translations of the two extracts , the same effect has been achieved as the original in the source text. The translators were Fidel in reproducing every detail in the original. They preserved the esthetic effect of the original.

## 5. Conclusions

Throughout the previous review and implementation of affective social distance, then applying it in the translation of the Glorious Quran, the study reached at the following conclusions:

1. Throughout reviewing the existing literature of affective social distance, it was discovered that the only real account for this phenomenon was that of Bogardus (1925).
2. The model mentioned above was inefficient in covering the relation in question of this study due to the following reasons:
  - a. Bogardus has accounted for human- to-human relations while the relation discussed in the study is God-messenger relation.
  - b. The essence of affective social distance among human beings (as mentioned in Bogardus 1925) is the mutuality of cultural acceptance/refusal, while the God-messenger relation is based on submission on the part of messengers and acceptance on the part of God.
3. The analysis of the translated texts revealed the following:
  - a. The proposed model proved its efficiency in depicting and describing the God-Messenger relation in The Holly Quran.
  - b. All the items proposed in the model seem to be implemented in the analysis if God-Messenger relation in the selected texts.
  - c. The distance is kept by the lowest participants (Messengers) in addressing the Highest participant (God).
  - d. The highest participant (God) reveals His part in this relation by showing the control over the distance by means of superiority at one end, and intimacy on the other end.

## References

The Glorious Quran

- Ali, A. Y. (1989). **The Holy Qur an: Translation and Commentary**. Es-salasil Printing and Publishing co., Al-Murgab, Kuwait.
- Arberry, Arthur J. (2003). **Holy Qur'an** . Qum: Ansariyan Publications.
- Bichi, Rita, (2008). "*Mixed Approach to Measuring Social Distance*"  
**Cognitie, Creier, Comportament** , 12 (4): 487-508
- Bogardus, Emory S., (1926). "*Social Distance in the City*". **Proceedings and Publications of the American Sociological Society**. 20: 40–46.
- Johnson, Mark (1992). "*Philosophical implications of cognitive semantics.*"  
**Cognitive Linguistics** 3(4): 345-366.
- Lakoff, George (1987). **Women, Fire and Dangerous Things; What Categories Reveal about the Mind**. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Langacker, Ronald W. (1991). **Foundations of Cognitive Grammar. Vol. II. Descriptive Application**. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Langacker, Ronald W. (2001). "*Discourse in Cognitive Grammar.*"  
**Cognitive Linguistics** 12-1: 143-188.
- Mesthrie, Rajend, Joan Swann, Andrea Deumert and William L. Leap (2000). **Introducing Sociolinguistics**. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Nix, J.V. (1993). **Assessing the existence of social distance and factors that affect its magnitude at a Southern University**. University of Mississippi.

- Park, Robert Ezra (1924). *"The Concept of Social Distance As Applied to the Study of Racial Attitudes and Racial Relations."* **Journal of Applied Sociology**. 8: 339-344.
- Reiss, Katharina. 2000. *"Type, kind and individuality of text: decision making in translation"* (1971), in Venuti, L., **The translation studies reader**. London: Routledge.
- Rohrer, Tim. (2000). *"Pragmatism, Ideology and Embodiment: William James and the Philosophical Foundations of Cognitive Linguistics."* In: Sandikcioglu, Estra and René Dirven (eds.). **Language and Ideology: Descriptive Cognitive Approaches**. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 49-81.
- Sharlamanov, Kire & Jovanoski, Aleksandar (2013) *"The Ethnic Relations in the Macedonian Society Measured Through the Concept of Affective Social Distance"*. **American International Journal of Social Science** Vol. 2 No. 3; May 2013:33
- Singer, M. R. (1998). *"Culture: a perceptual approach"*. In: M. J. Bennett(ed.) **Basic Concepts of Communication. Selected Readings**. Yarmouth, Maine, USA: Press, Inc. 97-110.
- Ungerer, Friedrich and Hans-Jörg Schmid. (1996). **An Introduction to Cognitive Linguistics**. London and New York: Longman.