

Problems of Translating Some Polysemous and Homonymous Lexical Verbs in the Glorious Qur'a:n into English

Dr. Misbah M. D. Al- Sulaimaan^(*)

The present paper aims at: (1) specifying some polysemous and homonymous lexical verbs in the glorious Qur'a:n, (2) showing how these verbs are realized in English by different translators, (3) specifying the method of translating these verbs, (4) pointing out some problems that may arise from translating these verbs, (5) suggesting some remedies for solving these problems, and (6) proposing or choosing a rendering which coincides with the religious interpretation.

To achieve these aims the study hypothesizes that: (1) there is no one-to-one correspondence between these polysemous and homonymous lexical verbs, and their equivalents in English, (2) rendering these verbs is affected by the cultural background of the translators, and (3) an effective rendering can be achieved if and only if both transliteration and communicative method are used.

1- Polysemy

The term 'polysemy' has been tackled by many scholars quite differently to the extent that confusion may undoubtedly occur. Any attempt to find a clear-cut definition of the term seems at first to be rather difficult. In this respect, different views will be presented in order to come up with an operational definition.

(*) College of Arts / University of Mosul.

Ullmann (1966: 232) states that polysemy refers to "the use of the same word with two or more distinct meanings". Leech (1974: 228) holds the same view and defines polysemy as "one word having two or more senses". Then, he adds that polysemy is the "existence of more than one semantic specification for the same lexical item. Steiner (1975: 10) describes polysemy as "the capacity of the same word to mean different things". Lyons (1977: 550) argues that polysemy refers to "one lexeme with several different senses". Baldinger (1980: 14) defines polysemy as "a case where one acoustic image symbolizes different realities, in that it can possess different contents or significations". Palmer (1981: 101), Leech (1981: 277), and Fromkin and Rodman (1983: 173) are of the opinion that polysemy refers to one word which has several meanings. Panman (1982: 108) gives a more specific definition when he says it is "the phenomenon that two or more identical forms have different, but related meanings".

Lyons (1981: 146) gives a more precise and adequate definition which states that "polysemy is a property of single lexemes; where a single lexeme has several distinguishable meanings and these meanings should be synchronically related".

Harold (2000: 4) remarks that polysemy refers to the fact that a "particular lexical item may have multiple meanings, which may have something in common with each other".

Moore (2000: 8) shows that polysemy originates from Greek. 'Poly' in Greek means 'many' and 'semy' means relating to meaning. Al-Hadithi (2002: 15) provides an eclectic definition and says

"polysemy is a case where a single lexeme possesses a set of different synchronically related meanings". This case is advantageous to the economy and efficiency of a language. The following examples serve to illustrate our argument:

- 1- They **grow** a lot of apples in this part of the country. (produce)
- 2- John is **growing** a beard. (developing).

It is questionable, however, whether we can talk of 'different meanings' in the case of 'grow', but rather of variants of a single meaning. We shall consider 'grow' therefore, to be a single word with a number of senses, i.e., variant, closely related meanings. Such words - and this includes many words in common usage-are said to be polysemous; they are cases of polysemy or multiple meaning.

From what has been mentioned so far, one can define polysemy as the case involving a single lexeme, which has a number of related senses or related variants of a single meaning.

2- Homonymy

Much ink has been spilt on the phenomenon of Homonymy; yet, it is still debatable. Jackson (1988: 4), for instance, defines homonyms as "words which are spelt and pronounced the same, but have clearly different meanings". Su (1994: 32) seems to be on the same line, but slightly different when he says "homonyms are different words which have the same form and sound, but different unrelated meanings". Pustejovsky (1995: 29) holds the same view when he describes homonymy as a case "where a lexical item accidentally carries two distinct and unrelated meanings". He classifies homonymy as a type of polysemy, proposing that there are

two kinds of polysemies: complementary and contrastive polysemies; homonymy being the latter.

Moore (2000: 9) seems to use a simple definition saying that "homonyms are different lexemes with the same form".

To substantiate what we have already mentioned, let us consider the following examples:

Bank (1) means financial institution.

Bank (2) means side of river.

Bank (3) means a row of keys on a keyboard.

Words like 'bank', which are spelt and pronounced the same, but have clearly different meanings are called homonyms.

After reviewing some definitions of the term 'homonymy' one can define homonymy as: two or more different lexemes which have the same pronunciation and spelling, if and only if their meanings are unrelated.

3- Synonymy

The definition of the term 'synonymy' is still controversial. It has been viewed differently by different scholars. The first and most rigid definition is that of the traditionalists which says: two lexemes are said to be synonymous, if and only if they are interchangeable in all contexts, without any change in the meaning resulted (Dixon, 1966: 66). To check the validity of such a definition it requires checking the relations between lexemes in all conceivable contexts which is theoretically and practically impossible. Person (1989: 1), Farghal and Shunnaq (1999: 133) have defined synonymy in terms of sameness of meaning. Such a definition is rather wide, and leaves

open the possibility of complete interchangeability which have been already rejected.

A compromise solution is that of Lyons (1981: 155) in which synonymy has been defined in terms of sameness in sense viz partial interchangeability, or as Lockwood (1972: 136) has called, complete substitutability in some contexts (for further details, see Al-Jawady, 2000:6).

Jackson (1988: 65) gives a very comprehensive definition when he says "synonymy needs to be defined in terms of context of use: two words are synonyms if and only if they can be used interchangeably in all sentence contexts. Let us consider the following example: "Can you think of any sentence context in which one member of a pair may be used and the other member not?" Make sentence frames to illustrate this point, e.g.,

'I am not at __ to tell you'.

The word 'liberty' may be inserted, but not its synonym 'freedom'.

From what has been said so far, one can say that scholars have stressed the sameness and similarities of features. However, Cruse (1986:95) emphasizes the differences or different semantic 'traits' as he calls them:

"Synonyms then, are lexical items whose senses are identical in respect of 'central' semantic traits, but differ if at all, only in respect of what we may provisionally describe as 'minor' or 'peripheral' traits".

Cruse (1986: 95) goes on talking about the importance of considering the low degree of implicit contrastiveness which are the difference that any pair may be compared with the degree of semantic overlap. This definition, after adding the mentioned concept 'partial interchangeability', seems to be satisfactory, since both similarities and differences are taken into consideration. Nevertheless, we will suggest the following definition.

Synonyms are lexemes whose meanings are identical in respect of semantic features, but different in respect of peripheral features, if and only if interchangeability is possible in all contexts and cotexts.

4- Ambiguity

Ambiguity refers to a word, a phrase or a sentence that can be given more than one interpretation, e.g.,

1 -I went to the *bank*.

The word 'bank' may mean 'financial institution' or it may mean 'side of river' (Leech, 1981: 79). Crystal (1985), likewise, says that the general sense of the term 'ambiguity', refers to a word, or sentence which expresses more than one meaning.

Prather and Swinney (1987: 291) believe that ambiguity is ubiquitous in languages. It exists in all levels of language, i.e., phonology, graphology, lexicology, etc. Our paper focuses on lexical ambiguity which is the most important type of ambiguity (Ullmann, 1962: 158). Gleason (1965: 115) calls this type of ambiguity 'vocabulary ambiguity'. Chomsky (1977: 67) calls this type of ambiguity 'idiosyncratic ambiguity'. Let us consider the following examples:

2-1 lost my glasses.

3- I met my cousin yesterday.

Both examples (2) and (3) are lexically ambiguous. The 'lexical ambiguity in (2) is attributed to the homonymous word 'glasses' which refers either to 'spectacles' or 'glasses for drinking'. While in (3) it is due to the polysemous word 'cousin' which means either uncle's son or daughter or aunt's son or daughter. Su (1994: 32) believes that this type of ambiguity emerges either from polysemy or homonymy.

In sum, one can say that lexical ambiguity may result from polysemy or homonymy. Therefore, a translator should be aware of these two phenomena and much practice on his part is needed.

5- What is Translation?

Translation has been viewed differently by different scholars. There is no unanimous agreement about its definition, models and types. However, some scholars attempt to define it and specify its types and models. As for its definition, they believe that translation is an operation performed on two languages or more. It is performed, in general, by replacing the semantic elements, syntactic structures and cultural norms of the SL text by the same elements (semantic elements, syntactic structures and cultural norms) of the TL text (see Nida and Taber, 1974: 79). With regard to its types and models, Catford (1965) classifies the types of translation according to rank, extent and level. Nida and Taber, (1974) mention two types of translation, namely formal equivalence and dynamic equivalence. The up-to-date methods of translation are those of Newmark (1988

and 1991). In what follows we will talk about the characteristics of each one in some detail.

6- Semantic Translation

Newmark (1988: 7) mentions that in semantic translation, the concentration is on the message rather than on its effect or force. The basic aim of the translator is to convey the SL formal and contextual meaning of the original texts as accurately as the semantic and syntactic structures of the original SL text. This type of translation is characterised by being more complex, more concentrated, inclusive of more details and focus is on the content rather than the intention of the author of the original text, or the resultant effect (for further detail, see Newmark, 1991:30).

7- Communicative Translation

In communicative translation, Newmark (1988: 7) confirms that the focus is on reproducing the same effect on the TL receiver as that of the original text on the SL receiver (i.e., it emphasizes the force of the message more than the content of the message). In this method of translation, the translator gives himself the right to add or remove certain lexical items in order to make the thought of the SL text clear to the reader. Communicative translation is characterised by being subjective, smoother, clearer, simpler and more direct than the semantic one. For this reason, Newmark prefers this method to the semantic one. As far as we are concerned, we will adopt the communicative method because it is freer than the semantic one. Therefore, we will be able to give an effective rendering which coincides with the religious interpretation, Islamic culture and belief.

8- Equivalence in Translation

Equivalence in translation is a concept that has received much heated discussion between those who approve its actual existence and those who deny it. In fact, these arguments are not of the type in favour of or against, but of whether equivalence can be achieved or not. In this respect, theorists of translation offer different solutions to achieve equivalence between Source Language and Target Language such as dynamic and formal equivalence (Nida, 1964), grammatical equivalence (Catford, 1965), textual equivalence (Van Dijk, 1972), semiotic equivalence (Hatim and Mason, 1990), ideational equivalence (Farghal, 1993), pragmatic equivalence (Hickey et al, 1993) and functional equivalence (Farghal and Shunnaq, 1999). In our paper, we will focus on the notion of lexical equivalence and its bearing on the translation of polysemous and homonymous lexical verbs.

Nida and Taber (1974: 12) state that "translation consists in reproducing in the receptor Language the closest natural equivalent of the SL message; first in terms of meaning and second in terms of style". It is apparent that this definition restricts 'reproduction' to the closest natural equivalent and considers the reproduction as the main task of the translator. De Ward and Nida (1986: 11) are on the same line and say that "the natural equivalence in translation involves not only content of the message, but also form. Likewise, Emery (1996: 143) remarks that translation is an essentially dynamic search for equivalence at the referential, contextual, pragmatic and semiotic levels, a process whose goal is (inevitably) a

product (a TL text)". De Beaugrande (1999: 81) holds, somehow, the same view and says that "translation is an activity of substituting words inside phrases or sentences and it is a vastly complex process of coordinating two dialects between theory and practice".

Baker (1992: 11) points out that in a hierarchical approach to translation, lexical equivalence is the first step upward and is the first element to be considered by the translator. Jumpelt (cited in Al-Hadithi, 2002: 76) also stresses that "adequate translation must begin with establishing equivalences between sets of lexical items in two distinct languages". What can be deduced from Baker's and Jumpelt's statements, is that there are no established equivalents. This view is stressed by Streconi (cited in Al-Hadithi, 2002: 76) who states that "B had never been equivalent to A before it appeared in a translation: using inferences of the adductive kind, the translator makes the two elements equivalent". It is clear that this statement implies that equivalence depends on contextual elements which are to be the source of inference.

Other theorists of translation suggest defining translation in terms of transference of meaning. For instance, Mencerne (1994: 281) states that "translation deals with discourse types as expressed in their original language to carry communicative purposes". Al-Hamad (1997: 187) holds the same view and defines translation in terms of transference of meaning and thought from the SL into the TL "(for a similar view, see Al-'Isawi, 2001:74).

Aziz (1997: 53) purports that homonymy is difficult to transfer from one language into another as languages rarely resemble each

other in their homonyms, despite the universality of the phenomenon of homonymity. On the other hand, he says that, basically, polysemy should help the process of translation as it provides equivalent senses in different languages. But the problem lies in the fact that the similarity of two lexical items in two languages might be in one or two of their senses and not all of them.

From what has been mentioned so far, one can deduce that the working definition of translation lies between two extremes, which may be named as traditional and modern.

The traditional view is characterised by replacing an SL text by a TL text in order to achieve a maximum equivalence, but this process is sometimes difficult to achieve because SL and TL lexicalize semantic material differently and these lexical items are determined by different pragmatic conditions in different contexts.

The modern view is characterised by comprehending and grasping the author's meaning and recreating that meaning in the TL in order to achieve a maximum natural equivalence of meaning. For this reason, we will adopt the modern view which depends on the transference of meaning.

9- The Translation of the Glorious Qur'a:n

The Glorious Qur'a:n, Muslims Revealed Book, has attracted the attention of many people since the very first days of its revelation, and inspired so many people all over the world and prompted them to make endeavors to better understand its content. Thousands of books and articles written on the Glorious Qur'a:n and

its interpretation in different languages substantiate this fact (Al-Waly, 1969: 61).

The Glorious Qur'ain is a difficult book not only for the native speakers of Arabic, but also for the scholars of Arabic. Its language is regarded as surpassing everything that can be written in Arabic. Translating the Glorious Qur'a:n certainly requires literary skill, deep insight, penetrating mind, intuition, inventiveness, and a deep understanding of its texts. The translator clearly needs to be at home in both SL and TL in order to convey the meaning as well as the force of the message. He must have phonological, morphological, syntactic, semantic and pragmatic knowledge. He must have a historical religious background. He should be familiarized with the notions and the principles of the religious texts. He should have a daily knowledge of Islamic Culture and a sufficient experience in Exegesis. That is to say, the translator must be a genius and an encyclopaedic figure (cf. Wigtil, 1985: 22; Bell, 1991: 207; Jasper, 1993: 2; Hatim and Mason, 1997: 111-126; Namir, 1998: 10; and Homeidi, 2000: 20).

The above-mentioned unique features of the Glorious Qur'a:nic text pose some problems for the translators. These problems may be grammatical (e.g., tense and mood); cultural (e.g., the existence of some notions and concepts in SL culture and their absence in TL culture); textual (e.g., conjunctions and discourse references); stylistic (e.g., use of metaphors); semantic (e.g., lexicons, idioms and collocations); contextual (e.g., usage and

accuracy) (cf. Muhammed 1986: 80; Kussmaul, 1995: 65; Gutt, 1998: 52; and Wolt and Marchl, 1999: 131).

Text Analysis and Translation

Regarding the distribution of our data, six Qur'anic verses have been chosen. The analysis of the data is carried out by utilizing comprehensive tables which include: SL Text, TL Text, meaning, type of method, degrees of translational coincidence with the religious interpretation (high, medium, and low). The meanings of the lexical verbs equivalents have been taken from the *Longman Dictionary (1978)*, *Roget's Thesaurus (1980)*, and *Oxford Advanced Dictionary (1985)*. In case of having an effective rendering, which coincides with the religious interpretation, it will be chosen as a proposed rendering; otherwise a new rendering will be suggested.

SL Text (1) (النازعات: 37) (فَأَمَّا مَنْ طَغَى)

Interpretation

To go beyond all limits and bounds that have been set by Allah (Al-Qurtubi, 1966: 131, Al-Tabrasi, 1973: 343 and Al-Sabuni, 1981: 516).

TL Texts

- 1- And as for him who was outrageous (Palmer, 1942: 515).
- 2- Then, as for him who rebels. (S.Ali, 1955: 603).
- 3- Those that transgressed (Dawood, 1956: 52).
- 4- Then, as for him who is inordinate (M.Ali, 1963: 1141).
- 5- Then, for him who rebelled (Z. Khan, 1970: 603).
- 6- And who shall have transgressed (Sale, 1977: 569).
- 7- Then, as for him who hath transgressed (Rodwell, 1978: 49).
- 8- Then, as for him who was insolent (Arberry, 1980: 324).

- 9- Then, as for him who ***rebelled*** (Pickthall, 1982: 605).
 10- Then, for such as ***he has indeed transgressed*** all bounds (Ali, 1993: 1565).
 11-Then, for him who ***Tagha*** (transgressed all bounds, in disbelief, oppression and evil deeds of disobedience to Allah). (Al-Hilali & M. Khan, 1996: 1085).

Text Analysis (1)

<i>SL Text (Arabic)</i>	<i>No.of Text</i>	<i>TL Text (English)</i>	<i>Meaning</i>
طغى	1	to be outrageous	to be violent, to be unbearable.
	2	to rebel	to resist, to fight against.
	3	to transgress	to go beyond all bounds.
	4	to be inordinate	not to be controlled or restrained.
	5	to rebel	to resist, to fight against.
	6	to transgress	to go beyond all bounds.
	7	to transgress	to go beyond all bounds.
	8	to be insolent	to insult, to offence.
	9	to rebel	to resist, to fight against.
	10	to transgress	to go beyond all bounds.
	11	Tagha	transliteration and interpretation

Degrees of Transnational Coincidence with the Interpretation

<i>Title</i>	<i>Semantic Method</i>			<i>Communicative Method</i>	
	<i>High</i>	<i>Medi</i>	<i>Low</i>	<i>High</i>	<i>Low</i>
1		+			
2			+		
3		+			
4		+			
5			+		
6		+			
7		+			
8			+		
9			+		
10		+			
11				+	

The Proposed Rendering

Then, for him who ***Tagha.*** (has transgressed all bounds, in disbelief, oppression and evil deeds of disobedience to Allah).

SL Text (2) (إِذَا الشَّمْسُ كُوِّرَتْ) (التكوير: 1)

Interpretation

To wind round, lose its light, throw into the sea and to be vanished (Al-Qurtubi, 1966 :228, Al-Tabrasi, 1973: 441, and Al-Sabuni, 1981:518).

TL Texts:

- 1- When the sun is folded up (Palmer, 1942: 517).
- 2- When the sun is wrapped up (S. Ali, 1955: 606).
- 3- When the sun ceases to shine (Dawood, 1956: 17).
- 4- When the sun is folded up (M. Ali, 1963: 1 147).
- 5- When the sun is veiled (Z. Khan, 1970: 606).
- 6- When the sun shall be folded up (Sale, 1977: 571).
- 7- When the sun shall be FOLDED UP (Rodwell, 1978: 45).
- 8- When the sun shall be darkened (Arberry, 1980: 325).
- 9- When the sun is overthrown (Pickthall, 1982: 609).
- 10- When the sun (with its spacious light) is folded up (Ali, 1993: 1606).
- 11-When the sun Kuwwirat (wound round and lost its light and is thrown) (Al-Hilali and M. Khan, 1996: 1089).

Text Analysis (2)

<i>SL Text (Arabic)</i>	<i>No. of Text</i>	<i>TL Text (English)</i>	<i>Meaning</i>
كورت	1	to fold up	to collapse, to come to an end.
	2	to wrap up	to cover on or to roll up.
	3	to cease	to stop, to bring to an end.
	4	to fold up	to collapse, to come to an end.
	5	to veil	to cancel
	6	to fold up	to collapse, to come to an end.
	7	to fold up	to collapse, to come to an end.
	8	to darken	to make or become dark.
	9	to over throw	to put an end to, to ruin, to defeat.
	10	to fold up	to collapse, to come to an end.
	11	kuwwirat	transliteration and interpretation.

Degrees of Translational Coincidence with the Interpretation

<i>Title</i>	<i>Semantic Method</i>			<i>Communicative Method</i>			
	<i>No. of Text</i>	<i>High</i>	<i>Medium</i>	<i>Low</i>	<i>High</i>	<i>Medium</i>	<i>Low</i>
1			+				
2			+				
3							
4			+				
5							
6			+				
7			+				
8							
9							
10			+				
11					+		

The Proposed Rendering

When the sun Kuwwirat. (wound round, folded up, darkened and overthrown).

SL Text (3) (وَإِذَا الْأَرْضُ مُدَّتْ) (الانشقاق: 3)

Interpretation

When earth is stretched out, spread, expanded and flattened (Al-Qurtubi, 1966: 250, Al-Tabrasi, 1973: 460, and Al-Sabuni, 1981: 537).

TL Texts

- 1- And when the earth is stretched out (Palmer, 1942: 517).
- 2- And when the earth is spread out (S. Ali, 1955: 611).
- 3- When the earth expands (Dawood, 1956: 48).
- 4- And when the earth is stretched (M. Ali, 1963: 1158).
- 5- And when the earth is stretched forth (Z. Khan, 1970: 611).
- 6- And when the earth shall be stretched out (Sale, 1977: 574).
- 7-And when Earth shall have been stretched out as a plain (Rodwell. 1978: 47).
- 8- When earth is stretched out (Arberry, 1980: 331).
- 9- And when the earth is spread out (Pickthall, 1982: 614).
- 10- And when the Earth is flattened out (Ali, 1993: 1622).
- 11-And when the earth is stretched forth. (Al-Hilali and M. Khan, 1996: 1089).

Text Analysis (3)

<i>SL Text (Arabic)</i>	No. of Text	<i>TL Text (English)</i>	<i>Meaning</i>
مَدَّتْ	1	to stretch out	to make wider, longer, and larger.
	2	to spread out	to extend the surface or the width.
	3	to expand	to make or become larger.
	4	to stretch out	to make wider, longer, and larger.
	5	to stretch out	to make wider, longer, and larger.
	6	to stretch out	to make wider, longer, and larger.
	7	to stretch out	to make wider, longer, and larger.
	8	to stretch out	to make wider, longer, and larger.
	9	to spread out	to extend the surface or the width.
	10	to flatten out	to extend the surface or width, to expand or become flat.
	11	to stretch forth	to make wider, longer, and larger.

Degrees of Translational Coincidence with the Interpretation

<i>Title</i>	<i>Semantic Method</i>			<i>Communicative Method</i>		
	<i>High</i>	<i>Medium</i>	<i>Low</i>	<i>High</i>	<i>Medium</i>	<i>Low</i>
1	+					
2		+				
3		+				
4	+					
5	+					
6	+					
7	+					
8	+					
9		+				
10	+					
11	+					

The Proposed Rendering

When the earth . Muddat. (stretched out, spread out expanded and flattened).

SL Text (4)

(وَصَدَّقَ بِالْحُسْنَى) (الليل: 6)

Interpretation:

And believes what Allah has promised him (Paradise) (Al-Qurtubi, 1966: 260, Al-Tabrasi, 1973: 466, and Al-Sabuni, 1981: 539).

TL Texts

- 1- And believes in the best (Palmer, 1942: 528).
- 2- And testifies to the truth of what is right (S. Ali, 1955: 621).
- 3- And believes in goodness (Dawood, 1956: 24).
- 4- And accepts what is good (M. Ali, 1963: 1128).
- 5- And testifies to the truth of that which is right (Z. Khan, 1970: 621).
- 6- And professeth the truth of that faith (Sale, 1977: 583).
- 7- And yieldeth assent to the God (Rodwell, 1978: 32).
- 8- And confirms the reward most fair (Arberry, 1980: 341).
- 9- And believeth in goodness (Pickthall, 1982: 626).
- 10- And (in all sincerity) Testifies to the Best (Ali, 1993: 1658).
- 11- And believes in Al-Husna (Al-Hilali and M. Khan, 1996: 1117).

Text Analysis (4)

<i>SL Text (Arabic)</i>	<i>No. of Text</i>	<i>TL Text (English)</i>	<i>Meaning</i>
وَصَدَّقَ	1	to believe	to feel sure of the truth of some thing.
	2	to testify	to give evidence.
	3	to believe	to feel sure of the truth of some thing.
	4	to believe	to feel sure of the truth of some thing.
	5	to testify	to give evidence.
	6	to profess	to declare that one has belief.
	7	to yield	to give agreement to.
	8	to confirm	to agree definitely to.
	9	to believe	to feel sure of the truth of some thing.
	10	to testify	to give evidence.
	11	to believe	to feel sure of the truth of some thing.

Degrees of Translational Coincidence with the Interpretation

<i>Title No. of Text</i>	<i>Semantic Method</i>			<i>Communicative Method</i>		
	<i>High</i>	<i>Medium</i>	<i>Low</i>	<i>High</i>	<i>Medium</i>	<i>Low</i>
1		+				
2						
3		+				
4		+				
5			+			
6		+				
7		+				
8		+				
9		+				
10			+			
11		+				

The Proposed Rendering

And believes this should be highlighted also see 1,3 in Al-Husna.(to feel sure of the truth of something and agree definitely to).

SL Text (5) (قَتِيلَ أَصْحَابِ الْأَخْذُودِ) (البروج: 4)

Interpretation

Cursed be the makers of the pit and woe to them because they dug trenches far burning the believers. (Al-Qurtubi, 1966: 272, Al-Tabrasi, 1973: 478, and Al-Sabuni, 1981: 544).

TL Texts

- 1- The fellows of the pit were slain (Palmer, 1942: 522).
- 2- Cursed be the diggers of the trench (S. Ali, 1955: 612).
- 3- Cursed be the diggers of the trench (Dawood, 1956: 48).
- 4- Destruction overtake the companions of the truth (M. Ali, 1963: 1161).
- 5- That ruined are the makers of the pit (Z. Khan, 1970: 612).
- 6- Cursed were the contrivers of the pit (Sale, 1977: 576).
- 7- Cursed the masters of the trench (Rodwell, 1978: 32).
- 8- Slain were the Men of the Pit (Arberry, 1980: 332).
- 9- (Self-) destroyed were the owners of the ditch (Pickthall, 1982: 616).
- 10- Woe to makers of the pit (of fire) (Ali, 1993: 1627).
- 11- Cursed were the people of the ditch (the story of the Boy and the King) (Al-Hilali and M. Khan, 1996: 1117).

Text Analysis (5)

<i>SL Text (Arabic)</i>	<i>No. of Text</i>	<i>TL Text (English)</i>	<i>Meaning</i>
قَتَلَ	1	to slay	to kill
	2	to curse	to inflict injury or destruction on somebody.
	3	to curse	to inflict injury or destruction on somebody.
	4	destructio	being destroyed
	5	to rain	to destroy or inflict serious damage.
	6	to curse	to inflict injury or destruction on somebody.
	7	to curse	to inflict injury or destruction on somebody.
	8	to slay	to kill
	9	to destroy	to damage.
	10	to woe	to curse upon.
	11	to curse	to inflict injury or destruction on somebody.

Degrees of Translational Coincidence with the Interpretation:

<i>Title</i> <i>No. of</i>	<i>Semantic Method</i>			<i>Communicative Method</i>		
	<i>High</i>	<i>Medium</i>	<i>Low</i>	<i>High</i>	<i>Medium</i>	<i>Low</i>
1	+					
2		+				
3		+				
4			+			
5		+				
6	+					
7		+				
8	+					
9			+			
10		+				
11				+		

The Proposed Rendering:

Killed were the people of the pit. (***Cursed*** be the makers of the pit and woe to them because they dug trenches for burning the believers.

SL Text (6) (وَإِذَا الْقُبُورُ بُعْثِرَتْ) (الانفطار: 4)

Interpretation:

When the Graves are turned upside down, hurled about, and the dead were out and recreated (Al-Qurtubi, 1966: 280, Al-Tabrasi, 1973: 286, and Al-Sabuni, 1981:564).

TL Texts:

- 1- And when the tombs are turned upside down (Palmer, 1942: 519).
- 2- And when the graves are laid open (S. Ali, 1955: 608).
- 3- When the graves are hurled about (Dawood, 1956: 16).
- 4- And when the graves are laid open (M. Ali, 1963: 1 152).
- 5-And when the graves shall be turned upside down (Z. Khan, 1970: 608).
- 6-And when the graves shall be turned upside down (Sale, 1977:572).
- 7-And when the graves 'shall be turned upside down (Rodwell, 1978: 44).
- 8- When the tombs are overthrown (Arberry, 1980: 330).
- 9- And the sepulchres are overturned (Pickthall, 1982: 611).

10- And when the Graves Are turned upside down-(Ali, 1993: 1627).

11-And when the graves are laid open (Al-Hilali and M. Khan, 1996: 1092).

Text Analysis (6)

<i>SL Text (Arabic)</i>	<i>No. of Text</i>	<i>TL Text (English)</i>	<i>Meaning</i>
بعثرت	1	To turn upside	To put everything in disorder.
	2	To lay open	To expose, to reveal.
	3	To hurl about	To throw violently
	4	To lay open	To expose, to reveal.
	5	To lay open	To expose, to reveal.
	6	To turn upside	To put everything in disorder.
	7	To turn upside	To put everything in disorder.
	8	To overthrow	To fall, to put an end to.
	9	To overturn	To cause to turn over.
	10	To turn upside	To put the upper side
	11	To lay open	To reveal, to expose....

Degrees of Translational Coincidence with the Interpretation

<i>Title</i>	<i>Semantic Method</i>			<i>Communicative Method</i>		
	<i>High</i>	<i>Medium</i>	<i>Low</i>	<i>High</i>	<i>Medium</i>	<i>Low</i>
1	+					
2		+				
3		+				
4		+	+			
5		+				
6	+					
7	+					
8			+			
9		+				
10	+					
11			+			

The Proposed Rendering

And when the graves ***Bu'thirat*** (turned upside down, hurled about, and the dead were out and recreated).

Findings and Conclusions

On the basis of our theoretical part and data analysis, our study has come up with the following findings and conclusions:

- 1-Polysemy has been redefined as: "a single lexeme which has a number of related senses or related variants of a single meaning".
- 2-Homonymy has been redefined as: "two or more different lexemes which have the same pronunciation and spelling, if and only if their meanings are unrelated".
- 3-Synonymy has been redefined as: "two lexemes whose meanings are the same in respect of semantic features, but different in respect of peripheral features, if and only if interchangeability is possible in all contexts and cotexts.
- 4-Lexical ambiguity may result from polysemy or homonymy (see examples, 1,2 and 3 p:5). As a result, a translator should be aware of these two phenomena and much practice on translator's part is needed.
- 5-Arabic and English do not resemble each other in respect of their lexical verbs. Our study reveals that these verbs in Arabic are either polysemous or homonymous or both. Their semantic fields are very wide. While their chosen English equivalents are not like that, i.e., there is no one-to-one correspondence between the SL text and TL text.
- 6-Polysemy, homonymy and synonymy are the main cause of the focal problem in most lexical semantic studies. For instance, a

translator, sometimes interprets a message which contains polysemous and homonymous lexemes by resorting to senses not intended by the addresser. This makes him unable to receive the intended message and; therefore, unable to give an effective rendering.

- 7-Some translators seem to follow each other. This fact is revealed from the use of the same lexical verb or through the use of a synonymous lexeme ignoring the fact that lexemes cannot be used interchangeably in all cotexts and contexts (see text analysis: 1,2,3,4,5 and 6).
- 8-All verbs under discussion have been translated semantically except (3) instances which have been translated communicatively by Al-Hilali and Khan (1996).
- 9-To solve the problems arising in (5) and (6), it is preferable that translators should investigate all possible meanings through the use of reliable dictionaries taking into consideration both context and cotext.
- 10-Translators should also be familiarised with all religious interpretations in order to avoid the ambiguity and to give the same effect as to that of the SL text.
- 11-Transference of meaning is suggested and this can be achieved via communicative method of translation, and in case of untranslatability both transliteration and communicative translation should be followed.

References:

- Al-Hadithi, S.K.M. (2002): *Multiplicity of Meaning in English-Into-Arabic Translation*. (Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis). Al-Mustansiriyah University.
- Al-Hamad, A. (1997): "aθaru ?al-taw d₃I:h ?al - nahawi fi:tar d₃amati ?al - nusu:s, Sawaahidu min ?al - Qur'a:n ?al - kari:m". In: *mad₃allat abhaaθ ?al-jarmu:k*. Vol. 15, No.2, pp. 187-222.
- Al-Sabuni, M.A. (1981): *safwatu ?al-ta-faasi:r : tafsi:ru ?al Qur'a:ni ?al-kari:m, d₃aami^ʿun baina ?al-ma ?θu:r wa-?al ma ?qu:l*, Beirut: daar ?al-Qur'a:n ?al-kar:m.
- Al-Tabrasi, A.A. (1973): *mad₃ma^ʿ - ?al-bajaan fi: tafsi:r ?al-Our'a:n*. Beirut: daar-?al-ma^ʿarif.
- Al-ʿisawi, B. (2001): *?al-tard₃amatu ?ila ?al-ʿarabijja : qadaaiaa wa-?aaraa?*. daar ?al-fikr ?al ʿarabi.
- Al-Qurtubi, A.A. (1966): *?al-d₃aami^ʿu li?ahkaam ?al-Our'a:n*. Cairo: daar ?al-kutub ?al-misrijja.
- Al-Waly, A. (1969): *nahwa ?al-Qur'a:n ?al-kari:m*. Beirut: daaru-?al-ʿilmi lilmalaajji:n, Vol. 2.
- Al-Jawady, R.H.J. (2000): *An Integrated Approach to Synonymy In English*. (Unpublished M.A. Thesis), University of Mosul.
- Aziz, Y.Y. (1997): *AI-Ma'na Wal-Tarjama*. Beni-Ghazi: Qar-Younis University Press.

- Baker, M. (1992): *In Other Words: A Course-Book on Translation*, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd.
- Bell, R.T. (1991): *Translation and Translating: Theory and practice*. London: Longman Group Ltd.
- Baldinger, K. (1980): *Semantic Theory*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Cruse, D.A. (1986): *Lexical Semantics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- De Beaugrande, R. (1999): "Translation and Semantics in Theory and Practice". In: *International Journal of Translation*. Vol. ii. No. 1-2. pp. 7-28.
- De Warrd. J. and Nida. E.A. (1986): *From One Language to Another: Functional Equivalence in Bible Translating*. Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers.
- Dixen. R.M.W. (1966): *What is Language? A New Approach to Linguistic Description*, London: Longman Group Ltd.
- Emery, P.O. (1996): "An ATM-Based Model of Human Translation and its Application to an Arabic Literary Text". In: *Babel*. Vol. 42, No. 3, pp. 141-153.
- Farghal, M.(1993): "Meaning in Translation: A Theoretical Model". In: *Meta*. xxxviii, 2, pp. 252-267.
- Farghal, M. and Shunnaq, A. (1999): *Translation with Reference to English and Arabic: A Practical Guide*. Irbid: Dar Al-Hilal.
- Fromkin, V. and Rodman, R. (1988): *An Introduction to Linguistics*, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd.

- Gleason, H.A. (1965): *Linguistics and English Grammar*. New York: Holt Rinehart & Winston.
- Gutt, E. (1998): "Pragmatic Aspect of Translation: Some Relevance-Theory Observation". In: Leo Hickey (ed.), *The Pragmatics of Translation*, pp. 41-53.
- Harold, F.(2000): "Pragmatic Inferencing". In: Haroldfs @ ccat.sasuppen. edu.
- Hatim, B.and Mason, I. (1990): *Discourse and the Translator*. London: Longman Group Ltd.
- Hickey, L., Lores, R., Gomez, H., and De Carrasco, A., (1993): "A Pragmatic Aspect of Literary Translation". In: *Babel*. 39, (2), pp. 77-88.
- Jackson, H. (1988): *Words and Their Meaning*. London & New York: Longman Group Ltd.
- Jasper, D. (1993): (ed) *Translating Religious Texts: Translation, and Interpretation*. London: The Macmillan Company Ltd.
- Kussmaul, P. (1995): *Training the Translator*. (Benjamin Translation Library, 10) Benjamins: Amesterdam, 177, pp. 54-71.
- Lockwood, D.G. (1972): *Introduction to Stratificational Linguistics*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc.
- Lyons, J. (1977): *Semantics: Vol. 1 & 2*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Lyons, J. (1981): *Language. Meaning and Context*. London: Fontana Collins.
- Leech, G. (1981): *Semantics*. Harmondsworth: Penguin
- Menacerne, M. (1994): "Translation as a Means of Foreign Language". In: *Translation*. Vol. xiii, No. 3-4, pp. 279-292.
- Mohammad, I. (1986): *Some Cultural Problems in English-Arabic Translation*. (Unpublished M. A. Thesis) University of Mosul.
- Moore, A. (2000): "Semantics - Meanings. Etymology and the Lexicon". In: armoore 1955 @ bigfoot. com.
- Newmark, P. (1988): *Approaches to Translation*. New York: Prentice Hall International Ltd.
- Newmark, P. (1991): *About Translation*. New York: Prentice Hall International Ltd.
- Nida, E. (1964): *Toward a Science of Translating with Special Reference to Principles and Procedures Involved in Bible Translation*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Nida, E. A. and Taber, C.R. (1974): *The Theory and Practice of Translation*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Palmer, F.R. (1981): *Semantics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Panman, O. (1982): "Homonymy and Polysemy". In: *Lingua*. No. 58, pp. 105-136.

- Person, G. (1989): "Deep and Profound: A Study in So-Called Synonymy". In: *Umea Papers in English*. Umea University Press.
- Prather, P.A. & Swinney, D.A. (1987): "Lexical Processing and Ambiguity Resolution: An Autonomous Process in an Interactive Box". In Steven, L. S., Garison, W.C. & Michael, K.T.(eds.), *Lexical Ambiguity Resolution*. California: Morgan Kaufmann Publishers.
- Pustejovsky, J. (1995): *The Generative Lexicon*. Massachusetts: The MIT Press.
- Steiner, G. (1975): *After Babel: Aspects of Language and Translation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Su. S.P. (1994): *Lexical Ambiguity In Poetry*. London & New York: Longman Group Ltd.
- Ullmann, S. (1962): *Semantics: An Introduction to the Science of Meaning*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Ullmann, S. (1966): "Semantic Universals". In: J.H. Greenberg, (ed.), *Universals of Language*. Cambridge: Mass.: MIT Press, pp. 217-255.
- Van Dijk, T., (1972): "Foundations of Typologies of Texts". In: *Semiotica*. 6, pp. 279-323.
- Wigtil, D. N., (1985): *The Translation of Religious Texts in the reco-Roman World*. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University Microfilms International.

Wolf, M. and Marchl, S. (1999): "Liberating Truth in Latin America. The Translation of the Liberation Theology in a Cultural Context". In: Albaladejo, T.; Calabuing, I.; Lefevre, A.; and Petofi, J. (eds.), *Translating Divine Truth: The Translation of Religious Texts*, pp. 131-153.

ملخص

مشكلات ترجمة بعض الأفعال المفرداتية (المتعددة المعاني) والمشاركات اللفظية في القرآن الكريم إلى الإنكليزية

د. مصباح محمود السليمان (*)

يهدف هذا البحث إلى (1) تحديد بعض الأفعال التي تتسم بتعدد المعاني والاشتراك اللفظي في القرآن الكريم. (2) تبين المعادلات الترجمية لهذه الأفعال في الإنكليزية، (3) تحديد طريقة ترجمة هذه الأفعال، (4) تحديد بعض المشكلات التي تنجم عن ترجمة هذه الأفعال، (5) تقديم مقترح لحل هذه المشكلات، (6) اختيار ترجمة فعالة أو اقتراح ترجمة جديدة بحيث تتوافق مع التفسير الديني والمجال الدلالي لهذه الأفعال في لغة الأصل.

ولتحقيق هذه الأهداف تفترض الدراسة ما يلي:

- (1) لا توجد علاقة متكافئة بين هذه الأفعال في لغة الأصل ومعادلاتها الترجمية في لغة الهدف، (2) ترجمة هذه الأفعال تتأثر بالخلفية الثقافية للمترجمين، (3) يمكن إعطاء ترجمة فعالة فقط في حالة اتباع التقابل الحرفي مع الترجمة التواصلية.

(*) قسم الترجمة - كلية الآداب / جامعة الموصل.