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Abstract
The current paper deals the study of prototype theory as a cognitive phenomenon. So, prototype theory can be defined as a model of meaning categorization in terms of conceptual and contextual construction. The prototype theory has also been mapped in forms of the conceptual lexical entity – related transfer in the Glorious Qur'anic text. Translation on the other hand is hypothesized as a process of construing the discourse according to the cultural recognition principle within the norms of idealized cognitive model of knowledge sharing. The study then focused
on categories that refer to the conceptual constructions in lexical entries to be construed by receptor. The most important example of prototypical categorization has been furcated in me-first orientation approach. The conceptual lexical entity is near to the psycho-cognitive system of mind, so as it comes in the first position of the semantic structure. The eco-culture can interplay in the recognition of the semantic - conceptual construction of the discourse, and this consequently a complementary partition of the translating process as mental rather than linguistic activity.

1. Categorizing Prototypes:

Prototype is a model of categorization in cognitive semantics, where some members of a category are more central and pivotal than others in discourse. Basic categories are relatively homogeneous in terms of sensory-motor knowledge of human mind. The basic level of category has the nearest degree of cue validity in the discourse. Thus, a category may have a priority and a semantic-conceptual construction in the discourse than other categories within the same discourse. Some categories are posited to focus on the essence of conceptual construction of meaningful image. On the other hand, the basic categories are full of informational content and can easily be categorized in terms of semantic contexts as well as have their own eco-cultural relations with other components in discourse. Prototype theory can be extended beyond lexical and semantic levels to discourse and conceptual levels of analysis as well. Prototype theory also works predominantly with the interactive information of (i.e., knowledge sharing) prototypes of conceptual lexical entities in the discourse, and this is called Idealized Cognitive Model (ICM). The transfer from the language into another is strongly based on the prototype theory of knowledge and theories of markedness and universality in languages have much in common (Jenson, 1985: 14; 1987: 5; Nayar, 2006:204; Nigel, 2005:218). The above discussion can be seen in the following Qur'anic text:

O assembly of jinn and men! If you have power to pass beyond the zones of heavens and earth, then pass beyond (them) but you will never be able to pass them except with authority. Then which of the Blessings of your Lord you both deny? (Al-Hilali and Khan, 1996: 969).
The semantic models are clearly based on conceptual components constructed to identify an emphasis of certain idea in the hierarchy of the discourse. Functionally, it is thought that the basic level categories are a decomposition of the world into maximally informative categories. The prototype approach is cognitively the most direct way of circumventing the problem of measuring semantic models. The conceptual variables of discourse components are eco-cultural to deal with the concentration on the main concepts of lexical entities (Jenson, 1985:13; Nayar, 2006:203).

The categorization in general has a reference to the whole processes of organizing human experience into concepts with the association of the semantic components of the discourse. The concept is a sort of mental scheme, it is an effective partition of representing knowledge relation with other concepts in the discourse. The idea of prototype makes possible that the subject has a mental construction, identifying that typical features of several categories and the individuals find a new object. They may compare it to the prototype in their memories. Thus, in the conceptual constructions, one may confirm the presence of variables for same concept. Prototype semantics has given the way to the true revolution about the cognitive theory. Hence, the use of the conceptual components is coming from the referential experience and the prototype sphere is more adequate for conception. It is difficult however to explain the motor–activity of prototype inside language individually, because the prototype clusters are constructed from the context of interactions. The double origin of prototype is bound then to share knowledge relations between the subjects with ecological templates, i.e. contextual factors (Cf. Jenson, 1985:12; Lakoff, 1987: 8; Eckardt, 2003: 436).

2. Prototype Theory

A new theory of categorization is based however on principle that extended far beyond those envisioned in the classical theory. It aims at surveying the complexities of the way people really categorize. Categorization is not a matter to be taken lightly; there is nothing more basic than categorization to the thought, perception, action and speech. In reference, inference, emotions, allusions, notions and symbols categories are employed. Any particular action performed on occasion is a kind of motor activity. Discourse is understood in terms of employing dozens categories in the mental model that contains categories of speech sounds, words and clauses, statements. All these are entailed with conceptual categories. Most categorization is automatic and unconscious. In order to understand the discourse in the categorization of prototype theory, it is possibly make sense about things and experiences encountered. Some categories emerge directly from cultural experience and knowledge.
There are natural dimensions to the categories for abstract and concrete perceptual objects based on the conception of the objects by means of the intellectual sensory models of prototype. The lexical analysis in the discourse is philosophically set forth from the conceptual structure of the real world. This real world is the basic component of conception (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980:126; Lakoff, 1987:137; Bahr and Lenk, 2005: 210; Nayar, 2006:204). Let us see the following Qur‘anic text:

مُتَّكِئِينَ فِييَا عَمَيْيَا فِي نَارِ جَيَنَّمَ فَتُكْوَى بِيَا جِووَ انُهنُ ْ وَجنُ  ونُهنُ ْ وَ نُهنُ لأنُانُ ْ ىَذَا مَا كَنَزْتُمْ لأَنفُسِكُمْ فَذُوقُواْ مَا كُنتُمْ تَكْنِزُونَ (التوبة/35)

Reclining therein on raised thrones, they will see there neither the excessive heat, nor excessive bitter cold (as in Paradise there is no sun and no moon) (Al-Hilali and Khan, 1996: 1065). The semantic categories of natural languages are treated in a manner quite similar to the concept formation paradigm. Some, interpreters of the Glorious Qur’an stated that the notion of The major trend of semantic mapping cognition of retrieving this Qur‘anic text is to treat the conceptual category of lexical entity (شَوْلًا) in relation with the conceptual category of another lexical entity (زَوْهَرَيرًا) even though the concept of (زَوْهَرَيرًا) refers to the whole category of cold density, but in the context the conceptual component is to the (moon) as a bundles of discrete components of category that construe how words can be used in their context which can possibly realize component of conception. The components clearly differentiate the category from all others and also construe each component–category with a context–sensitive and logically comparable to all others (Al Sabooni, 1986:351; Warren, 1977:19). Or as in:

وَالَّذِينَ يَكْنِزُونَ الذَّىَبَ وَالْفِضَّةَ وَوَ يُنفِقُونَيَا فِي سَبِيلِ المّوِ فَبَشِّرْىُم بِعَذَابٍ أَلِيمٍ (التوبة/34)

And those who hoard up gold and silver and spend them not in the Way of Allah, announce unto them a painful torment. On the Day when that will be heated in the fire of hell and with it will be branded their forheads, their flanks and their backs. This is the trasure wich you hoarded for yourselves. Now taste of what you used to hoard (Al-Hilali and Khan, 1996: 351). Or as in:

يُعْرَفُ الْمُجْرِمُونَ بِسِيمَاىُمْ فَيُؤْخَذُ وِ ل سَّ وَاصِي وَا اوَ ْ وَا ِ (التوبة/41)

The translator in such cases should resort to footnotes in translation in order to clarify the some unclear situations within the SL text in such a case.

2 This text refers to the people who have never given charity to the poor. جِبَاهُهُمْ وَجُنىبُهُمْ وَظُهُىرُهُمْ refers to the mean who may see the poor coming, the mean then frown when the poor meat him he turned aside. When he would be asked he turned his back (Al – Sabooni, 1986: 534). This is an innuendo of prototype series of conceptual components of the discourse.
The Mujrimun (polytheists, criminals, sinners) will be known by their marks and they will be sized by their forelocks and their feet (Al-Hilali and Khan, 1996: 970).

The conceptual lexical entity of (ال مجرمون) in SL has various equivalents in TL (polytheists, criminals, sinners), thus the translator tried to use three equivalents in TL to achieve the suitable conceptual lexical entity in another language. This Qur'anic text sometimes leads to the impression that prototype categorization of things as they are, they come into natural kinds and conceptual categories of idealized cognitive model fit the kind of things they are in real world. Events, actions, emotions, spatial and social relationships and lexical entities of the enormous range are categorized. Any adequate account of human thought must provide an accurate theory for all categories, both concrete and abstract. To change the very concept of a category is to change not only our concept of the mind, but also our understanding of the world. Lakoff (1987) stated that meaning is based on reference; it concerns the relationship between symbols and things in the world. The conceptual system of mind among language users is different; hence the cognitive models are not the same because of the variances in ecological media, cultural preferences and linguistic acquisition. The prototype is thus mental interpretation, so categories are represented in the mind in terms of prototypes. Degrees of category membership for entities are determined by the degree of similarity and/or priority to prototype (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980: 71; Lakoff, 1987:8; Crystal, 1991:248; Ferrando, 1998:16; Cf. Al-Sabooni, 1986a: 35, b298; Lang, 2009: 317).

3. Culture – Language Recognition:

Culture-recognition in general can roughly be divided into three categories: material culture, institutional culture and mental culture. Language belongs to institutional culture, which is closely related to mental culture in formation, processing and performance. Differences in mental culture are what produce the differences in languages involved in translation. The mental is culture mainly manifested in image and function, integrity and individuality, covertness and overtness, thought and concept (Hongwei, 1999:121).

It then further provides effective methods to solve culture-bound prototypes in translation from one language into another. Culture is an extremely complex concept and an enormous subject. It embraces almost everything in the world, whether material or spiritual. The material culture refers to all the products of manufacture and technology. Institutional culture refers to various systems and the theories that support them, such as social systems, religious systems, ritual systems, educational systems, kinship systems and language. The mental culture refers to the mentality and behaviors, their thought patterns, beliefs, conceptions of value, doctrines, manners and aesthetic standards (Hongwei, 1999:121; Gee, 2000: 58).

Fraser (1996:73) states that it is hardly to probe the culture-specific component which contains consequently the conceptual structures that have a sort of deep-posted relationships inside each other. This may impose the potentiality of context (Cf. Thomas, 1995: 22).

Proceeding from between the backbone and ribs (Al-Hilali and Khan, 1996: 1098).

Language possesses all sectors of cultural preferences. Like all other aspects of culture, language is not inherited, but acquired and shared by whole society interactions. Language is conventional and governed by rules which are acknowledged and observed by all individuals of participants in society within the ecological templates of culture. Language mirrors other parts of culture, supports them, spreads them and helps to develop others as in textures. This special criterion of language distinguishes it from all other facets of culture and makes it crucially important for the transferring of culture in translating process. It is no exaggeration to say that language is the life-blood of culture and that culture is the track along which language forms and develops (Hongwei, 1999:121; Cf. Bailey, 2005:9).

Verily, in the creation of the heavens and the earth, and in the alternation of night and day, and the ships which sail through the sea with that is of use to the mankind, and the water (rain) which Allah sends down from the sky and makes the earth alive therewith after its death, and the moving (living) creatures of all kinds that Has scattered therein, and in the veering of winds and clouds which are held between the sky and the earth, are indeed (proofs, evidences, signs, etc) for people of understanding (Al-Hilali and Khan, 1996: 56).
this text refers to the creation of heavens and earth with the overwhelming evidences of Allah's Power is to refer to the sequence of night and day with a firm and precise system. The night come followed by diurnal, and faded to be night. The day extended and the night habitually comes to be short and vise versa. He also scattered through the earth in the change of the winds and clouds which they trail like their slaves between the sky and the earth (Al-Sabooni, 1986a: 111; Al-Qaheri, 2003: 191).

Or in:

Verily, Allah is not ashamed to set forth a parable even of a mosquito or so much more when it is bigger (or less when it is smaller) than it. And as for those who believe, they know that it is the truth from their Lord, but as for those who disbelieve, they say "What did Allah intend by this parable?" by it He misleads many, and many. He guides thereby. And He misleads thereby only those who are Al-Fasiqun (the rebellions, disobedient to Allah) (Al-Hilali and Khan, 1996: 18).

In this Qura'nic text, Allah did set forth a parable, they are hypocrites who said, Allah is too glorified to say such these parables (Al–Azeez, 2003:15). is to refer to the unbelievers for their blasphemy. is to refer to the believers who are guided by the truth and Qur'an (Al Sabooni, 1986a: 45).

4. ME – FIRST ORIENTATION:

It is observed that culture is viewed via what is prototypical member of culture like determines an orientation of the concepts within the conceptual system. Discourse may form a conceptual reference framework to point out an enormous member of concepts. The conceptual system is oriented with respect to - whether or not – similar to the properties of the prototypes. Since, participants in the discourse typically function in an upright position to transfer, transact and perform actions and viewed as being basically thematic. The psychological orientation of human culture and natural instinct is the basis in the hermeneutic experience for viewing participants in the discourse as more up than down, more front than back, more active than passive, more good than bad. The cultural orientation correlates with the fact that English contains
orders of words that are more normal than others (Lakoff, and Johnson, 1980:132).

The general principle is relative to the properties of the prototypical category, the word who's meaning in nearest comes first. This principle states a correlation between form and content like the other principles, it is a consequence of figurative tropes in the normal conceptual system; nearest is the first. The conceptual construction usually comes first to point out the more inferential orientation by the participants in the discourse. This may interrelated with the matter of emphasis on certain concept. Thus more coherent word order suitable to the cognitive model comes first. The basis of this theory is the successive mappings from reality to language via perception and cognition as well as ecologically, cognitively and culturally established ideas (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980: 132).

Everyone is going to taste death, and We shall make a trail of you with evil and with good. And to Us you will be returned (Al-Hilali and Khan, 1996: 593).

وَنَبْلُوْكُم بِالشَّرِّ وَالْخَيْرِ this text reveals that Allah may test the believers with ordeal and blessing to see who is the real believer and blaspheme. The patient and depressed test them with agony and luxury, health and sickness, richness and poverty. He may test believers with lawful and taboo to see who is allegiance and guilt (Al–Sabooni, 1986:262). The farthest conceptual construction of underlined Qur'anic text is to refer semantically to the prototypical categories of the mental models, and emphasis on the ideological spheres to be inferred by receptors of the discourse. To summarize, since the discourse is however conceived in linear order, it constantly has to choose which words to put first. Given otherwise, random choice between up and down, down and up, we automatically choose up and down of the two concepts up and down (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980:133). The phrase (الشَّرِّ) in this context is oriented nearest to the prototypical receptor in this discourse. Since, (الْخَيْرِ) of our conceptual system has been given second part to pass certain meaningful construction and emphasis on the part of the discourse. The word order (الْخَيْرِ) and (الشَّرِّ) is thus more coherent with the conceptual system of mental model then the order

زَيْنَا إِلَّإِّكَ نَعْلَمُ ما نُفِي وَمَا نُفِيْنَ عَلَى اللّهِ مِن شَيْءٍ فِي الأَرْضِ وَلَا فِي السَّمَاءِ (إِبْرَاهِيْمٍ/٣٨)

O our Lord! Certainly, You know what we conceal and what we reveal. Nothing on the earth or in the heaven is hidden from Allah (Al-Hilali and Khan, 1996: 467).
it refers that the believers says O' our Lord You knows what we hide and declare. Anything in cosmos can never been hidden to Allah who knows everything in the earth and heaven. In this text, the lexical item (earth) has been mentioned first with reference to the believers (as discourse participants) then the lexical item (heavens) (Cf. Al – Sabooni, 1986a:100).

To Him belong the keys of the heavens and the earth. He enlarges provision for whom He wills, and strains (it for whom He wills). Verily, He is the All-Knower of everything (Al-Hilali and Khan , 1996: 872).

This text refers to Allah to Greatest Who ascribed to Have the powers of everything: rains and plants. He bestowed the living in terms of his own power (Sabooni, 1986b: 135). There are some other types of prototypical relationships among the lexical items of the discourse. Some conceptual components expressed by lexical items have a property of being related in terms of linear prototypical and logical connectivity. Words are coherent logically and semantically according to the conceptual system of discourse. As in:

And those who invoke not any other ilah (god) along with allah, nor kill such as allah has forbidden, except for just cause, not commit illegal sexual intercourse – and whoever does this shall receive the punishment (Al-Hilali and Khan , 1996: 663).

There is a sort of linear conceptual relation between the words ( وَلَا يَزْنُونَ ) and (وَلَا يَتُولُونَ ). Those who invoke not, with Allah, any other god, nor slay such life as Allah has made sacred, except for just cause, nor commit fornication and any that does this meets punishment (Al-Sabooni, 1986b: 370).

5. Meaning Postulates:

The postulates of meaning categorization form to be a continuum prototype. So, the construction of meaning is a dynamic process implies to define a space where this process can be taken place, where stable states can be defined and so on. Meaning is not fully isolated category, but it is constructed and construed by the receiver of the discourse through a process of the selection of the suitable conceptual entity of the structure in accordance with the conditions imposed by the context which it occurs. This brings us to two of our initial points: the possibility of categorization and the conceptual construction of meaning. Semantics requires high quality of knowledge in a specific context. Therefore, it is

Obligatory to use the term semantics very carefully and not just in the sense of attributes. However, exactly this happens very often in image analysis, when all prototypical information is trivially called conceptual components (Bähra and Lenk, 2005: 12; Cf. Wahrlton, 2003: 416). This discussion is illustrated in the flowing figure:

![Diagram](image)

**Figure (2): Meaning Conceptual Integrity Adapted with Bähra and Lenk, 2005:12**

This can be seen in:

\[
\text{إِنَّ بَطْشَ رَبِّكَ لَشَدِيدٌ} \quad (12) \quad \text{إِنَّوُ ىُوَيُبْدِئُ وُيُعِيدُ} \quad (البروج/13)
\]

Verily, He it is Who begins (punishment) and repeats (punishment in the Hearafter) (or originates the creation of everything, and then repeats it on the Day of Resurrection) (Al-Hilali and Khan, 1996: 1095).

The image within this text may emerge a set of meanings and interpretations clearly. It is an entity, some kind of abstract mental series of prototypes whether abstract or mental object and activity contained in the discourse. The categorization of meaning is predominantly an individual process that can be best ultimately understood as a sequence of concepts. It lies obviously in the common organization of the sensory system and mental model to induce a basic analysis of multifarious conceptual constructions, continuous reality in relatively prototypes, dynamic categories. These can be represented as abstract instances which can be considered as the ultimate cognitive equivalents of prototypical configurations. They are then submitted to further, culturally conditioned analysis which provides a more precise, but culturally and linguistically determined categorization immediately leading to linguistic forms. The multiplicity of occurrence of a word enables the receiver to build up an
abstract image of the context that depends on the linguistic experience (Tomaszewyke, 1998:22; Clift, 1999:544; Hobbs, 2003: 10; Alonso, 2003: 14). Or as in:

قُل لَّئِنِ اجْتَمَعَتِ الإنسَانُ والْجِنُّ عَمَى أَن يَأْتُواْ بِمِثْلِ ىَذَا الْقُرْآنِ وَ يَأْتُونَ بِمِثْمِوِ وَلَوْ كَانَ بَعْضُيُمْ لِبَعْضٍ ظَيِيرًا (الإسراء/88)

Say: "If the mankind and the jinn were together to produce the like of this Qur'an, they could not produce the like thereof, even if they helped one another." (Al-Hilali and Khan, 1996: 527).

This Qur'anic text assures that if the Mankind and the Jinn were to gather to produce something similar to this Qura’n, they will never produce the like thereof, even they are promoted each other. This is the emphasis and evidence to the sanctity of the Quranic text itself (Al-Qahery, 2003: 274). Meaning of this text is based on faith. So, the word and the meaning are sacred. The interpretation of the meaning is to some extent is the process which operates within the prototypes of the mental models. So, the prototype theory can be manifested in terms of the categorization process the emphasis on (Jinn) before Mankind, but this can be done by the receptor of language in an unconscious fashion (Aziz and Lataiwish, 2000: 110; McArthur and Bruza, 2002:3).

6. Translation, information and knowledge Sharing:

Translating is a bilingual process, it is assumed to be a special issue of the general phenomenon of human information processing. It habitually takes place in both short-term and long-term memories through devices for decoding text in the source language and encoding text into the target language via non-language specific semantic representation. One of the basic tenets of prototype theory is the link between translation model and meaning categorization in all aspects of discourse on the one hand and model of human communication on the other. The processes are involved in the conceptual system of mind (Bell, 1991: 230; Bassnett, 2002: 35).

The background information of knowledge can be retrieved from the part of the computed components of the discourse. The focus of the semantic prototype entailed within the context of conceptual series of components. The information retrieving is however made the semantic structure clear for the translator of the text i.e. makes prototypes orientation clear for the translator and this is cognitively highly sophisticated issue in the process of translating (Al-Qaini, 2000: 499; Cf. Naoum, 2001: 42; Cf. Bailey, 2005:10).

Knowledge representation as well helps in networks of translating process, as a comprehension phase. Since the human memory recognizes and retains more quickly the prototype models. It finds a sensory manner of categorization via making the mental processes of understanding. The

network simulates typical aspects of human cognition having as essential feature of the flexibility in the modeling of the cognitive phenomena. The network simulates the concepts through the association of the new properties to the basic concepts in the discourse itself (Bell, 1991: 230; Cf. Fraser, 1996: 67; Al-Qini, 2000: 499). To sum, receptors of language often perceive the end-product of translation (i.e. target text) as the only material available for scrutiny. This tendency to ignore the process of decision-making lies behind the lack of objectivity in translation. Consequently, any attempt to evaluate translations by analytic comparison of source text and target text is bound to divert away from accuracy and fidelity without considering the procedures undertaken by the translator to resolve problems (Hatim and Mason 1990: 3; Juffs, 2004: 205).

The intuition plays a crucial role in translating the source text, it is hermeneutic and/or interpretive. Further, languages vary in their choice of lexical orientations of the lexical parsing, conceptual structures and rhetorical usages. It is prudent, therefore, to talk about the adequacy of a translation rather than the degree of equivalence. Equivalence is relative and not absolute and the translator imposes his/her own subjective preferences of style in target text and that consequently causes loss of meaning gap between SL and TL (Al - Qinai, 2000: 499; Haiman, 2005: 114; Ahmed, 2005: 5:40).

Perhaps a more practical theory of translation would view it as a process of inter-textual alignment. The source text as a pattern gets aligned with the target text as a pattern. The individual conceptual components and semantic categorization are to be performed in accord with their position and function within the patterns-recognition memory. The target text is already an approximation. The degree of approximation can always be improved. The translator can work through a series of approximation text in source language (de Beugrande, 2003: 9).

Conclusions:
The current study concluded the following points:
1. Prototype theory of categorization is the basic unit of meaning. Some categories have concentration than others in the discourse, and constitute the profound of the conceptual construction of the ICM of mind.
2. The prototypical categories may sometimes be posited in the discourse to emphasize the conceptual lexical entry.
3. The translator of the category prototype should master eco-cultural spheres of both languages. Translation is viewed as a knowledge core and is therefore manipulated to achieve maximum transferring in the TL version within the cultural norms of the receptor language.
4. Knowledge plays an essential role in the prototypical instances in construction in the discourse offer precisely enriched information to the discourse to be understood.

5. The differences in language founded in differences of cultures. The translation is however plays a transfer of language; it is also a transfer of mental culture. The process of translation is actually one of mental transfer accomplished through language.

6. The cognitive semantic theories of conceptual lexical entries are badly in need of association to translatology, because translation is a mental rather than linguistic activity.
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