

Translatability of Qur'anic Antonymy

Aladdin Al-Kharabsheh and Ghaith Al-Jdayeh

Dept. of English, The Hashemite University, Jordan

Received on: 07-11-2016

Accepted on: 02-04-2017

Abstract

The central concern of this study has been with the translatability of Qur'anic antonymy. To test out the main premise of the study, reference has been made to three renowned Qur'anic translations, and for a proper *semantic zooming in* on the selected examples, reference has also been made to three commendable Qur'an-related exegeses. The study shows that Qur'anic antonymy represents a case of semantic non-identity, where two distinct levels of *inverse semantic duplicity* exist simultaneously: an *overt one at the basic level*, and a *covert one at the metaphorical level*. The study also concludes that such a *synthetic inverse semantic complexity* prevents translation from being an untroubled communication, as a great deal of translation troubles and turbulences have been detected and highlighted. Analysis additionally reveals that translation loss has been found to be an inescapable corollary of such a *synthetic inverse semantic duplicity*, and perhaps, of untapped exegetical polemics. Finally, subscribing to the view that translation can virtually be "an interpretive act", especially in the Qur'anic context, the *literal-exegetic translation approach* has been proposed and advocated in this study as an amenable solution that can enable rendering the *synthetic inverse duplicity* both literally and interpretively, as to preserve the intended meanings and splendors of the pristine Qur'anic depiction style.

Keywords: Qur'anic antonyms, translatability, overt inverse semantic duplicity, covert inverse semantic duplicity, synthetic inverse semantic complexity, literal-exegetic translation.

1. Introduction

Negotiating meaning between any given pair of languages that exhibit sharp linguistic and cultural differences may present recalcitrant problems that would require exerting extra effort on the part of the translator. Of a particular interest in this paper is the translation of Qur'anic antonyms, which do seem to throw up certain specific challenges, owing to the common fact that the Holy Qur'an features various prototypical, linguistic, stylistic, phonetic, and rhetorical properties. Such properties and/or subtleties effect a supreme and efficient style that makes the Qur'an a unique and distinctive Book that is difficult to be handled translationally (cf. Asad 1980, 7; Al-Ananzeh 1992, 16; Mustapha 2001, 202; Afsaruddin 2002; Abdul-Raof 1999, 45; Abdul-Raof 2001, 7-12 & 68-9; Abdul-Raof 2004; Leemhuis 2006, 156, among others).

Antonymy, a descriptive semantic concept, has been generally used to refer to two lexical items that are opposite in meaning, and which are extricably bound to offer semantically non-identical expressions. Qur'anic antonyms, the central concern of this study, are no exception to this, as translating them can be said to be notoriously difficult, partly because they do seem to display idiosyncratic lexical semantic information that may not be easily relayed to English, and partly, because they can be said to represent a case where non-identical semantic relations are likely to surface up between the SL (i.e. Arabic) and the TL (i.e. English).

Within the same context, Al-Kharabsheh (2008, 18) neatly asserts, “it is taken for granted that any two translation equivalents, in a pair of languages, should stand in a lexical semantic relation. However, since the conceptual space is not segmented identically for all languages, these corresponding equivalents may often stand in other relations to each other.” So, the conceptual differences between Arabic and English are expected to give rise to much of the translation turbulences in this context. It also follows that translating antonyms largely depends on the degree of semantic congruence between the SL and the TL concerned, i.e., on the degree of congruence between the SL’s concept system and the TL’s.

What further complicates the translatability of Qur’anic antonyms is that they exhibit two distinct sets of *inverse semantic duplicity* that interact with each other at the same time: *an overt inverse semantic duplicity at the basic level* and *a covert inverse semantic duplicity at the metaphorical level*. This can be explained by the fact that each Qur’anic antonym emerges to hold two different meanings simultaneously: a basic meaning and a metaphorical one. So, these interacting sets of semantic relationships are likely to baffle the translator, and to put him/her before a mammoth task of not only finding the intended (i.e. scriptural) meaning, but also of offering a TL version, without distorting the message, or without much loss of meaning.

2. The Present Study

In this study, a special attention is given to the translatability of Qur’anic antonymy. It is crucial to point out right from the outset that a study by Al-Kharabsheh (2008), entitled “Translating Autoantonymy in the Qur’an”, and another by Al-Kharabsheh and Al-Azzam (2008) entitled “Translating the Invisible in the Qur’an” act here as a springboard for the present one, as a swelling interest in *Qur’anic antonymy* has developed out of these two studies. Another pushing impetus for carrying out this study comes partly from the fact that there is a voluminous body of studies that address antonyms from a linguistic point of view, but not from a translational perspective.

The underlying premise of this study is that Qur’anic antonymy represents a special case of semantic non-identity in the sense that they display two distinct but interacting sets of *inverse semantic duplicity: an overt inverse semantic duplicity at the basic level* and *a covert inverse semantic duplicity at the metaphorical level*. In other terms, Qur’anic antonyms can be envisaged as a case of *semantic idiosyncrasy* that does not seem to lend itself to simple and straightforward rendering. This *semantic idiosyncrasy* stems from the fact the meanings of the Qur’an are fathomlessly deep and immeasurably infinite to the point that even a single letter can yield layers of meaning and connotation. Thus, understanding the meanings of the Qur’an heavily draws on its interpretations advanced by established and authoritative expounders or exegetes. Interestingly enough, ensuring conformity with the exegetic efforts and traditions goes in line with the view that translation can be considered *an act of interpretation*, and so, this study adopts such an ‘interpretive view’. Yet, at the same time, it is believed that retaining the literal meaning is quite important in the sense that it reveals much of the Qur’an’s power of portrayal. Thus, such a conflated view is believed not only to capture and communicate the semantic import of any given Qur’anic antonym, but also to reveal and retain the Qur’an’s beauty and splendors.

Based on this, the purpose of this study is threefold: 1) to investigate the translatability of Qur'anic antonyms into English through highlighting the difficulties and problems associated with such a linguistic phenomenon. 2) to identify the translational strategies that have been employed by three selected Qur'anic translators. 3) to find out some other translational procedures that can help translators to deal with such kind of expressions. To materialize the objectives of the present study, three authoritative Qur'anic translations have been selected for comparing and contrasting purposes. These are as follows: *The Noble Qur'an: Arabic Text and English Translation* (1992) by Thomas B. Irving, *The Meaning of The Glorious Koran* (1992) by Marmaduke Pickthall, and *The Holy Qur'an: Text Translation and Commentary* (1984) by Yusuf Ali. The study also heavily relies on three commendable exegeses as yardsticks for *semantic zooming*. These include the following: Ibn-Khathir (1998) *Tafseer al-Qur'an al-A'deem*, Al-Sabouni (1981) *Safwat Al-Tafaseer*, and Al-Zamakhshari (2001) *Al-Kashshaf*. The three selected translations will be compared and contrasted with each other, they will also be analyzed in light of their interpretations and based on their linguistic and scriptural contexts.

3. Theoretical Framework

3.1. Antonymy in English

Though antonymy is “the only sense relation to receive direct lexical recognition in everyday language” (Cruse 2000, 167), a robust taxonomizing system does not seem to have emerged yet, as there are many diverging and controversial perspectives and labels on this linguistic phenomenon (cf. Lyons 1977; Cruse 1986; Murphy 2003). Such controversies blocked yielding an agreed upon definition. Despite the fact that exposure to antonymy is immeasurable, and that any language user can provide a long list of antonymous words, describing them in a clear and precise manner has turned out to be a difficult task. Antonym, therefore, seems to lend itself more to illustration than description. Surveying the related literature shows that antonymy has been defined from two standpoints: semantic and lexical.

As far as the semantic perspective is involved, the *Longman Dictionary of Applied Linguistics* (Richards, Platt and Weber 1985, 14) defines an antonym as “a word which is opposite in meaning to another word”. Likewise, in his *Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics*, Crystal glosses on antonymy by saying that “in its most general sense, it refers collectively to all types of semantic oppositeness” (1985, 18). According to these two definitions, antonymy is often looked at simply as *oppositeness of meaning* (see also Palmer 1974, 94).

However, not any two semantically opposed words are antonyms, a fact that can be ascribed to the “interpretative nature of linguistic semantics” (Geeraerts 1993, 263). For example, *weak/strong*, *happy/sad* and *hot/cold* are antonyms, but *feeble/strong*, *thrilled/sad*, and *hot/cool* are not (though they are semantically opposites), as they seem to lack the “clang” (Muehleisen 1997, 4); these express contrast but lack the antonymous power (for more information on the semantic perspective, see also Maurice 1975; Cruse 1976; Louwrens 1989; Hofmann 1993; Bertocchi 2003; Saeed 2009; Riemer 2010; Paradis and Willners 2006 & 2011). The upshot of all that has been mentioned is that the semantics-driven perspective is not adequate enough to account for our intuitions about *opposites*.

The lexical perspective, on the other hand, boils down to the notion that antonymy is a lexical relation, exclusive to words rather than concepts (cf. Justeson and Katz 1991 & 1992). They capitalize on the scale of size as evidence, contending that although *weak/feeble*, *happy/thrilled*, and *cold/cool* are synonyms, most language users of English would intuitively regard *weak/strong*, *happy/sad*, and *hot/cold* as the most adequate antonymous pairs. Semantically, *feeble*, *thrilled*, and *cool* remain diametrically opposed to *strong*, *sad*, and *hot*, respectively, but the words themselves are not envisaged antonymous (see also Fellbaum 1995).

However, a sound definition of antonymy should meet both the lexical and the semantic criteria: antonyms should exhibit “oppositeness of meaning” (Jackson 1988, 75), but they also should demonstrate a robust, deeply-rooted lexical relationship with each other. Those lexical pairings which satisfy both criteria are labeled as *prototypical* or *canonical* antonyms, whereas those lexical pairings which satisfy the first criterion, but not the second, are known as *peripheral* or *non-canonical* (technical terms adopted from Cruse 1986, 198 and Murphy 1994, 4, respectively; see also Murphy 2003 & 2007 and Steven 2012). Typically, antonyms are classified into three categories: *gradable* (e.g. clever/stupid), *ungradable or complementary* (e.g. pass/fail). The latter is also called *absolute opposites*, as they draw a sharp demarcating line between these two categories. The third category is *converse antonyms* or *relational antonyms* (e.g. husband/wife). Form-wise, antonyms are taxonomized into *morphologically related opposites* (e.g. educated/uneducated), and *morphologically unrelated opposites* (e.g. soft/tough) (cf. Lyons 1977, 272-281 & Palmer 1981, 95).

3.2 Antonymy in Arabic

Antonymy is a pervasive-universal linguistic phenomenon, and like any language, Arabic features antonymy at a large scale. The Arabic label for *antonymy* is Al-Taḥḍād (التضاد). Arabic Antonymy or *Al-Taḥḍād* has been studied by different Arab scholars from different perspectives (see Al-Anbari 1987; Al-Samara'i 1997; and Nassar 2003, among others). At this juncture, it is useful to point out that there are three other Arabic labels, namely, Al-Tibāq (الطباق), Al-Mutabaqa (المطابقة), Al-Muwafaq (الموافقة), and Al-Muqabala (المقابلة) that have recently been used interchangeably with Al-Taḥḍād. Indeed, these four technical terms have originally been taken from Arabic prosody. Thus, Al-Taḥḍād in Arabic linguistics and any of these prosodic terms, are faces for the same coin (see Tabanah 1988, 425; Al-Sikaki 1983, 423; Al-Jurjani 2002, 54; Al-Alawi 2002, 197, and Al-Qazwini 1998, 317).

Perhaps, the first to touch on Al-Taḥḍād was Sibawayh in his book *الكتاب* (Al-Kitāb) when he classified the Arabic lexis into three categories. He neatly puts (translation is ours):

I know that their talk [the Arabs] may include the following: having two different lexical items denoting two different meanings such as *جلس* and *ذهب* (i.e. to sit and to go, respectively), or two different lexical items denoting the same meaning, such as *ذهب وانطلق* (i.e. to go), or one lexical item denoting two different meanings at the same time, such as *وجدت* which means *to grieve or to feel sad for somebody* and *to find something (after losing it)* (Sibawayh, n.d./1988, 24).

On his part, Qutrub's (n.d. / 1984, 244) concept of antonym capitalizes on Sibawayh's third category, i.e., having one word that expresses two meanings that are opposite or antonymous to each other. In his book on الأضداد (Al-Adhdaad, i.e. antonyms), Al-Lughawi (n.d. /1996, 32) glosses on antonymy as follows (translation is ours):

الأضداد (i.e. antonyms) is the plural of ضد (i.e. an antonym), which means the opposite of something, such as السواد والبياض (i.e. blackness vs. whiteness), والسخاء والبخل (generosity vs. miserliness), والشجاعة والجبن (courage vs. cowardice). Do not you see that القوة (i.e. power) and الجهل (i.e. ignorance) are different in meaning, but not antonymous to each other; rather, the word الضعف (i.e. weakness) is what can be considered antonymous to the word القوة and the word العلم (i.e. knowledge) is what can be regarded antonymous to the word الجهل. So, contrast is broader than antonymy in the sense that antonymous words reflect contrast, but contrasting words are not necessarily antonymous (see also Al-Tahanwi 1967, 874; Al-Fayrouz-Abadin.d. / 2005; Ibn-Zakaryyan.d. /1979; Ibn-Manzur, n.d. /1981).

Similar to English, Arabic occasions *gradable antonyms* (e.g. ذكي/غبي clever/stupid, respectively), *ungradable or complementary antonyms* (e.g. نجح/سب pass / fail, respectively), and *converse antonyms* or *relational antonyms* (e.g. زوج/زوجة husband/wife, respectively). Arabic also occasions *morphologically related opposites*, (e.g. متعلم/غير متعلم educated/uneducated, respectively), and *morphologically unrelated opposites* (e.g. ناعم/خشن soft/tough, respectively). It is crucially important to point out that those *morphologically related opposites* are termed in Arabic as الطباق السلبي (i.e. Negative Antonymy), whereas those *morphologically unrelated opposites* are termed as الطباق الإيجابي (i.e. Positive Antonymy). To wrap up, Arabic does feature the same sense relations found in English; yet, Arabic has its own technical terminology in this regard (see also Bani Abduh 1998, Al-Momani 2008 and Alomoush 2010).

3.3. A Translational Perspective

Indeed, little research has been conducted on Qur'anic antonymy from a translational point of view. Al-Kharabsheh (2008) examines the translation of auto-antonymy in the Holy Qur'an. The study shows that the conceptual complexity of autoantonymy evidently manifests itself in the difficulties that translators have in finding a suitable translation. It also provides further evidence for the claim that total lexical equivalence between Arabic and English, especially in Qur'anic discourse, cannot be always achieved, which may, consequently, confuse and shackle translators. Similarly, Al-Kharabsheh and Al-Azzam (2008) translationally investigate a special kind of Qur'anic antonymy: non-lexicalized invisible antonymy. The study concludes that (1) translating such expressions that carry two meanings (i.e., visible and invisible) is problematic and elusive in the sense that such expressions incessantly trigger an inevitable translation loss, (2) translating such expressions requires possessing a working linguistic-exegetical background, without which, the result would be unsatisfactory and misrepresenting translation,

and (3) a proper rendering of any given expression that carries two meanings hinges not only on its textual context or broader context (the scriptural-theological context), but also on the combination of both.

Abdel-Nasser (2013) examines 'contronyms', the encapsulation of two opposite meanings in one lexical item, as a linguistic phenomenon that manifests the resourcefulness of the Arabic language and that encourages and activates the role of context in decoding the intended meaning on the part of the speaker or the producer of the utterance. The study makes the main conclusion that sense relations are very intricate and that every Qur'anic translation has its own merits in elaborating the various shadows of meaning encapsulated in these contronyms. Finally, Mahmood and Mohammed (2012) examines Al-Adhdad (opposites). The study concludes that Al-Adhdad, in comparison with English, is a remarkable Arabic semantic phenomenon which represents a problematic area for the translators who carry out their translations at a purely linguistic level, without realizing that another meaning, precisely the opposite meaning, may be intended depending on the context of situation (see also Ali 2004).

4. Discussion

For the sake of this analysis, the study will be using the following Roman numerals to stand for the three translations: I, II, and III will stand for Irving (1992), Pickthall (1992), and Ali (1984), respectively. The running configuration here will be as follows: the SL Arabic Holy verse which contains the intended Qur'anic antonyms is provided first, and the Qur'anic antonyms in question will be highlighted through underlining; then, it will be followed by its three translations, and finally a discussion will be presented. Now let us consider some illustrative examples:

Example (1):

{وَمَا يَسْتَوِي الْأَعْمَىٰ وَالبَصِيرُ} (فاطر: 19).

1. (The blind and the sighted are not equal). (437).
2. (The blind man is not equal with seer). (446).
3. (The blind and the seeing are not alike). (1159).

In the Qur'anic verse above (i.e. example 1), the two underlined Arabic lexical items الأعمى and البصير are not only opposite in meaning, but are also antonymic to each other. Casting a quick glance, readers and translators alike, particularly those who do not possess a full understanding of the divine message, or those who are oblivious to the Qur'an-related exegeses, are likely to envisage the inverse semantic duplicity triggered by the surface and / or overt meaning of these expressions, i.e. *the overt inverse semantic duplicity at the basic level*, as the intended one. However, *a covert inverse semantic duplicity at the metaphorical level* seems to permeate such a text. In order to decide on the appropriate meaning that suits the context of the situation, Al-Sabouni (1981, 572), IbnKhatir (1998, 729), and Al-Zamakhshari (2001, 617) provide both the basic and non-basic meanings of these two words: الأعمى literally means 'blind', whereas البصير literally means 'seer'. Obviously, in this specific Qur'anic context, these words do not mean what they literally mean. Indeed, there does existan operative *covert inverse semantic duplicity*

at the metaphorical level, as God (i.e., Allah) intends to differentiate between those who believe in Islam and those who do not by depicting them as 'blind' vs. 'seer'. Thus, الأعمى here means the 'the disbeliever' whereas البصير means 'the believer'.

Translationally speaking, Irving (1992, 437) and Pickthall (1992, 446) rendered the two lexical items الأعمى and البصير literally, as 'seer', 'sighted' vs. 'blind', thereby leaving out the metaphorical meaning highlighted by the Qur'an-related exegeses. Ali's (1984, 1159) translation, however, seems to be the closest, as he offers a literal translation, i.e., *the blind* vs. *the seeing* in the text and touches upon the metaphorical through a paratextual tactic, namely, footnoting (Ali 1984, 1159). Indeed, in this example in particular, the translation options, *the blind* vs. *the seer* can be used metaphorically in English, as is the case in Arabic. In other words, translating the Arabic antonyms الأعمى and البصير literally as *the blind* vs. *the seer* can do the job, as 'astute readers' should be able to figure out the beautiful metaphorical images that lurk behind *blind* vs. *seer*, i.e., *the disbeliever* vs. *the believer*.

Actually, it all depends on the type of TL readership. If the targeted TL readership is Qur'an-savvy that can draw the necessary inferences for understanding the metaphorical meaning from the literalness inherent in the text, then literal translation seems a perfect choice here. Yet, attention should be drawn to the fact that foreign (i.e. non-Arab) TL readers may not possess an explicit knowledge and a good command of Arabic as native speakers, and so, this translation may not work out, as semantic loss at the allegorical level is incurred. Alternatively, another tenable translation that can be suggested here is one that offers the two meanings in the body of the text, i.e., a literal-interpretive or a literal-exegetic translation that injects the second layer of meaning, i.e., the metaphorical one, between two brackets, alongside the literal options, e.g., "The blind (i.e. the disbeliever) and the seer (i.e. the believer) are not alike". This translation seems to suit most categories of TL readers.

Example (2):

{وَلَا الظُّلُمَاتُ وَلَا النُّورُ} (فَاطِر: 20).

1. (Nor are darkness and light). (437).
2. (Nor is darkness (tantamount) to light). (446).
3. (Nor are the depths of Darkness and the Light). (1159).

Similarly, in this Qur'anic verse (i.e. example 2), the two Arabic words الظلمات and النور exhibit a canonical antonymous relationship. Literally, these two words display an *overt inverse semantic duplicity at the basic level*: 'darkness' vs. 'light', whereas a thorough look at them reveals a *covert inverse semantic duplicity at the metaphorical level* according to the Qur'anic context. In fact, Al-Sabouni (1981, 572), Ibn Khathir (1998, 729) and Al-Zamakhshari (2001, 617) thoroughly discussed this Qur'anic verse, as they differentiate between the word الظلمات which literally means 'darkness'; yet, in this Qur'anic context, the meaning is totally different because it metaphorically means 'the state of being away from the Qur'an's instructions or Islamic instructions'. This also applies to the word النور which literally means

'light', but again in this Qur'anic context, it metaphorically means 'the state of following and obeying the Qur'an's instructions or Islamic instructions'. Now, the two sets of inverse semantic duplicity are crystal clear in light of their relevant exegeses.

As far as the three translations are concerned, the three translators communicated over to the TL the *overt inverse semantic duplicity at the basic level*, as they provided the same translation option, i.e., 'darkness' vs. 'light', for الظلمات and النور respectively. Similar to the previous example, the literal translation options *darkness* and *light* can also be used metaphorically in English. On the assumption that TL audience is quite knowledgeable on the Qur'an, and that the required envisionment of the text in the reader's mind is likely to take place, this can be a translation that may fare so well in the TL, as it conveys the picturesque Qur'anic depiction in such a communicative event. Since envisionments vary with individual readers and with different types of audiences, a considerable translation loss at the metaphorical level is quite noticeable, i.e., *the covert inverse semantic duplicity at the metaphorical level*: 'the denial state of the Qur'an's instructions' vs. 'the adherence state to the Qur'an's instructions'. Such a translation loss should be palliated through a literal-exegetic translation, such as the following:

Neither darkness (i.e. the denial state of the Qur'an's instructions) nor light (the adherence state to the Qur'an's instructions)

The above option, which reflects a conflated conceptualization of translation, targets customary readers, for whom reference networks and presuppositions of the original text are not a necessary condition for drawing the *relevant allegorical meanings* from the text.

Example (3):

{فَأَصْحَابُ الْمَيْمَنَةِ مَا أَصْحَابُ الْمَيْمَنَةِ وَأَصْحَابُ الْمَشْأَمَةِ مَا أَصْحَابُ الْمَشْأَمَةِ} (الواقعة: 8,9).

1. (First those on the right hand; what of those on the right hand? And then those on the left hand; what of those on the left hand) (561).
2. (The companions on the right, what do the companions on the right mean? The companions on the left, what do the companions on the unlucky side mean?) (534).
3. (Then there will be, the companions of the right hand, what will be the companions of the right hand? And the companions of the left hand, what will be the companions of the left hand?) (1485).

Al-Sabouni (1981, 306), Ibn Khathir (1998, 362), and Al-Zamakhshari (2001, 455) argue that depiction of the Great Event, i.e., the Judgment Day is followed by a treatment of the conditions of people on that Day. On the one hand, people on that Day will be of two kinds: أصحاب الميمنة which literally means *people on the right-hand side*, but which metaphorically means those who are being referred to as *the fortunate ones*, 'since the record of their deeds are given to their right hands'. This category of people symbolizes the saved believers who did righteous or good deeds, and so they shall be granted divine rewards. Furthermore, the Arabic word ميمنة (i.e., right-hand sidedness) is cognate with يمين which denotes happiness. Thus, the first class of people includes the happy and the fortunate.

On the other hand, the linguistic stretch أصحاب المشئمة literally means *people on the left-hand side*, but metaphorically means those who are *unfortunate*. How unfortunate they are as 'the records of their deeds shall be given to their left hands', as a result of the bad deeds they committed during their earthly existence. This class of people symbolizes those who committed sins, and those who were involved in wrong-doing. Moreover, the Arabic word مشئمة (i.e., left-hand sidedness) is cognate with شؤم which denotes bad omen or pessimism. Thus, the overt inverse semantic duplicity at the basic level can be grasped in *people on the right-hand side vs. people on the left-hand side*, whereas the covert inverse semantic duplicity at the metaphorical level can be grasped in those who are *fortunate* vs. those who are *unfortunate*.

As far as the translations are involved, Irving (1992, 561), Pickthall (1992, 534) and Ali (1984, 1485) relayed these two Qur'anic antonyms literally, as follows: أصحاب اليمين 'those on the right hand', 'the companions on the right', and 'the companions of the right hand', respectively, whereas أصحاب المشئمة was literally relayed as 'those on the left hand', 'the companions on the left', and 'the companions of the left hand', respectively. In fact, in this particular example, the literal translation approach does not seem to be productive, as neither 'those on the right hand', 'the companions on the right', and 'the companions of the right hand', nor 'those on the left hand', 'the companions on the left', and 'the companions of the left hand' can possibly be envisaged to be conducive of metaphorical meanings in naturally occurring situations. These translation options do not even seem to scratch the surface meanings, thereby leading to a considerable translation loss in the receptor language. Thus, the literal-exegetic translation approach emerges here as a possible workable one that can retain both basic and the non-basic, i.e., the interpretive levels of the evident inverse semantic duplicity as well as the Qur'anic beauty of depiction:

those on the right hand (i.e. those who are fortunate in the Hereafter) vs. those on the left hand (i.e. those who are unfortunate in the Hereafter)

Example (4):

{يَوْمَ تَبْيَضُّ وُجُوهٌ وَتَسْوَدُّ وُجُوهٌ} (آل عمران: 106).

1. (One day some faces will turn white while other faces will turn black) (63).
2. (On the day when (some) faces will be whitened and (some) faces will be blackened) (79).
3. (On the day some faces will be (light up with) white, and some faces will be (in the gloom of) black) (150).

Having a quick look at example (4) above can reveal that the two underlined Arabic words تبيض (lit. to whiten) and تسود (lit. to blacken) stand in an antonymous relationship to each other. However, a careful examination of the context where they figure in reveals also the presence of another inverse semantic duplicity that exists at a covert metaphorical level in such a verse. According to Al-Sabouni (1981, 222), IbnKhathir (1998, 518), and Al-Zamakhshari (2001, 427), God, on the Day of Judgment, regards the

faithful and the pious, who follow His prophet Mohammed, and who pursue the straight path, as individuals *with radiant or whitened faces*, i.e., metaphorically *with blessed faces*. By contrast, God literally describes those individuals who never pursued the right path that could have led them to happiness as those *with black / blackened faces*, i.e., metaphorically *with unblessed faces*. In short, this example shows the two types of antonymic relationships here: the *overt inverse semantic duplicity at the basic level of meaning, i.e. white vs. black or whiten vs. blacken*) and the *covert inverse semantic duplicity at the metaphorical level of meaning, i.e., blessed vs. unblessed*.

Leveling out these two layers of antonymy in translation does not seem to be an easy task, especially if the translator is not quite aware of the hidden one. In rendering *تبيض* and *تسود* into English, Irving (1992, 63) and Pickthall (1992, 79) directly refer to their literal meanings: ‘white / black’ and ‘whiten/blacken’, respectively, leaving behind the non-basic (i.e., the metaphorical) meaning that a strong reference is made to in the Qur’an-related exegeses. Ali (1984, 150), on the other hand, conveys one layer of the meaning in the body of the text, i.e., the literal layer; yet, he adopts the paratextual solution, i.e. footnoting, in a bid to capture the other layer of meaning, i.e., the metaphorical. At the same time, however, Ali’s attempt to salvage the metaphorical meaning in a footnote does seem to be quite successful in ‘hitting the nail on the head’, when he verbatim said:

The face ‘wajh’ expresses our personality, our inmost being. White is the color of light: to become white is to be illumined with light, which stands for felicity, the rays of the glorious light of Allah. However, black is the color of darkness, sin, rebellion, misery, removal from the grace and light of Allah. And these are the signs of heaven and hell. The standard of decision in all question is the justice of God (ibid., 150).

Like the previous example, the literal translation approach seems to be futile in this specific context, as neither *white/whitened face*, nor *black/blackened face* can be used metaphorically in English in ordinary communicative situations to mean *blessed/unblessed face*. As a result, a big translation loss represented in the antonymic relationship at the metaphorical level: ‘blessed’ vs. ‘unblessed’ cannot be avoided. Hence, recourse to the literal-exegetic translation approach can be made as to resolve the dilemma and articulate both aspects (i.e. the literal and the interpretive ones) of such a synthetic semantic complexity, as follows:

On the Judgment Day, some faces will turn white (i.e. will be blessed) while other faces will turn black (i.e. will be unblessed).

Example (5):

{وَلَنُذِيقَنَّهُمْ مِنَ الْعَذَابِ الْأَدْنَىٰ دُونَ الْعَذَابِ الْأَكْبَرِ لَعَلَّهُمْ يَرْجِعُونَ} (السَّجْدَةُ: 21).

1. (Still We shall let them taste worldly torment rather than supreme torment, so they may yet turn back) (417).
2. (And verily We make them taste the lower punishment before the greater, that haply they may return) (425).

3. (And indeed We will make them taste of the penalty of this (life) prior to the supreme penalty, in order that they may (repent and) return) (1097).

The Arabic expressions العذاب الأدنى and العذاب الأكبر in example (5) above are two linguistic chunks that are evidently antonymous at the basic level. However, consulting exegetes, like Al-Sabouni (1981, 505), Ibn Khathir (1998, 610) and Al-Zamakhshari (2001, 520) reveals a hidden antonymy at the non-basic level. According to them, العذاب الأكبر literally means *the great torment*, while it metaphorically means *the Hereafter torment*. However, before *the Hereafter torment* there will be العذاب الأدنى which literally means *the minor torment*, i.e., metaphorically, the one that will be in this mundane life. Thus, the latter expression metaphorically means *the worldly torment*, which may come in the form of misfortune, a sudden disaster, an illness, pains, hardships, a tortured conscience, or a secret sorrow, etc. But this *worldly torment* may be really a mercy, as it gives them a chance to repent. To wrap up, the *overt inverse semantic duplicity at the basic level* is self-evident in *the minor torment vs. the great torment*, whereas the other one is exegetically revealed in a *covert inverse semantic duplicity at the metaphorical level of meaning*, i.e., *the worldly torment vs. the Hereafter torment*.

Translationally speaking, it has been found that these Qur'anic antonyms are translationally difficult to handle, as the three translators showed a remarkable degree of incompatibility between them. For instance, Irving (1992, 417) renders العذاب الأدنى metaphorically by giving the option *worldly torment*, whereas العذاب الأكبر is delivered at the basic level as *supreme torment*, which does not signal to *the Hereafter torment*, i.e., a marked translation loss that the translator could have avoided had he consulted the relevant Qur'anic commentaries. The situation seems worse in Pickthall's (1992, 425) translation, who extolled the surface layers of meaning of these Qur'anic antonyms, as he offered *lower punishment vs. greater punishment*. Of course, the translation loss here is greater than that in Irving's translation, as the *covert inverse semantic duplicity at the metaphorical level of meaning* has totally been ignored. Indeed, the English literal choices *lower punishment vs. greater punishment* or any other literal ones do not look to express the afore-mentioned interpretive, i.e., metaphorical meaning. Thus, the literal translation approach appears to be destructive in this specific context as it causes a significant translation loss.

However, Ali's (1984, 1097) astutely combines literalism and paratextuality in rendering the meaning of Qur'anic antonyms above, by explaining the literal meaning in the body of the text, and the intended meaning in a footnote. Ali renders العذاب الأدنى metaphorically as *the penalty of this life*, whereas العذاب الأكبر literally as *the supreme penalty*. So, this translation is beset by the problem of metaphorical in dealing with the first chunk, but literal in the second. Despite the fact that this may baffle 'the lay reader'; yet, Ali attempts to sensitize the reader in a footnote to the fact that these two stretches display two meanings. Again, Ali's paratextual material does not seem to make a clear-cut distinction between both of them:

The final penalty is to come in the Hereafter, and there is no doubt about it. But before it comes, a minor penalty comes in this life, it may be in some of tribulation, a sudden sharp pain or painful emotion or sorrows. But this minor penalty may be really a mercy, as it gives them a chance of repentance and amendment (ibid., 1097)

Interpretively speaking, the three translations above seem to trigger a translation loss in one way or another, and in light of the fact that literal translation approach did not work out in this example, the translation loss can be redressed through the literal-exegetic translation approach, which appears to possess the explanatory and pictorial power needed in such a context:

And indeed We will make them taste of *the minor torment (i.e. the worldly torment)* prior to *the greater torment (i.e. the Hereafter torment)* so that they may repent and return

In the above suggested translation, the added parenthetic interpretations cater for clarity and precision in meaning without the need for the reader to exert the extra effort of consulting lengthy explanations that would be normally provided in footnotes, the traditional tactic followed by many translators. While maintaining its exegetic quality, as is the case with all previous examples, this translation strictly adheres to the original Arabic text of the Qur'an, i.e., no changes or accidental alterations have been brought about, whether pertaining to subject, verb, object, adverb, preposition, conjunction, tense, use of active and passive voice. Etc...

Example (6):

{وَلَقَدْ عَلِمْنَا الْمُسْتَقْدِمِينَ مِنْكُمْ وَلَقَدْ عَلِمْنَا الْمُسْتَأْخِرِينَ} (الحجر: 24).

1. (We know which of you try to get ahead and we know those who hold back) (263).
2. (And verily we know the eager among you and verily we know the laggards) (263).
3. (To Us are known those of you who hasten forward, and those who lag behind) (642).

Casting a quick glance at example (6) above reveals that the two underlined Arabic lexical words *المستقدمين* and *المستأخرين* exhibit antonymous relationship. The word *المستقدمين* literally means 'those who preceded you at a certain point of time', while *المستأخرين* literally means 'those who came (to life) after you at a certain point of time': they are all known to God, and He will gather them all together on the Judgment Day. In other words, reference is made to these two categories of people, as to stress the fact that those who are the first to accept Islam, i.e. early adherents to Islam, and those who embraced Islam later on, i.e. the late adherents, are very well known to God in terms of who is enthusiastic and devoted to Islam and who is cold and sluggish (cf. Al-Sabouni 1981, 108). This interpretation gives rise to the *overt inverse semantic duplicity at the basic level of meaning*. However, Ibn Khathir (1998, 725) and Al-Zamakhshari (2001, 538) provide a different interpretation that gives rise to the *covert inverse semantic duplicity at the metaphorical level of meaning*. For them, the word *المستقدمين* also means 'those who come early to the prayer', whereas the word *المستأخرين* means 'those who come late to the prayer'.

In the above example, translation loss is clear in Irving's (1992, 263) and Pickthall's (1992, 263) literal translations, as they express one layer of meaning (i.e. the basic one) at the expense of the other

(i.e., the metaphorical one). This is quite evident in the translation options they yielded. Hence, Irving's options 'get ahead' / 'hold back' as well as Pickthall's 'eager / laggards', and Ali's 'hasten forward'/'those who lag behind' hover around the basic meaning. Though Ali (1984, 642) provided a footnote, he never seemed to have touched upon the metaphorical meaning, as such a footnote only enlarged on the basic meaning (see Ali's explanatory footnote, *ibid.*, 642).

Obviously, this example is pretty challenging, as all the translation options delivered by the translators may not trigger the second layer of meaning even in the minds of discerning readers. Consequently, the decline to convey such a semantic-scriptural nuance constitutes a translation loss that should be compensated for. Indeed, each layer will require a particular grade of understanding and comprehension, and English to which such a Qur'anic verse is translated does seem to be limited in conveying such layers of meaning as laconically as the SL, i.e. Arabic. To attempt to maintain semantic totality, sentence structure, lucidity and flow that may echo the SL, i.e., the Qur'an, the following possible literal-exegetic translation can be suggested:

And indeed, We (Allah) know early adherents to Islam (and those who come early to the prayer), and indeed, We know those who embraced Islam later (and those who come late to the prayer).

Example (7):

{وَمَا يَسْتَوِي الْبَحْرَانِ هَذَا عَذْبٌ فُرَاتٌ سَائِغٌ شَرَابُهُ وَهَذَا مِلْحٌ أُجَاجٌ} (فَاطِر:12).

1. (Both seas are not alike: this one is sweet, fresh, refreshing to drink, while other is salty, briny) (436).
2. (And the two seas are not alike: this, fresh, sweet, good to drink, this (other) bitter, salt) (445).
3. (Nor are the two bodies of flowing water alike, the one palatable, sweet, and pleasant to drink, and the other, salt, and bitter) (1156).

Any great salty ocean with its seas and gulfs is all one, and the great masses of sweet water in rivers, lakes, ponds, and underground springs are also one. Yet, each is connected with the other by the constant circulation, which sucks up vapors, carries them about in clouds or atmospheric moisture, and again brings them condensed into water, snow, or hail, as to mingle with rivers and streams and as to get back into oceans. In example (7) above, the two Arabic constructs عذب فرات and ملح أجاج stand in a prototypical antonymous relationship to each other. In the first construct (i.e. عذب فرات) the adjective عذب (i.e. fresh) collocates so strongly with the other adjective فرات (i.e. sweet), and both collocate with ماء (i.e. water). On the other hand, in the second construct (i.e. ملح أجاج), the noun ملح (i.e. salty), which functions here as an adjective, and أجاج (bitter) collocate with each other so strongly, and both collocate with ماء (i.e. water) as to give the opposite picture (i.e. the other kind of sea). So, the Qur'an gives the example of two seas: one which is sweet, fresh to drink from, and the other is bitter salty; these two conflicting pictures make up the *overt inverse semantic duplicity at the basic level of meaning*.

Al-Sabouni (1981, 569), Ibn Khathir (1998, 726), and Al-Zamakhshari (2001, 614) offer both the basic and non-basic layers of meaning of these Qur'anic antonyms: the expression عذب فرات literally means 'potable sea', whereas its metaphorical meaning is 'the right way that people pursue to obtain

God's satisfaction'; the expression ملح أجاج literally means 'unpotable sea', whereas its metaphorical meaning is 'the wrong way that people pursue to obtain God's satisfaction'. So, the three consulted exegeses reveal the existence of a *covert inverse semantic duplicity at the metaphorical level of meaning*: 'the right way that people pursue to obtain God's satisfaction' vs. 'the wrong way that people pursue to obtain God's satisfaction'. The superb breath-taking Qur'anic depiction here requires no further emphasis.

As far as the translations are concerned, and based on the foregoing discussion, none of the three translators has successfully conveyed the covert meanings of عذب فرات and ملح أجاج in the verse above (cf. Al-Sabouni (1981, 569), Ibn Khathir (1998, 726) and Al-Zamakhshari (2001, 614). More specifically, the three translators handled the two antonymous constructs in question literally: Irving (1992, 436) 'sweet, fresh, and refreshing to drink' vs. 'salty, briny', Pickthall (1992, 445) 'fresh, sweet, good to drink' vs. 'bitter, salt', and Ali (1984, 1156) 'palatable, sweet, and pleasant to drink' vs. 'the other, salt, and bitter'. As a consequence, a significant translation loss traceable in dropping out the interpretive meaning, i.e., in the metaphorically-driven inverse semantic duplicity should be redressed. In fact, even Qur'an-savvy readers may not be able to figure out, from the two opposed pictures of the sea that are painted in this terrific context, the afore-mentioned metaphorical meaning. A valid translation, which capitalizes on the literal-exegetic approach may handle such a semantic complexity:

And the two seas are not alike: the first is sweet and fresh to drink (i.e. the first is 'the right way that people pursue to obtain God's satisfaction'), while the other is salty and bitter (i.e. the other is the wrong way that people pursue to obtain God's satisfaction)

Example (8):

{مَا كَانَ اللَّهُ لِيَذَرَ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ عَلَىٰ مَا أَنْتُمْ عَلَيْهِ حَتَّىٰ يَمِيزَ الْخَبِيثَ مِنَ الطَّيِّبِ} (آل عمران: 179).

1. (God is no one to leave believers where you are now, until He sorts out bad from good) (73).
2. (It is not the purpose of Allah to leave you in your present state till He shall separate the wicked from the good) (87).
3. (God will not leave the believers in the state in which ye are now, until He separates what evil from what is good) (169).

In the battle of Uhud (i.e., the second military encounter between the Meccan disbelievers and Muslims), whilst outnumbered, Muslims gained the first round and forced the Meccan disbelievers' lines back, thus leaving much of the Meccan camp unprotected. When the battle looked to be only one step away from a decisive Muslim's victory, a serious mistake was committed by a part of the Muslim's army, which altered the outcome of the battle. A violation of Prophet Mohammad's orders by the Muslim archers, who left their assigned posts to despoil the Meccan camp, allowed a surprise attack from the Meccan disbelievers' cavalry, led by Meccan war veteran Khalid Ibn al-Waleed. This brought chaos to the Muslim ranks, as many Muslims were killed, and even Prophet Muhammad himself was badly injured. The Muslims had to withdraw up the slopes of Uhud. The Meccan disbelievers did not pursue the Muslims further, but marched back to Mecca declaring victory. By the end of this battle, and after what happened to Prophet Mohammed and his faithful companions, God revealed this verse (i.e. example 8

above) to Prophet Mohammed. God intends to sort out the hypocrites from the pious among Muslims themselves.

In example (8) above, the underlined word الطيب literally means 'good', whereas it metaphorically means 'Muslims who followed Prophet Mohammed's orders'. In contrast, the underlined word الخبيث literally means 'vicious', whereas it metaphorically means 'Muslims who did not follow Prophet Mohammed's orders' (cf. Al-Sabouni (1981, 246), Ibn Khathir (1998, 574) and Al-Zamakhshari (2001, 473). Concerning the three renditions and in reference with the Qur'an-related exegeses, it can be noticed that neither Irving's (1992, 73), nor Pickthall's (1992, 87) has captured the *covert inverse semantic duplicity* in الخبيث and الطيب i.e. 'the hypocrites' vs. 'the pious', as their translations only preserve the *overt inverse semantic duplicity at the basic level of meaning*, i.e., 'good' vs. 'vicious'. Though it was augmented with a footnote, Ali's (1984, 169) translation does not seem to have offered anything that is much different from Irving's and Pickthall's. Indeed, such a footnote is too loose to touch on the intended meaning, i.e., it is too loose to uncover for the reader the underlying *covert inverse semantic duplicity* (See Ali's fluid footnote, *ibid.*, 169).

Contemplating such a specific verse, the literal translation options (i.e. bad/good, wicked/good, and evil/good) provided by the three translators, respectively, seem to be counterproductive in terms of alluding to the other meaning, i.e., the metaphorical one. Even those readers who are familiar with the Uhud battle may find it quite difficult to infer from the literal fluid translation options bad / good, for example, the already explained covert meaning. With this an inevitable translation loss in mind, the following literal-exegetic translation can be proposed as to convey not only the literal meaning but also the unquestionable interpretive meaning:

God will not leave the believers in the state they are in now, until He draws a dividing line between the evil (i.e. Muslims who did not follow Prophet Mohammed's orders' in Uhd battle) and the good (i.e. Muslims who followed Prophet Mohammed's orders' in Uhd battle)

Example (9):

{أُولَئِكَ الَّذِينَ اشْتَرُوا الضَّلَالَةَ بِالْهُدَىٰ فَمَا رَبِحَت تِّجَارَتُهُمْ وَمَا كَانُوا مُهْتَدِينَ} (البقرة:16).

1. (Those are the ones who have purchased error at the price of guidance, while their bargain does not profit them nor have they been guided) (3).
3. (These are they who purchased error at the price of guidance, so their commerce doth not prosper, neither are they guided) (25).
4. (These are they who have bartered guidance for error but their traffic is profitless, and they have lost true direction) (19-20).

In a similar fashion, the underlined Arabic words الهدى and الضلالة in example (9) above can be regarded as prototypical antonymous pairing. In the Qur'anic context of this particular verse, the former literally means *guidance*, whereas the latter literally means *misguidance*. So, *guidance* vs. *misguidance* axiomatically give rise to the *overt inverse semantic duplicity at the referential level*. Yet, consulting the

relevant Qur'anic exegeses reveals that الهدى metaphorically means 'guidance in the sense of embracing Islam', whereas الضلالة metaphorically means 'misguidance or impiety in the sense of rejecting Islam'. In other words, exegesis-based evidence shows that there is a *covert inverse semantic duplicity at the metaphorical level*, which, for any translation activity, represents its point of departure (cf. Al-Sabouni (1981, 37), Ibn Khathir (1998, 82-83) and Al-Zamakhshari (2001, 130).

Regarding the three translations are mentioned, Irving (1992, 3), Pickthall (2002, 25) and Ali (1984, 19-20), rendered such an antonymous coupling literally as 'error vs. guidance', a literal translation that seems to do injustice to the other aspect of meaning, i.e., the metaphorical one that lurks behind such linguistic signs, and that seems to result in an inconceivable 'semantic derailment' unnecessarily. Heavy reliance on the immediate context may account for such a semantic derailment, let alone overlooking pertinent Qur'anic exegeses that can be of much help in such contexts. It is obvious that the literal translation strategy adopted by Irving (1992, 3), Pickthall (1992, 25) and Ali (1984, 19-20) have led not only to a clear semantic derailment, but also to a concomitant translation loss that badly needs to be compensated for.

At this juncture, it is crucially important to point out that the English word *error* does not look to be a good translation option to communicate over to the TL even the basic meaning of the Arabic word ضلالة, let alone the metaphorical one. Besides, the pair *error/guidance* in such a scriptural context emerges to be a discordant element that is likely to not only disfigure the Qur'anic stylistic effect, but also to disturb the harmony of semantic cohesion within the boundary of such a verse. Alternatively, the dichotomy *guidance/misguidance* is suggested here as a more intrinsically and semantically appealing, with a lexical cadence that tallies with marvelous Qur'anic portrayal of the scene. Accordingly, the following literal-exegetic translation can be yielded to serve both the uninitiated and astute readers alike:

Those are the ones who have bartered guidance (i.e. embracing Islam) for misguidance (i.e. rejecting Islam), but their trade is profitless, and they are astray

Example (10):

{وَمَا يَسْتَوِي الْأَحْيَاءُ وَالْأَمْوَاتُ} (فَاطِر: 22).

1. (The living and dead are not alike). (437).
2. (Nor are the living equal with dead). (446).
3. (Nor are alike those that are living and those that are dead). (1159).

In the Qur'anic context (i.e. example 10) above, God distinguishes between those who followed the right path and accepted Islam, as being الأحياء (lit. those alive), and those who refused Islam as being الأموات (lit. those dead). These two Arabic words are antonymous as they show opposite meanings to each other. In this specific Qur'anic context, Al-Sabouni (1981, 572), Ibn Khathir (1998, 729) and Al-Zamakhshari (2001, 617) assert that these words hold distinct metaphorical meanings that depart drastically from their literal ones. Metaphorically speaking, the word الأحياء means 'those wise people with lively-hearts', whereas the word الأموات means 'those ignorant people with dead-hearts'. Clearly, this

example, like the previous ones, offers both an *overt inverse semantic duplicity at the referential level* as well as a *covert inverse semantic duplicity at the metaphorical level*.

In reference to the three translations, it can be posited that the translation options 'the living' vs. 'the dead' offered by both Irving (1992, 437) and Pickthall (1992, 446) do not seem to qualify to the required level that can convey the full meaning of the antonymous coupling in question. Likewise, Ali (1984, 1159) offered a literal translation, supported with an ancillary footnote in bid to rescue the *overt inverse semantic duplicity* at the metaphorical level. However, Ali's footnote does not seem to have completely filled the gap, as direct reference to the metaphorical meaning has never been made as such. Again, as is the case with most of his footnotes, Ali's footnoting style was indirect and philosophical, rather than precise and to the point (see Ali's footnote, *ibid.*, 1159).

Evidently, one cannot lose sight of the fact that the noticeable semantic loss in Irving's and Pickthall's renditions can be attributed to their adherence to the literalness approach which gives much prominence to the surface meaning. Indeed, in this specific example, literal translation can be a valid option only if it is directed to TL readers, who possess explicit Qur'anic knowledge, and who would not grapple with covert, but quite discernible, meanings. As it has already been stated, this type of readers is a rarity. With this caveat in mind, lay readers will find it difficult to grasp the covert aspect of meaning and so, translation loss at this particular level can be easily realized. Thus, it is advisable to resort to our approach, i.e., the literal-exegetic, so as to capture the referential and metaphorical essence; yet, preserve the pristine Qur'anic portrayal of such a communicative situation. In echo to all that has been said, the following translation can be suggested:

Nor are alike those that are living (i.e. those wise people with lively-hearts) and those that are dead (i.e. those ignorant people with dead-hearts)

5. Conclusion

The primary concern of the current inquiry has been with examining the troubles and turbulences associated with translating Qur'anic antonymy. Overall, the study provides further evidence for the overarching premise that Qur'anic antonymy represents a case of semantic idiosyncrasy, or a case of semantic non-identity, as every examined Qur'anic antonymous pairing has been found to exhibit two distinct sets of inverse semantic duplicity: an *overt inverse semantic duplicity at the basic level*, and a *covert inverse semantic duplicity at the metaphorical level*. Given this *synthetic inverse semantic complexity* immanent in the obtained data, the study also draws the conclusion that Qur'anic antonymy is quite problematic from a translational point of view. Indeed, the upshot of the antecedent discussion comes to substantiate this conclusion, as Qur'anic antonymous expressions proved that they do not lend themselves to simple and straightforward conveyance.

Analysis also shows that semantic loss, and subsequently, translation loss is unavoidable, as the selected Qur'anic antonyms were mishandled translationally in various contexts. This can be explained by the fact that the three selected translators often opted for literal translation to touch on one level of the underlying inverse semantic duplicity, normally *the overt inverse semantic duplicity at the basic level*, but overlooking the other, i.e., *the covert inverse semantic duplicity at the metaphorical level*, thereby causing

a considerable semantic loss, which naturally incurred an inevitable translation loss. In short, translation loss has been found to be an inescapable corollary of the synthetic inverse semantic duplicity inherent in the discussed Qur'anic antonyms.

In light of the view that translation can be looked at as an interpretive act, it can also be concluded that in order to figure out the *synthetic inverse semantic duplicity*, and subsequently, in order to relay the intended meaning, i.e., the intended interpretation (s) of such anonymous constructions to the TL, translators should exploit the available authoritative exegeses of the Holy Qur'an. In other words, Qur'anic exegeses, in this study, proved to be quite useful for the *semantic zooming in* on the selected antonyms; a step deemed necessary to grasp and convey both levels of the synthetic inverse semantic duplicity.

Finally, the study proposes the *literal-exegetic translation approach* as an amenable solution that can be utilized when it comes to semantically-packaged constructions such as Qur'anic antonyms. This approach involves enabling a happy marriage between *literal translation* and *Qur'anic exegesis-driven interpretation* to take place, as it has been shown in the discussed examples. The idea here is to convey the synthetic inverse duplicity both literally and interpretively and preserve the astounding pristine Qur'anic style in portraying the communicative scene at the same time. Literal translation does the latter whereas exegetic translation does the former. Other translation procedures germane to some paratextual tactics, such as footnoting, endnotes, annotations can be suggested to deal with Qur'anic antonymy. Yet, these tactics are less preferable, due to the fact that one layer of meaning, normally the basic one would be given prominence in the body of the text, whereas the second allegorical layer (i.e. the metaphorical one in our case), would be relegated to a secondary and/or marginalized position, i.e., footnote, endnote, or annotation.

إمكانية ترجمة التضاد القرآني

علاء الخرابشة وغيث الجداية

قسم اللغة الانجليزية، الجامعة الهاشمية، الزرقاء، الأردن

الملخص

يشكّل موضوع "إمكانية ترجمة التضاد القرآني" محور اهتمام هذه الورقة البحثية، وللتحقق من فرضية الدراسة الرئيسية، فقد رجعنا إلى ثلاث ترجمات قرآنية معروفة، ولغايات التحقق من المعنى القرآني المقصود للأمثلة المختارة، فقد عدنا إلى ثلاثة تفاسير قرآنية معتمدة. وتشير نتائج الدراسة إلى أن التضاد القرآني يمثل حالة من حالات اللاتطابق المعنوي التي تتجلى على مستويين بارزين من مستويات الأزواجية الضدية في أن واحد وهما: "الأزواجية الضدية الظاهرية على المستوى الأساسي للمعنى" و"الأزواجية الضدية الباطنية على المستوى المجازي للمعنى". وبالنظر إلى هذه "الأزواجية الضدية المركبة"، فقد توصلت الدراسة أيضاً إلى أن التضاد اللغوي من شأنه أن يربك عملية الترجمة أو عملية التواصل التي تتم من خلال الترجمة، ويتضح ذلك من خلال تحديد الكثير من مواطن الخلل الترجمي والمطبات الترجمة وتسليط الضوء عليها، كما ويبيّن التحليل أن "الفقدان المعنوي" في عملية الترجمة يعدّ نتيجة طبيعية لا مفر منها لتلك "الأزواجية الضدية المركبة" ولاختلاف التفاسير القرآنية غير المستغلة. وأخيراً، ومن منظور أن هذه الدراسة تؤيد فكرة أن الترجمة يمكن أن تكون بالفعل عملية تفسيرية، لا سيما في السياق القرآني، فقد طرحت الدراسة نهج "الترجمة الحرفية - التفسيرية" إستراتيجية يمكن الاعتماد عليها في ترجمة "الأزواجية الضدية المركبة" حرفياً وتفسيرياً، لنقل المعاني المطلوبة وللحفاظة على تألق القرآن وجمالياته الأصيل في الأسلوب التصويري.

الكلمات المفتاحية: المضادات القرآنية، إمكانية الترجمة، الأزواجية الضدية الظاهرية، الأزواجية الضدية الباطنية، الأزواجية الضدية المركبة، الترجمة الحرفية - التفسيرية.

References:

- Abdel Nasser, Manal. 2013. Rendering the Arabic Conronym /Zann-a/ 'to surmise' into English in Four Qur'anic Translations. *International Journal of Linguistics* 5 (6): 110-137.
- Abdul-Raof, Hussien. (2001). *Qur'an Translation: Discourse, Texture and Exegesis*. UK: Curzon Press.
- Abdul-Raof, Hussien. 1999. Untranslatability of Semantically Oriented Qur'anic Syntax. *Offshoot: A Journal of Translation and Comparative Studies* 2 (2): 39-46.
- Abdul-Raof, Hussien. 2004. The Qur'an: Limits of Translatability. In *Cultural Encounters in Translation from Arabic*, Ed. Faiq, Said, 91-106. Clevedon/UK: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Afsaruddin, Asma. 2002. The Excellences of the Qur'an: Textual Sacrality and the Organization of Early Islamic Society. *The Journal of the American Oriental Society* 122 (1): 1-24.
- Al-Alawi, Yahya. 2002. *Al-Tiraaz li 'Asraar al-Balaghahwa 'Uluum Haqa'iq Al-'Ejaz* [Secrets of Rhetoric and the Science of Inimitability]. First Edition.
- Al-Ananzeh, Mohammad. 1992. *The Translatability of Implicature in the Holy Qur'an into English*. Unpublished M.A Diss. Yarmouk University, Irbid: Jordan.
- Al-Anbari, Mohammad. 1987. *Kitab Al-Adhdaad* [The book of Antonyms]. Verified by Ibrahim, Muhammad Abu Al-Fadl. Saida: Al-Maktabah Al-Asriyah.
- Al-Fayrouz, Abadi .n.d./2005. *Qamoos Al-Muheet* [The All-encompassing Dictionary]. Eighth Edition. Verified by Al-'Arqasusi, Mohammed. Beirut:
- Ali, Abdul Sahib. 2004. A Study of Antonymous and Synonymous Couplings in Arabic with Reference to Translation. *Babel* 50 (4): 346-360.
- Ali, Yusuf. 1984. *The Holy Qur'an: Text Translation and Commentary*. Thates-Salasil: Kuwait, Al-Murgab.
- Al-Jurjani, Al-Shareef. 2002. *Kitaab Al-Ta'areefaat* [A Book on Definitions]. Verified by Al-Ibyaari, Ibrahim. Beirut: Dar Al-Kitaab Al-'Arabi.
- Al-Kharabsheh, Aladdin. 2008. Translating Autoantonymy in the Qur'an. *Across Languages and Cultures* 9 (1): 17-40.
- Al-Kharabsheh, Aladdin. and Al-Azzam, Bakri. 2008. Translating the Invisible in the Qur'an. *Babel* 54 (1): 1-18.
- Al-Lughawi, Abu Al-Tayyeb. n.d. / 1996. *Kitab Al-Adhdaad fi Kalam Al-Arab* [The Book of Antonymy in Arab's Speech]. Second Edition. Verified by Hasan, Azzeh.
- Al-Momani, Mariam. 2008. *Auto-Antonyms in Arabic*. Unpublished M.A Diss. Yarmouk University. Irbid: Jordan.
- Alomoush, Omar. 2010. On Linguistic Aspects of Auto-Antonyms in Arabic. *International Journal of Academic Research* 2 (4): 408-413.
- Al-Qazwini, Mohammed. 1998. *Al-'Edaah fi 'Uluum Al-Balagh* [Explanatory Book on Rhetorical Sciences]. Fourth Edition. Verified by Ghazzawi, Baheej. Beirut: Dar 'Ehyaa' Al-'Uluum.
- Al-Sabouni, Ali. 1981. *Safwit Al-Tafaseer*. Beirut: Dar al-Qur'an al-Kareem.

- Al-Samara'i, Ibrahim. 1997. *Al-Tatawawur Al-Lugawi Al-Tarexi* [Historical Linguistic Development]. Beirut: Dar al-Andalus.
- Al-Sikaki, Yusuf. 1983. *Muftaah Al-'Uluum*. Verified by Zarzour, Na'eem. First Edition. Beirut: Dar al-Kutub Al-'Ilmayyah.
- Al-Tahanwi, Mohammed. 1967. *Khashshaf Istilahat Al-Funoon* [A Dictionary of Technical Terms]. Verified by Qadir, Mohammed *et. al.* Tahrán: Maktabat Khayyaam.
- Al-Zamakhshari, Mahmood. 2001. *Al-Khashshaf*. Beirut: Mu'asasat Al-Tareex Al-'Arabi.
- Asad, Muhammad. 1980. *The Message of the Qur'an*. United Kingdom. Gibraltar: Dar Al-Andalus.
- BaniAbduh, Omar. 1998. *A Diachro-Synchronic Analysis of Antonymy in Arabic*. Unpublished M.A. Diss. Yarmouk University. Irbid: Jordan.
- Bertocchi, Alessandra. 2003. Antonyms and Paradoxes. *Argumentation* 17 (1): 113-122.
- Cruse, D. Alan 1976. Three Classes of Antonym in English. *Lingua*, vol. 38, no. 3-4: 281-292.
- Cruse, D. Alan. 1986. *Lexical Semantics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cruse, D. Alan. 2000. *Meaning in Language: An Introduction to Semantics and Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Damascus: Dar Tilas. <http://wadod.net/bookshelf/book/880>.
- Damascus: Dar Tilas. <http://wadod.net/bookshelf/book/880>.
- Fellbaum, Christiane. 1995. Co-occurrence and Antonymy. *International Journal of Lexicography* 8 (4): 281-303.
- Geeraerts, Dirk. 1993. Vagueness's Puzzles, Polysemy's Vagaries. *Cognitive Linguistics* 4: 223-272.
- Hofmann, Th R. 1993. *Realms of Meanings*. New York: United States of America.
- Ibn Kathir, Al-Hafez. 1998. *Tafseer Al-Qur'an Al-'Azeem*. First Edition. Damascus: Dar Al-Fayhaa'.
- Ibn-Manzur, Al-Ansari. n.d./1981. *Lisanu Al-Arab* [The Tongue of the Arabs]. Six Vols. Cairo: Dar Al-Ma'aarif.
- Ibn-Zakaryya, Ibn Faris. n.d./1979. *Mu'ajam Maqayees Al-Lughah* [Language Standards Dictionary]. Six Vols. Verified by Abdul-Salam Haroon. Dar al-Fikker: Damascus.
- Irving, Thomas. 1992. *The Noble Qur'an: Arabic Text and English Translation*. Beirut: Dar al-Nahda al-'Arabiya.
- Jackson, Howard. 1988. *Words and their Meaning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Justeson, John and Katz, Slava. 1991. Co-occurrences of Antonymous Adjectives and Their Contexts. *Computational Linguistics* 17 (1): 1-19.
- Justeson, John and Katz, Slava. 1992. Redefining Antonymy: The Textual Structure of a Semantic Relation. *Literary and Linguistic Computing* 7: 176-184.
- Leemhuis, Fred. 2006. From Palm Leaves to the Internet. In *The Cambridge Companion to the Qur'an*, Ed. McAuliffe, Jane Dammen, 145-162. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Louwrens, L.J. 1989. Antonymy. *South African Journal of African Languages* 9 (1): 19-22.
- Lyons, John. 1977. *Semantics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Mahmood, Ziyad. and Mohammed, Mohammed. 2012. The Translation of Arabic Al-Adhdad (Opposites) in the Glorious Qur 'an into English: Problems and Strategies. *College of Basic Education Researchers Journal* 12 (1): 813-828.
- Maurice, Van Overbeke. 1975. Antonyms and Gradation. *Linguistique* 11 (1): 135-154.
- Mu'asasat Al-Risalah lil Tiba'ah wal Nashr wal Tawzee'. <http://shamela.ws/browse.php/book-7283#page1>.
- Muehleisen, Victoria. 1997. *Antonymy and Semantic Range in English*. Published Ph.D.Diss., Evanston: Illinois. <http://www.f.waseda.jp/vicky/dissertation/>
- Murphy, M. Lynne. 1994. *In Opposition to an Organized Lexicon: Pragmatic Principles and Lexical Semantic Relations*. Unpublished Ph.D. Diss., University of Illinois.
- Murphy, M. Lynne. 2003. *Semantic Relations and the Lexicon: Antonymy, Synonymy and Other Paradigms*. Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Murphy, M. Lynne. 2007. Antonyms as Lexical Constructions: Or, Why Paradigmatic Construction is not an Oxymoron. *Constructions* 1 (8): 1-37.
- Mustapha, Hassan. 2001. Qur'an (Koran) Translation. In *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*, Ed. Baker, Mona, 200–204. London and New York: Routledge.
- Nassar, Hussien. 2003. *Madxal Ta'areef Al-Adhdaad* [Introduction to Antonyms]. First Edition. Cairo & Port Said: Maktabat Al-Thaqafah Al-Diniyah.
- Palmer, Frank. 1974. *The English Verb*. London: Longman.
- Palmer, Frank. 1981. *Semantics*. Second Edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Paradis, Carita and Willners, Caroline. 2006. Antonymy and Negation - The Boundedness Hypothesis. *Journal of Pragmatics* 38 (7): 1051–1080.
- Paradis, Carita, and Willners, Caroline. 2011. Antonymy: from Convention to Meaning- making. *Review of Cognitive Linguistics* 9 (2): 367-391.
- Pickthall, Marmaduke. 1992. *The Meaning of the Glorious Koran: An Explanatory Translation*. London: Everyman's Library.
- Qutrub, Mohammed. 1984. *Kitab Al-Adahdad* [The Book of Antonyms]. First Edition. Verified by Haddad, Hinna. Riyadh: Dar al-'Uloom lil Tiba'ah wal Nashr.
- Richards, Jack, Platt, John, and Weber, Heidi. 1985. *Longman Dictionary of Applied Linguistics*. Harlow, Essex, England: Longman.
- Riemer, Nick. 2010. *Introducing Semantics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Saeed, John. 2009. *Semantics*. The British Library: United Kingdom.
- Sibawayh, Amr. n.d./1988. *Al-Kitab* [The Book]. Third Edition. Verified by Haroon, Abdul Salam Mohammed. Cairo: Maktabat al-Khanji. <http://shamela.ws/index.php/book/23018>.
- Steven, Jones. 2012. *Antonyms in English Construals, Constructions and Canonicity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tabanah, Badawi. 1988. *Mu'jam Al-Balaghah Al-'Arabyyah* [A Dictionary of Arabic Rehtoric]. Third Edition. Jeddah: Dar Al-Manarah & Riyadh: Dar Al-Rifa'i. Verified by Hindawi, Abdul Hameed. Sayda/Beruit: Al-Maktabah Al-'Asranyah.