JJMLL

Translating Mental Tropes Related to Active and Passive Participles: Syntactic Twisting and Semantic Exclusivity

Aladdin Al-Kharabsheh
Department of English, Kuwait University, Kuwait

Azhar Al-Azaizeh
Department of English, The Hashemite University, Jordan

Abstract

This paper endeavors to promote research into the under-explored field of mental tropes by investigating the *translatability* of two intriguing types*: the active participle* and *the passive participle.* These two types have been examined with special reference to the Qur'an. A close-reading-of-parallel-texts method has been used. The method involves the selection of Qur'anic texts and their corresponding translations in conjunction with a host of Qur'an-related authentic exegeses as to provide a point of departure for the ensuing discussion. Analysis mainly reveals two distinct cases of *syntactic twisting* and *semantic exclusivity*: the first is where *the active participle* is found to serve the function and give the meaning of the *passive participle*, and the second is where *the passive participle* is found to serve the function and give the meaning of *the active participle*. The study also shows that *translation incommensurabilities* (Kuhn, 1962) at the syntactic, semantic, pragmatic, rhetorical, and exegetical levels are very much in evidence in the selected translations, which may preclude a translation from assuming a trusted authority. Finally, the study proposes a tenable translation procedure to deal with Qur'anic mental tropes, viz. the *communicative-exegetic translation.*

Keywords: translatability, mental tropes, active and passive participles, syntactic twisting, semantic exclusivity, communicative-exegetic translation.

1. Introduction

Translating the Holy Qur'an from Arabic into English may give rise to many problematic issues, and on top of those are the semantic ones, which reveal the limitations and constraints related to its translatability. Indeed, such limitations and constraints hinge on the linguistic system of the Holy Qur'an. However, this does not imply that the meaning of the Qur'anic text is untranslatable; rather, it implies that other languages are likely to display different conceptual systems, and subsequently, different linguistic mechanisms and devices. Indeed, the translatability of the Holy Quran has early been discussed by many scholars. For example, Ibn-Qutaybah (1973, 12) believes that the Holy Qur'an is untranslatable based on the highly expressive powers and aspects of the Arabic language, rather than other languages, while Al-

Ananzeh (2015, 39-47) maintains that the problem of translation becomes larger when it comes to the religious texts, particularly the Qur'an, because of its sanctity and high rhetorical standards.

The contrast between *letter* and *spirit* has recently turned to be an *exegetical principle* and thus a *principle of translation* in the context of translating religious texts. Therefore, in a perennial argumentation about translation, the distinction between *letter* and *spirit* is deemed crucially important here (see DeJonge and Tietz 2015). On one extreme of this argumentation is the *universalist view*, which advocates that the deep structure common to all languages enables translation to take place, i.e., reproducing the deep structure or *spirit* of the text in another language is possible; rather, producing a true translation is possible. On the other extreme, the monadist or *relativist view* can be envisaged, which posits that each language depicts the world in a distinctive manner that "universal deep structures are either fathomless to logical and psychological investigation or of an order so abstract, so generalized as to be well-nigh trivial" (Steiner 1998, 7). In other words, yielding the deep structure or spirit is impossible, and so, yielding a genuine translation is impossible.

The *relativist view*, which can be seen as a strong resistance to the *universalist one*, and which is widely adopted by the West in connection to the translation of the Bible, has been embraced on the Islamic territories. This can be ascribed to the fact that the Qur'an has a divine authorship, and so, it is inimitable by humanity, i.e., the translation of the Qur'an is impossible, and any given translation of the Qur'an amounts to nothing more than an interpretation of it. In other terms, the Qur'an is untranslatable because it is divine in both its *meaning* and its *language*, in both its *spirit* and its *letter*, and because *meaning* and *wording* are so closely interwoven (for fuller accounts on sacred Oriental/Western languages and texts, see also Sawyer 2002; Francis X. Clooney 2010; Balagangadhara 2014; Robinson 2015; Stosch 2015; Andrejč 2016; Francis X. Clooney and Stosch 2017).

In light of *the relativist view* adopted on the Islamic soil, it is quite noticeable that most of the existing English translations of the Qur'an seem to have focused on rendering the basic message to the TL, but without capturing the peculiarities and prototypical features and nuances of the Qur'anic discourse (Ali, Alsaleh, Munif and Sharifah 2012; Aldahesh 2014; Zubair and Mudassar 2015; Al-Kharabsheh 2008). To this effect, Abdelwali (2007, 157) contends that "the versatility of the Qur'anic lexemes and styles were not captured in most of the English versions of the Qur'an." When the Qur'anic expression is semantically-loaded that translation fails to do it justice; a translator may resort to more than one word in the TL for it, or alternatively, the translator may elaborate the expression in the TL by means of a paratextual device such as footnoting or glossary (for more details on the translator's paratextual action, see Ahmed 2006 and Al-Kharabsheh 2017).

The main concern of this study is the Qur'anic mental trope expressions arising from the active and passive participles' relations. Generally, the term *trope* has many definitions. According to the Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary (2001, 823), *trope* is "a word or phrase that is used in a way that is different from its usual meaning in order to create a particular mental image or effect." In this context, Al-Jurjani (1991, 58) stresses that mental trope is "the treasure of rhetoric, the material of the talented poet,

and the essence of the eloquent author." In general, mental trope has six different relations with different attributions, following its derivational formation and syntactic class. These include the *causative relationship*, the *temporal relationship*, the *spatial relationship*, the *source relationship*, the *active participle*, and the *passive participle*.

The active and passive participle relations, the main focus of this study, co-exist in certain Qur'anic verses, where an *inversion* in their assumed roles, functions, and meanings occurs. This inversion will be referred to in this paper as a *syntactic twisting*. To elaborate, the Qur'anic mental trope expressions related to the active and passive participles represent two distinct cases of *syntactic twisting* and *semantic exclusivity*. The first has to do with the active participle when it functions as, play the role, and give the meaning of the passive participle, whereas the second is the opposite case; this is when the passive participle is found to function as, play the role, and give the meaning of the active participle. In a nutshell, when the active participle is used, it contextually offers the semantics of the passive participle, whereas when the passive participle is used, it contextually offers the semantics of the active participle. Thus, these two syntactically-reversed cases are not only motivating to translators, but they are also quite challenging, especially in a sensitive sacred text, such as the Holy Qur'an.Having this caveat in mind, the ultimate goal of this study is to examine the difficulties and problems associated with translating these two peculiar cases.

2. Theoretical Background

Despite the fact that a discrete compartment in the field of Arabic-English Translation studies has long been created for Qur'an-relatedones, literature relevant to the translation of Arabic mental trope (i.e.,مجاز عقلي Majaz 'Aqli), is quit esparse. It is believed that the first who is known to have used the termMajaz (i.e. trope) is Abu Obiedah (1961) in his book مجاز القران *Majaz Al-Qur'an* (i.e. Qur'anic tropes). Wansbrough (1970) investigates the technical significance of the term Majaz, which serves as an explanatory tool in Abu Obiedah's commentary book, *Majaz Al-Qur'an*.Wansbrough concludes that the study of variant readings of scripture, grammatical analysis, and lexical paraphrase were all elements of Masoretic exegesis. He estimates that the term *Majaz* was used by Abu Obiedah for a simply connoted periphrastic exegesis, epitomizing the 'insertion of explanatory elements into elliptic phraseology.' It was much later that the term *Majaz* was used technically to exemplify metaphorical expressions and the figurative usage of language. In Wansbrough's thesis, both grammatical as well as doctrinal reasons behind the use of the *Majaz* mechanism have existed (see also Alshehab 2015).

Lakoff and Turner (1989) put forward a theoretical framework, known as the Cognitive Theory of Metaphor. It is noteworthy that when we study any cognitive theory, one realizes that such a theory should in one way or another call the mind. Sharaf Eldin (2014) tackles one type of *Majaz*, i.e. metaphor, in the Qur'an within the theoretical framework put forward by Lakoff and Turner (1989). He concludes that the linguistic and rhetorical features of the Holy Qur'an continue to challenge linguists who strive to

convey the intended meaning of the Qur'anic verses. Linguists should rely on a number of dictionaries in both Arabic and English to pin down the specific meaning of words. A linguist should also consult various commentaries of the Qur'an to obtain proper interpretation of the Qur'anic verses (for a cognitive scholarly treatment of metaphor in Arabic religious discourse, see also Zahid 2007 and Al-Kharabsheh 2011). Demir (2016) concludes that cognitive theory attached importance to context rather than to words. Similarly, context in the Qur'an is a more important and determining factor than words, thus proving the universality of the Qur'an.

Haftador, Gholam and Barzeen (2014) examine various aspects of the intellectual metaphor, i.e. مجاز العقل *Majaz 'Aqli* by drawing on examples from Al-Zamakhshari's (2001) *Al-Kashshaaf*. Haftador et al. (2014) conclude that the intellectual metaphor occupies a prominent place in Al-Kashshaaf, and it can be stated that Al-Zamakhshari has utilized intellectual metaphors as a device to serve his Mu'tazilah (معتزلة) beliefs. Usage of reason is one of the principles of the Mu'tazilah school, leading Al-Zamakhshari to turn to the concept of intellectual metaphor in explanation of many Qur'anic verses, which initially seemed contrary to reason. The innovations of Al-Zamakhshari in *Tafseer Al-Kashshaaf* include new links for intellectual metaphors such as generality, association, and effect. Al-Jurjani is considered the first to introduce a prediction-based "mental trope", i.e., المجاز العقلي in which all words are literal and the predication is only figurative. Earlier to Al-Jurjani, certain scholars, such as Sibawayh سيبويه, al-Farra'الفراء, and Al-Mubarrad المبرد gave examples on mental trope, but they never coined the label *mental trope* for them, as Al-Jurjani did. Realizing the importance of this subject, Al-Jurjani authored a book, entitled "The Secrets of Metaphor in Rhetoric" / أسرار البلاغة في علوم البيان *Asraar Al-Balaghah fi 'Ilm Al-bayan*". This book is divided into three interrelated parts, المعاني *al-ma'ani* (meaning), البيان *Al-bayan* (figures of speech) and البديع *Al-badi'* (embellishment devices).

Al-Zamakhshari (2001) discusses *mental tropes* in Qur'anic context. He uses literary elements and figurative speech to convey the meaning of the Holy verses. He also insists that *mental tropes* consist of six different types depending on the derivational form of each expression; mental tropes occurrence is context- bounded in terms of subject, object, source, time, place, and reason. Similarly, Emritte (2011) addresses the linguistic tropes, their relationships, purposes and components, and the occurrence of tropes in Arabic language and the Holy Qur`an. While Emritte devotes the third chapter of his dissertation to studying the linguistic tropes in the Holy Qur`an, and their relationships, the fourth chapter comes to shed light on the mental tropes in the Holy Qur'an.

Likewise, Kata (2015) investigates the relations of mental tropes in the Holy Qur'an and he studies the causal relationship as a model. He concludes that mental trope expressions in the Holy Qur'an have many relations that can be investigated by studying the rhetoric of the Holy Qur'an. Kata (2014) highlights that mental trope is characterized by prevailing causative relations that can be considered a

typical model for studying other dominating relations. To avoid logic and routine, Kata chooses the prevailing predicative patterns in his study, and analyzes the rhetorical and literary feature of each pattern. Mouqadeh (2004) examines the present participle in the Holy Qur'an morphologically, syntactically and semantically. The study is divided into three sections: The first touches on the present participle's concept and function; the second focuses on the morphological scales of the applied present participle; the third addresses the syntactic side of the present participle (see also Al-Heeti 2010).

Sattaam's (2012) study can be considereda serious effort to refute the phenomenon of etymological inversion in the Qur'anic expressions. In his study, Jarallah defines the etymological inversion as a kind of meaning twisting that keeps the mere implicit meaning intact as it is in the Qur'an, which reflects the clusters of meanings and precision in the Qur'an. Elhindi (2008) investigates the rhetorical position of the word's form in the Holy Qur'an. He insists that the word's form has a great role in the development of rhetorical studying. He divides his study into three chapters each one of them complements the other. The entire study focuses on the rhetorical heritage and on the modern stylistic studies that highlight the rhetorical foundation of word's form.

3. Methodology

The current study is concerned with the procedures involved in analyzing and translating Qur'anic mental trope expressions pertinent to the active and passive participle relations from Arabic into English. The study generally adopts a *close-reading-of-parallel-texts* method in order to investigate the difficulties and problems related to translating mental trope expressions of the active and passive participle relations in the Holy Qur'an. The basis of this study is a comparing of the Arabic SL (the Qur'anic text in our case) with the three selected English translations. The comparing-contrasting component is carried out by *close reading*, which practically implies not only reading carefully and scrutinizing the needed aspect(s) or feature(s), but also –crucially- to use other translations for the same text as reading tools that can further enhance the evaluation process.

The data obtained for this study consists of twelve Qur'anic verses that contain the active or passive participle structures. These Qur'anic verses have been randomly selected from eleven different Qur'anic Surahs as to highlight and exemplify on the research problem. For an evidence-based semantic-rhetoric verification of the selected examples, the study makes reference to a host of famous Qur'anic exegetes: Al-Sabouni (1981), Al-Sha'rawi (1991), Ibn Katheer (1997), Al-Tabari (2001), and Al-Shareef Al-Radi (2011).The study also draws on three authoritative translations, namely, Irving's (1992) *The Noble Qur'an*, Pickthall's (2001) *The Glorious Qur'an*, and Ali's (1992) *The Meanings of the Holy Qur'an*. In order to carry out the analysis in a symmetric manner, a special coding is followed using the Roman Numerals (I, II, III) as to stand for the three translations for Irving (1992), Pickthall (2001), and Ali (1992) consecutively. The SL Qur'anic verse containing the active/passive participle mental trope is provided first, then, it is followed by its three translations, and finally a discussion is offered.

4. Discussion

Example (1):

{ وَإِذَا قَرَأْتَ الْقُرْآنَ جَعَلْنَا بَيْنَكَ وَبَيْنَ الَّذِينَ لَا يُؤْمِنُونَ بِالْآخِرَةِ حِجَابًا مَسْتُورًا } (الاسراء:٤٥).

I. "Whenever you read the Qur'an, We place <u>a hidden curtain</u> between you and those who do not believe in the Hereafter" (Irving 1992, 286).

II. "And when thou recites the Qur'an we place between thee and those who believe not in the Hereafter <u>a hidden barrier</u>" (Pickthall 2001, 119).

III. "When thou dost recite the Qur'an, We put, between thee and those who believe not in the Hereafter, <u>a veil invisible</u>" (Ali 1992, 686).

In Example (1) above, the word مَسْتُورًا (lit. hidden) is a *passive participle* form following the morphological mould maf'oul / مفعول. However, in this specific example, this passive participle form, i.e. مستورا actually serves the function of the *active participle*. In Arabic, the active participle normally follows the morphological mould faa'il فاعل/ and obviously indicates a meaning that is totally different from that initiated by the passive participle. In other terms, the passive participle مستورا serves the function and gives the meaning of the active participle ساتر. This reversed or twisted syntactic use, i.e., to use the passive participle in the place of the active participle is purposeful, and serves semantic and rhetorical functions in this Qur'anic context.

Syntactically speaking, as shown in Example (1) above, the passive participle مستورا post-modifies the noun حجابا, and so, the expression حجابا مستورا literally means a *hidden barrier/curtain*. However, a careful examination of the context reveals that it comes out to mean حجابا ساترا, with the active participle ساتر as a post-modifier for حجابا. In other terms, the word مستورا pragmatically means a veiling or separating barrier/curtain, i.e. a barrier, a curtain, or a wall, which can veil and/or separate "you" from "those who do not believe in the Hereafter". Moreover, this noble verse had been descended with regard to a group of pagans who used to do harm to Prophet Mohammad while he used to read the Qur'an at night in a corner in Al-Ka'bah. They used to throw stones at him and stand in his way while he was trying to invite people to embrace Islam.

Semantically speaking, Al-Sha'rawi (1991, 5873) and Ibn Katheer (1997, 42) discuss this verse as follows: when you recite the Qur'an, We place between you and those who do not believe in the Hereafter a hiding barrier, i.e., حجابا ساترا, that is, one that hides you from them, so that they cannot see you. This Qur'anic verse was revealed regarding those who wanted to assassinate Prophet Mohammad. So, the purpose behind having this barrier, i.e., حجاب is something that one can hide behind, not something that is

hidden by itself. On the other hand, this 'veil' or 'barrier' stands for the arrogance and ignorance, which used to hinder disbelievers from accepting the Qur'anic facts, which put them at a dead end in their mental and rational quest for knowledge. So, they will be ignored by Prophet Mohammad visually and mentally.

From a rhetorical perspective, the use of the word مستورا to describe the obscure veil hidden between the Prophet and the disbelievers who want to harm him demonstrates the importance of this veil and the heavenly miracles in making this veil not only invisible, but also protective. This can explain why the word مستورا gives the sense of ساترا. Moreover, this word (i.e. مستورا) gives the meaning of "cover" to the veil itself and shifts the reader's focus to the veil as the main word in the verse, while the main focus should be on the one behind veil i.e. (Prophet Mohammad). The rhetorical purpose here is to signify Prophet Mohammad's greatness and glorification, i.e., Prophet Mohammad is heavenly protected. Besides, using the passive participle in the sense of the active participle has many rhetorical connotations; it offers a twisted syntactic use but with a beautiful semantic aspect for the expression; it also expands the sense of the expression.

The three translators (Irving, Pickthall, and Ali) appear to have adopted the literal translation approach in dealing with the Arabic expression "حِجَابًا مَّسْتُورا" by adhering to the meaning of the form of the SL expression, i.e., by conveying the meaning of the passive participle, rather than focusing on the mental trope expression that necessitates using the active participle instead. Therefore, neither Irving's "a hidden curtain", nor Pickthall's "a hidden barrier", nor Ali's "a veil invisible" seems to be satisfactory translation options in this respect, as the English adjectives "hidden" and "invisible" can be translated into Arabic as مستورا, not ساترا. In each of these translation options, translation loss is quite noticeable, and a careful examination of such sacred contexts is needed. It should be also pointed out that the authoritative Qur'anic exegeses may help in understanding the semantics and rhetoric of such a linguistic phenomenon.

So, consulting these exegetical references is a necessary step before embarking on the practical side of the translation process. Since the commentaries given by Al-Sha'rawi (1991, 8573) and Ibn Katheer (1997, 42) provide evidence that the word مستورا means ساترا, *a communicative-exegetic translation strategy* can be offered here. This strategy will heavily draw on both the context as well as the selected exegeses, and it will also be applied to all selected examples to be discussed in this study. According to this strategy, the following translation options for the word مستورا can be given: Whenever you read the Qur'an, We place "*a covering/concealing/protective/ shielding*" curtain between you and those who do not believe in the Hereafter.

Example (2):

{فَلْيَنظُرِ الْإِنسَانُ مِمَّ خُلِقَ ﴿٥﴾ خُلِقَ مِن مَّاءٍ دَافِقٍ ﴿٦﴾} (الطارق:٥-٦).

 I. "So let everyman notice what he has been created from (5). He was created from <u>a fluid ejected</u> (6)" (Irving 1992, 591).

 II. "So let man consider from what he is created (5). He is created <u>from a gushing fluid</u> (6)" (Pickthall 2001, 246).

 III. "Now let man but think from what he is created! (5). He is created from <u>a drop emitted</u> (6)" (Ali 1992, 632).

 A quick glance at Example (2) above shows that the Arabic word دافق (lit. ejecting, gushing, emitting) is an *active participle* that follows the morphological pattern faa'il/فاعل. However, دافق actually serves the function of the *passive participle*. In other terms, the Arabic active participle دافق gives the meaning of the Arabic passive participle مدفوق (lit. ejected, gushed, emitted). This reversed syntactic use comes out to serve certain rhetorical functions in such a Qur'anic context. Syntactically speaking, the active participle دافق post-modifies the noun ماء, and so, the expression ماء دافق literally means a *gushing fluid*, whereas, a careful examination of the context reveals that it appears to mean ماء مدفوق, with the passive participle مدفوق as a post-modifier for ماء, i.e., to pragmatically mean a *gushed fluid*. In other words, the gushing process has been attributed to water or the fluid itself, not to the one who gushed it out, or who caused it to gush out.

 Al-Sha'rawi (2008, 284), Ibn Katheer (1997, 357), and Al-Sabouni (1981, 545) plainly state that God creates us from a fluid that gushed from men with strength and speed, which then will be poured out in the female's uterus. This gushing fluid comes out from between the men's backbone and among women's womb by the divine will, not by itself. Thus, the verse خلق من ماء دافق *He is created from a drop emitted*, is the answer to the question in the previous verse فلينظر الانسان مم خلق *Now let man but think from what he is created*. The question above is intended to stimulate and incite our meditation and consideration. Al-Tabari (2001, 262) clarifies that in the Arab Peninsula, the active participle form was used as adjective, instead of using the passive participle form for this purpose. On the rhetorical level, Al-Shareef Al-Radi (2011, 353) indicates that the word دافق means *gushing*, and that there must be a wit in not using مدفوق i.e. *gushed*. He shows that such a usage is quite indicative of the fact that water also does the gushing, which explains why the word دافق, not مدفوق, is used in this context. So, the mental trope in this verse reveals the scientific miraculousness of God (i.e. Allah) represented in this gushing fluid in comparison to other kind of liquids or running water.

As far as translation is concerned, Irving (1992, 591) and Ali (1992, 1632) employ the *communicative translation strategy* to convey the meaning of the Qur'anic expression ماء دافق by providing *a fluid ejected* and *a drop emitted*, respectively, which does seem to have succeeded in capturing the intended meaning pertinent to the passive participle, i.e., مدفوق rather than the SL active participle دافق. Pickthall (2001, 264), on the other hand, utilizes the literal translation approach when he offers *agushing fluid* for ماء دافق. While Irving and Ali's translations can be considered an echo of Al-Sha'rawi (2008, 284), Ibn Katheer (1997, 357) and Al-Sabouni's (1981, 545) interpretations, Pickthall's (2001, 264) translation can be considered an echo of Al-Shareef Al-Radi's (2011, 353) interpretation, who argues that while water does not come out by itself, there must be a power that forces the fluid to gush out. This may well explain why Pickthall opted for a literal treatment for the debatable expression ماء دافق. Finally, the following is a *communicative-exegetic translation* that can be suggested for the verse above. This translation captures the passive participle meaning, not the active participle's: "So let man consider from what he is created (5) He is created from *a gushed-out fluid* (6)".

Example (3):

{جَنَّاتِ عَدْنٍ الَّتِي وَعَدَ الرَّحْمَنُ عِبَادَهُ بِالْغَيْبِ إِنَّهُ كَانَ وَعْدُهُ مَأْتِيًّا} (مريم: ٦١).

I. "The gardens of Eden which the Mercy-giving has promised His servants even though [they are still] Unseen. So far as He is concerned, His promise has already been fulfilled" (Irving 1992, 309).

II. "Gardens of Eden, which the Beneficent hath promised to His slaves in the unseen. Lo! His promise is ever sure of fulfillment" (Pickthall 2001, 127).

III. "Gardens of Eternity, those which (God) Most Gracious has promised to His servants in the Unseen: for His promise must (necessarily) come to pass" (Ali 1992, 756).

Considering Example (3) above, the word مأتيا (lit. has been fulfilled) is a *passive participle* form that follows the morphological pattern maf'oul / مفعول. However, in this specific example, this passive participle form (مأتيا) actually serves the function and gives the meaning of the *active participle* آتيا (lit. coming to pass/forthcoming), which follows the morphological pattern faa'il /فاعل. This reversal in its syntactic use is initiated for a rhetorical purpose, which is to show the Qur'anic inimitability at the linguistic level in general, and the semantic-syntactic-interface level, in particular..Syntactically, the passive participle مأتيا post-modifies the noun وعده, and so, the expression وعده مأتيا literally means *has already been fulfilled*, whereas, a closer look at the context reveals that it turns out to mean وعده آتيا, which literally means *his promise will be kept*, with the active participle آتيا as a post-modifier for وعده to pragmatically mean a promise from God to his believers, and this promise must be fulfilled in the

Hereafter. From a semantic viewpoint, the promise in the verse is جنات عدن (i.e. Aden Paradise), which God has promised to his believers: a promise has been made while the servants do not see it.

This promise has a very special characteristic: it is ever fulfilled and always arrives. In other words, the promise of Paradise to those who deserve it, shall arrive (see Al-Sha'rawi 1991, 9137; Ibn Katheer 1997, 122, and Al-Sabouni 1981, 208). However, the verse shows a different image that the promise is already fulfilled. According to the exegeses, the word مأتيا is a passive participle that actually means the active participle آتيا, since believers should work hard to get the reward for their good deeds. Thus, God's promise is sure to come. Al-Sha'rawi (1991, 9137) and Ibn Katheer (1997, 122) delineate the mental trope in this verse, and explain that the passive participle مأتيًا gives the semantics of the active participle آتيا, the intended meaning in the verse. They also stress that one rhetorical purpose behind such a syntactic twisting has to do with the glorification and magnification of God's promise, and it also shows that God's promise will no doubt be accomplished.

Based on the foregoing discussion and in reference to the three translations, it is quite noticeable that Irving's (1992, 309) translation *has already been fulfilled* does not seem to have satisfactorily touched upon the intended meaning of the mental trope expression وعده مأتيًا, as this translation choice produces nothing more than a literal rendition. On the other hand, Pickthall (2001, 127) *is ever sure of fulfillment* and Ali's (1992, 756) translations *must (necessarily) come to pass*, respectively, can be regarded as two communicative translation options that look more convenient than Irving's literal translation in the sense that they grasped the contextually intended meaning, i.e., the semantics of the active participle آتيا.

Indeed, Pickthall and Ali's verifiable translation options appear to have grasped both aspects of the verse: the promise itself, and how it comes to be fulfilled. Depending on the commentaries and adopting a *communicative- exegetic translation* approach, some other possible translations can be suggested for the verse above: Gardens of Eden, those which (God) Most Gracious has promised to His servants in the Unseen: *for His promise must be kept/ fulfilled (in the Hereafter) / His promise will surely be kept / fulfilled (in the Hereafter).* Hence, the addition of *in the Hereafter* is crucially important to the astute reader as to comprehend the wisdom and rhetoric behind the existing syntactic-semantic twisting in this example.

Example (4):

{ إِنِّي ظَنَنتُ أَنِّي مُلَاقٍ حِسَابِيَهْ ﴿٢٠﴾ فَهُوَ فِي عِيشَةٍ رَاضِيَةٍ ﴿٢١﴾ } (الحاقة:٢٠-٢١).

I. "I always thought I would face my reckoning! (20). He will be in <u>pleasant living </u>(21)" (Irving 1992, 576).

II. "Surely I knew that I should have to meet my reckoning (20), then he will be in <u>blissful state </u>(21)" (Pickthall 2001, 234).

III. "I did really understand that my Account would [One Day] reach me! (20). And he will be in <u>a life of bliss</u> (21)" (Ali 1992, 1519).

Having a look at Example (4) above reveals that the word رَاضِيَةٍ (lit. satisfied / pleased) is an *active participle* that follows the morphological mould faa'il (فاعل). Yet, in this example the present participle is conducive of the *passive participle* semantics, which follows the morphological pattern maf'oul (مفعول), i.e., the active participle راضية expresses the meaning of the passive participle form that is مرضية (lit. satisfied / pleasing/ pleasant); it is a meaning that is clearly different from the one initiated by the active participle. From a syntactic point of view, the active participle راضية post-modifies the noun عيشة (i.e. living) and so, the expression عيشة راضية pragmatically means a *pleasant life*. Indeed, an in-depth analysis of this Qur'anic context supports such a reading, as the verse فهو في عيشة راضية contextually means *he will have a pleasant life*, thereby signalling that believers will be happy and extremely satisfied in their Hereafter life (i.e. in Paradise), as a reward for their faith.

Al-Sabouni (1981, 437) succinctly puts it that believers will have a very pleasant life that satisfies its owner. So, they live forever and never die; they will be in a good health and would never get sick; and they will have a blissful life in the Paradise of the eternity. In this verse, a metaphorical attribution takes place since life is an abstract thing and cannot be described in Arabic as راضية (lit. satisfied / pleased), an adjective that is attributable to human beings only. Ibn Katheer (1997, 230) comments on this verse by saying that it is a pleasant life for its owner, and it is not a pleasant and blissed by itself. He also advocates that the passive participle form should be used instead of the active participle one, but he does not attempt to account for such a syntactic twisting.Rhetorically speaking, the use of the active participle, instead of the passive participle, indicates a glorification of the blessings that God bestowed on His believers in Paradise, which made living or the Hereafter life itself, satisfied (not only the one who owns it). In other words, by means of the active participle, living or the Hereafter life is shown to be able to describe itself as a life of bless, and it is personated here as someone who lives in Paradise, as someone who can taste and/or enjoy its pleasures and delights, and as someone who can get satisfied with it. Such a precision of description is bound to accomplish the rhetorical purposes behind this syntactic twisted use.

From a translational perspective, Irving (1992, 567), Pickthall (2001, 234), and Ali (1992, 1519) emerge to have adequately conveyed the intended meaning of the expression عيشة راضية when they offered *pleasant living, blissful state* and *a life of bliss*, respectively. In fact, these renderings, which appeal to the communicative approach, fare well with the context as well as with the commentaries provided by the selected exegetes. In other terms, the three translators have yielded good translation options that heavily draw on the semantics of the passive participle, rather than that of the active, which can be deemed to be an evident translation success. The three options described Paradise as one that is full of happiness/pleasure, which imply that its owner will also be absolutely satisfied or pleased. Based

on the discussion offered here, a more polished *communicative-exegetic translation* can also be suggested here as follows: I always thought I would face my reckoning! (20), He will be in *a pleasant and blissful llife* (21).

Example (5):

{وَقَالُوا اتَّخَذَ اللَّهُ وَلَدًا سُبْحَانَهُ بَلْ لَهُ مَا فِي السَّمَاوَاتِ وَالْأَرْضِ كُلٌّ لَهُ قَانِتُون ﴿١١٦﴾ بَدِيعُ السَّمَاوَاتِ وَالْأَرْضِ وَإِذَا قَضَى أَمْرًا فَإِنَّمَا يَقُولُ لَهُ كُنْ فَيَكُون ﴿١١٧﴾} (البقرة: ١١٦-١١٧).

 I. "They say: God has adopted a son! Glory be to Him! Rather He owns whatever is in Heaven and Earth. All things are devoted Him (116). Devisor of Heaven and Earth, whenever He decrees some affair, He merely tells it: Be! And it is (117)" (Irving 1992, 18).

 II. "And they say: Allah hath taken unto Himself a Son. Be He glorified I Nay (but whatsoever is in the heaven and the earth is His. All are subservient unto Him (116). The Originator of the heavens and the earth! When He decreeth a thing, He saith unto it only: Be and it is (117) (Pickthall 2001, 22).

 III. They say: "(Allah) hath begotten a son": Glory be to Him.-Nay, to Him belongs all that is in the heavens and on earth: everything renders worship to Him (116). To Him is due the primal origin of the heavens and the earth: When He decreeth a matter, He saith to it: "Be" and it is (117). Ali (1992, 15).

In Example (8) above, the word بديع (lit. *amazing / astonishing / marvelous*) is a *passive participle* form that follows the morphological mould fa'eel/فعيل. However, in this specific example, the passive participle form, i.e. بديع actually plays the role of the *active participle*, which follows the morphological mould مفعل mouf'il, rather than the default mould faa'il فاعل/. In other words, the passive participle بديع plays the semantic role of the active participle مبدع (lit. *the Creator*). Syntactically speaking, the passive participle بديع pre-modifies the conjoined noun السموات والأرض (lit. the heavens and the earth) to metaphorically mean that God is the only Creator of the earth and the heaven, and the only Governor for everything in between. Therefore, such a participle-related manipulation or manouvering is purposeful, and is extricably bound to serve certain rhetorical functions in such a Qur'anic text and context.

This view has been substantiated by Al-Sha'rawi (1991, 549), Al-Sabouni (1981, 92), and Ibn Katheer (1997, 277), who concur that the verse means that God is the only Possessor of all things and creatures in the world of existence. On the other hand, Al-Sabouni (1981, 92) and Ibn Katheer (1997, 277) make reference to Tafseer Al-Tabari (2001, 540) to highlight the participle-driven syntactic-semantic interface immanent in this example. Accordingly, the rhetorical purpose behind using the passive participle بديع instead of the active participle مبدع is strongly supported by the meaning of the phrase كن فيكون /kunfayakun / (lit. 'Be! 'and it is) at the end of the verse. This verse means that it is not only that God issues a verbal command with the word 'Be'; rather, the reality is that when He wills

something to exist, it exists. There will be no time between that Will and its existence, not even a moment. So, for magnifying God's will and His acts of creation, the mode of expression in this verse capitalizes on the passive participle (i.e. بديع), for objectivity purposes, rather than the active participle (i.e. مبدع), which may communicate a sense of subjectivity.

Translationally speaking, Irving (1992, 18) and Pickthall (2001, 22) translate the expression بديع السموات والأرض as *Devisor* of Heaven and Earth and *The Originator* of the heavens and the earth!, respectively. Though these communicative translation options (Devisor / The Originator) can capture the intended meaning of بديع that is مبدع, there remains a caveat in mind concerning the unavoidable translation loss represented in the use of the personal nouns, which come in close proximity to the Arabic active participle. In other words, the use of the personal nouns in the TL may give rise to the subjectivity mode of expression, unlike the case in the SL which is marked by the objectivity one. This 'translation damage' should be elaborated to the reader either in the body of the text via annotating, or alternatively, paratextually via footnoting or endnoting. On the other hand, Ali's (1992, 15) *To Him is due the primal origin of the heavens and the earth* can be considered a much better communicative translation choice, as it revolves around the pragmatic bottom-line that the heavens and the earth are God's *creation* and that God is the subject and due to his will the object can be. Yet, what sets Ali's translation apart from Irving's and Pickthall's is that Ali's translation eschews the subjectivity mode, and transcends to the objectivity one. Following the *communicative-exegetic approach*, another possible translation for the verse above can be as follows: *The astonishing creation of the heavens and the earth are His and are due to Him.*

Example (6):

{قالَ سَآوي إِلَى جَبَلٍ يَعْصِمُنِي مِنَ الْماءِ قالَ لا عاصِمَ الْيَوْمَ مِنْ أَمْرِ اللهِ إِلاَّ مَنْ رَحِمَ وَحالَ بَيْنَهُمَا الْمَوْجُ فَكانَ مِنَ الْمُغْرَقِينَ}(هود: ٤٣).

I. "He said: I'll take refuge on a mountain which will protect me from the water. He said: Nothing is safe today from God's command except for someone who has been shown mercy. A wave swept in between them so he was one of those who were drowned" (Irving 1992, 226).

II. "He said: I shall betake me to some mountain that will save me from the water (Noah) said: This day there is none that saveth from the commandment of God save him on him on whom He hath had mercy. And the wave came in between them, so he was among the drowned" (Pickthall 2001, 96).

III. "The son replied: I will betake myself to some mountain: it will save me from the water." Noah said: This day nothing can save, from the command of God, any but those on whom He hath mercy!. And the waves came between them, and the son was among those overwhelmed in the Flood" (Ali 1992, 102).

Insofar as Example (6) is involved, the word عاصم (lit. *saver/defender/protector*) is an *active participle* form following the default morphological pattern faa'il فاعل. Yet, in this example the active participle performs the semantic role of the passive participle, i.e., عاصم emerges to offer the meaning of معصوم (lit. *protected/guarded*), which follows the default morphological pattern maf'oul مفعول. The passive participle معصوم signifies a major syntactic-semantic shift from that signified by the active participle form عاصم; it is a shift from the subjective case to the objective one. Syntactically speaking, the active participle عاصم post-modifies the entire prepositional phrase من أمر الله (i.e. *God's command*) to literally mean *there isno saver today from God's command*. However, scrutinizing this particular Qur'anic text-in-context shows that the entire chunk comes to mean لا معصوم من أمر الله i.e. *no one is saved from God's command*, or *no one is safe from God's command*. According to this careful reading, believers are saved/protected from God's command for their good deeds, but they cannot be savers/ protectors themselves, as God is the Saver/Protector.

In consistency with this reading, Al-Sha'rawi (1991, 6477), Ibn Katheer (1997, 406), and Al-Sabouni (1981, 16) highlight that God Almighty will grant the faithful people, who follow His commands and pursue the straight path, a blessed life full of peace, love, and safety. It follows also that those people are protected from drowning only by God's mercy. In this context, Al-Sha'rawi (1991, 6477) elaborates on how Prophet Noah's short-sighted son thought that he could escape from God's anger when he refused to board his father's ship when the deluge swept over. He also elaborates on how his son was certain that he would take refuge to the mountains which could never be overtaken by flood-waters, and that they would shelter him. At this juncture, Noah advised his son that no power was able to save anyone from God's command, and that only hope that remained for him for being saved was to become a believer, as nothing can resist the command of the Almighty, and disbelievers will be easily destroyed. The Prophet Noah's son committed that grave mistake, and the sweep of the deluge put an end to his life.

From a translational standpoint, Irving (1992, 226) renders the word عاصم as *Nothing is safe*, Pickthall (2001, 521) as *is none that saveth*, and Ali (1992, 102) as *nothing can save, from the command of God, any*. A close appraisal of the given translations displays that the three translators have managed to avoid the literal translation approach in dealing with the word عاصم as they have yielded satisfactory translation options that give a firm inkling of the pragmatic bottom-line of this stretch, as it has just been indicated above. The given options are likely to be conducive of the unfathomable meaning, i.e., the passive participle meaning, which lurks behind the SL active participle structure. Therefore, translation loss can be said to feature at the minimalist level, as the translators offered an accurate transmission of the essential content of the text in question, and their translations undertake to serve the reader. Indeed, translators should always be sensitive to such delicate structures and their associated meanings when it comes to translating sacred documents in general, and the Holy Qur'an in particular. Following the

communicative-exegetic translation, some other possible translation options can be suggested: "This day *no one can be saved from/protected from/immunized against* the command of God".

Example (7):

﴿وَاِنَّ يُونُسَ لَمِنَ الْمُرْسَلِينَ ﴿١٣٩﴾ اِذْ اَبَقَ اِلَى الْفُلْكِ الْمَشْحُونِ ﴿١٤٠﴾ فَسَاهَمَ فَكَانَ مِنَ الْمُدْحَضِينَ ﴿١٤١﴾فَالْتَقَمَهُ الْحُوتُ وَهُوَ مُلِيمٌ ﴿١٤٢﴾ فَلَوْلَا اَنَّهُ كَانَ مِنَ الْمُسَبِّحِينَ ﴿١٤٣﴾ لَلَبِثَ فِي بَطْنِهِ اِلَى يَوْمِ يُبْعَثُونَ ﴿١٤٤﴾﴾(الصافات: ١٣٩-١٤٤).

I. "Jonah was an emissary (139). When he deserted to the laden ship gambled (140). And was one of those who lost out (141). The fish swallowed him while <u>he was still to blame</u> (142). If he had not been someone who glorified [God] (143). He would have lingered on in its belly until the day when they will be raised up again(144)" (Irving 1992, 528).

II. "And lo! Jonah verily was of those sent (to warn) (139). When he fled unto the laden ship (140). And then drew lots and was of those rejected (141). And the fish swallowed him while <u>he was blameworthy</u> (142). And had he not been one of those who glorify (Allah) (143). He would have tarried in its belly till the day when they are raised (144)" (Pickthall 2001, 183).

III. "So also was Jonah among those sent by Us (139). When he ran away [like a slave from captivity] to the ship [fully] laden (140). He [agreed to] cast lots, and he was condemned (141). Then the big Fish did swallow him, and <u>he had done acts worthy of blame</u> (142). Had it not been that he [repented and] glorified Allah (143). He would certainly have remained inside the Fish till the Day of Resurrection (144)" (Ali 1992, 225).

A customary reading of Example (9) above may well guarantee taking the *passive participle* مليم, which follows the morphological pattern fa'eel فعيل, at the surface value to mean *the one who blames* (others). The difference between the default morphological pattern maf'oul مفعول and this particular one (i.e., fa'eel /فعيل) is that the former can produce a passive participle form whether the action has taken place or not. For example, مقتول (lit. killed) which follows this pattern can be used to talk about a person who is actually killed, or a person who is not killed, but who is considered killed (in the future). However, the latter (i.e. the morphological patternfa'eel /فعيل) only produces a passive participle where the action has actually taken place. For example, the passive participle جريح (lit. wounded/cut), which follows this pattern cannot mean anything but someone who is actually wounded or cut (in the body). Thus, the morphological pattern fa'eel /فعيل is used when the truth-conditions of the structure in question are met.

In light of all that has been said so far, it can be argued that مليمhere means that Prophet Jonah must have done something for which he deserves to be blamed, i.e., the passive participle مليم serves the function and gives the meaning of the *active participl* ملام (lit. *blamable*), which follows the

morphological pattern mif'al مفعال/. To this effect, Al-Sha'rawi (1991, 12844), Ibn Katheer (1997, 34), and Al-Sabouni (1981, 44) contend that Prophet Jonah was swallowed by the whale because he did a blameful sin, when he aborted his mission and ignored the divine message. In this verse, the word مليم is used to throw more light on the sin and its actor.

Considering the translations offered to this example, it can be noticed that Irving's (1992, 582) translation does not seem to have an appealing thud, as he followed, more or less, a literal approach. In fact, Irving touches upon the intended meaning only fleetingly through the translation choice *he was still to blame*, whereas Pickthall (2001, 183) slants to a fairly communicative translation when he provides the translation option *he was blameworthy*. Yet, Ali (1992, 225) does seem to have yielded the best translation option when he opts for *he had done acts worthy of blame*. Ali's translation choice is much more consistent with the exegetical sources than Irving's and Pickthall's, as it provides the readers with a very clear portrayal of the act and the one who is blamed for doing it. Exploiting the *exegetic-communicative strategy*, two other possible translations for مليم can be suggested as follows: *while he was quite blamable / while he well deserved to be blamed*.

Example (8)

{يَقُولُونَ أَئِنَّا لَمَرْدُودُونَ فِي الْحَافِرَةِ ﴿١٠﴾ أَئِذَا كُنَّا عِظَامًا نَّخِرَةً ﴿١١﴾ قَالُوا تِلْكَ إِذًا كَرَّةٌ خَاسِرَةٌ ﴿١٢﴾} (النازعات: ١٠-١٢).

  I. "They will say: Will we be restored to our <u>original state</u> (10). Once we are crumbled bones? (11). They say: That would then be a losing proposition! There would only be a single rebuke (12)" (Irving 1992, 717).

 II. "(Now) they are saying: Shall we really be restored to <u>our first state</u> (10). Even after we are crumbled bones? (11). They say: Then that would be a vain proceeding (12)" (Pickthall 2001, 242).

III. "They say (now): What! shall we indeed be returned to <u>(our) former state</u>? (10). What! - when we shall have become rotten bones? (11). They say: "It would, in that case, be a return with loss! (12)" (Ali 1992, 308).

The Holy Qur'an employs many syntactic and linguistic features that result in an effective and supreme style. In the example above, the underlined word حافرة (lit. a digger) is an *active participle* form that follows the default morphological pattern faa'il فاعل. Indeed, the word حافرة has three basic denominations in Arabic: (1) a beginning, an original state, or a former condition, (2) grave, and (3) Hellfire. However, reverting to the Qur'anic context of this example shows that this active participle is laden with the passive participle meaning, i.e., حافرة (lit. a digger) emerges to the mean محفورة (lit. grave), which follows the morphological pattern maf'oul مفعول.

More specifically, the convoluted usage of حافرة in the sense of محفورة in this context is metonymically used as to mean *a beginning, an original state, or a former condition*, as grave stands for the decomposition of bodies and returning to the original state, i.e., soil. The slippery meaning of حافرة into that of محفورة is substantiated by Al-Sha'rawi (2008, 84), Al-Sabouni (1981, 514), and Ibn Katheer (1997, 315), who elucidate how disbelievers deny the Afterlife and the Resurrection Day by making the inquiry: أَإِنَّا لَمَرْدُودُونَ فِي الْحَافِرَةِ *shall we be returned to our original/former state* (i.e., shall we die and decompose in the grave?). This inquiry is a metonymy for their denial of returning to the original/former state, and more importantly, for resurrection.

The analysis of the relevant translations evinces that the three translators have managed to convey the intended meaning of حافرة successfully in this particular example. Indeed, Irving's (1992, 717) *original state*, Pickthall's (2001, 242) *first state*, and Ali's (1984, 308) *former state* resonate as naturalized translation options that jettison or erode a welter of servile literal interpretations of حافرة; yet, they cannot rival the SL text, which has certain peculiarities that have been irredressably lost in the given TL options, i.e., a loss represented in the unattainable linguistic homogenization at the syntactic-metonymic level. However fluent or adulatory these translations, they may not establish *the grace and marvel* of the SLT.

In other terms, though these options can be praised for relaying correctly the meaning of the original, and for reflecting a scrupulous fidelity on the part of translators, uncontrollable aberrations, and subsequently, unavoidable translation loss remain there. This is a sufficient proof of the linguistic-cultural heterogeneity between Arabic and English. Before closing up, along the *communicative- exegetic method,* another possible translation can be proposed for حافرة as follows: *They will say: to dust we will return.* Though this translation may sound more idiomatic and more culturally appealing, it still can be castigated for incurring a translation loss in terms of the *syntactic twisting* outlined in this specific example. The same commentary applies to the translations proposed for all the foregoing examples adduced here.

5. Conclusion

This study has been mainly concerned with examining the translatability of two intriguing types of mental tropes, namely, *the active participle* and *the passive participle*, with a special reference to the Holy Qur'an. Overall, the study makes the main conclusion that mental trope expressions relevant to the active and passive participle structures do not lend themselves to simple and straightforward translation, as they give rise to a great deal of translation aberrations and incommensurabilities, owing to the fact that they feature some kind of *syntactic-semantic twisting* that is meant to achieve certain rhetorical purposes. This particular *syntactic-semantic twisting* can be glimpsed in two cases. The first pertains to the passive participle mental trope expression which, in certain contexts, has been found to serve the function and give the meaning of the active participle. The second is pertinent to the active participle mental trope

expression, which in some specific contexts has been found to serve the function and give the meaning of the passive participle.

The study has shown that deviations at the syntactic, semantic, pragmatic, rhetorical, and exegetical levels are very much in evidence in the three selected translations, which may avert a translation from becoming a trusted authority. It also follows that there has been a considerable inevitable translation loss wreaked by the delicate and complex meanings of the active and passive participle relations. Indeed, the study has shown that translating these expressions cannot be conveyed correspondingly to the target language by just adhering to the form of the source text, and since the semantic message of the source text has not been always maintained to the same degree to the target one, translators should be well-practiced and highly aware of such delicacies and complexities as to reduce translation loss as much as possible. The study has also proved that *the literal translation strategy* followed by the selected translators has been responsible for producing a great deal of the translation loss discussed in this context.

On equal footing, the study shows that the available authentic exegeses of the Holy Qur'an are crucially important points of reference, not only for the essential semantic verification of the mental trope in question, but also for fathoming the scriptural meaning and rhetorical purposes behind the cases of syntactic-semantic twisting. As far as the translation strategies are concerned, the study indicates that the three selected translators oscillated between the *literalist translation approach* and *the communicative translation method*. The former does not seem to have helped the translators much in producing good translations, whereas the latter does seem to have enabled them to give context-based translations that captured the essence of the syntactic twisting and semantic exclusivity to a certain degree. The study also proposes what can be labelled the *communicative-exegetic translation strategy*. This particular strategy, which heavily draws on both the context as well as the selected exegeses, has been applied to all examples adduced here.

ترجمة المجاز العقلي المرتبط باسم الفاعل واسم المفعول:

التلاعب النحوي والتفرّد المعنوي

علاء الدين الخرابشة

قسم اللغة الإنجليزية، جامعة الكويت، الكويت

أزهار العزايزة

قسم اللغة الإنجليزية، الجامعة الهاشمية، الأردن

الملخص

تهدف هذه الورقة البحثية، ومن خلال تسليط الضوء على نوعين من أنواع المجاز العقلي المذهلة، ودراسة مدى إمكانية ترجمتهما، إلى تحفيز إجراء أبحاث الترجمة ودراساتها في مجال المجاز العقلي الذي لم يعطى حقه بعد. ولقد تناولت الدراسة هذين النوعين من المجاز العقلي ضمن إطار القرآن الكريم، واعتمدت طريقة "تمحيص النصوص المتوازية ودراستها بتعمّق" التي انطوت على اختيار نصوص (آيات) قرآنية وترجماتها المقابلة لها زيادة على توظيف مجموعة تفاسير قرآنية أصيلة شكّلت بمجملها الجوهر الذي بني عليه النقاش الدائر في هذه الورقة البحثية. وتفرز الدراسة نوعين مستقلين من أنواع "التلاعب النحوي" و"التفرّد المعنوي" المرتبطين ارتباطاً وثيقاً بالمجاز العقلي، وهما: النوع الأول، وهو عندما يقوم اسم الفاعل بدور اسم المفعول أو عندما يؤدي اسم الفاعل وظيفة اسم المفعول ويعطي دلالته، والنوع الثاني، وهوالعكس تماماً، أي عندما يقوم اسم المفعول بدور اسم الفاعل أو عندما يؤدي اسم المفعول وظيفة اسم الفاعل ويعطي دلالته، كما تبيَن الدراسة أن حالات "الخلل الترجمي" translation incommensurabilities (كون/Kuhn1962) قد تجلّت على المستوى النحوي والمعنوي والبراجماتي والبلاغي والتفسيري في الترجمات القرآنية المعتمدة المنتقاة، مما يقوَض موثوقية أي ترجمة لتكون مرجعية في هذا السياق. وختاماً، تقترح الدراسة في نهايتها "الترجمة التواصلية-التفسيرية" طريقة جديدة لترجمة المجاز العقلي القرآني.

الكلمات المفتاحية: إمكانية الترجمة، المجاز العقلي، اسم الفاعل واسم المفعول، التلاعب النحوي، التفرّد المعنوي، الترجمة التواصلية-التفسيرية.

References

Abdelwali, Mohammad. 2007. "The Loss in the Translation of the Qur'an."*Translation Journal* 11(2). Accessible from: http://translational.net/journal/40Qur'an.htm

Abu Obiedah, Mu'ammar. 1961. *Majaz Al-Qur'an*. Cairo: Maktabat Al-Khanji.

Ahmed, Mazin. 2006. "Investigating Some Semantic Problems in the Translation of the

Holy Qur'an."*Adab Al-Rafidayn* (Iraq) 43, 61-72.

Al-Ananzeh, Mohammed. 2015. "Problems Encountered in Translating Conversational Implicatures in the Holy Qur'an into English." *International Journal of EnglishLanguage & Translation Studies* 3, 39-47.

Aldahesh, Ali. 2014. "(Un)Translatability of the Qur'ān: A Theoretical Perspective."*InternationalJournal of Linguistics* 6 (6): 23-45.

Al-Heeti, Abdul Al-Naser. 2010. "Al-'Oduul 'anSeeghat Ism Al-Maf'uulwa Dalalatihifi Al-Ta'beer Al-Qur'ani" [Deviation and Semantics of the Past Participle]. *Majalat Jami'at Al-Anbaarlil-Lughaatwa Al-Adaab* 3, 282-325.

Ali, Abobaker, Alsaleh Brakhw, Munif Fikri Bin Nordin, and Sharifah ShaikIsmail. 2012. "Some Linguistic Difficulties in Translating the Holy Qur'an from Arabic into English. "*International Journal of Social Science and Humanity* 2(6): 587-591.

Ali, Yusuf. 1992. *The Holy Qur'an: Text Translation and Commentary*. Maryland, United States: Amana Publications.

Al-Jurjani, Abdul Qahir. 1991. *Asraar Al-Balaghah* [Secrets of Rhetorics].Cairo: Maktabat Al-Khanji.

Al-Kharabsheh, Aladdin and BakriAl-Azzam. 2008. "Translating the Invisible in the Qur'an." *Babel* 54 (1): 1-18.

Al-Kharabsheh, Aladdin. 2011. "Arabic Death Discourse in Translation: Euphemism and Metaphorical Conceptualization in Jordanian Obituaries." *Across Languages and Cultures* 12 (1): 19-48.

Al-Kharabsheh, Aladdin.2017. "Qur'an-related Intertextuality: Textual Potentiation in Translation." *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature*6 (6): 195-207.

Al-Sabouni, Mohammed. 1981. *Safawt Al-Tafaseer* [The Best Exegesis]. Damascus: Dar Al-Rasheed lil-Nasher.

Al-Sha'rawi, Mohammed. 1991. *Tafseer Al-Sha'rawi* [Al-Sha'rawi's Exegesis]. Cairo: Mo'assasat Al-Yawm.

Al-Shareef, Al-Radi.2011. *Talkhees Al-Bayan fi Majazat Al-Qur'an* [Evidence-basedSynopsis in Qur'anic Figures of Speech].Beirut: Dar Maktabat Al-Hayat.

Alshehab, Mohammad. 2015. "Two English Translations of Arabic Metaphors in the Holy Qura'n." *Arab World English Journal* (Special Issue on Translation) 4: 295-306.

Al-Tabari, Mohammed. 2001. *Jame' Al-Bayan* [Comprehensive Evidence-based Commentary]. Al-Jeezeh: Dar Hajar.

Al-Zamakhshari, Mahmood. 2001. *Al-Khashshaaf* [The Path-finder Commentary]. Cairo: Dar Al-Ma'rifah.

Andrejč, Gorazd. 2016. "Incommensurabilityand Interreligious Communication." In *Wittgenstein and Interreligious Disagreement: A Philosophical and Theological Perspective*, ed. by GorazdAndrejč, 97-132. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Balagangadhara, S.N. 2014. "Translation, Interpretation and Culture: On the Disingenuity of a Comparative Theology. "*Canadian Social Science*, 10(5), 39-47.

DeJonge, Michael and ChristianeTietz. 2015. "Introduction: Translating Religion." In *Translating Religion: What is Lost and Gained?*, ed. by DeJonge, Michael and Tietz, Christiane,1-12. New York and London: Routledge/Taylor and Francis Group.

Demir, Sertaç.2016. "The Qur'an through the Cognitive Metaphor Theory" *Journal of Divinity Studies* 5, 21-33.

Francis X. Clooney, S.J. 2010. *Comparative Theology: Deep Learning across Religious Borders*. London: Wiley-Blackwell.

Francis X. Clooney, S.J. and Klaus von Stosch. 2017. *How to Do Comparative Theology*. New York: Fordham University Press.

Kata, Falah. 2015. "The Real and Metaphorical Source of Mental allegory and Applied Research in the Holy Qur'an". *International Journal of Language and Linguistics*, 2(4), 196-199.

Haftador, Hassan, Haftador Gholam and Somayya Barzeen. 2014. "Examination of Intellectual Metaphor in TafsirKashshaf by Zamakhshari." *Journal of Applied Science and Agriculture* 9 (2): 674-678.

Ibn Katheer, Isma'eel. 1997. *Tafseer Al-Qur'an Al-'Azeem* [Exegesis of the Holy Qur'an]. Beirut: Dar Al-Kutub Al-'Almiyyah.

Ibn-Qutaybah, Abu Mohammed Abdullah. 1973. *Ta'weel Mushkil Al-Qur'an* [Explanation of the Problems of Qur'an]. Cairo: Dar Al-Turaath.

Irving, Thomas. 1992. *The Noble Qur'an: Arabic Text and English Translation.* Beirut, Lebanon: Dar An-Nahda Al-Arabiya.

Kata, Falah. 2015. "The Real and Metaphorical Source of Mental Allegory and Applied Research in the Holy Qur'an." *International Journal of Language and Linguistics* 2 (4): 196-200.

Kuhn, Thomas. 1962. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Second Edition. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Lakoff, George and Mark Turner. 1989. *More Than Cool Reason: A Field Guide to Poetic Metaphor.* Chicago, Illinois: The University of Chicago Press.

Mouqadeh, Sameer. 2004. *Ism Al-Fa'il fil Qur'an Al-Kareem: Dirasah Sarfiyyah Nahawiyyah Dalalliyah fi Duu' Al-Manhaj Al-Wasfi* [The Present Participle in the Holy Qur'an: A Descriptive Morpho-syntactic-semantic Study]. Master Thesis. Al-Najah National University: Nablus/Palestine.

Pickthall, Mohammed. 2001. *The Meaning of the Glorious Koran: An Explanatory Translation.* London, England: Everyman's Library.

Robinson, Douglas. 2015. *The Dao of Translation: An East-West Dialogue*. First Edition. London: Routledge/Taylor and Francis Group.

Sattaam, Qati'. 2012. "Al-Tahawwl Al-Sarfiila Ism Al-Fa'il fil Qur'an Al-Kareem Bayna Al-Tafseer Al-'Etibatiwal 'Ejaz Al-Qur'ani" [The Morphological Change for the Present Participle in the Holy Qur'an between Absurd Explanation and inimitability]. *Al-'Ameed Journal* 4 (1): 55-102.

Sawyer, John. 2002. *Sacred Languages and Sacred Texts*. London and New York: Routledge/Taylor and Francis Group.

Sharaf Eldin, Ahmad. 2014. "A Cognitive Metaphorical Analysis of Selected Verses inthe Holy Qur'an." *International Journal of English Linguistics* 4 (6): 16-21.

Steiner, George. 1998. *After Babel: Aspects of Language and Translation*. London: Oxford University Press.

Stosch, Klaus von. 2015."Does Allah Translate God? Translating Concepts between Religions." In *Translating Religion: What is Lost and Gained?*, ed. by DeJonge,

Wansbrough, John. 1970. "Majāz al-Qur'ān: Periphrastic Exegesis." *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 33 (2): 247-266.

Zahid, Abdelhamid. 2007. "A Model for Metaphor Translation: Evidence from the Holy Qur'an." *Proceedings of the First International Conference on Sacred Text Translation*, pp. 89-114. University of Cadi Ayyad, Morocco. Accessible from:https://archive.org/details/AModelForMetaphorTranslationEvidenceFromTheHolyQuran/page/n3

Zubair, Hafiz and Shamana Mudassar. 2015. "A Comparative Study of Distinguished English Translations Concerning Interpretation of Majaz in the Holy Qur'an." *The Journal of Rotterdam Islamic and Social Sciences* 6(1): 167-184.

Dictionaries

*Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary.*2001. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.