

## **The Role of Micro Interpretation and Semantic Primitives In Translational Commensurability**

**Omar Sheikh Al-Shabab**

Department of Foreign languages, College of Art  
King Faisal University, Al-Ahsa, Saudi Arabia

### **Abstract:**

The hermeneutic approach to natural language translation concentrates on large scale notions such as text (Al-Shabab 2008 and Tymoczko 2007), a level which cannot tackle the basic mechanics responsible for transporting meaning at the level of concept, word or phrase. 'Incommensurability' between rival theories has been suggested as responsible for untranslatability due to variance of 'lexical structures' (Kuhn 1962 and Feyerabend 1975).

This paper investigates the role of micro interpretation and semantic primitives in executing semantic transportation, using examples from translating the Quran into European languages and English poetry into Arabic. The results show that translational commensurability involves specific processes of micro interpretation, in addition to general interpretation and grammatical and stylistic formulation.

### **Key Words:**

Interpretation , Semantic primitives, Translatability, Commensurability, Semantic transportation

### **1. Background and related issues**

Translation has preoccupied scholars from different disciplines. Philosophy and Linguistics are two prominent candidates for explicating this phenomenon which is often referred to as interdisciplinary. In the last fifty years philosophers, e.g. Quine (1960), Heidegger (2000), and linguists, e.g. Jacobson (1992/1959), Catford (1965) and Nida (1964) have often been quoted. The nature of translation opens it to insightful and far-reaching investigations and applications, ranging from discussion of religious discourse (Tymoczko, 2007) to information technology (Hutchins and Somers, 1992). The discussion of incommensurability and conceptual schemes has provided insights into translatability, interpretation and

understanding. The present paper maintains that a linguistic hermeneutic approach to natural language translation stands to benefit from the philosophical debate.

Simple observation and empirical evidence shows that translatability is conditioned by a certain level of inadequacy and that translation produces difference since 'No two translators will ever render identical translations of the same text ...' (Tinsley and Zohn, 1977, p. 103). Hence every translation is 'compromised'. In order to explain the data which manifest and support this observation, the hermeneutic approach has been suggested as the most plausible candidate (Schmidt, 1990; Al-Shabab, 2008). For a linguistic hermeneutic theory of translation to be applicable and verifiable, it has to be based on explicit and rigorous criteria in order to make such a theory tenable. The present work is a step in this direction, attempting, as it does, to demystify 'interpretation' by providing a workable proposal which describes and explains the role of interpretation in the miniscule process of transporting 'meaning' across language.

## **2. Micro Interpretation and Related Issues**

Interpretation is often discussed and understood as assigning meaning to utterances, or to works of art (Heidegger, 2000), by reference to large-scale context of text, reader, or even existence (Heidegger, 1996) and Gadamar, 1960). Although this applies to every interpretive act, still it can be said that every interpretive act is ultimately implemented in a narrow local range embodied in a semantic-grammatical unit identified as an 'interpretive stretch' (Al-Shabab, 2008). Moreover, interpretation is 'domestic as well as foreign' (Quine, 1960; Davidson, 1984) intra and inter lingual, since every act of reading involves interpretation.

Interpretation is similar to translation in that it is studied in a number of fields belonging to different disciplines. Twentieth century philosophy, especially the philosophy of language (e.g. Davidson, 1984 and Quine, 1960), philosophy of science (e.g. Kuhn, 1962, 1982) and existential philosophy (Heidegger, 1931, 2000) have contributed to the debate about interpretation from a philosophical perspective.

In his discussion of the evolution of scientific theories, Kuhn illustrated the nature and function of scientific paradigms in the process of theory change. He argued that scientific theories do not match due to the 'incommensurability' of 'old terms' in a new paradigm (Kuhn, 1962, p. 149). The notion of incommensurability triggered extensive research, because it has far-reaching consequences for interpretation, semantics, translatability,

understanding and relativism (for a thorough review see Bird, 2005; Sankey, 1993; and Hickey, 1995). Scholars seeking to refute the incommensurability thesis had to show how 'commensurability' can be attained, and in many cases this required a position concerning interpretation (Fultner, 1995), understanding (Pearce, 1989, p. 5, 16; Sankey 1991, pp. 416-418), translatability, and relativism (Cook, 1997; Hale, 1997; Hickey, 1995).

### **2.1 Incommensurability, Incomparability and Untranslatability**

The notion of 'incommensurability' was introduced independently by Kuhn (1962) and Feyerabend (1975). In his discussion of scientific paradigms and the evolution of scientific theories, Kuhn considered the possibility and validity of comparing rival theories (Kuhn, 1962, pp. 145-159), and here the results of the comparisons are hardly comprehensive though their 'incommensurability' is emphasized. Incommensurability basically means the absence of a common unit of measurement which can apply to the two theories which are put for comparison as Kuhn explains.

- (1) We have already seen several reasons why the proponents of competing paradigms must fail to make complete contact with each other's viewpoints. Collectively these reasons have been described as the incommensurability of the pre- and postrevolutionary normal-scientific traditions, ... (Kuhn, 1962, p. 148)

It is vital to look at the reasons Kuhn gave for 'incommensurability' to be maintained. His basic ground for incommensurability is that 'Within the new paradigm, old terms, concepts, and experiments fall into new relationships one with the other. The inevitable result is what we must call, though the term is not quite right, a misunderstanding between two competing schools' (Kuhn, 1962, 149). This is best seen in the lack of matching of the 'lexical structures' of each of the theories at hand, and the fact that scientific paradigms operate on different epistemological base, methodological and esthetic commitments and prime cases or examples, all of which work together to give the terms utilized in a scientific theory accurate meaning which cannot be matched by the terms used by a rival theory (Kuhn, 1962, pp. 148-151). This point about the specific function of a given set of terms in a theory is feasible and intuitively acceptable. To say that a scientific theory has its special unique semantic domain and thus is essentially different from other theories in the same field seems, apparently, equally acceptable. The problem with incommensurability was seen in blocking 'comparability' (Falguera, 1999, 33), a position which would allow accepting rival theories on equal footing and with no possibility of evaluating which has more descriptive or explanatory adequacy (cf. Sankey,

1991, p 415). This stance has dire consequences for not only those who uphold empiricism and positivism, but also opponents of 'relativism', since incommensurability is open to relativistic interpretations to say the least. Worst for translation theorists is that incommensurability also meant that there is no translation between and among terms from different scientific theories, i.e. untranslatability. Sankey (1993) traced the development of incommensurability in Kuhn's works recognizing three stages, the first of which shows Kuhn's early position based on methodological, observational and conceptual disparity between paradigms, (Sankey, 1993, pp. 760-765). The second stage is a transitional one which restricts the notion to the semantic sphere and assimilated it within the indeterminacy of translation (Sankey, 1993, pp. 765-770), and the last is Kuhn's later position of localized translation failure between subsets of terms employed by theories (Sankey 1993, pp. 770-772).

The philosophical, semantic (linguistic) and practical implications of incommensurability attracted great deal of criticism and debate, even from Kuhn himself (Kuhn, 1982). In the early stage Kuhn was concerned with intralingual incommensurability, having in mind theories within the same language. But in the final development of his thinking he was dealing with interlingual translatability, announcing that 'the claim that two theories are incommensurable is more modest than many of its critics have supposed' (Kuhn, 1982, p. 671). The modest version is called 'local incommensurability' (Kuhn, 1982, p. 671). He gives examples from French and English concluding the presence of 'overlap' and the absence of 'perfect translation' (Kuhn, pp. 678-680). Kuhn's major task remains to provide behaviorist and semantic evidence supporting incommensurability, albeit at a detailed local 'linguistic' level. Using linguistic methodology, the present paper will argue from a different perspective attempting to examine 'commensurability' across languages.

## **2.2 Commensurability, Equivalence and Interpretation**

When used in reference to translation, both incommensurability and equivalence share being based on measurement. Equivalence implies a linguistic equilibrium. Incommensurability came later to be used in discussions and examples of interlingual translatability, interpretation and understanding (Kuhn, 1982; Davidson, 1984; Glock, 1993). Commensurability was discussed mainly as a problem across languages and keeping the semantic value of a term, while incommensurability has focused on discussions of Quine's indeterminacy and the relationship between understanding and interpretation/translation (Kuhn, 1982; Davidson, 1984;

Glock, 1993). In his discussion of local incommensurability, Kuhn (1982) finds Quine's indeterminacy theory relevant to his later stage of a modified incommensurability, which after all both have relativist tendencies. It seems reasonable to say that a position supportive of translatability cannot but accept a certain version of commensurability. The specific question which needs an answer is this: what is exactly meant by commensurability and translatability? In this connection there is no easy definition of incommensurability (Feyerabend, 1975) and no definition of *translatability*. What can safely be said is that commensurability can be manifested in cases of mental schemes (Davidson, 1984) and that translatability is attained under conditions where it is assumed that complete translation is impossible. However, in both cases the exact process of the movement from one language to another is left unexplained.

Like commensurability, equivalence as a theory of translation handles examples externally, by examining cases where equivalence is assumed to be found and the extent to which it is being maintained and how (Halverson, 1997). However, equivalence has attracted much discussion as the crucial linguistic pivot of translation (Catford, 1965). But, by dealing with translation externally, equivalence is similar to commensurability in that it leaves the actual process of translating and translational variation outside the concern of translation theory. Catford, who rightly emphasized social context and situation, places equivalence as something 'to be observed' when he writes "A textual translation equivalent, then, is any TL (Target Language) form (text or portion of text) which is observed to be the equivalent of a given ST [Source Text] form text or portion of text" (Catford, 1965, p. 27). A close study of equivalence has shown that equivalence is not always attainable, a fact which has forced its supporters to extend its domain and admit more types and looser definitions (Halverson, 1997). Catford's basic contribution is best seen in putting translation theory in situational context, a position which emphasizes the notions of "text" and "language use" in real situation. He writes:

- (2) The SL (Source Language) and TL items rarely have 'the same meaning' in the linguistic sense; but they can function in the same situation. In total translation, SL and TL texts or items are translation equivalents when they are *interchangeable in a given situation*. (Catford, 1965, P. 49)

But interchangeability in this case is restricted to one situation and one direction, because back translation will never re-produce the ST item. As posited by Catford (1965), equivalence cannot handle *difference* or *inadequacy* in translation. Nida (1964) suggested that equivalence can best

be obtained if taken as 'dynamic' with necessary modifications. Although she uses the term equivalence in the title of every chapter in her book *In Other Words* giving the term equivalence currency and momentum, Baker (1992) expresses her reservation and doubt about the usefulness of the term. She states that:

- (3) Like the division of language into discrete areas, the term **equivalence** is adopted in this book for the sake of convenience – because most translators are used to it rather than because it has any theoretical status. It is used here with the proviso that although equivalence can usually be obtained to some extent, it is influenced by a variety of linguistic and cultural factors and is therefore always relative. [Underlining by the researcher]  
(Baker, 1992, pp.5-6)

The underlined expressions (by the author) reflect the spirit in which the term equivalence is used by Baker and how it has been theoretically dismissed even when it is adopted 'for the sake of convenience'. The discussion in Baker's book is not dissimilar to contrastive analysis at different levels of linguistic analysis, e.g. word equivalence, collocation and idioms, grammatical equivalence, textual equivalence, in addition to pragmatic equivalence under two headings coherence and implicature. Although Halverson's thorough review is generally supportive of the notion of equivalence in translation, it concedes that different 'equivalence types' and the 'lack of precision in definition' have to be accepted (Halverson, 1997 and Hermans, 1999, pp. 60-63).

Tightly related to equivalence is the notion of 'norm'. Schäfner writes 'Norms function in a community as standards or models of correct or appropriate behaviour and of correct or appropriate behavioural products' (Schäfner, 1999, p. 5). But a norm is accepted only after gaining currency, and it is not concerned with showing how the process of translation itself takes place. According to Hermans, normativity is a complex notion which is tied up to equivalence. He writes 'As we know, social conventions, norms and rules are intimately tied up with values. The content of a norm is a notion of what a particular community regards as correct or proper. The directive force of a norm is there to secure and maintain these notions as values' (Hermans, 1999, p. 58).

In addition to treating translation externally and being unable to account for difference, theories of commensurability and equivalence do not concern themselves with the process of crossing language boundary in translation. Translation, however, has been shown to generate difference due to a multitude of reasons, including lack of exact correspondence between

linguistic units (Catford, 1965, pp. 32-34; Baker 1992, pp. 82-116), the 'translator's intervention' which reduces equivalence to an 'illusion' (Hermans, 1999, p. 63), cultural differences (Snell-Hornby, 1988), and hermeneutic choices made by the translator (Turk, 1990; Al-Shabab, 2006 and 2008). At best equivalence can observe translational relations, while commensurability is a pre-condition for translatability.

Interpretation as a theory of translation will not only account for textuality as well as levels of linguistic analysis, but it also stands to account for difference and crossing of language boundary in the process of translation. The Interpretive Frame suggested in Al-Shabab (2008) has the potential of explaining the elements and local process of interpretation, but it does not handle the micro level of interpretation (Al-Shabab; 2008, pp. 1-34). This micro level which is responsible for moving meaning across language will be expounded in 3 below. Interpretation at this narrowly defined level is at the heart of the translator's decision-making at the minute conceptual, creatively active, operation.

### **2.3 Interpretation and understanding**

The relevance of understanding to interpretation and translation is widely acknowledged in the philosophical debate about incommensurability (Kuhn, 1982; Sankey, 1991) and in the discussion of conceptual schemes and interpretation (Davidson, 1984; Glock, 1993; Alvarez, 1994). Davidson's proposal of a conceptual scheme as necessary for interpretation has been criticized by Glock (1993) and reviewed by Fultner (1995). Glock, however, has produced a reading of Davidson in which he claims that Davidson maintains that 'linguistic understanding is always a matter of radical translation, which means that we translate or interpret even straightforward utterances from our own language, indeed our very own utterances' (Glock, 1993, p. 200). Glock (1993) claims that both Quine and Davidson uphold the thesis of the indispensability of translation and interpretation in relation to all types of communication, and he also claims that Davidson 'treats the terms 'understanding' and 'interpreting' as interchangeable' (Glock, 2003, p. 202). Later Glock suggests that 'These assimilations distort the concepts involved. In their ordinary use, the terms, 'understanding' and 'translating' or 'interpreting' are not equivalent' (Glock, 2003, p. 203).

Alvarez (1994, p. 254, 256) shows that Glock grossly misunderstood Davidson, and that 'such a conclusion [Glock's 1993] is flawed' (Alvarez, 1994 p. 354). She remarks that 'Davidson's holistic approach to meaning, which proceeds by relating whole sentences to behaviour, entails giving up

the concept of reference as basic to a theory of meaning. Glock takes this displacement of reference to be a renunciation of meaning' (Alvarez, 1994, p 360). On the other hand Davidson has an 'awareness of the absurdity of the view that understanding one's own utterances involves a process of translation or interpretation' Glock's argument entails 'the nihilist conclusion that there is no such a thing as linguistic understanding or meaning' (Alvarez, 1994, pp.254-5).

At stake here are two issues: first, understanding is essential for a theory of translation, second, Glock's elaborate and comprehensive reading of Davison and Quine is not motivated merely by the desire to show whether understanding precedes interpretation or not, since that point was argued in his (1993) paper, and it was rebutted by Alvarrez (1994).

Glock (1993) stated that his argument 'removes one aspect of ontological relativity, namely the relativity of understanding to a background theory. It does not refute the other aspect of ontological relativity – indeterminacy of translation – and leaves intact Quine's and Davidson's approaches to genuine cases of radical translation' (Glock, 1993, p. 207) (underlining added the researcher). In fact, he left the 'aspects of ontological relativity' and the 'genuine cases of radical translation' for another day, since these topics are talked in his book *Quine and Davidson on Language, Thought and Reality* in which he concentrates on the most fundamental question of philosophy of language, linguistic relativity, and knowledge at large. Glock devotes a whole book (Glock, 2003) to undermine what he sees as relativist aspect(s) of Quine's and Davidson's philosophy of language, and thus takes away the 'skeptical' and 'nihilist' out of Quine and Davidson. It must be remembered that Davidson had developed his thesis on "assertion" ((Davidson, 1990, 1993) well before and regardless of Glock's criticism (as in Hacker, 1996, 307), and that the relativist stance does not necessarily need to be radically 'sceptical' nor 'nihilistic'. Glock's attempt to show that Quine and Davidson have made '*definite mistakes*' and that those mistakes '*have been definitely rectified*' by him (Glock, 2003, p. 232) cannot be isolated from a wider ontological debate about "positivist" and "relativist" theories. It seems to be a case of insistence on misunderstanding, i.e. misinterpreting Quine and Davidson, which Alvarez clarifies when she says 'Davidson's holistic approach to meaning, which proceeds by relating whole sentences to behaviour, entails giving up the concept of reference as basic to a theory of meaning. Glock takes this displacement to be a renunciation of meaning.' (Alvarez, 1994 p 360). Glock relished the fight which has resulted in a book that re-



introduces Quine and Davidson and their topics to twenty-first century readers.

The relevance of understanding to a hermeneutic linguistic theory has been outlined by A-Shabab (2008). In this model understanding precedes interpretation, since it is one of seven elements which contribute to interpretation in language and translation (Al-Shabab, 2008, pp. 10-13). Linguistically, it is impossible to construe a reading, i.e. deciding on the function of a language utterance, before understanding, since whether reference theory, speech acts theory or a universal theory of meaning is adopted. One cannot assign meaning at different levels of language and different linguistic units without understanding them first. Therefore, language oriented theories of meaning in philosophy stand to benefit from data obtained from natural language applications.

#### **2.4 The Interpretative Frame and Micro Interpretation**

A linguistic hermeneutic theory can handle difference as well as the process of interpretation. Linguistically, interpretation is 'reading the ST' and then 'interpreting it in a new language' (Al-Shabab, 2008), but the theoretical designates needed for the hermeneutic reading and crossing the boundary between one language and another, need to be explicitly stated and tested. Al-Shabab (2008) proposes such designates under the label of the Interpretive Frame (IF) which operates through seven elements: (1) Being, (2) Environment; including language, (3) Understanding, (4) Experience, (5) Assertion, (6) Identity, and, (7) User. This last element is the most crucial one, for which three perspectives have been recognized: (1) the writer/ text maker, (2) the interpreter, and (3) the translator. These three functional roles show operational perspectives which give three linguistic, operational products: (1) text or utterance, (2) interpretation, and (3) translation. The model elaborates on the interpretive stretch, the scope of interpretation, and the communal and individual paradigms which make the epistemological base, methodological practice and typical applications (Al-Shabab, 2008).

General interpretation deals with all aspect of interpretation except the actual operation of moving a certain semantic value or semantic features across language. This specific narrow operation is called here micro interpretation. The general, wider, interpretation deals with the context, the linguistic parameters of discourse and most importantly the interpreter's (translator's) own experience, assertion, identity, and perspective, the last is latitude of interpretation which handles proximity to the ST and the

formulation strategies. The results of the translator's interpretive activities can be studied in the 'language of translation', a specific level or an independent language with features different from both the ST and TL features (Al-Shabab, 1996). The actual narrow bifocal operation of micro interpretation is local, ideational and strenuous. It involves a creative act which endows interpretation with a certain mystique. The section below attempts to describe this (creative) local interpretative process so as to relate it to the general and wider areas of interpretation mentioned above.

### **3. Micro Interpretation as a Process of Semantic Transportation**

As said before, the basic scope of micro interpretation is the exact point of crossing from one language to another carrying along ST meaning or message. To concentrate on the narrow process of the interlingual crossing, the term 'transportation' is used in order to emphasize the operative process of language crossing in translation. Studying semantic transportation involves: 1. Content of semantic transportation, 2. The process of transportation, 3. The methods used to achieve the transportation, 4. The outcome of transportation.

#### **3.1 Content of Semantic Transportation**

To study the content of semantic transportation or what is being transported, is not enough to identify 'meaning' or even one theory of meaning such as 'reference' as being the content of the transportation. Intuitively, one feels that a given translation, even at the level of one lexical item does not offer an adequate matching, and this has brought plenty of contemplation and caused theories like 'equivalence' to be open to constant revision ending up having to accept 'loose' definitions and unsatisfactory results (Halverson, 1997) to the extent that even a direct borrowing from the SL would be accepted though it shows the lack of equivalence or a match (Halverson, 1997). Thus, what is the exact content being transported in translation? At the level of one utterance or one word, the translator, having already assigned a reading to the wider context, is faced with a ST word. The immediate concern is to identify the features of 'components' of meaning, and then to decide on the core semantic feature of the word or utterance. This core semantic feature constitutes the semantic value of the lexical item or the utterance being translated. The process of transportation, and consequently the process of commensurability, hinges on this semantic value, which must be found in the TL. The semantic core which constitutes the semantic value of the utterance being transported to the TL is called here 'Lexum'. The lexum is not a word; it is best thought of as a semantic primitive, since it is in a pre-realization stage not as tangible as a linguistic

entity. In other words, **the Lexum as a semantic primitive is an ideational semantic content best thought of as a meaning nucleus of a semantic feature.** It is not an ordinary linguistic entity in use, since it has to be harnessed with regular, non mental, material (i.e. morphological form) and it has to be used in real text, i.e. activated as a functional linguistic form.

The semantic value of the lexum has to be realized in the TL, a realization which goes through an ideational stage before a TL utterance (single word) can be reached. The semantic core which is identified in the TL is the semantic value of the lexum, but in the TL. This semantic value which results from transporting the lexum, the core semantic value of the ST utterance, is called here Exum. **The Exum is the TL counterpart of the lexum; since it is a TL pre-realization notion, best thought of as a semantic primitive.** In this sense the exum needs to be materialized in TL morphological form and needs to be put to use in an actual text. Now to simplify what has been suggested so far in connection with the content of transportation in the micro interpretive process, the following formula can be presented:

1. ST utterance is analysed and the core semantic value, a lexum, is identified.
2. TL core semantic value, an Exum, is identified and later realized in a TL morphological form to function in a text.

To put it in other words, the ST utterance is reduced to a core semantic value, a lexum, which is transported to the TL where it is ideationalized as a core semantic value, an exum, which is realized in a TL morphological form to function in a text as an utterance, i.e. a translation.

### **3.2 The Process of Semantic Transportation**

The process of transportation of the lexum as a semantic primitive to an exum, a TL semantic primitive, takes place in the mental processing of the interpreter. Hence, the importance of the interpreter stems from the fact that s/he is the human transporter of semantic primitives across languages, which means that the process of transportation, and thus the process of interpretation as a whole, is conditioned by the knowledge-base, priorities, experience and abilities, and perspective of the interpreter. Each of the two languages involved, the variety of language being translated, and the direction of translation also play a role in the transportation of lexum to an exum. Translation theories concerned with equivalence, commensurability, and indeterminacy, limit the discussion to the results of the process of

transportation of the lexum to exum, and hence they cannot account for this vital process on which interpretation and translation are based. They investigate translatability in terms of matching of words or utterance, while neglecting the process which brings about translatability and what is being translated.

### 3.3 Methods of Semantic Transportation

The methods of transporting lexum to exum are controversial and varied. This is quite natural, taking into consideration the long history and diverse nature of interpretation and translation. Three main approaches to the methods used in interpretation to achieve the process of transportation will be briefly outlined below: a) lexicon-based methods, b) rule-bound methods, and c) hermeneutic creative methods.

a) The lexicon-based method adopts a passive attitude towards interpretation by taking the bilingual dictionary as the mine from which to excavate lexical choices readily available in the form of organized lists of words and phrases which can be general or specialized, short or long, academic and professional or ad hoc and faulty. As a rule, the dictionaries are bilingual and sometimes they are multilingual. Different techniques are employed to maximize the benefits of lexicons, dictionaries and glossaries, but these tools promote an approach which is neither informative nor enlightening for the present discussion, since it refers the process of semantic transportation of lexum to exum to the dictionary makers, and thus it by-passes this crucial operation in the process of interpretation. Due to the obvious limitation represented in the absence of human processing, one finds that Machine Translation programs are among the prime users of the lexicon-based method. The interpreter is concerned with choosing among possibilities and deciding on aspects of general wider interpretation, a task that no machine can fulfill successfully.

b) The rule-bound approach to the process of transportation is very interesting because it tries to regulate the process of extracting the lexum from the ST utterance and identifying the exum in the TL utterance. This approach is characterized by a bias for philological solutions, in addition to being favored by official bodies such as language academies which generally adopt conservative policies and a prescriptive perspective (Mubarak, 1985). Two simple examples from the Arabic Academy of Damascus in Syria, and King Fahd Society for Quran Translation in Saudi Arabia, will illustrate the point. The translation, or Arabization, of the term 'computer' is based on the semantic value of 'compute' which is transported as 'Hasaba', a three partite Arabic root derived from the semantic primitive

notion of 'dealing with numbers'. From the Arabic tripartite root of 'Hasaba' the morphological form 'Haseb' is the most common translation of 'computer' in use today. Taking this type of method into account, it is not an accident that the Arabic word for 'calculator' is 'Hasebeh' which uses the same exum, i.e. TL semantic primitive, from which 'Haseb' for computer is formed with a different morphological form.

In the translation of what is referred to as the 'meanings' of the Quran, the Muslim Holy Book, one significant editorial rule is to favor borrowing the ST Arabic words, and not to interpret them or transport them into TL exums. The argument in favor of this editorial practice is that certain terms are too specific and unique (to Islam) and, therefore cannot be rendered in any language other than Arabic. Examples of Quranic borrowings are words like 'rak'a' which refers to one specific unit in performing Muslim prayer (Al-Hilali and Khan, 1993, Appendix B, pp. 931-960; see Al-Shabab, 2003b for rendering Quranic names into European languages). This argument rests on the logic of untranslatability of certain 'terms' from divine texts, a position which Bacon used in the eleventh century to advocate the impossibility of the translation of the Bible? This kind of borrowing illustrates an old practice called 'translation by default' by Al-Shahab (2001, pp. 10-11). The rule of 'no interpretation', or translation by default, of certain terms is found and practiced occasionally by foreigners to refer to the culture of the SL, as in the case of using the Arabic word 'jihad/mujahidun' in reference to Islamic resistance and militants fighting against the Soviets in the 1980s of the twentieth century.

c) The hermeneutic approach to the process of transportation places the process of transportation totally within the domain of the individual interpreter, the first translator or the pre-dictionary translator. The interpreter's motivation for genuinely engaging in the process of semantic transportation is varied and complex, since the translator may wish to offer a new interpretation of an utterance which has been translated and accepted. The utterance and the text might have not been translated before. Anyway, this approach is particularly interesting for the study of interpretation and translatability (cf. Benjamin, 1992), since from the outset the translator sets to provide a new, different translation, either because the previous translation is considered to be inadequate or because the ST is completely new (see section 4 below for example).

### 3.4 The Product of Semantic Transportation

The outcome of the process of semantic transportation is of course a given translation. The TT (Translated Text) is the definitive achievement of the translator, an achievement which cannot be ignored in the study of translation. Although much has been written about general interpretation, the exact mechanics of transporting meaning across language through interpretation have not been incorporated within a hermeneutic theory of translation. The outcome of the process of transportation is a finished product, i.e. translation, which is supposed to function as an independent text or part of a text in a certain environment. The linguistic outcome of translation has been hypothesized as a specific language, the language of translation, which is different from the SL text and the TL comparable texts. The major feature of any translation is that it reflects the interpreter's own choices and identity and consequently it is bound to produce difference at many levels.

The process of semantic transportation explained above has four theoretical implications for interpretation and translation.

1) The process of micro-interpretation, even its conceptual manifestations, can be handled as observable behaviour, and hence it is not a transcendental operation which verges on the mystical. Rather it can be creative, intricate, and detailed, but not necessarily inaccessible to observation and methodological verification and influences.

2) The process of semantic transportation is not carried out by reference to a third language. The transportation process per se does not employ another language mental (in the mind) or physical (mathematical or otherwise) through which the movement across language takes place. Translation can take place without going through an intermediate language, and thus there is no need for assuming the existence of a 'pure language' (Benjamin, 1992), a 'universal language' or even language universal (Greenberg, 1966). A theory of translation can achieve descriptive and explanatory adequacy without reference to a theological or a conceptual language.

The language of translation suggested in Al-Shabab (1996) is not a pre-translation language which exists in its own right and to which translators resort, or via which they perform the process of semantic transportation. The language of translation is a posteriori designated a theoretical status as being different from SL translational corpora and from comparable TL texts. The language of translation is basically a post-translation language based on observationally described linguistic features and conventions and paralinguistic topics, practices, and cultural manifestations. Hence the

independence of the language of translation is established by virtue of a system of features and practices and post-translational translation specific features and practices adopted by translators who work in a certain area and who are translating between two specific natural languages and not any third language outside the SL, TL.

3) Methodologically, the translator is a decision maker as well as a creator of texts and meaning. The translator decides on an orientation, on specific latitude, and on strategies of formulating and writing up the TT. His/her identity and experience are paramount. Through his choices, preferences and approximations, he arrives at the realization he is satisfied with. In addition, the purpose and strategy employed in translation are those which are defined and adopted by the translator's own decision-making and undeclared practices.

4) It is a known fact that the TT is open to editing and change. Some translators may produce a different translation of the same text on a second attempt or in the process of editing. The various translations of the same text by the same translator or by subsequent translators who have already studied previous translations of the text they are going to translate, give translation scholars a chance to explore the grounds on which translators establish their new interpretations. The processes involved can hardly be found in data better than the data obtained from revised translations or repeated translations of the same ST. Moreover, the evolution of translational norms, translational standards and a culture specific to translation are few areas which accumulate thank to the continuous involvement of translators with the same corpus or body of translational data (Al-Shabab 2003). These areas constitute the best ground for exploring the inherent properties of *difference* and *inadequacy* in all translations. No theory based on equivalence can account for difference, inadequacy, or the transportation of meaning evident in natural language translation.

5) The methods of semantic transportation reveal that the translator's elaborate decision making and choices show conscious management of mental processing based on understanding. Thus understanding the concepts and relations in the ST takes place before interpreting ST utterances, in the sense that to interpret what is not understood, as Glock suggests in his reading of Quine and Davidson, is anti intuitive and not born by direct observation of translator's behavior, since even misunderstanding is no more than a type of mistaken understanding. The examples of translational data will be studied in the following section.

#### 4. Applications

In this section three examples of micro and macro interpretation are discussed. They are: (1) examples of rule-bound approach which favours philological and morphological solutions, (2) two examples of creative poetic translation, (3) an example of translating a religious text.

##### 4.1 Examples of the Rule-Bound Approach

An example of the rule-bound approach has already been discussed above in relation to translating the word 'computer'. Another quite interesting example is the word 'hātef' (هاتف), a translation of 'telephone', because the Arabic root 'hatafa' (هاتف) originally means to 'send a voice message through the air to someone who is far'; or 'hearing voices from mysterious unseen sources'. A multitude of problems is usually associated with the search for philological roots and morphological forms, and only few examples can be examined here. The English word 'destabilize' is usually rendered in two Arabic words 'za'za', 'istiqrar' (shake the stability). Thus the root 'istaqara' is a rendering of 'stabilize' and the suffix 'de' is rendered in another word. The English verb 'dramatize' is rendered through a paraphrase in the form of 'put on the stage, using 'masraH' (stage) and 'wadh'a' (put), giving 'wadh'a 'alā almasraH' (to put on stage). Moving to yet another suffix 'in' in the word 'inhumane', one finds the notion, or lexum, of negation transported to a negative exum in a separate word 'ghayr', and 'human' is transported via an adjective of the exum of 'insān' (human) to give the Arabic 'ghayr insāni'. A final example will clarify the nature of this method. The English verb 'establish' can be rendered in Arabic from the root 'asasa', while 'establishment' is rendered as a noun from the root 'asasa' to give 'mu'asasa'. But the English 'establishmentarian' cannot be rendered by using one word, and 'establishmentarianism' would require three words in Arabic. The morphological systems of the TL and the SL (Abdelrahman 1981) play an important role in the mount of notional entities as semantic primitives (Zoure, 2003) needed for reaching the words or terms of the TL.

But all the above affixes are derivational, leaving inflectional affixes and their grammatical functions (grammatical meaning) with their complex implications for translation outside the current discussion. Usually Comparative Linguistic provides information which can be used in identifying areas of similarities and differences between two languages; but no amount of comparison will help explain semantic transportation or general hermeneutic strategies employed in natural language translation.



## 4.2 Poetry Translation

Translating poetry is both desired and problematic, since many object to it and others put conditions on this practice (Tytler, 1791, p. 7, 79). This, however, has not stopped some from attempting to translate poetry and some examples are aesthetically satisfactory (see the discussion of translating Kubla Khan below) or 'devastating' (Sengupta, 1990, p. 63). Two examples from Dickenson and Coleridge will be examined. Dickenson starts one of her poems with the following lines:

(4) I dwell in Possibility—

A fairer House than Prose—

Dickenson's 'I dwell in possibilities' stirs debate at the general hermeneutic level, as three Arabic translations show that the word 'Possibilities' is rendered in three different ways. The meaning of this word hinges on its relation to the word 'Prose' in the second line. In all three translations ( Appendix A), the word 'Prose' is rendered as 'النثر', which is a kind of writing which is not rhythmic and less passionate, more mundane, and less aesthetic than poetry. Yet, in spite of the translation of 'Prose' using the same Arabic word, one finds that the word 'Possibilities' is rendered in three different ways in three translations at hand: 'almuhtamal' (the probable), 'الإمكان' (the potential), and 'الشعر' (poetry). The first two translations do not relate the word 'possibilities' to the poet's life, nor to the word 'Prose' in the second line. The third translation puts the word 'Possibilities' in opposition to 'Prose'; the poet is then saying that she does not live in the domain of 'Prose' (the capital letter is used to establish a domain), but in the creative world of 'poetry' (الشعر).

At the level of grammatical structure, the first translation uses a nominal sentence in the first line, which makes the existential 'I' ('an'ā) prominent, while the other two translations adopt a more standard word order in Arabic; a verb in which a subject is embedded and a complement where location is indicated. The process of semantic transportation is clearly focused on the search for a semantic primitive which embodies the lexical notion of 'Possibilities'. The first translation takes 'possible' to be 'probable' (المحتمل), while the second sees 'possible' as 'potential' (al'imkān) i.e. what is potentially possible. The third translation gives an elaborate reading of the ST and looks in the direction of opposition to 'Prose' which would the case of Dickenson be 'poetry' (alshi'r).

In the second example of poetry translation, two translations of four lines from Coleridge's 'Kubla Khan' are examined (see Appendix A). The simple emphatic statement in the first two lines (in Xanadu did Kubla Khan / A stately pleasure-dome decree) and the simple explanatory statement in the last two lines (For he on honey-dew hath fed, / And drunk the milk of Paradise), do not provoke much discussion at the general hermeneutic level, because the interpretive stretch, which is the base for interpretation at this level, is not included in them. But the grammatical and stylistic level and the semantic transportation level are quite interesting.

In the first two lines the grammatical structure would be most un-poetic had Coleridge used (2) instead of (1), as in the following.

(5) 1-In Xanadu did Kubla Khan

A stately pleasure-dome decree

2- Kubla Khan decreed

A stately pleasure-dome in Xanadu

The first Arabic translation in Appendix A does something similar to Coleridge's manipulations in terms of grammar and style.

(5a) في كساندو قبلا خان

: نافذاً المرسوم أصدر

[ fi xsanadū qublā khan

nāfītha almarsūmi 'aSdar ]

The Arabic verb ' 'aSdar ' (أَصْدَرَ) is kept to the end of the sentence, contrary to the general expectation in standard grammar of Arabic which requires that it is used before the subject, as it is the case in the second translation. In (5a) above, the emphasis is also lexically signaled by the use of 'nāfītha' which means something which will be definitely executed, to describe 'marsūm' (decree). The first translation is not only grammatically focused, but it also produces a rhythmic ordering of sounds, making the first and second lines end with a definitive stop. The translator here is a poet in Arabic, while the two translators who produced the second translation are not (see Al-Shabab, forthcoming, for more examples of poetic translation into Arabic).

At the level of semantic transportation, the second translation did not bother with deliberation on possibilities and their implications; the translators of the second translation did not claim that they are producing a poetic translation anyway, and their rendering is no more than a straightforward narration of the statements of the ST. The first translation is elaborate in lexical choices, and some words must have been produced after deliberate search and scrutiny. This, however, does not imply that the result is always laudable, since the TT should not be semantically divorced from the ST, and not an appropriation of the ST (Copeland 1991). Examination of the last two lines illustrates this point.

(5b) fahwa lam yuT·am siwā shahdi lmunaddā walmu·anbar  
he not fed except honey dewed and perfumed

(5c) wasuqāhu laysa 'illā labana lfirdawsi kawthar.  
And his drink no other than milk of Paradise Kawther [a river in Paradise]

It is clear that the poet/translator has shifted to the mode of Arabic culture and hence 'honey-dew' becomes 'عَنْبِر' (perfumed) (5b), and the 'milk of Paradise' becomes (كَوْثَر) 'Kawther' (5c), a word which is taken from the Quran denoting a river in Paradise (see the translation of this word into European language in the coming example). The semantic transportation has dislocated Coleridge's artistic creation, producing an effective translation which heavily encodes the Arabic, even Islamic, identity of the translator (Al-Shabab, 2006). This translation, however, exemplifies one possible approach to literary translation.

#### **4.3 Translation of the Quran into European Languages**

The translation of religious texts has preoccupied translators and translation theorists (Worth 1992). An example of the translation of the Quran, the Muslim Holy Book, raises questions related to 'belief' and 'faith' and long tradition of exegesis. The translation of a short Sura (Chapter) from the Quran into Latin, French, English, German, Italian and Spanish is briefly discussed below. The examples below represent the languages under consideration and more examples are found in Appendix B.

(6) إِنَّا أَعْطَيْنَاكَ الْكَوْثَرَ (١) فَصَلِّ لِرَبِّكَ وَانْحَرْ (٢) إِنَّ شَانِئَكَ هُوَ الْأَبْتَرُ (٣) .  
(سورة الكوثر ، عن نسخة صخر الإلكترونية للقرآن الكريم)

a) Arabic transliteration of Sura 108 based on Sakhr computerized version of the Quran

1. Innā aṭ-Taynāka alkawthar
2. faSalī lirabika wanHar
3. inna shani'aka huwa al'abtar.

b) Marracci's Latin translation: 1698, p. 826

1. Nos certè dedimus tibi Kauther.
2. Ora ergo ad Dominum tuum, jugula.
3. Porrò odio habens te, ipse erit excisus.

c) Du Ryer's French translation: 1647, p. 645

1. Nous t'auons donné une grande affluence de nos graces.
2. Prie ton Seigneur, elleve tes mains,
3. celui qui te haïra sera mal-heureux.

d) Sale's English translation: 1734 p. 593

1. Verily we have given thee Al Cawthar.
2. Wherefore pray unto thy Lord; and slay *the victims*.
3. Verily he who hateth thee shall be childless.

e) Rückert's German translation: 1888, p. 425

1. Wir haben dir veriehn den Kauther;
2. Bring deinem Herrn Gebet und Opfer!
3. Ja, wer dich haßt, der ist ein Abgestumpfter

f) Bonelli's Italian translation: 1991, 604

1. In verità, noi abbiamo dato a te il Kawthar.
2. Prega perciò il tuo Signore e immola a lui delle vittime.
3. In verità, chi ti odia sarà private di ogni bene.

g) Puebla's Spanish translation: 1872, p.645

1. Kauther es el nombre de un rio ó de un estanque del paraiso.
2. La palabra del texto significa: un animal que tiene cortada la cola ó un hombre que no deja despues de él ni hijos, ni aun la memoria de su nombre.

The general hermeneutic level has generated a debate about two main points. Quran exegetes have explained 'الكوثر' (alkawthar), the last word in the first verse, as 'a river in Paradise' (Al-Baidawi, 1960, p. 812; Abi Al-Su'oud, 1990, Vol. 9: pp. 205-206; Al-Zamakhshari, 1987, pp. 806-807). The translators were aware of this tradition (e.g. Sale, 1979/1734, p. 593; Paret, 1979, pp. 526-527; Blachère, 1957, p. 668) a fact which has prompted many to opt for translating the word by default, which is no translation but a direct borrowing of the ST word (underlined). Some translators did not adopt this meaning and have read the ST through the Arabic root 'kathura' (to multiply) and transported the meaning around the notion of 'growing and becoming more'. In Appendix B the first Latin translation uses an explanation 'fontem in paradiso' (a fountain in Paradise), a translation echoed in Ali's translation 'Fount (of Abundance); the first French translation uses '\_affluence de nos graces', echoed in Ross's 'affluence of our graces'; a number of translations also use the lexical item 'Abundance'. Of course, some translators may have been influenced by previous translations, and thus the process of semantic transportation may have been by-passed in favour of an easier short-cut to the available words borrowed not from the ST but from previous translation.

The second point of tension for general interpretation is the word 'الأبتر' (al'abtar) (6a3), the last word in the last verse in the Arabic text (underlined in 6 above). Quran commentators cite an incident in which someone taunted the Prophet Muhammad for not having a male child after the death of his son, and then they take this word to be a reference to the 'one who will be childless'. Most of the translations under study mention the story and semantic transportation seems to be guided by the overall concern with that particular incident. Still, as the above examples and the examples in Appendix B show, a wide room for variation does exist.

One interesting case of semantic transportation is seen in verse number two, where the Arabic expression 'wanHar' meaning 'and kill an animal as sacrifice' is rendered into 'slay the victim' (Sale, 1979/1734), 'jugula' (Marracci, 1698), 'elleve tes mains' (Du Ryer, 1647), 'immole des victims' (Savary, 1783), 'enseigne ses lois' (Zaida 1861), 'sacrifie' (Blachère 1957), 'immole' (Kechrid, 1984), 'sacrifie' (King Fah Quran Printing Complex, 1990), 'sacrifice' (Arberry, 1955), 'slaughter' (Shirazi, 2005), 'Opfer' (Rückert, 1888), 'opfere' (Paret, 1979), 'immola a lui delle vittime' (Bonelli, 1987), 'sacrifica' (Vernet, 1993). The complete translation in Appendix B shows that the translator has a number of options open to him/her, and that

some translators engage in the process of semantic transportation from point zero assuming that previous translations are inadequate and unsatisfactory. General interpretation and micro interpretation are two distinctive levels: the general level depends basically on the translator's knowledge, identity assertions and choice of latitude (Al-Shabab, 2008, pp. 105-107). Hence, latitude and style remain within the translator's perspective and prerogative. Micro interpretation is primarily concerned with the process of semantic transportation, which is the conceptual processing of meaning to obtain a Lexum, and transporting that into an Exum, which is the basis for the TL lexical search. The search in the process of semantic transportation has to be guided by the Interpretive referred to in (2.1) above.

### **5. Concluding Remarks**

The findings of the present discussion can be summed up in the following points.

1. Semantic transportation does not arise in cases in which the translator adheres to conventional practices, depending solely or mainly on the bilingual lexicon mental or physical.
2. Semantic transportation is guided and controlled by general, Macro, hermeneutic considerations.
3. On its own, the general hermeneutic engagement with the TL would not explain translation at the narrow level of semantic transportation.
4. New renderings in translation are motivated by new texts, utterances, words, which have not been translated before, or by the translator's dissatisfaction with previous translations. They necessarily generate *difference*.
5. Grammatical considerations are binding after a specific choice in the process of Semantic transportation has been made. Grammar takes control after the lexical choice and not before it.
6. Considerations of style and language functions operate on a level which comes into play almost at the same level of general hermeneutic reading and rendering.
7. Style and macro-functions of language in translation are characterized by a tenuous relationship with grammar. But they supersede lexical choices in the process of semantic transportation.

8. Translatability is based on a specific understanding of a particular linguistic realization. It involves general interpretation, micro interpretation, grammatical formulation and stylistic choices.
9. General interpretation and micro interpretation are inherent in language processing, and hence they are operational in every case of translation. They produce difference in translation and explain it. A linguistic hermeneutic theory of translation explains *difference*, permits translational commensurability, harbours *inadequacy*, and generates translational assertions which pave the way for evolutionary relativity of translation practice and culture.

Translatability is based on the translator's approximations, a make-do work which facilitates a certain type of communication between two parties who do not share a natural language. With the lapse of time the TT gains currency and power. But although the ideas and usage introduced by translation become familiar, their humble origin and relative status should not be forgotten. It is true that it is impossible to undo a translation after it has established itself in the TL and TL culture; still it is enlightening to have insights into the hermeneutic processes which enable humans to translate and to pin down the relative status of a given translation.

---



---

**References :**

1. Abdelrahman, W. H., 1981. The Role of Derivation in the Process of Neologisation in Modern Arabic. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, (SOAS) London University, UK.
2. Abi Al-Su'oud, M. B. I., 1990. Tafsiir Abi Al-Su 'oud (The interpretation [of the Quran] by Al-Su 'oud). Dar Ihya' Al-Turath Al-Arabi, Beirut
3. Al-Baidawi, N. A. A., 1960. 'Anwaar 'altanzii/ wa 'asraar 'alta 'wii (The Lights of the Descended Book [The Quran] and the Secrets of Interpretation). AI Othmaniya Press, Istanbul.
4. Al-Hilali, M. and Khan, M., 1993. The Noble Qur'an in the English Language. Maktaba Darussalam, Riyadh.
5. Al-Shabab, O. S., 2008. From Necessity to Infinity: Interpretation in Language and Translation. Janus, London.
6. Al-Shabab, O. S., 2006. The Arab Ulysses: The Translator's Identity and Experience. Techreen University Journal for Studies and Scientific Research 29 (1), pp. 187-205.
7. Al-Shabab, O. S., Forthcoming. The Interpretive Stretch: Creativity and Tension in Poetic Translation. Research Journal of Aleppo University. 59, pp. ??-??.
8. Al-Shabab, O. S., 2003. The Evolution of Translation Culture: Translating the Holy Quran into French. Journal of King Saud University, Languages & Translation 15, 21-48.
9. Al-Shabab, O. S. 2003. Translating Quranic Names into European Languages. In: Al-Shabab, O. S. and Al-Naser, S. Episodes in Interpretation the Language of Translation: Difference and Inadequacy in Translation. Dar Al-Hasad, Damascus, pp. 119-189 [in Arabic].
10. Al-Shabab, O. S. 2001. The Place of Marracci's Latin Translation of The Holy Quran: A Linguistic Approach. Journal King Saud University, Languages and Translation 13, pp. 57-74.
11. Al-Shabab, O. S. 1996. Interpretation and the Language of Translation: Creativity and Convention in Translation. Janus, London.
12. Alvarez, M. 1994. Radical Interpretation and Semantic Nihilism: Reply to Glock. The Philosophical Quarterly. 44 (176), pp. 354-360.
13. Al-Zamakhshari, M. b. O. 1987. Al-Kashaaf (The Illuminator). Dar Al-kitab Al-Arabi, Beirut.
14. Arberry, A. 1996/1955. The Koran Interpreted. Touchstone, New York,
15. Baker, M. 1992. In Other Words: A coursebook on Translation. Routledge, London and New York.



16. Benjamin, W. 1992/1934. The Task of the Translator. In: Schulte, R. and Biguenet, John (Eds), *Theories of Translation: An Anthology of Essays from Dryden to Derrida*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago and London, pp. 71-82.
17. Bird, A. (2005). Thomas Kuhn. In: Zalta, E. (Ed.), *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Retrieved on 15. July 2008 from: [plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2005/entries/thomas-kuhn](http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2005/entries/thomas-kuhn)).
18. Blachère, R. 1957. *Le Coran: (al-Qor'an)*. G. P. Maisonneuve & Larose, Paris.
19. Bomelli, Dott L. 1987. *Il Corano*. Milano, Editore Ulrico Hoepli.
20. Catford, J. C. 1965. *A Linguistic Theory of Translation: An Essay in Applied Linguistics*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
21. Coleridge, S. T. 1968. *Kubla Khan*. In: Hunter, J. P. *The Norton Introduction to Poetry*. W. W. Norton & Company, New York, pp. 352-353.
22. Cook, John R. 1997. *The Relation Between World and Language in the Philosophy of Donald Davidson: The Critique of Conceptual Relativism*. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Memorial University of Newfoundland, Canada.
23. Copeland, R. 1991. *Rhetoric, Hermeneutics, and Translation in the Middle Ages*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge and New York.
24. Davidson, R. 1984. On the very idea of a Conceptual Scheme. In: Davidson, R. *Inquiries into Truth and Interpretation*. Clarendon Press, Oxford, pp. 183-198.
25. Davidson, R. (1990). The Structure and Content of Truth. *Journal of Philosophy*. 87, pp. 279-328.
26. Davidson, R. 1993. Truth and Meaning. In: Moor A. W. (Ed.): *Meaning and Reference*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 92-110.
27. Dickinson, E. 1993. *Selected Poems of Emily Dickinson*. Tom Doherty Association, New York.
28. Du Ryer, S. 1647. *L 'Alcoran de Mahomet*. Antoine de Sammauille, Paris.
29. Falguera, J. L. 1999. Ontosemantic Divergence and Comparability of Theories. *Logica Trianguli*, 3, pp. 33-53.
30. Feyerabend, P. 1975. *Against Method*. Verso, New York.
31. King Fahd Society for Translating the Holy Quran. 1990. *The Holy Qur-an: English Translation of the Meanings and Commentary*. King Fahd Holy Quran Printing Complex, AI-Madinah AI-Munawwarah..
32. King Fahd Society for Translating the Holy Quran. 1990. *Le Saint Coran: et la Traduction en Langue Franryaisedu Sens de ses Versets*. King Fahd Quran Printing Complex, AI-Madinah AI-Munawwarah.

33. Fultner, B. 1995. Radical Interpretation or Communicative Action: Holism in Davidson and Habermas. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Northwestern University, USA.
34. Gadamer, H. G. 2003/1960. Truth and Method. Continuum, New York.
35. Glock, H. J. 2003. Quine and Davidson on Language, Thought and Reality. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
36. Glock, H. J. 1993. The Indispensability of Translation in Quine and Davidson. *The Philosophical Quarterly* 45 (171), pp. 194-209.
37. Greenberg, J. H. (ed.) 1966. Universals of Language. MIT Press, Cambridge Mass.
38. Hacker, P. M. S. 1996. On Davidson's Idea of a Conceptual Scheme. *The Philosophical Quarterly* 46 (184), pp. 289-307.
39. Halle, S. D., 1997. A Constant Relativism. *Mind, New Series*, 106 (421) pp. 33-57.
40. Halverson, S. 1997. The Concept of Equivalence in Translation Studies. *Target* 1-2, pp. 207-233.
41. Hamza, C. B. 1989. Le Coran. ENAG/ Alger.
42. Hermans, T. 1999. Translation and Normativity. In: Schäfner, C. (Ed.), *Translation and Norms*. Multilingual Matters Ltd., Clevedon, pp. 50-71.
43. Hermans, T. 1999. Some Concluding Comments on the Debates and the Responses. In: Schäfner, C. (Ed.). *Translation and Norms*. Multilingual Matters Ltd., Clevedon, pp. 133-140.
44. Heidegger, M. (John Stambaugh, translator), 1996. *Time and Being: A Translation of Sein and Zeit*. State of New York University, New York.
45. Heidegger, M. (Keith Hoeller translator), 2000. *Elucidation of Hölderlin's Poetry*. Humanity Books, Amherst and New York.
46. Hickey, Thomas 1995/2005. *History of Twentieth Century Philosophy of Science*. T. J. Hickey, USA.
47. Hutchins, J. H. and Harold L. S. 1992. *An Introduction to Machine Translation*. Academic Press, London and New York.
48. Jacobson, R. 1992/originally 1959. On Linguistic Aspects of Translation. In: Schulte, R. and Biguenet, J. (Eds.), *Theories of Translation: An Anthology of Essays from Dryden to Derrida*. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago and London, pp. 144-151.
49. Kechrid, S. E. 1979/1984. *al-Qur 'an al-Karim*. Dar El-Gharb El-Islami, Beyrouth.
50. Kuhn, T. 1982. Commensurability, Comparability, Communicability. *PSA: Proceeding of the Biennial Meeting of the Philosophy of Science Association*, 2, PP. 669-688.

51. Kuhn, T. 1962. *The Structure of Scientific Evolutions*. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
52. Irving, T. B. 1992. *The Noble Qur'an: Arabic Text and English Translation*. VT: Amana Books Brattleboro.
53. Marracci, L. 1698. *Refutatio Alcorani: 2 Volumes*. Typographia Seminarii, Patavii.
54. Mubarak, M. 1985. *Higher Education and Academic Research*. Dar Al-Nafais, Damascus, Syria.
55. Nida, E. A. 1964. *Towards a Science of Translating: With Special Reference to Principles and Procedures Involved in Bible Translating*. Brill, Leiden.
56. Paret, R. 1979. *Der Koran*. W. Kohlhammar Druckerei, Stuttgart.
57. Paret, R. 1980. *Der Koran: Kommentar und Konkordanz*. W. Kohlhammar Druckerei, Stuttgart.
58. Pearce, D. 1989. Translation, Reduction and Commensurability: A Note on Schroeder-Heister and Schaefer. *Philosophy of Science* 56 (1), pp. 158-164.
59. Quine, W. V. O. 1960. *Word and Object*. The M.I. T. Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
60. Retenensis, R. and Dalmati, H. 1543/1143. *Machumetis Sarracenorum Principis Vita ac Doctrina Omnis, Quae... Alcoranum Dicitur, ex Arabica Lingua ante cccc Annos in Latinam Translata...*, 3 Volumes. Translated, published, Basle.
61. Ross, A. 1649. *The Alcoran of Mahomet, Translated out of Arabique into French, by the Sieur Du Ryer... And Newly Englished, for the Satisfaction of all that Desire to Look into Turkish Vanities*. London.
62. Rückert, F. 1888. *Der Koran*. Mann, Frankfurt.
63. Sale, G. 1979/1734. *The Koran: Translated into English from The Original Arabic*. Frederick Warne, London.
64. Sankey, H. 1991. Incommensurability, Translation and Understanding. *The Philosophical Quarterly* 41 (165), pp. 414-426.
65. Sankey, H. 1993. Khun's Changing Concept of Incommensurability. *The British Journal for Philosophy of Science* 44(4), pp. 759-774.
66. Savary, M. 1783. *Le Coran*. 2 Volumes. Knapen and Fils, Paris.
67. Schäfner, C. (Ed.), 1999. The Concept of Norms in Translation Studies. In: Schäfner, C. (Ed.), *Translation and Norms*. Multilingual Matters Ltd., Clevedon, pp. 1-8.
68. Schmidt, D. J. 1990. *Hermeneutics and the Poetics Motion: Translation Perspectives V..* State University of New York at Binghamton, Binghamton, USA.

69. Sengupta, M. 1990. Translating, Colonialism and Poetics: Rabindranath Tagor in Two Worlds. In: Bassnett, S. and Lefevere, A. (Eds.), Translation, History and Culture. Pinter Publishers, London and New York, pp. 57-63.
70. Snell-Hornby, M. 1988. Translation Studies: An Integrated Approach. John Benjamins Company, Amsterdam and Philadelphia.
71. Tinsley, R. L. and Zohn, H. 1977. Translation: American Doctoral Dissertations, 1970-1974. The Modern Languages Journal 61 (3), pp. 101-109.
72. Turk, H. 1990. The Question of Translatability: Benjamin and Derrida. In: Schmidt, Dennis J.(Ed.), Hermeneutics and the Poetics Motion: Translation Perspectives V.. State University of New York at Binghamton Press, Binghamton, USA, pp. 43-56.
73. Tymoczko, M. 2007. Enlarging Translation Empowering Translators. St. Jerome Publishing, Manchester.
74. Tytler, A. 1791. Essay of the Principles of Translation. Dent, London.
75. Zoure, A. 2003. Universal Semantic Primes, and Their Application to French Monolingual and English-French Bilingual Lexicography: English Spatial Prepositions by, on ad into in French Translation of "Alice's Adventures *in Wonderland*". Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, USA.
76. Vernet, J. 1993. El Coran. Plaza & Janes, Gavà, Barcelona.
77. Worth, R. H. Jr. 1992/1943. Bible Translations: A History Through Source Documents. McFarland, Jefferson, USA.
78. Zaida, F. 1861. L 'Alkoran: Le Livre par Excellence. Imprimerie de la Societe Typographique Franco-Portugaise. Lisbonne.

## Appendix A

<b>1- Quotation from "I dwell in possibilities" by E. Dickenson</b>	
I dwell in Possibility— A fairer House than Prose—	
Arabic translation By Nour AL-Nuami	أنا قاطن ربوع المحتمل - أرحب من عوالم النثر-
Transliteration	'an'ā qāTinun rubū'a almuHtamal 'arHabu min 'awālim <u>lnathri</u> (Translation: Nour AL-Nuami)
Arabic translation by Sameer Al-NAsEr	أقطن في الإمكان بيتاً أرق من النثر
Transliteration	'aqTunu fī al'imkān baytan 'araqa mina <u>lnathri</u> .
Arabic translation By Omar S. Al-Shabab	أسكن عالم الشعر بيتاً أجمل من النثر.
Transliteration	'askunu 'ālam alshī'ri baytan 'ajmala mina <u>lnathri</u> .
<b>2- Quotation from Kubla Khan by S. T. Coleridge</b>	
In Xanadu did Kubla Khan A stately pleasure-dome decree: ..... For he on honey-dew hath fed, And drunk the milk of Paradise.	
Arabic translation by Sameer Al-NAsEr	في كساندو قبلا خان نافذاً المرسوم أصدر : ... فهو لم يُطعم سوى الشهد المُندي المُعَبَّر وسقاه ليس إلا لبَنَ الفردوس كوثر .
Transliteration	f ī xsanadū qublā khan nāfītha almarsūmi 'aSdar ..... fahwa lam yuT'am siwā shahdi lmunaddā walmu'anbar wasuqāhu laysa 'illā labana lfirdawsi kawthar.

Arabic translation by Sameer Al-Naser	<p>في زانادو شاء قبلا خان  أن بينى قبة مهيبه للملذات:  ....  لأنه قد أطعم الرحيق ،  وشرب من لبن الفردوس .</p>
Transliteration	<p>fī zānādū shā'a qublāya khan  'an yun'ā qutan mahībatan lilmalathāt:  .....  Li'anahu qad 'uT'ima alraHīq,  Washaiba min laban alfirdaws.</p>

**Translation of some lines from Coleridge's Kubla Khan into Arabic.**

## Appendix B

Sura 108 in Arabic, Sakhr computer program		إِنَّا أَعْطَيْنَاكَ الْكَوْثَرَ (١) فَصَلِّ لِرَبِّكَ وَأَنْحَرْ (٢) إِنَّ شَانِئَكَ هُوَ الْأَبْتَرُ (٣) .	
Transliteration		Innā aṭaynāka alkawthar (1) faṣalli lirabika wanHar (2) inna shani'aka huwa al'abtar (3).	
Translator	Date	Language	Translation
Retenensis, Robrtus and Harmannus Dalmata	1143, 1544 pp. 187- 188	Latin	Tibi iam fontem in paradiso præparauimus. Orationem igitur coram Deo fund, ipsiq suppliciter immola. Tuus enim hostis adiutoribus proleq carebit.
Marracci, Ludovico	1698, p. 826	Latin	Nos certè dedimus tibi Kauther. 2. Ora ergo ad Dominum tuum, jugula. 3. Porrò odio habens te, ipse erit excisus.
Du Ryer	1647, p. 645	French	Nous t'auons donné une grande affluence de nos graces. Prie ton Seigneur, elleve tes mains, celuy qui te haïra sera mal-heureux.
Savary, M.	1783, p. 457	French	Nous t'avons donné le Kautser. Adresse tes væux au Seigneur, & immole des victimes. Celui qui te hait, périra.
Fatma Zaida	1861, pp. 46- 47	French	1. Allah t'a destine, ô Mohammed, les bords du Kauther ( <i>fleuve du Paradis</i> ). 2. Adresse tes actions de grâce au Seigneur, et enseigne ses lois. 3. Celui qui te hait, périra sans laisser nul souvenir.
R. Blachère	1957, p. 668	French	En vérité, Nous t'avons donné l'Abondance. 2. Prie donc en l'honneur de ton Seigneur et sacrifie! 3. En vérité, celui qui te hait se trouve être le Déshérité!
Kachrid	1984, p. 824	French	1. Nous t'avons donné la rivière Kaouthar. 2. Prie donc à la gloire de ton Seigneur et immole. 3. C'est celui qui te déteste qui ne laissera personne (pour perpétuer son nom).
King Fahd Holy Quran Printing Complex	1990, p. 602	French	1. Nous t'avons certes, accordé l'Abondance. 2. Accomplis la Salât pour ton Seigneur et sacrifie. 3. Celui qui te hait sera certes, sans postérité.
Alexander Ross	1649, p. 392	English	We have given thee a great affluence of our graces. Pray to thy Lord, left up thine hands; he that hateth thee, shall be accursed.

George Sale	1734, p. 593	English	Verily we have given thee Al Cawthar. Wherefore pray unto thy Lord; and slay <i>the victims</i> . Verily he who hateth thee shall be childless.
J. M. Rodwell	1861, p. 14	English	Truly we have given thee an ABUNDANCE; Pray therefore to the Lord, and slay the victims. Verily whoso hateth thee shall be childless.
A. J. Arberry	1996 / 1955, p. 351	English	Surely We have given thee abundance; so pray unto thy Lord and sacrifice. Surely he that hates thee, he is the one cut off.
Darusslam Publishing,	2000, Vol. 3, p. 1384	English	1. Verily, we have granted you (O Muhammad) Al-Kauthar (a river in Paradise). 2. Therefore turn in prayer to your Lord and sacrifice (to Him only). For he who hates you (O Muhammad), he will be cut off (from posterity and every good thing in this world and in the Hereafter).
Thomas Irving	1989, p. 602	English	1. We have given you plenty, 2. So pray to your Lord and sacrifice 3. since your opponent is the one who will be lopped off.
Shirazi, Imam Muhammad	2005, p. 375- 376	English	1. Indeed We have granted thee Abundance. 2. So pray to thy Lord and slaughter. Indeed thy loather he is the cut-off.
A. Y. Ali	1934, p. 1706	English	1. To thee have We granted the Fount (of Abundance). 2. Therefore to thy Lord turn in Prayer and Sacrifice. 3. For he who hateth thee – <i>He</i> will be cut off (from Future Hope).
King Fahd Holy Quran Printing Complex	1990, p. 219	English	1. To thee have we granted the Abundance. 2. Therefore, to thy Lord turn in Prayer and Sacrifice. 3. For he who hateth thee,- He will be cut off (From Future Hope).
Al-Hilālī and Khān	1993 p. 926	English	1. Verily, We have granted you (O Muhammad) Al-Kauthar ;(a river in Paradise). 2. Therefore turn in prayer to your Lord and Sacrifice (to Him only). 3. For he who makes you angry (O Muhammad),-- he will be cut off (from every good thing in this world and in the Hereafter).
M A. Abdel Haleem	2004 p. 440	English	We have truly given abundance to you [Prophet] – so pray to your Lord and make your sacrifice to Him alone—it is the one who hates you who has been cut off.
Friedrich Rückert	1888, P. 425	German	1. Wir haben dir veriehn den Kauther; 2. Bring deinem Herrn Gebet und Opfer! 3. Ja, wer dich haßt, der ist ein Abgestumpfter



Rudi Paret	1996/ 1979, p. 438	German	1. Wir haben dir die Fülle gegeben. 2. Bete darum zu deinem Herrn und opfere! 3. (Ja) dein Hassler ist es, gestutzt (oder: schwanzlos, d.h. ohne Anhang(?) oder ohne Nachkommen?) ist. (Oder (als Verwünschung): Wer dich haßt, soll gestutzt bzw. Schwanzlos!)
D. L. Bonelli	1991 p. 604	Italian,	1. In verità, noi abbiamo dato a te il Kawthar. 2. Prega perciò il tuo Signore e immola a lui delle vittime. 3. In verità, chi ti odia sarà private di ogni bene.
Puebla, Vincente Ortiz De La	1872, p. 646	Spanish	1. Kauther es el nombre de un rio ó de un estanque del paraiso. 2. La palabra del texto significa: un animal que tiene cortada la cola ó un hombre que no deja despues de él ni hijos, ni aun la memoria de su nombre.
Juan Vernet	1993, p. 601	Spanish	1. Nos te hemos dado la abundancia. 2. Reza a tu Señor y sacrifica! 3. Quien te detesta es el mutilado.

**Translation of Sura 108 from the Quran into some European languages.**

## دور التأويل الدقيق وبدائيات المعاني في المقايسة الترجمة

عمر شيخ الشباب

قسم اللغات الأجنبية، كلية الآداب، جامعة الملك فيصل  
الأحساء، المملكة العربية السعودية

### الملخص :

يركز المنهج التأويلي للترجمة بين اللغات الطبيعية على دراسة مدركات كبيرة الحجم مثل النص (شيخ الشباب ٢٠٠٨ وتيموسكو ٢٠٠٧) ، وهو مستوى غير قادر على معالجة الآليات الأساسية المسؤولة عن نقل المعنى على مستوى المفهوم أو الكلمة أو العبارة . وحسب مقترح كون (١٩٦٢) وفيرباند (١٩٧٥) ، فإن " استحالة المقايسة " بين نظريتين علميتين متنافستين هي المسؤولة عن استحالة الترجمة بسبب التغير في " بنية المعاني المفرداتية " في كل من النظريتين .

يقوم البحث الحالي باستقصاء دور التأويل الدقيق وبدائيات المعاني في القيام بنقل المعنى في الترجمة ، ويستخدم لهذا الغرض أمثلة من ترجمة القرآن الكريم إلى اللغات الأوروبية وترجمة الشعر الإنجليزي إلى اللغة العربية . وتقوم المقايسة الترجمة حسب النتائج المستخلصة على عمليات محددة من التأويل الدقيق بالإضافة إلى التأويل العام والصياغة النحوية والأسلوبية .

### كلمات مفتاحية :

التأويل، بدائيات المعاني، إمكانية الترجمة، المقايسة، نقل المعاني