Homonymous Verbs in the Holy Quran: An Analysis of Three Translations of Some Quranic Texts in terms of Ray Jackendoff's Conceptual Structures

Adel A. Al-Thamery (PhD)   *Resercher Ali F. Al-Salihi*

University of Basra - College of Arts

Abstract

This paper attempts to examine the translations of Abdullah Yusif Ali, Marmaduke Pickthall and John Arberry of some homonymous verbs in some Quranic texts. In order to determine the meanings of the homonymous verbs, the exegete adopted in this paper is Al-Tabary. The model applied is " Jackendoff's Conceptual Structures ", where each conceptual structure is analyzed into its conceptual categories. This paper aims to find which conceptual structures of the translated texts (TT) match the conceptual structure of the source texts (ST). The present paper concludes that not all the conceptual structures of the translated texts (TT) are in full correspondence with the conceptual structure of the source texts (ST).

الأفعال ذات المشترك اللفظي في القران الكريم: تحليل في ثلاث ترجماتٍ لبعض النصوص القرانية وفق التركيب التصوري لـ (راي جاكنودف)

الأستاذ المساعد الدكتور   الباحث

عادل عبدالأمير الثامري   علي فوزي شعبان الصالحي

جامعة البصرة / كلية الآداب

الملخص:-

تهدف هذه الدراسة الى التحقق من من ترجمات عبدالله يوسف علي، مارمادوك بيكثل وجون أربري لبعض الافعال ذات المشترك اللفظي في بعض النصوص القرآنية. ومن اجل الوصول الى المعني الحقيق لهذه الأفعال، تم تطبيق تفسير (الطبري). حيث يتم تحليل الافعال القرانية ذات المشترك اللفظي على وفق منظور التركيب التصوري لـ جاكندوف. تهدف الرسالة إلى إيجاد مدى التطابق ماين التركيب التصوري للنصوص المترجمة والنص الاصلي. وهي محاولة أيضا للتعرف على الترجمات التي تمكنت من الحفاظ على نفس التركيب التصوري للنص الاصلي. وتمكنت هذه الدراسة من الوصول الى انه ليست كل التراكيب التصورية للنصوص المترجمة هي على تطابق تام مع تلك التراكيب التصورية للنص الاصلي.

1. Introduction

The study analyzes homonymous verbs in the Holy Quran according to one of the most essential theories in semantics, viz, Jackendoff`s Conceptual Structure. Jackendoff`s Conceptual Structure specifies that each structure including homonymous verbs is analyzed into certain conceptual categories. This study investigates homonymous verbs in the Holy Quran within the cognitive framework and more specifically in cognitive semantics.

The study aims to fulfill the following objectives:

1. Finding out are the conceptual categories of the conceptual structures of the target texts the same as the conceptual categories of the conceptual structure of the source text.

2. Identify the translator who keeps the same number and type of the conceptual categories of the conceptual structure of the source text in his translation.

The present study aims to answer the following research questions:

1. Are the conceptual categories of the conceptual structures of the target texts the same as the conceptual categories of the conceptual structure of the source text?

2. Which translator succeeded in preserving the same number and type of the conceptual categories of the conceptual structure of the source text in his translation?

2. Homonymy: Definitions and Background

Homonymy, is defined differently in English, but in general, a word is similar in form with another word either in pronunciation (i.e. homophone) or in spelling (homograph), or both, but differs from it in meaning is said to be homonymous. According to Lobner (2002: 42), the word homonym comes from the conjunction of the Greek

word 'homo' (same) and the suffix 'onymos'(name). Thus, it refers to two or more distinct concepts sharing the "same name" or signifier. Homonymy is defined as a word that is identical in form with another word, either in sound (as a homophone) or in spelling (as a homograph), or both, but differs from it in meaning. For example, *sale* (an act of selling something) and *sail* (to travel on water); *bark* (the skin of a tree) and *bark* (the sound of a dog).

Gramley and Patzold (1992:13) define homonymy as the existence of different lexemes that sound the same (homophones, e.g. *days/daze*) or are spelt the same (homographs, e.g. *lead* (guide)/*lead* (metal)) but have different meanings. In this way, they divide them into homophones and homographs.

Lobner (2002: 43) states that homonymy means lexemes with different meanings that happen to have the same sound form or spelling. He adds that homonyms agree in all points that make up a lexeme except in meaning. Davies and Elder (2004: 50) define homonymy as two words that have the same form but different meanings, as with a bank for money and a bank of the river. Cruse (2006: 80) mentions that homonymy occurs when unrelated meanings are signaled by the same linguistic form, as with *bank* (side of river) and *bank* (financial institution): the two *bank*s are said to be homonyms.

Homonymy is a phenomenon which relates to two distinct words that happen to share the same form in sound (homophones) and/or in writing (homographs). For example, the form *bank* relates to two different words with unrelated meanings, *financial institution* and *bank of a river*. These two senses are not only synchronically unrelated (unrelated in

current usage) but also historically unrelated. The word *bank* meaning *side of river* has been in the English language for much longer, and is related to the Old Icelandic word for *hill*, while the word *bank* meaning *financial institution* was borrowed from Italian *banca*, meaning *money changer's table*. Yule (2010: 107) on the other hand defines homonymy as a term used in semantics

for lexical items that are identical in spelling and pronunciation but have different meanings. Examples of homonyms are *lie* as in *you have to lie down* and *lie* in *don't lie, tell me the truth*, where the first (lie) is totally different from the second (lie) in meaning (Evans and Green, 2006:329).

According to Saeed (2009: 63), homonyms can be defined as unrelated senses of the same word:

Of course variations in pronunciation mean that not all speakers have the same set of homonyms. Some English speakers for example pronounce the pairs *click* and *clique*, or *talk* and *torque*, in the same way, making these homonyms which are spelled differently (Saeed, 2009: 64).

3. Types of Homonymy

There are so many types of homonymy depending on the degree of the similarity between the two lexemes. They are, complete (total and partial), word, of word forms, lexical and grammatical homonyms, as follows:

3.1 Complete Homonyms

They are the homonyms that have the same pronunciation and the same spelling i.e. they are the same in the spoken and written form. For instance, *bank* which means embankment and *bank* which means a place in which money is kept (Lyons 1982:72). So, such homonyms and the alike

are called *complete homonyms*. On the same track, Lobner (2002: 43) classifies homonyms into two types:

3.1.1 **Total homonymy:** Two lexemes share all the distinctive properties (grammatical category and grammatical properties, the set of grammatical forms, sound form and spelling). For instance, the two adjectives *light* and *light*, where the first one is the opposite of "dark" and the second one is the opposite of "heavy" or difficult (Lobner, 2002: 43).

3.1.2 **Partial homonymy:** This is the case when two lexemes with different unrelated meanings are in some but not all of their grammatical forms. For instance, the verb *lie* (lay, lain) and *lie* (lied, lied). Partial homonyms can give rise to ambiguity in some contexts, like (don't lie in bed) but can be distinguished in others (he lay/lied in bed) (Lobner, 2002: 43).

3.2 **Word Homonyms**

They are the homonyms where all the forms of an item are identical. Such homonyms can be found in the words that belong to the same part of speech. For instance, *seal* and *seals* (plural of *seal* which is an animal) and *seal* and *seals* (plural of *seal* which is an impression placed on things to legalize them) (Singh, 1982: 24).

3.3 **Homonyms of Word Forms**

They are the homonyms in which only few word forms are identical. Generally, the canonical forms in addition to some forms are alike and some others are not identical. For instance, *lie* that means not to tell the truth becomes *lied* in the past and past participle, while *lie,* that means to rest one's body, becomes *lay* in the past (Singh, 1982: 24).

3.4 Lexical Homonyms

We have this kind when the homonyms belong to the same part of speech, they are called lexical homonyms. The difference is only in their lexical meaning. They can be found under one entry in the dictionary (Singh 1982: 25). For instance, *trunk* (part of an elephant) and *trunk* (a storage chest).

3.5 Grammatical Homonyms

The words that have different lexical meanings as well as grammatical forms; when the verbs are transitive and in transitive or the words might be verbs, nouns or adjectives. For instance, the lexical item CUT is cut (v.), (no) or (adj) (Singh, 1982: 25)

Saeed (2009, 63), states that we can distinguish different types of homonymous words depending on their syntactic behavior, and spelling, for example:

1. Lexemes of the same syntactic category, and with the same spelling: for instance, *lap* (circuit of a course) and *lap* (part of body when sitting down).

2 Lexemes of the same category, but with different spelling: for instance, the verbs *ring* and *wring*.

3. Lexemes of different categories, but with the same spelling: for instance, the verb *keep* and the noun *keep*.

4. Lexemes of different categories, and with different spelling: for instance, *not* and *knot*.

4. The Translation of Homonymy in the Glorious Quran

Homonymy is one of the most remarkable phenomena in the Glorious Quran. Each homonymous word in the Glorious Quran has its own different meaning. The translators should fully comprehend and understand those homonymous words so as to be able to convey the implied meanings of those words. The readers of the Glorious Quran

should also recognize these homonymous words and try to understand each meaning.

Homonymy causes serious difficulties for the translators of the Glorious Quran. This kind of difficulty that the translators face in the process of translation produces an ambiguity. According to Newmark (1988: 219) this ambiguity is called *lexical ambiguity* which occurs when "a word has two senses which are both equally effective (pragmatically and referentially) in the relevant stretch of language". In such cases, the translators have to take into their consideration all the possible meanings that each homonymous word has, and then they have to consider the context more carefully so as to be able reach the intended meaning of these homonymous words.

5. Cognitive Linguistics and Translation

According to Rojo and Ibarretxe (2013:3-4), cognitive linguistics and translation have held a hate – love relationship. By talking about the love relationship, there are translations scholars have searched many linguistics works seeking for concepts and principles that are suitable to be applied to the field of translation. And linguists have also found translation as a rich source of examples for language teaching and the contrastive study of language. So, it can be said that there is some kind of attraction between cognitive linguistics and translation. But unfortunately this attraction at times has turned into mutual dislike relationship, i.e. The have hate relationship. Linguists on one hand have looked down on translation as a type of second class language activity which they have long considered inadequate as a language teaching method and too complex to reveal reliable data on linguistic communication. On the other hand,

translation scholars have shown the inability of the linguists to account for the cultural and cognitive aspects of translation. Regardless of this hate relationship, there is a meeting point between cognitive linguistics and translation where they can forget about the differences between them and start working together towards a cognitive theory of language and translation.

One of the advantages of bringing cognitive semantics to the field of translation is that cognitive approaches in general place the translator or interpreter rather than the text at the center of enquiry. These cognitive approaches also encourage a view of translation as a dynamic fluid activity that involves several parties and is influenced by a wide range by environmental factors (Sager, 1994:55).

Rojo and Ibarretxe (2013:10) argue that the era of 20th century has seen the field of translation studies entering a new period with a pats background loaded with notions to be redefined that made the present full with suggestive ideas to be developed, and made the future loaded with challenges awaiting to be achieved.

6. Jackendoff's Conceptual Structures

The central hypothesis of Jackendoff's conceptual semantics is that there is a level of mental representation, i.e. *conceptual structures*, these conceptual structures form sentence meanings and serve as the formal basis for inference and for connection with world knowledge and perception. Jackendoff (1983: 42) states that one of the most obvious aspects of the projected world is that it is divided up into *things* and *entities* with a certain kind of spatial and temporal integrity. Simply, a thing is the figure of a figure-ground opposition in the visual field; by contrast with the

figure, the ground is unattended and relatively less vivid. He maintains that in more complex cases (such as ordinary life), a multitude of things are perceived in the visual field, standing or moving in various relations to one another.

Jackendoff (1990: 7) expresses further information about the notion of concept in relation to semantic components and he argues that this notion is about physical objects in the mind of a person rather than a concrete object in one's hand. He states that:

The syntactic rules alone are not enough to capture the concepts of the mind, and a speaker potential ability of syntactic structure must be mentally encoded in terms of a finite set of primitives and a finite set of principles of combination that collectively describe and generate the class of possible sentences.

Jackendoff (1990: 43) argues that the innate formation rules of conceptual structures include conceptual categories that are regarded as the semantic parts of speech. These categories include entities that are entitled in capitals within square brackets such as [THING], [EVENT], [STATE], [ACTION], [PLACE], [PATH], [PRPOERATY] and [AMOUNT]. Each of these conceptual categories can be elaborated into a function argument organization of general form. Within the constraint of this general form, each category permits a variety of more specific elaborations which can be stated as a specialized formation rules. Some of the most important ones for the spatial domain primary of this analysis are discussed below according to Jackendoff (1990: 43-44) in (5) models that are followed when analyzing the (TT), only model number (3) will be adopted here and

other types of models fall outside the scope of the present paper.

3. $[EVENT] \rightarrow \begin{Bmatrix} [_{Event} \text{ GO ([THING], [PATH])}] \\ [_{Event} \text{ STAY ([THING], [PLACE])}] \end{Bmatrix}$

Jackendoff (1990: 44)

Jackendoff (1990: 44) states that model (3) means that the category [EVENT] can be elaborated as two Event-functions GO or STAY, both of them takes two arguments. The arguments of GO, that denotes motion along a [PATH], are the [THING] in motion and the [PATH] it traverses. This structure seems very clear in the sentence *Bill went to New York, w*here *Bill* stands for [THING] and *To New York* stands for [PATH]. The arguments of STAY, which denotes stasis over a period of time, are the [THING] standing still and its location, as in *Bill stayed in the kitchen,* where *Bill* stands for [THING] and *in the kitchen* stands for [PLACE].

7. The Analysis of the Translation of the Homonymous Verbs

1. The verb *Yashtari* (يشتري)

According to Al-Tabary (1994) this verb has three different unrelated meanings:

A. Buy يشتري: (Al-Tabary,1994: vol.4, 163), as in:

" إنَّ الله اشترى مِنَ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ أَنْفُسَهُمْ " (التوبة من الأية ١١١)

ST Analysis:

The conceptual structure of the underlined text in this verse is:

[*Thing* (المؤمنين *Thing*)] [Path من] ([*Thing* الله], ([*Thing* إشترى *State*]) ([أنفسهم])

TT Analysis:

The three translations of the verse are:

1. Allah hath purchased of the believers their persons. (Ali, 1989: 71)

2. Lo! Allah hath bought from the believers their lives. (Pickthall, 1997 :92)

3. God has bought from the believers their selves. (Arberry, 1964: 123)

The conceptual structures of the underlined texts in the three translations respectively are:

1. [*State* purchase ([*Thing* Allah], [*Path* of ([*Thing* the believers]), ([Thing their persons])

** 2. [*State* buy ([*Thing* Allah], [*Path* from ([*Thing* the believers]), ([*Thing* their lives])**

** 3. [*State* buy ([Thing God], [Path from ([Thing the believers]), ([Thing their selves])**

Comment:

The conceptual structures are the same in the target texts above, in Ali's translation the conceptual categories are [*State*] [*Thing*], [*Path*], [*Thing*] and [*Thing*]. In Pickthall's translation the conceptual categories are [*State*] [*Thing*], [*Path*], [*Thing*] and [*Thing*]. And in Arberry's translation they are [*State*] [*Thing*], [*Path*], [*Thing*] and [*Thing*]. According to the conceptual structure of the source text: [*State* إشترى ([Thing المؤمنين)] [Path من (الله Thing], [Thing)] أنفسهم]), all the three conceptual structures of the first meaning of the polysemous verb *Yashtari* (يشتري) match the conceptual structure of the source text.

B. Exchange يستبدل: (Al-Tabary,1994: vol.1, 120), as in:

أولئك ألذين اشتروا الضلالة بالهدى " (ألبقرة من الآية ١٦)"

ST Analysis:

The conceptual structure of the underlined text in this verse is:

[State إشتروا[Thing]) الضلالة Path] [بـ Thing],) (الهدى[

TT Analysis:

The three translations of the verse are:

1. These are they who <u>have bartered guidance for error</u>. (Ali, 1989: 1)

2. These are they who <u>purchase error at the price of guidance</u>. (Pickthall, 1997: 92)

3. Those are they that <u>have bought error at the price of guidance</u>. (Arberry, 1964:177)

The conceptual structures of the underlined texts in the three translations respectively are:

1. [State barter ([Thing guidance], [Path for ([Thing error])

2. [State purchase ([Thing error], [Place at ([Thing the price]), [Path of ([Thing guidance])

3. [State buy ([Thing error], [Place at ([Thing the price]), [Path of ([Thing guidance])

Comment:

The conceptual structures differ in the target texts above, in Ali's translation the conceptual categories are [State] [Thing], [Path] and [Thing], while in Pickthall's translation the conceptual categories are [State], [Thing], [Place], [Thing], [Path] and [Thing]. And in Arberry's translation the conceptual categories are [State], [Thing], [Place], [Thing], [Path] and [Thing]. So, in Ali's translation the conceptual categories are four, and in Pickthall's and Arberry's translation they are six. According to the conceptual structure of the source text: [State إشتروا ([Thing الضلالة], [Path بـ ([Thing الهدى)], the nearest conceptual structure of the second meaning of the polysemous verb Yashtari (يشتري) is in Ali's translation.

C. Sell : يبيع (Al-Tabary,1994: vol.1, 292), as in:

" بئسما **اشتروا** به انفسهم" (االبقرة من الأية ٩٠)

ST Analysis:

The conceptual structure of the underlined text in this verse is:

([*Thing* وا]) إشترى *State*]

TT Analysis:

The three translations of the verse are:

1. Miserable is the price for which they have sold their souls. (Ali, 1989: 5)

2. Evil is that for which they sell their souls. (Pickthall, 1997: 4)

3. Evil is the thing they have sold themselves for. (Arberry, 1964:25)

The conceptual structures of the underlined texts in the three translations respectively are:

1. [*State* sell ([*Thing* they]

2. [*State* sell ([*Thing* they]

3. [*State* sell ([*Thing* they]

Comment:

The conceptual structure of the source text consists of two conceptual categories: [*State*] and [*Thing*]. The conceptual structures of the target texts are the same where each conceptual structure consists of two conceptual categories: [*State*] and [*Thing*] as the analysis above shows. So, by comparing the conceptual structures of the target texts with the conceptual structure of the source text it is found that they match each other. This means that the three translators succeeded by preserving the same number of the conceptual categories of the source text in their translations.

2. The verb *Yaqdi* (يقضي)

Al-Tabary (1994) states that this verb has three different unrelated meanings:

A. Complete يُكمل: (Al-Tabary, 1994: vlo.1, 551), as in:

" فَإِذَا قَضَيْتُم مَّنَاسِكَكُمْ" (البقرة من الأية ٢٠٠)

ST Analysis:

The conceptual structure of the underlined text in this verse is:

قضيتم ([*Thing* مناسككم] *State*]

TT Analysis:

The three translations of the verse are:

1. So when ye <u>have accomplished your holy rites</u>. (Ali, 1989:11)

2. And when ye <u>have completed your devotions</u>. (Pickthall, 1997: 9)

3. And when you <u>have performed your holy rites</u>. (Arberry, 1964: 34)

The conceptual structures of the underlined texts in the three translations respectively are:

1. [*State* Accomplish ([*Thing* your holy rites]

2. [*State* complete ([*Thing* your devotions]

3. [*State* perform ([*Thing* your holy rites]

Comment:

The conceptual structures are the same in Ali's, Pickthall's and Arberry's translations. In each translation there are two conceptual categories, they are [*State*] and [Thing]. So, according to the conceptual structure of the source text [*State* قضيتم ([*Thing* مناسككم], it is found that the three conceptual structures of the target texts of the first meaning of the verb *Yaqdi* (يقضي) match the conceptual structure of the source text.

B. Give an order يعطي أمراً: (Al-Tabary, 1994: vol.1, 363), as in:

"وإذَا **قَضَى أمراً**" (البقرة من الاية ١١٧)

ST Analysis:

The conceptual structure of the underlined text in this verse is:

قضى [*State*]) (Thing [أمراً]

TT analysis:

The three translations of the verse are:

 1. When <u>he decreeth a matter</u>. (Ali, 1989: 6)

 2. When <u>He decreeth a thing</u>. (Pickthall, 1997 : 5)

 3. And when <u>He decrees a thing</u>. (Arberry, 1964: 27)

The conceptual structures of the underlined texts in the three translations respectively are:

1. [*State* decreeth ([*Thing* he], ([*Thing* matter])

2. [*State* decreeth ([*Thing* he], ([*Thing* thing])

3. [*State* decrees ([*Thing* he], ([*Thing* thing])

Comment:

The conceptual structures are the same in the translations of this clause. Each one of them consists of the three conceptual categories which are [*State*], [*Thing*] and [*Thing*]. However, no one of them matches the conceptual structure of the source text [*State* قضى]([*Thing* أمراً]. This means that the three conceptual structures in the target texts of the second meaning of the verb *Yaqdi* (يقضي) don't match the conceptual structure of the source text. i.e. the three translators didn't succeed in preserving the same number of the conceptual categories of the source text in their translations.

C. Create يخلق: (Al-Tabary, 1994: vol.6, 456), as in:

" **فقضاهن سبع سماوات**" (فصلت من الأية ١٢)

ST Analysis:

The conceptual structure of the underlined text in this verse is:

([سبع سماوات *Thing*], [هن *Thing*), قضى *State*]

TT Analysis:

The three translations of the verse are:

1. So <u>he completed them as seven firmaments.</u> (Ali, 1989:181)

2. Then <u>He ordained them seven heavens.</u> (Pickthall, 1997: 154)

3. So <u>He determined them as seven heavens</u>. (Arberry, 1964:286)

The conceptual structures of the underlined texts in the three translations respectively are:

1.[*State* complete ([Thing he], ([*Thing* them]) ([*Thing* seven firmaments])

2. [*State* orient ([Thing he], ([*Thing* them]) ([*Thing* as seven firmaments])

3. [*State* determine ([Thing he], ([*Thing* them]) ([*Thing* seven heavens])

Comment:

   The conceptual structures are the same in the target texts above, i.e. each one of them consists of four conceptual categories: [*State*], [Thing], [Thing] and [Thing]. But unfortunately no one of which matches the conceptual structure of the source text that consists of three conceptual categories: [سبع سماوات *Thing*], [هن *Thing*), قضى *State*]). This means that all of the conceptual structures of the target text couldn't transfer the same conceptual structure of the source text.

3. The verb *Ya`ati* (يأتي):

Al-Tabary (1994) points out that this verb has three different unrelated meanings:

A. Consummate ينكح: (Al-Tabary, 1994: vol.2, 5), as in:

" نسائكم حرث لكم <u>فأتوا حرثكم</u> أنى شئتم " (ألبقرة من الاية ٢٢٣)

ST Analysis:

The conceptual structure of the underlined text in this verse is:

[*State* فأتوا ([*Thing* حرثكم])

TT Analysis:

The three translations of the verse are:

1. Your wives are As a tilth unto you; so <u>approach your tilth</u> when or how ye will. (Ali, 1989: 12)

2. Your women are a tilth for you (to cultivate) <u>go to your tilth</u> as ye will. (Pickthall, 1997: 11)

3. Your women are a tillage for you; so <u>come unto your tillage</u> as you wish. (Arberry, 1964:36)

   The conceptual structures of the underlined texts in the three translations respectively are:

1. [*State* approach ([Thing your tilth])

2. [*Event* go [*Path* to ([*Thing* your tilth])

3. [*Event* come [*Path* unto ([*Thing* your tillage]

Comment:

   The conceptual structure of the source text is [*State* فأتوا ([*Thing* حرثكم]). The conceptual structure in Ali's translation conceptually matches the conceptual structure of the source text since it consists of the same two conceptual categories: [*State*] and [*Thing*]. The conceptual structures in Pickthall's and Arberry's translation consist of three conceptual categories: [*Event*], [*Path*] and [*Thing*]. This means that the conceptual structures of Pickthall's and Arberry's translation didn't transfer the same conceptual structure of the source text.

B. Grant يعطي: (Al-Tabary, 1994: vol.2, 163), as in:

" يؤتى الحكمة من يشاء ومن يؤتَ الحكمة فلقد أوتي خيراً كثيرا " (ألبقرة: من الاية ٢٦٩)

ST Analysis:

The conceptual structure of the underlined text in this verse is:

 يؤتي [*State* ([الحكمة *Thing*])

TT Analysis:

The three translations of the verse are:

1. He granteth wisdom to whom he pleaseth; and he to whom wisdom is granted receiveth indeed a benefit overflowing. (Ali, 1989: 15)

2. He giveth wisdom unto whom He will, and he unto whom wisdom is given, he truly hath received abundant good. (Pickthall, 1997: 13)

3. He gives the Wisdom to whomsoever He will, and whoso is given the Wisdom, has been given much good. (Arberry, 1964:41)

The conceptual structures of the underlined texts in the three translations respectively are:

 1. [*State* grant ([Thing he], ([*Thing* wisdom])
 2. [*State* give ([Thing he], ([*Thing* wisdom])
 3. [*State* give ([*Thing* he], ([*Thing* the wisdom])

Comment:

The conceptual structure of the source text is [*State* يؤتي ([*Thing* الحكمة]), which means that it consists of two conceptual categories: [*Event*] and [*Thing*]. The conceptual structures in Ali's, Pickthall's and Arberry's translation consist of three conceptual categories: [*State*], [*Thing*] and [*Thing*]. This means that no one of the conceptual structures

of the target texts match the conceptual structure of the source text.

C. Bring يُحضر: (Al-Tabary,1994: vol.5, 133), as in:

" <u>أتونى زبر الحديد</u>" (الكهف: من الاية ٩٦)

ST analysis:

The conceptual structure of this verse is:

[State أتوا ([Thing ي]), ([Thing زبر الحديد)]

TT analysis:

The three translations of the verse are:

1. <u>Bring me the blocks of iron.</u> (Ali, 1989: 109)

2. <u>Give me pieces of iron.</u> (Pickthall, 1997: 93)

3. <u>Bring me ingots of iron.</u> (Arberry, 1964: 179)

The conceptual structures of the underlined texts in the three translations respectively are:

1. [*State* bring ([*Thing* me], ([*Thing* the blocks of iron])

2. [*State* give ([*Thing* me], ([*Thing* pieces of iron])

3. [*State* bring ([*Thing* me], ([*Thing* ingots of iron])

Comment:

The conceptual structures, here, are the same in the target texts; each conceptual structure consists of three conceptual categories, [*State*], [*Thing*] and [*Thing*]. By comparing these conceptual structures of the target text with the conceptual structure of the source text [*State* أتوا] ([*Thing* ي]), ([*Thing* زبر الحديد]), it is found that all of the conceptual structures of the target texts of the fourth meaning of the verb *Ya'ati* يأتي match the conceptual structure of the source text.

4. The verb *Yaftah* (يفتح)

According to Al-Tabary (1994) this verb has three different meanings:

A. Open يفتح: (Al-Tabary, 1994, V4, 371), as in:

" ولما <u>فتحوا</u> متاعهم " (يوسف من الاية ٦٥)

ST Analysis:

The conceptual structure of the underlined text in this verse is:

([State فتح] ([Thing و]), ([Thing متاعهم])

ST Analysis:

The three translations of the verse are:

1. Then when <u>they opened their baggage</u>. (Ali, 1989: 85)

2. And when <u>they opened their belongings</u>. (Pickthall, 1997: 71)

3. And when <u>they opened their things</u>. (Arberry, 1964: 145)

The conceptual structures of the underlined texts in the three translations respectively are:

1. [State open ([Thing they]), ([Thing their baggage])

2. [State open ([Thing they]), ([Thing their belongings])

3. [State open ([Thing they]), ([Thing their things])

Comment:

The conceptual structure of the source text consists of three conceptual categories: [State], [Thing] and [Thing]. The conceptual structures of the target texts also consist of three conceptual categories: [State], [Thing] and [Thing] as the analysis above shows. This means that the conceptual structures of the target texts completely match the conceptual structure of the source text.

B. Judge يقضي: (Al-Tabary, 1994: vol.3, 468), as in:

" ربنا <u>افتح بيننا</u> وبين قومنا " (الأعراف من الاية ٨٩)

ST Analysis:

The conceptual structure of the underlined text in this verse is:

([State افتح] ([Thing بيننا])

TT Analysis:

The three translations of the verse are:

1. Our lord <u>decide thou between us</u> and our people in truth. (Ali, 1989: 56)

2. Our Lord! <u>Decide with truth between us</u> and our folk. (Pickthall, 1997: 4)

 3. Our Lord, <u>give true deliverance between us</u> and our people. (Arberry, 1964: 101)

The conceptual structures of the underlined texts in the three translations respectively are:

1. [*State* decide ([*Thing* thou]) ([*Path* between]), ([*Thing* us])

2. [*State* decide ([*Path* with]), ([*Thing* truth]), ([*Path* between]), ([*Thing* us])

3. [*State* give ([*Thing* true deliverance]), ([*Path* between]), ([*Thing* us])

Comment:

The conceptual structure of the source text consists of two conceptual categories: [*State*] and [*Thing*] as in [*Event* افتح ([*Thing* بيننا]). The conceptual structures of the target texts differ from one to another and no one of them match the conceptual structure of the source text. The conceptual structure of Ali's translations consists of four conceptual categories: [*State*], [*Thing*], [*Path*] and [*Thing*] as the analysis above shows. The conceptual structure of Pickthall's translation includes five conceptual categories: [*State*], [*Path*], [*Thing*], [*Path*], and [*Thing*] as the analysis above shows. And lastly, the conceptual structure of Arberry's translation has four conceptual categories: [*State*], [*Thing*], [*Path*], and [*Thing*] as the analysis above shows. This means that the conceptual structures of the target texts couldn't match the conceptual structure of the source text.

C. Grant victory ينصر: (Al-Tabary, 1994: vol.7, 51), as in:

" إنا <u>فتحنا</u> لك فتحاً مبينا " (الفتح الاية ١)

ST Analysis:

The conceptual structure of the underlined text in this verse is:

[*State* فتح ([*Thing* أنا]),

TT Analysis:

The three translations of the verse are:

1. Verily <u>We have granted</u> thee a manifest Victory. (Ali, 1989: 196)

2. Lo! <u>We have given </u>thee (O Muhammad) a signal victory. (Pickthall, 1997: 165)

3. Surely <u>We have given </u>thee a manifest victory. (Arberry, 1964: 306)

The conceptual structures of the underlined texts in the three translations respectively are:

1. [*State* grant ([*Thing* we])

2. [*State* give ([*Thing* we])

3. [*State* give ([*Thing* we])

Comment:

The conceptual structure of the source text consists of two conceptual categories: [*State*] and [*Thing*]. The conceptual structures of the target texts are the same where each conceptual structure consists of two conceptual categories: [*State*] and [*Thing*]. Conceptually, by comparing the conceptual structures of the target texts with the conceptual structure of the source text it is found that they match each other. This means that the three translators succeeded by preserving the same number of the conceptual categories of the source text in their translations.

8. Conclusion

The present paper investigates the problem of how conceptually translating homonymous verbs in the Holy Quran and arrives at the following results:

As far as the first research question "Are the conceptual categories of the conceptual structures of the target texts the same as the conceptual categories of the conceptual structure of the source text? " It is found that not all the conceptual categories of the TT are in full correspondence with the conceptual categories in the ST. Some those of these conceptual categories in the TT completely match the conceptual categories in the ST. Other conceptual categories of the TT do not match those of the ST. However, other conceptual categories in the TT agree only with the number of the conceptual categories in the ST, that is, the member of the conceptual categories are not the same.

As for as the second research question, i.e. " Which translator succeeded in preserving the same conceptual structure of the source text in his translation?" It is concluded that no one of the translators succeeded in keeping the same number and type of the conceptual categories of the conceptual structure of the source text in his translation in all of the selected Quranic texts. In some cases only Ali has succeeded in that while Pickthall and Arberry haven't. Other instances only Pickthall has succeeded in that while Ali and Arberry haven't. Other circumstances only Arberry succeeds in that and Ali and Pickthall haven't. Other occasions, all of the three translators haven't succeeded in keeping the same number and type of the conceptual categories of the conceptual structure of the source text in their translation. In other cases all of the three translators haven't succeeded in keeping the same number and type of the conceptual categories of the conceptual structure of the source text in their translation.

References

Cruse, A. (2006). *A Glossary of Semantics and Pragmatics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press Ltd.

Crystal, D. (2003). *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics.* (5th Ed). Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.

Davies, A. and Dlder, C. (2004). *The Handbook of Applied Linguistics*. London: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Evans, V. and Green, M. (2006). *Cognitive Linguistics: An Introduction*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press Ltd.

Evans, V. (2007). A Glossary of Cognitive Linguistics. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press Ltd.

Gramley, S. and Patzold, K. (1992). *A Survey of Modern English*. London: Routledge.

Holme, R. (2009). *Cognitive Linguistics and Language Teaching*. Palgrave Macmillan: Macmillan Publishers Limited.

Jackendoff, R. (1983). *Semantics and Cognition*. Cambridge, MA: MIT   Press.

Jackendoff, R. (1990). *Semantic Structures*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Lobner, S. (2002). *Understanding Semantics*. London: Hodder Education.

Lyons, J. (1982). *Language and Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Newmark, P. (1988). *A Textbook of Translation*. New York : Prentice Hal.

Palmer, F. L. (1984). *Semantics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rojo, A. and Ibarretxe, I. (2013). *Cognitive Linguistics and translation*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Sager, J. C. (1994). Langauge Engineering and Tranlslation. Concequences of Automation, Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Saeed, J. I. (2009). *Semantics*. (3th Ed). Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.

Singh, R. A. (1982). *An Introduction to Lexicography: Meaning and its Relationship to Form*. Available at:
www.ciil-ebooks.net/html/lexico/link6.htm

Yule, G. (2010). *The Study of Language*. (4th Ed). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Arabic References

Ali, Ali Yusuf. (1989). *The Holy Quran: Text, Translation and Commentary*. Maryland: Amana Corporation.

Al-Khuly, M.(2001). *Madkhal ila ilm Al-Dalalah*. Al-Urdun: Dar Al-falah.

Arberry, A. J.(1991). *The Koran interpreted*. Oxford: Oxford University
Press.

Al-Tabary, (1994). *Jame`e Al-Bayan A`an Taweel Ay Al-Quran*. Vol 1-7. Beirut: Muassat Al-Risala.

Atiq, A. (1985). *9lem Albadi*:9. Beruit : Dar Alnahda Al Arabia.

Mansur. (2009). Al-Ikhtilaf Wa Ma Yakhil Bilkate`a.

Pickthall, M. (1997). *The Meaning of the Glorious Koran*. Plum