The Translation of Qur'an Metaphors: Procedures and Examples

Dr. Zubaidah M. Kheir Hasan Ereksoussi
Umm AL-Qura University

The Translation of Qur'an Metaphors: Procedures and Examples

Dr. Zubaidah M. Kheir Hasan Ereksoussi

ABSTRACT

Metaphor translation is a problematic area since it requires an honest transfer of SL cultural meanings. In fact, it is more so when the metaphors translated are part of a sacred text like the Holy Qur'an, where a highly accurate rendition is usually in demand.

The main purpose of this paper is to identify and put in order of preference the different translation procedures that would yield appropriate translations of Qur'anic metaphors. In order to achieve this purpose, I will define metaphor, review the different procedures that theory presents for its translation, discuss their appropriateness, and relate them to their mother translation approach. Finally, an investigation of the actual procedures used in the translation of Qur'anic metaphor will be carried out in order to assess the level of success of each.

The importance of the study lies in its theoretical contributions as well as practical applications. It is also hoped that the present study would contribute to the production of a more appropriate translation of the holy message based on the findings of modern linguistics rather than on intuition.

ترجمة استعارات القرآن : أشكالها و نماذجها

د. زبيدة محمد خير حسن عرقسوسي

ملخص البحث

إن ترجمة الاستعارة العربية لا تزال محط دراسة وتأمل لأنها تتطلب نقـلا أمينـا لمجموعة من المعاني المتعلقة غالبا بثقافة اللغة المصدر، والتي قـد يتعـذر وجـود مقابـل حرفي لها في اللغة الهدف. وتزداد المشكلة تعقيـدا عنـدما تختص الترجمـة بالنصـوص الدينية المقدسة وبخاصة القرآن الكريم، ممـا يضـيق علـى المترجـم دائـرة التصـرف في الترجمة إلى أبعد الحدود.

لذا فقد هدفنا في دراستنا هذه إلى توضيح أشكال ترجمة الاستعارة المقبولة نظريا و التعرف على نماذجها، ثم استقصـينا أشـكال الترجمـة الفعليـة لاسـتعارات القـرآن ودرسنا مدى قبولها أملا في أن تساهم هذه الدراسة في ترتيب أشكال الترجمة الممكنـة حسب الأفضلية و كشف الأسباب الحقيقية التي تؤدي في بعض الأحيان إلى استغلاق ترجمة هذا اللون من البلاغة، وطرح الحلول العلمية العملية لمثل هذه الحالات.

وتكمن أهمية هذه الدراسة ليس بالتعريف بأشكال الترجمـة المقبولـة فقـط بـل بتحديد معاني الاستعارة بطريقـة تتفـق وعلـوم المعـاني الحديثـة ممـا يسـهل دراسـتها وترجمتها، و يسهم في الوصول لترجمة بلاغية قوية وصحيحة للقرآن الكريم أيضا.

Introduction:

Metaphor translation has always been a problematic translation area because it demands the transfer of different meanings, some of which are cultural and may not have ready equivalents in the TL. This problem gains in momentum and reaches its height when translating sacred texts since faithfulness to the Speaker, here, would highly restrict the translator's choices.

The main purpose of this paper is to identify and put in order of preference the different translation procedures that would yield appropriate translations of Qur'anic metaphors. In order to achieve this purpose, metaphor will be defined and exemplified clearly and precisely. Then, I would review the different procedures that theory presents for the translation of metaphor, discuss their appropriateness, and relate them to their mother translation approach. Finally, an investigation of the actual procedures used in the translation of Qur'anic metaphor will be carried out in order to assess the level of success of each, and highlight the main problems resulting from the choice of a certain procedure to the exclusion of others. Consequently, one can decide if an order of preference can be maintained among the different procedures.

The importance of the study lies in its theoretical contributions as well as practical applications. Theoretically, it would add to our knowledge of

metaphor, the different meanings involved in it, and the different procedures of translating it. Practically, it highlights the appropriateness potential of each translation procedure, specify its associated meaning loss, and suggest possible compensations of meaning. It is also hoped that the present study would contribute to the production of a more appropriate translation of the holy message based on the findings of modern linguistics rather than on intuition.

1. Metaphor and Its Types:

In Arabic, metaphor is "Isti'ara", which literally means borrowing. Al-Jurjani (d. 474 H)[1] concludes that it is named as such because in metaphor, just like in actual borrowing, there is a transfer of some benefit between two entities; and this is what distinguishes metaphor from simile where no transfer is involved. In particular, the transfer here is one of meaning rather than of name because the transfer of benefit is the cause of borrowing (Al- Jurjani, 1991a, p. 324-325). Moreover, just like in borrowing, in metaphor, three elements are involved: the entity from which we borrow, the entity borrowed, and the entity to which we borrow (Atiq, 1985, p. 167). Furthermore, for transfer to take place, there must be a relationship between the entity from which we borrow and that to which we borrow; and this relation must be one of

similarity because this relation is what distinguishes metaphor from other figures of speech such as metonymy and synecdoche (Al- Jurjani, 1991a, pp. 403-404).

Apart from its literal meaning, metaphor is defined as a kind of rhetorical meaning, the specification of which differs according to the meaning approach in which it stems. In general, there are two basic approaches to meaning, namely, the semantic and the pragmatic approaches. On the one hand, semanticists define meaning in terms of the relationship between a sign and its referent. Their main concern is to investigate the truth and falsity of meaning propositions. On the other hand, pragmatists define meaning as one of the communicative purposes of the speaker. Therefore, they explain meaning within an encompassing theory of language as a communicative act where context in its linguistic as well as situational forms play a major role in encoding and decoding speaker- meaning.

After reviewing theories of metaphor, both semantic and pragmatic, in both Arabic and English scholarships, we came to a conclusion (Ereksoussi, 2003) that no theory is complete or void of one or the other flaw except Al- Jurjani's semantico-pragmatic

theory of metaphor. Therefore, it is the theory chosen as a framework for this study.

1.1 Al- Jurjani's Theory of Metaphor

Al- Jurjani started by criticizing the two semantic theories of metaphor that preceded his work. The first of these used to define metaphor as a name transfer from one entity to some other entity. Of its pioneers are Al-Jahidh (d. 255 H), Ibn Qutaibah (d. 276 H), Ibn Al-Mo'taz (d. 296 H), and Ibn Ja'far (d. 337 H). Al-Jurjani (1991a, p. 405), along with other linguists of the time such as Al-Razi (d. 606 H), and Al-'alawi Al-Yamani (d. 751 H) in his <u>Tiraz</u> (vol. 1, p. 199), pointed out how such a definition leads to conceiving each language transfer as a metaphor. It also leads to misperceiving proper names such as "Asad (Lion), and Wardah (Flower)[2]" to be metaphors, which is plainly incorrect. According to this theory, which has Latin origins going back to Aristotle (1946), all metaphorical utterances are false. Of their proponents in today's English scholarships is Black (1962).

The second semantic theory of metaphor pioneered by Ibn Al-Athir (d. 637 H) defines metaphor as a meaning transfer from one entity to another based on some similarity between them (Ibn Al-Athir, 1939, Part 2, p. 83). The problem with this theory is that it defines simile in the same way though simile involves

no transfer at all. According to this theory, the differences between metaphor and simile are merely structural. It is claimed that in metaphor, similizing tools such as (like, as if, and as) are not used, and the similized entity might also be dropped (Ibn Al-Athir, 1939, Part 2, p. 83). Like the first semantic theory of metaphor, this second one has also Latin origins going back to Cicro (1942). Of their proponents in today's English scholarships are Ullman (1951), and Nowottny (1965).

According to this second semantic theory of metaphor, the word (lion) in (I saw a lion) referring to (Zaid) has two meanings. The first is the literal meaning of lion which is the predatory animal, and this one is certainly false. The second is a courageous being, and if Zaid is really courageous, the utterance is true.

Al- Jurjani criticizes this theory and points out a number of flaws in it. He argues (1991a, p. 322) that the differences between metaphor and simile are not only structural but also functional. In simile, an entity is never claimed to be some other one but only similar to some other one in some respects, and this is why it is usually used to express new images whereas metaphor expresses familiar images but in an exaggerated manner through which both entities fuse

together and become one in terms of the point of similarity intended (Al-Jurjani, 1991a, p. 248). Moreover, in simile, there is no transfer in the first place because both entities are mentioned clearly (Al-Jurjani, 1991a, p. 240). In addition, the structural differences themselves that are claimed by proponents of this theory do not always exist. For example, in the most rhetorical form of simile, namely X is Y, such as (Zaid is a lion), which is called "at-tashbeeh al-baleegh" in Arabic, no similizing tools are used, and in metaphor proper, the entity dropped could be the one similized to rather than the one similized.

It is interesting to know that when Al-Jurjani criticized these two theories of metaphor that has Latin origins, and proposed a better alternative, he was not interested in metaphor per se but he was trying to prove the inimitability of the holy Qur'an. While doing so, it became clear to him and to other linguists of the time that applying the previous two semantic theories of metaphor in interpreting the Qur'an would result in distorted interpretations of its meaning. Proponents of the first theory, for example, would claim the Qur'an to be void of metaphors and interpret it literally throughout because metaphors are false and Allah's Word cannot be described as such. Proponents of the second theory, on the other hand, would double the meaning of each and every word in the Qur'an, and

then get stuck while deciding which of the two meanings to choose and on what basis. Therefore, Al-Jurjani rightly deemed both as inappropriate and proposed a better semantico-pragmatic alternative within a more comprehensive global theory of language.

Al-Jurjani defines metaphor in semantic and pragmatic terms. Semantically (Al-Jurjani, 1991a, p. 251), metaphor is meaning transfer between two entities because of some similarity between them. Yet, it differs from simile in structure and in function. He concedes that the relation between a metaphoric sign and its referent is fusion. Thus, in (I saw a lion) referring to (Zaid), we see (a man in a lion's image) (Abu Musa, 1993, p. 177). Moreover, Al-Jurjani, at different parts of his two major works Al-Dala'el and Al-Asrar, and within a comprehensive theory of language and meaning defines metaphor in pragmatic terms as well. According to Al-Jurjani, as summarized in El-Hakkoni (1995) who uses modern linguistic terminology, language is a means of communication, and meanings are the speaker's communicative purposes. These meanings or communicative purposes are of two kinds: direct and indirect (Al- Jurjani, 1991b, p. 263). The direct meaning can be understood from the literal meaning of the utterance itself as in (Zaid went out). The indirect meaning, on the other

hand, cannot be taken literally because of some linguistic or situational contextual evidence. For example, in (I saw a lion) referring to Zaid, the situational context proves that the literal meaning is not intended which leads the hearer to assume that the speaker wants to similize Zaid to a lion in its prominent features, namely courageousness and bravery, but he chooses to exaggerate the presence of the similarity to the point where Zaid and the lion become one in bravery. "Meaning" and the "meaning of meaning" are the two terms chosen by Al-Jurjani to designate the direct and the indirect kinds of meaning respectively, and the latter is further divided into two subtypes: necessary and possible meanings of meaning (Al- Jurjani, 1991a, p. 220-222). The necessary ones must be there because of "something in the utterance itself", i.e., without them, the utterance is meaningless or its meaning is incomplete. In contrast, the possible ones are not a must. They can only be there in terms of the "intention of the speaker". In other words, there is no linguistic or contextual evidence that necessitates their being intended. Therefore, they can easily be denied by both the speaker and the hearer. In line with this theory of meaning, the metaphoric utterance (I saw a lion) referring to Zaid can be analyzed as follows:

I. The Meaning (i.e., the direct or literal meaning)

This includes the meaning of the lexical items involved and the meaning of their grammatical relations. The inconsistency of this meaning with the situational context of the utterance indicates the presence of other kinds of meaning.

II. The Meaning of Meaning Subdivisions:

a. The Necessary Meanings

There are two necessary meanings in the utterance under analysis. The first is the similarity assertion between Zaid and the lion in the lion's most prominent features. The second is the exaggeration assertion where Zaid is made a real lion in bravery and courageousness.

b. The Possible Meanings

The utterance could be intended to frighten Zaid's enemies, or to praise him, or to convince someone to hire him for security duties …etc. Yet, all these intentions are hidden and can therefore be easily denied.

By specifying clearly these different types of meaning involved in metaphor, Al-Jurjani could also solve the problem of the truth and falsity of metaphor. Unlike English scholars in the field (Ereksoussi, 2003), Arab scholars believe that meanings whose truth and falsity depend on the honesty of the speaker are not the

subject of truth analysis because they cannot be true or false in themselves. According to Arab scholars, only those necessary meanings that are evidenced by something in the utterance itself are the ones that can be designated as true or false (Al-Maidani, 1996, Vol. 1, p. 171-172). Moreover, not all of the necessary meanings are the subject of truth analysis, but only their negative and affirmative assertions (Al-Jurjani, 1991b, p. 527). Furthermore, of those negative and positive assertions, some are logical and others are fictitious or imaginary. The logical or mental ones are the wise sayings that people, in general, agree upon (Al- Jurjani, 1991a, p. 264), and therefore, they are always true. On the other hand, the fictitious ones cannot be the subject of truth analysis because they are merely fancies, not realities (Al-Jurjani, 1991a, p. 284-319). In line with this explanation, we can say that the similarity assertion involved in the above utterance must always be true whereas the exaggerated assertion, where the man and the lion become one in bravery, is only fictitious, and hence is not a subject for truth analysis. In this way, Al-Jurjani could explain the rhetorical element in metaphor, namely that it consists of both a necessary true meaning in addition to a fictitious one that keeps the door open for imagination to take place.

In short, Al-Jurjani could explain what constitutes a metaphor in semantic as well as pragmatic terms, and both explanations go hand in hand and support one another. El-Hakkuoni (1995, p. 122) clarified Al-Jurjani's concept of language as a communication system that aims at conveying to the listener the speaker's communicative purposes in a specific context. According to this view, meanings are the speaker's communicative purposes and they usually build up first in the speaker's psyche (Al-Jurjani, 1991b, p. 405), then he chooses the appropriate words and grammatical structures and relations to convey them (Al-Jurjani, 1991b, 412). In a previous study of mine (Ereksoussi, 2003, p. 53-65), I could deduce from various parts of Al-Jurjani's two major works, Al-Dala'el and Al-Asrar, metaphor encoding as well as decoding procedures, in addition to the role of context, both linguistic and situational, in specifying the direct and indirect meanings.

It is worth noting here that English contemporary pragmatic theories of metaphor do acknowledge the fact that metaphor is a meaning that is not possible in literal terms, but they fail to explain this distinguished meaning. Their suggested decoding procedures always end with a perception of a simile not a metaphor. Examples are Grice (1975/1999), and Searle (1979). This problem is due to the fact that Western linguists

either hold similarity as the only possible relation in metaphor but fail to distinguish metaphor from simile; or hold similarity to be only one of the possible relations in metaphor; hence, they fail to distinguish it from all other figures of speech. Proponents of the first group are Nowottny (1965) and Grice (1975/1999), whereas proponents of the second group are Richards (1936) and Searle (1979). Moreover, Western pragmatists have never tried to reconcile their findings about meaning with the ones in semantics.

Because of the maturity and comprehensibility of Al-Jurjani's theory of metaphor, it is the one that prevailed in Arabic literature since it appeared. All linguists who came after Al-Jurjani, such as Al-Zamakhshari (d. 538 H), Al-Razi (d. 606 H), Al-Sakkaki (d. 626 H), and Al-Qazwini (d. 739 H), adopted his theory of metaphor, but to them goes the credit for collecting the scattered information about this theory, and the credit for specifying its definitions and divisions because, as mentioned before, Al-Jurjani's main concern was only to prove the inimitability of the Qur'an, and while doing so he had to explain the meanings and the structure of the language of the Qur'an in general. In particular, Al-Sakkaki's definition of metaphor is the one given in most present day books about the subject. Al-Sakkaki (1973, p. 369) points out that metaphor is an utterance

"where you mention one of the entities involved in simile while intending the other, claiming that the similized entity has become the one similized-to, and providing a proof on that by asserting to the similized entity one of the prominent features of the similized-to entity."

1.2. Types of Metaphor

In English scholarships, many traditional typologies of metaphor exist. The most common of which is Newmark's (1988/2003, p. 106-113) where he lists the following seven types of metaphor:

1. dead metaphors (foot of a page)
2. cliché metaphors (head over heels in love)
3. standard/stock metaphors (his wife wears the trousers)
4. cultural metaphors (to stir one's stumps (from cricket))
5. adapted metaphors (they hold all the cards)
6. recent metaphors (political transparency)
7. original metaphors (a window of opportunity)

As rightly stated by Ghazala (2014, forthcoming), such classifications are of little use nowadays because of its "superficiality". There is no clear cut boundary between a dead metaphor and a cliché or a stock one, and so on. Leech (1985, p. 158), on the other hand, distinguishes four types of metaphor: (a) humanizing

metaphors, where a human characteristic is assigned to inanimate objects (His manners speak eloquently of him); (b) animistic metaphors, where animate characteristics are attributed to the inanimate (The shoulder of the hill); (c) abstract to concrete shifting metaphors, where a material or physical characteristic is assigned to an abstract concept (The light of learning); (d) the synesthetic metaphor, where experiences of one sense are described in terms of some other sense (Warm color). It is clear that similar to Newmark's typology, Leech's typology also suffers from the absence of clear cut boundaries between the different proposed types. In fact, Leech himself (1985, p. 158) points out that "Categories (a), (b), and (c), overlap because humanity entails animacy, and animacy entails concreteness." Moreover, Leech's classification is based on two unrelated criteria. The first is concerned with personification versus animalization, whereas the second is concerned with concrete/abstract shifting.

Ghazala (2014, forthcoming) points out that a better alternative to these traditional typologies is the contemporary typologies of conceptual metaphors "Put forward in terms of cognitive conceptualization in the first place," and he gave a crude account of eighteen types of metaphor. However, a thorough look at these types reveals that though these new typologies are a bit

better than the traditional ones, they still suffer from a number of drawbacks as compared with the Arabic typologies. First, most of their illustrative examples are still similes and not metaphors. Examples are primary conceptual metaphors (Purposes are destinations), complex conceptual metaphors (A purposeful life is a journey), complex metaphors (The world is a small village), and simple metaphors (My lawyer is a shark), and the like. Second, some of the types, such as "political metaphors" and "culturally sensitive metaphors" are not classified in terms of cognitive conceptualization. Furthermore, because of this absence of a unifying theme of classification, some suggested types might be identical to one another, but they are designated different terms only because they are suggested by different authors. Therefore, I will not implement any of these classifications in this study.

In contrast to Western classifications of metaphor, Arabic classifications are very precise and clear cut. In Arabic scholarships, Al-Sakkaki (1973, p. 373) distinguishes between explicit and implicit metaphor. The difference between the two is a structural one. In explicit metaphor or Al-Isti'ara Al-Tasrihiya, the entity mentioned is the one similized to whereas in implicit metaphor or Al-Isti'ara Al-Makniyah, it is the one similized. Thus, explicit metaphor conveys the meaning configuration of "Making a thing something

else by means of exaggerating the similarity point between the two, as in: I saw a lion at the battle". Implicit metaphor, on the other hand, conveys the meaning configuration of "Attributing a trait to some object that does not really possess it by means of exaggerating the similarity point between the two objects or entities involved, as in: the situation tells…" (Al-Sakkaki, 1973, p. 384).

Al-Sakkaki (1973, p. 388) also classifies metaphor into four different types in terms of the directionality in perceiving metaphoric images:

1. Metaphors representing concrete entities in terms of some other concrete ones as in:

   The horse flew. (Both flying and running are concrete, i.e., sensory perceived).

2. Metaphors representing abstract entities in terms of some other abstract ones as in:

   He faced death in fulfilling his dream. (Both the hardships of death and those one faces in fulfilling a life goal are abstract, i.e., sensibly or intellectually perceived).

3. Metaphors representing abstract entities in terms of some concrete ones as in:

   The dark ages. (Darkness is concrete while ignorance is abstract).

4. Metaphors representing concrete entities in terms of some abstract ones as in:

Mercy angels. (Angels are abstract whereas nurses are concrete).

It is evident that, in contrast to Leech's classification of metaphor, Al-Sakkaki's provides for all and only the four types of possible directionalities in perception. It is also worth noting here that contemporary English scholars still believe in the unidirectionality of perception. Lakoff (1993) emphasizes the principle that abstract concepts are understood in terms of concrete processes. Similarly, Kertesz (2004) makes it clear that "In a conceptual metaphor, … unlike the source domain[3], which is concrete and based on sensory experience, the target domain is abstract." As a result, in order to cover all possible types of metaphor, the selection of metaphors chosen for analysis in this study is made in light of Al-Sakkaki's classification of the directionality of shifts in metaphor perception.

2. Metaphor Translation Procedures: a Theoretical Perspective

While explaining the different kinds of meanings involved in metaphor and their equivalences theoretically, AL-Jurjani implies metaphor's different possible translation procedures. In fact, translation

involves a transfer of meaning from one language to another, and hence the way we conceptualize the meaning under translation determines the translation procedure that best reproduces it.

Thus, semanticists who believe metaphor to be merely a name transfer would translate metaphor by its sense only without mentioning the name of the entity from which the sense is borrowed (Al Musta'ar minhu). In other words, they would translate (I saw a lion) into (I saw a brave man), without mentioning the word lion at all. Al-Jurjani (1991a, p. 35-36) comments that if a translator chooses to do so, "He is not translating the metaphoric utterance; rather, he is giving his own utterance." This is because the translator has not translated the lion image at all. He merely confined himself to giving the general sense of the utterance. Moreover, as is clear from Al-Jurjani's discussion of some other examples (1991b, p. 304-305), such a translation could imply that the words (lion) and (brave) are synonyms which is plainly false. Furthermore, all the indirect meanings, both the necessary and the possible ones that are derived from seeing a man in a lion's image are lost.

The second group of semanticists who believe metaphor to be a compressed simile, i.e., a simile with no particles, would translate (I saw a lion) into (I saw a

man who is like a lion in bravery). Al-Jurjani (1991a, p. 322) criticizes this translation as well because it mentions both entities, i.e., the man and the lion, clearly; therefore, the receiver here can only see a man who is like a lion in bravery but never a man in a lion's image. In this translation, the exaggeration effect, where both man and lion become one in bravery, is lost, and hence all the possibly intended meanings based on it are lost too. Al-Jurjani notes (1991b, p. 364) that any change in form results in a change in meaning.

According to Al-Jurjani, the best way to translate a metaphor is by giving the same metaphor in the target language. He (1991b, p. 265) points out that if you translate (I saw a lion) into (I met a predatory animal), the translation is correct because it gives the same similizing act, the same exaggeration act, and hence the same meaning image. Since all the necessary meanings of meaning are produced, all their possible implications have become possible too.

However, substituting a SL image by some TL image that is derived from a different simile that shares only the same general sense with the original one is not accepted. AL-Jurjani (1991b, p. 312) says that images[4] such as "Your dog is kinder than others in its behavior with guests"; and "My young camels are all

weak and thin" cannot be equal although both are intended as descriptions of hospitality. The first suggests, by implication, that the man, who owns the dog, receives guests so often that his dog does not bark any more at anyone approaching his tent, whereas the second implies that the owner of the camels slaughters them for his guests, and since he is so frequently visited, none of his young cattle members enjoy the time when to become strong and fat. In terms of the different types of meaning that we have discussed above, we can say that Al-Jurjani rejects this strategy because the two images share only the general sense, i.e., only the possibly intended meaning, but differ in all other types of meaning both direct and indirect.

In short, according to Al-Jurjani, the only accepted translation strategy is the production of the same metaphor in the TL. The other three translation strategies, namely the reduction of metaphor to sense, the conversion of metaphor to simile, and the production of a different TL metaphor, all involve some meaning loss. Moreover, the last one involves also the addition of new meanings that are not intended in the SL text; a matter which makes it worse than the other two, especially in translating holy texts where accuracy is required.

On surveying English scholarships on the topic, we found that Shibles (1971) gives exactly the first three translation procedures given by Al- Jurjani. Moreover, similar to Al-Jurjani, he also contends that the best translation procedure is to produce the same metaphor in the TL.

Newmark (1982, p. 88-91), on the other hand, postulates seven strategies for metaphor translation, and puts them in the following order of preference:

1. The production of the same metaphor or image in the TL (provided that the image has comparable frequency and currency in the appropriate register).

2. The production of a different TL metaphor that shares the general sense with the original (i.e., replacing the image with a standard TL image).

3. The conversion of metaphor to simile, retaining the same image.

4. The conversion of metaphor to simile combined with its general sense.

5. The reduction of metaphor to sense.

6. Deletion of metaphor.

7. The reproduction of the same metaphor combined with its sense.

Obviously, similar to Al-Jurjani, Newmark's first preference is the production of the same metaphor in

the TL. The other alternatives, namely strategies number 2, 3, and 5 are equal to Al-Jurjani's three other basic strategies, i.e., converting metaphor to its simile paraphrase, or to its plain sense expressed either literally or indirectly by being implied in some TL standard metaphor. As for strategies number 4 and 7, each is a combination of some two of the four basic strategies suggested earlier by Al-Jurjani. The only new procedure or translation strategy, here, is the deletion of metaphor which cannot be accepted since it involves no translation at all.

Ghazala (1995, p. 155) also gives precedence to the reproduction of the same image, especially when translating holy texts where meaning is sacred (Ghazala, 2006). The only other method acceptable to him is the reproduction of the sense of a metaphor. His list of metaphor translation strategies does not include translation by simile. This is perhaps due to his communicative stance. He (1995, p. 162) contends that "The best translation is always to translate a metaphor with a metaphor or else the meaning." By 'meaning' he (1995, p. 162) refers to "The meaning we understand from any metaphorical expression, not the meaning of its individual words."

Az-Zahri (1990, p. 337-343) proposed eighteen strategies for the translation of metaphor. However, a

closer examination of these strategies reveals that they are merely different combinations of the four basic strategies suggested by Al-Jurjani, or combinations of these strategies with what we shall call the 'compensation strategies'. The 'compensation strategies' are the strategies used by the translator to compensate for any unavoidable translation loss necessitated by linguistic or cultural peculiarities of either the SL or the TL. As can be inferred from Az-Zahri's strategies, the only two compensation strategies available to the translator of authoritative texts, such as the Qur'an, are either to add a footnote or to add an explanatory phrase in the main text of the translation, with the proviso that such explanatory inserted additions are enclosed in brackets in order for them to be distinguished from the content of the original holy message.

In a nutshell, it is clear that translation theorists as well as meaning theorists agree that the best way to render a metaphor is to reproduce the same metaphor in the TL, but they differ in putting the other translation strategies in an order of preference. On the one hand, those concerned with meaning, such as Al-Jurjani, would reject all other translation strategies since the implementation of any is bound to produce some loss of meaning. Translation theorists, on the other hand, propose the use of the other translation

strategies because they know that translation is always a matter of more or less since languages differ in their cultural images and in the semantic range of each word. Therefore, our next question is: where the ideal strategy is blocked for some cultural or linguistic peculiarities, is there an order of preference obtaining among the less preferred strategies?

In a previous study of mine (Ereksoussi, 2008, p. 177-178), it was evident that the choice of any one of the less preferable strategies to the exclusion of others is readily explicable in terms of the translation approach adhered to in a translation. All translation approaches are, in the main, similar, in that they all aim at the reproduction of the three constituents of a message, namely form, content, and force. This is why all approaches to translation consider the reproduction of the same metaphor in the TL the best strategy since it is the one that reproduces all constituents of a message. However, where translation problems arise, the approaches to translation differ one from the other mainly in the emphasis given to each of the three constituents of a message. In semantic translation, where focus is on the reproduction of an equivalent content of the original message (Newmark, 1982, p. 22), the translation of a metaphor by simile retaining the same image is the strategy that reproduces the utterance meaning, and hence best suits the purpose of

semantic translators. In communicative translation, on the other hand, precedence is given to force (Newmark, 1982, p. 39); therefore, converting metaphor to sense is the strategy that best suits the purpose of communicative translators. Accordingly, semantic translators would translate Al-Jurjani's example "I saw a lion" into "I saw a man who is like a lion in bravery"; whereas communicative translators would opt for "I saw a brave man".

Although in each, a meaning constituent is reproduced, yet both involve some meaning loss. Therefore, if the text is authoritative, like the Qur'an, one should not hesitate to make up for any unavoidable meaning loss by employing the previously mentioned compensation strategies, namely the use of notes and of bracketed insertions.

As for the fourth translation strategy, where the SL image is replaced by a standard TL image that gives the same general sense of the original metaphor, it is evident that despite the fact that free translators, who give precedence to form over other constituents of a message, might opt for it, such a strategy does not suit authoritative sacred texts like the Qur'an because it would add meanings that are not intended in the original text. Clearly, adding unintended meanings to a sacred text is as harmful as deleting some intended

meanings from it, if not worse. This is because a meaning loss can be unavoidable, and hence justifiable whereas meaning additions cannot be so especially when translating metaphor since it is possible to give the sense directly with no additions.

In a nutshell, one can say that where the ideal translation strategy is blocked while translating Qur'anic metaphors, only two other strategies are accepted, namely converting the metaphor to simile retaining the same image or reducing it to sense. In practice, both of these less preferable strategies are equal alternatives because both retain some meaning constituents but sacrifice others. However, each is justifiable in terms of the priorities of a different translation approach.

3. Metaphor Translation Strategies Used in Qur'an Translations

After surveying the theoretically postulated strategies, we surveyed the actually used ones in different translations of the holy Qur'an in order to find out whether or not theory and practice do correspond to one another, whether or not there are any other strategies for metaphor translation, and whether or not the actual practical order of preference is identical to the theoretical one. Sixteen different Qur'anic metaphors were chosen: each four of them represent

one of the four types of metaphor as classified by Al-Sakkaki in his Miftah (1973, p. 388). The translations of these metaphors by Arberry (1955) and by Abdullah Yusuf Ali (1991) were chosen for analysis because of two main reasons:

1. None of these two translations is known for its deliberate inclusion of translation deviations or mistakes that usually render the translators' own beliefs which discussion is outside the scope of this research. In fact, a number of Muslim scholars complement the relative objectivity of these two translations. Of these scholars, one might mention Sanaullah (1988), Quidawi (1990), and Al-Nadawi (1972).

2. These two translations represent the two different approaches to translation[5]. Arberry's translation is known to be communicative (Al-Sheikh, 1990) whereas Yusuf Ali's translation is known to be semantic (AL-Nadawi, 1972). This difference in the approach adhered to in a translation helps in finding out whether the theoretical order of preference among the different metaphor translation strategies obtains in practice or not.

The meaning of each metaphor was determined in accordance with famous exegesis such as Tafsir Ibn Katheer (Ibn Katheer, 2000), Jami' Al-Bayan fi

Ta'weel Al-Qur'an (Al-Tabari, 1968), and Safwat Al-Tafaseer (Al-Sabouni, 1981). In fact, the analysis of these metaphors and their corresponding translations was done in an earlier study of ours (Ereksoussi, 2003, p. 218-345), which aimed at finding out the problematic areas in metaphor translation and their possible solutions, but that same analysis can help us in finding out the different actual translation procedures used in each translation. The following table lists the chosen metaphors, their different translations, and the procedure or translation strategy used in each translation.

Table 1: Metaphor translation procedures used in Arberry's and in Ali's translations of the holy Qur'an respectively

No.	Translation procedures used	Original metaphors followed by Translations of Arberry, and Ali, respectively
1		"و اشتعل الرأس شيباً" مريم: ٤
	Reproduction of the same metaphor	"My head is all aflame with hoariness"
	Reduction to sense	"And the hair of my head doth glisten with grey"
2		"وآية لهم الليل نسلخ منه النهار" يس: ٣٧
	Reproduction of the same metaphor	"And a sign for them is the night; we strip it of the day"
	Reduction to sense	"And a sign for them is the night: We withdraw therefrom the day"
3		"و تركنا بعضهم يومئذ يموج في بعض" الكهف: ٩٩
	Reproduction of the same metaphor	"Upon that day We shall leave them surging on one another"
	Conversion to simile	"On that day We shall leave them to surge like waves on one another"
4		"و قطعناهم في الأرض أمماً" الأعراف: ١٦٨
	Reproduction of the same metaphor	"And we cut them up into nations in the earth"
	Reduction to sense	"We broke them up into sections on this earth"

5		"فنبذوه وراء ظهورهم" آل عمران: ١٨٧
	Reduction to sense	"But they rejected it behind their backs"
	Reproduction of the same metaphor	"But they threw it away behind their backs"
6		"ختم الله على قلوبهم و على سمعهم و على أبصارهم غشاوة" البقرة: ٧
	Reproduction of the same metaphor	"God has set a seal on their hearts and on their hearing, and on their eyes is a covering"
	Reproduction of the same metaphor	"Allah has set a seal on their hearts and on their hearing. And on their eyes is a veil"
7		"و الشعراء يتبعهم الغاوون. ألم تر أنهم في كل واد يهيمون" الشعراء: ٢٤-٢٥
	Reproduction of the same metaphor	"And the poets-the perverse follow them; hast thou not seen how they wander in every valley"
	Reproduction of the same metaphor	"And the poets, it is those straying in evil who follow them: Seest thou not that they wander distracted in every valley?"
8		"و لما سكت عن موسى الغضب أخذ الألواح" الأعراف: ١٥٤
	Production of a different metaphor	"And when Moses' anger abated in him, he took the tablets"
	Reduction to sense	"When the anger of Moses was appeased, he took up the tablets"
9		"تكاد تميز من الغيظ" الملك: ٨

	Reproduction of the same metaphor	"And well-nigh (it) bursts asunder with rage"
	Reproduction of the same metaphor	"Almost bursting with fury"
10		"وأحيينا به بلدة ميتاً" ق: ١١
	Production of an extension of the original metaphor	"And thereby we revived a land that was dead"
	Reproduction of the same metaphor	"And we give (new) life therewith to land that is dead"
11		"فوجدا فيها جدارا يريد أن ينقض فأقامه" الكهف: ٧٧
	Deletion of metaphor	"There they found a wall about to tumble down, and so he set it up"
	Deletion of metaphor	"They found there a wall on the point of falling down, but he set it up straight"
12		"و آية لهم الأرض الميتة أحييناها" يس: ٣٣
	Reproduction of the same metaphor	"And a sign for them is the dead land, that We quickened"
	Reproduction of the same metaphor	"A sign for them is the earth that is dead: We do give it life"
13		"من بعثنا من مرقدنا" يس: ٥٢
	Production of an extension of the original metaphor	"Who roused us out of our sleeping place?"
	Reproduction of the same metaphor	"Who has raised us up from our beds of repose"
14		"أومن كان ميتا فأحييناه" الأنعام: ١٢٢

	Reproduction of the same metaphor	"Why, is he who was dead, and We gave him life"
	Reproduction of the same metaphor	"Can he who was dead, to whom We gave life"
15		"سنفرغ لكم أيها الثقلان" الرحمن: ٣١
	Reduction to sense	"We shall surely attend to you at leisure, you weight and you weight"
	Reduction to sense	"Soon shall we settle your affairs O both ye worlds"
16		"فانك لا تسمع الموتى" الروم: ٥٢
	Reproduction of the same metaphor	"Thou shalt not make the dead to hear"
	Reproduction of the same metaphor	"So verily thou canst not make the dead to hear"

Table 2: The Frequency of Use of Each Translation Procedure in Each of the Translations

No.	1	2	3	4	5	6
Metaphor translation procedures	Reproduction of the same metaphor	Reduction to sense	Conversion to simile	Production of an extension metaphor	Production of a different metaphor	Deletion of metaphor
Frequency of use by Arberry	10	2	0	2	1	1
Percentage	62.5%	12.5%	0	12.5%	6.25%	6.25%
Frequency of use by Ali	9	5	1	0	0	1
Percentage	56.25%	31.25%	6.25%	0	0	6.25%
Total	19	7	1	2	1	2
Average of use	59.37%	21.87%	3.12%	6.25%	3.12%	6.25%

Table (1) shows that the reproduction of the same metaphor, reducing it to sense, converting it to simile, producing an extension metaphor, producing a different metaphor, and deleting metaphor are the actual procedures of metaphor translation that are used in practice.

Table (2) shows their frequency of use in each of the translations. Such a frequency tells clearly that the highest tendency in both translations is to use the most preferred translation procedure. This is no wonder since it is the procedure that best reproduces the meaning of the original metaphor. Yet, unfortunately, it is not used whenever possible. In translating a holy text like the Qur'an, one should stick to this ideal procedure whenever possible. In thirteen out of the sixteen examples under study, the reproduction of the same metaphor is possible, and at least one of the translators produced it in those thirteen cases, but both of the translators failed to use it wherever it can be applied. Arberry used it in ten out of the thirteen possible times whereas Yusuf Ali used it nine times only. The percentage of adherence to the use of the most preferable strategy whenever possible is 76.92% by Arberry, and 69.23% by Ali.

Of the two other accepted procedures to metaphor translation, namely the reduction of metaphor to sense

and its conversion to simile, the former is more widely used by both of the translators; a matter which is justified and expected in Arberry's translation but not in Ali's. Arberry's translation is communicative and thus the production of the intention of the speaker which is the sense is a priority. This also explains Arberry's resort to the production of an extension metaphor as well as the production of a different metaphor because in both the sense of the original metaphor is reproduced in an implied manner. It also explains the reason why he avoids the conversion of metaphor to simile because in such a conversion only the content which is the utterance meaning is reproduced. However, since content is a priority in semantic translations such as Ali's, we expect him to convert metaphor to simile more often. Unfortunately, he does that only once. Moreover, he reduced metaphor to sense more often than Arberry. The only possible explanation of this heavy use of the reduction of metaphor to sense by Ali is Grice's (1999, p. 76-88) communication maxims, and in particular that of brevity which states that interlocutors usually express their intentions in the shortest manner; and the shortest in metaphor translation is the production of its sense only.

As for the fourth and fifth translation strategies, namely substituting a metaphor by an extension of it or

by a different TL metaphor that shares the same sense of the original, it is evident that Arberry uses both because in both the sense is implied. It seems that he resorts to these procedures because they are more literary, and hence may help reproduce the grandeur of the original. Unfortunately, since the text is holy and is highly authoritative, their implementation did more harm than good to the translation; they add meanings that are not intended by the original text. In translating metaphor number 8, for example, the original metaphor personifies anger by using the word (became silent) with it, but the translator uses the word (abated) which is usually used with winds and storms, and hence produced a different metaphor that adds some unintended meanings to the translation. Clearly, the addition of some meanings is worse than the omission of some because the latter is unavoidable at times whereas the former can easily be avoided. Ali, in contrast to Arberry, succeeded in avoiding these strategies completely in his translation. Similarly, substituting a metaphor by its extension is not justifiable simply because if an extension image is possible in any culture, the original metaphor must be possible as well. Therefore, there is no need to resort to an extension metaphor in the first place, especially while translating sacred texts. In example number 13, for example, the "place of sleeping" is borrowed to

substitute for "graves" in order to imply that death is similar to sleep, but Arberry[6] borrowed "roused" to substitute for "raised" in order to imply that rousing from sleep is similar to raising from death. Clearly, if the similarity between rousing from sleep and raising from death is familiar in any culture, then the similarity between death and sleep must be familiar too.

Finally, to our surprise, the deletion of metaphor, which involves no translation at all, was used once by each translator. But we think that they did so because of a number of reasons. First, the translators might not have perceived the metaphor in the first place because neither of them is an Arab. Arberry is English and Yusuf Ali is Indian. Second, the metaphor itself is unfamiliar. Ibn Katheer (2000, Vol. 6, p. 188) quoted a Hadith in which the prophet was asked by the early companions about the meaning of (يريد أن ينقض), literally (seeking to fall down), the prophet replied (مائلا), i.e., (bending or tilted). Ibn Katheer concludes that this implies that intending to do something is the first step in doing it. Third, the reproduction of the same metaphor here is not possible. In English, the expression "a wall that wants to fall down" is odd. Therefore, the translators were obliged to avoid such an odd translation. However, "There they found a tilted wall about to fall down, and so he repaired it" is a

translation that constitutes a better alternative especially if appended by a note explaining the cultural specific meaning derived from personifying the wall, and concluded by Ibn Katheer above. This is because, at least, the suggested translation reproduces the sense of the metaphor as explained by the prophet peace be upon him.

The previous tables show clearly that, in practice, where the most preferred strategy is not used, any other strategy can be chosen and not only the two theoretically accepted ones, namely the substitution of a metaphor by its simile paraphrase or its reduction to sense. In fact, Yusuf Ali adhered more than Arberry to the use of accepted strategies. Only in one case out of the sixteen studied cases that he deleted the metaphor altogether; and we explained above that he might not have perceived the metaphor there in the first place. His consistent use of only the strategies that produce the utterance' meaning can be attributed to his adherence to the semantic approach in translation, where the rendering of the meanings necessitated by the utterance itself is a priority. Arberry's use of strategies such as the production of a different TL metaphor or the production of an extension metaphor, on the other hand, can be attributed to his communicative stance because the Speaker's purpose

or the sense of the original is indirectly rendered by both of these strategies.

Moreover, although both translators use footnotes and inserted explanations, neither uses them to supplement for the meaning lost in metaphor translation. It is evident from the examples studied that their use is mandatory, especially in metaphors that express cultural specific meanings. In example number 15, for instance, the metaphoric meaning in (Soon shall we be free to judge you) will not be perceived if the translator is not aware of the fact that in the Islamic culture, nothing occupies Allah. He can do as many things as He likes without being occupied by any. For Him, any task, no matter how great is only a matter of a "Be" and it is. Without this piece of information, one can not perceive the hidden similitude between the act of Allah towards humans and Jinn on the day of Reckoning and that of someone who has devoted himself exclusively to judge someone else's wrongdoing to him. This is to show how severe and fearful the judgment action is. Therefore, this piece of information must be hinted in a footnote. Furthermore, some of Yusuf Ali's insertions and all of Arberry's insertions are not bracketed which makes it look as part of the original holy text, and therefore, they must be corrected.

In sum, the linguistic analysis of the types of meaning produced in the original metaphors as compared to the ones produced in their translations proves that out of the six different strategies that are actually used in practice for the translation of holy metaphoric texts, there are only three appropriate ones and these correspond to the three theoretically accepted strategies.

4. General Findings and Recommendations

1. In translating holy metaphoric texts, the most appropriate strategy is the production of the same metaphor in the TL provided that it enjoys the same familiarity in the TL culture. This is because any change in form would lead to a change in the meaning configuration.

2. The other two accepted but less preferred strategies are the substitution of a metaphor by its simile paraphrase or by its sense. This is because, in both, part of the original meaning is reproduced. Yet, they should be resorted to only when the production of the same metaphor is blocked, and they should be accompanied by the use of compensation strategies such as the use of footnotes or of bracketed explanatory insertions.

3. Each of these two less preferred strategies is connected to a different translation approach.

Theoretically speaking, in cases where the most appropriate strategy cannot be used, communicative translators should opt for the reduction of metaphor to sense whereas semantic translators should opt for the substitution of metaphor by its simile paraphrase.

4. In practice, however, reducing metaphor to sense is the strategy that comes next in its frequency of use to the ideal one regardless of the approach adhered to in a translation.

5. All other translation procedures are not preferable when translating holy texts because they do not reproduce the original meanings appropriately. Moreover, they may produce new unintended meanings.

6. The mistranslation of a metaphor may be caused by a number of reasons: (a) the translator's wrong choices of words and structures, (b) the unfamiliarity of the metaphor itself within the TL culture, and (c) the difficulty in deciding on the different meanings of a metaphor, particularly when translating into English where the theories of metaphor have not yet reached a consensus on what constitutes a metaphor as distinct from other figures of speech.

7. Currently, neither Arberry's nor Ali's translation of the Qur'anic metaphors can be recommended because both are in need of serious revision.

8. Yet, each of the two chosen translations excels on a different ground. On the one hand, Arberry's translation is outstanding in terms of reproducing the same metaphor whenever possible. On the other hand, Ali's translation excels in terms of its use of only those preferable strategies that reproduce at least part of the original message. However, both fail in terms of using compensation strategies to supplement for the inevitable meaning loss in metaphor translation. Therefore, it is recommended that a panel or committee involving commentators, translators and native specialists in English and Arabic languages be set up for the purpose of seriously revising the available translations. Their duties in relation to metaphor translation may include the following:

a. Selecting the best from each translation and putting them all in one translation to be recommended later, or correcting a number of translations in order to have a number of recommended translations in order to give people the impression that a translation, however

perfect, is never the Qur'an, and therefore, a number of versions can exist.

b. Making sure that a translation reproduces the same metaphor whenever possible.

c. Making sure that where the most preferable strategy is blocked, only the two other accepted strategies that reproduce at least part of the original message are used.

d. Making sure that compensation strategies are used to supplement for any inevitable meaning loss in a translation.

e. The committee may be set up every ten years or so to re-revise the available translations in light of the new discoveries in the fields of linguistics and translation in order to keep the recommended translations authoritative not only in terms of intuition but also in terms of sound scientific findings.

Notes and Comments:

1 Since these theories appeared before the invention of print, the date of the death of the author will be given, preceded by the letter (d), after its first mention in order to give the reader an idea about the work's approximate date of appearance. In subsequent quotes of the same author, however, the publishing date will be given for ease of reference.

2 These are merely names of people here.

3 In a conceptual metaphor, the source domain is that from which we draw metaphorical expressions, such as 'journey' in (love is a journey), and the target domain is that which we try to understand, i.e.,' love' in the same example.

4 The images discussed here are not claimed to constitute metaphors. Rather, they are metonymies. Yet whatever is said in relation to those figures of speech apply to all others. This is because Al-Jurjani's discussion is not limited to metaphor. It is intended to be general enough to include all types of texts.

5 It should be mentioned here that translation practice preceded translation theory, and the translations chosen were done before the appearance of the different approaches to translation. Yet, they can still be described as representing this or that approach if the main lines of an approach is traceable in them.

6 It should be noted, however, that the meaning chosen to be reproduced in Arberry's translation is linguistically justifiable since the original verb (بعث), according to Ibn Manzoor (n. d., Vol. 2, p. 117) and Lane (1980, Vol. 1, p. 223), could, in one of its unusual uses, mean "roused". However, translating it into 'raised' is more accurate for a number of reasons. First, the original verb (بعث) is commonly used to mean "raised to life". Moreover, the verb "raised" is equivalent to the original verb (بعث) in its being a common collocation with the "dead",

and only unusually used in association with "sleeping people", whereas the verb "roused" is used only in collocation with "sleeping people" like the Arabic verb (أيقظ). Finally, all authoritative commentaries available to me interpret the original verb (بعث) as meaning "raised to life".

English References:

1- Ali, A. The Holy Qur`an: English Translation of The Meanings and Commentary. King Fahd Holy Qur`an Printing Complex: Al-Madinah Al-Munawwarah. (1991).

2- Al-Sheikh, A. "A Study of Two Major Translations of The Holy Qur'an (The Last Section) A Linguistic Study". Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis. Alexanderia University: Alexanderia (1990).

3- Arberry, A. The Koran Interpreted. George Allen & Unwin Publishers. London. (1955).

4- Aristotle. Poetics. Trans. By I. Baywater. Oxford. (1946).

5- Az-Zahri, M. "Metaphor and Translation". Unpublished Ph. D. Thesis. University of Salford: U. K. (1990).

6- Black, M. Models and Metaphors. Cornell University Press. Ithaca. (1962).

7- Cicero. De Oratore. Trans. By E.W. Sutton and H. Rackham. 2 Vols. Loeb Classical Library: London. (1942).

8- El-Hakkouni, A. "Al-Jurjani's Theory of Ma<na Al-Ma<na". In Langues et Litteratures. (1995). Vol. Xiii: 121-146. Publications of The Faculty of Letters: Rabat.

9- Ereksoussi, Z. "A Pragmatic Study of Some Problem Areas in Translating Arabic Metaphors into English: Focusing on Three Translations of The Holy Qur'an". Unpublished Ph.D Thesis. Mohammed V University: Rabat. (2003).

10- Ereksoussi, Z. "Al-Jurjani's Semantico-Pragmatic Theory of Metaphor and Its Implications for Translations". In CDELT Occasional Papers. (2008). Vol. 45, June: 122-185. Ain Shams University: Cairo.

11- Ghazala, H. Translation as Problems and Solutions. ELGA Publication: Malta. (1995).

12- Ghazala, H. Metaphor Conceptualization and Ideologization: a Cognitive Stylistic Perspective. Forthcoming (2014).

13- Grice, H. P. "Logic and Conversation". In Jawrski, A & Coupland, N. (Eds.), The Discourse Reader. (76-88). Routledge: London. (1975, 1999).

14- Ibn Katheer, I. Tafsir Ibn Kathir. Ten Vols. Abridged by a group of scholars under the supervision of Al-Mubarakpuri. Darussalam: Riyadh. (2000).

15- Kertesz, A. Cognitive Semantics and Scientific Knowledge. John Benjamins: Amsterdam/ Philadelphia. (2004).

16- Lakoff, G. "The Contemporary Theory of Metaphor". In A. Ortony (Ed.) Metaphor and Thought. (202-251). Cambridge University Press: Cambridge. (1993).

17- Lane, E. An Arabic English Lexicon. (8 vols.) Librairie Du Liban: Beirut. (1980).

18- Leech, G. A Linguistic Guide To English Poetry. Longman Group Ltd.: London. (1985).

19- Newmark. P. Approaches to Translation. Pergamon Press: Oxford. (1982).

20- Newmark. P. A Textbook of Translation. Pearson Education Limited: England. (1988/2003).

21- Nowottny, W. The Language Poets Use. London. (1965).

22- Qidawi, A. "A Survey of English Translations of The Glorious Qur'an. In The Muslim World League Journal. (1990). Vol. 18, Nos. 5&6.

23- Richards, I. A. The philosophy of Rhetoric. Oxford University Press. New York. (1936).

24- Sanaullah, M. "English Translations of The Holy Qur'an". In Radiance. (1988). Feb.: 21-27.

25- Searle, J. R. Expression and Meaning. Cambridge University Press. Cambridge. (1979).

26- Shibles, w. An Analysis of Metaphor in The Light of W. M. Urban's Theories. Mouton. The Hague. (1971).

27- Ullman, S. The Principles Of Semantics. Glasgow. Oxford. (1951, 1976).

المراجع العربية:

١ – القرآن الكريم.

٢– ابن الأثير (٦٣٧هـ). المثل السائر. تحقيق محمد عبد الحميد. دار البابلي الحلبي للنشر: مصر. (١٩٣٩م)

٣– ابن جعفر (٣٣٧هـ). نقد الشعر. تحقيق الأستاذ مصطفى. الخانجي للنشر. (د. ت)

٤- ابن قتيبة (٢٧٦هـ). أدب الكاتب. مؤسسة العلم: بيروت. (د. ت)

٥- ابن قتيبة (٢٧٦هـ). تأويل مشكل القرآن. تحقيق أحمد صقر. المكتبة العلمية: بيروت. (١٩٨١م)

٦- ابن المعتز (٢٩٦هـ). البديع . تحقيق الخفاجي. دار الحكمة: دمشق. (د. ت).

٧- ابن منظور. لسان العرب. دار الفكر: بيروت. (د. ت)

٨- أبو موسى. التصوير البياني. مكتبة وهبة: القاهرة. (١٩٩٣م)

٩- الجاحظ (٢٥٥هـ). البيان و التبيين. ثلاثة أجزاء. دار الكتب العلمية: بيروت. (د. ت)

١٠- الجرجاني، عبد القاهر (٤٧٤هـ). أسرار البلاغة. تحقيق محمود شاكر. دار المدني للنشر: جدة. (١٩٩١م أ)

١١- الجرجاني، عبد القاهر. (٤٧٤هـ). دلائل الإعجاز في علم المعاني .تحقيق محمود شاكر. دار المدني للنشر: جدة. (١٩٩١م ب)

١٢- الرازي (٦٠٦هـ). نهاية الإيجاز في دراية الإعجاز. القاهرة. (١٣٢٧ هـ)

١٣- الزمخشري (٥٣٨هـ). أساس البلاغة. تحقيق الأستاذ محمود. دار المعرفة: بيروت. (د. ت)

١٤- السكاكي (٦٢٦هـ). مفتاح العلوم. تحقيق نعيم زرزور. دار الكتب العلمية: بيروت. (١٩٧٣م)

١٥- الصابوني. صفوة التفاسير. دار القرآن الكريم: بيروت. (١٩٨١م)

١٦- الطبري (٣١٠هـ). جامع البيان في تأويل آي القرآن. تحقيق محمود شاكر. دار المعارف: مصر. (١٩٦٨م)

١٧- عتيق، عبد العزيز. علم البيان . دار النهضة: بيروت. (١٩٨٥م)

١٨- العلوي اليمني (٧٥١ هـ). الطراز. دار الكتب. (د. ت)

١٩- غزالة، حسن. "أساليب المستشرقين في ترجمة معاني القرآن الكريم". بحث غير منشور قُدم في ندوة: القرآن الكريم في الدراسات الاستشراقية. تحت إشراف وزارة الشؤون الإسلامية والأوقاف والدعوة والإرشاد ومجمع الملك فهد لطباعة المصحف الشريف بالمدينة المنورة، في ٧-٩/ ١١/ ٢٠٠٦م

٢٠- القزويني (٧٣٩هـ). الإيضاح في علوم البلاغة. دار الجيل: بيروت. (د. ت)

٢١- الميداني، عبد الرحمن حبنكة. البلاغة العربية. جزءان. دار القلم: دمشق. (١٩٩٦م)

٢٢- الندوي. ترجمات معاني القرآن الكريم وتطور فهمه عند الغرب. دار الفتح: جدة. (١٩٧٢م)