

***Figurative Language and Semantic Connectivity in
Translating Qur'ānic Discourse:
A Cognitive Perspective***

**** Asst. Prof.Dr. Mohammed Abdullah Al-Mallah**

*** Lect.Mohammed Nihad Ahmed**

تأريخ القبول: ٢٠١٢/١١/٧

تأريخ التقديم: ٢٠١٢/١٠/٢٤

1. Process and Product of Understanding:

One of the prime motivations for maintaining a belief in a literal meaning stems from the phenomenological experience that different kinds of meaning are recovered during interpretation of figurative and literal language. It is the intermediate nature of much figurative language that makes its meaning seem special and, by contrast, literal meanings so ordinary and primary. One reason why many scholars believe that figurative language violates communicative norms is that they confuse the process and products of linguistic understanding. The understanding of linguistic expression reveals that interpretation and recognition involve tremendous diversity in the emphasis on different temporal points at which text has supposedly been understood (Gibbs, 1994: 116; cf. El-Awa, 2006: 26).

Interpretation takes place in real time ranging from the first milliseconds of processing to long – term reflective analysis. This temporal continuum may roughly be divided into moments corresponding to linguistic comprehension, recognition, interpretation, and appreciation (Gibbs, 1994: 19);

a. Comprehension refers to the intermediate moment –by-moment process of creating meanings. These moments' processes are mostly unconscious and involve the analysis of linguistic information, in combination with context and real world knowledge. This process allows receptors to figure out the semantic structure.

b. Recognition refers to the conscious identification of the products of the comprehension as types, i.e. the meaning understood by a reader of particular

**** Dept. of Translation / College of Arts / University of Mosul.**

*** Dept. of Basic Sciences / College of Dentistry / University of Mosul.**

semantic structure may be consciously recognized as metaphorical. It is by no means that recognition is an obligatory stage for the receptor's understanding the semantic structures.

c. Interpretation refers to an analysis of the early products of comprehension as tokens. One can consciously create an understanding of a particular type of text as having a particular content or meaning.

d. Appreciation refers to some aesthetic judgments given to the product as either a type or token. This is an obligatory part of understanding linguistic meaning and the receptors of the language can manage comprehension of the semantic structures within contexts without automatically making aesthetic judgments about what has been understood

2. Meaning Postulates

In general, figurative language understanding, like the semantic structure of tropes, begins in the first moments with the comprehension process and proceeds in time to the later moments of comprehension, recognition, interpretation and appreciation. Much of what takes place when figurative language is normally understood in everyday speech and during understanding of some literary texts does not demand a cognitive effort beyond comprehension. In other words, meanings of the figurative tropes can be comprehended without recognizing each semantic structure as metaphorical, ironic, idiomatic and so on (Gibbs, 1994: 118).

Semantic connectivity is postulated as one of the essential characteristics of language, being the decisive procedure to achieve the comprehension phase for receptors. Meaning as the potential part of the semantic structure is highly touched with our thoughts, concepts, actions, attitudes, and behaviors in specific situations (Campbell *et al*, 2003: 1). In any piece of discourse, meaning does exist as a set of goals, acts, and participants' reactions to the environment of the discourse itself according to what we take this meaning to be. Thus, the study of the semantic structure of discourse should be realized via analyzing the participants' reactions, the concepts construed by the structure of the discourse and other cognitive manifestations that are relevant to the comprehension phase of the conceptual structure of the discourse. In this context, semantics can be devoted to the investigation of discourse properties and the representational character of the individuals (*ibid*).

Hence, the cognitive semantic approach attempts to illuminate the circumstances in which we enrich our semantic knowledge through the clues of

the linguistic representations. In this respect, our semantic knowledge i.e. the background knowledge, accounts for the comprehension, interpretation, recognition and appreciation of the significant constructions within the discourse connectivity. The translator may recall all possible cognitive capabilities and conceptual constructions through embarking on translating. In this conceptual framework, the communicative coherent discourse is sustained by the subtle interplay of meanings, so that its investigation may facilitate focusing on both the crucial conceptual structures and semantic components of the discourse as in the following Qur'ānic text:

فَأَسْرُ بِعِبَادِي لَيْلًا إِنَّكُمْ مُتَّبَعُونَ (الدخان/٢٣)

1.(We inspired to him), "Go out with My Servants at night. You shall certainly be tracked down (Kassab, 1994: 883).

The concept of temporal relations in (أَسْرُ/اسْرُ/أَسْرُ), from the verb سَرَى/sarā/to go out) is normally interplayed with the going out at night; it is an adverb. The cause for the use of (أَسْرُ) and (لَيْلًا) (going out at night) is that the addressee (the Prophet *Muses* as well as his companions will be they are tracked down by unbelievers. This is the textual processing task; the conceptual frames¹ may be solved via analyzing exclusively the linguistic units in the text provided that their context is taken into account. So, one of the crucial components in an integrated theory of communicative interaction is the logical and semantic unity as part of the cognitive theory of language use. In this respect, the *appreciation* is posited as the first step phase taken by the translator to give a very accurate suitability in the TL. The cognitive impetus gives an insight into processing and constructing the enveloped facets of recognition systems such as the normal reproduction of the discourse (i.e. the closest natural equivalent) realizing the comprehension phase of the target text, data storage in the mental

¹Frames are the dynamic structures of knowledge that give the receptors a broad repertoire to the process of interpretation than to the task of understanding. The notion of *frames* is propounded as an inclusive term for a data-structure representing a stereotyped situation. It denotes the event sequences within the same frame (Tennen, 1979:145). The notion of frames refers to the conceptual structure of the semantic memory and parts of our knowledge of the world around; they organize the concepts that are either *Conventional* or *Experiential* to form a conceptual unit (i. e., entity) that might be construed through many cognitive tasks.

model, producing the bio-compatibility of the whole discourse (cf. Nida and Taber, 1974: 68; Levy, 2004: 153, Samerae, 2008: 123).

The final point may lead us to the case of naturalness. It designates the usage of the ambient contextual factors that sound to be normally used in the target discourse and the more relevant gestalt in target discourse. In the cognitive impetuses the various conceptual systems are usually related in one language by a sort of environmental coherent link; thus, the translator tries to elucidate the approximate equivalent discourse templates that make the target discourse more accessible to the target receptor (cf. van Dijk, 1993: 212; Hatim and Munday, 2006:207). This issue can be seen clearly in the Glorious Qur'ānic texts that consist of many figurative tropes which are both culturally and of cognitively specific as in the following:

وَأَذِّنْ فِي النَّاسِ بِالْحَجِّ يَأْتُوكَ رِجَالًا وَعَلَى كُلِّ ضَامِرٍ يَأْتِينَ مِنْ كُلِّ فَجٍّ عَمِيقٍ (الحج/٢٧)

2. Call all people to Pilgrimage, and they will come to you on foot and on every slender camel from every far route (Kassab, 1994: 570).

In this text, the translator faces a construction of figurative trope that bears cultural and conceptual templates. The expression (ضامر) (slender) is a reference to the conceptual structure of a long exhausting journey leading to a target entity. Another issue, the concept of (فج عميق) has been cognitively rendered into (far route) because the translator has recognized the susceptibility of interpretation in literal meaning and transferred it to the TL. To achieve a suitable comprehension for the TL receptors and then appreciated in TL, the expression (فج) (route) refers to the mountain way and that can be connected to the conceptual structure of tiredness because using this type of ways is associated with fatigue. So, the target discourse should be approximately equivalent to the source one within the contextual factors of the comprehension phase of the target receptors.

2. Interception of Knowledge and Understanding

It is believed that the figurative language and the use of tropes may require not only the special mental spaces, but need shared beliefs and knowledge held in the context of the semantic structure. So, the question is to what extent the knowledge and the common ground interact during figurative language interpretation? To answer this question, the concepts are to be held as temporary representations constructed from knowledge in the long-term

memory, while the understanding of words and sentences is primarily based on Idealized Cognitive Model (ICM). This may lead us to the agreement that the mind is not inherently literal; language is not independent of the mind but reflects our perceptual and conceptual understanding of experience, while figurative tropes are merely a matter of language and provide much of the foundation for thought, reason, and imagination. On the other hand, the modes of conceptual structures are modes of thought processing motivated by the meanings of the semantic structure (Gibbs, 1994: 16; Holmes, 2004:173). On this basis, knowledge templates are meaningful mental representations of how the world is organized and constituted in a hierarchical assemblage of data processing systems in the mental models ranging from the empirical certainties and axiomatic background assumptions to process grammatical structures, cultural transfer, figurative tropes, cross beliefs and the encyclopedic nature of the text (Hilferty, 2001:13). In cognitive semantics, this distinction is not highly strict, because meanings are those cognitive structures embodied in the knowledge templates (Antunano, 1999:6). The concept of knowledge is usually validated by the script-based cases in the mental models of human recognition systems. For this purpose, there are two tokens of knowledge (Antunano, 1999:6):

a. *Dominate Knowledge*: This type of knowledge enables modes of conceptual structures to infer actions and /or participants' interplay according to the personal or individual knowledge. This sort of knowledge describes the constructed situations in everyday life. Thus, interlocutors may draw inferences to realize the relevant situations in the various events of the discourse as in:

وَيَسْأَلُونَكَ عَنِ الْمَحِيضِ قُلْ هُوَ أَدَىٰ فَأَعْتَزِلُوا النِّسَاءَ فِي الْمَحِيضِ وَلَا تَقْرَبُوهُنَّ حَتَّىٰ يَطْهَرْنَ فَإِذَا تَطَهَّرْنَ فَأْتُوهُنَّ مِنْ حَيْثُ أَمَرَكُمُ اللَّهُ إِنَّ اللَّهَ يُحِبُّ التَّوَّابِينَ وَيُحِبُّ الْمُتَطَهِّرِينَ (البقرة/ ٢٢٢)

3. They ask you about menstruation, say: it is an ailment. You shall avoid intercourse with your women during menstruation and you should not approach them until they become clean. When they clean themselves, you may come to them in the manner ordered for you by Allah. Allah likes those who return to Him in repentance and who keep themselves (Kassab, 1994: 57).

In this Qur'anic text, the inferential construction is highly recognizable. The translator makes an approximate equivalent to the source text. The translator seeks the approximation principle to reach the similar understanding to the SL

by receptors attempting to keep the SL image through keeping the same sanctity of the original to the TL.

b. *Predominate Knowledge*: In this type, the receptors may interpret various situations and participate in the events and actions of the discourse. They perform less processing of the experienced events, a thing which exists in every naturally competent person, as in:

فَجَاءَتْهُ إِحْدَاهُمَا تَمْشِي عَلَى اسْتِحْيَاءٍ قَالَتْ إِنَّ أَبِي يَدْعُوكَ لِيَجْزِيَكَ أَجْرَ مَا سَقَيْتَ لَنَا فَلَمَّا جَاءَهُ وَقَصَّ عَلَيْهِ الْقِصَصَ قَالَ لَا تَخَفْ نَجَوْتَ مِنَ الْقَوْمِ الظَّالِمِينَ (٢٥) قَالَتْ إِحْدَاهُمَا يَا أَبَتِ اسْتَأْجِرْهُ إِنَّ خَيْرَ مَنْ اسْتَأْجَرْتَ الْقَوِيَّ الْأَمِينُ (٢٦) قَالَ إِنِّي أُرِيدُ أَنْ أُنْكِحَكَ إِحْدَى ابْنَتَيَّ هَاتَيْنِ عَلَى أَنْ تَأْجُرَنِي ثَمَانِيَةَ حِجَجٍ فَإِنْ أَتَمَمْتَ عَشْرًا فَمِنْ عِنْدِكَ وَمَا أُرِيدُ أَنْ أَمْلِكَ عَلَيْكَ سَتَجِدُنِي إِنْ شَاءَ اللَّهُ مِنَ الصَّالِحِينَ (القصص/٢٧).

4. Afterwards one of the two girls came to him (Moses), walking bashfully. She said: "My father calls you to reward you for having watered our flocks." Then he came to him and told him the story, he said: "do not be afraid, you will be saved from the unjust people." Said one of the girls: "O my dear father! Hire him: truly the best strong and trusty is the man to hire." He said: "I want to give one of two of my daughters to you in marriage, provided that you serve me for eight years; but if you complete them to ten years, it will be grace from you. But I do not want to make matters hard for you, if Allah wishes, you shall find me true to my word." (Kassab, 1994: 673).

Here, the knowledge templates are essential in achieving the understanding and comprehending phases in the discourse, which helps the translator to draw the suitable equivalent construction in the target reception. Within the encyclopedic knowledge templates of the mind, there are several mappings that are essential for processing the textual and contextual references. They are the schematic conditioning by which the receptor can exhibit the naturalness of the target text. So, the second token is of essential importance during translating. The receptor and/or translator can extract a contextual clue in the discourse in terms of the interpretive predominate knowledge (قَالَ لِأُرِيدُ أَنْ أُنْكِحَكَ إِحْدَى ابْنَتَيَّ) and then (قَالَتْ إِحْدَاهُمَا يَا أَبَتِ اسْتَأْجِرْهُ إِخَيْرَ مَنْ اسْتَأْجَرْتَ الْقَوِيَّ الْأَمِينُ).

(هَاتَيْنِ). Here, there is a sort of contextual clue (in terms of the predominate knowledge) to the necessity of the marriage frame provided by the interlocutor (father) within the discourse. Thus, the comprehension of particular observable indices should take place in terms of the concepts, categories and strategies.

The dominate knowledge is the organized conceptual systems. So, one of the methods of accounting for this organization is that of frames structured as chunks of knowledge (cf. van Dijk, 1993: 215).

Discourse in general bears upon the possession condition for the logical concept of coherence. The concept of coherence and connectivity is a special case, because the two very different domains coincide in one entity-related transfer and the semantic impetuses have their own effect of the discourse itself. There, it does not seem to anymore knowing what it is for something to be the semantic and logical value of the concept of coherence than finding inferences for the form of the knowledge and the semantic rules of figurative tropes and clues of the discourse. It is left unexplained by several scholars that the value of semantic clues and knowledge templates are the basis for comprehending the rules. The understanding process is the preliminary process of comprehension whereby the receptor would invoke the conceptual structures of the discourse patterns in terms of his/her own knowledge templates and experience what can be applied to the complex conceptual constructions within the discourse-based knowledge presented in the formulaic linguistic meaning (Even-Zohar, 2008: 278)

So, in describing the first step of comprehension, it is important to acknowledge the fact that there is always more to a recognitional concept than a recognitional capacity. The relation between recognitional capacity and recognitional concept involving it is one- to- many. The same recognitional capacity can contribute to the individuation of many different concepts; one can recognize types of flowers, but one's recognitional concept flower is to be distinguished from all of these: flower-seen-by-me; flower-seen-by-someone-or-other; flower-in-my-light-cone; and so forth. Yet the same basic capacity to recognize flowers contributes to the individuation of each of these concepts, for each of which one could formulate possession conditions that treat them as unstructured. The only formation is via interception of the understanding with the knowledge templates and with the way the context is formed. In giving that specification, we supply the fundamental condition for something to be the semantic value of the complex discourse. So, receptors regularly employ the semantic and contextual knowledge of certain discourse to achieve the comprehending process via their memory (Keller, 1998: 67; Peacocke, 2004: 97; cf. Schank and Burstein, 1985:147-148; Even-Zohar, 2008: 278).

In translation theory, the coherence of discourse rendering requires a semantic analysis and consequently a semantic classification of entities

because the linguistic representations act as clues affecting the meanings that reside in the translator's ICM. This concept comes not only from the external world but also from the nature of bodily experience with the world and the translators' ability to project from some aspects of discourse on this experience-some abstract conceptual reconstruction to comprehend the story structures using their knowledge about planning and problem solving. The translating process and/or act imposed certain constraints on communication and decision-making according to the knowledge structures found in the sequences of the discourse (Schank and Burstein, 1985:149; Antunano, 1999:11; Darwish, 1999:15). This is applicable to analyzing the information it contains, as in:

قَالَ أَوْلَوْ جِنَّتَكَ بِشَيْءٍ مُّبِينٍ (٣٠) قَالَ فَأَتَ بِهِ إِنْ كُنْتَ مِنَ الصَّادِقِينَ (٣١) فَأَلْقَى عَصَاهُ فَإِذَا هِيَ ثُعْبَانٌ مُبِينٌ (٣٢) وَتَزَعَّ يَدَهُ فَإِذَا هِيَ بَيْضَاءٌ لِلنَّاطِرِينَ (٣٣) قَالَ لِلْمَلَأِ حَوْلَهُ إِنَّ هَذَا لَسَاحِرٌ عَلِيمٌ (٣٤) يُرِيدُ أَنْ يُخْرِجَكُمْ مِنْ أَرْضِكُمْ بِسِحْرِهِ فَمَاذَا تَأْمُرُونَ (٣٥) قَالُوا أَرْجِهْ وَأَخَاهُ وَأَبْعَثْ فِي الْمَدَائِنِ حَاشِرِينَ (٣٦) يَا ثَوَكُ كُلِّ سَحَابٍ عَلِيمٍ (٣٧) فَجُمِعَ السَّحَرَةُ لِمِيقَاتِ يَوْمٍ مَعْلُومٍ (٣٨) وَقِيلَ لِلنَّاسِ هَلْ أَنْتُمْ مُجْتَمِعُونَ (٣٩) لَعَلْنَا نَتَّبِعُ السَّحَرَةَ إِنْ كَانُوا هُمْ الْغَالِبِينَ (الشعراء/٤٠)

5. Musa said, "Even if I show you something clear? Pharaoh said "Show it, if you are true. Then *Musa* dropped his stick and there it, genuine snake! Then he took his hand off and it looked white for those who were witnessing. Thereupon pharaoh said to the notables around, "verily this is a knowledgeable magician, who wants to drive you out of your land with his magic, so what do you advice? They said, "Delay him and his brother and deploy collectors in all cities that they may bring to you every knowledgeable magician. Then the magicians were gathered for a known day to be appointed. And it was said to the people will you attend the meeting that we may follow the magicians if they win? (Kassab, 1994: 632).

The communicative context of this event may be inferred per se through the encoded element of the construction first and the information based on the highly activated image schema in the receptors' mind, i.e., theory of mind mechanism-processing system that is a presumably limited, unconscious and automatic way for achieving the interpretation and explanation of the discourse action to be comprehended by TL receptors. As for the comprehension phase of this example, the receptor of any complex discourse has various strategies, relatively complete, for the verbalization of the concepts. Some strategies, however, rank higher according to the number of languages in a corpus. In such a case, through rendering this message, different versions of an event can be handled either by means of analyzing this model or drawing on the knowledge mappings, that is, through the use of the expressions in the target text. The translator in the above example manages to use the lexical item

magicians in terms of the recognition. Longman Advanced American Dictionary (2003: 863) demonstrates that the term *magician* is *the entertainer who performs the magic tricks*. Hence, Pharaoh accused Prophet Moses and his brother Aaron of being magicians in the first case because he did not believe in the Signs and the Revelations of Almighty Allah. Hence, pharaoh said to his attendants (قَالَ لِلْمَلَاحِزَةِ إِنَّ هَذَا سَاحِرٌ عَلِيمٌ) (Thereupon pharaoh said to the notables around, “verily this is a knowledgeable magician) as a reflection of what he watched and the domain is to mock at Moses and Aaron by saying magicians¹. Additionally, the lexical item *sorcerer* refers to the person who receives help from evil spirits (Summers, 2003:1387).

3. Cognitive Modes of Discourse

Cognitive semantics deals with languages of the world that do not link up directly to the real or metaphysical world, but they are anchored on the extensive process of mental constructions. The discourse incrementation must be consistent with the context of the stylistic functions of the conceptual structures. The reference of the lexical item or linguistic expression must make an interpretation for the information coherent with the data already included in the discourse domains. This consequently leads to the comprehension phase an important step for the appreciation (Tomaszezyk, 1999:17, cf, Gibbs, 1994: 22).

The mental construction and image schemas (aided by the figurative tropes representations) also allow this foundation of the human mind to instigate the cognitive change on the level of the individual designation to a better understanding of the discourse and then comprehension, interpretation and appreciation phases.

Hence, meanings are conceived as the instructions to set up ICM towards a particular situation (cf. Lakoff, 1987:74). The method of establishing these models is determined by focusing on the figurative structures of the discourse. This operation can be centered between the linguistic systems in the language and the unit of perception as in the translating process, by which the translator rebuilds new cognitive models with their domain constructions in the

¹The translator in this context should use magicians and not sorcerers because the contextual clue of the text bears a referential domain of mocking. The term magician refers to the individual fakes made by a person while the sorcerer refers to the person dealing with the evil spirits.

target discourse. He/she recreates a comprehension phase unconsciously; interpretation and appreciation in SL then transfer the same strategy into TL. These considerations are employed to analyze the semantic components of the discourse structural, semantic and logical connectivity in terms of the various schematic conditions, that is, taking the meaning within the discourse as a bundle of concepts constructed in a hierarchical fashion first, and second, decomposing the elements of discourse into sets of universal schematic primes (Tomaszezyk, 1996:18). In this respect, the cognitive domains are tangibly seen in those of figurative tropes because these types of genres have several conceptual interpretations and cultural specific phenomena that connect the discourse components into one another with logical entries on the one hand, and the semantic values and knowledge templates on the other, as in the following:

إِنَّ الَّذِينَ تَدْعُونَ مِنْ دُونِ اللَّهِ لَنْ يَخْلُقُوا ذَبَابًا وَلَوْ اجْتَمَعُوا لَهُ وَإِنْ يَسْلُبْهُمُ الذَّبَابُ شَيْئًا لَا يَسْتَنْقِذُوهُ مِنْهُ ضَعُفَ الطَّالِبُ وَالْمَطْلُوبُ (الحج/٧٣)

6. Verily, those on whom you call besides Allah, cannot create even a fly, even though they combine together for the purpose. And if the fly snatches away a thing from them, they will have no power to release it from the fly. So, weak are both the seeker and the sought (Al-Hilali and Khan, 1996: 621).

The domain-oriented tropes design the environments of the TL text that are usually directed by the translator to support the awareness of the context with the cognitive dynamic mechanisms. Semantic awareness in this case allows the contextual defaults to be assumed (the use of *even*), namely the comprehension of the given domain of discourse in the TL receptors (the use of *even though they combine together*), the interpretation of the connectivity of the parsed conceptual structures via providing the information (knowledge structures) of the text to be translated and finally the appreciation of the overall discourse participants (the use of *both* the seeker and sought). One of the most important points is the simulation component that enriches the notion of the equivalent contextual information in relevance to the dynamic behavior (cf. Fischer and Ye, 2001:5).

هُوَ الَّذِي خَلَقَكُمْ مِنْ نَفْسٍ وَاحِدَةٍ وَجَعَلَ مِنْهَا زَوْجَهَا لِيَسْكُنَ إِلَيْهَا فَلَمَّا تَغَشَّاهَا حَمَلَتْ حَمْلًا خَفِيًّا فَمَرَّتْ بِهِ فَلَمَّا أَثْقَلَتْ دَعَوَا اللَّهَ رَبَّهُمَا لَئِنْ آتَيْنَا صَالِحًا لَنُكَوِّنَنَّ مِنَ الشَّاكِرِينَ (الاعراف/١٨٩)

7. It is He who has created you from a single person (Adam), and then He has created from him, his wife (Hawwa/Eve), in order that he might enjoy the pleasure of living with her. When he had sexual relation with her, she became pregnant and she carried it about lightly. Then when it became heavy, they both invoked Allah, their Lord (saying): "if You give us a *Salih*

(good in every aspect) child, we shall indeed be among the grateful” (Al-Hilali and Khan, 1996: 324).

On these principles, the comprehension phase can be achieved if one comprehends a message, the translators embarked on using the interpretation phase to keep the comprehension first, i.e. they used some naïve expressions as literal conceptual structures on TL to transfer into TL. The use of (*Adam*), (the use of Hawwa/Eve), these sorts are habitually elucidated as a rough operational exemplification of the comprehension phase; they also used (*has sexual relation*) to be more comprehensible by the TL receptors; the translators should render it into (*had marriage, legal sexual relation*).

On the part of the translator, the interpretation is always characterized by a search for coherence on the target text; the translator pays much more attention to the domain texture, as well as the perceptual apparatus within certain ecological environment. Rebuilding new discourse domains in the target language involves an incrementating process that is cognitively a backed-storage strategy made by the translator in order to assign the constructions in the discourse entities, the interpretation of the trigger and target entities within ICM. Lexical items within the construction of discourse may change the referential and inferential procedures of comprehension on the part of the translator, because they reflect their own conceptual and perceptual functions of defining and interpreting the micro-world of discourse (Tomaszezyk, 1996:17).

Thus, a lexical item can be used to change the status of the cognitive construction of the discourse and contrarily, a lexical item varies with respect to the contextual perspectives within that discourse due to the contextual prerequisites. The lexical item also may change the status of discourse domains of the knowledge templates.

4. Coherence in Discourse-Processing

There is really a great deal of knowledge and thinking that is constituted by metaphorical mappings from dissimilar source and target domains. The basic concepts are partly constituted by conceptual structures of the discourse. The figurative tropes are examples of the highly sophisticated materials of the conceptual structures found in everyday language and thought (Gibbs, 1994: 435). In this respect, the figurative language entailed by the discourse, requires special cognitive processes in order to be understood. This strategy subsumes the procedures whereby the components of knowledge schemas are activated

by the conceptual connectivity. The means of the coherence includes the logical and semantic interplay such as causality and class inclusion and knowledge of how events, actions, objects and situations are organized. The processor (or translator) usually takes procedures of optimizing the design criteria as effectiveness and appropriateness of the participants and the components of the discourse. The translator seeks to reinitiate the approximating principle on the target discourse with relevance to the bases of monitoring and managing the contextual situations (cf. de Beugrande, 1980: 24). As a result, this idea is reflected in the process of choosing the relevant usage matters through rendering, because the translators try to re-establish a new linguistic and mental representation (cf. Lakoff, 1987:78). Hsiao (2003:197) demonstrates the very spontaneous point in the study of discourse as the state of affairs, which is indicated by temporal and spatial relations, because the referring expressions simply designate the participants' attitudes towards the situation. Hence, the linguistic representations of these sentences exhibit quite different meanings. Their choice within the discourse affects the translator's usage of the expressions relevant to that state of affairs in the target discourse. The general belief of this is that the token of state of affairs is basically codified by semantic conceptual mappings as in the following:

وَأَلْقَ مَا فِي يَمِينِكَ تَلْقَفَ مَا صَنَعُوا إِنَّمَا صَنَعُوا كَيْدٌ سَاحِرٌ وَلَا يُفْلِحُ السَّاحِرُ حَيْثُ أَتَى (٦٩) فَأَلْقَى
السَّحْرَةَ سَجْدًا قَالُوا آمَنَّا بِرَبِّ هَارُونَ وَمُوسَى (٧٠) قَالَ آمَنْتُمْ لَهُ قَبْلَ أَنْ آذَنَ لَكُمْ إِنَّهُ لَكَبِيرِكُمْ الَّذِي
عَلَّمَكُمُ السَّحْرَ فَلَا قَطْعَ أَيْدِيكُمْ وَأَرْجُلِكُمْ مِنْ خَلْفٍ وَأَصْلَابِكُمْ فِي جُدُوعِ النَّخْلِ وَتَعْمَنُ أَيْبَا أَشَدَّ
عَذَابًا وَأَبْقَى (طه/٧١).

8. "Throw down what is in your right hand, it shall devour what they have made, For what they have made is nothing but the cunning of the magician, and no magician shall thrive, wherever he might be." Thereupon the magicians fell down prostrate. They said, "We believe in the Lord of Harun and Musa! Pharaoh said: "You have believed in him before I gave you permission? Verily, he is your chief who has taught you witchcraft I swear, I shall cut off your hands and feet on alternate sides; crucify you on the stems of palm-trees; and let you know who of us punishes more severely and everlasting!" (Kassba, 1994: 534).

The use of the lexical item (تلقف) has a transparent mental impact on the meaning of the whole construction of the discourse comprehension in that situational event. It refers to *Moses's* stick which changed into a serpent to swallow up –in full speed- all the magicians fabrications and fakes around the on-seers. As we noticed elsewhere, the use of the lexical item within the discourse is required for the conceptual construction of the discourse

comprehension. If we observe the use of the lexical item (وَأَلْقَى), we see that it refers to the concept of throwing Moses's stick. Cognitively, the concept of stick is inanimate, while the construction (فَأُلْتَمِ) in the second part refers to the domain of the passive transformation of the verb (كَفَى) performed by the magicians. Till the moment directly after kneeling, the magicians were reckoned as inanimate, up to the action of the discourse context, because they were polytheists and unbelievers. This is a syntactic clue of the discourse context. Another essential point of this Qur'anic text which should be raised is that the *pharaoh* decided to torture them by cutting the new converts' limbs on alternate sides and hanging them in the trunks of the palm trees. The target domain construction of this discourse refers to the contextual clue of the target domain construction that is the tyranny, arrogance and stubbornness of the pharaoh (cf. Al-Saboni, 1986: 239; El-Awa, 2006: 31).

Hence, the interpretation is inevitable on the part of the translator because s/he tries to search for a coherent discourse which is relevant for the conceptual construction of the source discourse in a way that is perceivable by the target receptor. So, within the information retrieval in terms of the data processing source channels of the mind, the deep understanding requires a semantic analysis and a semantic classification of the lexical entries. This sort of strategy may differ in some kind of ontology and the logical composition of the discourse and it may be exploited in recognizing the terminological discrepancies in the field of discourse comprehension (Rieder, 2002:56; Gawronska, 2003:2).

The most decisive factor of realizing the closest natural equivalence is meaning priority and consequently the meaning of the text that is identified via context of the message. Meaning of the message can be elaborated in terms of the situational features of the text i.e. the environment of the text. In translation equivalence, context can be exploited in the cognitive structure to the redesigning process, because languages are not similar in the way of expressing concepts, i.e., conceptual structure (McGuire, 1980:25; Uwageh, 1996: 12; Hickey, 1998:219; Fischer and Ye, 2001:2).

In following example, the semantic and logical coherence embody the cognitive mappings and patterns of the knowledge and belief of the encoded data to recognize the discourse domain constructions of ICM (trigger and

target entities). Most concepts within the construction of the discourse instigate other concepts without making a formulaic reference to them.

وَأَمَّا مَنْ أُوْتِيَ كِتَابَهُ بِشِمَالِهِ فَيَقُولُ يَا لَيْتَنِي لَمْ أُوتَ كِتَابِي (٢٥) وَلَمْ أَدْر مَا حِسَابِي (٢٦) يَا لَيْتَهَا كَانَتْ الْقَاضِيَةَ (٢٧) مَا أَغْنَىٰ عَنِّي مَالِي (٢٨) هَلَكَ عَنِّي سُلْطَانِي (٢٩) خُدُوهُ فَعُلُوهُ (٣٠) ثُمَّ الْجَحِيمَ صَلَوُهُ (٣١) ثُمَّ فِي سِلْسِلَةٍ ذَرْعُهَا سَبْعُونَ ذِرَاعًا فَاسْلُكُوهُ (الْحَاقَّةُ/٣٢).

9. But he, who is given his record in his left hand, shall say: "Would that I was never given my record!" And I had never known how my account!" "Would that the first death has put an end to my life!" "my wealth has not availed me! and my authority has gone from me! (and it will be said to the angles in charge of him) take him and bind him, then burn him in the Kindling Fire. Then tie him with a chain seventy cubits long (Kassab, 1994: 1054).

This text includes a deep semantic interpretive connectivity among the underlined parts because reference is made to the unbeliever on Doomsday that who has enjoyed a higher status and prestige than others in this life. Thus, s/he now wishes that this situation was not real or that he would vanish before witnessing this awesome and horrible scene (Doomsday). So, the first part is (وَلَمْ

أَدْر مَا حِسَابِي) which refers to the preliminary action and/or instance for the understanding process, while (يَا لَيْتَهَا كَانَتْ الْقَاضِيَةَ) (Would that the first death has put an end to my life!) is the central act of the scenario actions. The third instance is the preemptive reasoning categorization of the interaction of the entities of discourse understanding that is: (مَا أَغْنَىٰ عَنِّي مَالِي) for the whole soliloquy of the unbeliever. In the final stage, the complete reasoning of comprehension phase is given in (هَلَكَ عَنِّي سُلْطَانِي) which is the overall reasoning that realizes the comprehension phase of the scenario, then shifting onto the scene of torture of the polytheists and unbelievers. The interpretation has been transferred in the next (خُدُوهُ فَعُلُوهُ) (and it will be said to the angles in charge of him) to give a detailed explanation to the TL receptors to achieve comprehension then appreciation, i.e. effectiveness.

5. Conclusions:

This study concluded the following points:

1. The translators' main task is to manage the principle of semantic connectivity while the conceptual structures are the primary challenge for solving the problem of giving a complete description of the semantic, communicative and intuitive relations in TL.

2. The semantic connectivity in terms of the cognitive basis is the most fundamental factor for transferring figurative tropes into TL.
3. Each expression in the language yields an infinite set of interpretations that are appreciated with respect to the suitable semantic limits.
4. Translators in general may vary with respect to the difference in the experience and the knowledge patterns of the ICM domains of the source discourse and this is reflected in the renderings.
5. The domains of the discourse knowledge draw upon the cognitive and contextual data stored in the mental modeling of the comprehension processes.
6. The meaning of discourse comes not only from the direct relationship with the external world, but also from the nature of the experience and ability to analyze the actions, events, participants and logical and semantic components of the discourse.
7. The phases of comprehension, interpretation, recognition and appreciation may be interchangeably posited in the translating process in accordance with to the degree of sophistication of the discourse templates.

References

- Al-Hilali, M. and Khan, M. (Trans.)(1996). *The interpretation of the Meanings of the Noble Qura'n in English Language*. Riyadh: Darul-Salam.
- Al-Saboni, M. (1986). *Safwatut Tafaaseer*. Damascus: Manaahilul Cirfaan, 1st (Vol. II).
- Al-Samrae, F. (2008) Asila Bayania. Al-Sahaba Press. Sharjah
- Antunano, I. (1999). *“What’s Cognitive Linguistics? A New Framework for the Basque”*. Paper Supported by Grant F199.53 from the Basque Government’s University and Research.
- Campbell, J. Q’ Rourke, M. and Sheir, D. (2003) *“Investigation in Philosophical Semantics: A Framework”*. Databank: Web Version of [Blackwell Publishers Synergy](#).
- Darwish, A. (1999). *“Towards a Theory of Constraints in Translation”* (Draft Version 0.2): Turjuman Online (pp.1-32).
- de Beugrand, R. (1980). *Text, Discourse and Process: Towards a Multidisciplinary Science of Texts*. Longman: Longman Group Ltd.
- El-Awa, S. (2006) (Textual relations in the Qur'an: Relevance and Structure. Routledge: London

- Even – Zohar, I. (2008). Culture Planning, Cohesion, and the making and Maintenance of Entities. In: Pym, A, Shlesinger and Silmeni (eds.). "Beyond Descriptive Translation Studies. John Benjamins: USA
- Fischer, G. and Ye, Y. (2001). "*Exploring Context to Make Delivered Information Relevant to Tasks and Users*". Workshop on user modeling for context applications, SI: 1-6.
- Gawronska, B. (2003). "*Employing Cognitive Notions in Multilingual Summarization of News Reports*". Department of Languages/University of Skovde: Sweden.
- Gibbs, R. (1994). Poetics of Mind: Figurative Thought, Language and Understanding. Cambridge Press: Cambridge
- Hatim, B. and Munday, J. (2006). Translation: An Advanced Resource Book. Routledge: London
- Hickey, L. (1998). "*The Pragmatics of Translation*". In: Hickey, L. (ed.), The Pragmatics of Translation (p.p. 1-9). Clevedon: Multi-lingual Matters Ltd.
- Hilferty, J. (2001). "*Cognitive Linguistics: An Introduction Sketch*". la Gramatica I la Semantica en l'estudi la variacio. Linguistics de la Universitat de Barcelona: Barcelona.
- Holmes, J. (2004). The Name and Nature of Translation Studies. In: Venuti, L. (ed.) "The Translation Studies Reader". P.p. 148-159.
- Hsiao, Y. (2003). "*Semantics and Cognition: An Introduction*". *Language and Linguistics*, 4:2, 197-205.
- Kassab, R. (1994). The Translation of the Meanings of the Glorious Quran. Al-Iman Press: Amman
- Kassab, R. (Trans.) (1994) *The Translation of the Meanings of the Glorious Qur'an*. Amman: AL-Iman Press.
- Keller, R. (1998). *Theory of linguistic Science* (Translated by Duenwald, K.), Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lakoff, G. (1987). *Women, Fire and Dangerous Things: What Categories Reveal about the Mind*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Levy, J. (2004). Translation as a decision Process. In: Venuti, L. (ed.) "The Translation Studies Reader". P.p. 148-159.
- Longman Advanced American Dictionary (2003). Pearson Education Limited. Longman
- McGuire, B. (1980). *Translation Studies*. London: Methuen and Co. Ltd.

- Nida, E. and Taber, C. (1974). *Theory and Practice of Translating*. Leiden: Brill.
- Peacocke, C. (2004). “*Interrelations: Concepts, Knowledge, Reference and Structure*”. Online Blackwell Publishing Synergy Ltd.
- Rieder, A. (2002). *A Cognitive View of Incidental Vocabulary Acquisition: From Text Meaning to Word Meaning?* Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Tübingen.
- Schank, R. and Burstein, M. (1985). “*Artificial Intelligence: Modeling Memory for Language Understanding*”. In: van Dijk, T. (ed.), *Handbook of Discourse Analysis* (pp. 145-166). London: Academic Press Inc.
- Summers, D. (2003). *Longman Advanced American Dictionary*. Pearson Education Ltd.: England.
- Tennen, D. (1979). Tennen, D. (1979). “*What’s in a Frame?: Service Evidence for Underlying Expectations*”. In: Freedle R. (ed.) *New Directions in Discourse Processing* (pp. 137-181). New Jersey: Albex.
- Tomaszcyk, B. (1999). *Depth of Negation: A Cognitive Semantics Study*. Lodz University Press.
- Uwageh, M. (2001) (Review). Leo Hachey (ed.), (1998). *The Pragmatics of Translation*. London: Multi-Lingual Matters. *Translatio*, xx: 3-4, 397- 407.
- van Dijk, T. (1993). “*Context and Cognition: Knowledge Frames and Speech Act Comprehension*”. Lectures in the Department of Psychology at the University of Colorado: Boulder.

اللغة المجازية والترابط الدلالي في ترجمة الخطاب القرآني منظور إدراكي

أ.م.د. محمد عبد الله داود و م.محمد نهاد أحمد

المستخلص

بات التآصر الدلالي يعرف بكونه جزءاً حيوياً من الخطاب. وفي هذا البحث، تم توضيح العمليات الذهنية التي تتفق مع الأطر الذهنية لدى الإنسان، وذلك لتحليل التراكيب التصويرية للاستيعاب، والتفسير، والاستدراك، ولتقييم عملية الترجمة وفقاً لعناصر المعرفة الذهنية. وهذه ربما يوظفها المترجم كجوانب متباينة وفقاً لنوعية الخطاب. وتم تناول النص القرآني بوصفه أرقى أجناس الكلام. وقد تم إتباع اقتطاع أجزاء من الخطاب لتبيان درجة الترتيب في التراكيب التصويرية داخل الخطاب المترجم إلى اللغة الهدف، فضلاً عن دقة اختيار المفردات، والتفسير، والتقييم، والتأثير، والأحداث. وتوصلت الدراسة إلى أن المترجمين ربما يتباينون في معايير المعرفة والقرائن الخطابية، وهذا ما يمكن ملاحظته في أسبقيات منهج معين عن الآخر، بوصفه خطوة أولى لنقل معنى النص القرآني بدقة، ويختلف المترجم في الإجراء المتبع لترجمة النص وفقاً لتباين التراكيب التصويرية للنص بين الحين والآخر. ومن الناحية الإدراكية، فإن الترجمة تحوي على عمليات ذاتية وغير إرادية متعلقة بالنمذجة الذهنية بغية توظيف الترابط الدلالي في النص الهدف، بينما توصف التراكيب الذهنية على أنها التحدي الجوهرى لحل مشكلة الوصف التكاملية للعلاقات الدلالية والتواصلية.