



Supplemental Coherence as a Cause of Ambiguity in English Quranic Translation: Al- Qariah Surah as a Case Study

Asst. Prof . Layth Nawfal Muhammed

University of Mosul

Layth.n.m@uomosul.edu.iq

Abstract

The present study aims at investigating the applicability of the supplemental coherence strategy, which never leads to the explication of thematic continuity, and highlighting its effects on the translation of the Glorious Quran, selecting al-Qariah Surah as a case study. It is hypothesized that employing supplemental coherence as a strategy in the translation of the Quranic surahs results in an ambiguous translation, and utilizing the explication (or explication) method is helpful in producing a clear and understandable translation. Seven English translations of the Glorious Quran by well-known translators, namely: Khan (2006), Pickthal (1930), Rashad (1989), Sarwar (1920), Shakir (1999), Sherali (2015), and Yusuf Ali (1934), were selected as the foundation for the present study. The analyses revealed the inefficiency of supplemental coherence strategy in providing clear translations, which are of great importance to non-Muslim or non-Arab readers. The analyses also revealed the impact of utilizing the explication method in creating a clear and understandable translation.

Key Words: Ambiguity , coherence, cohesion , explication , thematic, . supplemental .

التماسك النصي التكميلي كسبب للغموض في الترجمات الإنكليزية القرآنية : سورة القارعة انموذجاً
أ.م. ليث نوفل محمد
جامعة الموصل

المستخلص

تهدف هذه الدراسة إلى التحقق من إمكانية تطبيق استراتيجيات التماسك النصي التكميلي ، التي لا تؤدي إلى شرح الاستمرارية الموضوعية، وإبراز آثارها في ترجمة القرآن الكريم، واختيار سورة القارعة انموذجاً للدراسة . تفترض الدراسة أن توظيف التماسك النصي التكميلي كاستراتيجية في ترجمة السور القرآنية يؤدي إلى غموض في الترجمة ، وأن استخدام أسلوب الشرح يساعد في إنتاج ترجمة واضحة ومفهومة. وتم اختيار سبع ترجمات إنكليزية للقرآن الكريم لمترجمين معروفين، وهم: خان (2006) ، بكثال (1930)، رشاد (1989)، سروار (1920)، شاكير (1999)، شيرالي (2015)، ويوسف علي (1934). (كأساس لهذه الدراسة. وكشفت الدراسة عن عدم كفاءة استراتيجيات التماسك النصي التكميلي في تقديم ترجمات واضحة، والتي لها أهمية كبيرة للقراء من غير المسلمين أو من غير العرب. كما كشفت الدراسة أيضاً عن أثر استخدام أسلوب الشرح في خلق ترجمة واضحة ومفهومة.

الكلمات المفتاحية: الغموض، التماسك، التماسك، الإفصاح، الموضوع، . تكميلية .



1. Introduction

There is a lot of debate on the concepts of cohesion and coherence in the international linguistic community, which are both crucial to language. Cohesion, however, was widely recognized as a category for text and discourse analysis after the publication of Halliday & Hasan's seminal work *Cohesion and Coherence in English* (1976). De Beaugrande & Dressler (1981), who regard these two categories, cohesion and coherence, as two of the basic concepts of 'textuality', stress the importance of the relation between these two textual features. Creating coherence in a discourse is a dynamic process that only occurs through human interaction (Tárnyiková 2002: 56). Speakers and writers typically employ a few overt signals to lead listeners and readers to a proposed line of understanding. In contrast, readers and listeners use these signs as guidance to attain coherence and come to an explanation that is consistent with the communication intentions of speakers and writers. While all participants in a spoken conversation are constantly negotiating meaning, in written discourse there is no such overt negotiation of meaning. In other words, it is possible to achieve a coherent conversation through mutual signals, gestures, facial expressions, etc., between the speakers and the hearers, but this is not the case with written discourse, which lacks such visible signals. (Seidlhofer and Widdowson, 1999). According to Fries (2004: 9–50), the reader should comprehend some of the text's essential notions and possess the basic skills of reading and earlier knowledge. There appears to be widespread consensus in the discipline of Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) that coherence is subjective;" if we do not see the text as coherent, then it is not coherent to us". However, this appears to imply that both the addresser and the addressee have a basic level of reading, writing, and general knowledge. (ibid.)

2. Coherence ,Culture , and Translation

One of the defining characteristics of discourse is coherence, which appears during the communication process when the interactants strive to fulfill their individual communicative goals while depending on prior knowledge and context to deduce the omitted bits of meaning. Coherence might thus be described as the interpretive experience of "semantic unity" and a purpose generated by a text, which comprises notional connectivity, evaluative and dialogical consistency', and "textual relatedness". Textual relatedness is related to cohesion, which is a textual characteristic expressed by semantic ties between lexical elements and grammatical structures that explicitly connect clauses and/or clause complexes in a text. (See Halliday & Hasan 1976, 1989; Widdowson 1978; de Beaugrande & Dressler 1981). These text-based elements that give a text cohesion, however, do not always aid in achieving coherence or the meaningfulness of a text, whether it be written or spoken. It has been said that a text can only be coherent if the surrounding environment is similarly coherent. Coherence is therefore not assumed to be inherent" to a piece of



writing; rather, it is perceived as a discourse quality that arises during the process of actualizing a text's interpretative potential.(Dontcheva-Navratilova, 2001). Coherence is less visible and noticeable than cohesion since it is more concerned with determining the "sense" of a text than its overt discursive relationships. It results from objectifying meanings in order to create a coherent whole. According to Baker (2011), there are two main problems: the first is the relationship between coherence and pragmatics, and the second is the significant influence that interpretation can have on how textual systems are perceived. Therefore, researchers who are interested in coherence must pay great attention to both pragmatics and interpretation in any context involving textual exploration. By doing this, they can discover more about how language's coherence functions and how it impacts a text's overall meaning.

To discuss the text's pragmatic elements, different methods have been proposed. Brown and Yule (1983), for instance, suggest that realizing the author's anticipated meaning and in what way it might be conveyed to the reader is achieved by the inference method, as described by Brown, Yule, and Levinson in 1983. It is specifically important to keep in mind that readers' assumptions and worldviews can have a great effect on how they recognize the propositional substance of the texts they come across in daily life. That is, the propositional content is established in large part by the audience's world knowledge and background. The main problem, however, as Baker points out in 2011, is the cultural differences in how people view the world. This cross-cultural diversity can lead to misconceptions and misinterpretations of deeply embedded cultural texts like literature or sacred texts. According to Hatim and Munday (2004), these texts frequently have both implicit and explicit meanings, a diversity of contextual information, and effective rhetorical devices. Since these texts are often of a cultural, religious, or holy nature, it is necessary to fully understand their pragmatics (Baker, 2011; Hatim & Munday, 2004).

The versatility of these texts is a distinguishing feature. In agreement with Reiss' text-type theory, a text may show a mixture of functions or it may have a dominant function. The three main functions, according to Reiss, are operative, expressive, and informative. (Reiss , 1971 : 160 -167). Although it is commonly acknowledged that sacred texts are written to persuade their readers, there are many instances in which interpreters must also consider other motives. For instance, numerous chapters in the Quran describe legendary tribes and societies as well as the lives of former prophets (Bozorgi and Jabbari, 2014). In such cases, it is essential for the researcher analyzing sacred texts to know the mechanism that generates the data and creates the verse's textural characteristics (ibid.).To identify the hidden and connected linkages within translated sacred texts, Charolle (1983: 93) proposes two methods: supplemental coherence and



explanatory coherence. These approaches, argues Charolle, differ in their capacity to account for thematic continuity. Supplemental coherence, according to Charolle, never leads to the explicitation of a thematic continuation (an element is recurrent from one part to the subsequent one), while 'explanatory coherence justifies this continuation (it manifests the purpose why a certain thing is said about an element). But the question remains how can a coherent discourse be achieved?

3. Realization of a coherent discourse

The concept of implicature, or how we come to understand more than what is actually said, is one of the most important ideas that has developed in recent years in text studies. Implicature, as defined by Grice (1975), is the speaker's intentions or hints but not what is actually said. Consider the following example ,

1-"A: Shall we go to the movies tonight ? . B: I have got an exam tomorrow .

What makes A, or anybody else, connect the statement "I have got an exam tomorrow" to the question "Shall we go to the movies tonight"? Why do we assume B's response to be an answer to the preceding inquiry? The answer that has previously been put forward is that we do this to maintain the supposition of coherence. (Charolles, 1983) But even 'if we accepted it as an answer, in what way do we construe it? Does it imply, "No, because I have an exam?"

According to Grice, an implied meaning may be conveyed in a conventional or non-conventional way. Congenitally, a speaker employs textual resources that are usually believed to express specific links between propositions, like the conjunctions *thus*, *because*, and *in spite of*. Another device, suggests Grice, is a grammatical construction, as in the instance ,

2- "It's money that they want,"

The clause "they want something," which is a subordinate clause, expresses what is implied by the grammatical form itself.

But how can a speaker convey meaning that is not often codified in the language—or how does a hearer comprehend it? Grice offers a framework that, in his estimation, facilitates fruitful interactions between interlocutors. He defines his theory's outlines :

'Make your conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose and direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged.'



Grice proposed a method of analyzing implicature based on the cooperative principle and its maxims of relevance, quality, quantity, and clarity to more objectively direct speakers in their interactions. These maxims "promise" that interlocutors will be able to create a purposeful and meaningful framework for linguistic communication. (Bozorgi and Jabbari, 2014: 157). Another contribution of the cooperative principle is that it can be applied to situations in which the rules are violated or flouted (ibid.), as in the example ,

3- 'Do you know what time it is ?'

If this question is asked honestly, it means that I do not know the time and I would like to know the time . However, if the same utterance is employed as a rhetorical question in the right context and with the appropriate intonation , it could mean 'You are terribly late'. This is what Grice refers to as a conversational implicature . It is realized by flouting the maxim of quality which requires sincerity.

Weigand (2008) , however , states that despite the fact that Grice's theory is related to coherence, some experts have criticized this theory for the "normative nature" of the cooperative principle. Rather than depicting a dialogue as it is, such an approach tends to establish certain conventions that govern behavior. Grice's "normative method" is, thus, describing communication "as it must be" (ibid.). Consequently, the cooperative principle cannot naturally help in the analysis of actual speech created by people in their regular interactions. Translation, in accordance with Toury, requires a straightforward approach that is flexible enough to account for different translation strategies (Toury, 2012). The use of descriptive language or the addition of commentary are just two examples of the various strategies translators may employ to make a text coherent. Which of these strategies better complies with the rule of *quantity* from the perspective of Grice's maxims? Accordingly, a more descriptive approach is needed for translation.

4. Descriptive Translation Studies (DTS)

Toury (1995) introduced descriptive translation studies (DTS) with the goal of clarifying the mechanism and nature of translation. His aim was to suggest to Translation Studies (TS) a systematic framework and elevate translation to the status of a science. His paradigm was based on descriptive research. In other words, DTS aims to create a common basis for examining the basic nature of translation without adopting normative conventions, as opposed to standardizing or prescribing rules. Munday (2012) states that one of DTS's missions since it came to exist in the latter decade has been to identify any patterns that may be prevalent in, defining, or describing translations. As a result, researchers in the



discipline have attempted to develop strategies, frameworks, and models for descriptively studying translation. In a similar way, DTS suggested the concept of "translation universals" (ibid.). As defined by Pym (2010: 78), Translation Universal" is a feature that originates only in translations but not in other types of texts. With little caution, translation specialists have so far proposed the following universals: adaptation, lexical simplification', 'equalizing unique items, and explicitation (ibid., 79–80). "Explicitation" is a universal translation theory that is thought to be distinguished by higher redundancy of translations. (ibid.:79). Explicitation can be described more precisely by Munday (2009:187) as follows: Contrary to implicitation, explicitation (also known as explication) means "that information that is only implicitly mentioned in the ST is expressed clearly in the TT." This occurs at least at three levels of language: grammar, semantics, and pragmatics/discourse.

5. Ambiguity

Any translation of a text is based on the generally held idea that the translator must be aware of both the source language and the target language. This assumption, however, does not necessarily guarantee the generation of a flawless translation. (Qassis: 2021). This is particularly clear when rendering sacred materials, primarily Quranic texts, from Arabic into English. The translator who translates the Qur'anic texts should have interpretative and hermeneutic tools and in-depth knowledge of the SL and TL. Misinterpretation is likely to occur in the absence of such mechanisms (ibid.).

Ambiguity occurs at various levels of language. Lyon (1995) states that on a semantic level, one word can have multiple meanings, each of which can be categorized under a different grammatical category or part of speech. At the syntactic level, ambiguity occurs when a sentence suggests more than one structure, as in "*flying airplanes can be dangerous*'." (See also Clifton, Frazier, and Rayner, 1994). As a result, a word's intended meaning might change significantly according to the linguistic context in which it is used. "Psycholinguistic" investigations of "monolingual" language processing also show that the cognitive system overcomes this obstacle primarily by relying on linguistic context. (See Kellas, Ferraro, and Simpson, 1988; and for a review of cross-linguistic lexical ambiguity resolution, see Altarriba and Gianico, 2003.)

Translation equivalents vary for different reasons :

5.1 Polysemy

Polysemy is a linguistic occurrence where a single lexeme has numerous interrelated meanings. It also means a gathering of the senses at one entrance. Thus, words with several related but different senses are said to be polysemous.



Technically speaking, polysemy is the relatedness of meaning that goes along with an identical form. It is described as one form (spoken or written) having several meanings that are all related by extension. (Alsulaiman, 2011: 211). For example, the word *head* is a polysemous word that can be used to exhibit different senses, such as "*the head of a body*," "*the head of accompanying*," or the *head* of a department. Similarly, the word *date* is polysemous; it means an appointment and a social meeting. In such a case, however, ambiguity may arise and a word may exhibit different interpretations depending on the linguistic context in which it appears, as in the question: How about the date? The word *date* in this question is ambiguous and can have more than one interpretation unless it is explained to show which date is intended in this question.

5.2 Indeterminacy of meaning

Quine (2013) identifies two kinds of indeterminacy that emerge in the indeterminacy of translation: (1) inscrutability (vagueness) of reference and (2) holophrastic (structural) indeterminacy. The first pertains to ambiguity in the interpretation of specific words or phrases, as in *Marry saw a balloon*. (Crystal: 2003). In this instance, it is unclear when Marry saw it, how big the balloon was, what color it was, and other details. Therefore, the word *balloon* cannot have a singular interpretation. The second one denotes indeterminacy in complete sentences or larger parts of discourse. To clarify this point, Ilyas (1989: 120–121) cites the following example:

4-Old men and women.

For this example, more than one interpretation is possible. If the adjective *old* describes the word *men* only, the translation would be رجال , and if it describes both men and women, the translation would be رجال مسنون ونساء مسنات .

5.3 Cultural Ambiguity

When a word or a linguistic expression has the same referent in reality but various meanings in different cultures, this is referred to as cultural ambiguity. For instance, *Jesus* in English and *Essa* (عيسى) in Arabic have the same referent, but they have different meanings in each culture. For English speakers, "*Jesus*" is the son of God, whereas "*Essa*" is the prophet of God. *Essa* was uplifted to heaven alive and would return to earth (without being resurrected), while "*Jesus*" was crucified for the sins of men and would be raised from the dead. (cited in Alsulaiman, 2011: 3). Such cultural problems may encounter the translators of the Glorious Qura'n, who should be familiar with both cultures of ST and TT.

6 . Methodology and Data Collection

Seven English translations of the Glorious Quran by well-known translators, namely: Khan, Pickthal, Rashad, Sarwar, Shakir, Sherali, and Yousif Ali, were



selected as the foundation for the current study. In order to establish legitimacy based on the conventions of Quranic translation , a variety of Quranic interpretations produced by various commentators throughout a variety of time periods were used. The Surah being studied is Al-Qariah' 101. As the emphasis of this study is on the coherence of the translation of religious texts, the data were chosen in accordance with the purposive data collection approach. According to Williams (2001: 328) , he argues that, "compared with other disciplines, the data chosen for a study in translation must be obtained purposefully to guarantee the adequacy of the study." It is worth noting that arbitrary data selection will disrupt the stability of meaning and thus it is crucial to fully consider a text's coherence.

7. Text- Analysis

In this phase, the renditions are analyzed to determine how they convey the implied information; if they do not provide additional details, this would be a case of supplemental coherence (SC), but if they provide additional information, this would be a case of explication (or explication)

القارعة

-1

- 1- Khan : 'Al-Qari'ah (the striking Hour i.e. the Day of Resurrection)'
- 2- Pickthal : 'The Calamity!'
- 3- Rashad : 'The Shocker'.
- 4- Sarwar : 'The (unprecedented) crash!'
- 5- Shakir: 'The terrible calamity!'
- 6- Sherali : 'The Great Calamity !'
- 7- Yusuf Ali: 'The (Day) of Noise and Clamour':

Discussion :

In verse 1, Allah , Almighty mentions the word al-Qariah (القارعة), which is ,according to the interpreters, a name of Doomsday. However, this word was interpreted differently into striking hour, calamity, shocker, crash, and clamor. These expressions are quite ambiguous if they are isolated from their context, for each one of them can have more than one related meaning, i.e., polysemous. Translators 2 and 3 maintained the structure of the SL text in their renderings and thus provided an ambiguous translation. That is, they adopted the supplemental coherence (SC) strategy in their renderings, which does not allow further addition for clarity. Unlike the rest of the translators, who explicated the



verse by adding further information to their renderings and hence provided a clear translation .

لقارعة

ما

-2

1. Khan : 'What is the striking (**Hour**)?'
2. Pickthal: 'What is the Calamity?'
3. Rashad : 'What a shocker!'
4. Sarwar : 'What is the crash?'
5. Shakir : 'What is the **terrible** calamity!'
6. Sherali : 'What is the **great** calamity?'
7. Yusuf Ali : 'What is the (**Day**) of Noise and Clamour?'

3- وما ادراك ما لقارعة

1. Khan : 'And what will make you know what the striking (**Hour**) is?'
2. Pickthal : '**Ah**, what will convey unto thee what the Calamity is!'
3. Rashad : 'Do you have any idea what the Shocker is?'
4. Sarwar: 'Would that you knew what the crash is!'
5. Shakir: 'And what will make you comprehend what the **terrible** calamity is?'
6. Sherali : 'And what should make thee know what the Great Calamity is?'
7. Yusuf Ali : 'And what will explain to thee what the (**Day**) of Noise and Clamour is?'

Discussion :

In verses 2 and 3, there are two interrogative particles. Verse two begins with the interrogative particle ما , and verse 3 begins with the conjunction و and the interrogative ما . These interrogatives were translated into *what is* in the target texts to maintain the structure of the SL as a question in the TT as well. In text 2, translators 1, 5, 6, and 7 explicated the text by adding further information to their renderings, which removed the ambiguity provided by other translators who followed the supplemental coherence (SC). In verse 3, only translators 3 and 4 kept the ambiguity in their renderings resulting from the adoption of supplemental coherence (SC) which never allows any further information.

4- يَوْمَ يَكُونُ النَّاسُ كَالْفَرَاشِ الْمَبْتُوثِ

1. Khan : 'It is a Day whereon mankind will be like moths scattered about'.
2. 'Pickthal : 'A day wherein mankind will be as thickly-scattered moths'.
3. Rashad : 'That is the day when the people come out like swarms of butterflies'.
4. Sarwar: 'On that day, people will be like scattered moths' .



5. 'Shakir : 'The day on which men shall be as scattered moths',
6. 'Sherali : 'The day when men will be like scattered moths'.
7. 'Yusuf Ali : '(It is) a Day whereon men will be like moths scattered about'

5- وَتَكُونُ الْجِبَالُ كَالْعِهْنِ الْمَنفُوشِ

1. 'Khan : 'And the mountains will be like carded wool'.
2. 'Pickthal : 'And the mountains will become as carded wool'.
3. 'Rashad : 'The mountains will be like fluffy wool'.
4. 'Sarwar : 'And mountains will be like carded wool'.
5. 'Shakir : 'And the mountains shall be as loosened wool'.
- 6- 'Sherali : 'And the mountains will be like carded wool'.
7. 'Yusuf Ali : 'And the mountains will be like carded wool'.

Discussion :

The verses 4 and 5 constitute answers for the two preceding questions. It is to be noted that the introductory structure (*it is*) in rendering 1 text 4 and elsewhere is linguistically a matter of cohesion rather than coherence and hence cannot be counted as explication. In text 4, Only translators 4 , 5 and 6 made no explication to the verse . That is, they did not add any further information. As for the rest of the translators, they justifiably enhanced their renderings with additional information to clarify the meaning . In verse 5, however, all the translators adhered to the structure of SL, and hence no further information was added.

6- فَأَمَّا مَنْ ثَقُلَتْ مَوَازِينُهُ

1. Khan : 'Then as for him whose balance (**of good deeds**) will be heavy'.
2. Pickthal : 'Then, as for him whose scales are heavy (**with good works**)',
3. Rashad : 'As for him whose weights are heavy.
4. Sarwa : 'Those whose good deeds will weigh heavier (**on the scale**)'
5. Shakir : 'Then as for him whose measure of **good deeds** is heavy',
6. Sherali : 'Then, as for him whose scales are heavy',
7. Yusuf Ali : 'Then, he whose balance (**of good deeds**) will be (**found**) heavy',

Discussion :

In verse 6, there is a conditional sentence prefixed by the resumption *فا* (*fa*) and the particle *ما* (*ma*), and some of the translators maintained this structure in their renderings by using *as for* . Concerning the clarity of the renditions, only translators 3 and 6 didn't provide an explanation of the verse and hence provided ambiguous renderings such as *whose weights are heavy* ,and *whose scales are heavy* . Such renderings may confuse and distract the readers, making them think



that such information is irrelevant. Nevertheless, the rest of the translators explicated the verse by adding further justified information like: *measure of good deeds is heavy; balance of good works, on the scale will be found heavy*. This additional information may seem necessary for the readers in this context.

7- فَهُوَ فِي عِيشَةٍ رَّاضِيَةٍ

- 1- Khan : 'He will live a pleasant life (**in Paradise**)'.
- 2- Pickthal : 'He will live a pleasant life'.
- 3- Rashad: 'He will lead a happy (**eternal**) life'.
- 4- Sarwar : 'Will live a pleasant life',
5. Shakir : 'He shall live a pleasant life'.
6. Sherali : 'He will have a pleasant life'.
7. Yusuf Ali : 'Will be in a life of **good pleasure and satisfaction**'.

Discussion :

The verse 7 expresses the result of the preceding conditional sentence in verse 6. The translators began their renditions with futuristic structures(he will/shall) to express the future result of the believers. Concerning the clarity of the renditions, the noun phrase ' pleasant life', in the renderings above, was mentioned five times as an equivalent for the verse, but in none of these renderings, except in rendering 1, was explicated to show which "pleasant life " is intended. In other words, this rendering is ambiguous because it reflects a variety of senses. According to the scholar interpreters, the verse عِيشَةٍ رَّاضِيَةٍ means a pleasant and eternal life in Paradise. This interpretation, though stated differently, was provided by translators 1, 3, and 7, who explicated the verse. Translator 1 added the word paradise, translator 3 added the word " eternal" , and translator 7 added further information: *a life of good pleasure and satisfaction*. That is to say that translators 1, 3, and 7 adopted the explication procedure and provided clear and understood translation, while the rest of the translators confined their renderings to supplemental coherence (SC), which restricts the continuity of meaning.

8- وَأَمَّا مَنْ خَفَّتْ مَوَازِينُهُ

1. Khan : 'But as for him whose balance (**of good deeds**) will be light',
2. Pickthal : 'But as for him whose scales are light',
3. Rashad: 'As for him whose weights are light'.
4. Sarwar: 'but those whose good deeds will be lighter (**on the scale**)'.
5. Shakir : 'And as for him whose measure of **good deeds** is light',
6. Sherali : 'But as for him whose scales are light',
7. Yusuf Ali : 'But he whose balance (**of good deeds**) will be (**found**) light',

Discussion:

The verse 8 also contains a conditional sentence prefixed by the conjunction الواو and the particle "أما". Although the translators began their renderings with the adversative *but*, the preposition *as for*, and the additive *and*, all of which are



possible in this context to maintain the continuity of meaning, Concerning the renderings, only translators 2, 3, and 6 confined their translations to supplemental coherence (SC) and consequently provided ambiguous translations.

9 - فَأُمُّ هَاوِيَةَ

1. Khan : 'He will have his home in Hawiyah (**pit, i.e. Hell**)'.
2. Pickthal : 'A bereft and Hungry One will be his mother',
3. Rashad : 'His destiny is lowly'.
4. Sarwar: 'will have hawiyah as their dwelling'.
5. Shakir : 'His abode shall be the abyss'.
6. Sherali : 'Hell will be a nursing mother to him'.
7. Yusuf Ali: 'Will have his home in a (**bottomless**) Pit'.

Discussion :

The verse 9 expresses the result of the preceding verse . According to the commentators , the verse فَأُمُّ هَاوِيَةَ means : Hell will be his home . Translator 4 , however , transliterated the word الهاوية (hawiyah) without giving any further information clarifying it . Translator 5 rendered this word into abyss .The meaning of the word abyss , however , is open . That is ,according to al - Mawrid Dictionary , it means Hell , but it also means a very deep wide space or a hole that seems to have no bottom (Oxford Dictionary) , or it refers to fathomless water . Nevertheless, translator 1 who explicated the verse by adding the word Hell to his rendering , provided a clear and understood translation .Similarly , translator 7 added the word bottomless pit for the clarification of the verse . That is to say that translator 5 followed the supplemental coherence in his rendering ,while translators 1 and 7 explicated the verse by adding further information. As for the rest of the translators , they unfortunately mistranslated the verse .

10 - وَمَا أَدْرَاكَ مَا هِيَ

1. Khan : 'And what will make you know what it is?'
2. Pickthal : 'Ah, what will convey unto thee what she is!' -
3. Rashad : 'Do you know what it is?'
4. Sarwar : 'Would that you knew what hawiya she is?'.
5. Shakir : 'And what will make you know what it is?'
6. Sherali : 'And what should make thee know what that is?'
7. Yusuf Ali : 'And what will explain to thee what this is?'

Discussion :

In verse 10, there is a question again, which was conveyed as a question in the target text as well. The pronoun هي in the Arabic verse وَمَا أَدْرَاكَ مَا هِيَ refers back to the word al-hawiya (anaphoric).This can easily be realized by Muslims or Arab readers. But this is not the case with the people of other nations, especially when they come across renditions containing ambiguous references such as those given by the translators above. There is no clear reference to the word al-Hawiya; even in the rendering 4, it is mentioned indefinitely. This is due to



adopting the SC in transferring the meaning from the SL to the TL. This strategy, as it has earlier been stated, never allows for elaborating.

11- نَارٌ حَامِيَةٌ

1. Khan : ‘(It is) a **hot** blazing Fire!’
2. Pickthal: ‘Raging Fire’.
3. Rashad : ‘The blazing **Hellfire**.’
4. Sarwar : ‘It is a burning Fire’.
5. Shakir : ‘A burning fire’.
6. Sherali : ‘It is a blazing Fire’.
7. Yusuf Ali : ‘(It is) a Fire Blazing **fiercely**!’

Discussion :

The verse 11 is an answer to the preceding question in verse 10 (وما ادراك) (ماهيّة). The adjective حامية was translated differently. However, the clearest renderings given to this word are those of translators 1, 3, and 7, who explicated the word and made it obvious by adding further justified information such as *hot* by translator 1, "hell" by translator 2, and *fiercely* by translator 3. Unlike other translators, who gave no further information to clarify the word in their renderings, In other words, they adopted supplemental coherence in their renditions, which never allows any more explanation.

Table (1) Shows the Usage Percentages of Supplemental Coherence and Explication

Translators	Supplemental Coherence	Explication	Percentage of Supplemental	Percentage of Explication
T1	4	7	36%	63%
T2	7	4	63%	36%
T3	8	3	72%	27%
T4	7	4	63%	36%
T5	5	6	45%	54%
T6	8	3	72%	27%
T7	2	9	18%	81%
Total	41	36	3,354%	2,945%

1.8 Conclusions

The study has come up with the following conclusions :

1. Throughout analyzing and assessing the seven translations, supplemental coherence proved its inefficiency of producing an understood and reliable translation.
2. The reason behind the frequent use of supplemental coherence by the participant translators of the surah in question, as the percentages in Table 1



above show, may be due to their unawareness of the interpretation of this Quranic verse .

3. The explication method proved to be a helpful procedure in disambiguating and producing understandable translations.
4. Lexical ambiguity is the dominant type of ambiguity in the translations of the surah verses.

References

- [1] Al- Mawrid (2003). *A Modern English- Arabic Dictionary*: Dar Al Elim Lil- Malayen Beirut.
- [2] Al-Sulaiman , M. (2011). *Semantics and Pragmatics* . University of Mosul press .
- [3] Altarriba, J., & Gianico, J. L. (2003).“Lexical ambiguity resolution across languages: A theoretical and empirical review”. *Experimental Psychology*," 50, 159–170.
- [4] At-Tabari, A. (1954). *Jaami' Al-Bayaan 'an Ta'weel Ayil Quran*. Cairo: Al-Halabi
- [5] Baker, M. (2011). *In other words: A course book on translation* (2nd ed.). London and New York: Routledge. (218- 228)
- [6] Beaugrande De, R., & Dressler, W. (1981). *Introduction to text linguistics*. London: Longman. P.3
- [7] Bozorgi A. & Jabbari ,M .(2014).‘An Explanatory VS. Supplemental Approach to Coherence in English Translations of the Holy Quran. ’’ Global Gournal For interdisciplinary Social Sciences. **Vol.3(6):55-62** .
- [8] Brown, G., & Yule, G. (1983). *Discourse analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [9] Charolles, M. (1983). *Coherence as a principle in the interpretation of discourse*, Text, 3, 1, 71-97.
- [10] Clifton, C., Frazier, L., & Rayner, K. (Eds.). (1994). *Perspectives on sentence processing*. Hillsdale.
- [11] Crystal , D. (2003) . *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics*. Printed and bound in the United Kingdom by T.J International , Padstow , Cornwall .
- [12] Dontcheva-Navratilova, O. (2001) *Cohrence in Political Speeches*. Brno: Masaryk University
- [13] Fries, P.H. 2002. “The Flow of Information in a Written English Text”. In P.H. Fries et al. (eds) *Relations and Functions within and around Language*. New York and London: Continuum, 117-155.



- [14] Fries, P.H. 2004. "What makes a text coherent?" In D. Banks (ed.) *Text and Texture*. Paris: L'Harmattan, 9-50
- [15] Grice, H. P. (1975). "Logic and Conversation" .In: Cole . P . and Morgan ,J. (eds.) *Syntax and Semantics* , Vol. 3 : *Speech Acts*, PP . 22-40 .
- [16] Halliday, M. A. K. and Hasan, R. (1989) *Language, Context, and Text: Aspects of Language in a Social-Semiotic Perspective*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [17] Halliday, M.A.K, & Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman. P.4
- [18] Hatim, B, & Mason, I. (1997). *The translator as communicator*. London and New York: Routledge
- [19] Hatim, B, & Munday, J. (2004). *Translation: An advanced resource book*. New York and London: Routledge
- [20] Ibn Kathir, I. (1950). *Tafseer Al-Quraan Al-'Azeem*. Cairo: Al-Halab.
- [21] Ilyas , A. (1989) . *Theories of Translation : Theoretical Issues and Practical Implications* University of Mosul Press.
- [22] Kellas, G., Ferraro, F. R., & Simpson, G. B. (1988). " Lexical ambiguity and the Time Course of Attentional Allocation in Word Recognition". *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, 14, 601–609.
- [23] Khan , M . & Hilali T. (2006). *Translation of the Meanings of The Noble Quran in the English Language*.
- [24] Lyons, J. (1995). *Linguistic semantics. An Introduction* . Cambridge: Cambridge University press.
- [25] Munday, J . (ed.). (2009). *The Routledge Companion to Translation Studies*, revised edition, Oxon: Routledge . P. 285 .
- [26] Munday, J. (2012). *Introducing translation studies: Theories and application* (3rd ed.). New York and London: Routledge . NJ: Erlbaum.
- [27] Pickthall, M. (1930). *The Meaning of the Glorious Quran*. London.
- [28] Oxford , (n.d.) *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English* . Oxford University Press.
- [29] Pym, A. (2010). *Exploring Translation Theories*. London and New York: Routledge
- [30] Qassas , R. (2021) "Translation and the Individual Talent: Ambiguity in the Qur'anic Text and the Role of the Translator". Taibah University, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.



[31] Quine , W. (2013). *Word and Object* (New ed.). MIT Press. pp. 23–72.
Available on

New%20folder/Indeterminacy%20of%20translation%20-%20Wikipedia.htm.

[32] Rashad , k. (1989) . *Quran The Final Testament (Authorized English Version With the Arabic Text*. Islamic Productions .

[33] Reiss, K. (1971-2000). *Translation Criticism: the Potentials and Limitations*. (1st ed.). Manchester, U.K.: St. Jerome Publications.

[34] Sarwar, M. (1920). *Translation of the Holy Qur'an*. In: *Jami' Al-Tafasir 2.1*. (2010) [CD]. Ghom: Noor Computer Services Company (N.C.S.Co.)

[35] Shakir, M. H. (1999). *The Qur'an*. New York: Tahrike Tarsile Qur'an.

[36] Seidlhofer, B. and Widdowson, H. G. (1997) “Coherence in summary: The contexts of appropriate discourse.” In: Bublitz, W., Lenk, U. and Ventola, E. (eds) *Coherence in Spoken and Written Discourse*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 205-219.

[37] Sherali , M. (2015). *The Holy Quran Arabic Texts and English Translation* . Islamic International Publications Limited.

[38] Tárnayiková, J. (2002) *From Text to Texture. An Introduction to Processing Strategies*. 3rd ed. Olomouc: Univerzita Palackého.

[39] Toury, G. (1995). *Descriptive translation studies and beyond*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia (2nd ed.): John Benjamins. P.10

[40] Weigand, E. (Ed.) (2008). *Dialogue and rhetoric*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

[41] Widdowson, H. (1978) *Teaching Language as Communication*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

[42] Williams, M. (2001). The Application of Argumentation Theory to Translation Quality Assessment, *Meta* 2: 328-343.

[43] Yusuf Ali, A. (1934). *The Holy Qur'an: Translation and Commentary*. In: *Jami' Al-Tafasir 2.1*. (2010) [CD]. Ghom: Noor Computer Services Company.