

Translating Connotative Meaning in the Translation of the Holy Quran: Problems and Solutions

Noureldin Mohamed Abdelaal

Department of General Studies, Kolej Yayasan Pahang (KYP)
Kuantan, Pahang, Malaysia

Abstract

Connotative meaning is one of the most challenging aspects in translation, especially between two different cultures such as English and Arabic. The problem is more aggravated when the translation occurs from a sacred and sophisticated text such as the Holy Quran. As a result, losses in translation occur. This study, therefore, is an attempt to identify the losses in the translation of connotative meaning in the Holy Quran, propose strategies to reduce such losses, and identify the causes of such losses. For this purpose, seven examples were extracted from the Holy Quran and were qualitatively analysed. The analysis of the extracted data revealed that connotative meaning was quite challenging in translation and losses occurred. These problems in preserving the connotative meaning of the source text (ST) word or playing it down are due to two main causes: the first cause is the lack of equivalence, while the second one is the translator's failure to pick the most appropriate equivalent. Non-equivalence problems were mainly represented in lack of lexicalization, semantic complexity, culturally-bound terms, difference in expressive meaning, and difference in distinction of meaning between the source language (SL) and the target language (TL). Some strategies were suggested to reduce such loss in the translation of connotative meaning. These strategies include footnoting, transliteration, periphrastic translation, and accuracy of selecting the proper equivalent that can be achieved by triangulation procedures such as peer-checking and expert-checking.

Keywords: connotative meaning, the Holy Quran, translation loss, translation strategies

Cite as: Abdelaal, N. M. (2018). Translating Connotative Meaning in the Translation of the Holy Quran: Problems and Solutions. *Arab World English Journal for Translation & Literary Studies*, 2 (1). DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awejtls/vol2no1.5>

1. Introduction

One of the pivotal types of meaning is the connotative meaning, which was perceived by Leech (1983) as the communicative value expressions that go beyond the conceptual content. Newmark (1981) says that connotative meaning is based on the meaning evoked within a receiver of the message encoded. Bell (1991) adds that connotative meaning is associational, subjective, and affective. Connotative meaning is wide, and it is far more comprehensive than many other types of meaning because every trait of a word can be a part of its connotative meaning (Leech, 1983). Connotative meaning is one of the prime challenges in translation, which can be hardly preserved due to the differences between languages in expressing the connotations and associations of lexemes. A case in point is the Arabic word حج, which is sometimes rendered as ‘pilgrimage’. Although ‘pilgrimage’ may convey the denotative meaning of the Arabic word حج, it does not convey the connotative meaning of the word. The Arabic word refers to specific rites in a certain way following Prophet Mohamed (peace be to him). It is also associated with specific behaviors in terms of clothing and even moving from one place to another. It is a quite complex term that the word ‘pilgrimage’ falls short of conveying its meaning.

Koller (1979) differentiates between different types of connotation that are relevant to translation. He mentions that connotations can be at the speech level, whereby it deals with the elevated, poetic, normal, colloquial, slang usage, or vulgar usage of language. Another type of connotation, as identified by Koller, is connotations that are related to language used by specific groups of people, and thus it is socially-constrained. Koller also mentioned that connotations can be related to stylistic effect, or in other words, to the different styles of language, such as archaic, pompous, plain, or descriptive. Connotative meaning is fuzzy and changeful according to culture; hence, the wider the gap between the TL and the SL, the more difficult it is to translate these fuzzy and variable concepts (Ahmed, 2008). Such a complex nature of connotations makes rendering them challenging, especially when these connotations are related to an elevated style of language such as that of the Holy Quran. The Holy Quran is rich with many lexicons that are connotatively and denotatively difficult to render accurately. An example of such difficulty in preserving the connotative meaning in the TL in the translation of the Holy Quran is the translation of the very first *ayah* in the Holy Quran. Consider the following example, which was provided by Ahmed (2008):

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ (1:1)

In the Name of God, the Merciful, the Compassionate (1:1) (Arberry, 1982, p.19).

In the name of God, Most Gracious, Most Merciful (1:1) (Ali, 1968, p.7).

Examining Arberry’s and Ali’s translations above, it is noticed that the word ‘God’ does not seem to be connotatively an equivalent to the great name of Allah Almighty, that is, الله. The ST word, الله/ is a proper noun that implies oneness and which refers to a One and only One worship-worthy God. In other words, it refers to *Tawhid-ul-Uluhiyyah* (Oneness of Worship). All such meanings are not conveyed in the word “God”. Another example of losses in conveying connotative meanings occurred in the translation of the third *ayah* in surah al-Baqara which reads:

الَّذِينَ يُؤْمِنُونَ بِالْغَيْبِ (2:3)

who believe in the mysteries of faith (2:3) (Sale, 1734, p. 20)

Ahmed (2008) argues that Sale's rendition of غيب/ghayb/ as “mysteries” does not convey the connotative meaning of the ST word accurately because the word “mysteries” has connotations which do not exist in the Quranic word. Therefore, sometimes the problem is that either the ST word or the target text (TT) word has more or less connotations of the other one.

Another problem of translation, which is related to the connotative meaning, results from the semantically invisible meanings. Al-Kharabsheh and Al-Azzam (2008) postulate that Quranic lexemes have visible meanings, which are mistakenly deemed to be the intended ones; and invisible meanings, which are the really intended ones. Semantically invisible elements, according to Al-Kharabsheh and Al-Azzam (2008) have two meanings; surface (i.e. visible) meaning and deeper (i.e. invisible) meaning. These two types of meaning exist in the Holy Quran text. However, it might be arguable that all Quranic lexemes have invisible meaning that are always intended. The visible meaning is mostly the intended one in the Holy Quran. Al-Kharabeshah and Al-Azzam argue that a translator should be careful in conveying the invisible meaning and even making it explicit and clearly seen if needed. However, translators usually fail to translate such a kind of invisible meaning due to lack of exegetic knowledge or incomplete understanding of the Quranic semantically rich and complex text.

So far a limited number of studies have investigated some problems in the translation of connotative meaning (e.g. AlBazour, 2017; Abdelaal & Md Rashid, 2016; Abdelaal & Md Rashid, 2015; Himmod, 2013; Ahmed, 2008). However, these studies do not seem to provide holistic view of the problem and how it can be handled. Therefore, this study aims at probing the problems faced in rendering the connotative meaning in the translation of the Holy Quran. This study, in particular, aims to: 1) identify the losses in connotative meaning in the translation of some verses of the Holy Quran; 2) propose translation strategies to reduce such loss in the translation of connotative meaning; and 3) identify the causes of such losses.

2. Methodology

2.1 Research design

This research fits in the interpretive paradigm of qualitative research, which is deemed appropriate for the study of the complex nature of the translation of the examined text (i.e. The Holy Quran). As postulated by Creswell (2007), qualitative research is conducted when a complex detailed understanding of an issue is sought for, and when quantitative measurements and analyses do not fit in the research problem.

2.2 Sampling

Purposive sampling was adopted for this study, for its being appropriate for a qualitative research, such as this study. Seven examples were purposefully elicited from Surah Al Anaam (the Chapter of Cattle), AL-Aa'raf (the Chapter of Heights), and At-Tur (the Chapter of Mount). The translation selected is Muhammed Abdel Haleem's translation. It was selected because it tends to be brief and avoids paraphrasing and transliteration.

2.3 Data analysis

The data was interpreted and analysed by the researcher based on his prior knowledge and understanding, as suggested by Creswell (2007). In practice, the researcher read through the

translation to understand the meanings of the *ayahs* (verses), and the meanings of the lexicons used in the ST and the TT. Different dictionaries were consulted to understand the primary and secondary meanings of the lexicons used in the translation. Some of the *ayahs* that show failure or loss in conveying connotative meaning in translation were identified and extracted, the causes of such loss in translation were derived from the analysis. Monolingual and bilingual Arabic and English dictionaries were consulted to verify the losses in the translation of the connotative meaning, i.e. by comparing the meanings in the translation and the authentic ST meanings as interpreted in the exegesis books, and the Arabic monolingual dictionaries. To identify the failure or loss in the translation of connotative meaning, Koller's notion of connotative equivalence, which postulates that it is related to the lexical choices, especially between near-synonyms, or 'stylistic equivalence', was referred to. To identify the causes of the failure to translate the ST lexemes, Baker's typology of non-equivalence was adopted. Baker categorizes the most common non-equivalences between languages at the word level into eleven types, which are:

1. "Cultural specific concepts
2. SL concepts are not lexicalized in the TL
3. Semantically complex SL words
4. Different distinctions in meaning in the SL and the TL
5. The TL lacks a superordinate (Superordinate)
6. The TL lacks a specific term (hyponym)
7. Interpersonal or physical perspective differences,
8. Differences in expressive meaning
9. Differences in form: it is hard to find equivalent forms in a SL and TL
10. Differences in frequency and purpose of using specific form
11. The use of loan words in the SL

3. Results and Discussion

This section, therefore, aims at identifying the losses in connotative meaning in the translation of some verses of the Holy Quran, proposing translation strategies to reduce such loss in the translation of connotative meaning and identifying the causes of such losses.

Example 1

ST	(6:3) وَهُوَ اللَّهُ فِي السَّمَاوَاتِ وَفِي الْأَرْضِ ۚ يَعْلَمُ سِرَّكُمْ وَجَهْرَكُمْ وَيَعْلَمُ مَا تَكْسِبُونَ
Transl.	Wahuwa Allahu fee assamawatiwafee al-ardi yaAAalamu sirrakum wajahrakum wayaAAalamu mataksiboon
TT	"He is God in the heavens and on earth, He knows your secrets and what you reveal, and He knows what you do"

As seen in example 1, it seems that the connotative meaning of the Quranic word سرکم, which was translated, as "secrets", is not conveyed in the translation. The Quranic word refers to something which may not be known by any creature; however, Allah the Almighty knows it. By contrast, the English word "secret" refers to something that is known by only few people (Collins CoBuild Dictionary, 2006). Thus, the connotative meaning of the ST word, which implies the unknown by anyone, was not conveyed in the TT. This distorts the authentic meaning because

knowing what is known by even few people is still not such a great thing compared to Allah's the Almighty power and knowledge. This loss in translation is unavoidable because English does not have an equivalent word for the ST word. The only solution for such a kind of non-equivalence problem would have been to provide a footnote that explains the meaning in elaboration. It can then be concluded that the cause of such a problem in translation is lack of equivalence, or in particular, it is a distinction in meaning between the ST word and the TT word, as highlighted by Baker (1992/2011). Put simply, the ST word سر has more implications than the TT word "secrets", though they may sound denotatively equivalent.

In a similar vein, the ST word الله was rendered as "God", which tends to show a failure in conveying the ST connotative and denotative meanings. The ST word reflects a complex association of meanings. It denotes and connotes Oneness and all such complex meanings of believing in a One creator of the worlds that deserves to be worshipped; it highlights the Oneness of worship aspect. By contrast, the TT word "God" does not show such complexity and richness of meaning that exists in the ST word. This problem or loss in translation could have been avoided by transferring the name of Allah as it is, which is one of Newmark's (1988) suggestions for translating proper nouns, and which is also recommended by Pym (2004). Hervey and Higgins (1992) suggest that proper nouns be translated using exotism, viz. transferring the names as they are without any change; or transliteration, viz. shifting the name to conform the phonics of the TL.

Example 2

ST	قَدْ خَسِرَ الَّذِينَ كَذَّبُوا بِلِقَاءِ اللَّهِ حَتَّىٰ إِذَا جَاءَتْهُمُ السَّاعَةُ بَغْتَةً قَالُوا يَا حَسْرَتَنَا عَلَىٰ مَا فَرَطْنَا فِيهَا وَهُمْ يَحْمِلُونَ أَوْزَارَهُمْ عَلَىٰ ظُهُورِهِمْ ۗ أَلَا سَاءَ مَا يَزُرُونَ (6:31)
TRANSL.	Qad khasira allatheena kaththaboo biliqa-i Allahi hatta itha jaat-humu alssaAAatu baghtatan qaloo ya hasratana AAala ma farratna feeha wahum yahmiloona awzarahum AAala thuhoorihim ala saa ma yaziroona
TT	Lost indeed are those who deny the meeting with their Lord until, when the Hour suddenly arrives, they say, 'Alas for us that we disregarded this!' They will bear their burdens on their backs. How terrible those burdens will be! (p.82).

In example 2 above, the Quranic expression لقاء الله was translated as "the meeting with their Lord", which conveys the denotative meaning of the expression. However, the connotative meaning does not seem to have been conveyed. The Quranic expression, in the context of the *ayah*, refers to the Day of Judgment and even to the life after death; it also includes everything that will definitely happen on the Day of Judgment such as resurrection, accountability, rewarding, *Jannah* and Hellfire (Al Qurtubi, 2004). It is intuitively understood by native speakers of Arabic as the death and what comes after it. These shades of meaning are not conveyed in the translation, and thus the connotative meaning is lost in the translation. This loss occurred due to the difference in mapping the ST and TT words, as though the ST word has a denotative equivalent in the target language, the connotative meaning in the ST is not embedded in the TT word. This is a non-avertable loss that cannot be avoided due to the cultural difference between the SL and the TL. The connotative meaning is, then, recommended to be explained periphrastically. It can be rendered as "meeting with Allah (viz. Day of Judgment and its consequences)".

In a similar vein, the connotative meaning does not seem to be conveyed in translating *وزر* in example 2. The Quranic ST word was rendered as “burdens”, which does not seem to express the connotative meaning of the ST word. The Quranic word may mean burden; however, in this context it means sins and bad deeds (Ibn Ashour, 1984). Thus, the connotative meaning tends to be lost in the translation because the connotations of ‘burden’ are different from the connotations of the ST word. ‘Burden’ can mean something oppressive or worrisome; it can also mean something that can be carried (Webster Online Dictionary, 2013). However, the ST word connotations are different. They refer to sins, especially loads of sins. Such a kind of loss in the connotative meaning has mainly occurred to the cultural differences between the SL and the TL. Therefore explaining the meaning in a footnote can be a strategy to explicate the connotative meanings of the ST word.

Similarly, the ST word *الساعة* was rendered as “the Hour”, which may convey the denotative meaning of the ST word. However, it seems to fail to convey the ST connotative meanings. The ST word can refer to death or the Day of Judgment and it indicates that it is a definite time. The ST word basically refers to the Day of Judgment and how it is already definite, certain and decided. The TT word, however, does not seem to show all such meanings. The ST word is culturally bound, and thus it does not have an equivalent in the TL. It is not lexicalized in the SL which is one major cause of non-equivalence problems between a SL and a TL, as mentioned by Baker (1992/2011). To reduce the loss of the connotative meaning, a footnote may be provided to explain the complex meaning of the word, which, however, should not be exaggerated. It should be only sought in case of absence of more valid translation strategies.

Example 3

ST	قُلْ أَعْبِرُوا اللَّهَ اتَّخَذُ وَلِيًّا فَاطِرَ السَّمَاوَاتِ وَالْأَرْضِ وَهُوَ يُطْعِمُ وَلَا يُطْعَمُ قُلْ إِنِّي أُمِرْتُ أَنْ أَكُونَ أَوَّلَ مَنْ أَسْلَمَ وَلَا تَكُونَنَّ مِنَ الْمُشْرِكِينَ (6:14)
Transl.	Qul aghayra Allahi attakhithu waliyyan fatiri alssamawati waal-ardi wahuwa yutAAimu wala yutAAamu qul innee omirtu an akoona awwala man aslama wala takoonanna mina almushrikeena
TT	Say, ‘Shall I take for myself a protector other than God, the Creator of the heavens and the earth, who feeds but is not fed?’ Say, ‘I am commanded to be the first [of you] to devote myself [to Him].’ Do not be one of the idolaters . (Abdel Haleem, p.81)

Examining example 3, the Quranic ST word *ولي* was rendered as “protector” by Abel Haleem, which does not tend to convey the denotative or the connotative meanings of the ST word. The Quranic ST word refers to the fact that Allah is a worshipped God and creator who supports and helps His creatures (Makhlouf, 1992). On the other hand, the word ‘protector’ means to “to keep someone or something safe from harm, damage, or illness (Collins CoBuild Dictionary, 2006). The Quranic ST word is one of the names of Allah the Almighty, and thus transliteration seems to be a more proper translation strategy. Transliteration can be a successful method to translate culturally-bound terms, as the case here. However, it should be provided in a footnote or an endnote that explains the meaning in detail. One advantage of employing transliteration as a strategy is that it introduces new terms to the TL, and thus helps readership be more aware of the ST culture.

One more example of failing to render the connotative meaning in example 3 can be identified in translating يطعم as “feed”. The Quranic ST word, in this context, implies sustaining His creatures with every kind of need, without being Himself in need for them (Makhlouf, 1995; ibn Kathir, 2002). Sustain, though denotatively is not equivalent to the ST word, may have been closer in connotative meaning to the ST word. This gap or loss in the connotative meanings between the ST and the TT can be attributed to the distinction in meaning between the ST and the TT. It seems that this type of failure to convey the ST meaning may be reduced if it is translated to ‘sustain’, though it will not convey all the shades of the ST word meanings.

In a similar vein, the ST word مشركين was rendered as “Idolaters”, which seems to convey a loss in connotative meaning. The Quranic ST word means polytheist, that is, to worship others along with Allah the Almighty. It also refers to disbelievers in its general meaning. The Arabic ST word postulates different connotations from the TT word. It refers to all those who associate any with Allah the Almighty. However, the TT word “idolaters” refers to worshipping idols or admiring someone or something that does not deserve worshipping. The translator could have rendered the ST word as ‘polytheist’, which seems to convey the ST word meaning more accurately, as it indicates believing in more than one God. However, it does not convey the full ST word meanings; it rather closes the gap between the ST and TT words. A transliteration could have also been a more appropriate translation strategy.

Example 4

ST	قُلْ مَنْ حَرَّمَ زِينَةَ اللَّهِ الَّتِي أَخْرَجَ لِعِبَادِهِ وَالطَّيِّبَاتِ مِنَ الرِّزْقِ قُلْ هِيَ لِلَّذِينَ آمَنُوا فِي الْحَيَاةِ الدُّنْيَا خَالِصَةً يَوْمَ الْقِيَامَةِ ۗ كَذَلِكَ نُفَصِّلُ الْآيَاتِ لِقَوْمٍ يَعْلَمُونَ (7:32)
TRANSL.	Qul man harrama zeenata Allahi allatee akhraja liAAibadihi waalttayyibati mina alrriizqi qul hiya lillatheena amanoo fee alhayati alddunya khalisatan yawma alqiyamati kathalika nufassilu al-ayati liqawmin yaAAalamoona
TT	Say [Prophet], ‘Who has forbidden the adornment and the nourishment God has provided for His servants ?’ Say, ‘They are [allowed] for those who believe during the life of this world: they will be theirs alone on the Day of Resurrection.’ This is how We make Our revelation clear for those who understand (p.96).

In example 4, the Quranic word زينة was translated as “the adornments”, which indicates a failure in rendering the connotative meaning. The Quranic ST word, in the context of the *ayah*, refers to every kind of clothing whether for adornment or not, including regular clothing (Ibn Ashour, 1984). Also, al Baghawi (1989) and Ibn Kathir (2002) interpreted زينة as ‘clothing’. Likewise, Al-Qurtubi (2004) mentioned that the word refers to clothing, especially neat and nice clothing. All these meanings are lost in the translation since the English word “adornment” refers to things that make someone beautiful (Collins Cobuild Dictionary, 2006), and thus it does not include the basic needs of the human being. In addition, the *ayah* was revealed to refute the disbelievers’ assumptions that putting on clothes while circumambulating Ka’ba is not legal, or that some foods are forbidden (Ibn Ashour, 1984), which is not conveyed in the TT. This failure in conveying the connotative meanings of the ST word may have resulted from the difference in

expressive meaning between the SL and the TL, which is a non-equivalence problem (Baker, 1992/2011). A periphrastic translation would have been more appropriate for such a semantically complex word. It could have been rendered as “adornments with clothes” to close the gap between the ST word and the TT word.

Another tendency of failure to convey connotative meaning occurred in example 4 in translating the Quranic word الرزق as “nourishment”. The Quranic ST word الرزق refers to every type of food whether necessary for living or for enjoyment. It also refers to meat and *samn* (ghee) during hajj days, which were considered illegal and forbidden during the pre-Islamic era (Al Baghawi, 1989; Ibn Kathir, 2002). It also refers to what was considered as forbidden or illegal such as *al bahirah*¹ and *al saibah*² (al Baghawi, 1989). However, the English TT word ‘nourishment’ refers to the food that is necessary for living and growth (Collins Cobuild Dictionary, 2006). Thus, the connotative meaning is lost in the TT. This gap between the ST word meaning and the TT word is a result of the semantic complexity of the ST word, which is a non-equivalence problem that was highlighted by Baker (1992/2011). A word such as “provision” seems to be closer to the ST word meaning.

The translation of *نفسل* as “make clear” in example 4 is another example of the failure to preserve the connotative meaning in the translation. The translation does not seem to be accurate because the word means to detail and to make clear as well (Al Tabri, 1994). Although the primary meaning was conveyed in the translation, the connotative meaning is lost. A proposed translation for the ST Quranic verb is ‘explain in details’ because ‘explain’ indicates putting things clear. By the same token, the Quranic verb يعلمون in example 4, was translated as “know”, which tends to indicate a semantic loss in the translation. The Quranic verb يعلمون refers to gaining the knowledge and understanding what is explained and detailed to people in the Holy Quran (Al Tabri, 1994). However, the English word ‘know’ refers to perceiving directly (Merriam Webster Dictionary, 2007). The connotative meaning of the ST verb, in this context, seems to be lost in the TT. The cause of such a loss in the translation of the connotative meaning seems to be a result of difference in expressive meaning between the ST and the TT. Translating the ST verb as ‘understand’ seems to convey the ST word meaning more accurately.

Loss of denotative and connotative meaning seems to have also occurred in translating عباده as “His servants” in example 4. The Quranic word عباده refers to ‘worshippers’, in this context, and to Allah Almighty’s creatures in the general meaning (Ibn Kathir, 2002; al Baghawi, 1989). However, the word ‘servant’ implies serving or working for someone, which seems to be a semantic loss in the translation, which is avertable. ‘Worshippers’ seem to be the proper rendition of the ST word. In a similar vein, the word آيات was translated as “Revelation” in example 4. The translation seems ambiguous and is not conformant with the meaning of the word in this context. The Quranic ST word آيات means the laws of Allah Almighty and what is allowed (*halal*) and what is forbidden (*haram*) (Al Tabri, 1994), which is not conveyed in the TT. In this case, the denotative and connotative meanings are lost. This is a lack of lexicalization problem, which is a type of non-equivalence, as suggested by Baker (1992/2011). Here, I refer to Muhsin Khan’s translation of the word as “the Ayat (Islamic laws)” which is transliteration accompanied by explanation of the meaning. This sounds a proper translation strategy in this context.

Example 5

ST	(52:20) مُتَّكِيْنَ عَلَى سُرُرٍ مَّصْفُوفَةٍ وَرَوَّجْنَاهُمْ بِحُورٍ عَيْنٍ
TRANSL.	Muttaki-eena AAala sururin masfoofatin wazawwajnahum bihooirin AAeenin
TT	They are comfortably seated on couches arranged in rows ; We pair them with beautiful-eyed maidens ; (p.345).

As seen in example 5, the Quranic word مَّصْفُوفَةٍ was translated as “arranged in rows”, which tends to show a loss in the translation of the connotative meaning of the word because the Quranic word مَّصْفُوفَةٍ refers to the status when the inhabitants of the *Jannah* sit facing each other, where none gives his back to another (Ibn Kathir, 2002; Ibn Ashour, 1984). However, the translation refers to being in rows, which does not necessarily imply that those who lie on beds are facing or even love each other. The connotative meaning seems to be lost in the translation as explained. This loss in translation seems to be inevitable, and it results from the lack of lexicalization of the ST word. However, it can be reduced only by explaining the connotative meaning of the word in a footnote.

Similarly, the lexical items حور عین was translated as “beautiful-eyed maidens” in example 5. The TT expression does not convey the expressive and connotative meanings of the ST expression, which refers to having beautiful eyes, with big blackness and big whiteness, as well (Al Maani Dictionary, n.d.; Al Saadi, 2004). Moreover, the Quranic noun phrase refers to the women of *Jannah* who has features that are far more than only having beautiful eyes. The TT may have expressed the meaning of عین partially. However, it does not convey the full meaning of the ST word, as it does not indicate that the eyes are big or lustrous. Also, it does not convey the meaning of the ST word حور completely, i.e. the beautiful black eyes. This expression is culturally-bound, which can be only lent to the TL through transliteration.

Example 6

ST	وَمَا الْحَيَاةُ الدُّنْيَا إِلَّا لَعِبٌ وَلَهْوٌ وَلَدَارُ الْآخِرَةِ خَيْرٌ لِلَّذِينَ يَتَّقُونَ أَفَلَا تَعْقِلُونَ (6:32)
TRANSL.	Wama alhayatu alddunya illa laAAibun walahwun walalddaru al-akhirati khayrun lillatheena yattaqoona afala taAAqiloona
TT	The life of this world is nothing but a game and a distraction; the Home in the Hereafter is best for those who are aware of God. Why will you [people] not understand? (p.82).

As seen in example 6, the Quranic word لعب was rendered as “game”, which tends to be a non-equivalent of the ST word. The ST word لعب refers to all the enjoyments, pleasures and activities of the earthly life (Al-Qurtubi, 2004), which includes whatever people enjoy and love or hate in the earthly life. However, the TT word ‘game’, according to Collins Cobuild Dictionary (2006) refers to “an activity or sport usually involving skill, knowledge, or chance, in which you follow fixed rules and try to win against an opponent or to solve a puzzle.”. It also means amusement or diversion (Merriam Webster Dictionary, 2007), which does not convey the actual meaning intended in the ST. Thus, a loss in the connotative meaning seems to have occurred in the Abdel Haleem’s translation. The word ‘play’ could have been a better equivalent for the ST word. Another loss in example 6 occurred in the translation of the Quranic expression “الدار الآخرة” as “the

Home in the Hereafter”. The translator rendered the meaning literally, without conveying the complete meanings of the lexical items. The ST expression refers only to the eternal life in the hereafter. It does not refer to “Home”, which is a loss by addition. I guess that translating such an expression as “the Last Abode” could reduce the loss in the connotative meaning of the ST word.

Example 7

ST	(7:13) قَالَ فَاهْبِطْ مِنْهَا فَمَا يَكُونُ لَكَ أَنْ تَتَكَبَّرَ فِيهَا فَاخْرُجْ إِنَّكَ مِنَ الصَّاغِرِينَ
TRANSL	<u>Qala faihbit minha fama</u> yagoonu laka an tatakabbara <u>feeha</u> faokhruj innaka mina <u>alssaghireena</u>
TT	God said, ‘Get down from here! This is no place for your arrogance. Get out! You are contemptible . (p.95).

As seen in example 7, the Quranic word صاغرين was translated by Abdel Haleem as “contemptible”, which tends to be a loss in connotative meaning. The Quranic adjective word صاغرين describes a person who is humiliated and who accepts such humiliation and contempt (Al Asfahani, n.d.). However, the English word “contemptible” means to feel disrespect and strong dislike for somebody (Collins Cobuild Dictionary, 2006), which does not convey all the shades of the meaning of the ST word. Thus, the connotative meaning is lost.

In general, it seems that preserving the connotative meaning in the translation of the Holy Quran is challenging, as it has been explained. These findings are consistent with Ahmed (2008), who found that connotative meaning is lost in the translation due to cultural differences between the ST and the TT. To reduce such a kind of loss in connotative meaning in translation, a translator may resort to componential analysis of the ST word with its different connotative meanings and the suggested words in the TT for the translation of the ST word. Based on such componential analysis, the translator can decide on which words are near equivalents for the ST words.

As explicated above, it seems that the connotative meaning is difficult to preserve in the TT. Sometimes, there are more or less shades of meaning either in the ST lexical item(s) or the TT lexical item(s). These problems in preserving the connotative meaning of the ST word or playing it down are due to two main causes: the first cause is the lack of equivalence problem, while the second cause is a translator’s failure to pick the most appropriate equivalent. Non-equivalence problems were mainly represented in lack of lexicalization, semantic complexity, culturally-bound terms, difference inexpressive meaning, and difference in distinction in meaning between the SL and the TL. Some strategies were suggested to reduce such loss in the translation of connotative meaning. These suggested strategies include paraphrasing in a footnote, transliteration, periphrastic translation, and being more accurate in selecting the proper equivalent. Accuracy in selecting the proper equivalents can be achieved by triangulation procedures such as peer-checking and expert-checking.

4. Conclusion

The study aimed at identifying the losses in the translation of connotative meaning, propose strategies to reduce such losses, and identify the causes of such losses. The analysis of the extracted

data from three Quranic Surahs revealed that connotative meaning was quite challenging in translation and losses occurred. One cause of semantic loss in the Abdel Haleem's translation seems to result from the translator's failure to select appropriate equivalent of some words or phrases, which are avertable losses (As-Safi, 2011). In other words, the TT may have an equivalent for a ST word, but, a translator selects an inappropriate word. In regards to the translation at hand, there are many semantic losses that might have resulted from the translator's unawareness, or losses that could have been avoided. The second cause of losses was found to be lack of equivalence problem. Some translation strategies were proposed such as transliteration, and periphrastic translation. This study, therefore, suggests that translation of the Holy Quran be critiqued to enhance the production of a better translation. It is also suggested to refer to the plethora of translations to come out with a less erroneous translation.

Endnote

- 1 A slit-ear she-camel freed from work
- 2 A she-camel let loose for free pasture

About the author:

Noureldin Mohamed Abdelaal holds a PhD in translation and interpretation, preceded by an MA in English applied linguistics. He works as a lecturer for Kolej Yayasan Pahang (KYP). His research interests and publications are in the areas of translation and applied linguistics.

References

- Abdelaal, N. M., & Md Rashid, S. (2015). Semantic Loss in the Holy Qur'an Translation With Special Reference to Surah Al-WaqiAAa (Chapter of The Event Inevitable). *SAGE Open*, 5(4), 1–10. Retrieved from <http://sgo.sagepub.com/content/5/4/2158244015605880.abstract>
- Abdelaal, N. M., & Md Rashid, S. (2016). Grammar-Related Semantic Losses in the Translation of the Holy Quran, with Special Reference to Surah Al A'araf (The Heights). *SAGE Open*, 6(3). Retrieved from <http://sgo.sagepub.com/content/6/3/2158244016661750.abstract>
- Ahmed, M. (2008). Approaches to denotative and connotative meanings in the translations of the Holy Quran. *Adab Al-Rafidayn*, 2(50), 1–30.
- Al Maani Dictionary (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://www.almaany.com/>.
- Albzour, S. (2017). Connotations of the Word “fruit” in the Holy Quran : An Analytical Study. *International Journal of Linguistics*, 9(1), 117–136. <http://doi.org/10.5296/ijl.v9i1.10660>
- Ali, Y. (1968/2006). *The Holy Qur'an, Text, Translation and Commentary*(Trans.). Beirut, Lebanon: Dar al AArabia.
- Al-Kharabsheh, A., and Al-Azzam, B. (2008). Translating the invisible in the Qur'an. *Babel Revue Internationale de La Traduction International Journal of Translation*, 54(1), 1–18. <http://doi.org/10.1075/babel.54.1.02kha>
- Al-Qurtubi, S. (2004). *Al JamAA liahkam al Qur'an (Tafsir Al Qurtubi)*. Cairo, Egypt: Dar Al-Fikr.
- Alt-Tabari, M. (2004). *JaamiAA Al-Bayaan AAn Ta'weel Ayil Qur'an* [The commentary on the Quran]. Cairo: Al-Halabi. Dar Al- Maref.
- Arberry, A. (1982). *The Koran Interpreted*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Baker, M. (1992/2011). *In Other Words. A Coursebook on Translation* (2nd ed.). London and New York: Routledge.
- Bell, R. (1991). *Translation and Translating: Theory and Practice*. London and New York: Longman.
- Collins, H. (2006). *CoBuild Advanced Learner's English Dictionary*. Glasgow, Scotland: HarperCollins.
- Creswell, J. (2007). *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing among Five Approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Hervey, S., & Higgins, I. (1992). *Thinking translation : A course in translation method: French-English*. Taylor & Francis Routledge.
- Himmod, Z. (2013). Translating the Connotative Meanings of Colour Expressions in the Glorious Qur'an. *Majjalit Adab Al Faraheedy*, 15, 95–120.
- Ibn Ashour, M. (1984). *Tafsir Attahrir Wattanwir (Liberation and Enlightenment Interpretation Book)* (first). Tunis: Tunisian Publishing House.
- Ibn Kathir, H. (2002). *Tafsiru AlQur'ani Alkarim [Commentary on the Quran]*. Beirut, Lebanon: Maktabat Nour Al'ilmijja. (Original work published in 1995)
- Koller, W. (1979) Einführung die Übersetzungswissenschaft, Heidelberg: Quelle and Meyer.
- Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Newmark, P. (1981). *Approaches to Translation*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Pickthall, M. (2001). *The Meaning of the Glorious Qur'an*. Kuala Lumpur: Islamic Book Trust.
- Pym, A. (2004). *The Moving Text: Localization, Translation, and Distribution*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Sale, G. (1734). *The Koran*. London: Frederick Warne.