The Translation of the Verb "ظن" in the Glorious Quran into English: A Linguistic and Semantic Study

Dr. Salim Y. Fathi* & Dr. Luqman A. Nasser**

تاريخ التقديم: 2008/3/25 تاريخ القبول: 2008/6/18

1.1 Introduction:

Translation is an important part of human activities. It is a process by which the translator decodes the message sent by Source Language (SL) text producer and encodes it into Target Language (TL) receiver in such a way that similar meaning and intended effects are constructed between (SL) and (TL). The main goal of the translator is attained when transmitting the essence of the message and when he is faithful to the meaning of the (SL)text being transferred to the (TL) text.

An important question of translation is whether there is always a meaning-preserving translation. It may be the case that some (SL) meanings are not precisely expressed in (TL). It may even be the case that one cannot tell whether the same meaning in two languages has been properly expressed. These are important questions that will be addressed in this paper. It is to be concerned with the extent the translators have been able to convey the meanings and implications intended in the original text.

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

In translation, the case of recreating equivalent text would be more problematic, especially between two languages remote linguistically, culturally, and stylistically (as in the case between English and Arabic). A certain degree of meaning loss is expected due to the disparities that exist between the two languages and cultures. In this regard, Culler (1975:21-22) argues that languages are not nomenclatures and the concepts of one language may greatly differ from those of another, since each language articulates or organizes the world differently, and languages do not simply name categories; they articulate their own. So, one of the major problems of translation is the disparity among languages; the more disparities that exist between any two languages, the greater the meaning loss in the translation.

A distinction in the field of translation theory has been made between the SL-oriented translation approach and the TL- oriented translation approach. SL-oriented approach calls for transferring the linguistic form of the original text, whereas the TL-oriented translation approach seeks to achieve an equivalence effect, i.e., the effect the target text has on the target readers is expected to be similar to that created by the source text on the original readers. Accordingly, many theorists of translation (e.g. Nida, 1964; Catford, 1965; Newmark, 1988 among others) attempted to categorize types of translation. For them, types of translation could be generally divided into two main headings: the first one is directed to the form, whereas the second is directed to the message content (see, for example, Nida, 1964; Catford, 1965; Newmark, 1988;

Aziz and Lataiwish, 2000). However, appropriate rendition requires the grasp of form and message content. In other words, form and content have significantly important status.

In principle, the main task of the translator is to produce the most appropriate equivalent of Source Text (ST) in Target Text (TT). Thus, in translation theory, one of the most basic problems is the definition of equivalence criteria: precisely when is it justified in calling text B a translation of text A? And when is B an adequate or appropriate translation of A? It is commonly agreed (for example, Nida and Taber, 1969; House, 1977; Newmark, 1982; 1988; Baker, 1992; and Vinay and Darbelnet, 1995, among others) that there are many criteria of equivalence: grammatical equivalence, linguistic equivalence, functional equivalence, cognitive equivalence, pragmatic equivalence, the principle of equivalent effect on the receiver of the message and so forth. Indeed, equivalence is an essential basis for the discussion of problems which are important to translation theory and necessary for its application (Catford, 1965:33). Thus, finding an appropriate translation equivalent is a central question for the theories and practices of translation. The theory of equivalence has been studied by several scholars and researchers of translation (for example, Jakobson, 1959; Nida, 1964; Catford, 1965; among others). Most of them argue that the translator should search for the highest degree of closeness between the (SL) and (TL).

A detailed discussion of the notion of equivalence can be found in Nida (1964) and Baker (1992). For Nida, Dynamic Equivalence "is achievable when the message and response which is evoked in the receptor of (ST) and (TT) should be

the same". Thus, Nida (1964: 95) defines translation as "reproducing in the receptor language the closest natural equivalent of the message of the source language". Baker (1992) offers a detailed list of conditions upon which the concept of equivalence can be defined. She explores the notion of equivalence at different levels and puts together, in relation to the translation process, linguistic and the communicative approach to achieve an appropriate translation.

This paper calls for an equivalence that takes into account the contextual meaning of the verb "ظنّ". Giving an inappropriate equivalence may cause loss of meaning which is not acceptable in religious translation.

1.2 Propositional Meaning vs. Contextual Meaning:

In the field of semantics, types of meaning in words and utterances have been perceived from different perspectives (Leech, 1974; Halliday and Hasan: 1976, Cruise, 1986; Lobner, 2002). These scholars generally make a distinction between two main types. The first type of meaning is often referred to by several terms such as the "ideational " meaning, the "propositional" meaning, the "conceptual" meaning, the "lexical" meaning, the "logical meaning" or the "denotative" meaning. The second type of meaning, on the other hand, is termed as the "contextual" meaning, the "interpersonal" meaning, the "presupposed" meaning, the "evoked" meaning, the "stylistic" meaning, the "collocative" types of meaning, or the "connotative" meaning.

In this study, a distinction is made between contextual meaning and propositional meaning. The former is related to the speaker's feelings and attitude towards the event, rather than to what words refer to. It can not be judged as true or false, while the latter can be judged as true or false. It arises from the relation between it and what it refers to in a real world, as perceived by the speakers. Thus, it could be said that contextuals are evaluative. Such a distinction is drawn because the propositional meaning of a word is the type of meaning which could mainly be used in isolation from linguistic context, whereas the contextual meaning is derived from the situational context. Hence, the focus should be placed on the difference between the dictionary meaning and contextual meaning. Such a difference institutionalizes a significant development, particularly relevant to translation approach: SL-oriented approach and TL-oriented approach.

Kecskes (2002), analysing the relationship of situation-bound utterances and context, concludes that actual contextual meaning is the result of a 'confrontation' between the activated world knowledge represented by the actual context and prior standard contexts encoded in the lexical units the speakers have chosen to use. The standard approach to contextual vs. non-contextual meaning involves a model of linguistic organization where processing and production is divided into several components: a syntactic component, responsible for grammatical rules, structures, and grammatical functions; a semantic component which includes referential meanings; and a pragmatic or discourse-pragmatic component which fixes up the interpretation given in the semantic

component, according to contextual and pragmatic conditions. Ventura et al. (2004) say that imposing constraints on the neighbors for pair will accurately represent the contextual meaning of the pair. For instance, *cow-graze* should give a more specific representation of *cow* than *cow* without a context because constraints are built on the meaning of *cow*. These constraints initially involve measuring the neighbor-hood overlap between the neighbors of *cow* and the neighbors of *graze*, which then are used to compare another set of information (e.g., word, sentence).

It seems that contextuals are often much more difficult to analyse compared to propositionals because, as Baker (1992: 17) puts it, contextuals have "blurred edges"; their meanings are negotiable and are only realized in specific contexts. Most languages are likely to have equivalents for the more general verbs of speech such as say and speak, but many may not have equivalents for the more specific ones. According to Baker (1992:24), there may be a (TL) word which has the same propositional meaning as the source language word, but it may have a different contextual meaning. The difference may be considerable or it may be subtle but important enough to pose a translation problem in a given context. Differences in contextual meaning are usually more difficult to tackle when the (TL) equivalent is more emotionally loaded than the (SL) item. This is often the case with items which are related to sensitive issues such as religion, politics, and sex.

1.3 Word Meaning:

Defined loosely, the word is the smallest unit of language that can be used by itself (Bolinger and Sears, 1968: 43). Crystal (1985) defines a word as "a unit of expression which has universal intuitive recognition by native speakers, in both spoken and written language". He adds that defining a word as a unit of meaning or idea is of no help because of the vagueness of such notions. Therefore, he says that a word is a grammatical unit. Lyons (1977) says that a word exhibits several different denotations in isolation.

Baker (1992: 11)defines the written word as any sequence of letters with an orthographic space on either side. She gives a definition of the term word since it should be remembered that a single word can sometimes be assigned different meanings in different languages and might be regarded as being a more complex unit. This means that the translator should pay attention to a number of factors when considering a single word, such as number, gender and tense (ibid.:11-12). Enkvist (1965: 41) argues that language processing occurs through words with all the syntactic, semantic, pragmatic and collocational information that they carry with them. In this sense, words may motivate syntax, semantics, pragmatics and other types of linguistic information (ibid.). The meaning of a given word or set of words is best understood as the contribution that word or phrase can make to the meaning or function of the whole sentence or linguistic utterance where that word or phrase occurs (Zaki, 2000). In fact, between English and Arabic, differences are many and the shackles of a word for a word must be broken. To be more

specific, the Arabic word may be translated as an English phrase to express its meaning adequately and appropriately. For instance, as in our study, ظنّ has been translated into a phrase as shown in the analysis.

Landauer et al. (1998) argue that some words that have more than one contextual meaning receive a sort of average high-dimensional placement that out of context signifies nothing, and that many words are sampled too thinly to get well placed. Rieder (2002) studies the factors that determine the effort a learner makes to determine the meaning of an unknown word in a text, and those responsible for the degree to which the contextual meaning can be determined. He says that the dimension of the text comprehension process appears to be totally neglected in most current studies, so that no distinction is made between the text meaning level and the word meaning level within the comprehension process. Apart from the connection between a lexeme and its denotational concept, the denotational knowledge of a speaker will also contain knowledge about the potential lexical environment of words. However, Rieder (2002) states that even for lexemes which seem to have a unified denotation structure at first sight, the variation of the meaning from one context to another makes clear that the denotational meaning includes a range of different contextual specifications. He presents the following examples to substantiate his view.

(1) He poured **coffee** into his cup.
(2) A pound of **coffee** costs £3.
(3) **Coffee** is grown in Brazil.

While sentence (1) refers to coffee as a drink, sentence (2) is directed towards the meaning aspect of beans or powder. In sentence (3), in turn, coffee is seen as a plant or crop. These examples illustrate to what extent the recipient has to limit the denotational meaning potential of a word when specifying the contextual meaning of this word within a text. Furthermore, these observations also illustrate the basic difference between the concrete contextual meaning of a word and its abstract denotative meaning range. In the case where the reader knows the denotational word meaning, the process of determining the contextual meaning variant can thus be pictured as a process of *disambiguation, selection* and *stretching*: In the first step, the reader has to *disambiguate* the denotational meaning range through the surrounding context (sense, frame or collocational relations, syntax, etc.) and through his/her top-down expectations. This process is then followed by *selecting* the contextually relevant meaning aspects, or by *stretching* the word's meaning range if the contextual variant is not directly contained in the activated denotational spectrum (as e.g. in the case of metaphorical language). Rieder (2002) adds that the reader usually stays on the textual level when trying to figure out the meaning of the unknown word. It gives the impression that the process of deducing contextual word meaning is automatically situated on the lexeme level.

In terms of the semantic *enrichment* of the unknown conceptual structure, Rieder (2002) maintains that the learner also takes the text meaning as a starting point for forming a hypothesis about the contextual word meaning. As a result, the concept of the contextual meaning will be specified to a

certain degree, and the learner will be more or less certain that his/her meaning hypothesis is correct. He goes on arguing that the reader will specify the word meaning on the basis of its contribution to the text meaning and will not automatically assume that this contextual contribution is representative for its denotational meaning. He concludes that the contextual meaning in one context will only offer very limited information on the denotational meaning range.

1.4 Hedging vs. Certainty:

As hedging is a hybrid concept with the aspects of semantics and pragmatics, a clear indication of its linguistic forms and its definite corresponding function is unavailable. Linguists use the term *hedges* to describe words that point at uncertainty. This kind of hedging could raise questions about the certainty of what is being expressed and could also open up for readers an awareness of the value of conjecture. A hedge enables the authors to mitigate their certainty about their propositions, and to establish the interpersonal interactions with the readers by opening the possibilities of negotiations. To analyze or to learn how to use hedges is not straightforward (Hinkel, 2004), because there is no one-to-one correspondence between the function and form of hedging (Li, 1999).

In his study on logical properties of words and phrases such as *rather, very, largely, it seems that,* Lakoff (1972:195-213) introduces the term “hedges” to these words and phrases stating that “some of the most interesting questions are raised by the study of words whose meanings implicitly involve

fuzziness – words whose job it is to make things fuzzier or less fuzzy. Such words are referred to as 'hedges'", and he goes on to say that hedges "interact with felicity conditions for utterances and with rules of conversation". Thus, hedges are related to semantic and pragmatic indeterminacy (Channell, 1994).

Teufel and Moens (2002) say that the presence or absence of a modal auxiliary might be relevant to detect the phenomenon of hedging (i.e., statements in which an author distances himself from his claims or signals low certainty). Geschier (2004) argues that hedging verbs and adverbs are linguistic cues of evaluative positioning. They are modal indicators of the level of certainty or level of authority claimed by the speaker, adding that hedging lowers the strength of the claim to truthfulness.

Certainty Markers are closely connected to hedges because the items belonging to it also express the degree of commitment to the truth value of the proposition but at the opposite end of the scale, that is full commitment to it such as *certainly* and *know* (Crismore et al., 1993:52) The notion of certainty, or uncertainty, falls under the speculative type of subjectivity (Wiebe, 2000). Subjectivity has been defined as "aspects of language used to express opinions and evaluations" (Wiebe, 1994: 2000).

Modality also appears in verb choice. The frequency of the use of different modal verbs indicate an amplified voice of certainty because the verbs that express stronger conviction (*would*, *can*, and *will*) are much more common than those that communicate weaker conviction (*could* and *should*).

According to Simpson (1990: 66-67), modality refers to "a speaker's attitude toward or opinion about the truth value of a proposition expressed by a sentence and toward the situation or event described by a sentence".

There seems to be an agreement that there are at least three articulated points on a presumed continuum from certainty to doubt. Hoye (1997) suggests an epistemic trichotomy of ***certainty, probability, and possibility***, consistent with Holmes' (1990) scale of certainty of assertions and negations where the writer asserts **with certainty** that a proposition is true or not true; or that the proposition is probably or possibly true or not true. Rubin et al. (2004; 2005)study the identification of explicit certainty divisions and extended Hoye-Holmes' models by adding two extremes on the epistemic continuum scales: **Absolute certainty** (defined as a stated unambiguous indisputable conviction or reassurance) and **uncertainty** (defined as hesitancy or stated lack of clarity or knowledge), and re-defined the middle categories as **high certainty** (i.e., high probability or firm knowledge), **Moderate certainty** (i.e., estimation of an average likelihood or reasonable chances), and **low certainty** (i.e., distant possibility).

Pinkal (1985:48, cited in Schaffner, 1998) classifies hedges into four types: (1) Defining or specifying hedges such as "real, genuine, true, exactly, etc.". These hedges make a concept or a proposition more precise in that they narrow down the scope of indeterminateness of such concepts or propositions. (2) Despecifying hedges such as "kind of,

roughly, etc.". By extending the scope of indeterminateness of certain propositions, these hedges increase the vagueness of these propositions. (3) Modifying hedges such as "fairly, too, typical, etc.". They shift the scope of indeterminateness of the utterance and modify relative expressions based on a scale of degree when there is a hesitation on the part of the doer. (4) Quantifying hedges, such as "in every respect, in some respect. etc.", which clarify the characteristics of the whole scope of precision. Schaffner (1998:196) finds out three translation strategies for hedges including the deletion of hedges, where the relativising function of the SL statement is lost. Another strategy is the addition of hedges in which the statement becomes vague. Finally, the change in the perspective of hedging where the translator changes the type of hedging in the original text.

Urrea and Gradoville (2006) say that when using hedging, the intention of the speaker, is to weaken the assertion. For Fraser (1980: 344) mitigation can be used “to ease the anticipated unwelcome effect”. He makes three main distinctions: (i) “mitigation only occurs if the speaker is polite” (ibid.) but not the opposite; (ii) mitigation is not a speech act but modifies the force of a speech act; (iii) mitigation is not hedging but “hedging words can contribute to creating a mitigating effect” (ibid.). He finds it “difficult to construct a case where the speaker is viewed as impolite but having mitigated the force of his utterance”.

There are many items that can be classed as hedges. According to Tannen (1986:17-18), hedges measure the word or idea against what is expected by qualifying of modifying a

word or statement. Text producer can employ adverbs (e.g., perhaps, possibly), modal verbs (e.g., might, may), lexical verbs with a modal meaning (e.g., suggest, seem, appear), "parenthetical verbs" (e.g., guess, suppose) (Urmson, 1952: 481), downtoners (e.g., some, there is some evidence to suggest), and approximating expressions (e.g., this is about right). All these items may show a cautious commitment on the part of text producer to the truth of ideational material. Other linguistic devices used as hedges are, for example, verbs of cognition such as (think, feel, suppose), when they can be interpreted as expressing lack of commitment as to whether what follows is true. A number of adverbs of epistemic modality (uncertainty)clearly belong to hedges like (perhaps, may be*)* as well as higher clauses like "it is possible", and expressions such as "in my opinion" (Crismore et al.: 51-52).

An interesting distinction is made by (Crismore and Vande Kopple, 1997); they view that hedges can be presented in personal voice contained personal pronouns and those presented in impersonal voice contained the third person pronouns (ibid.:89). By the same token, Schaffner (1998) states that hedging devices include the use of modal auxiliaries, personal and impersonal constructions.

Yule (1996) views hedges from a pragmatic perspective. He argues that the use of hedges indicates that speakers are not only conscious of the Gricean Maxims(quantity, quality, manner, and relation), but that they want to show that they are trying to observe them (ibid.:39). The following examples act as hedges:

1. He could not live without him, I guess. (Yule, 1996:38)
2. As you probably know, I am terrified of bugs. (ibid.:38)
3. I don't know if this is important, but some of the files are missing. (ibid.:39)
4. I am not sure if this makes a sense, but the car had no lights. (ibid.:39)

According to Yule(ibid.) the underlined expressions are hedges. They are used to show that the speaker is aware of the maxims. In other words, the maxims of quality, quantity, relation and manner are flouted out as illustrated respectively in the above examples. However, the Cooperative Principle is at work.

Hedges can be included within the realm of modality if we accept Stubbs' (1986:5) view that "it is possible to indicate degrees of commitment to just three kinds of linguistic item: not only (1) to propositions but also (2) to illocutionary forces and (3) to individual lexical items". According to Simpson (1990: 66-67), modality serves to reveal how confident text producers are about the truth of the ideational material they convey. Generally speaking, all these types of hedges used in the (ST) lessen the text producer's commitment to the truthfulness of what s/he is saying; he does not present it as a "fact", but as something which is ' *possibly* 'or' *may be* ' or *'could be'* true. In this way, the text producer presents informed opinions, rather than objective truth. This rhetorical strategy shows the willingness of the text producer to negotiate with readers who hold a different view. Thus, it could be said that s/he attempts to show that the proposition is open to other possible interpretations. Indeed, this calls for explanation.

1.5 The Meaning of the Verb "ظَنَّ"

Grammatically, this verb is categorized under a heading termed أفعال القلوب (lit. verbs of heart: verbs of perception) that signify an act that takes place in heart and mind. Such verbs are classified into two types: أفعال اليقين (verbs of certainty) such as رأى، علم ، وجد (to perceive, to know, to find) respectively and أفعال الظن (uncertainty verbs) such as: ظن، خال، حسب، زعم (to think, to deem, to reckon, to imagine). According to old and modern Arab grammarians as well as non-Arab linguists (Ibn Yaʕish, 643: 64; Ibn-Al-Hajib, 646:328, Hassan cited in Al-Saqi, 1975: 163; Wright, 1971: 48, and Sultan, 2000: 53), the verb ظنّ is regarded as a ditransitive verb and functions as a predictor within sentence. It is also the origin of all the verbs of uncertainty that refer to mental activities. Old and Modern Arabic dictionaries (Ibn Mandur, 1994: 272; Al-Zubeidi 1306, H: 271 Vol.9; Ibn Zakarria, 1970: 462-63) agrees that the verb ظنّ signifies uncertainty and certainty.

Semantically, the verb ظنّ is commonly used for uncertainty and sometimes for certainty i.e. it is an antithesis. However, certainty is neither visible nor experiential but pondered. In other words, the meaning of this verb is encapsulated in the mind. But it does not denote the sense of knowledge (Ibn Mandur, 1994: 272).

ظنَ indicates that the addresser is not certain about the truth value of the propositions. The main purpose of ظنَ is to show doubtfulness, and it may convey interpersonal meaning as it reveals the addresser's attitude towards the content of the message and the addressee. Relying on some Arab

grammarians and linguists, the communicative function of ظنّ is determined by considering the textual and contextual factors in which the verb ظنّ takes place. For example, ظنّ can be interpreted as certainty verb when it is associated with the intensive particles such as إنّ "inna" (Al-Raghib cited in Al – Zubeidi 1306, H:271 Vol. 9). On the other hand, this verb can be interpreted as uncertainty verb when it is associated with the non- intensive particles such as أن "an" (ibid., Al-Samirai, 1968:437). It could also be argued that the presence of some lexical items associated with ظن can detect its intended meaning as will be shown in the analysis below.

Accordingly, ظنّ has been perceived from different perspectives. The verb ظنّ may be classified into hedging and certainty. When it is used as a hedging, it signifies doubt, while as certainty signifies the whole removal of doubtfulness. And in both cases it is viewed as politeness formula (Al-Zubeidi, 1306H: 271, Vol. 9).

1.6 Religious Translation:

It is accepted that a certain degree of meaning loss in translation is, as Nida (1964: 175) puts it, "inevitable", since "a translator can rarely do complete justice to the (linguistic) and cultural context of the communication, to the emotive features of meaning, and to the behavioral elements [of the source text]". Such inevitability may be tolerated in translating various text types. However, in Quranic discourse, it can distort the intended implications and deplete the evaluativeness of the Quran. At word level, as in the case of this study, exact translation may be "impossible" due to the fact that meanings

of words between Arabic and English do not correspond. However, Quranic translators should minimize the loss of the word meaning.

The language of religion is often so removed from the language of everyday conversation as to be almost unintelligible (David and Davy, 1969:147). The cultural and linguistic background exerts a unique range of pressures on the choice of forms to be used. These influences include the linguistic originals, speakability, appropriateness and intelligibility in that religious language must be clear for those to whom it is addressed including the avoidance of unnecessary difficulties of pronunciation (David and Davy, 1969:149). Therefore, religious language must be a language used by the majority of addressed individuals. On the other hand, too intellectual, obscure or unintelligible language is avoided (David and Davy, 1969:150).

Translating the Quran is not an easy task due to the fact that highly linguistic and rhetorical features (see, for example Al-Hashimi, 1960; Al-Jurjani, 1969). Most Quranic translators face enormous challenges in the process of translation. They are mainly concerned with conveying the message content avoiding the idiosyncrasies and specificities of the Quranic discourse. Modern Arab linguists (Shunnaq, 1994; Abdelwali, 2007) argue that in the Quran, there are many verses that are richly nuanced, strongly rhetorical and highly communicative, but when translated they look pleonastic in English.

One of the problems of translating Quran lies in the comprehension of the intended meaning. This may be due to

the difficulty of understanding the ancient Arabic language in which the Quran was written, which is much distant from contemporary Arabic. The latter, like other languages, continually changes over time. New words are being added and others take on different or added meanings. Thus, many words do not have only one meaning, and others are differently used at present from the way they were used in the past. For example, the word حرض (stir up) in contemporary Arabic indicates negative meaning as illustrated below:

حرضت بعض الجهات الخارجية على إثارة الفتنة الطائفية في العراق

Some foreign parties stirred up the sectarian sedition in Iraq.

However, this word used in the Quranic discourse signifies positive implication as in the following:

﴿يَا أَيُّهَا النَّبِيُّ حَرِّضْ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ عَلَى الْقِتَالِ﴾ (الأنفال: 65)

"O Prophet! rouse the Believers to the fight." (Yusuf Ali)

As shown above, the word حرض was appropriately rendered as(rouse) which triggers positive meaning in the (TL) reader's mind.

Analysis and Discussion:

It is agreed that the analysis of discourse should operate at two levels: the macro-level and the micro-level. The first one is mainly concerned with the global structure of the text which determines the overall organization of the discourse, whereas the second is mainly concerned with small elements such as words, collocations, and conjunctives. Such micro-elements in a discourse can serve to the purposes of the way

the macro-structures are organized and effectively contribute to the flow of discourse.

This could be applied to the theories of translation. Equivalence can appear at word level and above word level (discoursal level), when translating takes place from one language into another. Baker (1992) acknowledges that, in a bottom-up approach to translation, equivalence at word level is the first element to be taken into consideration by the translator. In fact, when the translator starts analyzing the ST s/he looks at the words as single units in order to find a direct 'equivalent' term in the TL. The inclusion of the verb ظنّ is restricted to linguistic and semantic analysis as shown below. Thus, the function of ظنّ will be determined in the (SL) and its rendition will be judged as appropriate in the (TL) if the translators capture the functional equivalence of this verb. Professionals in Arabic, English and translation were consulted. Also, some remarkable and reliable dictionaries were checked, especially "The Random House Dictionary of English Language" edited by Stein and Urdance (1983), Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary edited by Mish (2003). Such dictionaries were selected because co(n)text are taken into account. The verses selected in this study are of two types: impersonals (statements) as will be illustrated in verses 1, 2, 3 and 4, and personals as in 5, 6, 7 and 8 respectively.

SLT(1)	﴿فَإِن طَلَّقَهَا فَلَا تَحِلُّ لَهُ مِن بَعْدُ حَتَّىٰ تَنكِحَ زَوْجًا غَيْرَهُ فَإِن طَلَّقَهَا فَلَا جُنَاحَ عَلَيْهِمَا أَن يَتَرَاجَعَا إِن ظَنَّا أَن يُقِيمَا حُدُودَ اللَّهِ وَتِلْكَ حُدُودُ اللَّهِ يُبَيِّنُهَا لِقَوْمٍ يَعْلَمُونَ﴾ (البقرة: 230)						
	SL Verb		Tense	Function	Type		
	ظنّا		past	Hedging	Specifying		
Translators	**TLT**	**Class**	**Tense**	**Function**	**Type**	**appropriateness**	
Ahmed	think	verb	present	Hedging	specifying	+	+
Ayub	think	verb	present	Hedging	specifying	+	+
Pickthall	consider	verb	present	Hedging	specifying	+	+
Qarib & Darwish	think	verb	present	Hedging	specifying	+	+
Khan	feel	verb	present	Hedging	modifying	+	-
Rashad	-------	------	-------	-------	-------	-	-
Sarwar	think	verb	present	Hedging	specifying	+	+
Shakir	think	verb	present	Hedging	specifying	+	+
Sherali	sure	adj	present	Certainty	Absolute	-	-
Yusuf Ali	feel	verb	present	Hedging	modifying	+	-

Discussion:

The function of the verb "ظنّ" in this verse is specifying hedging because no human being is sure that he will observe the limits prescribed by ALLAH. Most translators have appropriately expressed the function of specifying hedging by the use of different verbs including "think" and "consider". Also, they have captured the same tense (present tense) as used in the (SLT). However, Khan and Yusuf Ali have inappropriately expressed different functions by their renditions of the verb "feel" which indicates modifying hedging. Such renditions could not grasp the communicative function of ظنّ. In a rare case, Rashad has deleted the function

of "ظن". On the other hand, Sherali has inappropriately used the adjective " sure " which indicates certainty. It could be argued that certainty marker, in this context, is inappropriate equivalent to the verb ظنّ because one can not make full commitment to his/her decision in unknown future. However, the use of this verb, in this verse, may indicate politeness that reveals the positive act and good intention.

SLT(2)	﴿وَرَأَى الْمُجْرِمُونَ النَّارَ **فَظَنُّوا** أَنَّهُم مُّوَاقِعُوهَا وَلَمْ يَجِدُوا عَنْهَا مَصْرِفًا﴾ (الكهف: 53)						
	SL Verb		**Tense**	**Function**	**Type**		
	فظنوا		**Past**	**Certainty**	**Absolute**		
Translators	**TLT**	**class**	**Tense**	**Function**	**Type**	**appropriateness**	
Ahmed	know	Verb	present	certainty	Moderate	+	-
Ayub	think	Verb	present	hedging	specifying	-	-
Pickthall	know	Verb	present	certainty	Moderate	+	-
Qarib & Darwish	will reckon	Verb	future	certainty	Absolute	+	+
Khan	apprehend	Verb	present	hedging	specifying	-	-
Rashad	will realize	Verb	future	certainty	Absolute	+	+
Sarwar	will have no doubt	Clause	future	certainty	Absolute	+	+
Shakir	shall know	Verb	future	certainty	Absolute	+	+
Sherali	realize	Verb	present	certainty	Moderate	+	-
Yusuf Ali	apprehend	Verb	present	hedging	specifying	-	-

Discussion:

In this verse, the verb "ظنّ" is preceded by the verb "رأى" (lit. "saw") which confines the function of ظنّ to certainty because the verb "see", in this context, is concrete rather than abstract. Some translators have noticed this linguistic clue and have given the appropriate function in their translations. Precisely, Ahmed and Pickthall, have used the verb "know" which indicates certainty. Similarly, Rashad used the verb

"realize" which also indicates certainty. These renditions are the most appropriate ones which give the precise function of moderate certainty. On the other hand, Ayub, Yusuf Ali and Khan have inappropriately used "apprehend" and "think" indicating hedging, and, consequently, they did not make use of the linguistic clue and inappropriately gave the function of hedging instead of certainty in that they have used which indicate specifying hedging. Other translators used absolute certainty by adding emphatic modal verbs as in "will reckon, will realize, will have no doubt". Such renditions are inappropriate simply because there is no emphatic marker in the (SLT), whereas "shall know" used by Shakir is appropriate because "shall" indicates only futurity rather than certainty.

SLT(3)	﴿الَّذِينَ يَظُنُّونَ أَنَّهُم مُّلَاقُو رَبِّهِمْ وَأَنَّهُمْ إِلَيْهِ رَاجِعُونَ﴾ (البقرة: 46)						
	SL Verb		**Tense**	**Function**	**Type**		
	يظنون		**Present**	**Certainty**	**Absolute**		
Translators	**TLT**	**Class**	**Tense**	**Function**	**Type**	**appropriateness**	
Ahmed	conscious	Adj.	present	hedging	Specifying	-	-
Ayub	reckon	Verb	present	hedging	Specifying	-	-
Pickthall	know	Verb	present	certainty	Moderate	+	-
Qarib & Darwish	reckon	Verb	present	hedging	Specifying	-	-
Khan	certain	Adj.	present	certainty	Absolute	+	+
Rashad	believe	Verb	present	hedging	specifying	-	-
Sarwar	certain	Adj.	present	certainty	Absolute	+	+
Shakir	know	Verb	present	certainty	Moderate	+	-
Sherali	know	Verb	present	certainty	Moderate	+	-
Yusuf Ali	bear in mind the certainty	predicate	present	certainty	Absolute	+	+

Discussion:

For believers, there is no doubt in meeting and returning to God. Therefore, the verb "ظنّ", in this verse, indicates certainty. Pickthall, Rashad, Shakir, Sherali have all given the appropriate rendition of certainty when they used the verb "know" which indicates certainty, whereas the same function is given by Khan and Sarwar who used the verb "certain". Paraphrasing also has been used to indicate certainty as seen in Yusuf Ali's translation of "ظنّ" into "bear in mind the certainty". However, other translators (Ahmed, Ayub, and Qarib & Darwish) have given inappropriate function in their translation because Ahmed has used the paraphrasing of "conscious" which indicates hedging, and both Ayub, and Qarib & Darwish have used the verb "reckon" which also indicates hedging. All translators have appropriately rendered the same present tense as used in the (SLT).

SLT(4)	﴿أَلَا يَظُنُّ أُولَٰئِكَ أَنَّهُم مَّبْعُوثُونَ﴾ (المطففين: 4)						
	SL Verb		**Tense**	**Function**	**Type**		
	يظن		**Present**	**Certainty**	**Absolute**		
Translators	**TLT**	**Class**	**Tense**	**Function**	**Type**	**appropriateness**	
Ahmed	think	Verb	Present	hedging	specifying	-	-
Ayub	think	Verb	Present	hedging	specifying	-	-
Pickthall	consider	Verb	Present	hedging	specifying	-	-
Qarib & Darwish	Think	Verb	Present	hedging	specifying	-	-
Khan	Think	Verb	Present	hedging	specifying	-	-
Rashad	know	Verb	Present	Certainty	Moderate	+	-
Sarwar	realize	Verb	Present	hedging	specifying	-	-
Shakir	think	Verb	Present	hedging	specifying	-	-
Sherali	know	Verb	Present	Certainty	Moderate	+	-
Yusuf Ali	think	verb	Present	hedging	specifying	-	-

Discussion:

In this verse, the use of a rhetorical question indicates certainty in the state of affairs. It is a question that expects no answer and requires a mental response rather than an explicit answer. The answer here is already known. This verse is loaded with the force of urging and astonishment. This purpose is strengthened by the use of الا. However, only three translators (Rashad, Sarwar, and Sherali) have kept the function of certainty when they used verbs of certainty such as "know and realize". The rest have inappropriately used the verb "think and consider" which express hedging. All translators have appropriately rendered the same present tense as used in the (SLT).

SLT(5)	﴿وَإِذَا قِيلَ إِنَّ وَعْدَ اللَّهِ حَقٌّ وَالسَّاعَةُ لَا رَيْبَ فِيهَا قُلْتُمْ مَا نَدْرِي مَا السَّاعَةُ إِنْ **نَظُنُّ** إِلَّا ظَنًّا وَمَا نَحْنُ بِمُسْتَيْقِنِينَ﴾ (الجاثية: 32)						
	SL Verb		**Tense**	**Function**	**Type**		
	نظن		**present**	**Hedging**	**modifying**		
Translators	**TLT**	**class**	**Tense**	**Function**	**Type**	**appropriateness**	
Ahmed	have only a vague idea	predicate	present	hedging	modifying	+	+
Ayub	think	verb	present	hedging	specifying	+	-
Pickthall	deem	verb	present	hedging	despecifying	+	-
Qarib & Darwish	guess	verb	present	hedging	modifying	+	+
Khan	think	verb	present	hedging	despecifying	+	-
Rashad	Are full of conjecture about it	predicate	present	hedging	despecifying	+	-
Sarwar	are suspicious about it	predicate	present	hedging	modifying	+	+
Shakir	think	verb	present	hedging	despecifying	+	-
Sherali	think	verb	present	hedging	despecifying	+	-
Yusuf Ali	think	verb	present	hedging	specifying	+	-

Discussion:

There are certain linguistic clues which indicate that the function of "ظنّ" is hedging in this particular verse. These clues include the word "بمستيقنين" and "الا ظنا": these contextual factors implicate modifying hedging rather than certainty. It seems that some Quranic translators have been able to take advantage of such clues and therefore they have provided an appropriate translation of the function of the verb "ظنّ" in spite of the fact that different wordings and structures have been used in these renderings. Ahmad, Qarib & Darwish, and Sarwar have given equivalences such as "have only a vague idea, are suspicious about it, and guess". All these forms express modifying hedging in that they express the hesitation of the speaker. Since there is an appropriate equivalence of the verb in the TL which is in this case "guess", they should have used it for the principle of economy in translation instead of resorting to paraphrasing. Paraphrasing should be the last resort for the translator, and in this regard, Cauer (1986, cited in Newmark, 1988:13) says that translation should be as literal as possible and as free as necessary. So, it can be argued that Qarib & Darwish's translation are the most appropriate ones as they could capture the highest degree of accuracy. Other translators have inappropriately rendered the verb by using "think" and "only think it is an idea" which indicate specifying hedging: and "deem it naught but a conjecture, do not think it but as a conjecture, are full of conjecture about it, we do not think (that it will come to pass), think it to be nothing but a conjecture", which indicate despecifying hedging. All

translators have appropriately rendered the same present tense as used in the (SLT).

SLT(6)	﴿إِنِّي ظَنَنتُ أَنِّي مُلَاقٍ حِسَابِيَهْ﴾ (الحاقة: 20)						
	SL Verb		Tense	Function	Type		
	ظننت		past	Certainty	Absolute		
Translators	**TLT**	**Class**	**Tense**	**Function**	**Type**	**appropriateness**	
Ahmed	certain	adjective	Past	Certainty	Absolute	+	+
Ayub	thought	verb	Past	hedging	specifying	-	-
Pickthall	knew	verb	Past	Certainty	Moderate	+	-
Qarib & Darwish	knew	verb	Past	Certainty	Moderate	+	-
Khan	did believe	verb	Past	hedging	specifying	-	-
Rashad	did believe	verb	Past	hedging	specifying	-	-
Sarwar	sure	adjective	Past	Certainty	Absolute	+	+
Shakir	knew	verb	Past	Certainty	Moderate	+	-
Sherali	knew	verb	Past	Certainty	Moderate	+	-
Yusuf Ali	did really understand	verb	Past	Certainty	Moderate	+	-

Discussion:

Arab grammarians agree that when the verb "ظنّ" is preceded and/or followed by the assertive particle of "Innaإنّ" the function of the verb is confined to the highest level of certainty. Another indication is that a rhetorical use of the tense, namely the event will take place in future, yet past tense is used to ascertain the certainty of the event. All translators have appropriately rendered the same past tense as used in the (SLT). Ahmad, Serwar and Yussif Ali have used some linguistic devices indicating a high level of certainty such as "was certain, was sure, and did really understand" that provide absolute certainty. Picthal, Qarib & Darwish, Shakir, and Sherali have not captured the absolute certainty as the verb

"know" gives the function of moderate certainty but not the absolute one. On the other hand, Khan and Rashid have inappropriately used "did believe" which indicates only emphatic specifying hedges. All translators have appropriately rendered the same past tense used in the (SLT).

SLT(7)	﴿وَدَخَلَ جَنَّتَهُ وَهُوَ ظَالِمٌ لِّنَفْسِهِ قَالَ مَا **أَظُنُّ** أَن تَبِيدَ هَٰذِهِ أَبَدًا﴾ (الكهف: 35)						
	SL Verb		**Tense**	**Function**	**Type**		
	أظن		**Present**	**Hedging**	**Despecifying**		
Translators	**TLT**	**class**	**Tense**	**Function**	**Type**	**appropriateness**	
Ahmed	imagine	verb	present	hedging	despecifying	+	+
Ayub	guess	verb	present	hedging	modifying	+	-
Pickthall	think	verb	present	hedging	specifying	+	-
Qarib & darwish	think	verb	present	hedging	specifying	+	-
Khan	think	verb	present	hedging	specifying	+	-
Rashad	think	verb	present	hedging	specifying	+	-
Sarwar	think	verb	present	hedging	specifying	+	-
Shakir	think	verb	present	hedging	specifying	+	-
Sherali	think	verb	present	hedging	specifying	+	-
Yusuf Ali	deem	verb	present	hedging	specifying	+	-

Discussion:

In this verse, the verb "ظنّ" is followed by "أن" which confines the function of "ظنّ" to hedging. All translators have been able to recognise the function of this verb "ظنّ". They have produced the function of hedging with different linguistic devices. However, only Ahmad has appropriately rendered the verb by using "imagine" which gives despecifying hedging. Other translators have used hedging devices such as "guess, think, and deem". They have not captured this type of hedging because their renditions provide specifying hedges rather than

despecifying. All translators have appropriately rendered the same present tense as used in the (SLT).

SLT(8)	﴿ قَالَ لَقَدْ عَلِمْتَ مَا أَنزَلَ هَٰؤُلَاءِ إِلَّا رَبُّ السَّمَاوَاتِ وَالْأَرْضِ بَصَائِرَ وَإِنِّي لَأَظُنُّكَ يَا فِرْعَوْنُ مَثْبُورًا ﴾ (الإسراء: 102)						
	SL Verb		Tense	Function	Type		
	أظن		Present	Certainty	Absolute		
Translators	TLT	class	Tense	Function	Type	appropriateness	
Ahmed	truly think	verb	present	Hedging	specifying	_	_
Ayub	Do think	verb	present	Hedging	specifying	_	_
Pickthall	deem	verb	present	Hedging	specifying	_	_
Qarib & Darwish	believe	verb	present	Hedging	specifying	_	_
Khan	I think you are, indeed	verb	present	Certainty	Absolute	+	+
Rashad	think	verb	present	Hedging	specifying	_	_
Sarwar	believe	verb	present	Hedging	specifying	_	_
Shakir	most surely I believe	verb	present	Certainty	Absolute	+	+
Sherali	certainly consider	verb	present	Hedging	specifying	_	_
Yusuf Ali	consider thee indeed	verb	present	Certainty	Absolute	+	+

Discussion:

Three different treatments have been followed in this case in which the verb "ظنّ" is preceded by "أن" and "emphatic ل" which confine the function of "ظنّ" to Absolute Certainty. The first group of translators including Pickthall, Rashad, Sarwar and Qarib & Darwish have inappropriately used verbs indicating hedging such as deem, think, and believe with no reference to certainty. The second group including Ahmed, Ayub, and Sherali, in spite of using certainty markers, they have used them immediately with the hedging verb" truly

think', Do think, and certainly consider, which is inappropriate in that these certainty markers certify only the verb and not the whole proposition, therefore, they should have been separated from the verb so that the whole proposition would be certified. The third group have appropriately used separate certainty markers to certify the whole proposition as in the translations of Khan, Shakir, and Yusuf Ali.

CONCLUSIONS:

1. This papers shows that the verb "ظن" has been grammatically realized by different parts of speech including verbs and predicates to express both hedging and certainty with their different types as in the following tables.

Table (1) The realizations used by the translators and their appropriateness

	Text No.1		Text No.2		Text No.3		Text No.4		Text No.5		Text No.6		Text No.7		Text No.8	
Ahmed	think		know		conscsious		think		have only a vague idea		certain		imagine		truly think	
	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-
Ayub	think		think		reckon		think		think		thought		guess		do think	
	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	-	-
Pickthall	consider		know		know		consider		deem		knew		think		deem	
	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	+	-	+	-	-	-
Qarib & Darwish	think		will reckon		reckon		think		guess		knew		think		believe	
	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-
Khan	feel		apprehend		certain		think		think		did believe		think		think	
	+	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	+	+
Rashad	------		know		believe		know		are full of conjecture about it		did believe		think		think	
	-	-	+	+	-	-	+	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	-	-
Sarwar	think		will realize		certain		realize		suspicious		sure		think		believe	
	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-
Shakir	think		will have no doubt		know		think		think		knew		think		believe	
	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	-	+	-	+	-	+	+
Sherali	sure		shall know		know		know		think		knew		think		certainly consider	
	-	-	+	-	+	-	+	-	+	-	+	-	+	-	-	-
Yusuf Ali	feel		apprehend		bear in mind the certainly		think		think		did really understand		think		consider	
	+	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	+	-	+	-	+	-	+	+

Table (2) the realizations of the verb "ظن" and their functions.

		Function					
		Hedging			Certainty		
Parts of speech	Verb	Lexical	Freq	Type	Lexical	Freq	Type
		think	29	specifying	will reckon	1	Absolute
		believe	6	specifying	will realize	1	Absolute
		Consider	4	Specifying	shall know	1	Absolute
		reckon	2	Specifying			
		deem	3	Specifying	know	11	Moderate
		apprehend	2	Specifying			
		feel	2	modifying	realize	2	Moderate
		imagine	1	Despecifying	understand	1	Moderate
	Noun	----------	-----	------	------	----	-------
	Predicate (Be+Adj)	are suspicious	1	modifying	are sure	2	Absolute
		are conscious	1	specifying			
					(be)certain	3	Absolute
		have only a vague idea	1	modifying	will have no doubt	1	Absolute
		Are full of conjecture about it	1	Despecifying	bear in mind the certainty	1	Absolute

2. Table No. (2) shows that the verb "Think" is the most common realization of hedging, used not necessarily appropriately in 29 cases out of 80, whereas, the verb "Know is the most common realization of certainty, used not necessarily appropriately in 11 cases out of 80. It also shows that grammatically, the verb "ظن" has been rendered

into a verb in 68 cases out of 80 and into a predicate (be+ Adj) in 11 cases, whereas it has been deleted in one case.

3. The translator must grasp the meaning of the original as best he can and then seek to reproduce that meaning in the Target Language. It seems that when the translators did pay a closer attention to the linguistic features of Arabic by seeking equivalent forms or using other lexical items in the target language, the translations were able to convey the meanings and implications intended by the use of the verb ظنّ in the original text. In this regard, table (3) shows that the translators have been able to reproduce the same function in 66% of the cases. Out of 8 cases, Shakir's translation has been the best in giving 7 appropriate functions. Yet, as far as the type of hedging and certainty is concerned, they have only given the appropriate type in 27%. Ahmed's translation has been the best in giving 4 appropriate types.

Table (3) Numbers of appropriate functions and types for each translator.

Translators	Appropriate function	Appropriate Type
Ahmed	5	4
Ayub	3	1
Pickthall	6	1
Qarib & Darwish	5	3
Khan	5	2
Rashad	4	1
Sarwar	6	5
Shakir	7	3
Sherali	6	0

Yusuf Ali	6	2

Appendix

Text No.1 ﴿فَإِن طَلَّقَهَا فَلَا تَحِلُّ لَهُ مِن بَعْدُ حَتَّىٰ تَنكِحَ زَوْجًا غَيْرَهُ فَإِن طَلَّقَهَا فَلَا جُنَاحَ عَلَيْهِمَا أَن يَتَرَاجَعَا إِن ظَنَّا أَن يُقِيمَا حُدُودَ اللَّهِ وَتِلْكَ حُدُودُ اللَّهِ يُبَيِّنُهَا لِقَوْمٍ يَعْلَمُونَ﴾ (البقرة: 230)

Ahmed If a man divorces her again (a third time), she becomes unlawful for him (and he cannot remarry her) until she has married another man. Then if he divorces her there is no harm if the two unite again if they **think** they will keep within the bounds set by God and made clear for those who understand.

Ayub Then if he divorces her (finally), she shall not be lawful to him afterwards till she marries a mate other than he; then if he also divorces her, it is no fault in the two that they return to each other, if they **think** that they will maintain God's bounds; and these are God's bounds which He makes clear to people who have knowledge.

Pickthall And if he hath divorced her (the third time), then she is not lawful unto him thereafter until she hath wedded another husband. Then if he (the other husband) divorce her it is no sin for both of them that they come together again if they **consider** that they are able to observe the limits of Allah. These are the limits of Allah. He manifesteth them for people who have knowledge.

Qarib & Darwish If he divorces her (for the third time), she shall not be lawful to him after that until she has wed (not for the purpose of remarrying her former husband) another spouse

and then if he divorces her it shall be no offense for either of them to return to each other, if they **think** that they can keep within the Bounds of Allah. Those are the Bounds of Allah. He makes them plain to people who know.

Khan	And if he has divorced her (the third time), then she is not lawful unto him thereafter until she has married another husband. Then, if the other husband divorces her, it is no sin on both of them that they reunite, provided they **feel** that they can keep the limits ordained by Allah. These are the limits of Allah, which He makes plain for the people who have knowledge.
Rashad	If he divorces her (for the third time), it is unlawful for him to remarry her, unless she marries another man, then he divorces her. The first husband can then remarry her, so long as they observe GOD's laws. These are GOD's laws; He explains them for people who know.
Sarwar	After a divorce for the third time, it is not lawful for the husband to resume marital relations with her or remarry her until she has been married and divorced by another husband. In that case, there is no sin for the former husband to marry her if they (both) **think** that they can abide by the law. These are the laws of God. He explains them for the people of knowledge.
Shakir	So if he divorces her she shall not be lawful to him afterwards until she marries another husband; then if he divorces her there is no blame on them both if they return to each other (by marriage), if they **think** that they can keep within the limits of Allah, and these are the limits of Allah which He makes clear for a people who know.
Sherali	And if he divorces her the third time, then she is not lawful for him thereafter, until she marries another husband; and, if he also divorces her, then it shall be no sin for them to return to each other, provided they **are sure** that they would be able to observe the limits prescribed by ALLAH. And these are the limits prescribed by ALLAH which HE makes clear to the people who have knowledge.

Yusuf Ali So if a husband divorces his wife (irrevocably), He cannot, after that, re-marry her until after she has married another husband and He has divorced her. In that case there is no blame on either of them if they re-unite, provided they **feel** that they can keep the limits ordained by Allah. Such are the limits ordained by Allah, which He makes plain to those who understand.

Text No.2 ﴿ وَإِذَا قِيلَ إِنَّ وَعْدَ اللَّهِ حَقٌّ وَالسَّاعَةُ لَا رَيْبَ فِيهَا قُلْتُمْ مَا نَدْرِي مَا السَّاعَةُ إِنْ نَظُنُّ إِلَّا ظَنًّا وَمَا نَحْنُ بِمُسْتَيْقِنِينَ ﴾ (الجاثية: 32)

Ahmed Whenever it was said: 'God's promise is certainly true, and there is no doubt about the Hour,' you replied: 'We know not what the Hour is. We **have only a vague idea**, but are not certain.'

Ayub And when it was said, 'God's promise is true, and there is no doubt in the Hour', you said, 'we do not know what the Hour is; we **think** it only a surmise, and we are not at all certain.'

Pickthall And when it was said: Lo! Allah's promise is the truth, and there is no doubt of the Hour's coming, ye said: We know not what the Hour is. We **deem** it naught but a conjecture, and we are by no means convinced.

Qarib & Darwish When it was said: 'The promise of Allah is true, and of the Hour there is no doubt, 'you replied: 'We do not know what the Hour is, we **guess**, assuming, and we are by no means certain.

Khan And when it was said: "Verily! Allah's Promise is the truth, and there is no doubt about the coming of the Hour," you said;" e know not what is the Hour, we do not **think** it but as a conjecture, and we have no firm convincing belief (therein)."

Rashad	When it is proclaimed that GOD's promise is the truth and that the Hour (of Judgment) is inevitable, you said, "We do not know what the Hour is! We **are full of conjecture** about it; we are not certain."
Sarwar	When it was said that the promise of God is true and that the Hour would inevitably come, you said, "We do not know what the Hour of Doom is, we **are suspicious** about it and we are not convinced".
Shakir	And when it was said, Surely the promise of Allah is true and as for the hour, there is no doubt about it, you said: We do not know what the hour is; we do not **think** (that it will come to pass) save a passing thought, and we are not at all sure.
Sherali	And when it was said to you, `The promise of ALLAH is certainly true, and as to the Hour, there is no doubt about its coming, 'you said, `We know not what the Hour is; we **think** it to be nothing but a conjecture, and we have no certainty concerning it.'
Yusuf Ali	And when it was said that the promise of Allah was true, and that the Hour- there was no doubt about its (coming), ye used to say, 'We know not what is the hour: we only **think** it is an idea, and we have no firm assurance.'

Text No.3 ﴿وَرَأَى الْمُجْرِمُونَ النَّارَ فَظَنُّوا أَنَّهُمْ مُوَاقِعُوهَا وَلَمْ يَجِدُوا عَنْهَا مَصْرِفًا﴾ (الكهف: 53)

Ahmed	The sinners will see the Fire and **know** that they will be thrown into it and will not find a way of escape from it.
Ayub	And the sinners will see the Fire, and **think** that they are about to fall into it, but will not find any escape from it. (53)
Pickthall	And the guilty behold the Fire and **know** that they are about to fall therein, and they find no way of escape thence.

Qarib & Darwish	And when the evildoers see the Fire of Hell they will **reckon** it is there they shall fall. They shall find no escape from it.
Khan	And the Mujrimun (criminals, polytheists, sinners), shall see the Fire and **apprehend** that they have to fall therein. And they will find no way of escape from there.
Rashad	The guilty will see Hell, and **will realize** that they will fall into it. They will have no escape therefrom.
Sarwar	When the criminals see hell fire, they **will have no doubt** about falling (headlong) therein, nor of finding anyone to save them.
Shakir	And the guilty shall see the fire, then they **shall know** that they are going to fall into it, and they shall not find a place to which to turn away from it.
Sherali	And the guilty shall see the fire and **realize** that they are going to fall therein; and they shall find no escape therefrom.
Yusuf Ali	And the Sinful shall see the fire and **apprehend** that they have to fall therein: no means will they find to turn away therefrom.

Text No. 4

﴿أَلَا يَظُنُّ أُولَٰئِكَ أَنَّهُم مَّبْعُوثُونَ﴾ (المطففين: 4)

Ahmed	4. Do they not **think** they will be raised (to life) again
Ayub	Do those not **think** that they shall be raised up, (4)
Pickthall	4. Do such (men) not **consider** that they will be again
Qarib & Darwish	Do they not **think** that they will be resurrected
Khan	**Think** they not that they will be resurrected (for reckoning),
Rashad	Do they not **know** that they will be resurrected?
Sarwar	Do they not **realize** that they will be resurrected
Shakir	Do not these **think** that they shall be raised again
Sherali	Do not such people **know** that they will be raised again
Yusuf Ali	Do they not **think** that they will be called to account?-

Text No. 5 ﴿الَّذِينَ يَظُنُّونَ أَنَّهُمْ مُلَاقُو رَبِّهِمْ وَأَنَّهُمْ إِلَيْهِ رَاجِعُونَ﴾ (البقرة: 46)

Ahmed	Who **<u>are conscious</u>** that they have to meet their Lord, and to Him they have to return.
Ayub	who **<u>reckon</u>** that they shall meet their Lord, and that to Him they are returning. (46)
Pickthall	Who **<u>know</u>** that they will have to meet their Lord, and that unto Him they are returning.
Qarib & Darwish	who **<u>reckon</u>** that they will meet their Lord and that to Him they will return.
Khan	(They are those) who **<u>are certain</u>** that they are going to meet their Lord, and that unto Him they are going to return.
Rashad	who **<u>believe</u>** that they will meet their Lord; that to Him they ultimately return.
Sarwar	who **<u>are certain</u>** of their meeting with their Lord and their return to Him.
Shakir	Who **<u>know</u>** that they shall meet their Lord and that they shall return to Him.
Sherali	Who **<u>know</u>** for certain that they will meet their Lord, and to HIM will they return.
Yusuf Ali	Who <u>bear in mind the certainty</u> that they are to meet their Lord, and that they are to return to Him.

Text No. 6 ﴿إِنِّي ظَنَنتُ أَنِّي مُلَاقٍ حِسَابِيَهْ﴾ (الحاقة: 20)

Ahmed	I **<u>was certain</u>** I'll be given my account."
Ayub	I **<u>thought</u>** that I should meet my reckoning'.
Pickthall	Surely I **<u>knew</u>** that I should have to meet my reckoning
Qarib & Darwish	**<u>Indeed, I knew</u>** that I should come to my reckoning.'
Khan	"**<u>Surely, I did believe</u>** that I shall meet my Account!"
Rashad	"**<u>I did believe</u>** that I was going to be held accountable."

Sarwar	I **was sure** that the record of my deeds would be shown to me".
Shakir	**Surely I knew** that I shall meet my account
Sherali	**Surely, I knew** that I would meet my reckoning
Yusuf Ali	"**I did really understand** that my Account would (One Day) reach me!

Text No. 7 ﴿وَدَخَلَ جَنَّتَهُ وَهُوَ ظَالِمٌ لِّنَفْسِهِ قَالَ مَا أَظُنُّ أَن تَبِيدَ هَٰذِهِ أَبَدًا﴾ (الكهف: 35)

Ahmed	And he walked into his garden, and, (forgetting) his limit, said: "I cannot **imagine** that this will ever be ruined,
Ayub	And he entered his garden wronging himself; he said, `I do not **guess** that this will ever perish;
Pickthall	And he went into his garden, while he (thus) wronged himself. He said: I **think** not that all this will ever perish.
Qarib & Darwish	And when, having wronged himself, he entered his garden, he said: 'I do not **think** that this will ever perish!
Khan	And he went into his garden while in a state (of pride and disbelief) unjust to himself. He said: "I **think** not that this will ever perish.
Rashad	When he entered his garden, he wronged his soul by saying, "I do not **think** that this will ever end.
Sarwar	He unjustly entered his garden and said, "I do not **think** this (property) will ever perish
Shakir	And he entered his garden while he was unjust to himself. He said: I do not **think** that this will ever perish
Sherali	And he entered his garden while he was wronging his soul. He said, `I do not **think** that this will ever perish;
Yusuf Ali	He went into his garden in a state (of mind) unjust to his soul: He said, "I **deem** not that this will ever perish,

Text No.8 ﴿قَالَ لَقَدْ عَلِمْتَ مَا أَنزَلَ هَؤُلَاءِ إِلَّا رَبُّ السَّمَاوَاتِ وَالْأَرْضِ بَصَائِرَ وَإِنِّي لَأَظُنُّكَ يَا فِرْعَوْنُ مَثْبُورًا﴾ (الإسراء: 102)

Ahmed	He replied: "You know that none but the Lord of the heavens and the earth has sent these (signs) as cogent proof. I **truly think**, O Pharaoh, your days are done."
Ayub	He said, 'thou indeed knowest that none has sent these down, except the Lord of the heavens and the earth, as clear proofs; and I **do think** that thou, O Pharaoh, art doomed to perish'. (102)
Pickthall	He said: In truth thou knowest that none sent down these (portents) save the Lord of the heavens and the earth as proofs, and lo! (for my part) I **deem** thee lost, O Pharaoh.
Qarib & Darwish	'You know,' he replied, 'that none except the Lord of the heavens and the earth has sent down these as clear proofs. Pharaoh, I believe you are destroyed.'
Khan	[Musa (Moses)] said: "Verily, you know that these signs have been sent down by none but the Lord of the heavens and the earth as clear(evidences i.e. proofs of Allah's Oneness and His Omnipotence, etc.). And I **think** you are, **indeed**, O Fir'aun (Pharaoh) doomed to destruction(away from all good)!"
Rashad	He said, "You know full well that no one can manifest these except, obviously, the Lord of the heavens and the earth. I **think** that you, Pharaoh, are doomed."
Sarwar	He replied, "Certainly you have come to know that these have been sent by the Lord of the heavens and the earth as lessons to people. Pharaoh, I **believe** that you are doomed to perdition.
Shakir	He said: Truly you know that none but the Lord of the heavens and the earth has sent down these as clear proof and **most surely** I **believe** you, O Firon, to be given over to perdition.

Sherali He said, `Thou thinkest well that none has sent down these Signs but the Lord of the heavens and the earth as so many evidences; and I **certainly consider** thee, O Pharaoh, to be doomed to perish. '

Yusuf Ali Moses said, "Thou knowest well that these things have been sent down by none but the Lord of the heavens and the earth as eye-opening evidence: and I **consider** thee **indeed**, O Pharaoh, to be one doomed to destruction!

REFERENCES

Abdelwali, M. (2007). The Loss in the Translation of the Qur'an. In: Translation Journal. Volume 11, No.2 April 2007.

Al-Hashimi, A. (1960). Jawahir ul-Balaaghati fil-Ma'ani wal-Bayani wal Al-Badi'. Cairo: Al-Maktabat ul-Tijariyyat ul-Kubra.

Al-Jurjani, A. (1969). Dalaa'il ul-I'jaz. Revised by Khafaji, M. Cairo: Maktabat ul-Qahira. House, J. (1977). A Model for Translation Quality Assessment, Tübingen: Gunter Narr. Verlag.

Al-Samirae, F. S. (1968). Al-Naho Al-Arabee:Naqd wa Binnaa. Beirut: Al-Sideeq House.

Al-Saqi, F. (1975). Aqsam ul-Kalam il-'Arabiyyi min hayth il-Shakli wa-Wadhifa. Cairo: Maktabat ul-Khanaji.

Al-Zubeidi, M. (1306H). Taj Al-Arous min jawahir Alqamous. Vol.9, Cairo: Almatbaa Alkeiria.

Aziz, Y. and Lataiwish, M. S. (2000). Principles of Translation, Benghazi: University of Garyounis.

Baker, M. (1992). In Other Words: A Course Book on Translation, London: Routledge.

Bolinger, D. and Sears, D. (1968). Aspects of Language, New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Catford, J. C. (1965). A Linguistic Theory of Translation: An Essay on Applied Linguistics. London: Oxford University Press.

Channell, J. (1994). Vague Language. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Crismore, A.; Markkanen, R. & Steffensen, M. (1993). "Metadiscourse in Persuasive Writing". *Written Communication*, 8, pp.39-71.

_____, A. & Vande Kopple, W. (1997). "Hedges and Readers: Effects on Attitudes and Learning". In: S. Markkanen & H. Schrode (Eds.), Hedging and Discourse: Approaches to the Analysis of a Pragmatic Phenomenon in Academic Texts. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, pp. 83-114.

Cruse, D. A. (1986). Lexical Semantics, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Crystal, D. (1985). A dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics. New York: Basil Blackwell.

_____ & D. Davy (1969). Investigating English Style. Hong Kong: Longman Group (FE) Ltd.

Culler, J. (1975). Structuralist Poetics: Structuralism, Linguistics and the Study of Language. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, and London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Enkvist, N. E. (1965). On defining Style: "an essay in Applied Linguistics In Linguistics and Style. Ed. John Spence. London oxford University Press. pp.1-56.

Fraser, B. (1980). "Mitigation". Journal of Pragmatics 31, 341-350.

Geschier, S. (2004). "The mediation of traumatic memories in Cape Town high schools and museums: an

epistemological investigation" in Journal of Education, No.33 (2004).

Halliday, M. and Hasan, R. (1976). Cohesion in English. London: Longman.

Hinkel, E. (2004). *Teaching academic ESL writing-practical techniques in vocabulary and grammar.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Hoye, L. (1997). *Adverbs and Modality in English*. London, New York: Longman.

Holmes, J. (1990). "Hedges and boosters in women's and men's speech." In: Language and communication 10 (3): 185-205.

House, J. (1977). A Model for Translation Quality Assessment, Tübingen: Gunter Narr. Verlag.

Ibn Alhajib, A. O. (646). Al-Idhah fi Sharhi Al-mufasal. Vol.2, reviewed by Musa Bannaai-Al-Aalili, Baghdad: Al-Aani Press.

Ibn Ya?ish, M. Y. A. (643). Al-sharhu Almufasal, Vol.1, the Munirya Printing House.

Ibn Mandur, J. M. (1994). Lisan al Arab, Vol.13, Beirut. The Arab Tongue House.

Jakobson, R. (1959). "On Linguistic Aspects of Translation" In: R. A. Brower (Ed.) On Translation. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, pp.232-239.

Kecskes (2002). *Situation-bound utterances in L1 and L2*. Mouton de Gruyter.

Lakoff, G. (1972). "Hedges: A Study of Meaning Criteria and the Logic of Fuzzy concepts". In: Papers from the

English Regional Meeting. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society, pp.183-228.

Landauer, T. K; Foltz, P. W. and Laham, D. (1998). An Introduction to Latent Semantic Analysis. Boulder, University of Colorado Press.

Leech, G. (1974). Semantics: the Study of Meaning, Harmondsworth: Pengwin.

Li, T. C. (1999). A Study of Hedging Expressions in Academic Journal Articles. (MA thesis). Taiwan: National Tsing Hua University Library.

Lobner, S. (2002). Understanding Semantics. Oxford University Press Inc.

Lyons, J. (1977) Semantics, Vol.I, London: Cambridge University Press.

Mish F. (2003). Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary. (Tenth Edition) Springfield, Massachusetts. Merriam-Webster, Inc.

Newmark, P. (1982). A Textbook of Translation, New York: Prentice-Hall International Ltd.

_____ (1988). Approaches to Translation, New York: Prentice-Hall International Ltd.

Nida, E. (1964). Towards a Science of Translating. Leiden: E. J. Brill.

_____ & Taber. C. R. (1969). The Theory and Practice of Translation. Leiden: E. J. Brill.

Rubin, V.; Stanton, J. M. and Liddy E. D. (2004). Discerning Emotions in Texts. AAAI Spring Symposium: Exploring Attitude and Affect in Text: Theories and Applications, Stanford, CA.

Rubin, V., Liddy, E., and Kando N. (2005). Certainty Identification in Texts: Categorization Model and Manual Tagging Results.

Shunnaq, A. (1994). "Semantic Redundancy and Translation from Arabic into English". *Turjuman*, l3 (2), pp. 103-120.

Simpson, P. (1990). "Modality in Literary – Critical Discourse". In: W. Nash (Ed.), The Writing Scholar: Studies in Academic Discourse. Newbury Park: Sage, pp.63-94.

Stein, J and Urdang, L. (1983). The Random House Dictionary of English Language. New York, Random House Inc.

Stubbs, M. (1986). "A Matter of Prolonged Field Work: Notes Towards a Modal Grammar of English". *Applied Linguistics*, 7 (1), pp.1-25.

Sultan, H. H. (2000) A Semantico-Syntactic Analysis of the verbs of perception in Arabic with Reference to English, Unpublished PH. D., University of Mosul.

Tannen, D. (1986). Spoken and Written Language: Exploring Orality and Literary. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Co.

Teufel, S., & Moens, M., (2002). Summarizing scientific articles: experiments with relevance and rhetorical status. *Computational Linguistics*, 28, 4, 409-445.

Urmson, J. O. (1952). "Parenthetical Verbs". *Mind*, 61, pp.480-496.

Urrea, E. and Gradoville, M. (2006)Variation in the Future Tense of New Mexican Spanish. *New Mexico, University of New Mexico*.

Ventura, M: Hu, X.; Graesser, A; Louwerse, M and Olney, A(2004) The Context Dependent Sentence Abstraction model. Memphis, At: (http://www. cogsci.northwestern.edu/cogsci2004/papers/paper432)

Vinay, J. P. & Darbelnet, J. (1995). Comparative Stylistics of French and English: a Methodology for Translation. Translated by J. C. Sager & M. J. Hamel. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Wiebe, J. M. (1994). Tracking Point of View in Narrative. Computational Linguistics 20 (2): 233- 287.

_____ (2000). Learning Subjective Adjectives from Corpora. Proceedings of the 17th National Conference on Artificial Intelligence (AAAI-2000). Austin, Texas, July 2000.

Wright, W. (1971). A Grammar of The Arabic Language, Vol. 1, 3rd ed., Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Yule, G. (1996). Pragmatics. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Zaki, M. M. (2000). "Translation and Meaning". Translation Journal, Vol.4, No.4.

ترجمة الفعل "ظن" في القران الكريم إلى الانكليزية: دراسة لغوية ودلالية

م.د. سالم يحيى فتحي* و م.د. لقمان عبد الكريم ناصر**

الملخـــص

يتناول هذا البحث ترجمة الفعل "ظن" في القرآن الكريم إلى الانكليزية. ويعنى بتحليل عينة من عشر ترجمات لثمان آيات قرآنية. وقد تحرى البحث عن مدى نجاح وفعالية التراجم في إيصال المعنى المقصود ومضامين الفعل "ظن". وقد افترض البحث وجود معنى واحد مقصود للفعل في كل حالة. وكشف أن الفعل ظن مربك للمترجمين بحيث أنهم أعطوا عدة تراجم للفعل نفسه في الآية نفسها.

إن هدف هذه الدراسة هو توضيح أن هذا الفعل يمكن أن يشير مرة إلى الشك وأخرى إلى اليقين. وقد اتبع المترجمون منهجين للترجمة الأول يستند إلى اللغة الهدف والثاني إلى اللغة الأصل. ففي بعض الحالات التي اتبع فيها المترجمون لغة الأصل لإيصال المعنى اللغوي والدلالي للفعل ، نجحوا في إيصال المضامين المقصودة في الخطاب القرآني. وبالتالي ساعدوا قارئ اللغة الهدف على فهم معنى الفعل كما يفهمه قارئ اللغة المصدر. فيما قدم المترجمون الذين تمسكوا باللغة الهدف تراجم غير دقيقة. تقترح الدراسة أن على مترجمي معاني القران الكريم إبراز الجوانب الدلالية والتداولية لأفعال الإدراك والحس خاصة للفعل "ظن". كما تقترح تفسير الفعل "ظن" إما إلى الشك أو اليقين حسب القرائن اللغوية والدلالية وتوصي بأن يهتم المترجمون بالوظيفة النصية لهكذا أفعال.

* قسم الترجمة/ كلية الآداب/ جامعة الموصل.

** قسم الترجمة/ كلية الآداب/ جامعة الموصل.