

مشكلات ترجمة العلامات الحوارية للربط والعطف فى بعض آيات القرآن الكريم

مقدمة من الباحثه : سوزان يوسف محمد مدني

ملخص البحث

يعد القرآن الكريم بمثابة المصدر الأول للتشريع الإسلامي، لذا فإن أى فهم خاطيء للنص القرآني من قبل المترجم سيؤدي إلى ترجمة خاطئة للمعنى المقصود مما يجعل القاريء الأجنبي يسيء فهم النص القرآني علي أساس أن النص المترجم - حسب ظنه - هو النص القرآني وليس مجرد ترجمة لمعانيه حسب قدرة المترجم أو كما فهم المترجم. ومن هنا فإن هذه الدراسة المقترحة تتناول مسألة المشكلات التي تواجه المترجم عند ترجمة (العلامات الحوارية) فى القرآن الكريم. وهذه العلامات فى القرآن الكريم هى تعبيرات مثل كذلك، اما ، و ، او ، عن ، الى الخ.

ومن الخصائص التي ميزت اللغة العربية تعدد معاني حروفها ، فتعدد معاني الحروف مكن سر اللغة وسر جمالها ، ففي اللغة العربية نرى تغير معني الحرف الواحد تبعاً لما يراد من معني فى سياق الكلام لأن معاني الحرف الواحد قد تصل الى الشعرات من المعاني كما هو الحال فى (اللام ، الباء ، من) . وقد بدأ الدرس النحوي منذ زمن مبكر من اجل التعرف على اسرار الذكر الحكيم ، اذ نسب الى على ابن ابي طالب انه دفع بصحيفة الى ابو الاسود الدؤلي جاء فيها " الحرف ما انبأ عن معني ليس بأسم او فعل " .

وقد اهتم الدارسون العرب بحروف المعاني وافردوا لها مصنفات خاصة بها فقد لاحظوا انها تقع ضمن حقل دلالي مشترك فضلاً عن انها وسائل ربط فى التركيب كما اهتم بها ايضا اهل الفقه و الاصول لان هذه الحروف بالنسبة لهم تدخل فى تحديد الاحكام الاصولية تبعاً لدلالاتها المختلفة.

Problems of Translating Coordinating Discourse Markers in Some verses of the Glorious Qur'an

Suzan Yussif Mohamed Madany

School deputy

Abstract

The essence of this study is to investigate the problems and difficulties that translators would face when translating the Discourse Markers in the Glorious Qur'an with reference to four translations of the meanings of the Glorious Qur'an (**Sahih , Abdel Haleem , Ghali and Arther**) keeping in mind conveying the wisdom and miraculous messages of the Arabic text into the target text. The study analyzes the selected Qu'ranic verses translations that consist of DMs in the Arabic text in order to identify the problems that may face translators in translation. Such problems could lead to errors and/or ambiguity and distortion of the meaning in the given translations. Therefore, this paper aims to identify the problems in order to avoid committing errors and to give solutions to these problems. These solutions may, hopefully, help the future-translators avoid misrepresentations of this linguistic and rhetorical phenomenon.

Keywords:

Discourse markers - Translation – The Glorious Qur'an – Pragmatics – *Skopos* Theory – Semantics

Problems of Translating Coordinating Discourse Markers in Some verses of the Glorious Qur'an

Suzan Yussif Mohamed Madany

School deputy

1.0 Introduction

1.1 Introducing the Study

The contribution of this study is to handle the problematic aspects of the translation of Arabic DMs, and to provide a framework to be adopted while rendering Arabic DMs. In addition, this study will be a contribution to translators of the glorious Qur'an as it would provide them with strategies to be used in translating DMs.

1.2 Objectives of the Study

This study aims at highlight the different possibilities of equivalence in the translation of DMs and the way in which these translations preserve the semantic value and the pragmatic function of the source text. Another aim is to show to what extent these translations distort the meaning of DMs in the Glorious Qur'an, and may result in a change of the intended message.

This study investigates the problems of translating discourse markers in the glorious Qur'an whose inaccurate translation may cause misunderstanding of the intended meaning of the text. If the translator has no background knowledge about the Qu'ranic text and the intended meaning of the text, this will lead to many misinterpretations. In the discourse of the glorious Quran, the discourse markers have purposeful aims even if the reader thinks they are aimless or have no meaning.

1.3 Research questions

The study attempts to answer the following questions:

- 1- What are the problems that translators face in translating DMs in the Glorious Quran?
- 2- How far can skopos theory be adopted to translate DMs in the glorious Quran?
- 3- What are the criteria that translators may use in order to give accurate and meaningful translations of the DMs in the Glorious Qur'an?
- 4- To what extent do English and Arabic reveal similar or different patterns of structure concerning the use of DMs?

2.0 Theoretical Framework

2.1 Discourse Markers Analysis

The nature of discourse markers adds a complication to the already difficult process of translation. Since discourse markers are a functional, rather than a lexical category, they cannot be translated on the basis of the meaning of the word. They may cause a problem to functional translation. Discourse markers must be understood in terms of their function within the discourse, so that the pragmatic value, rather than the lexical meaning of the word, is translated. In general, there is no one-to-one correspondence between two languages in the field of discourse markers: most of the time the correlates in the source language have not the same pragmatic meaning in the target language, constituting a usual pitfall in translation.

Translators must understand the pragmatic meaning of these markers since their translation is expected to produce the same effect on the addressees of the target text as the source text produces on its own addressees. This research is an attempt that may help translators to overcome the

problem of translating discourse markers according to context.

2.2 Defining Discourse Markers

Discourse markers have been much studied since the 1970s; different proposals and approaches have been developed on that subject. Fraser (1990, P383- 395) refers to their problematic and controversial nature. He points out that DMs have been studied by different researchers under different labels; they are considered as cue phrases (Knott and Dale, 1994), discourse connectives (Blakemore, 1987, 1992, 2002), discourse operators (Redeker, 1990, 1991), particles (Schourup 1985), discourse signaling devices (Polanyi and Scha, 1983), pragmatic expressions (Erman,1992), phatic connectives (Bazanella,1990) pragmatic formatives (Fraser, 1987), pragmatic connectives (van Dijk, 1979; Stubbs,1983) pragmatic operators (Ariel, 1994), pragmatic particles (stman, 19 pragmatic markers (Fraser 1988,1990; Schiffrin, 1987), conjuncts (Quirk et al., 1985) and sentence connectives (Halliday and Hasan, 1976). (Fraser 1990) maintains that all the above-mentioned researchers have agreed that DMs are lexical expressions that relate discourse segments, but they have disagreed on how they are defined and what functions they carry.

The term “discourse markers” is chosen in this study to refer to the expressions that are under investigation because it reflects how the study characterizes these items. The word “discourse” makes it clear that the items examined here function at the discourse level, i.e. above sentence boundaries. On the other hand, the word “marker” is more general than the term “connective,” and thus could comprise the different communicative functions that the items described in this study serve.

2.3 Approaches to Discourse Markers

DMs have been the focus of many studies, gaining importance from the 70s onwards. In this section I will review four research efforts that have been of great impact in the field of DMs will be reviewed. The first approach is the work of Schourup's (1999). The second work is of Schiffrin' (2003) who studied elements which mark "sequentially dependent units of Discourse". The third approach is the one by Fraser (1999) who approaches DMs from a grammatical-pragmatic perspective; the last one is by Blakemore (1987) who works with the relevance theory framework (Sparber & Wilson1987).

Schourup's Core Definition of Discourse Markers

Lawrence Schourup's (1985) work is one of the earliest studies with an exclusive focus on DMs. He uses the discourse particles for a subclass of DMs, referring to them as linguistic items that have no apparent grammatical relation to the sentence containing them, but that convey something about the speaker's relation to the content of the sentence. Schourup is one among many researchers who believes that DMs are classifiable according to their uses and attempts to isolate "an invariant semantic content for each marker" (Schourup, 1999, p.249)

His contribution to the study of DMs is that he broadened our view of DMs by demonstrating their role in discourse as an index of the speaker's "unexpressed thinking" (Schourup, 1985, p. 14), as well as a device to connect sentences at the structural level. In other words, for Schourup, DMs indicate not only the relationships between what is said, but also the speaker's 'thoughts' about what is said.

According to Schourup, DMs are "evincives," which indicate the speaker's private world. Schourup (1985, p.21) states that, "Discourse markers are used by speakers to reflect and display their private world of thinking about conveyed information".

In short, for Schourup, "accurate determination of core discourse marker meaning is essential to constrain theories of discourse marker function" Schourup (1985, p.253).

Schiffrin's Discourse Model

Deborah Schiffrin (1987) was one of the first to study DMs in a systematic way. DMs are defined by Schiffrin as "members of a functional class of verbal (and non-verbal) devices which provide contextual coordinates for ongoing talk" (p. 41). Drawing upon work by previous research, Schiffrin further specifies four conditions for an element to be used as a DM:

(1) Syntactic detachability, (2) range of prosodic contours, (3) tendency to precede the tone unit, and (4) operation at both local and global levels.

Concurrent with many coherence-based studies of DMs, Schiffrin's (1987) work is based on the fundamental assumption that the main function of DMs is to establish coherence within the discourse. Her argument is that mutual comprehension in a conversation is made possible by the participants' continual search for structural relationships between units of text or discourse. And in these processes, DMs play an important role in marking the relationships among units of talk and in integrating different components of discourse.

For Schiffrin (1987), DMs serve to index not only "textual coordinates of talk" but also "participant coordinates." That is, the contextual indexicality of DMs

allows for identification of specific discourse contexts in terms of both the structural relationship between two adjacent utterances (i.e., textual cohesion), and the relationship between the speaker and the hearer (i.e., the social context as speaker-hearer interaction such as tum-taking).

To summarize, Schiffrin's account of DMs is characterized by the emphasis on their "indexical function:" they "anchor an utterance into more than one discourse component at once", and thus "integrate those different components into one coherent discourse" (p. 330). Schiffrin considers DMs a kind of "discourse glue", in a Hallidayan sense. However, her approach is distinguished from others in that she views DMs primarily as markers of connection between units of behavior (i.e., social acts), rather than structural units at the sentence level, based on the assumption that language is inherently a social phenomenon.

Fraser's Grammatical-Pragmatic Approach

Unlike Schiffrin's work on DMs on discourse analytic framework; Bruce Fraser (1990, 1996), as a pragmatician, bases his framework upon the differentiation between propositional meaning and pragmatic meaning. That is, "sentence meaning is analyzable into two separate types of conventionally encoded information: content and pragmatic" (1990, p. 385).

Fraser's account of DMs is characterized by his attempt to classify various types of pragmatic meaning that DMs convey in discourse. Fraser uses the term discourse markers to refer to a group of expressions subsumed under "pragmatic markers".

In his later work, Fraser (1996) points out that DMs are a separate class of pragmatic markers: his framework of

pragmatic meaning, therefore, comes to have four types of pragmatic markers:

(1) Basic markers,(2) Commentary pragmatic markers, (3) Parallel markers, and (4) Discourse markers.

He further proposes four categories of DMs: topic change markers, contrastive markers, elaborative markers, and inferential markers. Topic change markers include such expressions as *by the way*. Contrastive markers signal that the utterance is in contrast to the propositional meaning of the preceding utterance, e.g., *but, however, instead, nevertheless, still, yet, etc.* Elaborative markers include such expressions as *above all, in other words, in fact, as a result, moreover, and too*, functioning as "a refinement of some sort on the preceding discourse" (p. 188).

Finally, inferential markers include "expressions which signal that the force of the utterance is a conclusion which follows from the preceding discourse" (p. 188), e.g., *therefore, thus, etc.* In short, Fraser (1996) views DMs as signals of "the relationship of the basic message to the foregoing discourse" (p. 169)

DMs in English and Arabic

a. Terminology

DMs are called differently depending on the various textbooks. For example, according to Biber et al. (2002, p 237), "linking adverbials" refer to conjunctions. Other terms such as those suggested by Halliday and Hasan (1976) are labelled as conjunctive adjuncts or conjunctive expressions. Schiffrin (1986, cited in Müller 2005, p.5) refers to conjunctions as discourse markers (DM) or simply discourse particles. They are called so particularly when they are used by researchers working on different languages. According to Schiffrin (1987), discourse markers refer to sequential

relationships between utterances aiming to indicate the coherence of texts. Therefore, she defines the concept of discourse markers both operationally and theoretically. She points out that discourse markers are "sequential dependent elements which bracket unit of talk" (1987:31, cited in Onodera, 2005p.16). From the operational point of view, the phrase "unit of talk" referred to the different elements of speech like: tone groups, sentences, actions and so on. That is to say, this definition is quite general. As a result, these units are based on the researchers' objectives.

For this reason, Schourup (1988, cited in Onodera, 2005p.16) explains that this definition should be related to a particular type of units rather than making it too general. Theoretically speaking, she defined DM as "contextual coordinates". That is markers are indicators of the produced utterances occurring in their local contexts (Schiffrin, 1987: 40, cited in Onodera 2005p.16).

b. Categorization of DMs

Grammatically speaking, conjunctions are words or phrases used to link parts of discourse together and to indicate the relationship between them. Conjunctions can have different forms; they may be coordinating conjunctions such as "and", "but" and "so"; they may be subordinating conjunctions like "after" and "because"; they may also be adverbials such as "as well", "as" and "afterwards" (Celce-Murcia & Larsen-Freeman, 1999 p 118).

From the semantic point of view, conjunctions are classified under several types of relations since there is no unique inventory of classification. In this discussion, we shall accept the categories suggested by Halliday and Hasan (1976 p. 238-239). Their scheme includes four main categories: additive, adversative, causal and temporal.

The first type is additive relation, it shows that the two clauses or sentences complete each other; and is expressed by conjunctions such as "and", "or", "in addition" and "likewise". Second, adversative relations, are used to express the contrary of what is being said, and they are characterized by conjunctions like "but", "however", "instead" and "on the contrary". Third, causal conjunctions express a reason or result of what is being said; they include "because", "for", "so", "therefore", etc. The final type is temporal relation; it relates the clauses or sentences in time and bears a sequential sense by means of conjunctions such as "next", "then", "after that" and the like (Halliday & Hasan, 1976 p. 243)

c. DMs as Cohesive Devices in English

Halliday and Hasan (1976) propose a set of cohesive devices which aim to create unified and well-formed texts. According to their classification, these cohesive devices are used to ensure cohesion and coherence, although most researchers claim that cohesive texts are not necessarily coherent ones.

Halliday and Hasan (1976) refer to conjunctions as "text building devices". They are linguistic expressions which link two parts of discourse, either between sentences, clauses or paragraphs. These expressions indicate a cohesive effect but which is different from other devices .They state that:

Conjunctive elements are cohesive not in themselves but indirectly by virtue of their specific meanings; they are not primarily devices for reaching out into the preceding text, but they express certain meanings which presuppose the presence of other components in discourse (p. 226)

Schiffrin (1986) agrees with Halliday and Hasan (1976) that such expressions show that the interpretation of

one clause is determined by the information derived from the prior clause (cited in Schiffrin, 2003). Hence, DMs as cohesive devices are not restricted merely to the semantic relations, but focus on one specific aspect which is their function i.e. the function conjunctions have are occurring in a succession without being related structurally (Halliday & Hasan, 1976). By contrast, Schiffrin (1986) claimed that conjunctions have both structural and cohesive roles. They are structural elements since they join parts of sentences together and cohesive because they guarantee the interpretation of the whole sentence (cited in Schiffrin, 2003).

d. Multiplicity of Functions

One of the problems of studying the functions of conjunctions in natural language is the multiplicity of its meaning. As a matter of fact, this multiplicity is not found in one specific direction which is "function to form". For example, causal relations can be expressed through the use of different conjunctions such as "because" and "so". But it is also directed from "form to function" i.e. one conjunctive item such as "and" can convey more than one conjunctive relation. For example, additives, adversatives and causal...etc. (Schiffrin, 2003). So the same conjunction expresses different functions. Moreover, Halliday and Hasan (1976) explains that although "and" is a conjunctive device that reflects an additive meaning, its meaning again signals the semantic content of text. So, if "and" expresses a contrast with what has been said before, then it conveys an adversative relation which is similar to "but" and "however" (Schiffrin, 2003).

e. DMs in Arabic

Arabic compound sentences are conjoined by means of conjunctive devices. These devices are usually known as conjunctive particles or the so called .huruf - ala'tf. Hence, the explicit expression of coordination is guaranteed through the use of conjunctions like "wa", "fa", "Thumma", "aw", "amma", "bal".

f. Functions of Arabic conjunctions

The main functions of Arabic conjunctions are additive, causal, adversative and temporal. They are, in fact, similar to the English ones (Alshorafa, 1994 p 22).

Additives

The most common devices in Arabic are "wa" and "fa". They are used mainly to express additive relations between parts of texts. The conjunctions "wa" and "fa" are rendered into English as "and" and "then". What differentiates between the two is the fact that "fa", in addition to being a coordinating conjunction, plays the role of linking pieces of information together. Moreover, the prefix "aw" is also an additive conjunction used to express an alternative purpose. "aw" is used to alternate between two Arabic sentences "defending himself" or "fighting with others". This means that the person uses self-defense or fights with another person.

Adversatives

Adversative conjunctions such as "bal" and "la:kin" reflect contrastive relations. They contain both the additive relation, by linking two opposite units of meaning together, and an adversative one which contains the logical meaning of "and" and "however".

Causal

Relations of this type are expressed through the use of conjunctions such as "fla budda? an" which is the equivalent of "it is a must that" or "therefore" in English. The prefix "li" i.e. the abbreviation of "liDa" reflects also a causal relation; they are used in the beginning of a sentence or within sentences.

Temporal

The final type of conjunctions in Arabic includes, for example, ".hinama", "Thumma" ثم and "inDama"; these conjunctions are the equivalents of "when", "then" and "and if" respectively. They ensure a temporal relation between the two events stated in the sentence. "Thumma", for example reflects a sequence of events in

it can be concluded that Arabic is highly cohesive within sentence boundaries and across them. Arabic conjunctions of different types have been suggested, and their similarity to the English ones is revealed.

3.1.3 Difference between Arabic and English DMs

Baker (1992) states that languages differ widely in their use of conjunctions. Generally speaking, English favors the use of small chunks in order to express the information in a clear manner, and, hence, cohesive devices signal the semantic relations involved between parts of texts. Moreover, English focuses strongly on the punctuation system in order to signal breaks and relations between chunks of information.

Arabic, however, prefers the use of regrouped and large grammatical chunks. Short sentences are very rare to exist, and this because punctuation and paragraphing have been developed only recently in Arabic. Few of them tend to

have large scale of meanings, and this depends on the context in which they occur. Thus, readers are the ones who signal the interpretation of the writer's intended meaning (Baker, 1992, p2).

3.1.4 Difficulties of Translating DMs

Some researchers found that the misuse, overuse and underuse of DMs affect text's cohesion and coherence. For example, Crew (1999) pointed out that “the overuse of connectives leads to potential communicative breakdowns.” As a result, they claims that the main reason behind these difficulties is the fact that DMs belong to different languages and cultures (Tapper, 199 8p117). Similarly, Thabit and Fareh (2006) suggests that the difficulties translator faces while translating are the result of a number of causes. First, the lack of equivalence between languages leads inevitably to breaks of ideas. In other words, the fact that there is no one to one correspondence between DMs in different languages, poses several problems. The problem is more aggravated when it comes to two distinct languages, as in the case of Arabic and English, for instance. Second, conjunctive devices are multifunctional. As explained above, DMs signal several logical relations between sentences and at the same time these relationships are indicated through the use of more than one connective. Third, more difficulties will erupt particularly when these markers in the source text are rendered into the target one as adverbial conjuncts.

3.0 Methodology of the Study

3.1 Significance of the Study

The present study is significant due to the fact that the translation of Arabic DMs is problematic, especially in the

Qu'ranic text. DMs play a circular role in transferring the meaning, as well as linking texts together.

The essence of this study is to investigate the problems and difficulties that translators face when translating the DMs in the Glorious Qur'an with reference to four translations of the meanings of the Glorious Qur'an keeping in mind conveying the wisdom and miraculous messages of the Arabic text into the target text. The study will analyze the selected Qu'ranic verses translations that consist of DMs in the Arabic text in order to identify the problems that may face translators in translation. Such problems could lead to errors and/or ambiguity and distortion of the meaning in the given translations. Therefore, the researcher intends to find out the problems in order to avoid committing errors and to give solutions to these problems. These solutions will, hopefully, help the future translators avoid misrepresentations of this linguistic and rhetorical phenomenon.

Thus the findings of this study are likely to contribute to the most appropriate strategies to be adopted while translating Arabic coordinating DMs specially Qu'ranic text where there is a high frequency of DMs.

3.2 Aim of the Study

This study aims at highlighting the different possibilities of equivalence in the translation of DMs and the way in which these translations preserve the semantic value and the pragmatic function of the source text. Another aim is to show to what extent these translations distort the meaning of DMs in the Glorious Quran, which may result in the change of the intended message.

This study investigates the problems of translating discourse markers in the glorious Qur'an whose inaccurate

translation may cause misunderstanding of the intended meaning of the text. If the translator has no background knowledge about the Qu'ranic text and the intended meaning of the text, this will lead to many misinterpretations. In the discourse of the glorious Quran, the discourse markers have purposeful aims even if the reader thinks they are aimless or have no meaning. These markers are important to convey the meaning you want. for example when such markers are omitted in parallel verses in the Quran, there is significance to that.

However, it is worth mentioning that the classification of discourse markers into different types, due to the functions they serve in an utterance, sentence, or text is not crystal clear, because the same discourse marker can function as a concessive discourse marker in one discourse, and as an additive discourse marker in another discourse. Such a notion of different roles and functions served by the same discourse marker is clearly apparent in Arabic. The following verse of the Holy Quran, which is unanimously considered the most perfect Arabic text, explicates this somewhat contentious notion.

قَالَتْ يَوَيْلَتِي ۖ أَلِدُ وَأَنَا عَجُوزٌ ۖ وَهَذَا بَعْلِي شَيْخًا ۖ إِنَّ هَذَا لَشَيْءٌ عَجِيبٌ ﴿٧٢﴾

Sahih International

“She said, "Woe to me! Shall I give birth while I am an old woman and this, my husband, is an old man? Indeed, this is an amazing thing!"

Ghali

“She said, "O woe to me! Will I give birth and I am an old woman, and this my husband is an aged man? Surely, this is indeed a wonderful thing."

Arther

“She said, 'Woe is me! Shall I bear, being an old woman, and this my husband is an old man? This assuredly is a strange thing.’”

Abdel Haleem

“She said, ‘Alas for me! How am I to bear a child when I am an old woman, and my husband here is an old man? That would be a strange thing!’”

The underlined وَ (WA) in this holy verse is a concessive discourse marker because being old prevents a woman from bearing a child. As a result, وَ (WA) in this verse is not an additive but concessive discourse marker. On the other hand, the same discourse markers (وَ) (WA) is considered as an additive discourse marker in the following holy verse:

فَصَلِّ لِرَبِّكَ وَأَنْحَرِ ۚ

Sahih International

So pray to your Lord and sacrifice [to Him alone].

Ghali

So pray to your Lord and slaughter (the sacrifice).

Arther

So pray unto thy Lord and sacrifice.

Abdel Haleem

So pray to your Lord and make your sacrifice to Him alone.

As shown in this verse, وَ (WA) is a discourse marker of addition; it only adds information to other already

mentioned information in the text without denoting any kind of concession or other semantic relation rather than addition. As a result, و (WA) in this verse is an additive discourse marker not a concessive one. Therefore, it is not unusual to attribute 20 semantic functions to (WA) in Arabic (Kelle, Marwan, Rasheed, 2013 P13). Consequently, this richness of functions attributed to only one discourse marker is undoubtedly a vital evidence for the significance of discourse markers in Arabic and is simultaneously a strong indicator to the importance of their investigations in Arabic discourse.

3.3 Research Problem

Translating religious texts has its own distinctive considerations as it has to do with accurate interpretations as well as ideologies and beliefs. The translators of such texts do not only need to be aware of the translation process but they must also know the interpretations of the verses.

This study attempts to investigate the problems that could occur in translating coordinating discourse markers in some selected verses of the Glorious Quran. Discourse markers are words or short "lexicalized phrases" (Schiffrin, 2001:57) that organize text. This organization is achieved by showing "how the speaker intends the basic message that follows to relate to the prior discourse" (Fraser, 1990, p.387). DMs help to create cohesion and coherence in a given text by establishing a relationship between the various ideas that are expressed within the text. Some of the relationships noted by Schiffrin are causal (therefore), conditional (if x, then y), temporal (then he) adversative (however) and additive (and).

Discourse markers are found in various grammatical categories including conjunctions, interjections and adverbs

(M.Phil, 2013 p41). Discourse markers can also connect utterances on either a single plane or across different planes. This means that a single marker can connect various units of dynamic meaning (coherence), as well as the surface structure of the text (cohesion). In the above list of discourse markers "then" is used in two different examples. This shows that a single form can be used to demonstrate various kinds of relationships between classes.

3.1 Sampling

The current study is a qualitative descriptive research that depends on collecting qualitative data and analyzing them from different perspectives. Samples of the study are taken from four translations of the Qur'an:

These four translations have been chosen due to the fact that they were conducted by translators of different backgrounds adopting different approaches to translation.

First, **Ghali's translation 2014** was chosen, as it is considered source oriented as he depended on analyzing the accurate semantic meaning of words to give the accurate message of the original text, as he states in his introduction to the translation. He states that "some of the main difficulties in a translation of the meanings of the Qur'an to English are the differences between the two languages, most important of which is the facts that Arabic has a wealth of basic vocabulary and a rich morphological and syntactic structure".

M. Ghali is an Azhar university professor of linguistics in Egypt. In my opinion, his translation seems to be a very good literal endeavor that matches the original Arabic form and style. He attempted to clarify some of the vague wording and structures of previous translation such as

synonyms, as well as Arabic morphological and syntactic system.

In his short introduction he mentions that during the translation process "the message must inevitably suffer some deficiencies or even loss, due to limitation of time and place" (Ghali, 2005 ixi).

Second, the translation of **Abdul Halîm** 2005 because it is considered Target-oriented translation as he depended on questionnaires given to native speakers of English in which he translated a page from the Qur'an and gave it to them to get their comments and correct his translation to make it understandable and up-to-date, and to convey the message of the original text of the Qur'an. In addition, Halîm added some comments and footnotes in his translation in order to clarify and point out the ambiguous points in the translated text, which is of great importance for the foreign readers who admitted that they understood the Qur'an for the first time after reading Halîm's translation as he declared in a conference in Morocco.

His translation is distinguished, modern and readable, and it is the first translation by an Arab Muslim to be published by a prestigious international academic i.e. Publisher-Oxford University press. It has been an international best seller, with numerous acclaimed reviews. The translation uses modern English language, presented in a story writing style while observing the Arabic norms to the maximum.

About the Qur'an translation he states that "interpretation is further complicated by the highly concise style of the Quran. A verse may contain several sentences in short, proverbial style, with pronominal references relating them to a wider context"

Third, the translation of **Sahih International** 2004 was chosen, the most influential and widely read English-language Qu'ranic translation in the world .It is written by three American women. They converted to Islam in the 1980s and now live and work in Saudi Arabia. But what makes the Sahih International translation of the Qur'an so different from other women's translations is that despite its origins, it is not a feminist reclamation of some of the Qur'an's most contested verses. Instead, the Sahih International Qur'an enjoys widespread popularity, including with some of the Islam's most conservative adherents.

Fourth, the translation of **Arthur J. Arberry** 1964 was chosen, because he offers one of the best translations of the Glories Qur'an. His translation was the first English translation by a scholar of Arabic and Islam. He rendered the Qur'an into understandable English and separated text from tradition. The Arberry version has earned the admiration of intellectuals worldwide and having been reprinted several times. His translation is the first English translation in the Qur'an by an English man who is a Muslim, as he states in his introduction "it may be reasonably claimed that no holy scripture can be fairly presented by one who disbelieves its inspirations and its message. And this is the first English translation of the Koran by an English man who is a Muslim".

Arberry was very keen to observe the Arabic sentence structure and phraseology which meant that his translation was very close to the Arabic original in terms of grammar .

4.0 Samples for Analysis

Samples of analysis are deliberately detailed by applying and making use of the adopted theories such as the skopos theory so as to evaluate and specify the suitable

strategy to be adopted to render the discourse markers in the Qur'an. Also, different Qur'an exegeses and Arabic dictionaries are consulted when necessary.

4.1 The coordinating conjunction “wa” (و)

Sample Analysis (1):

Surat An-Nisa’ (Women Chapter), verse (3)

﴿فَانكِحُوا مَا طَابَ لَكُمْ مِنَ النِّسَاءِ مَثْنَى وَثُلَاثَ وَرُبَاعَ﴾ (سورة النساء 3)

Ghalî

"Then marry such women as is good to you, two, three, four, (Literally: in twos and threes and fours)"

Abdul Halîm

"You may marry whichever [other] women seem good to you, two, three, or four."

Arberry

"Marry such women as seem good to you, two, three, and four"

Sahih international

"Then marry those that please you of [other] women, two or three or four."

Interpretation of the Verse

Tafsir al-Jalalayn interprets this verse saying that " If you fear that you will not act justly, [that] you will [not] be equitable, towards the orphans, and are thus distressed in this matter, then also fear lest you be unjust towards women when you marry them; marry such (mā means man) women as seem good to you, two or three or four, that is, [each man may marry] two, or three, or four, but do not exceed this." But in In *Tanwîr al-Miqbas min Tafsîr Ibn ‘Abbas* the verse

is interpreted as follows: "And if ye fear that ye will not deal fairly by the orphans) and if you fear that you will not preserve orphans' wealth, you should also fear not dealing fairly with women in relation to providing sustenance and apportionment. This was because they used to marry as many women as they liked, as many as nine or ten. Qays Ibn al-Harth for example had eight wives.

Evaluating the Translations

The coordinating conjunction WA (وَ) meaning 'and' has more than 16 functions in Arabic, the most commonly used are:

- a) Adding two things which means (and) or
- b) Giving a choice between two things which means (or).

This means that the reader may get confused or misunderstand the coordinating conjunction '**and**' in a different context which means '**or**'. In this verse, Allah (Glorified be He) says (مَنْثَىٰ وَتُلْتَّىٰ وَرُبَاعَ) which is translated as 'then marry (other) women of your choice, two, three or four (Hîlalî and Khan, 1996). Therefore, the coordinating conjunction **wa** '**and**' in the previous example does mean '**or**' as stated in the exegesis of the Glorious Qur'an.

As for Ghâlî's translation, it seems a source-oriented translation as he adheres to the semantic accuracy of the Arabic terms as he points out in the introduction of his translation of the Glorious Qur'an, "A translation of the meanings of the Qur'an should be based on a clear-cut methodology such as the one adopted here: the differentiation between synonyms". Despite the great effort Ghâlî did in translating the Quran, he admits that "No

translation can ever be a substitute for the Divine Revelation, with all its truth and glory.

It is clear that any translation of the Qur'an is time-bound, and this one is addressed mainly to those who are unable to read the Arabic original, hoping that the time will soon come when more and more Muslims will be motivated to master the Divine language and message of the Glorious Qur'an."

Although **Ghalî** attempts to be semantically accurate, it seems that semantic accuracy is not only enough to have a communicative translation of the Glorious Qur'an as it should be. Ghalî falls short in some aspects in this verse. As he omits the discourse marker and he just puts commas which does not give the original meaning of the Arabic marker (و) that should be translated as "or".

In this regard, the translation of '**Abdul Halîm** seems to be, from the point of view of the researcher, more native-like since it is semantically clear and rhetorically accurate. This has been achieved, may be, due to his approach of translation which depended on questionnaires for the translated verses and submitted them to English native speakers to get their comments in order to make his translation of the Glorious Qur'an as English native-like as possible. Another advantage of Abdul Halîm's translation is that he makes a comprehensive introduction before each surah which helps the foreign reader to recognize the general concepts of the surahs and this is a fluent way of averting misunderstanding of the verse by the foreign reader. That is why; the researcher thinks that Abdul Halîm's translation is considered target-oriented translation or audience-oriented translation.

As for the translation of **Arberry**, he commits the same mistake as Ghali by ignoring to translate the marker "or".

The translation of **Sahih** Attempts to give a comprehensive translation from all dimensions: semantic, rhetoric, and functional through the excessive use of marginal comments, footnotes, and bracketed illustrations. Thus, this translation can be considered a compromise between the source-oriented approach and the target-oriented one. The researcher thinks that it is the most appropriate translation because they translated the discourse marker "wa" (و) as "or". So the foreign reader could get the message that man should not marry more than four wives.

Suggested Translation

"Then marry those women that pleases you, one or two or three or four"

Sample analysis (2):

Surat Al ankbout (the Chapter of the Spider), verse (15):

(سورة العنكبوت 15) (فَأَنْجَيْنَاهُ وَأَصْحَابَ السَّفِينَةِ)

Ghali

"So We delivered him and the companions of the Ark"

Abdel Haleem

"We saved him and those with him on the Ark"

Arberry

"Yet We delivered him, and those who were in the ship"

Sahih International

"But We saved him and the companions of the ship"

Interpretation of the Verse

Tafsir Al Jalalyn interprets this verse as follows "Then we delivered him, namely, Noah, and the occupants of the ship, those who were with him in it, and We made this a sign, a lesson, for all peoples, for [all] peoples that would come after them, should they disobey the messengers sent to them. Noah lived for a further sixty years or more after the Flood, until mankind multiplied [again]."

Tanwîr al-Miqbâs min Tafsîr Ibn ‘Abbâs :(And we rescued him) Noah (and those with him in the ship) and those who believed in him who were aboard the ship, (and made of it) i.e. the ship of Noah (a portent) a lesson (for the peoples) after them.

In this verse, Allah has delivered Noah and the occupants of the ship, who were with him in it. The function of the discourse marker “wa” in this verse means "accompaniment" and "associations", so the aim of the DM "wa" in this context means “together” or “with”. Thus the translator should be fully aware of the different meanings and functions of the coordinating DM "wa" in order to avoid giving inappropriate translation.

The translations under study render “wa” as "and" since it is commonly used and understood in Arabic. But early Arab were more accurate and commanding in using Arabic, so they have known the different meanings and functions of the marker “wa” and could understand the implied meaning appropriately. In terms of cohesion, if the marker “wa” is translated as “and”, it would not give the exact meaning that the verse wants to deliver and assert.

Evaluating the Translations

As for **Ghali's translation**, although he attempts to be accurate semantically, it seems that the semantic accuracy

only is not enough. Ghali translates (wa) here as "**and**" which does not give the intended meaning of the Arabic marker (wa) "و" in this context that should be translated as "**together with**"

As for **Abdel Haleem**, he is more native like with clear semantic and rhetorical accuracy. So, it is clear that Abdel Haleem's translation is considered target-oriented and it is the most appropriate translation from the researcher's point of view.

As for the translation of **Arberry**, he commits the same mistake as Ghali by just translating it as "and" which does not give the exact meaning. As for the translation of Hilalî and Khan, although it attempts to give a comprehensive translation from all dimensions, they made the same mistake and translated it as "and".

Suggested Translation

From the researcher's point of view, the discourse marker "wa" in this context may be better to be translated as:

*"And we saved him, **together with** all who were in the ark...."*

4.2 The Discourse Marker (ثم) "Thumma"

Five well-known Arabic grammar references were examined in order to identify the discourse functions of "thumma" together with the frequency of each function, these are: Al-nahw al-waafii (1963); Al-Jana Addani fii Huroof Al-Ma'anii (1992); Al-Kitaab.2 vols (1966); Mugni Al-Labiib ?an Kutubi- AL ?aariib(2002); AL-mu9jam al-waafii fii adawaat al-nahw al-Arabi (1993).

The Functions of “thumma”

The Arabic DM “thumma” (ثم) ('then', 'and then', 'subsequently') is one of the most commonly used connective particles in Arabic. Generally speaking, the DM “thumma” is an adverb that indicates a sequential action, coming later in time than the action in the preceding sentence or clause. Syntactically, it works as a coordinating conjunction that links two elements (clauses, sentences, etc.) in order to make a compound element. It emphasizes the sequence existing between two structurally independent statements as an interval, thus, before “thumma”, a pause or an interval in the context to be understood. In other words, it links clauses/sentences by specifying how one clause /sentence is related to another in terms of time. “Thumma” holds five functions as follows:

1. Sequential Function with Span of Time

The sequential “thumma ثم” introduces a clause subordinate to the main clause by indicating time relationship between the two clauses. Semantically, this DM indicates that the two events involved in the resulting compound sentence, occurred successively, with pause of time between the two events in the sequence, and in the order indicated in the sentence. Often, the interval of time between the two events in a sequence is unspecified,

2. Sequential with immediacy or with a short Span of Time

Semantically, it indicates sequence (in order) with no interruption between the two involved events .i.e. immediate succession of the two actions that come before and after thumma.

3. Resumptive Function

'Resumption' ('Al-'isti'nâf) in Arabic can be introduced by the Arabic DM thumma. It is very frequently used at the beginning of clauses, sentences and paragraphs but not the first. In such cases, the resumptive DM thumma comes after a clause/sentence that had finished and, introducing a clause/sentence in order to serve the sequential function with span of time (whether it is short or long), in addition to the presumptive function where it is used to indicate speech continuity (but not topic continuity), i.e. the speaker resumes his speech, but with a new topic, presenting new information and takes the reader/hearer into quite new territory of new thought. The clause/sentence introduced by thumma is related pragmatically in a way to the sentence mentioned before, and this pragmatic relation is being understood by both the speaker and the hearer/reader.

4. Adversative Function

Adversative' ('Al-'istidrakiyah) in Arabic is usually expressed by the DM 'thumma'. The adversative thumma is used to connect two utterances (clauses, sentences) in order to make a compound element, the second of which stands in adversative relation with the preceding one.

5. Consequential Function

The logical relation that this DM indicates is that of result or consequence. In Arabic, thumma ('as-sababiyah) = 'the consequential thumma', usually betokens a relationship between two clauses of a context such that the second clause describes a state or an action which occurs as a consequence of the first one.

Sample analysis (4):

Surat An-Nahl (the Bees Chapter), verse (83):

﴿يَعْرِفُونَ نِعْمَةَ اللَّهِ ثُمَّ يُكْفِرُونَهَا﴾ (سورة النحل 83)

Sahih International

"They recognize the favor of Allah; **then** they deny it. And most of them are disbelievers."

Ghali

"They recognize the favor of Allah; **thereafter** they deny it; and most of them are the disbelievers."

Arther

"They recognize the blessing of God, **then** they deny it, and the most of them are the unthankful."

Abdel Haleem

"They know God's blessings, **but** refuse to recognize them: most of them are ungrateful."

Interpretation of the Current Verse

(*Tafsir al jalalyn*) interprets this verse as "They recognize God's grace, that is, they affirm that it comes from Him, and then deny it, by associating others [with Him], and most of them are ungrateful."

In this verse, *thumma* introduces an unexpected result that is "denying God's grace". The most appropriate translation of adversative *thumma* is "but" or "however". Allah's adversative attitude expresses negative feeling implying some sort of blame and anger towards the ungrateful.

Evaluating the Translations under Study

The four translations under study diverged in rendering the DM "thumma" in this verse. Sahih International and Arther

render it as “then” which is not an accurate meaning in this context according to the exegesis. On the other hand, Ghali renders it as “thereafter” which is also inappropriate semantically and exegetically. However, Abdel Haleem renders it as “but” and this may be more appropriate and functional translation. It, also, conforms to the interpretation of the verse. The DM “thumma” in this context means “but”, not “then” or “after”.

Therefore, the translation of Abdel Haleem is functional since it delivers the translation that makes the reader acquainted with the implied meaning of the verse on the one hand. It sticks to the original text meaning and spirit on the other hand. So, if an appropriate meaning is suggested, the translation of Abdel Haleem is better to be chosen in this context.

Suggested translation (Same as Abdel Haleem)

"They know God's blessings, **but** refuse to recognize them: most of them are ungrateful."

Sample analysis (5):

Surat Al-‘n‘am (the Cattle Chapter), verse (154):

(ثُمَّ آتَيْنَا مُوسَى الْكِتَابَ تَمَامًا عَلَى الَّذِي أَحْسَنَ وَتَفْصِيلًا لِكُلِّ شَيْءٍ)
(سورة الأنعام 154)

Sahih International

"Then We gave Moses the Scripture, making complete [Our favor] upon the one who did good and as a detailed explanation of all things."

Ghali

"Thereafter We brought Musa (Moses) the Book, perfect for him who does fair (deeds), and expounding everything."

Arther

"Then We gave Moses the Book, complete for him who does good, and distinguishing everything, and as a guidance."

Abdel Haleem

"Once again, We gave Moses the Scripture, perfecting [Our favour] for those who do good, explaining everything clearly, as guidance."

Interpretation of the Current Verse

Tafsir al-Jalalayn interprets the DM thumma in this verse as follows: Then (thumma is for [describing events in a] sequence) We gave Moses the Scripture, the Torah, complete, in grace, for him who does good, by observing it, and a detailing, an explanation, of all things, needed for religion, and as a guidance and a mercy, that perhaps they, that is, the Children of Israel, might believe in the encounter with their Lord, through the Resurrection.

In this verse thumma links two verses which are irrelevant syntactically each utterance is an independent meaningful sentence. Allah informs the reader two messages each one is different from the other in its basic meaning. In the first verse Allah informs us to follow his path and don't follow other ways opposed to it. In the second verse which starts with thumma Allah resumes his discourse by introducing a new topic that is his giving Moses the scripture. So, it gives the meaning of sequence.

Evaluating the Translations under Study

Both the translations of Sahih International and Arther render the DM thumma in this verse as "then", while Sahih International renders it as "thereafter" which are all accurate equivalents of the original Arabic text. However, the translation of Abdel Haleem renders it as "once again", and this is not totally appropriate in this context. Thus, the

DM *thumma* in this verse is better to be rendered as “then” or “thereafter” since it gives the meaning and connotation of sequence and ordering.

Suggested translation (Same as Sahih)

"Then we gave Moses the Scripture, making complete [Our favor] upon the one who did well and as a detailed explanation of all things."

4.3 The Discourse Marker (فا) “Fa”

The DM (فا) “Fa” has miscellaneous meanings and uses in the Arabic language. Ziad (1984-1405) presents a classification of “fa” in Arabic as follows:

- 1- **The copulative fa:** refers to arrangement and succession like in (جاء علي فسعيد) “Ali came and then Said.” (See 2000:185, الغاليني). Here al-faa’ might be an equivalent to the additive ‘and relation’. However, it mostly expresses the result or effect of a preceding clause whenever refers to connectivity. For example, “فَوَكَّرَهُ مُوسَى فَقَضَى عَلَيْهِ” (٩-٨) and “فَأَمَّا الْيَتِيمَ فَلَا تَقْهَرْ، وَأَمَّا السَّائِلَ فَلَا تَنْهَرْ” (190:ibid) (القصص:١٥).
- 2- **The redundant faa’ for emphasis** الفاء الزائدة للتوكيد It is of two kinds: one comes with a nominal clause implying meaning of condition (e.g. الذي يفوز فله جائزة) ; and the other kind is quite . “المدثر: ٣-٤” [وربك فكبر وثيابك فطهر].
- 3- **The causal faa’** الفاء السببية comes in few places, i.e. preceded by pure negation, pure demand, interrogation, prohibition, prayer (invocation), excitation, wishing (potation), anticipating, e.g. “فَاطِرٌ ٣٦ لَا يُفْضَى عَلَيْهِمْ فَيَمُوتُوا”
- 4- **The inception faa’** فاء الاستئناف: with it coupling is incorrect to connect what is before to what is after, since

meaning is different. Here al-faa' takes the adversative meaning of "but" or "and" as in (سافر أخوك فليته لم يفعل)

5- **Al-faa' that connect the condition with its answer**; it is called the **answering faa'** فاء الجواب or the connective faa' فاء الربط (ibid p133). It is inactive particle, eg " **وَإِنْ يَمْسَسْكَ اللَّهُ بِضُرٍّ فَلَا كَاشِفَ لَهُ إِلَّا هُوَ وَإِنْ يَمْسَسْكَ بِخَيْرٍ فَهُوَ عَلَىٰ كُلِّ شَيْءٍ قَدِيرٌ** الانعام 17 "

6- **Al-faa' of what is before it**, الفاء حسب مل قبلها. e.g. (فَأَجَاءَهَا الْمَخَاضُ إِلَىٰ جِذْعِ النَّخْلَةِ مَرِيمَ 23)

7- Al-faa' could come as a command verb of the verb eg. (بوعدك ف).

Sample Analysis (6):

Surat Al-'n'am (the Cattle Chapter), verse (154):

(سورة الأنعام 160) (مَنْ جَاءَ بِالْحَسَنَةِ فَلَهُ عَشْرُ أَمْثَالِهَا)

Sahih International

"Whoever comes [on the Day of Judgement] with a good deed **will have** ten times the like thereof [to his credit]"

Ghali

"Whoever comes with a fair deed, (Literally: the fair deed) **then he will have** ten times the like of it"

Arthur

"Whoso brings a good deed **shall have** ten the like of it."

Abdel Haleem

"Whoever has done a good deed **will have it** ten times to his credit"

Interpretation of the Current Verse

Both hasanaat and sayi'aat are multiplied at special times and in special places, but there is a difference between the multiplication of hasanaat and the multiplication of

sayi'aat. The multiplication of hasanaat is in both quantity and quality. What is meant by quantity is number, so a good deed is multiplied by ten times the like thereof; and what is meant by quality is that the reward is great and vast. With regard to sayi'aat, it is multiplied in terms of quality only, i.e., the sin is greater and the punishment is more severe. With regard to quantity a bad deed receives one sayi'ah, and it cannot be more than one.

Evaluating the Translations under Study

Both the translations of Sahih and Abdel Haleem rendered the DM fa in this verse as “**will have**”, while Ghali added “**then**” to “**will have**”, which are all accurate equivalents of the original Arabic text while Arthur render the DM fa in this verse as “**Shall have**”. , and this is not totally appropriate in this context as in traditional British grammar, the rule is that **will** should only be used with second and third person pronouns (you; he, she, it, they). With first person pronouns (I and we), the 'correct' verb to talk about the future is **shall** (oxford dictionary, 2013, 09). Thus, the DM "fa" in this verse is better to be rendered as “**will have**” or “**then he will have**” since it gives the meaning and connotation of preceded by pure demand.

Suggested translation (Same as Haleem)

"Whoever has done a good deed **will have it** ten times to his credit."

4.4 Different Discourse Markers in similar verses & Same Discourse Markers with different meanings.

(1)

(A) قُلْ سِيرُوا فِي الْأَرْضِ ثُمَّ انظُرُوا كَيْفَ كَانَ عَاقِبَةُ الْمُكْذِبِينَ ()
6:11 (الانعام 11)

(فسيروا في الأرض فيانظروا كيف كان عاقبة المكذبين) (ال عمران 137)
(3:137 عمران 137)

Table (4) Translations of 6:11 & 3:137

Translator	<u>6:11</u> (الانعام 11) <u>تُمُّ</u>	(ال عمران 137) <u>فَ</u> <u>3:137</u>
Sahih	Say, "Travel through the land; then observe how was the end of the deniers."	So proceed throughout the earth and observe how was the end of those who denied.
Ghali	Say, "Travel in the earth; thereafter look into how was the end of the beliers."	So travel in the earth, then look into how was the end of the beliers.
Arther	Say: 'Journey in the land, then behold how was the end of them that cried lies.'	Journey in the land, and behold how was the end of those that cried lies.
Abdel Haleem	Say, 'Travel throughout the earth and see what fate befell those who rejected the truth.'	Travel through the land, and see what was the end of those who disbelieved.

Interpretation of the Current Verse

(A)

Tafsir al-Jalalayn: Say to them ‘Travel in the land and see the nature of the consequence for the deniers’ of the messengers how they were destroyed through chastisement; perhaps they will take heed.

Tafsir Ibn'Abbas: (Say) O Muhammad, to the people of Mecca: (Travel in the land, and see) and reflect upon (the nature of the consequence for the rejecters!) what happened to those who denied Allah and His messengers.

(B)

Tafsir al-Jalalayn so travel in the land O believers and behold how was the end of those who denied the messengers that is how their affair ended in destruction. So do not grieve on account of their victory I am only giving them respite until their appointed time.

Tafsir Ibn 'Abbas (Do but travel in the land and see) and reflect upon (the nature of the consequence) how the ultimate end was (for those who did deny) the messengers and did not repent of their disbelief.

Evaluating the Translations under Study

Unless the translators of the Qur'an recognize the exact function of the Qu'ranic discourse marker, they would not be able to translate them adequately. In these two verses above they have exactly the same meaning but when translating it was translated with more than 6 different translations (Regarding the translation of the DM) some of them gave the exact meaning of the SL and some failed to do so.

Sahih & Arther translated ثم "thmm" as **Then** while Ghali translated as **Thereafter** and finally Abdel Haleem translated it as **And** which in my point of view is the most accurate meaning as they will see while traveling not after the action of traveling is done.

On the other hand the translation of verse 3:137 which used ف "Fa" instead of ثم "thmm" all the translators used "**And**" except Ghali used **Then** which is not the most accurate translation in my point of view.

So the suggested translation will be as follows:-

"Say: 'Travel throughout the earth and see how was the end of the deniers.'"

(2)

(A) قَالُوا إِنَّمَا أَنْتَ مِنَ الْمُسَحَّرِينَ (153) مَا أَنْتَ إِلَّا بَشَرٌ مِّثْلُنَا (الشعراء 153)
(153) 26:153

(B) قَالُوا إِنَّمَا أَنْتَ مِنَ الْمُسَحَّرِينَ (185) وَمَا أَنْتَ إِلَّا بَشَرٌ مِّثْلُنَا (الشعراء 185)
(185) 26:185

Table (5) Translations of 26:153 & 26:185

Translator	(الشعراء 153) 26:153	26:185 (الشعراء 185) و
Sahih	They said, "You are only of those affected by magic. You are but a man like ourselves"	They said, "You are only of those affected by magic. You are but a man like ourselves"
Ghali	They said, "Surely you are only of the utterly bewitched. In no way are you(anything) except a mortal, like us"	They said, "Surely you are only of the utterly bewitched. And in no way are you(anything) except a mortal, like us"

**Problems of Translating Coordinating Discourse Markers in Some verses of the
Glorious Qur'an**

Translator	<u>26:153</u> (الشعراء 153)	<u>26:185</u> (الشعراء 185) و
Arther	They said, "Thou art merely one of those that are bewitched, Thou art naught but a mortal like us"	They said, "Thou art merely one of those that are bewitched, Thou art naught but a mortal like us"
Abdel Haleem	They said, 'You are bewitched! You are nothing but a man like us.'	But they replied, 'You are bewitched! ,You are nothing but a man like us

Interpretation of the Current Verse

(A)

Tafsir al-Jalalayn: The prophet said will you be left secure in that which is here of good things — amid gardens and springs and farms and date palms with slender delicate and tender spathes? And you hew dwellings out of the mountains arrogantly- a variant reading of farihīna ‘arrogant’ has fārihīn ‘skillfully’-. So fear God and obey me in what I have commanded you and do not obey the command of the prodigal who cause corruption in the earth through acts of disobedience and act righteously’ by being obedient to God. They said ‘You are indeed one of the bewitched those who have succumbed so many times to sorcery that their minds have been overcome. And moreover you are just a human being like us. So bring us a sign if you are sincere’ in your Mission.

Tafsir Ibn'Abbas: (So keep your duty to Allah) so fear Allah regarding that which He commanded you of repentance and faith (and obey me) and follow my way and religion (And I ask of you no wage) no payment or provision

(therefore) in exchange for the profession of Allah's divine Oneness; (my wage) my reward (is the concern only of the Lord of the Worlds. Will ye be left secure) from death, cessation or punishment (in that which is here before us) of bounties, (In gardens and water springs) pure water (And tilled fields and heavy sheathed palm-trees) bearing ripe and seemly fruits, (Though ye hew out dwellings in the mountain, being skilful?) it is also said that this means: feeling proud of, and haughty about, your farms. (Therefore keep your duty to Allah) fear Allah regarding that which He commanded you (and obey me) and follow my way and advice, (And obey not the command of the prodigal) and obey not the words of the idolaters, (Who spread corruption in the earth) through disbelief, idolatry and calling to the worship of other than Allah.

(B)

Tafsir al-Jalalayn The prophet said "fear Him Who created you and the former generations' all creation before you. They said 'You are indeed one of the bewitched. You are just a human being like us.

Tafsir Ibn 'Abbas (And keep your duty unto) and fear (Him Who created you and the generations of the men of old) He created the people of old before you. (They said: thou art but one of the bewitched) you are neither an angel nor a Prophet; (Thou art but a mortal) a human being (like us) you eat and drink just as we do, (and lo! we deem thee of the liars) in what you claim.

Evaluating the Translations under Study

In Arabic, the conjunction "and (wa)" may have at least two main functions: one as a normal conjunction as its English counterpart "and" and one as a discourse marker especially when used initially. In the sentence, two verses above they have exactly the same meaning but it was

translated in 7 translations neglecting the translation of the DM “and (wa)” and only in one version (Ghali (B)) translated it into **AND** .

The four translations of A are right as there is no “and (wa)” and the meaning of all of them gave the exact meaning of the SL ; that is, he is a man and can be bewitched, but in the translation of (B) three of the translations chosen neglected the DM "wa and" , Only Ghali translated it into And which is the perfect translation of the DM, in my point of view, because in this verse ALLAH used the DM "wa and" as these, disbelievers were saying all the reasons why they should not obey God and his prophet first they said that he is bewitched then they said that he is also a man, so why we believe him.

So the suggested translations will be as follows:-

(A) 26:153

**They said, "You are only of those affected by magic,
which proves that you are but a man like ourselves"**

(B) 26:185

**They said, "You are only of those affected by magic, And
you are but a man like ourselves.**

5.0 Findings and Conclusion

The aim of this chapter is to present the conclusions drawn from the results of the current study for purposes of generalization, to make a bird's-eye view of the thesis as a whole and to make it easy for the researchers concerned with the translations of the Glorious Qur'ân to get the drift of the study without being forced to read the whole body.

5.1 Research Findings

- 1- Most translators ignore the multifunctional nature as a result their translation has not been successful. It has lacked the necessary cohesion.
- 2- The misuse of any particular marker has resulted in a significant confusion in the target language, That is, the misinterpretation of the function of a marker has distorted the indented meaning.
- 3- DMs often have a sphere of influence which is much larger than the immediate context of the verb they modify or the clause in which they occur.
- 4- DMs have a critical importance for linguistic discourse analysis, for translation for interpretation and for effective communication.
- 5- So, DMs not only have a broad sphere of influence, but also the degree of that influence is remarkable.
- 6- Translators need to use DMs with utmost care and discrimination, taking into account the multiplicity of functions the DMs have in discourse.
- 7- Allah delivered the Glorious Qur'an to Prophet Muhammad (PBUH), and He is The All-Knowing of the Arab nature and norms of language. Also, Allah knows that without using appropriate DMs many verses would have been exposed to wrong interpretation or ta'wîl. Another element that is crucial in this context is the hearer's expectations about the speaker's utterance which depends on his background knowledge of the speaker's history including his habit of the use of language in the sense that the more knowledge the hearer has about the speaker, his intentions, his language and his habit, the more complete and perfect his knowledge of the speaker's

intentions will be. In this regard, the phenomenon of the DMs in the Glorious Qur'a is utilized to avoid the wrong interpretation of the verses and to avoid falling into the dilemma of ta'wîl which in most cases gives other inappropriate levels of meanings rather than the intended meaning of the verse.

- 8- The findings of this research have revealed that some of the translation translations have failed to render the conjunctive „fa“ accurately into English. And the reason behind this deficiency is that they seem to be unaware of the multiplicity of functions that characterizes „fa“.
- 9- Poor reading habit will be a very good reason for misinterpretation of DM, the results shows that some of the translators lack the necessary knowledge about conjunctive devices which could be ensured through consistent reading.
- 10-The awareness of the multifunctional nature of Discourse Markers can be said to be an important factor to focus on in teaching translation.
- 11-The misinterpretation of the Discourse Markers is can be caused by poor translation experience and knowledge of both the SL and TL. Therefore, Translators should understand the meaning of the source language, first, and then translate this particular meaning. This would be achieved through a regular practice.
- 12-Because there is a wide belief that reading can be seen as an efficient exercise to develop the translation skill, it would be possible to design syllabus for teaching reading strategies in addition to teaching translation.

13-Discourse Markers should compose a major constituent in the syllabus of translation courses. That is, students should be taught to recognize the role of Discourse Markers in signalling the logical relations between clauses and sentences.

5.2 Conclusion

The rational and need of this study emerges from that within the past twenty years or so there has been an upsurge interest in studying the theoretical status of DMs ,focusing on what they are, what they mean and what uses they manifest, in spoken and written discourse , but for some reasons few studies have been conducted cross linguistically.

"The contrastive method proves to be useful heuristic tool capable of throwing valuable light on the characteristic features of the languages contrasted" (Firbas, 1992 p.13)

All languages make use of DMs, but there is no one to one correspondence between two languages in the field of coordination DMs: most of the time their correlate in the target language have not the same pragmatic meaning constituting translation problems.

Huruf el3atf (such as wa, fa, thumma) play a pivotal role in the realm of Arabic usage and they are looked upon as an indispensable devices for connecting and interconnecting parts of the Arabic discourse. They are a set of clues which create cohesiveness, coherence and meaning in discourse, when expressing our feelings, and ideas to other during the act of communications.

DMs facilitate grasping the intended meaning conveyed in the discourse and vice versa are true. The improper translation of a marker into a target language is likely to lead to unintended meanings.

When an inappropriate DM is used, translation loss many occur on the prosodic level, for example, because the use of this DM in this particular context implies an informational inappropriate intonation pattern.

The accuracy of the translation text should not be superficially evaluated by examining the target language text without matching it with the source language text.

Fareh (1998) compared and contrasted the discourse functions of English "and" and its nearest Arabic equivalent "wa" the results of this study revealed that the two connectives have various functions that do not often match. This mismatch although partial may lead to translation problems.

The addition of an Arabic DM will lead to different meaning relationships.

Substituting one or more Arabic DMs or transitional words for a certain English one, will result in changing the intended meaning relationships between the two conjoined discourse elements.

References

A- English Sources

1. B Fraser (1990) ,An approach to discourse markers - Journal of pragmatics, Elsevier
2. Baker, M. (1992). In Other Words: A Course Book on Translation. London, England: Routledge.
3. Baker, M. (2001). In Other Words. London: Routledge.
4. Baker, Mona. In Other Words: a Course book on Translation, London: Routledge.1992
5. Baker, Mona. In Other Words: a Course book on Translation, London: Routledge.1992. p.12
6. Bell, R. T. (1998). Psychological/cognitive approaches. In M. Baker (Ed), Routledge encyclopedia of translation studies. London & New York: Routledge.
7. Biber, D., Conrad, S. & Leech, G. (2002). Student Grammar of Spoken and Written English. Edinburgh: Longman.
8. Books If This Be Treason: Translation and Its Dyscontents Gregory Rabassa New Directions Publishing, Aug 29, 2006-
9. Blakemore, D. (1987), Semantic constraints on relevance, Oxford: Blackwell.
10. Celce-Murcia Marianne, Diane Larsen-Freeman, Howard Alan Williams, (1999) the Grammar Book: An ESL/EFL Teacher's Course.
11. Chai, J. Y. and Jin, R. (2004). Discourse structure for context question answering. In HLT-NAACL Workshop on Pragmatics of Question Answering.
12. Chomsk, N. (1981). Lectures on Government and Binding. Dordrecht: Foris publications.
13. Da Cunha, I.; SanJuan, E. and Torres M. (2010). Discourse segmentation for Spanish based on shallow parsing. Proceedings of the 9th Mexican international conference on

- Advances in artificial intelligence, (MICAI'10), p. 13-23. Springer-Verlag.
14. Schiffrin, Deborah. Discourse Markers Originally published: February 12, 1987.
 15. Schiffrin, Deborah. Handbook of discourse, 2001 Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
 16. Marwan A. Jarrah DISCOURSAL WA (AND) Kelle Taha University of Jordan University of Jordan Rasheed Jarrah Yarmouk University International Journal of English Language and Linguistic Research Vol. 1, No. 1, pp.10-20, June 2013 Published by European Centre for Research Training and Development UK (www.ea-journals.org)
 17. Segmentation of German written text. In: Tapio Salakoski, Filip Ginter, Sampo Pyysalo, Tapio Pahikkala (eds.): Proceedings of the 5th International Conference on Natural Language Processing (FinTAL 2006). Berlin: Springer, 2006.
 18. Hatch, E. (1992). Discourse & Language Education. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
 19. Hayes, Bruce - Introductory Phonology - WILEY-BLACKWELL A John Wiley & Sons, Ltd, Publication - 2011.
 20. Halliday, M.A.K & Hasan, Ruqaiya (1976), Cohesion in English.
 21. International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature online Vol1 no1 2012
 22. Jaaskelainen, R., (2005). Translation studies: what are they? Retrieved November 11, 2006 from <http://www.hum.expertise.workshop>.
 23. Jiraphatralikhit, J., Klinpoon, S., & Kaewjan, S. (2005). An analysis of strategies in translation of the movie subtitle: Behind the painting. Research Gate, 1, 54-71. Retrieved May

- 21, 2011, from
<http://aut.researchgateway.ac.nz./handle/10292/870.html>.
24. Jirawan, C.; Thana, S.; and Asanee K. (2005). "Element Discourse Unit Segmentation for Thai Discourse Cues and Syntactic Information", The 9th National Computer Science and Engineering Conference, 27—28 October, 2005.
25. Johnstone, B. (2002). Discourse Analysis. Malden: Blackwell.
26. Kelle, T. ,Marwan A. Rasheed Jarrah, DISCOURSAL WA (AND) , International Journal of English Language and Linguistic Research, Vol. 1, No. 1, pp.10-20, June 2013 , Published by European Centre for Research Training and Development UK (www.ea-journals.org)
27. Kelly, D. (2005). A handbook for translator trainers: A guide to reflective practice. Manchester, UK: St. Jerome.
28. Kenny, Dorothy (1998) 'Equivalence', in the Routledge Encyclopaedia of Translation Studies, edited by Mona Baker, London and New York: Routledge,
29. Kreidler, C. (1998). Introducing English Semantics. London: Routledge.
30. Krings, H.P. (1986). Translation problems and translation strategies of advanced German learners of French. In J. House, & S. Blum-Kulka (Eds.), Interlingual and intercultural communication (pp. 263-75). Tübingen: Gunter Narr.
31. Müller, S. (2005). Discourse Markers in Native and Non-native English Discourse. Amsterdam, Netherlands: John Benjamins.
32. Munday, J. Introducing Translation Studies. London: Routledge. 2001
33. Munday, Jeremy and Basil Hatim Translation an advanced resource book. Newyork: Routledge 2004

34. New Theory of the Holy Qur'an Translation. A Textbook for Advanced universities students of Linguistics and translation – Ali Alhaj – Hamburg - Anchor Academic Publishing 2015
35. Newmark, Peter (2000). The Deficiencies of Skopos Theory: A Response to Anna Trosborg. *Current Issues in Language & Society*, 7(3), 259-260.
36. Newmark, p. (1981). *Approaches to translation*. Tehran: Rahnama.
37. Newmark, P. (1988b). *Approaches to Translation*. Hertfordshire: Prentice Hall.
38. Nida EA (1964). *Toward a Science of Translating*, Leiden: E: J.Brill Orwell, George (1386). *Animal Farm*. Jungle publications.
39. Nida, E. A. (1964). *Towards a science of translation, with special reference to principles and procedures involved in Bible translating*. Leiden: Brill.
40. Nida, Eugene A and Taber. *The Theory and Practice of translation*. Leiden: E.J.Brill. 1969
41. Nord, C. (1991). Skopos, Loyalty and Translational Conventions. *Target*, 3 (1), 91-109.
42. Nord, C. 1997). *Translating as a Purposeful Activity Functionalist Approaches Explained*. Manchester: St. Jerome.
43. Olmos, S and Ahern, A. (2008). Contrast and propositional attitude: A relevance theoretic analysis of contrast connectives in Spanish and English. *Lingua*, 119(1)
44. Hussein Abdul-Raof, *Qur'an Translation: Discourse, Texture and Exegesis*, p. 2. Book , 2001
45. Ghali , Muhammad Mahmoud *Qur'an English Translation* 2005
46. Abdul-Raof, Hussein *Qur'an Translation: Discourse, Texture and Exegesis* (2013).

47. Radford, A. (1988). *Transformational Grammar: A First Course*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
48. Ramadan, Hassan Ahmed El-Sayed , *Problems of Translating the Embedded Meanings of Some Axiomatic Expressions in the Glorious Qur'ân: A Semantic Pragmatic Study* ,2013 A Thesis Submitted to the Department of English, Faculty of Arts in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for M.A. Degree in linguistics.
49. Reiss, K. and H. Vermeer (1984). *Groundwork for a General Theory of Translation*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
50. Robert Ewy 2009 *Stakeholder-driven Strategic Planning in Education: A Practical Guide for Developing and Deploying Successful Long-range Plans*.
51. Rochayah Machali. *Pedoman Bagi Penerjemah*. Jakarta: grasindo. 2000. p48
52. Rudolf Nababan, *Teori Menerjemah*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka pelajar. 2008
53. Rudolf Nababan. *Teori Menerjemah*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka pelajar. 2008. p30
54. Schaffner, C. (1998a). *Action (Theory of Translational action)*. In M. Baker, ed. *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. London: Routledge, pp.3-5.
55. Schiffrin, D. (2003). *Discourse Markers: Language, Meaning and Context*. In Schiffrin, D, D. Tannen and Heidi, E. Hamilton (eds). *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. Blackwell Publishing, Blackwell Reference. <http://www.blackwellreference.com/subscriber/book?> Retrieved April 4, 2014.
56. Seeger, F. and Brian, R. (2007). *The utility of parse-derived features for automatic discourse segmentation*. In *ACL*.
57. Seguinot, C. (1989). *The translation process*. Toronto: H.G. Publications.

58. Stubbs, M. (1983). Discourse Analysis: The sociolinguistic analysis of Natural Language. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
59. Study of Nida's (formal and dynamic equivalence) and Newmark's (semantic and communicative translation) translating theories on two short stories Shabnam Shakernia Merit Research Journal of Education and Review (ISSN: 2350-2282) Vol. 2(1) pp. 001-007, January, 2013
60. Schourup, Lawrence Clifford (1985), Common discourse particles in English conversation, book
61. Schourup, Lawrence Clifford (1999) discourse markers
62. Schiffrin, Deborah. (1987) Discourse markers, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
63. Fatima A. Al Kohlani, the function of discourse markers in arabic newspaper opinion articles, m.a, school of arts and sciences of Georgetown University Dissertation for Doctor of Philosophy.
64. Translation Processes, Practices and Products of Professional Indonesian Translators: A Thesis Submitted to the Victoria University of Wellington in Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Applied Linguistics, Mangatur Nababan 2003 Volume 19 of Theses: Linguistics, Applied
65. Vanessa Leonardi Equivalence in Translation: Between Myth and Reality translationjournal , 2000

B- Arabic Sources

Primary sources

القرآن الكريم

Secondary sources

1. زياد، محمد مسعد ، المستقصى في معاني الأدوات النحوية وإعرابها (١٩٨٤/١٤٠٥).

2. الغلاييني، الشيخ مصطفى 2000 و (جامع الدروس العربية. الجزء الثالث . ضبطه وخرج آياته وشواهد الشعرية الدكتور عبد المنعم خليل ابراهيم . بيروت: دار الكتب العلمية.
3. ابن الجوزي، أبو الفرج عبد الرحمن بن أبي الحسن علي بن محمد القرشي التيمي البكري . (١٩٨٣) . زاد المسير في علم التفسير، الطبعة الأولى .بيروت لبنان،المكتب الإسلامي للطباعة والنشر .
4. ابن القيم .إعلام الموقعين عن رب العالمين .راجعه وعلق عليه طه عبد الرؤوف سعد .بيروت، طبعة دار الجيل، بدون تاريخ.
5. ابن عاشور، الامام الشيخ محمد الطاهر .(1997). تفسير التحرير والتنوير .تونس، الدار التونسية للنشر .
6. ابن عباس، عبدالله . (١٩٩٢) . تنوير المقباس من تفسير ابن عباس .بيروت لبنان، دار الكتب العلمية.
7. ابن عجيبة .(٢٠٠٢) .البحر المديد في تفسير القرآن المجيد .٨ أجزاء .بيروت لبنان، دار الكتب العلمية.
8. ابن عرفة، عبدالله محمد بن عرفة المالكي .(١٩٨٦) .تفسير ابن عرفة .الطبعة الأولى، تحقيق د .حسن المناعي .تونس، مركز البحوث بالكلية الزيتونية.
9. ابن عطية، أبي محمد عبدالحق بن غالب ابن عطية الأندلسي الغرناطي الحافظ القاضي .(١٩٩٣) . المحرر الوجيز في تفسير الكتاب العزيز .تحقيق عبد السلام عبد الشافي محمد، ٥ أجزاء، الطبعة الاولى .لبنان، دار الكتب العلمية.
10. ابن كثير .(٢٠٠٠) .تفسير القرآن العظيم .القاهرة، مؤسسة قرطبة.
11. أبو حيان، الأندلسي .(١٩٩٣) .البحر المحيط .الطبعة الأولى، تحقيق الشيخ عادل عبد الموجود وآخرين .القاهرة، دار الكتب العلمية.
12. الأنصاري، عبدعلي .(١٩٤٨) .فواتح الرحموت بشرح مسلم الثبوت .الطبعة الثانية .إيران، دار الذخائر .