西南交通大学学报

第 57 卷 第 6 期
2022 年 12 月

JOURNAL OF SOUTHWEST JIAOTONG UNIVERSITY

Vol. 57 No. 6
Dec. 2022

ISSN: 0258-2724 **DOI：10.35741/issn.0258-2724.57.6.29**

Research article

Social Sciences

TRANSLATING SEMANTIC FEATURES BETWEEN ENGLISH AND ARABIC

翻譯英語和阿拉伯語之間的語義特徵

Mohammed Farghal [a,*], Ali Almanna [b]
[a] Applied Science Private University
Amman, Jordan, m_farghal@asu.edu.jo
[b] Hamed Bin Khalifah University, Qatar, alialmanna9@gmail.com

Received: September 15, 2022 ▪ Review: October 9, 2022
▪ Accepted: December 15, 2022 ▪ Published: December 30, 2022

This article is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution License (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0)

Abstract

This study aims to investigate the treatment of semantic features at word and phraseology levels in Arabic/English translation. It demonstrates by using enough textual data that translation involves significant decision-making at the levels of lexis and phraseology when considering semantic features. The Arabic/English corpus includes mismatches in both word and multi-word units. The translator's awareness of semantic symmetries and asymmetries in the language pair constitutes a foundation stone in his work. At the word level, special attention should be paid to lexical and referential/cultural gaps. While the former represents a gap in the semantic blanket of the target language, the latter constitute gaps in the world of experience. Therefore, translators must employ different translation procedures when handling such gaps, such as cultural approximation and descriptive translation. Likewise, at the phraseology level, utmost care should be taken when handling collocations and idiomatic expressions. While collocations may present several problems at the production level, idiomatic expressions are more challenging at the reception level.

Keywords: Translation, Semantic Features, Lexical Gaps, Referential Gaps, Collocations

摘要 本研究旨在調查阿拉伯語/英語翻譯中單詞和短語級別語義特徵的處理。它通過使用足夠的文本數據證明，在考慮語義特徵時，翻譯涉及詞彙和短語層面的重要決策。阿拉伯語/英語語料庫包括單詞和多單詞單元的不匹配。譯者對語言對中語義對稱和不對稱的認識構成了他工作的基石。在單詞層面，應特別注意詞彙和指稱/文化差距。前者代表目標語言語義層中的差距，而後者則構成經驗世界中的差距。因此，譯者在處理這種差異時必須採用不同的翻譯程序，例如文化近似和描述性翻譯。同樣，在用語層面，處理搭配和慣用語時應格外小心。雖然搭配在生產層面可能

會出現一些問題，但地道表達在接收層面更具挑戰性。

关键词: 翻譯、語義特徵、詞彙差距、指稱差距、搭配

I. INTRODUCTION

Although human languages share general rules in the sense of Chomsky's universal grammar, it remains true that parametric variation between languages involves much mismatches at the different levels of linguistic description. In this respect, [15] considers that languages phonologise, morphologies, syntacticise, lexicalize, and phraseologise differently within general parameters. This fact rightly motivated [23] to say that the translation between languages is a matter of replacing messages in one language with messages in another without getting trapped by surface linguistic features. [25, pp. 37–48] argues that there are few, if any, congruent structures between languages. One-to-one strict correspondence is, therefore, the exception rather than the rule in translation. In most cases, the translator is confronted with one-to-many or many-to-one correspondences while working with any language pair. Despite the numerous linguistic mismatches between languages, [24, p. 84] claims: "Whatever can be said in one language can be said equally well in any other language." While this statement may be true in a qualified manner, we consider that the disparities between languages are a matter of asymmetric equivalence or resemblance. In this way, similarity can be detected within difference.

[29, p. 8] stresses that due to differences in frequency, usage, connotation and the like meaning of any lexical item in Language *A* cannot be identical to that in language *B*. Such linguistic differences at the lexical or phraseological level, for instance, prompt translators to adopt certain strategies to minimize such 'linguistic inequivalences' [4, p. 74] This agrees with [19, p. 23] that highlights that "translation involves overcoming the contrasts between language systems: source language (SL) syntactic structures had to be exchanged for target language (TL) structures; lexical items from each language had to be matched and the nearest equivalents selected." Translators, being charged with such constraints imposed on them by virtue of the differences between the linguistic systems of the interfacing languages, i.e., the lack of a one-to-one relationship between lexical and grammatical categories opt for different strategies, such as addition, omission, paraphrasing, elaboration, adaptation and so on.

When discussing linguistic and/or textual considerations in the translation activity, one should distinguish between obligatory and optional features. On the one hand, obligatory features involve choices that must be followed by the translator to satisfy the rules imposed by the TL system, without which the translation will be ungrammatical. Optional features, on the other hand, represent cases where the translator can exercise real choice by deciding on one translation option rather than another/others. By way of illustration, let us consider the following English sentence along with its Arabic translation:

(1) Two black boys quarrelled while they were playing in a narrow alley.

(2) تشاجر الصبيان الزنجيان وهما يلعبان في الزقاق الضيق.

[Quarrelled the black (dual) boys (dual) and they (dual) were playing (dual) in the narrow alley].

Examining the Arabic translation in (2), we can readily see that the translator has implemented four obligatory features, viz. using the dual form (الصبيان for the two boys), marking an adjective, a pronoun and a verb (الزنجيان/هما/يلعبان) for the dual number and marking the adjectives for definiteness (الزنجيان/الضيق). Here, the translator has no choice but to follow these adjustments because the language system in Arabic imposes them. The violation of any obligatory feature would produce broken or 'pidgin' Arabic. One should note that obligatory features such as these are taken for granted as part of language competence, hence not deserving any further discussion in the translation activity.

In contrast, it is in the domain of optional features that translators exercise decision-making and flexible choice. Therefore translation criticism flourishes in this area apart from obligatory features. To look again at the translation in (2), one can imagine other linguistic options that could have been followed, albeit subject to translation criticism, as can be illustrated in (3–5) below:

(3) الصبيان الزنجيان تشاجرا وهما يلعبان في الزقاق الضيق.

[The two black boys quarreled and they were playing in the narrow alley].

(4) تشاجر الصبيان الزنجيان عندما كانا يلعبان في الزقاق

الضيق.

[The two black boys quarrelled when they were playing in the narrow alley].

(5) تعارك الولدان الزنجيان بينما كانا يلهوان في الشارع الضيق.

[The two black boys fell out while they were loitering in the narrow street].

As can be seen, each choice in (3) follows a linguistic option, which is different from the one adopted in (2). The first rendering (3) changes the word order from Verb-Subject to Subject-Verb while maintaining the choice of conjunction (coordination) and lexis. The second rendering (4) maintains the word order and lexis while changing the conjunction into subordination. For its turn, the last rendering (5) extensively changes the lexis (الولدان for يلهوان, الصبيان for يلعبان, and الشارع for الزقاق) while preserving the word order and the choice of the category of conjunction, i.e. subordination, albeit a different subordinator (عندما *'when'* vs. بينما *'while'*) is used.

Let us look at an authentic example from [20] along with its Arabic translation الشيخ والبحر[9]:

The boy was sad too and we begged her [the fish] pardon and butchered her promptly. (6)

(7) ولقد ران الحزن على الغلام أيضاً فالتمسنا من السمكة القتيل العفو والمغفرة ونحرناها.

[And the sadness overwhelmed the boy, so we begged for a pardon from the killed fish and slaughtered it].

[9], as can be observed, has followed some optional decisions. Firstly, he has rightly changed the word order to offer an unmarked structure comparable to the English one. Secondly, he has decided to elevate the style in Arabic by choosing a highly formal lexis, viz. ران, الغلام, فالتمسنا, and نحرناها, thus altering Hemingway's simple narrative into stilted narrative. Thirdly, the translator has decided to employ an Arabic synonymous lexical couplet, viz. العفو والمغفرة 'lit. 'pardon and forgiveness' in an attempt to offer more natural discourse. Finally, he has committed two lexical errors, viz. using the adjective القتيل *'the killed'* to post-modify the fish and employing the Arabic verb نحر *'slaughtered'* instead of the correct verb قطّع *'chopped'* when referring to the fish as if it were a sheep or a camel. In fact, fish are not slaughtered the way other animals are; they are taken just out of the water before they undergo chopping or anything else, nor are they killed like other animals. Below is a suggested translation that takes care of these critical points:

(8) ولقد شعر الصبي أيضاً بالحزن فطلبنا من السمكة العفو وقطّعناها على عجل.

[The boy was sad too, so we begged pardon from the fish and chopped it promptly].

It is within the bounds of these translation options that the translation critic can exercise his/her profession by showing how and why one option is preferable to the other options. In the rest of this paper, we will look at translation options relating to semantic features both at the word and phraseological levels. The semantics of any language consists mainly of lexical and phraseological features. Together, they cover both meaning that is compositional and meaning that is unitary. The former follows the Open Principle [38] and accounts for making meaning compositionally by deriving it from individual lexical items that are strung together according to the grammar of a given language. For example, the meaning of the sentence *'The boy chased the cat* is compositionally derived from the meaning of the content words *boy*, *chase* and *cat* combined with the function words/markers. The latter, in contrast, follows the Idiom Principle [38] and derives a unitary meaning from the entire multi-word phraseology. For example, the meaning of the bold-faced idiomatic expression in the sentence *'In her attempt to convince John, Mary is **flog**ging **a dead horse**'* cannot be derived from the literal meaning of the words in it. Rather, it has a conventional unitary meaning that comes to mind once encountered in communication. Mismatches between Arabic and English that require careful decision-making exist both at the level of words and phraseology, as will be demonstrated below.

This study investigates the treatment of semantic features at word and phraseology levels in Arabic/English translation. On the one hand, the focus at the word level is on both lexical and referential gaps to lay land on what translation procedures may be employed and to also check how successful translators are in rendering such gaps. However, this paper examines semantic features at the phraseology level, including different multi-word units such idiomatic expressions and collocations, to unravel the translation procedures used and the degree of success achieved.

II. RESEARCH METHOD

This is a qualitative investigation based mainly on a sample of authentic textual data involving the translation study items. The examples are extracted from various genres, including literary, religious, legal, and journalistic discourse. Each example is thoroughly discussed from a translational perspective, mentioning the strengths and weaknesses in the translator's tackling the translation unit in question. The translation

critique of the data offers theoretical, practical, and pedagogical implications, in an attempt to cater for the needs of different audiences.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A. Word Level

At the word level, the semantic blankets of languages are never complete; there are always gaps involving both lexical and referential gaps [22] and [31]. To start with lexical gaps, they represent holes where, in a language pair, one language lacks some lexemes that stand for shared concepts while the other language has compressed lexically those concepts in single words. Although both English and Arabic are highly lexicalized (e.g. in terms of nominalization and verbalization) regarding familiar concepts, some lexical gaps do exist between them. Therefore, when translating an SL lexeme corresponding to a lexical gap in the TL, the translator should unpack the sense of that lexeme if s/he is to render the sense correctly. Working from Arabic into English, for example, four of the names of the fingers of the human hand, viz. الإبهام، السبّابة، الوسطى، البنصر، الخنصر usually undergo lexical unpacking when rendered into English, viz. *thumb*, *the index finger*, *the middle finger*, *the ring finger* and *the little finger*, respectively. In many cases, Arabic lexemes corresponding to lexical gaps in English undergo lexical approximation, e.g. عم *'paternal uncle'* and خال *'maternal uncle* are usually rendered as *uncle* and عمّة *'paternal aunt'* and خالة *'maternal aunt'* as *aunt*. While this may work in many contexts where the side of kinship is unimportant, it may seriously fail in instances where such thing is significant. In such cases, the lexical unpacking of the kinship term becomes necessary.

To see how lexical gaps can present formidable problems to even highly professional translators, let us cite an example from fiction translation to observe how rendering an Arabic lexeme by approximation can be damaging to the coherence of the text. In translation of [26] مدن الملح: تقاسيم الليل والنهار, [36] translates the Arabic proverb ثلثين الولد لخاله [Two thirds of the boy for his maternal uncle] as *'Two-thirds of a boy are his uncle's.'* The fictitious encounter involves the citation of this proverb by a character to claim more influence for maternal kinship than paternal kinship on children. Unfortunately, the English translation obliterates this culture-bound schema by neutralizing the distinction between the Arabic lexemesعم *'paternal uncle'* and خال *'maternal uncle'* in a context where the discrepancy constitutes the intended message. The target reader will definitely fall prey to the incongruence brought about by a rendition that does not cohere with the surrounding co-text and context. The following are some target reader responses (American native speakers' responses) to the English translation in its context (reported in [17]:

- *Family is everything.*
- *Apples don't fall far from the tree.*
- *A boy learns from his family around him.*
- *People trust their uncles*
- *People follow their masters, etc.* (9)

As can be observed, the above English native speakers' responses obscure the intended message and consequently, on a closer examination, render the target text seriously incoherent. This incoherence is an immediate consequence of replacing the culturally determined, the specific role of maternal kinship with a universally determined, general role of family relatedness in the context of the formation of children's future behavior. To capture the intended message in such cases, where lexical approximation alone does not work, the translator needs to be an insider in both cultures: the source culture and target culture, i.e. s/he should unpack the Arabic kinship term, viz. *'A boy is his maternal uncle's by two thirds'* or *'Like maternal uncle like boy'*, which remodels the English proverb *'Like father like son.'* Only in this way will the text make sense within its context.

Translating from English into Arabic, there also exist some English lexemes that correspond to lexical gaps in Arabic. Depending on the context, among these we find words like *'spouse' that* translates into زوج *'husband'* or زوجة *'wife'*, and *'parent', which* translates into الوالد *'father'* or الوالدة *'mother.'* In some cases, the translator must read a sizeable portion of a text (e.g. a novel) to decide 'which is which' for treating a lexical gap. To cite a real example, the first author of this paper has translated the novel entitled *'Maps'* (1986/ خرائط 2013) by the celebrity Somali writer Nurrdeen Farah in which there is a recurrent reference to *Askar*'s (the protagonist's) two uncles (*Uncle Orrax* and *Uncle Hilal*). Starting to translate the novel without having read much through the text, the translator chose the Arabic paternal option for rendering both of them, viz. العم أوراكس and العم هلال, respectively. It was not until having gone past halfway in the translation that he discovered that the latter referred to a maternal rather than paternal uncle. This being the case, an order was made to the computer to replace all the occurrences of العم هلال by الخال

هلال. Without having done that the Arabic translation would have offered a distorted world of kinship relations.

In the following example, the translator has opted for an awkward paraphrase based on a dictionary definition because the lexeme *'affidavit'* is not lexicalized in Arabic:

In the words of a Lonrho ***affidavit*** *dated November 2, 1988, the allegations ....* (10)

(11) وحسب النص الوارد في **إفادة كتابية مشفوعة بيمين** قدمتها مؤسسة لونرو بتاريخ 2 نوفمبر 1988، فإن الادعاءات . . . (printed in [10, p. 38]; emphasis hers)

[And according to the text found in **a testimony accompanied by an oath** presented by Lourho corporation dated November 2, 1988, the claims . . .]

Although the term *'affidavit'* is not lexicalized in Arabic, the wordy definition is not justified in the Arabic rendering. A more acceptable and economical rendition would involve modifying the Arabic hyperonym شهادة 'testimony' by one word without falling prey to wordiness (11 above) as in (12) below:

(12) وحسب النص الوارد في **شهادة عدلية** قدمتها مؤسسة لونرو بتاريخ 2 نوفمبر 1988، فإن الادعاءات . . .

[And according to the text found in **a judicial testimony** ....].

In fact, most English lexemes corresponding to Arabic lexical gaps need to be unpacked naturally and economically, viz. *'alibi'* is rendered as الدفع بالغياب *'defense by absence'* and *'date'* is rendered as موعد غرامي *'a love appointment.'* Because lexical gaps relate to familiar, but unlexicalized concepts in the TL, the most important step is to locate the relevant hyperonym, and then to modify it by a lexical descriptor to communicate the unlexicalized sense component.

For their part, referential gaps, which represent partially shared or completely unshared concepts, i.e. those concepts in one language but they are only present partially or they are completely missing in the other, are more challenging in translation activity. To start with partial referential gaps, one can refer to the many religious concepts that are partially shared between Islam and Christianity, being the relevant religions when translating from Western Christian cultures into Arab Muslim culture. Among these terms, we find *'charity'* vs. زكاة/صدقة, *'pilgrimage'* vs. حج/عمرة, and *'ablutions'* vs. وضوء/تيمم. As can be seen, for each English term we have two Arabic terms that come under a hyperonym, e.g. the hyperonym *'giving to the poor'* has one form in Christianity (charity), whereas it manifests itself in two functionally different forms in Islam زكاة (which is compulsoy) vs. صدقة (which is optinal). In terms of translation, such partial referential gaps usually lend themselves to the strategy of approximation in casual mentions (e.g. the rendition of زكاة as *'charity'* in fiction translation) and to other strategies, including approximation, in technical/religeous texts. Below are five excerpted translations of a Quranic verse featuring this partial referential gap:

(13) وَأَقِيمُوا ٱلصَّلَوٰةَ وَءَاتُوا **ٱلزَّكَاةَ** وَمَا تُقَدِّمُوا لِأَنفُسِكُم مِّنْ خَيْرٍ تَجِدُوهُ عِندَ ٱللَّهِ إِنَّ ٱللَّهَ بِمَا تَعْمَلُونَ بَصِيرٌ

(The Cow, 110 / البقرة ، 110)

And be constant in prayer, and render ***the purifying dues****; for, whatever good deed you send ahead for your own selves, you shall find it with God: behold, God sees all that you do* (110). [7] (14)

Establish worship, and pay ***the poor-due****; and whatever of good you send before (you) for your souls, you will find it with Allah. Lo! Allah is Seer of what you do* (110). [30] (15)

And be steadfast in prayer and regular in ***charity****: And whatever good ye send forth for your souls before you, ye shall find it with God. For God sees Well all that ye do* (110). [3, p. 48] (16)

And perform the prayer, and pay the ***alms****; whatever good you shall forward to your souls' account, you shall find it with God; assuredly God sees what you do* (110). [6, p. 42] (17)

Keep up prayer and pay ***the welfare tax****; you will find any good you have sent on ahead for your own souls' sake is already [stored up] with God. God is observant of whatever you do* (110). [21, p. 9] (18)

As can be observed, the translation strategies adopted include approximation (charity/alms) and descriptive translation (the purifying dues/the poor-due/ the welfare tax). On the one hand, one should note that in the source culture the concept of زكاة is very specific and is associated with obligatory giving, so the approximating terms *charity*/*alms*, which are associated in the TL culture with voluntary giving, are too general. Moreover, in the SL culture, voluntary giving is associated with another term, that is صدقة, thus *'charity'* and *'alms'* technically become more appropriate renditions for صدقة rather than زكاة. In this way, [3] and [6] translations seriously diverge from what is meant by the Islamic concept and, without a footnote, the relevant features required for the full and coherent interpretation of the term are lost in translation.

However, descriptive translation employs the headwords *'due(s)/tax'*, i.e., something that is required, to denote the obligatory sense of زكاة. This decision succeeds in conveying the main,

general aspect of the term (i.e., its being obligatory); however, the translators differ in the choice of the modifying word to render the more specific meaning. [7] derives his rendition from the spiritual connotations of زكاة; he states in a footnote that its main function is to "purify a person's capital and income from the taint of selfishness" (p.18), thus basing his translation on the connotative meaning of the term. By contrast, [30] derives his translation from the category of people who are eligible to receive it, so he renders it as 'the poor-due'. In this way, both translators attempt to explicate the concept of targeting readers within the text and in footnotes. For its part, *'Welfare tax'* translation [21] may foster different implications. It pertains generally to the amount of money paid by all people, the rich and the poor alike, to the government for advancing society as a whole. Without a footnote, target readers are likely to interpret this term in a way different from that intended in the source text. For example, without specifying that زكاة is obligatory and levied on the well-to-do for the welfare of the poor, the readers might infer that it is required of the rich and the poor. This inference does not serve the intended message, which aims at compassion and social justice rather that placing an extra burden on the poor. Added to this, are the pejorative associations, which the term *tax* may arouse in taxpayers. The above different renditions give us an idea of how challenging the treatment of referential gaps in the translation can be in authoritative texts such the Holy Quran.

Referential gaps in less authoritative texts may also involve various translation strategies, including transliteration, approximation, descriptive translation, definition, omission, etc. The following are examples extracted from translation [8] of novel بداية ونهاية , where different strategies are employed to render referential gaps:

(19) لهذا قال أحدهم قبل البدء في اللعب:

- لا نريد غشا.

فقال حسن:

- طبعا.

فقال الشاب:

- فلنقرأ **الفاتحة**.

وقرءوا **الفاتحة** جرعا بصوت مسموع ولعل حسن حفظها حول هذه المائدة. (p. 40)

[Because of this one of them said before the beginning of playing:

- We don't want to cheating.

Hasan said:

- Of course.

The youth said:

- Let's read **al-faatiḥah**.

And they read **Al-Faatiḥah** in an audible voice and perhaps Hasan learned it

around that table].

Thus before they started the deal, one of them said, No cheating.

Of course, not, answered Hassan.

*The young man said, let's recite **the opening exordium of the Koran**.*

*They recited **Al-Fatihat** audibly; it was possible that Hassan had learned it at that*

gambling table. (p. 53) (20)

(21) وكان فريد **أفندي** يرتدي **جلبابا** ومعطفا أما حرمه فقد التفت **بالروب** . . . (p. 51)

[And Fareed **Affandi** was wearing a **julbaab** and an overcoat. As for his wife, she wrapped (herself) in a (bathroom) robe ... *Farid **Effendi** wearing an overcoat over his **gown**, and his wife **in a dressing gown**.* (p. 66) (22)

(23) ثم بلغ المسامع طرق على الباب فقطع أحدهم الحديث، وخفت نفيسة إليه ففتحته، فدخلت خادمة فريد أفندي محمد حاملة سلة مغطاة بغطاء أبيض وضعتها على السفرة وهي تقول:

- ستي تسلم عليك يا ستي وتقول هذا **فطير القرافة**. (ص 46)

[Then reached their ears knocking on the door, so one of them stopped talking

and Nafeesa went to it (the door) and opened it. So, the servant of Fareed Affandi

Mohammed entered carrying a basket covered with a white cover, placing it on

the table and saying:

- My mistress greets you with peace and says this is **pastry of graveyard**]

*A knock on the door interrupted their conversation. Nefisa hurried to open it. The servant of Farid Effendi Mohammed entered carrying a basket with a white cover and placed it on the table. My mistress sends you her regards, madam, she said, and she sends you **mourning pastry*** (p. 59–60). (24)

As can be observed above, the translator has used different strategies for dealing with referential gaps. In (20), the referential gap is defined in the first mention and transliterated in the second one. This is a successful strategy where a contextual and/or co-textual link is established between the definition and translaliteration. In (21), the first gap أفندي (a title of address indicating respest for and speriority of addressee or referent) is transliterated in (22) and elsewhere in the text. The title is constantly employed as an absolute social honorific when referring to Farid (Farid Effendi). One should note that this title may be used relationally (interactionally) in Arabic (for more on absolute and relational social honorifics, see [39], in which case it should be approximated to

something like *'sir'*, *'man'*, *'guy'*, *'big fellow'*, etc. depending on the context it occurs in. The other two items جلباب (a loose garment covering the body from neck to feet) is successfully approximated to *'gown* in English, while الروب 'robe', which is a borrowing in designating the kind of gown worn when having a bath, is unjustifiably approximated to 'a dressing gown.' To bring out this cultural nuance, the translator could have maintained the same lexeme (robe), adding a modifier, viz. 'a bathroom robe', to capture the extreme informality of that ecounter. Last, the gap in (23) فطير القرافة [pastry of graveyard], which is an Egyptian pastry offered at the graveyard when visiting the dead, is rendered in (24) as *'mourning pastry'*, thus substituting a more general term for a specific one. Here, the reader is introduced with the function of the pastry independently of the location, i.e., the pastry, according to the translation, may be served in any place, which is not the case. To render the gap more accurately in terms of culture transfer, the location at which the pastry is served needs to be pointed out, viz. *'graveyard pastry.'* One should note that the function of the referent here is incorporated in the location.

In some cases, several referential gaps belonging to different cultures become, through the passage of time, familiar with internationalism. Examples like *'Rock and Roll'* روك آندرول, *'hamburger'* هامبرغرand *'MacDonald'* ماكدونلد(American), *'pizza'* بيزا and *'pasta'* باستا (Italian), *'Allah'* الله, *'Imam'* إمام, *'hummus'* حمص and *'falafel'* فلافل (Arabic) have become largely familiar worldwide. The translator is not expected to struggle with internationlisms in translation. Once recognized, the should be formally borrowed. A good clue for the translator's judgment would be *Wikipedia*, where such items are usually illustrated and many of them are displayed in pictures (see [40, pp. 74–93].

To conclude this section, lexical and referetinonal gaps can be a challenging area for translators, including professional practitioners. While lexical gaps usually lend themselves to cultural approximation, e.g. English 'uncle' my be used for both Arabic عم 'patenal uncle' and خال 'mternal uncle' in contexts where this distinction is irrelevant, while descriptive traslaton, e.g. 'paternal uncle' for عم may be necessary in cases in which the distiction is a thematic element. Therefore, translators need to be vigilant regarding redering lexical gaps. For their part, referential/cultural gaps can be even more challenging than lexical gaps because the concepts they represent may be completely or partially missing in the experience of target readers, e.g. the Arabic term ضرة is a complete cultural gap in Anglo-American cultures, hence there is a need to either awakwardly render it through descriptive translation or creatively attempt lexical creation by producing new lexemes that stand for missing concepts in English, viz. 'co-wife' or 'fellow-wife'.

B. Phraseology Level

At the phraseology level, collocations and idiomatic expressions stand out as two important types of multi-word units that often necessitate special attention from translators. They are a major component of the lexicon and constitute an indispensable element of lexical competence ([1], [2], [11-14], [16], [17], [27], [28], [34], [37], and [38], among others). In terms of translation, [32] argued that collocations are more communicatively useful than idioms because they are more familiar in discourse and can only be hardly replaceable by individual lexical alternates. For example, the English collocation *'public support'* and its Arabic counterpart الدعم الشعبيare only awkwardly paraphraseable in translation. By contrast, idioms are less common in discourse and are usually replaceable by lexical alternates, for instance, the Arabic idiomatic expression حبرا على ورق [ink on paper] and its English functional counterpart *'dead letter'* can be replaced (albeit at the expense of reducing the degree of the text's emotiveness) by غير مفعّل and *'unimplemented'* in the two languages, respectively, as can be illustrated in (25) and (26) below:

The treaty has remained a dead letter for years now. (25)

(26) بقيت المعاهدة حبرا على ورق لسنوات الآن.

The treaty has remained nffective/unimlemeted for years now. (27)

(28) بقيت المعاهدة غير فعالة/مطبقة لسنوات الآن.

As can be noted, (25) and (26) and their couterparts in (27) and (28) convey the same messge altough this is done more emotively in the former by the employment of idiomatic functionally corresponding expressions in English and Arabic.

Collocations, to start with, manifest the behavior of words when they combine or keep company with each other. Word company may be derived predictably from the primary meaning of a word, in which case semantic correspondence can often be obtained between languages. For example, the English verb *'pay'* can collocate freely with words relating to money, viz. *pay wages* يدفع الأجور, *pay debts* يدفع الديون, *pay the*

ransom يدفع الفدية, *pay the rent* يدفع الأجرة, etc. In all these collocations, the collocator *'pay'* maintains its primary meaning, hence the ease of rendering them into Arabic. However, the verb *'pay'* predictably collocates with a few other items that have nothing to do with money, viz. *pay attention* يعير الانتباه [lend attention], *pay a visit* يقوم بزيارة [perform a visit], *pay a compliment* يعبّر عن الاعجاب[express admiration], and *pay respect* يولي الاحترام [express respect]. In all these cases, the verb *'pay'* has acquired collocational/secondary senses that largely differ from its primary sense, hence semantic correspondence rarely obtains between English and Arabic in collocations that sail away from the primary sense.

Collocations that feature secondary rather than primary senses may present the most problematic area for student translators (and even for practitioners) because of two reasons: firstly, they are mostly lexicalized differently between any two languages and secondly, they do not usually lend themselves to acceptable paraphrase in the TL (for more details, see [16], [18], and [32]. Consequently, the only guarantee to deal with collocations appropriately is the translator's possession of a good bank of them in the language pair. By way of illustration, following are some English collocations juxtaposed with their Arabic counterparts:

Table 1.
Some English collocations juxtaposed with their Arabic counterparts

English	Collocations	Arabic
Heavy rain	[Pouring rains]	أمطار غزيرة
Heavy sleep	[Deep sleep]	نوم عميق
Heavy meal	[Fatty meal]	وجبة دسمة
Heavy fog	[Condensed fog]	ضباب كثيف
Heavy smoker	[Person extreme in smoking]	مدخن شره
Heavy sea	[Wavy sea]	بحر مائج
Heavy industry	[Heavy industry]	صناعة ثقيلة
Heavy traffic	[Traffic crisis]	أزمة مرورية
Heavy bread	[Bread from unleavened dough]	خبز من عجين غير مختمر

(29)

A close examination of the above English collocations points to three possibilities when rendering them into Arabic. The first possibility, which is the least likely, is to have semantic/formal correspondence in lexicalization, as in (29g) where the primary sense of the collocator *'heavy'* is maintained. The second, which is the most likely, involves corresponding collocations where the collocator *'heavy'* is lexicalized differently in Arabic, as in (29 a, b, c, d, e, f, h). The translator's ability to call up TL collocations that differ in lexicalization but have the same communicative value is a foundation stone regarding the naturalness of the translation product. Some translations may sound unnatural simply because the translator fails to access the correct collocations in the TL by either imposing the first possibility or unjustifiably resorting to paraphrase, which is the third option. This option may be appropriately followed when the SL collocation does not correspond to a TL collocation (whether formally or functionally) as in (29 i). Thus, the paraphrase strategy in rendering a collocation is necessitated when the TL does not have a standard, familiar lexicalized collocation.

To observe actual problems that may arise from a mishandling of English collocations, following are some Arabic examples extracted from published translations:

(30) وقد **عزمت** المنظمة **قرارها** لإعطاء الجائزة للسيد أوباما.

[The organization **intended its decision** to give the award to Mr. Obama]

(31) لقد كان هروبا في آخر لحظة.

[It was a last moment flight]

(32) بدأت مسئولة العلاقات العامة التي عملت على **صيانة الضرر** الناجم عن أشخاص يطلقون العنان لأهوائهم مثل . . .

[The officer of public relations who worked on **maintaining the damage** resulting from persons unleashing their whims like ... started ...]

(33) . . . وكانت الأسلاك الكهربائية تلصق **بأعضائهم الجنسية**.

[... and the electric wires were attached to their **sex organs**]

To explain, the English collocations *make a decision'* يتّخذ قراراً [take a decision], *'have a narrow escape'* ينجو بأعجوبة 'escape miraculously', *'repair the damage'* إصلاح الضرر [repair the damage], and *'sex organs'* الأعضاء التناسلية [reproduction organs] in (30-(33) respectively have been erroneously translated into Arabic. Except for (31), which is an erroneous paraphrase *'It was a last moment flight'* of the English collocation '*have a narrow escape'*, the unnatural Arabic collocations in the examples above would struck the Arab reader.

Idiomatic expressions, for their part, are frozen expressions whose unitary meaning cannot be worked out from the dictionary meaning of the individual words in them. Such idiomatic expressions usually render the text more emotive. In terms of translation, however, the tinge of emotiveness furnished by idiomatic expressions can be maintained only when they appropriately lend themselves to rendering into corresponding

TL expressions (whether in form or function). Otherwise, their communicative import is rendered apart from the idiomatic phraseologies (for more details on strategies to translate idioms, see [10] and [29]. The following are some illustrative examples:

*It started **rain**ing **cats and dogs** when Peter met his **blind date** at the park.* (34)

(35) بدأت **تمطر كأفواه القرب** عندما قابل بيتر **فتاته التي يجهل هويتها** في المتنزه.

[It started **raining like mouths of goatskin** when Peter met **his girl whose identity is unknown to him** at the park]

*The Syrians are caught **between the devil and the deep blue sea** – their leaders cause great suffering, but an invasion would bring many other problems.* (36)

(37) لقد **وقع** السوريون **بين فكي كمّاشة**، ففي الوقت الذي يسبب قادتهم الكثير من المعاناة، سيجلب الغزو الأجنبي مشاكل عدة.

[The Syrians **fell between a pair of pincers**; while their leaders cause much suffering, a foreign invasion would bring many problems]

(38) من منظور تاريخي، يعدّ ابن خلدون منظراً **لا يشق له غبار** في علم الاجتماع.

[From a historical perspective, Ibn Khaldun is considered a theorist **whose dust cannot be penetrated** in sociology]

*From a historical perspective, Ibn Khaldun is considered a **past master** theorist in sociology.* (39)

Except for the idiomatic expression *blind date* in (34), which is paraphrased because a corresponding idiomatic expression does not exist in Arabic, the other idiomatic expressions in (34)-(38) travel idiomatically (functionally) between the two languages. One should note that the major challenge for translators here is to recognize the idiomatic expression as well as to understand its meaning before starting to search for a rendition. While the maintenance of the emotiveness in the target text should remain a priority in rendering idiomatic expressions, there are cases when paraphrase may be the only available option. Witness how the two English idiomatic expressions in (40) and (41) may have to be paraphrased into Arabic in (42) and (43), respectively:

*The gap between **the haves and have-nots** still shows up clearly in the parliamentary elections.* (40)

(41) ما زالت الفجوة بين **الأغنياء والفقراء** تظهر بوضوح في الانتخابات البرلمانية.

[The gap between **the rich and the poor** is still clearly visible in the parliamentary elections]

*The officials **went through the roof** when a local newspaper published a report about corruption.* (42)

(43) **استشاط** المسئولون **غضباً** عندما نشرت إحدى الصحف المحلية تقريراً عن الفساد.

[The officials **became very angry** when a local newspaper published a report about corruption]

Sometimes, idiomatic expressions correspond formally between English and Arabic while maintaining the same communicative value or, alternatively, are employed with different imports. Note how the idiomatic expressions *be all ears'* كلّي آذان صاغية and *'mop/wipe the floor with somebody'* يمسح الأرض بشخص ما correspond both in form and meaning, while *'Cinderella'* سندريلا and *'wash one's hand of somebody/something'* يغسل يده من شخص/شيء ما convey different imports in the two languages. To explain, the former *'Cinderella'* indicates bad, unfair treatment in English, but it signifies outstanding beauty in Arabic. The latter means disassociating with someone/something in English (i.e. to stop dealing with the entity in question), whereas it means stopping pinning hopes/relying on someone/something in Arabic. Translators, therefore, need to be wary of formal similarity between idiomatic expressions as they might be idiomatic false friends (for more details, see [35] and [5].

The following are two authentic examples from the once-Arabic version of Newsweek published in Kuwait, where the two strategies of calling up a TL idiomatic expression and paraphrasing the idiomatic expression are employed, respectively:

*The Fayeds have **turned** the pre-bid House Fraser strategy **on its head**.* (44)

(45) الإخوة الفايد قد **قلبوا** إستراتيجية هاوس أوف فريزر على عرض الامتلاك **رأساً على عقب**.

*Many Americans thought that Hillary Clinton would be the democratic nominee for president, but **the dark horse**, Barak Obama, was instead.* (46)

(47) اعتقد الكثير من الأمريكيين أن هيلري كلنتون ستكون مرشح الحزب الديمقراطي لمنصب الرئيس ولكن اوباما **وهو شخص لم يكن معروف** [sic]، هو من أصبح مرشحاً لهم.

Apart from the general quality of the translation, the English idiomatic expression *turn something on its head* in (44) is correctly rendered into the Arabic idiomatic expression يقلب الشيء رأساً على عقب[turn the thing's head on its bottom] in (45). By contrast, for lack of a corresponding Arabic idiomatic expression, the English idiomatic expression *'a dark horse'* in (46) has been reduced to the communicative sense in (47), viz. وهو شخص لم يكن معروف [who is a person who was not well-known].

To bring this section to a close, it can be

argued that following the idiom principle by investing in multi-word units in the translation activity is as important as following the open principle by making meaning through stringing individual words linearly in compliance with the language system [33]. This section clearly shows that good mastery of restricted collocations and idiomatic expressions is a prerequisite for offering a natural translation. The former may present serious problems at the level of production, e.g., rendering the Arabic collocation يقيم حفلة into 'make a party' in English rather than the natural collocations 'give/have a party'. One should note that restricted collocations do not usually lend themselves to paraphrase; hence the translator should have a good bank of them. The latter, by contrast, involves serious problems at the level of reception rather than production, i.e., figuring out what the idiomatic expression means. However, at the level of production, practically all idiomatic expressions are paraphraseable into lexical alternatives, e.g. 'to complicate things' for 'to add insult to injury', albeit this produces a loss in emotiveness. The authentic examples discussed in this section clearly show that even professional translators may become a victim to offering unnatural collocations and incompressible renditions of idiomatic expressions.

IV. CONCLUSION

Being fundamentally a linguistic exercise, the translation process must involve a close consideration of lexical and phraseological semantic features. This paper has selectively explored, with ample illustrative examples, semantic features that translators need to be alerted to in their work. In particular, various procedures of handling such features at the word level, including lexical and referential gaps, have been investigated with the hope of bringing them into the consciousness of practicing translators. Similarly, at the phraseology level, collocations and idiomatic expressions are elaborately discussed, particularly highlighting the possibility of lexical alternates in the case of the latter but a general lack of such option in the former, which renders collocations more challenging in translation activity.

In terms of research limitations, this paper is confined to Arabic/English data. However, its implications for treating semantic features at word and phraseology levels may well apply to other language pairs. More translation research is, therefore, needed in the area of semantic symmetries and asymmetries in other languages. The approach adopted in this paper offers theoretical arguments, practical applications, and pedagogical insights in the hope that this will benefit student translators, professional translators and translation academics, alike.

REFERENCES

[1] AISENTADT, E. (1981) Restricted Collocations in English Lexicology and Lexicography. *ITL Review of Applied Linguistics*, 53, pp. 53-61.

[2] ALEXANDER, R. (1978) Fixed Expressions in English: A Linguistic, Psycholinguistic and Dialectic Study. *English Studies and English Lessons*, 6, pp. 171-181.

[3] ALI, A.Y. (1934/2006) *The Meaning of the Glorious Quran*. Beirut and Cairo: Dār Al-Kitāb al-Lubnani wa Dār Al-Kitāb Al-Masrī.

[4] AL-MASRI, H. (2004) *Semantics and Cultural Losses in the Translation of Literary Texts*. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis. Purdue University.

[5] AL-WAHY, A. (2009) Idiomatic False Friends in English and Modern Standard Arabic. *Babel*, 55 (2), pp. 101-123.

[6] ARBERRY, A.J. (1955/1996) *The Koran Interpreted*. London: George Allen and Unwin.

[7] ASAD, M. (1980/2003) *The Message of the Qur'an.* England: The Book Foundation.

[8] AWAD, R. (1985) *The Beginning and the End*. Cairo: American University in Cairo Press. Translation of N. MAHFOUZ novel *bidaayatun wa-nihaayah* (1942-43)

[9] BA'ALBAKĪ, M. (1985) *The Old Man and the Sea* translated as الشيخ والبحر *al-Shaykh wa al-Bahar*. Beirut: Dār al-'ailm lil Malāyīn.

[10] BAKER, M. (1992) *In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation*. London/New York: Routledge.

[11] BAKER, M., and MCCARTHY, M.J. (1988) *Multi-word units and things like that. Mimeograph*. Birmingham: University of Birmingham

[12] BENSON, M., BENSON, E., and ILSON, R.F. (1987) *The BBI Combinatory Dictionary of English. A guide to word combinations*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John

Benjamins Publishing Company.
[13] COWIE, A. (1981) The Treatment of Collocations and Idioms in Learners Dictionaries. *Applied Linguistics*, 2 (3), pp. 223-235.
[14] COWIE, A. (1988) Stable and Creative Aspects of Vocabulary Use. In: CARTER, M., and MCCARTHY, M. (eds.). *Vocabulary and Language Teaching*, pp. 126-139. London: Longman.
[15] FARGHAL, M. (2012) *Advanced Issues in Arabic-English Translation Studies*. Kuwait: Kuwait University Press.
[16] FARGHAL, M., and OBAIDAT, H. (1995) Collocations: A Neglected Variable in EFL. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 33 (4), pp. 315-331.
[17] FARGHAL, M., and AL-HAMLY, M. (2004) Media Translation Assessment: A Case Study of the Arabic Newsweek. *Arab Journal for the Humanities*, 22 (86), pp. 265-293.
[18] FARGHAL, M., and AL-HAMLY, M. (2007) Lexical Collocations in EFL Writing. *The Journal of Asia Teaching English as a Foreign Language*, 4 (1), pp. 69-94.
[19] HATIM, B., and MASON, I. (1990) *Discourse and the Translator*. London/New York: Longman.
[20] HEMINGWAY, E. (1952) *The Old Man and the Sea* (translated as الشيخ والبحر *al-Shaykh wa al-Baḥar*. Beirut: Dār al-'ailm lil Malāyīn) Penguin books.
[21] IRVING, T.B. (1985/1993) *The Qur'an: The Noble Reading*. Iowa: The Mother Mosque Foundation.
[22] IVIR, V. (1977) Lexical Gaps: A Contrastive View. *Romansh and English Studies in Zagreb*, 43, pp. 167-176.
[23] JAKOBSON, R. (1959/1992) On Linguistic Aspects of Translation. In: SCHULTE, R., and BIGUENET, J. (eds.). *Theories of Translation: An Anthology of Essays from Dryden to Derrida*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, pp. 144-151.
[24] KACHRU, Y. (1982) Toward Defining the Notion 'Equivalence' in Contrastive Analysis. *Teaching English as a Second Language*, (5), pp. 82-98.
[25] KRAZESZOWKI, T. (1971) Equivalence, Congruence and Deep Structure. In: NICKEL, G. (ed.). *Papers in Contrastive Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 37-48.
[26] MUNIF, A. (1992) *Mudin-il-malh: taqaasiim-il-layl wan-n-nahaar* (Cities of Salt; Variations on Day and Night). Beirut: Arab Corporation for Studies and Publishing.
[27] NATTINGER, J. (1980) A Lexical Grammar for ESL. *Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages Quarterly*, (14), pp. 337-344.
[28] NATTINGER, J. (1988) Some Current Issues in Vocabulary Teaching. In: CARTER, M., and MCCARTHY, M. *Vocabulary and Language Teaching*. London: Longman, pp. 62-82.
[29] NEWMARK, P. (1991) *About Translation*. London: Multilingual Matters.
[30] PICTHALL, M. (1930/2006) *The Glorious Koran*. London: George Allen and Unwin.
[31] RABIN, C. (1958) The Linguistics of Translation. In: SMITH, A.H. (ed.). *Aspects of Translation*. London: Secker and Warburgy, pp. 123-145.
[32] SHAKIR, A., and FARGHAL, M. (1992) Collocations as an Index of L2 Competence in Arabic-English Simultaneous Interpreting and Translation. *Translation Journal*, 11 (3), pp. 227-245.
[33] SINCLAIR, J. (1987) Collocation: A Progress Report. In: STEELE, R., and THREADGOL, T. (eds.). *Language Topics: Essays in Honour of Michael Halliday*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 319-331.
[34] STRASSLER, J. (1982) *Idioms in English: A Pragmatic Analysis*. Tubingen: Gunter Narr Verlag Tubingen.
[35] TAYLOR, C. (1998) *Language to Language: a practical and theoretical guide for Italian/English translators*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
[36] THEROUX, P. (1993) *Cities of Salt: Variations on Night and Day*. Beirut: Cape Cod Scriveners.
[37] YORIO, C. (1980) Conventionalized Language Forms and the Development of Communicative Competence. *Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages Quarterly*, 14, pp. 433-442.
[38] SINCLAIR, J. (1991) *Corpus,*

Concordance, Collocation. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
[39] FARGHAL, M., and SHAKIR, A. (1994) Kin Terms and Titles of Address as Relational Social Honorifics in Jordanian Arabic. *Anthropological Linguistics,* 36 (2): pp. 240-253.
[40] FARGHAL, M., and ALMANNA, A. (2014) Some Pragmatic Aspects of Arabic/English Translation of Literary Texts. *Jordan Journal of Modern Languages and Literature*, 6 (2), pp. 93-114.

参考文:

[1] AISENTADT, E. (1981) 英語詞典學和詞典編纂中的限制搭配。国际交易日志應用語言學評論, 53, 第 53-61 頁。
[2] ALEXANDER, R. (1978) 英語固定表達：語言學、心理語言學和辯證法研究。英語研究和英語課程，6，第 171-181 頁。
[3] ALI, A.Y. (1934/2006) 光榮古蘭經的意義。貝魯特和開羅：黎巴嫩之家和埃及之家。
[4] AL-MASRI, H. (2004) 文學文本翻譯中的語義和文化損失。未發表的博士學位 論文。普渡大學。
[5] AL-WAHY, A. (2009) 英語和現代標準阿拉伯語中慣用的假朋友。巴別塔，55(2)，第 101-123 頁。
[6] 阿伯里，A.J. (1955/1996) 古蘭經解釋。倫敦：喬治·艾倫和昂溫。
[7] ASAD, M. (1980/2003) 古蘭經的信息。英國：圖書基金會。
[8] AWAD, R. (1985)。開羅：開羅美國大學出版社。N. MAHFOUZ小說比達亞屯哇尼哈耶(1942-43)的翻譯
[9] BA'ALBAKĪ, M. (1985) 老人與海。貝魯特：達爾艾爾姆小馬來人.
[10] BAKER, M. (1992) 換句話說：翻譯教程。倫敦/紐約：勞特利奇。
[11] BAKER，M. 和 MCCARTHY，M.J.。(1988) 多詞單位和類似的東西。油印機。伯明翰：伯明翰大學
[12] BENSON，M.，BENSON，E. 和 ILSON，R.F. (1987) 商务部英語組合字典。單詞組合指南。阿姆斯特丹/費城：約翰·本傑明斯出版公司.
[13] COWIE, A. (1981) 學習詞典中搭配和成語的處理。應用語言學，2(3)，第 223-235 頁。
[14] COWIE, A. (1988) 詞彙使用的穩定和創造性方面。載於：CARTER, M. 和 MCCARTHY, M.（編輯）。詞彙和語言教學，第 126-139 頁。 倫敦：朗文。
[15] FARGHAL, M. (2012) 阿拉伯語-英語翻譯研究的高級問題。科威特：科威特大學出版社。
[16] FARGHAL, M. 和 OBAIDAT, H. (1995) 搭配：英語作為外語中被忽視的變量。國際語言教學應用語言學評論，33（4），第 315-331 頁。
[17] FARGHAL, M. 和 AL-HAMLY, M. (2004) 媒體翻譯評估：阿拉伯新聞周刊案例研究。阿拉伯人文雜誌，22 (86)，第 265-293 頁。
[18] FARGHAL, M. 和 AL-HAMLY, M. (2007) 亞洲英語作為外語教學雜誌，4(1)，第 69-94 頁。
[19] HATIM, B. 和 MASON, I. (1990)。倫敦/紐約：朗文。
[20] HEMINGWAY, E. (1952) 老人與海（譯為بحر الا شد يخوالا 酋長和庭院r。貝魯特：達爾目標小馬來人）企鵝書籍.
[21] IRVING，T.B. (1985/1993) 古蘭經：高貴的讀物。愛荷華州：母親清真寺基金會。
[22] IVIR, V. (1977) 詞彙差距：對比視圖。薩格勒布的羅曼語和英語研究，43，第 167-176 頁。
[23] JAKOBSON, R. (1959/1992) 關於翻譯的語言學方面。載於：SCHULTE, R. 和 BIGUENET, J.（編輯）。翻譯理論：從德萊頓到德里達的論文選集。芝加哥和倫敦：芝加哥大學出版社，第 144-151 頁。
[24] KACHRU, Y. (1982)

在對比分析中定義“等價”概念。英語作為第二語言的教學，(5)，第 82-98 頁。
[25] KRAZESZOWKI, T. (1971) 等效性、一致性和深層結構。在：NICKEL,
G.（編輯）。對比語言學論文。劍橋：劍橋大學出版社，第 37-48 頁。
[26] MUNIF, A. (1992) 鹽城；晝夜變奏。貝魯特：阿拉伯研究和出版公司。
[27] NATTINGER, J. (1980) 英语的詞彙語法。向講其他語言的人教授英語季刊，(14)，第 337-344 頁。
[28] NATTINGER, J. (1988) 詞彙教學中的一些當前問題。載於：CARTER, M. 和 MCCARTHY, M. 詞彙和語言教學。倫敦：朗文，第 62-82 頁。
[29] NEWMARK, P. (1991) 關於翻譯。倫敦：多語言問題。
[30] PICTHALL, M. (1930/2006) 光榮的古蘭經。倫敦：喬治艾倫和安文。
[31] RABIN, C. (1958) 翻譯語言學。在：史密斯，A.H.（編輯）。翻譯方面。倫敦：塞克和華寶吉，第 123-145 頁。
[32] SHAKIR, A. 和 FARGHAL, M. (1992) 作為阿拉伯語-
英語同聲傳譯中大号2能力指標的搭配。翻譯雜誌，11 (3)，第 227-245 頁。
[33] SINCLAIR, J. (1987) 搭配：進度報告。載於：STEELE, R. 和 THREADGOL,
T.（編輯）。語言主題：紀念邁克爾·哈利迪(邁克爾哈利迪)的散文。阿姆斯特丹：約翰·本傑明斯，第 319-331 頁。
[34] STRASSLER, J. (1982) 英語成語：語用分析。圖賓根：岡特·納爾出版社圖賓根。
[35] TAYLOR, C. (1998) 語言對語言：意大利語/英語翻譯者的實踐和理論指南。劍橋：劍橋大學出版社。
[36] THEROUX, P. (1993) 鹽城：晝夜變化。貝魯特：科德角抄寫員.
[37] YORIO, C. (1980) 約定俗成的語言形式和交際能力的發展。向講其他語言的人教授英語季刊，14，第 433-442 頁。
[38] SINCLAIR, J. (1991) 語料庫、索引、搭配。牛津：牛津大學出版社。
[39] FARGHAL, M. 和 SHAKIR, A. (1994) 作為約旦阿拉伯語中關係社會敬語的親屬術語和地址頭銜。人類學語言學，36
(2)：第 240-253 頁。
[40] FARGHAL, M. 和ALMANNA, A. (2014)
文學文本的阿拉伯語/英語翻譯的一些實用方面。約旦現代語言文學雜誌，6 (2)，第 93-114 頁。