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Abstract—The objective of this work is to decompose the semantic primes of the polysemous verb ṭagha ‘transgressed’ and qatala ‘killed’ in some verses of Holy Qura’n in a new manner with reference to Jackendoff’s (1990) Semantic Theory. The researchers make use of the conceptual level to specify their conceptual structures and translate them correctly and then match the semantic compositions available with their syntactic counterparts with reference to Argument Structure Theory. The two levels of representations are linked by Semantic Projection Rules to determine the exact meaning intended in translation at the Logical Form. The researchers compare the interpretable as well as incorporated semantic features of the verbs in the verses with other situations in which the verb are used. Discrepancies in meanings because of polysemy will be taken care of with reference to the Theories of Argument Fusion and Incorporation. Semantic primes are represented at first by syntactic axioms and then fused into semantic concepts, namely, Thing, Event, State, Action, Place, Path, Property, Amount and Affect. These concepts lead to derive the final version of the wanted meaning for the verbs at LF. The researchers provided better versions of translation different from those already given by Palmer (1942), Dawood (1965), Khan (1970), Arberry (1980), Piekthel (1982) and Al-Hilali and Khan (1996).
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I. INTRODUCTION

Yule (2006, p. 107) has defined the term polysemy as “one form (written or spoken) having multiple meanings that are all related by extension”. For instance, in English the word ‘head’ is used in different situations to refer to (i) the head of human body, (ii) top of glass of beer, (iii) a person at the top of a company or department and many other things. It is evident that there will be a single entry with a numbered list of the different meanings of that word.

A number of international prominent translators have tried to make use of the theory of polysemy as a module to translate verses from holy Qura’n in an attempt to give accurate interpretation easy to be understood by non-Arab speakers. Their work suffers a lot of deficiencies due to the following reasons: (i) translators such as Palmer (1942), Khan (1970), Arberry (1980), Piekthel (1982) and Al-Hilali and Khan (1996) are non native speakers of Arabic and have various cultural backgrounds, which have led to negative results in the translation of certain verses of Holy Qur’an. (ii) The discrepancies in their cultural perspectives made translation of the verses so hard to elicit covert meanings of such verbs involved. In short, they focused merely on the translation of meaning of the Holy Qur’an and do not get involved in other matters.

II. THE TRADITIONAL VIEWS

The translators focused on the surface representations in stead of paying attention to other relevant factors that play a crucial role in translation, namely, the underlying meaning. They based their translation on the nature of the verbs insofar the transitivity theory is concerned. For the convenient of the analysis, the researchers start with the verse in (1):

1. fa?mma man ṭagha
then, for such as had transgressed all bounds
‘Then, for such as had transgressed all bounds.’
(Holy Qur’a’n; 1405 h, p. 1894, p. verse 37)
The verse in (1) has been translated by a number of translators in different ways. For instance, Dawood (1956, p. 52) translated it as [Those that transgressed], Sale (1877, p. 569) as [And who shall have transgressed], Rodwell (1978, p. 49) as [Then, as for him who hath transgressed]. A look at their analysis shows that the verb tagha 'transgressed' is used as an intransitive because there is no direct complement after the verb neither it shows the sense of an offence by violating a law. In other words, the violators are sinners. In contrast, Ali (1993, p.1565) translated the same verse as [then, for such as he has indeed transgressed all bounds]; he used the same verb as transitive due to the overt occurrence of the argument object 'all bounds' at the syntactic level. Though he tried to be more accurate than others; still, the meaning is incomplete due to the fact that the complement 'all bounds' does not specify what kind of boundaries or limits the transgressors have crossed nor show whether the bounds are realistic or abstract. Others such as Ali (1955, p. 603), Khan (1970, p. 603) and Piekthel (1982, p. 605) have translated the verse as [Then, as for him who rebels / rebelled]. The meaning of tagha is used in the sense of the verb yathauura 'to rebel'. This verb, in Arabic, means one leads a revolution against a leader or any form of high authority for a change but definitely not god. You can say [thaara al–jaishu 'ala al–qaa?i'id] 'The army rebelled against the leader' but not [thaara al–musili?u 'ala rabbi–hi] 'The transgressor rebelled against God'. This meaning can never be adhered to tagha because one can defy a person but cannot stand in an enemy position with God because he is non-materialistic. Likewise in English, the verb 'rebels' means to renounce the authority of the law and government to which one owes allegiance or to take up arms and openly oppose the government. Thus, God is a power that cannot be embodied in a humanistic vision to be taken action against. In short, their perception of translation was inadequate due to misunderstanding of determining the best equivalent for tagha. Palmer (1942, p. 515), Ali (1963, p.1141) and Arberry (1980) have translated the verse as [Then, as for him who is outrageous, inordinate / insolent]. Their forms of translation do not even imply the verb tagha and is replaced by the adjectives 'outrageous, inordinate and insolent' respectively. It is evident that the translators had used a pragmatic nuisance of the verb but of course it is incomplete. In short, the inadequacy of the translation of all the writers above took place due to the diversity of polysemous meaning the verb tagha has.

III. PROBLEMS FACED WITH THIS VERB

The above analysis involves a number of shortcomings because the verb tagha involves polysemous related meanings. Problems take place in their translation due to the followings:

(i). Their translation based solely on the syntactic structure meaning without taking into account the conceptual structure in which incorporated and deleted arguments that play a vital role in determining the exact meaning roaming in mind of the native speaker of Arabic that may contribute to better understanding of the verse.

(ii). The translators did not pay attention in translating the verse to the context of situation [place and time], or the occasion in which the verse itself was said or its relation to other verses in the surat. In other words, they focused on the associated not on the contextual meaning.

IV. THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES

Chomsky (1986, p. 23-46) divided the term 'language' into External-Language and Internal-Language. The focus of study is on the latter as it characterizes the system of knowledge of language attained and internally represented in the mind. It purports to depict exactly what one knows about a language: that is what has been acquired and learned by innate principles.

Jackendoff (1990, p. 7-25) has adopted the term I-language and made it possible to explain the notion of concept in relation to semantic components and argued that it is a physical objects in the mind of a person rather than it is a concrete object in one's hand. He argued that syntactic rules alone are insufficient to mirror concepts of the mind; rather a speaker potential repertoire of syntactic structure must be mentally encoded in terms of a finite set of primitives and a finite set of principles of combination that collectively describe and generate the class of possible sentences. While interpreting an entity, say a verb, a language user is taken to be creating or invoking a mental information structure, the syntactic structure of a verb must be compatible with its conceptual semantic structure of the same verb. The researchers may argue that internal concepts must be mentally generated on the basis of finite set of primitives and principles of combination; likewise, lexical concepts must consist of finite schemas that can be creatively compared and rule governed. X-Bar semantics has been proposed to mirror the conceptual categories into reality (p. 22-25). The basic formation rule for such categories stated in (1):

\[
\text{Entity} \leftarrow \begin{cases} \text{Event / thing / place / . . .} \\ \text{Token / Type} \\ \text{F ( < Entity1 <Entity2 <Entity3 >)} \end{cases}
\]

The model in (2) decomposes each conceptual constituent into three basic feature complexes: (i) the argument features allow for recursion of conceptual structure and hence an infinite class of possible concepts. (ii) The major syntactic phrases correspond to major conceptual constituent as in XP correspond to [Entity]. (iii) The basic correspondence of syntactic and conceptual argument structure can be formalized as a general correspondence rule of the form (3):
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3. XP corresponds to [Entity].

\[
\begin{array}{c}
X_0 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{YP} & \text{ZP} & \text{Entity} \\
\hline
F & E_1 & E_2 & E_3
\end{array}
\]

(Jackendoff, 1990, p. 25)

Here \( X_0 \) stands for any lexical item whose complements are optionally YP and ZP.

Jackendoff (1990, p. 43-46) has proposed that the innate formation rules for conceptual structure include a repertoire of major conceptual categories regarded as the semantic parts of speech. These categories include entities such as Thing, Event, State, Action, Place, Path, Property and Amount. Each of these entities can be elaborated into a function argument organization of general form in the schema (3). Within the constraint of this schema, each category permits a variety of more specific elaborations, which can be stated as a specialized formation rules. Some of the most important ones for the spatial domain primary of our analysis appear in (4):

4.

a. \[ \text{[PLACE]} \rightarrow \text{[place PLACE-FUNCITON ([THING])]} \]

b. \[ \text{[PATH]} \rightarrow \left\{ \begin{array}{c}
\text{TO} \\
\text{FROM} \\
\text{TOWARD} \\
\text{AWAY-FROM} \\
\text{VIA}
\end{array} \right\} \left\{ \begin{array}{c}
\text{THING} \\
\text{PLACE}
\end{array} \right\} \]

c. \[ \text{[EVENT]} \rightarrow \left\{ \begin{array}{c}
\text{Event GO ([THING], [PATH])} \\
\text{Event STAY ([THING], [PLACE])} \\
\text{Event INCH ([STATE], [THING])}
\end{array} \right\} \]

d. \[ \text{[STATE]} \rightarrow \left\{ \begin{array}{c}
\text{State BE ([THING], [PLACE])} \\
\text{State ORIENT ([THING], [PATH])} \\
\text{State EXT ([THING], [PATH])}
\end{array} \right\} \]

e. \[ \text{[EVENT]} \rightarrow \left\{ \begin{array}{c}
\text{Event CAUSE} \\
\text{[THING EVENT]} \\
\text{[EVENT]}
\end{array} \right\} \]

(4a) illustrates that a conceptual constituent belongs to the category Place can be elaborated as a place- function plus an argument that belongs to the category Thing. The argument serves as a spatial reference as in the expression [under the table]; the table designates a reference object and the preposition under expresses a place- function that maps the table into the region beneath it. (4b) elaborates a Path as one of five functions that maps a reference Thing or Place into a related trajectory; for instance, [in the house]. (4c) elaborates that the category Event can be elaborated as either of the two Event- functions GO, STAY or INCH one and two of which take two arguments. The arguments of Go, which denotes motion along a path, are the Thing in motion and the Path it traverses; for instance, [Bill went to New York]. The arguments of STAY, which denotes stasis over a period of time, are the Thing standing still and its location, as in [Bill stayed in the kitchen]. The expansion of Inch is to cover State as in [the light is red]. (4d) gives three State-functions: (i), BE, is used for specifying the location of objects as in [the dog is in the park] ;(ii) ORIENT, for specifying the orientation of objects as in [the sign points toward New York]; (iii) EXT, for spatial extension of linear objects along a path as in [the road goes from New York to San Francisco]. (4e) elaborates an Event as the Event – function CAUSE plus two arguments. (i) If a Thing, it is an agent as in [John opened the door] and if an Event, it is a cause as in [the door opened] (ii) if an Event, it is the Effect as in [he drank].

A. The New Perspective

The researchers try to solve the above problems with reference to Jackendoff’s (1990, p. 7-37) theory of semantic structure. The researchers use categories such as entities as Thing, Event, State, Action, Place, Path, Property and Amount to translate the verbs in question. The researchers argue that these terms do not convey their literal meaning in translation; but, in stead, they reflect conceptual concepts, which accurately build up the intended meaning at LF.

In order to come up with plausible solutions for the abovementioned inadequacies in translation, the researcher propose the following hypothesis:

B. The Hypothesis

Each lexical entity X in a sentence has both syntactic as well as a conceptual meaning. The translated meaning must be the result of mapping the conceptual with the syntactic meaning by semantic rules. The conceptual structure determines the meaning of the syntactic structure but not vice versa.

Before the researchers start analyzing the same verse, the concept of argument fusion is discussed as the basic machinery for relating arguments in the conceptual structure to arguments in syntax though they are not visible at the
syntactic form. Each lexical item in the sentence specifies how its conceptual arguments are linked to syntactic positions in the same phrase as in (5):

5. Argument Fusion
To form the conceptual structure for a syntactic phrase XP headed by a lexical item H:

a. Into each indexed constituent in H's lexical conceptual structure (henceforth LCS), fuse the conceptual structure of that phrase YP that satisfied the co-indexed position in H's sub-categorization feature.

b. If H is a verb, fuse the conceptual structure of the subject into the constituent indexed i in H's LCS, (cf. Jackendoff, 1990, p. 53).

The researchers refer to Jackendoff's theory of conceptual meaning and argument fusion to account for such inadequacies and offer better form of translation for the same verse repeated in (6):

6a. fa?mma man ţagha
particularly for that who violated over all bounds drawn by God
became atheists thus deserves the chastisement.

'Then, for that who violated all bounds drawn by God and became an atheist thus deserves the chastisement.'

6b. Syntactic – Structure / or PF
[S [ADV fa?mma] [NP man] [VP ţagha ].

[S [ADV fa?mma] ] [NP man] [VP ţagha ] [PP cala huduudi rabbi hi
particularly that who violated over limits God his
became he atheist deserves he det chastisement.

It is important to realize that the Deep-structure representation in (6c) is posited in this work to show the syntactic arguments that has been semantically and constituent-slected by the verb ţagha to make the analysis as simple as possible though not suggested by Jackendoff semantic structure theory.

6d. Conceptual – Structure
[ Event GO ([ Thing man 'person'] i, [ Path cala ‘over’ ([ Thing huduudi allahi ‘the limits drawn by god’] j [State yushbihu 'be' [Thing ([ man 'person'] i ) [Place fi 'AT' ([Property kaafiran 'atheist' ] i [ Event yamkuthu ‘stay’ ([ Thing cadhbaan 'chastisement' [ Place cala on ( Thing man 'person' [i])])])])]).

In order to see how (6d) is put together from its parts, let us examine the lexical entries of the verb tagha in this verse as in (6e):

6e. ţagha 'violated'
V
-------------
NP (external), PP, S1 and S2 (internal)
[ Event GO ([ Thing [i] , [ Path [ ] ) ].

NP
([Thing ])
cala 'over'
P
-------------
NP
[Path over ([Thing [j] ]).
yushbihu 'be'
S1
----------
NP, AP
[State BE ([ Thing [i] [Place AT ([Property [i] ]i)])].
yamkuthu 'stay'
S2
----------
NP, PP
[ Event STAY ([ Thing [ Place ON ([ Thing [i] ])]).]

The verb ţagha constituent-selects (henceforth c- select) an NP as an external argument; while, the PP, S1 and S2 as the internal ones and semantically selected at the conceptual structure. The verb at this level, semantically expresses a GO-function, which requires four arguments in this verse: (i) Thing in motion, (ii) Path-function that specifies the trajectory of motion (iii) State-function and (iv) Event-function. The first argument is indexed with [i], which the researchers will take by convention to indicate the subject position or "external argument". The second argument is filled in with the reading of the post-verbal PP, with which it is co-indexed in the sub-categorization feature. If no PP is syntactically present, the Path is simply unspecified as in [ţagha al-?insaanu 'the human transgressed'] means that a person traversed some unspecified trajectory. In other words, the well-formedness conditions on conceptual level require the path argument to be present in the conceptual structure even if it is not expressed overtly on the syntactic level because it is not selected syntactically with this verb; it is an "implicit argument". The third argument is the State-function in which the proposition S1 yushbihu kaafiran 'he be atheist' has semantically been selected by the verb tagha in this specific context. This function specifies the inchoative sense of BE/ BECOME that needs the sub-categorization of
the Thing which is co-indexed with external argument as they are identical. The Place- function is specified by the preposition AT and the Property 'atheist'. The fourth function specified as event-function is represented by the NP Thing cadhaaaban 'chastisement' and the PP cala man 'on a person' which are also semantically selected at the conceptual level. The researchers may argue that the entity Thing is identical in all the projections and bears the unique co-indexation [i]. They argue that the projected constituents, excluding the external argument, are semantically ‘implicit arguments’ at the conceptual structure and must be translated at the LF representations though they are not syntactically at the syntactic structure.

The question arises here: how do the researchers decide the ultimate form of translation of this verse at LF either for the benefit of research, or the readers as proposed in the hypothesis? The researchers argue that the translated meaning is decided by mapping the conceptual structure representations with the syntactic ones by referring to the following steps: (i) thematic roles such as Agent and Theme…etc are particular structural positions but with conceptual content, (ii) theta marking amounts to establishing a correspondence relation between the syntactic and conceptual arguments of a verb and formalize the co-indexing conventions, (iii) the argument fusion theory is used to integrate the readings of the syntactic complements and subjects with indexed argument positions in the conceptual structure of the head, (iv) the selectional restrictions are the conceptual information that a head supplies within an indexed conceptual constituent and (v) mapping between the conceptual structure and syntactic structure using the mechanism implicit argument in Jackendoff’s terms as the last step.

Thus, the verb tagha is expressed as follows: the Go-function needs the theta role of agent to be assigned to the argument man ‘those who’, the theta role of location is assigned to the PP hududu allahi ‘the religious limits of God’ in which the theta role of agent is meant for allahi ‘God’ and the theta role of theme for hududu allahi ‘the limits of God’. The State – function has the theta role of experiencer assigned to the argument man ‘those who’ due to the effect of the predicative adjective kaafiran ‘atheist’. The event function is assigned the theta role of theme to cadhaaaban ‘chastisement’ and the theta role of location to the PP cala man ‘on a person’. The second step is to match the syntactic with the conceptual arguments of the same verb. This process is done by co-indexation; the subject man of the matrix and the co-coordinated sentence carries the sign [i] as they are identical. However, the PP carries [j] as it refers to allahi. The third step is to integrate the syntactic complements with the subjects by the argument fusion. The subjects represented by the argument Thing in Go- function, State –function, and the complement objects of fi ‘at’ and cala are fused by man ‘person’ and the Path – function is fused by cala huddudi allaahi. The fourth step is to match the lexical verb tagha with the selected arguments semantically before being incorporated. The verb constituent- selects a subject as external argument and its semantic features are an adult and are able to commit either a sin or a virtue. It also semantically selects in specific the PP cala huddudi allaahi, the resultative clause yu’bahu kaafiran 'to become atheist' because the subject violates the limits of God and the eventive clause cadhaaaban cala man ‘chastisement on a person’ as the sinner receives the punishment . The last step is the result of the process in which we end up with the syntactic structure; this is due to the mechanism of incorporation. The verb tagha is an intransitive, in Arabic, but at the conceptual structure it semantically selects a PP, CLAUSE1 and CLAUSE2. It has the ability to incorporate the two arguments at the syntactic level and still makes the sentence grammatical as in (6a). In short, though the arguments are not necessary to be overt at LF; still, they constitute the meaning of not only the verb form tagha but also its adjective form qaaghyaah ‘tyrant’; otherwise, the meaning of the verb in this verse can be variable and some other verbs can be used in the same context such as tajawawa zaq ‘surpass’ tabadda ‘trespass’ and takha‘ ‘cross’.

The mechanism of incorporation is of a great significance in translation in this fashion though such features are not visible at the syntactic level but necessary for the understanding of the required material. The researchers may look at (7) from English to prove the point.

7a. John ate an apple.
7b. John ate marble.
7c. John ate.

(7a) and (7b) illustrate that the objects 'an apple' and 'marble' are specified referents; however, in (7c) the referent is only 'a full meal' but not 'an apple' or 'marble' in particular. So, if (7c) is translated into Arabic, it is as [?akala zaiduun 'Zaid ate’]; it means the same as its equivalent English counterpart because the object is covert. Thus, the translator will not interpret the absorbed argument 'a full meal' which, in fact, compulsory contributes to the grammaticality of the sentence at all levels since ?akala is a transitive verb and overtly needs an edible object. If we compare (7c) with (6e), the point of analysis is identical. The verb tagha is [+transitive] and needs internal arguments to be overt. However, it is translated as 'transgressed' or 'transgressed all bounds' but, in fact, it means tajawawa al-Qasaaan al-qadr wa 'irrafac wa ghala fi al kufri wa ?istaqaal al- cadhaba yawma al-qyaamaati 'that who transgressed all limits of God became atheist and deserved the chastisement of God in the dooms-day’. Of course, one cannot expect the translator to write all these concepts; but, one should keep in mind that conceptually they are understood due to both the cultural specific and the religious backgrounds. Thus, translators who focused on the meaning of lexical words at the structural structure are, in fact, incomprehensive and thus their versions of translation are surely inadequate. In other words, the researchers cannot ignore the hidden semantic connotations which are more important than the only syntactic forms as the latter constitute the grammaticality of the sentence at the syntactic form. In other words, there are verbs in Arabic that can not only
syntactically absorb the internal arguments such as ?kala ‘ate’ but also semantically can absorb certain entities at the structural level and still construct grammatical sentences. (cf. Jalabneh 2000, p. 247-269 for theta absorption)

The researchers may look at some other nuances of ťaţgha from standard Arabic to prove that the theory of conceptual structure is fit for translation.

8a. ťaţgha al-haakimu cala shacbi hi

‘The ruler tyrannized his people’

8b. ťaţgha al-haakimu

‘The ruler tyrannized’.

In order to check the syntactic structures of (8a) and (8b), we posit the conceptual structure of (8c) and the syntactic structure (8e):

8c. [ Event GO ([ Thing al-haakimu 'the ruler'] i, [ Path cala 'over' ([ Thing shacbi hi 'his people'] j [ State yuşbihu 'be' ([ Thing ([al-haakimu 'the ruler']li [ Place fi 'at' ([ Property mutaşallītān / ťaţghiyah 'tyrant' [ i ] ] ) ] ) ] ) ] ]).

8d. syntactic structure

ţaţgha 'tyrannized'

V

---------- NP (external), PP and S (internal)
[Event GO ([ Thing [ ] ] [ Path [ ] ] ) ].
NP
([ Thing [ ] ])
cala ‘over’
P
---------- NP
[ Path OVER ([ Thing [ ] ] ].
yuşbihu 'be'
S
---------- AP
[ State BE ([ Thing [ ] ] [ Place ([ Property [ ] i ] ) ] ] ).

In (8a) the verb ťaţgha 'tyrannize' is an intransitive verb and it semantically takes the PP cala shacbi hi 'over his people' as its internal complement at the conceptual level. In (8b) the verb absorbs the same complement PP at the syntactic structure. It is evident that (8b) is correct though the complement PP is not syntactically covert. This is because it not selected in syntax. Thus, syntactic structure alone does not solve the problem of meaning if we rely on the structural interpretations of this verb. Also, this level cannot tell us about other relevant arguments that contribute to the LF meaning: it is due to these deficiencies we opt for the conceptual structure theory to overcome such faults. Thus (8c) specifies every single concept that formalizes the meaning of the verb ťaţgha. The verb means 'tyrannize' is another nuisance of the verb; but this time it is related to the legal human rights. It semantically selects the PP cala shacbi hi 'over his people' and the embedded clause yuşbihu ťaţghiyah 'be a tyrant'. These semantic facts are visible at the conceptual structure and are very specific in Arabic as they not only depict the meaning of ťaţgha but also the adjective ťaţghiyah 'tyrant'. In this case, they determine the needed meaning at LF. In short, the verb ťaţgha in (8c) cannot be translated literally as 'transgressed' as in (6d) because in the former the verb has a different nuisance of meaning. The ruler violates human rights and the entity can be specified at the conceptual structure; however, in (6d) the verb ťaţgha is inclined towards implying the generic sense of violation as the verse is directed to everyone who violates the limits of God; however, the verb ťaţgha in (8c) specifies the meaning of being a tyrant in this structure. This is due to the fact that ruler violates the norms and the rights of humanity founded by the civil rule; otherwise, some other verbs are used but do not illustrate the same meaning of ťaţgha. Such verbs are tacd̲a, tajanna and tajaawaza ‘violate’. Thus, the difference between (6d) and (8c) is related to the kind of selection at the semantic level.

Other shades of meanings of the verb ťaţgha found in standard Arabic are presented in the subsequent specimens (9) and (10):

9a. ťaţgha al-sail u cala difatay hi.

flooded det stream over banks its

‘The stream flooded the banks’

The conceptual structure of (9a) is represented in (9b) whereas the syntactic one is shown in (9c):

9b. [ Event CAUSE ([ Thing al-sailu 'the stream'] i [ Event GO ([ Thing mai 'water'] j [ Path cala 'over' ([ Place ([ Thing difatayhi 'its banks'] k ) ] ) ] ) ] ) ].

9c. syntactic structure

ţaţgha 'flooded'

V

---------- NP (external)
[ Event CAUSE ([ Thing [ ] ] ).
In (9b) the verb тағга ‘flood’ projects the event-CAUSE and the event – GO functions in the conceptual structure but not in the syntactic structure. This is because the verb semantically incorporates the argument mai ‘water’ which covers the banks of the stream. This argument is to be deleted after being fused in the function. Thus the possible translated meaning is that the verb тағга means cover with only water but nothing else. In other words, the verb cannot be related to tyranny in Arabic particularly in this context. If (9b) is compared to (10b), the verb ағга made superior’ is transitive and its meaning is related to superiority complex in the sense of being bad character.

10a. ағга hu al -маалу
made superior him det money

10b. [Event CAUSE ([Thing al - маалу ‘money’]) i [ Event GO ([Thing ] i [ Path cala ‘over [ Place ([ Thing hu ‘him’]) ] [ State BE ([Thing ] [ Place fi ‘at’ ([Property fawqi superior ] ] ))])]]).

10c. syntactic structure
тағга ‘made superior’

V

---------- NP (internal)
[Event GO ([Thing ] i [ Path cala ‘over [ Place ([ Thing hu ‘him’]) ] [ State BE ([Thing ] [ Place fi ‘at’ ([Property fawqi superior ] ] ))])]]).

(10b) illustrates that the verb тағга ‘made superior’ in its new nuisance projects the event CAUSE-function in which al-маалу ‘money’ is indexed with [i]. It also projects the event- GO function which is illustrated by the identical entity [i] and the PP cala hu ‘over him’. The embedded clause represented by the state-function implies the entity [j] and the PP fi fawqi ‘at superior’. All the functions constitute the meaning of the verb at all levels though some of them are absorbed by the verb at LF. Thus, the native speaker of Arabic is able to recognize the difference in meaning through the conceptual concepts.

11a. тағга al - бақарату
shouted det cow

(11a) is in (11b) as the conceptual structure.

11b. [Event MOVE ([Thing al-бақарату ‘the cow’ ] )]

The verb тағга ‘shouted’ is an intransitive one because ad-dahik ‘laughter’ is not a part of the conceptual structure of such verb. Thus, it syntactically projects only the event-move function in which is the external subject which is filled by the argument al-бақарату ‘the cow’. It is significant to notice that the subject must be non-human or else the sentence is ungrammatical.

12a. тағга al - бахру
rose det sea

(12b) shows the verb тағга ‘rose’ is intransitive and it indicates that the sea is rough due to the rise of level of water in it. Hence, it selects the move-function in which the argument is fused to the subject position. The subject is inanimate and it indicates the meaning of water level. In short, (11b) indicates the sense of shout and the subject has to be non human whereas in (12b) the sense is related to the level of water and the subject is non- animate. Thus, the verb has two different semantic connotations which should not be mixed with тағга ‘became a sinner’ as in (8b).

To sum up, the verb тағга in (6d) is translated in different manner due to the help of the conceptual structure theory. It is obvious the syntactic structure theory is not enough to give a complete meaning of the verb in translation because certain arguments are not visible at the syntactic form; however, the conceptual structure theory followed in this work is needed for translation at LF because not only of language specific culture features but also to specify covert meanings projected at the conceptual level. A translator cannot keep close eyes when it comes to such factors in a language. Thus, the entities cala huduudi allahi ‘ over the limits of God’, yusbihu kaafiran ‘ became atheist’ and yastahiqu al- cadhaaba ‘ deserves the chastisement’ are taken care in the theory by mechanisms of (i) incorporation and (ii) argument fusion because they constitute the form as well as the semantic connotations of the verb in Arabic in this verse at LF. This
theory accounts for (8b) in which the same verb incorporates the arguments cala huquqi shacbihi 'over his people' rights' and yusbihu 'taghiyah ' be a tyrant' in the conceptual meaning but cannot be neglected in translation at LF as they constitute the form of the verb in this context. In (9b), the verb tagha 'floated' can cover difatayhi 'its flanks' only with mai 'water' and nothing else. These arguments are semantically visible at the conceptual level but not at the syntactic form. However, the same verb can be used in the reflexive sense of syntax and semantics as in (10b) in which the subject of the functions is fused with hu 'him' as the verb is causative. The adjective fawqi 'superior' is recovered from the verb at the structural form though it is not necessarily to be overt at the syntactic level. Hence; such theory is essential is vital to translate the verse in (6d) or else the version that relies on the syntactic structure alone is surely inadequate. Likewise, the verbs taqha 'shouted' in (11a) and taqha 'is rough' in (12a) are used in one sense as far as the constituent selection is concerned. For instance, in the former, it cannot incorporate any internal arguments as they are not selected and it has the concept of 'shout' as it is the only selected argument at the conceptual structure (cf. Jackendoff, p. 1990-90). In the latter, the verb taqha includes the meaning of 'rough' and illustrates the level of water in the sea; thus, such verbs in (7,9,10,11and 12) do not include the real meaning of the verb as in (6d).

In order to test the validity of the theory of decomposition at the conceptual level and analyze more of polysemous verbs, the researchers may look at the verb qatla 'killed' in the verse (13):

13. bi ai dhanbin qutila -t
   for what crime was killed fem
   ‘For what crime she was killed’

fgvvvv (Holy Quran, 1405 h, p. 1906, verse 09)

The verb qatla has been translated by a number of translators in different nuances; for instance, Palmer (1942, p. 518), Dawood (1986, p. 17), Arberry (1980, p. 26), Piekthel (1982, p. 609) and Khan and Al-Hilali (1996, p.1090) have given the meaning of ‘slain’. Some like Ali (1955, p. 606), Ali (1963, p. 1148), Khan (1970, p. 606) and Ali (1993, p. 1607) have given the meaning ‘to bring an end to someone's life’. Others like Sale (1866, p. 571) and Rodwell (1978, p. 45) have used the meaning of ‘to put to death’. It is obvious that the translators almost roam around one meaning ‘to bring someone’s life to an end’; but what attracts the attention is that none of them was able to be specific and give exactly how the female has been killed and the reasons behind the killing in this particular context. These facts are obvious in the analysis of the conceptual structure of the predicate in the verse in which the context carries a number of religious as well as cultural facts that help us to give better understanding of the verse in translation. The researchers may first look at the verb qatla 'killed' in a normal Arabic sentence(14a), then shift to the analysis of the verse in which the same verb is used as in (14c) respectively.

Syntactic – Structure
14a. [NP ahadun maa] [VP qatala al- binta]
    one some killed det girl
    ‘Someone killed the girl’
V
---------- NP, PP
(14b) is the conceptual structure for the active structure (14a):
14b. [Event CAUSE ([Thing ahadun maa 'someone'[i [Event GO ([Thing al-
    bintu 'the girl'  ]j, [ Path ([via [Thing an tamuta 'to die' ] ) ] ) ] ] ]).

In (14b), the verb qatla 'killed' is decomposed into the functions event- cause in which the argument ahadun maa ‘someone’ is fused as the subject. Then, it selects the event – go function in which the object al-bintu ‘the girl’ is also fused. The path- function is posited at the structure to show that the verb causes someone's life has come to an end. This entity is covert at the syntactic level because it can be incorporated semantically. It is evident that the abovementioned translators can translate the meaning of the verb by saying 'to kill, 'to slain' and 'to put to death', of course, without a need to give the exact reason behind killing. However, if the verb is used in a verse as is the case in (13), the situation of translation is entirely different. This semantic fact is visible in the omission of the non specific agent and the reason behind killing in this particular verse. The generic meaning of the verb as 'to put to death' is insufficient because there are other semantic nuisances are essential to be known and the translator has to be aware of such facts particularly when the case comes to the holy Qura’n. These facts are explicatied in a clear manner in the sentence (14c).

Syntactic – Structure
V
---------- NP, (PP)
14d. bi ai dhanbin qutila -t
   for what crime was killed fem
   ‘For what crime she was killed’

The conceptual Structure for the passive structure in (14d) is (14e):
14e. [ Event CAUSE ([Thing al-?ab 'the father'[i [Event GO ([Thing al-
   bintu 'the girl'  ]j, [ Path ([Thing ?an tamuuta li annaha wuladat untha 'to die
   alive as born a baby girl'][j by [ Event GO ([Thing al-bintu 'the girl'][j [Path fi
It is quite obvious that the specific agent al-?ab 'the father' as per this analysis is fused in the subject position as the cause of killing; the reason of killing which is ?amumula li annaha wulidat untha 'to die a live as she was born a baby girl' is fused in the path - function and the place of killing is fi al-huffrati 'to be buried in a whole'. Such meanings are not at all mentioned in the version of translation done by the traditional translators above. It is a fact that the decomposition of this verb in this verse shows that it has these three primary semantic notions in the conceptual structure and they are essential to be mentioned in translation; otherwise, the meaning will be generic as in (14a) which is in fact different. This is because Arabic cultural specifics impose such specific meanings to the verb which are understood by the native speaker. The researchers argue that Arabs before Islam used to bury the baby girls and keep the baby boys thinking that the former causes a shameful stigma for the father in his nomadic life. In short, one must keep in mind that not necessarily the verb qatal is to be treated semantically in the same manner in all the situations. In other words, the verb has generic meaning as in (14b) and very specific meaning in (14c) due to the interference of cultural and religious backgrounds.

V. CONCLUSION

As the traditional translators relied only on the information available at the syntactic structure in translating the two verses in which the verbs of polysemous meaning, namely tagha 'transgress', and qutila 'was killed' are used, their versions were insufficient. Thus, as an alternative, the researchers opted for Jackendoff's (1990) Semantic Theory in which the focus is on the content of the conceptual structure in addition to the syntactic level as well. For instance, we discovered meanings such as 'to violate the limits of God', 'tyrannize' 'made superior', shout' and 'is rough' in various contexts for the verb tagha and 'was slain' and 'to be buried alive as a baby-girl child in a whole' for the verb qutilat 'was killed'. To get more crucial unknown facts of the verbs, we have tested the validity of the semantic theory in translation and we have found that it is fit to be applied to Arabic religious texts. This is due to the fact that it makes use of the incorporated as well as overt semantic connotations in translation for the used verbs in the particular contexts. For instance, in (6d), the theory explains that the verb tagha 'violated the limits of God' engulfs specific conceptual concepts essential to be mentioned in translation. The researchers have found that the verb, in this context, has specific reference to the violation of limits of God and not to transgress all bounds as found in the traditional version. As a result of this violation, the transgressor became an atheist and due to this the person, in question, deserves God's chastisement in the doomsday. Such facts are confirmed if one has a look at the subsequent verses in the same Surat. All these entities are covert in the structure of the verse but constitute the exact meaning of the verb at all levels; otherwise, Arabic selects to use other specific verbs such as ta'adda and khalafa 'violate' as instances. The researchers argue that such significant meanings of tagha in (6d) cannot be neglected as they are crucial in translation. The researchers also argue that the meaning given by the traditional translators is merely syntactic since the object 'all bounds' satisfies the sub-categorization of the verb in question. In contrast, our version contains every single meaning in the conceptual structure and such arguments are linked to the syntactic structure by limited mechanisms, namely, argument structure, argument fusion and incorporation to be more specific. In (8c), the verb tagha is used in Modern Standard Arabic context; thus, it means 'to tyrannize'. The verb semantically incorporates the argument luqwaqi sha'ibi 'his people's rights' at the syntactic level, and due to this illegal act, the person, in question, becomes taghiyah 'tyrant'. Thus, the verb takes a negative religious depict of (6d). The difference between (8c) and (6d) is that in the former the verb at the conceptual level shows a kind of terrorism against human wrights but in the latter a kind of violation to Islamic rules proposed by God. In another context, in (9c), the verb tagha is used in a different sense; for instance, it incorporates the entity maw 'water' which is causative meaning. In similar situation, in (10b), the same verb incorporates the meaning faqwi 'made superior'. The similarity of (9c) and (10b) is that both of them do not carry a sacred meaning.

In contrast, in (11b) and (12b) the verb tagha is used in different senses. In the former it means 'shout' and in the latter 'rough'. These two entities as per the semantic theory are parts of the conceptual structures of the verbs in such contexts.

This theory is also very helpful to account for the derived meaning of the verb qatala 'killed' in (14b). As a matter of fact the verb is used in a standard Arabic sentence; it means 'cause some one to die due to killing'. This is, of course, a generic meaning. However, in (14c), the verb qutilat 'was killed' is used in the Qur'an verse; it has the specific meaning of 'cause a baby child to die in a dug whole as she born a girl but not a boy'. Hence, the meaning of killing used by the translators in (14b) is insufficient though the same verb is used. The researchers infer that the covert meanings of the verb qutilat 'was killed' in (14c) are religious based but not surface structure based. This is because the verb will give other meanings in standard Arabic which are different.

The researchers may argue that the syntactic structure theory alone is not a proper solution to be used in translation. As an alternative, we opt for the semantic theory as it accounts for both overt as well as covert arguments. The researchers can say that the theory of semantic structure with all its mechanisms, namely, (i) argument structure, (ii) argument fusion, (iii) incorporation and (iv) conceptual structure are universal properties and worth to be applied not only in religious texts but also in modern standard Arabic sentences. The researchers have succeeded in making the generalizations of Jackendoff's (1990) semantic theory correct. These generalizations about translation in specific contribute to better understanding of the religious book of Qur'an. Meanwhile, they also enrich the field of research in Arabic with new versions of translation by following new modern perspectives not in use before.
VI. TRANSLITERATION OF THE ARABIC PHONEMIC SYMBOLS OF CONSONANTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arabic</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
<th>Arabic</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>أ</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>ص</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ب</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>ط</td>
<td>l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ت</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>ظ</td>
<td>z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ث</td>
<td>th</td>
<td>ع</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ج</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>غ</td>
<td>gh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ح</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>ف</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>خ</td>
<td>kh</td>
<td>ق</td>
<td>q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>د</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>ن</td>
<td>k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ذ</td>
<td>dh</td>
<td>ل</td>
<td>l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ر</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>م</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ز</td>
<td>z</td>
<td>ن</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>س</td>
<td>sh</td>
<td>و</td>
<td>w</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notice: The researchers have a reference to the transliteration symbols only while writing the Arabic words in the texts. (c.f. Jalabneh, 2007)

VII. STANDARD ARABIC PHONETIC SYMBOLS OF VOWELS

![Diagram of Arabic vowels]

(c.f. Fari and et al, 2006, p. 74)

VIII. STANDARD ARABIC PHONETIC SYMBOLS OF CONSONANTS AS PER IPA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Labial</th>
<th>Inter-dental</th>
<th>alveolar</th>
<th>palatal</th>
<th>velar</th>
<th>uvular</th>
<th>pharyngeal</th>
<th>glottal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nasal</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>q</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>v</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>ds</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fricative</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>θ</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>s̱</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>χ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>v</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trill</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lateral</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximate</td>
<td>w</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notice: the researchers do not refer to the phonetic symbols but they used the transliteration ones while writing the Arabic specimens in the text. The phonetic symbols are listed only for knowledge (c.f. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Arabic_Phonology).
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