

TRANSLATING VOCATIVE SENTENCES BY EXCLAMATION IN THE GLORIOUS QUR'AN: A SEMANTIC ANALYSIS AND MESSAGE CHANGE[○]

Nida S. Omar,¹ Salahuddin Bin Mohd,² Kais A. Kadhim³

ABSTRACT

The present study takes place under the fifth item of this conference .It is concerned with investigation message change in vocative sentences in the glorious Qur'an when translated to English. The present study aims to find the answers to the following research question: "Do the syntactical and grammatical changes affect the quality of the rhetorical message when translating vocative sentences of Qur'anic texts [source language text (SLT)] to English [target language text (TLT)]? To achieve this aim, a componential analysis of both the SLT and the TLT is adopted to uncover the similarities and differences in the message content of both Arabic and English languages. To evaluate the message of both languages, Newmark's approaches to translations are used in this study, including the use of his terminologies such as over-translation, under-translation, replacement translation, and inaccurate translation. The Qur'an and one English version are analyzed according to Katz and Fodor's (1963) theory to observe the differences in the message of both SLT and TLT. The results of the current study show how the meaning is preserved in some occasions and lost in other occasions.

Keywords: *componential analysis, translation, Qur'an, comparison and Vocatives*

[○] This article was submitted on: 07/07/2015 and accepted for publication on: 12/10/2015.

¹ Nida, English Department, University of Malaya, email nidaa.omar@gmail.com

² Salahuddin, English Department, UM, email: Xtire_zar@yahoo.com

³ Kais, English Department, UM, email: Kaisamir2002@yahoo.com

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Meaning plays a crucial role in translation, without it the translation would be failed and silly. Meaning of vocative might be changed from its original meaning to other new one if the translator could not infer the meaning of the original text. This study aims to find the answers to the following research question: “Do the syntactical and grammatical changes affect the quality of the rhetorical message when translating vocative sentences of Qur’anic texts [source language text (SLT)] to English [target language text (TLT)]? The focus of the data on Qur’anic vocative sentence by exclamation translated by Yusuf Ali (2006) handled by componential analysis for Katz and Fodor (1963) and evaluated by the Newmark’s approaches of translation. The present study implies theoretical and practical value to Arab and English readers of the Qur’ān who like to grasp these verses. Practically, the study can be a good guideline for the translators since it presents the comparative aspects of translation, the vocative sentences by exclamation in Arabic and English on one hand and investigate effect of the syntactical and grammatical changes that may occur upon the quality of the rhetorical message when translating Qur’anic vocative sentence into English on the other.

2.0. Vocative in Arabic language

Vocative is a linguistic phenomenon that almost all languages share. It is used to attract the attention of the hearer by using certain vocative particles. It identifies the addressee whether it is object, thing or person. It is carried out by using certain vocative particles. These particles are “*hamza, ay, yā, aya, haya, āy and wā*”. The first two particles “*hamza and ay*” are used for calling the addressee near the speaker. The rest particles “*yā, aya, haya, āy and wā*” are used for calling the addressee away from the speaker. Arab rhetoricians have concerned with the semantic aspect of a sentence. They have classified the sentences according to their function into two main kinds. These are Declarative sentences and non-declarative sentences. The former deals with the false and true of their content. By contrast, the latter does not. They deal with such realizations as order (command), questions, prohibition etc. Non-declarative sentence is sub-classified into two branches. These are demanding and non-demanding. Demanding non-declarative sentence is divided by Arab rhetoricians to include five types. These types are order, question, wish, prohibition and vocative which is the pillar of the present study (Abu Musa 1987: 192-194; Atiq 1992: 66; al-Zawba`i 1997: 335-336).

2.1 Exclamatory vocative

The basic syntactic feature of exclamatory expression or sentences in Arabic is basically composed of:

- The vocative particle “يا / yā / O”.
- The preposition “لَ / lam” with fatha used to express wonder prefixed the object or noun that cause wonder.
- The noun or object denoting what is wondered at e.g. “يا لَلدَّاهِيَةِ / yā lildāhyia/ O what calamity!
- Rest of a sentence.

Saying of the poet Ma'arri, فَوَا عَجَبًا كَمْ يَدْعِي الْفَضْلَ نَاقِصُ / fa wa ajaban kam yadda'I al-fadla naqisu /O wonder! How bad people ascribed goodness to themselves!

The poet in this example expresses his wonder from the behavior of some people when they attributed to themselves good values while they are not good people.

Sometimes, the preposition “لَ / lam” is replaced by final letter called “alif / أ” to convey wonder as in “يا عَجَبًا / yā'ajjabā / how wonderful”. In this type usually the vocative particle “يا / yā” is realized with prolong sound as the speaker reflects his greatest wonder by using prolong sound (al-Sāmmirā'ī 2003: vo.14, p. 249)

2.2 Meaning of Exclamatory Vocative

The major meaning of the vocative according to Arab grammarians, linguists and rhetoricians is to attract the attention of the hearer. Occasionally, vocative is moved away from its original meaning to other rhetorical one. Exclamative meaning is one of those rhetorical meanings. It is carried out when the speaker expresses his/her exclamation and astonishment by using vocative sentence. Regard with translation, divine text might have multi-explanations and meanings. The translator has to reproduce only one of these meanings. He has to be able to infer the implied meaning rather than being explicitly stated. Shi (2006a cited in Izzat 2007:93) believes that any shift in meaning could change the message since the meaning is not concrete. When the translator produces the same response in the target language the translation is successful. Nida (1975) elucidates the semantic problems of words by virtue of the componential analysis theory. He states that the translator should take care of the significance of a message in translating the meaning of the source and target language. The

translator should be aware of the lexical, propositional and rhetorical content of the message. However, since language is general to refer to the particular intention of the writer, the translator cannot talk about purpose until it is guessed or actualized.

Therefore, the translator must be aware of the positive and negative connotations of words in the ST in order to translate with an appropriate connotation in the TT (Larson, 1998: p. 145). Finally, in order to arrive to the intended meaning, the translator has to decompose a text, furnish what is missing, synthesize the deconstructed meaning elements and integrate the text with his underlying mental knowledge and with the extra-linguistic parameters of the communication event (Al-Kufaishi, 2004, p.m 46)

3.0. METHODOLOGY

To follow the purpose of the current study, vocative sentences by exclamation are collected from Qur'an against one English version for Yusuf Ali (2006) are examined based on Newmark's approaches (1981, 1988) and Katz and Fodor's (1963) theory, which are summarized as follows.

3.1. Newmark's approach (1981, 1988)

A loss of meaning is inescapable in the process of translation because of the differences between languages. This, in turn, puts the translator in the field of over-translation and under-translation. Newmark (1988:284-285) reveals that over-translation provides the reader additional detail and information than the original text. In contrast, under-translation provides the reader lesser detail than the original text. He points out that ambiguous translation "carries a deal of lexical and grammatical ambiguity which may be linguistic or referential; hopefully this ambiguity will be cleared up by the micro and macro-context" (1988:122). Moreover, Newmark (1981, 1988) makes a distinction between semantic and communicative translation. In semantic translation, a translator endeavors to follow the author of the original text, whereas in communicative translation, the translator endeavors to reproduce the same effect as the source text on the target text. Other approaches of translations have been discussed by Newmark, such as word-for-word translation and literal translation. In word-for-word translation, a translator attempts to sustain the word order of the source text (1988:45-46). In literary translation, a translator attempts to convert the grammatical constrictions of the source text to the nearest equivalents in the target text.

3.2. Katz and Fodor’s theory (1963)

It deals with the semantics within the frame of generative grammar. In (1963:185) they have differentiated two types of components: semantic markers and distinguishers. The former stands for elements pertaining to a lexical item in a dictionary and reflect the systematic relations exist between the item itself and the rest of vocabulary in the language. The latter stands for idiosyncratic features of meaning of an item. Decomposing words/phrases/ clauses of a language into their meaning components in terms of semantic features denoted by [+] (present) and [-] (absence) of a feature shall be used in this study wherever applicable as notational technique of changes of messages between those of the ST in Arabic and their corresponding messages in the TT English translation.

4.0. DATA ANALYSIS:

The present study concentrates on vocative sentence by exclamation as one of a linguistic phenomenon occurred in qur`anic text. A light is shed partially on its syntactic structure to be more valuable. The data of this investigation is based on five verses from the Qur`an and their English translation by Yusuf Ali (2006). The rhetorical message changes by the English translation in each case are thoroughly explored.

Figure (1) Over-translation, inaccurate and semi replacement Translation

ST	١ - "قَالَ يَا وَيْلَتَا أَعْجَزْتُ أَنْ أَكُونَ مِثْلَ هَذَا الْغُرَابِ فَأُوَارِي سَوَاءَ أَحِي فَأَصْبَحَ مِنَ النَّادِمِينَ" (المائدة: ٣١).
TL	"Woe to me! Said he; Was I not even able to be as this raven, and to hide the shame of my brother?" (Yusuf Ali, 2006,p.256)
Trs	<i>Yā waylatā ājjiztū an akūna mithlā hādhā al-ghurāb fa-ūwāriya sawata akhī</i>
BT	O woe to me am I unable to be like this crow
Differences between the semantic features of ST and the semantic features of TT	ST : Yā [+Voc part] Waylatā [+N , head , ± sing , + inanimate , -V] ājjiztū [ā (alif) + part , + interrogative , + exclamation , + equalization] ājjiztū [(ājjiza) +V , +action , + past , + N ,] tū [+ 1 st pron , +sing , ±human] an [+subjunctive part] akūna [(kana) + , defective verb , + action , + past , +present ,+be] +I [1 st person (pron) , Mas , Fem , +sing , +objective] Mithlā [+N, +A ,+ inanimate] Hādhā [+demons pron , + sing , + near] Ghurāb [+N , ±sing , + inanimate]

	<p>TT :</p> <p>Woe [+ N , +plural] to [+ pre ,+ adv , + infinitive marker]</p> <p>Me [+pron,1st person ,+ Mas , +Fem , +sing , +objective]</p> <p>Was [+V , +past ,+ action] I [1st person (pron) , Mas , Fem , +sing , +objective]</p> <p>Not [+N ,+A, +Adv]</p> <p>Even [+ Adv , + A , + N ,+ V]</p> <p>Able [+A]</p> <p>To [+ pre ,+ adv , + infinitive marker]</p> <p>Be [+V (aux) ,+V ,+ action , +exist]</p> <p>As [+ Adv , + conj , + preposition]</p> <p>This [+demonstrative pron , +determiner ,+ sing , +near]</p> <p>Raven [+N , + sing , + V , + A]</p>
<p>Effect on message</p>	<p>It is evident that there is a semantic difference between the ST “يا وَيَلَاتَا / <i>Yāwaylatā</i>” and TT. It is an overtranslation. Also, there is a semantic difference between the ST “عَجَزْتُ / <i>‘ajjizū</i>” and TT; it is an overtranslation and inaccurate translation. Another semantic difference is shown between the “<i>an</i>” and TT; it is a semi replacement translation. The last semantic difference between the ST “مِثْلَ هَذَا الْعُرَابِ / <i>mithlāhādhāghurāb</i>” and TT). Thus, it is a semi replacement translation. Another difference in the semantic feature is noted between the ST “فَأُورِي / <i>fa-uwāriya</i>” and TT. Thus, it is a semi-replacement translation. Further, a semantic difference is also noted between the ST NP “سَوْءَةً أَحْيَى / <i>sawataakhī</i>” and TT. Thus, it is an overtranslation.</p>

The verse conceptualizes the status of Qabeel after he killed his brother Habeel. He is unable to do anything with the corpus of his brother. Then, Allah had sent a crow to guide how to bury the corpus of his brother Habeel. He was amazed from that action. He communicates his astonishment by calling something abstract. He calls وَيَلَاتَا / *Waylatā* to attend since it is the time to that. He did that by using the vocative particle يَا / *yā* which is omitted in translation. The lexical item وَيَلَاتَا / *Waylatā* consists of the lexical item وَيَل / *wayl* suffixed by the redundant letter “T” for strengthening the meaning and the final “alif” which has taken the place of the first person possessive pronoun to be *waylatū*. It is worth mentioning that the lexical item وَيَل / *wayl* is used in Arabic for both grief and surprise. So, the speaker uses it to express his feeling strongly towards the problem he has. By contrast, the lexical item “woe”

in English is interjection used to express astonishment, surprise, lamentation and many others. The lexical item “وَيْلًا / *Waylatā*” is NP rendered into NP “**woe unto me**”. So, the translator has produced an overtranslation.

Regarding with the VP “عَجَزْتُ / *‘ajjiztū*” in the ST. It is noted that it consists of the perfect verb “عَجَزْتُ / *‘ajjiza*” the first person pronoun “**I**” in the subjective case.

The VP “عَجَزْتُ / *‘ajjiztū*” is extended to include semantic features not available in the ST such as [+ neg part, +Adv, +A]. It is rendered into “**I not even able**”. In the same vein, the interrogative particle “**ā (alif)**” is used with the perfect verb to indicate the past. In Arabic, the interrogative particle “**ā (alif)**” is used for exclamation . So, the translator has used the auxiliary verb “**was**” to be equivalent to the ST “**ā (alif)**”. Hence, Yusuf has provided an overtranslation to the whole VP “أَعَجَزْتُ / *ā‘ajjiztū*” in the ST. In a fact point, the translator has retained the meaning of the ST “أَعَجَزْتُ / *ā‘ajjiztū*” but he did made a mistake by keeping the same tense in TT . Since the ST “عَجَزْتُ / *‘ajjiza*” is past tense refers to action happened in an indefinite time. Such action is expressed in English by using present perfect tense (Have I unable). Thus, keeping the same tense is inaccurate.

The ST “أَنْ أَكُونَ / *an akūna*” is a verb phrase in the subjunctive mood has been translated into “**to be**”. The particle “أَنْ / *an*” is a subordinating conjunction used in complementary clause. It is transposed to prepositional “**to**” . This obligatory transposition has maintained the meaning of the message. Hence, it is a semi–replacement translation. The verb “أَكُونَ / *akūna*” is imperfect verb in subjunctive mood. It is translated into verb “**be**”.

The ST “مِثْلَ هَذَا الْعُرَابِ / *mithlāhādhāghurāb*” is a NP has been changed to PP in TT. It is translated into “**as this raven**”. This change is a semi replacement translation. The co-ordinating conjunction “فَ / *fa*” in the VP “فَأُورِي / *fa-uwāriya*” is a causative particle has the meaning of temporal sequence since the event of the second clause follows immediately that of the first one. It is translated into conjunction “**and**”. The VP “أُورِي / *uwāriya*” is imperfect verb in the subjunctive mood. It is translated into infinitive verb “**to hide**”. The

meaning of the VP “فَأُورِي / *fa-uwāriya*” has been maintained. So, the translation is inaccurate.

As a final point, the NP “سَوَاءٌ أَحِي / *sawataakhī*” is in genitive case translated into NP “*the shame of my brother*”. Thus, it is an overtranslation. A deep glance at TT “*the shame of my brother*”, it is noted that the lexical item “*shame*” (equivalent to سَوَاءٌ / *sawata*) in English refers to a great scandal action or situation done by his dead brother and he wants to eliminate and hide that shame. While, in Arabic the lexical item “سَوَاءٌ أَحِي / *sawataakhī*” refers to parts of body without clothes (i.e. Genitals – private parts). To my best knowledge, the best equivalent to the ST “سَوَاءٌ / *sawata*” is “*naked corpse*” since the speaker talks about the whole dead body not private parts.

Figure (2) Inaccurate Translation and semi-replacement translation

ST	"قَالَتْ يَا وَيْلَتَى أَلِدُ وَأَنَا عَجُوزٌ وَهَذَا بَعْلِي شَيْخًا إِنَّ هَذَا لَشَيْءٌ عَجِيبٌ" (هود: ٧٢)
TL	She said "Alas for me! Shall I bear a child, seeing I am an old woman"(Yusuf Ali, 2006, p.530).
Trs	<i>yāwaylatā a- aliduwa _ anāđjūzun</i>
BT	O woe to me shall I bear child while I am an old woman
Differences between the semantic features of ST and the semantic features of TT	ST : Yā [+Voc part] Waylatā [+N , head , ± sing , + inanimate , -V] A - alidu [ā(alif) + part , + interrogative , + exclamation , + equalization] Wa [+ conj] Anā [+ pron, +first person, +sing , + subjective , + human] đjūzun [+ N , + sing , +V] TT : Alas [+ Voc part ,+interjection] For [+pre , + Conj] Me [pron,+ `1 st person , Mas , Fem , +sing , +objective] Shall [+ present participle , + V(modal) , +N] I [pron,+ `1 st person ,+sing, +animate] Bear [+ phrasal verb , + action , +pre , + Give birth]

	<p>A [+D, +indefarti ,+spec reference ,+sing] Child [+ N , ± sing , + animate] Seeing [+ Conj ,+ N , + Adv] I [+pron + 1st person ,+sing, +animate] Am [+ third person V , +sing , + present] An [+D, +indef art ,+spec reference ,+sing] Old [+A , - V] Woman [+ N , ± sing , + A]</p>
<p>Effect on message</p>	<p>There is a semantic difference between the ST “ يَا وَيْلَتِي / <i>Yāwaylatā</i>” and TT. It is an inaccurate translation. As to the semantic difference between the ST “ أَلِدُ / <i>ā – alidu</i>”and TT. Apparently, it is a semi –replacement translation. A quite semantic difference between the ST “ و / <i>wa</i>” and TT. Hence, it is a semi –replacement translation .The semantic difference is noted between the ST “ أَنَا عَجُوزٌ / <i>anā’ajūzun</i>” and TT . It is a semi –replacement translation.</p>

This vocative verse uncovers the exclamatory emotion of Ibrahim`s wife when she informed that she will have a baby. This exclamation is conveyed by calling abstract noun “ يَا وَيْلَتِي / *Yāwaylatā*” prefixed by the vocative particle “يا/ *yā*”. As it is mentioned earlier, the lexical item “ ويل / *wayl*” is used by Arabs to show their grief or surprise of something. The lexical item “ ويل / *wayl*” is suffixed by the final *alif* has taken the place of the first person possessive pronoun to be “ *waylatī*”. It seems evident that the translator has rendered the NP “ يَا وَيْلَتِي / *Yāwaylatā*” into NP “ *Alas for me !*”. Semantically, the translator has given other far meaning of that in the ST “ يَا وَيْلَتِي / *Yāwaylatā*”. The ST “ يَا وَيْلَتِي / *Yāwaylatā*” has the meaning of exclamation. That is, Ibrahim`s wife shows her surprise when she knows she will have a baby (AL-Razi, 2000: vol. 18, p. 23; Ibn Ashur 2000: vol. 11, p. 297). While, the TT shows that she is grieve because she will have a baby. Accordingly, there is a contradiction between two meanings. Thus, the internal meaning of the ST “ يَا وَيْلَتِي / *Yāwaylatā*” has been distorted. Hence, the translation is inaccurate.

According to the ST “ أَلِدُ / *ā – alidu*” is a VP prefixed by the interrogative particle *ā* (*alif*) and carries the meaning of exclamation. It is

transposed to auxiliary verb in the future *“shall”*. Hence, the translator has produced a semi-replacement translation. The verb phrase *“أَلِدُ / alidu”* is imperfect verb plus the first person pronoun *“I”*. It is rendered into *“give birth a child”*. The translator has transposed it to phrasal verb. Consequently, the translator has conveyed the internal meaning of the ST *“أَلِدُ / ā – alidu”* since the VP *“ / أَلِدُ alidu”* is imperfect verb in Arabic denotes future time. Also, the pregnancy takes a longtime. This means that the action will occur in the future not at the moment of speaking.

The ST *“وَ / wa”* is a conjunction transposed to preposition *“seeing”*. Evidently, the translator has provided a semi-replacement translation. In reality, Yusuf has given other far meaning. He translated the ST *“وَ / wa”* to *“seeing”* which means *“because”*. The internal meaning of the ST *“وَ / wa”* in Arabic has been distorted.

The ST *“أَنَا عَجُوزٌ / anāʾajūzun”* is translated from a simple sentence into a simple sentence. It is rendered into *“I am an old woman”*. The first person plural subject pronoun *“أَنَا / anā / I”* is changed to different class. It is changed to VP *“I am”*. Hence, it is a semi-replacement translation. In the same vein, the lexical item *“عَجُوزٌ / ʾajūzun”* is transposed from N to AP. It is also a semi-replacement translation. This obligatory shift at the level rank has maintained the internal meaning of the ST *“أَنَا عَجُوزٌ / anāʾajūzun”*.

Figure (3) Overtranslation and semi-replacement Translation

ST	3 – "قَالَ يَا بُشْرَىٰ هَذَا غُلَامٌ" (يوسف: ١٩)
TL	He said: "Ah there! Good news! Here is a (fine) young man!" So they concealed him as a treasure! (Yusuf Ali, 2006, p. 551)
Trs	<i>Yā bush`rā hādhā ghulāmūn</i>
BT	What a tiding news this is a boy!
Differences between the semantic features of ST and the	ST : Yā[+Voc part] Bush`rā [+N , head , ± sing , + inanimate ,+intended indefi , -V] Hādhā [+demons pron , + sing , + near]

<p>semantic features of TT</p>	<p>Ghulāmūn [+N , +sing , + inanimate] TT: Ah [[+ interj+, Voc part] There [+ pron , + A ,+ Adv] Good [+A , +N] News [+N , ± sing] Here [+Adv] Is [+copula, +V.b , +sing] A [+D, +indef art ,+spec reference ,+sing] (Fine) [+A, +V] Young [+N , +A] Man [+N , ±sing , +V]</p>
<p>Effect on message</p>	<p>A semantic difference is noted between the ST “بُشْرِيَا /<i>Yābush`rā</i>” and TT. It an overtranslation and semi –replacement translation.As for the ST “هَذَا غُلَامٌ /<i>hādhāGhulāmūn</i>” , the semantic difference between ST “هَذَا” and TT “هَذَا غُلَامٌ /<i>hādhāGhulāmūn</i>” and TT is noted obviously. Thus, it is a semi-replacement translation.</p>

The verse uncovers the story of saving Yusuf (PUH) from the well. And how the water-man was surprised when he saw him .He conveys his surprise by calling abstract thing to denote. He calls the addressee “بُشْرِيَا /*bush`rā*” by the vocative particle “يَا /*Yā*” . It is evident that the vocative particle “يَا /*Yā*” is rendered into exclamatory expression “*Ah there!*” to express the surprise of the speaker. The translator has produced an overtranslation as he added further semantic feature not found in the ST such as [+Adv]. As to the addressee lexical item “بُشْرِيَا /*bush`rā*” , it is a noun. It is changed to AP. It is rendered into “*good news*”. Absolutely, the translator has provided a semi-replacement translation. He has used an exclamative expression to give the connotation meaning of the lexical item “بُشْرِيَا /*bush`rā*” .

The ST “هَذَا /*hādhāGhulāmūn*” is a simple sentence consists of the demonstrative pronoun used deictically to refer to someone or something in the

outside world. It is used in this verse to the indefinite lexical item “عُلَامٌ”. The ST “هَذَا عُلَامٌ /hādhā Ghulāmūn” has been shifted to exclamatory simple Adverbial sentence “Here is a (fine) young man!”. A deep glance, it is noted that the ST “هَذَا /hādhā” is changed to a different class. It is changed to Adverb “here” instead of “this”. This change has distorted the meaning of the ST “هَذَا /hādhā” since the adverb “here” refers to place where Yusuf is. While, the demonstrative “هَذَا /hādhā /this” refers to the lexical item “عُلَامٌ /Ghulāmūn”. Accordingly, the internal meaning of the ST “هَذَا /hādhā /this” has been distorted.

Further, the ST “عُلَامٌ / Ghulāmūn”, it is a N changed to exclamatory AP. It is translated into a (fine) young man!. In fact, the translator has presented a semi- replacement translation. The internal meaning of the ST “عُلَامٌ / Ghulāmūn” has been distorted since the lexical item “عُلَامٌ / Ghulāmūn” refers to the boy between 11-17 years old. While the lexical item “a young man” refers to over age 17 years old. So, to the best of my knowledge the best equivalent to the ST “عُلَامٌ / Ghulāmūn” is the lexical item “youth”.

Figure(4)Anovertranslation

ST	قَالُوا يَا أَبَانَا مَا لَكَ لَا تَأْمَنَّا عَلَىٰ يُوسُفَ (يوسف: ٤)
TL	They said : "O our father ! why dost thou not trust us with Joseph (Yusuf Ali,2006 ,p.548).
Trs	yāabānā ma lakalātamannāalāYūsufā
BT	O our father! Why you do not trust us with Joseph?
Differences between the semantic features of ST and the semantic features of TT	ST : Yā [+Voc part] Abānā [(Ab)+N ,+animate ,+ sing , -V , intended indef] Nā [+ pron , +1 st person , +plu , + subject , + human] Ma [+interrpron, +non- personal reference] Laka [(la) +prep] Ka [+pron,+ 2 nd person , +genitive] Lā [+negative particle] Tamannā [(Taman) +V ,+pre ,+ action]

	<p>Nă [+ pron , +1st person , +plu , + subject , + human] Alā [+ prep] Yūsufa [+ proper noun] TT: O [+ interj part , Voc] Our [+pron, +poss , +plu] Father[+N , +sing ,+head ,+ human] Why [+interr part] Dost [+(aux) verb , 3rd person,+ sing , +V, +action] Thou [+pron,+2nd person , +human] Not [neg part] trust [+verb, + action , +taking care of] Us [+ pron , + 1st person, + plu , +Masc , +Fem ,+objective ,+human] with [+prep] Joseph [+proper noun]</p>
<p>Effect on message</p>	<p>There is only difference in semantic feature between the ST “تَأْمَنَّا / <i>tamannā</i>” and TT. It is a semi-replacement translation.</p>

The vocative verse focuses on the conversation between Jacob and his children. The exclamatory form is uttered by Yusuf’s brothers to their father asking about the reason behind his refusing to send Yusuf with them. They calling him “يَا أَبَانَا / *Yāabānā*” since he is near from them. It is a NP translated into NP “*O our father!*”.

The ST “ مَا / *ma*” is an interrogative particle translated into the interrogative particle “*why*”. The ST “لَكَ / *laka*” is a PP translated into pronoun “*thou*”. The translator Yusuf has retained the meaning of the ST “ مَا لَكَ / *ma laka*”. The negative particle “لَا / *lā*” is translated into negative particle “*not*”.

With regard to the ST “تَأْمَنَّا / *tamannā*” is a VP consists of the imperfect verb “تَأْمَنُّ / *taman*” and the first person plural object pronoun “*us*”. It is changed to phrasal verb in present tense. It is rendered into “*trus us with*”. The translator has retained the meaning of the ST “تَأْمَنَّا / *tamannā*”. But he has provided a semi-replacement translation.

The ST “عَلَىٰ يُوسُفَ” /*alāYūsufa*” is a PP translated into PP “*with Joseph*”. The translator has maintained the meaning and the same class of the ST .

Figure(5) An overtranslation and semi-replacement translation

ST	5- "فَالْت رَبُّ أَلَىٰ يَكُونُ لِي وَلَدٌ وَمَ يَمَسَّنِي بَشَرٌ" (آل عمران: ٤٧)
TL	She said: "O my Lord! How shall I have a son when no man hath touched me?" (Yusuf,2006,p.139)
Trs	qalat rabbi annayakūnūlīwaladunwalamyamsasnībashaarun
BT	O my Lord ! How shall I have a child and no man has touched me
Differences between the semantic features of ST and the semantic features of TT	<p>ST:</p> <p>Rabbi [(rab)+N, +head ,+animate, -V]</p> <p>bi [+pron, 1st person ,+poss ,+N , -V, sing, +V, ± human]</p> <p>anna [+interr part,+ exclamation]</p> <p>yakūnū [+V,+action, -N,+have]</p> <p>lī [(li - lam) +prep]</p> <p>lī [(ī)+ me,+ 1st person ,+pron,+ sing]</p> <p>waladun[+N, +sing ,-V ,+Masc]</p> <p>walam [(wa) +conj]</p> <p>lam [+jussive part]</p> <p>yamsasnī [+ V, +action , -N,+ touch me]</p> <p>ī [+1st person pron,+ sing,+ object]</p> <p>bashaarun [+ N,+sing ,-V,- adj ,+ human]</p> <p>TT:</p> <p>O[+Voc part ,+interj]</p> <p>My [+ pron,+poss , + 1st person , +sing, ± animate]</p> <p>Lord [+N , +head , +animate ,-V]</p> <p>How [+interr part ,±animate]</p> <p>Shall [+ V(modal) , -N , +future]</p> <p>I [+pron,+1stperson,+sing,+subject]</p> <p>Have [+V,+action, +aux]</p> <p>A [+indef art ,+spec reference , +sing]</p> <p>Son [+ N, +animate , +sing ,+boy]</p> <p>When [+adv ,+time]</p> <p>No [+neg part]</p> <p>Man [+N,+ animate ,+sing, +male]</p> <p>Hath touched [+ pr (perf) , +V, +action , +, -N ,+come into contact with]</p> <p>Me [pron,+ `1st person , Mas , Fem , +sing , +object]</p>

<p>Effect on message</p>	<p>A semantic difference is made clear between the ST “ رب / <i>rabbi</i>”and TT Hence, it is an overtranslation. Add, a significant difference is cleared between the ST “ يكون / <i>yakūnu</i>”and TT . Evidently, it is a semi –replacement translation. In the same vein, the ST “ لي / <i>lī</i>”has a semantic difference from TT. Thus, it is a semi –replacement translation. Further, a semantic difference is observed between the ST “ ولم / <i>Walam</i>”and TT. Consequently, it is a semi replacement –translation. Also, a semantic difference is observed between the verb phrase “ يمسنني / <i>yamsasni</i>” in the ST and TT. Thus, it is a semi replacement –translation.</p>
--------------------------	--

Maryam (PUH) conveys her wondering to Allah when she knew she will bear of a child since she is still virgin and no man has touched her. She calls the addressee “ رب / *rabbi* / *my lord*” without the vocative particle “ يا / *yā*”. Omission of vocative particle indicates that Allah is too near to his slaves. The translator was deduced the omitted vocative particle and translated it into ‘O’. He has produced an overtranslation since he added extra information not found in the ST “ رب / *rabbi*” such as [+voc part]. Besides, the particle “ أنى / *anna*” is a question particle used to express the exclamation in Arabic. It is rendered into an adequate equivalent “*How*”.

The verb “ يكون / *yakūnu*” is imperfect verb .It is with future relevance since it refers to an action will happen in the future. The translator has changed the imperfect verb “ يكون / *yakūnu*”into future. He translated it into “*shall have*”. The internal meaning of the message has been retained. He has produced a semi –replacement translation.

The prepositional phrase “ لي / *lī*” has been changed into first person singular pronoun ‘I’. This obligatory shift from PP to pronoun in order to maintain the meaning of the ST . It is a semi replacement translation. As to the lexical items “ ولم / *Walam*” prefixed by the conjunction “ و / *wa*”has been shifted into adverb time “ *when*”. Consequently, the translator has reproduced a semi –replacement translation as he made a transposition from one class to another. While, the negation particle “ لم / *lam*”, which is used with the jussive imperfect verb, has been translated into adv negation particle ‘no’. In fact, the translator

has maintained the meaning of the message. Also, the translator has produced a semi-replacement translation.

In addition to that, the verb phrase “يَمْسِسْنِي / *yamsasni*” is imperfect verb in jussive mood suffixed by the first person singular object pronoun “ي / *me*”. It has been changed to present perfect tense “*hath touched me*”. The translator has done a semi-replacement translation. The meaning of the message has been retained. The lexical item “بَشَرٌ / *basharun*” is a noun rendered into a noun “*man*”.

5.0. CONCLUSION:

One type of rhetorical purposes “vocative by exclamation” in Qur’an is determined in the present study. Based on the beneficial uses of the componential analysis of the approaches of Katz and Fodor (1963) and Newmark (1981, 1988), five vocative sentences by exclamation from Qur’an and English version are analyzed to present the message change. This study reinforces that the meaning of Qur’anic vocative sentences by exclamation is not preserved as much as possible in the given analysis since we found that the translator has used Overtranslation, Semi-replacement translation and Inaccurate translation. In a sense, the message is extended, pointed or put in the same tense and sometimes in different tense to coincide with the original text. However, the meaning of the Qur’anic vocative sentences by exclamation loses their meaning in TT when the translator fails to infer the internal meaning of the ST. From a theoretical perspective, using the componential analysis has been substantiated to be a highly feasible tool in this study to observe similarities and differences between the original text (i.e., Qur’an) and the English renderings. Consequently, it helps us to distinguish between the message of the source text and the given translated texts.

NOTE:

For the purpose of expressing grammatical categories, we have used the symbols: SLT(source language text), TLT(target language text), N(noun), NP(noun phrase), V(verb), VP(verb phrase), P(preposition), PP(prepositional phrase), A(adjective), AP(adjective phrase), D(determiner), DP(determiner phrase), Conj(conjunction), Masc(masculine), Fem(feminine), Part(particle), Voc(vocative), Neg(negative),

Sin(singular), Plur(plural), Pr-perf (present perfect), indefi art(indefinite article), defiart(definitearticle), Interrpart(interrogative particle), Pron(pronoun), poss(possessive), Demons(demonstrative), Adv(adverb) and interj(interjection).

6.0 REFERENCES

- Abu Musa, M. (1987). *Dalalat aL-Tarakib: DirasahTahlilyai Li-Masail ‘Ilm al-Ma’ani*.
- Al-Kufaishi, A. (2004). *Translating as a Learning and Teaching Strategy*. Babel .Vol.50, No.1, PP.45-59.
- Atiq, A. (1992). “*Ilma al-Ma’ani, wa aL-Bayan , wa aL-Badi’*”. Beirut: Dar al-Nahda aL-‘Arabiyyah.
- Al-Razi, F. (2000). Beirut: *Al-Tafsir al-Kabir*. Dar al-Kubub Al-‘Ilmiyyah.
- Al-Sāmmarrā’ī, F. (2003). *Ma’ūnī al-Naḥw*. Amman-Jordan: Dar-al-Fikr.
- Al-Zawbāī, T. (1997). *AL-Balaghah AL-‘Arabiya –“Ilm al-Ma’ani, al-Bayan, Balaghat aL-Qudamā wa Uslubiyyat aL-Mu’asirin*. Benghazi: Qaryounis University.
- Egypt: Maktabat Wahbah.
- Ibn Ashūr, M. (2000). *Tafsir Al-Taḥrīr wa al-Tanwir*. Beirut: Mu`asasat al-Tarikh.
- Izzat, A. (2007). *Ideological Shift in Translating the Glorious Qur'an into English*. Iraq: University of Mussel, Ph.D. Thesis.
- Jerrold, K. & Jerry, F. (1963). *The Structure of a Semantic Theory*. *Language Journal*, 39(2), 170-210.
- Larson, M. (1998). *Meaning –Based Translation: A Guide to Cross language Equivalence*. New York: University Press of America.
- Newmark, P. (1981). *Approaches to Translation*. London: Oxford.
- Newmark, P. (1988). *A Textbook of Translation*. London: Prentice Hall.
- Yusuf, A. (2006). *The Meaning of the Holy Qur`an*. U.S.A: Amana publications.

