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Abstract: This paper shows that cognitive synonyms feature a serious problem in Arabic English translation. The study explores the translation of a number of cognitive synonymous lexical items in their original context of use. These synonyms were taken from Mahfouz’s two famous novels: “Al-Liss wal-Kilab” and “Ziaq Al-Midaq”. Some other examples were also drawn from the Holy Quran. Thirty M.A students of Translation at An-Najah National University were the subjects of this study. They were requested to render these synonyms in their original contexts.

The study explains that the translation of cognitive synonyms has been frequently done formally, functionally or ideationally depending on two significant factors: the text-type in which they are used and the purpose of using them in a particular context. The study, however, argues that in religious and literary texts where synonyms are usually used to convey certain implicated meanings and where we seek to have the same effect on the Target Language (TL) receiver as that of the original on the Source Language (SL) receiver, the use of formal equivalence is ruled out and hence only functional and/or ideational equivalence should be called for.
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مشاكل ترجمة المترادفات الإدراكية من العربية إلى الإنجليزية

د. عكrama شهاب

قسم اللغة الإنجليزية

جامعة النجاح الوطنية - نابلس - فلسطين

ملخص: تبين هذه الدراسة أن المترادفات الإدراكية تشكل مشكلة في الترجمة من العربية إلى الإنجليزية. وتقوم الدراسة على عدد من المترادفات اللغوية المستخدمة في سياقاتها الأصلية، واستحضرت أمثلة على المترادفات من روايتين لتجنب محفوظهما "اللحام والكلاب" و"الوقات المدق", كما وأخذت بعض الأمثلة من القرآن الكريم.

تقوم غينية الدراسة من ثلاثين طالبة في برنامج ماجستير الترجمة في جامعة النجاح الوطنية، حيث طلبت منهم ترجمة المترادفات الإدراكية ضمن سياقاتها الأصلية.
1. Introduction

Synonymy has been defined and discussed in different ways by different writers. Palmer (1976:88), for instance, defines synonymy as "sameness of meaning". For Lyons (1968:446), synonymous lexical items are "those having the same sense", but, he adds that for these items to be synonymous, they should be substitutable in the utterance without affecting their conceptual meaning. For example, "discover" could be substituted for "find" in a sentence like "we found the boys hiding in the shed", without affecting the conceptual meaning of the sentence, but, "find" could not substitute for "discover" in "Sir Alexander Fleming discovered Penicillin in 1928" (cf. Jackson, 1988:65).

It should be emphasized that the phenomenon of synonymy has been a controversial issue among European and Arab linguists. In English, for example, there are two points of view regarding synonymy: the strict point of view and the flexible one. The former denies the existence of synonymy altogether. The flexible view, on the other hand, maintains that any two words which share at least one sense are synonymous (cf. Cruse 1986).

In the case of Arabic, it is important to note that Arabic is characterized by the overuse of synonymous lexical items. This richness of synonyms in Arabic can be ascribed to a complete set of factors which fall beyond the scope of this paper.

Like English, there are two teams of scholars concerning synonymity in Arabic: those who reject the notion outright, and those who believe in it (cf. Al-Saleh, 1960:292-301). The first team base their claim on the fact that any two words which have at least one semantic component in common are best described as attributes rather than synonyms. Accordingly, the lexical items "جواد" (fast horse), "أدهم" (completely black horse) are attributes rather than synonyms of "حصان" (horse). The second team, however, take the existence of synonymy for granted and believe in the slight differences between synonymous lexical items.
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In addition, this team maintain that Arabic should have synonyms since it is unique in the way it manipulates its super luxuriant vocabulary.

However, some scholars including Palmer (1976), Larson (1984), Cruse (1986), and Shunnaq (1992), adopt a compromise position. They maintain that the phenomenon of synonymy does exist in language, but they also point out that there are no "real", "identical", "absolute" or "total" synonyms. Cruse (1986), for example, notes that absolute synonyms do not exist at all, and if they exist they are extremely uncommon. He adds that "there is no obvious motivation for the existence of absolute synonyms in a language and one would expect either that one of the items would fail into obsolescence, or that a difference in semantic function would develop" (ibid: 270). From a historical perspective, Palmer (1976) stresses the fact that English tends to have synonyms as it is derived from different sources: Anglo-Saxon, French, Latin and Greek. Palmer further maintains that real synonymy does not exist in language for regional, stylistic, collocational, and emotive factors. In support of his claim, he cites reasons to show that total synonymity does not exist in any language. First, some synonyms belong to different dialects or they are of different geographical regions, for example, "fall" is used in the United States, whereas "autumn" is used in Britain. Second, some synonymous lexical items are used in different styles, either colloquial or formal; for instance, "man" and "gentleman", differ in their degree of formality. The former is less formal than the latter. Third, certain words may only differ in their emotive or evaluative meaning such as "liberty" and "freedom". Fourth, some words are collocationally restricted, e.g., "addled eggs" and "rancid butter". Finally, many words are close in meaning such as "adult" and "mature."

Larson (1984:73) takes a position similar to Palmer's when she notes that "there will be sets of words which are synonymous in their unclear meaning which, however, contain certain additional positive or negative overtones. One may be more formal and another less formal. One word may be appropriate in one situation and the other appropriate in a different situation."

Newmark (1981), on the other hand, discusses synonymy and does not accept that translation is a form of synonymy. He discusses two aspects of synonymy:

I. Synonymy in grammar: in this case, two sentences or more of different syntactic structure still have the same meaning. Put differently, the structure of the sentence can take different forms in expressing the same proposition,
and there is always a manipulation of the grammatical elements within the sentence in order to achieve, say, the focus of interest or emphasis. The example below illustrates this point:

a - Shakespeare composed great plays.

b - Great plays were composed by Shakespeare.

In (a) the emphasis, he argues, is on "Shakespeare" while in (b) the focus of interest is changed to be on "Great plays", yet the two sentences still have the same proposition.

2. Lexical synonymy: in this type, which is the main concern of our discussion, different lexical items share certain semantic properties and refer to the same topic. Shunnaq (1992:24) classifies this kind of synonymy into five sub-types according to their degree of similarity in meaning as shown by the typical diagram below

The first level in the diagram is an indication of antonymy, i.e. oppositeness of meaning. Near-synonyms are words that are almost synonyms, but not quite (cf. Edmonds and Hirst 2002). The third level represents two similar lexical items that can be interchangeable in certain contexts. Cognitive synonymy according to Cruse (1986) requires two conditions; firstly, they must be syntactically identical, i.e. noun+ noun, adj + adj, etc. Secondly, truth conditions must be preserved. For Edmonds and Hirst (2002) cognitive synonyms, are words that when intersubstituted in a sentence, preserve their truth conditions but may change the expressive meaning, style, or register of the
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sentence. Accordingly, the Arabic synonymous lexical items "قتوط يأس" (despair), "مطر، غيث" (rain), "ريح، ريح" (wind) "يحلف، يقسم" (to swear), "يحب، يحب" (to envy), "مطاع، موجع" (painful)…etc (see Appendix) belong to this type. Absolute synonymy, on the other hand, represents an exactly identical meaning shared by two lexical items.

Linguistically, Edmonds and Hirst (2002) argue that synonymy is one of the fundamental linguistic phenomena that influences the structure of the lexicon, but it has often been thought of as a “non-problem”: either there are synonyms which are completely identical in meaning and hence easy to deal with, or there are no synonyms, in which case each word can be handled like any other. They add later that synonymy is a complex phenomenon and it inherently affects the structure of lexical knowledge. For Hummer (2004: 148), a finer distinction between lexical items "should be grounded on corpus evidence". Generalizations, he maintains, over corpus data allow insight on the degree of synonymy in terms of shared or mutually exclusive context conditions as well as preferred contexts for the realization of the two synonym candidates. Thus, studying synonyms, argues Hummer (ibid), in real contexts is of great importance as the meaning of a word arises out of a context-dependent combination, of a context-independent core meaning and a set of explicit differences to its synonyms. So, in order to find the right word to use in any particular situation-the one that precisely conveys the desired meaning and yet avoids the unwanted implications-one must carefully consider the differences between all of the options (cf. Hummer 2004). Accordingly, an exact translation is probably impossible for every translation possibility will omit some sense or express some other possibly unwanted sense. Faithful translation, therefore, requires a sophisticated lexical-choice process that can determine which of the synonyms provided by one language for a word in another language is the closest or most appropriate in any particular situation (cf.Edmonds and Hirst 2002). The problem of cognitive synonyms is that they involve a strong “synonymy effect” (cf.Hino, Lupker and Pexman 2002). That is, they appear to be absolute and their subtle meanings are hard to grasp. This is why translators need to carefully investigate contextual cognitive synonyms in order to arrive at their precise intended meanings in a particular context.

It is also important to note that Arabic cognitive synonyms can be seen as a class of conventional implicature (Grice 1975). Thus all synonymous expressions used in this study give rise to conventional implicature by their
implicated meanings. In the literature on pragmatics, two types of implicature were identified: conversational and conventional. In conventional implicature, which is the focus of this study, "the conventional meaning of the words used will determine what is implicated, besides helping to determine what is said. What is conventionally implicated is part of the meaning force of the utterance" (Grice 1975: 6). That is, this type of implicature arises from conventional features of the words used in an utterance. Also, this type of implicature includes all non-truth aspects of what is conveyed by an utterance due to the words or forms the sentence contains. Levinson (1983:127) maintains that conventional implicatures are non-truth conditional inferences that are not derived from superordinate pragmatic principles like the maxims but are simply attached by convention to particular lexical items or expressions. Levinson notes that “Oh” as an initial particle in an utterance conventionally implicates that some news has been received and recognized. According to him, this particle has no propositional content that could be analyzed truth-conditionally. For further clarification, Levinson (p.129) cites the two French pronouns "vous" and "tu" as these two pronouns do not signal any difference in truth conditions, but they differ in the expressed social relationship between the speaker and addressee. For instance, using "vous" to a singular addressee conventionally implicates that "the addressee is socially distant from, or socially superior to the speaker."

2. Research Methodology

2.1. Research Design

This paper explores the translatability into English of some Arabic cognitive synonyms identified by the researcher as posing difficulties to translators of Arabic texts into English. These synonymous lexical items were considered in literary and religious texts. Some of these lexical synonyms were selected from Najib Mahfouz’s two famous novels: Ziqaq Al-Midaq rendered by Trevor Le Gassick (1975) into Midaq Alley, and Al -Liss wal-Kilab translated by Elyas (1987) into The Thief and the Dogs. Some other synonymous expressions were also drawn from the Holy Quran and translated by Arberry (1980). The researcher, of course, could have drawn all his data from only one source, but the examples of the study were selected from different sources translated by different translators to show that even professional translators were unable to render cognitive synonyms properly from Arabic into English.
The Problems Involved in Translating Arabic Cognitive

The study was conducted by means of a translation task. Thirty students in the M.A. translation program at An-Najah National University were assigned a number of underlined Arabic cognitive synonyms in their original contexts. The students were asked to translate only those synonyms (see Appendix). No time limitation was set to finish the task. The students’ translations together with Le Gassick’s, Elyas’s and Arberry’s renditions were analyzed and discussed.

2.2 Subjects
To further discuss the problem in question, a translation task was given to 30 M.A. students of translation at An-Najah National University. The subjects were haphazardly chosen. The researcher gave the task only to the students who expressed their willingness to do the job. All of these students were native speakers of Arabic. They hold a B.A. degree in English Language and Literature. During their study for the M.A. degree in translation, the subjects completed courses in translating Arabic (literary) texts into English, and vice versa. The researcher went through some of their term papers and found out that they produced decent work in both languages. In their second year, they were already exposed to a combination of theory and practice oriented syllabi and curricula. Therefore, all of them were expected to have a good command of both English and Arabic.

3. Limitations of the study
The present study is mainly concerned with the problem of context-determined cognitive synonyms in Arabic-English translation. This is to draw the attention of translators to the fact that cognitive synonyms encapsulate conventional implicated meanings that can be well figured out when they are used in context. My goal is not to propose model translations of the data of the study, but rather, I see that dealing with the problem at large would be more useful. With such aim in mind, the collected data is employed largely to explain the problems involved in the rendering into English of Arabic cognitive synonyms in their real texts.

4. Results
The translations of the synonymous expressions by the three (professional) translators: Le Gassick (1975), Arberry (1980) and Elyas (1987) and by the student translators have been analyzed and discussed. Table (1.a.) below summarizes the results by giving the percentage of students’ inappropriate renditions of each synonymous pair. Table (1.b.) shows inappropriate renderings
of these synonyms by the (professional) translators. The second table presents the researcher’s suggested translations of these synonyms in light of their context.

Table 1.a. Percentages of inappropriate renditions of each synonymous pair.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Synonymous Pair</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>ﻣﺎ ﴿ ﻪ ﴿ ﻋ ﴿ ﺧ ﴿ ﺎ ﴿</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>ﻣ ﴿ ﻛ ﴿ ﻋ ﴿ ﺝ ﴿</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>ﺧ ﴿ ﺩ ﴿ ﺘ ﴿ ﻣ ﴿</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>ﺱ ﴿ ﻩ ﴿ ﻋ ﴿ ﺯ ﴿</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>أ ﴿ ﻣ ﴿ ﻊ ﴿ ﻏ ﴿</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>ﺪ ﴿ ﺌ ﴿ ﻣ ﴿ ﺎ ﴿</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>ﺔ ﴿ ﺟ ﴿ ﺖ ﴿ ﺏ ﴿</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>ﺔ ﴿ ﺟ ﴿</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.b. Elyas's, Le Gassick's and Arberry's inappropriate renditions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Synonymous Pair</th>
<th>Elyas's rendition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>ﺸ ﴿ ﺔ ﴿ ﺔ ﴿</td>
<td>I envy you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ﻮ ﴿ ﺔ ﴿ ﺔ ﴿</td>
<td>I envied them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ﺔ ﴿ ﺔ ﴿</td>
<td>Le Gassick's rendition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>ﺔ ﴿ ﺔ ﴿</td>
<td>despair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ﺔ ﴿</td>
<td>Arberry's renditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>ﺔ ﴿</td>
<td>winds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ﺔ ﴿</td>
<td>wind</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Synonymous Pair</th>
<th>Model Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>أغبعلك حسبتهم</td>
<td>I wish I were…. I envied them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>يأس قنوط</td>
<td>despair total / complete despair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>رياح ريح</td>
<td>blessing winds fierce, deadly wind or gale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>يلحفون أقسمتم</td>
<td>They untruthfully swear You truthfully swore</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Model translations.
5. Analysis and Discussion

Having discussed the problem of synonymy in related theoretical works above, let us investigate the problems involved in translating cognitive synonyms from Arabic into English. To start with, the synonymous expressions "أغبتكم" and "حسمتهم" (see Appendix) were rendered by 75% of the respondents and by Elyas (1987) into "I envied them" and "I envy you", respectively. This demonstrates that Elyas as well as the students have failed to grasp the conventional meaning aroused by "أغبتكم" and consequently they considered it as a perfect synonym of "حسمتهم". Other students (15%), however, did not provide translation for "أغبتكم" and they wrote in Arabic its implicated meaning. This shows that those students were aware of the slight differences between "حسمتهم" and "أغبتكم", but they were not able to come up with an appropriate equivalent to "أغبتكم". In other cases, the remaining respondents (10%) could assign the implicated meaning of "أغبتكم", but they did not encode that meaning in English appropriately. The renderings by those students below bear witness to this:
- I'm pleased with.
- I'm very pleased for.

However, it should be emphasized that "حسمتهم" is defined in Lisan Al-Arab (1970:148-149) as to wish to have one's envied grace and at the same time to hope that he loses that grace. By contrast "أغبتكم" is defined as to wish to have one's grace without hoping that he loses it. Accordingly, the students', as well as Elyas' (1987) renderings as "I envied them" are congruent as far as "حسمتهم" is
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centered, but such a rendering does not convey the conventional implicated meaning of " أغطتك " . Thus, the utterance " أغطتك على صحتك " could be rendered into something like "I wish I were healthy like you."

Similarly, " يأس " and " قنوط " were considered by 85% of the respondents and by Le Gassick (1975) as absolute synonyms, and so they used them as equivalent to "despair". Fifteen percent of the subjects showed no response. This, in fact, reflects the magnitude of the problem. The difficulty of translating Arabic cognitive synonyms is further highlighted by Al-Shunnaq (1992:25) who maintains that:

"to translate Arabic cognitive synonyms into English could be misleading because of the slight differences which could not be conveyed through the translation process, i.e. nuances, tones, attitudes, etc. If we insist on complete equivalence for the SL and TL items to be synonymous there will be no translation in most cases. Therefore, the best criterion would be the intuition of a native Arabic speaker, who is supposed to judge such differences better."

Ibn-Manzour (1970) points out that " قنوط " is used to refer to one's fully and completely desperate state, even of good things. In other words, " يأس " , is stronger than " يأس " in suggesting loss of hope. Thus, if the translator chooses to be more faithful to the (SL) text, he can resort to paraphrase; that is, he can translate " قنوط " into "total or complete despair". It should be noted that the rendering of " يأس " into "despair" by the respondents and by Le Gassick (1975) is congruent . It goes without saying then that in the process of translating synonyms involving conventional implicated meanings, attention should be paid to the purpose beyond their use in context. According to Cruse (1986), synonyms are used to clarify the meaning of another lexical item. Observe the use of "dismiss" below in clarifying the meaning of "cashier":

"He was cashiered, that is to say, dismissed" (ibid: 267).

However, Newmark (1981) mentions other purposes of using synonyms; they are used to secure the cohesion of the text and to avoid repetition. Sometimes, they may provide additional comments about the topic. Observe the following example:

"Palestine is a small country-it is the Holy Land" (ibid:103).

Another purpose regarding literary writing is that synonymy, argues Newmark, is used for an aesthetic value, making the text more emotive. Having this in mind, the translator should be flexible when dealing with synonymous expressions. That is, he should not insist on complete congruence between (SL)
and (TL) when he runs short of finding the equivalent term in the (TL). He should first investigate the broader context in which synonymous expressions have been produced. For example, if they are used merely for the interest of redundancy as is often the case in political texts (cf. Shunnaq 1992), flexibility should be sought on the part of the translator. In other words, the translator has to have the option to choose between formal equivalence (Catford 1965) and functional equivalence (Nida 1964; Kachru 1982; De waard and Nida 1986). The former type attempts to reproduce as literally and meaningfully as possible the form and the content of the original (Nida 1964:159). The latter, on the other hand, attempts to provide "the closest natural equivalent to the source language message" (ibid: 166). Thus if synonymous expressions are used to convey a certain implicated meaning or to make the text more emotive, as is frequently the case in religious texts in general and the Holy Quran in particular, the translator, if possible, should resort to functional equivalence in order to convey the conventional implicated meaning of each synonymous expression. In some cases, however, Farghal's (1993) Ideational Equivalence can be of great help. This translation equivalence captures the idea independently of formal and functional constraints. It stresses the communicative sense of an utterance rather than its formal and/or functional correspondence in the (TL). This type of equivalence can be particularly useful when formal and functional equivalents fail. Farghal notes that when the translator becomes aware of this kind of equivalence, it may enrich his options in translation and may prevent odd and/or awkward expressions, hence the successful rendering of "فَقْنُوتٌ" into "total or complete despair", and مُعَطَّكُ ُعَلَى ُصَحتِكُ "I wish I were healthy like you".

We turn now to synonymous words in a religious context. Although the synonymous pair "اَلْرَيْحَى" and "اَلْرَيْحَى" (see Appendix) are not absolute synonyms, we have observed that Arberry (1980) and (70%) of the student translators provided the words "wind" and "winds", respectively as English equivalents. It is true that the former is rendered as singular and the latter as plural, but still they don’t convey the implicated meaning. So, they failed to convey the intended meaning and their translation is not that congruent. It should be noted that the word "winds" is a reasonable equivalent to "اَلْرَيْحَى" as both words have almost the same sense in both Arabic and English. They move or stir up the clouds and send down rain. However, since we are dealing with a quranic text where slight differences of lexical items do count, it could be more faithful if
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we translate "الرياح" ideationally into something like “blessing winds”. Fifteen percent of the respondents could figure out the implicated meaning of "ريح", but they were unable to encode that meaning well in their translation. Witness their renderings below:
- damage wind
- with a strong wind
- stormy weather

One of the respondents provided a reasonable rendering for "ريحة". He used the word “searing” wind in an attempt to express what is intended in "ريحة". The remaining students (10%) gave no response. It should be known that "الرياح" in quranic texts is used to conventionally implicate torment and destruction. Consequently, it can be translated ideationally as “fierce, deadly wind” or functionally as “gale”.

Quranic synonymous verbs can also be problematic for translators. Unfortunately, (85%) of the subjects and Arberry (1980) used the verb “swear” as an equivalent to "أقسم" and "يحلف". As for the remaining respondents (15%), they gave vague responses which I could not understand. Read their renderings below:
- whom you praised
- you were sure that
- you made an oath with

It should be recognized that the verb "يحلف" in all contexts in the Holy Quran is used to express breaking the oath and it is usually ascribed to hypocrites (cf. Arberry 1980). As for the verb "أقسم", it is used in honest, sincere oaths which are not broken. Thus, such a difference should be accounted for if we choose to be faithful to our translation. Since there is no correspondent verb in English to capture this subtle difference between the two synonymous pair, we may resort to ideational equivalence as an outlet. Hence, the two verbs can be translated into something like "they untruthfully swear" for "يحلفون" (see Appendix), and "you truthfully swore" for "أقسمتم".

As for the synonymous pair "مطر" and "غيث", I was wrongly under the impression that the students would easily figure out that "غيث" conventionally implicates relief and a long-waited rain and that "مطر" implicates a penalty imposed by God for wrongdoing. Such implicated meanings can be detected easily in my examples (see Appendix). Unfortunately, only (20%) of the
students could provide reasonable renderings for "غيث". Observe some of their renderings below:
- long-wanted rain
- helping and needed rain

As for Arberry (1980) and (80%) of the students, they treated "غيث" as an absolute synonym of "مطر" and provided "rain" as an equivalent. By so doing, they fail to convey the intended meaning as the English word "rain" does not implicate mercy or relief which is meant in the quranic verse. So, in order to be faithful and to relay the exact implicated meaning in the translation of (sensitive) texts, we can render "غيث" ideationally into something like: "sweeping rainstorm" and "life-giving rain", respectively. However it is still necessary to note that in other non-religious contexts, the word "مطر" can be formally rendered into "rain" and there is no need to account for its implicated meaning. Thus, the text-type is very crucial in deciding what translation equivalence translators should opt for in translating Arabic cognitive synonyms into English.

Now we come to successive or collocated cognitive synonyms (see Appendix). That is, a string of two synonymous words which usually come or occur together. Let me say at the outset that such a string of synonyms is, more often than not, used for both emphasis and stylistic or aesthetic purposes. It is not meant to further clarify the meaning but to beatify the text and make it more emotive. Usually, the second member or word of the synonymous pair is injected into the text to exhibit an interesting rhythm which is hard to reflect in translation. In translating such a string of successive cognitive synonyms, Shunnaq (1992: 25) maintains that "a parallel coupling in translation might be unnecessary and may even look redundant." Indeed, the problems with translating word-strings involving two synonyms are several. Since these collocated cognitive synonyms are mainly context-dependent, translators should first scan their wider context of use to see if they are used merely for emphasis and aesthetic values or they are meant to figure out subtle differences and relay certain implicated meanings. Translators should then exercise their intuition to see if there is a need to reflect such differences in their translation. In fact, in dealing with such cognitive synonyms, translators are usually torn between producing faithful renderings and making their translation sound natural in the TL.
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For more clarification, let us consider the synonymous pair "ألم" و"وجع" (painful) (see Appendix for the larger context). Apparently, this pair is used for an aesthetic value. That is, it is used in this context for emphasis and to make the meaning more comprehensive. Put differently, in using this pair in this particular context, I do not think that the writer (Mahfouz) wants to communicate to the reader the fine shades of meaning which exist between "ألم" و"وجع", but rather he intends to make his text more emotive and to implicate that rooting out a tooth in that inexperienced dentist's clinic is so painful (see Appendix).

In terms of analysis, it was noticed that most of the students (90%) provided the word "painful" as an equivalent to the synonymous pair "ألم" و"وجع". It seems the students realized that the pair was used by the writer to stress the meaning and to maintain a rhythmic beauty, which is exhibited in the use of nunation (التنوين) at the end of each word. The students could have made their translation better had they used words such as "severely; unbearably" with painful to reflect the implication intended by the writer, namely that the process of rooting out a tooth was so painful. In their endeavors to provide more faithful renderings, the remaining respondents (10%) gave formal translation which may not fit in our context. Observe their renderings below:
- painful and hurtful
- painful and agonic
- painful and aching

It should be emphasized that Arabic tolerates the use of successive synonyms much more than English. In other words, it is not necessarily to render a string of synonyms in Arabic into a string of synonyms in English. In most cases, such a practice may render our translation redundant or even awkward (cf. Shunnaq 1992).

As for Le Gassick (1975), his translation (unbearably painful) reflected the writer's implicated meaning.

In fact, the difference in meaning between "ألم" and "وجع" is so subtle and there is little information in Arabic books concerning such a difference. Ibn Manzour (1970) mentions a clearer account when he says that the word "ألم" is usually used with the Arabic word "العذاب" (torture), while the word "وجع" is used with the word "المرض" (sickness). According to Ibn Manzour (1970), in Arabic we usually say "ألم العذاب" "المرض" especialmente God's painful torture and "وجع" "المرض". We may conclude from this that "ألم" is stronger than "وجع" in
suggesting pain. However, I do not think translators should try to reflect such fine shades of meaning in their translation in this particular context. All what they need to do is to reflect the pair's overall implicated meaning by resorting to ideational equivalence. Thus, the synonymous pair can be translated into something like "severely and unbearably painful".

Sometimes collocated cognitive synonyms are figuratively or metaphorically used. For example, the synonymous pair "اللَّهِيَّةَ وَ السَّعَادَة" are used in context (see Appendix) to describe "Midaq Alley". Here the writer does not really mean that the miserable Midaq Alley is or feels happy. The writer in fact is being ironic and sarcastic by saying that about Midaq Alley. In such cases, translators face a double-edged problem. They have first to figure out the pair's intended meaning and then decide on whether to retain that metaphoric, ironic meaning in their translation. Ibn Manzour (1970) maintains that "اللَّهِيَّةَ" has to do with the psychological feeling of the person and it lasts longer than "السَّعَادَة". Moreover, "اللَّهِيَّة" is something one receives without doing any hard work or exerting any effort. As for "السَّعَادَة", Ibn Manzour says that it is limited and is usually felt when one's needs are met or his wishes are achieved.

In terms of analysis, it was found out that all the students (100%) successfully rendered "السَّعَادَة" into happiness, but they had a difficulty in translating "اللَّهِيَّة" properly. Fifty percent of the students gave no rendering for "اللَّهِيَّة", and others (30%) used different happiness-connoting words such as pleasure, joy, exultance...etc. The remaining respondents (20%) provided awkward translations such as the following:

- tranquility
- jokiness
- enjoys

I have to say that it might not be easy to find a word in English which can be used to reflect the implicated meaning of "اللَّهِيَّة". In this case, a translator should manage the situation and exercise his intuition in order to come up with a word that may be deemed a reasonable rendering of "اللَّهِيَّة".

As for Le Gassick (1975), he used only the word "bliss" as an equivalent for both "السَّعَادَة" and "اللَّهِيَّة", which is tolerable in English. According to Newmark (1988: 84) "a translator cannot do without synonyms; he has to make do with them as a compromise, in order to translate more important segments of the text, segments of the meaning more accurately. But unnecessary use of synonyms is a mark of many poor translations." Apparently, the use of "اللَّهِيَّةَ وَ السَّعَادَة"
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"السعادة" in our context (see Appendix) is meant for emphasizing the great happiness Midaq Alley enjoyed (ironically speaking of course) rather than for a real need to use two different words to refer to the same thing. Hence Le Gassick's (1975) "bliss" is a reasonable rendering of "السعادة و الالحنا". However, using a parallel coupling in this particular context such as "bliss and happiness" might be better. I have to mention also that Le Gassick's rendering should be praised because he enclosed his translation within inverted commas and used an exclamation mark to alert the reader that an ironic meaning is intended by the writer. Newmark (1991) argues that it is quite preferable, when translating ironical utterances, to use inverted commas and/or an exclamation mark in order to alert the readership. Accordingly, "الالحنا و السعادة" could be best translated into something like "bliss and happiness!"

For more clarification, let us consider the synonymous pair "باز و كسد". Ibn Mazour (1970) mentions that the word "كسد" is used when we find no market for a merchandise. That is to say, the products are available but they sell badly. The word "باز", he maintains, has to do with a dead stock or trade which has become unprofitable and hence ceased to exist.

It is clear from context (see Appendix) that the writer wants to emphasize that the art of saying poetry ceased to have currency among the people of Midaq Alley; listening to a radio replaced listening to poets. The writer could have used only the word "كسد" to reflect this implicated meaning, but he injected the word "باز" into the text just to emphasize the meaning and make it more comprehensive. I do not think there is a need for translators in this context to maintain the subtle differences which exist between "باز و كسد" in their translation. They should worry about the writer's overall intended meaning and reflect it in their rendering resorting to ideational equivalence.

In terms of analysis, it was noticed that the majority of the students (70%) gave no response. It seems that the students were unable to figure out the difference in meaning between "باز و كسد", or they simply could not realize the writer's contextual meaning. The remaining respondents seemed to know what is meant by the use of the synonymous pair but they could not render that meaning appropriately in their translation. Witness some of their renderings below:
- corrupted
- worthless and recessive
- worn out/ declined
As for Le Gassick (1975), his reasonable translation below indicates that he realized the writer's intended meaning:
- It had died like this
However, a better translation would be something like the following:
- This art had gone out of use.
- This art had become useless and futile.

In the end I would like to briefly shed light on what may happen when we translate English cognitive synonyms into Arabic. First of all, I dare say that the difficulties encountered by translators when they render Arabic synonyms into English are, more or less, similar to those faced by translators of English synonyms into Arabic. This may, in part, be due to the fact that the "synonymy effect" is maintained whether the synonymous pair is Arabic or English. However, unlike Arabic, in the case of English, the subtle differences between the members of the synonymous pair, I assume, may be easily figured out. So, the problem with translating English cognitive synonyms into Arabic does not mainly lie in how to distinguish the fine shades of meaning which exist between cognitive synonyms but in how to render them in Arabic.

Unlike English, Arabic is characterized by the overuse of synonyms (cf. Al-Saleh 1960). For example, Al-Suyuti (1986:405) maintains that there are forty-one synonyms for the word "السيف" (the sword), and eighty-seven synonyms for the word "العسل" (honey). So, unlike English, we can notice in Arabic what I would call "extended" cognitive synonyms. When it comes to translation, most translators may not be able to chase the slight differences which may exist among extended cognitive synonyms. Thus, some translators find themselves forced to provide in their translation the conceptual, denotative meaning of the synonymous words, which may be incongruent, especially in literary and religious texts.

Furthermore, in the case of translating English successive synonyms into Arabic, translators should realize that English word-strings involving two synonyms or more must be preserved in their Arabic translation. Better still if they can provide a parallel coupling in translation to preserve the aesthetic value of the original. Interestingly, Arabic has a proliferation of synonyms and translators may have several options to choose from. In the case of Arabic, however, the situation is the opposite. In most cases, translators are not encouraged to render Arabic word-strings involving two synonyms or more into English word-strings. In fact, a parallel coupling in English "may be
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unnecessary and may even look redundant" (Shunnaq 1992: 27). Shunnaq (ibid) also mentions that in this type of proliferation of synonyms, the two or three constituents express or convey the totality. In other words, translators should figure out the overall implicated meaning, which the writer usually aims at when he uses successive cognitive synonyms and they should try to convey this particular meaning in their translation.

To further explore the difficulties and problems of translating English cognitive synonyms into Arabic, the researcher highly recommends doing research in this area.

9. Conclusion

This study has attempted to trace the obstacles translators usually encounter when they render Arabic (successive) cognitive synonyms into English. It has been noticed that most of the student translators expressed formal equivalence in their translation, thus failed to reflect the synonyms' implicated meanings, which were intended by the writer. Those students seemed to be inclined to preserve the aesthetic value of the original; they attempted to be accurate by being more faithful to the SL text, but such a strategy distorted the intended meaning and made their translation sound awkward and less natural. Student translators should realize the fact that they should consider the context in which synonyms are used when they embark on translating Arabic cognitive synonyms into English. Put differently, attention should be paid to the purpose beyond the use of synonyms in context. For instance, if synonyms are used to convey certain implicated meanings, as is often the case in literary texts in general and sacred texts in particular, translators should not think of formal equivalence as an option and they should opt for functional and/or ideational equivalence in order to highlight the conventional implied meanings of these synonymous expressions. This has been shown in the successful rendering of “تونس” ideationally into “fierce, deadly wind” and functionally as “gale”.

In the case of successive synonyms or word-strings involving two synonyms, student translators should think of their overall implicated meanings and in most cases they should not attempt to provide a parallel coupling in the TL, which may look redundant and mark their translation as a poor one. Student translators should realize that, unlike Arabic, English does not tolerate the proliferation of synonyms. They should also be aware of the fact that word-strings involving synonymous collocates are injected into the text to stress the meaning and make it more comprehensive. They may not need to chase the fine
differences which exist between the members of successive synonyms, but they should try to use ideational equivalence in their translation to emphasize the message intended by the use of a successive synonymous pair in a particular context. We have witnessed the successful ideational rendering of "بَار و كَسْد" into" the art had gone out of use".

Finally, translators should exercise their intuition and have adequate knowledge of both languages in question in order to overcome problems that may arise from translating Arabic cognitive synonyms into English.
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Translation Task (Appendix)

ترجم ما تحته خط إلى الإنجليزية:

1. في زيارة لسلمان مبارك لأبي ريدة قال لي:
   أغبطك على صحتك يا محتمي. (النص و الكلاب: 20).
2. و عندما رأيت والدتي على مائدة العشاء حسنتهما، أراحا نفسهما من هموم كثيرة بالعمل. (النص و الكلاب: 48).
3. مادا يخلي له المستقبل وماذا يضمر لغلمانه! اشتهى به القنوط وضاعف قنوطه ما لاح في وجهه المعلم من الجزع والإصرار. (رقائق المدق: 10).
4. باستن الفداء الأبناء، كلم بيق له ولد على كثرة ما خلفه من الأطفال ذاق مراة الخيبة حتى أتسراب قلبه بالليأس. (رقائق المدق: 12).
5. "اللّه ﷺ يرسل السّبب فيقبر سحابة فيسطله في السماء كيف يشرى و يجعله كساء قترى اللّوود.


7. "فَكِيفَ إِذَا أَصَابَتْهُمْ مُصِيبَةٌ بَما قَدِمَتْ أَيْدِيِّهِمْ ثُمَّ جَاءَ وَلَدَ بِهِ "(الأعْرَافَ آيةَ 49).

8. "أَهْوَاءَ الَّذِينَ قَسَّمُوا الْيَوْمَ الْيَوْمَ الْيَوْمَ الْيَوْمَ الْيَوْمَا لَآً أَخْذُوهُمْ" (النَّسَاءَ آيةٍ 49).

9. وَهوَ الّذِي يَنْزِلُ الْغَيْثُ مِنْ بَعْضٍ فَيَمْشِي وَيَشْرُكُ رَحْمَتهُ (الشُّورَى 27).

10. وَأَمَرْتُنَا عَلَيْهِمْ مَعْطَّرًا فَسَاءَ مَعْطَّرَ الْمِنْذُرِينَ (الشَّعَراءَ 173).

11. اشْتَغِلْ فِي بَدِّيَّتِهِ مَمْرُوجًا لَتَنَبُّضَ أَسَانَ في الْجَمَالِيَّةِ فَفَقِهُ فَهُوَ بِذَوْقِهِ وَبِرَعِهِ! وَقَدْ اسْتَنْثِرَ بِصَوْفَاهُ الْمَبْنِدَةَ وَكَانَ يَفْضِلُ الْخَلْعَ غَالِبًا كَأَحْسَنِ عَلَانِيَّةٍ وَرَبَّمَا كَانَ خَلَعُ الْمَضْرَسِ فِي عَيَادَتِهِ" (الرَّفْعَةَ آيةٍ 8).

12. فَاكِفِهُ وَجُهُ السّاعَرِ وَذُكرَ مَحُسُورًا أَنْ قَهْوَةَ "كِرْشَة" أَخْرُ جَاوِهِ "فَوْقَوْهَا" (الرَّفْعَةَ آيةٍ 9).

13. مِرْحَبًا يَا زِقْفَ الْهَيَّةِ وَالْسَّعَادَةِ. دَمَتُ وَفَدَامُ أَهْلَ الْأَجَلَّ. يَا لَحْسُنِ هَذَا الْمَنْظُورِ وَيَا لَجَمَالِ هَؤُلاءِ الْمَآسِ. مَا أَرْيُ؟ هَذِهِ حَسَنَةُ السُّبْرَةِ جَالِسَةُ عَلَى عَتَبَةِ السَّيْرِ كَالْزَكْيَةِ عَيْنًا عَلَى الأَرْجَفَةِ وَعيْنَا عَلَى جَعْدَةٍ زَوْجَاهَا (زِقْفَ الْمَدْقُ).