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This study investigates socio-pragmatic failure in the translation of the culture-bound euphemistic expressions in the Qur'an since they imply many cultural aspects of Arabic. As used in the Qur'an, they have their own distinctive linguistic and non-linguistic features, namely, they are highly euphemized, basically culture-dependent, and largely context-sensitive. Accordingly, the meanings and functions they tend to convey are not easily captured because they lie not in what is literally said but in what is intended. As a result, the selected translations of the said expressions seem to be replete with two major translation problems: (a) skewing and ambiguity of source text intentionality and (b) inaccuracy in rendering the pragmatic functions in the target text. Moreover, the studies on the Qur'an translation reviewed in this study had never examined the socio-pragmatic failure in the renditions of the culture-bound euphemistic expressions in the Qur'an. The importance of this study lies in identifying that such a failure perplexes the target reader's understanding of the original text and leads to cross-cultural communication breakdown. The following objectives are targeted in this study: (1) to investigate the Qur'anic intended meanings of the culture-bound euphemistic expressions in the selected translations with reference to the Qur'anic exegeses, (2) to identify the extent to which the translators cited have retained the same pragmatic functions of source text in the target text, (3) to analyse the translation strategies translators of the Qur'an have adopted for translating the source text, and (4) to propose, as much as possible, the English functional-pragmatic equivalences to the culture-bound euphemistic expressions investigated. The data on the translation of source text were collected from the Qur'an and its four English translations carried out by four non-Muslim native speakers of English. The data, related to sexual matters and body effluvia, were selected for analysis on the basis that they are culture-bound and therefore difficult to translate. Qualitative content analysis was used to examine the source data by consulting the widely used traditional exegetical and rhetorical books to determine the source text intentionality. Additionally, the translated data were analysed according to the [exegetically-based] functional-pragmatic equivalence framework proposed by Searle (1969, 1975); Baker
Further, the translated data were assessed according to House's (1997, 2001, 2015) model of translation quality assessment. The findings of the analysis revealed that the translators examined have followed three translation trends: Firstly, they are often “woodenly” literal to the extent of distorting the original or produce meanings not intended at all. Secondly, they have rendered the source text into English counterparts that imply negative connotations via dysphemizing the original that is highly euphemized. Thirdly, they try to render not only the textual but also the contextual meaning by resorting to exegetical interpretation. However, the present study concludes that the difficulty of accommodating the functional equivalence of the Qur'anic concepts in English can be overcome when the translator does his/her best in looking for the areas of common interest and experience in both the source culture and target culture.
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Kajian ini mengkaji kegagalan sosiopragmatik dalam penterjemahan ungkapan eufemisme batasan budaya dalam al-Qur’an memandangkan wujudnya dakwaan yang mengatakan bahawa ungkapan tersebut berbeza sifatnya dalam budaya bahasa sumber dan bahasa sasaran. Perkara ini ditambah lagi dengan kesukaran menterjemah makna yang saling berhubungan dengan sosiobudaya dan konteks sosial sesuah teks. Kegagalan sosiopragmatik merujuk kepada kegagalan memahami makna, sebaliknya menonjolkan implikatur terhadap tujuan sesebuah ucapan. Perkara seumpama ini berlaku secara berleluasa dalam penterjemahan ungkapan eufemisme batasan budaya dalam bahasa Inggeris. Lebih khusus lagi, masalah ini wujud disebabkan unsur-unsur yang dikaitkan dengan budaya seperti yang telah disebutkan sebelum ini. Kegagalan penterjemahan unsur batasan budaya ini menyebabkan (a) penterjemahan teks sumber yang kurang tepat dan kabur dari segi makna dan (b) penyampaian mesej yang tidak tepat dalam teks sasaran. Walaupun kegagalan sosiopragmatik bukanlah sesuatu yang asing dalam kajian pragmatik dan penterjemahan, masih belum ada kajian secara analisis yang dilakukan terhadap perkara ini dalam penterjemahan ungkapan eufemisme batasan budaya yang terdapat dalam al-Qur’an. Kajian ini penting dalam mengenal pasti kesukaran pembaca sasaran dalam memahami teks sumber yang akhirnya menimbulkan masalah komunikasi silang budaya. Objektif kajian ini adalah untuk (1) mengkaji makna ungkapan eufemisme batasan budaya dalam teks terjemahan Al-Quran dan (2) untuk menentukan sejauh mana kesukaran mengetahui fungsi sosiopragmatik dalam teks sasaran, (3) untuk menganalisis strategi penterjemahan Al-Quran yang digunakan dalam penterjemahan teks sumber dan (4) untuk mencadangkan supaya kajian terhadap padanan fungsi pragmatik bahasa Inggeris dengan ungkapan eufemisme batasan budaya dijalankan sebanyak mungkin.

Data penterjemahan teks sumber diambil daripada al-Quran dan empat terjemahan dalam bahasa Inggeris oleh penutur jati bukan Muslim. 48 contoh yang berkaitan seksual dan efluvium dipilih untuk tujuan analisis atas dasar bahawa kedua-dua item
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<td>z</td>
<td>و</td>
<td>w</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>س</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>ه</td>
<td>h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ش</td>
<td>sh</td>
<td>ء</td>
<td>‘</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ص</td>
<td>š</td>
<td>ي</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ض</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>ة</td>
<td>ah*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Transliterated as ‘at’ in the context of a combination of two words.

B. Vowels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short</th>
<th>Long</th>
<th>Diphthong</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ا</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>ā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ي</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>ī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>و</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>ū</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>أ</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>أي</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>أ</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>او</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>أ</td>
<td>ay</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>أ</td>
<td>aw</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of Study

The Qur'an is considered as one of the world's classics that has been described as 'the inimitable symphony' as well as having been ranked among the 'greatest literary masterpieces' (Pickthall, 1930; Arberry, 1955; Guillaume, 1990). Its translations have been varied where different Muslim and non-Muslim translators have greatly vied one another to render the Qur'anic meanings into other languages. Particularly, English has enjoyed the priority in this respect for "its high prestigious status internationally [as] the most worldwide-spread language" (Al-Saggaf et al., 2013, p.3; cf. Sabry and Saleh, 2007; Al-Jabari, 2008). Currently, the number of Qur'an translations into English exceeds one hundred different versions of translation and the current world languages the Qur'an has been translated into are 118 (Sarasarabi, 2012; Al-Saggaf et al 2013).

Recently, English translations of the Qur'an have gained a much greater significance and essentiality for many reasons since, they, first of all, are the main source of knowledge and the only accessible recourse for the non-Muslims who are quite curious to get familiarized with Islam through first-hand knowledge (Sabry and Saleh, 2007). Second, the non-Arab Muslim communities have been increasingly growing in English-speaking countries (Al-Jabari, 2008). Third, greater academic interest in Islam has been motivated by the September 11th terrorist attacks where a large number of Western scholars have been stimulated to get more access to different Qur'an translations in an attempt to better understand both Islamic teachings, as revealed in the Qur'an, and the Muslim mentality as well (Al-Jabari, 2008). However, these translations, particularly those carried out by non-Muslim translators, seem to show a great deal of failure not only in capturing stylistic, pragmatic and figurative aspects of the Qur'an but sometimes even the linguistic ones (Muhammad, 2007; Kidwai, 2011; Al-Saggaf et al., 2013). In terms of translation equivalence, Abdul-Raof (2004) states that equivalence is "dramatically underachieved and, in some cases, not achieved at all in the Qur'an translations...[and that] English translations of the Qur'an provide neither cadence nor linguistic beauty" (p.93; see Ghazala, 2008).

In this light, the Qur'an translations would be discussed as having three trends: First, some of them are woodenly literal to the extent of barring the meaning, which leads many readers to discard the Book. Second, some translators attempt to make their translations readable and fluent, take liberties with the text by adding explanations and making interpretative decisions for the readers in the case of ambiguous verses without indicating these changes. This leads to destabilizing the text when comparing different translations and results in perplexing the readers (Sabry and Saleh, 2007). The third trend is represented by many translators of the Qur'an who attempt to convey not only the textual but also the contextual meaning, and they consequently adopt what is termed as 'the exegetical interpretation (tafsir) that is largely based on the medieval scholars' comments on the meanings of the Qur'an (Mohammad, 2005).
As for literal translation, it is undoubtedly the main source of distortion and ruin of the ST intentionality, and this kind of translation has been traditionally rejected by Muslim scholars, especially when it comes to verses with implicit meanings 'almutashabihat (Khalaf and Yusoff, 2012). In other words, literal translation of some verses in the Qur'an mostly brings about many bad consequences, for this kind of translation sounds natural and readable but the meaning transferred is totally different from that of the ST (Al-Jabari, 2008). Accordingly, the target readers are misguided since the meanings they conceive are not those of the Qur'an and these renditions result in a drastic distortion of the original meaning.

In line with this, the Arabic nature of the Qur'an has been strongly stressed by Muslim scholars since Qur'anic discourse is full of non-literal and figurative styles that are employed to express many effectively sublime features, namely, stylistic, linguistic and rhetorical. The use of these features making the translation of the Qur'an much more challenging (Ali et al., 2012; Al-Barakati, 2013). Therefore, Muslim scholars believe that all Qur'an translations are no more than approximate interpretations whose main task is to render the general meanings of the ST (Ayoub, 1997). In addition to its linguistic, stylistic and semantic richness, the Qur'anic discourse has another distinctive pragmatic feature that is embodied in its way of highly implicitly touching on distasteful taboo themes such as sexual matters and body effluvia (Al-Barakati, 2013). More specifically, translators' failure in providing the functional equivalence of culture-bound euphemistic expressions (CBEEs) in the Qur'an makes the translations of the Qur'an full of errors (Al-Ta'ei, 2010).

However, many Arab Muslim scholars' argue that the Qur'an is untranslatable, claiming that it is inimitable even in its own language (Arabic) and, therefore it seems impossible to translate it into a foreign language. This belief is assumed to be related to emotional, religious and national factors which are motivated by the Arabs’ pride, faith and love of their language (Bakir, 2010). As far as the Qur'an (un)translatability is concerned, Abu-Mahfouz (2011) states that some of the terms, such as halal, imam, jihad among others, that were once regarded untranslatable "are nowadays well-established words in the lexicon of many languages and can easily be translated. These terms, however, can be found in many good modern dictionaries across languages" (p.66).

In other words, Qur'an translatability seems very much possible and demanding, especially the translation of its meanings that can, in one way or another, be transferred to other languages (Abu-Mahfouz, 2011). However, some aspects of the Qur'anic discourse are still difficult to translate; especially examples of translation-resistant characteristics of the Qur'anic discourse as rhyme, rhythm, the pronoun of significance, the deletion of the subject, and so forth (Abu-Mahfouz, 2011). Based upon what has just been stated, this study proposes that 'nothing is untranslatable' taking the stance that translator's role is the most determinant factor in this regard since highly qualified and talented translators can find similar approximate equivalence of some kind even to the so-called untranslatable aspects. In this respect, Kidwai (1987, p.9) posits that
The Muslim Scripture is yet to find a dignified and faithful expression in the English language that matches the majesty and grandeur of the original. The currents of history, however, seem to be in favour of such a development. Even English is acquiring a native Muslim character and it is only a matter of time before we have a worthy translation of the Qur'an in that tongue.

This study stresses the importance of exegetical translation since most of the available Qur'an translations, regardless of their accuracy and adequacy, are insufficient since they provide incomplete understanding of the intended meaning that cannot be comprehended accurately when divorced from its socio-cultural and situational context. Undeniably, English-speaking translators of the Qur'an, especially, the non-Muslims have exerted great effort to produce Qur'an translations in their native language. However, many of them seem to have not accessed *tafsīr* books that provide the related contextual and socio-cultural knowledge (Hammad, 2008; Kidwai, 2011). As a consequence, native speakers of English who have read those translations have found it difficult to comprehend the ST intention due to the inaccurate and even poor translations produced (Al-Jabari, 2008).

To sum up, translations of the Qur'an have always been and still are an issue for studies on translation quality assessment in terms of translatability, accuracy, and adequacy (Khalaf and Yousuf, 2012). Yet, these studies are more incomprehensive, rather sketchy and introductory and, a penetrative critical analysis, based on a well-established theory of translation, has not yet been attempted (Kidwai, 2011; Al-Hammad and Salman, 2013). Therefore, the significance of this study lies in providing evidence via systematic comparative study on the translations of CBEEs in the Qur'an in terms of accurately transferring the ST intended meaning and function (Abdul-Raof, 2004, Kidwai, 1987; 2011).

### 1.2 Statement of the Problem

Pragmatics of translation is mainly concerned with how social contexts have their own influence on both the source text (ST) producer's linguistic choices and the translator's interpretation of the ST intended meaning in the TT. In translation, socio-pragmatic failure (henceforth SPF), as a part of cross-cultural failure, generally refers to a translator's misuse or misunderstanding of the social conditions placed on language in use (Thomas, 1983; Baker, 2011; Tang, 2013). Similarly, socio-pragmatic competence, i.e. the knowledge of 'when to use what' in cross-cultural communication according to different situational and socio-cultural contexts, has been adequately identified in sociolinguistics, in general, and the pragmatics of translation, in particular (Harlow, 1990; Sarac, 2008; Tang, 2013).

Most importantly, despite the fact that SPF and pragma-linguistic failure are closely related, this study is more focused on SPF. The latter basically located within socio-pragmatics, rather than on pragma-linguistic failure since it, as Crystal (2003) states, "has been used by some to refer to the more linguistic ‘end’ of pragmatics, wherein one studies these matters from the viewpoint of the structural resources available in a
language. **Socio-pragmatics**, by contrast, studies the way the conditions on language use derive from the social situation" (p.364). Furthermore, Thomas (1983) also asserts that pragma-linguistic failure is basically a linguistic problem that is caused by "differences in the linguistic encoding of pragmatic force, [whereas] socio-pragmatic failure stems from cross-culturally different perceptions of what constitutes appropriate linguistic behaviour" (p.99).

Illustratively, the meanings and functions conveyed by the CBEEs, in the Qur'an, cannot be understood without accounting for extra-linguistic clues, namely, social setting (appropriateness), the interlocutors' interpersonal relationships, the context, among other things (Al-Hammad and Salman, 2013; Al-Barakati, 2013). More to the point, figurative language, where meanings are often highly implied, is extensively used in Arabic, especially in the Qur'an, where many culture-bound euphemisms, implying cultural aspects of Arabic language and life, are commonly utilized (Abdul-Raof, 2004; Ghazala, 2008).

In this respect, the use of culture-bound euphemistic expressions (henceforth CBEEs) in the Qur'an is one of the areas that pose many translation problems. In other words, these problems may arise basically from the features abundantly found in the use of the CBEEs in the Qur'an. To be more specific, the CBEEs are, on the one hand, highly euphemized where non-literalism is quite evident, as stated above (Faraghal, 2010; Al-Barakati, 2013; Al-Shawi, 2014). This non-literalism and indirectness are employed due to the fact that CBEEs are mainly used, in the Qur'an, to express many taboo topics such as sex, genitals, bodily functions, among other things. For this purpose, these topics are referred to implicitly indirectly, i.e. they are softened by less harsh and more pleasant expressions (Faraghal, 2010; Al-Barakati, 2013). On the other hand, the CBEEs entail both historical and cultural aspects of meaning that are often difficult to comprehend.

Thus, the meanings the CBEEs tend to evoke are not easily captured since they lie in what is intended rather than what is literally said, and they, therefore, require more use of inference mechanisms on the part of the translator (Baker, 2011; Al-Hammad and Salman, 2013).

In this light, translating the CBEEs in a sacred text such as the Qur'an, which is complex in its intended messages, requires a deep understanding of the intended message(s) . The selected translators, who may lack knowledge of the rich and deep messages of the Qur'an, are assumed to have failed in bridging the gap resulting from difference between the cultural connotative meanings pertaining to the ST in the TT (Abdul-Raof, 2004/2005). Such an inadequate understanding of the source culture (SC) and the target culture (TC) in the process of translating CBEEs, in general, and those used in the Qur'an, in particular, leads to translator's failure in rendering the cultural aspects peculiar to the respective CBEEs. Furthermore, most of the selected translations are largely characterized by adherence to the SL syntax at the expense of the TL and they are mostly form-biased translations (Mustapha, 2001; Abdul-Raof, 2004). Having failed in grasping the intended meanings of the CBEEs, the translators
often tend to adopt the literal translation strategy, in their translations, which is deemed inappropriate for dealing with highly non-literal meanings of the CBEEs (Abdul-Raof, 2004). Moreover, Arabic utterances containing euphemisms cannot be dealt with literally for the "implicatures in their immediate, social context of use exhibit pragmatic failures when rendered into English [literally] (Shehab, 2016, p.21).

In this regard, the selected translations seem to be replete with two major translation problems (Abdul-Raof, 2004; Farghal, 2010):

1. Skewing and ambiguity of the ST intentionality
2. Inaccuracy in rendering the message in the TT

In other words, translators' failure in using appropriate socio-pragmatic features may result in SPF, which is generally caused by inadequate knowledge of either the ST linguistic or cultural background information or those of the TT or both. Specifically, such kind of failure occurs when a translator fails to perform the illocutionary act required by the situation (Thomas, 1983; Amaya, 2008; Al-Azab, 2012). For instance, the euphemistic word ‘al-fāḥishah (lit. vice) used in (Q.02:169), referring to extramarital sexual relationship, is translated literally into wickedness by Sale and Rodwell. This suggests that the translators might have never consulted the relevant exegetical books to determine the actual intention of the ST and do not find the functional-pragmatic equivalence of the ST, namely indecency, which is a well-established euphemism in English (Holder, 2008).

Therefore, the difficulty of accommodating the functional-pragmatic equivalence of the Qur'anic CBEEs in English can be overcome when the translator does his/her best in looking for the areas of common interest and experience in both the SC and the TC (Xiabin, 2005; Farghal, 2010; Yinhu, 2011, John, 2011). It can be noted that the areas of human experience are, in fact, a common target for euphemism in natural languages. Therefore, it is expected that euphemistic expressions between languages will be available in translation in varying degrees of correspondence (Farghal, 2010, p.174-175).

For example, the euphemistic expression liyaskuna ʿilayhā (lit. to dwell with her) is commonly used in the Qur'an to politely refer to sexual act where a highest degree of love, intimacy and respect are involved (Al-Razi, 1981; Al-Zamakhshari, 1998; Qutb, 2003). In English, the euphemistic expression 'find comfort in her' is utilized to express approximately the same intended meaning and functions evoked by the original (Dawood, 1978; Holder, 2008).

In view of the above highlighted problems, it is thus timely warranted to investigate the topic related to socio-pragmatic failure, which has been hotly debated within the scope of pragmatics and translation (Thomas, 1983; Gutt, 1998; House, 1998; Lou and Goa, 2011; Tang, 2013). Yet, analytical investigation of SPF in translation of the CBEEs in Arabic, in general, and those used in the Qur'an, in particular, has been a
neglected topic of study (Abdul-Raof, 2004; Fraghal, 2010; Al-Ta'ei, 2010). Furthermore, the studies on the translations of the Qur'an, reviewed in this study, had never examined the SPF in the renditions of CBEEs in the Qur'an. Moreover, these studies are mainly incomprehensive (Hammad, 2008; Kidwai, 2011). Studies which have investigated SPF revealed that such a failure perplexes the target reader's understanding of the original text, which leads to cross-cultural miscommunication (Hashimian, 2012, Al-Hindawi et al., 2014). Besides, this study further shows that translators opted for poor or even wrong renditions of the ST expressions in the TC and translation problems are often worsened when translators encounter cultural words or utterances containing implicit meaning.

With this gap in mind, this study investigates the occurrence of SPF in the English translation of the Qur'an by non-Muslim translators, namely, Sale (1734), Rodwell (1861), Arberry (1955) and Cleary (2004). Specifically, it examines the selected translators not according to "right or wrong" approach but in terms of "adequate or inadequate" translation (House, 1997; Munday, 2001). In other words, the selected translations are assessed in terms of the extent to which they have accurately conveyed the ST meanings and functions in the TT.

1.3 Objectives of the Study

Generally, this study aims at examining the English translations of the CBEEs in the Qur'an in terms of meaning and function in a pursuit of the occurrence of SPF and socio-pragmatic success in the examined data. In specific, the following objectives are targeted in this study:

1. To investigate the Qur'anic intended meanings of the CBEEs in the selected translations with reference to the Qur'anic exegeses.
2. To identify the extent to which the identified translators have retained the same pragmatic functions of the Qur'anic CBEEs in the TT.
3. To analyse the translation strategies that have been adopted by the translators in translating the CBEEs in the Qur'an, and
4. To propose, whenever applicable, the English functional-pragmatic equivalences to the CBEEs examined.

1.4 Research Questions

Based on the objectives stated above, this study attempts to address the following questions:

1. How far have the selected translators retained the intended meanings of the Qur'anic CBEEs in the TT?
2. To what extent have the translators selected maintained the same pragmatic function of the Qur'anic CBEEs in the TT?
3. What translation strategies have the selected translators of the Qur'an adopted in translating the CBEEs?
4. To what extent are functional-pragmatic equivalences of the Qur'anic CBEEs available in the TL?

1.5 Scope of the Study

Generally, this study aims at critically examining cross-cultural translation with special reference to the English translations of CBEEs in the Qur'an by translators who are non-Muslim native speakers of English. Specifically, it focuses on the SPF in the translations of the CBEEs in the Qur'an in four published English translations by the identified Non-Muslim translators. This study examines the translations of the CBEEs in only four main Qur'anic topics, namely, sexual intercourse, sexual intention, genitals, and bodily functions. These four topics, which are highly euphemized, constitute one of the most problematic issues that translators often encounter when translating the Qur'an. Furthermore, the selected Qur'an translations are examined in terms of SPF in rendering the ST intended meaning and function in the TT.

1.6 Significance of the study

It is identified (1.2) above that SPF, in the English translation of the Qur'an, has long been a neglected topic of study. This study would provide insightful information on how and why SPF occurs in the translation of the CBEEs in the Qur'an and what kind of translation strategies is proposed to minimize the loss caused by such a failure.

Also, this study contributes to highlight the idea of how translator's adoption of equivalence theory influences the way he translates, especially, when dealing with sensitive issues such as those implied in the Qur'anic CBEEs. More specifically, this study indicates that a translator often tends to use literal translation strategy, to render a highly euphemistic text, when he lacks the required socio-cultural and/or situational information that quite necessary to determine the ST intention.

In relation to this, this study would promote translators' awareness on how the lack of either the cultural or the pragmatic knowledge, associated with the source or the target culture in the process of translation would undoubtedly lead to the SPF. Consequently, a translator's lack of the required knowledge will inevitably cloud the target reader's understanding of the ST intended message.

Furthermore, this study attempts to draw the attention of scholars' and academics to the importance of exegetical translation strategy via consulting the exegetical books to determine the ST intention and function especially when dealing with highly culture-bound expressions as those used in the Qur'an. In this regard, this study is the first to apply the exegetically-based FPE that is deemed most applicably appropriate in working on how to adequately render the ST intended meanings and embedded functions in the TT.
Finally, the findings of this study would contribute to the literature on applied linguistics and translation in the Arab world by highlighting that SPF, as one of the major issues in cross-cultural translation, can be overcome if language learners and novice translators have been offered courses on meaning transfer from Arabic into English or vice versa. Particularly, this will be of great benefits to students of translation when they are offered training on semantic, pragmatic and socio-linguistic parameters, especially when dealing with culture-loaded texts.

1.7 Theoretical Framework

This study, which is qualitative in nature, is basically concerned with the analysis of the CBBEs that convey non-literal meanings. This perspective employed functional-pragmatic equivalence as its framework focusing on rendering the ST intended meaning and function in the TT as accurately as possible. The CBBEs seem to be used in the Qur'an to express an array of meanings and functions alluding to distasteful matters, such as sexual acts, sexual private parts, sexual intentions, and bodily functions. In addition, the CBBEs appear to function as mechanisms for avoiding staking the self-image of their recipients (Nazzal, 2005). Through the use of the CBBEs, the Qur'anic language is used as a communicative resource to guard against the interlocutors' self-image by utilizing the notions of indirectness and politeness which require the language user to mean more than what s/he literally says. To deal with the CBBEs, the context in which they are used is most essential in determining their meanings and the related functions they convey.

In this study, the theoretical framework that has been adopted to account for the analysis and interpretation of the CBBEs comprise three focal theories, namely Searle (1969/1975/1979), Baker (2011), and Gutt (2000). In terms of assessment, House's (1997) model of translation quality assessment is also adopted to examine the selected translations by virtue of socio-pragmatic success or failure in rendering the ST intended meaning and function(s). Based on the relevant theories, the Qur'anic translations are analysed according to an eclectic approach termed Exegetically-based Functional-pragmatic Model where the concept of equivalence is highly observed and reconsidered.

Firstly, Searle's (1969/1979) Speech Act Theory (SAT), especially, his Indirect Speech Acts (ISAs) is used as a framework to interpret the meanings and functions of the CBBEs in the ST and the TT. According to Searle’s SAT (1979), when speakers design their utterances to mean more than what they literally say, they really perform two types of "illocutionary acts", i.e. primary and secondary illocutionary acts (Nazzal, 2005). Specifically, one of the two illocutionary forces, referred to above, is literal or direct whereas the other is non-literal or indirect. The literal force refers to as the secondary illocutionary act, but the non-literal act, the primary one is implicitly performed (Searle, 1979), and "to interpret the primary speech act, the hearer must rely on shared background knowledge including context and make a number of logical inferences" (Machmud and Zen, 2013, p.2-3). In addition, Searle (1969) classified ISAs into five illocutionary acts, namely representatives, commissives, directives, expressive and declaratives, as detailed in chapter two (2.2.1.1).
In the light of Searle's theory, the CBEEs are viewed as indirect speech acts since, through which, the ST producer means more than what he actually says intending to produce certain effects on the hearer (see Farghal, 1995/2010; Madur, 2014). To this end, the CBEEs are mainly based on the notion of indirectness to accomplish the desired meanings and functions. In this respect, Searle provides a mechanism to account for these primary and secondary acts by distinguishing them as well-illustrated in the following example cited by Nazzal (2005):

(In an exchange between a husband and his wife, the former tries to mitigate the pragmatic force of his communicated utterance by way of indirect refusal).

1. Wife: We ran out of milk and bread.
2. Husband: I have not finished my work at the university yet.

To apply Searle’s mechanism, the husband obviously utilizes the notion of indirectness by producing two distinct acts through the utterance he performs. Specifically, his wife explicitly states her need for milk and bread expecting her husband to respond positively to her indirect request in line (1). In turn, the husband's response in line (2) implies much more than just asserting a state of affair. The husband has performed two illocutionary acts in line (2): the secondary act is what the husband actually states in his utterance, whereas the primary act is what he really wants his wife to infer from his assertion, i.e. he is unable to fulfil what she wants because he is still busy with his work. Thus, the primary act of the husband’s utterance in line 2 is understood as a polite rejection of her request in line 1, for "it would have been impolite and overbearing for the husband to be too explicit in rejecting his wife’s request" (Nazzal, 2005, p.258).

By and large, the notions provided by the ISAs can deal with various kinds of illocutionary acts not in terms of meaning only but also in terms of the action (pragmatic function) each language user performs when communicating inter/cross-culturally. In terms of the ISAs, the CBEEs in the Qur'an seem to mainly fall into two types of illocutionary speech acts, specifically, directive illocutionary acts and assertive illocutionary acts, where many pragmatic functions are conveyed such as ordering, requesting, warning, describing, reporting, prohibiting, among others (Madur, 2014). Therefore, the pragmatic functions identified in the ST are compared with those of the TT to see the point of similarity and difference in terms of the ST functions retained in the TT. In short, via applying the ISAs, there are general principles to interpret both the ST meaning and function. This can be accomplished by way of relaying on the speaker-hearer’s "mutually shared background information, both linguistic and non-linguistic, together with the general powers of rationality and inference on the part of the hearer"(Searle, 1975, p.61).

In combination with Searle's ISAs, Baker (1992; 2011), develops a closely related framework for analysing the challenges of providing equivalence in translation at many levels, namely word, above-word, grammatical, textual, pragmatic. At all levels, she emphasized the fact that when the ST contains cultural content, the translator's task becomes more challenging since the culture-related connotations go beyond just
the linguistic boundaries (Baker, 1992). Baker's pragmatic equivalence model is based mainly on three concepts, namely cohesion, coherence and implicature. It also makes use of Grice's notions of Cooperative principle and its maxims and Searle's ISAs, discussed above. Therefore, Searle and Baker constitute a complementarily systematic theoretical framework to deal with indirect speech acts such as CBEEs, but Baker's contribution lies in her modification and application of Grice's and Searle's findings to translation.

According to Baker, for a text to be meaningful in both the ST and in translation, it should be cohesive and coherent where cohesion is concerned with the surface meaning of a given text, i.e. meaning in terms of lexical, syntactical and semantic rules. On the other hand, coherence of a text, as Baker states "is a result of the interaction between knowledge presented in the text and the reader's own knowledge and experience of the world, the latter [is] influenced by a variety of factors such as sex, race, nationality, education, occupation, political and religious affiliations" (p.219).

Further, Baker emphasizes Grice’s concept of ‘implicature’, the conversational implicature, in particular, that is very much concerned with communicative texts in which what is said implies more than what is communicated by the surface meaning of words (Abdulla, 2009). When dealing with implied meaning, Baker asserts that the receptor, be he the listener/reader or the translator has to interpret the ST intentions by way of making inferences depending on relevant linguistic and contextual clues. In this respect, Baker states that the ST euphemisms, be they words or expressions, are normally cohesive, but only well interpreted when decoded according to their SL socio-cultural and situational context. She adds that euphemistic expressions are "conversational implicatures since the meaning they convey are always more than their literal meaning"(Abdulla, 2009, p.29).

To ensure how a speaker signals (or a hearer interprets) meaning which is not conventionally coded in language, Baker points out that the meanings of conversational implicatures can be inferred by reliance on Grice’s Cooperative Principle and its related maxims of Quantity, Quality, Relevance (Relation), and Manner. More specifically, Grice’s Cooperative Principle stipulates that language users tend to naturally believe that the utterances they produce should be clear, sincere, brief, and appropriate to the situation (Grice, 1975). More to the point, when language is put into action, certain non-linguistic features such as connectedness; purpose and co-operative willingness are utilized to establish the general principle of communication, i.e. the Co-operative Principle, (Grice, 1975). More importantly, Baker has modified Gricean maxims by including politeness as an additional maxim asserting that politeness may be regarded, in some cultures, as more important than truthfulness (Baker, 2011). According to Baker, flouting any of Grice’s maxims results in conversational implicatures since whenever any of these maxims is flouted; there will be an implied meaning. In the case of euphemisms, flouting of Grice’s maxims is quite justified and even demanding since the maxim of politeness, as Baker suggests, is more important and should be preserved via flouting theses maxims for social, religious and cultural considerations (Abdulla, 2009).
In a word, Baker’s discussion of pragmatics seems to be more relevant to the translation of euphemism, particularly, her use of the concepts of cohesiveness, coherence, and implicature (Abulla, 2009). Translators of euphemistic expressions should be well aware of the points highlighted by Baker to account for how to better determine the meanings implied in the employment of euphemism. The notions of the context of situation (relevance maxim) and the co-text (the linguistic conventions that surround the ST utterance) are highly emphasized by Baker and they are carefully utilized in the analysis of the CBEEs since both context and co-text play an integrally major role in determining the intended meaning as well as the function of the ST.

Gutt’s (1998/2000) Relevance Theory (RT) is very much concerned with how to view translation as an interpretive inferential activity due to the inferential nature of human communication. In addition, context as the central and crucial factor, in the interpretation of the speaker's or author's intention in communication, is accounted for in terms of the key notions RT offers, namely, optimal relevance, contextual effect and interpretive resemblance. As an interpretive cognitive activity, translation implies that the same utterance can express more than what it literally means, since the meaning of that utterance relies not only on its syntactic and semantic content, but more crucially on the socio-cultural context in which it occurs (Gutt, 1998). Therefore, the translator's/readers' use of the inaccurate or wrong contextual information can, unavoidably, result in communication failure. In RT, the inferential model entails that inference is the most dynamic mechanism in interpreting utterances because utterances according to this model are "not signals but pieces of evidence about the speaker's meaning, and comprehension is achieved by inferring this meaning from the evidence provided (Wilson and Sperber, 2000, p.229). Such evidence is offered by the relevant contextual information which is well explained by the principle of optimal relevance since, in terms of RT, context is assumed to be organized, where this kind of organization plays a vital role in the accessibility of contextual information provided on a given occasion. For example, in talking about childhood memories, it may be easy to remember one's own toys and it might take more effort of one to recall the colour of his/her toy. Consequently, "there is a correlation between the accessibility of information in our minds and the effort required to recall it" (Gutt, 1998, p.43).

For an utterance to be optimally relevant, three major conditions should be considered:(1) the addressee's intended meaning must be accessible to the addressee without 'unnecessary effort' and, (2) the addressee should find the ST intended meaning worthy of the effort exerted in terms of the benefits s/he is provided with (Sperber and Wilson, 1995; Gutt, 1998). In other words, the addressee will be more concerned with the ST meaning (s) that are more relevant to him/her, (3) an utterance is believed to be more relevant when it achieves some contextual effect, on the TT audience, and that contextual effect determines the degree of relevance an utterance has.

Accordingly, OR functions as the best guidance for the addressee in the process of comprehending and then interpreting the speaker-intended contextual information. In short, the recipient will seriously consider the information that is more accessible, less effortful and more relevant to him/her in terms of the contextual effect that kind of
information achieves. Additionally, the addressee will seriously consider the assumptions s/he has about contextual effect the speaker intends to create, and the former will accordingly play the trade-off mechanism between the contextual effect and the processing effort via heavily relying on the principle of OR (Sperber and Wilson, 1995; Hussein, 2009).

In combination with OR, interpretive resemblance is to be taken into consideration since it is a matter of degree, for it involves the sharing of explicatures and the implicatures an utterance consists of. Thus, two utterances interpretively resemble each other more closely, the more explicatures or implicatures they share (Sperber and Wilson, 1986 and Gutt, 1991). In this regard, the speaker, being engaged in interpretive use, will attempt to achieve interpretive resemblance to ST, which is strictly constrained by the principle of relevance. Consequently, s/he will opt for resemblance only in the relevant aspects which s/he assumes to satisfy the requirements of optimal relevance, previously referred to (Gutt, 1998).

Based on principle of interpretive resemblance, faithfulness to the ST intention is thus achieved due to the fact that the relevant aspects of the ST are assumed to be guaranteed in the translated text as a faithful representation of the original (Wilson and Sperber, 1988, Gutt, 1998). Quite related, Gutt's RT distances itself from the illusion of complete interpretive resemblance since it seems quite difficult and even impossible to achieve. In other words, it is quite impossible to transfer the linguistic properties of one language to another (Gutt 2000; Smith, 2002). However, it is often possible to reproduce in the TT the communicative clues of the ST in such a way that provides similar communicative function.

In other words, the RT views translation in terms of pragmatic inference, which plays crucial role in the process of ST producer's understanding and interpretation. The key concepts offered by the RT constitute an explanatory framework for translating the implicit utterances where the ST intention is not easily captured. As discussed earlier, the framework of RT is based on the new notion that examines translation as clues-based interpretive use of language across language boundaries.

In the same respect, House's (1997) model of translation quality assessment (TQA) is based on many interrelated notions such as cultural filter, overt vs. covert translation, situational dimensions, namely field, tenor and mode, as will be explained in chapter two (2.2.4.1). Accordingly, the CBEEs, being part of the Qur'anic discourse, are uttered in a given socio-cultural and situational context with implicit intentions. These CBEEs can be well examined in terms of register since they occur within a given field, namely religion, where the translator should know how to identify the field of the ST and s/he must be well-informed of all about the cultural and historical background concerned (House, 1997).
Similarly, a translator should be able to figure out the *tenor* of a euphemism where the relationships of the ST producer and the addressees are of much importance in providing dynamic communication. Who uses such CBEEs and for what purpose and what force or effect is intended on the part of the ST and then the TT receiver (Abdulla, 2009). The *mode* of the CBEEs, how the text is communicated and how its parts fit together (House, 2009), is of significance since through which the translator can realize the extent to which the ST is cohesive and coherent (House, 1997). The mode of euphemism usage is perhaps less important, although if the euphemism is used in the context of simultaneous translation, the translator may not have the time or the opportunity to reveal the hidden meaning, unless he is already familiar with the euphemism (House, 1997).

According to House’s model, the ST and the TT are analysed in terms of register to identify their profiles, first. Second, their genre is realized in register analysis. Third, the profiles of the ST and the TT are compared to identify the aspects of matches and mismatches between them according to the genre and the situational dimensions of genre and register. Fourth, the degree to which the two profiles match is then taken as an indicator of quality (House 2009, p.224).

In short, all the four theorists have much in common because all of them consider the concept of equivalence as a relative identity. Also, all these theories highly emphasize the importance of both the ST and the TT and stress the significance of socio-cultural and situational context in translation. Above all, they provide a systematic model for analysis, which makes it possible to critically examine the translations of the CBEEs in the Qur’an. The discussed theories are outlined in figure (1.1):
As the figure above suggests, the theories adopted constitute the framework for the explanation and interpretation of the data examined in this study. These theories seem to fit each other in terms of providing adequate understanding and assessment of how the Qur'anic CBEEs are rendered in the TT.

1.8 Conceptual Framework

In this study, the conceptual framework includes many concepts to be examined in many interrelated phases of analysis. On the one hand, CBEEs in the Qur'an are examined in terms of their intentionality and function, where the ST intention and function are determined by consulting the major exegetical books, namely Al-Razi (1981), Al-Tabari (2000); Al-Zamakhshari (1998); Ibn Ashūr (1997) and Qutb, (2003), among others. These exegetical books are consulted because they view the Qur'an from a rhetorical perspective which is the main focus in examining CBEEs in the Qur'an, first. Second, they have enjoyed popularity, acceptance and reliance by Muslims all over the world since they are considered as the major books of *tafsir*. On
the other hand, the selected CBEEs are found to fall under four main categories, i.e. sexual intercourse, sexual intention, genitals and bodily functions. In addition, the TT first analysed according the related theories, referred to in (1.7) above, to cater for whether the selected translations convey similar or different meanings and functions of the CBEEs in the TT. Second, the TT is assessed according to House's (1997) model and it is found that the ST is rendered by employing five main translation strategies, literal translation, explication, hyponymy, partial translation and functional-pragmatic equivalence. In this study, employing House's model aims at accounting for the accuracy and the adequacy of the non-Muslim translations of the Qur'anic CBEEs into English.

Accordingly, socio-pragmatic failure (SPF) and socio-pragmatic success (SPS) are identified in the light of the relevant theories. Specifically SPF is the point of focus in this study for the translators investigated are assumed to mainly fail in rendering the ST intentionality and function(s) for they seem to lack the sufficient socio-cultural and contextual knowledge required in this regard. In this study, four of the translation strategies employed, i.e. literal, hyponym, explication, partial translation, result in the occurrence of SPF. As for functional-pragmatic strategy, it is revealed that this particular translation strategy is the most workably applicable to the translation of CBEEs in the Quran into English. It leads to SPS in transferring the meanings and functions of the ST into the TT. Figure (1.2) represents the conceptual framework in this study where the key concepts are outlined.
Figure 1.2: Conceptual Framework
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According to figure 1.2, the concepts examined in this study are highlighted whereby their conceptualization of the ST and the TT and their relatedness are both identified.

1.9 Definition of Key Terms

The key terms used in this study are defined below. These include terms such as culture, culture-bound expressions, pragmatics, socio-pragmatic failure, and equivalence.

Culture

Culture is what determines the interpretations of the ‘meaning’ of other people’s behaviour since it consists of not only things, people, behaviour and emotions but of an organization of these things. It is the forms of things that people have in mind, their models for perceiving, relating, and otherwise interpreting them (Goodenough, 1964, Hofstede, 1980 cited in Bahameed, 2008). In this study, culture is very much associated with the shared principles people use to co-ordinate and communicate their activities and it is closely linked to "the knowledge, activities and artefacts associated with a given language community and which provides added meaning to the basic linguistic, referential meaning of words (Gelles and Levine, 1995, Spencer-Oatey, 2008, Palumbo, 2009). In other words, socio-cultural knowledge, in the sense stated above, determines the way people interpret, use and perceive the messages implied in the intercultural and cross-cultural linguistic codes of CBEEs in the Qur'an.

Culture-bound Euphemistic Expressions

Culture-bound expressions are words or expressions that are intrinsically and uniquely bound to a certain culture and are, therefore, related to the “context of a cultural tradition” (Newmark, 1988; Terestyényi, 2011, Sobhan and Saeed, 2015). In the Qur'an, these culture-bound expressions are highly euphemized and they therefore termed culture-bound euphemistic expressions (CBEEs). In short, the CBEEs are translation-resistant for they are very much linked to the ST culture and they are much more context-sensitive, since they are produced to designate special discourse peculiar to a given speech community.

Euphemism

In almost all cultures, language users tend to strictly avoid using certain words and expressions associated with unpleasant, inappropriate or embarrassing subjects, such as sex, bodily functions, death, among others (Allan and Burridge, 2006; Holder, 2008). These topics are called 'taboos’ where euphemising is solely the basic device employed by language users (Farghal, 2010; Al-Shawi, 2013, Shehab et al., 2014). Euphemism is, thus, defined as the practice of expressing offensive or delicate issues in a way that makes them sound more pleasant (Leech, 1983; Larson, 1984). In this study, the data examined in the Qur'an are highly euphemized, since sex-related
actions and parts in addition to bodily functions are red lines that cannot be approached
directly in the Arab and Islamic culture.

**Functional equivalence**

Functional Equivalence (FE) is the translation strategy that is concerned mainly with
rendering the ST content rather than its form (Motamadi, 2008) where producing a TT
function, that is approximately similar to that of the ST, is highly prioritized
(Newmark, 1988). In this study, functional equivalence refers solely to that procedure
used to render the ST pragmatic function as accurately as possible in the TT.

**Intended meaning**

In pragmatics, the *intended meaning* (pragmatic meaning) is more related to the study
of meaning from the language user's intention whereby s/he means more than what is
literally said (Searle, 1969; Thomas, 1983; Baker, 2011). In this study, the intended
meaning is more concerned with the implicit meaning the CBEEs in the Qur'an. This
kind of meaning, though involves pragmatic function, is a bit different in terms of the
message it indicates (a detailed account on the difference between pragmatic meaning
and pragmatic function is presented in chapter two (2.1.5.1.2).

**Pragmatic Equivalence (PE)**

Pragmatic equivalence (henceforth PE), is more concerned with the rendering in the
TL the ST producer's intention rather than his/her literal utterances or words (Baker,
2011, Munday, 2001). In this study, PE refers to the socio-culturally accurate
rendering of both the pragmatic meaning and function of the CBEEs in the TT.

**Pragmatic function**

Pragmatic function is the illocutionary force a given speech act entails in addition to
the meaning it expresses and it refers to the embedded associative connotations of a
word or an expression that carries implicit meanings (Searle, 1969, 1979; Baker,
2011). Pragmatic function, in this study, is the illocutionary force conveyed by CBEEs
in the Qur'an besides the meanings they indicate.

**Socio-pragmatic failure**

The term socio-pragmatic failure is defined as the language user's inability to
understand what is meant by what is said due to his/her insufficient knowledge of the
social conditions placed on language in use (Thomas, 1983; Al-Hindawi et al.2014).
In this study, the SPF is basically concerned with the translator's failure (inability) to
render the ST intended meanings and functions of the Qur'anic CBEEs in the TT.
Translation strategy

A translation strategy is "a potentially conscious procedure for solving a problem faced in translating a text, or any segment of it." (Loescher, 1991, p.8) In the light of this definition, the notion of consciousness is essential since a strategy refers to what is intentionally used by translators to deal with translation problems (Cohen, 1998; Venuti, 1998). In this study, translation strategies refer to those conscious procedures employed by the Qur'an translators in translating the CBEEs from the ST into the TT.

1.10 Structure of the Thesis

This study consists of five chapters which are as follows:

Chapter one covers the background to the study and states its problem as well as its questions, objectives and scope. Besides, it offers an overview of both the theoretical and conceptual frameworks alongside the significance of the study. In addition, a brief account on the key concepts, used in this study, is presented.

Chapter two provides a detailed account of the key concepts, i.e. culture, culture-bound expressions, socio-pragmatic failure and so forth. In the section dedicated to key concepts, the concepts of equivalence and socio-pragmatic failure are examined in more detailed accounts since they are regarded as a corner-stone of this study. In addition, a detailed survey of the related theories, namely Searle (1969) and Baker (2011), Gutt (1998, 2000) and House (1997). In addition, Newmark's (1981; 1988) and Chesterman's (1997) approaches are adopted in the analysis of the translation strategies used by the translators selected in this study. Furthermore, this chapter includes a critical view on the previous studies as well.

Chapter three discusses the research methodology including the research approach and design. It provides an account of the source of data, data identification, rationale for the data selection and the data verification. In addition, the steps taken in the process of data collection are described. This chapter includes the methods and the frameworks for data analysis and interpretation.

In chapter four, the verses that contain CBEEs are, firstly, textually and contextually analysed according to the research questions raised. The ST intended meanings and functions are determined by consulting the major exegetical books which provides the socio-cultural and situational contextual background. Secondly, the TTs are also textually and contextually analysed where pragmatic analysis is prioritized to investigate how CBEEs are translated and whether the selected translators have succeeded or failed in reproducing the ST meanings and functions in the TT. The four research questions are sought to be answered in a way that systematically guides the whole data analysis. The assessment of translations the Qur'anic CBEEs is based upon textual and contextual analysis and the results of the verification sheets. The textual and contextual analysis serves identifying the findings via answering the research
questions while the verification sheets help verify the study findings by showing the extent to which the experts' answers are in accordance with those findings.

**Chapter five** presents an overview of the findings arrived at in a form of conclusions. Limitation and contribution of the study as well as the recommendations for further future research are identified.

1.11 **Summary**

This chapter provides an overview on the background of the study and states the statement of problem investigated in this study. The general and the specific objective of the study in addition to the research questions are provided. Furthermore, this study sheds light on the scope, significance, theoretical and conceptual frameworks of the study. Finally, the structure of the thesis and the key terms, used in this study, are briefly presented.
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