Morphopragmatic Analysis of Word Derivation Variations in the Holy Quran and their Translations into English

Abed Shahooth Khalaf [1]*, Ayad Hamad Ali [1], Fatin Khalil Ibraheem[1], Sabariah Md Rashid [2]

[1] Department of English, University of Anbar, Ramadi, Iraq.
[2] Department of English, UPM, Selangor, Malaysia.

Abstract

Objectives: This study aims to examine the effect of variations in word derivations in the Holy Quran on conveying their communicative impact when translated into English. Specifically, the study seeks to identify which of the selected translations have preserved the intended pragmatic effect triggered by word derivation variations in each Ayah when translated into English.

Methods: To achieve this objective, the study compiles a corpus consisting of Ayahs containing randomly selected morphological derivation variations from the Holy Quran and their translations in English by Ali (1934), Pickthall (1930), Ghali (1996), Arberry (1955), Palmer (1947), and Al-Hilali and Khan (1984). The content analysis method was employed to identify instances of word derivation variations in the corpus, and Nida's (1964) principle of equivalent effect was adopted to examine the loss of the communicative impact of these words in each translation.

Results: The findings of the study indicate that almost all the selected translations failed to preserve the intended pragmatic effect triggered by the variation in word derivations in the Holy Quran when conveyed to English recipients.

Conclusions: The reasons behind this failure might be attributed to the translators' inability to grasp the intended pragmatic implications resulting from morphological variations of words.

Keywords: Morphopragmatic analysis, derivation variations, communicative effect, equivalent effect

تحليل صرفي براغماتي لتنوع اشتقاق الكلمات في القرآن الكريم وترجمتها إلى اللغة الإنجليزية

عبد شاحوذ خلف1*، إياد حماد علي1، فاتن خليل إبراهيم1، صبرية محمد رشيد2
1قسم اللغة الإنجليزية، كلية الآداب، جامعة الأنبار، الرمادي، العراق.
2قسم اللغة الإنجليزية، كلية اللغات الأجنبية والاتصال، جامعة يو بي ام، سيلانجور، ماليزيا.

ملخّص

الأهداف: يهدف هذا البحث إلى دراسة أثر تنوع مشتقات الكلمات في القرآن الكريم على إيصال تأثيرها التواصلي عند ترجمتها إلى اللغة الإنجليزية، وتحديد الترجمات التي حافظت على التأثير التواصلي المقصود الناتج عن تنوع اشتقاق الكلمات في كل آية عند ترجمتها إلى اللغة الإنجليزية.

المنهجية: جمعت الدراسة عينة تتكون من آيات قرآنية تشتمل على تنوع المشتقات وترجماتها في اللغة الإنجليزية من قبل علي (1934)، وبيكثال (1930)، وغالي (1996)، وآربري (1955)، وبالمر (1947) والهلالي وخان (1984). استعملت طريقة تحليل المحتوى في تحديد حالات تنوع اشتقاق الكلمات في النص الأصلي، ونظرية نايدا (1964) للتأثير المكافئ في دراسة فقدان التأثير التواصلي لهذه الكلمات في كل ترجمة.

النتائج: تشير نتائج الدراسة إلى أنَّ جميع الترجمات المختارة تقريبًا فشلت في الحفاظ على التأثير البراغماتي المقصود الناجم عن التنوع في اشتقاق الكلمات في القرآن الكريم إلى المتلقي الإنجليزي.

الخلاصة: يمكن أن تعزى أسباب هذا الفشل إلى عدم قدرة المترجمين إدراك التأثير البراغماتي المقصود الناتج عن التنوع في بناء الكلمة في النص الأصلي ونقله إلى المتلقي.

الكلمات الدالة: التحليل الصرفي البراغماتي، تنوع الاشتقاق، التأثير التواصلي، التأثير المكافئ.

1. Introduction

Translation of the Holy Quran from Arabic into other languages is still a sensitive issue in Islamic theology. Since Muslims consider Quran inimitable, they argue that the Quranic text should not be separated from its source language or written form or at least the Arabic text should be next to it (Fatani, 2006). There has been a boom in studies on English translations of the Holy Quran as a result of expanding Muslim populations in English-speaking countries and the increase of scholarly interest in Islam (Mohammad, 2005). Some of these studies have emphasized the impossibility of translating the Holy Quran. Rahman (1988), for instance, argues that the inspired language of the Quran "can never be completely satisfactorily translated into another language" (p. 24).

In the same line, Denffer (1983) points out that Muslim intellectuals agree that it is impossible to transfer the Quran word by word in an identical form and meaning into another language because the words of the target language may not give the proper shades of meaning. Similarly, Abdul-Raof (2001) maintains that the Quranic discourse has its own distinctive features at the semantic, syntactic, and rhetorical levels, such features make Quran challenging for translators. Likewise, Abdelaal (2019) affirms that translating religious texts is challenging, especially the Holy Quran. The author argues that Quran translators have attempted to produce accurate renditions thereof, yet due to the sacredness of the text, their attempts have not been very successful.

The Arabic vocabulary used in the Holy Quran conveys a set of ideas with various subtle shades of meanings, which are impossible to express completely with a finite number of words in other languages (Khalifa, 1989). This can be proved by the verbs "isṭa'a'" and "istaṭa'a'". These verbs were translated differently as 'could' (أسطاع)(and 'was able to' (أستطاع) (by Sale (1734), Ali (2010), Pickthall (2001) and Rodwell (2012). The two words are not identical in meaning; there is a notable difference in meaning between the two words. The Quranic verb أسطاع is only used for relatively easy actions, such as climbing a hill, while أستطاع is used for a harder task as piercing a tunnel through the hill (Khalifa, 1989). Conversely, Al-Ghazalli (2012) argues that translators failed to accurately render the verb phrase in the Quranic translation because of the gap in grammatical structure or the inaccuracy in selecting the proper lexicons.

Scholars and translators still argue about the translatability of Quran whether it is translatable or untranslatable. In this regard, Baker (2011) thinks that the Quran is untranslatable and any translation is a form of explanation. Accordingly, some Muslim scholars count the translations of the Quran as an explanation and interpretation, and this assumption is supported by Murata and Chittick (2006) who claim that the translation of the Quran is merely an explanation and an interpretation and does not represent the original text of the Quran. In addition, El-Farran (2006) concludes that the translator of Quran is expected to commit mistakes irrespective of having good or bad intentions. Such mistakes occur due to either the lack of equivalent expressions in the target language.

2. Literature Review

This part attempts a survey of the literature pertaining to the focus of the present study. It starts with an examination of the issue of word derivation in English and Arabic to highlight the strategies used in the morphological variation in each language. Then the discussion will be focused on issues of pragmatics that have bearing on the study. This is followed by a critical examination of the related past studies that focused on the problems peculiar to the Quran translation into English, particularly issues related to the pragmatics of the Holy Quran. Some critical comments on these related studies, in terms of their focus, significance and findings, are presented.

2.1. Word Derivation in English and Arabic

Word derivation in English is a morphological process which refers to the formation of new lexemes (words) which either causes a change in the category of the word or adds new meanings or leads to both (Lieber, 2009). On the other hand, derivation in Arabic is defined as "forming a new word from another word which is similar in meaning but different in form" (Al-Jorjani, 1983, p. 18). Morphology is subdivided into inflectional and derivational morphemes. Derivational morphemes can be either prefixes or suffixes, whereas inflectional morphemes can be only suffixes. Unlike inflectional morphemes, derivational morphemes can change the meaning of a word or its part of speech (Meyer, 2009). For example, the positive verb 'construct' can be changed into a negative verb when a negative prefix (de-) is added to it 'deconstruct'.

So there is a change in the form of the verb and meaning as well.

Derivational morphemes depend on the types of stems they affix to. Thus, derivational morphology is regarded lexical because it changes one 'lexical entry' into another, shifting its meaning, and sometimes, but not always changing its word category (Pavey, 2010). The entry of the word 'act' is a noun, but when adding the suffix (-ive), 'active', the entry changes into an adjective. Concerning its role in language, Booij (2005) states that the function of English derivation is "to enable the language user to make new lexemes" (p. 17). Such lexemes are related to different grammatical categories like nouns, verbs, adjectives and adverbs. As for the Arabic language, Al-Foadi (2018) asserts that Arabic derivation is a main way of adapting new words to the Arabic language as it is counted as the safest and the most effective way to adapt and assimilate foreign terms to Arabic.

In addition, Bauer (2000) affirms that the derivation of verbs follows certain patterns which are not numerous, but restricted. Roughly speaking, verbs are derived from other verbs, in addition denominal and deadjectival verbs are common forms of verb derivation. However, Hamid and Ali (2020) argue that derivation in English has no patterns, i.e., it is a random process, but the Arabic language has fixed patterns for verbs and nouns. The verb 'write' has the present form 'yaktubu', while its past is 'kataba' (wrote), but in English 'play' becomes 'played', while 'run' turns to be 'ran' in the past.

According to Al-Jarf (1990), Arabic morphological derivation is a natural way to produce new vocabulary through adding affixes to roots. Arabic derivation is divided into simple, root modification, and metathesis. Whereas English derivational suffixes are productive where one can sometimes add another suffix, such as (beat, beating, beatings), in Arabic the process requires altering sound positions of a word through diacritics, such as (ضَرَبَ – يَضْرِبُ). To recapitulate, the process of English derivation requires roots and affixations, while derivation in Arabic requires diacritics, which are placed on different positions of the word, and can change the meaning of the word. In addition, English derivation is performed randomly, while Arabic derivation is based on a fixed set of inflectional patterns.

2.2. Meaning in Context

Pragmatics is a field of linguistics, which has gained much attention recently. It is viewed as the "study of those context-dependent aspects of meaning" (Horn and Ward, 2006, P xi). Basically, it deals with the propositions of the structures, but not with the logical forms rather the meanings conveyed through these forms. In line with this, Cruse (2006) believes that pragmatics is concerned with the aspects of meaning which are dependent on context. According to Levinson (1983), pragmatics is the study of those relations between language and context which are grammaticalized or encoded in the structure of a given language. According to him, pragmatics focuses on the relationship between structures and contexts.

Speakers usually mean much more than their words, i.e., a speaker can mean something quite different from what the words say. For instance, if someone says 'It's hot in here! He describes the place's condition as being hot, but actually this is an implicit where he means 'please open the room's windows' (Thomas, 2013). Consequently, Thomas states that the common definitions of the term pragmatics "meaning in use or meaning in context" (p.1), are accurate and perfectly adequate. Moreover, for Yule (1996) and Katz (1977) pragmatics is related to how the speaker or writer says his words and how the listener or reader interprets these words, but they also refer to the role played by context where they assume that context influences what it is said by the speaker. Moreover, pragmatics refers to the study of language in context, which sets down its attention on the language users and the context in which words are uttered instead of centering on reference, truth or structures. More specifically, it studies how the same sentence can express different propositions from one context to another (Stalnaker 1974; Gazdar 1979).

Pragmatics is the study of how language is used and how the structures of language are adapted to the functions performed in the context, and how language is used to create discourse (Brinton 2000). The type of discourse could be written or verbal – this actually does not matter because the forms and context are the significant factors in understanding the meanings conveyed by the speech acts. The Speech Act Theory was developed by Austin (1962) who underlines the performative acts and proved through some examples that we do not make statements or questions, rather we perform actions (Asp and Villiers, 2010). Austin classified the speech acts into three types; the locutionary act, the illocutionary act, and the perlocutionary act.

2.3. Studies on the Translation of the Holy Quran

A quick survey of the scholarly work carried out on the translations of the Holy Quran shows that there is plethora of research in this domain. Almost all grammatical, semantic, stylistic, rhetorical aspects in the Holy Quran among others have been the main focus of linguists and translation scholars. The following brief survey will examine studies pertaining to focus of the present study.

Abdul-Raouf (2004) investigated the linguistic idiosyncrasies and prototypical features of Quranic expressions, which might be the main cause of the problems of translating the Holy Quran. According to the author, these features are not found in the linguistic norms of other languages leading to failures in translations of the Holy Quran. The author examines a number of lexical and semantic mismatches in different translations of the Quran. He attributes these voids in meaning to the fact that a word in the Holy Quran can have one shade of meaning which the target language lacks. He correctly argues that "some Quranic lexical items are pregnant with Quran-specific emotive overtones, which in turn create lexical voids. The lexical compression of Quranic expressions can only be tackled through […] semantic decomposition of words" (2004, p. 93). Abdul-Raof proposes transliteration as a translation strategy to render some Quranic expressions to avoid the loss of their sensitive overtones. According to this author, Arabic has morphological mechanisms which allow it to create various words from the same root. An example is the verb "نزل" (descended) and "أنزل" (revealed) whereby the first indicates the act of the revelation of the Holy Quran which lasted for years, while the second means 'revealing at once'. In the translations he examines, no distinction was made between the uses of this verb. The translators used the term "sent down" for both.

In a similar vein, Mahmoud (2008) examines four translations of *Surah* "An-Nas" with the aim to highlight the importance of cultural bearings on the translation of the Holy Quran. To prove his assertion, the author gives the example of the word "صدور". In three of the selected translations, it was rendered as "breast", however Ali's translation opted for the correct equivalent by rendering it into "heart". The mistranslation of this example indicates that when the translator misinterprets the connotative meaning of a word, s/he would lose great cultural aspects of the source text. This is true as the word "صدور" in the Holy Quran is used to talk about the heart; not only the breast. The author concludes that "The word order, the selection of lexical items and syntactic structures in the Quranic text all dictate semantic subtleties whose delicate underlying meaning can be quite difficult to tackle through translation"(p. 1867).

From a pragmatic perspective, Al-Azab and Al-Misned (2012) carried out a comparative analytical study on the translation of the Holy Quran. The authors argue that pragmatic loss in the translation of the Holy Quran can cause the pleasure of reading this sacred book to fade away. To prove their argumentation, the authors examined a number of cases of pragmatic loss including loss of genre, textual meaning, referential versatility, culture specific terms, prevalence, word order, syntactic conflict, exaggerated forms, ellipses, gender, grammatical category and tense which cause a loss in meaning due to the inability of the translators to maintain these features. The authors conclude their study by emphasizing the importance of maintaining the structure, style and rhetoric of the Holy Quran to keep its spirit.

Taking a semantic and pragmatic orientation, Ashaer (2013) conducted a descriptive analytical study on three translations of the *Surah* "Yusuf" (Sale, (1734), Dawood, (1956) and Ali, (1934). The aim was to identify causes of failure leading to loss in meaning carried out by the translators on the semantic and pragmatic levels. The three translators were unable to grasp the intended meaning of certain words or speech acts resulting in inaccuracy in the translations. This orientation has left an effect on the recipients other than that intended by the source text on its recipients. The author concludes that translators need to vary methods of translating the Holy Quran. There are cases in which literal translation can be used, others transliteration while in others communicative translation can be adopted to overcome the cases of meaning loss. Moreover, the author attributes failures in translation to the translators not referring to Quran exegeses which can help give the clear story, and the intended meanings of the verses in the *Surah.*

In addition, Sideeg (2016) investigated the variation in translating intended meanings in the Holy Quran by examining the renditions of seven verses in seventy English translations focusing on variables such as the pragmatics of the Quran, the translator's culture and ideology. The findings of the study indicate that the translators' failure to arrive at the intended

meanings in the selected verses due to translators' ideology and their unawareness of the salient meaning of these verses. Moreover, the intended meanings in the selected verses are better transferred by adopting the literal translation strategy and explication that preserve the source text's lexes and structures, although with some loss of the intended meaning.

On a different level, Al-Badani et al. (2016) carried out a contrastive comparative study by adopting a content analysis model to examine the utilization of the expansion strategy in rendering *iltifāt* (switch) in Sūrat *al-Baqarah* in Ali's translation. The authors compared the selected Quranic verses to their counterparts in the target text to examine the adequacy of expansion strategy in translating *iltifāt i*n these verses. To that end, the author consulted several exegetical books, like Ibn al-Athīr, (637/1239); al-Suyūṭī, (911/ 1505); and Badr al-Dīn al-Zarkashi, (794/ 1391) to determine the intended meaning in the selected verses. The findings of the study indicate that translating *iltifāt* represents a challenge for Quran translators due to differences between the Arabic and the English languages. Moreover, Ali's utilization of the expansion strategy in translating *iltifāt* is mainly based on grammatical and syntactic considerations, hence it was used to decrease the effect of sudden *iltifāt* from one pronoun to another.

Furthermore, Abdullah (2017) carried out a qualitative study with the aim to examine instances of pragmatic losses in three English translations, namely word- for-word translation, literal translation and running translation with lexical and syntactic expansion of Surah al-Kahf in the Holy Quran. To achieve this objective, the study adopted a comparative pragmalinguistic model. Abdullah argues that due to differences between English and Arabic such as the morphological, phonological, lexical, syntactical, stylistic, social, psychological and cultural, pragmatic losses particularly in religious texts become inevitable. However, it is the responsibility of the translator to find a strategy of compensation through additions, domestication or foreignization, to attenuate the pragmatic loss, otherwise it might distort the gratification of the source text and lead to incomplete understanding of its nuances. The findings of the study reveal great similarities and differences in the selected translations indicating clear instances of pragmatic losses specifically in tense, texture, grammatical category, gender, textual meaning, and culture-specific terms.

As the previous account on the scholarly work carried out on certain aspects of the translations of the Holy Quran shows, the majority of the previously surveyed studies seem to have focused mainly on pragmatic issues and overlooked the effect of morphological derivation variations on conveying the intended pragmatic communicative effect embodied in the source texts. Therefore, the value of the present study stems from its attempt to contribute to fill up this gap in the literature by conducting a morphopragmatic analysis of word derivation variations in the Holy Quran with reference to their realizations in English to check whether the effect of this variation has been preserved in the translations or not.

3. Methodology

This study adopts Nida's (1964) principle of equivalent effect in which the translator should do his/her best to maintain the effect of the target text on the target receptor similar to that of the source text on the source receptor. Accordingly, the analysis of the data collated for the purpose of this study will be focused on whether the equivalents opted for in the selected translations have preserved this effect in the English versions of the Ayahs or not.

3.1. Data and approach of the study

This study is descriptive in nature with no attempt for value judgment. It is qualitative and adopts a corpus-based analysis approach to identify which of the selected translations have preserved the intended pragmatic effect triggered by word derivation variations in the selected Ayahs in English.

The translations selected are by Ali (1934), Pickthall (1930), Ghali (1996), Arberry (1955), Palmer (1947), and Al-Hilali and Khan (1984). These selected translations are globally the most commonly cited in studies on the Holy Quran (Fakhry, 2009). These translations are done by Arab Muslim and Non-Arab Non-Muslim translators. The rationale behind collating this number of translations is to widen the scope and analysis of the study. The data of the study comprise only typical illustrative examples of word derivation variations in the Holy Quran compared with their translated versions in English.

3.2. Data collection

The data collection of the study included two stages: 1) randomly collating Ayahs from the Holy Quran, which contain instances of word derivation variation and highlighting the exact word with this variation by underlining and bold type. 2) gathering the translations of each Ayah from the six selected translators and highlighting the equivalent in English of the word containing derivation variation by underlining and bold type. A literal direct translation of the selected words is also given between parentheses and sometimes a transliteration of the same word is provided to familiarize non-native speakers of Arabic with these words.

3.3. Data analysis

The content analysis method was adopted in the analysis part whereby the selected Ayahs containing word derivation variation are put side by side with their translations in English. Then, the proposed equivalents of these variations in the translations are examined under Nida's (1964) principle of equivalent effect. Indeed, Nida proposed one of the most influential dichotomies of translation equivalence, namely, formal and dynamic equivalence. According to the author, formal equivalence focuses on maintaining the form and content of the message in the source language when rendered in the target text. It is clear that the approach is source text oriented. Nida argues that "the message in the receptor language should match as closely as possible the different elements in the source language" (p. 159). In contrast to formal equivalence, Nida proposed dynamic equivalence which emphasizes the concept of 'equivalent effect'. Later, the term "dynamic" was replaced with "functional" (Nida & Taber, 2003).

Moreover, the pragmatic significance of the variation in word derivation in the Holy Quran is highlighted by consulting exegeses of the Holy Quran (Al-Samarrayi, 2000 & Al-Qaisi, 1996 among others) to be compared with the provided translations and identify which of the selected translations have preserved the intended pragmatic effect triggered by word derivation variations in the selected Ayahs in English. A sufficient context is also given where necessary for a full understanding of the vicinity in which the selected words are used. Some English-English dictionaries are also consulted for exact examination of the provided equivalents to further check their accuracy in preserving the intended pragmatic implication resulting for the morphological derivation variation.

4. Results and Discussion

According to Al-Qaisi (1996), there are 246 forms of word derivation variations in the Holy Quran which are repeated 1885 times in the different chapters, Surahs and Ayahs. In what follows, the discussion will be focused on only typical illustrative examples of these variation cases because it is impossible to cover all of them due to word limitations.

Example1: (97 – الكهف) فَمَا اسْطَٰعُوٓاْ أَن يَظْهَرُوهُ وَمَا اَسْتَطَٰعُوٓاْ لَهُۥ نَقْبًا

1.	Ali	Thus were they made **powerless** to scale it or to dig through it.
2.	Pickthall	And (Gog and Magog) **were not able to surmount**, nor **could they pierce (it).**
3.	Ghali	So, **in no way were they able to surmount it**, and **in no way were they able to bore** it.
4.	Arberry	So they were **unable** either to scale it or pierce it.
5.	Palmer	They **could not** scale it, and they **could not** tunnel it.
6.	Al-Hilali and Khan	So they [Ya'juj and Ma'juj (Gog and Magog)] **could not scale it or dig** through it.

Example 1 above illustrates a case whereby two morphological derivation variations of the same verb are used, but with different pragmatic implications. The first variation is "isṭa'u" (Lit. they could), while the second is "ista'ṭ'u" (Lit. they managed) with the addition of "t", both derived from the same base form namely the verb "yastaṭia'u" (Lit. he is able). According to Al-Qaisi (1996), the form "isṭa'au" is repeated only one time, while the form "ista'ṭ'u" is repeated four times (p. 99) in the Holy Quran. Pragmatically speaking, this derivation variation entails different implications in the context in which it is used in example 1 above. More specifically, in this particular Ayah, the form "isṭa'au " lost the

"t" to go in harmony with the state of affairs it describes, i.e. the ease of scaling the barrier (though very difficult) compared with the difficulty of digging through it expressed with the word reacquiring the "t" to become "ista'ṭ'u ". This morphological variation with the omission of the "t" requires less effort on the part of the speaker to articulate "isṭa'au" as a reflection of the less difficulty of scaling the barrier compared with the extreme difficulty of digging through it reflected by the addition of the "t". (Ibn A'shoor, 1997; Al-Qaisi (1996, p. 100); Al-Samarrayi (2000, p. 10)). Moreover, Al-Samarrayi (2000) adds another important point, namely that since scaling the barrier requires less time, the "t" is deleted from the verb describing the state of scaling, however, it is added to digging through the barrier since this definitely requires longer time (p. 11).

When these details are projected on the selected translations of this Ayah, a close examination shows that this different pragmatic communicative effect triggered by the morphological derivation variation has not been reflected to the recipients who depend exclusively on reading these translations to understand this Ayah in the Holy Quran. To be more specific, Ali's translation, for instance, uses the expression "made powerless" in the passive construction to express scaling the barrier or digging through it. Consequently, this translation falls short of highlighting the different pragmatic implications intended in the Ayah. This translation does not make any distinction whether in terms of the less high/very high complexity of scaling/digging through the barrier, or in terms of the shorter/longer duration of time required for scaling or digging through it. Thus, it cannot be said to be representing an optimal translation equivalent for the Ayah in the source text. This is also the case with Pickthall's translation, though it uses the expression "were not able" for scaling the barrier and the modal auxiliary "could" for piercing it. Once more this translation blurs the less high/very high complexity of scaling or digging through the barrier, and the shorter/longer duration of time for its scaling/digging through it intended in the Ayah. Similarly, Ghali's translation equates scaling the barrier with digging through it by using the exact words twice "in no way were they able", a fact which is also reflected in the remaining three translations; Arberry's by using the word "unable", Palmer's by using the model auxiliary "could not" and Al-Hilali and Khan's by using the model auxiliary "could not".

In view of Nida's (1964) principle of equivalent effect that should be maintained in the target text to affect the target reader in the same way the source text has affected the source reader, all selected translations fall short of preserving a similar communicative effect on the recipients. As a result, while English speakers who depend exclusively on these translations will lose much due to blurring different pragmatic implications resulting from the morphological derivation variation occurring to the words, Arab Muslim readers who are native speakers of Arabic can easily arrived at these nuances.

Furthermore, the translators have neither attempted to indicate this difference in pragmatic implications resulting from the morphological changes of the words to the recipients in parentheses, nor have they used a footnote for that same purpose as a form of compensation for this loss of the intended implications. (e.g. *Although the verbs "isṭa'au" and "ista'ṭ'u" come from the same root "yastaṭia'u" in Arabic, yet in the second verb, the addition of the letter 't' is meant to emphasize the idea that digging through the barrier is more difficult and takes longer time than scaling it.) This idea of compensation is stressed by Abdullah (2017, p. 69), who argues that "the strategy of compensation is frequently applied, whereby the loss of one pragmatic element in a TT is accepted for balancing it through addition of another pragmatic element somewhere else." The reason behind the inaccuracy of preserving a similar communicative effect on the recipients may be attributed to lack of intensive readings in the various books of interpretation of the Holy Quran, particularly those which focus on the rhetoric of the word in the Quranic expression, implication of the derivation variation in the morphology of words in the Holy Quran, and the semantics of structures in the Holy Quran. Ashaer (2013, p. 4) emphasizes this notion stating that "the correct understanding of the verses of the Quran and their intended meanings can only happen if the translator refers to the most important books of exegeses which discuss all that is related to the Quranic verse semantically, pragmatically and rhetorically". A similar case pertaining to word derivation variation and its pragmatic implication is further illustrated in example 2 below;

<div dir="rtl">وَهَلْ نُجَازِىٓ إِلَّا ٱلْكَفُورَ (سبأ – 17)</div>

وَسَنَجْزِي ٱلشَّٰكِرِينَ (ال عمران 145) :Example2

1.	Ali	and never do We give (such) **requital** except to such as are ungrateful rejecters.
		And swiftly shall We **reward** those that (serve us with) gratitude.
2.	Pickthall	**Punish** We ever any save the ingrates?
		and We will **reward** the thankful.
3.	Ghali	and do We **recompense** (thus) except the ever-disbelieving (one)?
		and We will soon **recompense** the thankful.
4.	Arberry	'We ever **recompense** any but the unbeliever?
		and We will **recompense** the thankful.
5.	Palmer	and do we so **reward** any but misbelievers?
		and we will **recompense** the grateful.
6.	Al-Hilali and Khan	And never do We **requite** in such a way except those who are ungrateful (disbelievers).
		And We shall **reward** the grateful.

In example 2 above, there are two morphological derivation variations of the same verb, each reflecting a different pragmatic implication in its context in the Ayah. The first variation is "wasanajzi" (Lit. we will reward), while the second is "nujazi",' نُجَازِى (Lit. we reward), both derived from the base form namely the verb "ujazi" (Lit. he rewards). According to Al-Qaisi (1996), the form "najzi، نَجْزِى' is repeated 19 times, while the form "nujazi" نُجَازِى' is repeated only one time in the Holy Quran. (pp. 53-54). Pragmatically speaking, this derivation variation entails different intended implications very necessary for a full understanding of the Ayah. More specifically, the form "najzi، نَجْزِى'can express two meanings; either reward (كَذَٰلِكَ نَجْزِى كُلَّ كَفُورٍ - فاطر - 36) (Lit. **we will reward the thankful**) or punish (**Lit. thus we punish every unbelieving one**) (وَسَنَجْزِى ٱلشَّٰكِرِينَ - ال عمران 145) depending on the context in which the word is used. Accordingly, if the word "najzi" نَجْزِى' is surrounded by words or attributes expressing the good state of the believers, the patients, people of faith, i.e., righteous people in general, it takes the positive implication of 'reward'. If, on the other hand, it is surrounded by words or attributes describing the bad state of the unbelievers, the wicked treacherous and evildoers, it takes the negative implication of 'punishment'. On this basis, in the Ayah above (وَسَنَجْزِى ٱلشَّٰكِرِينَ - ال عمران 145), (Lit. **we will reward the thankful**), the word "najzi" نَجْزِى' expresses the positive implication of 'reward' because the Ayah immediately preceding it talks about those people who are willing to have the requital of the Hereafter, and whom Almighty Allah promised to bring them of it. In the second Ayah, (كَذَٰلِكَ نَجْزِى كُلَّ كَفُورٍ - فاطر - 36), (**Lit. thus we punish every unbelieving one**), the word "najzi،نَجْزِى' expresses the negative implication of 'punishment' because the whole Ayah preceding it talks about those who have disbelieved, and for them there will be fire of hell, their end will not be decreed and so they die, nor will any degree of the torment of fire be lightened for them. "Thus We recompense every constant disbeliever". (Ghali, 1996).

As for the form "nujazi،نُجَازِى' , it has one meaning only, namely that of 'punishment', (Al-Qaisi, 1996, p. 55; Al-Zamakhshari, 1986). This intended meaning is also emphasized by the context in which the word "nujazi" is used in the above Ayah. The key word for this interpretation is the word "unbeliever" (كفور), to make the harmony between the verb "nujazi" نُجَازِى' which is sarcastically used in this context and the due requital the unbelievers deserve on the basis of their bad deeds. Hence, Almighty Allah requites the unbelievers in an absolutely fair way as equivalent to the vicious and worldly deeds they commit, yet the requital is neither duplicated nor exaggerated.

Now, we examine whether these pragmatic implications caused by the morphological derivation variation have been preserved in the selected translations of the two Ayahs or not. To start with, Ali's translation uses the noun "requital" as an equivalent for the word "nujazi،نُجَازِى' . According to Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary (n.d), the word 'requital' means something given in return, it is a compensation, or retaliation. Hence, if the word requital is associated with the other words in this translation, particularly 'ungrateful rejecters', it can be said that the translation preserves that pragmatic implication of 'punishment' intended in the Ayah above. To reiterate, this translation maintained a similar communicative effect to the recipients as that intended to the source text recipients. Moreover, it shows that the translator was able to fully grasp the

intended meaning behind the word "nujazi",نُجَازِى ' and transfer it to the recipients. As for Pickthall's translation of this Ayah, it uses the word "punish" as an equivalent for the verb "nujazi",نُجَازِى '. This translation represents a direct optimal translation equivalent as it leaves no traces of doubt of the translator's ability to grasp the intended pragmatic implication of the verb "nujazi" in the example above. Hence, it has been very faithful in preserving the spirit of the source text, and rendering its communicative effect to the recipients. As for Ghali and Arberry, they both use the same word "recompense" as an equivalent for the verb "nujazi" in the Ayah above. According to the Merriam- Webster Online Dictionary, the word 'recompense' means to give something to by way of compensation (as for a service rendered or damage incurred) and it also carries the meaning of punishment. On this basis, the translators were able to arrive at the intended meaning in the Ayah and render it to the target recipients. By so doing, they could arrive at the pragmatic implication resulting from the morphological derivation variation of the verb "nujazi" and transfer it to recipients, thus preserving the intended communicative effect in the target text.

Palmer's translation uses the word "reward" as an equivalent for the verb "nujazi' in example 2 above. The Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary defines the word 'reward' as something that is given in return for good or evil done or received or that is offered for some service or attainment. Since this definition implies that the word 'reward' can be something given in return for evil done or received, this means that it carries the meaning of 'punishment'. In such a case, it can be a translation equivalent for the verb "nujazi' in the Ayah above. In addition, it shows that the translator was able to arrive at the intended pragmatic implication of the verb "nujazi", and hence, it communicates a similar pragmatic effect to the target reader as that intended by the source text on the source reader. Finally, Al-Hilali and Khan's translation is almost similar to that of Ali's although it uses the verb "requite" as an equivalent for the "nujazi" in example 2 above. Consequently, the translator could arrive at the intended pragmatic implication of the derivation variation and communicate a similar communicative effect to the target readers.

Concerning the translation of the verb "najzi" in the second Ayah above, Ali, Pickthall and Al-Hilali and Khan use the word "reward" as a translation equivalent for this verb. This means that these translators were able to grasp the intended pragmatic implication and communicate a similar communicative effect to the target readers. In addition, Ghali, Arberry and Palmer opt for the word "recompense" as a translation equivalent for the verb "najzi" in the Ayah above. Once more, this translation preserves that intended communicative effect of the verb "najzi" in the Ayah above to the target readers.

The analysis above shows that, in the light of Nida's (1964) communicative effect, all the selected translations were successful in preserving a similar communicative effect of the intended pragmatic implications of the morphological derivation variations in the two Ayahs above to the target readers. However, a keen reading shows that the majority of the translations used the words 'reward, recompense, requite' interchangeably as equivalents for the verb "nujazi" or the verb "najzi". Sometimes, the same single word is used by the same translator, for instance Ghali and Arberry, to mean 'reward' or 'punishment'. This means that these translations have utilized the polysemous nature of these words to mean 'reward' in some places and to mean 'punishment' in others. Now, we move to example 3.

Example 3: (3 - التحريم) فَلَمَّا نَبَّأَهَا بِهِ قَالَتْ مَنْ أَنْبَأَكَ هَٰذَا قَالَ نَبَّأَنِيَ ٱلْعَلِيمُ ٱلْخَبِيرُ

1.	Ali	Then when he **told** her thereof, she said, "Who **told** thee this? "He said, "He **told** me Who knows and is well-acquainted (With all things)."
2.	Pickthall	And when he **told** it her she said: Who hath **told** thee? He said: The Knower, the Aware hath **told** me.
3.	Ghali	Then, as soon as he (fully) **informed** her of it, she said, "Who has **informed** you of this?" He said, "The Ever-Knowing, The Ever Cognizant has (fully) **informed** me."
4.	Arberry	when he **told** her of it, she said, 'Who **told** thee this?' He said, 'I was **told** of it by the All-knowing, the All-aware.'
5.	Palmer	But when he **informed** her of it, she said, 'Who **told** thee this?' he said, 'The wise one, the well−aware **informed** me.

6.	Al-Hilali and Khan	Then when he **told** her (Hafsah) thereof, she said: "Who **told** you this?" He said: "The All-Knower, the All-Aware (Allah) has **told** me."

In example 3, another morphological derivation variation entailing a different pragmatic implication is manifested in the verb 'نَبَّأَ' "naba" (Lit. informed). The Ayah displays two main forms; "naba" 'نَبَّأَ' and "anba" 'أَنْبَأَ' (Lit. informed with the addition of "أ"). In the two cases, the proposition communicated is that of an agent informing a piece of information. However, there is a slight morphological derivation variation triggered by the addition of "أ" to the second form. Interestingly enough, this morphological variation has triggered a different pragmatic implication, necessary in communicating the proposition of this Ayah. To understand this pragmatic implication, an idea about the episode embodied in the Ayah is necessary to be given here. The episode the Ayah narrates is an incident between the Prophet Muhammad (Peace and Prayers be Upon Him) and one of his wives, namely (Hafsah). The Prophet disclosed a matter in confidence to (Hafsah), then she told it to another wife, i.e. 'Aishah. When Almighty Allah made it known to the Prophet; he informed part thereof and left a part. Then when he told her (Hafsah) thereof, she said: "Who told you this?" He said: "The All-Knower, the All-Aware (Allah) has told me." (Al-Hilali and Khan). Coming very close to this Ayah, we discover that when the Prophet (Peace and Prayers be Upon Him) is the informer of the news, the Holy Quran uses the verb "naba" 'نَبَّأَ' where the "أ" is dropped, while when Hafsah inquiries about the same idea (the informer), the verb "anba" 'أَنْبَأَ' with the addition of "أ" is used. According to Al-Qaisi (1996, p. 116), the form "naba' 'نَبَّأَ' is used 46 times, while the form "anba" 'أَنْبَأَ' is used 4 times in the Holy Quran. Al-Qaisi (1996) argues that the form "naba" 'نَبَّأَ' is more emphatic when the speaker is absolutely certain about the proposition conveyed. This is why it is normally used when the informer is either Almighty Allah or Prophet Muhammad (Peace and Prayers be Upon Him) because what is informed should absolutely be true. The form "anba" 'أَنْبَأَ', on the other hand, can display doubt, not certainty. This is why in the Ayah above it is used by Hafsah, thinking that it is the angles who disclosed the secret or it was Aishah. Therefore, she was not certain about the informer and this is why she put her inquiry in the form of a question. (Al-Qaisi, 1996).

When the selected translations of this Ayah are examined, one discovers that Ali, Pickthall, Arberry and Al-Hilali and Khan use the same verb, namely "told" as an equivalent for the two morphologically different verbs "naba" 'نَبَّأَ' and "anba" 'أَنْبَأَ' utilized in the Ayah above. This being the case, the intended different pragmatic implication manifested in the Ayah through the different morphological derivation variations has been blurred to the recipients of the translation. More specifically, the target readers with no knowledge of Arabic might think that the degree of certainty conveyed through the informing source is the same. This is true since nothing in the translation shows any difference in this regard, and the loss in the intended communicative effect could have been passed unnoticed. This same approach of translation is used in Ghali's translation of the same Ayah above, but via the use of a different verb. In this translation, the verb "informed" is used as an equivalent for the verbs "naba" 'نَبَّأَ' and "anba" 'أَنْبَأَ' used in example 3 above. As with the previously discussed translations, this translation does not make any distinction between the different verbs in the Ayah to signal the intended different pragmatic implication concerning the more emphatic and absolute certainty about the proposition conveyed. On this basis, it falls short of being able to communicate a similar translation effect to the target recipients as that intended by the source text on the source recipients. Finally**,** Palmer's translation utilized the verb "informed" as a translation equivalent for the verb "naba" 'نَبَّأَ' when the source of the assertion (informer) is the Prophet (Peace and Prayers be Upon Him), and the verb "told" as a translation equivalent for the verb "anba" 'أَنْبَأَ' when the source of the assertion is Hafsah. This selection of verbs in the translation indicates that Palmer might have been aware of the intended difference in the degree of emphasis and certainty between "naba" 'نَبَّأَ' and "anba" 'أَنْبَأَ'**.** However**,** according to Collins Online Dictionary, the verb "inform" is more formal, while the verb "tell" is used to state something more emphatically. Based on this distinction between the verb "inform" and the verb "tell", Palmer's translation lacks accuracy by reversing the more emphatic verb "tell" to be an equivalent for the verb "anba" 'أَنْبَأَ' by the less emphatic one "inform" to be an equivalent for the verb "naba" 'نُبَأَ'. Hence, it falls short of preserving the intended pragmatic effect triggered by the variation in the morphology of the verb "naba" 'نُبَأَ' in the Ayah above.

When these translations are examined against Nida's (1964) principle of equivalent effect which the target text should preserve on the recipients similar to that of the source text on the source recipients, all selected translations were not accurate in this regard. Accordingly, the different pragmatic implications resulting from the morphological derivation variation occurring to the words in the source text have been blurred to the English readers of this Ayah.

Suggested translation	"But when he (Prophet Muhammad) **told** her (Hafsah) of it, she said, 'Who **informed** thee this?' he said, 'The wise one, the well−aware **told** me."

Example: 4 (الشعراء)

هَلْ أُنَبِّئُكُمْ عَلَىٰ مَن تَنَزَّلُ الشَّيَاطِينُ (221) تَنَزَّلُ عَلَىٰ كُلِّ أَفَّاكٍ أَثِيمٍ (222)

إِنَّ الَّذِينَ قَالُوا رَبُّنَا اللَّهُ ثُمَّ اسْتَقَامُوا تَتَنَزَّلُ عَلَيْهِمُ الْمَلَائِكَةُ أَلَّا تَخَافُوا وَلَا تَحْزَنُوا وَأَبْشِرُوا بِالْجَنَّةِ الَّتِي كُنتُمْ تُوعَدُونَ (فصلت - 30)

1.	Ali	on whom it is that the evil ones **descend**? They **descend** on every lying, wicked person,
		the angels **descend** on them (**from time to time**): "Fear ye not!" (they suggest), "Nor grieve! but receive the Glad Tidings of the Garden (of Bliss), the which ye were promised!
2.	Pickthall	upon whom the devils **descend**? They **descend** on every sinful, false one.
		the angels **descend** upon them, saying: Fear not nor grieve, but bear good tidings of the paradise which ye are promised.
3.	Ghali	on whom Ash-Shayatîn **keep coming down**? They **keep coming down** on every most vicious (and) constant falsifier.
		upon them the Angels **keep coming down** (saying), "Do not fear (anything), nor do you grieve, and have good tidings of the Garden that you are promised.
4.	Arberry	on whom the Satans **come down**? They **come down** on every guilty impostor.
		upon them the angels **descend**, saying, 'Fear not, neither sorrow; rejoice in Paradise that you were promised.
5.	Palmer	upon whom the devils **descend**? they **descend** upon every sinful liar,
		the angels **descend** upon them−'fear not and be not grieved, but receive the glad tidings of Paradise which ye were promised;
6.	Al-Hilali and Khan	upon whom the Shayiitin (devils) **descend**? They **descend** on every lying, sinful person.
		on them the angels will **descend** (**at the time of their death**) (saying): "Fear not, nor grieve! But receive the glad tidings of Paradise which you have been promised!

Another effect of the morphological derivation variation leading to different pragmatic implications is that illustrated in example 4 above in the two forms "تَنَزَّلُ" **'tanazal'** and "تَتَنَزَّلُ" **'tatanazal'**. According to Al-Qaisi (1996, 122), the form "تَنَزَّلُ" **'tanazal'** is repeated 3 times and the form "تَتَنَزَّلُ" **'tatanazal'** is repeated 3 times in the Holy Quran. Morphologically speaking, in the case above, normally the verb "تَتَنَزَّلُ" **'tatanazal'** (Lit. **descend**) is written with the "t" doubled in initial position to imply something different from the case when it is written with "t" dropped from this position to become with one "t" only "تَنَزَّلُ" **'tanazal'** and imply something else. Pragmatically speaking, it has been written with "t" doubled in initial position to go in harmony with the descending of angles on the believers in a very calm and tranquil state. Hence, the sequence and repetition of the "t" implied a description of the arrangement and quietness of the state of descending of angles on the believers. (Al-Qaisi, 1996). In addition to this interpretation, Al-Samarrayi (2000) argues that the descending of angles is greater in this Ayah compared with other Ayahs. It is meant to imply that angles descent every second throughout the whole year on the believers to give them good tidings of their destiny in paradise. This happens every time a believer dies, and hence the verb describing this state of affairs is given in full to reflect the continuous descending of angles. (p. 11). However, when the descending was that of the devils on every lying and wicked person, the "t" is dropped from the word to become "تَنَزَّلُ" **'tanazal'** to suit the implicit and swift state of this descending. Moreover, this descending is not so great as the devils do not descend on all unbelievers, but on a group of them.

Having these details in mind, now we examine the selected translations for these two forms of the same verb with different pragmatic implications. To start with, Ali, Pickthall, Palmer and Al-Hilali and Khan employ the verb "descend" as a translation equivalent for the form "تَنَزَّلُ" **'tanazal'** in the first Ayah in example 4 above. However, although this rendition can be said to be the most functionally equivalent counterpart, it does not describe the type of descending of the devils as being swift and implicit falling on a part of an aggregate as has been indicated in the above discussion. Thus, this pragmatic implication resulting from the morphological derivation variation of the form in the source text has been blurred to target text recipients. Maybe an addition to this translation such as an adverb describing the type of the angles' descending would have made this clear for the recipients who are unfamiliar with the Arabic language. On the other hand, Ghali's translation utilizes the expression "keep coming down" which is more suitable as a description of the descending of angels in the second, not the first, Ayah in example 4 above. Once more the implicitness and swiftness of the descending are not highlighted in this translation. Therefore, as with the previous four translations, Ghali's translation has not been quite faithful to preserving the spirit of the source text particularly when it comes to maintaining the intended pragmatic effect to the target recipients. In the same token, Arberry's translation utilizes the expression "come down" which is quite similar to that used by Ghali except with the omission of the word "keep" and the "ing" suffix. Hence, this translation suffers the same problems as that of Ghali's.

As for the translation of the second form "تَتَنَزَّلُ" **'tatanazal'** in the second Ayah in example 4 above, Ali, Pickthall, Palmer, Arberry and Al-Hilali and Khan utilized the verb "descend' as a translation equivalent for this form. Although the coming down of angles is usually expressed in English with the use of the verb "descend", yet this rendition does not fully describe the state of this descending as being quiet, arranged and sequenced falling on a great number of believers as the arrangement of the letters "t" is meant to show to the reader. This is mainly the implied pragmatic implication the morphological derivation variation has caused to the form of the verb. This being the case, this rendition does not fully communicate the intended communicative effect of the source language text to the target recipients. Nevertheless, two important points need to be highlighted regarding this rendition. First, Ali's rendition adds the expression "from time to time" to describe the descending of the angles. Second, Al- Hilali and Khan's rendition adds the expression "at the time of their death" to specify the exact occasion of the descending of angels. It can be argued that additions like these can be helpful as clarifications for the readers to communicate as much as possible of the intended effect of the source text. However, they are not enough to achieve that end as much of the nuances in the source text should have been transferred to the target readers. They point to the fact, nevertheless, that the translators could have compensated much in their translations should they have opted for certain clarification techniques whether in parentheses or in footnotes.

In the light of Nida's communicative effect, it can be argued that, with varying degrees, the selected translations have not fully preserved the intended pragmatic implication triggered by the morphological derivation variation in the two forms discussed above. Accordingly, they cannot be said to have left the same effect on the target text recipients as that intended by the source text on the source recipients. On this basis, a translation loss has been experienced depriving the target recipients from nuances in the source text vey necessary to preserve its spirit to the target readers.

Suggested translation	upon whom the devils **descend**? they **descend** (**swiftly and implicitly**) upon every sinful liar,
	on them (**the believers**) the angels will **descend** (**quietly and sequentially at the time of their death**) (saying): "Fear not, nor grieve! But receive the glad tidings of Paradise which you were promised!

Example: 5

وَلَا تَقْرَبُوهُنَّ حَتَّى يَطْهُرْنَ فَإِذَا تَطَهَّرْنَ فَأْتُوهُنَّ مِنْ حَيْثُ أَمَرَكُمُ اللَّهُ إِنَّ اللَّهَ يُحِبُّ التَّوَّابِينَ وَيُحِبُّ الْمُتَطَهِّرِينَ (البقرة – 222)

1.	Ali	and do not approach them until they are **clean**. But when they have **purified** themselves, ye may approach them in any manner, time, or place ordained for you by Allah.
2.	Pickthall	and go not in unto them till they are **cleansed**. And when they have **purified** themselves, then go in unto them as Allah hath enjoined upon you.

3.	Ghali	and do not draw near them till they are **pure**. So, when they have **purified** themselves, then come up to them (i.e., to have sexual intercourse) from where Allah has commanded you."
4.	Arberry	and do not approach them till they are **clean**. When they have **cleansed** themselves, then come unto them as God has commanded you.'
5.	Palmer	and go not near them till they be **cleansed**; but when they are **cleansed** come in to them by where God has ordered you verily
6.	Al-Hilali and Khan	and go not unto them till they are **purified** (from menses and have taken a bath). And when they have **purified** themselves, then go in unto them as Allah has ordained for you.

Example 5 illustrates a different yet very interesting case of the effect of the morphological derivation variation on shaping the intended pragmatic implication of the verb in the selected Ayah. In this example, the same word " يتطهر" 'yataṭahar' (Lit. to purify) is written once with " ي"(يَطْهُرْنَ) 'yaṭhurna' initial position and another with " ت" (تَطَهَّرْنَ) 'taṭaharna' initial position to signal different implications. According to Al-Qaisi (1996, p. 96), each of these words has been repeated one time only in the Holy Quran. The author argues that the word يَطْهُرْنَ" 'yaṭhurna' (Lit. be purified) with the "ي" initial position implies the end of menstruation blood after each monthly period. However, a husband is still not allowed to approach his wife even when menstruation blood stops until she has taken a bath to be completely clean "تَطَهَّرْنَ" 'taṭaharna' (p. 97). Hence, a distinction should be made between the uses of each word on the basis of its morphological derivation variation. For Arab Muslim readers, this distinction is clear, and thus the effect of this pragmatic implication is known to them. On this basis, careful attention should be paid to this pragmatic implication difference in order for the translation to maintain this effect on the target text recipients. Any ambiguity or confusion resulting from the inaccurate selection of a translation equivalent to stand for the morphologically different forms in the source text might lead to bad consequences when it comes to fully understanding the intended implication hereof. Having this view in mind, now we turn to the selected translations of this Ayah to check which of these translations have exhibited accuracy in preserving the intended different pragmatic implication.

To start with, Ali's translation uses the adjective "clean" as a translation equivalent for menstruation blood end embodied in the word "يَطْهُرْنَ" 'yaṭhurna' in the Ayah above and the word "purified" as a translation equivalent for the word "تَطَهَّرْنَ" 'taṭaharna' in the same Ayah. However, this translation does not make it clear whether the word "clean" means clean from the menstruation blood or not. It is a general reference and might have caused ambiguity to the readers who might question the use of two words "clean" and "purified" in the same context. Similarly, the word "purified" is used to stand for the word "تَطَهَّرْنَ" 'taṭaharna' (to take a bath) after the end of the menstruation blood to be clean for sexual intercourse. It can be argued that the use of a very short parenthetical sentence after the word clean (form menstruation blood) and another after purified (to take a bath) would have resolved the equivocation and preserved a similar communicative effect as that intended in the source text. The same applies to Pickthall's translation although it utilizes the word "cleansed" as a translation equivalent for the word "يَطْهُرْنَ" 'yaṭhurna' in the source text and the word "purified" as an equivalent for the word "تَطَهَّرْنَ" 'taṭaharna'. Ghali's translation utilizes the word "pure" as an equivalent for the word "يَطْهُرْنَ" 'yaṭhurna' and the word "purified" as an equivalent for the word "تَطَهَّرْنَ" 'taṭaharna' in the Ayah above, followed by a clarifying parenthetical sentence (to have sexual intercourse) specifying the intent behind purification. In addition, Arberry's translation uses the adjective "clean" as an equivalent for the word "يَطْهُرْنَ" 'yaṭhurna' and the word "cleansed" as an equivalent for the word "تَطَهَّرْنَ" 'taṭaharna'. Moreover, Palmer's translation opts for the same word "cleansed" as a translation equivalent for the words "تَطَهَّرْنَ" 'taṭaharna' and "يَطْهُرْنَ" 'yaṭhurna' used in the Ayah above, thus blurring any intended pragmatic implication between the two uses. Finally, Al-Hilali and Khan's translation uses the word "purified" as a translation equivalent for the word "يَطْهُرْنَ" 'yaṭhurna' in the source text. However, the word "purified" is followed by a parenthetical sentence (from menses and have taken a bath) which was meant to specify the purpose behind purification. By so doing, there will be no role for using the word "purified" in the second part of the Ayah to stand for

"تَطَهَّرْنَ" 'taṭaharna'.

To sum up, it can be argued that the six selected translations have not been accurate in signaling the difference in the pragmatic implication resulting from the morphological derivation variation in the Ayah above. They have worked into blurring the difference between the two employed forms of the same verb in the Quranic verse.

When applying Nida's concept of translation equivalent effect, one can safely say that the selected translations do not accurately preserve the same communicative effect on the target recipients as that intended by the source text on the source recipients. Put differently, while the Arab Muslim readers of the Ayah above can have access to the different pragmatic implications resulting from the morphological variations of the same verb, the English readers with no knowledge of Arabic are not given any clue in the translations of the difference in use between the two forms of the same verb.

Suggested translation	and do not approach them till they are **purified** (from menses). And when they have **cleansed** themselves (i.e., have taken a bath), then approach them (i.e., to have sexual intercourse) in the manner Allah has ordained for you.

Conclusion

The study has attempted a morphopragmatic analysis of word derivation variations in selected Ayahs in the Holy Quran and six of their translations in English. The aim of the study has been to identify whether the selected translations have been accurate in preserving the intended pragmatic implication triggered by the morphological derivation variation or not. For that end, the study has adopted Nida's translation equivalent effect which proposes that a faithful translation should preserve on the target recipients an effect similar to that triggered by the source text on the source recipients. The findings of the analysis show that in almost all (except in rare occasions) the studied illustrative examples, the provided translations have not been accurate in transferring the intended pragmatic effect triggered by the morphological derivation variations in the Quranic verses. Consequently, the nuances communicated to the source text recipients have been blurred to the target texts recipients. The analysis has also shown that the translators' inability to grasp the intended pragmatic effect resulting from the morphological variation was the main cause behind their inability to find equivalents in English to transfer similar or approximate effect to the recipients who depend on their translations for full understanding of the intended meaning on the verses. Moreover, this inability to grasp the source text intended pragmatic effect may be attributed to the translators' not having consulted books of exegeses which would have been very helpful in this regard. The effect of these exegeses has been very clear in the rare occasions in which some of the translators have grasped the intended pragmatic intention and produced optimal equivalence in the target texts. To add insult to injury, the translators did not opt for any compensation strategy in the form of parenthetical sentences or footnotes to acquaint the readers with the intended pragmatic intention caused by the morphological derivation variation. The importance of this technique is also emphasized by Abdul-Raof (2004, p. 56), who argues that "the Quranic message will always remain inflicted with inaccuracies and gaps of information which can only be solved through the addition of enlightening exegetical footnotes and explanations."

References

Abdelaal, N. (2019). Translating denotative meaning in the Holy Quran: Problems and solutions. *Pertanika: Journal of Social Science & Humnities*, 27(1), 13 - 33.

Abdul-Raof, H. (2001). *Qur'an translation: Discourse, texture and exegesis*. Curzon. UK.

Abdul-Raof, H. (2004). *The Qur'an: Limits of translatability*. In *Cultural encounters in translation from Arabic* (pp. 91-106). Bristol, Blue Ridge Summit: Multilingual Matters. https://doi.org/10.21832/9781853597459-010.

Abdullah, M. (2017). *A comparative study of pragmatic losses in English translations of the Holy Qur'ān*. Unpublished Doctoral Thesis. National University of Modern Languages, Islamabad.

Al-Azab, A. E. E. & Othman A. A. (2012). Pragmatic losses of Quran translation: A linguistic approach. *English Language and Literature Studies*, 2(3), 42-49. http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/ells.v2n3p42

Al-Badani, N. A., Norsimah, M. A., Intan, S. Z., & Ashinida, A. (2016). Expansion strategy in the translation of Iltifāt in Sūrat Al-Baqarah. *AWEJ, 5*, 54-65.

Al-Foadi, R. A. (2018). Derivation as the main way of adapting new terms to Arabic. *Modern Journal of Language Teaching Methods*, 8(3), 175–180.

Al-Ghazalli, M. (2012). A study of the English translations of the Qur'anic verb phrase: The derivatives of the triliteral. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 2(3), 605–612.

Al-Hilali, M., & Khan, M. M. (1984). *Interpretation of the meanings of the Noble Qur'an in the English language*. Riyadh: Darussalam.

Al-Jarf, R. (1990). *A contrastive analysis of English and Arabic morphology for translation students*. King Saud University: AL-Obeikkan Printing Press.

Al-Jorjani, M. A. (1983). *Definitions*. Beirut: Dar Alkutob Alelmyah.

Al-Qaisi, A., M. (1996). *Siru Al-ijazi fi Tanaw'i Al-syiaghi Al-mushtaqati min Asaln Lughawin Wahidin fi Al-quran*. Amman: Dar Al-Bashir for Publishing and Distribution.

Al-Samarrayi, F. S. (2000). *Balaghatu Al-kalimatu fi Al-tabeeri Al-qurani*. Baghdad: General Society for Cultural Issues.

Al-Zamakhshari, M. A. A. (1986). *Al-kashaf fi Haqaiq Al-tanzeel wa Eyoon Al-aqaweel fi Wujuh Al-taweel*. Beruit: Dar Alkitab Al-arabi.

Ali, A. Y. (1934). *The Holy Qur'an, text, translation and commentary*. Kuala Lumpur, Saba Isalmic Media.

Ali, M. M. (2010). *English translation of the Holy Qur'an with explanatory Notes*. London: Ahmadyya Anjuman Lahore Publications.

Arberry, A. J. (1955). *The Koran interpreted*. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.

Ashaer, T. N. A. (2013). *A semantic and pragmatic analysis of three English translations of Surat "Yusuf"*. Unpublished Master's thesis, An-Najah National University, Palestine.

Asp, E. D. & Villiers, Jessica. (2010). *When language breaks down: Analyzing discourse in clinical contexts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University.

Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to do things with words*? Clarendon: Oxford.

Baker, M. (2011). *In other words: A course book on translation*. Abingdon: Oxon.

Bauer, L. (2000). *Introducing linguistic morphology.* Washington, DC. Georgetown University Press.

Booij, G. (2005). *The grammar of words*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Brinton, L. (2000). *The structure of modern English: A linguistic introduction*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co.

Collins Online Dictionary. (n.d). Retrieved from https://www.collinsdictionary.com/dictionary/english/tell.Accessed April 2022.

Cruse, D. (2006). *Lexical semantics*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.

Denffer, A. (1983). *'Ulum al-Qur'an: An introduction to the sciences of the Qur'an*. The Islamic

El-Farran, S. (2006). *The Problem in Translating the Noble Quran*. http://www.ahlalquran.com/English/show_article.php?main_id=733 . Accessed May 2022

Fakhry, M. (2009). *An interpretation of the Quran*. New York. New York University Press.

Fatani, A. (2006). Translation and the Qur'an. In *The Qur'an: An encyclopedia*. (pp. 657–669). Great Britain:Routledge.

Gazdar, G. (1979). *Pragmatics: Implicature, presupposition, and logical form*. London: Academic Press.

Ghali, M. M. (1996). *Towards understanding the Ever-Glorious Quran*. Cairo: Dar An-Nashr forUniversities.

Hamid, I., & Ali, S. F. (2020). Agentive forms formation in English and Arabic. *Adab Al-Rafidayn*, 50(81), 61-80.

Horn, L. & Ward, G. (2006). *The handbook of pragmatics*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Katz, J. (1977). *Propositional structure and illocutionary force*. New York: Crowell.

Khalifa, M. (1989*). The sublime Qur'an and orientalism*. (2ⁿᵈ ed.). International Islamic Publishers. Karachi: International Islamic Publisher (Pvt.) Ltd.

Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lieber, R. (2009). *Introducing morphology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mahmoud, A. (2008). Cultural and pragmastylistic factors influencing translating Surat "An Nas" of the Glorious Quran into English. *An- Najah Univ. Journal for Reseach,* 22(6), 1849-1884

Merriam-Webster. (n.d.). Requital. In Merriam-Webster.com dictionary. Retrieved December 16, 2022, from

https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/requital

Meyer, Charles (2009). *Introducing English linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mohammad, K. (2005). Assessing English translations of the Qur'an. *Middle East Quarterly*. 12 (2), 58-71.

Murata, S & Chittick, W. (2006). *The vision of Islam*. London. I.B. Tauris.

Nida, E. A. (1964). *Towards a science of translating*. Leiden, Holland: E.J. Brill.

Nida, E. A., & Taber, C. R. (2003). *The theory and practice of translation*. Boston Brill: Leiden.

Palmer, E. H. (1947). *The Koran (Qur'an)*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Pavey, E. (2010). *The structure of language: An introduction to grammatical analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pickthall, M. (2001)**.** *The meaning of the Glorious Qur'an*. Kuala Lumpur: Islamic Book Trust.

Rahman, F. (1988). Translating the Qur'an. *Religion & Literature Journal*. 20(1): 23-30.

Rodwell, J. (2012). *The Koran*. Mineola: Dover Publications, INC.

Sale, G. (1734). *The Koran*. London: Frederick Warne.

Sideeg, A. (2016). Translating 'invisible meanings': A critique across seventy versions of the Qurān in English. *AWEJ, 5*, 77-99.

Stalnaker, R. (1974). Pragmatic Presupposition. In *Semantics and Philosophy*. (pp. 197-213). New York: New York University Press.

Thomas, J. (2013). *Meaning in interaction: An introduction to pragmatics*. London: Longman. Foundation. UK.

Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.