Abstract
This paper tries to investigate the significance of semantics in translating cultural specific terms. In the beginning I explore the characteristics of translation strategies and the different classifications of semantic procedures and strategies applicable to the translation of Arabic/English cultural-specific terms. The main aim is to revisit Chesterman’ model of strategies (1997) regarding the semantic strategies of translation in general. Then I will elaborate on the usefulness of all semantic relations, including those mentioned by Chesterman, for translating cultural-specific terms. I then examine the different semantic relations, specifically entailment/hyponymy, synonymy, and antonymy in an attempt to indicate that employing semantic relations in translating cultural-specific terms could be a useful strategy that eases cultural exchange of Arabic concepts and peculiarities. Finally I explore four semantic processes that are commonly considered in translation in general and could be more useful for translating cultural terms: semantic repetition, semantic omission, semantic addition, and truth condition. Supported with examples we tried to show how such processes influence the naturalness and preciseness of translation. The last one is not only important in keeping the naturalness of the TT but also in maintaining the integrity of the translated item.
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وحاولوا إظهار مدى تأثير هذه الظواهر على سلاسة الترجمة ودقتها. ودعتم لعلك بلامثة. وأخبر هذه الظواهر ليست مهما فقط في الحفاظ على سلسلة النص امتدحنا لونك أيضا في الحفاظ على مناسبة ما يتم ترجمته.

الكلمات الرئيسية: الترجمة العربية، المنهج الدلالي للترجمة، لمساطرات والكلمات ات لخصوصية الثقافية. لاحا واضاءة للترجمة الطفيفة مقترنة الحال.
1. Introduction
The semantic approach to translation began a few decades ago as a repercussion of structural linguistics, advocated by Catford, Jakobson, Nida, Newmark, and so on; the latter introduced the concepts of semantic and communicative translation. Newmark (1981: 5) argues that the "translation theory derives from comparative linguistics, and within linguistics, it is mainly an aspect of semantics; all questions of semantics relate to translation theory." With the development of functional linguistics, the discipline started to reshape itself and conform to the social context of both the ST and TT, a direction represented by Vermeer, Nord, Halliday, Mona Baker, Basil Hatim and Mason. Nevertheless, all such theories did not find its way to the market of translators because they are still using some sophisticated jargons which are not easy to understand among non-professional or novice translators who in fact run the wheel of translation in the market. Also, most of the translators are non-native speakers of the target language, so they may find some difficulties in figuring out the intricacies and ambiguities of word senses in the ST, particularly connotative meaning, hyponymy, and synonymy. The main goal of both sciences, translation and semantics, is to capture the meaning of an utterance. In translation we try to transfer meaning while in semantics we focus on analyzing and defining it. Therefore, we should combine the two sciences and try to use the contributions in both fields to facilitate cultural exchange.

An overview of translation procedures
A translation procedure is often applied by translators to solve a given problem in the ST (Source Text). In this sense, we may have an endless list of procedures. Translation procedures are sometimes used interchangeably with translation strategies. In this respect, Loescher (1991:8) calls a translation strategy as "a potentially conscious procedure for solving a problem faced in translating a text, or any segment of it." However, Bell (1998:188) made a distinction between global and local strategies indicating that the former deal with whole texts while the latter deal with text segments. The two scopes of strategies are called methods and procedures by Newmark (1988) who uses translation procedures for the translation of sentences and the smaller units below, while a translation method is used for the whole text.

One of the frequently quoted classifications of procedures is that proposed by Vinay and Darbelnet (1958) who divided translation procedures into two categories, direct and oblique, that correspond to literal and free method of translation. Under each category Vinay and Darbelnet listed further subcategories. Specifically, under
Direct Translation, he listed borrowing, calque, and literal translation, while under Oblique Translation, he put transposition, modulation, equivalence and adaptation.


Another model of translation procedures was proposed by Chesterman (1997) which can be summarized in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Syntactic strategies</th>
<th>Semantic Strategies</th>
<th>Pragmatic strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Literal Translation</td>
<td>Synonym</td>
<td>Cultural Filtering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calque</td>
<td>Antonym</td>
<td>Explicitness Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transposition</td>
<td>Hyponymy</td>
<td>Information Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit Shift</td>
<td>Converses</td>
<td>Interpersonal Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phrase Structure Change</td>
<td>Abstraction Change</td>
<td>Illocutionary Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause Structure Change</td>
<td>Distribution Change</td>
<td>Coherence Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence Structure Change</td>
<td>Emphasis Change</td>
<td>Partial Translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohesion Change</td>
<td>Paraphrase</td>
<td>Visibility Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level Shift</td>
<td>Trope Change</td>
<td>Transediting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheme Change</td>
<td>Other Semantic Changes</td>
<td>Other Pragmatic Changes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Translation Procedures by Chesterman (1997)

For cultural translation, Scholars of translation proposed some strategies that can be useful in translating cultural-specific items. For instance, in the first place, Newmark (1988: 81-93) proposed fourteen strategies for translating cultural-specific items: Transference, Naturalization, Cultural Equivalent, Functional Equivalent, Descriptive Equivalent, Synonym, Through Translation, Modulation, Recognized Translation, Compensation, Componential Analysis, Paraphrase, Couplets, and finally, "Notes, Additions, Glosses".

Hervy & Heggins (1992) put forward five translation procedures for cultural transposition: (1) Exoticism (2) calque, (3) cultural borrowing, (4) communicative translation, and (5) cultural transplantation. These procedures can be represented in the following scale (Hervey, Higgins and Haywood 1995: 20).

Venuti (1995: 20) proposed two basic strategies for translating cultural differences, domestication and foreignization. The former can be defined as "an ethnocentric reduction of the foreign text to target-language cultural values, bring the author back home". On the other hand, foreignization means "an ethnodeviant pressure on those (cultural) values to register the linguistic and cultural difference of the foreign text, sending the reader abroad". The translator can either employ one of these strategies willingly (to implement his/her own ideology) or unwillingly (by
succumb to the dominant ideology or patronage (ge to ”bring the author back home“ or ”sending the reader abroad“. Target readers/audience should be considered in that decision. If the audience have no idea about the other culture and the purpose is not academic like in translating literary works, jokes, and materials for children, so the translator has to bring the author back home to make the text easy to understand and minimize the exoticism and strangeness of the foreign text. In short, some argue that fluent translations give an upper hand to the colonizer, encourage cultural colonization, and deny the Other. Some others argue that foreignization is more truthful and ethical, though they do not sound fluent, typical and natural.

In this paper I will draw on the above strategies and revisit Chesterman’s model of strategies (1997) regarding the semantic strategies. I will elaborate on the usefulness of all semantic relations including those mentioned by Chesterman in translating cultural specific terms. To me, these translation procedures and strategies are quite useful for translating cultural specific terms from Arabic into English and vice versa.

Methodology

Data

The paper shows how useful semantics is in translating cultural-bound terms, therefore, selected examples that are cited in academic studies or published translation will be analyzed from the semantic perspective. These examples are collected following Newmark (1988: 95)’s classification of cultural items as shown below.

1) Ecology: flora, fauna, hills, winds, plains (example: ﺍﻟﻀﺐ alḍabb ”lizard“)

2) Material culture: food, clothes, houses and towns, transport (example: جبة jubba ”garment”, مسجد masjid ”mosque“)

3) Social culture: work and leisure (example: ساعة sa'ah ”brief time“)

4) Organizations, customs, activities, procedures, concepts (including the following sub-categories)

   • Political and administrative (Examples: انداز çindhar ”ultimatum“, بين bayan ”communiqué“, جهاد jihat ”holy war“, شيخ sheikh ”sheikh, الاخوان alikhwan ”members of Brotherhood“)

   • Religious (examples: الحج alhajj ”pilgrimage“, فتح مكة fath makkah ”liberation of Makkah“, كافر kafir ”unbeliever“, صراط sirat ”path“)

   • Artistic (Example: ومضحات ”muwashshahat verse“)

5) Gestures and Habits: This may involve, among other things, forms of address, ways of showing respect to others, greetings, eye contact, turn-taking body language.

   (examples: ﻣﻦ ضلك min fadlik ”please“)
Semantic Analysis

Nida and Taber (1969) explored a variety of semantic issues which are crucial for translators, including referential meaning (denotation), connotation and componential analysis. To pursue the premise, we are going to discuss the various semantic issues that can be utilized for translating cultural-specific terms.

Types of Meaning: Denotative and Connotative meanings

Traditionally, the study of word meaning is believed to be the study of the context-independent meaning of something (a word, phrase, or sentence). It is some sort of denotative meaning which can be defined as the direct dictionary definition of a word, stripped of any overtones, emotion, or attitude. For instance, the denotation of the word "Sun" is "the shining star in the sky". It is therefore sometimes known as the cognitive or referential meaning.

Connotative meaning

Connotation is defined as the overtones that a given word has, e.g. 'pass away / kick the bucket'. To put it in Lyons' words (1977: 176): "the connotation of a word is thought of as a emotive or effective component additional to its central meaning". For example, الفتح الإسلامي or فتح مكة are conventionally translated as "Conquest of Makka" and "Islamic Conquests". The dictionary meanings revolve around one single concept: "conquest, victory, triumph". Such definitions may be negatively understood in the West or anywhere outside the Arabic speaking communities. No one likes unjustified wars or invasions. Al-Halawani (2003: 89-100) looked up both the English and Arabic dictionaries for the term الفتح. He found out that the English meanings as given in dictionaries are not equivalent. According to Al-Halawani (ibid: 92) the Arabic dictionaries show the following meanings:

- Opening s.th or a territory with a good intention
- Starting s.th. which is usually good
- establishing friendly relations with people
- Winning s.th. by force
- Judging between opponents
- Asking Allah for victory

Now let us consider the meanings given in English dictionaries:

- Suppressing and oppression
- Entering or attacking anything harmful
- Launching campaigns for mischief and plunder
- Entering others' properties with evil intentions
- Encroaching upon the rights or properties of others

Indeed, slam is the most misrepresented religion in the West. This may be of the common misconception that Islam expanded by sword and some other
misconceptions which may be sorted out linguistically. This partly goes back to the unfortunate translation such as the one under investigation (Conquest of Makka or Islamic Conquest). The translator may be driven by the senses given in dictionaries overlooking the connotations of the word. This word actually does not reflect the real concept of فتح in Islam which is associated with mercy, justices and freedom. The best alternative is "liberation", because the main aim of the Islamic military actions is to defend the Muslims' land or to give freedom to people so that they can determine their way of life.

The translator should be aware of the uses of words and their associations so that s/he can maintain the exact content of the text. Consider for instance the word إنذار "warning", which should be translated as "ultimatum" in military context, or "reminder" in bank or school correspondence. Also the word بيان is translated as communiqué, or proclamation in the military context, but it can be "statement" in general contexts.

Connotative meaning flavours a given word either positively or negatively in varied ways. For example، غارات can be translated into "raids, attacks, strikes" It depends on the attitude of the addresser or addressee. Dickins et al (2002) gives an extensive account of the different types of connotative meanings: attitudinal, associative, affective, allusive, collocative, and reflected. This classification of the connotative meanings relatively overlaps with Leech’s account (1981: 18) who states:

Reflected meaning and collocative meaning, affective meaning and social meaning: all these have more in common with connotative meaning than with conceptual meaning; they all have the same open ended, variable character, and lend themselves to analysis in terms of scales or ranges, rather than in discrete either-this-or-that terms.

Types of Connotative meanings

1- Attitudinal meaning

The translator may express his/her own attitude towards an issue in the text in a way that does not clash with the Arabic text and makes use of the overtones and the company that words keep in English. A well-know example is the English word "homosexuality“ which may be translated as shudhudh jinsi (lit. sexual oddity) or mithliyyah jinsiyyah (lit. sexual sameness). The translator may go for any of them depending on his/her attitude towards both of them. The latter seems softer and less repulsive. Another example quoted by Dickins et al (2002: 67) illustrates the significance of such connotative meaning in identifying the position of the translator.

باختصار توفر الانقلابات العسكرية الفرص لتحويل قادتها من مناصب عسكرية إلى زعامات سياسية.
In short, military coups provide their perpetrators with the opportunity to move from military posts to political leadership.

"leaders" in the example above has a negative sense. It was translated as "perpetrators" to reflect the translator's attitude towards such an act which is of course not heroic or good.

2- Associative meaning

The mental picture of a given word in a certain situation may give it extra negative/positive shades of meaning or any other sense. Negative or positive senses are not determined because of phonic elements; it is rather attributed to a word because of the negativity or positivity of its associations. The word "crusade" حرب صليبية, "jihad" جهاد they may be both positively or negatively understood. It entirely depends in context. "Jihad" is positive to Muslims; whereas it is negative to non-Muslims. The same applies to "crusade". Negative/positive senses of words may be triggered because of the word's associations, which may be language-specific. It all depends on the senses evoked in either the SL or TL.

3- Affective meaning

This is concerned with the attitude of the addressee and the emotional content of the verbal or written message. To put it in Leech's words (1981: 16): ‘affective meaning is largely a parasitic category in the sense that to express our emotion we rely upon the mediation of other categories of meaning – conceptual, connotative, or stylistic’.

For example, in Modern Arabic to make a form of request we use the imperative form with or without some softening words like نم فضلك، رجاء، وسمحت "please.

The form using such softening words is widely used today, among educated people, with everyone, be him a friend, a person of higher position, or anyone we do not know. To translate a sentence containing such words we have two possible ways as follows:

May I have this book, please?
Can I have this book, please?

The first question is more polite and can be used to address people of higher position or whom the speaker does not know.

4- Allusive meaning

This connotative meaning "occurs when an expression evokes an associated saying or quotation" (Dickins et al 2002: 70). This is prevalent in the Arabic language which is so influenced by the Glorious Qur'an and the Prophetic sayings. Religious speakers very often make use of such a phenomenon to draw the attention of their listeners/readers. They use certain expressions that recall a particular saying or term. For example,
The oath which members of the Brotherhood swore to [him], pledged ‘total commitment, loyalty, trust and unswerving obedience, in comfort and adversity, suffering and joy’ [‘

This example (quoted by Dickins et al, 2002: 71) involves an illusion to the Prophetic hadith that reads,

بايعنا رسول الله على السمع والطاعة في اليسر والعسر والمنشط والمكره وألا ننازع الأمر أىلو (البخاري).

We give a pledge to the messenger of Allah to listen and obey in comfort and adversity, suffering and joy and not to dispute with people.

5- Collocational Meaning

The way a word combines with other words may reveal a pattern that may be overlooked by the translator. Although this pattern is a universal linguistic phenomenon, yet translators may fail to find one-to-one correspondence of collocations between languages. In English, for instance, they drag their feet (not their tails as in Arabic) and in Colloquial Arabic, the verb for drink not only collocates with water, but also with tablets and cigarettes. We also express hard-obtained things as to take sth. from the lion's mouth but in English it is from the horse's mouth. Baker (1992: 53) states,

What a word means often depends on its association with certain collocates. When the translation of a word or a stretch of language is criticized as being inaccurate or inappropriate in a given context, the criticism may refer to the translator's inability to recognize a collocational pattern with a unique meaning different from the sum of the meanings of its individual elements.

In this respect, we are concerned with the shades of meaning which pop up in the text owing to the use of a certain item, on the one hand. For example, once we mention the word handsome, we can expect the following word to be boy, man. On the other hand, collocational meaning could be a reason for ignoring the use of certain words in specific contexts. The word intercourse, which has a general meaning, is avoided in everyday speech for its frequent co-occurrence with sexual.

6- Reflected Meaning

It is a meaning that evokes another senses of a given word or phrase in the hearer’s or listener’s mind beyond the basic sense. The context then tones up or down the intended meaning. The point we should focus on here is how the reflected meanings are considered in translation as such evoked meanings may vary from a language to another. For instance, we have two words in English for the Arabic فألإ rat and mouse. The Arabic word has two meanings reflected: a) the basic sense (which is the referent
in the real world: the known animal in this case); b) the metaphorical sense (a cowardly person). In English, on the other, the word *mouse* shares the same senses of its Arabic equivalent, while the word *rat* triggers another reflected meaning lacking in Arabii, c.e. ‘someone who betrays his/her fellows’. "Reflect ed meaning is normally a function of polysemy, i.e. the existence of two or more denotive meanings in a single word“ )Dicki, nset al, 2002: 72.

**Componential analysis**

Like in morphology, words are decomposed into its minimal morphemes (resettlements: re+settle_ ment+s), semanticists tend to explain the word meaning through decomposing the word into its minimal parts. Then they piece together such meaning units to give the overall meaning of a word or a phrase (Cruse 2000, Griffiths 2006). Let us consider the following examples:

*Die*: become, not, alive,  
*Wumt*: لا، يصبح، حيا

*Kill*: cause, to become, not, alive, unintentionally  
*يقتل*: لا، يصبح، حيا، بغير قصد، غير قانوني

*Murder*: cause, to become, not, alive, intentionally, illegally  
*يقتل*: يصيب، لا، يصيب، حيا، بقصد، غير قانوني

*Execute*: cause, to become, not, alive, intentionally, legally  
*يعدم*: يسبب، لا، يصيب، حيا، بقصد، قانوني

This kind of analysis of word meaning is very useful in differentiating between word senses. It helps the translator to spot the contrastive features that characterize each word in both ST and TT in an attempt to see how they differ in identifying the semantic field of words. This way of ‘contrasting identifying meaning’ (Lars on 1984/1998:88) is so important for the translator to see the degree of overlap or difference between the SL and TL terms and then identify the gaps in vocabulary in either language, when s/he fails to find one-to-one correspondence.

Following this mechanism of decomposing words, we will be able to test the translation of the word *fat-h فتح* conquest, that has been discussed above, as shown in the following figures.
Semantic Relations

There are a number of relations that hold between words and sentences in the domain of semantics and lexical semantics. The main ones are: inclusion (hyponymy/entailment), overlapping (synonymy), complementation (opposites, antonyms, reversives, converses) and contiguity (the related meanings of the words "walk", "run" "crawl", etc. are contiguous) (Nida, 1975). As Manfred Bierwirsch (1970: 166-67) put it:

The study of meaning deals, on the one hand, with the way words and sentences are related to objects and processes in the universe,
and on the other, with the way in which are related to one another in terms of such notions as ‘synonymy’, entailment’ and contradiction.

Therefore, the translator should consider two definitive aspects of word meaning: sense and reference. The former which is traditionally called meaning is a linguistic relationship (between words, phrases and sentences) whereas the latter is an extralinguistic relation as it deals with the relationships between language and the world.

**Entailment/ Hyponymy**

Hyponymy is the relation which holds between two items where one implies the other. This notion can help us translate a word which is not available in the target text dictionary or use; we can translate it as "X is a type/sort/kind of Y". For instance, sometimes the translator comes across a word which is used in one of its senses as a general or as a more specific word. Consider the following example, "animal" and "dog", "vehicle" and "car". The first word is more general than the second. The translator can resort to this technique when he fails to find an equivalent. So s/he can use either word as an equivalent of the word under investigation. This is the significance of hyponymy in translation. S/he can, on one hand, give a more general or more specific alternative. For example, the Arabic word اليراق, which is associated with the Prophet Muhammad ascension to heavens, is mainly translated as "animal" based on the description given in the Biography of the Prophet. However, "animal" which is a general term can modify the whole class of animals. To be more specific, we can say "flying animal", which shows what sort of animal it is. For the word the lic wordzarm "day be usf, edor رداءً قحصأ لا a more general sense like "garment" can be used. But with words like ماءً املطل، ماء البحر، ماء المزهر، ماء الرجل، ماء وجه the translator should particularize because each one of these words may give different denotations.

**Synonymy**

When asking anybody about the meaning of a given word, s/he will intuitively give you more than a word as alternatives. In this respect, many dictionaries are assembled to fulfill that purpose like Roget's Thesaurus, Webster's Synonym Dictionary and Crabb's English Synonyms. Such dictionaries provide for every entry a list of words that have close meaning or descriptive detail of the concept. Synonymy is sameness or similarity of meaning between words. Elewa (2004) argues that the range of synonymity may fluctuate between absolute and propositional/near sameness of meaning. The former type of synonyms, which is rare in natural languages, necessitates a complete interchangeability of words without any sort of alteration in meaning (Bloomfield, 1935: 145, Ullmann, 1962: 142). On the other hand, the latter occurs when two words overlap in one semantic area.
Ullmann introduced a test for ruling out seemingly synonymous pairs called the substitution test (ibid). He states, ‘The best method for the delimitation of synonyms is the substitution test … which is considered one of the fundamental procedures of modern linguistics, and in the case of synonyms it reveals at once whether, and how far, they are interchangeable’. He gave a few examples like broad and wide which are used synonymously in broad sense and wide sense, but fail to keep that synonymy in five foot wide.

Similarly, (quoted in Cruse, 2000) used a different test, i.e. the normality profile test: The meaning of a word is its normality profile across its grammatical occurrences. He argued that there is a normality profile for all possible words and sentences in a language. One single occurrence where we find one item of a pair more or less normal than the other can undermine the synonymy relation between them. ‘Every difference of meaning between two expressions will show up as a difference of normality in some context’ (Cruse 2000: 12. Therefore, we can distinguish between words through the grammatical aspects of meanings, as every word can be more or less normal than the other as shown in the following examples:

We started the engine. (normal)
*We began the engine. (abnormal)
During his illness (normal)
*During his disease (abnormal)

The Haasian test is semantically based and does not work otherwise. Cruse (1986: 281) gave some examples with no semantic explanation; they merely depend on language use or selectional restriction. In other words, there is no semantic reason why ‘ones record can be spotless, unblemished or impeccable, but not flawless, whereas one’s credentials cannot be but the last. Let us consider the following example (Cruse, ibid).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>unblemished</th>
<th>spotless</th>
<th>flawless</th>
<th>immaculate</th>
<th>impeccable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>argument</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complexion</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviour</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Record</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reputation</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taste</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credentials</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ = common/normal, - = uncommon/abnormal, ? = questionable
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Antonymy
Like synonyms, using antonyms plays an important role in translation. The process of transferring a SL antonym into its TL counterpart is not applied mechanically without significant implications. Sometimes we fail to find an appropriate lexical antonym, so we use a morphological one. For instance, in English the opposite of the word 
“natural” can be “unnatural” and “man-made” may give more positive senses than the negated lexical antonym as ihe i” ns not ignorant“ because .e double negationaccording to logic rules, make a positive meaning. Therefore, we can use an antonym to render a SL word or expression that does not contain a negation using a negated word or vice versa. This could be a useful technique when the translator who should be working as a mediator between two different cultures comes across a word or phrase that is sensitive to the Target audience. Then s/he himself tries to find a way out by using a negated form as in the following examples.

Is it permissible for us to invite non-Muslims to the ‘Eid celebration so that they may witness the great gathering of Muslims and so that we may call them to Allah and educate them about Islam?
There is no problem in interacting with non-Muslims, mixing and being beneficent to them, because this is an encouragement for them [to embrace Islam].

"Non Muslims at the time of the Messenger used to enter his Masjid and sit with him, so there is no harm in any of this."

The word الكفار was translated into "non-because "Muslim ethe lexical antonym s "infide"l, "unbeliever", have negative connotations and are used with some apprehension by the target audience.

Actually, this technique can be widely employed either for amelioration or neutrality. Let us consider the following example:

"It is not wise to give supreme power to those who do not have clear-headed ideas to use it."

We won't further discuss the other types of relations that hold between words such as complementation, contiguity, etc. because they, to some extent, are not of great importance to the translator. We would rather have a look at some semantic processes which are more vital in the process of translation in general in the translation of cultural-specific terms in particular.

Semantic Processes

There are many semantic processes that have been used by scholars of translation for solving translation problems. For instance, Baker (1992) listed "omission" as a strategy for translating idioms and she used. Dickins et al (2002) also referred to semantic addition in translation in general. For the purpose of this paper I will use four semantic procedures for the translation of cultural-specific terms: semantic repetition, omission, deletion and truth condition.

Semantic Repetition

A general look at prose in Modern Standard Arabic shows that Arabs tend to mention two synonyms following each other in most cases to give more rhetorical force to
their expressions. It is customarily used in situations where the speaker’s fluency is needed for convincing the addressees especially in religious and political contexts. The speaker, therefore, tends to use adjacent terms which share some of the semantic properties for stylistic reasons. Ullmann (1962: 193) called this phenomenon quasi-synonymy. For example, safety and security in for the safety and security of this state.

The repetition of synonyms in this fashion is widely used in Modern Standard Arabic. Let us consider the following examples.

(1) شرحت الدرس وفصلت
I explained and elaborated the lesson.
I explained the lesson

(2) تكلم وقال
He spoke and said.
He said

(3) يجاهد ويعارب في سبيل الله
He fights and battles for Allah’s cause.
He fights (or battles) for Allah’s cause

In the above examples it is obvious for Arabic speakers that the two different verbs in every sentence can be substituted for only one verb in English. Use of phrases that communicate a single idea should be avoided in English because of their wordiness and clumsiness as in the following examples.

circle around (circle)
may possibly (may)
invited guest (guest)
past history (history)
biography of one’s life (ife)

Dickins et al (2002: 59) noted that all major parts of speech (N, V, Adj and Adv) can undergo such a phenomenon. They also stated that the repetition of synonyms can be ‘when a co-syndetic connective is used, particularly with the use of adjectives or ‘asynthetic’ without using connectiveThis .s conjunction between seemingly synonymous words is not only acceptable in Modern Standard Arabic but is used frequently in the everyday language as well.

We may also find this phenomenon often used in Late Classical Arabic. Let us consider the following examples from Al-Hamadhani’s Maqamat quoted by Tam as Ivanyi (1993: 52-53):

(4) تركته وانصرفت
I left him and departed. (redundant)
I left him (or I departed).

intelligence and cleverness. (redundant)
intelligence (or cleverness)

Perception and consciousness. (redundant)
Perception (or consciousness)

Obscurenness and ambiguity. (redundant)
Obscurenness (or ambiguity)

A number of techniques can be used to translate semantic repetition into English (Dickins et al: 2002: 59):

(1) The two Arabic words can be merged into one English word (when the two words are close in meaning). The two adjectives in تدابير قاسية وسارمة may be translated as 'sever measures', قدرة العسكري علي تحديث المجتمع وعصرنته 'the military's ability to modernize society', and مشورة مسيرة مواصلة 'continuously'.

(2) Employing at least partial grammatical transposition (when the two words are obviously different in meaning). The phrase تحلل للاهى للاهى للاهى للاهى للاهى للاهى للاهى للاهى للاهى للاهى Llah alalalalala may be translated as 'the collapse of all moral values'. Here the N+N of the Arabic has been replaced by an Adj. + NP in English. وشعر الرجل بالضيق والحرج 'the man began to feel slightly claustrophobic', وقد أكدت البحور الجامعية هذه الظاهرة المخلة وتناولتها بالاستقصاء والتحليل 'Academic research has confirmed and carefully analysed this disgraceful phenomenon'.

(3) Keeping the repeated words unchangeable (when the English equivalents have the same emphatic force as in Arabic). السلوك اهتمجوالبريي 'this savage and barbaric behaviour'. This is employed with respect of formulaic language, especially in religious and legal texts.

You have the right to our unquestioning obedience, complete trust and total confidence. This is the oath which we have taken and the pledge which we have made.

have been expanded in English although they can be merged for more emotive meaning.
Semantic Omission

In the previous section we discussed the various ways of semantic repetition. In some cases we tend to omit the repeated part if it bears no figurative function. Now let us turn to another point where omission takes place not on the basis of repetition.

This occurs when one or more words from the SL text are not included in the TT. For example, the particle إن which is often translated as "verily", "certainly" or "surely" can be dropped from the TT, except the formulaic language, particularly the Holy Qur'an and Prophetic Traditions, simply because an affirmative sentence can give the same meaning of emphasis in English. There are some Arabic patterns of cohesion which are represented differently in English. Consider the following:

 التى، بما و...، أما بعد

Such words are used in Arabic to introduce either a sentence or a paragraph. They should be ignored in the English text.

The kind of language a given community uses for addressing other members of the community varies from a language to another. For example, the way we address anyone in power, authoritative, social, academic, etc., in Arabic is different from that in English. We like to give lengthy titles before even mentioning his/her name. For example، السديد الأساتذة الدكتور "Mr. Prof. Dr". This can be translated as "Prof.". Sometimes the title in English is not translated with prominent people. So we can strip off the title from prominent people. Consider the following: الأساتذة الدكتور الشيخ ويسف، الأستاذ الدكتور القراضي. This can be translated as "Yusuf Al-Qaradawi". Actually, such big names give currency to titles, not the other way round.

Sometimes the ST gives explanations to inform the ST audience of something which is not common to them. For example،

A car accident happened in Leeds.

We can omit secondary information which are well-known to the TL audience in accordance with the typical use of those audience. For example، بابا الفاتيكان و بولس الثاني can be translated as "Johan Paul II" because everyone in the West knows who this person is.

Semantic Addition

Similarly to omission, the translator can add some words to help the TL reader understand the text. This happens when the general usage of English or a specific context requires more words to be included. Consider the following example (Ives 1999:13, quoted in Dickins et al 2002:24):

this is translated as "ever since the days of Turkish hegemony". In English, the word "hegemony" as a concept
involves time more strongly than does the Arabic word *ﻫﻨﻤﻴﺔ*. So we can add any word that denotes time such as "days, months, years, and even "time" itself.

In religious texts, translators also tend to add some words to narrow the cultural gap between the ST and the TT. For example, the word الحج can be translated as "pilgrimage to Makka" to eliminate pilgrimages in other religions. This can be done for the first time you mention the word. We can also convert the SL alphabets into the TL text, i.e. transliteration, when the translator fails to find a partial or full equivalent of a given SL term and then do one of the following procedures: to add a glossary at the end of the book.

1) to use footnotes or endnotes.
2) to insert a partial or full explanation either parenthesized or free in the text, next to the italicized term.

The last procedure could be more practical because it provides the reader with the meaning in the shortest way possible. S/he does not need to turn over the page or even look below as in the following translated paragraph (Evans, 1994:165, quoted in Dickins, 2002: 33):

The concert programme consisted of fifteen sections, six of which were in the Egyptian style as we know it from radio and television. These six parts comprised *muwashshahat* verse form and solos influenced by the Egyptian School- from classical instruments such as the plucked dulcimer (*qanun*), the Arab lute (*the ud*) and the *nay* flute. The structure of the music groups was also influenced by the Egyptian School, as they contained large numbers of violins.

Such borrowed words are explained in a way that retains their meanings in the SL.

**Truth Condition**

The most basic purpose of semantics in this paper is to keep the truth condition intact. In other words, the translator should not produce any thing that might affect the truth or falsity of a given statement. For example,

There are countless examples in the Glorious Qur'an.

Actually, we can count every single example let alone verses and letters in the Glorious Qur'an even by the naked eye. So, to translate the above sentence, we would better say, "there are numerous examples in the Glorious Qur'an."
The following example could further show how important the consideration of truth condition is. The word 
الساعة in the example below is always translated as "hour", even in early Arabic texts before the invention of watches and the use of modern time division.

جلس بنا نزنء ساعة
Let's sit together to strengthen our faith for an hour.

We should be aware, when translating, of the language use and references at the time of the text production. The word ساعة is used during the early Islamic period to denote a "period of time". This period of time does not necessarily consist of 60 seconds. So, to translate such a word in early Islamic texts, the translator should not limit it to the sense which is currently used today. Alternatively, s/he can pick a word or a phrase that refers to time division broadly such as "period of time, brief time, short time". The word الساعة with a definite article is entirely used to refer to the beginning of "the Day of Judgment". This could be acceptable because "the hour" is typically used in English to refer to a particular time or moment as in "the hour of his execution". So we can say "the Hour of Judgment" or "the Hour of Resurrection", which is more specific than the word "the hour" and is aligned with similar frequent phrases such as "the Day of Judgment or Resurrection".

Indeed, meaning involves reference to word form coupled with its representation in the real world. Meaning is not entirely based on word form and reference in the real world, it is greatly influenced by linguistic devices as well as non-linguistic ones such as the translator's way of thinking, use of language, and his/her knowledge of the TL or the specific field of the translated text.

**Conclusion**

In this paper we explored the significance of considering semantics as a vital stage in the process of translation. We focused on the original content of the ST irrespective of how they fit in the TL cultural setting and then incorporated the semantic knowledge in the process of translation. Having discussed the different types of meaning as well as the possible relations that hold between words outside the syntactic domain, such as synonymy, hyponymy, etc., we realized that translation and semantics must go hand in hand. In other words, the theoretical framework of meaning should be considered in informing the practice of translation.

Considering the semantic processes discussed in this paper: semantic repetition, semantic omission, semantic addition, and truth condition, could enhance the process of translation and make it more practical and replicable. We noticed how the uses of words and their associations may bring about meanings that are not discernible separately. Furthermore, componential analysis could be a useful technique to spot the subtle differences between the word senses, particularly the seemingly synonymous pairs of words. At the end, for a good and proper translation, it is
particularly imperative and helpful for a translator to be aware of the role that semantics plays in translation.
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