

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.63332/joph.v5i6.2577>

Untranslatability Within and Beyond Lexical Level in Arabic-English Translation

Fhaid Saad Alajmi¹

Abstract

This paper primarily explores the concept of Untranslatability and how Translation Studies' definition impacts its meaning and made it a nemesis of religious and poetic texts. The key significance of this study is how untranslatability occurs at and beyond lexical levels. At lexical level, it discusses how the Quranic masculine singular pronoun “هو” in reference to the Islamic God is untranslatable due to the distinction both Arabic and English have. Whereas poetry is discussed beyond the lexical level to showcase the impossibility of rendering both sense and style from Arabic into English. The study discussion revealed that sacred scriptures should never be translated but rather explained and that poetry is impossible to translate if the purpose is to maintain both style and meaning.

Keywords: Arabic-English Translation, Poetry Translation, Quranic Translation, Translatability, Untranslatability, Translation Studies.

Introduction

Background to the Field

From the outset, translation as an academic discipline is undoubtedly a phenomenon that has accentuated and evolved into a branch of applied linguistics. In the late 1970s, at the Louvain Colloquium on Literature and Translation, André Lefever advocated for translation studies to be recognized as a field of study that addresses the challenges presented by the production and description of translation. Ironically, translation as a study field was one of—if not the only—fields that existed as a practice prior to being theorized. Consequently, the initial establishment of the field was inappropriate, and its definition by theorists may likewise be imprecise.

The starting point of translation as a practice remains ambiguous, with some theorists suggesting that it originated approximately 3000 B.C., when holy Babylonian tablets were rendered into Sumerian and Akkadian languages. Others claim that the first endeavor was the translation of either the Bible from Hebrew and Greek into Vulgar Latin or the translation of *The Epic of Gilgamesh*, a poem composed in Sumerian and rendered into many Asian languages. Regardless, if one, for instance, assumes that the Bible was the first text to be translated during the original translation practical phase, then such translations occurred without the influence of contemporary theoretical frameworks; hence, translators back then possibly encountered terms, concepts, and/or expressions that were impossible to translate, or in other words, untranslatability occurred.

¹ Independent Author, Email: FhaidSaadAlajmi@gmail.com



Statement of the Problem

The primary issue with religious terms and poetic texts is that most translators fail to thoroughly analyze the source text to uncover its profound or unmasked meanings; if they venture beyond the lexical or the semantic surface levels, the source text (henceforth ST) becomes untranslatable.

Research Questions

The key research questions guiding this study are:

1. How has the imprecise definition of Translation Studies and its establishment as an academic discipline triggered the notion of Untranslatability?
2. Why cannot the Quran, or any sacred scripture, be translated? With reference to exemplifying the Arabic singular masculine pronoun “هو” to refer to God as a gender-neutral entity.
3. What prevents poetry from being translated, from both aesthetic and semantic perspectives?

Research Paradigm

In this study, I employed the descriptive analytical method, which entails thorough examinations of the concept of untranslatability, extensive searches, and in-depth analyses of the translations of the Arabic pronoun "هو" by two different translators from two different backgrounds who are Mustafa Khattab and M. Pickthall. Moreover, renderings of Arabic poetry are investigated thoroughly to determine their translatability. The data for the poetry section were extracted from *An Anthology of Contemporary Folkloric Gulf Poetry* by Fhaid S. Alajmi (2023). The analysis of poetry is divided into two categories; one being aesthetic, and the other is semantic. This is done for the sake of explaining why poetry is untranslatable from two different aspects of language.

Review of Literature

Theoretically and in practice, the concept of untranslatability has been a controversial matter in translation studies and is still being discussed by many researchers. There are several studies conducted to examine the phenomenon of untranslatability between Arabic and English. Most of which were on lexical levels that are related to the translation of specific cases of articles, particles, and single words in the Holy Koran. For example, Jones (2016) carried out a study to examine the Quranic term “لَعَلَّ” ‘la ṣala.’ The study findings revealed that the nonchalance led Western translators to convey it as 'so that,' which is a blatant translationese. Al-Haj (2022) examined the notion of untranslatability and the related challenges found in some Quranic terms, such as ‘heart’ in Surah Al-Tawbah ‘Repentance.’ The research revealed that such word is unrenderable because it loses its senses when translated into Arabic, which is a mundane predicament when translating the Quran into English. Other researchers who went beyond lexical levels are Kashgary, D. A., and Abdelaal and Rashid.

Kashgary D.A. (2010) explored the notion of equivalence and untranslatability. In her article, *The Paradox of Translating The Untranslatable: Equivalence vs. non-equivalence in Translating from Arabic into English*, she argues that the notion of ‘Untranslatability’ should be replaced with the term non-equivalence, as untranslatability only occurs at the word level. If it happened at the textual level, then an acceptable equivalent can be achieved. “If equivalence is the essence

of translation, non-equivalence constitutes an equally legitimate concept in the translation process” (ibid). In like manner, Abdelaal and Rashid (2015) state that the semantic loss found in the translated Surah “Al-Waqiʿah” ‘the event inevitable’ exists. Furthermore, they argue that the untranslatability can be either a complete or partial one. Their research revealed that semantic loss occurs mainly because of cultural gaps, as the lexicons of the Holy Quran are culturally bound.

Other scholars have gone past the lexical level to examine the translation of puns. Al Shra'ah (2011) examined the translatability of puns in Kamal Nusair's satirical works from Arabic to English. The researcher argues that the chosen puns are poorly translated into English because of the fundamental differences between Arabic and English, the translators' lack of awareness regarding the author's intention in the source language, and the resultant loss of pun meaning in the target language. Moreover, his research indicates that the translators employed four different strategies to translate puns into English: literal translation, paraphrase, functional translation, and a combination of literal translation. Moreover, Wu and Pan (2012) prove that generating a comparable pun in the target language is impossible because of the three traditional principles of faithfulness, smoothness, and elegance. From their viewpoints, this does not imply that the pun is untranslatable; rather, it is crucial to exclude certain elements to maintain the more important component of the pun. Their analysis also indicates that rewriting and/or inserting footnotes are methods—commonly employed in pun translation—that can more effectively convey the original material to the target language. Furthermore, Poetry was the center of attention for one of the most distinguished scholars in Arabic-English translation. Ghazala (2019) examines the translatability of poetry and its considerable challenges in translation. He believes that an effective poetic translation is entirely reliant on prosody and sound; otherwise, it should be termed poetical translation rather than poetic translation.

Untranslatability

The concept of untranslatability cannot be set without correctly adjusting the definition of translation itself. As aforementioned, the initial establishment of the field was inappropriate; henceforth, its definition by theorists may likewise be imprecise. For example, a prominent scholar, Catford (1978, P.20) defines translation as “the replacement of textual material in one language (SL) by equivalent textual material in another language (TL),” whereas Newmark (1988, P.5) defines it as the process of “rendering the meaning of a text into another language in a way that the author intended the text.” Both of which give clear instructions on what to prioritize during the process of translation, one being the textual material and the latter being the intended meaning. If we take Catford’s definition of translation, a SL-oriented approach will eliminate the deep semantic meaning of words and only respect the surface meaning. Such an approach leads to literal translation and surely paves the way for untranslatability to occur due to the distinction each language has. On the other hand, Newmark’s is more flexible as it urges us to communicate the intended meaning of the TL as it was communicated in the SL. This approach advocates for free translation and is TL-oriented; therefore, it cannot be fully successful due to various reasons. One being the lack of exact equivalences or references between both languages, the dissimilarities of speakers’ mindsets and cultural backgrounds, and most importantly, the impossibility for translators to comprehend what the original author’s intended meanings were. Consequently, the definition of translation should be altered into a more fixable concept to prevent any changes in languages and their features. For this and other reasons, translation can be defined as ‘the approximate reproduction of a source language sense into a target language

sense'; otherwise, untranslatability occurs. By all means, the utilization of the adjective 'approximate' is imperative due to the fact that translators can never reproduce an exact language, but an approximate one.

Notably, our main concern is the sense rather than the form. This is because languages derive from different family trees that may or may not have common morphological and/or syntactical forms. In fact, languages that descend from or share a common language group may have a higher approximate percentage of translation success, respecting both the form and sense of the SL. On the other hand, if the SL and TL do not derive from a common ancestor, then the form plays an insignificant role, but the intended meaning can be expressed differently. Therefore, by neglecting the form, if the implied meaning cannot be approximated, untranslatability arises. Untranslatability, the opposite of our definition of translation, can be defined as 'the ineffectiveness of the TL to reproduce an approximate meaning of the SL.' Such definition carries the impossibility to render the meaning from one language to another, whether due to linguistics or cultural differences.

Newmark (1988) argues that untranslatability differs from impossible translation, one being cultural and the latter being linguistic. Such distinction is useless and adds no value, simply because what is untranslatable is the same as impossible to translate. He (ibid) also states that it is absurd to call words that cannot be rendered precisely into another language as 'untranslatable,' especially when they can be described in four or five words in a footnote. Such strategy, in my perception, eliminates the act of translating and replaces it with the act of defining and/or explaining. If one opts to define or explain a term or a concept in a footnote, then untranslatability takes place because there is no equivalence in the TL. Likewise, Kashgary's (2010) article entitled *The Paradox of Translating The Untranslatable* describes the concept of non-equivalence, which is, as Baker (1992) states, the struggle to translate a word or text from one language to another due to the lack of equivalence. In other words, non-equivalence is nothing but a fancy name for untranslatability. Our issue is not with naming it this or that; it is primarily the process of recognizing and taking it into consideration. For example, some argue that one of the suggested methods of dealing with non-equivalence is the use of explanatory Ghazalah (2002), or descriptive equivalences. Both of which—similar to Newmark's point—indicate defining and explaining rather than translating. Using such methods is a clear indication of the occurrence of untranslatability.

Moreover, untranslatability that occurs beyond the lexical level was merely discussed, as most researchers focused on purely cultural and/or religious terms in Arabic-English translation. To put it differently, single items were the center of attention among most theorists due to their fixed meanings in any given cultural or religious context. Still, some argue that there is no such concept as untranslatability and chase the illusive concept of perfect translation. Newmark (1998, P.6) insists that "there is no such thing as a perfect, ideal, or correct translation." This statement paves our way to neglect both descriptive and explanatory methods of translation and surely supports the acceptance of untranslatability that exists within the lexical level and beyond it. Thus, our main purpose is to identify its occurrences beyond the lexical level and highlight it as a matter of concern in both applied and theoretical translation studies.

Lexical Level

Semantically, every single lexical item has primary and secondary meanings and sometimes even figurative language depending on the characteristics of the given language. All meanings can be determined by the context, but what if we want to translate a contextless word? Is the denotative, or, in other words, is the semantic surface structure enough?

Translating single, isolated words is truly the most difficult task to do. Indeed, every translator has to have a context to base his/her translation on; otherwise, an indeliberate translationese may occur. Newmark (1988, P. 193) says that many translators are deceiving themselves when they opt to not translate words but rather sentences, ideas, or messages, and they should only translate words that are more or less linguistically, referentially, culturally, and subjectively influenced in their meanings. His classification plainly indicates that some words are untranslatable and should always be integrated in a pre-set context; therefore, a gap in translation occurs. The issue with untranslatability, in other words, the existence of non-equivalence, mainly results from two categories: one is linguistic, and the other is extra-linguistic. The linguistic is the surface structure of the given language, and the extralinguistic is the deep meaning. The occurrences of untranslatability at the lexical level can pave the way to understanding its existence and sophistication beyond that. It showcases the initial steps of confusion that happen to translators from single words that cannot be rendered naturally to the TL readership. Most of these single lexical items that are found in Arabic-English translations are related to religious cultural contexts, regional features, and

Religious Words

Many researchers delved into the untranslatability of some religious words. Mainly, they were focused on grammatical differences between Arabic and English and how to surmount such differences. For example, Jones (2016) carried out a study to examine the Quranic term “لَعَلَّ” ‘la ʕala,’ which means ‘so that’ and according to Jones, this does not render the exact function of this Arabic particle. Needless to say, most researchers only focused on untranslatability as either grammatical-oriented or word-to-word rendering issues. Notably numerous religious terms have meanings that transcend their surface interpretations in sacred texts. For example, in the Islamic faith, “الله” ‘Allah’, which is the name of God is believed to be genderless. As an illustration, look at the following example:

Example (1):

ST: (4) قُلْ هُوَ اللَّهُ أَحَدٌ (1) اللَّهُ الصَّمَدُ (2) لَمْ يَلِدْ وَلَمْ يُولَدْ (3) وَلَمْ يَكُنْ لَهُ كُفُوًا أَحَدٌ (4)

Surrah: Chapter (30) surat Al-Ikhlās, verse 112:1 to 112:4

TT:

(1): “Say, O Prophet, **He** is Allah—One and Indivisible; Allah—the Sustainer needed by all. **He** has never had offspring, nor was **He** born. And there is none comparable to **Him**.” Dr. Mustafa Khattab, The Clear Quran (Quran.com).

(2): “Say: **He** is Allah, the One! Allah, the eternally besought of all! **He** begetteth not nor was begotten. And there is none comparable unto **him**.” M. Pickthall (Quran.com).

Both translations suggest a translational issue that extends beyond mere semantic and lexical levels. In the TTs, Allah/God is signed with the pronoun 'He,' which is a literal translation of the Arabic third-person masculine singular personal pronoun "هو". The ST readership is aware that Arabic language lacks neutral pronouns; hence, the masculine single pronoun "هو" is employed by default. If rendered as 'He,' the target language readership will infer that they are engaging with a masculine deity and portray him as a male accordingly. Added to that, substituting the masculine singular pronoun 'He' in the translation with the nominative pronoun 'Allah' will present an additional complication. Arabic verbal forms, similar to numerous Semitic languages, are categorized as either masculine or feminine.



Figure (1): Target text, their meanings, and their morphological structure.

Arabic pronouns can be either attached, as illustrated in figure (1), or detachable, exemplified by "هو," which translates to 'He'. In Arabic, genders are explicitly indicated; hence, if the verb is prefixed with "يـ", it signifies a third-person masculine singular pronoun. Consequently, the translation will invariably use the English male pronoun. In addition, if the nominative pronoun 'Allah' is employed to substitute the pronoun 'He' to address the issue of masculinity, then we cannot substitute the detached pronoun "هـ" in "لَهُ كَفْرًا أَحَدًا" meaning 'And there is none comparable unto **him**.' This exemplifies untranslatability at the lexical level. This situation suggests that the Quran is untranslatable and that translators should refrain from attempting to translate it. Certain English Islamic Scholars use the term 'Tafsir,' meaning 'explanation' or 'commentary,' for translated Quranic texts instead of 'translation' in order to avoid potential ambiguities associated with the language or concepts present in Quran or other sacred scriptures.

The previously discussed example of untranslatability at the lexical level facilitates a deeper comprehension of its presence beyond this level. This example encompasses not only linguistic untranslatability—the grammatical structure—but also philosophical and fundamental understanding of a certain concept.

Beyond Lexical Level

Generally speaking, If the primary focus is on anything larger than a single semantic unit, it transcends the lexical level. For instance, sentences, clauses, tones, and stylistic elements are beyond the lexical level. Untranslatability can manifest beyond the lexical level, even in the presence of contexts. Several concepts and/or styles are incapable of being translated or

reproduced. The main focus is to identify the chief difficulties encountered while translating the untranslatable. Such challenges cannot be surmounted by current translational strategies and techniques. This is due to the consistent disregard for the equivalent effect on such occasions. Our main concern on untranslatability beyond the lexical level will be focused on poetry, as its significance inevitably transcends the lexical level and often disregards equivalent effects; however, translators frequently attempt to render them. This invariably produces translationese, and eventually, the intended message is never conveyed.

Poetry

All sorts of texts are known to be either literary or non-literary. The latter can be effectively dealt with by translation strategies, whereas literary texts, as Francis (2019:152-153) states, have some unique features that are crafted to serve an aesthetic purpose rather than conveying information and are judged as fictional rather than fact-based items. Their primary goal, as Ghazala (2012: 2) stresses, is to evoke emotions and/or provide entertainment rather than impart knowledge via literary language. In translation studies, poetry has been approached differently by theorists because translating it poses various challenges for the translators due to its aesthetic and expressive properties. Hariyanto (2003, p.1) asserts that “translating literary works like poetry is, perhaps, always more difficult than translating other types of text,” and due to the predicaments translators face when translating poetry, Jakobson (1960) says that poetry, by definition, is impossible to translate. The other perspective is made by Khulusi (2000:34), who stresses that “poetry should be translated by poets only, or else, it is untranslatable.” This statement might be valid if the primary objective is to trigger the sentiments of the readers by making the rhyme and rhythm the priority. If that was the case, then it is not a matter of needing a poet to prevent the loss of many poetic features, as rhyme and rhythm can be easily found by inserting synonyms or near-synonyms that introduce musicality.

In contrast, if the main purpose of translating poetry is to deliver the message of the poem, then the translation will be considered as prose rather than a poem. This is because the source text’s ST short verses will be replaced with long verses in the target text TT in order to deliver the meaning rather than the aesthetic features. This will undermine the poem’s stylistics; the translated text will either be prose or the meter will be improperly structured. This will create a dilemma of sacrificing either meaning or musicality. Poems are distinguished from ordinary language by their prosodic and sound characteristics. According to Ghazala (2008: 294), these include rhyme, rhythm, alliteration, assonance, consonance, chiming, onomatopoeia, meter, foot, beat, off-beat, and tone. However, given that we are examining texts from categorically different language families, the effects of these sound features will not be entirely implemented. At this point, poetry is aesthetically untranslatable. In the pursuit of conveying meaning, the intricate components of deep semantic structure, including classifications of attributes, relations, things, and events, are invariably diminished, since they fail to reproduce the original impact in the target text. To better understand why conveying the sense of poetry through translation is impossible to achieve, consider the following example:

Example (2):

TT	ST
<i>Bygone you were, like a thunderstorm</i>	مَعَ السَّلَامَةِ ارْجَلِي رَاجِلِ بَرُوقِ
<i>A silhouette of an abandoned house,</i>	صَوَّهْ عَلَى بَيْتِ بَهْ النُّورِ طَافِي
<i>your lightnings revealed</i>	...
...	بَيْتِ مَهْجُورِ مَا سَكِنَ فِيهِ مَخْلُوقِ
<i>A forsaken one, within dwelt a soul</i>	وَيَدْخُلُ مَعَ عَقْدِ الذَّرَى فِيهِ سَافِي
<i>Dust seeps from the cracks of its door</i>	...
...	مِظْلِمِ سِرَاجَةِ مِنْ أَوَّلِ الْعَامِ مَخْرُوقِ
<i>Its burnt lantern not touched for years</i>	يُنْكِ سَحَابِ بَرَقَهَا فِيهِ ضَافِي
<i>It bathed in tears as the cloud pours</i>	...
...	مَعَ السَّلَامَةِ أَطْلَقِي بِيَدِشْ سُنُوقِ
<i>Set free, the bird of love</i>	جِرْ وَحْشْ كَامِلِ مِنَ اللَّهِ وَافِي
<i>Let it soar on wings above</i>	...
...	مِنْ عَقْبِ مَا هُوَ بَارِقُ الرَيْشِ لَاحُوقِ
<i>a joyful melody is what the bird all sang</i>	عَافِ اللُّحُوقِ وَعَافِ صَيْدِ الْمَقَافِي
<i>Now, clipped wings, only sad serenade we</i>	
<i>hear</i>	

An Anthology of Contemporary Folkloric Gulf Poetry (2023)

Prior to examining the efficacy of conveying the meaning, it is pertinent to highlight that all examples presented are my own translations, extracted from my book, *An Anthology of Contemporary Folkloric Gulf Poetry*, wherein I prioritize conveying meaning over preserving aesthetic features in my translations. The meaning remains inadequately conveyed because of the cultural references present in the source text. The term “بروق,” meaning ‘lightnings’ in the source text, signifies the ending of the winter season. During this seasonal period, a rapid meteorological transition occurs, with the sky transforming from serene to tempestuous in an instant. This weather phenomenon is referred to as ‘Sarrayat,’ literally ‘the departing ones.’ This theme points out that the beloved one departed in wrath, forsaking the days of happiness.

In the second verse of the first stanza, the SL word “بيت,” meaning ‘house’, does not connote an actual physical house but rather a black Bedouin tent crafted from woven goat hair that symbolizes the poet’s heart. This is evident in the second stanza, where the poet indicates that a soul once resided in this tent. This soul is his beloved one who departed from him. Consequently, what is significant in meanings in both stanzas are diminished, as our role as translators is to convey texts instead of expressing the poet's sentiments. Likewise, it is impossible to ascertain the poet's intended meaning in any specific poem; hence, the translation would cease to be a poem and instead become an extensive prose, preventing the TT from being classified as poem.

Furthermore, in the fourth and fifth stanzas, the poet embodies the essence of a wild falcon. In numerous Gulf states, falcons are regarded as the national emblem, representing both strength and purity. The poet reflects on his former self as an eminent falcon, distinguished by remarkable hunting skills, yet now finds that the falcon is burdened by weariness and sorrow. I utilized free translation to modify the image by replacing this culture-specific concept with 'love bird' to offer a close equivalence for the target readership. The emotions evoked by cultural references frequently become obscured in translation, owing to regional referential items that may be unfamiliar to the target audience, especially Western readers. Another example of the why poetry is untranslatable is the following:

ST:

يا وجودي كل ما هبَّ نسَّاس الشمال
وجد من حدّه زمانه على إلی ما یبیه

Interlinear translation:

الشمال	نسَّاس	هبَّ	ما	كل	وجودي	يا	
North	breeze	blew	what	all	my	Hey	
					existence		
یبیه	ما	إلی	على	زمانه	حدّه	من	وجد
He	what	to	on	His time	besieged	who	being
wants							

In general, interlinear translation serves to demonstrate the semantic shifts and deviations in vocalizations that arise when engaging with a vernacular language. For instance, the subtle semantic shift often goes unnoticed by numerous Arabic-English translators who lack familiarity with the dialectal nuances of certain Arabic Gulf lexicons, such as the term “وجودي,” which translates to ‘my existence’ in modern standard Arabic, yet relates to an individual's status in life. Added to that, the term “وجودي” is consistently employed in poetry to convey the melancholic sentiments that the poet is undergoing. Moreover, variations in vocalizations known as “التشكيل” are extensively employed in vernacular poetry. For instance, the terms “كل” and “الشمال” are derived from “كلن” and “الشَّمَال”. Each diacritic is equipped with the capacity to alter meaning, and if the translator is not aware of that or unfamiliarized with Gulf vernacular, then translationese occurs.

Literal Translation:

Oh my existence whenever blows the breeze of North
Like the existence of who besieged by his time onto what he not want.

Employing literal translation—understanding that it as the last option to opt for translators—consistently disregards the grammatical structure of the target text. This will undoubtedly distort all the aesthetic elements that a poem ought to contain, yet it provides insight into the surface meaning of the message and is consistently culture-oriented. Nonetheless, literal translation is inadequate for addressing poetry.

Idiomatic Translation:

Poor me whenever the chilly breeze blows,
Reminds me of things I desire to forget the most.

Utilizing the idiomatic translation, the most flexible form of translation, allows the target text to convey a clear understanding of the meaning. However, the profound significance of the 'chilly breeze' is lacking, as it serves as a term specific to the region. This term refers to a timeframe, primarily before the summer season, during which cool air moves from Europe to the Gulf region, known for being one of the hottest places on earth. The breeze influences the desert inhabitants, who often gather outside their tents to relish their time together in pleasant weather. In the ST, it conveys a sense of nostalgia that resonates with all nomadic tribes in the Gulf. Conversely, my translation must adhere to the length of the source text. From a stylistic perspective, if we fail to adhere to the verse length and extend it, it ceases to be a poem and becomes prose instead.

Conclusion

The idea of Untranslatability is entirely contingent upon the definition of translation itself. Untranslatability arises when translators are unable to convey a similar meaning of the source text. The approximation must convey both the intended meaning and the conceptualization of a specific notion. Also, instances of untranslatability typically arise when engaging with two distinct languages that do not originate from or share a common language family tree. Moreover, sacred scriptures ought not to be translated in a way that could lead to misunderstandings among TT speakers; thus, the meaning can be clarified and referred to as a 'commentary' instead of a translation. In a comparable manner the Arabic singular masculine pronoun “هو” cannot be translated into English as 'He', since the Islamic God is recognized as gender neutral. Ultimately, poetry has been shown to be untranslatable in both aesthetic and semantic aspects when it comes to Arabic-English translation.

References

- Abdelaal, N. M., & Md Rashid, S. (2015). Semantic Loss in the Holy Qur'an Translation with Special Reference to Surah Al-WaqiAAa (Chapter of The Event Inevitable). *Sage Open*, 5(4).
- Alajmi, Fhaid S. (2023). *An Anthology of Contemporary Folkloric Gulf Poetry*. Kuwait.
- Al-Haj, A. A. M. (2023). Lexical-Semantic Problems and Constrains Met in Translating Qur'anic Arabic-Specific words "Nasf نفس" into English: A Cross-lingual Perspective. *Technium Social Sciences Journal*, 44, 1025-1040.
- Al-Shra'ah, M. (2011). *Translatability of Pun in Kamel Nusairat's Sarcastic Articles into English*. Yarmouk University, Irbid, Jordan.
- Baker, M., & Baker, M. (1992). In *Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation* (1st ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203133590>
- Catford, J. C. (1978). *A Linguistic Theory of Translation: An Essay in Applied Linguistics*.
- Ghazala, H. (2002/2008). *Translation as Problems and Solutions: A Textbook for University Students and Trainee Translators*. Dar El-Ilm Lil-Malayin; Beirut.
- Ghazala, H. S. (2019). Poetic Vs. poetical Translation of Poetry (English-Arabic). *Arab World English Journal for Translation & Literary Studies*, 3 (1) 3-21.
- Hariyanto, S. Problems in Translating Poetry. Retrieved April 2025, from www.researchgate.net/publication/322735211_problems_in_translating_poetry <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244015605880>
- Jakobson, R. (1960). *Closing Statement: Linguistic and Poetics*, in Sebeok, T.A. (ed) *Style in Language*.
- Jones, A. (2016). So That You May Be Reminded. *Arabist: Budapest Studies in Arabic*, 37, 99-114.
- Kashgay, A. D. (2010). The Paradox of Translating The Untranslatable: Equivalence vs. non-equivalence in translating from Arabic into English. *Journal of King Saud University*, 23, 47-57.
- Khulusi, D. (2000). *The Art of Translation (in Arabic)* (2nd ed.). Cairo: Al-Hay'ah Al-Misriyyah Lil-Kitab.
- Newmark, P. (1988). *A Textbook of Translation*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Surrah Al-Iklas, retrieved April, 2025 from <https://quran.com/112?translations=19>
- Wu, Y., & Pan, Q. (2012). Strategies on Translation of English Puns. *Theory & Practice in Language Studies*, 2(10), p.2133-2138.