

CLASSICAL ARABIC RHETORIC AND SIMILE IN QURANIC TEXT WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO TRANSLATION

Prof. Dr. Hamid Hussein Al – Hajjaj

Ph.D in Linguistics & Translation, Jordan

ABSTRACT

The present study tries to provide the interested reader with a clear and comprehensive picture of a number of essential issues in Classical Arabic Rhetoric and Quranic Arabic.

The first issue to be presented and discussed in this work is plethora of various designations (labels) used by Arabists, modern and traditional Arab linguists to describe this language within the framework of Semitic languages. Each designation is used in certain stylistic and lexical environment. The most distinctive label is the Arabic variety which is closely connected to the Glorious Quran. Most of these Arabic varieties have been analyzed, exploring their features, merits, insufficiencies and shortcomings.

This issue, namely, the detailed treatment of types and sub – types of Arabic designations, that very much exist nowadays, are used by various official academic institutions in the Arab World. Thus, it is extremely important for investigators working in the field of Arabic language study.

Another issue, which is looked at in this work, is simile. This trope is one of the basic and most frequently and productively used figure of speech in the Glorious Quranic Verses. Here, we have focused upon the role of similitive expressions in the domain of this Divine Book.

Literal and figurative semantic values have also been dealt with in the present paper. We have tried to show in an evident way how the rhetorical features add semantic forces and values to the Quranic Text. This process could have an important impact over the rendition of this text into English and other languages. The nature of simile is another issue in this variety of Arabic. The Quranic similitive expressions are distinguished from those which are used in Non – Quranic Arabic lies in the nature of aesthetic features of both uses in both varieties and the translational product of the text.

Key words: *Simile, Classical Rhetoric, Quranic texts, Quranic language, translation.*

BRIEF INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

As the title of the present paper suggests, simile is empirically seen as one of the basic and fundamental figures of speech in Classical Quranic and Poetic Arabic. In addition to that, it plays a quite decisive role in the Glorious Quran, Prophetic Tradition and classical poetry. Its role is very clear in providing religious as well as literary (poetic) texts with magnificent images about life, life after death and other related concepts in Islamic culture.

Metaphor proper will not be considered, in detail, in this work since simile and metaphor are understood by Arab rhetoricians as two structurally and semantically connected rhetorical tropes, namely, simile, somehow or another, is naturally implied in the structure of Arabic metaphorical expressions and domains to the extent that Miller (1979:1) regards metaphors as abbreviated similes. Some of essential and common features and mechanisms of these two figures of speech will be dealt with later on in some detail as we proceed in this work. Because of their effective rhetorical force and since simile and metaphor are seen by most workers in the field of Arabic language study, rhetoric, philosophy, psychology etc., as being powerful figurative devices, having an important impact on Quranic Text, they will therefore be tackled in relation to the translation of this Divine Book. Thus, the present paper will be devoted to the study of simile, touching sometimes upon the concept of metaphor in Arabic Classical rhetoric and pay attention to translation in an attempt to establish some underlying principles that govern the process of formulating similitive and metaphorical constructions in Classical Arabic. It is hoped that accurate and objective accomplishment of these interrelated figures of speech will ultimately lead to establishing and postulating precise and convincing accounts to help exploring simile and its important role in Quranic and Classical Arabic language.

ARABIC USED IN THIS STUDY

Linguists, rhetoricians, and semanticists, who are specialized in the field of Semitic languages, in general, and Arabic, in particular, are familiar with the fact that there are too many designations (i.e., labels) used in the

relevant literature for naming, describing, and tackling issues connected with Arabic none of which, as we believe, is entirely convincingly objective.

Before we start discussing and analyzing strong points as well as insufficiencies and shortcomings in the structure of each of those labels, an overall picture of Arabic taken up in the present work should be given. It goes without saying that Arabic, with its rich literary heritage, is one of the major languages of the world. Since the Middle Ages it has enjoyed a universality that makes it one of the world's great languages, along with Greek and Latin; English, French, Spanish, and Russian. This status reflects not only the number of Arabic speakers, but also the place the language has occupied in history, the important role it has played – and is still playing – in the development of Arab – Muslim society (Chejne, 1969:3). This distinguished position of Arabic makes it differ in many respects (linguistic and non-linguistic) from its sister languages and the other languages of the world. It is deeply rooted in the history of the Arab Nation. In addition, it has been seen as a self-sufficing and living entity possessing great endowments embedded in its capacity to effectively adjust to the law of evolution. This viewpoint has been held and echoed by an indefinite number of intellectuals up till the present time.

Stetkevych (1970:1) admires this language quite evidently, he says that “Arabic has lived for one millennium and a half essentially unchanged, usually gaining, never completely losing. Venus-like, it has been in a perfect state of beauty, and it has preserved that beauty in spite of all the hazards of history and all the corrosive forces of time.” This sort of admiration and praise Arabic has received from objective linguists, Arabs and non-Arabs, Muslims and non-Muslims, makes the Arabic speakers and non-Arabic Muslim speakers think that this language is a privileged one.

Most researchers, in the domain of Arabic linguistics, have lengthily talked on various aspects of Arabic. They have paid much attention to the structure of this language which has been described by most of them as being almost similar to a mathematical abstraction. The perfect lexical and morphological systems of the three radical consonants, the derived verbal forms or molds with their basic meanings, the exact formulation of the present and past participles, etc., all of these linguistic

characteristics, which are, in one way or another, relevant to the aesthetic features of the language, have made everything in this language expressing clarity, logic, system, and abstraction.

What we have already said can make everyone acquainted with this language acquire aesthetic taste by which he can grasp the structure of Arabic as an algebraic formula. This is, of course, the first notion speakers of Arabic can encounter where it cannot be removed from their minds and can be established as an ultimate truth.

As we have mentioned earlier, a number of labels have been used by scholars to designate Arabic language in general, and the variety of Arabic in question specifically. These designations have carried and denoted structural properties of Arabic. However, they are not totally satisfactory, as has already been stated. Among the most common labels are “Classical Arabic”, “Neo-Classical Arabic”, and “Modern Classical Arabic”. Clearly, these technical namings or labels should not be passed unquestioned. In other words, very strong objections might be raised against the above unrealistic labels, the most essential of which is that they obviously lack the logically required precision. The attachment of the concept “Classical” to the above free varieties of Arabic, so to speak, is in actual fact, almost completely artificial and deliberate since most of Arabic structural manifestations are certainly difficult to fit into any normal and reasonable acceptance of this term (Beetson, 1970:12). Besides, native speakers of Arabic are reluctant to accept this naming which has been mostly formed by Arabists and Orientalists, most of these scholars, if not all, have not given Arabic the attention and care it deserves. They have been perfectly aware of the fact that by these terms they actually refer to the language of the Glorious Quran, Islamic Sacred Book, Prophetic Tradition, and pre-Islamic poetry. So, taking this situation into consideration, it will be quite clear that by these labels, they have aimed at making Arabs believe that their language is no longer used and cannot be capable of facing the challenges of the present and future civilizations. Now, it is not difficult to infer that this approach in treating this variety of Arabic, which is very much alive, is far from being objective, logical, and scientific. Those Arabists and Orientalists have wanted to destroy most of the language of the

Quran and Prophetic Tradition for it is still regarded by Arabs and Muslims as being the most faithful register of their cultural achievements as well as the basis for political-cultural resurgence throughout the width and breadth of the Arab and Muslim Nations. In other words, this philosophy has been oriented towards weakening Arabic language and consequently deforming the Divine nature of the Glorious Quran which is written in this language.

It is important to state here that Arabists in particular have placed too much emphasis on the matter that Arabic of the pre-Islamic era and the first four Islamic centuries is “Classical” in the sense that it is similar to Latin, the ultimate goal they in fact want to arrive at is to consider this God-given language, which is unique in beauty and majesty and considered by Arabs and Muslims as the most eloquent of all languages in expressing thoughts and emotions, a dead language. Orientalists know that this variety of Arabic will stay forever the most perfect, the clearest, the most concise, and the richest of all languages. Such a perfect, noble, and elegant language can never be logically called or described as (Classical, Neo-Classical, or even Modern Classical) language. It is also basic to notice that the terms “Neo-Classical Arabic” and “Modern Classical Arabic” juxtapose names for two varieties that are commonly considered antithetical in nature.

“Literary Arabic” and “Modern Literary Arabic” are other two widely used labels although many of their manifestations have nothing to do with literature as is the case with newspaper advertisements. So, “Literary” or “Modern Literary” as technical terms have not been established yet since Arabic can be just Arabic as long as it is not colloquial or dialectal. The term “Modern Literary Arabic”, is, in reality, so specific because it focuses on “Literary genres” and excludes other types of writing such as Journalistic Prose.

“Written Arabic” and “Modern Written Arabic” are also used in the relevant literature. They are frequently employed as in media for spoken communication, as in the formal speeches, and in the radio broadcasts addressing the whole Arab Nation.

“Modern Arabic” and “Contemporary Arabic” are two additional misleading designations which are not specific enough to exclude the present-day colloquial dialects.

“Standard Arabic” and “Modern Standard Arabic” have been used as well. “Standard Arabic” is not clear enough where it can be used instead of any of the previously mentioned labels. “Modern Standard Arabic” seems to be the most satisfactory label against which objections can only be minimal. To us, this term cannot be utterly acceptable because the historical basis of what is meant by this linguistic variety has not been taken into account. What has been taken into consideration is just the current circumstances which affect some aspects of Arabic.

Now, the variety of Arabic which is going to be used and made reference to, throughout this study, is the Quranic Arabic Language (henceforth QAL). This variety of Arabic language as its designation suggests, is exclusively associated with the style of Arabic that is employed in the language of the Glorious Quran. It could also be said that this language may, to a certain extent, be close to the grammatical (i.e., syntactic) system of Arabic as codified in the early Islamic period which continues to be generally considered the norm for Modern Arabic usage.

QAL has attained dominance, which has never lost, not only in the Arab - Land but also throughout the Islamic World.

Since the Glorious Quran is considered to be the earliest surviving document of written Arabic, its language is unmistakably that of the most perfect form. This variety of Arabic clearly expresses a relationship between Arabic language and Islam. In other words, QAL was the medium in which the message of Islam is embodied and through which transmitted from generation to generation.

As the Glorious Quran stresses, Islam is the religion brought to the Arabs in their language as previous peoples had received their message from God in their languages. So, Islam is represented by the Glorious Quran as much the conveyer of the language as the Arabic language was the conveyer of Islam. The high prestige accorded to the QAL is the result of being the most highly developed variety of Arabic on all possible linguistic levels. Furthermore, this variety of Arabic has been regarded as the main pillar of the faith for Arab and non-Arab Muslims and the most basic prop of the Pan-Arabism.

LITERAL VS. FIGURATIVE MEANING

Simile is considered to be one of the basic tropes (metaphors) in the Quranic Text (henceforth QT). As we have already mentioned, it is embedded in every sort of metaphor in Arabic texts. Before going to discuss the core of simile in this specific text, the role played by literal and figurative aspects of meaning in text should be considered. This is seen as an important and basic requirement for the proper dealing with similitive expressions in the text in question. Every single simile in the Glorious Quran should have these two aspects of meaning.

Figurative language has been intensively used by so many workers in the field of language study. It has been very much used by poets, rhetoricians, literary critics, linguists, philosophers and writers in general. It is a tremendously effective means used to accomplish better understanding of texts.

Literal language, on the other hand, has been regarded by linguists and semanticists as representing the underlying structure of the figurative utterances.

Because of this essential logical and stylistic role, similitive language in general and metaphorical expressions in particular have been seen by most workers in the field of rhetoric, as primary devices for creating novel thoughts. In other words, they have not been considered as a mere ornamentation or an extralinguistic element added to everyday language. Reviewing the related literature and the long history of rhetoric since the time of Greek antiquity, will undoubtedly reveal a lot of facts in support of the above-mentioned argument. Similitive expressions (being metaphorical in nature and functional in the Quranic Arabic) are adopted throughout this work to represent (not only the most compact and vigorous way of saying a thing) but also the way in which the particular thing can be said at all. This last remark holds especially true when the thing to be said involves an interpretation or evaluation. So, similitive constructions used in the Glorious Quran can very much enrich QT by supporting it with so many factual and precise semantic values. Thus, we can claim that this figure of speech is an “indeed indispensable instrument for interpreting experience” (Brooks & Warren ,1949:448), this state is not only seen or felt in Arabic text, it could also be seen

in various sorts of texts employed in other languages in the world. Thomas (1969:74) believes that metaphorical structures, in general, can enrich utterances with an unlimited number of semantic and non-semantic values each of which can involve linguistic or psycholinguistic force over perceivers. Thus, they can very much help to shape the attitude of the receptors. Furthermore, linguists and particularly lexicologists, believe that metaphorical uses of lexical items are of basic importance for developing languages (Jespersen, 1968:431). These uses can expand the semantic wealth of words which result in creating powerful linguistic capabilities enabling native speakers of language to express their finest attitudes and feelings, besides, making them deal, in a much more accurate way, with a very wide range of linguistic contexts. This situation, i.e., having many uses for the same lexical item or having many words to deal with the same thing would make the language under discussion textually and metaphorically rich as is the case with the QAL. Scholars, who are familiar with the linguistic and stylistic features of QTs, can precisely feel the extensive use of the similitive and other metaphorical devices in the Glorious Quran, on various linguistic levels, which make the QT highly figurative. This does not mean that this phenomenon can only exist in the QTs. It exists, as well, in the Arabic literary works, and could also be found, though in a less noticeable size, in Modern Standard Arabic.

It might be true to claim that comprehending each of these two different aspects of natural language, i.e., literal and figurative, completely rely upon the right and subtle perception of the other. Pickens, et al (1985:484) describe the process and mechanisms used in realizing these two aspects of human language by saying that “figurative understanding is a multi-stage process that begins when literal comprehension fails, and depends upon principles different from other types of comprehension. According to this view, only when an expression is literally uninterpretable does a listener (or reader) attempt to deal with it non-literally”. In other words, if all possible tests of literal text interpretation fail to yield, logically and semantically, an acceptable interpretation, the native speaker (or the reader) might, at this stage, judge the text, under analysis, either as contradictory i.e., as involving a negation of literal

statement, or as presenting a deliberate opposition of given/new information, then and only then, an attempt can be made to construct sense-in-nonsense, namely, attempt a metaphorical interpretation. As can be easily felt, figurative understanding of texts takes longer than literal understanding. In addition, metaphorical meaning can be seen as being an optional process since it represents the surface meaning of the text. However, the interpretation of the relationship between literal and figurative aspects of an expression, in a certain text, can be established by native speakers of language through various linguistic and non-linguistic methods all of which might ultimately lead to the fulfillment of the above-mentioned task. For instance, the interpretation process can be described in terms of semantic transformation (see among others, Thomas 1969, Bickerton 1969, and Searle 1979) or, in terms of semantic reconstruction (cf. Weinrich 1966), or in terms of principles derived from a logical analysis of proposition (see among others, Kintsch 1974, Clark and Luey 1975, and Miller 1979).

What has been said so far can indicate that literal and figurative aspects of language are of equal importance where each of them is considered to be essential for everyday as well as aesthetic communication as in the QT.

NATURE OF SIMILE IN QURANIC TEXT

It is an established fact, known by linguists and rhetoricians that the subject of simile and its distinctive role in language and history of thought has been thoroughly discussed since the start of Greek civilization. In other words, the objective assessment of the rhetorical and linguistic importance of this figure of speech could be traced back to the early beginnings of philosophical thinking. However, we do not know, for sure, when and where the civilized human being has started, for the first time, to think of and look for theoretically productive ways of employing simile on a linguistic, rhetorical, or stylistic device in the process of everyday communication. That is to say, the precise history of the stylistic uses of this figure of speech is not completely known or well-documented. We are also not very well aware of the time traditional linguists and rhetoricians began investigating the fundamental

principles which underlie the mechanisms of simile or be capable of accounting for its nature.

Modern rhetoricians do not have a clear-cut idea about the real motivations behind the first attempts made by ancient scholars to study figurative devices, in general, and simile, in particular. They believe that research on figurative devices such as simile, metaphor, metonymy, synecdoche etc., has started at the age of superstitions. Thinkers of this period in the history of knowledge, the most distinguished of whom is the Greek philosopher Aristotle (d.322 B.C.) has studied these figures of speech and attempted to explore their basic features in his well-known Books Poetics and Rhetoric where he had regarded simile as a kind of metaphor; the difference is but slight (Rhetoric III.1406 b) quoted by Hawkes (1972:8).

The principal role played by the above-mentioned figures of speech has accounted for a number of basic questions related to the nature and use of human language. Furthermore, these figures of speech have been used by philosophers, logicians, and thinkers as being powerful tools in the art of philosophical argumentation. They have been employed for the purpose of convincing or persuading people.

Since figures of speech can add a tremendous power to the everyday linguistic exchanges, namely, interlocutors use them in the normal communication through which the range of semantic values of the lexical items are extended and an accomplishment of an effective impact on receptors is resulted, they have been considered as an essential part of the subjects of stylistics, i.e., these rhetorical figures are treated as stylistic devices. Through the employment of these stylistic devices, men of letters; poets, orators and other literary workers, have become more competent in the field of literary creative works.

As has been already stated, simile is seen as one of the basic figures of speech in Quranic Arabic. QTs, for instance, include too many different sorts of simile. This does not mean, of course, that this topic is trivial or of no stylistic significance in the other languages of the world. It is rather a universal phenomenon since one might find very beautiful similes in the works of other nations. However, Arabic might lack a specific kind of simile in its literary works, as is the case with the epic simile which is very common in Greek poetry. What

could also be true to claim is that simile in QAL is more central than in other known languages.

Simile used in Arabic or in the Glorious Quran suggests that this topic is highly developed where no one can further extend it or even significantly add to it. This is an empirical evidence to prove that Arab traditional rhetoricians have been comprehensively and creatively were successful in assimilating Greek rhetorical traditions and formulating their own rhetorical philosophy. The number and kinds of simile which have been used in the QTs can evidently support this claim.

In addition to the aesthetic uses of the similitive expressions in the QTs, great theoretical efforts have been made by Arab rhetoricians to develop various similitive techniques frequently employed by poets, orators and also in the official correspondence.

Simile is distinguished from other figures of speech by using explicit comparison introduced by a certain copula of similitude such as “like”, “is like”, “as”, and so on and so forth. This comparison denotes similarity between two things of unlike nature that yet have something in common (Abrams, 1957:61; Beckson and Ganz, 1960:194; and Corbett, 1971:479), as is quite clear in: “She glided in the room like a swan” (Brooks and Warren, 1949:435).

The concept of comparison, in its restricted technical sense, and the appropriate particle of similitude compulsorily required in the production of any similitive expression in English and perhaps in many other languages in the world. However, Arabic is slightly different in this matter since it could do away with the copula of similitude and the expression is still regarded to be similitive. This sort of simile is considered to be at utmost importance for it is expressively powerful. It is termed in Arabic rhetoric as “profound simile” “?at-tashbi:h ?al-bali:gh” or “?at-tashbi:h ?al-mujmal ?al-mu?akad” defined by Arab rhetoricians as a simile in which its particle and ground are both obligatorily deleted. This sort of simile, as its name refers to, is distinguished from the rest of the Arabic types of simile simply by being more concise and has a very noticeable impact over eloquent native speakers of Arabic (Mutlu:b and ?al-Basi:r, 1982:191). It is used in the Glorious Quran in various ways and in different syntactic positions. For instance, in the Quranic Verse (henceforth QV):

(صم بكم عمي فهم لا يرجعون)

Deaf, dumb, blind –

So they shall not return;

Arberry (1988:3) Su:rah II, Verse 18, ?al-Baqarah.

The expression in which this sort of simile is included occupies the syntactic position of being “comment” (i.e., *khobar*). In addition, the tenor of this simile, which is represented by the underlying pronoun “هم”, is compulsorily deleted from these deep structural positions of the QV. So, the deep rhetorical structure of this Quranic simile is:

(هم كالصم، هم كالبكم، هم كالعمي، فهم لا يرجعون)

(For many other syntactic positions in which this sort of simile may occur, see, ?al-Jundi:, 1967: vol.2, pp: 294-295).

Most Western rhetoricians believe that the above discussed QV does not involve any simile, it is rather a metaphorical expression simply because of the non-existence of the copula of similitude and the obligatorily deleted ground. In other words, they believe that in the production of a simile, the components of the comparison, that is to say; copula of similitude, tenor, vehicle, and sometimes ground should all be explicitly stated on the surface structure of the similitive expression. For example, in the expression: (Her face is as white as silver.) “Her face” and “silver” are explicitly reported to share the feature of being “white”.

In the Western rhetorical literature on the subject of simile, two types of simile are recognized, the first of which is called “declared” and the second is “perceived”. The former is distinguished from the latter in terms of “ground”. All formal elements are usually stated in the production of the ‘declared’ simile. For instance: “John is, as precise as a computer” and, in addition to the above condition which is clearly met, similarity in the meaning of the “ground” of this simile is almost absolute despite the fact that two components, i.e., “tenor and vehicle”, of the simile are completely different from each other. In the “perceived” simile, on the other hand, as in “John is like a computer” the “ground” of the simile is left for the perceiver to assess its importance to the “tenor” and “vehicle” of the whole expression. This type of simile

seems to be rhetorically more powerful than the previous one for it makes the perceivers feel that there are various degrees of difference in the explicitness involved in the structure of this similitive expression which are to be grasped by them.

Simile in Quranic Arabic and rhetoric may constitute a quite complicated rhetorical system where it might be seen as a network involving different, but complementary, semantic, syntactic and rhetorical ways of looking at one integrated phenomenon.

Arab rhetoricians, semanticists, and exegetists of the Glorious Quran have exerted every possible effort to develop a comprehensively syntactico-stylistic theory by which they could become competent to deal with every linguistic, semantic, and rhetorical aspects that are involved in the Arabic literary and QTs. It must be stated, however, that limitation of space prevents us from dealing with all aspects of this theoretical framework. Competent researchers, who are acquainted with the rhetorical works accomplished by Arab rhetoricians and exegetists, would appreciate the tremendous achievements and encyclopedic theoretical views put forward by Arab workers in the field of rhetoric. They could easily find out that these works are very rich in information and unbelievably impressive.

Simile is considered to be one of too many rhetorical topics that have been developed and elaborated upon by Arab linguists for it represents one of the predominant styles in Arabic in general and QT in particular.

TYPES OF SIMILE IN QURANIC TEXT

Arabic similitive expression either be sensory or mental in nature. This division includes four rhetorico- semantic sub-dividing possibilities:

1. Tenor and vehicle are both sensory as can be seen in the following QV:

(وَحُورٌ عَيْنٌ ، كَأَمْثَالِ اللُّؤْلُؤِ الْمَكْنُونِ)

And wide-eyed hour is

As the likeness of hidden pearls.

Arberry (1988:560), Su:rah LV1, Verse 22-23, ?al-Wa:qi9ah.

2. Tenor can be sensory whereas vehicle is mental as in the following instance:

“A bad physician like death” (?al-Ha:shimi:, no date:250).

(طبيب سوء كالموت)

It should be noted that this type of similitive expression is commonly used in Arabic poetry. It is completely non-Quranic. In other words, it does not occur in the Glorious Quran (?al-Jundi:, 1967: vol.2. p: 99, and Sharaf, 1965: pp: 165-166) and that is why it is not encouraged by Arab rhetoricians, semanticists and Muslim exegetists to be used in writing related to the concept of rhetorical eloquence.

3. Tenor can be mental and vehicle is sensory as can be seen in the following QV:

(الله نُورُ السَّمَاوَاتِ وَالْأَرْضِ)

God is the light of the heavens and the earth;

Arberry (1988:356) Su:rah XXIV, Verse 35, ?an-Nu:r (see also Ali, 1973:907). Here, the tenor “God” is much more meaningful than the vehicle “Light” where this is quite rare in Arabic because it is against the logic of Arabic rhetoric and the concept of simile at the same time. (Yamu:t, 1983:105).

4. Tenor and vehicle could be both mental. This kind of Arabic simile is sub-divided into:

- A. Illusory as is the case with the simile in the QV:

spathes

(طَلْعُهَا كَأَنَّهُ رُؤُوسُ الشَّيَاطِينِ)

Its are as the heads of Satans.

Arberry (1988:458) Su:rah XXXVII, Verse 65, ?aṣ - Ṣa:fa:t (for more details see ?al-Jundi:, 1967: vol.2, pp:99-104 and Yamut, 1983: pp: 103-104).

- B. Sentimental as for instance: “Happiness is like love.”

Tenor and vehicle of the Arabic simile can be divided into three further sub-classes:

1. Those which can occur as two singular lexical items as in the QV:

(فَإِذَا انشَقَّتِ السَّمَاءُ فَكَانَتْ وَرْدَةً كَالدِّهَانِ)

And when heaven is split asunder, And turns crimson

like red leather-

Arberry (1988:558) Su:rah LV, Verse 37, ?ar-Raḥma:n.

2. They can be different, namely, one component is singular and the other is either plural or dual as can be clearly seen in the following QV:

(مَثَلُ الَّذِينَ كَفَرُوا بِرَبِّهِمْ أَعْمَالُهُمْ كَرَمَادٍ اشْتَدَّتْ بِهِ الرِّيحُ فِي يَوْمٍ عَاصِفٍ)

The likes of those who disbelieve in their lord:

Their works are as ashes,

Whereon the wind blows strong Upon a tempestuous day:

Arberry (1988:248) Su:rah XIV, Verse 18, ?:bra:hi:m.

3. They might occur to form two compound images as in the QV:

(مَثَلُ الَّذِينَ حُمِلُوا التَّوْرَةَ ثُمَّ لَمْ يَحْمِلُوهَا كَمَثَلِ الْجِمَارِ يَحْمِلُ أَسْفَارًا..)

The likeness of those who have been loaded with the Torah, then they have not carried it, is as the likeness of an

ass carrying books.

Arberry (1988:583) Su:rah LXII, Verse 5, ?al-Jum9ah.

Here, the simile is considered to be constituting a compound image which refers to the state of the ass carrying valuable books without being able to realize their real importance (Sharaf, 1965: pp: 167- 168).

Arab rhetoricians have studied the phenomenon of the multiplicity of the tenor and vehicle in the Arabic similitive expressions. They have found that they are divided into four distinctive types:

- 1 “Intertwined simile” (?at-Tashbi:h ?al-malfu:f) which is very commonly used in Arabic poetry specifically of the Abbasid period where rhetorical figures are evidently and intentionally sought for and occur with great frequency,(Ritter,1954:3). In this sort of simile, a number of tenors occur one followed by another and joined by coordinators in the first hemistich and then a number of vehicles followed in the second hemistich.
- 2 “Separated simile” (?at-Tashbi:h ?al-mafru:q) in which the tenor is mentioned first then followed by its vehicle.
- 3 “Equalizing simile” (Tashbi:h ?at-Taswiyah) which is also frequently used in the Arabic poetry of the Abbasid period. In this sort of simile a more than one tenor might occur in the first hemistich and just one vehicle included

in the second hemistich.

4. “Combining simile” (?at-Tashbi:h ?al-jam9) where a more than one vehicle is stated for just one tenor (for more detailed information on this issue, see among others, ?al-Ha:shimi:, no date: pp: 258-259; ?al-Jundi: , 1967: vol.2 , pp: 129-150; Yamut, 1983: pp: 107-110; and ?al – Mara:ghi:, no date: pp: 225-226).

It is important to mention that none of the four types of the above-said similes occurs in the QTs. In other words, more than a tenor or vehicle in one similitive expression in the Glorious Quran can never occur for stylistic reasons. Namely, native speakers (i.e., pure Arabs) prefer to use one single tenor and compare it (in the similitive structure) to only one vehicle and they are reluctant to break this stylistic tradition in verse or prose. The ground of the Arabic simile has been used by Arab rhetoricians as a criterion to establish further six types of similitive expressions. These are:

1. “Exemplificatory simile” (?at-Tashbi:h ?at-Tamthi:li:) in which the ground is seen as an image generated by two or more factors in a compound form (Yamut, 1983:136). This can be easily felt in the following QV:

(مَثَلُ الَّذِينَ يُنْفِقُونَ أَمْوَالَهُمْ فِي سَبِيلِ اللَّهِ كَمَثَلِ حَبَّةٍ أَنْبَتَتْ سَبْعَ سَنَابِلٍ فِي كُلِّ سَنَابِلَةٍ مِائَةُ حَبَّةٍ.....)

The likeness of those who expend their wealth in the way of God is as the likeness of a grain of corn that sprouts seven ears, in every ear a hundred grains.

Arberry (1988:39) Su:rah II, Verse 261, ?al-Baqarah.

In this QT, the tenor is the state of a man who spends little for the sake of God’s satisfaction, and gains a lot whereas the vehicle is the state of a man who grows a grain of wheat which gives him seven ears, each of which has a hundred grains. The ground of this beautifully expressed simile is the compound image of any one who works little for God and gains too much in return.

2. “Non-Exemplificatory simile” (?at-Tashbi:h ghayr ?at-Tamthi:li:) where one does not need to analyse the whole similitive expression in order to know its exact ground. It is quite clear and straightforward that for this reason, it is sometimes termed as “Explicit simile” (?at-Tashbi:h ?a-Şari:h) (Taba:nah, 1962:70) as

in:

Ali is as sharp as a sword.

3. “Detailed simile” (?at-Tashbi:h ?al-Mufaşal) in which the ground is explicitly mentioned as for instance: **“Ali’s ethics are as elegant as a romantic poem.”**
4. “Comprehensive simile” (?at-Tashbi:h ?al-Mujmal) in which the ground or any of its traces is completely deleted as can be seen in the following QV:

(خَلَقَ الْإِنْسَانَ مِنْ صَلْصَالٍ كَالْفَخَّارِ)

He created man From sounding clay Like unto pottery
Ali (1973:1470) Su:rah LV, Verse 14, ?ar-Raḥma:n.

5. “Superficial and Trivial simile” (?at-Tashbi:h ?al-qari:b ?al-mubtadhal) in which the ground and other components of the simile are all mentioned as in the following instance:

“Her face is red as a rose.”

6. “Far-fetched simile” (?at-Tashbi:h ?al-ba9i:d ?al-ghari:b) which is semantically difficult to comprehend. ?al-Jurja:ni: (d. 471 or 473 A.H / 1078 or 1080 A.D) believes that this simile needs some sort of profound analysis in order to grasp its precise and exact meaning (1954:117). For instance:

“This violet is like fire of sulfur.”

The subject of simile in Arabic has been further developed and complicated by Arab scholars in the field of rhetoric where the copula of the similitude has been used as a stylistic criterion to introduce additional types of similitive expressions in Arabic. These are:

1. “Non-emphatic simile” (?at-Tashbi:h ?al-mursal) in which the copula is present in the similitive structure as in the QV:

(سَابِقُوا إِلَىٰ مَغْفِرَةٍ مِّن رَّبِّكُمْ وَجَنَّةٍ عَرْضُهَا كَعَرْضِ السَّمَاءِ

وَالْأَرْضِ.....)

Race to forgiveness from your Lord, and a Garden the breadth whereof is as the breadth of heaven and earth,
Arberry (1988:566) Su:rah LVII, Verse 21, ?al-Ḥadi:d.

2. “Emphatic simile” (?at-Tashbi:h ?al-mu?akad) in which the copula of the similitude is deleted as in the following QV:

(وَيُطَافُ عَلَيْهِمْ بِآيَةٍ مِنْ فِضَّةٍ وَأَكْوَابٍ كَانَتْ قَوَارِيرًا، قَوَارِيرًا مِنْ فِضَّةٍ قَدَّرُوهَا تَقْدِيرًا)

and there shall be passed around them vessels of silver and goblets of crystal,

crystal of silver that they have measured very exactly.

Arberry (1988:622) Su:rah LXXVI, Verses 15-16, ?al-?insa:n.

To conclude, we should make clear that this subject cannot be dealt with in such a limited space for it is one of the widest topics in Arabic rhetoric. In addition, this figure of speech is very frequently used in Arabic poetry, QTs, Prophetic Tradition and they are used in too many various ways where it becomes one of the most outstanding and effective features that distinguishes Arabic rhetorical styles from non-Arabic ones.

The Glorious Quran has employed most of the well-known types of simile the subject of which has been mainly deduced from the Arab realistic life in general. They describe their environment, rivers, seas, water, thunder, lightning, mountains, deserts, plants, vegetation, wild animals, and so on and so forth. All these aspects of environment are aesthetically reflected in the QTs through using different types of similitive expressions.

It is true to say that a lot of essential issues related to the subject of Arabic simile are left undiscussed for the problem of space as has been already mentioned.

ASSESSMENT OF RENDERING SIMILES INTO ENGLISH IN TWO QURANIC TRANSLATIONS

Arab – Muslim scholars, in general, believe that the Glorious Quran represents the highest linguistic achievement of Arabic. Therefore, it has been dealt with as being a miracle that cannot be possibly imitated in any shape or form by any mortal. In other words, the QT is seen as completely unique in style, pure in origin and unexcelled in beauty. Its formal, stylistic and rhetorical structures can be described as unexampled, unexceptionable and unexpected even by highly eloquent Arab – Muslim speakers. This has become an established belief among Quranic commentators, theologians, traditionalists, philologists, linguists and even literary critics simply for the Divine nature of the Quran and for seeing this Revealed Book as a transcript

of the Word of God from the Preserved Talbot “?al – Lawḥ ?al – Mahfu:dh”. The doctrine of the Divine nature of the Glorious Quran with reference to its highly respectable semantic value, wording and its most minute details has come to encompass the whole Arabic language.

The Quran has exerted an enormous influence on the religious, intellectual, psychological and aesthetic life of the Arab – Muslim people directly through a magnificently developed linguistic style. Every text in this miraculous Book constitutes a mixture of rhetorical characteristics pointing to various aspects of life, some of which are purely intellectual, others are social, psychological, philosophical, ethical or aesthetic. Metaphors as a concept in its all possible types and various sorts of simile in the Quran play an essential and deciding role in these tropical expressions. This part of the present work can be intended to cover all or most of the issues and questions related to the meaning and references that can be produced by possible implicatures of metaphorical and similitive uniqueness of the QT.

This objective, as we all agree, cannot be accomplished in such a limited space. So, what has been decided to do instead is to provide the reader with very carefully selected and representative details on these three implicatures (i.e., meanings) conveyed by some representative instances of simile taken from the QTs, these meanings will be exposed in a quite concise manner.

The Quranic similes are used to be logically and linguistically connected with the general semantic values of the QT. In other words, the metaphorical and non – metaphorical structures and their reflected semantic forces and features are to be taken as one united whole. (Badawi, 1950:37 and ?al–Khaṭi:b, 1964:20ff).

Assessing translation may be seen as a process which practically relies upon principles and norms derived from translation and criticism. Source text (henceforth ST) and target text (henceforth TT) represent the core of this research field. In translation assessment, assessors usually emphasize the importance of explaining the linguistic features within the area of translation equivalence and determine whether or not certain linguistic features in the TT are appropriate equivalents of corresponding features in the ST (Lambert and Gorp, 1985:46). Of course, a statement such as this should not

be understood as being an attempt at simplifying the work of evaluating translated texts or making people look at the problem of establishing sound equivalents as an easy job to handle. The critical comparisons carried out by translation assessors should work towards explicating the linguistic aspects of both ST and TT in order to arrive at the most acceptable equivalence. This, as a matter of fact, could come as a result of presenting a thorough description of the ST and TT structural features.

Now, the QT
exemplificatory simile.

Arberry (1988:3). Su:rah II, Verse 17, ?al – Baqarah. He translates it as:

The likeness of them as the likeness of a man who kindled a fire.

Ali (1973:20), on the other hand, renders the same QT as:

Their similitude is that of a man who kindled a fire;

As can be clearly seen, the SL simile has been rendered into a simile in the target language in T1, while it has been rendered into the target language as non – simile in T2. The most common feature that could be felt in the above translations of this QT is the tendency towards literalness.

It seems that there is no sharp semantic difference between T1 and T2 except in the strategy adopted for the rendition of simile once into simile and another into non – simile. The difference in the use of the lexical item “likeness” in T1 and “similitude” in T2 has no real negative effect on the message of this QV since these two lexical items can be interchangeably used in English. It may be true to claim that the use of “as”, as an equivalent to the Arabic preposition “-ك”, is more appropriate than using the English word “like” though both indicate the equality or sameness of two things, i.e., both may refer to the state of having almost or exactly the same qualities, characteristics, etc. (Guralnik, 1986:pp:79, 819).

T2 may be considered different from T1 where its literal

The present section will try to locate the right and precise equivalents to the translation of a number of Quranic similes in two current translations of the Quran. To achieve such an important goal, an overall linguistic analysis of the translations of these Quranic similes will be produced taking into account what has been already stated. The Quranic translations which are to be assessed in this section will be given the following symbols for short (A.J. Arberry as T1 and A.Y. Ali as T2)

"مَثَلُهُمْ كَمَثَلِ الَّذِي اسْتَوْقَدَ نَارًا....."

approach to translate this QV has not been actually resulted in a simile, which indicates that literal translation could still be seen literal even in case an important word such as the similitude copula is deleted, i.e., the internal relations between its components are literally oriented.

We may claim that T1 should be evaluated as being the more accurate and faithful rendition of the above Quranic similitive text.

Another QV to be taken here is:

"أَوْ كَصَيِّبٍ مِنَ السَّمَاءِ فِيهِ ظُلُمَاتٌ وَرَعْدٌ وَبَرْقٌ....."

Arberry (1988:3). Su:rah II, Verse 19, ?al -Baqarah. He translates it as:

or as a cloudburst out of heaven in which is darkness, and thunder, and lightning.

Ali (1973:20), on the other hand, renders the same QT as follows:

Or (another similitude)

Is that of a rain – laden cloud From the sky: in it are Zones

Of darkness, and thunder and lightning

The simile in the ST can be very easily located in T1 despite the deletion of the phrase “the likeness of them” which has been already mentioned in verse 17. The word “heaven”, which has been used in this rendition to be an equivalent to the Arabic lexical item “السماء”, is more accurate, in my opinion, than the word “sky” used in T2 for it provides the Quran reciter with a more suggestive religious impression. Reading T1 carefully will make any translation assessor believe that this rendition is extremely fidel although it is literal to a certain extent.

In T2, Ali has explicitly mentioned the originally deleted linguistic phrase in the ST where it has been enclosed between brackets in an attempt to remind the Quran reciter that there exists a repetition of some sort in the underlying structure of this QT which still has an effect on the overall meaning of the QT. Bracketing, as a translation technique, has no positive value in this rendition. On the contrary, it has made it look like an ordinary Quranic paraphrase. The phrase “a rain – laden cloud” introduced in T2 as an equivalent to the source language phrase “كصيب” is not that accurate because it is too long, structurally complicated and moreover not preceded by the required copula of similitude. It seems that Ali has been unsuccessful in using the colon after the lexical item “sky” and he provides us with some unneeded details such as “in it are zones of”. This is an addition (i.e., an error) which has weakened the force of the translation as a whole. Such a redundant piece of information should not be mentioned at all. It appears that Ali’s translation is totally affected by his vast knowledge on the exegesis of the Quran. This could be proved by the addition he has brought to make this rendition, as he thinks, easily graspable. Therefore, these additions, redundancies and brackets should all be clipped for they have a weakening impact over the intended message of the QT. Furthermore, if simile is measured by the Western approach to construct this figure of speech, we may say that the source language simile has been rendered into target language non – simile since the similitude copula in the ST “ـ” has been deleted in this translation.

As is the case with the translation of the first QT,

Arberry’s rendition is considered the best for it contains no redundancy, accurate and always takes into account the fact that QTs should be dealt with without adding to it or taking from it any linguistic material whatever its size is.

The last example to be taken and assessed here is the following QT:

"ثُمَّ قَسَتْ قُلُوبُكُمْ مِنْ بَعْدِ ذَلِكَ فَهِيَ كَالْحِجَارَةِ أَوْ أَشَدَّ قَسْوَةً....."

This QV contains an instance of a non – emphatic and comprehensive simile. Arberry (1988:9). Su:rah II, Verse 74, ?al – Baqarah. He translates it as:

Then your hearts became hardened thereafter and are like stones, or even yet harder,

Here, Ali (1973:36) renders the same QT as:

Thenceforth were your hearts Hardened: they became Like a rock and even worse In hardness

In T1 and before analysing the similitive part of this translated QT, Arberry has accurately transferred the dormant metaphor in “ثُمَّ قَسَتْ قُلُوبُكُمْ مِنْ بَعْدِ ذَلِكَ” into a dormant metaphor in the TT in an evident literal manner. The similitive expression in this text has been quite faithfully rendered into a target language simile adopting the same approach of translation. The lexical items “قلوب” and “حجارة” have been used in their plural forms which are seen as another accurate treatment of the ST. In T2, Ali has also rendered the Quranic simile into a simile in the TT after transferring the source language dormant metaphor, which has just been mentioned, into a dormant metaphor in the TT. Concerning the similitive statement, Ali should take into account that the phrase “and even worse in hardness” is too long where it could be made shorter in order to become more concise without affecting the message of the QT as is the case in T1. In addition, the use of the lexical item “rock” in its single form in the similitive expression “they become like a rock”, seems to be a little disharmonious with the word “hearts” in the first part of the QT.

CONCLUSIONS

The present paper has centered upon the analysis of simile, its nature and types in the Glorious Quran. Investigating a number of issues related to the domain of translation assessment and criticism if this figure of speech has also been dealt with in this work. In addition, the QT and its impact on Arabic language has been explained as well. The following conclusions are drawn from this study in an attempt to make the overall picture of this subject seem more productive, objective and convincing.

1. First of all, Muslim scholars, Arabs and non – Arabs, regard the Quran as a unique text, and hence untranslatable. Culture and rhetorical features are the main reasons for this position.

The extensive use of simile, similitive expressions, metaphors and other tropes in QTs has made it to appear highly figurative. This state has also made Arab rhetoricians and linguists exert their utmost efforts to devise specific theoretical frameworks based upon the relationship between literal and tropological meaning of the QTs so as to figure out the exact intended semantic values. The exploration of the features of this relationship has been of tremendous importance for the rendition of the QTs into various non – Arabic languages.

2. Two distinct approaches have been located in the current translations of the Quran, the first of which adopts the literal orientation whereas the second adopts the communicative orientation. The literal approach is quite dull, static and unobjective whereas the other approach is more expressive, more flexible and has a wider range in rendering Quranic similes and tropes. Quranic similes in this approach are either translated into similes or non – similes. The rendition of the Quranic similes into similes should not be understood as being similar to the first approach where one could find some addition (bracketed information) in this case.
3. Various sorts of similes have played a very significant stylistic (rhetorical) role in the QTs. They have practically proved that this rhetorical figure is very much developed in Arabic language where it could be the direct reason behind pushing Arab rhetoricians to put forward a number of rhetorical techniques to distinguish between each type of similes in Arabic. This work is regarded to be an attempt in simplifying the task of

comprehending and interpreting the intended similitive meaning used in the QT.

4. Arab rhetoricians have based their classifications of the types of similes as well as metaphors, on empirical grounds supported by factual data directly drawn from the Glorious Quran, Prophetic Tradition and Arabic highly poetic sources.
5. Most current translations of the Glorious Quran are literal in nature. This orientation can be easily verified in the domain of rendering figures of speech in general, metaphors and similes in particular. The surface meaning of these rhetorical figures is treated by Quran translators as being the deciding factor in the rendition of this Devine Book. In other words, the deep message of the Quranic trope is rarely considered. Indeed, most of the current difficulties in the translation of the QTs into English are resulted from the vast linguistic and extra – linguistic differences between the two languages.
6. Semantic translation has been the dominating approach in the rendition of the Quran in general. The wide application of this translation method has resulted in such a prevailing literal orientation. Communicative and Affective translation methods have been quite rarely used in rendering QTs despite the fact that they are much more expressive of the underlying forces of the metaphorical and similitive expressions.
7. The Aristotelian belief that simile can also be seen as a metaphor proper and that the difference between them is but slight has not been completely accepted by Arab and non – Arab rhetoricians and semanticist. To be more objective, these two types of tropes may be said to be closely related but not completely similar. The difference between what is similitive and what is metaphorical is quite noticeable whether on the level of structure or content. The message which is conveyed by metaphor is much deeper and may have more significant semantic force than what is normally conveyed by similes. In other words, it is logically and empirically mistaken to map all metaphors into similes.
8. Rendering the QT into English in general and its similes and metaphors (tropes) in particular requires highly competent translators who are entirely aware of the specifics of the source and target texts' structures and cultures in order to score the highest possible degree of fidelity and faithfulness. If these requirements are not met, a low quality translation is the only expected result.

One of the most difficult problems that faces translators of the Quranic similes and metaphorical expressions is that of finding out the most precise and adequate cultural equivalents to these figures of speech. This case may make translators reach a conviction that Quranic metaphors and similes, which carry cultural forces (implicatures) cannot be translated into English simply for the impossibility of finding a target language cultural situation that is totally similar to the source language cultural situation in which above rhetorical figures are used.

9. The translation of the Quran, if it can ever be precisely and faithfully accomplished by highly competent translators relying upon an approach specifically designed for the rendering of this exceptional text, should also be described unique as the original is,

NOTE ON transliteration

The following system of transliteration has been adopted in the present paper

No.	Arabic Letters	Transliteration Symbols	Arabic Speech Sounds	Phonological Features
1.	ء	ʔ	/ ʔ /	Voiceless glottal stop
2.	ب	b	/ b /	Voiced bilabial stop
3.	ت	t	/ t /	Voiceless dental stop
4.	ث	<u>th</u>	/ θ /	Voiceless inter – dental fricative
5.	ج	j	/ dʒ /	Voiced post - alveolar fricative
6.	ح	h	/ h /	Voiceless pharyngeal fricative
7.	خ	<u>kh</u>	/ x /	Voiceless velar fricative
8.	د	d	/ d /	Voiced dental stop
9.	ذ	<u>dh</u>	/ ð /	Voiced inter – dental fricative
10.	ر	r	/ r /	Voiced alveolar approximant
11.	ز	z	/ z /	Voiced alveolar fricative

12.	س	s	/ s /	Voiceless alveolar fricative
13.	ش	sh	/ ʃ /	Voiceless post – alveolar fricative
14.	ص	ʃ	/ ʃ /	Voiceless velarized alveolar fricative
15.	ض	ḍ	/ ḍ /	Voiced velarized dental stop
16.	ط	ṭ	/ ṭ /	Voiceless velarized dental stop
17.	ظ	dh	/ ʒ /	Voiced velarized dental fricative
18.	ع	ʕ	/ ʕ /	Voiced pharyngeal fricative

19.	غ	gh	/ g /	Voiced uvular trill
20.	ف	f	/ f /	Voiceless labio – dental fricative
21.	ق	q	/ q /	Voiceless uvular stop
22.	ك	k	/ k /	Voiceless velar stop
23.	ل	l	/ l /	Voiced alveolar lateral (approximant)
24.	م	m	/ m /	Voiced bilabial nasal
25.	ن	n	/ n /	Voiced alveolar nasal
26.	هـ	h	/ h /	Voiceless glottal fricative
27.	و	w	/ w /	Voiced labio – velar approximant
28.	ي	y	/ j /	Voiced palatal approximant

REFERENCES

- Abrams, M. (1957). A Glossary of Literary Terms. Delhi: The Macmillan Company of India Ltd.
- Ali, A.Y. (1973). Translation of the Glorious Quran. Libyan Arab Republic: The Call of Islam Society.
- Arberry, A.J. (1988). The Koran Interpreted. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Aristotle (1952). Rhetoric. Tr. W. R. Roberts. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- _____ (1965). Poetics. Tr. W. Hamilton. London: Heinmann
- ?al – Badawi:, ?. ?. (1950). Min Bala:ghat ?al – Qur?a:n. Cairo: Da:r Nahdat Misr lil Tiba:9at wal Nashr.
- Beckson, K. and Gonz, A. (1960). A Reader's Guide to Literary Terms. New York: The Noonday Press.
- Beeston, A.F.L. (1970). The Arabic Language Today. London: Hutchinson and Co. (Publishers) LTD.
- Bickerton, D. (1969). "Prolegomena to a Linguistic Theory of Metaphor". Foundation of Language. 5:35 -52.
- Brooks, C. and Warren, R.P. (1949). Modern Rhetoric. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World.
- Chejne, A. G. (1969). The Arabic Language: Its Role in the History. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Clark, H.H. and Lucy, P. (1975). "Understanding What is Meant from What is Said: A Study of Conversationally Conveyed Requests". Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behaviour. 14:56-72.
- Corbett, E.P. (1971). Classical Rhetoric for Modern Student. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Guralink, D.B. (1986). Webster's New World Dictionary of the American Language. 2nd College ed. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- ?al-Hašhimi:,.?. (no date). Jawa:hir ?al-Bala:ghah fi: ?al-Ma9a:ni: wal Baya:n wal Badi:9. Beirut: Da:r ?ihya: ?at – Turath ?al – 9arabi:.
- Hawkes, T. (1972). Metaphor. London: Methuen.
- Jespersen, O. (1968). Language: Its Nature, Development and Origin. London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd.
- ?al-Jundi:, 9. (1967). Fann ?at-Tashbi:h. Cairo: Maktabat ?al-?anjlu: ?al-Miřriyyah, vol 2.
- ?al-Jurja:ni:, 9.Q. (1954). ?sra:r ?al-Bala:ghah. (ed.) Muhammad 9abdul Mun9im Khafa:ji:.
Cairo: Maktabat ?al – Qa:hirah.
- ?al -Khaṭi:b, 9.K. (1964). ?i9ja:z ?al -Qur?a:n fi: Dirasa:t Kashifah li: Khaša: ?iř ?al Bala:ghah ?al– 9arabiyyah wa Ma9a:yyriha:. Miřr: Da:r ?al – 9arabi:.

Kintsch, W. (1974). The Representation of Meaning in Memory. Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Lambert, J. and Gorp, H.V. (1985). "On describing translation". In Hermans, T. ed. The Manipulation of Literature: Studies in Literary Translation. London: Croom Helm Ltd. pp:42 – 53.

ʔal – Mara:ghi:, ʔ. M. (no date). 9ulu:m ʔal – Bala:ghah wal ʔal – Baya:n wal Ma9a:ni:. Cairo:
ʔal– Maktabah ʔal -9arabiyah wa Maṭba9atuha.

Maṭlu:b, A. and ʔal – Baṣi:r, K.H. (1982). al -Bala:ghahwa ʔat -Tatbi:q. Mosul: Da:r ʔa -Kita:b Press.

Miller, G. A. (1979). "Images and Models, Similes and Metaphors". In Ortany. A. ed. Metaphor and Thought. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. pp:202-250.

Pickens,J.D.,Pallio,M.R.andPallio,H.R.(1985):"Developmental Analysis of Metaphoric Competence", in Paprotte, W. and Driven, R. eds. The Ubiquityof Metaphor. Amsterdam: Benjamins Publishing Company. pp:481-523.

Searle, J.R. (1979-b). Expression and Meaning. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ṣharaf, H.M. (1965).ʔas – Suwar ʔal – Bayaniyyah bayna ʔal – Nadhariyyah wa ʔal – Tatbiq. Miṣr: Dar Nahdat Miṣr lil Ṭiba9ah wal Nashr.

Stetkevych, J. (1970). The Modern Arabic Literary Language: Lexical and Stylistic Development. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Ṭaba:nah, B. (1962). 9ilm ʔal-Baya:n. Cairo: Maktabat ʔal- ʔanjlu: ʔal-Miṣriyyah.

Thomas, O. (1969). Metaphor and Related Subjects. New York: Random House.

Weinreich, U. (1966). "Explorations in Semantic Theory". Current Trends in Linguistics. 3:395-477.

Yamu:t, Gh. (1983). 9ilm ʔasa:li:b ʔal-Baya:n. Beirut: Da:r ʔal-ʔaṣa:lah.