

Challenges in Translating the Qur'anic Expressions "*Nazara*" and "*Qadara*" and Their Derivational Forms into English

Adnan Lutfallah Ahmed Muhammad.

Prof. Dr. Shifaa' Hadi Hussein (Ph.D.)

University of Tikrit / College of Art / Department of Translation

malalah1973@gmail.com

Abstract

This paper explores the translation of two Qur'anic expressions, "*nazara*" and "*qadara*," which exhibit distinct grammatical, lexical, and cultural features. Due to their nuanced meanings and frequent occurrences in the Qur'an, these expressions pose significant challenges for accurate translation into English. The study aims to explore the challenges involved in translating the Qur'anic expressions "*nazara*" and "*qadara*" into English, examine the associated lexical issues, analyze the methods used by translators, and determine the meanings attributed to these expressions. The hypotheses include the semantic and grammatical richness of these expressions which leads to difficulties of their translation, lexical issues as the primary challenge, the use of oblique strategy, and the prominence of connotative meaning over conceptual meaning in translation. The analysis focuses on four Qur'anic samples, translated by six prominent translators and interpreted by well-known scholars. This paper adopts Vinay and Darbelnet's (1995) model of translation, and Leech's (1981) model of meaning classifications.

Keywords: ("*nazara*" and "*qadara*" expressions, problems of translation, methods of rendering, types of meaning).

تحديات ترجمة التعبيرين القرآنيين "نظرة" و"قدرة" ومشتقاتهما إلى اللغة الإنجليزية

عدنان لطف الله احمد محمد أ.د. شفاء هادي حسين

جامعة تكريت / كلية الآداب / قسم الترجمة

malalah1973@gmail.com

المخلص

يستكشف هذا البحث ترجمة تعبيرين قرآنيين هما "نظرة" و"قدرة"، والذين يتميزان بخصائص نحوية ومعجمية وثقافية فريدة. ونظرًا لاختلاف معانيهما وتكرارهما في القرآن الكريم، يُشكل هذان التعبيران تحديات كبيرة أمام ترجمتهما بصورة دقيقة إلى الإنجليزية. تهدف الدراسة إلى تفحص التحديات التي تتطوي عليها ترجمة التعبيرين "نظرة" و"قدرة" إلى الإنجليزية، وبحث المشكلات المعجمية المرتبطة بهما، وتحليل أساليب المترجمين، وتحديد المعاني المنسوبة إليهما. تشمل فرضيات البحث الثراء الدلالي والنحوي لهذين التعبيرين الذي يقود إلى صعوبة في ترجمتهما، والتحديات المعجمية كتحدٍ رئيسي، واستخدام استراتيجية الترجمة غير المباشرة، وغلبة المعنى الإيحائي على المعنى المفاهيمي في الترجمة. يركز التحليل على أربع عينات قرآنية ترجمها ستة مترجمين بارزين، وفسرها علماء معروفين. تتبنى هذه الورقة نموذج فينابي وداربلنت (١٩٩٥) في الترجمة، ونموذج ليتش (١٩٨١) في تصنيف المعاني.

الكلمات المفتاحية: (تعبير "نظرة" و"قدرة"، مشاكل الترجمة، أساليب الترجمة، أنواع المعنى).

1.Introduction

English and Arabic are two distinct languages that differ significantly in their genealogical, typological, and linguistic characteristics. English, a member of the Indo-European language family, is one of the most widely spoken languages globally. Morphologically, it is classified as an inflectional language but exhibits clear analytical tendencies. In contrast, Arabic belongs to the Afro-Asiatic Semitic language family and is highly inflectional, incorporating both fusional and agglutinative features within its morphological framework. These fundamental differences pose significant challenges for translators working between the two languages, particularly given their unrelated linguistic systems and unique cultural contexts.

The translation of meaning between English and Arabic is further complicated by the fact that even shared linguistic phenomena may be interpreted differently due to variations in grammar, syntax, semantics, and cultural nuances. This research focuses on the translation of two important Qur'anic expressions "*nazara*" and "*qadara*" and their derivatives in the Glorious Qur'an. As a sacred text, the Qur'an demands a high level of precision and sensitivity in translation to preserve its divine message and sanctity. The expressions under study present challenges due to their semantic depth, contextual variability, and sometimes the absence of direct equivalents in English.

Translators often face difficulties when dealing with novel contexts and derivations of these two expressions, especially when the target language lacks corresponding lexical or cultural equivalents. Such challenges are compounded by the inherent linguistic and cultural discrepancies between English and Arabic, including issues of equivalence, grammatical structure, and interpretive divergence. This study aims to shed light on these complexities and explore potential strategies for achieving accurate and meaningful translations of "*nazara*" and "*qadara*," while respecting the linguistic richness and sacred nature of the Qur'anic text.

2. Aims of the study

The study aims at:

1. Studying why translators find it difficult to translate "*nazara*" and "*qadara*" in Glorious Quran into English.
2. Studying the problems (whether lexical, grammatical or cultural) faced by the translators to translate the expressions "*nazara*" and "*qadara*" in the Glorious Qur'an into English.
3. Studying the methods of translation to render the expressions "*nazara*" and "*qadara*" in the Glorious Qur'an into English.
4. Studying the type of meaning founded in the expressions "*nazara*" and "*qadara*" in the Glorious Qur'an.

3. Hypotheses of the study

To fulfill the above aims, the study hypothesizes that:

1. Translators find it difficult to translate the expressions “*nazara*” and “*qadara*” in the Glorious Qur'an into English.
2. Translators face lexical problems in translating the expressions “*nazara*” and “*qadara*” in the Glorious Qur'an into English.
3. Translators rely heavily on oblique method of translation, particularly modulation, to translate the expressions “*nazara*” and “*qadara*” in the Glorious Qur'an into English.
4. Translators rely on the connotative meaning in rendering the expressions “*nazara*” and “*qadara*” in the Glorious Qur'an into English.

4. Literature Review

4.1 The Concept of Meaning

As a concept of meaning, McDougall (1913:305) states that when a word is heard, it does not only sound familiar but also has a meaning, and when the meanings of the words come to consciousness, the meaning of the entire sentence also comes to consciousness. Ogden and Richards (1923: 186) assert that "meaning is an intrinsic property and a unique, unanalyzable relation to other things; it is the words that relate to a term in a dictionary, the meaning and substance of a word, and an intended occurrence or volition".

Palmer (1981: 3) indicates that scholars interested in the field of semantics have examined the concept of 'meaning' itself, whether as a noun or a verb, and have confirmed that it carries multiple meanings depending on the specific sentence in which it appears. These varying senses cannot be fully understood without reference to interpretation within the context of the communicative situation.

Ibn Mandhur (1993: 106) states that "meaning," "interpretation" (tafsir), and "exegesis" (ta'wīl) are synonymous. and that the meaning of a word refers to its underlying purpose or intention.

4.1.1 Word and Meaning

(Kempson, 1977: 2) notes that words mostly refer to dictionary definitions, which convey the meaning of a term in isolation, independent of any specific phrase. This issue becomes more complex when it comes to sentences. Saeed (2003:10) observes that certain linguists conceptualize the mental storage of words as a *lexicon*, analogous to a dictionary containing words and their meanings. Jabal (2009: 10) highlights that a single word can have multiple meanings, and conversely, multiple meanings can be conveyed by a single word.

4.1.2 Theories of Meaning

There are several theories seek to define meaning based on scientific and methodological foundations. Although they yield valuable insights, the complexity of meaning and its interrelations demand ongoing refinement, leading to continuous scholarly debate over its interpretation across intellectual, ideological, and historical dimensions. The following are among these theories: Russell (1905) proposed a referential theory of meaning, which asserts that the meaning of an expression lies in the specific object to which it refers. According to this view, at least for most expressions, meaning is determined by a direct link between the linguistic sign and the external object it denotes. This theory emphasizes that meaning arises from the act of naming things, based on a direct relationship between the signifier (the word) and the signified (the referent) (Griffin, 2020:1–3). Also known as the conceptual theory, the ideational or mentalistic theory is based on the idea that meaning is rooted in mental concepts. According to Locke (1999: 86–87), an idea represents whatever is present to the mind when thinking—such as a thought, image, concept, or mental representation. As Hospers (1967:19) explains, meaning is not just about mental ideas but is tied to observable behavior. This theory becomes more complex when applied to words

used in full sentences or broader contexts, where meaning depends on the behavioral reactions they are expected to produce in specific situations.

4.1.3 Types of Meaning

Yunira et al. (2019: 105) point out that, since meaning is not a single or unified concept, linguists and philosophers of language often categorize it into various types. These distinctions are based on different aspects of communication, context, and interpretation. The paper focuses on two primary types of meaning—**conceptual** and **connotative**—which are particularly relevant to the topic under investigation. These types are selected from among the seven categories of meaning identified by Leech (1981) as follows:

First, **conceptual** (or denotative) meaning refers to the dictionary definition of a word. It has the capacity to accurately interpret texts and is a crucial component of human linguistic communication, comparable to the syntactic and phonological levels of language. It plays a significant role in sentence analysis, translation, and interpretation. Second, **connotative** meaning refers to the emotional or associative meaning of a word—beyond its purely conceptual content. It accounts for the changes in a word's meaning depending on the situation and context (Leech, 1981:9–13).

4.2 Lexical Relations

Löbner, et al., (2013: 203) state that understanding the meanings of lexemes is challenging due to disagreement among semanticists on the type of meaning found in entities. There is a point of view that says understanding vocabulary and language meaning is based on meaning relations, which are considered the most significant semantic data in linguistics. Three types of relations need to discuss in the current paper which are:

a. Synonymy which refers to the differences in words and agreement in meanings, or it is the use of several words for one thing. For instance, when we say ((ضرغام)، (أسامة)، (اسد) or (ليث)) all refer to the English word lion

(Al-Tunji & Al-'Asmar, 2001:161). Hurford, Heasley, and Smith (2007:106) define a synonym as "the relationship between two predicates that have the same sense." The identity of sense should be known, so for this reason, it is a strict definition.

b. Polysemy, according to Saeed (2003: 64-65), is defined through the concept of "relatedness," since the historical development of items and the speaker's intuition are considered criteria for realizing this type of lexical relationship. On the other hand, Saeed (ibid) refers to a word with only one lexical entry as polysemy, but if it has two or more entries, it falls under the phenomenon of homonymy. Yule (2020: 138) indicates that "when we encounter two or more words with the same form and related meanings, we have what is technically known as polysemy." It can be characterized as one written or spoken form that has several meanings that are all connected via extension.

d. Homonymy, according to Palmer (1981: 100-106) is a phenomenon means that "there are several words with the same shape." He adds that we always resort to the dictionary to know whether the phenomenon of a certain word is a homonymy or polysemy; if it is the former, it must have more than one entry, but if it is the latter, it must have one entry. He adds that the coordination test is one of the ambiguity tests, as the sentence "John and Bill went to the bank" cannot mean that one of them went to the financial institution and the other to the river. Also, context and co-text play a vital role in revealing this ambiguity.

4.3 Derivation

Natural languages can have a lot of aspects in common or might differ greatly. So, it is feasible to search for similar phenomena in various languages; among these phenomena is the "derivation." The research takes

the concept of derivations in both English and Arabic to clarify to the reader how word derivation can alter its grammatical class and meaning.

a. English derivation refers to the process by which new words are created by combining existing words with derivational affixes or bound bases, as in teleplay, deplane, emplane, ecosystem, and re-ask. In the excitement of speaking or writing, words like these—some of which may be unfamiliar—are frequently formed, and because their components are recognizable, their meanings are usually easy to understand (Stageberg, 1981: 121). Yule (2006:57) states that word formation may be defined as the process of creating new English words. This process is known as derivation, and it is performed through the use of a huge number of little 'pieces' of the English language that are not often included separately in dictionaries.

b. Arabic derivation refers to the process of forming one word from another, provided that they are compatible in meaning and structure but differ in form, such that one word can be traced back to another. It is a linguistic discipline that examines how one word is extracted from another, where one serves as the original or root form and the other is considered a derivative (Diab, 2021: 199–200). Al-Salih (2009: 174–175) defines derivation as: *“The generation of some words from others, tracing them back to their origin, identifying their root, and evoking their original common meaning in addition to their new meaning.”* He further explains that there are three principal types of derivation, which serve as methods for creating new words and meanings: **al-asghar** (the minor derivation), **al-kabeer** (the major derivation), and **al-akbar** (the most comprehensive derivation).

4.4 Translation

Halliday's perspective (1965: 123-125) about translation is that "translation as an activity faces only one way; the translator observes an event in one language, the 'source' language, and performs a related event in another, the 'target' language. But the total result is two texts which stand in

mutual relation: each is, as it were, a translation of the other." In other words, when an item or pattern appears in language A and another in language B, in real-world usage and under certain circumstances this allow us to refer to these items as "equivalent."

Catford (1965: 20) defines translation as "the replacement of textual material in one language (SL) by equivalent textual materials in another language (TL)." In light of this definition, two important terms appear: textual material and equivalent. The first one means that it is not possible to translate the entire text exactly, but only certain materials that this text contains. The second means that the process of translation is the replacement of the materials of (SL) with what is equivalent in (TL).

Nida and Taber (1982: 12) state that "translating consists in reproducing in the receptor language the closest natural equivalent of the source-language message, first in terms of meaning and secondly in terms of style." They adopted the term reproduction for translation, indicating that translation is the process of reproducing the most closely related meaning and information on the condition that the process must be accompanied by grammatical and lexical adjustment.

Newmark (1988:5) defines translation as "rendering the meaning of a text into another language in the way that the author intended the text." He adds that the task of translation is not as easy as it appears in the definition as a process of reproducing the meaning in the SL message exactly (like the original) in the TL.

4.4.1 The Concept of Equivalence

Catford (1965: 27) states that equivalence in translation is an "empirical phenomenon" on the one hand and a "condition and justification" on the other. He adds that textual equivalence is a text or part of a text in the TL that is observed to be equivalent to a text or part of a text in the SL on a particular occasion, where finding a textual equivalent depends on the authority of a skilled translator or bilingual informant.

Baker (2018: 10-11) states that if language were only a way of naming a group of universal concepts, translation between languages would be simple; one would use the English name instead of its Arab name in the translation of a certain concept; for instance, the word "mindfulness" refers to the practice of fully focusing on the present moment without judgment or distraction. In Arabic, there is no single term that accurately expresses this concept, so phrases like "الذهنية اليقظة" (mental alertness) or "الذاتي الواعي" (self-awareness) are used to clarify its meaning.

When discussing the issue of equivalence in translation at the word level, we have to distinguish between a word, on one hand, which is "the smallest unit of language that can be used by itself" (Bolinger and Sears, 1968:43) or a written word, which is "any sequence of letters with an orthographic space on either side" (Baker, 2018:10). And a morpheme, on the other hand, which is "the minimal formal element of meaning in language" (Baker, 2018: 11).

4.4.2 Contextual Translation

According to Baker (2018: 16) a translator cannot translate a term without taking the context into account. To accurately translate words and utterances into another language, a translator must carefully consider the context. Baker (ibid) asserts that the translator has to do more than the typical reader requires to comprehend a text well. After the translator has comprehended the interpretation of a sentence's words, he must translate the sentence's whole meaning into the target language in an appropriate way. For example, the word "warm" could mean hot, friendly, ardent, zealous, etc., so its meaning depends on the context in which it appears.

4.4.3 The Glorious Qur'an Translation

Abdullah (1983: 90) points out that the translation of the Glorious Qur'an is not considered the Qur'an itself, but rather an attempt to convey its meanings so that the target audience can read it and be guided by its teachings. In this context, translation refers to the transfer of the meanings

and messages of the Glorious Qur'an into another language—an act that closely resembles interpretation. When translating the source language (SL) into the target language (TL) in the case of the Glorious Qur'an, the translator typically assumes two essential roles: first, to interpret the text, and second, to produce an appropriate translation of that interpretation. The translator must maintain a balance between interpreting the source text and accurately conveying its meaning in a way that aligns with the cultural and linguistic background of the target audience. In doing so, precision is required in bridging both the literal and interpretive meanings (Anani, 1997: 184–185).

4.4.4 Problems of Translating the Glorious Qur'an

This research focuses on the roots of the two expressions nazara and qadara, which appear frequently in the Glorious Qur'an in various derivational forms and with multiple meanings. According to statistical data, the expression nazara occurs (132) times in the Qur'an, carrying meanings such as looking, observing, contemplating, considering, examining, among others. Similarly, qadara appears (129) times with meanings such as power, ability, measurement, destiny, decree, and so on. These expressions were not selected arbitrarily; they possess unique linguistic and semantic features, including the phenomenon of polysemy and the influence of contextual variation on their interpretations.

When translated, these expressions may fall within the realm of synonymy, a point examined in this study using the Oxford University Press Dictionary (2007), which has been adopted as a reference. Notably, nazara and qadara appear in different grammatical categories, including past and present verbs, imperatives, and nouns. Identifying the grammatical category of each instance is essential to determine whether transposition has been employed as a translation strategy to achieve a more accurate equivalent.

The paper analyzes four sample verses: two containing nazara and two containing qadara. Translating such expressions demands high linguistic

sensitivity and semantic awareness in order to preserve their intended Qur'anic meanings and reflect their full semantic weight. Their meanings are often shaped by three primary factors: (1) Arabic diacritics (e.g., fatha, kasra, damma), (2) the immediate context within the verse, and (3) the interpretations provided by various exegetes. This study relies mainly on the latter (i.e., tafsir), as it incorporates all three dimensions.

Based on six translations produced across different time periods, this research observes both overt and subtle variations in how these expressions are rendered into English, influenced by the translators' choices and the types of meanings they prioritize. The study presents proposed translations either formulated by the researcher or attributed to one or more of the translators examined. The six selected translations are by:

Al-Hilali and Khan (2019). Pickthall, M. M. (2011). Husain, (2018). Sarwar, H. (2011). Shakir, M. H. (2009) Sher 'Ali, M. (2004)

This is a qualitative study that focuses on semantic analysis informed by the exegetical interpretations of the Qur'anic text and their influence on translation strategies and outcomes. It also involves a comparative analysis of different English renderings to evaluate their accuracy in conveying meanings that closely align with the original Arabic. The research adopts Vinay and Darbelnet's translation model (1995), particularly the distinction between direct and oblique translation, and Leech's model (1981) of meaning classification, focusing on the distribution of conceptual and connotative meanings. Furthermore, the study investigates the lexical, grammatical, and cultural challenges encountered in rendering these two key expressions into English, as follows:

a. Lexical Problems:

Baker (2018: 10–12) points out that many words have more than one meaning, which requires the translator to carefully examine and understand both the concept of the word and its underlying root. The linguistic system views each word as possessing a specific value within the lexical network,

and each word acquires a distinct "personality" shaped by its use within that system.

b. Grammatical Problems:

Jakobson (1959: 235) emphasizes that grammatical patterns play a pivotal role in the translation process. He argues that translators must consider the grammatical structures in the source language and how they are represented in the target language. Similarly, Catford (1965: 22) introduces the term *total translation*, referring to the importance of achieving equivalence on two fundamental levels: lexical and grammatical. This entails replacing both grammatical and lexical elements from the source language with appropriate equivalents in the target language.

c. Cultural Problems:

Wu (2008: 123) asserts that culture, language, and translation are deeply interconnected, with translation playing a central role in bridging cultural gaps. Language, shaped by culture, acts as the bridge between translation and cultural understanding. Its significance lies in its function as a means of expression and communication across nations. One of the core principles of translation is faithfulness to the original text, which involves accurately conveying the cultural connotations embedded in the source. While this can present challenges, Wu argues that cultural meanings can still be rendered effectively through the process of *re-coding* (ibid.).

5. Data Analysis

SL Text: (1)

﴿قَالُوا نَحْنُ أَوْلُوا قُوَّةً وَأَوْلُوا بِأَسْسِ شَدِيدٍ وَالْأَمْرُ إِلَيْكِ فَانظُرِي مَاذَا تَأْمُرِينَ﴾

(النمل ٣٣)

TL Texts:

1. Al-Hilali-Khan (translator 1) (2019: 651): They said: "We have great strength, and great ability for war, but it is for you to command; so **think over** what you will command."

2. Pickthal (translator 2) (2011:425): They said: We are lords of might and lords of great prowess, but it is for thee to command; so **consider** what thou wilt command.

3. Husein (translator 3) (2018:247): They said, "We possess the power, we possess the fighting skills, and the ultimate command is in your hand. You **decide** what to do."

4. Sarwar (translator 4) (2011:343): They replied, "We have great power and valor. You are the commander, so **decide** as you like".

5. Shakir (translator 5) (2009:181): They said: We are possessors of strength and possessors of mighty prowess, and the command is yours, therefore **see** what you will command.

6. Sher 'Ali (translator 6) (2004:439): They replied, "We possess power and we possess great prowess in war, but it is for thee to command; so **consider** what thou wilt command."

Interpretation:

Az-Zamakhshari (2009:782), Al-Andalusi (1993, vol.7: 70), Al-Tabari (1994, vol. 5:559), and others point out that the interpretation of (انظُرِي) due to the context of the verse means expressing an opinion after thinking.

Discussion:

Al-Hilali & Khan use the phrasal verb "think over," which means considering an idea or plan carefully before giving an opinion or making a decision (Cambridge University press, 2025); it also involves analyzing the situation and deep reflection. This phrasal verb differs from the one-word verb "think," which means general mental activity. It is an oblique method of translation falling under modulation procedure due to a change in

phrasing or the angle of expression while maintaining the core meaning. The meaning of the verb is connotative in the TL because it refers to reflection and contemplation before decision-making. Accordingly, the translation is appropriate.

Pickthal and Sher Ali employ the verb "consider," which reflects the use of an oblique translation method, specifically within the procedure of modulation, because it conveys the general concept of meaning, which is consistent with the context, so the translation is appropriate. The type of meaning is connotative since it refers to deep thinking and contemplation of the situation, not merely sensory perception.

Husain and Sarwar use the verb "decide," which is regarded as an oblique method of translation falling under the modulation procedure. This translation is partially accurate, but it misses the connotation of contemplation and thoughtful consideration as a context that encourages calm reflection rather than hasty decision-making, while the expression (انظر) indicates contemplation, reflection, and deep thinking before making a decision. The type of meaning is connotative, as it expresses deep thinking or contemplation. Accordingly, a lexical problem is detected, and the translation is inappropriate.

Shakir uses the verb "see," which means to perceive with eyes, to understand, to know, to watch, to find out, to notice, to foresee, etc. (Oxford University Press, 2007: 394). It is worth noting that the common usage of the verb "see" is an act of watching with the eyes, and in particular contexts, it is used for thinking and considering. This is unnatural and unsuitable usage in the Qur'anic context, as it could make the sacred meaning be violated. Also, it may be understood literally (as physical sight) and thus fails to convey the full meaning and creates a misleading impression in English. Accordingly, a lexical problem is detected, and thus the translation is inappropriate. In light of the discussion above, this method is a direct,

literal procedure. The type of meaning is conceptual because the translator adopts the dictionary meaning.

Table (1): Analysis of the TLT1.

Trans.No.	Method of translation							TLT type of meaning	Problems of translation			Appr.
	direct			oblique					lex.	gra.	cult.	
	bor.	cal.	litr.	tra.	mo.	eq.	ad.					
T.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	connotative	-	-	-	+
T.2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	connotative	-	-	-	+
T.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	connotative	+	-	-	-
T.4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	connotative	+	-	-	-
T.5	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	conceptual	+	-	-	-
T.6	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	connotative	-	-	-	+

-proposed rendering: (think over).

SL Text: (2)

﴿لِيُنْفِقْ ذُو سَعَةٍ مِّن سَعَتِهِ وَمَن قَدِرَ عَلَيْهِ رِزْقُهُ فَلْيُنْفِقْ مِمَّا آتَاهُ اللَّهُ لَا يُكَلِّفُ اللَّهُ نَفْسًا إِلَّا مَا آتَاهَا سَيَجْعَلُ اللَّهُ بَعْدَ عُسْرٍ يُسْرًا﴾ (الطلاق ٧)

TL Texts:

1. Al-Hilali-Khan (translator 1) (2019: 992): Let the rich man spend according to his means, and the man whose resources are **restricted**, let him spend according to what Allah has given him. Allah puts no burden on any person beyond what He has given him. Allah will grant after hardship, ease.

2. Pickthal (translator 2) (2011: 638): Let him who hath abundance spend of his abundance, and he whose provision is **measured**, let him spend of that which Allah hath given him. Allah asketh naught of any soul save that which He hath given it. Allah will vouchsafe, after hardship, ease.

3. Husain (translator 3) (2018:376): The rich husband shall provide support in accordance with his means, and **the poor** shall provide according

to the means that GOD bestowed upon him. GOD does not impose on any soul more than He has given it. GOD will provide ease after difficulty.

4. Sarwar (translator 4) (2011:516): Let the well-to-do people spend abundantly (for the mother and the child) and let **the poor** spend from what God has given them. God does not impose on any soul that which he cannot afford. God will bring about ease after hardship.

5. Shakir (translator 5) (2009:278): Let him who has abundance spend out of his abundance and whoever has his means of subsistence **straitened** to him, let him spend out of that which Allah has given him; Allah does not lay on any soul a burden except to the extent to which He has granted it; Allah brings about ease after difficulty.

6. Sher 'Ali (translator 6) (2004:674): Let him who has abundance of means spend out of his abundance. And let him whose means of subsistence are **straitened** spend out of what ALLAH has given him. ALLAH burdens not any soul beyond that which HE has bestowed upon it. ALLAH will soon bring about ease after hardship.

Interpretation:

Ibn 'Āshūr (1984, vol. 21:331) points out that the meaning of (قُدْرَ), according to the context of this verse, refers to one whose provision was limited to a specific amount as a kind of restriction. At the same level, Al-Tabari (1994, l. 7:321) interprets this expression as one whose provision is constrained or reduced and not expanded by Allah.

Discussion:

Al-Hilali & Khan use the expression “restricted” to render the Arabic expression (قُدْرَ). According to the Cambridge University Press (2025), “restricted” means limited, especially by official rules, laws, amount, range, etc., so it is a direct literal translation because the meaning is conveyed literally. The type of meaning is conceptual since it is dictionary-based and has no additional meaning or feeling of sadness or poverty. Accordingly, the translation is appropriate.

Pickthall changes the method of expression about meaning in the TL while maintaining the core of the original meaning in the SL by using the verb "measure." This verb has various meanings, including discovering the exact size or amount; also, judging the quality, effect, or value of something (Cambridge University Press, 2025). Accordingly, it is oblique method of translation through the procedure of modulation because it attempts to simplify the meaning in the TL by using a common word in English, "measure," but at the same time, a lexical problem is detected and thus makes the translation inappropriate. The type of meaning may seem conceptual because "measured" carries meaning as limitation or calculation, but in the context of the verse, it carries connotative emotional meaning as poverty and hardship.

Husain and Sarwar use oblique translation with two procedures simultaneously: the first one is transposition, whereby the Arabic verb (قُدِرَ) changes to the noun "poor"; the second is modulation, that the translators use a different word which is not far from the essential meaning of the original expression in the SL. The type of meaning is connotative because "poor," especially in the English language, carries additional connotations such as empathy, weakness, and neediness. It is noteworthy that "the poor person" refers to someone who is clearly and definitively in poverty, but the Arabic phrase (وَمَنْ قُدِرَ عَلَيْهِ رِزْقُهُ) describes someone with limited means, not necessarily someone who is poor, so the translation is inappropriate due to cultural and lexical problems.

Shakir and Sher 'Ali prefer the verb "straitened," which means a difficult condition due to much less money available to someone than there was in the past (Cambridge University Press, 2025). Based on the above, it is a direct literal translation. The type of meaning is connotative, even though it appears conceptual, because it is associated with describing cases of severity in English literature and carries, in addition to poverty,

connotations of dignity and respect. Accordingly, it is an appropriate translation.

Table (2): Analysis of the TLT2.

Trans.No.	Method of translation							TLT type of meaning	Problems of translation			Appr.
	direct			oblique					lex.	gra.	cult.	
	bor.	cal.	litr.	tra.	mo.	eq.	ad.					
T.1	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	conceptual	-	-	-	+
T.2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	connotative	+	-	-	-
T.3	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	connotative	+	-	+	-
T.4	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	connotative	+	-	+	-
T.5	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	connotative	-	-	-	+
T.6	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	connotative	-	-	-	+

- **Proposal rendering:** (straitened).

6. Conclusions

Based on the theoretical framework presented above, and the analysis of the data selected this paper has arrived at the following conclusions:

1. Translators find it is difficult to translate the expressions “*nazara*” and “*qadara*” in the Glorious Qur'an into English due to the cultural specificity, conceptual depth, and diversity of interpretations. Accordingly, hypothesis number (1) stated above is verified.

2. Translators face lexical problems more than any other problems due to the multiple and varied meanings of the Arabic expressions “*nazara*” and “*qadara*.” These challenges stem from several interrelated factors, including the difficulty in identifying accurate lexical equivalents, the stylistic nature of the terms, their diverse derivations, diacritical marks affecting meaning, and the influence of the situational context. Accordingly, hypothesis number (2) stated before is verified.

3. Translators rely on the oblique translation method, particularly through modulation, to render the expressions “*nazara*” and “*qadara*,” because in some cases, there is an absence of direct lexical equivalents in the target language, the semantic and cultural complexity embedded in these terms. Accordingly, hypothesis number (3) is verified.

4. Translators reflect connotative meaning in translating the expression “*nazara*” and “*qadara*” in the Glorious Quran into English, so hypothesis number (4) is verified.

References

1. Abdullah, A. A. (1983). **Tarjamat Al-Qur'an Al-Karim**. Al-Madinah Al-Munawara: Al-Jamiaah Al-Eslamiya Bilmadinah Al-Munawara.
2. Al-Andalusi, A. H. (1993). **Tafsir Al-Bahr Al-Muheet**. Edited by Sheikh Adel Ahmed Abdel Mawgod and Sheikh Ali Mohammed Ma'awad. Beirut: Dar Al-Kotob Al-Ilmiyah.
3. Al-Hilali, M. T. & Khan, M. M. (2019). **The Noble Qur'an: English Translation of the Meanings and Commentary**. Medina, Saudi Arabia: King Fahd Complex for the Printing of the Glorious Qur'an.
4. Al-Salih, Subhi, I. (2009). **Diraasat fi Fiqh al-Lughh**. Beirut: Dar Al-eilm Lilmalayeen.
5. Al-Tabari (1994) **Tfsir Al-Tabari**. Edited by Dr. Bashshār ‘Awwād Ma‘rūf and ‘Iṣām Fāris al-Harastānī. Beirut: Al-Risalah Foundation.
6. Al-Tunji, M. and Al-Asmar, R. (2001). **Al-Mu'jam al-Mufaṣṣal fi Ulūm il-Lugha**. Beirut: Dar Al-Kotob Al-Ilmiyah.
7. Anani, M. (1997). **Al-Targama Al-Adabea Byen Al-Natharea Wal Tatbeek**. York House, UK: Hidawi Foundation.
8. Az-Zamakhshari, M. O. (2009). **Tafsir ul-Kashshaf**. Edited by: Khaleel Ma'moon Sheeha. Beirut: Dar El-Ma'refah.
9. Baker, M. (2018). **In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation**. London: Routledge.

10. Bolinger, D., & Sears, D. (1968). **Aspects of Language**. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
11. Catford, J. C. (1965). **A Linguistic Theory of Translation**. London: a. Oxford University Press.
12. Diab, M. (2021). **Tarikh Adab Al-Lugha Al-Arabiyya**. York House, UK, York: Hidawi Foundation.
13. GRIFFIN, N. (2020). RUSSELL'S USE THEORY OF MEANING. **JOURNAL FOR THE HISTORY OF ANALYTICAL PHILOSOPHY**, 8(3). Retrieved from: (<https://doi.org/10.15173/jhap.v8i3.4142>)
14. Halliday, M. A. K., Macintosh, A., & Strevens, P. (1965). **The Linguistic Sciences and Language Teaching**. London: Longman Publishing House.
15. Hospers, J. (1967). **An Introduction to Philosophical Analysis** (2nd ed.). London: Routledge.
16. Hurford, J. R., Heasley, B., & Smith, M. B. (2007). **Semantics: A Coursebook** (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
17. Husain, M. (2018) **The Glorious Qur'an - English Translation with Arabic text: Through the messenger**. California: CreateSpace Independent Publishing Platform.
 - a. https://godprovenas1.com/quran_translation/MH/QT.pdf
18. Ibn Ashur, M. T. (1984). **Tafsir al-Tahrir wa al-Tanwir** (Vol. 19).
 19. Tunis: Tunisian Publishing House.
20. Ibn Mandhur, M. B. (1993). **Lisan Al-Arab**. (Vol. 15). Beirut: Dar Sadir.
21. Jabal, M. H. (2009). **Almaa'na Alughawi: Dirasa Arabia Mustakila Nadharyan wa Tatbiqyan**. Cairo: Dar Tiba for printing.
22. Jakobson, R. (1959). **On Linguistic Aspects of Translation**. in R. A. Brower (ed.) *On Translation*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
23. Kempson, R. M. (1977). **Semantic Theory**. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

24. Leech, G. (1981). **The Study of Meaning**. London, England: Penguin Books.
25. Löbner, S. (2013). **Understanding Semantics** (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.
26. Locke, J. (1999). **An Essay Concerning Human Understanding**. London. London, England: Basset. Retrieved from:
 - a. (https://www.philotextes.info/spip/IMG/pdf/essay_concerning_human_understanding.pdf)
27. McDougall, W. (1913). **Body and Mind: A History and A Defense of Animism**. London, England: Methuen & Co. (Original work published 1911).
28. Newmark, P. (1988). **A Textbook of Translation**. Harlow, England: Longman.
29. Nida, E. A., & Taber, C. R. (1982). **The Theory and Practice of Translation**. Leiden, Netherlands: E.J. Brill.
30. Ogden, C. K., & Richards, I. A. (1923). **The Meaning of Meaning**. New York, NY: Harcourt, Brace & World.
31. Oxford University Press. (2007). **Oxford Dictionary of Synonyms and Antonyms**. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
32. Palmer, F. R. (1981). **Semantics**. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
33. Pickthall, M. M. (2011). **Roman Transliteration of The Holy Qur'an With Full Arabic Text**. Pakistan, Lahore: Qur'an Majeed Printing Complex
34. Saeed, J. I. (2003). **Semantics** (2nd ed.). Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
35. Sarwar, H. (2011). **The Holy Qur'an Arabic Text and English Translation**. Singapore: The Islamic Seminary Inc.
36. Shakir, M. H. (2009). **The Holy Koran (Qur'an) English translation of the meanings**. UK: Ezread publication.
37. Sher Ali, M. (2004) **The Holy Quran: Arabic Text and English Translation**. Islamabad: Islam International publication, Ltd

38. Stageberg, N. C. (1981). **An Introductory English Grammar** (4th ed.). New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
39. Vinay, J.-P., & Darbelnet, J. (1995). **Comparative Stylistics of French and English: A Methodology for Translation**. Amsterdam, Netherlands: John Benjamins.
40. Wu, J. (2008). The Analysis of Cultural Gaps in Translation and Solutions. **English language teaching**, 1(2), 123-127. Retrieved from: <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/7964/dcac87a7c91dbd1cd02340ce463c528000c9.pdf>
41. Yule, G. (2006). **The Study of Language**. UK: Cambridge university press Cambridge.
42. Yule, G. (2020) **The Study of Language**. 7th edn. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
43. Yunira, S., Fradina, S., Sumbayak, M., Putri, N. S., & Derin, T. (2019). Re-Visits The Grand Theory of Geoffrey Leech: Seven Types of Meaning. **REiLA: Journal of Research and Innovation in Language**, 1(3), 105-110. Retrieved from: (https://www.researchgate.net/publication/338231447_Re-Visits_the_Grand_Theory_of_Geoffrey_Leech_Seven_Types_of_Meaning)