Componential Analysis Theoretic Approach to Translating English literature into Arabic with Reference to Artificial Intelligence

Dr. Nathume Younis Salih

nazim.younis@alnoor.edu.iq
Al-Noor University

ABSTRACT

Translating literature represents a significant challenge for translators particularly, translating novels. When translation is performed between two languages with different linguistic systems and cultures, as is the case with English and Arabic , this challenge will aggravate and hinder the task of translation. Lack of translation equivalence in the target language that provides the same meaning for some lexical items in the source language is one of the many issues translators have while translating novels.

The study endeavors to tackle this problem through using componential analysis, hence forth (CA), as a tool to achieve the most appropriate rendering for such lexical items. For the sake of defining the scope of the study, the novel of Ernest Hemingway "A Farewell to Arms" has been selected as a sample study.

The study explores the domain of artificial intelligence with relation to the process of translation. (AI) which will henceforth stands for Artificial Intelligence, represents a modern field of study with contributions to various studies, be that scientific, medical, educational, etc.

The study aims at defining certain steps to analyze source language lexical items and their renderings in the target language, so translators can pinpoint the more acceptable translation methods. The study comprises a theoretical framework for (CA), translation and artificial intelligence.

The main hypothesis of the study is that there is no categorical translation equivalence in translating literary texts from English into Arabic; it also assumes that (CA) can be utilized to determine the most accurate meaning of lexical items.

To test the validity of the hypotheses, a practical chapter that tackles the analysis of 3 lexical items quoted from Hemingway's novel "Farewell to arms" has been included. The analysis is done according to Vinay and Darbelnet (1958) model which comprises several translation procedures subsumed under direct and oblique translation strategies. The study concludes that (AI) can be applied to choose the most appropriate translation version. It also concludes that Componential analysis can be used to verify the accuracy of translation.

Key Words：**Artificial Intelligence, translation, componential analysis, equivalence**.

The Theoretical Part

استخدام اسلوب التحليل المكوناتي في ترجمة الادب الانكليزي الى العربية بالإشارة الى الذكاء الصناعي

أ.م.د. ناظم يونس صالح

كلية النور الجامعة

الملخص

ان ترجمة الاعمال الادبية تعد تحديا بالنسبة للمترجمين خاصة عندما يتعلق الامر بترجمة الروايات. وعندما تتم الترجمة بين لغتين مختلفتين ثقافيا ولغويا كما هو الحال بين العربية والانكليزية فان هذه المشكلة ستتفاقم وستجعل عمل المترجم اكثر صعوبة. ان من ضمن التحديات التي تواجه المترجم عند ترجمة الرواية هي عدم وجود المكافئ اللغوي الذي يحقق نفس المعنى في اللغة الهدف. تحاول الدراسة ان تتصدى لهذه المشكلة من خلال استخدام اسلوب التحليل المكوناتي كأداة للوصول الى المعنى الاكثر ملائمة لبعض المفردات اللغوية. وقد تم اختيار رواية همنغواي "وداعا للسلاح" كنموذج للدراسة.

تهدف الدراسة ايضا الى تناول موضوع الذكاء الصناعي وعلاقته بالترجمة حيث يعد الذكاء الصناعي من الحقول العلمية الحديثة والذي يبحث في مختلف انواع الدراسات العلمية والطبية والتعليمية الخ. تفترض الدراسة بانه لا يوجد مكافئ ترجمي محدد في ترجمة النصوص الادبية

من الانكليزية الى العربية كما تفترض ايضا انه من الممكن استخدام التحليل المكوناتي للوصول الى المعنى الدقيق للمفردات اللغوية.

تهدف الدراسة الى تحديد الخطوات اللازمة لتحليل المفردات اللغوية وترجمتها الى اللغة الهدف بحيث يتمكن المترجم من تحديد الاساليب الملائمة للترجمة. تتضمن الدراسة اطارا نظريا يتضمن موضوعات التحليل المكوناتي والترجمة وكذلك الذكاء الصناعي.

من اجل اختبار صحة الفرضيات فان الدراسة تحوي فصلا عمليا يتناول تحليل ٣ مفردات لغوية مقتبسة من رواية همنغواي "وداعا للسلاح". وقد تم اجراء التحليل بالاعتماد على نموذج الترجمة الخاص بفيناي ١٩٥٨ والذي يتضمن العديد من الاساليب الخاصة بالترجمة

تخلص الدراسة الى ان من الممكن استخدام التحليل المكوناتي من اجل التحقق من دقة الترجمة.

الكلمات المفتاحية: استخدام، اسلوب التحليل المكوناتي، ترجمة الادب الانكليزي، العربية بالإشارة، الذكاء الصناعي.

Definition of Translation

Various academics have defined and interpreted translation in different ways. Some of them perceive it as a transference of meaning, others view translation as equivalence related process.

Translation For Ray (1962: 187) is " meaning transference from one language into another". Translation for Savory (1968: 34), is : "A craft that attempts to substitute a written statement or message in another language".

Shunnaq and Farghal (1999: 2) asserts that translation is " considered as a project for meaning transfer from one language to another".

Equivalence based Translation is the approach favored by Mcguire (1980: 29), Aziz and Lastaiwish (2000: 61), Nida and Taber (1974: 12), Catford (1965: 1), Aziz (1989: 258).

According to De Beaugrande (1978:13), translation is an interaction process among the translator, the author of and the reader of the text. rather than a study of contrast and comparison of two texts.

Schaffner   (2000:146) confirms that translation necessitates   "a conscious and careful consideration of all the related aspects in order to

acquire a target text that might properly implement its function for its recipients".

 Sulaiman (1999: 145) views translation as "a skill and an art, a process that comprises understanding, analysis, rewriting the text by utilizing semantic, contextual, and social factors of both source and target texts".

Artificial Intelligence

It's evident that the official birthdate of this new science is 1956, when John McCarthy first used the term "Artificial Intelligence."

The field of Artificial Intelligence (AI) focuses on how to replicate human perception, learning, decision-making and problem-solving processes in computers and other technologies. More recently, with increasing computing power and data, (AI) has pushed the boundaries of humanlike intelligence. The development and advancement of Artificial Intelligence (AI) has already benefitted numerous industries, including finance, healthcare, education, social services, and transportation.

This is attributed to the rapid rise of AI applications and the quick development of (AI) technologies. (AI) has also been utilized in several fields, such as image processing, face recognition, audio recognition, text recognition, natural language processing, and speech recognition.

The study of (AI) began with mathematicians trying to figure out how machines can simulate reasoning capabilities of humans based on atomic computation units (i.e., "0" or "1")while philosophers were trying to understand how human brains can produce highly complex patterns based on basic neural cells.

Mathematical logic was a major influence on Alan Turing's (1937: 22) theory of computation, which postulated that a machine could recreate any act of mathematical deduction possible by randomly rearranging symbols as simple as "0" and "1,".

Artificial Intelligence and Translation

The main challenge in AI-based translation comes from the difficulties in understanding the semantics of texts as well as understanding the syntactic structure of texts to translate them. The start of machine translation was merely a direct word-by-word translation based on a predefined dictionary without intelligence. With the appearance and flourishing of the first generation of AI systems, rule-based machine translation soon developed based on expert systems.

A machine translation paradigm known as "rule-based machine translation" uses linguistic expertise contained in the form of rules that translate from the source language to the target language. It is based on the AI technology of the expert system. The first rule-based machine translation systems were developed in the early 1970s with the invention of expert systems.

Direct machine translation, transfer-based machine translation and interlingual machine translation are the three broad categories into which rule-based machine translation fell under until the 2010s, just before the deep learning explosion.

Direct machine translation systems first translate all words from source to target languages and then reorder or reform the words to obtain a proper sentence in the target language based on rules input by experts. Without grammatical information, the translated sentence in the target language is frequently grammatically incorrect.

Transfer-based machine translation systems first obtain the grammatical structure of the sentence in the source language and then reconstruct the sentence in the target language with correct grammar based on rules. Interlingual machine translation generalizes this idea to translate between any source and target languages by building up an intermediate language, so one needs to first reconstruct the intermediate language from the source language and then reconstruct the target from the intermediate. However, all rule-based machine translation systems,

no matter which category they belong to, cannot produce satisfying results due to their simple rule-based nature.

Word Meaning:

Academics acknowledge that it could be challenging to pinpoint the meaning of a term. In this sense, Matthews (1991: 180) argues that context is crucial for determining a word's meaning.

He emphasizes that " meaning of words is not easy to identify since the word 'meaning' might have several senses when it is relevant to the surrounding context.

The lexical structures of all languages are organized into distinct lexical entries that contain details pertinent to specific words. These words are the smallest lexical units having a non-compositional meaning that can be spoken separately and still carry semantic substance, according to Matthews (1991: 181).

According to Matthews (1991: 104) there are two ways to define words:

1. At the level of linguistic definitions, which show how words function within the framework of formal grammar. This method divides the concept of word into several theoretically distinct concepts.

2. At the level of metaphysical definitions, that answer questions, like "what are words" and "how words should be individuated?" by defining the metaphysical sort of words and thereby clarifying the concept of a word.

Two distinct categories of theories—semantic theories and basic theories of meaning—have addressed word meaning.

Semantic theories of meaning, commonly referred to as theories of reference, focus on the semantic meanings of linguistic expressions (Kerson, 1977).

Conversely, the main focus of the foundational theories of meaning is on how lexical objects can achieve their semantic values.

Semantic theories provide a different question than the previously stated ones; what are the semantic values of language expressions? According to their core views, how do language phrases acquire their semantic values? (ibid).

"For Saussure, a linguistic unit meaning can only be defined by its relationship with other linguistic units, so every word in a language is defined in terms of its relationships with other words in that language system. Consequently, any language's vocabulary is thought of as a system of interconnected parts". (Saussure, 1916: 114).

Componential Analysis (CA):

The simplest definition of componential analysis (CA) is a method of elucidating the sense relations that exist between lexical items. Another definition of it, is the examination of a group of connected language objects, particularly the interpretations of words into feature combinations (Goodman, 1952; Palmer, 1983; Matthews, 2007).

Another way to characterize componential analysis is as a method for figuring out a word's fundamental meaning components (Munday, 2001; Bell, 1991; Newmark, 1992; Hatim and Munday, 2004; Shuttleworth and Cowie, 1997).

According to some researchers, componential analysis (CA) is the process of dissecting lexical items into several semantic components, so as to identify and label the relationships between the components that are common to all lexical items in a methodical manner (J. Channell, 1981: 117-120; Crystal, 1987; Nida et al., 1977; Nida, 1975; Lehrer, 1974: 66). The lexis indivisible smallest parts, or minimal components, can be stated using componential analysis, according to Aitchison (2003: 92).

We can also define (CA) as "the examination of words using organized collections of semantic characteristics that are indicated as (present),

(absent), or (indifferent) in relation to a characteristic or a feature." (Finegan, 2004: 181–182; Saeed, 2009: 265; Jackson, 1996: 80).

(CA) represents the dissecting of a word's meaning into its semantic components, or as another way to put it, breaking it down into individual components (Wardhaugh, 1977: 163; Kreidler, 2002: 87; Allan, 1986: 169; Crystal, 2003: 91; Kess, 1976: 168; Leech, 1981: 89).

A word's meaning will be reduced to its most basic contrastive components by these semantic features.

 "The labels for the dimensions of meaning are (+, −), implying that the features that are marked carry (+) and the traits that are not marked carry (−)". (Crystal, 2003: 90).

_   +   +

woman

   male   *human*   *adult*

+   +   +

Man

   male   *human*   *adult*

                              −   +   −

Girl

   male   *human*   *adult*

Componential analysis is important because it concentrates on the universal meaning components of words rather than language and cultural distinctions between languages. This means that, in addition to offering an understanding of word meaning, componential analysis also serves as a means of examining the relationships between words that have similar meanings.

The Theory of Componential Analysis:

Componential analysis (CA) offers a viewpoint for determining word meanings as well as a method for thinking about the connections between words that share a common meaning. In the end, (CA) focuses less on linguistic and cultural variances among languages and more on words meaning that can be considered universal.

The Sapir–Whorf hypothesis states that linguistic categories and language influence how individuals perceive their environment (Sapir, 1956).

In reality, Sapir was attempting to make the point that while Arabs have fewer words in their language to describe snow than do the Eskimo, who have more words for "snow," the latter will perceive snow differently and, ultimately, will have a worldview that is different from the former. Similarly, the Eskimo will perceive "camel" differently from Arabs who own more words to describe camels in their language than do the Eskimos (ibid).

In the context of componential analysis, lexemes that have a common field of meaning are referred to as semantic fields.

In addition, certain semantic characteristics that distinguish individual lexemes from one another while maintaining a common meaning attribute for all lexemes are another characteristic of a semantic field (Trier, 1931).

A word's meaning is composed of meaningful components that together form its complete sum, as stated by Katz and Fodor (1963).

Componential theory was Katz and Fodor's primary area of interest; they worked mostly on characterizing words in terms of many semantic components. Color vocabulary and keywords related to kinship were among these words.

Lexmes' meanings are broken down into elements that can be compared between individual words or groups of related words. These semantic

elements serve a discriminating purpose by allowing us to distinguish between the meanings of various lexemes (ibid).

Componential Analysis Application:

It is difficult to apply (CA) to the semantic analysis of lexical items. The following are some limitations that Nida (1975: 25) places on the application of componential analysis:

1. Some words have cultural connotations, which means that context might have an impact on their meanings .

2. Not all linguistic vocabulary domains are suitable for constituent analysis.

3. componential analysis focuses solely on referential meaning, which means that the relationship between the lexeme and the referent is the main point of interest.

4. Lexical items overlap is the focus of componential analysis.

5. It can be applied to systems of classifications or taxonomies.

Advantages of Componential Analysis:

The following succinctly describes componential analysis's primary benefits:

1. Entities can be categorized into natural classes using componential analysis; for example, a boy and a man can be placed together as (+human, +male).

2. This method enables us to respond to two questions. Firstly, are lexical elements and phrase combinations semantically acceptable, and if a given combination is meaningful or nonsensical. Secondly "What does a particular combination of lexical terms mean?"

3. A coherent sentence relevance is determined by the meaning compatibility of its lexical elements. For instance, we can presume that the word "pregnant" includes the word "female," in which case the expression "a pregnant woman" would have significance, while the expression "a pregnant man" would have no sense whatsoever.

4. The structure by which lexemes obtain their meanings is demonstrated by componential analysis; to recognize something as something, we also need to recognize what it is not, what it contrasts with, and what property or properties enable the contrast. (Sankaravalayuthan, 2018: 133).

Componential analysis involves a few phases, which are described in the section that follows.

Componential Analysis Steps:

Nida (1964: 44) suggests certain steps for componential analysis processes . According to him, one can only perform a comparative study inside the same semantic area.

According to Nida (1975: 48), the process for identifying the diagnostic traits comprises the following:

1. "Identifying the shared characteristics and aligning all pertinent variations in structure and potentially associated operations."

2. Taking into account how the characteristics relate to one another for the purpose of identifying overlaps and dependencies.

3. "Developing a collection of diagnostic attributes and evaluating the suitability of said features."

moreover, Nida (1975: 54-61) has reformulated the aforementioned steps into six practical steps necessary for the analysis of the meaning components of any given SL item.

A: preliminary selection of meanings that seem to be closely connected is made in the sense that they share many common components, which helps to construct a well-defined semantic domain.

In this instance, the terms "father," "mother," and "son" all refer to humans and specific individuals who are linked to one another either through blood or marriage.

B: Enumerating every particular type of referent for every meaning within the relevant scope.

C: Figuring out whether aspects of the definitions of one or more terms may be accurate, but not all of the terms under consideration.

D. Figuring out which diagnostic elements apply to each interpretation.

E: Comparing the results of the first procedure's data cross-check.

F: Systematically describing the diagnostic findings.

The Practical Part:

In this part of the research a profound analysis for several lexical items selected from Hemingway's novel "Farewell to Arms" will be implemented. The analysis will focus on the SL item sense components along with the sense components of the proposed TL renderings.

Text no.1: "**There were villas with iron fences**".

1. Situation:

Situation	The speaker describes leaving the town and the sights he observed, including large fruit plantations with water ditches and villas.			

Dictionaries	Definitions	Sense 1	Sense 2	Sense 3
		House	Detached or semidetached	Large
Cambridge dictionary	"Villa: a large house, especially one used for holidays in a warm country."	house	–	Large
Oxford dictionary	"Villa: a detached or semidetached house in a residential district."	house	detached or semidetached	–
Merriam Webster dictionary	"Villa: a detached or semidetached dwelling house, usually suburb".	house	detached or semidetached	–
Collins dictionary	"Villa: a villa is a fairly large house, especially one that is used for	house	–	Large

holidays in Mediterranean countries"			

2.Defining SL item (villas) sense components

3.A. Defining TL item(دور) sense components

مكون دلالي ٣	مكون دلالي ٢	مكون دلالي ١	التعريف	المعاجم
كبير	مستقل او غير مستقل	بيت		
	–	دار	دور : جمع دار	معجم المعاني
	–	المحل	دور : المكان يجمع السكن والبناء	المعجم الوسيط
	–	بيت	دور : منزل او بيت	المعجم الرائد
–	–	دار	دور : دار السلام: الجنة	معجم اللغة العربية المعاصر

3.B. Defining TL item(دارات) sense components

مكون دلالي ٣	مكون دلالي ٢	مكون دلالي ١	التعريف	المعاجم
كبير	مستقل او غير مستقل	بيت		
––	–	الدار	دارات: الدارة: الدار	معجم المعاني
–	–	الدار	دارات: الدارة هي البيت الصغير	المعجم الوسيط
–	–	المحل	دارات: الدار : المكان يجمع المساحة والبناء	المعجم الرائد
–	–	الدار	دارات: دارات جمع دارة وهي الدار الصغيرة	معجم اللغة العربية المعاصر

3.C. Defining TL item (قصورهم)sense components

مكون دلالي ٣	مكون دلالي ٢	مكون دلالي ١	التعريف	المعاجم
كبير	مستقل او غير مستقل	بيت		
الواسع	مستقل	المنزل	قصورهم: جمع قصر وهو البيت الكبير	معجم المعاني

المعجم الوسيط	قصورهم: القصر : البيت الواسع الفخم	البيت	مستقل	الواسع
المعجم الرائد	قصورهم: جمع قصر وهو البيت الكبير	المنزل	مستقل	الواسع
معجم اللغة العربية المعاصر	قصورهم: القصر : البيت الواسع الفخم	البيت	مستقل	الواسع

4. Analysis:

SL Text	There were villas with iron fences.
TL1	كانت هناك دور ذات اسيجة حديدية.
TL2	كانت هناك دارات ذات اسيجة حديدية.
TL3	حيث بنى أثرياء ميلان قصورهم الفخمة.

Sense components	House	Detached or semidetached	Large
SL	villas	+	+	+
TL1	دور	+	–	–
TL2	دارات	+	–	–
TL3	قصورهم	+	+	+

5. Discussion:

Translator 3 rendering corresponds to the original meaning and thus in line with the meaning of the sense components. 1 and 2 renderings contradict the intended meaning and thus inconsistent with sense components meaning. These two translations represent an example of adaptation of meaning because the TL item meaning represents only a part of the meaning of the SL item. Translator 3 has used the procedure of literal translation.

Text no.2: "**I nearly sent him some pipe tobacco once**".

1. Situation:

Situation	The speaker is praising the bartender, describing him as a very kind and longtime friend who once sent him some pipe tobacco as evidence of their friendship.

2. Defining SL item (pipe tobacco) sense components.

Dictionaries	Definitions	Sense 1 Substance	Sense 2 Prepared from dried leaves	Sense 3 Used for smoking	Sense 4 Used with pipes

Cambridge dictionary	"Pipe tobacco: a substance smoked in cigarettes, pipes, etc. that is prepared from the dried leaves of a particular plant."	substance	prepared from dried leaves	smoked in cigarettes	pipes
Oxford dictionary	"Pipe tobacco: a preparation of the nicotine−rich leaves of an American plant which are cured by a process of drying and fermentation for smoking."	nicotine rich	leaves	smoking	–
Merriam Webster dictionary	"Pipe tobacco: the leaves of cultivated tobacco prepared for use in smoking".	tobacco	leaves	smoking	–
Collins dictionary	"Pipe tobacco: tobacco suitable for smoking in a pipe."	tobacco	–	smoking	pipe

3.A. Defining TL item (تبغ البيبة وتبغ الغليون) *sense components*

المعاجم	التعريف	مكون دلالي ١	مكون دلالي ٢	مكون دلالي ٣	مكون دلالي ٤
		مادة	تحضر من الاوراق الجافة	تستخدم للتدخين	تستخدم مع الغليون
معجم المعاني	تبغ الغليون: نبات مر المذاق يجفف ثم يستخدم للتدخين في الغليون	نبات	يجف	للتدخين	الغليون
المعجم الوسيط	تبغ الغليون: نبات يتم استخدامه للتدخين في الغليون	مادة نباتية	تجف	يدخنها	غليونه
المعجم الرائد	تبغ الغليون: نبات يجفف ويتم استخدامه كتبغ للغليون	نبات	–	تدخينا	–
معجم اللغة العربية المعاصر	تبغ الغليون: نبات مر المذاق يجفف ويستخدم للتدخين في الغليون	نبات	––	تدخينا	الغليون

3.B. Defining TL item (علب سكاير) *sense components.*

المعاجم	التعريف	مكون دلالي ١	مكون دلالي ٢	مكون دلالي ٣	مكون دلالي ٤
		مادة	تحضر من الاوراق الجافة	تستخدم للتدخين	تستخدم مع الغليون
معجم المعاني	علب: العلبة وعاء يحفظ فيه الشيء. سجاير: ورقة ملفوفة تحوي كمية من التبغ للتدخين	التبغ	ورقة	يدخن	–
المعجم الوسيط	علب: جمع علبة سجاير: لفافة من التبغ	التبغ	لفافة	–	–
المعجم الرائد	علب: العلبة وعاء يحفظ فيه الشئ سجاير: جمع سيجارة	سيجارة	ورق	–	–
معجم اللغة العربية المعاصر	علب: وعاء لحفظ الاشياء سجاير: كمية من التبغ يتم لفه في ورقة ليدخن.	التبغ	ورقة رقيقه	يدخن	–

4. Analysis:

SL Text	I nearly sent him some pipe tobacco once.
TL1	ارسلت اليه في يوم من الايام مقدارا من تبغ الغليون.

TL2	ارسلت اليه في يوم من الايام مقدارا من تبغ البيبه.			
TL3	لقد ارسلت له ذات يوم علب سجاير.			
Sense components	substance	Prepared from dried leaves	Used for smoking	Used with pipes
SL	Pipe tobacco	+	+	+	+
TL1	تبغ الغليون	+	+	+	+
TL2	تبغ البيبة	+	+	+	+
TL3	علب سجاير	+	+	+	−

5. Discussion:

Translators 1, 2 renderings are consistent with the SL sense components meaning. However, (تبغ الغليون) is more suitable than (تبغ البيبة) because the latter represents a transliteration of (pipe tobacco).

Translator 3 rendering (علب سجائر)is contradictory to the SL sense components meaning and thus deemed incompatible with the SL text meaning.

Whereas translator 2 has employed transliteration, translator 3 has employed the procedure of adaptation. Translator 1 has also selected the translation technique of adaptation.

Text no.3: "I paid the driver".

1. Situation:

Situation	The speaker discusses giving the carriage driver money after he and his girlfriend were driven to the hospital.

2. Defining SL item (driver) sense components.

Dictionaries	Definitions	Sense 1	Sense 2	Sense 3
		Person	Drive	Vehicle
Cambridge dictionary	"Driver: someone who drives a vehicle"	someone	drives	vehicle
Oxford dictionary	"Driver: a person who	person	drives	vehicle

	drives a vehicle."			
Merriam Webster dictionary	"Driver: The operator of a motor vehicle"	operator	–	motor vehicle
Collins dictionary	"Driver: the driver of a vehicle is the person who is driving it."	person	driving	vehicle

3.A. Defining TL item(الحوذي)sense components.

مكون دلالي ٣	مكون دلالي ٢	مكون دلالي ١	التعريف	المعاجم
سيارة	يقود	شخص		
–	يقود	سائق	الحوذي: السائق الذي يقود عربة الخيل	معجم المعاني
–	يقود	سائق	الحوذي: السائق الذي يقود العربة	المعجم الوسيط
–		سائق	الحوذي: السائق الذي يقود عربة الخيل	المعجم الرائد
–	–	سائق	الحوذي: السائق الذي يقود العربة	معجم اللغة العربية المعاصر

3.B. Defining TL item(السائق)sense components

مكون دلالي ٣	مكون دلالي ٢	مكون دلالي ١	التعريف	المعاجم
سيارة	يقود	شخص		
السيارة او القطار	يقود	من	السائق: من يقود القطار او السيارة ونحوهما	معجم المعاني
السيارة	يقود	من	السائق: الجمع ساقة والسائق هو من يقود السيارة	المعجم الوسيط
السيارة	يقود	من	السائق: جمع ساقة وسائقون والسائق هو من يقود السيارة	المعجم الرائد
السيارة	يقود	من	السائق: الشخص الذي يقود السيارة	معجم اللغة العربية المعاصر

4. Analysis:

SL Text	I paid the driver.		
TL1	واعطيت الحوذي الاجرة.		
TL2	واعطيت السائق الاجرة.		
TL3	ثم اعطى السائق.		
Meaning components		Person	Drive	Vehicle
SL	Driver	+	+	+
TL1	الحوذي	+	+	−
TL2	السائق	+	+	+
TL3	السائق	+	+	+

5. Discussion:

Renderings of translators 2 and d 3 (سائق) for the SL item (driver) is appropriate with comparison to the meaning of the SL item sense components. Conversely, rendering presented by translator 1 is inappropriate with comparison to the meaning of the SL item (driver) sense components. Taking the context into consideration, rendering of translator 1 (الحوذي) will be compatible with the SL text intended meaning.

Adaptation is the translation procedure used by translator 1. While literal translation procedure has been used by translators 2 and 3.

Conclusions:

1- Componential analysis can be used to verify the accuracy of translation.

2- Different approaches are utilized by translators to address the issue of translating non-equivalency scenarios. The process of adaptation is the most common .

3- The way translators have applied translation techniques has not been consistent .

4- Context is ineffective in interpreting the meaning of lexical items with a single sense. Conversely, context is required to render the intended meaning when it has several senses.

5- (AI) can be applied as a tool to select the most appropriate translation version.

Recommendations:

1-Careful management of each word in the translated text is necessary for literary translation. Any misinterpretation of a word could result in an improper rendering and alters the meaning of the original text

2-Translation of literary works necessitates a profound understanding of both the source and target languages' cultures.

3-When translating literary works, translators should try to be as accurate and consistent as they can .

4-When teaching translation, componential analysis should be considered as a method for defining the most acceptable meaning of SL problematic issues.

REFERENCES:

Al-Sulaiman, M.M. (2010). *Semantics and Pragmatics*. University of Mosul Press.

Aitchison, J. (2003). *Linguistics*. London: Hodder & Stoughton, Ltd.

Allan, K. (1986). *Linguistic Meaning*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Aziz, Y. (1989). *A Contrastive Grammar of English and Arabic*. Mosul, University of Mosul.

Aziz, Y. Y. and Lataiwish, M. S. (2000). *Principles of Translation*. Beni-Ghazi: Qar-Younis University Press.

Bell, R. T. (1991). *Translation Theory*, Where are we going? META, 31 (4) (1991), pp. 403-415.

Catford, J. C. (1965). *A Linguistic Theory of Translation*. London: Oxford University Press.

Crystal, D. (1987). *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

_____ (1991). *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics*. Oxford: Blackwell.

_____ (2003). *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics*, 5th Edition. Oxford: Blackwell.

de Beaugrande, R. (1978). *Factors in a Theory of Poetic Translation*. Assen, Van Gorcum.

de Saussure, F. (1916). *Cours de Linguistique Generale*. Paris: Payot.

_____ (1922). *Recueil des publications scientifiques de Ferdinand de Saussure*. Edited by C. Bally & L. Gautier. Genève: Sonor, Lausanne: Payot, Heidelberg: C. Winter.

Farghal, M. and Shunnaq, A. (1999). *Translation with Reference to English and Arabic: A Practical Guide*. Irbid: Dar Al-Hilal for Translation.

Finegan, E. (2004). *Language. Its Structure and Use*. 4th Edition. United States of America: Thomson Wadsworth.

Goodman, N. (1952). "On Likeness of Meaning". In: Leonard Linsky (ed). *Semantics and the Philosophy of Language*. London: University of Illinois Press.

Hatim, B. (2001). *Teaching and Researching Translation*. Pearson Education Limited, Harlow.

Hatim, B. and Mason, I. (1990). *Discourse and the Translator*. London: Longman Group Ltd.

_____ (1997). *The Translator as Communicator*. London/New York: Routledge.

Hatim, B. and Munday, J. (2004). *Translation: An Advanced Resource Book*. London/New York: Routledge.

Katz, J. J. and Fodor, J. A. (1963). "The Structure of a Semantic Theory".

Kearns, J. (2009). "Strategies". In: M. Baker and G. Saldanha (eds.), *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies* (pp.282-285). London: Routledge.

Kerson, R. (1977). *Semantic Theory*. London: Cambridge University Press.

Kess, J. F. (1976). *Psycholinguistics: Introductory Perspectives*. London: Academic Press INC.

Kreidler, Ch. (2002). *Introducing English Semantics*. New York: Routledge.

Leech, G. (1974). *Semantics*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Ltd.

_____ (1981). *Semantics*. Middlesex: penguin.

Lehrer, A. (1974). *Semantic Fields and Lexical Structures*. Amsterdam: North Holland Publishing.

Matthews, P. H. (1991). *Morphology*, 2nd Edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

_____ (2007). *Concise Dictionary of Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

McGuire, B. S. (1980). *Translation Studies*. London: Methuen and Co. Ltd.

Munday, J. (2001). *Introducing Translation Studies*. London/New York: Routledge.

_____ (2016). *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications* (4th Ed.). Routledge (ISBN: 1138912557).

Newmark, P. (1982). *Approaches to Translation*. Oxford: Pergamon Press Ltd.

_____ (1988). *A Text Book of Translation*. London: Prentice Hall International Ltd.

_____ (1992). *About Translation*. Hertfordshire: Longman Group Ltd.

Nida, E. A. (1964). *Toward a Science of Translating With Special Reference to Principles and Procedures Involved In Bible Translation*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.

_____ (1975). *Componential Analysis of Meaning*. Belgium: Mouton.

Nida, E. A. and Taber, C. R. (1974). *The Theory and Practice of Translation*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.

Nida, E.; Louw, E.; Johannes, P and Smith, R. B. (1977). *Semantic Domains and Componential Analysis of Meaning*. USA: Indiana University Press.

Palmer, F. R. (1976). *Semantics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Palmer, F. R. (1983). *Semantics* (2nd Edition). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ray, P. S. (1962). "A Philosophy of Translation". In: *Babel*. Vol.III, No.4, pp.182-188.

Saeed, J. I. (2009). *Semantics* (3rd Edition). United Kingdom: Wiley Blackwell.

Sankaravelayuthan, R. (2018) An Introductory Course On Semantics And Pragmatics

Sapir, W. (1956). *Language, Thought and Reality: Selected Writings of Benjamin Lee Whorf*. John B. Carroll (ed.), MIT Press.

Savory, T. (1968). *The Art of Translation*. London: Jonathan Cape Ltd.

Schaffner, C. (1998). *Translation and Quality*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

_____ (Ed.) (2000). *Translation in the Global Village*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Shuttleworth, M. & M. Cowie (Eds.) (1997). *Dictionary of Translation Studies*. Manchester: St. Jerome.

Sulaiman, S. (1999). "The Translatability Continuum in Culturally Divergent Contexts: The Case of English and Arabic". In: *Dirasat*. Special Issue, pp.145-161.

Vinay, J. P. and Darbelnet, J. (1958). *Stylistia Comparee du Francais et de L'anglais*, Didier, Paris.

_____ (1995). *Comparative Stylistics of French and English: A Methodology for Translation*. Amsterdam: Benjamin's Publishing Company.

Wardhaugh, R. (1977). *Introduction to Linguistics*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Whorf, B. L. (1946). *The Hopi Language, Toreva Dialect. Linguistic Structures of Native America*, Ed: H. Howeer. New York; Viking Fund Publications in Anthropology. pp.158-183.