

2003

Arabic Metonymy and Its Translation into English

Hamid H. Al-Hajjaj

Applied Science University, hamidhalhajjaj@yahoo.com

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.aaru.edu.jo/albalqa>

Recommended Citation

H. Al-Hajjaj, Hamid (2003) "Arabic Metonymy and Its Translation into English," *Al-Balqa Journal for Research and Studies البلقاء للبحوث والدراسات*: Vol. 10 : Iss. 2 , Article 6.

Available at: <https://digitalcommons.aaru.edu.jo/albalqa/vol10/iss2/6>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by Arab Journals Platform. It has been accepted for inclusion in Al-Balqa Journal for Research and Studies البلقاء للبحوث والدراسات by an authorized editor. The journal is hosted on [Digital Commons](#), an Elsevier platform. For more information, please contact rakan@aarj.edu.jo, marah@aarj.edu.jo, u.murad@aarj.edu.jo.

ARABIC METONYMY AND ITS TRANSLATION INTO ENGLISH

Dr. Hamid H. Al-Hajjaj

Dept. of Foreign Languages, The Applied Science University

ABSTRACT

The present paper deals with the Arabic metonymy and the possibility of rendering this trope into English. At the outset of this work, the researcher attempts to present some introductory remarks related to the subject in question such as the approaches which are adopted by Arab and non-Arab linguists and rhetoricians to define the conception of metonymy. It also tackles the rhetorical and non-rhetorical considerations used in the interpretation of Arabic metonymy. An attempt is also made to study and analyze a number of Quranic, Prophetic and poetic metonymical texts where this process has revealed some very subtle rhetorical features which are considered to be stylistically (aesthetically) and semantically powerful. This work touches upon other related issues such as the classification of the metonymical expressions in Arabic rhetoric and their various functions in Arabic texts. Perfectly grasping these issues can very much help in the process of rendering Arabic metonymies into English. Finally, some important conclusions have been arrived at which can provide the interested reader with further insights into the subject of metonymy.

الكناية في اللغة العربية وترجمتها الى اللغة الانكليزية

ملخص

يعالج هذا البحث موضوع الكناية في اللغة العربية وإمكانية ترجمتها الى اللغة الانكليزية. ففي بداية هذا البحث تطرق الباحث الى التعريف بهذا الموضوع ومفهومه لدى بلاغي ولغويي العرب وغيرهم. كذلك فقد عالج هذا البحث الاعتبارات البلاغية وغير البلاغية المستعملة في تفسير الكناية العربية. وقد حاول الباحث أن يدرس ويحلل نماذج نصية قرآنية كريمة ونماذج من الحديث النبوي الشريف وأخرى من الشعر العربي حيث أظهرت هذه العملية بعض المميزات البلاغية الدقيقة التي تعد مهمة جدا من الناحية الاسلوبية (الجمالية) والدلالية. ومن الموضوعات الأخرى ذات الصلة التي اشتمل عليها البحث تصنيف العبارات الكنائية في البلاغة العربية وتوضيح وظائف الكناية العربية وحصرها في النصوص اللغوية المختلفة ودلالات هذه الوظائف. وفي القسم الأخير من البحث عرض الباحث بشيء من الإيجاز بعض الأفكار التي يمكن أن تساعد في ترجمة الكنايات العربية الى اللغة الإنكليزية. وتضمن القسم الأخير من هذا البحث أيضا أهم الاستنتاجات التي توصل اليها الباحث.

Arabic Metonymy and Its Translation into English

- I. Introductory Remarks.
- II. Arab Rhetoricians and Metonymy.
- III. Arabic Metonymy: Rhetorical and non-Rhetorical Considerations.
- IV. Metonymy in the Glorious Quran.
- V. Metonymy in the Prophetic Tradition.
- VI. Metonymy in the Arabic Poetry.
- VII. Types of Arabic Metonymical Expressions.
- VIII. Functions of Arabic Metonymy.
- IX. Rendering Arabic Metonymical Expressions into English.
- Conclusions.

I. Introductory Remarks

As can be easily deduced from the title of the present study, the emphasis is to be completely placed upon metonymy, its role in Arabic language and the problem arising when rendering metonymical utterances into English. Of course, some other issues, closely related to this topic, will also be dealt with in some detail in order to make the picture of the whole work seem clearer and more comprehensive.

Generally speaking, lexical items, used in textual frames, may logically hide some implicit semantic values in addition to their explicit ones. This can be evidently seen when shifting from the domain of the literal meaning to that of the figurative one.

It is an established fact that tropes and schemes are brought in by language users in place of less powerful (affective) expressions where this process of textual selection is decided by poets, literary text writers, native speakers etc. according to various reasons most of which are situationally or aesthetically determined.

Metonymy may be defined as a rhetorical device whereby lexical items are provided with affective semantic values (connotations) in addition to their normal informative values. This definition, of course, cannot be considered very much conclusive since some other rhetorical devices can also be brought in to do similar functions, as is the case with tropes such as simile, metaphor and synecdoche. We intended to explore this area later on by starting with English as a cross reference, moving into Arabic rhetoric where the subject occupies a considerable space, and ending with the impact of the difference, in treating metonymy in the two languages, on translation products. The problem which this work intends to tackle starts from the unequal effort to

define this phenomenon in both languages. In English, the term "metonymy" suffers from great deal of confusion (with noticeably a lesser degree in Arabic). In fact, one of the major concerns of this study is to formulate a definition which is free of shortcomings inherited in the traditional treatments of this subject. We are of the view that a definition of this sort should be informative to the extent that it sets metonymy clearly away from other rhetorical devices which represent an essential characteristic of all types of literary writings.

The literature, which has been produced by western rhetoricians and linguists on the affective uses of language, treats metaphor and metonymy almost interchangeably (cf. Garber, 1959; France, 1969; Barthes, 1968; Schefer and Rice, 1979; Ortony, 1979). Contrary to the concept of metaphor, which has been studied both intensively and extensively (cf. Al-Hajjaj, 1995), metonymy has been considered as one of two forms, namely, "indirect" and "dead" metaphor (broadly speaking).

Leech (1974:216-219) talks about metonymy in terms of semantic transfer that can account for the following text which might seem absurd at the surface level of representation:

The floor was more humane than platform (ibid:218)

Following Leech (ibid) the above text can be assigned to one of two interpretations:

The (people on the floor) were more humane than the (people on the platform) or

The floor was more (comfortable to sit on) than the platform.

Another way of dealing with metonymy is implied in Newmark's (1982:85) following statement: "Metonymy is a one-word image, which replaces the object, which may be later become a dead metaphor". The technical term used to refer to this type of metonymical expression is synecdoche. Newmark (ibid) cites the following examples to illustrate these types of expressions:

A sail (for a yacht), the seven seas (for the whole world).

Garber (1959:189) holds a similar view as he states that "the effects of metonymy are achieved by substituting the part for the whole.....". However Garber's metonymies cannot be used in such a way unless there is a connection of ideas between the metonymy and the expression it replaces as can be seen in the following:

Mark Antony, dying in Cleopatra's arms in Shakespeare's drama whispers "I'm dying, Egypt dying".

Of course, Antony is speaking not to the Egyptian Nation (historically speaking), but to the Egyptian Queen, who, in his mind is synonymous with the Nation.

Other examples of this type of metonymy are provided by Corbett (1965:446) who defines metonymy as a "substitution of some attributive or suggestive word for what is actually meant". His examples include:

Crown (for royalty), mitre (for bishop), bottle (for wine), brass (for military officers).

Thus, the above brief discussion makes it clear that the notion of metonymy is treated confusingly by western rhetoricians and linguists let alone the theoretical framework underlying this treatment.

II. Arab Rhetoricians and Metonymy

When we come to the treatment of metonymy by Arab rhetoricians and linguists, we find the case surprisingly different. Metonymy has received its due attention on the part of Arab rhetoricians. As this extensive rhetorical heritage cannot be covered in this limited space, it is believed that quick remarks will suffice to make the case clear.

As for the problem of definition, the following list of definitions though by no means exhaustive, may shed some light on the way the subject is dealt with in Arabic rhetoric:

- 1- Metonymy is "a lexical item which is used in place of a vulgar or taboo word referring to the same overall sense", ?al-Farāhīdī, (1967).¹
- 2- Metonymy is "to speak about something indirectly through using words or structures having similar logical referents", ?ibn Fāris, (1949).²
- 3- Metonymy is "to speak about something and what is referred to is something else", ?al-Jawharī, (1956)³, ?ibn Manzūr, (1956)⁴ and ?al-Fayrūz?ābādy, (no date)⁵.

As can be clearly noticed, the above three definitions were presented by Arabic lexicologists who were interested in the linguistic meaning of the word "بِنْيَة" (lit. metonymy) more than in its technical sense (scope). They tried to establish a semantic framework between words and their possible metonymical uses. This semantic framework should be taken into consideration in order for the metonymy not to be mixed with the other Arabic tropes such as metaphor, synecdoche, pun, etc. Here, we could see that the metonymical utterance is neither an explicit and normal (literal) use of words nor very much concealed to the extent that cannot be comprehended. Metonymy in both forms (lexical and structural) is like a transparent material which is neither oblique nor naked.

- 4- Metonymy is "all what is understood from an expression and its context without mentioning the actual referent", (?abū 9ubaydah, 1955 vol.1, p:73)
- 5- It is a means "to express an idea or to refer to an object by means of another idea or expression", (?al-9askarī, 1971, pp:353-356).
- 6- It is "to use a substitute expression where explicitness is not preferred", (?al-Xafājī, 1953:192, see also ?al-Jāhīz, 1938, vol.1, pp:332-334).
- 7- It is "when the speaker wishes to bring about a particular meaning but does not use the actual expression put forward in the language for this meaning, but instead he uses another expression of similar semantic informative value or synonymous to the first", (?al-Jurjānī, 1961:45).
- 8- It is "a way of leaving explicit mentioning of an object to what is associated with the object itself. Transference will take place from the "given" to the "left", (?as-Sakkākī, 1937:189).
- 9- It is "any expression denoting a figurative or non-figurative meaning by means of features suitable for both", (?ibn ?al-?athīr, 1939, vol.2, p:197).
- 10- It is "a means whereby the native speaker conveys an ugly meaning by using a nicely formulated expression", (?al-Miṣrī, 1961, pp:143-146).

Metonymy in Arabic, in actual fact, is not so simple as can be deduced from the above list of definitions. It is very much complicated to the extent that it cannot be sometimes figured out unless the perceiver is very well acquainted with the rhetorical secrets of Arabic. These difficulties in perceiving Arabic metonymies can face rhetoricians, linguists, literary critics and other workers in the field of language study when dealing with poetic texts in particular. Even some

Quranic metonymies are considered to be extremely intricate to the extent that some commentators of the Glorious Quran cannot tell for sure whether a lexical item or a structure in a certain Quranic text is a metonymy or another rhetorical figure of speech. This issue and other related ones will be elaborated upon as we proceed in this work.

Now, it is possible to generalize some remarks characterizing the Arab rhetoricians' approach to deal with metonymy. First, their normal account is semantically-oriented focusing on meaning transference from actual expressions to their metonymies. Second, it seems to me that this method is powerful and productive enough to solve the problem of overlap between metonymy and other Arabic tropes particularly metaphor and synecdoche. Third, the term "metonymy" is taken in its general sense to include not only single-word expression, it may be extended to account for whole chunks of metonymical expressions (i.e., it may be structural, see section VII below).

III. Arabic Metonymy: Rhetorical and non-Rhetorical Considerations

Arab rhetoricians in general have arrived at a conclusion that metonymy is formulated on the basis of leaving aside an utterance, which is literally qualifying an NP in a text, to be replaced by another one which is semantically or pragmatically related to its field. Metonymical expressions are relatively easily pinpointed in texts in case the semantico-lexical boundaries and the semantico-syntactic features of metonymy are exactly defined. This convention can sometimes be violated specifically when it overlaps with "ʔat-Tawriyyah" (lit. pun) which is seen as a choice between two lexical senses the most hidden or concealed of which is decided to be the required pun.

As far as metonymy is concerned, Arab rhetoricians believe that overlooking the literal (explicit) meaning does not necessarily result in making the non-literal (implicit) meaning hidden or to be semantically foregrounded. These meanings are treated this way because they represent an urgent psychological need felt by the language user. He/she wishes to overlook the explicit semantic values in the metonymical utterance because there would be another more natural semantico-rhetorical option at his/her disposal which is much more productive in serving the purpose in question. In addition, leaving the literal lexical or structural meaning is accomplished by native speakers without being planned to. This means that when the meaning (the required one) is intentionally concealed, the metonymy would become deeper in its psychological effect to the extent that it might become

very close to the boundaries of other rhetorical schemes or tropes in Arabic a case which normally results in a very intricate sort of rhetorical overlap in the text under analysis.

A metonymical utterance is not as explicit as another utterance which is literally or unmetonymically used. However, the semantic values of some structural metonymies are as concealed as other things which are intentionally hidden. These hidden semantic values need very sophisticated rhetorical techniques to be precisely located. The lexical metonymies in Arabic do not need this technique in its formulation. That is to say, native speakers of Arabic do not feel any necessity to complicate or hide the meaning of this sort of metonymy which is the dominant one in Arabic rhetoric.

Deeply hidden lexical meaning is a prerequisite in the formulation of Arabic pun whereas what is to be accomplished by lexical metonymy is a much less degree of hiding or concealing since the most important objective to be achieved by lexical metonymy in Arabic is to indicate not to conceal.

Arab rhetoricians may have various points of view regarding this trope. Some Arab scholars believe that metonymy cannot be considered a trope in Arabic rhetoric. They treat it as not more than an expression mentioned to refer to its normal, literal, factual and established meaning. This means that the linguistic meaning of the expression is not transferred to another area of semantics where this reason is quite enough to take metonymy out of the domain of tropes, (?ar-Rāzī, 1982:102-105).

?as-Sakkākī (1937:213-220), on the other hand, distinguished between the concept of trope and metonymy saying that metonymy cannot be in contradiction with its direct literal meaning. So, when we say : “طويل الحزام” (lit. his sword-belt is long), we in fact refer to his sword-belt characteristics without any need to go deeper in our interpretation and what we want to refer to at the same time is that he is a tall man where the logical relationship between the two senses is quite clear. The same thing can be claimed when we say that some girl is “تدوم الضحى” (lit. a lie-in-a-bed till the first hours of morning). Here, we mean that this girl sleeps in the morning without going deeper to search for the meaning that she is “served and that she does not need to do anything by herself” because such an interpretation is arrived at through logically considering the semantic features of the metonymical structure itself. On the contrary, when we come to the domain of metaphor and say for instance “في الدار اسد” (lit. there is a lion in the house), we are not allowed to adopt the technique which is based on what is meant by the phrase “a lion” without going deeper in our analysis of the text in question since the relationship between what is

metaphorical and what is literal needs to be based on many various factors in order for one to be replaced by another. Further, in the formulation of Arabic metonymical expressions, the transference to be established goes from what is relating to what is related with whereas in the formulation of the other Arabic tropes, the transference is done in the reverse order.

ʿibn ʿal-ʿathīr (1939: vol.3, 49-75) who took another position put forward a definition for metonymy, which is regarded by some Arab rhetoricians as representing a new trend in the treatment of this rhetorical subject. He (ibid) says that “metonymy in Arabic rhetoric is an utterance produced by the language user. It could be figuratively and non-figuratively interpreted by perceivers provided that there should be a logical and relating description established between the figurative and non-figurative features of the metonymical expression. Besides, he (ibid) considers metonymy a part of metaphor proper on the basis that it is not called metonymy unless the metonymized object is concealed, the thing which is done when formulating metaphor in Arabic. So, the logical relationship between metonymy and metaphor as thought by ʿibn ʿal-ʿathīr is one of inclusion, i.e., each metonymy is a metaphor but not vice versa.

ʿal-Ḥalabī (1980:141-147) believed that “metonymy is not a trope since what is considered in the analysis of the metonymical expressions is the original (literal) meaning where this meaning refers to another meaning which is the intended one. So, when we say that someone is “ثَمِيرٌ رَمْلُ الْفَيْرِ” (lit. a man with much ash in his firestone) we want to refer to the factual meaning of this expression but we put it this way in order to establish a logical proof that the referred to is generous. Thus, metonymy for ʿal-Ḥalabī is to mention the synonymous sense and, in reality, the language user is aiming at its most cognate utterance (see also ʿan-Nuwayrī, no date, vol.7, pp:59-61).

ʿal-Qazwīnī cited in ʿas-Sakkākī (1937: pp: 237-273) defined metonymy as an utterance used to denote the synonym of its meaning with the possibility of intending its original and direct sense. So, the difference between metonymy and the other tropes in Arabic rhetoric comes from these two options. Tropes other than metonymy cannot accept but the intended indirect meaning for it is not similar in function to the literal meaning and there should exist a logical tie between what is tropological and what is literal in nature. Other Arab rhetoricians followed or rotated around ʿal-Qazwīnī's orbit are ʿal-Magribī 1939, ʿas-Sakkākī 1937, ʿat-Taftazānī 1937, ʿaṣ-Ṣuyūfī 1939 and ʿibn Maʿṣūm ʿal-Madanī 1968.

IV. Metonymy in the Glorious Quran

It is a well-known fact that metonymy has been extensively used by native speakers of Arabic since almost two hundred years or more before the advent of Islam. This can be simply proved by textual instances taken from poetry composed during the pre-Islamic era.

In the following three sections of the present work, we shall try to explain the role which is played by metonymy in the Quranic texts, Prophetic Tradition texts and poetic texts.

The thing which is worth mentioning here is the intensive use of metonymy in the Quranic texts, a point which can be utilized to justify the Arab's interest in this trope. The Glorious Quran is considered to be the decisive norm of the affective use of language. It is a yardstick with which all other literary production could be evaluated. With this fact in mind, one can deduce the objective reasons behind the Arab rhetoricians' interest in this trope to settle serious problems emerged from its use in the Quranic texts. The problem becomes more acute in the field of translation where translators have exerted great efforts to render metonymical Quranic expressions into English (see section IX below).

A number of metonymies which occur in the Glorious Quran imply some very important juristic judgements as is the case with the Quranic text in *ʿan-Nisāʿ*, *ʿāyah* 43: “*لَوْ لَمَسْتُمُ النِّسَاءَ*” (or ye have been in contact with women), (Ali, 1973: 194). Here, touching women or having contact with them is a metonymical structure which means “having sexual intercourse with women”. So, Muslims are not allowed to do their prayers unless they have bathed (Pickthall, 1930: 98). The fourth Caliph *ʿalī Bin ʿabī Ṭālib* (may Allah honor him) said that the word “*لَمَسْتُمُ*” (lit. touched) in this Quranic text refers to “sexual intercourse”, (see, *ʿaṭ-Ṭabarī* 1959, vol.5, p: 65, and *ʿabū ʿubaydah* 1955, vol.1, p: 24).

Yet, this Quranic text was literally interpreted by *ʿal-ʿimām Mālik* and his followers in the city of *ʿal-Madīnah*. They believed that Muslims may touch their wives or odalisques with sexual drive where this is quite enough to invalidate ablutions.⁶

Metonymies in the Glorious Quran may cause serious problems even to the Prophet's Companions. When the *ʿāyah* 187, *ʿal-Baqarah* “*حَتَّىٰ يَخْشَيْتُمْ يَكْفُ الْخَيْطِ الْأَبْيَضِ مِنَ الْخَيْطِ الْأَسْوَدِ*” (until the white thread dawn

appears to you distinct from its black thread),(Ali,1973:74) revealed,the Prophet's Companion ʿadī Bin Ḥātimʿaṭ-Ṭāʿī (may Allah be pleased with him) put a white and black thread under his pillow in order for him to know when fasting begins. It is quite clear that this Companion adopted the literal meaning of this part of the ʿāyah forgetting that what is counted here is the metonymical meaning only. He mentioned what he did to the Prophet Muḥammad (Allah's blessing and peace be upon him) where the Prophet said to him: "إِنَّ وَسْطَكَ إِنِّ لَغَرِيضٌ" (lit. your pillow then is wide) which is another metonymy for dullness, the Prophet said to the Companion that what is referred to here is the whiteness of day and the blackness of night (see, ʿad-Dārimī, 1930, vol.2, p: 5).

In ʿal-Furqān, ʿāyah 47 "وَهُوَ الَّذِي جَعَلَ لَكُمُ اللَّيْلَ يَبْسًا" (And He it is Who makes the Night as Robe for you), (Ali, 1973:937), where the Arabic word "يَبْسًا" is used as a metonymy to mean "cover and screen". In ʿal-ʿanbīyāʿ, ʿāyah 17 "كَمْ لَرْنَا أَنْ نَأْكُلَ لِهَوَا الْخَفَاءِ مِنْ لَنَا" (If it had been Our wish to take (just) a pastime we should surely have taken it from the things nearest to us...), (Ali, 1973: 825). Commentators such as Qatādah and ʿal-Ḥasan said that the word "لِهَوَا" (lit. amusement) in this ʿāyah is used as a metonymy to mean "المرأة" (lit. woman). ʿibn ʿabās (may Allah be pleased with him) said that it is a metonymy but it means "الولد" (lit. son). In my opinion, both interpretations are acceptable since a woman (slave girl or even wife) and sons for a man are like interesting and valuable things to live and play with (ʿibn Qutaybah 1954, pp: 162-163).

The last Quranic metonymy to be analysed here is mentioned in ʿal-Kahf, ʿāyah 42 "وَأَحْبَطَ بِشَمْرِهِ فَلَمْ يَبْقَ يَنْتَبِذْ يَتْلَبْ عَلَيْهِ عَلَى مَا أَتَقَىٰ فِيهَا" (So, his fruits and (enjoyment) were encompassed (with ruin) and he remained twisting and turning his hands over what he had spent on his property), (Ali, 1973: 741). The expression "يَتْلَبْ عَلَيْهِ" (lit. wringing hands) should be understood as referring to a metonymical sense which exactly means "contrite", (see, ʿabū ʿubaydah, 1955, vol.1, p: 404).

To conclude, as has already been said the Glorious Quran contains a tremendous number of metonymies that constitute a network of various images all of which create aesthetically unique texts. This and other tropes and schemes make the Quranic texts unbelievably affective which attract researchers to investigate its rhetorical features.

V. Metonymy in the Prophetic Tradition

The Prophet's sayings come second as a source in the Islamic law as well as in their linguistic values after the texts of the Glorious Quran. Arab and non-Arab Muslim researchers have devoted great efforts to study the linguistic as well as the non-linguistic features of the Prophetic Tradition as a whole.

One of the rhetorical aspects which have been deeply studied is metonymy as representing one of the major tropes in this text, other tropes are simile, metaphor and synecdoche. Of course, this text could have rhetorical figures other than tropes such as schemes and rhetorical meanings which are formulated by syntax and rhetoric, i.e., Arabic rhetoric is divided into three major divisions, tropes, schemes and rhetorical meanings. These three domains play an essential role in the Prophetic texts.

In what follows, a brief account of the role of metonymy in the Prophet's sayings will be presented in order to add to the picture drawn in the previous pages. The Prophet of Islam (Allah's blessing and peace be upon him) for instance, said to his cameleer " *يا أنجوشة رويدا سوك بالفلوير* " (O, ?anjusha, drive slowly the camels with the glass vessel), (Khān, no date, vol.8, pp: 148-149), see also (?al-Buxārī, 1888, vol.8, p:244, Muslim, 1955, vol.4, p: 1811 and ?ad-Dārmī, 1930, vol.2, p:295).

Most, if not all, Muslim researchers believe that the word " *الفلوير* " (lit. phials) in this Prophetic saying is a metonymy for soft, tender (soft-hearted, tender-hearted) and gentle women.

The Messenger of Allah (Allah's blessing and peace be upon him) produced a big number of metonymies in his sayings all of which came in the nicest possible way of eloquence. They are full of aesthetic frames and for this reason they are very much affective, attractive and linguistically sensitive. For instance, the Prophet (Allah's blessing and peace be upon him) says:

" *يقيم وخضراء النمن* " (lit. be careful of the green of the dung) where the phrase "green of the dung" is a metonymy for any "beautiful woman of a bad origin", (see, ?al-9askarī, 1952, pp: 353-356).

Finally, the Prophet (Allah's blessing and peace be upon him) says: " *هذه مكة قد رمتم بالقلل قبيها* " (lit. this is Mecca throwing you with pieces of its liver) where the phrase " *القلل قبيها* " (lit. pieces of its liver) is considered by ?ash-Sharīf ?ar-Raḍī (1937:14) as a metonymy for those well-known people, or sons of the leading people in the tribes of Quraysh. What supports this interpretation is the fact that the word " *قبي* " (lit. liver) is used in a way which is similar to the use of the word " *قلب* " (lit. heart) to mean things or people who are of

well-known or leading families as when we say that this man is the heart of his family, tribe and so on and so forth.

VI. Metonymy in the Arabic Poetry

Arabic poetry constitutes a very natural domain for the use of metonymy. Arab poets since the pre-Islamic era have been fond of expressing themselves on too many different subjects through this rhetorical trope. They found it quite productive when referring to certain aspects of life. They believe that things cannot be always expressed explicitly for various reasons. So, one of the choices available for this poet or that is to use certain rhetorical devices such as metonymy, metaphor, synecdoche, pun, etc., in order to be on the safe side. These rhetorical figures are used to refer to these situations implicitly, an issue which will be dealt with later on in this work.

In what follows, some Arabic poetic lines are presented where each one contains a metonymical utterance directed to accomplish a certain rhetorical purpose:

- 1- ?imru?ul Qays cited in ?abū 9ubaydah (1955, vol.1, pp:75-76) says:

ألا زعمت بمسباسة اليوم التي كثرت وإن لأحسب المنز أمثالي

the Arabic lexical item “المنز” (lit. the secret) is a metonymy for “التكاح” (lit. sexual intercourse). This analysis is supported by the Quranic text in ?al-Baqarah, ?āyah 235: “ولكن لا تواعدوهن سرا” (But do not make a secret contact with them), (Ali, 1973: 94, see also ?ibn Qutaybah, 1954, pp: 162-163).

- 2-?imru?ul Qays cited in ?al-Baṭalyūsī (1979, vol.1, p:82) says:

وبهضة خدر لا يرلم خبازها ثملعت من لهن بها غير معجل

the word “بهضة” (lit. an egg) is a metonymy for a very beautiful woman.

- 3- 9urwah Bin ?al-Ward cited in Tha9lab (1948:43-46) says:

ألمنم جسمي في جنوم كثيرة وأضنو قراح الماء والماء بارد

here, the whole poetic line is considered to be a metonymical structure where it is used to mean “when food, drink and other essential things are very rare, the poet made them available for his guests who are preferred even to himself”.

4-?abū Dhu?ayb ?al-Hudhalī cited in ?aṭ-Ṭabarī (1954, vol.21, p:94, see also 9abdul ?ar-Raḥmān, 1985:118) says:

و قد علفت دم القنبل إزرها تبرأ من دم القنبل و يزو

the lexical item “إزرها” (lit. a long wrapper or veil) is used in this poetic line as a metonymy for the woman herself which is referred to in this poetic line.

5-Ṭarafah Bin ?al-9abd cited in ?al-Fayyād (1986: 156) says:

أبينني ألي يمنى يمنى جفتني فالفرخ لم صيريني في شمالك

two metonymies are used in this poetic line, in the first hemistich we have “يمنى يمنى” (lit. your right hand) which is used as a metonymy for “a respected and loved status”. The second metonymy lies in the phrase “في شمالك” (lit. in your left hand) in the second hemistich. Here, it is a metonymy for a “low status”.

6- 9umar Bin ?abī Rabī9ah (1992: 537) says:

بعيدة مهنوى الفرط إنا لتوكل أبوها، و إنا عبد شمس و هاشم

the metonymy lies in the construction “بعيدة مهنوى الفرط” (lit. a distant falling of the ear-ring) which refers to the fact that the “neck of the girl”, described in this poetic line, is long “which is considered to be a prerequisite for a woman to be beautiful at that time.

7- ?al-Mutanabī (1978, vol.2, p:149) says:

تشتكى ما اشتكت من طرب الشو في إليها، و الشو حيث الشو

the expression “و الشو حيث الشو” (lit. complete longing and desire associated with thinness) is used as a metonymy by the poet to mean “lying”. This analysis is sustained by the word “تشتكى” (lit. she complains) used at the beginning of the text. Another meaning could be deduced from this text is that the complaining girl is healthy and in good condition. This implicature is regarded as another evidence for considering the above underlined expression a metonymy.

VII. Types of Arabic Metonymical Expressions

Arab rhetoricians have put forward many classifications for the types of metonymy each of which is based on a certain philosophy or understanding. This situation may suggest that Arab rhetoricians have grasped the nature of the concept of metonymy differently a case which implicitly refers to the importance of this trope in

Arabic rhetoric. In the following, the major approaches to the classification of metonymy will be briefly traced, commented upon and criticized if possible.

ʿal-Jāhīz mentioned in ʿal-Fayyād (1986: 131) classified Arabic metonymies into two major types. This classification is based on the motives which lie behind using this rhetorical trope. He believed that there are only two motives that drive Arabs to use metonymy in their every day language the first of which is based on substituting a word for another in order to make the meaning seem more elegant and polite. So, instead of calling some one "بخل" (lit. stingy) we call him "provident" and "reformer". The second is based on the principle of accuracy specifically when addressing people of high rank. Arabs address such people carefully and accurately. One cannot, for instance, say to a Caliph:

"هل أنت نائم يا سيدي؟" (lit. are you asleep, sir?). What should be said here in this context is "هل غلبك النعاس يا سيدي؟" (lit. are you fighting drowsiness, sir?). It seems to me that ʿal-Jāhīz mixed between the functions of metonymy in Arabic and its types.

ʿibn Qutaybah (1954: 256-274) has also mixed between the purposes and types of metonymy in his attempt to classify Arabic metonymies. So, instead of calling a man "Ḥussein", he may be addressed by his eldest son, in case he has, otherwise people may choose a name collocated with his first name to become his official or social name. So, a man whose first name is Ḥussein may be addressed by ʿabū 9alī which seems to be more venerable and dignified. The second type of metonymy is "التعريض" (lit. implicature). For instance, when an honorable man addresses a certain woman by saying that she is beautiful this means that he wishes her to be his wife. In other words, this way of addressing is understood as a hint or a symbol, or even an implicit call for joining by marriage.

ʿal-Mubarid (1956, vol.2, pp:674-677) classified metonymies into three types. In reality, these cannot be regarded as types, they are rather functions. The first is to use metonymy for "التسمية والتغطية" (lit. obscurity and covering). The second is to use metonymy for accomplishing "الفتاب" (lit. politeness) and finally, it is used for "التفخيم والتعظيم" (lit. glorification and exaltation).

ʿar-Rāmḥarmazī cited in ʿal-Fayyād (1986:152-153) classified metonymies in Arabic into two types: first "الكلمات بلا تقييد أو تخصيص" (lit. unrestricted and unspecified metonymies) and second "الكلمات المفسرة" (lit. the interpreted metonymies). ʿal-Jurjānī (1961: 44-48) believed that metonymies in Arabic should be divided into three distinct types; these are: "كناية النسبة" (lit. metonymy of proportion) "كناية عن صفة"

(lit. metonymy for adjective) and “الكناية عن الموصوف” (lit. metonymy for the described or attributed object). ʿas-Sakkākī (1937: 213-220) almost repeated the same details mentioned by ʿal-Jurjānī concerning the classification of Arabic metonymies.

Finally, ʿibn ʿal-ʿathīr (1939, vol.31, pp: 49-75) presented a different classification where he divided metonymies into three main types. These are: first, “تمثيل” (lit. representation), second, “رداف” (lit. synonymy) and third, “مجاورة” (lit. contiguity).

What has been said so far regarding the types of Arabic metonymy cannot represent all Arab rhetoricians' points of view on this topic because such a survey cannot be done in this limited space. What has been done in this part of the present work may provide us with a clear picture about how Arab rhetoricians think about the conception of metonymy.

Metonymy from Arab rhetoricians' point of view can be structurally classified as follows:

- 1- Adjectival metonymy, where the attributed NP is used as an adjective with another NP annexed to it as in “عريض الوسادة” (lit. a man of a wide pillow), i.e., dull or stupid.
- 2- An attributed NP metonymy whereby the attributed NP cannot be used as an adjective to describe another NP, e.g., “ذات الواح وشمش”، Sūrah 54, ʿāyah 13, ʿal-Qamar (lit. an object that is made of broad planks and caulked with palm-fibre), Ali(1973:1456), i.e., ship or steamer. Another representing instance is the Arabic phrase “أعمى العمرة” (lit. the blind of the town ʿal-Maʿarrah), i.e., the great Arab poet ʿabū ʿal-ʿalāʾ ʿal-Maʿarrī.
- 3- Attributive metonymy, here, the relationship between the attribute and the NP attributed to it is indirect. Instead, the attribute is conjoined with another NP or object related to the first NP, e.g., “تعيش العزة في بيوت العراقيين” (lit. dignity lives in the houses of the Iraqis).

Before concluding, another productive classification of Arabic metonymies is also found in the related literature. This classification is adopted by a lot of workers in the field of Arabic rhetoric. It is based on transferring images from the metonymical expressions to the underlying structures. This technique has generated three major types of metonymical expressions which are: exemplificatory, synonymous and contiguous metonymies. This classification as well as the previous one are semantically-oriented. It serves as an additional evidence for the interest and

the attention paid by the Arab rhetoricians to the subject of metonymy.

VIII. Functions of Arabic Metonymy

The following list of functions is provided to account for the most salient semantic features of the metonymy in Arabic rhetoric:

- 1- To show Allah's greatness and power as in:
 "هوَ الَّذِي خَلَقَكُمْ مِنْ نَفْسٍ وَاحِدَةٍ", (it is He Who created you from a single person), (Ali, 1973: 398), Sūrah 7, ?āyah 189, ?al-?9-rāf.
- 2- To leave an expression to another which is more elegant as in:
 "إِلَّا مُتَخَفِّفًا لِلْغَلَا أَوْ مُتَحَوِّزًا إِلَى فِتْنَةٍ", (Unless maneuvering for battle or intent to join a company), (Pickthall, 1930: 183), Sūrah 8, ?āyah 16, ?al-?anfāl.
- 3- Euphemism as in:
 "وَيَا مَرُوفًا بِالتَّلَوِّ مَرُوفًا بِإِزْمَا", (And, if they pass by futility, they pass by it with honorable avoidance), (Ali, 1973: 943), Sūrah 25, ?āyah 72, ?al-Furqān.
- 4- To evoke the addressee's wit as in:
 "فَاتَّقُوا النَّارَ الَّتِي وَقُودُهَا النَّاسُ وَالْحِجَارَةُ", (Then fear the fire whose fuel is Men and Stones), (Ali, 1973: 21), Sūrah 2, ?āyah 24, ?al-Baqarah.
- 5- To achieve eloquence as in:
 "أَوَلَمْ يَأْتِ الْفِتْنَةَ وَهُوَ فِي الْخِصَامِ غَيْرَ مُبِينٍ", (Is then one brought up among trinkets, and unable to give a clear account in a dispute), (Ali, 1973: 1327), Sūrah 43, ?āyah 18, ?al-Zuxruf.
- 6- To verify expressions as in:
 "فَالَهُنَّ بَيْضٌ مُكْتَوَّنٌ", (As if they were delicate eggs closely guarded), (Ali, 1973: 1197), Sūrah 37, ?āyah 49, ?aṣ-Ṣāffāt.
- 7- To exaggerate abomination as in:
 "وَقَالَتِ الْيَهُودُ يَدُ اللَّهِ مَرْبُودَةٌ", (The Jews say: God's hand is tied up. Be their hands tied up and they accursed for the blasphemy they utter. Nay His hands are widely outstretched), (Ali, 1973: 263), Sūrah 5, ?āyah 64, ?al-Ma'idah.
- 8- To warn of fate as in:
 "كَيْتَبُ يَدَا أَبِي لَهَبٍ وَتَبَا... وَالْزَّوْجَةُ حُتْلَبَةٌ", (The power of Abu Lahab will perish, and he will perish And his wife, the wood-carrier), (Pickthall, 1930: 675), Sūrah 111, ?āyah 1 and 4, ?al-Masad.
- 9- To accomplish brevity as in:
 "فَإِنْ لَمْ تَنْظُرُوا وَلَنْ تَنْظُرُوا", (But if ye cannot and of asurety ye can not), (Ali, 1973: 21), Sūrah 2, ?āyah 24, ?al-Baqarah.

IX. Rendering Arabic Metonymical Expressions into English

Metonymy and culture are two extremely related topics and this is why it is so hard to find exact equivalents to metonymical expressions across languages. The problem becomes more acute when the SL and the TL are genetically unrelated. So, because of these major setbacks in dealing with metonymy, we do need certain strategies or procedures to overcome problems facing translators when rendering metonymies from one language into another, a well-known metonymical expression in one culture may have an entirely different meaning in another. An "owl" may represent "wisdom" in the western culture but for the eastern culture it stands for "stupidity" and "bad omen".

Metonymical expressions are the reverse of plain speaking. They are used when the language user wishes to talk about controversial subject or whenever there is a taboo sense in a particular culture. They cluster around death, sex, excretion, war, personal characteristics and other aspects of life. They could add to the linguistic utterances' networks of various sorts of features capable of making such metonymical expressions of tremendous effect on perceivers.

Western translation theorists such as Newmark (1982: 125) believes that "English stock metonym such as "the Crown" for the Monarch, "Shakespeare" for Shakespeare's works, "the bed" for marriage or sex, "the kettle" for water, "the cellar" for wine often cannot be translated word by word". So, translating these metonymies productively requires knowledge of the TL culture. He (ibid) talks about institutional metonymies such as Rue de Rivoli. The Kremlin, the White House, Bonn saying that they "may or may not require explanatory expression in the TL, depending on the knowledge of the putative typical reader".

Finally, he (ibid) considers the third type of metonymy according to the western rhetoric. He says "original metonymies, which are rare, since metonymies normally imply a recognized and contiguity, adjacency or causal relationship between one object and another, are translated communicatively unless they are important".

A more common procedure for translating metonymies is to replace the SL image with another established image in the TL, if one exists that is equally frequent within the same register. They are precisely rendered if the image is transferred within a correspondingly acceptable and established collocation. A change of meaning may be resulted in case this condition is not met. However, compensation may be done here and there in the same linguistic context.

Translating metonymical expressions could be accomplished through reducing these expressions to sense or literal language. But one has to bear in mind that this procedure could decrease the aesthetic power of the SL which is resulted in dull translation.

Metonymies which are heavily loaded with cultural content can sometimes be rendered by retaining the figurative element in the text and adding the sense. In fact, this is a compromise procedure which keeps some of the metonymical motives.

Conclusions

The present paper has studied in some detail metonymy in Arabic rhetoric . Many issues related to this essential trope have been dealt with in order for the present work to appear more comprehensive and more useful, the most important of which is the attempt to find out productive procedures and strategies to be adopted by translators to render Arabic metonymical expressions into English. The most salient conclusions that this study has arrived at are the following:

- 1- Arab rhetoricians' method of dealing with metonymy is semantically-oriented focusing on semantic transference from actual (literal) expressions to their metonymies. In other words, their account is based on meaning.
- 2- Arab rhetoricians' approach to interpret metonymical structures is powerful enough to solve the problem of overlap between metonymy and other tropes such as metaphor proper and synecdoche.
- 3- Arab rhetoricians understand the term "metonymy" to include not just single-word expressions (lexical metonymies), it extends to account for whole chunks of metonymical structures (structural metonymies) as well.
- 4- English rhetoricians' treatment of metonymy is inflicted with many drawbacks especially in its underlying theoretical framework. Sometimes people cannot be able to differentiate between metonymy, metaphor proper and synecdoche in western rhetoric.
- 5- The theoretical framework, adopted by Arab rhetoricians for the purpose of distinguishing between various types of tropological expressions, is much more adequate than the one adopted by English rhetoricians.
- 6- Since semantic values of lexical items vary from one speaker to another and from one context to another, Arabic lexical metonymies are also subjected to this fact, a matter which is added to the difficulties facing translators when rendering Arabic metonymical expressions into English.
- 7- Translators have to choose between communicative and semantic translations when rendering a metonymy in one culture (Arabic) which may have entirely different meaning in another culture (English).

- 8- Arabic metonymical expressions (lexical and structural) which are mostly culture-bound, can hardly be translated without some sort of semantic loss.
- 9- In the translation of the Arabic metonymical expressions especially the Quranic ones, readers can very easily feel that the spirit of the original is sacrificed or that the translation is full of inadequacies (see, Nida, 1969: 92).

References

The Glorious Quran.

- ?abdur-Rahmān, N. (1985). *?al-Wāqī9 wal ?istūrah fī Shi9r ?abī Dhu?ayb ?al-Hudhalī ?al-Jāhili*. Amman: Dār ?al-Fikr Press.
- Al-Hjjaj, H.H. (1995). *Simile and Metaphor in the Glorious Quran with Reference to Translation*. Unpublished Ph.D thesis. Al-Mustansiriyyah University, College of Arts, Department of Translation, Baghdad.
- Ali, A.Y. (1973). *Translation of the Glorious Quran*. Libyan Arab Republic: The Call of Islam Society.
- Barthes, R. (1968). *Elements of Semiology*. (Trans.. by :Annette Lavers and Colin Smith). New York: Hill and Wang.
- ?al-Baṭalyūsī, 9āṣim bin ?ayyūb bin ?as-Sayyid. (1979). *Sharḥ ?al-?aṣḥ9ār ?as-Sitah ?al-Jāhiliyyah*. Ed. By: N.9awād. 2vols. Baghdad: Dār ?al-Ḥuriyyah Press.
- ?al-Bukḥārī, ?abū 9abdillāh Muḥammad bin ?ismā9īl. (1888). *Ṣaḥīḥ ?al-Bukḥārī*. Cairo: ?al-Mīmīyyah Press.
- Corbett, E.P. (1965). *Classical Rhetoric for Modern Student*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- ?ad-Dārimī, 9abdullāh bin 9abdil Raḥmān. (1930). *Sunan ?ad-Dārmī*. Damascus: ?al-?i9tidāl Press.
- ?al-Farāhīdī, ?al-Khalīl bin ?aḥmad. (1967). *Mu9jam ?al-9ayn*. Ed. by: 9abdullah Darwīsh. Baghdad: ?al-9ānī Press.
- ?al-Fayyād, M.J. (1986). *Metonymy*. Iraqi Scientific Academy Review: 37 (1): 119-205.
- ?al-Fayrūz?ābādī, Muḥammad bin Ya9qūb. (no date). *?al-Qāmūs ?al-Muḥīṭ*. Beirut: Dār ?al-9ilm Lilmalāiyn Press.
- France, P. (1965). *Rancine's Rhetoric*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Garber, P. (1959). *Effective English*. New York: Round House.
- ?al-Ḥalabī, ?abū ?ath-Ṭhanā? Shihāb ?ad-Dīn Muḥammad Bin Fahd. (1980). *Ḥusn ?at-Tawasul ?ilā Ṣinā?at ?at-Tarasul*. Ed. by: ?akram 9uthmān Yousuf. Baghdad: Dār ?ar-Rīyāḍ Press.
- ?al-Jāhiz, ?abū 9uthmān 9amr bin Baḥr. (1938). *?al-Ḥaywān*. 3 vols. Ed. by: 9abdul Salām Hārūn. Cairo: ?as-Sāsī Press.
- .(1960). *?al-Bayān wal Tabyīn*. Ed. by: Muḥammad 9abdul Salām Hārūn. Cairo: ?al-Khānjī Press.
- ?al-Jawharī, ?ismā?īl bin Ḥammād. (1956). *?aṣ-Ṣiḥāḥ: TāJ ?al-Luḡah wa Ṣiḥāḥ ?al-9arabiyyah*. Ed. by: ?aḥmad, 9abdul 9afūr 9aṭṭār. Cairo: Dār ?al-Kitāb ?al-9arabī Press.
- ?al-Jurjānī, 9abdul Qāhir. (1961). *Dalā?il ?al-?i9jāz fī 9ilm ?al-Ma9ānī*. Ed. by: Muḥammad Raṣḥīd Riḍā and Muḥammad Maḥmūd ?aṣh-Shanqīṭī. Cairo: ?al-Manār Press.
- Khān, M.M. (no date). *The Translation of the meaning of Ṣaḥīḥ ?al-Bukḥārī* 9vols. Ankara: Hilāl Yayınları.
- ?al-Kḥafājī, ?abū Muḥammad 9abdullāh Muḥammad bin Sa?īd bin Sinān. (1953). *Sirr ?al-Faṣāḥah*. Ed. by: 9abdul Mīṭ9āl ?aṣ-Ṣa?īdī. Cairo: Muḥammad 9alī Ṣabīḥ Press.
- Leech, G. (1974). *Semantics*. London: Penguin Books.
- ?al-Madannī, ?as-Sayid 9alī Ṣadr ?ad-Dīn bin Ma9ṣūm. (1968). *?anwār ?ar-Rabī9 fī ?anwā9 ?al-Badī9*. 6 vols. Ed. by: Shākīr Hādī Shukur. Najaf: ?an-Nu9mān Press.
- ?al-Magribī, ?ibn ya9qūb. (1939). *Mawāhib ?al-Fattāḥ fī Sharḥ Talkḥīṣ ?al-Miftāḥ*. (Printed Within Shurūḥ ?al-Talkḥīṣ). Cairo: (Printing house not mentioned).

- ʿal-Miṣrī, ʿabū Muḥammad Zakīyy ʿad-Dīn ʿabdul ʿazīm bin ʿabdil Wāḥid bin Ẓāfir known by ʿibn Dhī ʿal-ʿiṣbiʿ ʿal-Miṣrī. (1961). *Taḥrīr ʿat-Taḥbīr fī Ṣināʿat ʿash-Shiʿr wan-Naṭh wa Bayān ʿiḍjāz ʿal-Qurʿān*. Ed. by: Ḥanafī Muḥammad Ṣharaf. Cairo: ʿar-Risālah Press.
- ʿal-Mubarrid, ʿabū ʿal-ʿabbās Muḥammad bin Yazīd. (1956). *ʿal-Kāmil fī ʿal-Lughah wal ʿadab*. 2 vols. Ed. by: Muḥammad ʿabū ʿal-Faḍl ʿibrāhīm and ʿas-Sayid Ṣhaḥātah. Cairo: Nahḍat Miṣr Press.
- ʿal-Mutanabī, ʿabū ʿaṭ-Ṭayib ʿaḥmad bin ʿal-Hussein. (1978). 2 vols. *Sharḥ Diwān ʿal-Mutanabī*. Ed. by: ʿabū ʿal-Baqāʿ ʿal-ʿukbarī. Beirut: Dār ʿal-Maʿrifah Press.
- Newmark, P. (1982). *Approaches to Translation*. Oxford: Pergamon Press Ltd.
- Nida, E.A. (1964). *Towards a Science of Translation*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- ʿan-Nuwayrī, Ṣhiḥāb ʿad-Dīn ʿaḥmad bin ʿabdil Wahāb. (no date). *Nihāyat ʿal-ʿarab fī Finūn ʿal-ʿadab*. Cairo: Ministry of Information Press.
- Ortony, A. (ed) (1979). *Metaphor and Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pickthall, M. (1930). *The Meaning of the Glorious Koran: An Explanatory Translation*. London: George Allen ND Unwin Ltd.
- ʿal-Qazwīnī, ʿal-Khaṭīb Jalāl ʿad-Dīn Muḥammad bin ʿabdil Raḥmān. (1937). *ʿal-ʿiḍjāh fī ʿulūm ʿal-Balāghah*. Ed. by: A Committee of Arabic Teachers at ʿal-ʿazhar University. Cairo: ʿas-Sunnah ʿal-Muḥammadiyyah Press.
- ʿar-Rāzī, Fakhr ʿad-Dīn Muḥammad bin ʿumar. (1985). *Nahāyat ʿal-ʿiḍjāz fī Dirāyat ʿal-ʿiḍjāz*. Ed. by: ʿibrāhīm ʿas-Sāmarāʾī and Muḥammad Barakāt Ḥamdī ʿabū ʿalī. Amman: Dār ʿal-Fikr Press.
- ʿar-Raḍī, ʿash-Ṣharīf Muḥammad bin ʿal-Hussein. (1937). *ʿal-Majāzāt ʿan-Nabawyyah*. Ed.

- by: Muḥammad Muṣṭafā. Cairo: Muṣṭafā
ʿal-Bābī ʿal-Ḥalabī Press.
- ʿas-Sakkākī, ʿabū Yaʿqūb Yūsuf bin ʿabī Bakr
Muḥammad bin ʿalī. (1937). *Miftāḥ ʿal-
9ulūm*. Cairo: ʿal-Bābī ʿal-Ḥalabī Press.
- Schefer, P. and Rice, D. (1979). "Metaphor,
Metonymy and Synecdoche". *Semiotica*:
21 (1-2): 121-149.
- ʿash-Shaybānī, ʿabū ʿabdillāh ʿaḥmad bin
Muḥammad bin Khalīl. (1895). *Musnad
ʿal-ʿimām ʿaḥmad bin Ḥanbal*. 6 vols.
Cairo: ʿal-Mīmiyyah Press.
- ʿaṣ-Ṣiyūfī, Jalāl ʿad-Dīn ʿabdul Raḥmān bin ʿal-
Kamāl. (1939). *Sharḥ 9uqūd ʿal-Jumān
fī 9ilm ʿal-Ma9ānī wal-Bayān*. Cairo:
(No Printing House Mentioned).
- ʿaṭ-Ṭabarī, ʿabū Ja9far Muḥammad bin Jarīr.
(1954). *Jāmi9 ʿal-Bayān 9an Taʿwīl ʿay
ʿal-Qurʿān*. Cairo: Muṣṭafā ʿal-Bābī ʿal-
Ḥalabī Press.
- ʿat-Taftazānī, Sa9d ʿad-Dīn bin Mas9ūd bin 9umar.
(1937). *ʿal-Mukhtaṣar fī Sharḥ Talkhīṣ
ʿal-Qazwīnī*. Cairo: (No Printing House
Mentioned).
- Tha9lab, ʿaḥmad bin Yaḥyā. (1948). *Qawā9id
ʿash-Shi9r*. Ed. by: Ramaḍān ʿabdul
Tawāb. Cairo: Dār ʿal-Ma9rifah Press.
- ʿabū 9ubaydah Ma9mar bin ʿal-Muthannā. (1955).
Majāz ʿal-Qurʿān. 2 vols. Ed. by:
Muḥammad Fuʿād Saḥkīn. Cairo: ʿas-
Sa9ādah Press.
- ʿibn ʿabī Rabī9ah, 9umar. (1992). *Diwān 9umar bin
ʿabī Rabī9ah*. Ed. by: Yūsif Ṣḥukrī
Farahāt. Beirut: Dār ʿal-Jīl Press.
- ʿibn ʿal-ʿathīr, Diyāʿ ʿad-Dīn ʿal-Jazrī. (1939). *ʿal-
Mathal ʿas-Sāʿir fī ʿadab ʿal-Kātib
wash-Shā9r*. 2 vols. Ed. by: Muḥammad
Muḥyī ʿad-Dīn ʿabdul Ḥamīd. Cairo:
Muṣṭafā ʿal-Bābī ʿal-Ḥalabī Press.
- ʿibn Fāris, ʿaḥmad bin Zakariyyā. (1949). *Mu9jam
Maqāyīs ʿal-Lughah*. Ed. by: ʿabdul
Salām Hārūn. Cairo: Dār ʿihyāʿ ʿal-
Kitāb ʿal-9arabī Press.

- ʿibn ʿal-Ḥajjāj, ʿabū ʿal-Ḥasan Muslim. (1955). **Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim**. Ed. by: Muḥammad Fuʿād ʿabdul Bāqī. Cairo: ʿīsā ʿal-Bābī ʿal-Ḥalabī Press.
- ʿibn Manẓūr, ʿabū ʿal-Faḍl Jamāl ʿad-Dīn Muḥammad bin Mukaram. (1956). **Lisān ʿal-ʿArab**. Beirut: Dār Ṣādir Press.
- ʿibn Qutaybah, ʿabū Muḥammad bin ʿabdillāh bin Muslim. (1954). **Taʿwīl Muṣṣḥil ʿal-Qurʿān**. Ed. by: ʿaḥmad Ṣaqr. Cairo: Dār ʿihyāʿ ʿal-Kutub ʿal-ʿarabiyyah Press.
- ʿal-ʿaskarī, ʿabū Hilāl ʿal-Ḥasan bin ʿabdillāh bin Sahl. (1952). **Kitāb ʿaṣ-Ṣināʿatayn**. Ed. by: ʿalī Muḥammad ʿal-Bajāwī and Muḥammad ʿabū ʿal-Faḍl ʿibrāhīm. Cairo: Muṣṭafā ʿal-Bābī ʿal-Ḥalabī Press.

¹ See the word كنى in ?al-Farāhīdī. (1967).

² See the word كنى in ?ibn Fāris. (1949).

³ See the word كنى in ?al-Jawharī.. (1956).

⁴ See the word كنى in ?ibn Manzūr. (1956).

⁵ See the word كنى in ?al-Fayrūz?ābādy. (no date).

⁶ The Arabic lexical item "massa" which is quite close in meaning to the Arabic word "lamasa" is metonymically used to indicate the same semantic value (i.e., sexual intercourse) in ?al-Baqarah, ?āyahs 236 and 237, ?āli-9imrān, ?āyah 17, Maryam, ?āyah 20 and ?al-?aḥzāb, ?āyah 49.

