Linguistic Difficulties of Translating Religious Texts into English

Saif Habeeb Hasan, Yasir Mohammed Saleh, AthraaMohammed Salih
Department of English / College of Education / University of Samarra / Iraq
saif.habeeb@uosamarra.edu.iq
yasirmohammed@uosamarra.edu.iq
athraa.m@uosamarra.edu.iq

Abstract
This paper deals with 'the linguistic difficulties of translating religious texts into English'. These difficulties are as a result of different ways of interpreting the religious texts. Islamic text (Qur'ānic and Prophetic Traditions) is considered as one of the religious texts. The linguistic knowledge is very important to interpret and understand the intended text. The translators of Islamictext (as sample of religious text) face several difficulties in translating such texts. Specially the translators of Qur'ānic text and Prophetic Traditions , it is really uneasy task because the Qur'ānic text and Prophetic Traditions are sacred, therefore; they cannot be translated literally, because of the rhetorical aspectsof them. In this papersomeAyās of the GloriousQur'ān and Prophetic traditions will be tackled to show the different types difficulties of translating religious texts. This paper is worthy for those who are interested in the translation of the GloriousQur'ān and Prophetic Traditions, especially non-Arab speakers.

Keywords: Religious texts, translation, linguistic difficulties

1. Introduction:

The   translators   of religious textface several different problems. Concerning the translators of Islamic texts, they are really in dilemma, that because the Islamic texts whether the glorious Qur'ān or Hadeeth (Prophetic traditions) have certain characteristics, First, the Qur'ānic text and Prophetic Traditions are sacred and cannot be translated literally. Second, the variation of interpretations makes it hard to choose the convenient one. The rhetoric of the Qur'ān and the Prophetic Traditions makes them difficult, if not impossible, to find the suitable equivalent in the target language.

2. Procedures:

The procedures of this study are:

1. Collecting data:

   Data are collected from four books of translation of the Glorious Qur'ān and the Prophetic Traditions that are translated by translators from different cultures and geographical cultures.

2. Analyzing data according to different linguistic levels namely lexical, syntactic and semantic levels of a word and the whole text for different translations.

3. Definitions of translation:

There are many definitions for translation: Newmark (1988a:7, cited in Al. Samarra'i, 2011:81) defines translation as a craft involves replacing a written message or statement in one language by the same message or statement in another language. For Hatim and Munday (2004: 3-4) say there are two directions in translation: the first is a process that emphasizes the role of the translator in taking the source text (ST) and changes it into the target text (TT). The second direction points out that translation a product produced by the translator himself.

Colina (2015:3) defines translation as a process of product resulting from transferring or the way of mediating written texts from one language to another.

4. Types of translation

4.1 Types of translation according to Roman Jakobson

Roman Jakobson looks at translation in three ways:

1. Intralingual translation or rewarding is an interpretation of verbal signs by means of another set of signs in the same language.

2. Interlingual translation or translation proper is an interpretation of verbal signs by means of signs of non-verbal sign systems. (Munday, 2009:5; Venti, 2000:114).

3. Intersemiotic translation: it is a form of translation which one interprets verbal signs by signs of non-verbal system (Illys,1989:29).

4.2 Types of translation according to Larson

According to Larson (1984:15) there are two main kinds of translation. They are as follows:

A. Form-based translation:

Form-based translations attempt to follow the form of the source language and are known as literal translations. This type of translation has subtypes as:

1. An interlinear translation: is a completely literal translation. It is desirable in reproducing the linguistic features of a text when have a linguistic study of that language. But literal translations are of little help to the receptor language speakers who are interested in the meaning of the source linguistic text. A literal translation sounds nonsense and has little communication value. For example:

I left my spectacles on the	*J'ailaissémes lunettes*
table downstairs.	*la table en.*
Where are you?	*Oùêtes – vous?*

When the two languages are related grammatically and idiomatically, a literal translation is the suitable solution which is revisable and complete. That is common when translating between two languages of the same family (e.g. French and Italian) and more than that when sharing the same culture (Venuti, 2004:86).

2. Modified literal translation: is a type of literal translation modifies the grammar enough to use acceptable sentence structure in the receptor language. However, the lexical items are translated literally, these are also changed to avoid nonsense or to improve the communication. However, the result still does not sound natural (Larson, 1984:16).

B. Meaning-based translation

Meaning based translations make every effort to communicate the meaning of the source language text in the natural forms of the receptor language. Such forms are called idiomatic translation (Larson, 1985:15). This type has subtypes, they are as follows:

1. Idiomatic translations use the receptor language's original forms, both in the lexical item's choice as well as the grammatical constructions. A good translator tries to translate idiomatically since a truly idiomatic translation does not seem as a translation (Larson: 1984:16).

2. Unduly free translations are regarded unacceptable for many reasons. Translations are unduly if they add additional information not found in the source text, if they change the source language or if they misinterpret the facts of the source language text's historical and cultural settings (Larson: 1984:17).

4.2 Types of Translation according toNewmark

There are two types of translation according to Newmark (1988b: 39). They are as follows:

A. Semantic translation:

The major interest is on aesthetic value of the SL text. It may translate words that are not important culturally by culturally functional terms by not by cultural equivalent. This translation may take other concessions to the readership (Newmark, 1988: 46).

The main features of semantic translation due to Newmark (1988: 39 – 53) can be summed up as follows:

1. It seeks to interpret the exact contextual meaning of the original.
2. It is more informative rather than effective.
3. It is more complicated, awkward, elaborated and not interested in the transmitter's intention but the thought processes.
4. It contains loss of meaning, therefore; it is always lower than its original.
5. It is usually concerned with the translator as a person, and often in contrast to his culture as well as the norms of his language.
6. It attempts to recreate the flavour and tone of the original.
7. It is wide and universal.
8. It is sometimes linguistic and encyclopedic.
9. It is an art, since it is essentially the work of but one translator.

B. Communicative translation:

Communicative translation aims to render the exact contextual meaning of the original so that both language and content can be acceptable and intelligible by readers (Newmark, 1988:47).

The features of the communicative translation according to Newmark (1988: 39 – 53) are as follows:

1. It seeks to produce an effect on the reader the same as that acquired by him in the original.
2. It should confirm the 'force' rather than the content of the message.
3. It seems to be easier, simpler, more direct and more convenient, it tends to be under translate.
4. It may obtain in force and clearness what semantic translation loses.
5. It is interested basically in the receptors, commonly in the language's context and cultural diversity.
6. In a communicative translation, the thought-processes in the words have the same importance as the intention behind them.
7. It works on a limited basis.
8. It is totally functional.
9. It is occasionally the result of a team of translators.

5. Strategies of translation:

The strategies of translation are many, here some of them:

5.1 Literal translation:

In this strategy, the source's language unit depends totally on the meanings of the individual items. Literal translation ranges from one word to one word, through group to group, collocation to collocation, clause to clause and sentence to sentence. the aim of faithfulness in translating each SL is in preference of the goal of accuracy in communicating the message's meaning. Therefore, many translators of religious texts have followed this strategy, trying to attain faithfulness (Sirriyya, 2009: 33 – 34).

5.2 Translation proper:

Translation proper of a sign is finding the optimal native equivalent a translator strives to provide. The translator looks for the ideal native TL equivalent for the SL sign that results in as closely as possible the SL message such as the following examples:

- God   (Allah)
- Prophet   (Nabie)

(Sirriyya, 2009: 34 – 35)

5.3 Loan blending:

The morphemic structure of a SL sign is analyzed into its constituents, and the base morpheme is borrowed, sometimes with necessary phonological substitutions and other morphemes are substituted by the TL morphemes due to this strategy. These other morphemes are generally the inflectional and derivational morphemes.

5.4 Acculturation:

In this strategy, a TL cultural sign translate an SL cultural sign. By providing a cultural equivalent this process is not faithful, yet it supplies a pragmatic impact on the TL reader (Newmark, 1988: 83)

5.5 Transliteration:

This strategy is used when the translator fails to find other suitable equivalents. According to this strategy, the word of source language is transferred into the receptor language in its original form (transcription).

5.6 Complete transliteration:

Here there is a complete phonological substitution of the SL sign by the TL phonemes. For example, (Fatima tuAzzahraa) is completely transliterated as (Fātima-tu-z-Zahrā') (Sirriyya, 2009: 37).

5.7 Partial transliteration:

There is a partial phonological substitution of the SL sign when pronounced in the SL as well as partial morphological substitution; consider the following example:

Clean the teeth with siwāk   (Yastāk)

(Khan, 154, cited in Sirriyya, 2009: 37-38).

5.8 Translation couplet:

The SL sign is rendered to the TL sign by two different strategies. The first one is transliteration. The translator resorts to this strategy when he sees one equivalent will not be enough to the SL message, and when the original TT readership is not famous in TL.

(Newmark, 1982:76, cited in Sirriyya, 2009: 39).

5.9 Translation triplet:

The translator will resort to use a third equivalent when the two equivalents are not enough. The three equivalents usually represent the literal translation, transliteration and denotative meaning.

5.10   *Definition***:**

In certain cases, the translator may not find an equivalent that suits mostly all the denotations of the SL signs due to the lack of correspondence between cultures. Therefore, the translator uses a definition of the SL sign. For example:

-    Istikhara which a supplication for seeking Allah's guidance.

(Ibid: 40)

5.11   Paraphrasing:

This strategy contains supplying explanation of the denotations of the SL sign or a part of the ST to give more detail, the translator should be careful to avoid breaking one of Grice (1979) conversation maxims" the maxim of quality: Don't say too much or too little. (Newmark,1988:90; Sirriyya, 2009: 40 – 41).

5.12   *Addition***:**

This strategy supplies any additional information or notes for those aspects which have been omitted because of different reasons. The translator then has to resort to the missing information so that the TT can be obvious. The best thing to be done is to insert the addition within the text in order not to interrupt the concentration of the TT readership. According to Newmark, (1982:92, cited in Sirriyya, 2009: 41), there are three types of additions: cultural addition, technical addition, and linguistic addition (Sirriyya, 2009: 41 – 43).

5.13   *Deletion***:**

The translator may "undertranslate" the SL message or delete words altogether in his attempts to focus on the TT audience. Sometimes, the translator finds the translation of the SL sign misunderstood in the TL. This may be due to the lack of correspondence or lack of cultural background of it (Ibid: 43 - 44).

6. Culture

Some linguistic schools consider language as a social phenomenon, which is normally closely connected with culture. Supporters of the relation between language and culture think while language is a culturally determined practice, additionally to a mainly linguistic procedure. Thus, the differ from radical cultural view in which translation, to be mainly or exclusively, as culture related (Riccardi, 2008:92 - 93).

According to different levels of social and social and individual views of culture, the concept of culture can be (informally) defined as a type of "collective programming of the human mind". Hofstede (1984) states that "culture is not a material phenomenon; it does not consist of things, people, behaviour or emotions. It is rather an organization of these things that people have in mind, their model of perceiving, relating, and otherwise interpreting them" (Goodenough, 1964:36, cited in Riccardi, 2008: 94).

Language is closely related to culture, it is not assumed that that language effects culture, on contrary language is affected by culture to such an extend i.e. it can be a mirror of people culture.

Crystal (2003: 119) defines cultural transmission to be a suggested defining property of human language (contrasting with the properties of many other semiotic systems), whereby the ability to speak any language is transmitted from one generation to another by a process of learning, and not genetically. This does not deny the view that children may be born with certain innate predisposition towards language, but it is to emphasize the difference between human language, where environmental learning has such a large role to play, and animal systems of communication, where instinct is more important.

According to Islam, there will be linguistic consequences due to the discrepancy between cultures. That happens when Islam goes to a non-Arabic speaking society, whether as a new religion to that society or as a foreign religion described in lectures and books. Notions need to be adjusted to suit the cultural and linguistic domain of the non-Arabic speaking society. This requires the re-interpretation of specific Arabic idioms to guarantee their apprehension by the new society. As an example, one may meditate on the words that can help in translating the word (Jilabāb)and (Khimār). These two words are related to the Islamic clothing of a woman which can be semantically analyzed.

(Sirriyya, 2009: 31)

7. **Levels of analyzing texts :** there are different level to analyze any texts, these are :

7.1 The semantic level

Many disciplines are interested in studying meaning. All of them are interested in discovering how the meaning can be illustrated and shown. These disciplines have many ways to investigate the meaning, linguistics, as one of these disciplines, uses the field of semantics. According to semantics, the emphasis here is on studying the meaning of speech. To define meaning, it is the meaning of a word on the basis of a specific context. Meaning is culture-dependent due to translation studies (Munday, 2009: 206).

 One should also differentiate between deep (semantic) and surface (grammatical, lexical, phonological) structures of languages. The deep structure, meaning, is behind the surface structure. One thing is used as the base of translation into other languages is meaning. It is also assumed that meaning is not organized in the same way the surface structure is arranged. It is a system of semantic units and relations between these units. These units, relations, and conventions are used as a guide that helps the translator (Larson, 1984:26).

Meaning is of different types in translation. There are denotation (also called denotative, referential, or extensional meaning) and connotation (or connotative, emotive, or expressive meaning). Newmark (1991:28) assorts three main kinds of meaning: cognitive, communicative, and associative that are normally used in any translation. The cognitive meaning means what has been said in true; the communicative meaning that the writer or speaker is asking for the reader's or listener's approval or mere attention; and the associative meaning means that the writer or speaker is on familiar or fairly 'symmetrical' terms with the reader or listener.

*7.2 **The syntactic level***

A lot of structures come to be ungrammatical, but totally comprehensible when it is translated by a beginner which can be justifiable only if the translator intentionally confirms that it is valuable to the grammar of the TL. The SL structure which exists is important but it is less common in the target language than the source language. The commonest syntactical mistake is when the translator ignores the distinguishing features of his/her language's grammar (Newmark, 1991:83).

One of the confusing matters of the grammatical terminology is that the possessive construction of English rarely refers to real possession. The phrase 'his house' may refer to any place that a person normally lives in, whether his own or not. In the case of 'his leg', the

meaningful relation is more complicated. It is actually part of the person and not a thing that is sold or bought. (Nida, 2001:53). addressers of some languages reject translating phrases literally as 'his God', because they think that nobody can own God, in spite of their being 'worship God' or 'trust God' (Nida, 2001:54).

Many translators who have no experience think of grammatical words to be nouns, verbs, adjectives, adverbs, prepositions, conjunctions, …etc. They sometimes suppose that if the translation to be faithful they have to conform to the receptor language. That is, nouns should be translated by nouns, verbs by verbs, adjectives by adjectives, and such a process leads to unnaturalness and even impairment of meaning in a receptor language. Those classes are based on the words' forms and their divisions in sentences (Nida, 2001:55).

It is better for translators to focus on referential classes of words than on the formal distributional features since that forces them to think of what is actually happens in a text. It also works as a tool for unpacking some of the complicated combinations of words through which content could be transmitted to a language in which the same content may have different grammatical order (Nida, 2001:56).

7.3 The lexical level

The lexical overlapping is more serious than grammatical interference. That is because lexical interference may corrupt the sentence's meaning while the grammatical one is normally stylistic. Its clearest form is the faux ami in which both source and target languages contain thousands of Greco-Latinisms that give a second meaning in another language (Newmark, 1991:83).

A great number of the plain literal meaning of a text is carried by the conformation of words and phrases. As a result, part of interpreting any text requires translating the literal meaning carried by its grammatical structure. A TT has to be formed by placing words into grammatical forms according to the structures and conventions of TL and by using lexical items found in the TL (Hervey and Higgins, 2002:58).

Jakobson discusses the delicate problem of equivalence in meaning between words in different languages. He states that "there is ordinarily no full equivalent between code-units". It is not easy for the message to be 'equivalent' in ST and TT, the 'code unit' will be different since they related to two different languages. Jakobson borders on the problem of equivalence with the following definition: "Equivalence in difference is the cardinal problem of language and the pivotal concern of linguistics". In Jakobson's discussion, the problem of meaning and

equivalence confirms the discrepancy in structure and terminology rather than on any language's ability to render a message written in another verbal language (Munday, 2008:38).

According to Larson (1984:177) any text should contain key words which are crucial to the theme under discussion. The translator has to find them and use single receptor language lexical items on each occurrence of them.

8. Context

According to Nida (2001) there are two types of contexts:

A. Syntactic contexts:

This type confirms that the role of the context is of greater importance than the role of any central element. That indicates that context supplies more distinctive to the meaning than the term analyzed. An obvious example is the verb 'run' which has different meaning in different contexts.

If one investigates the meaning of contexts such as 'the boy was running' and 'the horse was running'. The feet's motion is different from that of bipeds, but there are repeated cases where on foot is in touch with the surface (Nida, 2001: 31 – 32).

But 'run' may occur in very different contexts. For example, the clock is running, the heart is running, the machine is running, and the car is running. These sentences contain different kinds internal, and sometimes mechanized running, as in the case of the last sentence. The reference is not to the movement of the car but the movement of the engine which is left running (Nida, 2001: 33).

B. Paradigmatic context:

Here, it is crucial to decide the meaning of expressions on the basis of contrasts and comparisons with the related words' meaning within the same paradigmatic set, for example, talk, whisper, babble, murmur, stutter, sing, hum. All of the terms are related to the same field of noise produced by speech organs, but each has a specific meaning, depending on features as verbalization, musical pitch, repetition and voicelessness (Nida, 2001: 36).

Crystal (2003:103) defines context as "a general term used in linguistics as phonetics to refer to specific parts of an utterance (or text) near or adjacent to a unit which is the focus of attention. The occurrence of unit (e.g. a sound, word) is partly or wholly determined by its context, which is specified in terms of the unit's relations, i. e., the other features with which it combines as a sequence. The everyday sense of the term is related to this, as when one 'puts a word in context' (contextualizes), in order to clarify the meaning intended, as in dictionary

entries. Providing a context in this way is referred to as contextualization words, it is suggested, have meaning only when seen in context.

9. The difficulties of translation of Islamic texts:

The Qur'ān and Prophetic Traditions are Arabic texts and the repeated question, how the Qur'ān and Prophetic Traditions should be known to those who do not understand it, is argued since time. in the early day of Islam some Arab Muslims had the opinion that the Qur'ān was addressed to them. They did not intend that non-Arabs need not notice God's message. Yet, these groups should have observed the uncorrupted version of the revelation that have been directed to them (McAuliffe, 2006: 154).

There are two reasons why a total solution was not found to this problem. The first one is the doctrine of the inimitability of the Qur'ān was correlated with a belief in the singular properties of Arabic. The Qur'ān was considered to display and employ all the superior characteristics of the Arabic language and thus it could not be interpreted in another language, as the Torah and Psalms had been rendered into Arabic. The second reason is that Arabic word for 'translation' (tarjama) seemingly meant literal translation. If someone was able to translate the Qur'ān literally, a translation which exposed all the subtle ties of the original Arabic text, then the miracle of Qur'ān would be equaled. That is impossible because the Qur'ān announces.

The solutions were found and many translations by Muslims and non-Muslims have been made. If the translation could be regarded as a commentary, that was not meant to duplicate the original text, but only to serve understanding, then it was allowed. Muhammad Al – Zurqānī stated that the translation of the Qur'ān in the sense of a rendering of all its meanings and intentions is impossible. It should never been attempted whether it is assumed to be a literal or an explanatory translation. The translator might not seek to find the equivalent of the Qur'ān but the equivalent of the tafsīr of the Qur'ān and that it is permitted because it does not seek to be a replacement of the original text (McAuliffe, 2006: 155 - 156).

10. Data analysis:

This sub-section deals with the translation of some Ayās of the Glorious Qur'ānand Prophetic Traditions. Here, they will be studied and analyzed according to different levels.

10.1   Sample one:

"ذَلِكَ وَمَنْ يُعَظِّمْ شَعَائِرَ اللهِ فَإِنَّها مِنْ تَقْوَى الْقُلُوبِ" (Al-Hajj: 32)

" ThālikawamanyuadhamShaā'r Allah Fa'nahā min TaqwaAlquoob" Al-Hajj: 32

1. *"Thus it is [what has been mentioned in the above said Verses (27, 28, 29, 30, 31) is an obligation that mankind owes to Allah]. And whosoever honours the Symbols of Allah, then it is truly from the piety of the heart".*

(Al-Hilāli and Khan, 2011: 446)

2. " All that; and whosoever venerates God's Waymarks, that is of the godliness of the hearts" (Arberry 2003:441)

Interpretation:

It is obvious that the translator has tried his best to convey the message into the TL as nearly as possible to that of the SL. The key word in this verse (Ayā) is (Shaā'r) which can be translated differently by the translators. The first translator translates (Shaā'r) as 'symbols' while there are many lexical items can be used to translate this differently such as 'waymarks'wich is translated by the second translator. They are lexically two different meanings, as 'symbol' or 'sign' refers to an abstract mark which represents something. 'Waymark' refers to a concrete sign which can be seen and felt. The accuracy of the translators will certainly depend on the knowledge of the translator in the exegesis (Tafsīr of the Glorious Qur'ān). This is clarifies the difficulty on lexical level.

Consider another lexical item, in translating the word (Taqwa) as 'piety', while it can be translated differently as 'godliness'. It seems that for many translators and as it is plain through this example as well as the meaning of the word 'piety' is that this word is more appropriate than godliness.

The word (yuadham) is translated here in different ways. It can be translated as 'honours', or 'venerates' or as 'magnifies'. That shows the different dependence and understanding of the Qur'ānic text. Thus, it is necessary to have a linguistic knowledge and to study the text accurately to specify the exact equivalent for this lexical item.

10.2   Sample two:

" قَالَ رَبِّ إِنِّي وَهَنَ الْعَظْمُ مِنِّي وَاشْتَعَلَ الرَّأْسُ شَيْبًا وَلَمْ أَكُن بِدُعَائِكَ رَبِّ شَقِيًّا ". (Maryam: 4).

" Qāl   Rabi IneeWahanaAl'adhmu mini Waishta'lAlr'suShaibaWalamAkunBiduā'ka Rabi Shaqiya"Maryam: 4

1. *"He said: My Lord! Indeed my bones have grown feeble, and grey hair has spread on my head, and I have never been unblest in my invocation to You, O my Lord ".*

(Al-Hilāli and Khan, 2011:402)

2. "saying, O my Lord, behold the bones within me are feeble and my head is all aflame
    with hoariness And in calling on Thee, my Lord, I have never been hitherto
    unprosperous" (Arberry 2003:399)

Interpretation:

In this text, one can see that (Ishta'l / burn) is a lexical item that is used metaphorically, it is
implicit metaphor. Here the intended meaning is not " burn" . it is a stylistic used. According
to the text, the translator needs to use the different strategies to clarify the intended meaning,
thus, the first translator identifies the intended meaning by defining and paraphrasing in
addition to use the strategy of acculturation in a try to transfer the target meaning. So that the
translator use the word spread instead of the word burn. The text is understood by the
addressees, whereas the second translator use the phrase ''all inflame''. this is a literal
translation which does not convey the intended meaning of the source text.

10.3   Sample three:

11. " قال النبي (صلى الله عليه وسلم): إذا كانَ يَوْمُ الجُمُعَةِ، كانَ علَى كُلِّ بابٍ مِن أبْوابِ المَسْجِدِ مَلائِكَةٌ يَكْتُبُونَ الأوَّلَ
فالأوَّلَ، فإذا جَلَسَ الإمامُ طَوَوُا الصُّحُفَ، وجاؤُوا يَسْتَمِعُونَ الذِّكْرَ".

"QālAnnabiSalaAllahuAliyhiWasalam: IthāKānYaoomAljum'aKānAlaKuliBāb   min
AbuābAlmasjidMalā'kaYa'ktuboonAl'awalFalawalFathāJalasaAlimāmTaoo   As-
SuhfWajā'ooYastami'oonAth-thikir"

1. *" The prophet (*SalaAllahuAliyhiWasalam *)said " on every Friday the angles take their
    stand at every gate of the mosque to write the name of people chronologically (i.e.
    according to time of their arrival for Friday prayer) , and when the Imam sits (on the
    pulpit) they fold up their scrolls and get ready to listen Duiker" (Khan, 1996:644).*

2. *The Messenger of Allah said " when it is Friday, the angels stand at every door of the
    mosque and write down the names in order of their arrival. When the Imam sits (on
    the pulpit for delivering the Khutabah, they fold up their sheets (record book) and
    listen to the Dhikr*. **(Al-Mundhiri,2000:237)**

    Interpretation:

            In this text, the first translator follows different strategies to avoid the
    difficulties of the test. In the source text (IthāKānYaoomAljum'a)"if it is Friday" , but

the translator use another way to translate this syntactic structure by using different strategy to covey the intended meaning " on every Friday" . The translator uses a paraphrasing strategy in addition to adding the word "every" which is not exist in the source text. Another difficulty appears in this text, the syntactic structure of the source text (Al'awalFalawal) here it is not clear if it is translated literally, thus, the translator adopts strategy of definition and addition to avoid this problem, he adds " (i.e. according to time of their arrival for Friday prayer)"

The second translator adopts different strategy, for the first part " it is Friday" the translator adopts literal translation, while in second part (Al'awalFalawal) , the translator uses the communicative translation in a try to give the intended meaning.

11.Conclusions

The two languages (English and Arabic)are of different families. Thus, it is absolutely expected to have differences in different levels (syntactic semantic levels) the translators should be aware about their translation especially translators of Islamic Texts.

Translation of the Islamic texts is vary important because millions of non-Arab people need to know and understand the Islamic texts (Qur'ānic and Prophetic Traditions) . Such translation even if not impossible but it is really uneasy task for any translator. The translators should be aware of the Arabic language, its structure, linguistic properties, and history, and for surely the exegesis of the Qur'ān And Hadith (Prophetic Traditions). The translators should also know more about its culture, the lexical, syntactic and semantic levels in order to be able to produce an accurate translation. Because the Islamic texts are sacred, so no one can render its texts into any other language completely. The solution is made by the scholars of Islam which requires the translation of the exegesis (Tafsīr) or meaning of the Glorious Qur'ān Al-Hadith (Prophetic Traditions). The rhetoric of the language of Qur'ān and Prophetic Traditions makes the task harder. The translator must know a great deal of this language to be able to transfer it correctly.

References

Arberry, Arthur J. (2003): Holy Qur'an. Iraq : Ansariyan Publications.

Al-Hilali, M. T. and Khan, M. M. (2007): Translation of the Meaning of the Noble Qur'ān in the English Language. Al-Madinah Al-Munawwarah: King Fahad Complex for the Printing the GloriousQur'ān.

Al-Hilali, M. T. and Khan, M. M. (2011): Translation of the Meaning of the Noble Qur'ān in the English Language. Al-Madinah Al-Munawwarah: King Fahad Complex for the Printing the HolyQur'ān.

Al-Mundhiri, Al-Hafiz Zakiuddin (2000): Summarized Sahih Muslim. Riyadh: Darussalam Publications.

Al-Samarrai, SaifHabeeb (2011). Syndeton and asyndeton in the Glorious Quran With reference to their Realization in English. (unpublished M.A. thesis). University of Tikrit.

Colina, Sonia (2015). Fundamentals of Translation. UK: Cambridge University Press.

Crystal. D. (2003). A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics. London: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Hatim, B. and Munday, J. (2004): Translation. London: Routledge.

Hervey, Sandor G. J.; Higgins Ian (2002): Thinking Translation. London: Taylor and Francis. Routledge.

Ilyas, Asim Ismail (1989). Theories of Translation. Musel : University house for printing, publication and translation.

Jaber, I. N. (2010): Translating the Genre of Qur'ān: the Challenge of Translating the Inimitable. Baghdad: Journal of the College of Education for Women: vol. 21 (4).

Khan, MuhammedMuhsin (1996). Sahih Al-Bukhari, Riyah: Dar-us-Salam.

Larson, Mildred L. (1984): Meaning-based Translation. London: University Press of America.

McAuliffe, Jane D. (2006): The Cambridge Companion to the Qur'ān. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.

Munday, J. (2008): Introducing Translation Studies. London: Routledge.

Munday, J. (2009): The Routledge Companion to Translation Studies. London and New York.

Newmark, P. (1988): A Textbook of Translation. London: Prentice Hall Int. Ltd.

Newmark, P. (1991): *About Translation Multilingual Matters*.

Nida, Eugene A. (2001): Contexts in Translating. Philadelphia: Benjamins Translations Library.

Riccardi, A. (2008): Transaltion Studies. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.

Sirriyya, Sawsan, Salih (2009): Translation Islamic Religious Texts into English. Damascus: Yatub House for Publishing and distributing.

Venuti, L. (2004): The Translation Studies Reader. London: Routledge.