



Makale / Article

Makale Gnderim Tarihi: 7 Mart 2020
Makale Kabul Tarihi: 6 Haziran 2020

Handling Some Linguistic Problems in adith Translation by Reference to Venuti's Domestication and Foreignization Strategies

Mohammad Sa'id Mitwally Alrahawan*

zet

Bu makale, Muhsin Khan'ın *Sahih-i Buhari* tercemesini Lawrence Venuti'nin yerelleřtirme ve yabancılařtırma stratejileri iřığında eleřtirel bir bakıř aısı ile incelemektedir. Makale, 'yerelleřtirme' veya 'yabancılařtırma'nın hedef kitlenin kltrel arka planı, evirinin hedefi ve orijinal metnin mesajı gibi belirli etkenlere gre mtercimin tercihine kaldıđı varsayımından hareketle, bu tr stratejilerin Khan tarafından uygulanabilirliđini ve onun uygulamasının yeterliđini test etmeyi amalamaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Hadis, eviri, *Sahih-i Buhari*, Venuti, yabancılařtırma, yerelleřtirme.

Abstract

This paper provides a critical review of Khan's translation of *Şahih al-Bukhārī* in light of Lawrence Venuti's" strategies of 'domestication' versus 'foreignization'. It aims at testing the applicability and adequacy of using such strategies by Khan, based on the assumption that opting for either 'domestication' or 'foreignization' is left to the discretion of the translator according to specific factors such as the background of his readership, the goal of the target text and the message of the source text.

Keywords: adith, translation, Şahih al-Bukhārī, Venuti, foreignization, domestication.

* Assoc. Prof., Department of Orientalism, Taibahu University, Medina; Dept. of Islamic Studies in English Faculty of Languages and Translation, Al-Azhar University, Egypt, msaid42@hotmail.com, orcid.org/ orcid.org/0000-0002-9240-0110.

** Larry Venuti, professor of English at Temple University, USA, is a translation theorist and historian as well as a translator.

1. Introduction

This paper provides a critical review of Muhsin Khan's¹ translation of *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* in light of Lawrence Venuti's strategies of 'domestication' versus 'foreignization'.² It aims at testing the applicability and adequacy of using such strategies by Khan, based on the assumption that opting for either 'domestication' or 'foreignization' is left to the discretion of the translator according to specific factors such as the background of his readership, the goal of the target text and the message of the source text. There are two reasons for choosing Khan's translation of Bukhārī. The first reason is that Khan's translation is the only complete translation of Bukhārī which has been published. There are other translations which are either incomplete like that of Mo ammad Asad or unpublished translations which are currently subject for modification such as Aishah Belew's translation of Bukhari which is only available at the internet. The second reason is that Khan showed overindulgence in providing interruptive brackets, explanations, footnotes which are mostly deemed to show an intensive dominance of the Arabic source in his translation. It made his translation an ideal experimental material to justify his recourse to those techniques to support his reader with explanations of this classical text.

Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī is a compilation of ḥadīth literature which contains myriads of ḥadīths originally compiled and transmitted in oral tradition, some of them are of literary nature including narratives which are rich mines of salient cultural and linguistic features while others are legal dicta of a persuasive authority. It further includes Prophetic exegeses of certain verses of the Qur'an and historical chronology of the early genesis of Islam and the life of Prophet Muḥammad.

2. The Research Method

In this critical review, I will use Venuti's strategies which primarily rely on his basic dichotomy between "foreignization" and "domestication". Venuti draws on Schleiermacher's notion on translation in the early 19th century when he proposes two alternative strategies for a translator: the translator can take the reader to the author, or bring the author to the reader. They refer to two techniques of translation later coined by Venuti; a translation, which 'domesticates' and a translation, which 'foreignizes' respectively.

-
- 1 Muhammad Muhsin Khan, born 1927 CE, is a Pashtun author known for his English translations of *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* and the Qur'an, titled *The Noble Qur'an*, which he completed along with Muhammad Taqi-ud-Din al-Hilali. Khan is neither a native speaker of Arabic, nor English. He received a degree in Surgery from the University of Punjab and worked in the Ministry of Health in KSA for 15 years. His work at the Islamic university was in the medical field and he spent his entire life as a physician.
 - 2 Lawrence Venuti, *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation* (London and New York: Routledge, 1995).

According to Venuti, domestication refers to “an ethnocentric reduction of the foreign text to target-language cultural values, bring the author back home,” while foreignization is “an ethnodeviant pressure on those (cultural) values to register the linguistic and cultural difference of the foreign text, sending the reader abroad.”³ On ethical grounds he elaborated in his *The Translator's Invisibility*, Venuti is against domestication, and for foreignization,

Venuti indicates that translation approaches “involve the basic tasks of choosing the foreign text to be translated and developing a method to translate it.”⁴ By employing the concepts of domesticating and foreignizing, Venuti envisions a strategy for a translation; a method which tends to emphasize the significance of cultural variances in a source text. It comes through the following sub-norms:

1. A ‘deliberate inclusion of foreignizing elements’.⁵ These ‘norms’ include linguistic elements that endorse foreignization in a TL. They adhere to the ST structure and syntax (e.g. the adjunct positions in the first sentence), as well as the calques and the archaic structure.⁶ All those elements were utilized by Venuti in his own translation of works by the nineteenth-century Italian Tarchetti. Venuti used both archaisms and colloquialisms in addition to British spelling to clash his reader with a ‘heterogeneous discourse’, which are all of a crucial impact to make translation traces visible.

2. A translator’s choice of a foreign text and the invention of translation discourses. A foreignizing translator can use “a discursive strategy that deviates from the prevailing hierarchy of dominant discourses (e.g. dense archaism), but also by choosing to translate a text that challenges the contemporary canon of foreign literature in the target language.”⁷ Venuti refers to Pound’s,⁸ departure from modern English to Anglo-Saxon text to imitate its “compound words, alliteration and accentual meter.”⁹ He cites Pound, Newman and himself as examples of foreignizing translators. Archaism seems to be a major feature of this strategy.¹⁰

3. Foreignization is further discerned, according to Venuti, by retention of

3 Venuti, *The Translator's Invisibility*, 20.

4 Lawrence Venuti, *The Scandals of Translation: Towards an Ethics of Differences* (London and New York: Routledge, 1998), 240.

5 J. Munday, *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications* (New York: Routledge, 2001), 147.

6 Venuti, *The Scandals of Translation*, 16-17.

7 Venuti, *The Translator's Invisibility*, 148, 310.

8 Ezra Pound, *Literary Essays* (New York: New Directions and London: Faber and Faber, 1954).

9 Venuti, *The Translator's Invisibility*, 34.

10 Venuti, *The Translator's Invisibility*, 195.

the linguistic and cultural features of the source texts; what Jean-Jacques Lecercle calls 'remainder'.¹¹ They include "regional or group dialects, jargons, clichés and slogans, stylistic innovations, archaisms, neologisms" (470-71). Xianbin explains these markers further to include "technical terminologies ... and literary figures like metaphor." (2).¹²

3. Domestication and Foreignization of Khan's Translation of *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*

3.1. Syntactic Elements

Ḥadīth discourse has a unique syntactic structure which has an impact on meaning.¹³ According to Venuti, a translator is presumed to be "faithful to the foreign" text's syntactic structures by showing its foreign elements.¹⁴ In a foreignizing translation, "the translator disrupts the linguistic and genre expectations of the target language in order to mark the otherness of the translated text."¹⁵ Domestication of syntactic structures may be discerned through 'rationalization'; a negative tendency coined by Berman referring to affecting syntactic structures of the original by "reordering its rambling sentences through punctuation and sentence order."¹⁶ By reviewing Khan's translation, we could identify the following syntactic features, which are peculiar to Arabic.

3.1.1. Verb-Subject-Object Sentence Order

In linguistic typology, classical Arabic is generally described as being VSO, with an alternative SVO order. Khan shows his adherence to Arabic syntactic structures by favoring the Arabic verb-subject-object. Throughout his translation he prefaces ḥadīth s with the structure (V-S-O) as in the phrase, "Narrated Sa'īd b. Jubair: Ibn 'Abbās in the explanation of the Statement of Allah (ﷺ) ...", which he rendered as a translation for the Arabic, "قَالَ: حَدَّثَنَا سَعِيدُ بْنُ جُبَيْرٍ، عَنِ ابْنِ عَبَّاسٍ فِي قَوْلِهِ تَعَالَى:"

11 Venuti, *The Translator's Invisibility*, 470-71.

12 He based himself on Venuti's email to a Chinese postgraduate student named Ma Jia (Eddie) on December 2, 2002. He referred to the url: <http://tscn.tongtu.net/>, as viewed on 2003-11-12 for a full text of the email but I could not find it.

13 Some grammarians do not lend credence to using ḥadīth as a source in the realm of syntax, for the sole reason that it was not transmitted verbatim but their view has been countered by the argument that certain Prophetic traditions were transmitted verbatim particularly those concise phrases of succinct style. Proponents of using ḥadīth as a reference source in syntax further propose that the early first and second Islamic centuries witnessed prominence in Arabic language and rhetoric which were exemplified in narrations attributed to Prophet Muhammad.

14 Venuti, *The Translator's Invisibility*, 5.

15 Kjetil Myskja, "Foreignisation and resistance: Lawrence Venuti and his critics", *Nordic Journal of English Studies*, 12: 2 (2013), 3.

16 Antoine Berman, "Translation and the Trials of the Foreign", *The Translation Studies Reader*, ed L. Venuti (New York: Routledge, 1985), 288.

(Bukhārī 1: 6). He consistently follows this reversed order of structure at the outset of each report. He deliberately includes these ungrammatical foreign syntactic elements in his translation. Poucke “measures” this level of translation as “strong foreignization.”¹⁷

3.1.2. Non-Regular Use of Pronouns and Prepositions

It is a metalinguistic feature for Arabic verbs to assimilate various meanings in specific syntactic and stylistic cases; commonly known as *taḍmīn*. It is shown at the syntactic, stylistic and semantic levels. In syntax, Ibn Jinnī defines *taḍmīn* as a “verb implying the meaning of another verb, when each verb is connected to the regularly used preposition of the other.”¹⁸ This is however an approximate coinage of the definition maintained by Arabic Language Assembly, Cairo.¹⁹ An example of syntactic *taḍmīn* is the use of the pronoun ‘*man*’ (من) in the Prophet’s saying: “فَمَنْ وَفَىٰ مِنْكُمْ فَأَجْرُهُ عَلَى اللَّهِ وَمَنْ أَصَابَ مِنْ ذَلِكَ شَيْئًا فَعُوقِبَ بِهِ، فَهُوَ كَفَّارَتُهُ، وَمَنْ أَصَابَ مِنْ ذَلِكَ شَيْئًا، فَسْتَرَهُ، فَسْتَرَهُ اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ، إِنْ شَاءَ عَفَرَ لَهُ، وَإِنْ شَاءَ عَذَّبَهُ”

It is primarily classified as a relative pronoun but, by virtue of *taḍmīn*, it additionally functions as a conditional noun. This is the reason we had two various translations of the text: Khan renders it as solely implying the former meaning, “And whoever among you and whoever commits, and whoever commits...”, while Belwey (Bukhārī H6402)²⁰ renders it as a conditional noun, “If any of you”. In this ḥadīth, I believe that Belwey’s translation reveals peculiar syntactic features of the source text. Throughout Bukhārī ‘*man*’ grammatically functions as a relative pronoun and a conditional noun simultaneously. In most cases Khan and Belwey favor rendering it as a relative pronoun such as in (Khan 1:81; Belwey H103), (Khan 1:83; Belwey H110). We can safely say that the majority of their renderings of ‘*man*’ do not reflect the salient feature of the source text’s peculiar structure.

Furthermore, *taḍmīn* is extended to include a non-regular use of prepositions, such as ibn Mas’ūd’s saying, (كَانَ النَّبِيُّ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ يَتَّخِذُنَا بِالْمَوْعِظَةِ فِي الْأَيَّامِ، كَرَاهَةَ السَّامَةِ عَلَيْهِ). The noun ‘السامة’ is regularly connected with the preposition ‘من’, not ‘على’. When the regular preposition is substituted, it implies boredom and stressful difficulty. Khān does not draw a reader’s attention to this implication in his translation. He

17 Piet Van Poucke, “Domestication and foreignization in translation studies”, *TransUD-Arbeiten zur Theorie und Praxis des Übersetzens und Dolmetschens*, 2012, 141.

18 Ibn Jinnī, Abū al-Faṭḥ ‘Uthmān al-Mūsilī, *Al-Khaṣā’iṣ* (Al-Hay’ah al-‘Ammah al-Miṣriyyah li al-Kitāb, n.d.), 2: 507.

19 Yāsīn Abū al-Hayjā, *Mazāhir at-Tajdīd an-nahwī ladā Majma‘ al-Lughah al-‘Arabiyyah fī al-Qāhira* (‘Alām al-Kutub al-Ḥadīth, 2008), 17.

20 Belwey’s translation is only available online: <http://bewley.virtualave.net> (accessed 25 April 2015). Since it is has not been published in print, I use ḥadīth numbers in my quotations.

renders it as “The Prophet (ﷺ) used to take care of us in preaching by selecting a suitable time, so that we might not get bored.” (Bukhārī, 1:60). Other translators of Bukhārī could not render *taḍmīn* implied by this word. Belewly renders it as ‘not wanting it to become boring for us’. Such is the case of Khaṭṭāb (Tirmidhī 4:197). I presume a foreginizing translator may reflect the meaning of boredom and stress by rendering it as, “lest it should lay aggravating boredom on us”.

In Bukhārī (1:7), Heraclius is reported as saying, “وَلَوْ كُنْتُ عِنْدَهُ لَعَسَلْتُ عَنْ قَدَمَيْهِ”. The verb ‘*ghasala*’ is transitive which requires a direct object. It is not used with a preposition. A non-regular use of the verb with a preposition adds a connotation. Instead of rendering it ‘wash his feet’ as Khan does, it means ‘wash off his feet in reverence’ (Ibn Ḥajar 2:16). Similarly, the verb ‘يعود’ is used with the preposition ‘إلى’. When it is used with ‘في’ in the Prophet’s saying, “وَأَنْ يَكْرَهُ أَنْ يَعُودَ فِي الْكُفْرِ” the meaning changes. Khan renders it as ‘to revert to disbelief’ though it is supposed to mean ‘to revert and stabilize in disbelief.’²¹

Overlooking *taḍmīn* in some cases led to fatal mistranslations of texts such as the use of ‘إلى’ in the context of the statement, “فَإِنَّا نَرَىٰ وَجْهَهُ وَنَصِيبُحَنَّهُ إِلَى الْمُنَافِقِينَ” makes the translation of Khan “but we have always seen him mixing with hypocrites and giving them advice” seem different from Ibn Ḥajar’s explanation of the verb to be “we see his favoritism and his loyalty to the hypocrites”.²²

In conclusion, Khan could not reflect *taḍmīn* in his translation of Bukhārī either due to the difficulty of introducing readable English equivalent that makes his style fluent or due to his too literal translation of the Arabic text.

3. 2. Lexical Elements

3.2.1. Lexical Archaism

Venuti regards a dense use of archaic lexical items as part of ‘a discursive strategy’ to evade prevalence of a domestic discourse.²³ Khān sticks to a dense use of archaic words in his translation. Sometimes his recourse to archaism does not maintain an adequate choice for foreignization. It sometimes causes inconsistency or a mistranslation. For instance, he dominantly uses the word ‘apostle’ in reference to Prophet Muhammad, in almost 6408 occurrences. Though he is much allergic to all biblical terms of loaded cultural variations, Khān uses the word in its inappropriate meaning. In the Bible, an ‘*apostle*’ refers to one of the twelve disciples chosen by Christ to preach his gospel (Elwell ‘Apostle’). Most other translators of ḥadīth refer to ‘*rasūl*’ as Messenger and to ‘*nabiyy*’ as

21 Ibn Ḥajar, *Fatḥ al-Bārī sharḥ Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* (Beirut: Dār al-Ma’rifah, 1379 AH), 1: 62.

22 Ibn Ḥajar, *Fatḥ al-Bārī*, 1: 522.

23 Venuti, *The Translator’s Invisibility*, 148.

a 'Prophet'. Capitalization may refer to an underlying foreignization of the text without recourse to the biblical term.

Furthermore, an extravagant use of exotic terms may show the text as a mystery, especially when Khan uses transliteration for words which have English equivalent without being of cultural significance, but to obscure the meaning, such as his rendering of the phrase:

يَمْرُقُونَ مِنَ الدِّينِ مُرُوقَ السَّهْمِ مِنَ الرَّمِيَّةِ، فَيَنْظُرُ الرَّمَامِي إِلَى سَهْمِهِ إِلَى نَضْلِهِ إِلَى رِصَافِهِ، فَيَتَمَارَى فِي الْمُرُوقَةِ، هَلْ عَلِقَ بِهَا مِنَ
الدَّمِ شَيْءٌ

[They] will go out of their religion as an arrow darts through the game, whereupon the archer may look at his arrow, its Nasl at its Risaf and its Fuqa to see whether it is blood-stained or not (i.e. they will have not even a trace of Islam in them)

3.2.2. 'Conventional' and 'Loaded' Proper Nouns

According to Hermens, proper nouns are categorized into conventional and 'Loaded names'.²⁴ The former seem 'unmotivated', while the latter 'motivate' for translation and range from faintly 'suggestive' to overtly 'expressive' names and nicknames.²⁵ Some historical names like prophets, saints and kings mentioned in the bible are examples of 'loaded' proper nouns. A translator of ḥadīth has two opposing strategies of rendering them to English readers: either to present them in their biblical forms or to adapt a pre-established translation norm such as orthographic adaptation. For example, a Muslim translator of ḥadīth looks at David as a biblical historical figure with its Judaic associations including biblical passages as (2 Sam. 11:2-27) which conflict with Muslim perspective of Prophets' infallibility. A translator usually resorts to transcription or transliteration to introduce Islamic ideological perspective associated with Dāwūd; the infallible Prophet. Khan opts for the latter to emphasize Muslim ethnocentric attitude. Moreover, the name 'Eve' is loaded with religious associations such as the Judo-Christian concept of original sin while Ḥawwā' is an Islamic form associated with the Qur'anic verse; "no bearer of burdens will bear the burden of another" (Qur'an 6: 164).²⁶ Such is the case of Jesus who is depicted as 'son of God' versus Isā who is rendered as 'God's slave and servant' (Qur'an 19: 30).

The problem of rendering historical names is a reiteration of the heated argument raised on how 'English Christian names should be translated'²⁷ into

24 Theo Hermans, "On Translating Proper Names, with Reference to *De Witte* and *Max Havelaar*." *Modern Dutch Studies*, ed. Michael Wintle (London: Athlone, 1988), 12.

25 Hermans, "On Translating Proper Names", 12.

26 In quoting English translation of the Qur'an, I used Umm Muhammad Aminah Assami's *Sahih International Quran Translation* (Saudi Arabia: Dār Abdulqāsim, 2005).

27 J. F. Aixelá, "Culture-specific Items in Translation", in *Translation, Power, Subversion*,

Spanish; an argument which lasted for fifty years and found its ramifications in translations of Shakespearean's names. In ḥadīth discourse rendering those names in their biblical forms does not necessarily require a tacit approval of all ideological bearings of the name, but they still pose an anticipated dominance of the target text's culture. Foreignizing those names by the adoption of orthographic forms proves fidelity to the translated text. Sometimes domestication is preferable in order not to alienate the name in such cases, because it reflects the perspective of different religions or cultures to the same person.

3.2.3. Technical Terms

In his translation of Bukhārī, Khan is very conservative in presenting Islamic technical terms in orthographic forms. He does not adopt English coinages or spelling forms in modern English dictionaries. Terms like *salah*, *hajj*, which became parts of contemporary English dictionaries are rendered by Khan as *ṣalāh* and *ḥajj*. He still uses them as foreign elements inserted at the text. It stems from his conviction that Muslim *ṣalāh* is different from Christian prayers. Foreignization by the adoption of transliteration becomes inevitable when it relates to terms like *jihad*, which has cultural associations.

Khan further resorts to 'clarification' in translating the Arabic word '*an-Nāmūs*' in the report, "هَذَا النَّامُوسُ الَّذِي نَزَلَ اللَّهُ عَلَى مُوسَى". Khān domesticates it by rendering it in an explanatory translation, "This is the same one who keeps the secrets (angel Gabriel)". Belewiy refers to orthographic adaptation by rendering it as "Namus" and then designating it as Gabriel (H3). The reason Khan refers to 'clarification' is the absence of an English equivalent of the word. The only available equivalent for this word is '*nomos*,' which refers in Greek mythology to "the daemon of laws and ordinance" (Collins "nomos"), but it may be branded as a 'qualitative impoverishment'.

The problem of translating technical terms of Bukhārī arises when Khan attempts to domesticate the text to seem logical and fluent for English readers. The reason is that most of Khan's clarifications are based on his own interpretation of the text or on commentaries of earlier exegetes. For example, 'a pledge of allegiance to this Prophet' is further defined as '(i.e. embrace Islam).' (Bukhārī 1: 7). Some of Khan's clarifications are redundant and ascertain that one reads a commentary domesticated to be instructive and informative. Berman calls this an 'empty' expansion, which "adds nothing, that it augments only the gross mass of the text."²⁸ Berman criticizes disruptive additions to the text which renders an elaborate explanation instead of a translation of the text. An example is Khan's explication of the essential pillars of Islam in brackets as, "To testify that there

ed. R. Álvarez and M.C. África Vidal (Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 1996), 59.

28 Berman, "Translation and the Trials of the Foreign", 290.

is no deity (owing the right to be worshipped) but Allah and that Muhammad is Allah's Messenger, to offer the (compulsory congregational) prayers dutifully and perfectly, to pay Zakat (i.e. obligatory charity), to perform Hajj. (i.e. Pilgrimage to Mecca)" (Bukhārī 1: 8).

Khan's intensive clarifications of technical terms led to an overall 'expansion' i.e. "translation tends to be longer than the original."²⁹ Khan provides elaborate explanations of most transliterated terms he introduces. For example, the word '*mabrūr*' is explained to be "(i.e. accepted by Allah, performed with the intention of seeking Allah's pleasure only and not to show off, without committing a sin and in accordance with the traditions of the Prophet)." (Bukhārī 1: 26). Extensive elaborations of Khan's translation exists in almost all of his translation and pose one of the critical points for his work. For example in the first volume, Khan provides more than 30 clarifications, most of which are redundant: (Bukhārī 1: 19, 26, 35, 38, 39, 89, 104, 124, 155; 166, 187; 197, 222, 226).

I believe an adequate strategy for translating Islamic technical terms of adīth consists in foreignizing those terms by the adoption of transliteration. A glossary of technical terms has to be supplemented at the end of a translated work or the technical meaning should be provided at least at footnotes.

3.2.4. Honorific Words

A translator may express a high degree of conservatism to the source text by rendering it in exotic form by either introducing it in its original script or by making 'orthographic adaptation,' 'where the original is expressed in different alphabet' by transcription or transliteration.³⁰ Khan prefers the use of Arabic honorific symbols following certain names in the body of his English text as an imitation of the Arabic source. For example, He suffixes certain names with honorific phrases expressed in Arabic script such as (ﷻ) 'Lord of majesty and Bounty', (ﷻ) 'the Mighty and Sublime' or (ﷻ) 'Glorified be He'. He further adds (ﷻ) 'blessings and peace be upon him', (ﷻ) 'may Allah be pleased with him', (ﷻ) 'May Allah be pleased with her' following names of Prophet Muhammad, a member of his male or female companions respectively. Honorific symbols pose a challenge for fluency especially for non-Arab readers or those unfamiliar with Arabic scripts. Khan does not render meanings of those symbols at the glossary of technical terms though he dominantly used them at his work. By using those honorific expressions, Khan affirms that they are of the type of invocations that have to be recited in Arabic sounds as they have originally been intended to be though a reader does not know how to articulate these phrases. Khan opts for a strategy, which follows Venut's emphasis on endorsing discursive foreign elements of the

29 Berman, "Translation and the Trials of the Foreign", 290.

30 Aixelá, "Culture-specific Items in Translation", 61.

source text, though it is not pragmatic in the translation of Ḥadīth.

3.2.5. Toponyms

Toponyms refer to various place names, proper names of the location, region or part of the Earth's surface with its natural and artificial features, e.g., City of God, Bara, Rio.³¹ Bukhārī includes numerous place names, which Khan renders in various strategies. First, he introduces toponyms in their Arabic transliterated forms adding notes to demarcate their recent political borders such as '*ash-Shām*,' which is rendered by Khan as 'Sham (Syria, Palestine, Lebanon and Jordan)' (Bukhārī 1: 7, 1: 108). Aixelá terms this 'extratextual gloss,' where an additional explanation is offered in the target text to clarify the meaning for the reader. Such explanations usually appear as footnotes, glossary items or detailed explanations in brackets.³² Second, Khan provides toponyms in orthographic forms without reference to their limits such as in (Bukhārī 1: 235; 2: 81; 2: 114; 2: 349). He further renders '*ash-Shām*' in (Bukhārī 1: 240) as referring to 'Jerusalem' while in (Bukhārī 1: 98) as 'Syria'.

Third, Khan domesticates a toponym by giving its English equivalent though it entails a cultural dominance of the target text. For example, Khan uses 'Mecca' and 'Medina' for names of the two holy cities though they have been objected by some Muslims to be misnomers of the proper Makkah and Madinah. Inconsistent renderings of toponyms make it difficult to determine Khan's strategy of translating them.

3.2.6. Anthroponyms

Anthroponyms include people's names and nicknames as well encompassing names that refer to regional background).³³ Like his translation of toponyms, Khan is inconsistent in adopting a definite strategy in translating anthroponyms. For example, he translates '*ar-Rūm*' as 'Romans' in (6: 273, 6: 282; 6: 331, 6: 335), while he uses 'Byzantines' in (Bukhārī 3: 387, 4: 116). A historical investigation may reveal anachronism. The problem lies in his references to peoples who still exist today. Though he manages to foreignize Yemenites (Bukhārī 4: 153) he fails to adopt the same strategy for 'Syrians' (Bukhārī 1: 140) and 'Ethiopians' (Bukhārī 1: 440). The latter can be easily foreignized by as 'Abyssinians'.

In conclusion, toponyms and anthroponyms may have English equivalents with a historical bearing. The most adequate strategy is to present them in their old English equivalents. Transliteration is the option for rendering toponyms and

31 E. Espindola, *The Use and Abuse of Subtitling as a Practice of Cultural Representation: Cidade de Deus and Boyz 'N the Hood* (Santa Catarina: Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina, 2006), 49-50.

32 Aixelá, "Culture-specific Items in Translation", 67.

33 Espindola, *The Use and Abuse of Subtitling*, 49-50.

anthronyms with no English equivalents or those whose English equivalents are of sensitive cultural problems.

3.3. Cultural Markers

Culture makers are signs of identity of a particular culture. They include as, Xianbin He quotes Venuti, “technical terminologies ... and literary figures like metaphor.”³⁴ They include ‘reminders’, a term Venuti borrowed from Lecercle to refer to elements that constitute a foreign element within the target cultures which can be used to mark the foreignness of a translated text.³⁵ A good translator, according to Venuti can “release the remainder by cultivating a heterogeneous discourse, opening up the standard dialect and literary canons to what is foreign to themselves, to the substandard and marginal.”³⁶

3.3.1. Figures of speech

The Collins English Dictionary defines figure of speech as “an expression such as a simile, in which words do not have their literal meaning, but are categorized as multi-word expressions that act in the text as units” (“figure”). Since Arabic figures of speech primarily rely on the process of migration from a primary meaning to a figurative connotation, it entails ambiguity, which undermines the clarity of a source text.

3.3.1.1. Euphemism

Euphemism, as Leech defines, is “the practice of referring to something offensive or delicate in terms that make it sound more pleasant or becoming than it really is.”³⁷ For the Prophet’s saying, “إن من شر الناس عند الله منزلة يوم القيامة الرجل يفضي إلى المرأة،” “وتفضي إليه ثم ينشر سرها” (Bukhārī 2: 399). The word ‘يفضي’ is a euphemism for ‘having sexual intercourse’. Khan translates it as, “escorts with his wife”. There are, however, three strategies for rendering this euphemism:

a. To translate it literally by reference to the lexical meaning of ‘*afḍa*’ i.e. to occupy the *faḍā*’ (place or space) of someone.³⁸ By following this technique, Siddiqi has deleted euphemism in his translation, “the man who goes to his wife and she goes to him” (Muslim 838).

b. To provide a literal translation of euphemism by including a non-

34 Xianbin He, “Foreignization/domestication and yihua/guihua: a contrastive study”, *Translation Journal* 9/2 (2005), 2, <http://www.bokorlang.com/journal/32foreignization.html> (accessed 5 May 2015).

35 Venuti, *The Scandals of Translation*, 11.

36 Venuti, *The Scandals of Translation*, 11.

37 Geoffrey N. Leech, *Principles of Pragmatics* (London and New York: Longman, 1983), 147.

38 E. W. Lane, *Arabic-English Lexicon* (Cambridge: The Islamic Texts Society, 1984), 2414.

euphemistic addition to the text like rendering the phrase as, 'to go to his wife [for carnal intercourse]'.
 c. To disregard euphemism by providing the intended meaning as the translator of Abū Dāwūd's *sunan* does, "a man who has intercourse with his wife" (Abū Dāwūd 5:298).

Khan's translation adopted foreignization by conveying the meaning in obscure terms without being literal. Khan applies different strategies in translating euphemism in Bukhārī.

Bukhārī relates the story of three men who took shelter in a cave where the rock blocked it and each one started to reiterate a sincere act that he offered for God. The second one reiterated his story with his cousin whom he seduced. When she agreed he was between her legs, she said, (أَتَى اللَّهَ وَلَا تَفْضَنَ حَتَمًا إِلَّا بِحَقِّهِ). I will compare five translations of this euphemism. Khan provides two translations; where he, at the first (Bukhārī 3: 229) translates it as "she asked me not to deflower her except rightfully (by marriage)". He provides an English euphemistic word with an equivalent meaning, but without providing a deep sense of obscurity as it appears in the original text. Aishah Belew imitates Khan to some extent, "Fear Allah and do not deflower without right" (Bukhārī H3278). It is a form of domestication. Khan provides another translation for the phrase, "It is illegal for you to outrage my chastity except by legitimate marriage." He creates a euphemistic expression not familiar in English by rendering the word 'khatam' as chastity. It does seem to equate with the Arabic elegant expression. Siddqui could grasp that elegance by his, "fear Allah and do not break the seal (of chastity) but by lawful means" (Muslim 1672). He provides a noun-euphemistic clarification, where he draws the text closer to the English reader to clarify the significance of the phrase. In his translation of *Riyāḍ aṣ-ṣāliḥīn*, Yusuf renders another variant of Bukhārī translation where he presented it as, "Fear Allah and do not break the seal unlawfully" (Nawawī 5). I presume this is a pure foreignization of the text.

Euphemism is used in ḥadīth discourse for depicting male-female intimate relation. The Following report has two examples of this type of euphemism. The Arabic text reads as follows:

(جاءت امرأة رفاعة القرظي النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم، فقالت: كُنْتُ عِنْدَ رِفَاعَةَ، فَطَلَّقَنِي، فَأَبَتْ طَلَّاقِي، فَتَزَوَّجْتُ عَبْدَ الرَّحْمَنِ بْنِ الرَّبِيعِ إِيمًا مَعَهُ مِثْلَ هُدْبَةِ الثَّوْبِ، فَقَالَ: «أَتُرِيدِينَ أَنْ تَرْجِعِي إِلَى رِفَاعَةَ؟ لَا، حَتَّى تَدُوقِي عُسَيْلَتَهُ وَيَدُوقَ عُسَيْلَتَكَ»

The first euphemism lies in the phrase '*hudbatu thawb*' which is translated according to different strategies as follows:

- Khan: "he is impotent" (Bukhārī 3: 489).

- Khaṭṭab: 'what he has is like the fringe of a garment' (Nasā'ī 4: 131)
- Siddique: 'what he possess is like the fringe of a garment (i.e. he is sexually weak)' (Muslim: 834)
- Belew: " the frayed end of cloth [i.e. impotent]" (Bukhārī H2496)

Khan domesticates the text by giving the intended meaning, while others provide varying degrees of foreignization except Siddique and Belew who provide clarifying notes. However, we can hardly find an English equivalent for this euphemistic expression that is why Khaṭṭāb's translation opts for foreignization.

The other euphemism used in this context is the sentence, 'حَتَّى تَذُوقِي عُسْبَانَتَهُ وَيَذُوقُ عُسْبَانَتِكَ'. Khan completely avoids literal translation. He renders it as "until the second husband consummates his marriage with her" (Bukhārī 7: 136). Belew put it as "until you have enjoyed his sweetness and he has enjoyed your sweetness". She imitates the source text, which introduces a foreign expression to the target text. But is there a reason for Khan's abandonment of a literal translation of this euphemistic expression? I presume he regards the expression as dysphemistic, which contrasts neutral euphemism. However, the Prophet's use of this expression is intended for a legal reason. When a woman is irrevocably divorced for three times, she is not supposed to remarry her ex-husband except upon marrying another without a mutual consent. She has, then, to consummate this marriage. Tumaymah b. Wahb; the woman who encountered with the prophet in a dialogue liked to get back to Rifā'ah without a consummation of the second marriage so that she accused her husband of impotence. This is the reason the Prophet uses dysphemism reprimand both her and her ex-husband. Khan, however, domesticates both expressions to make his translation rational and intelligible for his target audience.

3.3.1.2. Metonymy

According to Merriam-Webster, this is "a figure of speech in which a thing or concept is called not by its own name, but rather by the name of something associated in meaning with that thing or concept" ("metonymy"). The Arabic approximate equivalent for metonymy is *kināyah*, where the name of an item is moved to fill in something else with which it is linked.³⁹ Abdul-Raof distinguishes between Arabic *kināyah* and the English metonymy by affirming that "Metonymy in classical Arabic signifies the intrinsic signification of the lexical item employed by the communicator."⁴⁰ A translator is presumed to recognize a metonymy, identifies its culture reference and renders it to an English reader by maintaining

39 'Abdur-Rahmān Ḥasan Ḥanbbanakah, *Rawā'i min aqwāl ar-rasūl* (Damascus: Dār al-Qalam, 1996), 2: 127.

40 Hussein Abul-Raof, *Arabic Rhetoric, a Pragmatic Analysis* (London and New York: Routledge, 2006), 233.

a level of elegance and its cultural variation. An example for Arabic metonym is the Prophet's saying, (يُخْرَجُ فِي آخِرِ الزَّمَانِ قَوْمٌ أَحْدَاثُ الْأَسْنَانِ). The expression *ahdāthu'l-asnān* is translated as 'young-toothed people'. The youthfulness is referred to indirectly through freshness of teeth.

In Bukhārī, the well-known *hadith* of Umm Zar' is a masterpiece of artistic and literary language in which 'Aishah; the Prophet's wife relates to the Prophet anecdotes of eleven women depicting their spouses' affairs with them. The report includes numerous metonyms. Khan is not consistent in either foreignizing or domesticating the text. For example, Khan translates, "عظيم الرماد" as "His ashes are abundant" (Bukhārī 7: 82) by leaving a target audience in abyss of guessing the meaning. Though he provides clarifying notes (i.e. generous to his guests), a reader cannot comprehend the cultural reference or relation between ashes and guests. Khan's clarification classified his rendering to be completely domesticating. Sometimes translation with domestication is the only option. He further domesticates 'رفيع العماد' which literally means 'one who has a raised ceiling' as 'tall generous man' but he foreignizes 'طويل النجاد' by rendering it as 'wearing a long strap for carrying his sword'. The fifth woman describes her husband as 'إِنْ دَخَلَ، وَإِنْ خَرَجَ أَبَدًا'. Khan reveals the secret of why he is leopard at home while he turns a lion outside by domesticating the meaning through explanatory notes to show that he 'sleeps a lot' at home and 'boasts a lot' in front of men. The sixth woman defames her husband's image by enlisting his bad qualities through five euphemistic expressions as follows, 'إِنْ أَكَلَ لَفًّا، وَإِنْ شَرِبَ اشْتَفَفَ، وَإِنْ اضْطَجَعَ انْتَفَفَ، وَلَا يُوَلِّغُ الْكَفَفَ؛ وَإِنْ لَبَّغَ الْبَسَفَ'. Khan domesticates the text by providing the intended meaning of those expressions, "The sixth one said, "If my husband eats, he eats too much (leaving the dishes empty), and if he drinks he leaves nothing; if he sleeps he rolls himself (alone in our blankets); and he does not insert his palm to inquire about my feelings." (Bukhārī 7: 82). Khan reveals what is supposed to be concealed. Other translators of Bukhari do not transfer euphemism in their English translations. Belwey, for example, imitates Khan with slight lexical and stylistic variations (Bukhārī H4893). I propose those expressions may be foreignized as follows, "If my husband eats, he cleans up. If he drinks, he gets all sups. If he sleeps, he wraps himself up, stretching no hands to show I am up".

The seventh woman expressed her husband's impotence in euphemistic expression, which is interpreted differently by commentators of *hadith*: رُوِجِي غَيَابًا؛ أَوْ جَمَعَ كَمَا لَكَ أَوْ غَيَابًا طِبَاءًا كُلُّ دَاءٍ لَهُ دَاءٌ شَحَكَ أَوْ فَلَكَ. The original text is dot-distorted. The word 'غَيَابًا' has been exchanged with 'غَيَابًا' in a stage of transmission due to a misreading of a written version of the report. Khan does not convey technical mechanism to his readers. He translated the two variants as probably intended in the original text. Furthermore, he translates the word nude of its euphemistic ornament. Belwey utterly expressed the intended meaning by rendering it as,

“heavy in spirit or impotent”. The word ‘طقاء’ is literally derived from the verb ‘*ṭabaqa*’ (to cover). A camel is ‘*ṭabāqā*’, when it lacks strength or ability to cover distances. A man is ‘*ṭabāqā*’ because he is impeded in his speech.⁴¹ Khan domesticates it as ‘foolish’. I suggest it be rendered as ‘tongue tied’ to show fidelity to the ‘letter’ and to show the aesthetic traces of the ST euphemism.

The eighth woman shows her husband in an elegant style by describing his touches and smells as, ‘المسُّ مسُّ أرنبٍ، والرَّيحُ رِيحُ زَرَنْبٍ’. Khan domesticates the text by clarifying the reason of making a similarity between her husband and a rabbit, “My husband is soft to touch like a rabbit.” The tenth woman refers to her man’s generosity by describing his camels as follows: لَهُ إِبِلٌ كَثِيرَاتُ الْمَبَارِكِ قَلِيلَاتُ الْمَسَارِحِ، وَإِذَا سَمِعْنَ صَوْتَ الْمِرْزَهْرِ أَيْقَنَ أَنَّهُنَّ هَوَالِكُ. Khan fully domesticates the text by clarifying its meaning, “Most of his camels are kept at home (ready to be slaughtered for the guests) and only a few are taken to the pastures. When the camels hear the sound of the lute (or the tambourine) they realize that they are going to be slaughtered for the guests”. We can smell that elegant fragrance of the desert in Belewy’s rendering, “He has camels, most of which are kept in pens while only a few are sent to graze. When they hear the sound of the lute, they are certain that they will be slaughtered.” (Bukhārī H4893) It gives a room for the reader’s imagination to contemplate both letter and intent of the text. The only problem of Belewy’s translation is that she abused the rhyme, which is intended in this narrative. The eleventh woman, the report is known for her name, is umm Zar’, gave a positive and faithful description of her spouses’ good days with her, though, he at the end divorced her and got married to another woman. She described everything surrounding her husband starting with him: أَنَا مِنْ خَلِيٍّ أَذْنٍ، وَمَلَأَ مِنْ شَحْمٍ عَضُدَيْ، وَجَعَلَنِي قَبِيحَةً إِلَى تَفْسِي، وَجَدَنِي فِي أَهْلِ غُثَيْمَةٍ بِشَقٍّ، فَجَعَلَنِي فِي أَهْلِ صَهِيلٍ وَأَطِيطٍ وَدَائِسٍ وَمُنَقٍّ، فَعَبْدَةٌ أَقُولُ فَلَا أَصْبِحُ وَأَرْقُدُ فَأَنْصَبُ. Khan renders it as, “He has given me many ornaments and my ears are heavily loaded with them and my arms have become fat (i.e., I have become fat). And he has pleased me, and I have become so happy that I feel proud of myself. He found me with my family who were mere owners of sheep and living in poverty, and brought me to a respected family having horses and camels and threshing and purifying grain. Whatever I say, he does not rebuke or insult me. When I sleep, I sleep till late in the morning, and when I drink water (or milk), I drink my fill.” I however, propose to foreignize the text as follows, “Of gold he made my ears dressy, filled out the flesh of my body so it is heavy, delighted me and made me happy. He found me in people of sheep to grow displacing me to people of horses and camels, oxen and crops to plow. No rebuke when I speak nor awake when I sleep.”

To conclude, I prefer presenting Arabic euphemisms and metonymys of

41 Lane, *Arabic-English Lexicon*, 1827.

adith through a foreignizing strategy for the following reasons: First, there is a definite relation between the literal and intended meanings of euphemism. This relation is known by the original text. Second, euphemism “is purposefully employed to keep a reader from a reality or an emotion that could prove to be embarrassing or hurtful.”⁴² It becomes marginalized when the meaning of euphemism is transferred prone of any aesthetic ornament. Third, euphemism primarily relies on “domestic values, social recreations and ideological forces which are hardly identified in parallel equivalents in target language.”⁴³

3.3.1.3. *Metaphor*

This refers to a figure of speech in which a word or a phrase is applied to an object or action that it does not literally denote in order to imply a resemblance (Collins “metaphor”). Soskice affirms the dependence of religious language in almost all traditions upon metaphorical speech.⁴⁴ In ḥadith discourse, a word may be used to indicate a literal, a juristic or a customary meaning. In the latter two cases a word departs from the literal to the metaphorical. For instance, the Arabic word ‘*riba*’ may be used in its literal sense to mean ‘increase’ or in its juristic meaning to mean ‘usury’. In some cases, distinction between literal and metaphorical usages of a locution is plain but in other cases it is not. I will give examples of metaphors of this type. How Khan responds to phrases not determined to be used in literal or metaphorical senses and which strategy seems adequate in translating those metaphors?

To give an example, the Prophet is reported as saying, “*الْمُتَبَايِعَانِ كُلُّ وَاحِدٍ مِنْهُمَا بِالْحِيَارِ*”, “*عَلَى صَاحِبِهِ مَا لَمْ يَتَقَرَّفَا، إِلَّا بَيْعَ الْحِيَارِ*”. The word ‘*al-mutabāyi‘ān*’ may linguistically refer to the ‘two purchasing parties’ and metaphorically to the ‘two negotiating parties’. Moreover, the word ‘*yatfarraqa*’ may be literally translated as ‘physically depart’ or ‘end negotiation’. This is the reason Ḥanafī and Mālīkī jurists upheld that as long as negotiations are going on, the option of cancellation is still effective. Shāfi‘ī jurists maintain that the right of cancellation terminates by physical departure of the session. Proponents of the first view based their argument on similar phrases of traditions such as the word ‘*yabi*’ in the Prophet’s saying, “*لا يبيع لأخيه*” is used to mean ‘bargain’. Khan opts for a literal translation of the phrase, “Both the buyer and the seller have the option of canceling” (Bukhārī 3: 183). By translating the phrase to be of one definite meaning, Khan domesticates the text to a Shāfi‘ī interpretation. He gives clarification of the text by introducing

42 Manar Abdulhafeedh Abdallah, *Translating English Euphemisms into Arabic: Challenges and Strategies* (PhD diss., Princeton University, Diss. Sharjah University, 2009), 76.

43 Munday, *Introducing Translation Studies*, 145.

44 Janet M. Soskice, *Metaphor and religious language* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985), 1.

his excessive use of explicatory notes and rationalization draw his texts home. I believe the context of traditions can efficiently clarify the message without recourse to rationalize or clarification.

3.3.2. Ideological and Ethical Constraints

Religious texts, as Hatim concludes, are “carriers of ideological meaning and vulnerable to changing socio-cultural norms.”⁴⁶ Translation of religious texts may be influenced by the target leadership in this case, “religious and ethical norms can hinder or at least impede the use of both foreignization and domestication in translation, especially if the target readership has a conservative religious nature.”⁴⁷

In ḥadīth discourse, a translation problem is a subsequent of syntactic ambiguity when a text harbors two linguistically acceptable interpretations, but a translator’s choice is primarily determined by his ideological tendency. It may further arise when a text is apt to encompass a number of indefinite variables but a translator restricts it to one definite meaning in order to substantiate a certain approach. If a translator moves towards his readers by adopting a unilateral attitude by disregarding others, it is a domestication tailored to serve ideological leanings.

In Bukhārī, we encounter a series of structures that feature grammatical ambiguity because of pronominal reference. For instance the structure (خَلَقَ اللهُ آدَمَ) (عَلَى صُورَتِهِ) has a pronominal affix (هـ) cliticized to the proper noun (الله), resulting in syntactic ambiguity, which has also led to different interpretations and translations. This pronominal object affix can either refer to (God) which leads to the meaning that Adam has a form as Allah has a form (both are not identical or similar) or refer to (Adam) thus leading to the meaning that Adam has been created in the form Allah has chosen for him. Khan chooses the second meaning by assuming that the antecedent of the pronoun is Adam, thus meaning that Allah created Adam in his (meaning Adam’s) complete form (Bukhārī 8: 246). This, however, conflicts with the other variant version related by Ibn Abī ‘Aṣim in which the Prophet said, (فَإِنَّ ابْنَ آدَمَ خُلِقَ عَلَى صُورَةِ الرَّحْمَنِ).⁴⁸ In comparing the two narrations, it is evident that the most appropriate translation would be “Allah created Adam in His form”, but due to ideological constraints, Khan had to opt for

46 Hatim, B. Hatim and I. Mason, *The Translator as Communicator* (London: Routledge, 1997), 35.

47 Mariam H. Mansour, “Domestication and Foreignization in Translating Culture-Specific References of an English Text into Arabic, *International Journal of English Language & Translation Studies*. 2/2, 23-36, <http://eltsjournal.org> (accessed 10 April 2015).

48 Ibn Abī ‘Aṣim, *As-Sunnah*, ed. M. Nāsir ad-Dīn al-Albānī (Beirut: al-Maktab al-Islāmī, 1400 AH), 1: 228.

a safe interpretation lest his translation should be classified as of Ash'arī⁴⁹ leanings. Khan's ideological contains consist in the accentuation on God's utter distinction from the temporarily produced and the problem of rendering a physical similitude of a human match.⁵⁰ Khan attempts to domesticate the text to be acceptable for a certain category of target readers.

Khan's choices are more obvious when a prophetic tradition is apt to various juristic interpretations subsequent of semantic ambiguity. In case of opting to foreignization, a translator is presumed to be loyal to the original text. He attempts make his translation as polysemous as the original text. At translator may be held partial to a certain religious group or school of law if he domesticates his translation to a category of readers. For example, the text of the following ḥadīth evoked disagreement among scholars on the legal value of dipping unwashed hands in ablution vessels upon awaking: وَإِذَا اسْتَيْقَظَ أَحَدُكُمْ مِنْ نَوْمِهِ فَلْيَغْسِلْ يَدَيْهِ (عَبْدُ اللَّهِ بْنُ مَسْعُودٍ رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ قَالَ: قَالَ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ: إِذَا اسْتَيْقَظَ أَحَدُكُمْ مِنْ نَوْمِهِ فَلْيَغْسِلْ يَدَيْهِ). According to Mālik and Shāfi'ī, it is emphatically recommended to wash one's hands before dipping them in an ablution vessel.⁵¹ They interpreted the impetrative (فليغسل) as a form of recommendation, though it is of an imperative mode. According to a Shafi'ī or Mālikī translator, the text will be rendered "And whoever wakes up from his sleep should wash his hands three times". Moreover, according to Mālik the ruling is contingent to the case of a person doubting the purity of his hands. Therefore, a Mālikī translator is expected to convey the meaning of doubt in the target text by rendering the phrase (فإنَّ أَحَدَكُمْ لَا يَدْرِي أَيْنَ بَاتَتْ يَدُهُ) as "for one may not know where his hands were". Dāwūd and Zahirītes relied on the explicit meaning of this ḥadīth to confirm that washing hands before immersing them in the ablution bowl is obligatory after having sleep either during day or night. The text, according to them, should be rendered differently, "And whoever wakes up from his sleep must wash his hands three times before dipping them in the vessel". Ahmad distinguished between nocturnal sleep and that of the day. He understood from the words 'ayna bātāt (where his hands slept)' the traditional sleep during night. Accordingly the phrase should be translated to mean "where his hands spent the night".

Khan is not consistent in following a certain interpretation though he leans to a definite view and overlooks others. Khan's translation is classified according

49 Ash'arīyya's main dichotomy from mainstream Muslims lies in their interpretation of God's attributes versus literal interpretation of Ḥanābalis (W. Montgomery Watt, "Ash'ariyya", *Encyclopaedia of Islam (EI²)*, [Leiden: Brill, 1986], 1: 696).

50 Juwaynī, Abū al-Ma'ālī 'Abdul-Malik Imām al-Ḥaramayn, *Guide to Conclusive Proofs for the Principles of Belief: Al-Irshad*, ed. trans. Paul E. Walker (Garnet Publishing, 2001), 21.

51 Ibn Rushd, Abū al-Walīd Muḥammad b. Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. Aḥmad b. Rushd, *Bidāyat al-mujtahid wa nihāyat al-muqtaṣid* (Cairo: Dār al-Ḥadīth, 2004), 1: 16.

to various schools of laws as follows:

Segment	School of Law
And whoever wakes up from his <u>sleep</u>	Mālik, Shāfi'ī and Zāhirites
should wash his hands before putting them in the water for ablution	Mālik and Shāfi'ī versus Zāhirites and Aḥmad
because nobody knows where his hands were “	Shāfi'ī and Aḥmad
during sleep.	Mālik, Shāfi'ī and Zāhirites

A proposed translation should be polysomic in the sense it assimilates all possible interpretations of various juristic approaches. It may be as follows: “And whoever wakes up from his sleep is to wash his hands three times before dipping them in the utensil, because nobody knows where his hands slept.”

For Khan, a translator of a religious text is not only ethically committed to present the foreign faithfully but he is ideologically obliged to endorse his latent beliefs that make him walk on thorns. A translator of a religious text have a duty towards Prophet Muhammad (the author of ḥadīth), to his readers and to his various cultures whether distinct or shared. By foreignization, a translator prioritize fidelity to the text which is a part of his ethical commitment and ideological beliefs by rendering it free of any leanings.

4. Conclusion

By applying Venuti's (1995) dichotomous strategies of foreignization and domestication to Khan's translation of Bukhārī, I conclude that Khan generally attempts to foreignize his text by accentuating its distinctive syntactic, lexical and cultural features. Khan does not opt for foreignization in all of his choices. Though he shows adherence to Arabic VSO structure, he does not reflect non-regular usage of prepositions and certain Arabic syntactic and stylistic articles such as *taḍmīn*. This is due to a seeming difficulty in rendering them readable to in his English translation.

For his lexical equivalents, Khan prefers foreignization through a dense use of archaic words. However, an extensive exploitation of exotic terms turned some of his texts into mysteries. He opts for orthographic representation of honorific words and phrases, loaded names in addition to proper nouns. His clarifications of those terms do not always result in a fluent and smooth reading of his target language. It includes discursive remarks and explications, which are mostly redundant. He does not show a consistent strategy for rendering toponyms and anthroponyms.

The problem of Khan's translation lies in translating cultural markers. In most cases he disregards euphemism, metonyms and metaphors either by straightly and clearly providing the intended meaning or through the intensive clarifications he provides to reveal mysteries of the elegant Arabic discourse. With regard to ideological and ethical constraints, Khan is not only ethically committed to faithfully present the foreign elements but he is also ideologically obliged to endorse his latent beliefs that make him walk on thorns.

Hadīth discourse includes latent cultural, social, ideological and juristic variations which have been subjected to voluminous rubric of exegeses of creedal, juristic and philological compendiums which resulted in vast arrays of differences among theologians, jurists and philologists. Taking those discrepancies into consideration necessitates that a translator has to show fidelity to the letter of the text. Any alteration or substitution of concepts, lexical items or figures may be supportive of an orientation or an approach. The text has to read as general and polysomic as it first originated. By reference to foreignization and domestication, I opt for foreignization which does not only maintain the foreign elements of the text but maintains its foreign attitudes and orientation to be apt to various interpretations.

Bibliography

- Abdallah**, Manar Abdulhafeedh, *Translating English Euphemisms into Arabic: Challenges and Strategies* (PhD diss., Princeton University, Diss. Sharjah University, 2009).
- Abul-Raof**, Hussein, *Arabic Rhetoric, a Pragmatic Analysis*, London and New York: Routledge, 2006.
- Aixelá**, J.F. "Culture-specific Items in Translation", in *Translation, Power, Subversion*. Ed. R. Álvarez and M.C. África Vidal, Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 1996, 52–78.
- Assami**, Aminah, *Sahih International Quran Translation*, Saudi Arabia: Dar Abdulqasim, 2005.
- Abū Dāwūd**, Sulaymān b. al-Ash'ath, *Sunan abi Dāwūd*, trans. Yasir Qadhi, Riyadh: Darusslam, 2008.
- Berman**, Antoine. "Translation and the Trials of the Foreign", *The Translation Studies Reader*, ed L. Venuti, New York: Routledge, 1985, 284-298.
- Al-Bukhārī**, Abū 'Abdullah Muḥammad b. Ismā'il b. Ibrāhīm b. al-Mughīrah al-Ju'fi. *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*, trans. M. Muhsin Khan, Riyadh: Darussalam, 1997.
- Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*, trans. Aishah Belew, <http://bewley.virtualave.net> (accessed 25 April 2015).
- Collins**, William, *Collins Dictionary*, Harper Collins Publishers, 2006, www.collinsonlinedictionary.com (accessed 14 April 2015).
- Elwell**, Walter A., "Entry for 'Apostle'", *Evangelical Dictionary of Theology*, Baker Bytes, 2001.
- Espindola**, E, *The Use and Abuse of Subtitling as a Practice of Cultural Representation: Cidade de Deus and Boyz 'N the Hood*, Santa Catarina: Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina, 2006.
- France**, Peter. "Translation Studies and Translation Criticism" in *The Oxford Guide to Literature in English Translation*, ed. Peter France, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000, 3-10.
- Ḥanbbanakah**, 'Abdur-Raḥmān Ḥasan, *Rawā'i 'min aqwāl ar-rasūl*, Damascus: Dār al-Qalam, 1996.
- Hatim**, B. and Mason, I, *The Translator as Communicator*, London: Routledge, 1997.
- He**, Xianbin, "Foreignization/domestication and yihua/guihua: a contrastive

- study”, *Translation Journal* 9(2) 2005. <http://www.bokorlang.com/journal/32foreignization.html> (accessed 5 May 2015).
- Hermans**, Theo, “On Translating Proper Names, with Reference to *De Witte* and *Max Havelaar*”, *Modern Dutch Studies*, ed. Michael Wintle, London: Athlone, 1988, 11-13.
- Ibn Abī ‘Aṣim**, *As-Sunnah*, ed. M. Nāsir ad-Dīn al-Albānī, Beirut: al-Maktab al-Islāmī, 1400 AH.
- Ibn Ḥajar**, Aḥmad b. ‘Alī, *Fatḥ al-Bārī sharḥ Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*, Beirut: Dār al-Ma’rifah, 1379 AH.
- Ibn Jinnī**, Abū al-Fatḥ ‘Uthmān al-Mūshilī. *Al-Khaṣā’iṣ*. Al-Hay’ah al-‘Ammah al-Miṣriyyah li al-Kitāb.
- Ibn Rushd**, Abū al-Walid Muḥammad b. Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. Aḥmad b. Rushd. *Bidāyat al-mujtahid wa nihāyat al-muqtaṣid*, Cairo: Dār al-Ḥadīth, 2004.
- Lecerle**, Jean-Jacques, *The Violence of Language*, London Routledge, 1990.
- Lane**, E. W, *Arabic-English Lexicon*, Cambridge: The Islamic Texts Society, 1984.
- Juwaynī**, Abū al-Ma‘ālī ‘Abdul-Malik Imām al-Ḥaramayn, *Guide to Conclusive Proofs for the Principles of Belief: Al-Irshad*, trans. Paul E. Walker, Garnet Publishing, 2001.
- Leech**, Geoffrey N. *Principles of Pragmatics*. London and New York: Longman, 1983.
- Mālik b. Anas**, *Al-Muwatta of Imam Malik Ibn Anas: The First Formulation of Islamic Law*, trans. Aisha Abdurrahman Bewley, Scotland: Madinah Press Inverness, 2015.
- Mansour**, Mariam H, “Domestication and Foreignization in Translating Culture-Specific References of an English Text into Arabic, *International Journal of English Language & Translation Studies*. 2/2, 23-36, <http://eltsjournal.org> (accessed 10 April 2015).
- Munday**, J., *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications*, New York Routledge, 2001.
- Muslim b. al-Ḥajjāj an-Naysābūrī**, *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*, trans. Abdul Hamid Siddiqui, Kitab Bhavan, 2000, <https://www.shareislam.com/order/books/SahihMuslim.pdf>. (accessed 6 May 2015).
- Myskja**, Kjetil. “Foreignisation and Resistance: Lawrence Venuti and His Critics”, *Nordic Journal of English Studies* 12/2, 1-23.

- Al-Nasā'ī**, Aḥmad b. Shu'ayb b. 'Alī b. Sinān b. Baḥr, *Sunan an-Nasā'ī*, tran. Aḥmad Khaṭṭāb, Riyadh: Darussalam, 2007.
- Poucke**, Piet Van, "Domestication and foreignization in translation studies", *TransUD-Arbeiten zur Theorie und Praxis des Übersetzens und Dolmetschens*, 2012, 139-157.
- Pound**, Ezra, *Literary Essays*, New York: New Directions and London: Faber and Faber, 1954.
- Sidighi**, A., "Translating Persian Metaphors into English", *Metaphor and Imagery in Persian Poetry*, ed. Ali Asghar Seyed-Gohrab, Leiden: Brill, 2012.
- Soskice**, Janet M., *Metaphor and religious language*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985.
- Tymoczko**, M., "The Metonymics of Translating Marginalized Texts", *Comparative Literature*, 47/1 (1995), 11-24.
- Translation in a Postcolonial Context*, Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing, 1999.
- Venuti**, L., *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*, London and New York: Routledge, 1995.
- The Scandals of Translation: Towards an Ethics of Differences*, London and New York: Routledge, 1998.
- Watt**, W. Montgomery, "Ash'ariyya" *Encyclopaedia of Islam (EI²)*, Leiden: Brill, 1986, 1: 696.
- Yang**, Wenfen, "Brief Study of Domestication and Foreignization in Translation", *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 2010, 77-80.
- Yāsīn**, Abū al-Hayjā', *Mazāhir at-tajdīd an-naḥwī ladā Majma' al-Lughah al-Arabiyyah fi al-Qāhira*, 'Alām al-Kutub al-Ḥadīth, 2008.