

A Study of Semantic and Communicative Losses in the English Translation of *Ar-Raheeq-ul-Makhtoom* by Safi-ur-Rehman Mubarakpuri

Marrium Sayyed¹ Muhammad Abdullah^{2*}

¹ Lecturer (VF), Department of English Linguistics and Literature, Riphah International University, Islamabad, Pakistan.

Email: syedmaryamgardezi@gmail.com

² Associate Professor, Department of English Linguistics and Literature, Riphah International University, Islamabad, Pakistan.

Email: abdullah.baig@riphah.edu.pk

ABSTRACT: Cross culture communication is highly significant in today's global village and translation plays a pivotal role in this regard. However, scholars mention various issues in the translation itself. This study investigates semantic and communicative losses in the translation of *Ar-Raheeq-ul-Makhtoom* from Urdu to English. The source text carries rich cultural and religious references, terms and phrases that pose a real challenge to the translator for accurate translation in the target language. Researchers have used Peter Newmark's theory on semantic and communicative translation as a theoretical and analytical framework in the study. The analysis highlights that the translator most frequently adopts the communicative approach to make the text comprehensible and sometimes, he prefers semantic translation when the text is culturally and religiously rich. The findings of the study reveal that semantic faithfulness and communicative clarity may help convey the exact meanings of the source text up to greater extent.

Pages: 191 – 202

Volume: 5

Issue: 5 (May 2026)

Corresponding Author

Muhammad Abdullah

✉ abdullah.baig@riphah.edu.pk

Cite this Article: Sayyed, M., & Abdullah, M. (2026). A Study of Semantic and Communicative Losses in the English Translation of *Ar-Raheeq-ul-Makhtoom* by Safi-ur-Rehman Mubarakpuri. *The Regional Tribune*, 5(5), 191-202.

<https://doi.org/10.55737/trt/v-v.288>

KEYWORDS: Institutional Support, Socio-Cultural, Psychological Challenges, Professional Growth, Well-Being of Women Police

Introduction

Dating back as far as 3000 BC, the practice of translation has undergone major changes in its essence till date (Newmark, 1976, p.5). Translation studies is an interdisciplinary subject that discusses different aspects of translation and its theories. According to Kundera (1992), translation has many different types, but the most appropriate is that which has fidelity to its original text. The main purpose of translation is to make the text easy and understandable to its readers. Jakobson's work, "On Linguistics Aspects of Translation" is considered as the most foundational work in the field of translation studies. It discusses different theories.

Translation plays a remarkable role in the transmission of ideas, knowledge and cultural concepts from one language to another. It gains more importance when it is a matter of religious texts. The current study analyzes the semantic and communicative losses in the self-English translation of *Ar-Raheeq-ul-Makhtoom*. It is a well-known and award-winning biography of the Prophet Muhammad (SAW) originally written in Arabic and Urdu by *Safi-ur-Rehman Mubarakpuri* and first time published in 1976. Later, it was translated into English.

Importance of Translation in Religious Texts

Translation plays a very important role in understanding religious and cultural texts (Abdullah & Sayyed, 2024). Religious texts not only contain sacred messages and the biographies of the Prophets, but they also have culturally rich references. To make them accessible to the larger audience, they are translated into different languages.

Translation enables the readers from different linguistic backgrounds to understand spirituality and different religious values that may otherwise not be comprehensible to them. This is how translation plays the role of a bridge among different languages and connects different societies by sharing divine messages in a comprehensible way. From an Islamic perspective, it plays an even more important role because it translates different complex ideas and *Seera/Hadith* to convey important information. Translating religious text contains some challenges. Such texts have some religious and culturally rich terminologies, that rarely find their linguistic equivalence in target languages (Abdullah & Asghar, 2017). Therefore, metaphors and sacred references are not accurately translated, so it's a challenging task to find exact equivalence in the target language. The translator must keep a balance between semantic fidelity and communicative clarity, and also make the text comprehensible to the readers without distortion of the original meanings (Abdullah, 2019). A little mistake in translating the religious texts can lead to the loss of original meanings.

Rationale for the Study

Translating sacred texts is a challenging task because it should maintain the semantic meanings and, along with that, try to convey the accurate meanings of the source text. *Ar-Rheeq-ul-Makhtoom* is a book written by *Safi-ur-Rehman Mubarakpuri*, originally written in Arabic and Urdu, and then translated into English, it is the most relevant sample of this problem. Despite the fact that religious translation should maintain the originality of the source text, there are still semantic and communicative losses because of linguistic, metalinguistic, and cultural dissimilarities between Urdu and English.

Although *Ar-Raheeq-ul-Makhtoom* is widely read and translated, its English translation is still not critically analyzed. There are a lot of examples of words whose meanings are not fully conveyed in the target language. The current study has discussed these losses; it discusses in detail the loss of semantic and communicative meanings which may create ambiguities for the readers. Therefore, the current study was carried out to identify these losses that can be seen in the English translation of *Ar-Raheeq-ul-Makhtoom*. It particularly highlights how cultural and linguistic elements play their role in altering the meanings.

Research Questions

- a) What are the semantic and communicative losses in the English translation of *Ar-Raheeq-ul-Makhtoom*?
- b) How do these losses affect the original message of the source Urdu text?

Theoretical Framework

The current research has used Peter Newmark's semantic and communicative translation theory for its detailed analysis. Semantic translation focuses on conveying the exact source text meanings. In other words, it prioritizes accuracy, which means conveying the exact meanings of the source text to the target audience. On the other hand, communicative translation is rendered to make the text readable and comprehensible to its target readers. By using this theoretical framework, this research recognizes the semantic and communicative losses in the translated text and explain the effect of these losses on the audience or readers.

The Significance of the Study

This study is important because it discusses semantic and communicative losses in the English translation of *Ar-Raheeq-ul-Makhtoom*, a renowned text in Islamic religious literature. This study carries out a linguistic inspection and shows how meanings and cultural references can be changed and modified during translation. The findings of this research can help other translators and researchers understand the challenges and difficulties while translating

religious texts. Researchers and readers may gain guidance about that part of the book where semantic and communicative meanings may alter, differ or lose originality. It may help future researchers by providing effective strategies about how to preserve semantic meaning accurately along with successful communication in the target language. In a nutshell, this study helps in upgrading the translation's standard, comprehensibility of cultural references or religious terms and increases linguistic awareness in the context of rich Islamic literature.

Literature Review

This section carries detailed examination of the literature that is appropriately relatable to the current research. This research examines the semantic and communicative losses in the English translation of *Ar-Raheeq-ul-Makhtoom*. It includes discussions on different theoretical approaches, such as Eugene Nida's formal and dynamic equivalence, Peter Newmark's semantic and communicative perspectives of translation, as well as challenges of translating religious texts such as *Ar-Raheeq-ul-Makhtoom*, where there are culturally and religiously rich terms that are difficult to be translated accurately in any other language. It also discusses previous research on religious texts and highlights the research gap.

Key Concepts in Translation Studies

Translation studies is a multidimensional area of research that explores different theories, their explanation, implementation and the process of translation. To understand the challenges of semantic and communicative losses it is important to understand some basic concepts in the field of translation studies. The most basic concept in Translation studies is to understand the terms Source Text (ST) and Target Text (TT). Source Text means the original text, and the Target Text means the translated text. It is important to understand in translation studies how cultural and religious texts are translated in the target text, what difficulties translators usually face during the process of translation and how meanings are altered in the translated text. Difficulty in translation raises the question that what makes the translation challenging, difficult and complex. According to Hale and Campbell (2022), a text may be equally challenging to translate into different languages.

Theoretical Approaches to Translation Studies

The field of translation studies has changed over time. In the beginning, it only concentrated on the stern laws; these laws are about the fidelity of the translated text to the source text or to the original text and focus on maintaining equality between the languages. With the passage of time new approaches were introduced in the field of translation studies that focus on the aim and cultural aspects of translation. To understand the semantic and communicative aspects in translation and their losses in the English translation of *Ar-Raheeq-ul-Makhtoom*, it is very important to study these different approaches in detail. Each theory describes how translators handle issues in translation, such as faithfulness to the source text as well as readability and comprehensibility of the target or translated text. It also elaborates how culturally rich terms are required to be handled in translation.

Eugene Nida's Formal and Dynamic Equivalence

It is the fundamental concept in the field of translation studies to focus on finding the literal meanings to translate the text in the target language. Early scholars such as Eugene Nida focused on faithfulness to the source text; as he says, we must analyze the transmission of a message in terms of its dynamic dimension (Nida, 1964, p. 120). This analysis is especially important for translating, since the production of equivalent messages is a process, not merely of matching the parts of the utterances, but also of reproducing the total dynamic characters of communication.

His perspective stresses creating the same effect in the translated text as the source text has, and conveying the exact meanings of the original text in the target language. He further says about dynamic equivalence “Translating consists in reproducing in the receptor language the closest natural equivalent of the source language message, first in terms of meaning and secondly in terms of style” (Nida, 1969, p. 12), and “there should be a high degree of equivalence of response, or the translation will have failed to accomplish its purpose” (Nida, 1969, p. 24). However, some critics proclaim that strict conformity with the source text can lead to the loss of semantic or cultural notions, especially when the translator translates culturally or religiously rich terms (Catford, 1965).

Peter Newmark's Communicative vs. Semantic Translation

To analyze the distinction between semantic and communicative translation, Peter Newmark's work is very important. It is a very influential framework for examining translation methods. Newmark (2001) is a very important theorist in the field of translation studies. He claims that the idea of both communicative and semantic translation represents his major contribution to general translation studies. His distinction between these two methods of translation has become the foundation in translation studies. Semantic translation is like word-to-word translation. It tries to maintain the source language message as it is and translates every word with its synonyms. According to Lui (2004) semantic translation is a kind of translation that tries to express the use of language. Newmark (1988) further claimed that semantic translation is suitable for ‘expressive’ texts translation where the specific language of the speaker is as important as the content. This is primarily because semantic translation intends to illustrate every detail of the source text's contextual meaning by maintaining its characteristics and expressions. Furthermore, it emphasizes the importance of the content and form as it attempts to recreate the exact tone and flavor of the original text. Because semantic translation strives to maintain the distinguishing features of the source language, it illustrates the writer's thought process in the best way. Although, in most cases, translators try to translate word-for-word, the loss of meaning is still inevitable.

Skopos Theory

Another important concept in the field of translation studies is Skopos theory. It is given by Hans Vermeer in the late 1970s, and states that every text has specific grounds and motives, and it should fulfil those motives (as cited in Nord, 1977, p.29). It is an effective perspective in Translation Studies as it is about the main purpose or skopos of translation. Skopos theory discusses the aim of translation, and it focuses on the reader of the translation. Translation's purposes can be many, as its purpose may be to inform others, to chase others or maybe to amuse others and the translator shapes his choices according to the skopos of translation. Therefore, skopos theory discusses the purpose of translation, why translation is done, and who the reader of this translation is. This study has targeted the English translation of *Ar-Rheeq-ul-Makhloom*, which is about the biography of the beloved Prophet Muhammad Sallah-o-Alaih-e-Wasallam (SAW), and this biography is originally written in Arabic and Urdu; then it was translated into English. The skopos of this translation is to know about the life of our Prophet Muhammad (SAW) and to make the whole world to know the life of the Prophet Muhammad (SAW).

Pym (2021) explains that, from the perspective of skopos theory, the translator must struggle in the translation of an emotionally charged original text. He distinguishes the two types of equivalence: natural and directional equivalence in translation. However, Wendland (2012) proclaims that there is no specific difference within the types of equivalence suggested by Pym. He further elaborates by saying that natural equivalence has carries directional equivalence. However, exact equivalence is unachievable between the two culturally different languages.

Semantic and Communicative Translations and Losses

Semantic translation means to convert the text in the target language to its synonym. Lui (2004) states that semantic

translation exactly conveys the sense of the language and this practice makes it an art. Semantic translation has some characteristics as appended below:

- ▶ Semantic translation is like the original text.
- ▶ It tries to keep the original meanings of the source text as it is.
- ▶ It does not focus on the comprehensibility of the readers of the target text.

Semantic loss means when a translated text is unable to convey exact message of the source text to the target readers. Although semantic text means to remain faithful to the source text, this type of translation is quite challenging because it is impossible to find exact equivalent word in the target language. There are many such words that have many different meanings; it is very important to translate them properly so that the exact meanings are conveyed to the readers. Laxen and Lavour (2010) have talked about these difficulties in translation and said that words may have many possibilities of translation and it is challenging for a translator to convey the accurate sense of the source text to the target readers.

On the other hand, the purpose of communicative translation is just to convey the sense and not to translate the text word to word. It is always written in a natural way by focusing on conveying the sense of the source text. According to Eugene Nida, the translation process includes conveying the message in a way that readers of the target language can easily understand the text completely. He should completely comprehend the message of the source text (Waard & Nida, 1986).

Communicative loss occurs when some portion of the message or sense of the original is not fully conveyed through linguistic expression or the process of communication—for instance, when something is elaborated to someone and the exact message is not fully understood by the listener; this is called communicative loss. It is the main purpose of communicative translation that makes the text easy, comprehensible and relevant to its readers. The following table provides a summary of the primary distinction between semantic translation and communicative translation as determined (Zu & Dong, 2015):

Table 1

Semantic vs Communicative Translation

Semantic Translation	Communicative Translation
This approach is author centered.	This approach is reader centered.
This approach is semantic and syntactic-oriented. It means the focus is on the literal meanings of the text.	It focuses on the effects of translated text on the readers.
Length of sentences, position, and integrity of clauses, word positions, etc. preserved whenever possible. Usually more awkward, more exhaustive, more complex shorter, and insufficient to convey the exact sense of the message.	The translation is clearer, easily understandable, and more natural and it has a specific style and tone, but it is in detailed explanation.
It is a source language-biased translation.	It is a target language-biased translation
Always considered inferior to the original because of the loss of meaning.	As it is easy and comprehensible this is why it is better than the original.
Out of time and local place- “eternal”	It is interim and connected to a particular scenario.
The translator is bound and not allowed to improve or to correct.	The translator can make corrections remove ambiguities and improve the text.
The main focus of the translator is on words, collocations, and clauses.	The main focus of the translator is on the sentences and paragraphs.
Only one translator translates it.	The work of more than one translator.
Meaning, more focus is on literal meanings.	Communication, more focus is on essence.

The considerable distinctions between ST and CT are evident in the above table. Whereas CT primarily focuses on the comprehension of the receptors, ST mostly concentrates on the literal meaning of the source text.

Challenges in Translating Religious and Historical Texts

Translating a text is not a simple activity; it is not simply the conversion of one word to another word or the transformation of the source language to the target language. It has some complexities, and these complexities may be about linguistic principles/structures or cultural or contextual problems in dissimilar languages. If someone ignores these complexities the meaning will be lost or changed. The translator is bound to face such challenges because finding exact equivalence is not possible. There are various culturally rich expressions that pose difficulties in translation. Tylor states that “culture...is that complex whole which includes knowledge, belief, art, morals, law, custom and any other capabilities and habits acquired by man as a member of society” (Tylor, 1871, p.1). Similarly, according to Edward Sapir, “we see and hear and otherwise experience very largely as we do because the language habits of our community predispose certain choices of interpretation” (Sapir, 1958, p.69). According to Tokowicz and Kroll (2007), the most important thing about the memory of a two-tongued person is that it creates a connection and link between two different languages. It is a fact that it is not an easy task to find exact equivalence between two languages.

In light of the detailed analysis of existing studies, it may be concluded that although there is a lot of research done on Islamic religious texts, texts such as *Ar-Raheeq-Ul-Makhtoom* have been less explored. Therefore, this study has targeted the Urdu-to-English translation of the award-winning biography of Hazrat Muhammad (SAW) from the perspective of Newmark’s semantic and communicative propositions about the art of translation.

Methodology

The current study has used Peter Newmark’s Semantic and Communicative propositions on translation as a theoretical and analytical framework for the study. Peter Newmark was a renowned Professor of translation studies at Surrey University. He earned lot of respect as a theorist in the field of translation studies.

Research Design

The study has used qualitative research and does comparative analysis to examine the semantic and communicative losses in the English translation of the renowned Islamic text, *Ar-Raheeq-ul-Makhtoom*. The study focuses on its Urdu version as a source text and English as a target text. The qualitative approach is most suitable here as it explores and investigates the most difficult cultural and religious terms, phrases and sentences which pose a real challenge for the translator in the process of translation. In this method, phrases and sentences are consciously selected and analyzed in detail. This means data is sorted out logically and consciously instead of taking the complete text (Ritchie et al., 2003). The current research focuses on how the translator, or the author, has translated the text and sees the faithfulness of the author with the source text or with the target text. It sees how the author translated religiously and culturally rich expressions in the target language and made the text comprehensible for its readers. It discusses the difficulty and challenges of the translator in translating such texts and how he creates balance between the source text and the target text. The translator faces difficulty in translating religiously significant texts because these texts have such terms, phrases and expressions that don’t have exact equivalence in the target language. In this situation, the translator plays their role and creates a balance between both texts and makes it understandable for their audience.

Data Collection

The study has used *Ar Raheeq-ul- Makhtoom* and its translated text, *The Sealed Nectar*. *Ar Raheeq-ul- Makhtoom* is the source text, which is written in Urdu, and *The Sealed Nectar* is the translated text in English. The text is religious

and it is the biography of our beloved Prophet Muhammad (SAW). The study inspects the writer's fidelity to the source text or the target text. It examines how he translates culturally significant terms and makes their translation comprehensible for the English world. The study uses Peter Newmark's Semantic and Communication translation theory as a lens for its deep analysis and discusses the semantic and communicative losses in the process of translation.

Sampling Techniques

The current research takes the most significant religiously and culturally rich expressions, terms and phrases as these create difficulty in translation. It is difficult for the translator to translate them exactly as they are in the source text because every culture has different terminologies for different expressions. This study discusses all these issues in detail by using semantic and communicative translation theory as an analytical lens. Subsequently, the study identifies the semantic and communicative fidelity of the author and how the meanings are lost when it is translated from Urdu to English.

Data Analysis Procedure

The data is analyzed under two categories: semantic and communicative. The selected data consists of religiously and culturally significant expressions and they are examined by using Peter Newmark's theory as the lens. Both texts are compared with each other. Texts are kept in the comparable columns of the table. The study chooses the source text and its English translation and discusses in detail the elements of faithfulness from the perspective of semantic or communicative translation.

Ethical Considerations

The study is about a religious text, *Ar Raheeq-ul-Makhtoom* and its English translation. It examines the selected examples with extreme care and prevents itself from making wrong explanations. Quotations and citations are clearly and accurately mentioned to avoid any ambiguity. All the results are explained and written honestly and faithfully. The research carries its analysis without any prejudice. The study has not included irrelevant information, and all these precautions convince that the study is objective, honestly done and ethically sound.

Data Analysis

This part of the study documents the analysis quite comprehensively.

Semantic Analysis

This type of translation is almost like word for word or literal translation. It focuses on conveying the exact equivalence to the target audience. But in this type of translation, the translator has to face difficulties seeing the equivalence in the target language. Religious texts have culturally and religiously rich terms and phrases, it is impossible for the translator to find the equivalent terms and phrases in the target language. This study has some terms and phrases from the text *Ar Raheeq-ul-Makhtoom* and its English translation, *The Sealed Nectar*, for its exploration and analysis.

Communicative Analysis

Communicative translation is a type of translation in which translator tries to convey the main message of the source text. This translation focuses on conveying the idea of the text to its readers. Communicative translation has more faithfulness to its target readers. The translation modifies the terms, phrases and sentences according to the comprehensibility of the source text to its readers. The study has included *Ar Raheeq-ul-Makhtoom* as a source text; there are many such examples that are culturally and religiously rich terms that are untranslatable exactly in the target language. In this situation, the translator prioritizes communicative translation over semantic translation. Therefore,

the main purpose of communicative translation is to make the text easy and understandable for its readers. Table below represents the most significant terms, phrases and sentences that the study is going to discuss in detail.

Table 2

Significant Terms in View of Semantic and Communicative Perspectives

S. NO	Topic	Terms, Phrases and Sentences	Nature of Loss
1	Arab <i>hakoomaten or sardariyan</i> عرب حکومتیں اور سرداریاں	<i>Khandaq</i> ” (44)(Ditch) خندق	Semantic
2	Arab <i>Hakoomaten or sardarian</i> عرب حکومتیں اور سرداریاں	اصحاب الغیل Ashab-il-Feel (45)	Semantic
3	Sham ki Badshahi شام کی بادشاہی	Wassiyyat (51) وصیت	Semantic
4	Yahood key sath Muaidah یہود کے ساتھ معاہدہ	(264) کوئی آدمی اپنے حلیف کی وجہ سے مجرم نہ ٹھرے گا Koi aadmi apny haleef ki waja sy mujrim nah thehry gaa.	Semantic
5	Arab <i>Adyaan-o-Mazahib</i> عرب ادیان و مذاہب	Jinn (57) جن	Communicative

Discussions

The following table shows the detailed discussions and analysis of the above-mentioned examples by using the lens of semantic and communicative theory proposed by Peter Newmark.

Table 3

Semantic Perspective	Communicative Perspective
In the source text, Ar Raheeq-ul-Makhtoom, the term “<i>Khandaq</i>” gives the reference of the trench that is made by the Muslims for their defense during Ghazwa e Khandaq. The word “<i>khandaq</i>” has cultural and religious significance. It shows Muslims’ war strategy. This word is culturally and religiously significant and loaded. It is translated in the target text as, “Ditch”. In English, it means a small, narrow passage, a common, ordinary form or structure. This term is culturally neutral and has no religious significance. According to Newmark, the purpose of semantic translation is to secure the source text’s meanings, cultural references and the most important is to have fidelity to the source text. Thus, from the semantic point of view, the conversion of “<i>Khandaq</i>” as “Ditch” is not exactly conveying the message of the source text because it removes the sacred battle plan and it does not successfully convey the religious and cultural richness. This is how, “Ditch” is semantically lost because it fails to convey the cultural and religious meanings of “<i>Khandaq</i>”.	On the other hand, communicative perspectives mean to convey the idea of the original text, make the text readable and comprehensible for its readers, in this perspective, text should be simple and it focuses on readers’ response. The terms and phrases should be translated according to its readers’ culture, and their understanding is the main purpose of the translation. Therefore, in the communicative perspective, “Ditch”, is the most accurate choice for the translator because it makes the text smooth, easy and understandable. It ignores cultural and religious terminologies. It makes its readers understand the text easily. This is why; “Ditch” is communicatively successful translation strategy as it makes the translation easy and smooth. It conveys the basic meanings clearly. Therefore, the translation is more faithful to its target readers as its focus is to make the text comprehensible for its readers.

Semantic Perspective	Communicative Perspective
Next example for discussion and analysis is also chosen from the same topic that is culturally and religiously loaded term. As discussed earlier, semantic translations' purpose is to convey the exact linguistic meanings of the source text. This example is taken from original text that is in Arabic and it has deep religious meanings. The word, "Ashab" (اصحاب) its factual meanings are, fellowship, friends and companions and "Feel" (الفيل) means elephant. The closest meaning of this phrase is, "people of the elephant". This term gives the reference of Abrahah's army of Elephant, it is an event that is historical and narrated in the <i>Holy Quran Surah Al-Feel</i>. As semantic translation focuses on conveying the literal meanings, cultural relevance and religious exactness. It can be translated as "The Elephant Army" but translating it as, "people of the elephant" is the semantic loss of the term because its religious and cultural meanings are not exactly conveyed.	In conclusion, translation of "Khandaq", as "ditch", in the source text shows a communicative translation strategy although the term clearly conveys the effective military meanings to its audience and semantically it is lost and it does not fully convey its exact, accurate meanings and it removes cultural and religious depth and has fidelity to its target readers. Finally, the translation remains faithful to its target audience as it makes the text easy to understand by omitting cultural and religious depth. However, the translation, "People of the Elephant" is communicatively translated which means translation should be according to the comprehensibility of the target audience. It focuses on making the translation easy to understand and it omits the cultural and religious meanings of the term. It just conveys the main idea and the core message of the source text to the target audience. "The people of the Elephant" is a translation that gives the general idea of the source text, it enhances the readability for the international readers. Although it's clear, easy to understand but it fails to convey the exact meanings, however, this translation is communicatively perfect, or effective but semantic meanings are lost.
<i>Wassiyat</i>, is another term for analysis, it is translated in the target text (<i>The Sealed Nectar</i>) as 'request'. It is a general translation that is unable to convey the exact message of this highly religious and culturally loaded term. Here the translator faces challenges translating it properly. <i>Wassiyat</i> has intense and deeper sense and emotional meanings in Urdu language. The author has translated it as request that completely changes its sense and eliminates the seriousness of the term and loses its effects and change the meanings for the readers. Therefore, this translation has more faithfulness to its target audience.	The translation of, <i>Wassiyat</i> as 'request' is totally different from its original meanings. This translation prefers readers' accessibility and understanding but it omits its exact meanings. <i>Wassiyat</i> means a person's final words or wish before dying and that person must fulfil that wish with whom this <i>Wassiyat</i> is made. Therefore, in communicative perspectives, the translator translates it to increase its accessibility because he knows that the readers or audience will be unable to understand the actual meanings of <i>Wassiyat</i> and that is why the translator prioritizes readability and comprehensibility and ignores its exactness. This is how the translation keeps communicative preference.

Semantic Perspective	Communicative Perspective
Another example for analysis is, کوئی آدمی اپنے حلیف کی وجہ سے مجرم نہ ٹھے گا Is translated as, “Neither shall commit sins to the prejudice of others” in this example, مجرم is translated into two words commit sins, this translation is not literal, it just conveys the general meanings of the source text. حلیف کی وجہ سے is again translated generally as, <i>to the prejudice of others</i>, this type of translation focuses the shift and gives more attention to another aspect where it compromises its faithfulness to the source text and it has less fidelity to its Urdu text.	“Neither shall commit sins to the prejudice of others” This type of translation is close to the understandability of its audience as its phrases are altered according to their perception. This translation ignores its literal meanings and changes the sentence structure according to its readers. Translation, “to the prejudice of others” is more comprehensible to its readers. Although it is easy to understand but it compromises the text’s original meanings and context, however, remains faithful to the target readers. In this translation, the translator does not focus on literal translation but elaborates it more so that the reader can easily understand the idea of the message. In conclusion, the translation is communicatively successful but loses its semantic meanings and generally conveys the idea of the source text.
Another example taken from <i>Ar Raheeq-ul-Makhtoom</i> is, <i>Jinn</i>, it remains the same as, <i>Jinn</i>, in the translated text which means the translation is more faithful to its source text. The translator tries to maintain its originality and does not translate because in doing so it may change its original sense and this method aligns with Newmark’s semantic translation that focuses on faithfulness to the source text, as this term has no exact equivalence in target language, so the translator borrows this word as it is from the Urdu language and does not take the risk to misinterpret the term, that may totally change the meanings of the term, <i>jinn</i>.	In communicative perspective, the term <i>Jinn</i> carries a communicative loss as <i>Jinn</i> has no equivalence in English and it does not convey its complete meanings. Newmark suggests that the main purpose of communicative translation is to make the text easy for its readers but due to cultural differences sometimes it is very difficult to translate the term exactly. So, there is a need to provide the context of the text to make it comprehensible and understandable to the target readers.

Conclusion

The main purpose of the current study was to examine the semantic and communicative losses in the English translation of *Ar Raheeq-ul-Makhtoom* (Sealed Nectar) written by Safi-ur-Rehman Al-Mubarakpuri by using Peter Newmark’s Semantic and Communicative theory. The study analyzed culturally and religiously rich terms, phrases and sentences taken from the source text that is written in Urdu and translated into English. It discussed in detail how meanings are changed in the process of translation according to the target culture. The meanings were changed to make it easy for its readers. The study has used Peter Newmark’s Semantic and Communicative translation approaches as a lens to assess the semantic and communicative losses, the fidelity, comprehensibility and practical usefulness of the English-translated text.

The findings of the study reveal that although the self-English translation has successfully conveyed the meanings of the source text to the target audience by conveying the general idea to its global audience, there are a lot of examples of semantic and communicative losses. This study has mentioned these losses, discussed and analyzed them in detail. These examples are culturally and religiously significant; that is why it is a challenge for the translator to find out the exact equivalence of such a term in the target language. To convey the message of the original or source text, the translator focusses on conveying the message and the general idea of the source text because it is impossible

for him to translate such text literally. So, semantic loss occurs when there is no exact equivalence in the target language; on the other hand, communicative loss is noticed when cultural tone, linguistic effects and emotional impact are not achieved or minimized.

The study recommends that the translator, who is working on sacred and holy texts, must prefer an approach that makes the text easy for its readers. The text holds a religious and cultural orientation, but the translator adopted a balanced attitude and combined semantic accuracy with communicative usefulness. The explanatory notes help to understand the religiously difficult terms and phrases. The translation mostly preferred communicative approach to make the source text message easy and understandable for its audience. Moreover, awareness of cultural norms and pragmatic meanings in the process of translation at the end of the translator may enhance the readability of the translated text for nonnative readers around the world.

References

- Abdullah, M. (2019). *A comparative study of pragmatic losses in English translations of the Holy Quran* (Doctoral dissertation, National University of Modern Languages, Islamabad).
- Abdullah, M., & Asghar, J. (2017). Study of pragmatic losses in the English translations of SÅ «rah Al Ikhlas: A comparative pragmalinguistic analysis. *Research Journal Al Basirah*, 6(2), 1-14. <https://doi.org/10.12816/0051335>
- Abdullah, M., & Sayyed, M. (2024). A study of narrative techniques in Surah Yusuf: Semantic and communicative perspectives. *Global Social Sciences Review*, 9(4), 51-63. [http://dx.doi.org/10.31703/gssr.2024\(IX-IV\).06](http://dx.doi.org/10.31703/gssr.2024(IX-IV).06)
- Catford, J. C. (1965). *A linguistic theory of translation: An essay in applied linguistics*. Oxford University Press.
- Hale, S., & Campbell, S. (2002). The interaction between text difficulty and translation accuracy. *Babel*, 48(1), 14-33. <https://doi.org/10.1075/babel.48.1.02hal>
- Kundera, M. (1992). *L'immortalité*. Gallimard.
- Laxen, J. & Lavour, J.M. (2010). The role of semantics in translation recognition: Effects of a number of translations, dominance of translations, and semantic relatedness of multiple translations. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*. 13(2), 157-183. <http://doi.org/10.1017/S1366728909990472>
- Lui, G. L. (2004). On translation of Chinese ancient poetry through Newmark's "semantic translation" and "communicative translation." *Journal of Shijiazhuang Teachers College*, 6(4), 55-59
- Newmark, P. (1976). *The theory and the craft of translation*. *Language Teaching and Linguistics Abstracts*, 9(1), 5-26. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444800002913>
- Newmark, P. (1988). *A Textbook of Translation*. London: Prentice Hall International Ltd.
- Newmark, P. (2001). *Approaches to translation*. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press. <https://doi.org/10.2991/jisem-15.2015.55>
- Nida, E. A. (1964). *Toward a science of translating: With special reference to principles and procedures involved in Bible translating*. Brill Archive.
- Nida, E. A., & Taber, C. R. (1969). *The theory and practice of translation*. E. J. Brill.
- Nord, C. (1997). *Translating as a purposeful activity: Functionalist approaches explained*. St. Jerome. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315760506>
- Pym, A. (2001). Introduction: The return to ethics in translation studies. *The Translator*, 7(2), 129-138. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13556509.2001.10799096>
- Ritchie, J., Lewis, J., & Elam, G. (2003). Designing and selecting samples. In J. Ritchie & J. Lewis (Eds.), *Qualitative research practice: A guide for social science students and researchers* (pp. 77-108). Sage Publications.
- Sapir, E. (1958). *Culture, language, and personality: Selected essays*. University of California Press.
- Tokowicz, N., & Kroll, J. F. (2007). Number of meanings and concreteness: Consequences of ambiguity within and across languages. *Language and Cognitive Processes*, 22(5), 727-779. <https://doi.org/10.32996/ijllt.2022.5.4.11>
- Tylor, E. B. (1871). *Primitive culture: researches into the development of mythology, philosophy, religion, art, and custom* (Vol. 2). J. Murray.
- Waard, J. D., & Nida, E. A. (1986). *From one language to another: Functional equivalence in Bible translating*. Nelson.
- Wendland, E. R. (2010). Framing the frames: A theoretical framework for the cognitive notion of "frames of reference." *Journal of Translation*, 6(1), 27-50.
- Zu, M., & Dong, Y. (2015). A brief analysis of communicative translation and semantic translation. *Proceedings of the 2015 Joint International Social Science, Education, Language, Management and Business Conference*. <https://doi.org/10.2991/jisem-15.2015.55>