

## When the Context Has the Upper Hand. The Translation of Religious Expressions

Sukayna Ali, The University of Jordan  
Marwan Jarrah, The University of Jordan  
Hanan Al-Jabri, The University of Jordan

### **Abstract**

*This article investigates the translation of religious expressions in the context of everyday interactions in Jordanian Arabic (JA) where they remarkably serve as discourse markers. Expressions of this nature are required to be pragmatically translated, given the fact that their semantic content is largely peripheral to the meaning of the accompanying utterance. Using relevance theory, this article provides evidence that these expressions have procedural meanings, as their intended meanings are significantly derived from the context. In order to corroborate this finding, the current study involved the participation of fifty graduate students majoring in Applied English at the University of Jordan. A translation task of fifty utterances and exchanges was used to collect the data. Five of the most popular religious expressions in JA were employed. Each of these expressions was used eight times in context-rich exchanges representing four different pragmatic functions and twice in de-contextualized utterances. The findings demonstrate that when these expressions are taken out of context, translations are mostly literal or dependent on the translator's arbitrary guesses of the intended meaning. On the other hand, when context was given, translators avoided literal translations and produced renditions that matched the pragmatic functions which these expressions convey in the various contexts.*

**Keywords:** religious expressions; context; Arabic; relevance theory

### **1. Introduction**

Religious markers (i.e. expressions that encompass a diverse range of religious entities such as God, The Prophet, the Devil, and other commonly associated characterizations) are very common in Jordanian Arabic (JA). Jarrah & Alghazo (2023) identified a total of 2083 tokens of 18 religious expressions in 350 interactive exchanges and conversations in this Arabic dialect. This relatively significant number of occurrences of religious expressions is highly indicative of the wide spread of such expressions in JA. Such religious expressions have been observed to serve a broad range of functions such as mitigating the force of directives, expressing an invocation, a compliment, modesty, and sarcasm, and acting as a conversational backchannel (Farghal 1995; Migdadi et al. 2010; Migdadi & Badarneh 2013).

The present research article aims to examine the translations of most commonly used religious expressions in JA. The importance of this examination is based on the fact that religious expressions appear as versatile expressions with multiple pragmatic functions, which are contingent upon the specific context in which they occur (Farghal 1995; Jaradat 2014; Al-Rojaie 2021). An example of a religious marker is *ma:fa:llah*, which has the literal meaning of ‘what God wishes (has and will come true)’. *ma:fa:llah* can convey various meanings depending on the context in which it appears; these meanings include a mockery, a

compliment, or an expression of humbleness (Migdadi et al. 2010). In (1) below, *ma:fa:llah* is used as a compliment booster that aims to foster the flattering effect of the statement:

- (1) *ma:fa:llah kunti: ʔaħla: waħdeh bil-ħafleh ʔil-jo:m*  
 ‘What God wishes. You were the prettiest [girl] at the party today.’

The use of *ma:fa:llah* in this example serves the purpose of flattering the recipient’s attractive appearance. Simultaneously, the inclusion of this marker implies that the speaker is attempting to safeguard the recipient from the potential harm caused by the evil eye (see Migdadi et al. 2010; Al-Khawaldeh et al. 2023).

It is evident that the context has a substantial effect in determining the intended meaning of religious expressions (Clift & Helani 2010). Evidence for this comes mainly from the fact that when these markers are dropped out of context, determining their correct meaning will be exclusively reliant on the receivers’ arbitrary guesses and will only be valid in instances where the recipients’ predictions about the right meaning coincidentally match the correct intended one.

In this research article, we hypothesize that religious markers express procedural meanings rather than conceptual ones (see Sperber & Wilson 1986). We demonstrate that the purpose of these expressions is to indicate the particular type of inference that the listener should be engaged with based on the given context, which is taken here to be “the set of premises used in interpreting [it]” (Sperber & Wilson 1986: 15), rather than to convey specific concepts. This assumption is substantiated by the analysis of translations conducted by novice translators, who were tasked with translating both contextualized and decontextualized exchanges and utterances. We anticipate that the translators will be capable of accurately translating the intended meaning within contextualized exchanges. However, they are likely to struggle in understanding the intended meaning of such expressions in decontextualized utterances and will only convey the semantic meaning of such expressions.

The present article is organized as follows. Section 2 offers an overview of the relationship between language, culture, and religion. Then, Section 3 elucidates the contrast between procedural and conceptual meanings as proposed by relevance theory. Section 4 pertains to the examination of religious expressions as discourse markers, and Section 5 provides an overview of research conducted on the translation of religious expressions. Section 6 presents the methodology employed in this study, mainly elucidating the procedures adopted for data collection and analysis. Finally, Section 7 encompasses the primary analysis and discussion, and Section 8 is the conclusion.

## 2. Language, culture, and religion

The modern world is largely marked by a remarkable diversity of religious traditions and convictions, each of which is embedded within its cultural settings (Danz 2020). Irrespective of the particular religious beliefs that dominate a specific culture, it is widely recognized that religion wields a pervasive impact on a diverse range of areas within the culture where it is practiced. Therefore, religion has always played a prominent role in human culture, exerting influence over beliefs, values, and social practices (Bamyeh 2019). This close interconnection between culture and religion has led to the perception that culture and religion are mutually constitutive (Brown 2014). Besecke (2005: 184) contends that religion “exists in the social

world as culture exists in the social world –via shared meanings and practices. Reducing religion to its institutional expressions (church, sect, cult) is analogous to reducing culture to media, to movies, to the arts, to the educational system”. Needless to say, embracing religion encompasses more than just possessing abstract beliefs, as the impact of religion is manifested in a diverse range of material forms (Keenan & Arweck 2016). Without these manifestations, such as arts, buildings, music, and dances, religions would remain purely theoretical and limited to the realm of theology (Keenan & Arweck 2016).

The impact of religion on a particular society is more conspicuous in cultures where it serves as a fundamental principle for individuals in most facets of their daily life activities and undertakings, as is clearly evident in Arab culture (Young 2001). The Arab culture manifests the impact of religion not only with respect to the practice of worship but also to all aspects of life. In Jordan, for example, the name *Muhammad*, which carries a great religious value (i.e. it represents the name of the Prophet Muhammad), is very popular in the Jordanian culture, let alone other names and titles of the Prophet such as Ahmad and Mustafa. The Jordanian news agency Petra reported that the number of male individuals with the name Mohammad in Jordan in 2022 was 760,582 (Petra 2022). This figure is relatively high when compared to the total male population of Jordan. The impact of religion on names extends beyond individual naming conventions and also encompasses those of streets, educational institutions, and organizations. According to Sulayman (2018), a considerable number of the main streets in Jordan are named after significant Islamic battles that took place in the area, prominent caliphs from different periods of Islamic history, and leaders who played crucial roles in the Islamic conquest. Additionally, official certificates in Jordan, including passports and identification cards, feature some religious aspects (Al-Ali 2006). Al-Ali (2006) noted that a considerable percentage of marriage invitations within Jordanian society start with either a direct quotation from the Holy Quran (40%) or one of Prophet Mohammad’s Hadiths to confer blessings upon the betrothed couple (35%). Religion also exerts influence on the social values that are commonly observed in Jordan. According to Gharaybeh (2014), religious values hold a prominent position in the hierarchy of values, followed by those that originate from the social class and political systems among others.

The influence of religion is predominantly observed in linguistic expressions. This pertains not solely to the utilization of religious expressions in language, but also to the vital role that religion assumes in the analysis of language variation, evolution, and preservation (Darquennes & Vandebussche 2015). The emergence of ‘language and religion’ as an area of study within the domain of sociolinguistics is therefore not surprising.

The Arab culture is known to be heavily influenced by religion; hence, it is not uncommon to observe the use of religious expressions in almost every conversation (Abboud 1988; Morrow 2006; Welji 2012). Religious expressions are used “in a variety of forms, and in private and public settings, as wishes, offers of congratulations, greetings, farewell and gratitude expressions, curses and other forms” (Al-Rojaie 2021: 3). This influence of religion on the Arab culture is evidenced by many researchers (see Abboud 1988; Jastrow 2004) who demonstrated that the religious beliefs of Arab speakers, particularly those of Islam, Christianity, and Judaism, have contributed significantly to the dialectical variation observed in the Arab world. In addition, linguistic variation utilized by adherents of religious sects, such as Sunnis and Shiites, are also influenced by their respective religious beliefs and practices. According to Morrow & Castleton (2007), the recurrent use of *Allah* expressions in Arabic serves as a means for Muslims to acknowledge the comprehensive influence of Allah on all aspects of their being. The prevalence of religious expressions in Arab culture,

including Jordan, may be linked to the Islamic principle of *ḍikir ʾallah* ('mentioning Allah'), which emphasizes the constant remembrance of God (Welji 2012). This involves invoking the name of God throughout the day, rather than solely during prayers.

In view of this, religious expressions do not only serve as an indication of a religious commitment but also fulfil diverse functions by virtue of the use of conventional semantic equivalents that serve a comparable purpose (Nazzal 2005). For instance, the religious expression *wallah* ('swear by God') has a number of procedural interpretations, each of which is determined by the context in which it is uttered. It can be used to ask for confirmation, to show disbelief, and to express mockery, among others.

In this research article, we provide evidence that there is no semantic relationship between religious expressions used primarily as discourse markers in Jordanian Arabic (JA) and the procedural meanings they encode. Rather, we show that such expressions convey dynamic, pragmatic meanings of which situational and contextual aspects can only determine their intended meanings. The study proves this claim through the use of translations provided by the participating translators, who are found to discern the procedural meanings of these religious expressions and reflect their understanding onto their translations, which were far from literal when contextual cues are present. The present study aims to answer two research questions:

- Question (A): To what extent is there a distinction made by translators between the procedural and semantic meanings of religious expressions?
- Question (B): What is the function of context in helping translators identify the procedural meaning of religious expressions?

Our main hypothesis posits that, in light of their shared status as native Arabic speakers, the translators possess the capacity to produce translations that effectively convey the procedural meanings associated with these religious expressions. We also assume that the task of translators to accurately comprehend the pragmatic meaning is significantly more challenging in the absence of contextual information, as opposed to when such information is readily available.

### 3. Conceptual vs procedural meanings in relevance theory

Relevance theory is a cognitive theory of human communication that was originally proposed by Sperber & Wilson (1986). One of the fundamentals of this theory rests on the assumption that communication relies on the speaker making the utterance ostensive so that the receiver would understand the speaker's intention and subsequently infer the intended meaning (Sperber & Wilson 1987, 1995; Alott 2013; Ali et al. 2024). According to relevance theory, the linguistic forms used by communicators during communication are insufficient to convey the intended meanings. Instead, those forms only serve as inputs for the inferential process, which heavily draws on context rather than on linguistic forms (Carston 2008). This key premise of relevance theory is taken as the starting point for the current study.

Linguistic forms convey two different types of meaning: conceptual and procedural (Sperber & Wilson 1987). The majority of words convey concepts that stand out for possessing logical traits such as entering into entailment or contradiction relations, acting as input to logical inferences, and having truth-conditional characteristics (Wilson & Sperber

1993). Other words have procedural meanings as they outline how to manipulate concepts (Yus 2006). Their function is to suggest how to ‘take’ the sentence or phrase where they occur, rather than conveying a concept, hence leading the listener’s overall effort to decrease. As explained by Wilson (2011), the purpose of procedural expressions is to activate cognitive processes, which are specific to a given domain and can be used to communicate inferentially. Such expressions serve to direct the inferential process through the use of procedural restrictions on the intended contexts and cognitive effects. As a result, they lend support to the computational rather than the representational side of comprehension. Discourse markers, the main focus of our study, belong to this category because they specify the type of inferential process that the listener should undertake (Blakemore 2002; Harb et al. 2022).

In the early stages of relevance-theory related research, procedural words had been treated as contributing only to non-truth-conditional aspects of meaning. However, Wilson & Sperber (1993) expanded the role of procedural meaning in that it can constrain the derivation of explicatures (Alott 2013). To illustrate the difference between conceptual and procedural meanings, consider the following example in (2):

- (2) *This airline is very affordable and safe, so I will purchase the tickets before they sell out.*

The word *airline*, for example, encodes the concept AIRLINE which contributes to build the propositional meaning of the sentence. However, the discourse connective *so* supports a reading in which the second clause is seen as a conclusion which is supported by the first. This discourse marker specifies the type of the inferential process that the receiver should perform, which, in this example, is the process of concluding that purchasing the tickets results from the fact that the airline is very affordable and safe.

Similar to the discourse connector *so*, religious expressions direct receivers to a certain meaning depending on the context. Consider the following exchange that takes place between a son (A) and a father (B):

- (3) A: *dʒibit ʔaqall ʕala:mah fi: ʔilʕuʕbah fi: ʔimtiha:n ʔilʕulu:m*  
‘I got the least mark in the class in the science exam.’

B: *ma:ʕa:llah ʔana: faxu:r fi:k*  
Literally: ‘What God wills. I am proud of you.’

The religious expression *ma:ʕa:llah* is commonly employed as a means of shielding individuals from the evil eye of others and those who harbour feelings of jealousy (Migdadi et al. 2010). However, in this particular context, it serves as a tool to express sarcasm. In other words, the utilization of this expression within this interaction substantiates an interpretation that indicates the father’s discontentment with his son’s performance, as evidenced by his mockery of the son’s result. The interpretation of *ma:ʕa:llah* does not entail the father’s invocation of God’s name to safeguard his son from the evil eye. Rather, it serves as a means for the father to express his derision and disillusionment regarding his son’s academic performance. As for the translation, it would be more appropriate to render it into English as ‘I am ridiculing you’.

According to relevance theory, discourse markers do not encode concepts but influence inferential processes by indicating the type of inference the listener is expected to

make (Alott 2013). Thus, discourse markers help achieve relevance by guiding the listener's attention toward the intended contextual effects, thereby reducing the overall effort required to interpret the utterance. The purpose of this study is to look into how religious expressions would confine the inferential phase of comprehension by identifying the type of inference process that the translators are expected to go through and how this would be manifested in their translations.

#### 4. Religious expressions as discourse markers

Apart from being used to show the speakers' religious commitment, previous studies on the topic have shown that religious expressions are utilized in a range of contexts to render multiple meanings (Verdonik & Kačič 2012; Jarrah & Alghazo 2023). Numerous studies have looked into the pragmatic multifunctionality of religious expressions, concentrating on their functions, which are most frequently used in discourse. These studies showed that the semantic content of religious expressions has little or no bearing on the speaker's intended meaning (Nazzal 2001; Al-Rojaie 2021).

A number of scholars have confined the scope of their studies to JA. Farghal (1995) argued that *ʔinfʔa:llah* can be a directive device, meaning it can be used to ask for information from the interlocutor while also making it clear to the recipient that the speaker is not placing inquiries on them. It may also serve as an expressive tool to convey feelings of hope and indifference, among others, or as a commissive tool that only loosely commits the addressor to action. The aim is to avoid jeopardizing social relationships with others.

Al-Khatib (1995) delved into the topic of taboos in JA. According to the findings of the research, some religious expressions are employed as a means of alleviating the effects of certain unfavourable subjects. As an illustration, *la: samaħa ʔallah* ('God forbids') is usually used when death is mentioned in order to mitigate its unfavourable effects.

Al-Adaileh (2007) undertook a linguistic investigation into the concept of politeness as it pertains to British and Jordanian cultures. He noted that certain religious expressions are utilized to achieve this objective, such as *laʔnatu ʔallah ʔala: ʔalfajtʔa:n* ('the curse of God is on Satan'). The utilization of this expression serves the function of expressing remorse while conveying the absence of intentionality with regard to the error committed.

According to Migdadi et al. (2010), the religious expression *ma:ʔa:llah* ('What God wills') has numerous other uses than its conventional application as a weapon against the evil eye. These uses can range from praising others to, at the other end, mocking them.

Migdadi & Badarneh (2013) investigated the use of religious expressions that center on the veneration of the Prophet. A prominent illustration can be observed in the expression *sʔalli ʔannabi* which exhibits diverse meanings contingent upon the context, such as claiming one's turn to speak or safeguarding the speaker from evil eye. Migdadi and Badarneh pointed out that identifying the many meanings of religious statements offers benefits not only in understanding the discourse but also in improving translation efficiency and streamlining the process of learning a foreign language.

Jaradat (2014) conducted a similar study and concluded that many religious expressions have relatively lost their original semantic meaning and have taken on other meanings. An example is *jallah* which might mean 'barely' or 'let's.' Additionally, the study has uncovered that certain religious expressions have undergone modifications in their

grammar-related functions. For instance, *jallah* serves as both an adverb and a verb in ‘barely’ and ‘let’s,’ respectively.

More recently, Jarrah & Alghazo (2023), for example, explored the pragmatics of *la: ila:ha illa alla:h* (‘no god except Allah’) and concluded that this religious marker is primarily used to express surprise or disagreement, to take the lead in conversations, or to cancel information. Among all of the aforementioned roles, *la: ila:ha illa alla:h* also assumes the role of a mitigator, owing to the fact that religious expressions are generally more acceptable to individuals due to the favourable impact of religious connotations and the influence that religion holds within the Jordanian society. Jarrah and Alghazo (2023) further argued that this religious expression has a variety of prosodic manifestations related to the function it serves, which makes it easier to determine the function the speaker is trying to convey.

Although the topic of identifying the functions of religious expressions receives much attention in research, the translation of religious expressions does not. One major reason for this paucity in research comes from the fact that most translation studies target Standard Arabic where the use of religious expressions as discourse markers is extremely limited if any. However, when we look beyond Standard Arabic and focus on the functions of religious expressions in vernaculars, we find how rich and important these expressions are for translation studies especially those that capitalize on the role of the context in determining the optimal rendition of the source text. Therefore, it seems important to conduct a translation study that aims to examine whether translators will exhibit attentiveness towards the pragmatic meanings of religious expressions, and how they would articulate such meanings in written form.

## 5. Religious expressions in translation

As previously mentioned, researchers in the field of linguistics have demonstrated profound interest in the investigation of the pragmatic functions of religious expressions. Nevertheless, it appears that the subject matter has yet to garner the interest of researchers within the field of translation studies. We assume that the efficacy of rendering religious expressions that serve as discourse markers and have procedural meanings is largely contingent upon the translator’s understanding of the pragmatic import of the religious expression within a particular context. It goes without saying that conveying the semantic meaning of such expressions while neglecting to calculate their pragmatic value would give rise to literal translation that falls short of fulfilling the communication function and, as a result, will cause a breakdown in the overall meaning of the exchange in question. Translators are expected to distinguish between religious terms that are simply used to convey their semantic religious meaning (i.e. invocations) and those that are used as discourse markers whose semantic value is wholly irrelevant to the context. In the first case, translators need to exercise caution because religion is one of the most delicate cultural issues given its divine character. Any translation mistakes or inaccuracies will not be tolerated, especially within the Arabic context, where phrases relating to religion are sacred.

When religious expressions are utilized as discourse markers, translators must ensure that their translations convey meanings which are equivalent to the intended meanings of the speaker, rather than simply replacing the words with their semantic equivalents. According to Baker (1992), to achieve equivalence between the source text and the target text, the

translator should not only render the semantic meaning of words and expressions but also the context of these linguistic forms and their cultural background. Hence, the context has the upper hand in rendering the translation of religious markers adequately.

Upon reviewing the existing literature on the translation of religious expressions, it has come to light that the matter of translating religious expressions as discourse markers is yet to be explored. The researchers have directed their attention towards the conceptual translation of religious expressions and the appropriate means of conveying their meanings while encompassing all associated religious connotations. Specifically, researchers have examined the challenges associated with translating religious expressions and have sought to identify optimal strategies for preserving the intended meaning in the target text, among other issues. While some prior studies focused on religious expressions per se, others examined them within the broader context of culture-specific terms. Almubark et al. (2014), for example, looked at how Sudanese students translated expressions that were culturally unique from Arabic into English, including certain religious terms. The study revealed that the translators struggled with these concepts mostly because they were unable to find direct equivalents for them in English. According to Al Zubi (2013), the intricate meanings conveyed by Islamic expressions in the Holy Quran have proved resistant to translation due to their incorporation of psychological, religious, mental, and moral dimensions.

Dweik & Abu Shakra (2011) focused primarily on the translation of Arabic religious collocations into English. They used sentences extracted from the Holy Quran, the Hadith, and the Bible, and tasked M.A. translation students to translate them into English. As per the results of the study, it is recommended that translators refrain from utilizing literal translation and instead take into account the contextual factors as well as the disparities between the Arabic culture and belief systems and those that are commonly observed in English-speaking societies. According to Dweik & Abu Helwah (2014), the difficulties Jordanian students find when encountering religious phrases are mostly caused by some disparities between English and Arabic and a lack of understanding regarding the significance of the context in translation.

Investigating the translation of religious terms used in religious occasions as in Ramadan, Eid, and marriage celebrations, Khammyseh (2015) confirmed that difficulties of translating from Arabic to English primarily result from cultural gaps, stylistic variations between the two languages, and a lack of English language equivalences. According to Shanazary (2020), the majority of the Islamic Shi'a concepts that were translated from Persian into English to fill in religious lexical gaps were reproduced literally or by transliteration. It is clear that most studies focused on the conceptual meanings of religious expressions, but none of them investigated their procedural meanings. In other words, the current study would be the first to look into the translation of religious expressions as discourse markers.

## **6. Methods**

As native speakers of JA, we designed the corpus of the study represented in a translation task comprising ten utterances and forty exchanges in JA, precisely suited for the goals of the study. As mentioned earlier, this article tackles the translation of only five religious expressions (or any of their variant forms) that are regarded as being among the most common ones used in JA. The selection of these religious expressions was not haphazard.



Rather, it was grounded in the findings of Jarrah & Alghazo's (2023) study. Their research examined the prevalent expressions in JA, utilizing a corpus derived from authentic conversations within the Jordanian society. The religious expressions selected for the present research are the ones that were mostly observed in the corpus of Jarrah & Alghazo's study. These religious expressions are *ʔinfa:llah* ('if God permits'), which was observed 520 times in the study of Jarrah and Alghazo (2023), *sʕalli ʕannabi* ('Bestow blessings upon the Prophet') which occurred 301 times, *ma:fa:llah* ('what God wills'), which occurred 266 times, and *la: ʔila:ha ʔilla ʔalla:h* ('no god except Allah') which occurred 204 times. The last religious term considered is *wallah*, which means 'swear by God.' Although Jarrah & Alghazo claimed that it is prevalent in Jordan, they excluded it as it did not align with the aims of their research.

Each of these expressions was used eight times in context-rich exchanges that achieve four different functions, and twice in de-contextualized utterances where translators are not provided with clues that might help in figuring out the pragmatic meaning. It is imperative to acknowledge that the examination of solely four functions pertaining to each religious marker does not insinuate that said markers possess only four functions within the context of JA. Instead, these functions are utilized as a representative sample due to the difficulty in addressing all conceivable functions of each of the five religious markers. The reason why this is unattainable is that although each religious marker is associated with certain functions, the range of functions that a religious marker can fulfil cannot be restricted easily as its meaning is contingent upon the context.

The number of utterances and exchanges used as the study's data is deemed adequate because, as suggested by Jarrah & Al-Jarrah (2023), less than fifty would not satisfy the aims of the study as they would not be representative. Fifty graduates from the University of Jordan majoring in Applied English took part in the study and had two hours to complete the task. All participants have completed five English-Arabic (or vice versa) translation courses. These courses are Translation 1 (English-Arabic), Translation 2 (Arabic-English), Translation of Legal Texts, Translation of Business and Economic Texts, and Translation of International Conventions. Moreover, all participants have either completed at least one translation training course or work part-time in the field of translation. All participants took a pre-test to ensure that they were qualified to participate in the study. The pre-test findings revealed that the participants are distinct in terms of their translation skills. The translation task assigned to participants was accomplished using Microsoft Teams. To avoid ruining their translations, participants were not informed of the study's objectives until after they had completed the task.

## 7. Findings and discussion

The study's findings reveal that when religious expressions are presented with context, the translations rendered are not literal and represent the speaker's intended meanings. The translations provided aligned with the pragmatic meanings of the expressions rather than their semantic content. By contrast, the decontextualized utterances underwent either a literal translation or were subject to varying interpretations based on the translator's understanding of these brief utterances. To simplify the presentation of the findings, they are divided into two separate sections: Section 7.1 addresses the translation of decontextualized religious discourse markers, whereas Section 7.2 focuses on the translation of contextualized ones.

### 7.1 The translations of decontextualized religious discourse markers

As previously stated, the presence of contextual information plays a crucial role in facilitating the translators' accurate comprehension of the procedural meaning associated with a religious marker. According to Searle (1978), the meaning of expressions does not reside in their literal interpretations. Instead, their meanings are contingent upon a set of background assumptions, which could be limitless in number. Hence, the absence of such background assumptions gives rise to high percentage of literal translations in decontextualized utterances. For more clarification, consider the following illustrative example that highlights the significance of context in ascertaining the meaning of religious markers:

- (4) a. *la: ?ila:ha ?illa ?alla:h ha:j ?a:xir marrah*  
 'No god except Allah; it is the last time'
- b. A: *?inta ma: biddak tbat<sup>t</sup>il sirqah wa...*  
 'Don't you want to stop stealing and...'
- B: *la: ?ila:ha ?illa ?alla:h ha:j ?a:xir marrah*  
 'No god except Allah. It is the last time.'

In the decontextualized utterance in (4a), the procedural meaning of the religious marker is difficult to ascertain due to insufficient contextual information, making it challenging for translators to accurately interpret its intended meaning. However, the incorporation of B's statement in example (4b) within a wider context allows for a reasonable inference that the purpose of the religious marker is to facilitate the transition of speaking turns, thereby preventing A from furthering their utterance. Among the most accurate renditions of this religious marker in English is 'Hold on. It is the last time', or 'stop, please. It is the last time.' Here is another example:

- (5) a. *Wallah ?awwal marrah ba?rif.*  
 'I swear by God it is the first time I know about this.'
- b. A: *kul sanah ?aha:li: ?il-mant<sup>t</sup>iqah bitrad3dzu:ni: bil- ?ajjam ?atraffah lil- ?intixa:ba:t*  
 'Every year the residents of the neighbourhood spend days begging me to run for elections.'
- B: *Wallah ?awwal marrah ba?rif.*  
 'I swear by God it is the first time I know about this.'

Utterance (5a) lacks clarity regarding the procedural meaning of *wallah* due to the brevity of the context provided, which does not offer any specific indication of its intended meaning. Hence, in the context of translation, the rendition of this religious marker would predominantly entail a literal approach (i.e. 'I swear by God'), or potentially rely on speculation. Nevertheless, in exchange (5b), having B's utterance within a context facilitates the translator's ability to infer the intended procedural meaning. The utterance made by A exhibits a notable level of arrogance and exaggeration, providing translators with indications that the religious marker *wallah* is likely employed in a sarcastic manner. One proposed translation for *wallah* in this particular exchange is 'This is absurd/ridiculous.'

The findings indicate that literal translations dominated the ten decontextualized utterances of religious markers, with translators providing the semantic meanings of the five markers. For the remaining translations, translators primarily relied on their guesses of the intended meanings, resulting in variations. Table 1 presents a summary of the findings related to the translation of decontextualized religious markers:

Table 1: The Translations of Decontextualized Religious Discourse Markers

The decontextualized religious marker	The number and the percentage of literal (semantic) translations		The other translations, their frequency, and the corresponding percentages		
<i>la: ?ila:ha ?illa ?alla:h</i> ('No god except Allah')	35	70%	Oh my God	4	8%
			Wow	3	6%
			Do not give up	3	6%
			Do not say this	1	2%
			Stop	1	2%
			Why do you say this	1	2%
			I do not believe this	1	2%
			This is not true	1	2%
<i>Wallah</i> ('I swear by God')	43	86%	I am sure	5	8%
			I am certain	4	6%
<i>ma:fa:llah</i> ('What God wills')	35	70%	I like it	6	12%
			Unbelievable	3	6%
			You surprised me	2	4%
			Wow	2	4%
			I am excited	1	2%
			Are you serious	1	2%
<i>?infa:llah</i> ('If God permits')	46	92%	Hopefully	3	6%
			I will do	1	2%
<i>s'alli ?annabi</i> ('Bestow blessings upon the Prophet')	39	78%	Do not panic	3	6%
			Do not rush	2	4%
			That is not certain	2	4%
			Relax	2	4%
			Do not get mad	2	4%

As illustrated in Table 1, some of the five religious markers, such as *la: ?ila:ha ?illa ?alla:h*, *ma:fa:llah*, and *s'alli ?annabi* have multiple translations due to the lack of context. Conversely, others had only two translations. For example, *Wallah* is used by Jordanians to add a religious nuance to their statements, hoping to be believed. The phrases *I am sure* or *I am certain* are the most conventional meanings associated with this expression. Consequently, these were likely the primary choices for translators, as the absence of context makes this translation the safest, with no evidence suggesting alternative meanings.

## 7.2 The translations of contextualized religious discourse markers

As previously noted, each of the five religious expressions was used eight times in context-rich exchanges serving four distinct functions. To streamline the presentation of the findings, each of the five markers is discussed individually, starting with *la: ?ila:ha ?illa ?alla:h* and concluding with *s<sup>ʕ</sup>alli ʕannabi*.

### 7.2.1. *la: ?ila:ha ?illa ?alla:h*

Regarding the contextualized exchanges, the following table shows one example on each of the functions represented by *la: ?ila:ha ?illa ?alla:h*. (To see the other exchanges used in the study, please refer to the appendix).

Table 2: Functions and translations of *la: ?ila:ha ?illa ?alla:h* in context-rich exchanges

Function	The exchange	The translations of the religious expression and their frequency
Expressing surprise	A: <i>kul t<sup>ʕ</sup>ulla:b ?ilnaħu dʒa:bu: ʕala:ma:t ka:mlah bi: ?il?imtiħa:n</i> 'All syntax students got full marks in the exam.' B: <i>la: ?ila:ha ?illa ?alla:h kullhum t<sup>ʕ</sup>ilʕu: tʕomiski:</i> 'No god except Allah. They all became Chomsky.'	1- What do you know (3) 2- Well (9) 3- That is really strange (1) 4- Really (12) 5- Are you serious (7) 6- Are you kidding? (4) 7- No way (4) 8- That is surprising (10)
Expressing rejection	A: <i>bidna: ?insa:fir ha:d ?ilʕi:d la?innuh t<sup>ʕ</sup>alʕa:neh ro:ħi:</i> 'We need to travel this Eid because I feel really bored.' B: <i>la: ?ila:ha ?illa ?alla:h ma: fi: mas<sup>ʕ</sup>a:ri:</i> 'No god except Allah. There is no money.'	1- Stop asking (2) 2- No, not now (2) 3- No way (4) 4- Not now (16) 5- forget it (12) 6- Sorry (14)
Turn taking	A: <i>?ana: ma: baħib ħada: jintiqid tas<sup>ʕ</sup>arrufa:ti: ?aw..</i> 'I do not like it when someone criticizes me or...' B: <i>la: ?ila:ha ?illa ?alla:h ?inta mi:n ?idʒa: fi:k</i> 'No god except Allah. Who criticized you?'	1-Excuse me (28) 2- Pardon me (12) 3- Give me a second (5) 4- Hold on please (5)
Information cancelling	A: <i>smiʕtu: ?innu dʒa:ritna: ?it<sup>ʕ</sup>allaqat?</i> 'Did you hear that our neighbour got	1- stop (7) 2- please stop (10)

	divorced?' B: <i>la: ?ila:ha ?illa ?alla:h, ma: daxalna: bilna:s</i> 'No god except Allah. It is none of our business.'	3- let's change the topic (33)
--	---	--------------------------------

In the first exchange, where *la: ?ila:ha ?illa ?alla:h* is deployed to express surprise, the findings show that 100% of the translators got the right meaning of this discourse marker, where the literal translation is completely absent from the scene. In other words, the surprise that was lexically expressed in Arabic using the expression *la: ?ila:ha ?illa ?alla:h* is pragmatically translated into English in a variety of ways. All of the translations presented, while different, are commonly used in English to indicate the same meaning which is expressing surprise. The sentence *what do you know*, for example means "something you say when you are surprised by a piece of information" (Cambridge Dictionary, n.d.). This percentage is not surprising given that all students achieving full marks in the exam serves as a clue for the translators to interpret the intended meaning as one of surprise. In light of relevance theory, *la: ?ila:ha ?illa ?alla:h* constrained the translators' inferential processes by identifying the type of inference process that they are supposed to go through. By doing so, this expression led translators to obtain relevance by directing them to the desired contextual effects, so minimizing the overall necessary effort.

The percentage of pragmatic translations was also 100% in the remaining three functions in Table (2). This high percentage demonstrates that when the context is available, there is essentially no possibility for contextual equivalency errors in religious markers' translation.

### 7.2.2. Wallah

This religious marker was utilized in eight sentences to serve four pragmatic functions: expressing disbelief, expressing sarcasm, confirming, and showing honesty. Table 3 summarizes the findings of students' translations of this religious marker.

Table 3: Functions and translations of *wallah* in context-rich exchanges

Function	The exchanges	The translations of the religious expression and the frequency
Expressing disbelief	A: <i>?il muba:ra:h ?illi ra:hat ?alei:k xils'it ?amanjih s'ifir</i> 'The match you missed ended 8/0.' B: <b>wallah</b> 'Swear by God?'	1- For real (17) 2- Wow! (10) 3- I do not believe (7) 4- I do not buy this (8) 5- Swear by God (8)

Expressing sarcasm	A: <i>kullhum biḡa:ru: minni laʔinnu dʒamali: ʔistiθna:ʔi:</i> 'They all envy me because my beauty is phenomenal.' B: <b>Wallah?</b> 'Swear by God'	1- Oh really (10) 2- Wow (10) 3- This is wonderful (18) 4- This is ridiculous (12)
Confirming	A: <i>ʔinta mitʔakkid ʔinnak radʒdʒaʕit ʔilmasʕa:ri:</i> 'Are you sure you returned the money?' B: <b>Wallah ʔana ma: bansa:</b> 'I swear by God. I do not forget.'	1- No doubt (15) 2- Sure (22) 3- I am sure (8) 4- Definitely (5)
Showing honesty	A: <i>ʔitdʒa:wazit yija:ba:ti: xajif ʔildokto:r jihrimni:</i> 'I exceeded the limit of absences. I am afraid the doctor might deprive me.' B: <b>Wallah ʔiða: mitwaqqiʕ hal ʔiʕi: ru:h ʔisqit ʔilmaddeh</b> 'I swear by God if you see this happening go and drop the course.'	1- Well (10) 2- Honestly (23) 3- I swear by God (7) 4- To be honest (10)

For illustration, let us discuss the second example in which *wallah* was used to signify sarcasm. Speaker A is boasting that other people are envious of her exceptional looks. Speaker B responds with one word: *wallah*. People in Jordan do not express plainly that they are beautiful. Rather, they hear such compliments from others. As a result, when they openly boast about their beauty, they become a target of mockery, as proven by the huge number of comments mocking arrogant people on social media platforms. Taking this into account, translators concluded that B's response should be interpreted as a mockery. They expressed this in their translations by using various terms such as *wow* or *this is ridiculous*, as shown in Table 3 above. The translations demonstrate that *wallah* is a discourse marker that directed the translators' attention to conclude that B is being sarcastic about what was said.

Another point that bears mentioning here is that the translators, while working on the task, assumed the intonation of *wallah* to be falling-rising to convey a sarcastic function. They observed that different intonations could impart entirely different meanings to this religious expression. As pointed out by Jarrah & Alghazo (2023), when discussing the different functions of *la: ʔila:ha ʔilla ʔalla:h*, surprise *la: ʔila:ha ʔilla ʔalla:h* is characterized by a prominence on the word *ʔila:ha* while disagreement *la: ʔila:ha ʔilla ʔalla:h* is characterized by prominence on *la:* which literally means 'No'. They contended that the difference in prominence position is imperative to differentiate between the two functions (Jarrah & Alghazo 2023: 82).

### 7.2.3. *ma:fa:llah*

This religious marker is used in the study to fulfil four pragmatic functions: protective invocation, complimenting, bragging, and mitigating. The translations of *ma:fa:llah* are summarized in Table 4.

Table 4: Functions and translations of *ma:fa:llah* in context-rich exchanges

Function	The exchanges	The translations of the religious expression and the frequency
Protective invocation	A: <i>ʔiftareit sajja:rit lamborgi:ni: ʔaggha: mijjit ʔalf</i> ‘I bought a Lamborghini that is worth a hundred thousand.’ B: <b><i>ma:fa:llah</i></b> <i>tiḥki:f guddam ḥad</i> ‘What God wills. Do not mention this to anyone.’	1-May God protect it. (11) 2-May God keep it safe (14) 3-What God wills (10) 4-May God save it (8) 5- Keep the price a secret to stay safe (7)
Complimenting	A: <i>ʔu: raʔjik bi fusta:ni: ʔildʒdi:d</i> ‘What do you think about my new dress?’ B: <b><i>ma:fa:llah</i></b> ‘What God wills.’	1-Very nice (22) 2-Amazing (22) 3- I have not seen such elegance (3) 4- You have a wonderful fashion sense (3)
Bragging	A: <b><i>ma:fa:llah</i></b> <i>kul ʔixwa:ni: daka:trah bi dʒa:mʕa:t marmu:qah</i> ‘What God wills all my brothers are doctors in highly esteemed universities.’ B: <i>ʔah smiʕit</i> ‘Yes, I heard about this.’	1- I am proud that (39) 2- I’m very blessed (11)
Mitigating	A: <i>ki:f tʕaʕim ʔil ʔakil?</i> ‘How does the food taste?’ B: <b><i>ma:fa:llah</i></b> <i>bas kti:r ma:liḥ</i> ‘What God wills, but it is too salty	2- Not bad (14) 3- Delicious (36)

A close examination of the translations of *ma:fa:llah* when the context is provided indicates that this expression has been translated literally only when employed as a protective invocation, where the literal translation has been provided ten times, accounting for 20% of this function’s translations (see Table 4 above). The reason for this is that utilizing *ma:fa:llah* to protect individuals from the evil eye is its most common function in JA (Migdadi et al. 2010; Al-Khawaldeh et al. 2023). Jordanians often use this religious expression whenever something noteworthy or desirable is mentioned or observed.

All other translations demonstrate that the translators realized that the semantic meaning of *ma:fa:llah* was not intended. In the second exchange, for example, when A asks

B about the latter's opinion of the new dress, B's response was understood to mean compliment, as evidenced by all 50 translations that express nearly the same meaning: admiring the dress and complimenting the one wearing it. In English, the adjectives 'amazing,' 'nice,' 'wonderful,' and 'elegant' were all adopted to replace *ma:fa:llah*. In the third example, the speaker used *ma:fa:llah* for bragging and showing off, a function that was correctly identified by the translators who rendered *ma:fa:llah* into English as 'I am proud of' and 'I am blessed that.' The same is true for example four, in which this religious expression is employed to avoid stating the speaker's opinion directly, especially because these opinions include some criticism. In Jordan's collectivist society, it is critical to apply mitigators that do not directly threaten the hearer's positive face. This explains why 72% of translators rendered *ma:fa:llah* as 'delicious', and 28% as 'not bad' then stated what is wrong with the food right after. In other words, *ma:fa:llah* in this example was used to introduce the comment about the food being salty.

#### 7.2.4. *ʔinfa:llah*

This religious marker is used to serve the functions of asking for information, mitigating, expressing hope, and congratulating as shown in Table 5.

Table 5: Functions and translations of *ʔinfa:llah* in context-rich exchanges

Function	The exchanges	The translations of the religious expression and the frequency
Asking for information	A: <i>ʔinfa:llah tʔliʕit maʕa:h bil sajjara w ʔinta ʕa:rif ʕinha masru:qah</i> 'You did not get into the car with him knowing it is stolen, did you?' B: <i>la: ma: tʔliʕit</i> 'No, I did not.'	1- don't tell me that (27) 2-Don't say that (23)
Mitigation	A: <i>ʔinta la:zim tsʕa:lih ʔahmad. ʕu: ma: sʕa:r bidʕal ʔibin ʕammak</i> 'You need to make it up with Ahmad. No matter what, he is still your cousin.' B: <i>ʔinfa:llah xalliha: ʕal tasa:hi:l</i> 'If God permits. Leave it to circumstances.'	1- I will see (9) 2-I do not intend to (17) 3- I do not have the intention (14) 4-I might do (10)
Expressing hope	A: <i>ʔinfa:llah rah jindzah ʔahmad w jirfaʕ ra:skom</i> 'If God permits, Ahmad will pass and make you proud.' B: <i>ʔallah jismaʕ minnak</i> 'May God hear from you.'	1- hopefully Ahmad will pass and make you proud (41) 2- I hope (7) 3- I am sure (2)



Congratulating	A: <i>ʔinfa:llah ʔalf mabru:k</i> 'If God permits, congratulations.' B: <i>ʔallah jiba:rik fi:k</i> 'God bless you'	1-the utmost congratulations (2) 2- Congratulations (48)
----------------	--	---

According to Table 5, translators have accurately identified the various procedural meanings associated with this religious marker. The translations were not literal, suggesting that translators recognized a divergence between the intended meaning and the literal interpretation. For example, when employed as a mitigator, *ʔinfa:llah* has been translated in various ways, all of which convey the speaker's lack of willingness to carry out an action. Translations such as 'I will see' and 'I might do' are used to express uncertainty regarding the action of reconciling with the cousin, as illustrated in Table 5. When used to express the procedural meaning of hope, translators commonly interpret *ʔinfa:llah* as 'hopefully,' 'I hope,' or 'I am sure.' The last translation shares the same meaning as the first two, as they all convey hope. However, the last translation conveys a stronger sense of hope for the desired action to be realized.

#### 7.2.5. *sʕalli ʕannabi*

*sʕalli ʕannabi* is also used to serve four functions, all of which are presented in Table 6.

Table 6: Functions and translations of *sʕalli ʕannabi* in context-rich exchanges

Function	The exchanges	The translations of the religious expression and the frequency
Recalling	A: <i>ʔil ʔawraq ʔilli: tʕalabu:ha minnak bil safa:rah</i> 'What documents did the embassy ask you to bring?' B: <i>dʒawa:z ʔil safar w ʔallahumma sʕalli ʕannabi ʕahadit ʔilmi:la:d</i> 'The passport and bestow blessings upon the Prophet the birth certificate.'	1-what else (38) 2- ummm (12)
Seeking protection from the evil eye	A: <i>ʔil jo:m liʕib rija:l madri:d kan xura:fi:</i> 'Today Real Madrid's performance was outstanding.' B: <i>sʕalli ʕannabi ʕala: tʕu:l ja:rab</i> 'Bestow blessings upon the Prophet' I wish they play the same for ever.'	1- don't jinx them (7) 2- touch wood (36) 3- Do not nag (7)
Claiming the floor	A: <i>dʒi:l ʔiljo:m muf zaj dʒi:l na ma: bjismaʕu: ʔilkala:m w...</i> 'Today's generation is different from ours. They do not listen and...' B: <i>sʕalli ʕannabi miʕ kullhum waʕid fi:</i>	1- Wait please (10) 2- Hold on (19) 3- I disagree (4) 4- Give me a second please (17)

	<i>heik w fi: heik</i> 'Bestow blessings upon the Prophet they are not all the same.'	
Terminating disruptive or undesirable activities	A: <i>s<sup>ʕ</sup>a:r la:zim ʔaħut<sup>ʕ</sup>ullah ħad ħatta law biddu js<sup>ʕ</sup>i:r muʃkileh</i> 'I have to set limitations for him even if doing so would cause a problem.' B: <i>s<sup>ʕ</sup>alli ʕannabi ma fi: daʕi: tkabbir ʔilqis<sup>ʕ</sup>ah</i> 'Bestow blessings upon the Prophet. There is no need to worsen the situation.'	1- Calm down (9) 2- Do not do this (31) 3- Do not rush (10)

Table 6 demonstrates that the translators successfully identified the procedural meanings of the religious marker *s<sup>ʕ</sup>alli ʕannabi* in all of the provided examples. In JA, the primary purpose of this religious marker is to ward off the malevolent effects of the evil eye (Migdadi and Badarneh 2013). The translation of this expression into English has been expressed through various statements, such as 'don't jinx,' 'touch wood,' and 'do not nag.' These English statements serve the purpose of advising individuals against feeling envious. The religious marker *s<sup>ʕ</sup>alli ʕannabi* is also employed as a mnemonic device, serving a similar purpose to English expressions such as 'what else' and 'umm'. This religious marker is also used to claim the floor in a favourable way given the good impact religious terms leave on receivers (Migdadi & Badarneh 2013). Such a function was identified by translators who rendered it in many ways including 'hold on' and 'give me a second'.

The general pattern regarding the translation of religious expressions is accordingly manifested in the fact that the right (or the optimal relevant) translation is the one which is affiliated with a context. Translations of decontextualized sentences are misled and do not achieve complete interpretive resemblance. Therefore, it is plausible to propose that the degree of relevance of the translated texts whose source texts include discourse markers is exclusively determined by contextual effects (see Al-Shawashreh et al. 2021). This is accounted for assuming that context is the psychological construct, "a subset of the hearer's assumptions about the world" (Sperber & Wilson 1986: 15). Therefore, the notion of *context* is not only related to the external physical factors or the immediately preceding utterances or text, situational circumstances, or cultural factors. It rather refers to part of the hearer's cognitive environment (Zhonggang 2006). This environment, defined essentially as the set of facts that are manifest to the hearer (Sperber & Wilson 1986: 39), acts on the basis of the external environment and hence stresses the importance of the information available for processing the utterance or the text. The context is therefore the part of cognitive environment used in the interpretation of a text. According to Sperber and Wilson (1986: 141), the context is not given but selected; therefore, the selection of a particular context is "determined by the search for relevance". This directly accounts for the generation of different translations of the examples with religious expressions when the context is not given. The participants selected a context in their pursuit for the optimal relevance. However, given the fact that the context is not given, each participant may select a different context (depending on his/her cognitive environment), hence producing a different

translation. On the other hand, when the context is given, the search for optimal relevance is guided by the contextual effects, a matter that results in producing proper translations of religious expressions with interpretive resemblance of the source texts. Therefore, successful communication is based on the potential context, which is mutually shared by the reader and the communicator. The notion of context should therefore be delimited and defined by the criterion of optimal relevance (Gutt 1996). In order to make an utterance optimally relevant to its audience, certain contextual implications should be taken into consideration (Zhonggang 2006).

As for religious expressions, it is evident that they express procedural meanings which act as constraints on sentence computation. These expressions are examples of elements where procedural information can be linguistically encoded (Blakemore 1987). Religious expressions are found to encode information that constrains the inferential phase of the utterance interpretation with no contribution to the conceptual representation of the utterance. Therefore, the use of religious expressions has the role to reduce the processing effort required to achieve the intended cognitive effect. According to Hussein (2009), any piece of information which constrains the computational process of the given utterance would be considered to be effort-saving because the processing effort is exerted in the computational process of testing the relevant interpretation. For instance, when the religious expression *s<sup>ʿ</sup>alli fannabi* is used to protect the speaker from the effects of evil eye, it expresses a procedural meaning which guides the hearer in the inferential phase of the process of utterance interpretation. Therefore, this expression instructs the hearer to infer that the speaker does not want the hearer to envy him or say an expression that can cause damage to him. Therefore, the translation where this expression is rendered as ‘God bless you’ or the like is deemed relevant as a ‘premise’ to the ‘conclusion,’ ‘fearing evil eye’ communicated by the speaker. The use of religious expressions can guide the hearer during the process of the utterance interpretation, through making available an inference that constrains the utterance interpretation (Blakemore 2007).

## 8. Conclusion

This paper provides evidence that religious expressions are used as discourse markers in JA. Our evidence draws on the translation of a number of these expressions from Arabic into English. According to our findings, the optimal translation, which achieves interpretive resemblance of the source text, is the one where the religious expression is translated as a procedural element which guides the speakers during the process of interpreting the utterance. Context is shown to play a significant role in identifying the optimal translation. Religious expressions in the decontextualized sentences are rendered arbitrarily with no contribution to the sentence interpretive/communicative meanings. On the other hand, these expressions are rendered systematically despite the fact that these expressions are pragmatically dynamic and may express different meanings.

## Appendix

- 1- لا اله الا الله. انت ذكي
- 2- لا اله الا الله انت عجبتي
- 3- أ: بكل طلاب النحو جابوا علامات كاملة بالإمتحان  
ب: لا اله الا الله، كلهم طلوعوا تشومسكي !
- 4- أ: مع إنه السيارة اللي كانوا فيها اتحطمت كلياً ولا حدا من الركاب انصاب  
ب: لا اله الا الله !
- 5- أ: بدنا نساfer هاد العيد لأنه طلعهنا روجي .  
ب: لا اله الا الله ما في مصاري
- 6- أ: بابا بدى أغير تخصصي. مش لاقى حالي فيه  
ب: لا اله الا الله صرت سنة ثالثة
- 7- أ: أنا ما بحب حدا ينتقد تصرفاتي أو ..  
ب: لا اله الا الله انت مين إجى فيك؟
- 8- أ: أنا قلقان لأنو موادي عم بتصير أصعب كل ما بمشي في التخصص و ...  
ب: لا اله الا الله انت بس ادرس منيح
- 9- أ: سمعتوا انه جارتنا تطلقت؟  
ب: لا اله الا الله ما دخلنا بالناس
- 10- أ: أموت و أكل منسف و سباغتي و دجاج مشوي و ..  
ب: لا اله الا الله بلاش نحكي عن الأكل برمضان
- 11- و الله أنا شفت
- 12- و الله بكرة عندي دوام
- 13- أ: جايبتلك خبر حلو إنت جيت أعلى علامة بالشعبة .  
ب: و الله؟
- 14- أ: المباراة اللي راحت عليك خلصت ثمنية صفر  
ب: و الله؟
- 15- أ: كلهم بيغاروا مني لأنه جمالي استثنائي  
ب: و الله !
- 16- أ: انت ما عملت اشي يذكر في المشروع هاد كله شغلي أنا  
ب: و الله؟
- 17- أ: أنت متأكد انك رجعت المصاري؟  
ب: و الله. أنا ما بنسى
- 18- أ: الدكتور لغى المحاضرة هو خبرنا عالتيمة  
ب: و الله؟
- 19- أ: أنا عن جد حاطط عيني عليها  
ب: و الله اذا بدك رأيي روح احكي معها
- 20- أ: تجاوزت غياباتي خايف الدكتور يحرمني  
ب: و الله اذا متوقع هالاشي روح اسقط المادة .
- 21- ما شاء الله بدى أروح بكرة .
- 22- ما شاء الله خلينا نجرب
- 23- أ: اشتريت سيارة لمبرجيني حقها مية ألف  
ب: ما شاء الله تحكيش قدام حد
- 24- أ: ما شاء الله بنتك بتجنن ضللك اقرئي قرآن عليها  
ب: دايماً بقرأ
- 25- أ: شو رأيك بفسطاني الجديد؟  
ب: ما شاء الله
- 26- أ: ما شاء الله كل أبحاثك إبداع استمتعت بقرائتهم  
ب: شكراً

- 27- أ: كيف حال ابنك؟  
ب: ما شاء الله جاب منحة و رح يسافر لبريطانيا قريباً  
28- أ: ما شاء الله كل اخواني دكاترة بجامعات مرموقة .  
ب: اه سمعت  
29- أ: كيف طعم الأكل؟  
ب: ما شاء الله زاكي بس لو أملح شوي  
30- أ: قرأت البحث تبجي؟  
ب: اه ما شاء الله بس التحليل لازم يكون أعمق .  
31- أ: ان شاء الله بكرة عندي موعد  
32- أ: ان شاء الله بس أحمد شاطر  
33- أ: ان شاء الله طلعت معه بالسيارة و انت عارف انها مسروقة؟  
ب: لا ما طلعت  
34- أ: ان شاء الله عرفت نتائج فحص الدم تبعل؟  
ب: اه، كللهم مناح  
35- أ: انت لازم تصالح أحمد. شو ما صار بيبضل ابن عمك  
ب: أن شاء الله خليفها عالتساهيل  
36- أ: اعمل حسابك تبجي معنا عالحفلة اليوم  
ب: إن شاء الله  
37- أ: ان شاء الله رح ينجح أحمد و يرفع راسكم  
ب: الله يسمع منك  
38- أ: ان شاء الله رح يطلع فستانك العرس زي ما بدك و أحسن  
ب: بتأمل  
39- أ: ان شاء الله ألف مبروك  
ب: الله يبارك فيك  
40- أ: ان شاء الله يتربى بعزك  
ب: شكراً  
41- صلي عالنبى يمكن أغير رأيي  
42- صلي عالنبى أنا ما بهتم  
43- أ: شو الأوراق اللي طلبوها منك بالسفارة؟  
ب: جواز السفر و اللهم صل عالنبى شهادة الميلاد  
44- أ: هاد زاكي شو المكونات؟  
ب: كوسا و بندورة و اللهم صل عالنبى لحمه و فلفل  
45- أ: اليوم لعب ريال مدريد كان خرافي  
ب: صل عالنبى. على طول يا رب  
46- أ: عملتي كل هالأصناف لحالك؟  
ب: صلي عالنبى  
47- أ: جيل اليوم مش زي جيلنا ما بسمعوا الكلام و ...  
ب: صلي عالنبى مش كللهم واحد في هيك و في هيك  
48- أ: أبوي اقترح نستثمر المصاري بكوفي شوب و ..  
ب: صل عالنبى بتفق مع أبوك هاد رح يكون أفضل استثمار  
49- أ: صار لازم أحطلله حد حتى لو بده يصير مشكلة .  
ب: صل عالنبى ما في داعي تكبر القصة  
50- أ: قررت انسحب من المسابقة  
ب: صلي عالنبى صرت مبلش

## References

- Abboud, Peter. 1988. Speech and religious affiliation in Egypt. In Jazayery, Mohammad A. & Winter, Werner (eds.), *Languages & cultures: Studies in honour of Edgar C. Polomé*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 21–27.
- Al-Adaileh, Bilal. 2007. *The speech act of apology: A linguistic exploration of politeness orientation in British and Jordanian culture*. Leeds: University of Leeds. (Unpublished PhD Thesis).
- Al-Ali, Mohammed. 2006. Religious affiliations and masculine power in Jordanian wedding invitation genre. *Discourse and Society* 17(6): 691–714.
- Al-Khawaldeh, Sami & Jarrah, Marwan & Alghazo, Sharif. 2023. Evil-eye expressive strategies between utterers and interpreters: A pragmatic study on colloquial Jordanian Arabic. *Journal of Pragmatics* 204: 6–20.
- Al-Shawashreh, Ekab & Jarrah, Marwan & Zuraikat, Malek. 2021. The functions of the verb ‘to say’ in the Jordanian Arabic dialect of Irbid. *Poznan Studies in Contemporary Linguistics* 57(2): 221–248.
- Ali, Sukayna & Abdul Rahman, Wan & Chow, Yuan. 2024. An analysis of explicatures in English-Arabic subtitles. The case of Friends on Netflix. *International Journal of Arabic-English Studies* 24(2): 457–482.
- Al-Khatib, Mohammad. 1997. Congratulation and thank you announcements in Jordanian newspapers: Cultural and communicative functions. *Language Culture and Curriculum* 10(2): 156–170.
- Alottt, Nicolas. 2013. Relevance theory. In Capone, Alessandro & Lo Piparo, Franco & Carapezza, Marco (eds.), *Perspectives on linguistic pragmatics*. Germany: Springer. 57–98.
- Almubark, Amin & Manan, AmerrudinAbd & Al-Zubaid, KhairiObaidTayyeh. 2014. The hindrances in translating specific cultural concepts from Arabic into English. *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 19(3): 166–173.
- Al-Rojaie, Yousef. 2021. The pragmatic functions of religious expressions in Najdi Arabic. *Saudi Journal of Language Studies* 1(1): 3–25.
- Baker, Mona. 1992. *In other words: A coursebook on translation*. London: Routledge.
- Bamyeh, Mohammed. 2019. *Lifeworlds of Islam: The pragmatics of a religion*. Oxford University Press.
- Besecke, Kelly. 2005. Seeing invisible religion. Religion as a societal conversation about transcendent meaning. *Sociological Theory* 23(2): 179–196.
- Blakemore, Diana. 2002. *Relevance and linguistic meaning. The semantics and pragmatics of discourse markers*. Cambridge University Press.

- Blakemore, Diana. 2007. Constraints, concepts and procedural encoding. In Burton-Roberts, Noel (ed.), *Advances in Pragmatics*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- Brown, Douglas. 2014. *Principles of language learning and teaching: a course in second language acquisition*. Pearson.
- Carston, Robyn. 2008. *Thoughts and utterances: The pragmatics of explicit communication*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Clift, Rebecca & Helani, Fadi. 2010. Inshallah: Religious invocations in Arabic topic transition. *Language in Society* 39(3): 357–382.
- Danz, Christian. 2020. Religious diversity and the concept of religion. *Neue Zeitschrift für Systematische Theologie und Religionsphilosophie* 62(1): 101–113.
- Darquennes, Jeroen & Vandenbussche, Wim. 2015. Language and religion as a sociolinguistic field of study. Some introductory notes. *Sociolinguistica* 25(1): 1–11.
- Dweik, Bader & Abu Helwah, Wafa'a. 2020. Translating historical and religious texts from Arabic into English. Problems and solutions. *Hebron University Research Journal* 9(1): 285–303.
- Dweik, Bader & Abu Shakra, Mariam. 2011. Problems in translating collocations in religious texts from Arabic into English. *The Linguistics Journal* 5(1): 5–14.
- Farghal, Mohamad. 1995. The pragmatics of 'inshallah in Jordanian Arabic. *Multilingua*, 14(3): 253–270.
- Gharaybeh, Khlaif. 2014. General socio-demographic characteristics of the Jordanian society. A study in social geography. *Journal of Culture, Society and Development* 4(1): 95–104. (<https://www.iiste.org/Journals/index.php/JCSD/article/download/10039/10251>) (Accessed 2023-05-23).
- Gutt, Ernst-August. 1996. On nature and treatment of implicit information in literary translation: A relevance-theoretic perspective. *International Journal of Translation Studies* 8(2): 241–256.
- Harb, Mustafa & Jarrah, Marwan & Alghazo, Sharif. 2022. Discourse markers within sentence grammar. Further evidence from ʿaad in Jordanian Arabic. *Ampersand* 9, 100082.
- Hussein, Muhammad. 2009. *Relevance theory and procedural meaning: the semantics and pragmatics of discourse markers in English and Arabic* (Doctoral dissertation, Newcastle University).
- Jaradat, Abdullah. 2014. The linguistic variants of Allah expressions in Jordanian Arabic. *Cross-cultural Communication* 10(1): 61–68.
- Jarrah, Marwan & Alghazo, Sharif. 2023. PRAGMATIC functions of religious expressions. In Pihlaja, Stephen & Ringrow, Helen (eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Language and Religion*. London: Routledge. 78–95.

- Jarrah, Marwan & Al-Jarrah, Rasheed. 2023. Translating explicatures between Arabic and English. Completing logical forms and calculating pragmatic competence and metalinguistic knowledge. *Babel* 69(2): 188–215.
- Jastrow, Otto. 2004. Jüdisches, christliches und muslimisches Arabisch in Mossul. In Haak, Martine & De Jong, Rudolf & Versteegh, Kees (eds.), *Approaches to Arabic Dialects. A Collection of Articles presented to Manfred Woidich on the occasion of his sixtieth birthday (Studies in Semitic languages and linguistics 38)*. Leiden: Brill. 135–150.
- Khammyseh, Daoud. 2015. The problems in translating Islamic expressions in religious occasions. *Journal of Education and Practice* 6(35): 103–109.
- Migdadi, Fathi & Badarneh, Mohammad & Momani, Kawakib. 2010. Divine will and its extensions. Communicative functions of *maašaallah* in colloquial Jordanian Arabic. *Communication Monographs* 77(4): 480–499.
- Migdadi, Fathi & Badarneh, Mohammad. 2013. The pragmatics of prophet-praise formulas in Jordan. *Anthropological Linguistics* 55(1): 61–91.
- Morrow, John. 2006. *Arabic, Islam and the Allah lexicon: How language shapes our conception of God*. The Edwin Mellen Press.
- Morrow, John & Castleton, Barbara. 2007. The impact of globalization on the Arabic language. *Intercultural Communication Studies* 16(2): 202–212.
- Nazzal, Ayman. 2005. The pragmatic functions of the recitation of Qur’anic verses by Muslims in their oral genre. The case of Insha’ Allah, ‘God’s willing.’ *Pragmatics* 15(2–3): 251–273.
- Petra News Agency. October 8, 2022. 697 Jordanians have the name Mohammad. ([https://petra.gov.jo/Include/InnerPage.jsp?ID=75091&lang=ar&name=local\\_news](https://petra.gov.jo/Include/InnerPage.jsp?ID=75091&lang=ar&name=local_news)) (Accessed 2023-05-23).
- Searle, John R. 1978. Literal Meaning. *Erkenntnis* (1975-) 13(1), 207–224.
- Shanazary, Mohammad. 2020. Challenges of translating Persian books of Islamic laws into English. *Journal of Language, Education and Translation Studies* 1(1): 105–124.
- Sperber, Dan & Wilson, Deirdre. 1986. *Relevance. Communication and cognition* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Sperber, Dan & Wilson, Deirdre. 1987. Presumptions of relevance. *Behavioural and Brain Sciences*, 10(4): 736–753.
- Alrai Newspaper. April 26, 2018. Naming streets in Jordan. (<https://alrai.com/article/10434602/%D8%A3%D8%AE%D8%B1-%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%A7%D8%B3%D8%A8%D9%88%D8%B9/%D8%AA%D8%B3%D9%85%D9%8A%D8%A9%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%B4%D9%88%D8%A7%D8%B1%D8%B9-%D9%81%D9%8A-%D8%B9%D9%85%D8%A7%D9%86>) (Accessed 2023-05-23)



- Verdonik, Darinka & Kačič, Zdravko. 2012. Pragmatic functions of Christian expressions in spoken discourse. *Linguistica*, 52(1): 267–281.
- Welji, Nazir. 2012. *Adding Allah to Ahamdulilah. The use of Arabic God-phrases for performative functions*. San Diego: University of California at San Diego. (Unpublished Master's thesis).
- Wilson, Deirdre & Sperber, Dan. 1993. Linguistic form and relevance. *Lingua* 90(1–2): 1–25.
- Wilson, Deirdre. 2011. The conceptual-procedural distinction. Past, present and future. In Escandell-Vidal, Victoria & Leonetti, Manuel & Ahern, Aoife (eds.), *Procedural meaning. Problems and perspectives*. Emerald Group Publishing. 3–31.
- Young, Steve. 2001. *American Muslims the new generation*. New York: Continuum International Publishing Group Inc.
- Yus, Francisco. 2006. Relevance theory. In Brown, Keith (ed.), *Encyclopedia of language & linguistics* (2nd ed.). Amsterdam: Elsevier. 512–519.
- Zhonggang, Sang. 2006. A relevance theory perspective on translating the implicit information in literary texts. *Journal of Translation*, 2(2): 43–60.

Sukayna Ali  
Department of English language & Literature  
School of Foreign Languages  
The University of Jordan  
e-mail: [sukayna.ali@ju.edu.jo](mailto:sukayna.ali@ju.edu.jo)

Marwan Jarrah, PhD (The corresponding author)  
Department of English language & Literature  
School of Foreign Languages  
The University of Jordan  
e-mail: [m.jarrah@ju.edu.jo](mailto:m.jarrah@ju.edu.jo)

Hanan Al-Jabri  
Department of English language & Literature  
School of Foreign Languages  
The University of Jordan  
e-mail: [h.aljaberi@ju.edu.jo](mailto:h.aljaberi@ju.edu.jo)