مجلة جامعة الشارقة للعلوم الإنسانية والاجتماعية

اسم المقال: أساليب ترجمة المفردات ذات الخصوصية الثقافية وتطبيقاتها في المعجم الثنائي اللغة (عربي – إنجليزي)
اسم الكاتب: عبدالفتاح صالح أبو السيدة
رابط ثابت: https://political-encyclopedia.org/index.php/library/8853
تاريخ الاسترداد: 2026/11/01 23:19 +03

الموسوعة السياسيّة هي مبادرة أكاديمية غير هادفة للربح، تساعد الباحثين والطلاب على الوصول واستخدام وبناء مجموعات أوسع من المحتوى العلمي العربي في مجال علم السياسة واستخدامها في الأرشيف الرقمي الموثوق به لإغناء المحتوى العربي على الإنترنت.
لمزيد من المعلومات حول الموسوعة السياسيّة – Encyclopedia Political، يرجى التواصل على info@political-encyclopedia.org

استخدامكم لأرشيف مكتبة الموسوعة السياسيّة – Encyclopedia Political يعني موافقتك على شروط وأحكام الاستخدام المتاحة على الموقع https://political-encyclopedia.org/terms-of-use

تم الحصول على هذا المقال من موقع مجلة جامعة الشارقة للعلوم الإنسانية والاجتماعية ورفده في مكتبة الموسوعة السياسيّة مستوفياً شروط حقوق الملكية الفكريّة ومتطلبات رخصة المشاع الإبداعي التي ينضوي المقال تحتها.

UNIVERSITY OF SHARJAH
where civilizations meet

University of Sharjah Journal

International Refereed Periodical

of

Humanities & Social Sciences



Vol. **11**, No. **1**
Sha'ban 1435 H. / June 2014 AD.

ISSN: 1996-2339

Equivalence Procedures for Culture-Specific Words and Their Application in the Arabic-English Dictionary

Abdul-Fattah S. Abu-Ssaydeh
College of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences - University of Sharjah
Sharjah - UAE

Received on : 15-05-2012 **Accepted on : 25-03-2013**

Abstract

Despite the extensive research carried out on the definition, classification and translation procedures of culture-specific words (CSWs) in text translation, little attention has been given to these procedures in the creation of equivalence in the bilingual dictionary. This paper examines the nature and adequacy of the major CSWs translation procedures as well as their application in two Arabic-English dictionaries: Wehr's Dictionary of Modern Written Arabic and Munir Baalbaki's Al-Mawrid: A Modern Arabic-English Dictionary. The analysis will show that, statistically, the most commonly used procedure is borrowing, followed by explanation, explanatory equivalence and a combination of these three procedures. Other procedures, namely cultural equivalence, functional equivalence and synonymy, are less frequently used and produce, for the most part, inadequate and/ or inaccurate equivalents as evidenced by examples in sections B., C. and E. It will further demonstrate that the two dictionaries show inconsistencies, errors of judgment and occasional failure to employ procedures that best capture the exact meaning of the word in the target language. It will be concluded that if the dictionary intends to provide accurate and unambiguous interlingual equivalents, the compiler will have to resort to procedures capable of accomplishing this task. Such procedures will, more often than not, involve borrowing, explanation, explanatory equivalence or a combination of these procedures.

Keywords: translation, procedures, culture-specific word, bilingual, dictionary.

1. Introduction: On Culture, Language And Lexicography

The primary objective of this paper is twofold: the first is to examine, illustrate and evaluate the adequacy of the major procedures proposed for the translation of CSWs in the literature and, secondly, to critically assess the application of these procedures in two Arabic-English dictionaries and try to determine whether the lexicographers concerned have succeeded in creating accurate and clear interlingual equivalents for this category of words. These dictionaries are H. Wehr's A Dictionary of Modern Written Arabic (DMWA) and R. Baalbaki's Al-Mawrid; A Modern Arabic-English Dictionary (M). The dictionaries can be described as synchronic, general and unidirectional (Arabic-English) dictionaries. The first of these was based on an Arabic-German version and published in 1961 while the other appeared in 1988. Both are among the most commonly used Arabic-English dictionaries in the Arab World and beyond. The Arabic CSWs investigated were one hundred words and were culled from both dictionaries. The significance of this research arises from the fact that bilingual dictionaries in general and Arabic-English dictionaries in particular have received very little attention from researchers working in the fields of applied linguistics, lexicography and translation theory in general. This is attested by the fact that very few papers and conferences have been devoted to this particular topic over the past several decades.

Some of the notions that are pivotal to this paper have been extensively covered in the relevant literature: the meaning of culture, the relationship between culture and language, the classification of CSWs and the various procedures (or strategies) proposed for their rendition into the target language (TL). Therefore, our discussion of these notions will be intentionally minimal and will serve primarily to preface the discussion of the main topics in this paper.

In its broader sense, culture may be defined as "… the way of life and its manifestations that are peculiar to a community that uses a particular language as its means of expression" (Newmark, 1988, p. 94). (See also White, 1992; Roberts 2007). Vermeer (1986, cited in Nord 1997) defines culture as "the entire setting of norms and conventions an individual as

a member of a society must know in order to be 'like everybody' or to be different from everybody" (p. 28). The interdependence between culture and language cannot be overemphasized. According to Lotman, no language "…can exist unless it is steeped in the context of culture; and no culture can exist which does not have at its centre, the structure of natural language" (1978, pp. 211-32). To S. Bassnett, language is "... the heart within the body of culture" (1992, p. 22). And whether we agree with Newmark's claim that language is not part of culture (1988, p. 95) or with Vermeer who holds that language is, indeed, an integral part thereof (2000), we maintain, with Toury, that translation "… involves at least two languages and two cultural traditions" (Toury, 1978, p. 200). Reflecting this complex relationship, dictionaries , according to Roberts, "… present not only language, but also culture. Language represents culture because words refer to a culture. Therefore, dictionaries, which constitute an archive of the words of a language, present, de facto, the culture underlying the language" (2007, p. 277).

2. CSWs: Designations and Classifications

An important "given' in translation is that languages are anisomorphic; no two linguistic systems can be fully matched, regardless of their proximity. This anisomorphism is most evident in CSWs as well as larger lexical units such as prefabricated chunks, idioms and proverbs. CSWs themselves are known in the literature by several names: culture-bound words (Lefevere, 1992); culture-specific terms (Williams, 1990; Matter-Siebel 1995); cultural words (Savić and Čutura, 2011); culture-bound expressions (Aciobanitei), cultural terms or words (Newmark, 1981 and 1988), culture-bound terms (HE Xue-bing, 2006), culture-specific items (Kaledaite and Asijavičiūte, 2005; Terestyényi, 2011) and realia (Schäffner & Wiesemann, 2001; Vlahov and Florin (1980 cited in Tellinger 2003)). CSWs can be defined as "… words and combinations of words denoting objects and concepts characteristic of the way of life, the culture, the social and historical development of one nation and alien to another" (Florin, 1993, p. 123). Summing up their nature and the difficulties they present the translator with, Aixelá (2007) maintains that CSWs are "… textually actualized items whose function

and connotations in a source text involve a translation problem in their transference to a target text, whenever this problem is a product of the nonexistence of the referred item or of its different intertextual status in the cultural system of the readers of the target text" (p. 58).

As this particular class of words poses a serious challenge to the translator, its different categories and translation procedures have been detailed in several papers and book chapters by a variety of eminent researchers including Newmark (1988), Baker (1992), Kujamäki (1993), Kalëdaitë and Asijavièiûtë (2005) and Paluszkiewicz-Misiaczek (2005), just to name a few. One of the most quoted classifications in the literature is that given by Newmark (1988) who categorizes CSWs into the following areas: 1) ecology 2) material culture 3) social culture 4) organizations, customs, ideas and 5) gestures and habits (pp. 94-103).

3. Lexicography and Translation: The Notion of equivalence Revisited

Despite the fairly extensive research carried out in the area of CSWs, the vast majority of the work focuses on the creation of "textual (or contextual) equivalence", and not interlingual equivalence as expressed in the bilingual dictionary. This focus is manifestly clear in the topics handled, the constant reference to the translator and not the lexicographer, the translation procedures proposed and the examples cited. More to the point in this paper is the total absence of research conducted on the status of this particular lexical phenomenon in the Arabic-English dictionary. To avoid any terminological confusion, we should point out that the interlingual senses given in the bilingual dictionary have been referred to in bilingual lexicography as "lexical equivalence" (Zgusta, 1979/ 2006) "lexicographic equivalence" (Nielsen, 1994), "translations equivalence" (2007) and "dictionary equivalence" (Teubert, 2007). We shall adopt the last of these terms.

In this paper, we maintain that dictionary equivalence may overlap but will, in certain instances, diverge from (con)textual equivalence. In (con)textual

equivalence, the unit of translation may be as short as a single morpheme but as long as a whole paragraph. (Con)textual equivalence is context-sensitive and the potential number of equivalents likely to be found for a given entry will far outstrip those given by any dictionary. It is dynamic, pragmatic and represents the interplay between a host of factors including dictionary equivalence, translation methods and syntactic, stylistic as well as collocational considerations. Dictionary equivalence, on the other hand, is context-free, semantic-oriented, static and serves as the default repertoire of equivalents in the target language. Equivalents given in the bilingual dictionary (BD) will, as Borneman aptly puts it, act as "initial gangplanks, not completed bridges" (1989, p. 99). And while (con)textual and dictionary equivalents employ overlapping translation procedures, the two types of equivalence maintain their differences: certain procedures utilized in (con)textual equivalence (such as deletion, footnotes, compensation and modulation) are not feasible in the dictionary. Moreover, lengthy equivalents resulting from the use of explanations may not be palatable choices in translated texts. But in spite of this confused and uneasy relationship, BD's remain indispensable tools in the process of translation (Boreman, 1989: pp. 99-100).

According to Gouws (2002) and Adamska-Sałaciak (2006), equivalence between and among languages falls into three categories:

a. Full or congruence, where an "equivalent relation of congruence is characterized by a one-to-one relation on lexical, pragmatic and semantic level. Both source and target language forms have exactly the same meaning…" (Gouws, 2002, p. 196). Adamska-Sałaciak describes this equivalence as "the least troublesome" (2006, p. 17);

b. Partial equivalence or divergence where the senses of a dictionary entry in the source language (SL) and its equivalent in the target language (TL) will overlap; and

c. Zero (or surrogate) equivalence where "… the source-language word may express a concept which is totally unknown in the target culture "(Gouws, 2002, p. 200). This category represents "… the most complex

type of equivalence to be dealt with in a bilingual dictionary"(ibid).

But what is an equivalent in the BD? "A translation equivalent", to quote Gouws again, "is a target language item, which can be used to substitute the source language item in a specific occurrence, depending on specific contextual and cotextual restrictions" (2012, pp. 28-2002). To Zgusta, an "interlingual equivalent" has the "… same lexical meaning as the respective lexical unit of the source language" (1971, p. 312). Unfortunately, neither definition is helpful when dealing with CSWs from a lexicographic point of view. For one thing, neither explains how one particular translation procedure is more appropriate for the creation of interlingual equivalence than another. Secondly, they both deal with the lexis in the source language en mass, as it where, irrespective of the degree of correspondence its constituents may have with the target language lexis. In the case of CSWs, we are looking at a unique group of words where equivalence will be at best partial and, at worst, totally absent. Thirdly, they fail to clearly address the needs of the user and the nature of the dictionary in question. In a translation or encoding dictionary, the lexicographer may settle for an approximation in the interlingual sense by proposing equivalents that are "intelligible, economical and elegant" (Atkins and Bouillin, 2006, p. 37). But in a decoding dictionary, such as the one that informs our perspective in this paper, issues of economy and elegance must take a back seat to accuracy, clarity and thoroughness. In the latter case, the yardstick for determining the extent of the success of the BD will be the provision of a target language equivalent or equivalents that maintain the semantic integrity of the CSW in the source language and fully and accurately express its exact sense in the target language. In the case of CSWs, this demand on the dictionary may, understandably and inevitably, result in a fair degree of foreignization and/or lengthy and cumbersome explanations.

4. Translation Procedures of CSWs: An Overview

Ideally, the selection of an appropriate translation procedure depends on the degree of correspondence the source language entry may have with its proposed interlingual equivalent. CSWs represent unique concepts which,

according to Snell-Hornby (1995), can (only) be translated by one of two procedures: explanation and definition (p. 539), with the latter, I suspect, being synonymous with what we shall term in this paper explanation. Harvey (2000), on the other hand, suggests four procedures: functional equivalence, formal/ linguistic equivalence, transcription (or borrowing) and descriptive or self-explanatory translation where generic words are used (pp. 2-6). The list of procedures suggested by Graedler (2000) includes making up a new word, giving an explanation of the source language entry in the target language, preserving the source language term intact (again borrowing) and finding a word in the target language with the same relevance (p. 3). Other studies on translation procedures of CSWs also abound: for further details, the reader is referred to Tomaszczyk (1984), Ivir (1987), Mona Baker (1992), Hervey and Higgins (1992), Chesterman (1997), Schaffner and Wiesemann (2001), Higashino (2001), O'Donoghue (2005), Paluszkiewicz-Misiaczek (2005), Kalëdaitë and Asijavièiûtë (2005), Pavlovic and Poslek (2012), Adamska-Sałaciak (2006), Armellino (2008) and Podolej (2009).

5. The A-E Dictionaries: Translation Procedures

Let us turn now to the procedures used in the translation of CSWs in order to assess their adequacy in general, to determine which of them have been used in the two A-E dictionaries and to examine to what extent both lexicographers have succeeded in capturing the precise senses of the Arabic entries. We shall start with borrowing.

A. Borrowing:

As a translation procedure, borrowing (also known as transference, direct transfer and transcription) involves taking a word from the source language and using it in the target language as an equivalent, with the borrowed word sometimes undergoing some phonological changes or manifesting spelling variations. In addition to its (relative) precision in the rendition of interlingual sense, this procedure brings local color and atmosphere to the target text (Newmark, 1988, p. 96). Newmark, however, warns that the drawbacks this procedure may entail include the possibility of creating wrong collocations

and exposing the dictionary user to a "considerable amount of foreignness" (p. 96). Nonetheless, borrowing is used extensively either on its own or in combination with other procedures in both dictionaries: more than half of the one hundred Arabic CSWs examined in DMWA are given borrowed equivalents. In M, the number is slightly less but it is still statistically very significant.

The apparent simplicity of borrowing as an equivalence procedure, however, belies its extreme complexity in bilingual lexicography. Historically speaking, Arabic has given several languages, including English, numerous words, but the number of words lent to English in the recent past has been negligibly small. In fact, Arabic has been practically a net borrower of English words, including CSWs: we have borrowed , either directly or through literal translation, a fairly large number of English words in the fields of technology (انترنت، تلفون، فيديو) , sports (غولف، رغبي، كريكيت، بولو، تنس), food (بيتزا، همبرغر، سباغيتي، ماكارونـي), place and institution names (البيت الأبْيَض، الكْريمْلين، السّاحة الحمْراء، مجلس العُموم) , metaphors (مَوْجة، شَفافِيَة) and even idioms (وضع العربة أمام الحصان، ذرف دموع التماسيح، الكرة في ملعبه، على مرمى حجر).

Sound lexicographic practices dictate that the safest policy in borrowing is to use a borrowed word that has firmly established itself in the target language vocabulary. For a word to qualify as such, however, it has to satisfy, according to Adamska-Sałaciak (2004), a number of criteria: it has to be known to the speakers of the borrowing language; it has to be frequent enough in lexical corpora to substantiate this acquired status amongst the speakers of the target language and it has to be universally represented in the standard monolingual dictionaries of that language (p. 448). The fact that certain borrowed words may exhibit variations in their spellings (e.g. Mecca and Makkah, Quran and Kuran, nabk and nabq, etc.) is not significant in principle. However, the extent to which a word will be represented in monolingual lexicography may vary as the words niqab and hijab show. The first of these, niqab (نقاب), is cited in Google more than four hundred thousand times; it is given as an entry in Collins English Dictionary Online, Merriam-Webster Dictionary Online and Wordnet. It also appears 112

times in the Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA). Hijab (حجاب) is cited 310 times in COCA and close to six hundred thousand times in Google, in addition to its appearance in several standard monolingual dictionaries including The American Heritage Dictionary Online, Collins English Dictionary Online and Wordnet. Neither word, though, appears in Longman English Dictionary Online, Macmillan Dictionary Online or in either of the two Arabic-English dictionaries under review.

Even when a word has been used by native speakers or cited in general English dictionaries for scores or even hundreds of years, there will be no guarantee that it will appear in all the major lexicographic works. Take, for example, the word futwa (also spelled fatwa and fetwa) (فتـوى) which, according to the Dictionary of Etymology Online, made its first appearance in English in the 1620s. It is cited in the American Heritage Dictionary Online, Collins English Dictionary Online, Macmillan Dictionary Online, Oxford Dictionary Online and Longman English Dictionary Online. Other borrowings of a similar nature include Jihad 1896) (جهـاد)), sunni (سُـنّيّ) 1620)s), Hajj (حَـجّ) and Shiite 1728) (شـيعِيّ)). Masjid (مسـجد), (c 1400), by comparison, is cited in Macmillan Dictionary Online but there is no trace of it in Longman English Dictionary Online or Merriam-Webster Dictionary Online. Mudiria (a word used by DMWA as an equivalent to Arabic (مديريـة)) is cited in Merriam-Webster Dictionary Online but nowhere else in major English lexicographic works. Simoon 1790) (ريـح السّـموم)) is cited in The American Heritage Dictionary Online, Collins English Dictionary Online and Merriam-Webster Dictionary Online; yet it does not materialize in Longman English Dictionary Online or Macmillan Dictionary Online. Mihrab (محـراب), which appears in several dictionaries including Oxford Dictionary Online, is absent from Longman English Dictionary Online and Macmillan Dictionary Online. The word kasida is given in DMWA as a borrowing against قَصيـدَة , and it is indeed present in several major English dictionaries, with the exception of Longman English Dictionary Online, Macmillan Dictionary Online and Oxford Dictionary Online.

This inconsistency of listing borrowed words in the English monolingual dictionary is mirrored in the English component of both M and DMWA. While both dictionaries cite huori (حوريـة), rebec (ربابـة) , Shaitan (شـيطان) ,

jinn (جِنّ) , ghoul (غـول) , imam (إمـام), mihraab (محـراب) , and Khamsin (ريـاح الخامسين), DMWA alone cites zimmi (ذِمّـيّ), Rajab(رجـب) , muta (زواج المتعـة), sant (السـنْط) , futwa (فتْـوى) , feddan (فـدّان) , kasida (قَصيـدَة) , kantar (قنْطـار) , couscous (كُسْـكُس) , the kiswa (كسْـوَة الكَعْبَـة) and muezzin (مـؤذِّن).M, on the other hand, exclusively lists sirocco (ريـح الصبـا) and dab (ضـبّ) .

Sometimes, the various forms of a borrowed word are not all cited as equivalents in the English component of the A-E dictionary. An example is the Arabic entry رَبـاب or ربابَـة which M translates as rebec, rebeck. DMWA, on its part, cites rebab or rebec, a stringed instrument of the Arabs resembling the fiddle, with one to three strings (in Eg. usually two-stringed). The borrowed term rebab given by DMWA is also cited in several English dictionaries including the Random House Dictionary Online and should have merited citation in M. Another example is the word moucharaby (مشربية) which appears as a borrowing in DMWA but not in M. Other spelling variants of the word which English dictionaries cite (namely mashrabiyah and mishrabiyeh) also fail to appear in DMWA.

Another aspect of borrowing which may cause concern for the bilingual lexicographer is the fact that some of the Arabic words borrowed into English have changed their meanings and, as such, need to be approached with extreme caution. A case in point is the Arabic word lute which is cited in both M and DMWA as an equivalent to the Arabic entry عـود: etymologically speaking, this word entered the English language from Old French (lut) which took it from Old Provencal, with the latter borrowing it originally from Arabic. In the Random House Dictionary, however, the Arabic word ‘oud is described as a member of the lute family, a definition which recognizes the fact that the two words are not synonymous . It is worth noting, however, that the word ‘oud appears more than thirteen million times in Google and is cited in Merriam-Webster Dictionary Online, the Random House Dictionary Online, Collins English Dictionary Online and the American Heritage Dictionary Online. As such, it would have served as an ideal English candidate for its Arabic equivalent.

English dictionaries may also vary in the amount of senses they provide against the borrowed word. This will only serve to disorient the dictionary user as to the exact range of senses in which a borrowed word is to be used. To illustrate, let us look at the English meanings given to the word imam (إمـــام) in a number of English and American monolingual dictionaries:

imam:

i. Macmillan Dictionary Online: a Muslim priest or leader

ii. Longman English Dictionary Online: a Muslim religious leader or priest

iii. Merriam-Webster Dictionary Online:

1. the prayer leader of a mosque

2. a Muslim leader of the line of Ali held by Shiites to be the divinely appointed, sinless, infallible successors of Muhammad

3. any of various rulers that claim descent from Muhammad and exercise spiritual and temporal leadership over a Muslim region

iv. The Random House Dictionary Online:

1. the officiating priest of a mosque.

2. the title for a Muslim religious leader or chief.

3. one of a succession of seven or twelve religious leaders, believed to be divinely inspired, of the Shi'ites.

v. Collins English Dictionary Online:

1. (Non-Christian Religions / Islam) a leader of congregational prayer in a mosque

2. (Non-Christian Religions / Islam) a caliph, as leader of a Muslim community

3. (Non-Christian Religions / Islam) an honorific title applied to eminent doctors of Islam, such as the founders of the orthodox schools

4. (Non-Christian Religions / Islam) any of a succession of either seven or twelve religious leaders of the Shiites, regarded by their followers as divinely inspired

vi. The American Heritage Dictionary Online:

(Islam)

1. a. In law and theology, the caliph who is successor to Muhammad as the lawful temporal leader of the Islamic community.

   b. The male prayer leader in a mosque.

   c. The Muslim worshiper who leads the recitation of prayer when two or more worshipers are present.

2. a. A male spiritual and temporal leader regarded by Shiites as a descendant of Muhammad divinely appointed to guide humans.

   b. An earthly representative of the 12 such leaders recognized by the majority form of Shiism.

3. A ruler claiming descent from Muhammad and exercising authority in an Islamic state.

4. a. Any one of the founders of the four schools of law and theology.

   b. An authoritative scholar who founds a school of law or theology.

If we examine DMWA, we shall find that it lists only the senses imam, prayer leader; leader; master. M, disappointingly, gives no more than three of these senses: imam, leader and chief. These discrepancies, not only amongst English lexicographers but also in Arabic-English lexicography, tend to cloud the picture further.

In the process of finding English equivalents, some lexicographers, including Munir Baalbaki in his famous work Al-Mawrid: An English-Arabic Dictionary (1968), have actually borrowed extensively from English. This trend, but in reverse, is quite evident in DMWA which

introduces a number of "new" Arabic words into the English language. For example, the collocation زواج المتْعـة is translated in this dictionary as muta. The dictionary adopts the same approach with the Arabic words صـاع (saa), دينـار (dinar),كوفيـة (kaffiyeh) and والـي (which DMWA translates as vali, with a Turkish pronunciation). DMWA's stance on this issue begs the question: does the bilingual lexicographer have the prerogative to suggest totally new words and "lend" them to the target language? In this context, it must be conceded that new words are introduced into Arabic by translators on a regular basis. The difference, however, between translators and lexicographers is the weight the public attaches to the latter's work as an authority that is rarely disputed or challenged. This author agrees with Zgusta (1983) that the introduction of totally new words in the target language should be restricted to the words where other translation procedures would not apply or where the word is totally unique to the source language (i.e. cases of zero equivalence). Moreover, the introduction of a new word in the target language should combine with other translation procedures such as explanation, explanatory equivalence or synonymy. And this, we note, has been a regular practice in DMWA.

The apparent rationale underlying certain English equivalents given to Arabic CSWs in both DMWA and M is elusive. Take the case of the Arabic word عيـد (eid). Muslims celebrate two major eids; the first at the end of Ramadhan (the Islamic month of ritual fasting) and the second at the conclusion of hajj ceremonies. These two eids are translated by DMWA and M as Lesser Bairam and Greater Bairam respectively. Now, as the reader may notice, I have used the word eid several times thus far and for a good reason; this word has found its way into the pages of several English monolingual dictionaries including Macmillan Dictionary Online, Cambridge Advanced Learner's Dictionary Online, Wordnet, etc. By contrast, the word bairam, we are told, is a Turkish word (with probably Persian connections) that means festival or holiday (the Random House Dictionary Online). The puzzling question, then, would be: why did the compilers of DMWA and M resort to a word of Turkish origin as an English equivalent of an Arabic CSW? Secondly, the phrases Eidu L-FiTr and Eidu L-ADHa, are cited in numerous English dictionaries and are found in abundance in Google; the

first records more than fifteen million citations and the second more than four million citations. They are also cited several times in COCA, though an exact count is difficult due to the different spellings the two expressions appear in and their overlap with proper names. With this overwhelming evidence, one would probably suggest that new equivalents be proposed for these two Arabic expressions in both dictionaries.

B. Cultural Equivalence:

Cultural equivalence "involves replacing a culture-specific item or expression … with a target language item which describes a similar concept in the target culture and thus is likely to have a similar impact on the target readers" (Paluszkiewicz-Misiaczek, 2005, p. 244). This procedure is often adequately used in textual equivalence as it provides "… readily accessible and comprehensible" equivalents in the target language (Williams,1990, p. 56). In the translation of literature, it will also help to "… preserve the realistic perspective of the literary texts" (O'Donoghue, 2005, p. 13). However, cultural equivalents in the BD are deemed "… inaccurate and not equivalent to the original culture-specific terms" (Williams, 1990: 56). They, additionally, "may lead to overgeneralizations or simple misunderstandings" (Paluszkiewicz-Misiaczek, 2005: 244). Despite the infrequency of this type of equivalence in both dictionaries, the discussion of the examples where it has been actually used demonstrates the inaccuracy and, subsequently, the inadequacy of this procedure in the creation of accurate interlingual equivalents. The examples we shall look at are عَنْقاء, غول, جِنّـيّ and شـيْطان.

The first of our examples, جِنّـيّ, is explained in M as jinni, demon, fairy. As this list shows, M coupled borrowing with cultural equivalents. DMWA, on the other hand, gives the following equivalents: jinn, demons (invisible beings, either harmful or helpful, that interfere with the lives of mortals). In the latter example, DMWA provides the user with a borrowing, an English CSW and an explanation. Arabic dictionaries define جِنّ as creatures that are made of fire and are invisible. Some are good while others are bad. Jinn, furthermore, form part of the Islamic belief and are the counter creatures of man. A demon, according to general English dictionaries, is an evil spirit. Fairy, the other cultural equivalent cited by M, is a mythical being

of folklore and romance usually having diminutive human form and magic powers. As these definitions clearly demonstrate, there is very little or no overlap in the cultural narrative of the Arabic entry and the English words proposed as equivalents beyond the fact that all words represent forms of non-human existence.

The picture becomes less acceptable when a long list of synonymous interlingual CSWs are proposed as equivalents for the source language entry. To illustrate, take the Arabic word غـول. The equivalents given to it by M are ghoul, goblin, ogre, bogey, bogy, hobgoblin, bugbear. (We note in passing that M has resorted, yet again, to a combination of borrowing and English CSWs). DMWA cites ghoul, a desert demon appearing in ever varying shapes; demon, ginni, goblin, sprite; ogre, cannibal. The definition given by the Arabic monolingual dictionary for this word is identical with the explanation provided by DMWA in the first sense. To determine how different these creatures are from the image Arab lexicographers draw for this creature, and how inaccurate some cultural equivalents may be, let us examine the meanings of the English equivalents suggested by both M and DMWA (all of which are based on Macmillan Dictionary Online):

goblin: a creature in children's stories that looks like a small person and enjoys causing trouble

ogre: a large, frightening, and cruel person in children's stories

bogey; bogy, bogyman: an imaginary evil creature used in stories for frightening children

hobgoblin: a small ugly creature in children's stories who harms or tricks people

bugbear: something that keeps annoying or worrying you

Collins English Dictionary Online adds the following definition for hobgoblin: a goblin is said to eat naughty children and thought to be in the form of a bear.

Borrowing, etymology, mythology and lexicography may occasionally

conspire and converge to blur the picture further. A case in point is the Arabic word عنْقـاء . According to both classical and modern Arabic monolingual dictionaries, this is a kind of mythical bird, though no one seems to be able to describe what its body is like: طائِـر مَعْـروف الإسْـم مجْهـول الجِسْـم . Neither Lisanu L-'Arab nor Al-SaHHaH, nor Almuujamu L-WaSeet go beyond the basics we have just given. In several Arabic texts, it is referred to as الـرُّخّ, a mythical bird the reader may come across in Sinbad travels and the tales of The Arabian Nights. M gives as English equivalents phoenix and griffin (or griffon, a spelling variant) while DMWA equates it with griffon and describes it as a legendary bird. But according to the Random House Dictionary Online, the griffin (or griffon) is a fabled monster, usually having the head and wings of an eagle and the body of a lion. The phoenix, according to the same source, is a mythical bird of great beauty fabled to live 500 or 600 years in the Arabian wilderness, to burn itself on a funeral pyre, and to rise from its ashes in the freshness of youth and live through another cycle of years: often an emblem of immortality or of reborn idealism or hope. As this explanation shows, no parts in the meaning of the proposed English equivalent have any relationship whatsoever to the Arabic entry. On the other hand, the word phoenix comes from Greek and refers to a mythical bird. Its appearance in Old English as fenix is first recorded around the year 900 A.D. Around 1590's, this word was used metaphorically ("that which rises from the ashes of what was destroyed"). The myth of this bird appears in cultures that are as diverse as those of India, China and Ancient Egypt. In Modern Arabic, this word has been borrowed and in this same metaphorical sense as طائـر الفينيـق. Outside the Arabic monolingual dictionaries, however, Modern Arabic abounds in examples where both words الفينيـق and العنقـاء are used interchangeably, a trend that lends a certain degree of credibility and legitimacy to the English equivalent phoenix, though the same cannot be said of the English word griffin.

Religious terms tend to have very well-defined but complex meanings that form part of a larger system of beliefs. Attempts to match senses across faiths will inevitably result not only in inaccuracy and distortion but also in outright rejection. For example, against the Arabic word شَـيْطان, Muujamu Llughalti L-'Arabiyyati L-Mu'aSira Online (2008) lists the following

senses: 1. Iblis 2. any rebellious human or jinn who is a follower of Iblis 3. the muse of the poet 4. very naughty or devilish. Additionally, this word is equated with Iblis only when it is definite and singular (الشَّـيْطان). In DMWA, the metaphorical sense and the literal one are confused (Shaitan, Satan, devil, fiend). M cites two sets of English equivalents separated by a semicolon against شَـيْطان: The Devil, Satan, Lucifer, Shaitan; devil, fiend, demon. The word شـيْطان , in the religious context, is Iblis, a fallen angel made of smokeless fire (as opposed to Adam who was made of clay). He was thrown out of Heaven because he refused to prostrate himself before Adam. We should also note that the word Iblis (occasionally Eblis) is cited twenty-nine million times in Google and is given in several English dictionaries including Merriam-Webster Dictionary Online, Wordnet, Collins English Dictionary Online and The American Heritage Dictionary Online. Iblis is closely related to, but is not completely identical with, the English words Satan, Lucifer and the Devil. The word Shaitan itself is also cited in the majority of monolingual English dictionaries. This discussion leads one to conclude that the borrowed words Iblis (or Eblis) and Shaitan could be proposed as the most accurate equivalents for the Arabic word when it is used as a CSW.

C. Functional Equivalence:

To avoid confusion, let us state that "functional equivalence" in this paper is not identical with the notion that is usually contrasted with "formal equivalence" as used by Nida or by Zgusta (1983). Rather, we shall use this concept in the sense given to it in Harvey (2000) and Newmark (1988). According to the latter, this procedure "… requires the use of a culture-free word, sometimes with a new specific term; it therefore neutralizes or generalizes the SL word; and sometimes adds a particular, e.g. baccalauriat - French secondary school leaving exam'; Sejm - 'Polish parliament" (p. 83). Theorists are divided on the validity of functional equivalence as a translation procedure for CSWs; while Newmark (1988) points out that it "neutralizes or generalizes the SL word" (p. 83) and Sarcevic describes it as "misleading and should be avoided" (1985:131), Weston (1991) lauds it as "the ideal method of translation" (p. 23). Examples of this fairly rare procedure are represented in our list by two expressions: مجْلِـس شـورى and

بيْـت المـال which we will discuss below.

Although the actual manifestations of the Arabic political entity مجْلِـس شـورى may vary significantly in the number of members, the method of selection and the actual legislative powers they might be granted, they all share one fundamental aspect: they are all based on the Islamic notion of consultation as a cornerstone of governance. In this sense, the concept is purely religious and needs to be understood and translated as such. Turning to our two dictionaries, we shall find that M translates this concept as state consultative council or court, council of state, state council. DMWA, on the other hand, uses the last equivalent given in M: state council. To begin with, this council indicates a proper name and would, therefore, appear in capital letters: Consultative Council. Secondly, these equivalents, when used, will deprive the word of any religious connotation that gave it its essential meaning in the first place. Thirdly, Google cites the Anglicized form, Shura Council, close to a million times and COCA twenty-one times. The phrase or a close variant thereof (i.e. Shura, Shoora) appears in a few English monolingual dictionaries including Collins English Dictionary Online and Oxford Dictionary Online. Armed with these facts, the lexicographer would be prudent to propose the Arabized form (Shura/ Shoora Council) as an equivalent.

Let us take another religious concept: the Arabic phrase بيْـت المـال. M gives as equivalents to بيـت المـال the words treasury and exchequer . DMWA, in turn, suggests fisc, treasury, exchequer (Islamic law). All these equivalents suggest the basic element of the meaning: the treasury of a state. However, none of them accurately reflects the precise meaning of the Arabic phrase. Wordnet online defines fisc as follows: a state treasury or exchequer or a royal treasury; originally the public treasury of Rome or the emperor's private purse. By contrast بيت المـال started as بيـت مـال المسلمين or بيـت مـال الله and was abbreviated in later periods. It is part of an Islamic administrative setup whose major sources of income are zakat, kharaj (tax imposed on the products of agricultural lands), sadaqaat (amls, charity), khumsu lghana'im (one fifth of war spoils) and jizya (an amount of money paid by the People of the Book). It is reported that during the lives of Prophet Mohammad

(pbuh) and Abu Bakr, the First Caliph, بيـت المـال was almost always empty as the monies received were promptly distributed amongst the deserving categories. This analysis of the sense of the Arabic term clearly shows that it is a financial institution that is completely distinct in nature and functions from the governmental agencies that oversee financial matters in, say, the United Kingdom or the United States of America.

D. Explanatory Equivalence and Explanations:

Zgusta (2006) differentiates between explanations and explanatory equivalents, equating the first with somewhat lengthy definitions we find in the monolingual or bilingual dictionaries (e.g. defining تشْبيب as rhapsodizing about a beloved woman and one's relationship to her, celebrating her in verse) and the latter with the notion of insertibility (p. 235) (e.g. defining مُتَصَـرّف as an administrative officer). We shall maintain this distinction in this paper. Both explanations and explanatory equivalents are used in the dictionaries under review and both statistically rank second to borrowing; DMWA has used explanations 52 times and explanatory equivalents only thirteen times. By comparison, M tends to frequently provide short explanatory equivalents and almost consistently steers away from lengthy explanations.

It stands to reason to assume that an explanatory equivalent will typically consist of a fairly short phrase (perhaps a maximum of three words), thus permitting it to be inserted in the translated text without much awkwardness. An explanation, on the other hand, will be any defining equivalent that is in excess of three words and which, if inserted in a translated text, may distract the reader. In the bilingual dictionary, the explanation itself should be kept distinct from encyclopedic information, thus striking a balance between achieving clarity and space restrictions imposed on the paper dictionary. For example, نكاح المتْعة , as an Islamic term, would be adequately explained as usufruct marriage contracted for a specified time and exclusively for the purpose of sexual pleasure, without necessarily going into the technical details such a complex type of marriage would entail (DMWA p. 890). زَكاة is sufficiently clear if given a definition such as the one in Merriam-Webster Dictionary Online: an annual alms tax or poor rate that each Muslim is

expected to pay as a religious duty and that is used for charitable and religious purposes. By comparison, the explanation cited against the word إحْـرام in DMWA is too long and is, fortunately, the exception rather than the rule in this dictionary: state of ritual consecration of the Mecca pilgrim (during which the pilgrim, wearing two seamless woolen or linen sheets, usually white, neither combs nor shaves and observes sexual continence.)

The choice between an explanatory equivalent and an explanation in the creation of dictionary equivalence would depend on the word itself and on the extent to which the procedure selected ensures clarity, accuracy and precision of meaning. Explanation would be most appropriate when used in complex CSWs that have not been borrowed (e.g. دانـق : W: an ancient coin = sixth of dirham) or where a simple explanatory equivalent would not be sufficient (e.g. DMWA سَـعْي : the ceremony of running seven times between the Safa and Marwa (performed during the Pilgrimage)). Explanatory equivalence, on the other hand, may take the form of the scientific name of a CSW (e.g. DMWA قِرْطِـم: safflower (Carthamus tinctorius; bot.) and سَـنْط a variety of sant tree (Acacia nilotica; bot.). And while translators and lexicographers may worry about the length of an explanation given against a certain entry, the brevity of an explanatory equivalent could also conceivably lead to problems. An example is the Arabic word مَحْـرَم which M translates as an unmarriageable person. Now, a person may be unmarriageable for a variety of reasons including age. But a مَحْـرَم as an Islamic Sharia term indicates a person who may never marry a woman at any time for specific reasons including blood relations, milk-suckling relations and in-law relations. Another example of brevity that may mislead or fail to express the meaning with sufficient clarity is the equivalent given by M to زواج المُتْعَـة which is translated as temporary marriage. By comparison, the definition given by DMWA is much clearer: muta, temporary marriage, usufruct marriage contracted for a specified time and exclusively for the purpose of sexual pleasure (Isl. law). A third example is the equivalents of ريـح السّـموم which DMWA translates as: hot wind, hot sandstorm, simoom. If the borrowed word is not known to the dictionary user, neither the phrase hot wind nor the phrase hot sandstorm would be sufficient in and by itself to provide the user with information that

would set this word apart from other kinds of hot winds and sandstorms; the geographical location, the dryness, the ferocity and the dusty nature of this wind. The English explanatory equivalent may also be too general to be of any use; the translation of the Arabic word متصـرف as administrative officer in M is a good example. The English phrase is currently given to the ruler of Hong Kong who is appointed by the Chinese Government. It can be the title of a job in the private sector or part of the university administrative setup. A UK government site defines administrative officers as those who "… work in a wide range of departments and agencies that deliver services to the public and develop government policies" (Next Step).

Explanatory equivalents and explanations are frequently used, or may be used, in conjunction with other translation procedures, for example borrowing, as we shall demonstrate in Section F. below. This combination of procedures may be utilized effectively when the borrowed word has yet to establish a firm foothold for itself in its new environment, when the lexicographer is uncertain of its frequency and also in cases when the lexicographer decides to "lend" a word to the target language. To illustrate, take the Arabic word كوفيّـة, a common type of headdress in the Levant and the Arabian Gulf region. Against this word, M cites kaffiyeh, an Anglicized word. Unfortunately, this word does not appear in any dictionary checked, it does not exist in the Corpus of Contemporary American English and there is no guarantee that it would mean anything to the native speaker of English. If we are to include it as a case of borrowing, the addition of an explanation becomes imperative. Therefore, preference should be given to DMWA which defines it as kaffiyeh, square kerchief diagonally folded and worn under the 'iqal as a headdress.

Compared to the other translation procedures, the provision of an explanation, together with borrowing, is perhaps the clearest way to express the precise meaning of a CSW in the target language. The major drawback of using an explanation on its own, however, is that it lacks the brevity and local color a borrowed word may lend to the meaning and would be too lengthy for inclusion in a translated text. This, we are aware, would make the task of the translator that much harder, but it will provide him with the opportunity to use his ingenuity to propose alternative translation procedures, including

compensation, footnotes, glosses and deletion.

E. Synonymy:

Synonymy as a translation procedure may be defined as "the use of a near target language equivalent" for a source language entry (Newmark, 1988, p. 84). Absolute synonymy between lexical items "is extremely rare" within the same language (Lyons, 2002, page 61); synonyms may vary at the level of formality, regional distribution, socio-expressive meaning, exact denotation, collocational range, etc., making full interchangeability virtually impossible. At the interlingual level, synonymy may exist in certain cases (e.g. in the names of months, days, nomenclature and scientific and technical terminology elements) which form the beginning of a cline of equivalence that terminates in nil equivalence that finds its most obvious representation in CSWs (Snell-Hornby, 1987, p. 165). However, the practice of using interlingual synonymy in bilingual dictionaries is, in general, inordinately common and often leads to errors in writing and translation. The employment of interlingual synonymy in the creation of equivalence for CSWs is particularly risky as true synonymy in this instance runs counter to the very nature of this group of words. For this reason, if the lexicographer decides to use synonymy as a translation procedure, both he and the dictionary user must realize that the interlingual equivalent is at best an approximation and at worst an inaccurate equivalent to the CSW in the source language. This fact was appreciated by both Wehr and Baalbaki who used this procedure very sparingly. Let us, however, examine some of the equivalents the two dictionaries have used.

If we look at the English equivalents M and DMWA cite against the Arabic word زكاة, we will find that both lexicographers give almsgiving, alms, charity and alms tax. A cursory examination of the actual meaning of the Arabic word would reveal that these proposed English equivalents are very inadequate as none of them encapsulates the religious status and the complex nature of the Arabic word. In fact, there are no financial institutions in the English speaking world that even remotely resemble this unique Islamic concept. Therefore, a much more accurate translation would make use of borrowing and probably a short paraphrase that would be along the lines

proposed by Merriam-Webster Dictionary Online:

زكاة: **a**. zakat **b**. an annual alms tax or poor rate that each Muslim is expected to pay as a religious duty and that is used for charitable and religious purposes

There are other justifications the lexicographer can use for proposing borrowing as a translation procedure for this particular word. Firstly, the word zakat is cited more than sixteen million times in Google. Secondly, it appears 44 times in the COCA and is recognized as part of the English lexical stock in Merriam-Webster Dictionary Online, Collins English Dictionary Online and the Random House Dictionary Online, the latter point being conveniently overlooked by both Wehr and Baalbaki.

The proposition of more than one interlingual synonym may further blur the picture. The Arabic word مُخْتار, for example, is translated as both chief and mayor; the first is too general in meaning and has a huge range of potential collocations, and apart from the fact that both the مختـار and the mayor are official positions and fall within civil administration, the two words have nothing in common from a semantic perspective.

Similarly, confusion may arise from the practice of proposing the same English word as an equivalent to two distinct Arabic CSWs. To illustrate, take the words مُحافَظَـة and مديريـة , both of which are translated, again in both dictionaries, as province. M, additionally, equates قضـاء, another administrative unit, with province. Other examples are represented by the equivalents proposed for the Arabic word والـي in M which translates it as ruler, governor, administrator, prefect, administrative official and in DMWA which cites the words governor and vali against this Arabic entry.

F. Combining Procedures:

In some cases, bilingual lexicographers resort to a combination of two or more translation procedures in the provision of interlingual senses. The analysis of the two dictionaries under consideration shows that the following combinations were used:

a. A borrowed word plus an explanation:

As stated above, an explanation is viewed as any English definition in excess of three words. This procedure was used quite extensively in DMWA but only two examples were found in M. Any attempt to understand why this is the case will be mere conjecture; it is possible that as DMWA primarily targets Western users and Western students of Arabic, its compiler may have felt that the exact senses of the borrowed words needed to be explained in detail to the target users. This practice is reminiscent of Edward Lane's work in the nineteenth century where very lengthy, and almost encyclopedic, explanations were provided against Arabic CSWs. Baalbaki, on the other hand, perhaps felt that it would be more convenient to provide his Arab target users with economical equivalents that are either borrowings or explanatory equivalents which can be used in translation or when an Arab student wants to know the English meaning(s) of an Arabic word. Be that as it may, the following examples represent the approach adopted by DMWA:

حِنّاء: henna (a reddish-orange cosmetic gained from leaves and stalks of the henna plant)

ديوان: divan, a collection of poems written by one author

مصطبة: mastaba, outdoor stone bench (built into the side of the house)

شادوف: shadoof, counterpoised sweep for raising irrigation water

الخماسين: khamsin, a hot southerly wind in Egypt

سَـنْجَق: DMWA: sanjak, administrative district and subdivision of a vilayat (in the Ottoman Empire)

ذِمِّيّ: a zimmi, a free non-Muslim subject living in a Muslim country

الـرُخّ: roc, the name of a fabulous giant bird; M: roc; fabulous huge bird of prey

قُفْطـان: caftan, a long- sleeve outer garment, open in front and fastened by a hizam

The above examples show that the explanations are given in a variety of ways: between brackets following the borrowed word, as senses separated from the borrowed word by a coma or as an explanation that consists of two parts; one an explanation and the other additional bracketed information that helps to further clarify the sense.

b. A borrowed word plus one or more explanatory equivalents:

إمام : DMWA: imam, prayer leader

ديوان: M: divan, collection of poems

مصطبة: M: mastaba, outdoor bench, seat

هَوْدَج: DMWA: camel litter, howdah

صوفِيّ: DMWA: Sufi, Islamic mystic

حورية: DMWA: huori, virgin of paradise

M: divan, collection of poems, poetical works

c. A borrowed word and one or more synonyms:

والي: DMWA: ruler, governor, vali

بَقْشيش: DMWA: baksheesh, gratuity, tip; M: baksheesh, gratuity, tip

d. A borrowed word and a gloss: الكعبة : the Kaaba (in Mecca);

e. A borrowed word and one or more cultural equivalents:

جِنِّي : M: jinni, demon, fairy

شـيطان: DMWA: Shaitan, Satan, devil, fiend; M: the Devil, Satan, Lucifer, Shaitan

f. Two borrowed words:

طربوش : M: tarboosh, fez; DMWA: tarboosh, fez

شيشة: narghile, hookah

g. A borrowed word, a cultural equivalent and an explanation:

جِنّ: DMWA: jinn, demons (invisible beings, either harmful or helpful, that interfere with the lives of mortals)

h. A borrowed word, an explanatory equivalent and an explanation:

محـراب: DMWA: a recess in a mosque indicating the direction of prayer; prayer niche, mihraab

i. Two or more explanatory equivalents:

جاهليـة: DMWA: pre-Islamic paganism, pre-Islamic times; M: pre-Islamic times, pre-Islamic epoch, pre-Islamic paganism

Other combinations, as we have seen in Podolej (2009), may be permissible; however the ones listed above are those manifested in the two dictionaries we are investigating.

Statistically, the number of cases where a combined approach to equivalence was used represented about half the meanings given in DMWA and slightly less than that in M. Of significance is the fact that in almost every case, the combination consisted of a borrowed word and another procedure, an approach to the treatment of CSWs that recognizes their uniqueness and the need to emphasize borrowing as the major common denominator in the creation of English equivalence. These combinations, though, can be potentially dangerous; given a list of English equivalents based on different procedures will only reflect the inherent strengths and weaknesses of these procedures as we explained earlier. A borrowed word will be a better representation of the sense than a brief, and perhaps incomplete, explanatory equivalent. A lengthy explanation will not be as suited to the needs of the translator as a single borrowing and it may even miss some of the semantic components of the SL word. A case of borrowing will be far more accurate than any synonym, cultural equivalent or functional equivalent.

6. Conclusion

The analysis of the two A-E dictionaries shows that they diverge in the extent of their coverage of Arabic CSWs. It also demonstrates that both dictionaries tend to focus on borrowing as the major translation procedure, but while DMWA tends to combine borrowing with explanations, M prefers to use borrowing with explanatory equivalents or some other procedure. Both dictionaries make less use of other strategies including functional equivalence, cultural equivalence and synonymy. These rough quantitative indicators reflect clearly the unique nature of CSWs and the need to preserve this characteristic in the rendition of their senses into the target language. The examples discussed in the paper further highlight cases where the lexicographer's decisions led to a variety of problems, including inaccuracies, inconsistencies and erroneous equivalents. Added to this is the use of more than one procedure, thus creating the false impression that the resultant equivalents are all equally precise and interchangeable. This is on the one hand. On the other, the two dictionaries fail to list a huge number of CSWs that exist in the different colloquial varieties of Arabic such as the types of boats and musical instruments common in the Arabian Gulf countries. Such words do appear in texts that focus on local and regional sub-cultures, and this makes it imperative for the translator to utilize appropriate procedures for dealing with such words. In doing so, the translator may find the dictionary practices beneficial to a certain extent: borrowing as a translation procedure must be given priority while the remaining procedures must be used with extreme care. But even when the CSW is dealt with in the dictionary, the seasoned translator should be well aware of the fact that the BD is the starting point and not the final destination in the process of target text creation. Ultimately, it is the translator who has to decide which equivalent is most appropriate for his needs, and in this he will be guided by textual considerations – such as the translation methods and target text skopos - that may sway him to accept one or more of the equivalents, call into question the procedure(s) proposed in the creation of an equivalent or even transcend the boundaries of the bilingual dictionary itself to give primacy to textual equivalence.

Bibliography

Abu-Ssaydeh, A. F. "Is a Hybrid Dictionary a tenable Proposition?" Accepted for publication in IJAES.

Aciobanitei, Maria. (2010). Translating Culture-Bound Expressions. A paper presented at the International Conference: Translation Studies: Retrospective and Introspective Views. Fifth Edition, University of Galaţi, Romania.

Adamska-Sałaciak, Arleta. (2011, July 5-7) "Equivalence in a semantic and lexicographic perspective: A case study". The 16th Annual International AFRILEX Conference UNAM, Windhoek, Namibia.

Adamska-Sałaciak. (2007). "*Meaning and the Bilingual Dictionary. The Case of English and Polish". International Journal of Lexicography, 20(1),* 85-87.

Adamska-Sałaciak, Arleta. (2012, February 25). "Lexical and Semantic Borrowing in a Bilingual Dictionary". Euralex 2004 Proceedings (pp. 443-450). June 21, 2012.

<http://www.euralex.org/elx_proceedings/Euralex2004>

Aixelá, Javier Franco. (2007). "Culture-Specific Items in Translation" . In Román Avarez and M. Carmen -Africa Vidal (Eds.), Translation, Power, Subversion (pp. 52-78). Beijing: Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press.

Armellino, Elisa. (2008). "Translating Culture-Bound Elements in Subtitling -

An Example of Interlinguistic Analysis: a scene from Scent of a Woman" . Translation Journal 12(2). March 21, 2012.

http://translationjournal.net/journal/44culturebound.htm

Atkins, B.T. and P. Bouillon. (2006). "Relevance in Dictionary Making: Sense Indicators in the Bilingual Entry". In Lynne Bowker (Ed.),

Lexicography, terminology and translation (pp. 25-44). University of Ottawa Press.

Baker, M. (1992). In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation. London: Routledge.

Bassnett, S. (1992). Translation Studies. London: Routledge.

Borneman, Eva. (1989). "Translation and the Lexicographer". In Mary-Snell Hornby and Esther Pohl (Eds.), Translation and Lexicography (pp. 99-104). John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Chesterman, Andrew. (1997). Memes of Translation. John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Florin, S. (1993). "Realia in Translation". In P. Zlateva (Ed.), Translation as a Social Action: Russian and Bulgarian Perspectives (pp. 122-128). London and New York: Routledge.

Gouws, R.H., and D.J. Prinsloo. (2010). "Surrogate equivalence in bilingual dictionaries with specific reference to zero equivalence in dictionaries for African languages". Tydskr. geesteswet. [online], 50(4), 502-519. March 25, 2012.

<http://www.scielo.org.za/scielo.php?pid=S0041-47512010000400004&script=sci_abstract>

Gouws Rufus H. (2002). "Equivalent relations, context and cotext in bilingual dictionaries". Hermes, Journal of Linguistics, 28, 195-210. April 2, 2012.

<http://download2.hermes.asb.dk/archive/download/H28_11.pdf>

Graedler, A.L. 2006. "Cultural shock". April, 12, 2012. <http://www.hf.uio.no/iba/nettkurs/translation/grammar/top7culture.html>

Hartman, R.R.K. (2007). Interlingual Lexicography: Selected Essays on Translation Equivalence. Tubingen: Max Nieme yer Verlag.

Harvey, Malcolm. (2000). "A Beginner's Course in Legal Translation: the

Case of Culture-Bound Terms". ASTTI/ ETII , 357-369. May 15, 2012.

http://www.tradulex.org/Actes2000/harvey.pdf

Hervey, Sándor G. J., and Ian Higgins. (1992). Thinking Translation. Routledge.

Higashino, Yumi. (2001, December). "Cultural equivalence: its effectiveness and complications -- Has 'white gloves' achieved the equivalent effect of 'shiro tabi'?". Interpretation Studies 1, 53-63.

Ivir, V. (1987). "Procedures and Strategies for the Translation of Culture". In G. Toury (Ed.), Translation Across Culture (pp. 35-46). Bahri Publications: New Delhi.

Kalëdaitë and Asijavièiûtë and Vilma Asijaviciute. (2005). "Translation of Lithuanian Culture-Specific Items Into English". Kalbotyra, 55(3), 31-37.

Kujamäki, Pekka. (1993). Zur Übersetzung von Realien Bezeichnungen in Literarischen Texten: Eine descriptive Analyse der Übersetzungen von Prosa Hannu Salamas. Unpublished Licentiate Dissertation. University of Joensuu.

Leemets, Helle. (1992). "Translating the "untranslatable" words". In H. Tommola, K. Varantola, T. Salmi-Tolonen and J.Schopp (Eds.), Papers submitted to the 5th EURALEX International Congress on Lexicography, in Tampere, Finland. Part 2 (pp.473-478). Tampere: University of Tampere.

Lefevere, André. (1992). Translating Literature. New York: The Modern Language Association of America.

Lotman, J., and B. Uspensky. (1978). "On the Semiotic Mechanism of Culture". New Literary History, 211-32.

Lyons, John. (2002). Linguistic Semantics. 2nd edition. Cambridge University Press.

Matter-Siebel, Sabina. (1995). "Kulturspezifika bei der literarischen Übersetzung anhand einer Betrachtung von William Faulkners The Hamlet". In N. Salnikov (Ed.), Sprachtransfer – Kulturtransfer (pp. 109-134). Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang Gmbtt.

Newmark, Peter. (1988). A Textbook of Translation. Hertfordshire: Prentice Hall.

Newmark. (1981). Approaches to Translation. Oxford: Pergamon.

Nielsen, Sandro. (1997). The bilingual LSP dictionary: principles and practice for legal language. Tubigen: Narr.

Nord, C. (1997). Translating as a Purposeful Activity. Manchester: St. Jerome.

O'Donoghue, Salla. (2005). Cognitive Changes in Reader-Evoked Frames: Culture-specific references in Edna O'Brien's The Country Girls and its Finnish translation. A Pro gradu Thesis in English. Department of Languages, University of Jyvaskyla.

Paluszkiewicz-Misiaczek, Magdalena. (2005). "Strategies and Methods in Dealing with Culture Specific Expressions on the Basis of Polish-English Translations of Certain Administrative and Institutional Terms". Theory and Practice in English Studies: Proceedings from the Eighth Conference of British, American and Canadian Studies, 3, (pp. 243-248). Brno: Masarykova univerzita.

Pavlović, N., & D. Poslek (1999) "British and Croatian Culture-Specific Concepts in Translation". British Cultural Studies: Cross-Cultural Challenges, 157-168. May 15, 2012. www.britishcouncil.hr/english/bcs/pavbac.pdf

Podolej, Magdalena. (2009). Culture in bilingual dictionaries: Analysis of cultural content and culture-specific vocabulary in E-P-E dictionaries. May 13, 2012.

<ifa.amu.edu.pl/fa/files/Podolej.pdf>

Qing, XIA. (2010). "On English Translation of Culture-Specific Items in the Ancient Chinese Official System: A Descriptive and Comparative Study on Hawkes' and Yangs' English Translated Cases of Hong Lou Meng. Cross-cultural Communication, 6(4), 40-57.

Roberts, Roda P. (2007). "Dictionaries and culture". In Henrik Gottlieb and Jens Erik Mogensen (Eds.), Dictionary Visions, Research and Practice (Terminology and Lexicography Research and Practice 10) (pp. 277-297). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Samovar, Larry A., and E. Porter Richard. (1991). Communication between cultures. Belmont: Wadsworth Publishing Company.

Sarcevic, Suzan. (1985). "Translation of Culture-Bound Terms in Laws". Multilingua 4(3), 127-133.

Savić, Vera and Ilijana Čutura.(2011). "Translation as Culturl Transportation". JoLIE 4, 125-149.

Schäffner, Christina, and Uwe Wiesemann. (2001). Annotated Text For Translation: English – German: Functionalist Approaches Illustrated. Clevendon: Multilingual Matters.

Snell-Hornby, M. (1995). Lexicography and translation. In S. W. Chan, & D. E.

Pollard (Eds.), An encyclopaedia of translation—Chinese-English /

English-Chinese (pp. 533–545). Hong Kong: The Chinese University of Hong

Kong.

Snell-Hornby, Mary. (1990). "Dynamic in meaning as a problem for bilingual lexicography". In J. Tomaszcyk and B. Lewandowska-Tomaszcyk (Eds.), Meaning and Lexicography (pp. 209-226). John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Snell-Hornby, Mary.(1987). "Towards a learner's bilingual dictionary". In

Anthony Cowie (ed.), The dictionary and the language learner (pp. 159-170). Tübingen: M. Niemeyer.

Tellinger, Dusán. (2003). "A reáliák fordítása a fordító kulturális kompetenciája szemszögéből". Fordítástudomány, 5(2), 58-70.

Terestyényi, Enikő. (2011). " Translating Culture-specific Items in Tourism Brochures". SKASE Journal of Translation and Interpretation [online]. March 23, 2012. <http://www.skase.sk/Volumes/JTI06/pdf_doc/02.pdf>.

Teubert, Wolfgang. (Ed.). (2007). Text Corpora and Multilingual Lexicography. John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Tomaszczyk, Jerzy. (1984). "The culture-bound element in bilingual dictionaries". In Reinhard Rudolf Karl Hartmann (Ed.), LEXeter '83 Proceedings. Papers from the International Conference on Lexicography at Exeter, 9-12 September 1983, (pp. 289-297). Tübingen : Niemeyer.

Toury, G. (2004). "The Nature and Role of Norms in Translation". In L. Venuti (Ed.), The Translation Studies Reader (pp. 204-218). London: Routledge.

Vermeer, H. (2000). Skopos and commission in translational activity. In L. Venuti (Ed.),

The Translation Studies Reader (pp. 221-232). London: Routledge.

Weston, Martin. (1991). An English Reader's Guide to the French Legal System. New York/ Oxford: Berg.

White, Leslie A. (1992). "Culture". In The new Encyclopaedia Britannica. Vol. 16.

Wierzbicka, Anna. (1985). Lexicography and conceptual analysis. United States of America: Karoma Publishers, Inc.

Williams, Jennifer. (1993). "The Translation of Culture-specific Terms". Lebende Sprachen, 2, 55-58.

Xue-bing, HE. (2006). "Translating Cultural-Specific Items: A Descriptive Study". Sino-US English Teaching, 3(12), 82-93.

Zgusta, Ladislav. (2006). Lexicography then and now: Selected Essays. In Frederic S.F. Dolezal and Thomas B. I. Creamer (Eds.). Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.

Zgusta, Ladislav. (1983). "Translational equivalence in the Bilingual Dictionary". Euralex May 2012 (pp. 147-154). http://www.euralex.org/elx_proceedings/Euralex1983/024).

Zgusta, Ladislav. (2006 [1979]). "Equivalents and Explanations in Bilingual Dictionaries". In M. A. Jazayery, E. Polomé and W. Winter (eds.), Studies in Honor of Archibald A. Hill. 385–392. Vol. IV. Mouton: The Hague. Reprinted in Zgusta, L. (2006). Lexicography Then and Now (pp. 230–235). Tübingen: Max Niemeyer.

Zgusta, Ladislav. (1971). Manual of lexicography. Prague: Academia.

Dictionaries:

Almuujamu L-WaSeet Online

The American Heritage Dictionary Online,

Baalbaki, Munir. (1968). Al-Mawrid: An English-Arabic Dictionary. Bierut: DAR EL-ILM LILMALAYIN.

Baalbaki, Rohi. (1988). Al-Mawrid; A Modern Arabic-English Dictionary. Bierut: DAR EL-ILM LILMALAYIN.

Cambridge Advanced Learner's Dictionary Online

Collins English Dictionary Online

Dictionary of Etymology Online

Lisanu L-'Arab Dictionary Online

Longman English Dictionary Online

Macmillan Dictionary Online

Merriam-Webster Dictionary Online

Muujamu Llughalti L-'Arabiyyati L-Mu'aSira Online

Muujamu SSaHHAAH Online

Oxford Dictionary Online

The Random House Dictionary Online

Wehr, H. (1974). A Dictionary of Modern Written Arabic. 3rd edited by Milton Cowan. Beirut: Librairie Du Liban and London: Macdonald & Evans LTD.

Wordnet

Corpus:

Corpus of Contemporary American English

Google

أساليب ترجمة المفردات ذات الخصوصية الثقافية وتطبيقاتها في المعجم الثنائي اللغة (عربي-إنجليزي)

عبد الفتاح صالح أبو السيدة
كلية الآداب والعلوم الإنسانية والاجتماعية - جامعة الشارقة
الشارقة - الإمارات العربية المتحدة

الملخص

على الرغم من كثرة ما كُتب في موضوع تعريف المفردات ذات الخصوصية الثقافية وتصنيفها وطرق ترجمتها، فإن منهجية وضع المقابلات لهذه المفردات في المعجم الثنائي اللغة لم تحظ باهتمام واسع في أوساط الباحثين. لذلك يسعى هذا البحث إلى استقصاء طبيعة المفردات العربية ذات الخصوصية الثقافية ومدى كفاية الأساليب المستخدمة لنقلها إلى اللغة الإنجليزية من خلال تحليل هذه الكلمات في معجمين ثنائيي اللغة، هما: معجم هانز فير معجم اللغة العربية المعاصرة، وقاموس المورد عربي- إنجليزي للدكتور روحي بعلبكي. وسيظهر التحليل بأن أكثر أساليب الترجمة شيوعا لهذا النوع من المفردات هو الاقتراض يليه التفسير أو الشرح ثم المعادل التفسيري ومن بعده أسلوب يجمع بين هذه الأساليب الثلاثة. أما أساليب الترجمة الأخرى مثل المعادل الثقافي والمعادل الوظيفي والمرادفات فهي أقل شيوعا، وتؤدي في الأغلب الأعم إلى إيراد معان غير دقيقة. كما سيبرهن البحث على أن المعجمين قيد النظر يميلان أحياناً إلى عدم الاتساق في المنهجية والخطأ في التقدير والعجز عن إيراد المعني الصحيح أو الدقيق للكلمة في اللغة المنقول إليها. ويختم البحث بالتأكيد على أن فرادة هذه الكلمات تقتضي من واضع المعجم انتقاء الأسلوب الملائم الذي يعكس هذه الخاصية ليضع بين يدي مستخدم المعجم المقابلات الإنجليزية التي تفي بالمعنى بوضوح ودقة. ولعل أفضل أساليب الترجمة التي تحقق هذه الغاية هي الاقتراض والشرح والمعادل التفسيري، أو أي أسلوب آخر يجمع بين هذه الأساليب المختلفة.

الأستاذ الدكتور عبد الفتاح أبو السيدة: يعمل حاليا أستاذا للترجمة وعلم اللغة في جامعة الشارقة، وتتركز بحوثه في ميدان صناعة المعاجم والدراسات اللغوية المقارنة.