JJMLL

Challenges of Rendering Chauvinism into Arabic: Implications for Dictionary Users and Translation Equivalence

Mohammad al-kuran *
Translation department, Yarmouk University, Jordan

Abstract

Bilingual dictionaries sometimes do not satisfy the needs of dictionary users because they offer partial equivalents or incomplete information. This status does not avail the users who seek to immediately retrieve the required information. The users presume that language entries in bilingual dictionaries are communicative equivalents that can be used to translate specific occurrences of the source language item. If the semantic and communicative translation does not hold between the SL and TL, the user will not be able to render the item in question successfully. This paper examines the target language equivalents for 'chauvinism in English –Arabic dictionaries, namely the Oxford English-Arabic Dictionary (2014); Al-Mawrid, English- Arabic (2006); *Al-Muɣni al-Kabi:r* (1995); The Oxford Word Power (2006); The Dictionary, English-Arabic (2004), as a representative sample. These dictionaries do not catch the broad range of the concept that covers many sorts of claims and social attitudes in its native linguistic sources. To make up for this deficiency, the paper highlights the appropriate strategies that translators can use to render this concept communicatively into Arabic. The study is based on the communicative functional approach which assumes that dictionary meaning is insufficient to resolve potential ambiguities and that the contexts are necessary to unpack specific senses or connotations of the item. This deficiency has an impact on the translator's choice of strategy to meet the target readers' needs. Finally, strategies and suggestions for helping to achieve equivalence in bilingual dictionaries are discussed.

Keywords: Equivalence, Contextual translation, Communicative equivalence, Ambiguity, Contested concept.

1. Review of Literature

Although chauvinism is widely used in English, its origin resides in the French language. Hocus (2008) ascribes this concept to a French soldier named Nicolas Chauvin who was devoted to Napoleon. His name was used to create a term defining a specific outlook that he shared. Under Napoleon, the term referred to devoted veteran soldiers. However, the French people ridiculed these veterans as simpletons because they were still blindly devoted to a leader who had fallen from grace. In the 19th century, Chauvin

* Corresponding Author: **mkuran9@gmail.com**

and the men he represented became a comic stereotype that was exploited by French wrights. Later, the term came to indicate excessive nationalism and patriotism. In the modern world, the concept has been reduced to matters of interest or concern such as group egotism or group favoritism, dominance, social distance, struggle over the natural resources of the state, and hatred of immigrants who share the benefits of the welfare system. Goldschmidt (2015), for example, referred to welfare state nationalism as a political notion to exclude immigrants from welfare benefits and restrict it to certain groups. Along these lines, Bowles and Gintis (2000, 45) link "chauvinism to in-group and out-group markers, such as race, ethnicity, and language". The tendency of certain groups to think only of their own interests to the exclusion of others is an assumption that they regard themselves as superior and more valuable. Ibelema (2021, 124) points out that "cultural chauvinism that had its roots in the European renaissance and nationalism branded all non-western as nefarious". She also refers to all movements, including Africanism as "a form of cultural chauvinism that came into being as a reaction to colonization" (p. 124)

Most recently, especially from the 1960s onwards, chauvinism as prejudice against women has found its way as men think that they are more capable and more intelligent than women. Prasad (2019) mentions that the 'male chauvinist', and its extension 'male chauvinist pig' emerged in the early1970s among feminists for men who believe in their superiority over women. According to Prasad, 'pig' is used first by the American Civil Right Movement activists to denigrate the police, and by extension, those with the power to suppress.

The fact that chauvinism stands for a broad range of claims and social views makes it difficult to pin it to one standard definition in English dictionaries and encyclopedias. Arguments about the proper use of the concept have triggered endless disputes about its exact definition. Hooft (2012) notes that people confuse 'chauvinism' with nationalism and patriotism. He argues that these do not refer to the same thing. Nationalism, he contends, refers to the formation of one's identity but involves no pursuit of national interests at the expense of valid aspirations of others. Patriotism, on the other hand, is conceived of as having pride in the national symbols and historical milestones of one's country but involves no readiness to defend them against foreign threats. Similarly, Hooft draws a fine line between imperialism and chauvinism in that the former involves the pursuit of one country's goals both through diplomacy and war, whereas the latter is only concerned with the formation of one's identity

The dictionary meaning of chauvinism usually involves aggressive and exaggerated nationalism which is a seemingly equivalent notion to patriotism and imperialism. Apparently, what chauvinism represents depends on how different types of people look at the meaning. The impact of the translator's own ideology and the dominant ideology on the target text cannot be neglected. Schaffner (2003 refers to the lexical and grammatical levels within the text as an ideological aspect, which may be represented in the deliberate choice or avoidance of a particular word to communicate a specific message. So, translation is a conscious choice of words and meaning. Along these lines, Hooft (2014) points out that, from an ethical perspective, linking aggressiveness to chauvinism is unwelcome by a cosmopolitan who ascribes such perception to the ignorance of people about the true sense of the term. For a cosmopolitan, chauvinism is seen as a formation of one's identity rather than an object of commitment to pursue the

goals of one's country at the expense of the valid aspiration of others. In other words, there should be a sharp line between patriotism, love of one's country, and aggressive nationalism from a cosmopolitan point of view.

At another level, Stevenson (2010) holds that chauvinism involves a series of negative connotations about women such as hatred, prejudice, sexual assault, violence, rape, and subjugation. This series of words is provided with no clear distinct boundaries of meaning. This category represents male chauvinism in which males see themselves as superior to women. The notion of superiority may apply to racism, ethnocentrism, nationalism, and all other forms of prejudice.

Likewise, Agnes et al. (2003) in Webster's New World College perceive chauvinism in terms of devotion to one's country, race, and sex as well as an aggressive, threatening warlike foreign policy. The latter is listed in this dictionary as jingoism. Seemingly, the semantic range of chauvinism involves devotion to all types of objects. The listed entries under the headword "chauvinism" are not absolute synonyms. Terms like racism, sexism, and jingoism are by no means identical in meaning, and each entry listed under chauvinism is capable of some shades of meaning. A jingoist, for example, is not only one who is aggressive and pursuing a warlike policy, but also implies some religious connotations: jingo may be a euphemism for Jesus, or an exclamation used to indicate strong assertion.

The interconnected concepts that are usually associated with chauvinism are equally susceptible to contests about their proper use because they overlap with no clear semantic boundaries. This means that to define chauvinism you need to define all other presumably overlapping equivalents. For example, although dictionaries use sexism and misogyny as equivalents for chauvinism, these two presumably synonymous terms are not identical in meaning. The Oxford English Dictionary (2000) defines sexism as prejudice against women based on sex, whereas misogyny refers to the ingrained prejudice or contempt for women. While both definitions are related to prejudice, the dictionary indicates a subtle difference in the attitude toward women. Unlike the Oxford English dictionaries, other dictionaries generally do not cater to such a subtle difference.

Furthermore, Agnes (2003) in Webster's New World College Dictionary mentions lengthy descriptions and derogatory manifestations of the term. At one level, the term denotes, in this dictionary, a young lower-class person identified by brash and loutish behavior and the wearing of real or fake clothes as a clear signal to show a lack of respect. Athletic baseball caps and flashy jewelry, according to Webster, are aspects of 'chauvinism' that adorn lower-class persons working in groups and engaging in aggressively loutish behavior. This dictionary mentions that the root of the term is depicted as thieving, post-smoking, gaudy jewelry, bling-loving, boob-displaying with no ambition

Due to the overlapping feature of concepts in social sciences, Connolly (1983) and Gallie 1965) consider chauvinism a contested concept for having abroad and a variable set of properties where each is open for interpretation. Therefore, chauvinism, as a concept, does not allow precise identification and definition given a person's thoughts, feelings, and desires that comprise a person's self-identity. The subjective view of the term is not likely to pin the concept to one specific connotation since concepts in

social science change with time and circumstance and are ideologically oriented. After all, chauvinism has no physical concrete image that allows a clear physical description or analysis.

Although many authors have striven to elucidate its meaning precisely, they have failed to reduce the debate by settling on a precise one-to-one correspondence between the concept and its proper equivalent. The concept is fluid to such a degree that people, in general, see no clear-cut distinctions between the concept and the list of equivalents provided in dictionaries. Lack of congruity on a single definition of chauvinism, for example, failing to pin chauvinism to nationalism, allowed people to associate it with political, cultural, and social objects of all types. On the other hand, there are no definite words in English dictionaries that can bridge the gap between the interrelated equivalents. For example, there is no clear definition of chauvinism in the sense of excessive or prejudiced loyalty to one's religion, one's race, or culture on one hand, and 'bigotry' an overlapping concept, which simply denotes intolerance towards those who hold different opinions than oneself. The fact that bridging concepts are almost impossible feeds into the deceptive nature of the term, which has its sway upon the Arabic perception of the term. Thus, the state of confusion about what chauvinism exactly means poses an immediate obstacle to the attainment of rigorous knowledge and effective translations.

2. Statement of the Problem

A close look at English -Arabic dictionaries shows a couple of items in the target paradigm for chauvinism. Doniach (2011) in the Oxford English - Arabic dictionary of current usage displays *ta?ssub watˤani*, meaning exaggerated patriotism or aggressive nationalism along with a morphological adaptation of chauvinism *ʃuːfiːniyya* in the Arabic language paradigm. Similarly, Baalbaki (2006), in, *Al-Mawrid*, which attracts a great number of translators, professionals, and students alike, offers a morphologically adapted equivalent (*ʃuːfiːniyya*) in the target language along with a single target expression *ɣuluw fil watˤaniyya*, exaggeration in one's love of his country. In a similar vein, al-karmi (1995), in his dictionary, *Al-muɣni al-Kabiːr,* translates chauvinism as *muɣaːlaːh fil watˤaniyya* or t*amʒiːdil ?ummah*, meaning glorifying one's nation or exaggeration in one's love of his nation and so does Oxford Word power (2006) where chauvinism is rendered into ta*? ssub watˤani* with no morphological or phonological adaptation of the source term into the conventions of the target language. Similarly, Arts (2014) in Oxford English- Arabic Dictionary shows similar results.

The dictionaries use only a narrow range of target items, a couple of items in the target language as equivalents for chauvinism thereby blocking the dictionary user's mind on these two senses, and ignoring other connotations for chauvinism such as male chauvinism, sexism, misogyny which are listed as entries under chauvinism in English monolingual dictionaries. The items in the target language are incomplete and imprecise because they lack definitions and explanations. In other words, they do not cater sufficiently to dictionary users' needs. Vinay and Darbelnet (1995, 255) argue that "the TL item and its SL counterpart are not considered full equivalents in a bilingual dictionary unless they are listed so." In other words, the rendering of an SL expression or term in a dictionary or glossary does not guarantee a

successful translation unless it takes into consideration the full usage and semantic spectrum of the SL term to meet the likely needs of the dictionary user.

Seemingly, dictionary makers assume that each word has a direct replacement in the other language, which is not actually the case. For a dictionary to be a sufficient translation tool, a wider range of associations in context from reliable sources should be provided to help infer a particular sense that fits a particular context. For example, a bilingual dictionary is supposed to provide information that would enable the user to infer a particular sense of chauvinism, say, hatred of women based on sex(sexism) versus ingrained prejudice against women (misogyny). Although both senses are more likely to be indications of male chauvinism, there is a slight difference between the two, which is not accounted for in the cited bilingual dictionaries.

As far as loanword adaptation is concerned, the morphological and phonological adaptation of chauvinism into Arabic *ʃuːfiːniyya* keeps it semantically ambiguous. Although adaptation can be justified in terms of linguistic gap (i.e., lack of an entirely native word for the source term), it unpacks not much of the bundle of its components of meaning to the user. Conversely, the native equivalent *taʔssub*, meaning exaggerated nationalism, is offered in these dictionaries as a native semantic equivalent for chauvinism. Still, there is a difference between *taʔssub* in the sense of exaggerated nationalism and other rival forms of superiority such as sexism, misogyny, and imperialism which are listed as entries under chauvinism in the source dictionaries. The target language options of the bilingual dictionary do not cover the semantic range of their counterparts.

3. Theoretical Framework

This study rests upon the communicative functional approach to translation which gives the translator a significant role as a mediator between the author of the source text and the receivers of the target text. House (2009:72) views translation "as both linguistic and cultural activity involving communication across two different cultures rather than a kind of cross-linguistic substitution" This view forms a shift from the referential or dictionary meaning to the contextual and communicative equivalence that requires the translator's cognitive efforts to resolve ambiguities by dwelling on appropriate translation procedures that will ensure a more effective and comprehensive rendering of the ST message in the target language. The cited bilingual dictionaries do not offer translation equivalents or sufficient contextual information for dictionary users. They cannot be considered a substitute for the translator's communicative competence of the TL and SL Swanepoel (1989, 202) argues that "it is a misconception to assume that the general bilingual dictionary is an ideal translation tool for professional translators"

Based on the functional communicative approach, Nida (1986) developed a dynamic equivalence of translation with the intention of enabling both target readers and source readers to understand the text in a similar fashion. As such, the translator's communicative and cognitive competence is essential for executing translation solutions based on the translator's own explanations, descriptions, or notes. The lack of equivalence in bilingual dictionaries allowed the translator to compensate for the lack of

communicative equivalence via his own strategies. It is no wonder that the success of translation depends upon the degree of craftsman in the act of translation

Noteworthy is the fact that a text could be a particular text, a certain concept, a page, a full book etc. According to Catford (1978, 20), "translation theory is concerned with individual words as well as full texts, and both may be equally important in the context." A translation that does not involve the entire text is called 'restricted translation', as in our case. Catford holds that a specific SL element may be translated into a TL equivalent or transferred to the TL untranslated. Although Catford considers 'transference' not a case of translation because it involves no semantic information, he acknowledges that translators tend in certain circumstances to transfer or adapt a specific SL to the target language conventions for pragmatic reasons.

In the following section, the article sheds light on the underlying motives that prompt the translator to either translate or adapt the concept of chauvinism into the target language to achieve an approximate level of equivalence in meaning. It is noteworthy that the type of equivalence that concerns this study is directional: that is, the one that the translator can create rather than a natural or pre-existing one. Pym (2010, 37) argues that "there is no such thing as a perfect equivalence between languages; it is always assumed equivalence" To achieve such assumed equivalence, the translator is free to choose whatever strategies he thinks are appropriate for the item in question. These strategies are not dictated by the ST. The functional communicative approach allows the translator to compensate for the linguistic limitation and lack of equivalence by adopting strategies that can ensure a more effective and comprehensive rendering of the ST item in the target language

4. Translation Versus Transference

In directional translation, the translator uses his communicative functional competence to ensure a more effective and comprehensive rendering of the ST text or item in the target language. Since bilingual dictionaries lack the specialization required by professional translators, the translators are free to apply appropriate translation strategies, which are not dictated by the ST to achieve approximate equivalence.

The strategies that the translator adopts are intended to achieve communicative equivalence which is by no means natural or pre-existing. Strategies as diverse as footnotes, marginal notes, definitions, and additional information can be used to help achieve an approximate communicative equivalence that is hard to achieve at a lexical level in bilingual dictionaries.

Because translating such an ambiguous concept, which is deeply rooted in the source context, poses a challenge for the translator for being too broad, the translator may choose to borrow or adapt the term morphologically and phonologically to the conventions of the target language to avoid translation failures or producing a translation that is not obscurity free or easy to understand by the target reader in the target cultural context. The translator's choice of either strategy has its own challenges when translating such a broad term that covers various sorts of claims and policies.

Challenges of rendering chauvinism into Arabic: Implications for Dictionary Users and Translation Equivalence

4.1 Pure Borrowing

This translation technique maintains the SL term in its original form in the target language without changing any of the letters. Molina & Albir (2002, 520) propose a "pure borrowing technique to translate the source item into the target language". They refer to this technique as "the full absorption of words without any modification of pronunciation" (p. 84). While one may regard borrowing as a way of enriching the TL vocabulary, this option brings into the translation a foreign sense, which may cause the target readers to lose interest in reading a text that is not an original piece of writing. On the other hand, one may argue that if the reader is unaware of the eponym's referent or its historical significance, it is unlikely to facilitate understanding. It may create more confusion for the target readers as they come across a term preserved in its original form untranslated.

The decision of whether or not to maintain the loanword in its foreign version depends on other considerations. Newmark (1998, 200) considers the occurrence frequency of the term within a given text. If the term is a key one in the text, he suggests "analyzing the term in a footnote at its first mention, and scrupulously repeating the word at all later citations." If the recurrence of the term in other stretches of the text conveys different senses of this ambiguous term, the translator may need to explain the meaning in brackets or in a footnote alongside its foreign version. If it occurs in the context of any rival concepts such as sexism and misogyny, the translator may have to illustrate the subtle shades of meaning between such concepts in order not to mislead the reader into believing that chauvinism means both sexism and misogyny. More, it is not for granted that chauvinism used in the context of sexism always refers to male chauvinism. This unqualified term may refer to female chauvinism as superior to men by some feminist authors or authors from different cultural backgrounds. As for female chauvinism, Lota (2011) notes that "female chauvinism' could be substantiated for Muslim women who often argue about numerous advantages they have over men" (p. 156). The distinction between both types of chauvinism depends on the context. To illustrate the subtle shades of meaning, the translator needs to draw on the SL dictionary resources to communicate the message as closely as possible.

On the other hand, the straightforward transfer of the term may indicate to the reader that there is no cultural connotation that he/she should concern himself with. Sandra (2015:124) states that "eponyms that do not have any connotations pose no problem at all, simply because their only referent is the person himself." It all depends on whether the target reader is familiar with the eponym. As Newmark (1998, 201) contends, a "concept with a single connotation should be transferred without any translation". He makes it clear that the decision to transfer a cultural or ideological term depends on the target language readership. For example, transference without any translation is meaningful to initiated readers as it places emphasis on the foreign culture and keeps names and concepts. However, "transference with zero translation may cause problems and limit comprehension if the target general readership is the focus" (p. 201). In this case, the translator needs to use analytic language to reflect the peculiarities of the concept and distinguish it from other rival concepts. If the concept, for example, occurs in the context adjacent to nationalism in the text, the translator should stretch the confines of the target language to elucidate the difference between chauvinism and 'nationalism' as rival terms. He may go even a further step, based on

his understanding of the author's intention, to clarify the difference between chauvinism and patriotism in a footnote in the target text.

At another level, transference of this loanword to the target language may arouse a negative emotional connection to chauvinism by those readers who believe that chauvinism is named after someone who had done terrible things and gave rise to different types of prejudice and extremely unreasoning partisanship of a group against another. Therefore, the general target readership may not be interested in reading a translation that appears, say, to foster purported racism and sexism. This might explain the reason that the cited bilingual dictionaries have not listed male chauvinism, sexism, misogyny, and feminism as equivalents under the dictionary entry 'chauvinism'. This shows that "correspondence in translation may be more complicated for the translator than with term the differences in language structure." (Nida 1982, 130).

In the same line of thought, Garcia Vebra (1982) suggests that concepts that are so culture-specific should not be translated into the target culture. By the same token, Al mala:'iki (1986) recommends borrowing and adapting this concept to the TL conventions. He argues that contested concepts had better be borrowed and adapted to the TL phonological and phonological norms to avoid a translation failure due to the ambiguity of the term.

4.2 Naturalized Borrowing

The contested view of chauvinism may prompt the translator to transfer the concept to the target language with some modification. Molina and Albir (2002, 84) refer to "the term taken over into the target language with a modification of pronunciation as naturalized borrowing". Thus, this technique is realized by adapting the term to the TL morphological and phonological norms, the translator can come to salvation by keeping himself away from handling the confusing definitions of the term. On the other hand, the transferring of chauvinism untranslated to the target language may confuse the readers even more if not associated with a footnote or comment.

Another rationale behind the naturalized borrowing of the term to the TL conventions is to make it part of the TL by adjusting it to the phonology and orthography of the receptor language. Stetkevynch (2006, 36) regards naturalization as one way of "lexical expansion and vocabulary growth via loanword adaptations to the rules of the target language". In the case of Arabic, the English suffix ism, as in chauvinism, is usually translated into the Arabic suffix '*iyya*' in the sense of movement, belief, ideology, philosophy, and so forth. This suffix-'*iyya*' can be added to an already existing native word in the receptor language as in ʕ*dam-iyya* (nothingness) for nihilism, a belief in nothing, or to a loanword as in ʃuːfiːniyya (chauvinism) where the consonants *ch* and *v* are adapted to the Arabic sounds ʧ and ƒ since the two English letters do not exist in the Arabic paradigms. This foreign word can be readjusted to fit in the sound paradigm of Arabic, for it is impossible to reproduce the exact equivalent of the original owing to the phonological differences between the two languages

To accomplish this process, the foreign term should be a one-word term. Stetkevynch (2006, 7) notes that "a one-word term is more amenable for derivation in the target language than two or more words."

.As a handy reference, *Almawrid,* the most well-known English-Arabic bilingual dictionary, provides adapted forms for this concept in its adjective and adverb forms: *ʃuːfiːniyy* and *ʃuːfiniyyan,* respectively. While 'chauvinism', 'chauvinistic', and 'chauvinistically' have morphological readjustments that run parallel to their English syntactic forms, there is no adapted form in the dictionary that runs parallel to the syntactic form '*chauvinise'.* So, if this verb occurs in the source text to be translated, the translator ought to create an approximate readjustment of the verb to the sound and orthographic patterns of Arabic by way of derivation.

Derivation, however, is not always from existing roots. The analogical approach to verb derivation is another strategy of which translators should be aware. "The readjustment of the foreign verb to the sound and orthographic pattern of Arabic need not be an exact reproduction" (Stetkevynch 2006, 37). Sometimes, "readjustment can be a matter of approximation rather than derivation from existing roots of Arabic" (37). Therefore, it looks sometimes like a linguistic habit more than a philological norm.

The lack of a readjusted verb form that can be used as an equivalent for 'chauvinise' in the cited dictionaries, especially *Al-mawrid*, which enjoys a highly revered status, is evidence that these dictionaries are not only incomplete in terms of semantic provision, but also in terms of matching the orthographic and phonological conventions of the target language, or that they are inconsistent in their morphological approach to the different word classes of the same item. That is, the orthographic forms are provided in these dictionaries for chauvinism, chauvinistic, and chauvinistically as noted earlier, but not for 'chauvinise'

As a solution to this problem, monolingual dictionaries in the target language provide a wealth of information on morphology and possible meanings. For example, *Lisaːn ʔl ʔrab by ʔbn Manzˤuːr* is the best-known and comprehensive monolingual dictionary of the Arabic language, uses *ʃaːfa*, to see, look over, or feel superior. Although this verb is derived from an existing Arabic root, *ʃawafa*, it has a compatible sense to that of 'chauvinise' in the source text, i.e., to feel superior, which can be used as a parallel to its syntactic form

The translator may opt for borrowing the term and adapting it to the TL phonological and morphological conventions to make it easier to pronounce, spell, and memorize. Such adaptation is one way of lexical growth and expansion of the language. Even though purists may object to adapting loanwords to the rules of Arabic for the sake of purity, it is noteworthy that Arabic has many non-Arabic words which are used as though they were originally Arabic such as *falsafah* (philosophy) and *demokraːtiyya* (democracy). After all, the identity of a language is not derived from the identity of its lexicon, and English is a good example where a high percentage of its lexicon is of Latin and Greek origin.

5. The Impact of Bilingual Dictionaries on Translators as Dictionary Users

Despite being brief and simple to use, English-Arabic bilingual dictionaries offer direct equivalents that are only parts of the concept, *taʔssub ˈ watˤani, muɣaːlaːh fil watˤ aniyya,* and *muɣaːlaːh fil qawmiyyah* (exaggeration nationalism). However, in traditional English monolingual dictionaries and

encyclopedias, this concept has a wide range of meanings that go into the sort of depth that is not possible in most bilingual dictionaries due to space restrictions.

Citing only Bilingual dictionaries may reinforce initiated readers' belief in some equivalents and obviate other meaning possibilities. To account for other possible meanings, the dictionary user may need to look up the concept/word in monolingual dictionaries in the source language to spot any meanings that are missing in the bilingual dictionaries he is using. Sticking only to a bilingual dictionary is not helpful to a good translation such that contexts are rarely provided to infer specific connotations of the concept, especially when the relationship between 'term' and 'meaning' involves confusion and inconsistency in usage.

Generally speaking, a translator does not improve his competence by relying on bilingual dictionaries. On the contrary, he gets used to imprecise or wrong equivalents believing that what is offered in these dictionaries is the only actual meaning of the term. Over time, he may develop incurable incompetency because of his complacency about his belief in some equivalents as a result of his blind beliefs in bilingual dictionaries. Alternatively, it is more productive to consult monolingual dictionaries in the source language to understand the numerous definitions of the term in its native language. Likewise, consulting monolingual dictionaries in the target language like *Lisaːn Ɂl Ɂrab (The Tongue of the Arabs by almasri (2016),* which is a treasure of knowledge in terms of information and word derivation, can help facilitate morphological adaptation of FL words to the TL-appropriate verb patterns.

The translator's decision to transfer, adapt, or translate depends on his assessment of the pragmatic effect in each case. It is, however, more plausible to adapt and translate such a contentious concept than to only adapt it to match the TL phonological and orthographic conventions. Seemingly, neither a single semantic equivalent nor a morphological adaptation of 'chauvinism' is sufficient by itself to elucidate the ambiguity of this concept on the one hand and meet the target reader's needs on the other. There are senses embedded in the SL item that should be unpacked and accounted for by the prescribed equivalents listed in the target language paradigm.

6. Strategies for Achieving Equivalence in Bilingual Dictionaries

The fact that the target items of the bilingual dictionary are partial equivalents necessitates a fresh perspective on how the structure of a bilingual dictionary, primarily at a micro-structural level of lexical paradigms, can be improved to facilitate communicative success. At one level, the dictionary-makers make no distinction between TL synonymy and SL polysemy. A dictionary user may be tempted to believe that different target synonyms or equivalents can replace a lexical item in its different senses. For example *taɁssub* ' (bigotry) and *Hubil watˤan,* love of one's country used as equivalents for chauvinism are not synonyms, nor is it clear what senses of the source item they differentiate. Add to this, the target equivalents as in the case of chauvinism imply boastful glorification and devotion to one's country and nation, thereby ignoring other senses that chauvinism enjoys in English dictionaries.

The presentation of the target language equivalents without making a distinction between them may indicate that the lexicographer is not willing to assume responsibility for this practical failure. Chadwick

(1996, 20) recommends that a definition be given for each sense of the entry word. In other words, it is not enough to provide equivalents, data are necessary to distinguish between those senses.

The idea that target language items in the cited bilingual dictionaries are partial equivalents or partial synonyms indicates that contextual differences do exist between them. This fact implies that the relation between the target language items and the source language lemma is one of lexical divergence. In this case, chauvinism can be replaced by different translation equivalents because there are more contextual nuances embedded in the reference range of chauvinism. For example**,** Oxford Word Power bilingual dictionary uses two target items to account for two contextual nuances of the meaning of nationalism, which is embedded in the semantic spectrum of chauvinism. That dictionary uses *istigla:l* (independence) and *Infisa:l* (breaking away) as equivalents for nationalism in response to a statement such as "nationalism is strong in Sudan" which implies the desire of the people there to form an independent state by means of breaking away from Sudan. Other cited dictionaries provide no illustrative examples to show contextual differences to explain the nuances of specific senses embedded in the general reference of chauvinism. Zgusta (1971) contends that in the case of distant cultures, not equivalents, but encyclopedic information should be given in bilingual dictionaries.

What lexicographers may want to do to help translators achieve communicative equivalence is to think contextually, rather than through one-to-one translations because lexical equivalents are of limited use. Therefore, it is more useful to display the full semantic range of dictionary entries for the optimal usage of the contextual spectrum of the SL item. Otherwise, as Adamska-Salaciak (2010b, 142) notes, "a bilingual dictionary tagged to particular senses is in fact a semi-bilingual dictionary that naturally fails to perform the essential functions that a fully-fledged bilingual dictionary fulfills." In a similar vein, Back (2004, 452) gives a key role to "examples as illustrative means of particular senses, which serves as contextual guidance for bilingual dictionary users."

Also, special labels can be used to differentiate between sets of synonymous and polysemous equivalents within target synonymy paradigms.

The additional information that the lexicographer directs at equivalents will have to be integrated within these sets. Such techniques play an important part in making the microstructure a truly effective key to communicative success. Thus, a combination of special labels and illustrative examples altogether represent the contextual guidance that would help translators distinguish between the various senses of the item, and hence appreciate the importance of bilingual dictionaries as tools of empowerment in the search for communicative equivalence.

7. Suggestions for Lexicographers / Dictionary Compilers

The basic function of a bilingual dictionary is to help users to translate from one language into another or to help users understand foreign language texts and concepts. In such situations, users expect bilingual dictionaries to include different types of data that can avail them in their search. Yet, bilingual dictionaries are "inadequate since meeting the needs of all prospective users is untenable" (Adamska-Salacia 2015, 47). The English-Arabic dictionaries mentioned earlier are no exception to this notion. To

maximize the usefulness of such dictionaries, one may suggest ways, in addition to the aforementioned strategies, to improve the coverage, translation, and accessibility.

First**,** context and meaning are pivotal principles in making a bilingual dictionary. Chadwick (1996) notes that bilingual dictionaries must provide data to distinguish between the translations of the word since a term cannot always be accurately rendered by a matching word in another language. The fact that words generally have more than one meaning points to the central problem of lexicography where the senses of words vary in several dimensions. It follows that the organization of the entry in a dictionary should show how the various senses interrelate. This may be accompanied, according to Chadwick, by definitions as explicit descriptions of the word

Second**,** the distribution of senses cannot be reflected as lists of words as the structure of entries in most English-Arabic dictionaries indicates. Meanings should be a hierarchy of sections and subsections and the order of senses should be chronological with written examples of all uses of each word. The simple exhibition of the senses had better display a logical development. Although tracing down the historical record of senses is somehow difficult in a dictionary, it is usually sufficient to enable us to infer the actual order. Lyons (1989) notes that the order in which special senses come before more general and abstract before figurative represents the semantic ascent, which helps dictionary users to identify the historical references of the term, and hence the appropriate contextual meaning

Third: a lexicographer may want to include general meaning before a more specific sense. Semantic description in terms of contextual relations with other rival concepts, and in terms of opposition to words of different meanings is useful in discriminating between senses and avoiding to use a term in the context of another. Given the fact that meaning is identifiable from context, the addition of more contextual information that concentrates on the context of the situation would avail users more than sticking to just one general sense.

Fourth**,** the range of the items in the target language paradigm should cover the semantic range of the SL item and its interrelations with other words. Thus, the use of chauvinism only in the sense of nationalism and patriotism in the target language to the exclusion of other rival terms such as sexism, male chauvinism, misogyny, racism, imperialism, and jingoism, to mention a few, is inadequate. The target language paradigm should mirror the source language paradigm and convey the entire range of senses, which, unfortunately, is not the case. The target option *ta?ssub* is not sufficient by itself to cover the semantic range of the English concept along with its rival concepts. It cannot also be taken as a superordinate equivalent since the term has no objective technical references that relate to the same semantic field. To handle this issue better in future dictionaries, the need for a clear indication and discrimination of the relations within the target language synonymy paradigm is of great advantage to users. The lexicographer may also need to differentiate between target synonymous and target polysemous items within the target language paradigm. The need to reinterpret synonyms as contextual rather than strictly semantic phenomena might be another practical option for lexicographers.

8. Conclusion

The paper examined the likely challenges that the translator might encounter in translating the English term 'chauvinism' into Arabic and in adapting it to the phonological and morphological conventions of the target language. The study shows that the lack of inter-lingual synonyms calls for innovative techniques both by the translator and lexicographers to meet the target needs of the user. While the translator can compensate for the lack of equivalence in bilingual dictionaries depending on his communicative ability and knowledge of both languages, the lexicographer may need to provide an extensive range of information that gives a clear picture of the semantic spectrum of every target item to make sure that the contextual differences between these items correspond to the various senses embedded in the SL term. In light of the encyclopedic information that dictionary-makers can provide, the translator can furnish a definition altogether with a loanword or a morphologically adapted form. After all, the ability to understand, connect, and combine seemingly ambiguous concepts is a manifestation of translational activity

أوجه الصعوبة في ترجمة مصطلح الشوفينيَّة إلى العربيَّة ودلالات ذلك على من يستخدم القاموس وعلى مفهوم التكافؤ الدلالي

محمد القرعان

قسم الترجمة، جامعة اليرموك، الأردن

الملخص

لا تلبي القواميس الثنائيَّة على الأغلب حاجة من يلجأ إلى استخدامها لأنها لا تقدم مكافئات دلاليَّة وافية. وهذا الأمر ليس في صالح من يلجأ إلى استخدامها لاستخراج المعلومات المرجوَّة، إذ إن مستخدم القاموس يفترض أن المدخلات المكافئة في القاموس هي دلالات يمكن استخدامها للتعبير عن المعاني في سياقاتها المختلفة، والحقيقة أن المستعين بالقاموس ليس بوسعه أن يترجم المعنى بنجاح إن لم يكن هناك تطابق في الدلالة المعنويَّة والسياقيَّة - أي المعبرة عن المعنى حسب السياق الواردة فيه - في القاموس الثنائي. وبناء على ذلك تستكشف هذه الورقة المقابلات العربيَّة المستخدمة كمكافئات دلاليَّة لمصطلح الشوفينية في عينة من القواميس الانجليزيَّة العربيَّة من حيث مدى ملاءمتها في أبعادها السياقيَّة التواصليَّة. كما تبرز الدراسة الاستراتيجيات المناسبة لنقل المعنى إلى العربية بصورة أفضل. وتقوم الدراسة على المنهج الوظيفي التواصلي الذي يفترض أن المعنى الوارد في القاموس الثنائي غير كاف ، فنقله على صورته لا يحل الإبهام أو الغموض لغياب السياق الذي يكفل توضيح الإيحاءات والمعاني المختلفة للمصطلح، وهذا الخلل في القاموس الثنائي له أثره على المترجم الذي يلجأ إلى اختيار استراتيجيَّة ما لنقل المعنى بطريقة تلبي حاجات القارئ في اللغة المنقول إليها. وأخيراً تناقش الدراسة استراتيجيات تحقيق التكافؤ الدلالي في القواميس الثنائيَّة.

الكلمات المفتاحية: التكافؤ الدلالي، الترجمة النصيَّة، التكافؤ التواصلي، الغموض، مصطلح مختلف على دلالته.

References

Adamska Salaciak 2010a. Why We Need Bilingual dictionaries? In Kernerman I.
  Bogaards. P. (Eds) *English Learners' Dictionaries at the DSNA 2009*. Tel Aviv: K. Dictionaries, 131-147.

Agnes, Michael. 2013. *Webster's New World College*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Al-karmi, Hasan. 1995. *Al-Muɣni al-Kabiːr (The Great Enricher)*. Beirut: Maktabat Lubnan.

Almalaːki, Jamiːl. 1986. Democracy, *The Arabic Tongue Journal* 27 (35).

Al-Masri, Ibn Mazur. 2016. *Lisaːn Ɂl Ɂrab* {the tongue of the Arabs}, Beirut: Dar Sadir.

Arts, Tressy. 2014. *The Oxford English-Arabic Dictionary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Baalbaki, Ramzi. 2000. *Al-Mawrid Arabic-English/English-Arabic Dictionary*. Beirut: Dar El-iIm Lil-Malayeen.

Back. Martyn. 2004**.** 'A New Bilingual Learner's Dictionary Format. The Junior Bilingue in Williams G. Vessier S. (Eds), *EURALEX 2004 Proceedings* Lorient, France: 451-455.

Baker, Mona. 1992. In Other Words: A Course Book on Translation. London: Routledge.

Born, MaxMurray and Augustus Henry 2022. *The Oxford English Dictionary: A New Dictionary on Historical Principles.* Oxford Clarendon Press, 1978 Clarendon Press.

Bowles Samuel and Gintis Herbert 2000 Reciprocity, Self-Interest, and the Welfare State. *Nordic Journal of Political Economy* 26 (1): 33–53.

Catford. J C. 1978. *A Linguistic Theory of Translation*. Oxford: Oxford Press University.

Chadwick, John. 1996. *Lexicographica Graeca: Contributions to the Lexicography of Ancient Greek*, Oxford: Clarendon.

Doniach, Nakdimon 2011. The Oxford English -Arabic Dictionary of Current Usage. Oxford University Press

Gallie, W.B. 1965. *Essentially Contested Concepts. Aristotelian Society.* London: Harrison and Sons.

Garcia Yebra.Valentin. 1982. *Teoria Practica de la Traduccion*, Madrid: Gredos Print.

Goldschmidt Tina. 2015. Anti-immigrant sentiment and majority support for three types of welfare: the case of Germany. *European Societies* 17 (5): 620–652.

Hocus, Bogus. 2008. *Extreme Patriotism.* Los Angeles: Blue Press. Bird.

Hooft, Stan.Van. 2014, 2012. *The Handbook of Virtue Ethics*. London: Routledge.

Ibelema, Minabere. 2002. *Intercultural Communication and the Politics of Superiority*.Routledge.

Lota, Vladimir. 2011. *Elusive Chauvinism*. Seattle: Rain City Press

Lyons, John 1989 Semantics Ascent: a Neglected Aspect of Syntactic typology in D.
  Arnold, M. Atkinson et al. (eds), *Essays on Grammatical Theory and Universal Grammar*, Oxford: Clarendon, 153-186.

Newmark, Peter. 1998. *A Textbook of Translation*. London: Prentice Hall.

Newmark, Peter. 2010. Translation and Culture. In B. Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk and

 M. Thelen (Eds.), *Łódź Studies in Language: Meaning in Translation* . Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 171-182

Nida, Eugene. Albert. 1996. *The Sociolinguistics of Inter-lingual Communication*. Brussels: Hazard.

Nida, Eugene Charles, Russell. 1982. *The Theory and Practice of Translation*. Leiden: Brill Pres

Prasad, Pallavi. 2019. The Revolutionary Origins of the Term "Male Chauvinism Pig'. MIssing Information

Pym, Anthony. 2010. *Exploring Translation Theories*. London: Routledge.

Sandra**,** Juzbašić. 2015. Translation of Proper Nouns: Strategies and Implications. (Diploma Thesis). Retrieved from https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/299370771.pdf**.** Accessed July 15, 2021.

Schaffner, Christian. 2003. Third Ways and New Centers: Ideological Unity or Difference? In M. Calzada Perez (Ed). *Apropos of Ideology: Translation Studies on Ideology-* Ideologies on Translation Studies . Manchester: St. Jerome, 23-42.

Stetkevynch, Jaroslav. 2006. *The Modern Arabic Literary Language*. Washington: Georgetown University Press.

Stevenson, Angus. 2010. *The Oxford Dictionary of English*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Swanepoel, Pieter. 1989. *Only Study for LEKPER-Q.* Pretoria: University of South Africa

Vinay, Jean Paul, and Darbelnet, Jean. 1995. *Comparative Stylistics of French and English: A Methodology for Translation*. (ed). Amsterdam: John Benjamins

Zgusta, Ladislav. 1971. *Manual of Lexicography*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter