



LUND
UNIVERSITY

Translating “gender” into Arabic: “*jins*”, “*jinsayn*”, “*naw*” or “*jindar*”?

A study of the translation of the concept “gender” in
single- and multi-word expressions in feminist
knowledge building

Cecilie Olivia Buchhave

Supervisor: Lena Ambjörn

Centre for Language and Literature, Lund University

MA in Language and Linguistics, Arabic

SPVR01 Language and Linguistics: Degree Project – Master's (Two Years) Thesis, 30 credits

October 2021

Abstract

The terms “gender” and “sex” are central to feminist concerns. In English scholarship “gender” is disputed within and outside of feminism, despite its seemingly political correctness as an alternative to “sex” (Olson 2012; Gunnarsson 2011). This thesis aims to describe how “gender”, multi-word expressions with “gender”, and the derivative “gendered” are translated into Arabic target texts (TTs) by the transnational Muslim feminist movement *Musawah for Equality in the Family*, funded by UN Women. The study further investigates if a distinction between “gender” and “sex” in the Arabic data is made. Anchored in descriptive translation studies (Tymoczko 2007), and due to the variation in translations of constructions with “gender” into Arabic, this study also addresses theoretical understandings of equivalence in postpositivist and feminist translation studies (Nida and Taber 1982; Godard 1989; Flotow 1997). A Total of 87 pages of Arabic text was read. “Gender” as a single word, in a multi-word construction, or as the derivative “gendered” occurred 133 times. “Sex” or “sexes” occurred eight times, and thus 141 relevant cases were identified. Of these, 39 are presented in the analysis, since similar translations occurred several times. For example, “gender equality” occurred 32 times in the STs, but just two different translation solutions were identified in the TTs, and thus these two are presented. The study shows that, although the movement tends to use various different equivalents to the word “gender” some multi-word expressions e.g. “gender equality”, have more established Arabic equivalents. Further it is shown that, occasionally, a distinction is constructed between “sex” and “gender” in Arabic. *Musawah* uses mainly “*jinsayn*”, “*naw*” or “*jindar*” to denote “gender” in the TTs, and in some cases the meaning of “gender” is transformed into specific identity categories such as “women and men”.

Keywords: Equivalence, Descriptive Translation Studies, Feminism, Gender, Gendered, Arabic, Musawah for Equality in the Family, Muslim/Islamic Feminism

Acknowledgements

From Lund University, special thanks to Lena Ambjörn for supervising me through thorough feedback and valuable critique - even during your vacation. Further, thank you for making me realise how complex and important translation practice is now and historically. Also thanks to Åsa Wikström for always being helpful.

From Copenhagen University, I want to thank June Dahy for being a patient and inspiring teacher and translator at the Bachelor in *Middle Eastern Societies and Languages*.

Further, huge thanks to Connie Carøe Christiansen and Cecilie Poulsen-Hansen Mehyar from KVINFO, the Danish Centre for Gender, Diversity, Information and Equality. They drew my attention towards the practical challenges of translating feminist terminology, and especially “gender” in interlinguistic transnational partnerships. Also thanks to Alessandro Granato and Synne Bjerkestrand for the discussions on translating feminist and gender terminology into Arabic.

Thanks to the movement *Musawah for Equality in the Family* for their important work and for replying to my question regarding their translation practice into Arabic.

I also want to express my gratitude to my friends, Anne and Emma, for proofreading. Further, to the two of you, and to Helene, Slaíne, Sebastian, Kontiki, Sara, Birgitte, Solvej, Jesmin, Tessa, Ana-li, Yamit, Elisabeth, Inge, Bertil, Tove, Christoffer, Casper, and Camilla and to everyone in Blanche: Thank you for supporting me by being you.

Table of contents

Abstract	3
Acknowledgements	4
Note on Transliteration	9
Primary Sources in Arabic	12
Chapter 1: Introduction	15
1.1. Purpose and Research Questions (RQs)	16
1.1.1. Motivation, hypotheses and presumptions	17
1.1.2. Note on Arabic roots	18
1.1.3. Structure of the paper	20
Chapter 2: Background	21
2.1. Meanings of “gender”	21
2.1.1. “Gender” in translation	22
2.2. Feminisms and the case of Musawah	23
2.3. Theoretical background on language and translation	24
2.3.1. Language and equivalence in translation	25
2.3.2. Functional and formal equivalence	28
2.4. Former studies on translations of “gender” into Arabic	29
2.4.1. The word “ <i>jins</i> ” in Arabic language	30
2.4.2. Translations of “gender” into Arabic in practice	31
Chapter 3: Method and Empirical Data	36
3.1 Method in use: Descriptive translation studies	36
3.1.1. How the method is applied	37
3.1.2 Exemplifying the applied method	39
3.3. Empirical data and selection criteria	41

3.3.1. Selection criteria of empirical data	41
3.4. Main methodological limitations	43
3.4.1. Who are Musawah’s translators? Translator visibility in the empirical data	44
3.4.1. A note on the East-West dichotomy	45
Chapter 4: Analysis of empirical data	47
4.1. Analysis of constructions	47
4.2. “Gender” as “<i>jinsayn</i>” in multi-word expressions	48
4.2.1. “Gender equality”	48
4.2.2. “Gender justice” and “gendered”	52
4.2.3. “Gender discrimination”, “gender gap”, and “gender parity”	54
4.3. Varying Arabic roots in translation of MWEs	57
4.3.1. “Gender relations”, “gender roles and rights”, and “gender responsibilities”	57
4.3.2. “Gender roles”, “spousal (gender) rights”, and “gender stereotypes”	60
4.4. MWEs with “gender” translated into n-w-’	64
4.4.1. “Gender norms”, “gender studies” and “gender lines”	64
4.5. Loan word of the root j-n-d-r	66
4.5.1. “Gender-sensitive” and “gender-neutral”	67
4.6. The derivative “gendered”	68
4.7. “Gender” and “sex”	71
4.7.1. The distinction between “gender” and “sex”	72
Chapter 5: Discussion, Conclusions and Further Research	79
5.1. Discussion of results	79
5.1.1. Discussion of influence by the UN Women	80
5.1.2 Discussion of gender binarism with and without the grammatical dual form	80
5.1.3 Discussion of results regarding the distinction between “gender” and “sex”	81
5.2. Conclusions on RQ1 and subquestions	83
5.2.1. Conclusions to RQ 1.1. and RQ 1.2.	83
5.3. Conclusions on RQ2: “Gender” and “sex”	84
5.4. Future Research	86

References	88
Appendixes	91
Table 1: MWEs and their frequency in each ST and in total	91
Table 2: “Gender”, “sex” and “gendered” and their frequency in each ST and in total	92
Table 3a: Frequency of “gender”, “sex”, and “gendered” in ST and equivalents in TT 2018	92
Table 3b: MWEs in ST 2018 and equivalents in TT 2018	93
Table 4: MWEs in ST02 2016 and equivalents in TT02 2016	94
Table 5a: “Gender”, “sex”, and “gendered” in ST03 2017 and equivalents in TT03 2017	95
Table 5b: MWEs ST03 2017 and equivalents in TT03 2017	95
Table 6: MWEs in ST04 2017 and equivalents in TT04 2017	96
Table 7a: “Gender”, “sex”, and “gendered” in ST 2016 and equivalents in TT 2016	96
Table 7b: MWEs in ST 2016 and equivalents in TT 2016	96

Note on Transliteration

ء	hamza	’
ا	alif	ā
ب	bā’	b
ت	tā’	t
ث	ṭā’	ṭ
ج	jīm	j
ح	ḥā’	ḥ
خ	ḵā’	ḵ
د	dāl	d
ذ	ḏāl	ḏ
ر	rā’	r
ز	zāy	z
س	sīn	s
ش	šīn	š
ص	ṣād	ṣ
ض	ḏād	ḏ
ط	ṭā’	ṭ
ظ	ẓā’	ẓ
ع	‘ain	‘
غ	ġain	ġ
ف	fā’	f
ق	qāf	q

ك	kāf	k
ل	lām	l
م	mīm	m
ن	nūn	n
هـ	hā'	h
و	wāw	w, u, or ū *
ي	yā'	y, i, or ī *

**Wāw* and *yā'* are represented as w and y when representing consonants

Madda (ّ) is represented as; 'ā in the middle or at the end, as in qur'ān, and ā at the beginning of a word

The *tā' marbūṭa* (ة) is represented by a, and represented by at when it is the ending of the first noun of an *idāfa* and with an h when it appears after ā.

The table above illustrates the transliteration system provided by Wehr (1979), which is used for all transliterations done by the author. When quoting other scholars directly, their transliteration is left untouched. Regarding the name of the movement that published the publications used as empirical data, its official spelling, *Musawah*, is used. When referring to the movement's Arabic "equivalent" for equality, it is translated according to Wehr as *musāwāh*

Regarding the transliteration of the loan word جندر , it is not established enough to have one correct vocalisation, and could be transliterated as "*al-jindir*", as well, but in this thesis, I have chosen the option "*al-jindar*".

Primary Sources in Arabic

Arabic primary sources, i.e., the target texts (TTs) in the present study, accompanied by the English source texts (STs). Selection criteria are elaborated on in Chapter 3.

Musawah. 2018. *man yanfuq? man yar'a? من ينفق؟ من يرعى؟* link:
[WhoProvidesWhoCares_Ar.pdf \(musawah.org\)](#) (accessed 2021.10.17) (TT 2018: 59 pages, Arabic).

Source text: Musawah. 2018. Who Provides, Who Cares? link:
[WhoProvidesWhoCares_En.pdf \(musawah.org\)](#) (accessed 2021.10.17) (ST 2018: 58 pages, English)

Musawah. 2016. *qawānīn al-usra al-muslima: mā alladī yaj'a-l-iṣlāḥ mumkinān/ قوانين الأسرة: ما الذي يجعل الإصلاح ممكناً؟* link:

[KnowledgeBuildingBriefs-2-Muslim-Family-Laws-What-Makes-Reform-Possible-AR.pdf \(musawah.org\)](#) (accessed 2021.10.17) (TT02 2016: 3 pages, Arabic)

Source Text: Musawah. 2016. Knowledge Building Brief 02 “Muslim Family Laws: What Makes Reform Possible?” link:

[KnowledgeBuildingBriefs-2-Muslim-Family-Laws-What-Makes-Reform-Possible-EN.pdf \(musawah.org\)](#) (accessed 2021.10.17) (ST02 2016: 3 pages, English)

Musawah. 2017. *al-islām wa-qadīya al-musāwāh bayna-l-jinsayn/ الإسلام وقضية المساواة بين الجنسين* (accessed 2021.10.17.)Link:

[KnowledgeBuildingBriefs-3-Islam-and-the-Question-of-Gender-Equality-AR.pdf \(musawah.org\)](#) (accessed 2021.10.17) (TT03 2017: 4 pages, Arabic)

Source text: Musawah. 2017. Knowledge Building Brief 03 “Islam and the question of Gender Equality”. link:

[KnowledgeBuildingBriefs-3-Islam-and-the-Question-of-Gender-Equality-EN.pdf \(musawah.org\)](#) (accessed 2021.10.17) (ST03 2017: 4 pages, English)

Musawah. 20216. *sīdāw wa-qawānīn al-usra al-muslima/ سيداو وقوانين الأسرة المسلمة* Link:

[KnowledgeBuildingBriefs-4-CEDAW-and-Muslim-Family-Laws-AR.pdf \(musawah.org\)](#) (accessed 2021.10.17) (TT04 2017: 6 pages)

Source text: Musawah. 2017. Knowledge Building Brief 04 “CEDAW and Muslim Family Laws” link:

[KnowledgeBuildingBriefs-4-CEDAW-and-Muslim-Family-Laws-EN.pdf \(musawah.org\)](#) (accessed 2021.10.17) (ST04 2017: 6 pages)

Musawah. 2016. *ru'ya "Musāwāh" al-usra/ رؤية "مساواة" للأسرة* Link:
[MusawahVisionFortheFamily_Ar.pdf](#) (accessed 2021.10.17) (TT 2016: 14 pages, Arabic).
Source text: Musawah. 2016. Musawah Vision for the Muslim Family. Link:
[MusawahVisionFortheFamily_En.pdf](#) ((accessed 2021.10.17) (ST 2016: 13 pages, English)

The five Arabic target texts (TTs) are all translated from English source texts (STs) and both STs and TTs are published by *Musawah* as a part of their knowledge building initiative. They further have in common that they are a part of the UN Women Regional Program for the Arab States within the framework of the “Men and Women for Gender Equality programme” funded by the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA). In total 87 Arabic pages were judged to be relevant for this study, all of which are included in the above. The text, “Musawah Framework for Action”, in Arabic *إطار عمل حركة "مساواة" iṭār 'amal ḥaraka "Musāwāh"* (2009: 6/6 pages) is used and referred to in the study to explain *Musawah's* work, but is not a part of the empirical data which the primary sources constitute, since it is not funded by the UN. It is mentioned in: “[Musawah Key Publications and Projects](#)” (2020) as a part of the knowledge building initiative, which is also the case with six other texts in this initiative not meeting all selection criteria, and two videos, also not included.

Chapter 1: Introduction

Translations of the concept “gender” is the subject of this thesis, which is not concerned with grammatical gender, though this too is an important aspect of English-Arabic translation studied by Sadiqi (2006) and Al-Ramahi (2014). The terms “sex” and “gender” are central to feminist concerns (Flotow 2019: 182), their meaning and use being controversial. Focus is on “gender” in a transnational Arabic context, purposing to describe and document how “gender”, the derivative “gendered” and multi-word expressions (MWEs) with “gender” are translated by the Muslim feminist movement [Musawah for Equality in the Family](#), referred to as *Musawah*. The case of *Musawah* is relevant because translations of “gender” into Arabic by transnational movements have not been studied systematically. What the English “gender” means is discussed in section 2.1. To Kamal (2008, 2016, 2018) and Mehrez (2007), the issue of translating feminist and gender terminology is of major concern for translators and scholars writing about gender issues in Arabic (2016:67-68):

The word “gender” is among the most problematic terms in Arabic translation—a complexity intensified by the fact that it is often understood in the Arabic sociocultural context as a foreign concept; and since it implies the empowerment of women, it is looked upon with skepticism, if not rejected altogether. Thus the Arabic translation of the word “gender” mainly appears in feminist and development contexts, and the Arabic equivalent is not yet well-defined. (Kamal 2008: 263-264)

Arabic is experimenting with equivalents to “gender” and more or less fixed multi-word expressions with the word. Thus, study considers “gender” as a translation problem, which is:

/.../ any difficulties we come across at translating that invites us to stop translating in order to check, recheck, reconsider, rethink or rewrite it or use a dictionary, or a reference of some kind to help us overcome it and make sense of it. Translation problems can be posed essentially by the grammar, word, style, sound and/or usage of the concerning languages. (Faruquzzaman et. al. 2019: 60).

1.1. Purpose and Research Questions (RQs)

The purpose of this thesis is to investigate how *Musawah* translates “gender” in different constructions from English into Arabic. It explores whether patterns can be identified across the primary sources to see if some constructions have more established equivalents than others. This is addressed through the overall research question:

How is the concept of “gender”, derivatives of the word, such as “gendered”, and multi-word expressions with “gender”, such as “gender equality”, translated from English into Arabic in written knowledge building publications published by the feminist transnational movement *Musawah for Equality in the Family*?

Disputes over the meaning of “gender” as a concept in combination with its widespread usage in academia, development, and activism across linguistic contexts makes it relevant to translation studies. Though approached before, translation of “gender” into Arabic is not well documented and described. “Gender” and multi-word expressions (MWEs) with “gender” in transnational feminist contexts have to my knowledge not been addressed before. The case and the distinction between single word concepts and MWEs is new. The overall RQ has been divided into the following subquestions:

- (1) What Arabic roots and words are used as equivalents to “gender” when entering into multi-word expressions, and how is the derivative “gendered” translated in the Arabic TTs?
 - 1.1. What multi-word expressions (MWEs) with “gender” and what derivatives of “gender” are identified in the STs?
 - 1.2. How are the identified multi-word expressions translated in the TTs?
 - 1.3. What Arabic roots are used when constructing equivalence to the derivative “gendered” in the TTs?
- (2) How are “gender” and its correlative “sex” translated into Arabic in the TTs?
 - 2.1. Does the movement *Musawah for Equality in the Family* distinguish between “gender” and the correlative “sex” in Arabic in the empirical data?

1.1.1. Motivation, hypotheses and presumptions

Based on work experience with feminist organisations¹ in Arabic contexts, the hypothesis underlying the purpose was that the same publisher would use different Arabic words and roots to denote “gender”. This seems obvious in light of the findings in the present study, but reading Mehrez (2007), and Kamal (2008), the impression is that mainly “*an-naw’ al-ijtimā’ī*” or the abbreviation “*an-naw’*” would be preferred in the global development and human rights context that *Musawah* can be placed in, considering its purpose and the fact that it is funded by the UN Women. RQ1 and its subquestions bring a new contribution which is an explicit focus on the difference between the word “gender” when used as a single word concept, or in constructions here considered MWEs. e.g., “gender equality”, “gender stereotypes”, or “gender relations”. The derivative “gendered” is treated because it also occurred in the data.

Regarding RQ2, the Arabic root, j-n-s, has by former studies been described as an equivalent to “sex” (Mehrez 2007; Kamal 2008). However, before developing this study’s method and selection criteria for empirical data, I read *Musawah*’s “Framework for Action” (ST/TT 2009), which I later decided not to include in the data because it was not funded by the UN. Still, it is relevant because it led to the initial hypothesis that *Musawah* would not distinguish between “gender” and “sex”. In this document both “gender equality” and “equality between the sexes²” are used in English (2009: 2-3), and both of these are translated into “*al-musāwāh bayna-l-jinsayn*” in the Arabic version (2009: 2-3). However, as is shown in Chapters 4 and 5, this hypothesis is not accurate since *Musawah* in some cases seem to make a distinction in Arabic, though it is far from all.

¹ See e.g., the organisations Tadwein, Mawjoudin, Nazra, among others.

² This English construction seems like a back translation from Arabic, considering, however, I have not investigated whether parts of *Musawah*’s “Framework of Action” could have been formulated in Arabic first rather than English, since I decided not to include this text after developing selection criteria for the data.

The theoretical discussion showing how these two branches agree and disagree on equivalence is a contribution placing the study in the field, while it also supports the method and terminology applied in the analysis. The theoretical perspectives on “gender” and “feminism” are included because they are used broadly in various fields, but not always explained well or distinguished.

1.1.1. Defining multi-word expressions (MWEs)

To distinguish between “gender” as a single word concept and in multi-word expressions, this paper opts for a broad definition of MWEs as:

“lexical units larger than a word that can bear both idiomatic and compositional meanings. (...) the term multi-word expression is used as a pre-theoretical label to include the range of phenomena that goes from collocations to fixed expressions” (Masini 2005: 145 cited in Müller et. al. 2011)."

I chose a broad definition to avoid discussing how to categorise terms such as “gender equality”, and “gender justice”, since it is not the purpose of the present study. Some of the MWEs identified, for instance, “gender equality” might have a more “fixed” meaning and usage in popular contexts than others, e.g. “gender justice”. The distinction between single words and MWEs was made after reading the data. It became clear that e.g. “gender equality”, had a more established equivalent across the TTs as “*al-musāwāh bayna-l-jinsayn*” than “gender” as a single word, which mainly varied across TTs, and slightly within TTs.

1.1.2. Note on Arabic roots

Versteegh writes that Arabic roots in most cases consist of three consonants termed “radicals” when they compose a root.(Versteegh 2014:89). An example of such a root can be j-n-s, which is relevant to the present study because this root is the basis for the singular noun *jins*, and dual noun “*jinsayn*”. The latter is often used by *Musawah* as equivalent to “gender”, e.g. in the

“gender equality”. The other trilateral root important to the present study is n-w-ʿ, which is used in the singular noun *nawʿ* and the adjective *nawʿiyy(a)*. However, roots can also consist of more radicals, (Badawi, et al. 2004:26). This is the case with the loan word “*jindar*”, composed by j-n-d-r. A root can cover several meanings, sometimes related, sometimes opposite. (Badawi 2004:26).

1.1.3. Defining the Arabic language variety in the empirical data

As other languages, Arabic exists in many varieties. Ibrahim writes that Arabic is in a “diglossic situation”. Accordingly, Ferguson (1959), distinguished between a “High” and “Low” variety, “High” is used in writing and learned in formal education, while “Low” is used in daily conversation and informal situations. The relationship between the two varieties is a continuum on which mixing occurs, which is emphasised further in studies of both spoken and written words. (Ibrahim in Bassiouney 2010: 23). Instead of “High” and “Low”, one can distinguish between Standard Arabic (SA) and the different dialects, though these also mix. SA can be placed at one end of the continuum, and dialect at the other. A user of Arabic is thus able to “move” from one end to the other and back again on this spectrum (Hallberg 2016: 37-38), adjusting their language variety to the situation. It can be problematic to categorise an utterance, and even parts of it, as “dialect” or “SA” because of frequent overlaps between both grammar and vocabulary (2016: 38). In SA, some further distinguish between Classical Arabic and Modern Standard Arabic (MSA). MSA is said to have developed in the 19th century in Egypt and the Levant, especially within science and journalism as a result of societal changes. However, Bassiouney (2009: 12) noted that MSA is constructed in Western scholarship, and is not used in Arabic literature on the subject. This study uses SA since it is not about language varieties, and thus defines the variety in the empirical data in a broad sense.

1.1.3. Structure of the paper

Chapter 1 specified the purpose and accounted for the motivation. Chapter 2 unfolds the theoretical background on equivalence in translation and addresses “gender” and feminism, ending in a review of earlier studies on translation of “gender” into Arabic. Chapter 3 explains the method applied, accounts of selection criteria for data, and reflects on the limitations of the study, including the author’s standpoint. Chapter 4 presents the analysis, demonstrating how “gender” and the derivative “gendered” are translated in various constructions. Finally, Chapter 5 discusses and concludes on the results by answering the RQs. Chapter 5 ends by suggesting further research on feminist activism and discourse, and on translation of “gender” into Arabic by other actors than the movement *Musawah*. In the appendix tables 1-7 showing the constructions with “gender”, “sex” and “gendered” and their frequency in each text from the data are provided.

Chapter 2: Background

Section 2.1. discusses the concept of “gender” in translation, followed by addressing feminism(s) as social movement and theory in section 2.2. In section 2.3, the study specifies the theoretical framework by addressing equivalence in translation theory. 2.4. addresses former studies of Arabic translations of “gender”.

2.1. Meanings of “gender”

The concept of “gender” is used in various Anglophone contexts, and some problematise the often uncritical adoption in academic disciplines, including non-Anglophone areas of scholarship (Olson 2012; Kamal 2018:140). To Flotow, “gender” designates “/.../the socio-cultural attitudes that go with biological sex.” (1997: 100), and refers to the sociocultural construction of *both* sexes (1997:5). To her, including “other sexual orientations” has blurred the term. (1997: 100), but this is a longer discussion, arguably depending on the context.

“Gender” was established in 1990’s “Western” third-wave feminism (2018:140) through Butler’s theory of gender performativity. (Butler 2006 and 2011). Butler’s aim with “gender performativity” is not to dismiss “sex” as a category, or to isolate “sex” from “gender”. She sees “sex” as the materiality of the body, but discusses to what extent this materiality and the idea about natural categorisation is constructed, exploring the stabilised materiality of sex, accordingly taking place *through* gender performativity. “Gender” is understood as the social or cultural norms, a ritualised repetition by which the effects of gender and the materiality of sex is stabilised, thus neither “sex” or “gender” are isolated (Butler: 2011: Preface x, Introduction

xxiii). Olson acknowledges that Butler explains how gender is not a matter of subjective choice, but maintains that: 1) “Gender” as a concept makes little sense in many languages, 2) is an expression of American hegemonic dominance in scholarship. 3) has been a reactionary concept undermining feminism's political call for change (2012: 11). Accordingly, “gender” is often chosen as a politically correct synonym for “sex”, to denote the first category of identity based on external genitalia, when concluding that the child is “a girl” or “a boy”. (2012:3). “Gender” then becomes an euphemism for a human being’s sex, mirroring a natural attitude assuming a binary system of women and men based on natural anatomical differences. Many authors now carefully distinguish between “gender” and “sex”, and look to gender to explain the behaviour, practices, roles, and social organisation of sex. (2012:3).

2.1.1. “Gender” in translation

Though an anglophone term, the theory behind “gender” refers to French existentialism, i.e. Beauvoir’s statement from 1949, “on ne naît pas femme on le devient” translated by Parshley into “one is not born, but rather becomes a woman”. Not using the term, “both Beauvoir and Parshley were talking about gender” (1997:5). “Gender” in translation has been studied in languages other than Arabic as a troubled concept due to linguistic and cultural differences. Brodzki finds it problematic to construct equivalence between the French “genre” and the English “gender”. (2011: 274), raising the question: “What do/will ‘we’ mean when we talk about gender?” (2011: 279). This emphasises why any study on “gender” should pay attention to the definitions and contextual meaning. For example, Brodzki’s argues that the meaning of “sex”, has a more restricted semantic field than the word French “sexe”. (2011: 273).

2.2. Feminisms and the case of *Musawah*

Feminism presumes that inequalities between sexes in all parts of the world exist, and these are considered to be socially constructed (Okin in Phillips 1998: 116). This study follows Kamal's and Frye's definition of feminism as a theory as:

“/.../ systems of concepts, prepositions and analysis that describe and explain women's situations and experiences and support recommendations about how to improve them.” (2018: 137).

Further, feminism can be understood as: “/.../a kind of social movement, one that may generate and be aided by theory”(2018:137). Whether theory or practice, feminism is concerned with women's flourishing, participation and control of resources. Recognising the plurality of political thought, ideology and aspects of identity incorporated in feminism, today the plural form, *feminisms* is often used as an umbrella for e.g.: “Arab feminism”, “liberal feminism”, “postcolonial feminism”, “Islamic or Muslim feminism” etc. All manifest themselves in theories and/or socio-political activism (1997:100; 2018: 137).

Feminism , as opposed to “gender”, emerged in different Arabic localities as an “indigenous” social movement before an established theoretical framework, including terms such as “gender” began to “travel” from Europe and North America This is reflected in the fact that feminism has a more established equivalent than “gender” in Arabic, “*an-niswiyya*”, which enjoys wider acceptance in e.g., the Egyptian context. (Kamal 2018:139). Some understand feminism to be concerned mainly with women as a suppressed group, whereas others are attentive to include other identities perceived as underprivileged. The intersection with, race, ethnicity, religion, and socio-economic background has similarly been the subject of feminist studies. Discussions on different feminisms, and universalism versus cultural relativism are vast, but are excluded from the present study due to the scope. See e.g. Mohanty (1989), Gunnarson (2011), and Phillips (1998).

2.2.1 Musawah as Muslim Feminism

Musawah states to: “/.../apply feminist and rights-based lenses in understanding and searching for equality and justice within Muslim legal tradition,” ([Our Work](#), accessed 2021.07.23). The movement works with texts central to Muslim faith and self-identify as feminist. I define *Musawah* as a Muslim feminist movement based on Embabi’s argument that Islamic/Muslim feminism has its substance provided by the central text of Islam, the *Qur’ān*. Engagement takes different forms: theological, philosophical, exegetic, translational, activist, etc., and can engage with the prophetic traditions, *ḥadīth*, and existing quranic interpretation, including jurisprudence (2020:481), *fiqh*. Engagement with Islam covers a spectrum from hostility towards tradition, to engaging with Islam offering alternative readings of core texts, as *Musawah*. We should not per definition construct opposition between “secular” and “Muslim/Islamic” feminisms in Muslim countries. Badran emphasises how “secular” feminisms emerging among Muslims in in Africa and Asia in the early 20th century expanded upon Islamic modernist as well as secular nationalist and humanitarian ideas of the time.(2010:2-3). Similarly, *Musawah* uses terms and concepts from international human rights, connecting with European and North American intellectual heritage and academic scholarship, similar to many “secular” feminist.

2.3. Theoretical background on language and translation

This section accounts for the view on translation and equivalence, informed by Tymoczko, Venuti, Godard, Flotow, Nida, and Jakobsson. Definitions of proper translating are almost as numerous and varied as those who have discussed the subject. (Nida in Venuti 2004: 131), but this study is not concerned with what is “proper” - it approaches translation from a descriptive rather than prescriptive perspective. Meanwhile, it sees translation as being not merely an act of transferring a message, but a process of knowledge production (Kamal 2008:254).

2.3.1. Language and equivalence in translation

Jakobson states that the translator recodes and transmits a message received from another source, accordingly, translation involves “/.../two equivalent messages in two different codes.” (Jakobson in Venuti: 2004: 114). Jakobson distinguished between three ways of translating verbal signs 1) Intralingual translation, which renders verbal signs by means of other signs of the same language. 2) Interlingual translation is the interpretation of verbal signs by means of some other language. 3) Intersemiotic translation, i.e., interpretation of verbal signs by means of signs of nonverbal sign systems (2004:114). Jakobson uses the term code-unit to describe words or idiomatic phrase-words (2004:114), but here, we refer to the use of the single word “gender” or to MWEs with “gender”.

All cognitive experience is conveyable in any language. The translator’s task is a matter of interpreting whole messages rather than isolated code-units. Meaning should not be found in the single units, since languages are structured in different ways, and no full equivalence, or identity, exists. Though not emphasising this to the same degree as feminist theorists like Godard and Flotow, Jakobson was attentive to the various possibilities when translating the same text, recognising the many problems of translation where terminology can be qualified and amplified by loan-words, neologisms or semantic shifts, and circumlocutions (2004: 115). Venuti states that Jakobson underestimates the interpretive nature of translation, since recoding is an active rewording that does not transmit the foreign message but *transforms* it (2004: 69).

An opposition between translating prioritising pragmatic equivalence, easily intelligible to the receptor, and translating that is formally equivalent and prioritises the linguistic and cultural features of the foreign text, has been drawn in postpositivist translation theory. Equivalence has been understood in different ways, as “accuracy,” “adequacy,” “correctness,” “correspondence,”

“fidelity,” or ‘identity’. Following Venuti, equivalence is:: “/.../a variable notion of how the translation is connected to the foreign text.” (2004: 5)

Nida distinguished between “dynamic” and “formal” varieties of equivalence (2004: 121), describing how an ST message can correspond to a message in the TT in terms of more or less formal equivalence. Equivalence is not a matter of exact identity between the units, since this is not possible. Nida later replaced the term “dynamic” with “functional” (Venuti 2004: 121, Nida and Taber 1982), as to why this study will use formal and functional when describing the examples from the empirical data in Chapter 4. Nida and Taber’s approach to translation is that:

Translating must aim primarily at ‘reproducing the message.’ To do anything else is essentially false to one’s task as a translator. But to reproduce the message one must make a good many grammatical and lexical adjustments. (Nida & Taber: 1982: 12).

To them, the translator must strive for equivalence rather than identity (1982: 12), aiming at finding the closest “natural equivalent” (1982: 13) which can only be found through thorough grammatical, semantic and contextual/cultural analysis of the SL and TL and the ST and purpose of the TT. However, what is the closest natural equivalent is not necessarily agreed upon (1982: 13), as is clear regarding the word “gender” when translated into Arabic. This is relevant in relation to scientific or theoretical language, which according to Kamal does not end with the choice of one option over the other. The introduction of a new term initiates a discussion and negotiation of the concept or term, which might lead to “fixation” (2018: 134), which Nida would consider a “natural equivalent”. However, the discussion can also foster the development of other alternatives (2018:134). “Gender” and the identified MWEs serve as good examples to problematise the notion of “natural equivalence”, and to exemplify the negotiation in feminist knowledge building where the message should be comprehensible for the target group, while challenging status quo, since it has a reformative objective. As such, feminist knowledge building can also be seen as a place for distributing and developing new terms and concepts in a certain context. Hence, it can be discussed if the translator should opt for a functional solution

immediately comprehensible, or a more formal one, challenging to comprehend for some, but nevertheless potentially can enrich discourses on gender and feminism in e.g. Standard Arabic.

Godard sees translation as production, emphasising difference as positive and productive. To her, a theory of translation focusing on equivalence ignores “/.../the extreme difficulty in translating meaning because of the importance of co-textual (formal) and contextual relationships.” (1989: 48). Translation should not strive for equivalence in two messages. To Godard, translation theory has been too convinced that a message may be transposed from one language to another “/.../so that the meaning of the message is preserved and there is an identity of content in the two texts” (1989: 47). She emphasises meaning as context dependent since language is not transparent. “Equivalence is located between the coding/decoding operations of two text systems rather than between the contents or words of two messages.” (1989: 48). To Godard, languages organise the world differently, as to why ST and TT construct two different “worlds” (1988: 49). The translator creatively intervenes to produce a new text, a “mimicry”, of the ST, which is manipulated to target another audience in the target language. The process is Author-Text-Receiver = Translator-Text-Receiver.

Godard’s view on language difference mirrors Nida’s, since he states that languages reflect different realities, and solutions must be based on the translator’s acquisition of sufficient “cultural information.” (2004: 69), since a translation has to make sense to the receptor in order to justify its existence. (Nida in Venuti 2004: 132). Nida’s notion of cultural awareness is important, but a static view of “culture” is traceable, and his notion of culture risks essentialising persons sharing the same language. A more dynamic view on “culture” as ever changing and diverse is suggested (Merry 2006: 10), recognising the plurality among Arabic language users in a national and transnational sense. A translation acceptable in one period is often unacceptable in

another, (2004:131), and additionally translations accepted in one community or context, are not necessarily accepted in another, even in the same period.

There are similarities between Nida and Godard who share some fundamental views on the impossibility of full equivalence or identity between messages. Nida also acknowledges the productive aspect of translation, mentioning that “a translator of poetry creates another poem” (2004: 131). However, he also states: “/.../one must in translating seek to find the closest possible equivalent.” (2004: 129), which Godard would disagree with, not focusing on achieving equivalence but on extending feminist writing. (Flotow 1997).

2.3.2. Functional and formal equivalence

Functional and formal equivalence can be seen as a spectrum, and the same text, or expression, can have both functional and formal features, e.g. if it is formal in structure but functional semantically, or the opposite. Formal equivalence focuses on the message itself as it appears “originally” in the source language, in both form and content (2004: 129). Formal equivalence prioritises that the message in the target language (TL) matches as closely as possible to the different elements in the source language (SL), and is received by the users of the TL similarly to how it was received in the SL. Functional equivalence is at the other end of the spectrum, defined as a principle in which a translator seeks to translate the meaning of the original so that the TT triggers the same impact on the target audience as the original did upon the ST audience.

Frequently, the form of the original text is changed; but as long as the change follows the rules of back transformation in the source language, of contextual consistency in the transfer, and of transformation in the receptor language, the message is preserved and the translation is ‘faithful’ (Nida and Taber 1982:200).

Translators aiming at formal equivalence set up rules intended to be applied in order, and designed to specify exactly what should be done with each unit or combination of units in the source language so as to select the appropriate corresponding form in the target language (1982:

33). In functional equivalence, the translator must instead analyse the message in terms of the grammatical relationships, the meanings of the words and combinations of words. The analysed material must then be “transferred” in the mind of the translator from language A to language B, and the material must be restructured in order to make the final message fully acceptable in the TL (1982: 33). Here, feminist translation theory would suggest that it is not a matter of transferring a message, but rather transforming it (Godard 1989).

“Extreme” formal equivalence can be named a gloss translation:

/.../a gloss translation of this type is designed to permit the reader to identify himself as fully as possible with a person in the source-language context, and to understand as much as he can of the customs, manner of thought, and means of expression. (2004: 129).

We assume that the same would count for non-male readers. The point is that in the formal orientation, the message in the target culture is compared with the message in the source culture to determine standards of accuracy and correctness, without modifying it to fit the “culture” of the TL. Considering that various cultures speak the same language, “target group” can be a suitable alternative to “target culture”.

2.4. Former studies on translations of “gender” into Arabic

Earlier findings on translations of “gender” from English into Arabic do not focus on translations targeting a transnational Arabic audience. Mehrez (2007) and Kamal (2008; 2017; 2018) described examples of SA, mainly from an Egyptian context, although Kamal also provides general reflections on the translation of *Encyclopaedia of Women and Islamic Cultures* (EWIC) not targeting a specific nation. Mehrez considers language and translation to be “meaning construction” and investigates “the problem of meaning construction as it relates to translating gender” (2007: 117), arguing that the various translations into Arabic suggests that the field of gender studies in the Egyptian context is at a promising state, but then criticises the translations

in use for being either reactionary, reproducing essentialist notions of gender, or alienating to an Arabic audience. She approaches a specific text through a descriptive method, but becomes slightly prescriptive in her critique of existing translations, and her refusal of the loan word “*al-jindar*”, as well as established words such as “*jinsayn*”. Kamal to some extent follows Mehrez, but is concerned with the polysemous meaning of “*an-naw*” since it means “genre” in literary studies, and contrary to Mehrez, Kamal argues in favour of “*al-jindar*”.

2.4.1. The word “*jins*” in Arabic language

Mehrez states that the history of the word gender in the Arabic context is one of cross-cultural communication and translation of knowledge (2007:109). The English word “gender”, the Arabic word “*jins*” and the French word “genre” all come from the Greek word *genos*³ meaning species, sort, category, birth, race, family, etc. ([Oxford Classical Dictionary](#) accessed 2021.08.09). The Arabic word “*jins*” (جنس) is a Greek loan word, and after entering Arabic, the noun “*jins*” obeys the possibilities of the linguistic realm in which it can develop (2007:109). “*Genos*” morphologically resembles the basic Arabic trilateral root, because it is made up of three consonants, which can be rendered in Arabic as three radicals constituting the root (Versteegh 2014:89). This makes “*jins*” easily naturalised in Arabic. The noun “*jins*” in Arabic currently signifies “sex”, “kind”, or “species⁴”, and among the primary meanings of “*jins*” are: gender (as grammatical category), kind, sort, species, category, class, sex, as in male, female, and race (Wehr 1979: 141). Today the Greek “*genos*” and the Arabic “*jins*” are no longer identical, or antithetical, or complementary, but different (2007: 109). The derivative forms from the trilateral root j-n-s have extended the word’s field of signification beyond immediate categorisation. Today, “*jinsī*” means sexual; “*jinās*”, assonance; “*jinsīya*”, nationality; “*tajnīs*”, naturalisation;

³ Mehrez stated that the Greek word is “genus” (2007: 109), but Ambjörn, the supervisor of the present thesis, made me notice that the Greek origin is actually “*genos*”, whereas “genus” is Latin. Thus, Mehrez must have confused the two but nevertheless

⁴ again, Mehrez actually writes “genus” though “*genos*” is correct

“*tajānus*”, homogeneity, etc. (2007: 109, 1979: 141). Regarding “gender” and “sex”, Mehrez considers “*jins*” in contemporary Arabic as the most natural equivalent to “sex”, rather than “gender” (2007: 116). Still, the root j-n-s has been used in attempts to construct a neologism in Arabic as equivalent to the concept of “gender”. As Mehrez (2007) points out, Ghazoul stated in the literary journal *Alif*:

Gender does not have a ready-made unequivocal signifier in Arabic, nor for that matter in many European languages, thus *Alif*, after lengthy discussions with linguists, critics and poets, decided not to Arabize the term “gender” by giving it an Arabic pronunciation and script, but to derive a term from the Arabic root which corresponds to the etymological significance of ‘gender’. (Ghazoul 1999:6)

Hence, j-n-s has fostered various specific terms, including “sex” and “sexuality”, it adds confusion to use any of the existing terms to an “already misunderstood concept” (1999:6). According to Mehrez and Ghazoul, the neologism “*junūsa*” corresponds morphologically to “*unūtha*”, meaning femininity, and “*dhukūra*”, masculinity. The idea behind it “/.../incorporates notions of the masculine and the feminine as they are perceived in a given time or place, with all the ideological twists and politics that such a construction and vision imply” (Mehrez 2007:111) (Ghazoul 1999:6). Mehrez welcomes that the translation recognises gender as a “dynamic process rather than a static essence” (2007: 111). However, only the editor used the neologism, and hence, though credited by Mehrez, it has never really been accepted broadly by Arabic users.

2.4.2. Translations of “gender” into Arabic in practice

Instead of using “*junūsa*” as equivalent to “gender” in e.g. “gender studies” the journal *Alif* used “*an-naw’*” or “*al-jins*”, as in: “*dirasāt al-jins*”, which Mehrez notes can be confounded with studies of sex, sexuality, race, or nation, or “*dirasāt an-naw’*” which to her is problematic because it can be confused with studies of biological kind, species, sort, or nature. (2007: 111). Here, Kamal contributes by adding that “*an-naw’*” can also be confused with the study of

literary genre, which is one of the same issues that Brodzki emphasised regarding “gender” as equivalent to “genre” in French (Brodzki in Flotow: 2011). Kamal states that:

The word *naw'* without a qualifier (i.e. *al-naw' al-ijtima'i*) becomes confusing, as it carries the connotations of literary genre (*al-naw' al-adabi*) rather than the implied socio-cultural dimensions embedded in the word/concept/term “gender”. Thus, although the word *al-naw'* may essentially denote “gender” in the contexts of development, sociology and political science, the same word initially denotes “genre” in the context of literary studies. (2018: 69, note that Kamal transliterate ځ as ' rather than ʿ which deviates from this study)

Hence, Kamal considers “*an-naw'ʿ*” and “*an-naw' al-ijtima'ī*” as well-established close equivalents to “gender” in development contexts, which *Musawah* belongs to, and her notion can to some extent be confirmed by this thesis’ data, but not entirely, since *Musawah* also uses other words.

Kamal notes that English-Arabic dictionaries limit translation of “gender” to “*al-jins*”, which she, like Mehrez considers to be the equivalent of “sex” in reference to the biological categories of male/female, or to “gender” in the grammatical categorisation masculine/feminine forms. She also notes that The Academy of the Arabic Language:

/.../translates ‘gender’ as *al-jins* and *al-naw'*. ‘Gender’ translated as *al-jins* is further explained as referring to the state of an individual in terms of male and female; whereas *al-naw'* is defined as ‘a term which has become common recently instead of sex in cultural anthropology.’ (2008: 262-263, Kamal’s transliteration, italics added in present study)

“Gender” in translation into Arabic increased in the 1990s, and is characterised by high lexical variety in itself and in its derivative forms. One of the earliest common translations of “gender” was the explanatory translation mentioned, “*an-naw' al-ijtimā'ī*”, i.e., “social gender,” (or social kind/sort/type). It was abbreviated as “*an-naw'ʿ*” in development studies and social sciences, most likely because it became widely used after extensive translation by UN translations of developmental documents. (2008: 262-263).

Another early use of “gender” in Arabic is from an interview published in Arabic with, among others, Hoda Elsadda, a founder of *Women and Memory Forum* in Cairo⁵ (2007: 117), referring to “gender” as: “*al-thaqāfi wa’l-ijtimā’i li’l-jins*”, ie., “the cultural and social construction of sex”. Mehrez finds that none of the participants uses the same terminology to denote “gender”(2007: 118-119). Mehrez’s description is based on what she considers “/.../a quick survey of some of the ‘solutions’ to the problem of translating gender /.../” (2007:110), and further identified the following translations:

- “*Junūsa*”
- “*Dirasāt al-jins*” (which Kamal and Mehrez would back translate into “studies of sex” rather than “studies of gender”)
- “*Dirasāt an-naw’*” (studies of kind, gender, sex, type, genre, form)
- “*An-naw’ al-ijtimā’i* (the social kind,gender, sex, type, sort)
- “*An-naw’*” (kind, gender, sex, genre, sort, type)
- “*An-naw’ al-ijtimā’i (al-jindar)*” (The social gender/sex (gender))
- “*Al-jindar*” (loan word, “gender” from English)
- “*Al-bu’d al-junūsi*”, rendered as “the gender dimension” by Mehrez (2007:119)
- “*Al-tashakkul al-thaqāfi wa-l-ijtimā’i li-l-jins*”, rendered as “the cultural and social construction of sex”, by Mehrez (2007: 119)

When Mehrez refers to later publications by the journal *Alif*, she identifies an “Arabisation”, or transliteration of the English “gender”, which has entered as a new loan word in e.g. “*dirasāt al-jindar*”, on top of “*dirāsāt an-naw’ al-ijtimā’i*”. Mehrez’s states that the loan word “alienates rather than communicates anything to an Arabic speaker” (2007:111). Her point that importing an originally “Western” concept in an originally “Western” linguistic presentation can result in combative nationalistic responses is valid considering the hypersensitivity to “Western” hegemonic discourses today. However, it can be argued that it depends on the target group whether “*al-jindar*” is accepted or not, since Arabic language speakers are heterogenous. The

⁵*Women and Memory Forum* in Cairo is a group of scholars and researchers whose main project is to rewrite Arab cultural history from women’s perspective

use of “*al-jindar*” is the point on which Kamal disagrees with Mehrez. Kamal argues in favor of “*al-jindar*”, which she have opted for as a translator of feminist literary theory and translation editor of EWIC (2008, 2018). Kamal provides the following arguments in favour of “*al-jindar*” as equivalent for the word “gender”:

- Transliteration in Arabic points out the origins of the concept as foreign carrying cultural baggage.
- “*Jindar*” in Arabic enjoys the grammatical flexibility as a word having the possible quadri-literal root (j-n-d-r), which allows for further derivation of words such as “*jindariyya*” (“gendered”, according to Kamal),
- One of the features of Arabic language is its long history of borrowing, adopting, assimilating and appropriating words and terms from other languages.
- “*Jindar*” as a term and concept has already been appropriated by young Egyptian feminists.⁶
- “*Jindar*” fits better within literary discourses where “*an-naw*” refers more to the literary concept of “genre” than to the socio-cultural concept of “gender”.
- “*Jindar*”, asserts its identity as a “travelling concept”, in an Egyptian context and in other Arabic contexts (2018: 144)

“Gender” as a concept in Anglophone literature has “travelled” to Arabic, as it has to other linguistic contexts. Kamal refers to Olson and Millan’s critiques of the journeys of the concept, and accordingly one of the problematics is that “gender”:

/.../has been appropriated by international organisations and development projects, and intentionally transported with its tool-kit (gender-mainstreaming policies). It is in this context that gender as a concept masquerades as a more inclusive term than feminism, and attempts to encompass it if not replace it. (2018: 141)

⁶ I add that I have noticed the use of “jindar/jindariyya” by Tunisian ([Mawjoudin](#)), Moroccan ([Nassawiyat](#)) and Algerian ([Association Alouen](#)) feminist actors, seemingly it is especially used extensively by organisations focusing on LGBTIQ+, but this needs more documentation.

Kamal argues that “gender” travels better when situated within feminist theory as a concept and analytical tool, and within feminist activism rather than in development projects⁷. Kamal’s preference for “*jindar*” reflects Godard’s suggestion to keep some cultural traces in translation.

Kamal or Mehrez become prescriptive in their interpretation of “*jins*” as equivalent to “sex” rather than “gender”. Further, they do not mention the dual form of *jins*, i.e., “*jinsayn*”, which is remarkable since the analysis presented in Chapter 4 shows that “*jinsayn*” is opted for by *Musawah* in several MWEs. Kamal and Mehrez are mainly concerned with either academic discourses or the example from the UN, but do not consider that the UN uses different roots to denote “gender” depending on the construction. The impression is that actors are consistent in their use and translations of “gender”, but that it depends on ideology and field of research or work. To Kamal and Mehrez the subject is important, because they consider translation as meaning construction and knowledge production: “/.../the task of the feminist translator is to consider language as a clue to the workings of gendered agency,/.../” (2007:112). To Mehrez, this agency is lost when using what to her are essentialist nouns such as “*an-naw*” or “*al-jins*” to denote “gender” in e.g. “gender studies”. She argues that their historical use reinforces notions of separation and difference between women and men, and reproduces natural and fixed categories on behalf of ideas of socially constructed identities, and of formation and performance. In her view, neologisms such as “*al-junūsa*” show the possibilities in the Arabic language, and she advocates for similar attempts.

⁷ The division between “development work” and “feminist activism” is not as clear as Kamal makes it sound, since feminist actors often work as a part of or are funded by “development” programmes, as is also the case with *Musawah*, considering their funding from SIDA through UN Women.

Chapter 3: Method and Empirical Data

This chapter elaborates on the applied method for investigating translations of “gender” in the data reflecting on limitations and the researcher's perspective, ending in a remark on how the East-West dichotomy is not necessarily an accurate way of classifying knowledge production.

3.1 Method in use: Descriptive translation studies

Flotow criticises translation studies for having been too occupied with formulating theoretical models rather than studying existing translations. Accordingly, it has been more prestigious for linguists to engage with abstract theory than actual translations. Also, researchers need skills in *two* linguistic and cultural contexts, making it methodologically challenging (1997:89). Documenting translation in use, the descriptive method views equivalence as having a posteriori nature, since meaning and equivalence is seen as a relationship constructed by the translator: Any given text can be translated in different ways (2007:41). Accordingly, this study's aims not to prescribe any specific translation or use of “gender”, but to describe it.

Flotow (1997) among others (Tymoczko 2007, Venuti 2004) stresses the intersection of cultural and translation studies but emphasises the importance of recognising the material realities of translation and criticises what she considers an increasingly “metaphorical” use of translation which ignores this materiality. Further, Flotow mentions that most scholarship has been done in English and/or with texts translated into English, often failing to recognise these texts for their meaning. She also criticises the focus on “equivalence” if the context is not considered. (1997:95). This study treats equivalence as an abstraction but applies it as an approach to

investigating actual translations in a material sense. This study also uses the term “discourse” which is:

/.../ways of combining and integrating language, actions, interactions, ways of thinking, believing, valuing and using various symbols, tools and objects to enact a particular sort of socially recognisable identity. (Gee 2014:46).

The broad definition acknowledges discourses as constructed beyond the analysed text and is attentive to the intertextuality in a discourse which is constituted by more than one utterance or text, reflecting other utterances and texts. Utterances and texts contain - and are part of various discourses. A thorough discourse analysis includes more aspects of *Musawah*'s communication such as the layout, choice of media for the genre, and could consider the videos that are parts of the same knowledge building initiative. However, it is impossible to include everything in one study, and choices must be made. Additionally, this is not a study of discourses as such, but a study of equivalence between specific English concepts and their Arabic translations, i.e., a part of *Musawah*'s feminist discourse, but also other discourses on local, national and transnational levels. I have read *Musawah*'s description of their work and visions on their English and Arabic websites, to understand its visions, target groups, methods, and ideological background.

3.1.1. How the method is applied

The methodology is both inductive and deductive, the latter because existing theories on equivalence as constructed by the translator are used in relation to the data. The inductive part is exemplified by investigating whether some patterns or tendencies can be identified in the different publications or generally in the data, but obviously only for the specific sources in this data, not for transnational Arabic in general, since this would demand a set of extremely diverse publications from many different authors.

The first step in collecting data for the investigation was to find a publisher that used “gender” in English publications translated into Arabic. After deciding on *Musawah* as a case, I read their English key publications to select the most suitable texts, i.e., texts that were translated into Arabic from English, and mentioned “gender”. *Musawah*’s production is extensive, and to limit the study, I chose to focus on their knowledge building initiative, and then limited the material further by only including publications funded by UN Women. I read each ST parallelly with its TT noting each occurrence of “gender” or “gendered” in the ST, while finding the corresponding piece of text in the TT. In the longest text, ST 2018, I also searched electronically in the document to make sure that my counts of “gender” and “gendered” were accurate, and all the way I made sure to exclude notes and references not translated in the TTs. After having done the immediate identification of relevant constructions in each text, all occurrences and translations of “gender” were noted for each ST/TT, and a list of MWEs and their equivalents was made for each ST/TT. This was also done for the derivative “gendered”. In total, this gave 133 occurrences of “gender” or “gendered”, and eight occurrences of “sex/sexes”, in total, 141 cases. In section 4.1., a table including all concepts and their frequency in each ST is provided. In Chapter 4, 39 examples are analysed grammatically and semantically through the notion of formal and functional equivalence. The 39 examples are selected from the 141 relevant cases. The idea behind the selection criteria is that some constructions are translated in the same way several times, and to serve the purpose, it is not relevant to present the same translation solution several times, hence one example of each different translation is included. Regarding concepts with high frequency and nearly consistent translation, e.g., “gender equality” translated into “*al-musāwāh bayna-l-jinsayn*”, other cases occurring in the data could have been relevant, but example (1) has the advantage of showing that *Musawah* quotes UN Women’s translation of “gender equality” and then uses the same nearly consistently across texts, as discussed in Chapter 5.

Tables 1-7 (Appendixes), show how the concepts and the derivative are translated in each TT. To answer RQ2, I noted all occurrences of the correlative word “sex” when used as the categorisation of identities. “Sex” and the related adjective “sexual” was sometimes used in other meanings and contexts such as copulation or in “sexual harassment”. It is noted that these were not surprisingly translated by means of the j-n-s root, which is also used in some cases when constructing equivalents to “gender” and its correlative “sex”, in relation to identity categories. However, this point does not contribute to fulfilling the purpose of this study, and hence, it is not treated further. Only occurrences of “sex” as correlative to “gender”, i.e., in the meaning of identity categories, are included in the analysis.

3.1.2 Exemplifying the applied method

The analysis and selection of examples was approached text by text, and the frequency of the relevant constructions identified in each ST are presented in Table 1 and 2 (Appendixes). This is not mainly a quantitative study, but word frequency is provided for each text to give the reader an idea about the scope of the use of the expressions. Some MWEs only occurred once, making it impossible to state if there is a tendency in Musawah’s translations of these.

Often, the same MWE with “gender” is identified in more texts, and often the same translation solution is opted for various times in the same text or across texts. To present the results in a simple way without being reductive, Chapter 4 offers at least one example of the translation of each MWE. In the cases where the same MWE is translated in various ways, examples from all the different solutions are provided.

I divided the different solutions into categories describing the tendencies. These are: 1) New loan word, when the root j-n-d-r is used, in “*jindar*” or “*jindariyya/jindarī*” 2) Gender-binarism through grammatical dual, i.e., when the root j-n-s is used to form the dual noun “*jinsayn*” 3)

Singular of j-n-s, “*jins*” 4) Global development term which is “*an-naw*’”, because this according to former studies is an abbreviation of the explanatory *an-naw’ al-ijtimā’ī*, coined by the UN and used in development contexts and social sciences, and 5) New loan word plus development term, which is a combination of 1) and 4), and finally 6) Transformation of “gender” in the TT, which is the least formal way of translating since “gender” in these cases is translated into equivalents, such as “man and woman” or “boy and girl”.

For example, “gender” is translated into “*jins*” (ST/TT 2016: 13/13) “*naw*’” (ST/TT 2018: 34/34), “*jindar*” (ST/TT 1/1, 2/2, 2/2, and 4/4), and “*jinsayn*” (ST/TT 4/4), and is also transformed more functionally into a more specific identity category, for example when translated into *ġīyāb al-musāwāh fī-l-umūr al-muta’alliqa bi-n-nisā’* (ST/TT 2016: 5/5). Occasionally this thesis describes it as “dismissing” “gender”, which does not mean that the meaning of the concept is necessarily dismissed in the context, just the gloss or term.

The analysis follows the following steps: 1) Identification of relevant concepts and derivatives (only derivative identified was “gendered”) in ST, and how many times they each occurred 2) Identification of Arabic root and words, including word class and numeral form used in the TT to construct an equivalent to the words “gender” and “gendered” in each of the identified relevant constructions 3) Comparison of the translations of the same concept or the derivative to decide whether it is translated in the same or different ways. If different translations of the same construction exist, all are provided in Chapter 4. When the same construction is translated through the same Arabic equivalent in all texts, it is only provided once. All occurrences have been considered in the discussion and conclusions in Chapter 5. Appendixes, a table for each ST/TT mentioning all the MWEs and their translations, including their frequency is provided.

3.3. Empirical data and selection criteria

A list of the data is provided under “Primary Sources in Arabic” prior to the introduction. A feminist approach begins in the choice of subject and data, filling knowledge gaps and shedding light on subjects related to women’s experience and work, historically less investigated in most disciplines until “feminist research programmes” started to be initiated explicitly. (Wylie 2012:54-55). This considered, feminist theory contributed to my orientation towards feminist organisations and their language, and as argued, the choice is subjective yet empirical and intersubjectively testable. Further, it fills a scientific gap, as argued in section 2.4. From a feminist position it is positive if the study fill a scientific gap, while striving at contributing to improve feminists’ communication, though it serves as a tiny piece in a large puzzle. Striving for transparency my personal interests and assumptions about patriarchal structures in the world inspired by feminist theory are not hidden. This does not necessarily clash with “traditional” scientific virtues - irrational elements and creative intuition in scientific discoveries confirm that getting ideas in science is not a question of pure logic (1972: 32). If creativity and irrationality is accepted as a part of scientific improvements, then accepting, for example, the fight for social equality, as motivation and source of inspiration should not be problematic, at least not if the method can be tested intersubjectively. *Musawah*’s extensive production and accessibility makes their translations a practical study object, allowing others to test the findings from this study.

3.3.1. Selection criteria of empirical data

The empirical data and selection criteria are crucial for the findings in any study. The conclusions could be fundamentally different if the data was composed by UN publications, or publications by activists identifying as “queer”. This emphasises how an empirical study is never

“objective” (2007: 145-147) if objectivity is seen as one true way to describe phenomena in the world. Scientific methods are always subjective:

/.../influenced by ideas and beliefs related to subject positions, frames of reference, interpretations, mental concepts, and received meanings such as theoretical frameworks and disciplinary paradigms. (Tymoczko 2007: 146)

The first step was to find a feminist publisher that used “gender” in English publications translated into Arabic. Many activists post “ad hoc” translations in either English or Arabic on social media or their websites. Studying the use of “gender” and MWEs with “gender” in Arabic without having an English ST would be more challenging methodologically, because we cannot be sure if for example “*al-musāwāh bayna-l-jinsayn*” refers to “gender equality”, or “equality between the sexes” or something similar. After choosing *Musawah*, I limited my data to their key publications translated into Arabic. All *Musawah*’s publications exist in English, and many, but are translated into Arabic and French. To get coherence in the set data, I only included texts that are a part of *Musawah*’s knowledge building initiative funded by the UN Women’s *Men and Women for Gender Equality* programme. *Musawah*’s knowledge building videos are also a part of this initiative, but this would have been beyond the scope. The last criteria was that the ST must mention “gender” or “gendered”. It was not a criteria that any of the texts mentioned “sex”, since RQ 2 was not formulated prior to the selection of data.

References and notes are read but excluded from the empirical data. Also, one more knowledge brief, “Knowledge Building Brief 01 (2016) exists, but does not mention “gender” thus it did not meet the selection criteria and was excluded. Hence, the empirical data is in total 84 English and 87 Arabic pages.

3.4. Main methodological limitations

This is a case study of *Musawah*, and the aim is to document how gender is translated in specific “Musawah Key publications” which are a part of the movement’s knowledge building initiative. If the reader is interested in how gender is translated into Arabic in an Egyptian and to some extent general context, a starting point was provided in section 2.4. On a larger more general scale, the present study cannot provide answers, since the method is limited to consider a smaller corpus of data qualitatively rather than quantitatively investigating a large corpus composed by translations from various publishers and patrons. With programming and computational methods applied in contemporary corpus linguistics, larger analysis of equivalence would be possible, but arguably, the empirical data in this study showed that the variety of grammatical constructions with “gender” and its derivatives in combination with the diverse solutions would make it challenging to investigate it quantitatively in a meaningful way, and qualitative analysis would be needed.

Being a non-native speaker of Arabic has limitations besides from the fact that we can never fully be sure that no human mistakes are made. I do not claim to have the same extensive vocabulary as an Arabic scholar who has lived and used the Arabic language during most of their educational and social life. There may also be contextual aspects, history, and connotations to the concepts studied and their translations that I am blind to, or translation strategies or solutions that I consider in a certain way partly due to my position as a linguistic and cultural outsider. This is not meant to imply that there is one Arabic culture essential to all Arabic speaking nations or communities. However, considering the interlinked and shared history, media, literary and cultural heritage, which is possible due to SA, there are different negative and positive attitudes regarding feminism and gender, which can be traceable on a transnational scale.

Brodzki notes that an outsider with access to other languages has the privilege “...to detect or identify a translation problem that would otherwise elude a monolingual native speaker” (2011:263). The fact that I am not a native speaker of neither English nor Arabic with a more “intuitive” use, may have contributed to recognising a need to systematically and in depth consider the interpretations and use of “gender” in different grammatical constructions.

3.4.1. Who are *Musawah*’s translators? Translator visibility in the empirical data

I contacted *Musawah* via email asking about their translations into Arabic. Methodologically, it was important to get confirmed that the publications were translated from English into Arabic. Besides confirming this, *Musawah* informed me that its “knowledge building team” is responsible for the translations. However, I did not manage to get information on who/how many internal and/or external translators were involved, which can be considered a limitation. TT 2018 is the only publication stating that it is a translation, mentioning the translator, ‘*Uṭmān Muṣṭafā ‘Uṭmān. Musawah. Malakī aš-Šamānī and Sāra Mārsū* (TT 2018, above table of contents), revised the translation linguistically. Though I expected them to be translations from English, TT02 2016⁸, TT03 2017, TT04 2017, and TT 2016 do not mention whether this is actually the case. Visibility of the translator is generally desirable, (Godard 1989: 47; Kamal 2008), but none of the publications include a “note on translation”, which could have been helpful when analysing it, to get an idea about the strategy and considerations behind the choices described - especially considering the huge scope of ST 2018, and the various references to terms related to feminist and human rights concepts from originally Anglophone discourses. For the target group, a note could have been helpful for receptors not reading the English ST⁹.

⁸ In the English ST there is more visibility since it is stated that the *Qur’ān* verses are translated by Kecia Ali. She is the author of *Sexual Ethics and Islam: Feminist Reflections on Qur'an, Hadith, and Jurisprudence* (2016) and further mentioned by Musawah as an Islamic Feminist <https://www.musawah.org/advocacy-toolkit/further-resources/> (accessed 2021.07.21)

⁹ Same level of visibility is present in the ST regarding interpretation and translation of classical Arabic texts into English, since the ST mentions the translator of the quotes from the *Qur’ān* included in the publication, while also mentioning that it will be stated when Musawah relies on another translation (ST 2018).

3.4.1. A note on the East-West dichotomy

This paper uses the word “Western”, implying a perspective that must be accounted for (2007:15), since it is shaped by Scandinavian educational institutions. For example, English grammatical terms are used to describe the Arabic grammar, with *idāfa*¹⁰ and as an exception. *Musawah* and the theorists Kamal and Mehrez are difficult to classify as either Eastern or Western. The connection with European and North American scholarship is obvious, as is the transnational Arabic. That the shared intellectual heritage between “East” and “West” is overseen in mainstream books on translation theory would be a relevant discussion in relation to English-Arabic translation studies, but is beyond the scope of this study. Tymoczko states that self-reflexivity in translation lacks before postpositivist theory in the Western history of translation, and that translation was considered as an instrumental process before (2007:15), overlooking sources from the classical age of Islam, rarely included as a factor in Western scientific history, except from specified literature. One could mention Ḥunayn b. Ishāq (808–873/877 AD) who produced and reflected on translations from Greek into Syriac and Arabic and he produced knowledge through a sophisticated method. He did not rely on a mechanical word-to-word translation, but on a hermeneutic process of consulting earlier translations, revising his own, and interpreting the meaning of whole sentences to transfer messages rather than exact linguistic units and structure. (Rosenthal 1992:17). Due to limited scope I settle here by referring to Rosenthal 1992; Owerwein 2005; Gutas 1998, and also Ḥunayn’s account of his translations of Galen (ed. Bergsträsser 1925).

¹⁰According to Hawwari et. al., *idāfa* is in Arabic grammar a common construction made up of two nominal parts (nouns, adjectives, proper nouns), where the whole construction serves as a single syntactic unit, which is arguably the case with example (1). There is no good equivalent term for *idāfa* in English, but it can be said to cover several phenomena including what in English is known as noun-noun compounds and Saxon & Norman genitives, among other things. (Hawwari, Abdelati et. al. 2016.

“Explicit Fine Grained Syntactic and Semantic Annotation of the Idafa Construction in Arabic”. LREC)

Chapter 4: Analysis of empirical data

In section 3.1.2 the applied method for the analysis is exemplified. In this Chapter, 39 examples are presented. In tables 1-7 (Appendixes), all constructions identified as relevant and their translations are provided to document the results and give an overview of the words' and MWEs', individual frequency in each text and in total.

4.1. Analysis of constructions

The analysis moves forward, expression by expression, providing examples of all the different identified translations of each construction through 39 examples. It mentions how many times the word or MWE occurred in total (see also table 1 and 2 in appendix), provides a rather formal back translation (though not an extreme gloss translation, since this would not serve the present purpose), and transliterates the concepts focused upon. The transliteration and back translation illustrate how the word denoting “gender” in each example can be interpreted and allow readers not familiar with Arabic to follow the analyses. My back translations are to the formal side, aiming at explicitly showing that “gender” in the TTs is rendered in dual, singular or plural form. In the cases where the loan word root j-n-d-r is not used, I have chosen to let “sex” or “sexes” follow “gender” or “genders”, to emphasise that the reader would not know from the TT whether the “*jinsayn*”, “*jins*”, or “*naw*” actually referred to “gender” or “sex”.

4.2. “Gender” as “*jinsayn*” in multi-word expressions

This section describes MWEs where “gender” is in nearly all cases translated into “*al-jinsayn*”. Lacking a better or established term for this tendency, this paper describes it as gender-binarism through the grammatical dual form. The analysis starts by describing the most frequent, “Gender equality”, which occurred 32 times in total, and in all STs.

4.2.1. “Gender equality”

Example (1) is from the funding note appearing in all STs, stating that the production of the paper funded by the UN Women Regional Office for the Arab States, undertaken within the framework of the “Men and Women for Gender Equality programme” funded by the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA). This programme funded all publications. The note appears in all STs. However, for unknown reasons, the note is not translated into TT 2016, though it mentions in another note or “disclaimer” that it is funded by the UN. (TT: 2016).

Example (1) exemplifies how *Musawah* in almost all cases constructs equivalence between “gender equality” and “*al-musāwāh bayna-l-jinsayn*”. “Gender equality” occurred 32 times, and is translated into “*al-musāwāh bayna-l-jinsayn*” as in (1):

(1) ‘Men and Women for Gender Equality’ programme /.../
(all STs)

برنامج «الرجل والمرأة من أجل المساواة بين الجنسين»
(TT02 2016, TT03 2017, TT04 2017, TT 2018)

Back translation: *The “man and woman for equality between the two genders/sexes” programme*

“Men and Women for Gender Equality”, which is the name of the programme funding the publications constituting the data. In the TT, *barnāmaj* can be grammatically described as the first part of an *idāfa* construction with the second part, the specification or name of the programme, placed in quotation marks in STs and TTs. This indicates that this specific translation of “gender equality” is originally a translation conducted by UN Women’s translators, which will be discussed in Chapter 5.

In the TTs, the second part of the *idāfa*, the focus here, is translated into, “*ar-rajul wa-l-mar’a min ajl al-musāwāh bayna-l-jinsayn*”. In “Future research”, it is explained why “men and women” is transformed into singular nouns in Arabic, the choice is discussed and further studies on the matter is suggested, since it is beyond the scope to account for the inconsistent use of plural and singular when translating “men” and “women” into Arabic. *Barnāmaj* in the TT is placed in the beginning. To construct meaning, the words must be reorganised, making it structurally functional because English and Arabic are structured in different ways, and it would obscure the meaning to not rearrange the corresponding units when aiming at a somewhat equivalent message. “Gender” in “gender equality” is translated into “*al-jinsayn*”, and is thus based on the root j-n-s, here expressed in the grammatical dual of the singular noun *jins*, as of why it is categorised in this study as a solution that through grammar confirms gender-binarism. Further, the noun + noun compound, here considered as the MWE “gender equality” is transformed into a construction of three words “*al-musāwāh*” (singular female noun) + “*bayn*” (preposition) + “*al-jinsayn*” (dual masculine noun).

Jakobson stated that languages differ in what they *must* convey and not what they *may* convey. (2004:116). That Arabic must indicate grammatical gender in nouns, adjectives and verbs, and that it operates with grammatical duality whereas English does not, is an unavoidable difference between English and Arabic. In Arabic, we find a grammatical dual in addition to plural and singular, whereas English only distinguishes between the two latter. Concerned with Russian

which also operates with grammatical duality, Jakobson mentions the issue of translating from SLs not operating with the dual form, such as English, into languages which do, e.g. Russian, and in our case, Arabic. If translating the English: “she has sisters” (modification of Jakobson’s example with brothers), into a language distinguishing between dual and plural, we have to choose if we want to present the “she” as having two sisters or more than two sisters for Arabic readers. Sometimes the translator can judge what choice is the closest equivalent to the message as a whole based on the context. A basis for the decision could be somewhere in the same text or it could be inferred by logic, or maybe even intertextuality. This is relevant in an English-Arabic translation of “gender”, since choosing the dual reflects an interpretation of “gender” which only covers the heteronormative genders, female and male. I would argue that a more formal translation of “gender equality” in both form and meaning would opt for a singular equivalent to “gender”. This could be considered as a less functional choice since Arabic must choose between singular, dual, and plural when translating. A heteronormative perception of what the word “gender” is in the real world would lead to the dual as a natural or even logic choice, which is comprehensible for the majority of Arabic readers. The translator could choose not to use the dual, even though, arguably, the perception of gender in most contexts in the world is heteronormative, i.e. binary. Further, considering the polysemous nature of “*jins*” in singular could add confusion. It should be noted that if a singular, i.e., “*jins*” was chosen, the preposition “*bayn*” (between) would not be an acceptable solution because “equality between (one) gender” would not make sense logically, and some other construction should be made. *Musawah*’s translator(s) might have considered the chosen construction as more natural than anyone with “*jins*”, or they chose “*jinsayn*” due to the polysemous nature of “*jins*”. However, they could have opted for another solution, if wanting to avoid the heteronormative binarism inherent in the grammatical dual, yet the functional equivalence constructed by opting for “*al-musāwāh bayna-l-jinsayn*”, could be a strategic communication strategy since the message. In two cases

“gender equality” appears in the ST and not in the TT: Example (1) is not translated into TT 2016. The other is example (2), where a corresponding paragraph can be identified, but in it, “gender” as a term is avoided:

- (2) At the same time, it is important to recognize that increasing women’s labour participation rates will not automatically lead to gender equality in the workforce, in society, or in families (ST 2018: 34)

على أنه من الأهمية بمكان أن نعي، في الوقت نفسه، أن زيادة معدلات مشاركة المرأة في سوق العمل لن تؤدي تلقائياً إلى المساواة في قوة العمل، أو في المجتمع، أو داخل الأسرة (TT 2018: 34)

Back translation: *It is important to recognise at the same time that increasing the woman’s participation rates in the labour market will not automatically lead to equality in the workforce, or in society, or in the family.*

The term “gender” is not transferred into this paragraph, but arguably the message can in this transformation be decoded as quite similar to the ST due to the heteronormative world created in both texts. Logically “men” must then be the other part of the workforce, and “gender” is interpreted as covering women and men. This tendency, dismissing the term “gender”, transforming it into specific gender/sex categories, in this case “the women’s” is an example of functional equivalence between STs and TTs, both semantically and structurally.

Besides from cases where “gender” in “gender equality” is transformed into one or more identity categories as in example (2), or in TT 2016 where the note on funding is not translated, there is another occasion in the data where “gender equality” is not translated into “*al-musāwāh bayna-l-jinsayn*”, but here it is “equality” that has another constructed equivalent. Instead of “*musāwāh*” (مساواة), “equality” is in this one case translated into “*tasāwī*” (تساوي) in an *idāfa* construction with “*al-jinsayn*” (ST 2018/TT 2018: 57/58).

4.2.2. “Gender justice” and “gendered”

Example (3) shows how “gender justice” is translated, revealing that it belongs to the same tendency as “gender equality”. The derivative “gendered” appears in the same paragraph from ST/TT 2018: 9, but “gendered” will be addressed again in section 4.6. “Gender justice” appears once in ST 2018, example (3), and three times in ST03 2017, and is translated in the same way.

(3) Therefore, when tackling the issue of family well-being and gender justice within families as understood in Muslim legal tradition, the question is not simply who has rights and who does not, but rather the impacts of hierarchical rights on different family members, the burdens entailed in the gendered responsibilities, and the implications of gendered identities arising from this legal framework. (ST 2018: 9).

وبالتالي، فعند تناول قضية صاح أمر الأسرة والعدالة بين الجنسين داخل الأسرة، كما يفهمها التراث الفقهي الإسلامي، فالسؤال ليس من الذي له الحق في ماذا ومن الذي ليس له الحق، بل ما هي آثار الحقوق التراتبية على مختلف أعضاء الأسرة، والأعباء المترتبة على المسؤوليات المصنفة نوعياً (جندياً)، وانعكاسات هذا الإطار القانوني على هويات النوع (TT 2018: 9)

Back translation: *Therefore, when tackling the issue of family well-being and justice between the two genders/sexes within the family, as the Islamic legal heritage understands them, then the question is not who has the right to what and who does not have the right, but what the impacts of hierarchical rights are on the different family members, and the burdens regulated by classified gendered responsibilities (gendered), and this legal frame is repercussions of gender identities.*

The back translation illustrates how the conceptual meaning of “gender” is interpreted in “gender justice” and in “gendered” since the different lexical and grammatical choices indicate that the interpretation of the word “gender” in “gender justice” and the derivative “gendered” are different if based on the translation into Arabic, even in the same text and within a few lines. “Gender justice” is in English constructed as a noun compound of two nouns: gender + justice. In *Musawah*’s translation it is translated into “*al-‘adāla bayna-l-jinsayn*”, meaning that, as with “gender equality”, the Arabic reader would not necessarily know that the TT refers to the relatively well-established feminist term “gender justice”. However, for a reader unfamiliar with

the concept, it is arguably easier to comprehend “justice between the two sexes/genders” than the more abstract, “gender justice”, since “*jinsayn*” is already a specification and interpretation of who the “gender justice” concerns, namely men and women. “Gender justice” is a relatively well established term within feminist development discourses, though what it means exactly is unsettled (see e.g. Forti 2018). It is not impossible that readers familiar with this term in English, would make the connection when reading “justice between the two sexes/genders” in Arabic, but arguably the reference is difficult if only reading the TT without the ST. Some might interpret “*jins*” and hence “*jinsayn*”, as “sex” and “sexes”. The example, as other examples such as example (1) illustrates, as Godard has emphasised, that language is not transparent: “/.../the English ‘yes’ is not the same as the French ‘oui’ because there is also the French ‘si’” (1989: 48). Similarly, “*al-‘adāla bayna-l-jinsayn*” is not the same as “gender justice”. Still, this solution can still be considered as an equivalent in the context. Whether it is the closest equivalent will depend on the context.. Grammatically, the Arabic solution is constructed by a definite singular noun “*al-‘adāla*” + preposition “*bayn*” + noun in definite dual form “*al-jinsayn*”. This can be described as having some formal, but mainly functional features in structure and meaning. Considering both form and meaning, the generic meaning of the English “gender justice” is kept since the definite article in Arabic can be used to indicate generic terms or concepts. Hence, the singular noun “*al-‘adāla*” is grammatically definite in Arabic though it is not in the English ST, making this word functional grammatically but formal in terms of meaning. Recognising that exact equivalence between words do not exist, neither inter-, nor intralinguistically, “*al-‘adāla*” and “justice” are not identical, but considering them as close equivalents is not problematic. However, it should be noted that a fundamental difference between English and Arabic is that nouns (as well as verbs and adjectives) in Arabic are grammatically gendered, classified as either feminine or masculine. Jakobson has argued that this affects the way we understand the meaning of words (2004:117). Though it could be relevant elsewhere, this discussion will be avoided here,

since, it is not relevant in this specific example, and secondly this study is limited to focus on the concept of “gender” unrelated to grammatical gender though it recognises that a feminist strategy can be to manipulate what is considered patriarchal grammar. (Flotow 1997).

The derivative “gendered” appears 15 times in ST 2018, once in ST03 2017, and twice in ST 2016. In the TTs of the two latter, “gendered” is dismissed. “Gendered” is in (3), as elsewhere, not translated into the same root as “gender justice”, as of why I made a distinction in the back translation. “Gendered” appears twice in example (3), which is why we address it briefly in this section, however it will be addressed again in section 4.6. When translating “gendered” in TT 2018, the Arabic root opted for consistently in this text is n-w-‘, making it different from the one used for “gender” in e.g. “gender justice” and “gender equality” in the same text, even though one should think that they hold the same conceptual meaning. In “gendered responsibilities” example (3), the loan word created from the quadrilateral root j-n-d-r is added in parenthesis. This can at best help the reader, if familiar with the English concept of “gender”, to understand the contextual meaning of the polysemous *naw’iyyān* (نوعيا), here in accusative nunation of the adjective, derived from the root n-w-‘ (نوع). The loan word is also in accusative, “*jindariyyān*”, demonstrating its potential for “arabification”. Further, “*jindariyyān*” contributes to the reader’s understanding of the meaning of the noun *an-naw’* when used in the following *idāfa* construction: “*huwiyyāt an-naw’*” (هويات النوع), because it previously appeared in the same paragraph.

4.2.3. “Gender discrimination”, “gender gap”, and “gender parity”

The root j-n-s expressed in the dual noun, “*jinsayn*”, is used in other constructions than “gender equality” and “gender justice”. The following constructions are translated with this grammatical binarism, if “gender” is not dismissed: “Gender gap”, “gender discrimination”, and “gender

parity”. “Gender discrimination” appears once (ST 2018: 8), and is translated into “*at-tamyīz bayna-l-jinsayn*”:

(4) /.../gender discrimination/.../ (ST 2018: 8)

(TT 2018:8)/.../ التمييز بين الجنسين /.../

Back translation: *discrimination between the two genders/sexes*

Similarly, “gender” in “gender parity” (ST/TT 2018: 34/34 and 53/54) is translated into “*al-jinsayn*”, but “parity” is not translated in the same way:

(5)/.../gender parity/.../ (ST 2018: 34 and 53)

(TT 2018: 34)/.../ مساواة كاملة بين الجنسين /.../ (5a)

(TT 2018: 54)/.../ التكافؤ بين الجنسين /.../ (5b)

Back translation of 5a: *full equality between the two genders/sexes*

Back translation of 5b: *parity between the two genders/sexes*

In (5a) *musāwāh kāmila* seems to be constructed as equivalent to “parity” even though *musāwāh* elsewhere, including in the name of the movement, is equivalent to “equality”. Suddenly, in (5b), the verbal noun “*takāf’u*” is constructed as equivalent to “parity”. However, the translation of “parity” or “equality” is not so relevant to the purpose of this study. The relevance is only clear if we consider the wholeMWE of “gender parity” which is translated in two different ways in TT 2018, even though “gender” is translated in the same way in both cases, and in that sense is a part of the same tendency: Gender-binarism through grammatical dual form.

This tendency is also traceable in translations of “gender gap”, which occurred six times, also only in ST 2018 (pp. 29, 30, 31, 38, 53, 54). The preferred solution by *Musawah* is to render “gender” in this concept as “*jinsayn*”, exemplified in (6):

(6) /.../gender gap/.../ (ST 2018: 30, 31, 38, 54)

(TT 2018: 30, 31, 39 and 54) /.../ الفجوة بين الجنسين /.../

Back translation: *the gap between the two genders/sexes*

In another example, the Arabic translation restructures the words in the concept when described by an adjective in English, since in one of the cases, ST 2018 writes:

(7)/.../large gender gap. (ST 2018: 53)

/.../ فجوة كبيرة بين الجنسين. (TT 2018: 54)

Back translation: *a large gap between the two genders/sexes*

Here, the adjective *kabīra* follows, and agrees with the noun it describes, *fajwa*, in terms of grammatical gender and number as it should according to Arabic grammar rules. It thus forms the indefinite construction “a large gap” (between the two sexes/genders). That the structure is functionally changed because “*kabīra*” is added between “*fajwa*” and “*bayna-l-jinsayn*” has the consequence that the noun compound, “gender gap”, arguably an entity in English, is not rendered as an entity in the same way in the TT because the adjective is added. However, in this paper it is considered to belong to the same tendency as example (6), since “gender” is the main focus, and this is translated into “*jinsayn*” in both cases.

There is one occasion where “gender” in “gender gap” is transformed into identity categories:

(8) Around the world, the gender gap between Muslim girls and boys in education is closing, (ST 2018: 29)

يتزايد تقلص فجوة التعليم بين الفتيات والفتية من المسلمين حول العالم، (TT 2018: 29)

Back translation: *The educational gap between Muslim girls and boys around the world is increasingly shrinking,*

This is another functional translations of “gender” here rendered as an “educational gap between girls and boys”: *fajwa al-ta'lim bayna-l-fatayāt wa-l-fitya*.

4.3. Varying Arabic roots in translation of MWEs

This section provides examples of those MWEs that are translated by means of varying Arabic roots.

4.3.1. “Gender relations”, “gender roles and rights”, and “gender responsibilities”

Before addressing other tendencies, three more uses of “*jinsayn*” are provided in (9) and (10)

(9)/.../gender relations/.../ (ST03 2017: 2; ST 2018: 12, 13, 50)

(TT 2018: 12, 13, 50; TT03 2017: 2) /.../العلاقات بين الجنسين/.../

Back translation: *relations between the two genders/sexes*

In ST/TT 02 2016 “gender” in “gender relations” is also translated by means of the dual form “*jinsayn*”, but here, *Musawah*’s Arabic equivalent for the adjective “egalitarian” is placed between “relations” and “between the two genders” in the translation of the concept:

(10) /.../towards egalitarian gender relations in the family and society (ST02 2016: 3)

(TT02 2016: 3) نحو علاقات متساوية بين الجنسين داخل الأسرة والمجتمع

Back translation: *towards egalitarian relations between the two genders/sexes in the family and society*.

This example from TT 2016 illustrates how restructuring of the words makes the word order different from the ST to the TT when an adjective is added to the concept. Structural functional equivalence is constructed by inserting the adjective *mutasāwiyya* between the plural noun “‘*alāqāt*” and the preposition “*bayna*”. Hence *mutasāwiyya* agrees with “‘*alāqāt*” in grammatical gender and number, and the two becomes noun-adjective compositions in the TT. This transfers a similar message of “egalitarian relations”. The specific word “gender” which is the focus here is despite this small difference translated similarly in (9), and can be ascribed to the tendency of gender-binarism through grammatical duality.

In examples (9) and (10) “gender relations” is translated into a construction similar to “gender equality”, “gender justice”, “gender discrimination”, and “gender parity”, though an adjective is added in (10), making it slightly different structurally. Only in case in TT 2018 “gender relations” is translated using another Arabic equivalent::

(11) /.../ gender relations /.../ (ST 2018: 3)

(TT 2018:3)/.../ علاقات النوع /.../

Back translation: *gender/kind/type/genre relations*

The change in root from j-n-s to n-w-‘, constructs a different Arabic equivalent to “gender relations” here, i.e., “*‘alāqāt an-naw’*” instead of “*al-‘alāqāt bayna-l-jinsayn*”, as in (9).

This root n-w-‘ used widely in UN translations, and as mentioned in section 2.4., it is generally popular in development work and in the social sciences. However, it is not necessarily in itself implying social construction unless it is followed by the adjective *al-ijtimā‘ī* (social). As Kamal notes, about *naw’*:

/.../is used to distinguish between males and females, and it combines both biological and cultural characteristics as being the foundations or factors determining the social status of male and female, as well as the role each of them play in society (Kamal 2008: 262).

It also means, kind, type or form, and is used for species in biology, and it can mean genre, e.g., in literary studies. Considering Kamal’s definition of the meaning, it can also be an “equivalent” to the English word “sex”, which is correlated to “gender” in meaning, but is often perceived to have a meaning restricted more to biological differences. No matter how it is interpreted and translated, it is a fact that *Musawah* in TT 2018 constructs *an-naw’* as equivalent to both “gender”, and the related “sex”. Some translations of “gender” into “*an-naw’*” is followed by “*al-jindar*”, which is never the case when translating “sex”. However, “*al-jindar*” does not always follow “*an-naw’*”, and hence, there is no consistent distinction in TT 2018. Before providing other examples of translations by means of the root n-w-‘, we turn to one more translation of “gender relations”:

(12) /.../gender relations /.../ (ST 2016: 2,4,9, 12 and 13)

(TT 2016: 2, 4, 9,12 and 13) العلاقات بين الرجال والنساء

Back translation: *relations between men and women*

In two cases the adjective “hierarchical” precedes “gender relations” (ST 2016: 2, 4), and in the TT, the equivalent “*at-tarātubiyya*” (تراتبية) is added between “*al’alāqāt*” and “*bayna-l-rijāl wa-l-nisā’*” in the TT (TT 2016: 2, 4), forming a noun-adjective construction with *al’alāqāt*. Since this is similar to the solution opted for in (10), where the adjective *mutasāwiyya* was added, another example of this is not included, because the focus of this study is on “gender”. The important thing to note about example (12) is that the “gender” in this case is dismissed in the Arabic translation of “gender relations”: *al’alāqāt bayna-r-rijāl wa-n-nisā’*. Here, *Musawah* in the Arabic version refers to the more specific categories of “men and women” instead of “gender”. It should be noted that the plural form of the nouns “women” and “men”, is used. In the section “Future research” in Chapter 5, we return to this point, and argue that it is something that can be considered a feminist strategy, but should be explored further.

Now it will be showed that the same logic in *Musawah*’s interpretation of “gender” is similar in “gender roles and rights” and “gender responsibilities” in example (13) and (14)

(13) /.../gender roles and rights/.../ (ST03 2017: 2)

(TT03 2017: 2)/.../ أدوار وحقوق الجنسين

Back translation: *roles and rights of the two genders/sexes*

(14) /.../gender responsibilities/.../(ST 2018: 3)

(TT 2018:3)/.../ مسؤوليات الجنسين

Back translation: *responsibilities of the two genders/sexes*

Musawah’s translations of (10), (13), and (14), into: “*al-’alāqāt bayna-l-jinsayn*”, “*adwār wa-ḥuqūq al-jinsayn*”, and “*masu’ūliyyāt al-jinsayn*”, shows the same logic in *Musawah*’s interpretation of “gender” and a similar functional translation strategy as in the translations of “gender equality”, “gender justice”, “gender gap”, “gender discrimination”, and “gender parity”.

Though “gender roles and rights” in example (13) is a longer construction where “gender” refers to two other concepts, namely “roles” and “rights”, it can be divided into two parts, translated by means of the *iḍāfa* construction in Arabic, which is also the case with “gender responsibilities” in (14). Both “*adwār wa-ḥuqūq*” in (13) and “*masu’ūliyyāt*” in (14) forms the first part in the *iḍāfa* and are both followed by “*al-jinsayn*”. Though the word order is different, these translations’ formal feature is that most of the individual units are rendered in the Arabic as in the English regarding word class and numeric form - except for “*al-jinsayn*” which is transformed into the Arabic dual form. As argued in discussions of other translations of “gender” into “*al-jinsayn*”, the reader would not necessarily connote the concept of “gender” when reading the translations: “*al-’alāqāt bayna-l-jinsayn*”(10), “*adwār wa-ḥuqūq al-jinsayn*” (13), and “*masu’ūliyyāt al-jinsayn*” (14). Arguably, this is also the case with the translations of “gender relations” into: *al-’alāqāt bayna-r-rijāl wa-n-nisā’*. Regarding, *’alāqāt an-naw’*, the polysemous “*an-naw’*” evoke the notion of “gender” to readers familiar with development and human rights discourses, or social sciences, but could in other contexts be interpreted as “sex” rather than “gender” in addition to “kind”, “type”, and “sort”. “*An-naw’*”. That *Musawah* in two cases in TT 2018 has translated “sex” into “*an-naw’*”, as will be shown in examples (37), makes it difficult to decide if/how it distinguish between “sex” and “gender”, and also how *Musawah*/the translator(s) distinguish between the meanings of the roots n-w-’, and j-n-s. Following section show that the relatively new loan word “*al-jindar*” is sometimes used with the root n-w-’.

4.3.2. “Gender roles” , “spousal (gender) rights”, and “gender stereotypes”

In (13), “gender roles and rights” was translated by means of “*jinsayn*” (TT 2018). This is not the case with “gender roles” and “gender roles and identities”. In example (15) the root j-n-d-r is used twice to form different word classes:

(15) b. Rights, responsibilities, and gender roles

Islamic jurisprudence and related modern family laws grapple with how rights and responsibilities are interconnected and their implications with regard to gender roles and identities. (ST 2018: 9)

ب. الحقوق والمسؤوليات وأدوار النوع (الجنس)
يشترك الفقه الإسلامي و ما إتصل به من قوانين الأسرة المسلمة الحديثة مع الارتباط الوثيق بين حقوق و مسؤوليات الزوجين و
إنعكاسات ذلك على أدوار و هويات الرجل و المرأة الجنسانية
(TT 2018: 8)

Back translation: *b. Rights and responsibilities and gender/kind/sort/type/form roles (gender)*
Islamic fiqh clashes with what is connected to modern Muslim family laws which is related to the reality between rights and responsibilities for the two spouses while this is also reflected in the gendered roles and identities for the man and the woman.

The quadrilateral root j-n-d-r, the new Arabisation of the English “gender” is used twice, as a noun in parentheses after the second part of a definite *idāfa* construction, “*adwār an-naw’ (al-jindar)*”, as an equivalent to “gender roles”, and as an adjective describing the identities of men and women in “*adwār wa-huwīyat ar-rajul wa-l-mar’a al-jindariyya*”, showing again how it gets assimilated into the Arabic language, at least on a formal level. Whether accepted on a semantic level is likely to depend on the context and audience. Using the development word and the loan word together as equivalent to “gender” can be seen as an attempt to communicate the conceptual meaning of the English “gender” accurately. Further, this solution does not grammatically reflect binarism in the corresponding words, but the discourse as a whole still does.

In “unequal spousal (and more generally gender)” the word “gender” is also avoided in TT 2016 which tends to be concrete about the identity categories it addresses:

(16) /.../unequal spousal (and more generally gender) rights within the family and society.
(ST 2016: 5)

/.../ غياب المساواة في الحقوق بين الزوجين في أسرة والمجتمع (وغياب المساواة في الأمور المتعلقة بالنساء بصفة عامة). (TT 2016: 5)

Back translation: *absence of equality in the rights between the two spouses in the family and the society (and absence of equality in matters related to women in general).*

“Gender” in this construction, is similar to the translation of “gender relations”, also in ST/TT 2016 avoided. In general a functional translation is opted for, since “unequal spousal (and more generally gender) rights” is translated by describing the absence of equality in cases connected to women in general: “*ġīyāb al-musāwāh*”, in rights between “the two spouses”: “*az-zawjayn*”, and “*ġīyāb al-musāwāh fī-l-umūr al-muta‘alliqa bi-n-nisā’*”.

“Gender stereotypes” is also translated in various ways, but is in TT 2018 quite consistently translated into *aş-şuwar an-namaṭiyya lil-naw’* (ST/TT: 3/4 ,4/4, 5/5, 13/13, 20/19, twice on 24/24, twice on 53/54, three times on 54/55, twice on 55/56), as in (18):

(17) /.../gender stereotypes/.../ (ST 2018: twice on 4)

(TT 2018: 3,4) الصور النمطية للنوع

Back translation: *the rigid pictures of gender/kind/type/sort/form*

Firstly, “gender stereotyping”, “*at-tawṣīfāt an-namaṭiyya lil-jindar*” is translated differently in TT04 2017 than “gender stereotypes” in TT 2018, though the use of *an-namaṭiyya* is consistent. Further, it shows that the only time gender appears in ST04 2017, it is solved through the loan word solution “*al-jindar*”, which in itself is quite a formal, yet as an entity it is translated functionally since the two word concept becomes a noun + adjective, “*at-tawṣīfāt an-namaṭiyya*” + the preposition “*li*” (لِ) + loan word noun “*al-jindar*”. It is remarkable that there is no explanation or definition of the loan word, which suggests that the targeted reader is expected to be familiar with the English concept, even though the knowledge brief genre, being short and limited in its amount of information, has the potential to reach an audience not as eager to read long publication about women’s and gender rights, and hence could have an educative potential regarding the spreading of feminist or women’s rights ideas to less obvious circles, but it is not necessarily what *Musawah* has in mind. This author’s knowledge about the readership and its use of the knowledge building documents is limited to anecdotal experience from my work at KVINFORM, which is a Danish knowledge centre working specifically on gender and women’s

rights with partners sharing this aim, and hence these actors are already familiar with the term “gender”, but the discussion in Chapter 2 showed that this does not guarantee that they all interpret it in a similar way, and hence, a definition would not be misplaced.

TT 2016 does not use the dual form “*jinsayn*” to denote “gender”. “*Jinsayn*” is used once in this text, to denote “sexes”, and not “gender” (ST/TT 2016:5/5). *Musawah*’s translators have in this text often chosen to specify further on what genders exact (or sexes, depending on preferred terminology) are addressed by opting for “*ar-rijāl wa-n-nisā*”, which is a closer equivalent to “men and women” in a back translation than to “gender”. Further, in example (20) from ST/TT 2016, it is noticeable that the plural forms of men and women are used in Arabic instead of the singular as elsewhere in the data, for example in example (15) from ST/TT 2018.

(18) /.../, rather than on fixed hierarchical divisions or gender stereotypes. (ST 2016: 12)

/.../، وليس على تقسيمات تراتبية ثابتة، أو أفكار نمطية مقولبة عن الرجال والنساء
(TT 2016: 13)

Back translation: *and not on fixed hierarchical divisions, or rigid, molded thoughts regarding men and women.*

Here, the English MWE, the singular noun gender + the plural noun, stereotypes, has the correspondent: *afkār namaṭīya muqawlaba ‘an ar-rijāl wa-l-nisā’*. The past participle “*muqawlaba*” was not present in standard dictionaries such as Wehr, but since it is a derived from *qawlab* (قَوْلَبَ), meaning, among other things, “mold” or “form” or “model” (Wehr 1979: 785) it can be translated into “formed” or “molded”, or maybe even “stereotyped” in this context. In any case, the construction of equivalence in this example is on the structural level functional, considering that six words in the TT corresponds to two in the ST. But does it on a semantic level still construct a similar message in the TT? The answer can be either no, or, to some extent, and the latter is what I would argue. The reason is that the text as a whole seems to understand gender as women and men. In that sense, the modification does not change the message

fundamentally. However, it does emphasise the categories “women” and “men” more, which is a recurring feature for TT 2016. This could be criticised if this publication’s purpose is to inform about the concept of “gender”, but this is not the case. Rather it is to provide arguments for equality between men and women in Muslim marriages and families. It should be noted, that “gender stereotypes” also appears in two other cases with a similar but not identical translation into: *al-afkār an-namaṭīya ‘an ar-rijāl wa-n-nisā’* (الأفكار النمطية عن الرجال والنساء) (TT 2016: 7, 12), i.e., almost the same but without *muqawlaba*, and with definite articles on the plural noun, *al-afkār* and its appertaining adjective *an-namaṭīyya*.

4.4. MWEs with “gender” translated into n-w-‘

Before returning to “gendered” which already appeared in example (3), the MWEs often translated by the root n-w-‘ are addressed. This root is often used when translating the derivative “gendered”, especially in TT 2018, as is shown clearly in the tables provided in Chapter 5.

4.4.1. “Gender norms”, “gender studies” and “gender lines”

In some MWEs, “gender norms”. “gender studies” and “gender lines” the *n-w-‘* root is mainly used to render “gender” in Arabic, e.g. in:

(19) /.../ gender norms /.../ (ST 2018 41, 50; ST03 2017: 1)

(TT 2018: 42, 51; TT03 2017: 1) /.../ معايير النوع /.../

Back translation: *standards of gender*

“Gender studies” (ST/TT:55/56) and “gender lines” only appear once, and we do not know if *Musawah* would repeat the translation they opted for in the exclusive cases. It can be said though, that the translations belong to the pattern where , “gender” is translated into “*an-naw*”:

(20) /.../gender studies/.../ (ST 2018: 55)

/.../ دراسات النوع /.../ (TT 2018: 56)

Back translation: *studies of gender*

The translation of “gender lines” is functionally solved, and “gender” here becomes “*asās an-naw*”:

(21) Community institutions can train both men and women on basic household skills, caregiving skills, and household management techniques, simultaneously emphasising how such responsibilities can be divided equally instead of along gender lines. (ST 2018: 55)

وهنا تستطيع المؤسسات المجتمعية تدريب الرجال والنساء، على حد سواء، على المهارات المنزلية الأساسية، ومهارات الرعاية، وتقنيات إدارة شؤون الأسرة، مع التأكيد، في الوقت نفسه، على أن تلك المسؤوليات يمكن تقسيمها بالتساوي بين الطرفين، بدلاً من تقسيمها على أساس النوع (TT 2018: 56)

Back translation: *And here, societal institutions can train both men and women alike in basic household skills, and caregiving skills, and the family’s technical household matters, and for sure, at the same time, that equal division of these (suffix hā=these refers to responsibilities) between the two parties is possible instead of basing their division on gender.*

The same root, root n-w-^٤, is used in the translation of “gender bias”, but the difference us that “gender” is turned from noun in English to an adjective in the Arabic;

(22) *Physical care (hadanah¹¹), however, has generally always had a gender bias towards women, /.../ (ST 2018: 19)*

أما الحضانة، فقد اتسمت في العادة بالانحياز النوعي تجاه المرأة، /.../ (TT 2018: 19)

Back translation: *Regarding al-ḥadāna, it has in general been characterised by gendered/sexed bias towards the woman.*

¹¹ This is how the word appears in the English *Musawah* publication, and therefore I have not transliterated this word according to Hans Wehr’s system.

Here the noun + noun concept “gender bias” is equivalent to “*inḥīyāz an-naw‘ī*”. The informal aspect of this is mainly structural, i.e., the change of word classes. In example (25) it is shown that this is not the only time the noun “gender” becomes an adjective in Arabic, and that “*an-naw‘ī*” is not the only word used for this in TT 2018, since the loan word “*al-jindariyya*” is used in (23).

4.5. Loan word of the root j-n-d-r

This section shows how the root j-n-d-r as equivalent to “gender” in practice enters into *Musawah*’s Arabic translation as a loan word both as adjective and noun. The first, “gender roles and identities” is a longer construction than most of the other examples, since “gender” in (25) refers to both “roles” and “identities”:

(23)/.../gender roles and identities (ST 2018: 9)

(TT 2018: 8) /.../أدوار و هويات الرجل و المرأة الجندرية/...

Back translation: /.../gendered roles and identities of the man and the woman /.../

In (23), the loan word root j-n-d-r to render “gender” is used. In many cases it is considered as a formal feature. However, considering that “*al-jindariyya*” is an adjective describing men’s and women’s “gender roles” and “identities” I argue that a formal back translation would use the derivative adjective “gendered”, while noting that from ST to TT in this case, the masculine singular noun gender in a construction with roles and identities became a feminine adjective in the Arabic, since congruence between plural non-human nouns and their adjectives in Arabic grammar is created by writing the adjective in the feminine form, also when the noun is in masculine. That “man” and “woman” are added in the TT, shows an explanatory strategy

specifying that it is men's and women's roles and identities, and not some undefined gender-identity which I argue contributes to popularising the narrative on equality and justice in Islam while still transferring the term and conceptual understanding of gender as social construction, or a process, though here as an adjective rather than an actual simple concept.

4.5.1. "Gender-sensitive" and "gender-neutral"

The compound nouns "gender-sensitive" (ST/TT 2018: 52/53; ST/TT03 2017: 3/3), and "gender-neutral" (ST03 2017: 2) are translated through similar strategies though they occurred in two different texts. The former occurred twice in the same page in ST 2018, and once in ST03 2017, which is also the text in which we find the only occurrence of the latter "gender-neutral". Both the constructions are translated into Arabic by means of the loan word "*al-jindar*". (TT03 2017: 2 and 3), as we see in:

(24)/.../ gender-neutral laws, (ST 2017: 2)

(TT03 2017:2) /.../ القانون المحايدة تجاه الجندر ,

Back translation: *the laws neutral towards gender*

This translation, "*al-qanūn al-muḥāyada tujāha al-jindar*" is formal in the sense that it uses the loan word "*al-jindar*", but structurally functional, as we have seen elsewhere. In the same text, TT03 2017, this tendency of using "*al-jindar*" is strong. For example, it is also used in a similar construction when translating "gender-sensitive" (ST03/TT03 2017: 3/3)

(25) /.../gender-sensitive/.../ (ST03 2017: 3)

(TT03 2017: 3) /.../ حساسة تجاه الجندر /.../

Back translation: *sensitivity towards gender*

These two are translated through a similar strategy, and both construct quite a formal equivalence since *muḥāyada* can be back translated into neutral and *ḥasāsa* into sensitive. The main

difference is not in the meaning but in the structure since the preposition *tujāha* (تجاه) is added in the TT in both cases. However, in another publication, TT 2018, “gender-sensitive” is translated differently. here, the root n-w-‘ is used instead of j-n-d-r:

(26) /.../gender-sensitive/.../ (ST 2018: 52)

(TT 2018: 53)/.../حساسية تجاه النوع

Back translation: *sensitivity towards gender/kind/sort/type*

We cannot know why *Musawah* in TT 2018 chose and the translation then is “*ḥasāsa tujāha-n-naw*”, but generally, n-w-‘ appears in various constructions in TT 2018, but not elsewhere in the empirical data.

4.6. The derivative “gendered”

“Gendered” was the only derivative of “gender” occurring in the empirical data. It occurred in ST 2018 15 times as (*ila naw*’ (ST/TT: 2/2; 45/46) “*an-naw*’” (ST/TT: 9/9) “*lil-naw*’” (ST/TT: 11/11)”’*an an-naw*’*iyya*” (ST/TT :21/21; 44/45) ‘*ala asās an-naw*’ (ST/TT: 40/41) “*hasab an-naw*’” (ST/TT: twice on 44/45) “‘*an an-naw*’” (ST/TT: 46/47) “‘*ala an-naw*’” (ST/TT: 4/4; 16/15; 46/47) “*an-naw*’*ī (al-jindarī)*” (ST/TT: twice on 9/9). In TT03 2017 and TT 2016 it was dismissed as a term, but the constructionist idea about men and women’s identities was maintained.

Example (27) shows “gendered”, translated through “*an-naw*’*ī*”, as an adjective followed by “*al-jindarī*”, another adjective, from the loan word “*al-jindar*”:

(27) Similarly, women’s legal rights to spousal maintenance and to child custody are interconnected with their assumed gendered roles primarily as sexual partners to their husbands and caregivers to their children. (ST 2018: 9)

وبالمثل، يجري الربط بين حقوق المرأة القانونية في النفقة وحضانة الأبناء وبين ما اعتبر دورها النوعي (الجندي) المفترض كشريكة جنسية للزوج ورعاية لأبنائها (TT 2018: 9)

Back translation: *For example, there is a link between the woman's legal rights in disbursement and child custody and what is regarded as her presumed gendered (gendered) role as sexual partner to the husband and caregiver to her children.*

“Gendered” is rendered through two roots in the same translation, namely n-w-‘, followed by j-n-d-r in parenthesis, making it clear that *Musawah* here refers to English derivative of the concept of “gender”. Thus, the Arabic reader is explicitly guided in their interpretation of the polysemous *an-naw’ī*. There are many functional features in this rather long example, but focus is on the derivative of “gender”, i.e., “gendered”. This use of the new loan word, “*al-jindarī*” is a formal feature, and can be described as a foreign element in the text pointing at its origin in the English language. Regarding word class, the adjective function is kept, since n-w-‘ is here expressed in the definite masculine *nisba*-adjective “*an-naw’ī*”, and the same is the case with “*al-jindarī*”. However, there are also functional features: “Gendered” is an adjective describing “roles” in English, but in Arabic, “roles” is transformed into the singular “*dawr*”, meaning “role”. It is made definite in Arabic since the suffix, “*hā*” is attached. Since there must be agreement in a noun-adjective construction in Arabic, “gendered” is translated into *an-naw’ī* (*al-jindarī*). In any case, the adjective use of j-n-d-r here shows its flexibility and adaptability in Arabic linguistic norms which it now obeys.

A tendency is identified based on all occurrences of “gendered”, since it is often, especially in TT 2018 constructed by the root n-w-‘, either adjectively (7) or as a noun following the preposition *li* (ل) or ‘*an* (عن). These prepositions indicate that it is something from the outside shaping the subject, and hence could imply a social construction as will be shown:

(28) /.../gendered stereotypes /.../ (ST 2018: 11)

(TT 2018: 11)/.../الصور النمطية للنوع

Back translation: *the stereotyped (or rigid) images of the gender/genre/type/form/kind.*

“Gendered” in “gendered stereotypes” is translated into Arabic in translation “*aş-şuwar an-namaṭiyya lil-naw’*”. We find the exact same solution in the semantically similar English MWE “gender stereotypes” (ST 2018: 4, 5, 13, 24, 46, 53, 54, and 56 and TT: 3, 4, 5, 13, 24, 47, 53, 54, 55, and 56), though in one single case, *al-muta’alliqa bi* is inserted between “*an-namaṭiyya*” and “*an-naw’*”(ST/TT 2018: 20/19). The other case where “gendered stereotypes” occur we find the same root n-w-’ and a preposition used as equivalent to “gendered” (ST 2018:46/TT 2018: 47). Again, “gendered” is solved with the root, but this time, the correspondent to “stereotypes” is *at-taṣawwūrāt an-namaṭiyya* (التصورات النمطية عن النوع) instead of *aş-şuwar an-namaṭiyya*, which consequently can be back translated to stereotypical/rigid imaginations/conceptions of “gender” rather than images.

In ST03 2017, “gendered” appears once when *Musawah* criticises the “protectionist” approach to gender equality for not being substantial enough and accordingly bad because it assumes innate differences between men and women based on nature. It is stated:

(29) Instead, based on gendered ideas about the ‘nature’ of women and men this approach says there are defined roles for men and women. (ST03 2017: 1)

إذا يستند أصحاب هذا الاتجاه إلى أفكار متعلقة بطبيعة المرأة والرجل ليقولوا بوجود أدوار محددة لكل منهما
(TT03 2017: 1)

Back translation: *Indeed, this orientation relies on ideas connected to “the nature” of the woman and the man, and those holding it say that there are roles ascribed to both of them.*

Here, “gendered” is not translated through j-n-d-r, n-w-’, or -j-n-s. Instead, “gendered” as a word is dismissed maybe because the idea is considered to be inherent in the following: “*ida yastanid aşḥāb haḍā al-itijāh ilā afkār mut’alliqa “bi-ṭabī’a” al-mar’a wa-r-rajul li-yaqūlū bi-wujūd adwār muḥḍada li-kulli min-humā*”. I argue that the message, including the idea about gendered roles for men and women are produced in the Arabic TT03 2017 because it is explained even without using an actual close lexical equivalent. Similar but not identical solutions were opted for twice in TT 2016, as in (32).

(30) /.../which in turn dictate “fixed” and gendered societal roles for women and men.
(ST 2016: 5)

.../الصفات "الخاصة" لكل منهما التي تملّي بالمقابل أدوار متباينة على كل منهما. (TT 2016: 5)
Back translation: “fixed” features for the two of them which then dictate distinguished roles for the two of them

4.7. “Gender” and “sex”

The language in ST/TT04 2017, about CEDAW addresses women’s rights and non-discrimination against “women” rather than “gender” or “sex/sexes”. Like CEDAW, *Musawah* mainly uses the words “women” and “men”, rather than “gender” or “sexes”. In fact, the ST only mentions “gender” once, and sex once, in the meaning of identity categorisation. In the TT, the Arabic equivalent for “sex” is transformed into a specification of the categories, i.e., “men and women” (literally, “man” and “woman”). It is included in the empirical data because both “sex” and “gender” are mentioned in relation to “stereotyping” in the ST but it is not clear what the difference is between “sex role stereotyping” and “gender stereotyping” is. In any case, the notion of distinguishing between “sex” and “gender” is here maintained in the Arabic TT:

(31) Sex Role Stereotyping and prejudice (article 5) (ST04 2017: 3)

الأدوار النمطية للرجل والمرأة والتحيز (المادة 5) (TT04 2017: 3)

Back translation: *Rigid roles for the man and the woman and prejudice (article 5)*

“Article 5” refers to the article’s number in the CEDAW. *Musawah* avoids the issue by translating the grammatical construction “sex role stereotyping” into: “*al-adwār an-namaṭiyya li-r-rajul wa-l-mar’a*”. It is a functional translation, conveying a similar meaning. It should be mentioned that the Arabic translation of the original English convention itself, CEDAW, has adopted the word “*jins*” for “sex” and “*jinsayn*” for “sexes” (article 1 and 5 in CEDAW English and CEDAW Arabic).

Both ST and TT create a heteronormative world, which also CEDAW does, targeting specifically discrimination against women, and not all other gender-minorities.

ST04 2017 mentions “gender” once, in the MWE “gender stereotyping”, which is close in meaning, but not identical to example (18). The context is different, since this is *Musawah*’s own summary of CEDAW without direct references to the articles in the convention. The ST states:

(32) CEDAW specifically addresses issues of gender stereotyping, (ST04 2017: 3).

تعالج سيداو تحديداً مسائل متعلقة بالتوصيفات النمطية للجنس، (TT04 2017: 3)

Back translation: *CEDAW specifically treats issues concerning rigid classification of gender,*

4.7.1. The distinction between “gender” and “sex”

The translation of “gender” as a simple concept varies across the TTs, and even in the same TT. In ST02 2016 and ST04 2017, it did not occur as a simple concept. In ST 2018, it occurred 10 times, and in nine cases, it was translated into *an-naw’* (ST/TT: Four times on 19/19; once time on 30/30; 34/34; 36/36; 46/47; 56/57). Only in one case in TT 2018, “gender” as a simple concept was dismissed, as we see in example (35):

(33) Mothers lose this right if they remarry or when the children reach a certain age, which varies according to the gender of the child and the different legal schools. (ST 2018: 47)

وتفقد الأم هذا الحق إذا تزوجت أو عندما يصل الابن أو الابنة إلى سن معينة، تختلف باختلاف المذاهب الفقهية.
(TT 2018: 47)

Back translation: *And the mother loses this right if she remarries or when the boy or the girl reaches a specific age, varying in the different fiqh schools.*

Here, the concept of “gender” is in the TT substituted by “*al-ibn aw al-ibna*”, literally, the boy or the girl, which in a functionalist back translation can be boys and girls. *Musawah*’s translation of the ST is a functionalist translation. The TT is more specific since it conveys information in a more explicit way by mentioning the sexes of the children. It communicates close to the same

message as the ST, if we consider the whole discourse, however, the message as a whole in this example could have been more “equivalent”. The TT is more specific on one hand, but leaves out information on the other, namely the information that the mother’s right to her child is actually dependent on the “gender of the child”. This information is left out, in favour of specifying that the child is “the boy” or “the girl”. If *Musawah*’s overall use of “gender” had been more gender-fluid, i.e not centred around a binary system of women and men, girls and boys, this translation had been a more drastic change in meaning, but due to *Musawah*’s overall discourse in the ST, the main change in meaning is related to the fact that the TT leaves out some facts.

The loan word “*al-jindar*” (root: j-n-d-r) is in TT03 2017 in all cases except for one constructed as equivalent to the simple concept of “gender”, though this is not the case when it occurs in TT 2018, where it is translated into *an-naw*’ if it was not dismissed, or in TT 2016, where it occurred once and was translated into “*al-jins*”.

“Gender” is here considered in itself, and here, the “deficiency” in Arabic to provide a close equivalent to the concept of “gender” is amplified by the transliteration or loan word “*al-jindar*”. This can in itself be seen as a “formal” choice considering that the concept is not modified by opting for a word more broadly used and standardised in dictionaries. However, Kamal noted that she sees an increasing use of “*al-jindar*” in activist discourses, stating that it does not need to be specified in specialised writings. (2008:264). The simple concept of “gender” appears five times in ST03 2017, and in four of them, “*al-jindar*” is used, as in the following example:

(34) First, concepts such as ‘gender’, ‘equality’, and ‘justice’ are always **socially constructed**. (ST03 2017: 4, bold in original)

أولا المفاهيم من قبيل "الجندر" و"المساواة" و"العدل" هي المفاهيم **شكلها المجتمع**. (TT03 2017: 4)

Back translation: *Firstly, concepts such as “gender”. “equality” and “justice” are concepts formed by the society*

In this translation into “*awālān, al-mafāhīm min qabīl al-jindar, wa-l-musāwāh, wa-l-’adal hiya al-mafāhīm šakkalhā al-mujtama’*”, the social construction is emphasised and the imported conceptual meaning of the loan word “*al-jindar*” is explained. This tendency is here described as the loan word strategy, and if considering only the concept “gender”, it is a formal solution. The source text TT03 2017 translates the simple concept of “gender” by means of this strategy in four out of five cases, as also shown in table 5a in Chapter 5. Thus, it is a strong tendency in this specific text, but not across texts. In one case in ST03 2017, “gender” as a single word concept is not translated into “*al-jindar*”:

(34) The notions of gender and rights found in classical *fiqh* (Islamic jurisprudence) were constructed in a specific time and context. (ST03 2017: 4)

إن الفهم الفقهي للعلاقة بين الجنسين وحققهما متشكل بزمان ومكان معين. (TT03 2017: 4)

Back translation: *Indeed the fiqh understanding of the relation between the two genders/sexes and the two’s rights was shaped by a specific time and place.*

In *Musawah*’s translation: *inna al-fahm al-fiqhī lil-’alāqa bayna-l-jinsayn wa-huqūqhumā mutašakkil bi-zamān wa-makān mu’ayn*, as also shown in the back translation, “gender” as a simple concept is suddenly translated in a way that fits the tendency of grammatical gender-binarism rather than the loan word strategy as seen elsewhere in TT03 2017. We can only guess why *Musawah* here chose “*jinsayn*”, but maybe it is because the message here is about the understanding of men and women in *fiqh* at classical times, and hence the translator(s) might have considered it unnatural to suddenly mention the modern loan word and concept “*al-jindar*” in this specific sentence, but this is only a guess.

In TT 2016, the singular “*al-jins*”, is for the first and only time in the data used as corresponding to “gender” as a simple concept as (38) shows:

(35) Specific attributes and roles should not be assigned on the basis of gender,.. (ST 2016: 12-13)

ولا ينبغي تعيين أدوار وصفات محددة على أساس الجنس (TT 2016:13)

Back translation: *And specific roles and attributes should not be assigned on the basis of gender/sex*

“Gender” is translated into “*jins*” in its singular form, which is unusual for *Musawah*. It is the only occasion in this text where “gender” appears in this ST as a simple concept, and hence it is difficult to speak about consistency, but it is a point in itself that we have not seen this translation elsewhere in the data. It is noted that the same root j-n-s is also used when constructing equivalence between “sex” in the meaning of copulation, in the same singular form, for example in “marital sex is considered a husband’s right” (ST 2016: 6): “*haiṭu yu’tabar al-jins haqqān lil-zauwj*” (حيث يعتبر الجنس حقاً للزوج) (TT 2016: 6). “Sex” in this meaning has related adjectives “sexually” and “sexual”, translated into Arabic nisba-adjectives of the same root as “*jinsī*” or “*jinsiyya*” (ST/TT 2016: 3/3, 6/6), for example in “sexual violence” (ST 2016: 6) translated into “*al-’unfal-’jinsī*” (العنف الجنسي) (TT 2016: 6).

The next example returns to translations of “sex” in the meaning of identity categorisation, since equivalence to “sex” or “sexes” in Arabic is sometimes constructed in the same root as “gender”:

(36) These inequalities are justified and rationalized on the basis of assumptions about ‘innate’ differences between the sexes and ‘distinct’ sets of male and female attributes, which in turn dictate fixed and gendered societal roles for women and men (ST 2016: 5).

ويجري تبرير هذا التباين وعقلنته على أساس افتراضات متعلقة بالاختلافات "الجوهرية" بين الجنسين، والصفات "الخاصة" لكل منهما، التي تملئ بالمقابل أدواراً اجتماعية متباينة على كل منهما. (TT 2016: 5)

Back translation: *The justification of this disparity and its rationalisation occurs on a basis of assumptions connected to “essential” differences between the two sexes and “distinct” attributes to both of them which in return dictate dissimilar social roles for both of them.*

The derivative “gendered” in the construction “gendered societal roles for men and women” is here avoiding a one-to-one Arabic word equivalent for “gendered”. However, arguably the meaning of “gendered” in this context is still conveyed through the notion of social roles for both the “man” and the “woman”.

Regarding translation of the distinction between “sex” and “gender” in general, the same Arabic root, j-n-s is used for both, as mentioned. However one could say that there is a distinction because TT 2016 uses the dual for “sexes” while the singular is used for “gender,” contrary to what we have seen in examples from other texts, where “*jinsayn*” has frequently been used to denote “gender” in various MWEs.

“Gender”, as a single word concept or as the derivative “gendered” appears 133 times in total, whereas “sex” or “sexes” appears 6 times in total as single word concept, and one in the MWE “sex role stereotyping” (ST04 2017). Four of the occurrences as a simple concept, “sex”, are in ST 2018, and two of those are not translated. This shows how *Musawah* in the ST has adopted “gender” as a term in English, arguably in its binary interpretation, considering that the text address men and women exclusively in a way where “gender” seems to become synonymous with “sex”, or even an euphemism for it (Olson: 2012: 3). “Sex” is translated into “*an-naw'*” in two of the cases (TT 2018: 16 and 38) whereas it is left untranslated in the subtexts to the figures on page 32 and 33 (TT 2018). An example of the use of “sex” in ST 2018 is in the headline of a table showing the gap between women and men regarding unpaid work:

(37) Average time spent (in hours) on paid and unpaid work, by sex (ST 2018: 38)

متوسط الوقت الذي ينفق في العمل المأجور وغير المأجور، حسب النوع (TT 38 :2018)

Back translation: *Average time spent which is spent on paid and unpaid work depending on sex*

This is one of the two times “sex” is translated into Arabic, and in both cases, the constructed equivalent to sex is *an-naw'* which at first seems confusing, considering that this root elsewhere is often used to denote “gender” or “gendered”. However, the choice in itself is not necessarily strange, considering Kamal’s understanding of *an-naw'*, as mentioned above.

TT 2018 does not distinguish between “sex” and “gender” by means of different roots or grammatical forms. In general, the notion of gender and of sex is binary, which is sometimes reflected directly in the TT by means of grammatical forms. This is especially the case regarding “gender equality” and “gender justice”, and when using the root j-n-s.

In (38) and (39) from ST03 2017 *Musawah* constructs an Arabic equivalent to “sex” with the singular, “*jins*”:

(38) But 'equity' is now used in many global and national discourses as a synonym for complementary rights that thus discriminate based on sex (ST 03 2017: 2)

بيد أن المصطلح "إنصاف" يستخدم الآن في العديد من الخطابات على المستويين العالمي والوطني كمرادف للحقوق التكاملية، وبالتالي يميز على أساس الجنس (TT 03 2017: 2)

Back translation: *However, the term 'equity' is now used in many discourses on the two levels, global and national, as a synonym for merging rights and by that it discriminates based on sex.*

This is an example of “sex” translated as “*al-jins*”, and in (42) “sex” is translated in the same in way, showing the consistent equivalence constructed in this specific texts, which further to a large degree distinguishes between “gender” and “sex” as simple concepts. In (42) “sex” and “gender” are used in the same sentence in the ST, and in the TT, and this indicates that *Musawah* aims at distinguishing the two:

(39) Equity: provides for complementary but unequal gender roles and rights. While it claims to take into account differences, in practice it promotes discrimination by using assumptions based on sex and gender as the basis for laws, policies, and programmes (ST 03 2017: 3)

الإنصاف بطري أدواراً وحقوقاً تكاملية للجنس ولكنها غير متساوية. وفي حين يدعي هذا الاتجاه إنه يأخذ في اعتباره الاختلاف، فإنه في الممارسة يعزز التمييز بإسناده إلى مسلمة قائمة على الجنس والجنس كأساس للقوانين والسياسات والبرامج (TT 03 2017: 3)

Back translation: *Equity favours inclusive roles and rights for gender but not equal. While it claims this direction that takes difference into consideration, in practice it increases*

discrimination by its ascription to assumptions relying on sex and gender as the basis for laws and policies and programmes.

Here, “*al-jindar*” is used twice as equivalent to “gender”, while “*jins*” is used as equivalent to “sex”. In sum, “*jins*” is in TT03 2017 constructed as equivalent to “sex”, which is different from TT 2018 where “*an-naw*” was equivalent to “sex”, as shown in example (37). “Gender” as single word is in ST03 2017 constructed as equivalent to “*al-jindar*” in most cases, but “*al-jinsayn*” in one. In TT 2018, “*an-naw*” is the preferred equivalent to “gender” as single word concept. In ST/TT 2016 “gender” is translated into “*jins*” the one time it occurred as single word. In ST02 2016, and ST04 2017, “gender” or “sex” only occurred in MWEs.

Chapter 4 analysed selected examples documenting the overall functional orientation to the translation of “gender” in single and multi-word constructions, and the derivative “gendered”. The main findings from the different texts in the empirical data will be discussed and concluded upon in Chapter 5 where RQ 1, and RQ2, including their subquestions, are approached.

Chapter 5: Discussion, Conclusions and Further Research

This chapter discusses some of the points touched upon in the analysis in Chapter 4 before concluding on RQ 1, RQ2 and their subquestions, ending by suggesting how translation of “gender” and related terminology can be addressed in future studies.

5.1. Discussion of results

Various issues could be discussed based on the analysis, including the approach itself. Considered retrospectively, the study could have benefited from focusing upon a fewer number of the most frequent MWEs, such as “gender equality” and “gender stereotypes” analysing these in depth, rather than providing examples of all the different MWEs, since it would have nuanced the analysis and conclusions, and allowed comparison with translations by another organisation.

The different translations of “gender” in the data might have to do with the way “gender” is interpreted in the different constructions it appears in. Or, it can be related to *Musawah*’s perception of their target group’s ideas about gender. The study would have benefitted from knowing more about the translators of the different TTs and to what extent *Musawah* staff members were involved. For example, if each publication has a different translator(s) this can, at least partly, explain part of the variety. Lastly, we should not underestimate practical reasons such as whether *Musawah* even has a well-defined internal translation strategy.

5.1.1. Discussion of influence by the UN Women

That *Musawah* quotes a UN Women translation of “gender equality” and across texts in the data uses this same translation, as is clear from tables 1-7 (Appendixes). This can be related to the fact that UN Women is funding the knowledge building project, but this is not confirmed. What we can know is that “*al-musāwāh bayna-l-jinsayn*” appears first in UN Women’s online “Gender Sensitive Lexicon”, but that suggestions using “*an-naw’ al-ijtimā’ī*” (the social sex/kind/sort/type) to denote “gender” in translation of “gender equality” also appears in this UN tool. In general, the lexicon in many expressions with “gender” favours solutions with “*an-naw’ al-ijtimā’ī*”, but not always. ([UN Women](#), accessed 2021.10.24). Surprisingly, *Musawah* does not use “*an-naw’ al-ijtimā’ī*” a lot, but prefers the less explanatory abbreviation “*an-naw’*”, sometimes followed by the loan word “*al-jindar*”. Hence, *Musawah* does not seem to be that *Musawah* always follows the UN, though to some degree they do, also in English, as we saw in example (31), but not always. It is noticable that CEDAW’s original UN translators adopted the word “*jins*” for “sex” and “*jinsayn*” for “sexes” (article 1 and 5 in [CEDAW English](#) and [CEDAW Arabic](#)), but *Musawah* does not follow this distinction - neither in general, nor in the knowledge building brief specifically targeting CEDAW. How UN organisations such as UN Women, and UN Committees such as CEDAW, also translate “gender” and “sex” in various ways and not necessarily makes a distinction would take another study to document and analyse. Here, it is just noted that it is possible that *Musawah* leans on the UN in some but not all cases.

5.1.2 Discussion of gender binarism with and without the grammatical dual form

In the analysis I have shown how the notion of *two* genders is sometimes, but not always, manifested grammatically through the use of the dual form in Arabic. Kamal and Mehrez, as treated in section 2.4, considered this as reactionary solutions, reproducing essentialist notions of

gender. However, considering that the movement's general discourse on gender is also a binary discourse in English, this translation goes well with the message as a whole. From a semantic perspective, whether it is meaningful to use the grammatical dual when translating "gender" depend on the interpretation of the context ahead of the translation: Does it belong to a gender-binary discourse? Or one, where the purpose is to include the possibility of a more fluid and flexible understanding of gender and sexuality? Or is the purpose to extend terminology from one language to another? From a functional perspective based on *Musawah's* heteronormative discourse in the STs, the message conveyed when translating "gender equality", into "*al-musāwāh bayna-l-jinsayn*" is comprehensible for most Arabic readers, and if reading the TTs without having read the STs many would probably connect it to the relatively well established English MWE, "gender equality", but whether a link would be made to "gender justice" as a concept within feminism when reading "*al-'adāla bayna-l-jinsayn*" is hard to say. And whether it is important is also up for discussion. To know whether the incentive behind the translation choices were strategic, political or practical the present study cannot now without following up on the results with *Musawah* and the translator(s) in a qualitative interview.

5.1.3 Discussion of results regarding the distinction between "gender" and "sex"

Considering each publication individually is necessary to conclude on whether a distinction is made between "gender" and "sex" in the TTs. In TT 2018, no distinction is made based on the Arabic words and roots when translating the English correlative words "gender" and "sex", since "*an-naw*" was constructed as equivalent to "sex", (example 37), while the same root and word, "*an-naw*", was also constructed as equivalent to "gender" both when occurring as a single word concept and in various MWEs (see Tables 3a and 3b). Meanwhile, "*al-jinsayn*" was also used in various MWEs, e.g. "gender equality". This indicates that *Musawah's* translator(s) in TT 2018 possibly make a distinction between different Arabic correlated words that can be used as

equivalents for both “sex” and “gender”, but does not distinguish between the English concepts of “sex” and “gender”.

In ST02 2016, “sex” does not occur, and “gender” only occurred in the MWEs “gender equality”, and in “gender relation”. In both MWEs, “gender” is translated into “*al-jinsayn*”, i.e., the solution where gender-binarism is inherent in the grammar. However, we can not use the text in this context, because “sex” is not mentioned.

TT03 2017 is different, since the singular “*jins*” is constructed as equivalent to “sex”, making it different from TT 2018. As a single word concept, “gender” occurred five times, and the new loan word “*al-jindar*” (j-n-d-r) is in all cases except for one, constructed as its equivalent.

ST04 2017 mentions “sex” once in the MWE “sex role stereotyping”. The MWE “gender stereotyping” is comparable to see if a distinction between “sex” and “gender” is made based on Arabic roots and words. “Sex role stereotyping” is transformed into “*al-adwār an-namaṭiyya li-r-rajul wa al-mar’a*”, and can be back translated into “man” and “woman” instead of “sex”, whereas “*jindar*” is used to denote “gender” in the latter. Hence, there is a distinction between “sex and” “gender”, but only in the MWEs “sex role stereotyping” and “gender stereotyping”, since “sex” only occurred this one time in ST04 2017, it is difficult to know to what extent the distinction and choice of Arabic equivalents were intentional and whether the same distinction would be made in other constructions.

ST/TT 2016 is different again since “gender” as a single word concept is translated into “*al-jins*” while “sexes” is translated into “*al-jinsayn*” (Table 7a)

5.2. Conclusions on RQ1 and subquestions

RQ1, including subquestions, is answered based on the analysis (Chapter 4), and Tables 1-7 (Appendixes). To remind the reader, RQ1 asks:

- 1) What Arabic roots and words are used as equivalents to “gender” when entering into multi-word expressions (MWEs), and how is the derivative “gendered” translated in the Arabic TTs?
 - 1.1. What multi-word expressions with “gender” and what derivatives of “gender” are identified in the STs?
 - 1.2. How are the identified multi-word expressions translated in the TTs?
 - 1.3. What Arabic roots are used when constructing equivalence to the derivative “gendered” in the TTs?

5.2.1. Conclusions to RQ 1.1. and RQ 1.2.

Providing an overview of all identified MWEs with “gender”, Table 1 is available as an appendix. “Gender” as a single word concept, the derivative “gendered” or “gender” in an MWE, occurred 90 times in ST 2018 in total. “Sex” occurred four times in this ST, and was translated into Arabic two times. 10 times, “gender” as a single word concept occurred, while the derivative “gendered” occurred in 15 cases. In 66 cases, the word “gender” entered into a construction here described as an MWE. In cases where it appears as a single word concept the root n-w-‘ was overtly used. Table 3b (Appendixes) provides an overview of all MWEs identified in ST 2018 and their translations in TT 2018. In ST02/TT 2016 “gender” occurred in “gender relations”, and “gender equality”, both translated by means of the dual form “*jinsayn*”.

In TT03 2017, the dual, “*jinsayn*”, is used to denote “gender” in “gender equality”, “gender justice”, “gender relations”, and “gender norms”. One time, this grammatical gender-binarism is used as equivalent to the single word concept of “gender”. However, in most cases, the loan

word solution is used for the single word concept “gender” and the same, i.e. the j-n-d-r root, is also used in the MWEs “gender-neutral”, “gender-sensitive”, and “gender roles”. In TT04 2017 “*jindar*” is used to denote “gender” in “gender stereotyping”, while “*jinsayn*” is used in “gender equality” (Table 6). In ST 2016, the tendency in MWEs is to transform “gender” into more specific identity categories (Table 7b)

5.1.6. Conclusion on RQ 1.3.

In TT 2018 the derivative “gendered” appeared 15 times in ST 2018, and is translated by means of n-w-‘, into either an adjective or a noun with a preposition, if not transformed into something more functional specifying the identity categories, as in ST/TT03 2017, where “gendered” appears once and is transformed into “*al-mar’a wa-l-rajul*” (TT03 2017: 1). In TT 2016, The Arabic possibilities “*an-naw’*” or “*al-jindar*” are not used, and the derivative is not translated by means of the roots j-n-s, n-w-‘, or j-n-d-r, but is explained as a process shaping women’s and men’s role based on essentialist assumptions about them, and thus the idea about construction of gender identities and roles is still conveyed (TT 2016: 5, 7) although the actual term is not included. This makes it a more functional translation than the translations of “gendered” in TT 2018. In ST02 2016, and ST04 2017, the derivative “gendered” does not appear.

5.3. Conclusions on RQ2: “Gender” and “sex”

Based on the analysis in Chapter 4 and the tables provided in the appendixes, this section concludes by answering RQ2, including subquestion, 2.1:

- 2) How are “gender” and its correlative “sex” translated into Arabic in the TTs?

2.1. Does the movement *Musawah for Equality in the Family* distinguish between “gender” and the correlative “sex” in Arabic in the empirical data?

The answer varies as discussed, depending on the publication. We can not conclude once and for all that a distinction between “sex” and “gender” is made in the Arabic TTs when occurring as single word concepts or in MWEs.

TT 2018 translates both “sex” and “gender” into *an-naw’*. Meanwhile, as a single word concept, the tendency in TT03 2017 is that “gender” is translated into the new loan word, “*al-jindar*” (j-n-d-r), but in one case it is translated into “*al-jinsayn*”. “Sex” on the other hand is translated into “*jins*”. A distinction is thus made, but it is based on a relatively low frequency of the words, and overall, “gender” is in most cases translated into “*al-jindar*” or “*an-naw’*” when occurring as a single word concept. The exception is ST/TT 2016 where “gender” as a single word concept is translated into “*al-jins*” while “sexes” is translated into “*al-jinsayn*” (Table 7a). This is the only time in the data where “gender” is translated into the singular noun “*jins*”. In any case, the same root is here opted for, but the change in grammatical numeric form can be interpreted as an attempt to distinct “sex” from “gender”.

Since “gender” and “sex” is distinguished between occasionally makes the hypothesis that *Musawah* does not distinguish between “gender” and “sex” partly wrong. A distinction is identifiable in some cases, though not always. Across texts, *Musawah* has not constructed one single preferred equivalent to neither “gender” as a single word concept, nor the word “sex”, and does not consistently distinguish between the two.

“Gender” as a single word concept or in MWEs or as a derivative, “gendered”, was translated into “*an-naw’*”, “*al-jindar*”, “*al-jins*”, or “*al-jinsayn*”, or an adjective derived from one of these (Table 1 and 2 in appendixes. “*Al-jins*”, can not be considered an actual tendency since it just occurred once as equivalent to “gender” (in TT 2016). The actual tendencies regarding “gender” as a single word count on either the loan word “*jindar*” or the development term “*naw’*” depending on the text. As we see in table 3a, TT 2018 mainly uses the root *an-naw’*, while it is clear that those handling the translation of TT03 2017 preferred “*al-jindar*”, which can be a

consequence of different translators, target group or purpose of the publication. The strongest tendency across texts is by far the translation of “gender equality” into “*al-musāwāh bayna-l-jinsayn*”.

5.4. Future Research

Based on this study and Kamal’s reflection on Arabic feminist discourses, a future study could look into feminist manipulation of Arabic grammar norms, e.g. in relation to identity categories such as “*ar-rajul*” (الرجل) and “*al-mar’a*” (المرأة). Often these indefinite English plural forms are transformed into definite Arabic singulars, which obeys traditional Arabic grammar norms, since the generic collective in Arabic is indicated by a definite singular (Fischer 2002:54). It would arguably be more interventionist to Arabic language norms, and more noticeable to native readers to translated them into plurals such as “*ar-rijāl*” (الرجال) and *an-nisā’* (النساء). “*Al-mar’a*” does not have a plural in Arabic, thus “*an-nisā’*” is a close equivalent if using this feminist translation strategy. According to Kamal, understanding the distinction between the concepts of *woman* and *women* in feminist theory, takes into account:

/.../the emphasis on cultural diversity and plurality among women instead of dealing with “women” as a monolithic term and a singular entity, implies an understanding of cultural nuances and theoretical backgrounds, which cross the boundaries of word and text, (2008:261).

Accordingly, it nearly forces a feminist translator into using the plural form in Arabic, since the plural, connecting the text to feminist discourse and theory. (2008: 261).

Further studies on other movements or organisations such as the Tunisian [Mawjoudin – we exist](#) (official spelling, not my transliteration) which focuses on LGBTIQ+ rights, could also be relevant, looking upon terminology and discourse around queer identities in Arabic. To document how they translate “gender” in various expressions and compare the findings with

findings from this thesis could shed light on “gender” in Arabic in a LGBTIQ+ context. In general, other translations of English feminist terms and discourse would be relevant to investigate in their Arabic translations, e.g. terms such as “patriarchal”, which in *Musawah*’s translation has the constructed equivalent *al-abwiyya* (الأبوية) (ST/TT 2016: 5/5) derived from the same root as the Arabic word used to signify “father”.

References

- Abdelaal, N. 2020. *Translation between English and Arabic A Textbook for Translation Students and Educators*. Palgrave Macmilan (e-book).
- Al-Ramahi, R., 2014. Gender in Translation from English into Arabic: Ideological Perspectives Case Study: Texts on Products. *Indian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 40,(1-2).
- Bergsträsser. 1925. Ḥunain ibn Ishāq über die Syrischen und Arabischen Galen Übersetzungen, Leipzig Ḥunayn b. Ishāq's account of the translations of Galen, ed. Excerpt from the Arabic text.
- Butler, J., 2006. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York: Routledge.
- Butler, J., 2011. *Bodies that matter*. e-book: Abingdon, Oxon : Routledge.
- Derichs, C., 2010. Transnational Women's Movements and Networking. *Gender, Technology and Development*, 14(3), pp.405-421.
- Faruquzzaman Akan*, Rezaul Karim, Abdullah Mohammad Kabir. 2019. An Analysis of Arabic-English Translation: Problems and Prospects. Chowdhury Faculty of English, King Khalid University, Abha, Saudi Arabia. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*
- Fischer, W. and Rodgers, J., 2002. *A Grammar of Classical Arabic*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Gee, J., 2014. *An introduction to discourse analysis*. 4th ed. London: Routledge.
- Ghazoul, F., 1999 Editorial. *Alif: The Journal of Comparative Poetics* 19: 6.
- Godard, B., 1989. Theorizing Feminist Discourse / Translation. *Tessera*.
- Gunnarsson, L., 2011. A defence of the category 'women'. *Feminist Theory*, 12(1), pp.23-37.
- Hawwari, A. et. al. 2016. Explicit Fine Grained Syntactic and Semantic Annotation of the Idafa Construction in Arabic. LREC
- Kamal, H., 2008. Translating Women and Gender into Arabic. *WSQ: Women's Studies Quarterly*, Volume 36, Numbers 3 & 4, Fall/Winter, pp. 254-268
- Kamal, H., 2016. Translating Feminist Literary Theory into Arabic, *Studia filologiczne: uniwersytet Jana Kochanowskiego*, vol. 29, issue 2, pp. 57-73.

- Kamal, H., 2018. Travelling Concepts in Translation: Feminism and Gender in the Egyptian Context. *Synergy* volume 14.
- Mehrez, S., 2007. Translating Gender. *Journal of Middle East Women's Studies*, 3(1), pp.106-127.
- Merry, S., 2006. *Human Rights and Gender Violence: Translating International Law into Local Justice*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Mohanty, C., 1988. Under Western Eyes: Feminist Scholarship and Colonial Discourses. *Feminist Review*.
- Murphy, G., 1988. Comprehending Complex Concepts. *Cognitive Science*, 12(4), pp.529-562.
- Müller et. al. 2011. *Word Formation, An International Handbook of the Languages of Europe*. De Gruyter
- Nida, E. and Taber, C., 1982. *The theory and practice of translation*. Leiden: published for the United Bible Societies by E.J. Brill.
- Phillips, A., 1998. *Feminism and politics ; ed. by Anne Phillips*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Popper, K., 2005. *The logic of scientific discovery*. (2nd ed.) London: Routledge.
- Raafat, Y., 2019. Sugar-Coating Female Genital Mutilation in United Nations Documents in English and Arabic: A Diachronic Study of Lexical Variation. *SSRN Electronic Journal*,.
- Sadiqi, F., 2006. Gender in Arabic. Brill Encyclopedia of linguistics,. BRILL
- Tymoczko, M., 2007. *Enlarging translation, empowering translators*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.
- United Nations. 1979. Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW) English: <https://www.ohchr.org/documents/professionalinterest/cedaw.pdf> and Arabic: <https://www.un.org/womenwatch/daw/cedaw/text/0360793A.pdf> (both accessed 2021.10.31)
- UN Women. <https://www.unwomen.org/en/digital-library/genderterm?search=gender+equality%20.%20> (accessed on 2021.10.31)
- Venuti, L., 2004. *The translation studies reader*. e-Library: Taylor & Francis.
- Versteegh, C., 2014. *The Arabic language*. Edinburgh University Press.
- von Flotow, L., 1997. *Translation and Gender*. 1st ed. Manchester and Ottawa: St. Jerome Publishing and University of Ottawa Press.
- von Flotow, L. and Farahzad, F., 2011. *Translating women*. University of Ottawa Press.

von Flotow, L., 2019. On the Challenges of Transnational Feminist Translation Studies. *TTR*, 30(1-2), pp.173-194.

von Flotow, L. and Kamāl, H., 2020. *The Routledge handbook of translation, feminism and gender*. London and New York: Routledge: Taylor and Francis Group.

Wehr, H., edited by Cowan, J.M. Snowball Publishing.

Wylie, A., 2012. Feminist Philosophy of Science: Standpoint Matters. *Proceedings and Addresses of the American Philosophical Association* Vol. 86, No. 2 (November 2012), pp., pp.47-76 (30 pages).

Appendixes

Table 1: MWEs and their frequency in each ST and in total

MWE	ST 2018	ST02 2016	ST03 2017	ST04 2017	ST 2016	Total	Arabic root for “gender”
Gender equality	16	1	12	2	1	32	j-n-s, <i>or</i> dismissed
Gender stereotypes (stereotyping in one case)	16			1	1	18	n-w- ^ʿ , <i>or</i> j-n-d-r, <i>or</i> dismissed
Gender relations	5	1	2		5	13	j-n-s, <i>or</i> n-w- ^ʿ , <i>or</i> dismissed
Gender roles	10					10	j-n-s, <i>or</i> n-w- ^ʿ + j-n-d-r, <i>or</i> j-n-d-r
Gender gap	6					6	j-n-s
Gender norms	2		1			3	n-w- ^ʿ
Gender justice	1		2			3	j-n-s
Gender-sensitive	2		1			3	n-w- ^ʿ <i>or</i> j-n-d-r
Gender parity	2					2	j-n-s
Gender discrimination	1					1	j-n-s
Gender studies	1					1	n-w- ^ʿ
Gender-neutral			1			1	j-n-d-r
Gender lines	1					1	n-w- ^ʿ
Gender bias	1					1	n-w- ^ʿ

Gender responsibilities	1					1	n-w-‘ and (j-n-d-r)
Gender roles and rights			2			2	j-n-d-r
spousal (and more generally gender) rights					1	1	dismissed
Sex role stereotyping				1		1	dismissed

Table 2: “Gender”, “sex” and “gendered” and their frequency in each ST and in total

MWE	ST 2018	ST02 2016	ST03 2017	ST04 2017	ST 2016	Total	Arabic root(s)
Gender	10		5		1	16	j-n-s, or n-w, or j-n-d-r, or dismissed
Sex (or sexes)	4		2		1	7	j-n-s, or n-w-‘, or dismissed
Gendered	15		1		2	18	n-w-‘ or dismissed

Table 3a: Frequency of “gender”, “sex”, and “gendered” in ST and equivalents in TT 2018

Word	Frequency	Arabic word in TT and pages in ST/TT
Gender	10	<i>an-naw’</i> (ST/TT: four times on 19/19, once on 30/30; 34/34, 36/36, twice on 46/47, 56/57)
Sex	4	<i>an-naw’</i> (ST/TT: 38/38) Twice “sex” occurred in sentences related to two different tables (ST 2018: 32, 33) not translated into the TT, but kept in English (TT 2018: 33)
Gendered	15	<i>ila naw’</i> (ST/TT: 2/2; 45/46) <i>an-naw’</i> (ST/TT: 9/9) <i>li-n-naw’</i> (ST/TT: 11/11)

		<i>'ana-n-naw' iyya</i> (ST/TT :21/21; 44/45) <i>'ala asās an-naw'</i> (ST/TT: 40/41) <i>hasab an-naw'</i> (ST/TT: twice on 44/45) <i>'ana-n-naw'</i> (ST/TT: 46/47) <i>'ala-n-naw'</i> (ST/TT: 4/4; 16/15; 46/47) <i>an-naw'ī (al-jindarī)</i> (ST/TT: twice on 9/9)
--	--	---

Table 3b: MWEs in ST 2018 and equivalents in TT 2018

MWE	Frequency	Arabic translation(s) and page in ST/TT
Gender equality	16	<i>al-musāwāh bayna-l-jinsayn</i> (ST/TT: pre-page/pre-page, 5/4, 5/5, 11/11, 22/22, 29/29, four times on 34/34, 53/53, 54/55, 55/56) <i>tasāwī-l-jinsayn</i> (ST/TT: 57/58) dismissed twice on (ST/TT: 34/34)
Gender stereotypes	16	<i>aṣ-ṣuwar an-namaṭiyya li-n-naw'</i> (ST/TT: 3/4 ,4/4, 5/5, 13/13, 20/19, twice on 24/24, twice on 53/54, three times on 54/55, twice on 55/56) <i>at-taṣauwurāt an-namaṭiyya</i> (46/47) dismissed once (ST/TT: 5/5)
Gender roles (once in the construction “gender roles and identities)	10	<i>adwār an-naw'</i> (ST/TT: 9/8, 9/9, 41/42, final p./final p.) <i>adwār an-naw' (al-jindar)</i> (one time ST/TT: 9/8) <i>adwār al-jinsayn</i> (one time ST/TT: 36/37) “Gender roles and identities” (ST: 9) into <i>adwār wa-huwīyat ar-rajul wa-l-mar'a al-jindariyya</i> (TT: 8) Twice “gender roles” is dismissed (ST/TT: table of contents, and 3/3) Once translated by referring to <i>al-jinsayn</i> by means of the dual suffix on <i>adwār</i> , i.e. <i>adwār-humā</i> (أدوارهما TT 53)
Gender gap	6	<i>fajwa kabīra bayna-l-jinsayn</i> (ST/TT twice on 53/54) <i>fajwa bayna-l-jinsayn</i> (ST/TT: 30/30, 31/32, 38/39)

		in one case, gender gap in the ST is transformed into: <i>fajwa at-ta 'līm bayna-l-fatayāt wa-l-fitya</i> (ST: 29 TT: 29)
Gender relations	5	<i>'alāqāt an-naw'</i> (ST/TT: 3/3) <i>al-'alāqāt bayna-l-jinsayn</i> three times (TT: 12, 13, 50) Once a section mentioning “gender relations” in the ST is absent from the (ST: 14)
Gender norms	2	<i>ma 'āyīr an-naw'</i> (ST/TT: 41/42; 50/51)
Gender discrimination	1	<i>tamyīz bayna-l-jinsayn</i> (ST/TT: 8/8)
Gender justice	1	<i>al-'adal bayna-l-jinsayn</i> (ST/TT: 9/9)
Gender responsibilities	1	<i>masu 'ūliyyāt al-jinsayn</i> (ST/TT: 3/3)
Gender studies	1	<i>dirāsāt an-naw'</i> (ST/TT: 55/56)
Gender lines	1	<i>taqsimihā 'ala-asās an-naw'</i> (ST/TT: 55/56)
Gender bias	1	<i>inhīyāz an-naw'ī</i> (ST/TT 19/19)
Gender-sensitive	2	<i>ḥasāsa tujāha-n-naw'</i> (ST/TT: twice on 52/53)
Gender parity	2	<i>musāwāh kāmila bayna-l-jinsayn</i> (ST/TT 34/34) <i>at-takāf'u bayna-l-jinsayn</i> (ST/TT 53/54)

Table 4: MWEs in ST02 2016 and equivalents in TT02 2016

MWE	Frequency	Arabic translation(s)
Gender equality	1	<i>al-musāwāh bayna-l-jinsayn</i> (ST/TT: 4/4)
Gender relations	1	<i>'alāqāt mutasāwiyya bayna-l-jinsayn</i> (ST/TT: 4/4)

Table 5a: “Gender”, “sex”, and “gendered” in ST03 2017 and equivalents in TT03 2017

Word	Frequency	Arabic translation(s) and page in ST/TT
Gender	5	<i>al-jindar</i> (ST/TT 1/1, twice on 2/2, and 4/4) <i>al-jinsayn</i> (ST/TT 4/4)
Sex	2	<i>jins</i> (ST/TT: 2/2, 3/3)
Gendered (ideas)	1	Transformed into: <i>afkār muta'alliqa “bi-ṭabī'a”</i> <i>al-mar'a wa-r-rajul</i> (ST/TT: 1/1)

Table 5b: MWEs ST03 2017 and equivalents in TT03 2017

MWE	Frequency	Arabic translation(s)
Gender Equality	12	<i>al-musāwāh bayna-l-jinsayn</i> (10 times) (five times on 1/1, four times on 2/2; 3/3, twice on 4/4) Twice “gender equality” is followed by “and justice” in the ST (ST03 2017 1 and 2). This is rendered by means of the dual suffix added on the preposition “bayn”. Hence, the whole construction is in these cases translated into: <i>al-musāwāh bayna-l-jinsayn wa-l- 'adal bayna-humā</i> (TT 1/1 and 2/2), which can be back translated into: <i>equality between the two genders/sexes and justice between the two</i>
Gender norms	1	<i>al-mu'āyir al-muṭabaqa 'alāa-l-jinsayn</i> (ST/TT: 1/1)
Gender-neutral (laws)	1	<i>al-qawānīn al-muhāyada tujāha-l-jindar</i> (ST/TT: 2/2)
Gender-sensitive	1	<i>ḥasāsa tujāha-l-jindar</i> (ST/TT: 3/3)
Gender roles and rights	2	<i>adwārān wa-ḥuqūqān takāmuliyya lil-jindar</i> (ST/TT: twice on 3/3)
Gender justice	2	<i>al- 'adal bayna-l-jinsayn</i> (ST/TT: 1/1, 2/2)

Gender relations	2	<i>al- 'alāqāt bayna-l-jinsayn</i> (ST/TT: 2/2, 4/4)
------------------	---	--

Table 6: MWEs in ST04 2017 and equivalents in TT04 2017

MWE	Frequency	Arabic translation(s) and pages in ST/TT
Gender Equality	2	<i>al-musāwāh bayna-l-jinsayn</i> (ST/TT: 1/1, 6/6)
Gender stereotyping	1	<i>at-tawṣīfāt an-namaṭiyya lil-jindar</i> (ST/TT: 3/3)
Sex role stereotyping	1	<i>al-adwār an-namaṭiyya li-r-rajul wa-l-mar'a</i> (ST/TT: 3/3)

Table 7a: “Gender”, “sex”, and “gendered” in ST 2016 and equivalents in TT 2016

Word	Frequency	Arabic translation(s) and pages in ST/TT
Gender	1	<i>al-jins</i> (ST/TT: 13/13)
Sexes	1	<i>al-jinsayn</i> (ST/TT: 5/5)
Gendered	2	Transformed into (<i>adwārān ijtīmā'iyya mutabāyina 'ala kul minhumā</i> (ST/TT: 5/5)) and (<i>qawa ḡaīr mutāf'a fī-ṭārī-z-zawāj wa-l-mujtama'</i> (ST/TT: 7/7))

Table 7b: MWEs in ST 2016 and equivalents in TT 2016

MWE	Frequency	Arabic translation(s) and pages in ST/TT
Gender equality	1	Section not transferred into the TT

spousal (and more generally gender) rights	1	“gender” transformed more functionally (ST/TT: 5/5)
Gender stereotypes	2	Transformed: (<i>al-afkār an-namaṭiyya 'an ar-rijāl wa-n-nisā'</i> (ST/TT: 7/7) and (<i>afkār namaṭiyya muqawlaba 'an ar-rijāl wa-n-nisā'</i> (ST/TT: 12/12))
Gender relations	5	“gender” transformed into: <i>al'alāqāt bayna-r-rijāl wa-n-nisā'</i> (ST/TT: 2/2, 4/4, twice on 9/9, 13/13)