LUND UNIVERSITY

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

A study of the translation of “gender” as a simple and in complex concepts in Muslim 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

September 2021

Abstract

The terms “gender” and “sex” are central to feminist concerns, and 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). The aim of this thesis is to describe how “gender”, complex concepts 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. “Gender” is here defined as a simple concept, while considered to enter into a complex concept in constructions such as “gender equality”. Defining “gender” as a simple concept does not indicate that it is simple to interpret, but is based on word quantity in the concept. The method is anchored in descriptive translation studies (Tymoczko 2007), and due to the variation in translations of constructions with “gender” into Arabic, this study also aims at discussing 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 simple concept or in a complex concept, or “gendered” occurred 133 times. The “sex” or “sexes” occurred eight times, hence, 141 relevant cases were identified. Of these, 42 are presented in the analysis, since various similar translations occurred several times. For example, “gender equality” occurred 32 times in the STs, but only two different translation solutions were identified in the TTs, and thus just these two are presented. Concluding, an equivalent to the simple concept of “gender” is unsettled, even within the same movement. The study shows that the movement has constructed nearly consistent equivalents to some complex concepts e.g. “gender equality”. Further it shows that a distinction is occasionally constructed by *Musawah* between “sex” and “gender” in Arabic. The conclusion is that *Musawah* uses either “*jins”, “jinsayn”, “naw’”* or “*jindar”* to denote “gender” in the TTs. Further, “gender” as a term is sometimes dismissed and instead transformed into the specific identity categories “man/men” and “woman/women” or “girl/girls” and “boy/boys” in the Arabic TTs.

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, Inge, Bertil, Tove, Christoffer, Casper, and Camilla and to everyone in Blanche: Thank you for supporting me by being you.

Table of contents

Note on Transliteration

ء hamza	ʾ
ا alif	ā
ب bāʾ	b
ت tāʾ	t
ث t̲āʾ	t̲
ج jīm	j
ح ḥāʾ	ḥ
خ k̲āʾ	k̲
د dāl	d
ذ d̲āl	d̲
ر rāʾ	r
ز zāy	z
س sīn	s
ش šīn	š
ص ṣād	ṣ
ض ḍād	ḍ
ط ṭāʾ	ṭ
ظ ẓāʾ	ẓ
ع ʿain	ʿ
غ ġain	ġ
ف fāʾ	f
ق qāf	q
ك kāf	k

ل lām	l
م mīm	m
ن nūn	n
ه 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 *iḍāfa* 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 جِنْدر , 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

Selection criteria will be elaborated on in Chapter 3, for now, a list of English source texts and Arabic target texts, i.e., the primary sources, is provided with direct links to the texts:

- Who Provides, Who Cares? (ST 2018: 58 pages), in Arabic *man yanfuq? man yar'a?/* من ينفق؟ من يرعى؟ (TT 2018: 59 pages)
- Knowledge Building Brief 02 "Muslim Family Laws:What Makes Reform Possible?" (ST02 2016: 3 pages) in Arabic *qawānīn al-usra al-muslima: mā alladī yaj'al al-islāh/* قوانين الأسرة المسلمة: ما الذي يجعل الإصلاح ممكنا؟ (TT02 2016: 3 pages)
- Knowledge Building Brief 03 "Islam and the question of Gender Equality" (ST03 2017: 4. pages) in Arabic *al-islām wa-qaḍīya al-musāwāh bayna-l-jinsayn/* الإسلام وقضية المساواة بين الجنسين (TT03 2017: 4 pages)
- Knowledge Building Brief 04 "CEDAW and Muslim Family Laws" (ST04 2017: 6 pages), in Arabic *sīdāw wa-qawānīn al-usra al-muslima/* سيداو وقوانين الأسرة المسلمة (TT04 2017: 6 pages)
- "Musawah Vision for the Muslim Family" (ST 2016: 13 pages), in Arabic *ru'ya "Musāwāh" al-usra/* رؤية "مساواة" لأسرة (TT 2016: 14 pages).

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). Further, they have in common that *Musawah's* knowledge building team has been involved in the translation. In total 87 Arabic pages were judged to be relevant for this study, all of which are included in the above. Three of the publications, the knowledge building briefs, can be placed in the same category of publications based on layout and writing style. The two others are quite different from them, and also different

from each other, which will be addressed in Chapter 3, where also selection criteria will be elaborated on. The text, "Musawah Framework for Action", in Arabic مساواة" إطار عمل حركة/ *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 still 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 "gender" as a concept is the subject of this study, which is not concerned with grammatical gender, even though this is another important aspect of English-Arabic translation studied elsewhere (Sadiqi 2006; Al-Ramahi 2014). The terms "sex" and "gender" are terminology that is central to feminist concerns (Flotow 2019: 182), and their meaning and use is controversial. Specifically, this study focuses on the word "gender" in a transnational Arabic context, and the purpose is to describe and document how "gender", the derivative "gendered" and complex concepts with "gender" are translated by the Muslim feminist movement Musawah for Equality in the Family, hereafter referred to as *Musawah*. The case of *Musawah* is relevant because translations of "gender" into Arabic by transnational movements have not been studied systematically documenting how the same movement, which in this case is involved in the translation process, chooses different equivalents to denote the word "gender" sometimes in the same text.

This author understands the concept of "gender" in its broadest sense as a term that can, but not always is: "used to designate the socio-cultural attitudes that go with biological sex /…/ Originally focused on male and female but now being blurred to incorporate other sexual orientations" (Flotow 1997: 100). That Flotow considers it blurrying to incorporate sexual orientations in the concept of "gender" is understandable in some cases, however, using it in connection to LGBTIQ+[1] can in other cases contribute to expanding the notion of only two genders and a heterenormative world in general. This study will address critical approaches to the various uses of the term "gender" which is criticised for being an expression of American hegemony (Olson 2012), undermining feminist politics, failing to be inclusive to other affiliated ideologies, identities, and politics, e.g., LGBTIQ+. (2018: 140). Kamal (2008, 2016, 2018) and Mehrez (2007)

[1]Abbrevatin of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Intersexual, Trans, Queer +. The abbreviation is common in some Anglophone activist and/or development contexts concerned with women's rights or gender, but far from all.

state that the issue of translating feminist and gender terminology has been a major concern for translators and scholars writing about gender issues in Arabic (2016:67-68), and Kamal notes that:

> 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. (2008: 263-264)

Arabic seems to be in the process of experimenting with the translation of the word "gender" not only the simple concept, "gender" but also the derivative, "gendered", and when composing complex concepts such as "gender equality" or "gender stereotypes". Though addressing the use of "gender" in English, this study is not about intralingual, but interlingual translation from English into Arabic. "Gender" is here considered 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).

In the five STs, the word "gender", as a simple concept, as a derivative or as a part of a complex concept appeared 133 times. In Chapter 5, tables showing all the different translations are offered for each primary source text. The selection of examples presented in Chapter 4 is based on the purpose of the study, and the related RQs. Therefores, they include at least one example of each word or grammatical construction identified as constructed equivalents to the simple concept "gender" and all the complex concepts identified. Examples also show all the different ways that "gendered" is translated. Finally, they include all the different equivalents constructed for "sex" to show if and how a distinction between "sex" and "gender" is constructed in some TTs.

In in some cases, "gender", "gendered" or "sex" occurred in the ST, but was not translated by means of a close Arabic equivalent such as "*an-naw'*", *"al-jindar", "al-jins",* or "*al-jinsayn"*, or an adjective derived from one of them, but by specifying the gender-categories, e.g., *ar-rajul wa al-mar'a,* literally*,* "the man and the woman". This was mainly a tendency in TT 2016, but also

occurred in other texts, including the longest publication TT 2018. Due to the limited scope, I have not included examples of all the different varieties of this solution, but provide examples of it, and refer to it as a tendency that dismisses "gender". The effect of this is that "gender" becomes less abstract, while the specific concept is lost. However, the idea about constructed roles or identities for men and women can be maintained without transferring the concept in a close equivalent Arabic word. In Chapter 4, 42 examples are included and analysed grammatically and semantically through the notion of formal and functional equivalence. The 42 examples are selected from 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 just as relevant as the one presented in Chapter 4.

The aim is to explore how "gender" is actually translated into Arabic in practice, and further, to see if a distinction between "sex" and "gender" in the Arabic TTs is made. The conclusions are provided in Chapter 5, but already it can be revealed that "gender" in its various constructions is translated by means of the roots j-n-s, j-n-d-r, n-w-ʿ, both j-n-d-r and n-w-ʿ or dismissed. Some complex concepts such as "gender equality" and "gender justice" has nearly consistent equivalents in the data. Overall, across texts, *Musawah* has not constructed consistent equivalents to neither "gender" as a simple concept, nor the word "sex", and does not consistently distinguish between the two.

1.1. Purpose and Research Questions (RQs)

The purpose of this study is to investigate and document how the same movement translates "gender" differently in different constructions when translating the word from English into Arabic. The aim is also to explore whether patterns can be identified across the primary sources constituting the data, to see if some constructions have more established equivalents than others. The purpose is addressed through the following overall research question:

> How is the simple concept of "gender", derivatives of the word, such as "gendered", and complex concepts with "gender", such as "gender equality", translated from English into Arabic in written knowledge building publications published by the transnational movement *Musawah for Equality in the Family*?

The purpose is relevant due to the unsettled status of the term "gender" in Arabic language. 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. Especially Arabic translations of "gender" and complex concepts with "gender" in a Muslim feminist context has to my knowledge not been addressed before. Both the case and the choice to distinguish simple- and complex concepts systematically is new. To address the purpose of the study, the overall research question has been divided into the following subquestions:

(1) What Arabic roots and words are used as equivalents to "gender" when entering into complex concepts, and the derivative "gendered" in the Arabic TTs?

1.1.What complex concepts with "gender" and what derivatives are identified in the STs?

1.2. How are the identified complex concepts translated in the TTs?

1.3. What Arabic roots are used when constructing equivalence to the derivative "gendered" in the TTs?

(2) How are the simple concept "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

RQ 1 and its subquestions bring a new contribution which is an explicit focus on the difference between the word “gender” when used as a simple concept as in “gender” or in a composition forming a complex concept such as “gender equality”, “gender stereotypes", or “gender relations”. Further, the derivative “gendered” is treated, because it occurred in several STs, and it was observed when analysing the data that sometimes the root n-w-ʿwas used to form either a noun or an adjective when translating “gendered” while in other cases a close equivalent in Arabic was dismissed in favour of a more functional strategy. What is meant by Arabic roots is explained in subsection 1.2.2. The theoretical background for equivalence in translation studies is provided in Chapter 2.

Regarding expectations to RQ1, based on experience with women’s rights projects in Arabic speaking contexts, and as a reader of communication from feminist organisations and movements[2] in English and Arabic, the hypothesis that underlies the purpose and following RQs was that the same publisher would use different Arabic words and roots to denote“gender”. This might seem obvious in light of the findings in the present study, but it has not been documented and described before. Reading Mehrez (2007), and Kamal (2008), the impression is that mainly “*an-naw' al-ijtimāʿī*” or the abbreviation “*an-naw'ʿ*”would be used in the international development and human rights context that *Musawah* can be placed in, considering the movement’s purpose and the fact that it is funded by the UN Women. This study is designed to analyse and describe how “gender” is translated into Arabic, and conclude whether any patterns can be observed depending on whether it is the simple concept of “gender” itself, or if it enters into a construction with other words, as a complex concept.

[2] See e.g., Tadwein, Mawjoudin, Nazra,

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 sexes[3]" 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.

This study could be criticised for having prioritised wrongly by including theory on both feminist translation and earlier postpositivst translation theory, but arguably 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. I wanted to draw attention to the fact that though many consider the terms "gender" and "feminism" to go together, some feminist theorists criticise the vast and uncritical use of "gender".

1.1.1. Defining simple and complex concepts

To distinguish between simple and complex concepts, Murphy's definition is used, and hence:

> A concept is 'simple' if it can be represented as a single lexical item; 2. a concept that requires more than one lexeme, is 'complex,' 3. Unless its linguistic expression is lexicalized (i.e., idiomatic). So, dog and apartment seem to be simple concepts, whereas apartment dog seems to be complex. The qualifier in the third part of the rule serves to rule out idiomatic phrases like dog house, which has the conventional meaning 'house that a dog sleeps in,' and therefore may no longer be a truly complex concept. (Murphy 1988: 35).

[3] 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.

Thus, considering "gender" as a simple concept is only based on the quantity of words in the concept, and not whether it is simple to interpret. Murphy notes that it can be difficult to categorise grammatical construction as one or the other, however, the categorisation is applicable for operational use. This is relevant since some might consider "gender justice" and "gender equality" as being on the limit between complex concepts and an idiomatic phrase or concept, at least within some fields. However, it can be argued that the meaning is not stable and conventional enough to be considered idiomatic. The distinction between simple and complex concepts was made after I had read the empirical data, and observed something that could possibly be tendencies regarding the translations of e.g., "gender equality", which seemed to be consistently translated into "*al-musāwāh bayna-l-jinsayn",* even when "gender" had other equivalents in other constructions. I wanted to investigate whether this tendency was consistent and whether other tendencies or patterns could be identified and described.

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 complex concept of "gender equality". The other triliteral 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). The polysemous meanings of j-n-s and n-w-ʿ will be addressed in section 2.4.

1.1.3. Defining the Arabic language variety in the empirical data

As other languages, Arabic exists in many varieties. This section addresses how the Arabic language variety in the empirical data is defined in this thesis. Referring to Ferguson (1991) and Hudson (2002), among others, Ibrahim writes that the Arabic language is in a "diglossic situation". Accordingly, Ferguson (1959), distinguished between a "High" and "Low" variety, where the former is used in writing and learned in formal education, while the Low is used in daily conversation and informal situations. He started by dividing these two varieties, but recognised in 1991 that the relationship between them is a continuum on which mixing occurs, something that is emphasised further by other scholars and studies in 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 obviously also mix. According to Hallberg, 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 (2016: 37-38), and hence adjust their language variety to the situation. Following Hallberg, 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. The linguistic changes were according to Hallberg primarily on "/.../the lexical and phraseological levels, while the basic syntax remained unchanged." (2016: 7). However, Bassiouney (2009: 12) noted that MSA is constructed in Western scholarship, and is not used in Arabic literature on the subject. This study is not about language varieties, and thus defines the variety in the empirical data in a broad sense, as to why it uses SA to describe it. I want to emphasise that this study's categorisation of *Musawah*'s transnational SA is a general categorisation which can be critiqued and specified more, and additionally can be put into a political perspective. Though *Musawah's* language is here classified as SA, it would be interesting to investigate *Musawah's* social media platforms and discuss whether they incorporate dialect. Such a study has been done by Ibrahim in Arabic newspapers showing how some newspapers use more and more dialect. (Ibrahim in

Bassiouney 2010: 23). Also, since parts of these publications are based on readings of classical Arabic texts, it could be interesting to investigate this in another study to see how *Musawah* works around the fact that some of their English publications rely on translations from classical Arabic texts such as the *Qur'ān* and *Ḥadīṯ*. However, both these aspects are beyond the scope here. In sum, SA covers both classical and what some refer to as MSA, while dialects refer to those national and regional languages spoken and written everyday that are not official languages in any countries. The present thesis describes the language in the TTs in the empirical data as SA.

1.3. Structure of the paper

This chapter has specified the purpose and the RQs of the study, and provided some key definitions on simple and complex concepts, and on the language variety studied. Relevant definitions of gender and feminism, including discussions of these will be provided in Chapter 2, which also unfolds the theoretical background on language and translation, including equivalence, feminist translation studies and discourse. Chapter 2 ends in a literary review of earlier studies of translation of "gender" into Arabic. Chapter 3 is dedicated to explaining and exemplifying the method applied, and also reflects on the limitations of the present study, including the standpoint and perspective of the author. Chapter 3 also provides an overview of the empirical data and its selection criteria. Chapter 4 presents the analysis, demonstrating through 42 examples how "gender" and the derivative "gendered" is translated in various constructions in *Musawah*'s Arabic TTs. Finally, Chapter 5 concludes on the results by answering the overall RQ, which is divided into RQ1 and RQ2, including their subquestions. Here, tables showing the constructions with "gender", "sex" and "gendered" and their frequency in each text from the data are provided. 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*.

Chapter 2: Background

This chapter starts by discussing different understandings of the concept of "gender" in section 2.1, followed by an explanation and discussion of feminism(s) as social movement and theory in section 2.2, including a brief introduction to Islamic/Muslim feminism, which is the kind of feminism that the publisher of our empirical data, *Musawah*, can be ascribed to in section 2.2.2. In section 2.3, the study specifies the theoretical framework by addressing equivalence, visibility and transparency in translation, finishing the chapter by going through former studies of "gender" in Arabic translations.

2.1. Defining "gender" in translation

Though considering "gender" as an Anglophone term, this study recognises that the theory about the phenomenon refers back to French existentialism, more precisely Simone de Beauvoir who in 1949 wrote: "'on ne naît pas femme on le deviant'" which was translated by E.M. Parshley in 1953 as "'one is not born, but rather becomes a women'". As Flotow notes, "both Beauvoir and Parshley were talking about gender" (1997:5). Neither of them used the term "gender", but today this term in feminist theory refers back to Beauvoir's notion of women's socialisation. Flotow's own definition of the term "gender" in her book *Translation and Gender: Translating in the era of feminism*, is that it designates "/.../the socio-cultural attitudes that go with biological sex." (1997: 100), and refers to the sociocultural construction of *both* sexes (1997:5), i.e., women and men, and that including "other sexual orientations" has blurred the term. (1997: 100). The concept of "gender" is used in various Anglophone contexts, and some problematise the often uncritical adoption in many academic disciplines, including non-Anglophone areas of scholarship (Olson 2012; Kamal 2018:140). "Gender" in interlingual translation has been studied in languages other

than Arabic as a troubled concept due to linguistic and cultural differences. In the French context, Brodzki has investigated translations of "gender" in different constructions. She does not distinguish between "gender" as a simple concept and in complex concepts, but generally finds it problematic to construct equivalence between the French "genre" and the English gender. (2011: 274). Brodzki raises 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 usages of the term.

Literature on "gender" in translation describes it as either a concept within feminist theory, or a field of knowledge of its own which is interdisciplinary, connected to cultural-, literary- and women's studies (Olson 2012; Kamal 2018). The term was firmly established in "Western" third-wave feminism in the 1990s (2018:140), and Olson points to Judith Butler's theorising of gender performativity as one of the reasons with emphasis on her book from 1990, *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity* (Butler 2006), which as Olson notes, has been subject to "facile readings" (2012: 9). In her second book, *Bodies that Matter: On the Discursive Limits of Sex* (2011) first published in 1993, Butler elaborates on gender performativity, making it clear that her aim is not to dismiss "sex" as a category, or to isolate "sex" from "gender". She sees "sex" as the materiality of the body, but she discusses to what extent this materiality and the idea about natural categorisation is constructed, seeking to explore the stabilised materiality of sex, accordingly taking place *through* gender performativity. "Gender" is then 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 does not credit Butler for her clarification, but acknowledges that Butler explains how gender is not a matter of subjective choice. Olson's main points of critique against "gender" as a concept are: It makes little sense in many languages, e.g. French, and as the present study addresses; Arabic. Secondly, it is an expression of American hegemonic dominance in scholarship. Finally, in practice it 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”. This is determined on the child’s day of birth or now, for those who want and have access to the relevant technology, prenatally. (2012:3). Olson mentions that using “gender” as an euphemism for a human being’s sex has been described in sociology as a natural attitude assuming a binary system of women and men based on what is considered natural anatomical differences. Another use of “gender” is as a differential category, where “gender” is defined in contradistinction to “sex”, to describe the learned feminine and masculine norms of behaviour. Thus some consider it self-evident that it means “/…/the culturally constructed forms of behavior that roughly correlate with social difference”. (2012:3). Thus, especially in the social sciences, many authors now carefully distinguish between “gender” and “sex”, and look to gender to explain the behaviour, practices, roles, and social organisation of sex. Though this distinction is popular, Brodzki argues that it cannot be directly imported to French, since “sexe” and “genre” are not equivalent to “sex” and “gender”. Accordingly, “genre” is a correlative to “gender”, but not an adequate equivalent. They overlap, but one should not be subsumed by the other. (2011: 279). Accordingly, “gender” was created in English because the word “sex” has a more restricted semantic field than the word “sexe” in French: “Indeed, ‘identité sexuelle,’ until recently, was regarded as the translation of the English term ‘gender identity’” (2011: 273).

“Gender” in English can mean classificatory difference, as when used for describing grammatical categories, or learned masculine and feminine behaviours. Further copulation and non-heteronormative sexual acts are retained in the uses of “gender”. Hence, “It is not easy to offer a clear definition of gender, because it continues to be used confusedly and synonymously with both sex and sexuality” (Olson 2012:4). While Flotow considered it blurrying for “gender” to include different sexual orientations in the term, Kamal’s perspective is that “gender” has failed to include LGBTIQ+, since these closely affiliated ideologies, identities, and politics. have had to develop their own ideology and terminology as Queer Theory. However, Kamal holds that “gender” as a

concept should not be dismissed (2018: 140), since it can be useful as an analytical category within feminism, but that it easily loses its political potential outside of feminism (2018: 143). Section 2.3. will discuss what feminism is, and further explain the branch of Islamic/Muslim feminism in which the publisher of the empirical data, *Musawah*, can be placed.

2.2. Feminism(s)

The material studied is published by a social movement considering itself to: "/.../apply feminist and rights-based lenses in understanding and searching for equality and justice within Muslim legal tradition," (Musawah.org, Our Work, accessed 2021.07.23). This section addresses how feminism can be understood. Feminism relies on the presumption that inequalities between sexes, or genders, depending on the terms used, in all parts of the world exist, and these inequalities are considered to be socially constructed (Okin in Phillips 1998: 116). The definition depends on whether it is seen as an ideology, a paradigm, a social movement, an academic theory, or a combination. Kamal follows Frye's definition of feminism as a theory, i.e. a: "/.../ 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). Kamal also agrees with Frye's notion of the interplay between feminism as activism and theory: "Feminism may also be understood as a kind of social movement, one that may generate and be aided by theory. Both are concerned with women's flourishing – women controlling adequate resources, of all sorts, to live well" (2018:137).

Feminism is contested with the debate on relativism, essentialism and inclusivity. For example some understand feminism to be concerned mainly, or even only, with women as a supressed group, whereas others are more attentive to include other identities also perceived as less privileged than "white heteronormative cis-gendered men", for example non-binary and transgender persons as well as persons having a minority sexual orientation. Additionally, the intersection with other

aspects of identity, such as race, ethnicity, religion, and socio-economic background has similarly been the subject of many feminist studies. This intersectional approach developed after Mohanty's critique of what she considered "Western" feminism's essentialist perception of women in less privileged contexts (1988). Mohanty has an important point, and the postcolonial and intersectional approach is relevant because women live in more or less privileged realities. Women too can be powerful and suppress other individuals, including men. Still, it is possible to identify and discuss issues causing suppression to groups of "women", without having an essentialist perception of all women's experiences as identical. In "A defence of the category 'women'" Gunnarson argues that even though "/.../the category 'women' does not reflect the whole reality of concrete and particular women, it nevertheless refers to something real, namely the structural position as woman." (2011: 23). Gunnarson is not satisfied with definitions of feminist theory avoiding to mention women or gendered relations, focusing only on power and resistance. If feminism was feminist because it focused on power and resistance, it could pertain to all theoretical frameworks about those terms (2011:23). Gunnarsson acknowledges that the use of categories such as "women" and "men" are never innocent, which can be interpreted as an encouragement to consider their cultural, historical and contemporary implications as well as the identities they exclude. It is important to deconstruct deterministic and essentialist notions of what it means to be man or woman, but we need "women" and "men" as categories. The focus on "women" as advocated by feminist theorists such as Gunnarsson is practiced by *Musawah* along with the use of "gender", while also incorporating an intersectional view e.g.,, when stating that not all women experience discrimination and inequality in the same way because of differences in "/.../class, age, ethnicity, race among other things" (*Musawah* ST03 2017: 2). However, *Musawah's* intersectionality never expands to sexuality or moves beyond a binary perception of "women" and "men", which some would criticise, while other would consider it strategically wise maintain a heteronormative focus, especially considering the political and social context of the state-laws they try to change.

Kamal mentions that most societies across the world have witnessed different forms of feminism. As opposed to "gender", feminism emerged in different localities including Arabic contexts such as Egypt. Hence, feminism was already an "indigenous" social movement before a more established theoretical framework began to "travel" from especially Europe and North America (2018:139). 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. Recognising the plurality of political thought, ideology and aspects of identity incorporated in feminism(s), today the plural form, *feminisms* is often used (1997:100) as an umbrella for both "black feminism", "liberal feminism", "radical feminism", "postcolonial feminism", as well as "Islamic feminism" and "Arab feminism" etc. They all manifest themselves in theories and/or socio-political activism (2018: 137). Some feminisms intersect with other disciplines, theories, and ideologies, and are both academic and activist, or somewhere in between. An example of this can be the diverse field often termed Islamic feminism in which the transnational social movement *Musawah* can be placed.

2.2.1. Muslim/Islamic feminism and the case of *Musawah*

Embabi has surveyed Arabic translations of what she calls "faith-based feminist texts" (2020:492), i.e., feminist texts which include an Islamic/Muslim perspective (2020:481). She notes that feminist ideas and concepts travel fast due to modern communication technology, making it possible to publish and spread ideas transnationally. She sees feminism as a paradigm though she does not define "paradigm". Islamic/Muslim feminism is a growing field within this diversed feminist "paradigm" (2020:481). The diversification means that an accurate definition of "Islamic Feminism" is difficult, some prefer the term "Muslim feminism" (2020:481), or would hesitate to consider themselves "feminist", due to the historical connotations of the word, which some consider a Western term, like "gender", and an expression of modern cultural imperialism. However, Kamal (2018) and Badran (2010) argue that feminism developed in different places in the world as social movements. Embabi's definition of Islamic/Muslim feminism is that its

substance is 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, *ḥadīṯ*, and existing Quranic interpretation, including jurisprudence (2020:481), *fiqh*. The engagement with Islam covers a spectrum from hostility towards all tradition, to others, such as *Musawah*, believing in the possibility of engaging with the discourse of Islam about women, offering alternative readings of the core texts. Despite the diversity, Muslim/Islamic feminists agree on a reformist approach and declare their work as providing alternative voices on the injustices experienced by Muslim women in Muslim contexts (2020:481).

Badran is critical to the sharp opposition between "secular" and "Muslim/Islamic" feminisms in Muslim countries, since the feminisms emerging among Muslims in predominantly Muslim countries in Africa and Asia in the early 20th century incorporated and expanded upon Islamic modernist as well as secular nationalist and humanitarian ideas of the time, but are mainly referred to as secular (2010:2-3). Her observation is relevant in relation to movements such as *Musawah*, here considered a Muslim feminist movement, because of its substance based in Islam. However, *Musawah* also uses terms and concepts from international human rights, and shares a connection with European and North American intellectual heritage and academic scholarship, similar to many "secular" feminist, an thus the categories "Muslim feminisms", and "secular feminisms", are not productive is they imply an opposition, since both faith-based and non-faithbased are diverse branches The early "secular" feminisms in the Muslim world were nationbased in contrast to the global and transnational Islamic/Muslim feminisms of today. Early feminisms were mainly driven by social movements, while Islamic/Muslim feminism in the 1990s emerged as new feminist *discourse,* driven by theology, characterised by "...increasingly sophisticated interpretations of the Qur'an on the part of feminist intellectuals and new approaches to Islamic jurisprudence" (Badran 2010:2, Badran's transliteration). Still, it has an activist element informed by the experience of the early feminists. Islamic/Muslim feminism brings together interpretation and implementation (2010:2), and are broadly received by privileged and ordinary women.

Muslim/Islamic feminisms are also special because they emerged in an era of globalisation, which has been used to form collective organisation at national *and* transnational levels (2010: 1-2). *Musawah* regards itself as a "global movement for equality and justice in the Muslim family" (www.musawah.org), and Derichs defines it as a transnational social movement (2010: 407), a definition followed here, since, as Flotow notes, the term "transnational" rather than "international" or "global" in feminism evokes shared and collaborative communication across and despite borders and languages to promote mutual interests, while "international" seems to imply largely official, diplomatic channels (2019: 174)

For *Musawah*, the main issue is reform policies to improve equality in the law and family and thereby in society. In the Musawah Framework for Action (2009), available in English and Arabic, among other languages, *Musawah's* three core principles are:

1. The universal and Islamic values of equality, non-discrimination, justice and dignity are the basis of all human relations.
2. Full and equal citizenship, including full participation in all aspects of society, is the right of every individual
3. Equality between men and women requires equality in the family. (Musawah Framework for Action 2009: 4-5)

Different scholars inform *Musawah*, and the work they rely upon range from new interpretations of Quranic verses that influence women's lives and the husband-wife relationship, to abstract questions, such as identifying a new paradigm for interpreting gender-relations based on the concept of justice and compassion. Others produce scholarship related to changing realities, particularly with respect to personal status laws (what *Musawah* often refers to as Muslim family law) and inheritance laws/practices. (2020:482-483).

2.2.2. Feminist discourse

In her article "*Theorizing Feminist Discourse/ Translation*", Godard (1989) stated that a feminist critical reflection on translations of either feminist or non-feminist texts requires an informed understanding of feminist discourse in terms of the relationship between feminism and language.

Godard's feminism is concerned with women and language rather than gender in its broadest sense, but arguably her reflections could also be useful in studies of discourses of other identity groups considered to be misrepresented in language. Discourse is not clearly defined by Godard, but her notion of discourse clearly goes beyond one utterance and includes notions of how language is used in general, or by specific actors about specific topics. This study also considers discourse in a broad sense defining it as:

> /.../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).

To Godard, a feminist discourse is translation in two ways: It brings forward an unheard previously muted discourse, and secondly it consequently displace the dominant discourse to "destroy the discursive mechanism", for example by assuming the feminine role deliberately, which accordingly is to convert subordination into an affirmation (1989:46). Further, feminist discourse involves a conscious process of questioning the constructions of language and meaning, which is what *Musawah* can be said to do when insisting on re-interpretations of the Islamic legal tradition and its discourse, as in their Framework of Action[4]:

> Thus, contemporary family laws, whether codified or uncodified, are not divine, but are based on centuries-old, human-made fiqh interpretations that were enacted into law by colonial powers and national governments. Since these interpretations and laws are human-made and concern relations between humans, they can change within the framework of Islamic principles and in accordance with the changing realities of time and place. (2009: 4 English version)

However, *Musawah* is not radical in their general approach to language structure, and does not deconstruct patriarchal language on the structural, grammatical level, at least not in this data. Still, *Musawah's* discource is feminist, and is what Godard and Kamal consider "double" and multivoiced. It is an echo of *Musawah* and the other. When re-interpreting former interpretations of *fiqh* the writing carries multiple voices: The voice of women's perspective and experience on the one hand and the reflection of the mainstream patriarchal norms and values on the other

[4] Musawah's "Framework of Action" is not a part of the empirical data, but has been used, among other texts, to understand Musawah's vision, areas of work, objectives and general discourse

(2016:60). The perspectives present in *Musawah's* discourse are, for example, previously patriarchal interpretations of the religious sources, which the movement tries to subvert through their perspectives. On this note, the next section on translation theory is introduced, but before, it is emphasised that both Kamal and Godard consider feminist discourse in translation, and translation in general, as production, not reproduction, or put in another way, one of re/writing and transformation rather than equivalence and transference (2016:60) (1989).

2.3. Theoretical background on language and translation

This section accounts for the view on translation and equivalence. The section is informed by Tymoczko, Venuti, Godard, Flotow, Nida, and Jakobsson. Also, the occasional use of "Western" and "Eastern" in the present study is discussed, arguing that the distinction is difficult to avoid, but not necessarily the most accurate if the purpose is to understand translation of knowledge as a part of knowledge production in a contemporary or historical perspective. As Nida noted, definitions of proper translating are almost as numerous and varied as the persons who have undertaken to discuss the subject (Nida in Venuti 2004: 131). The present study is not concerned with what is "proper", since it approaches translation in a methodological framework which is descriptive rather than prescriptive. At the same time, it sees translation as being not merely an act of transferring a message, but a process of knowledge production (Kamal 2008:254), and thus it does not deny that some of the discussions about how to translate "gender" in the articles referred recommend certain solutions and are critical towards others, and thus they tend to be prescriptive in that sense, but this is not the aim here. Perceiving translation as knowledge production can also serve as explanation for *Musawah's* motivation for its extensive translation practice, since it is incorporated in the movement's knowledge building initiative to translate its work into languages other than English.

2.3.1. Equivalence in translation theory

In his essay "On Linguistic Aspects of Translation", first published in 1959, Roman Jakobson states that the translator recodes and transmits a message received from another source, and defines translation as involving "/.../two equivalent messages in two different codes." (Jakobson in Venuti: 2004: 114). Jakobson distinguished between three ways of translating verbal signs 1) Intralingual translation or rewording, which is rendering of 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 is an interpretation of verbal signs by means of signs of nonverbal sign systems (Jakobson in Venuti 2004:114). Jakobson uses the term code-unit to describe words or idiomatic phrase-words (2004:114), but in this study, we refer to the use of the word "gender" in either a simple concept, as in "gender" or in a composition forming a complex concept, as in e.g., "gender equality", or "gender relations". This study also refers to derivatives of the word "gender", as in "gendered".

Following Jakobson, all cognitive experience is considered conveyable in any existing language. The translator's task is a matter of interpreting whole messages rather than isolated code-units. This is partly because languages are structured in different ways, and because no full equivalence exists neither in intra-, nor inter-linguistic translation. Though not emphasising this aspect to the same degree as feminist theorists like Godard and Flotow, Jakobson was attentive to the various possibilities when translating the same text, recognising that the translator may face what can be termed problems of translation. In these cases, Jakobson writes that terminology can be qualified and amplified by loan-words or loan-translations, neologisms or semantic shifts, and by circumlocutions (2004: 115). Though Jakobson mentions that no full equivalence exists, Venuti's view is that Jakobson underestimates the interpretive nature of translation. To Venuti, it is a fact that recoding is an active rewording that does not transmit the foreign message but transforms it (Venuti 2004: 69).

As Venuti mentions, an opposition between translating that prioritises 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 translation theory since the sixties. Further, equivalence has been understood in different ways, as "accuracy," "adequacy," "correctness," "correspondence," "fidelity," or 'identity". Here, we follow Venuti's definition of equivalence as: "/.../a variable notion of how the translation is connected to the foreign text." (2004: 5)

Nida was a pioneer on the matter, distinguishing between "dynamic" and "formal" varieties of equivalence (2004: 121), which he uses to describe how a message in the ST can correspond to a message in the TT in terms of more or less formal equivalence. Thus equivalence is not necessarily 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 the analysis 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, obviously what is the closest natural equivalent is not necessarily agreed upon (1982: 13), as is clear regarding the word "gender" when translated into Arabic, among other languages.This is relevant in relation to scientific or theoretical language, which Kamal notes 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), or as Nida would probably consider a natural equivalent. However, the discussion can also foster the development of other alternatives (2018:134). We will see in Chapter 4 that "gender" as a concept

and complex concepts with the word serve as good examples to problematise the notion of natural equivalence, and to exemplify the negotiation between formal and functional in knowledge building where the message should be relatively easy to comprehend, but ideally also challenge status quo, especially in relation to feminist knowledge building, which has a political, reformative objective. Seen in that light, feminist knowledge building or advocacy can also be seen as a place for distributing and developing new terms and concepts in a certain linguistic context. These reflections shows that it is not set in stone whether the translator should opt for a functional solution immediately comprehensible, or a more formal one, that might be more challenging to comprehend for some recipients, but nevertheless have the potential of enriching discourses on gender and feminism in for example transnational standard Arabic.

Godard sees translation as production and emphasises difference as a positive and productive aspect. Translation should not strive for equivalence in two messages, and to Godard, much 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 claims that this is an illusion, because language is not transparent. Instead, she suggests that; "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, or a "mimicry", of the ST, so that it is manipulated to target another audience in the target language. The process is Author-Text-Receiver = Translator-Text-Receiver. It should be noted that in the data of this study, there is a difference since the author, i.e., *Musawah*, is deeply involved in the translation process. This should affect the production of the translation to some degree, since definitions and interpretations of the concepts in translation do not rely on someone from the outside. Still, it is clear from the various translations that interpretation of the concept "gender" is not consistent in the data, which might have to do with the way "gender" is interpreted in the different constructions

it appears in. Or, it might have to do with *Musawah's* perception of their target group's ideas about gender. Lastly, we should not underestimate that practical reasons such as inattentiveness or lack of reflection on the polysemous nature of "gender", as well as the various Arabic equivalents can be a factor that has impacted the translations.

The notion of context and recipient was coined before Godard, by Nida, arguing that translations must communicate and make sense to the receptor, or else they have not justified their existence (Nida in Venuti 2004: 132). Nida is also attentive to the purpose of the translation which affects the translator's choices. Godard's view on language difference mirrors Nida's, since he states that languages reflect different realities. Hence, solutions must be ethnological, based on the translator's acquisition of sufficient "cultural information." (2004: 69). Although Nida's notion of cultural awareness and recipients is important, a somewhat static view of "culture" is traceable, and his notion of culture risks essentialising persons sharing the same language. This thesis suggests a more dynamic view on "culture" as ever changing and diverse (Merry 2006: 10), existing in plurality among Arabic language users both in a national and transnational sense. Nida also notes that a translation acceptable in one period is often quite unacceptable at a later time (2004:131), and it can be added that translations accepted in one community, context, or field, are not necessarily accepted in another, even in the same time period and in the same country.

The above shows that there are similarities between Nida and Godard who share some fundamental views on the impossibility of full "equivalence" or identity between messages. Nida is also acknowledging the recreational, productive aspect of translation when mentioning that "a translator of poetry creates another poem" (2004: 131). However, Nida is still striving for equivalence stating that: "/.../one must in translating seek to find the closest possible equivalent." (2004: 129). Here feminist translation theory, including Godard, would disagree, since its focus is not on achieving equivalence but to extend feminist writing reflections and feminist writing. (Flotow 1997). As Godard states, language produces meaning, often through repetition (1989: 48-

49), and the transformative aspect of translation should embrace difference rather than keeping it in the disguise of transparency between languages.

2.3.2. Functional and formal equivalence

This section elaborates on formal and functional equivalence since the terms are applied in the analysis and description of the examples included from the empirical data. These two basic orientations are built on the notion that the translator can construct more or less formal or functional equivalence (Nida in Venuti: 2004: 129, Nida & Taber: 1982). To Nida, formal equivalence focuses its attention on the message itself as it appears "originally" in the source language, in both form and content (2004: 129). Orientation towards formal equivalence will privilege that the message in the target language (TL) should match as closely as possible to the different elements in the source language (SL), and be received by the users of the TL similarly to how it was received in the SL. It should be noted that this is a spectrum, and we will see that the same text, even the same sentence, or the same concept can have both functional and formal features, because a text, or a piece of text such as a paragraph or a period can be formal in structure but functional semantically, or the opposite. A translation characterised by formal structural equivalence might be called a "gloss translation" in which the translator attempts to reproduce as literally and meaningfully as possible the form and content of the original. Nida states that:

> /.../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).

Though Nida refers to the reader as male, 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 constantly 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. Again considering that various cultures speak the same language, one might suggest the word target group instead of culture.

Nida and Taber place functional equivalence at the other end of the spectrum, and is defined as a translation principle in which a translator seeks to translate the meaning of the original so that the TT will trigger the same impact on the target audience as the original wording 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).

The translation method will vary according to the orientation. If the aim is to produce formal equivalence, translators 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).

2.3.3. Visibility of the translator

Nida and Taber state that "The best translation does not sound like a translation." (1982: 12). Here feminist translation theory considers it different since the translator's visibility and explicit self-reflixivity is of high priority (Godard 1989: 47). Godard suggests keeping some of the "cultural" traces from the ST, and considering the reader-oriented approach, she also advocates that these should be explained instead of erased:

> The elimination of self-reflexive elements results in the suppression of signs of the author-function but also in those of the translator-function since her (or his/their) manipulative work on these elements is rendered invisible in the resulting conflation of the two texts. (1989: 47).

This view is adopted by the self-declared femininst translator and literary scholar Kamal. She notes that many feminist translators call for visibility of the translator, and this is reflected in her own translational practice. She states that she was conscious about including a "Note on Translation", when editing the Arabic translation of the book, *Encyclopedia of Women and Islamic Cultures* (EWIC). In the note she explains the process that governed the selection of equivalents in the translation of gender-related terminology (2008: 258). To Kamal, the translation of EWIC is not just an effort to transfer the text of the encyclopedia from English into Arabic, but also an attempt to highlight dimensions related to the linguistic and cultural contexts in the transference of knowledge and the accompanying process of producing knowledge in Arabic (2008:158). Kamal emphasises the role of the translator in their involvement in selection and judgment during the translation process, and aims at results that reflect representation rather than equivalence (2008:158).

2.4. Former studies on translations of "gender" into Arabic

This section implicitly supports the overall purpose of the study, which is to investigate and describe how *Musawah* translates "gender", complex concepts with "gender" and the derivative "gendered" into Arabic. Firstly, this account of earlier findings on translations of "gender" from English into Arabic confirms the present study's contribution to the field, since none of the former studies have distinguished between simple and complex concepts when describing "gender"in Arabic. Neither have they systematically described more translations published by the same author, and further, I have not identified other studies focusing on translations targeting a transnational Arabic audience. Kamal's and Mehrez's reflections, including normative ones, about translation of "gender", contribute to qualify and control my interpretation and analysis of *Musawah's* translations into Arabic as a non-native speaker of Arabic.

The relevant articles are written by Samia Mehrez (2007), and Hala Kamal (2008, 2017, 2018). It should be noted that when both Mehrez and Kamal describe examples, they are in SA but mainly from an Egyptian context, although Kamal also provides inputs on a general level through her reflections on the translation of *Encyclopaedia of Women and Islamic Cultures* (EWIC) not targeting any specific Arabic 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), aguing that the various translations into Arabic suggests at first glance that the field of gender studies in the Egyptian context she is occupied with 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. Among other things, she approaches a specific text through a descriptive method, but towards the end she becomes slightly prescriptive in her critique of existing translations, and her refusal of the loan word "*al-jindar"*. Kamal follows some of Mehrez findings, but on the other hand she is concerned with what the present study terms polysemous meaning of "*an-naw'"* since it also means genre in her field of 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). Originally, the English word "gender", the Arabic word "*jins"* and the French word "genre" all come from the Greek word genos meaning species, sort, category, birth, race, family, etc. (Oxford Classical Dictionary accessed 2021.08.09). 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, the Arabic word *jins* (جِنس) 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 triliteral

root, because it is made up of three consonants which can be rendered in Arabic as the three radicals constituting the root (Versteegh 2014:89). This makes *jins* easy to naturalise in Arabic. The noun *jins* in Arabic currently signifies "sex", "kind", or "species", and among the primary meanings of *jins* are: gender (as a grammatical category), kind, sort, species, category, class, sex, as in male, female, and race (Wehr 1979: 141). Mehrez points out that the histories of the Greek *"genos"* (again she actually writes "genus") and the Arabic "*jins"* are no longer identical, or antithetical, or complementary, but different (2007: 109). She notes this because the derivative forms from the triliteral root j-n-s have extended the word's field of signification beyond that of immediate categorisation. Today, *jinsī* means sexual, *jinās*, assonance; *jinsīya*, nationality; *tajnīs*, naturalization; *tajānus*, homogeneity, etc. (2007: 109, 1979: 141). In the context of "gender" and "sex", Mehrez can be said to consider "*jins"* in contemporaray Arabic as the most natural equivalent to "sex", rather than "gender" (2007: 116). However, 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 editorial of 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)

The editorial continues by arguing that, because the triliteral root 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). Therefore, a new term needed to be constructed, which Mehrez agrees with. 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, she notes that 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 she also finds 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 genre in literary theory, 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 ع as ' rather than ʿ which deviates from this study)

Hence, Kamal considers "*an-naw'"* and "*an-naw' al-ijtima'ī"* as relatively well established or close equivalents to gender in development, which is a context *Musawah* can be said to belong to, and her notion can to some extent be confirmed by the empirical data, but not entirely, since *Musawah* also uses other words. Kamal states that standard English-Arabic dictionaries limit the 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, which accordingly is regarded as the highest authority in translation and coinage of new terminology in Arabic:

> /.../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)

Also, Kamal points to the fact that "gender" in translation into Arabic is characterised by high lexical variety in itself as in its derivative forms. She states that it increased in Arabic translations in the 1990s. One of the earliest common translations of the concept of "gender" was the explanatory translation already mentioned, "*an-naw' al-ijtimā'ī",* meaning "social gender," (or social kind/sort/type). It was abbreviated as "*an-naw'"* in development studies and social sciences, most likely because it became widely used after extensive translation of developmental documents and material in development organizations (2008: 262-263).

Another early use of "gender" in Arabic is an example not from a translation, but from an interview published in Arabic with, among others, Hoda Elsadda, one of the founding members of the *Women and Memory Forum* in Cairo[5] (2007: 117). Mehrez finds that none of the participants use the same terminology to denote "gender", and she identifies the following usages in that interview:

> /.../*al-bu'd al-junūsi* (the gender dimension) to *dirāsat al-nau'* (studies of kind), to *al-tashakkul al-thaqāfi wa'l-ijtimā'i li'l-jins* (the cultural and social construction of sex), to an outright refusal to translate the concept of "gender" since it is perceived as a Western introduction for which there is no Arabic translation." (2007: 118-119, Mehrez's transliterations, italics added)

Mehrez's description here is based on what she considers "/.../a quick survey of some of the 'solutions' to the problem of translating gender /.../" (2007:110).

Mehrez also refers to later publications by the journal *Alif* on women and gender, and in that context identify a new 'Arabisation', or transliteration of the English word "gender"*,* which has entered as a new loan word in e.g. "*dirasāt al-jindar"*, on top of "*dirāsat an-naw' al-ijtimā'ī".* Mehrez's normative statement is 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

[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

considering the hypersensitivity to "Western" hegemonic discourses today. However, focusing on the receptor, it can be argued that it depends on the target group whether "*al-jindar"* is accepted or not, since Arabic language speakers are a heterogenous group. The use of "*al-jindar"* is the point on which Kamal disagrees with Mehrez, since Kamal in several articles (2008, 2018) 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). In sum, Kamal provides the following arguments in favour of "*al-jindar"* as the closests equivalent for the word "gender":

- Using transliteration in Arabic points out the origins of the concept as a foreign that carries its own 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
- *"Jindar"* fits better within literary discourses where the term *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)

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

> /.../it 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)

Kamal believes that "gender" travels better when situated within feminist theory as a concept and analytical tool, rather than outside. And within feminist activism rather than in development

projects[6]. Kamal's preference for "*al-jindar"* agrees with Godard's notion of keeping some cultural traces when translating.

This section identified two authors who have described translations of "gender" into Arabic, and also referred to the invention of Ghazoul's neologism in the journal *Alif*. It is important to note that most of their examples are from an Egyptian context, whereas the publications in the empirical data in the present study target a transnational Arabic speaking audience. However, all examples mentioned by Kamal and Mehrez are in SA like the data analysed here. Also, the UN translations referred to above must be considered trans-arab. The present thesis adds to the existing literature on translations of "gender" into Arabic, since it - besides from expanding it to a transnational context - also has a different focus through a method that describes various translations by the same publisher, and distinguishes between "gender" as a simple concept, a derivative "gendered" and in a complex concept, such as "gender equality".

Earlier studies on the translations of "gender" into Arabic have identified 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-ijtim'ī* (the social kind,gender, sex, type, sort)
- *"An-naw'"* (kind, gender, sex, genre, sort, type)
- *"An-naw' al-ijtimā'ī (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'ī li-l-jins",* rendered as "the cultural and social construction of sex", by Mehrez (2007: 119)

[6] 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.

Kamal or Mehrez become rather 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 complex concepts and nearly consistently as denoting "gender" in the complex concepts of "gender equality" and "gender justice". Kamal and Mehrez are mainly concerned with either academic discourses and one example from the UN. Reading the literature, the impression is that actors are consistent in their use and translations of "gender", but that it depends on ideologi 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. It is noted in the present study that former studies have not found that the plural of the noun "*jins"*, i.e. "*ajnās"* has been used. Perhaps its meaning as "kinds", "types" or "genres" is too established, but this question remains unanswered.

A last remark is that their approach to translation, also in academia, is that translators are agents who can affect cultural change. Translation becomes activism with the potential to subvert power. Power is then not merely "top down", but exercised by actors "/.../seeking empowerment and engaging in resistance" (Tymoczko 2007: 45).

Chapter 3: Method and Empirical Data

This chapter aims at placing the present study methodologically within the field of descriptive translation studies and feminist translation studies. Afterwards, it explains the specific method designed for investigating translations of "gender" in the empirical data. This chapter also reflects 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, even though this study also falls back to using the term "Western" as a way of describing e.g., "Western feminism".

3.1 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. Further, researchers need skills in *two* linguistic and cultural contexts, making it methodologically challenging in practice (1997:89). Encouraged by the lack of investigations, this thesis describes how equivalence is constructed between English source texts (STs) and Arabic target texts (TTs) focusing on the concept of "gender", its derivative, "gendered" and complex concepts with "gender" such as "gender equality" to describe how these are translated from English into Arabic in publications published by the Muslim feminist transnational social movement *Musawah*. The descriptive method, which documents translations in use, is related to the view on equivalence as having a posteriori nature, since equivalence is seen as a relationship constructed by the translator: Any given text can be translated in different ways (2007:41). This implies that the aim in the present study is not to prescribe any specific translation or use of gender, but to describe it. In *Enlarging*

Translation, Empowering Translators (2007), Tymoczko characterises different developments related to thinking about translation in the postpositivist history of translation studies stating that translation studies are complex and diverse approached by different methods and disciplines, but has its foundation in philosophy of language, linguistics and literary studies (2007:15-50). Descriptive translation studies are anchored in linguistics, developed through postpositivist perspectives which problematised earlier views on translation as "a matter of common sense" (2007:19), expanding research and theories on translation to involve context and cultural aspects, through several "turns". Since the 1980s it has turned towards a focus on translation in relation to culture and power, where power is complex and translation can be seen as a place where discourses meet and power relations are negotiated (2007: 45). Related, an increasing self-reflectivity and recognition of the non-universal fact of translation due to the subjective judgements, interests, and perspectives of the translator (2007:19) are important aspects of this descriptive method.

3.1.1. Feminist and descriptive translation studies

This study also relies on feminist translation theory considering language as a powerful tool that is both shaped by and has taken part in shaping gender inequalities historically. Feminist theory then contributes to the theoretical basis for the method, but it also contributed to understanding *Musawah* as a movement, which is crucial in an analysis of its publications constituting the data. Flotow has described and theorised different feminist translation practices including experimental (1997:14), interventionist (1997:24), revision of earlier texts, (1997:35-45), and rereading and rewriting earlier translations (1997:49). *Musawah's* feminist approach to language and translation is mainly to revise earlier Islamic texts, including translations of them, but they are not occupied with undermining, subverting or destroying the "conventional everyday language maintained by institutions, universities, publishing houses, the media, dictionaries/.../" (1997: 14). The part of *Musawah's* translation practice studied here, i.e., the translation of their English publications into Arabic, can be seen as relying on revision and possibly interventionist readings and translations of

faith-based texts, but is also feminist since the production and sharing of knowledge is done through translation purposing to capacity build civil society beyond English users. Kamal notes that actors working with feminist translation, besides from the linguistic mastery of both languages, must have:

> 1) a deep understanding of feminist terminology and theory; 2) the conscious realization of the translation process as one that entails interpretation, mediation and transformation; 3) reflection on the ethical implication involved in translating feminist thought; 4) an awareness of the prospective readership in relation to the readers' and translators' specialisation. (2017: 72).

3.1.2. Selecting empirical data

According to Tymoczko, any research area, including translation studies, must include following aspects in their scientific methods: Empirical data and their theoretical interpretation, terminology, classifications and abstractions, and, formal elements, i.e., ways of calculating or conducting methods, for example techniques of establishing and interrogating corpora (2007: 146-147). The empirical data and selection criteria are specified in section 3.3. since it is crucial for the findings in any study. The conclusions could have been fundamentally different if the data was composed by UN publications, or publications by activists identifying as "queer". if the data had been conservative religious writings or national law texts - the two latter might not use the English term "gender", but this would be interesting to investigate in future studies. This emphasises how an empirical study is never "objective" (2007: 145) 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)

Chapter 2 accounted for the theoretical background for interpreting the data and showed that judgement and choice is accepted as a part of any translation process according to Jakobson, Nida, Godard, and Flotow. The main classification and abstractions used are formal and functional equivalence, and the techniques for interrogating the corpora, or data, are inspired by concordance

methods, even though these often tend to investigate larger corpora, as for example done by Rafaat in her investigation of lexical variation in UN publications on female genital mutilation (FGM), showing how the UN has been inconsistent in their translation of female FGM into Arabic (Raafat 2019).

3.2. How the method is applied

The methodology is qualitative hermeneutic, and 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 a publisher that used "gender" in English publications translated into Arabic. After deciding on *Musawah* as a case, I read through 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" as a simple concept were noted for each ST/TT, and a list of complex concepts 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, 42 examples are analysed grammatically and semantically through the notion of formal and functional equivalence. The 42 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 just as relevant as the one presented in Chapter 4.

In Chapter 5, tables showing how the concepts and the derivative are translated in each TT are provided. To answer RQ2, I noted all occurrences of the correlative word “sex” when used as the categrisation 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. The frequency of “sex” and how it is translated is also provided in the tables.

3.2.1 Exemplifying the applied method

This subsection accounts for the method applied in the analysis designed to fulfill the purpose, and selection of examples provided in Chapter 4. The overall RQ is:

How is the simple concept of "gender", derivatives of the word, such as "gendered", and complex concepts with "gender", such as "gender equality", translated from English into Arabic in written knowledge building publications published by the transnational movement *Musawah for Equality in the Family*?

This overall RQ was divided into RQ1 and RQ2, including their subquestions:

(1) What Arabic roots and words are used as equivalents to "gender" when entering into complex concepts, and how is the derivative "gendered" translated in the Arabic TTs?

1.1. What complex concepts with "gender" and what derivatives are identified in the STs?

1.2. How are the identified complex concepts translated in the TTs?

1.3. What Arabic roots are used when constructing equivalences to the derivative "gendered" in the TTs?

(2) How are the simple concepts "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?

To answer RQ1 and RQ2, including subquestions, the analysis of and selection of examples was first approached text by text, and the frequency of the relevant constructions identified in each ST are presented Chapter 4, while chapter 5 provides tables for each text showing the Arabic words and root used in the TTs. Though this is not mainly a quantitative study, quantity regarding word frequency is provided for each text to give the reader an idea about the scope of the use of the concepts. Some complex concepts only occurred once, making it difficult to conclude on whether its translation is consistent. However, they can still be a part of a tendency.

Often, the same complex concepts with "gender" are 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 complex concept. In the cases where the same concept is translated in various ways, examples from all the different tendencies I have divided the different solutions into five categories describing the tendencies. The categories of tendencies are 1) New loan word, i.e., 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) Development or social science 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) Dismissal of the term "gender" in the TT, which is the least formal way of translating since "gender" in these cases is translated into words which arguably would not be considered close equivalents, such as "man and woman" or "boy and girl".

In practice this means that, for example, the simple concept of "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 dismissed, for example when translated into *ġīyāb al-musāwāh fī-l-umūr al-muta'alliqa bi-n-nisā'* (ST/TT 2016: 5/5).

The analysis follows the following steps for each ST/TT in the data: 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 word, 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 concepts, simple as well as complex 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 concept exist, all are provided in Chapter 4.. However, if the same complex concept is translated consistently in all texts, it is only provided once. All the occurrences have been included in the analysis, as will be clear in Chapter 5 where the RQs are finally answered, and a table for each ST/TT mentioning all concepts and their translations, including their frequency is provided.

Finally, the analysis of the word "gender" was compared to the translation of "sex" in order to Answer RQ2 and its subquestion.

3.2.2 Why this combination of methods?

Flotow (1997) among others (Tomyczko 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. An example of this could be the notion of women "translating" themselves into the language of patriarchy (1997:95), which belongs to Godard's theory on feminist discourse and translation. 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" at least if the context is not considered:

> Theories that concern themselves with overarching abstractions about 'translatability', "equivalence in difference" or "dynamic equivalence" and view translation as a primarily linguistic operation carried out between two languages eschew the concrete issues of cultural difference, of context and of the discursive possibilities and options available at a specific historical moment. (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" as defined following Gee in 2.2.2. Tools from discourse analysis such as intertextuality, are used to understand the empirical data published by *Musawah*. 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. Further one utterance or text can contain various discourses while also being a part of many other discourses. A thorough discourse analysis would include other aspects of *Musawah's* communication such as the layout, choice of media for the genre, and possibly include the videos that are parts of the same knowledge building initiative. However, it is impossible to include everything in one analysis. Choices must be made to limit the study. Secondly, this is not mainly a study of discourses as such, but rather a study of equivalence between specific English concepts and their Arabic translations, concepts which are a part of *Musawah's* feminist discourse, but also other discourses on local, national and transnational levels.

Discourse analysis also provides attentiveness to the "worlds" constructed, e.g., a binary heteronormative "world" which can be constructed differently or emphasised more or less in a translation - by purpose or not. To study *Musawah*'s discourse and worlds, I have been oriented towards *Musawah's* description of their work and visions on their English and Arabic websites, which are different and not characterised by actual translation of all sections from English into Arabic. This was done to get an idea about their visions, target groups, methods, and ideological background. It provided information about the declared feminist aim at building and sharing knowledge based on reinterpretations of Islamic sources combined with human rights law and knowledge on national laws in countries they define as having a more or less legislative base in Islamic sources. (In Arabic: من نحن , accessed 2021.07.10, in English Our Work, accessed 2021.07.10)

3.3. Empirical data

As feminist standpoint theory suggests, a feminist approach begins already in the choice of subject and empirical data, filling knowledge gaps and shedding light on subjects related to women's experience and work, which historically have been investigated less in most disciplines until "feminist research programmes" started to be initiated explicitely. (Wylie 2012:54-55). In this sense, feminist theory has contributed to my orientation towards feminist organisations and their language when initiating the work on the present thesis, and as argued, the choice is subjective but none the less 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 both provides new knowledge to fill a scientific gap, while striving at contributing to improve feminists' communication. The

contribution may not make any difference in itself, but serves as a small piece in a large puzzle. To be as transparent as possible, I aim at accounting self-reflexively of personal interests and assumptions about patrarchal structures in the world, inspired by feminist theory. This can also be seen as a "traditional" scientific virtue, at least for the followers of Popper who did not believe in a pure logical way of getting new ideas in science, and also accepted irrational elements and creative intuition in scientific discoveries (1972: 32). If creativity and irrationality is accepted as a part of scientific improvements, then accepting, for example, the fight for social equality, including gender equality, as motivation and source of inspiration should not be problematic, at least not if the method can be tested intersubjectively - which should be the case with the applied method, since all links for the empirical data are provided and accessible. *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

Keeping the overall research question in mind, the purpose is to investigate and describe translations of "gender" into Arabic, and in a more systematic and case based way than former studies have done before, as argued in section 2.4. Considering the reflections in section 3.3. I was especially interested in feminist actors, organisations or movements' translation and use of "gender" in Arabic. Hence, the first step was then to find a feminist publisher that used "gender" in English publications translated into Arabic. This was not easy since most activists do not have a systematic translation practice. Many post more "ad hoc" translations or post more randomly in either English or Arabic on e.g., social media, blogs or their websites. Studying the use of "gender" and complex concepts with "gender" in Arabic without having an English source text 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, when it occurs in Arabic. After finding *Musawah*, I started by limiting my data to their key

publications. Then there was an obvious cut since the publications must be published by *Musawah* in English and translated into Arabic. All *Musawah's* publications exist in English, and many, but not all are translated into at least Arabic and French by the "knowledge building team". To get confirmed that *Musawah* was handling the translations internally, and not by an external translator, I contacted *Musawah* through a direct email available on their website where I asked specifically about their translations into Arabic. To get some kind of coherence in the set data, I decided to only include 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 since the method would be very complicated if an analysis of spoken language in videos were included on top of written texts. The last criteria was that the ST must mention gender or derivative words of gender, and complex concepts with gender. It was not a criteria that any of the texts mentioned "sex", since RQ 2 was not formulated prior to the selection of data, since the initiate idea and main purpose was the investigation of "gender", because it is worth noticing that both are used in English, but not necessarily distinguished between. It will be concluded in Chapter 5 that a distinction is constructed in some TTs, but not all.

3.3.1 Overview of empirical data

This led to the following empirical data, meaning that the English STs and Arabic TTs are:

- Who Provides, Who Cares? (ST 2018: 58 pages), in Arabic *man yanfuq? man yar'a?/* من ينفق؟ من يرعى؟ (TT 2018: 59 pages)
- Knowledge Building Brief 02 "Muslim Family Laws:What Makes Reform Possible?" (ST02 2016: 4. pages) in Arabic *qawānīn al-usra al-muslima: mā allaḏī yaj'al al-iṣlāḥ*/ قوانين الأسرة المسلمة: ما الذي يجعل الإصلاح ممكنا؟ (TT02 2016: 4 pages)

- Knowledge Building Brief 03 “Islam and the question of Gender Equality” (ST03 2017: 4 pages), in Arabic *al-islām wa-qaḍīya al-musāwāh bayna-l-jinsayn/* الإسلام وقضية المساواة بين الجنسين (TT03 2017: 4 pages)
- Knowledge Building Brief 04 “CEDAW and Muslim Family Laws” (ST04 2017: 6 pages), in Arabic *sīdāw wa-qawānīn al-usra al-muslima/* سيداو وقوانين ألأرسة المسلمة (TT04 2017: 6 pages), and last,
- “Musawah Vision for the Muslim Family” (ST 2016: 13 pages), in Arabic *ru’ya “Musāwāh” al-usra/* رؤية "مساواة" لألسرة (TT 2016: 14 pages).

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.

Considering the varying length, layout, amount of information, references to other sources etc. the selected data could be divided into three different categories, or genres. The knowledge building briefs belong to the same category, since especially their length and layout is similar, characterised by brief sections, colours, various headlines and subsections, different text types, and varying text-density. “Who provides? Who Cares?” is more extensive and includes information and tables about laws and social structures in different countries relevant by *Musawah*, but the colourful style and layout are similar to those of the knowledge building briefs. The last text in the data, “Musawah Vision for the Muslim Family”, is different in layout style, since it does not include tables, figures, or pictures. In content, it mostly reflects *Musawah’s* own visions and goals without referring as much to concrete laws, but instead it refers more to concepts from Muslim sources which it re-interprets. The final part reprints verses from the *Qur’ān*, and these are excluded from the data and the comparison of ST 2016 and TT 2016, which then consist of 13 pages for the ST, and 14 pages for the TT.

3.4. Further 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, transnational and more general scale, the present study cannot provide answers, since the method is limited to consider a relatively small 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 some qualitative analysis would be needed. When designing this project, it was challenging to find Anglophone feminist texts published by non-governmental organisations or social movements translated into Arabic. There are plenty of written femininst text in both Arabic and English available on social media, blogs, websites, journals etc., and these would be interesting to study also, but through in-depth discourse analysis rather than translation studies of equivalence since this kind of analysis requires ST and TT. It would be possible to repeat the same method used here on other publications published in English and translated into Arabic by such actors, and though limited, there are other interesting organisations using translation as a part of their activist and/or knowledge building strategy. One example could be the Tunisian organisation *Mawjoudin - we exist* (official spelling), which we will return to in Chapter 5 when suggesting further research. Also, the UN, especially produces various translations which would be interesting to analyse, especially considered the fact that according to their online Gender-sensitive lexicon, the term "*an-naw' al-ijtimā'ī"* is used when translating the simple concept of "gender", and in some complex concepts or constructions, e.g. in "gender based violence", whereas, e.g. "gender equality" seems

to be translated into *"al-musāwāh bayna-l-jinsayn"*. (UN Women: Gender-sensitive lexicon, accessed 2021.08.03) hence, "gender equality" is by *Musawah* translated as in the UN dictionary.

Being a non-native speaker of Arabic does have some limitations besides from the obvious fact that we can never fully be sure that no human mistakes are made. As the author of this thesis, 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 cultural 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. "Cultural" in this context is not meant to imply that there is one Arabic culture essential to all Arabic speaking nations or communities. However, considering the more or less interlinked and shared history, media, literary heritage, religious influence, traditions, music, films, etc., which is possible due to SA, there are different negative and positive attitudes regarding feminism and gender, which could 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). Furthermore, the fact that I am not a native speaker of neither English nor Arabic, who might have 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. I do not claim to be the only one who has identified the problems arising when translating "gender" into Arabic, but the method undertaken here is different from earlier studies considering that only one case, *Musawah*, is studied in depth, shedding light on the various translations done by the same author, even in the same text.

3.4.2. Visibility and non-visibility of the translator(s) in the empirical data

It could be considered a limitation that TT 2018 is the only publication stating that it is a translation, mentioning the translator, who is *'Uṯmān Muṣṭafā 'Uṯmān. Musawah* staff members *Malakī aš-Šamānī* and *Sāra Mārsū* (TT 2018, above table of contents), revised the translation

linguistically and coordinated it. Though I expected them to be translations from English, TT02 2016[7], TT03 2017, TT04 2017, and TT 2016 do not mention whether this is actually the case. I contacted *Musawah* through a contact email available at their website explaining the purpose of the present study, and was informed that *Musawah* has a "knowledge building team", which is involved in the translation of English texts into other languages, including Arabic, in the knowledge building initiative. Though visibility of the translator is in this study seen as desirable, this genre is meant to be "brief" and informative on limited pages, and hence a long note on translation and vocabulary is not necessarily a strategic choice. Still, it could have been noted in a briefly that they are translated from English. 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 generally the various references to terms related to feminist and human rights concepts from originally Anglophone discourses. Further, though not so relevant for this section, a note could have been helpful for receptors not reading the English ST[8].

3.4.1. A note on the East-West dichotomy

This paper uses the term "Western", but as Tymoczko notes, West of what? (2007:15). The term implies a perspective and a position that must be accounted for. The present view is shaped by Scandinavian educational institutions, affecting the study. For example, mainly the English grammatical terms are used here to describe the Arabic grammar, with *idāfa*[9] as an exception.

---

[7] 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)

[8] 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).

[9] According 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

Also, the theories and the scientific approach rely on what Tymoczko classifies as Western postpositivist scientific tradition (2007:18). However, the movement *Musawah* and the articles provided by Kamal and Mehrez are difficult to classify as either Eastern or Western, even though the connection with European and North American scholarship is obvious.

What is less obvious in "Western" literature, is the shared intellectual heritage with what we classify as the Middle East and North Africa today. Tymoczko emphasises the importance of self-reflexivity in translation, something that she misses in what she describes as the earliest sources in the Western history of translation still available. These early writings date back to the historical period of Hellas. Accordingly, translation was considered an instrumental and defined process with a circumscribed domain (2007:15) in the Hellenistic period, and Tymockzko states that problems of translation and the solutions to them were seen as "obvious". This presumption about correct and generalizable translation is why Tymoczko states that statements on translation from before 1900 are difficult to use and to teach in translation theory (2007:17). She could have mentioned available sources from the classical age of Islam. These are rarely included as a factor in Western scientific history, except from specified literature. An example is Ḥunayn b. Isḥāq (808–873/877 AD) who produced and reflected on translations from Greek into Syriac and Arabic, occasionally with Syriac as the mediating language. He produced knowledge through a sophisticated method of translation, his time considered. 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 the message rather than the exact linguistic units and their structure (Rosenthal 1992:17, see also Ḥunayn's account of his translations of Galen, ed. Bergsträsser 1925). Overwein argued that Ḥunayn's method was more reader-oriented than text-oriented based on comparisons of his translations of Galen into respectively Syriac and Arabic (2015). This reader orientation may not have been theorised directly by Ḥunayn but Overwein's

(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)

study shows a well-developed approach to translation that involves self-reflexivity. Further, Gutas states that Ḥunayn stressed that it is important to know for whom the work was translated to in order to evaluate its quality in the beginning of his famous risāla. Accordingly, the task for the TT was to produce these features, and not a presumed "integrity" of the ST, which in Gutas view is often assumed today (1998:140-141). The knowledge production, including translation, in the Classical Islamic Civilisation produced translated from Greek into Arabic which are today considered a part of the Western scientific history. Some would have been lost, were they not translated into Arabic in this period, since they do not exist in Greek anymore. However, this is not the topic of this thesis, but meant to point out the fact that a hardline dichotomy between Western and Eastern scientific history is not necessarily productive, since the history is shared and interlinked.

Chapter 4: Analysis of empirical data

It has been argued that the term "gender" can be considered as a translation problem, and as argued in Chapter 2 the translator(s) must choose between different words and roots based on the purpose of the text, recipients, interpretation, ideology, politics, and arguably also personal taste.

The concepts and derivatives have first been identified in the English publications: "Who Provides, Who Cares" (ST 2018), "Muslim Family Laws:What Makes Reform Possible?" (ST02 2016:), "Islam and the Question of Gender Equality" (ST03: 2017), "CEDAW and Muslim Family Laws" (ST04: 2017), and "Musawah Vision for the Family" (ST 2016). In total 42 examples are provided in Chapter 4, starting from section 4.2., following 4.1., which offers a table showing the frequency of all the simple and complex concepts identified with "gender", and the derivative "gendered", which is the only derivative of "gender" appearing in the STs.

Based on *Musawah's* "Theory of Change", which is not a part of the empirical data but an important strategic document to read in order to understand *Musawah's* direction, methods and visions, *Musawah* wants to "popularise the narrative on equality and justice in Islam" possibly aiming at reaching readers not familiar with the English concepts, but at the same time, they aim to: "...build the capacity and courage of activists, decision-makers and rights groups at the national, regional and global levels." (Theory of Change accessed 2021.08.06). This indicates that the primary target group is persons and organisations familiar with feminist and gender discourses already. Anecdotally, based on my work experience at KVINFO[10], I add that the knowledge building briefs are distributed by email among organisations working with gender equality and women's rights in several countries where Islam plays a role in state laws, however whether the

[10] KVINFO is Denmark's knowledge centre for gender and equality. KVINFO works at the intersection between knowledge, politicy and practice. About Kvinfo (accessed 2021.09.09)

Arabic or English is downloaded and read more, I cannot know, it would require questionnaires or access to *Musawah*'s data on the matter. To know more about *Musawah's* reflections on target groups, and the strategic language choices it would be productive to conduct qualitative interviews with *Musawah's* staff members. Further, qualitative interviews with the translators would be beneficial if aiming to fully understand the if and how the translators distinguish semantically between the different roots, and different uses of singular and dual, but this is beyond the scope and purpose of this thesis.

4.1. Overview of constructions and their frequency in STs

The applied method and the selection of examples was explained in Chapter 3, section 3.1. The analysis now starts by providing an overview of the relevant identified concepts and derivatives in table 1, showing their individual frequency in each text and in total. Then the analysis moves forward concept by concept, and to remind the reader, the translation solutions have been categorised into different tendencies by this study. These are: 1) Loan word, i.e., when the root j-n-d-r is used, 2) Gender-binarism through grammatical dual, i.e., when the root j-n-s is used to form the dual noun "*jinsayn"* 3) 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 4) Loan word plus development term, which is a combination of 1) and 3), and finally 5) Dismissal of the term "gender" in the TT. The identified concepts and derivative (only derivative identified was "gendered"), and their frequency are:

Table 1: Concept complex and their frequency in each ST and in total:

Complex concept	**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, *or* dismissed
Gender stereotypes (stereotyping in one case)	16			1	1	18	n-w-ʿ, *or* j-n-d-r, *or* dismissed
Gender relations	5	1	2		5	13	j-n-s, *or* n-w-ʿ, *or* dismissed
Gender roles	10					10	j-n-s, *or* n-w-ʿ + j-n-d-r, *or* 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 *or* 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-ʿ *and* (j-n-d-r)

Table 2: Other constructions with “gender” and their frequency in each ST and in total:

Construction	**ST 2018**	**ST02 2016**	**ST03 2017**	**ST04 2017**	**ST 2016**	**Total**	**Arabic root(s) for “gender”**
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 3: Simple concepts and the derivative and their frequency in each ST and in total:

Simple concept or derivative	**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-ʿ, or dismissed
Gendered	15		1		2	18	n-w-ʿor dismissed

To keep focus on the purpose of this study, namely how "gender" is translated as simple and in complex concepts, and as derivative, the analysis now moves forward concept by concept, providing examples of all the different identified translations of each concept through 42 examples on total. The basis for selection of examples is exactly that all the different roots and words used in translations of each concept are presented. It mentions how many times it occurred in total, provides a 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 makes it easier for readers not familiar with Arabic to follow the analyses.

4.2. Complex concepts with "gender" as "*jinsayn*"

This section describes the complex concepts 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. When the translation of the terms is only nearly consistent, it will be shown in what way. The analysis starts by describing the most frequent, "Gender equality", which occurred 32 times in total, and in all STs. The following subsection, 4.2.2., treats "gender justice" which in the Arabic data belongs to the same gender-binary tendency. Due to practical reasons, 4.2.2. also briefly touch upon "gendered" because it appears in the same paragraph in ST 2018, and therefore explicitly illustrates how one Arabic root is used in the data when translating "gender" in "gender justice" and another in the derivative "gendered". However, "gendered" is addressed again in section 4.6.

4.2.1. "Gender equality"

Example (1) is from the funding note which appears in all STs, stating that the production of the paper funded by 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 UN programme funded all publications. This funding appears in all STs: ST 2018 (before table of contents), ST02 2016, ST03 2017, and ST04 2017, (final page), and ST: 2016 (before table of contents). 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, but that the views do not necessarily reflect those of the UN (TT: 2016).

Example (1) exemplifies how *Musawah* in almost all cases constructs equivalence between the complex concept of "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*
This more formal back translation illustrates how exactly the word denoting "gender" in "gender equality" has been interpreted, and will be provided in all examples. My back translations are to the formal side, aiming at explicitly showing when "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".

The translation of "programme", i.e., *barnāmaj* is not a part of this study's focus, but is included in the example to give the reader some context to the construction "'Men and Women for Gender Equality'", which is the name of the programme funding the publications constituting the data. In the Arabic 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 both STs and TTs in example (1). 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 section 5.3 "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. To get back to our main focus, the word "gender" in the complex concept of "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 the complex concept of "gender equality" is

transformed into a construction of three words "*al-musāwāh"* (singular female noun) + *"bayn"* (preposition) + *"al-jinsayn"* (dual masculine noun).

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. However, in this example, we focus on another structural difference between English and Arabic The numeric structure. In Arabic, we find a grammatical dual in addition to plural and singular, whereas English only distinguishes between the two latter. Jakobsen stated that languages differ in what they *must* convey and not what they *may* convey. (2004:116). 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 translators 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 root, if wanting to avoid the heteronormative binarism inherent in the grammatical dual. However, the functional equivalence constructed by opting for "*al-musāwāh bayna-l-jinsayn",* could be a strategic communication strategy since the message, in this case "equality between the two genders (or sexes)", i.e., females and males, is concrete and clear. To know why this equivalent was chosen over other possible numeric forms and roots, the present study would have to be followed up by a qualitative interview with *Musawah*. In any case, from a functional perspective based on *Musawah's* generally heteronormative discourse in the STs, the message conveyed in this translation of "gender equality", is not far from the message in the STs, though the complex concept in itself is more abstract in the STs than in the TTs, but reading "*al-musāwāh bayna-l-jinsayn"* in the TTs without having read the STs would not necessarily make the reader think of the relatively well established English complex concept, "gender equality".

Since "gender equality" is translated into "*al-musāwāh bayna-l-jinsayn"* in all corresponding cases in the empirical data except for two, where the term "gender" is dismissed, this paper argues that *Musawah* has constructed a consistent equivalent in Arabic for themselves, based on this data. *Musawah* only uses the root j-n-s in this complex concept, and always expresses it in the dual form. However, 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" is dismissed:

(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)

علـى أنـه مـن الأهميـة بمـكان أن نعـي، فـي الوقـت نفسـه، أن زيـادة معـدلات مشـاركة المـرأة فـي سـوق العمـل لـن تـؤدي تِلْقائِيّاً إلى المسـاواة في قـوة العمل، أو في المجتمع، أو داخل الأسـرة (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 still 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" can be described as the most obvious examples of functional equivalence between STs and TTs, both semantically and structurally.

Besides from cases where "gender" is dismissed from "gender equality", as in example (2), and 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"* (مُساواة), "equality" is in this one case translated into "*tasāwī"* (تَساوِي) in an *idāfa* construction with "*al-jinsayn*" (ST 2018/TT 2018: 57/58).

4.2.2. "Gender justice" and "gendered"

Example (3) shows how the complex concept of "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. The complex concept of "gender justice" appears once in ST 2018, which is in example (3), and three times in ST03 2017, and is consistently 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 الإسامي، فالسؤال ليس من الذي له الحق في ماذا ومن الذي ليس له الحق، بل ما هي آثار الحقوق التراتبية على مختلف أعضاء اًالأسرة، والأعباء المترتبة على المسؤوليات المصنفة نوعيا (جندريا) ، وانعكاسات هذا الإطار القانوني على هويات النوع (TT 2018: 9)

Back translation: *Therefore, when tackling the issue of family well-being matters and justice between the two genders/sexes within the family as it is understood in the Islamic legal heritage, 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 caused by classified responsibilities of (gendered) type/kind/form and repercussions of this legal frame are in identities of (gendered) type/kind/ form?*

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. The complex concept of "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 a reader familiar with this term and concept 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). This is different in the way that it is a complex concept, but the point is maintained, namely that

"*al-ʾadāla bayna-l-jinsayn"* is not the same as "gender justice". Still, the translation theory that this study relies on holds that this solution can still be considered as an equivalent in the context. However, it is arguably not the closests equivalent. Grammatically, the Arabic solution is constructed by a definite singular noun "*al-ʾadāla"* + 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-ʾadāla"* 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-ʾadāla"* 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-ʿ, 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-ʿ (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 *iḍāfa* 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)

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

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, hence, he complex concept as an entity is not rendered consistently, though it only appears twice in the data, namely in TT 2018:

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

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

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

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 whole complex concept 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, that is gender-binarism through grammatical form.

This tendency is traceable in translations of the complex concept "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)

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

Back translation of (6): *the gap between the two genders/sexes*

There is not much to add regarding the use of "*jinsayn"*, since it has already been treated in example (1), (3), . However, regarding the translation of "gender gap" as a complex concept, it can be mentioned that 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. ((54 :TT 2018

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 complex concept and 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 dismissed:

(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 example of one of the most functional translations of "gender" this time in the complex concept of "gender gap", which as a concept or term is dismissed in the TT and it is instead rendered as an "educational gap between girls and boys": *fajwa al-ta'līm bayna-l-fatayāt wa-l-fitya*.

4.3. English complex concept with different Arabic roots in translation

This section provides examples of those complex concepts 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)

/.../العَلاقات بين الجنسين /.../ (TT 2018: 12, 13, 50; TT 03 2017: 2)

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)

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

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 "*ʹalāqāt"* and the preposition "*bayna".* Hence *mutasāwiyya* agrees with "*ʹalāqāt"* 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 of this small difference translated in the same way as in (9), and can be ascribed to the tendency of gender-binarism through grammatical dual.

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. However, in TT 2018: the complex concept of "gender relations" in one case translated into:

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

/.../ عَلاقات النوع /.../(TT 2018:3)

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

The change in root from j-n-s to n-w-ʿ, constructs a different Arabic equivalent to "gender relations" here, i.e., *"ʹalāqāt an-nawʿ"* instead of *"al-ʹalāqāt bayna-l-jinsayn",* as in (9).

This root n-w-ʿ 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-ijtimāʿī* (social). As Kamal notes, about *nawʿ*:

> /.../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" in some constructions, and the related "sex", to be shown in example (40). However, it will also be shown that in 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-ʿ, we turn to one more translation of "gender relations", where a close equivalent for the word "gender" is dismissed:

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

العلاقـات بيـن الرجـال والنسـاء(TT 2016: 2, 4, 9,12 and 13)

Back translation: *relations between men and women*

In two cases the adjective "hierarchical" precedes the complex concept of "gender relations" in the ST (ST 2016: 2, 4), and in the TT, the chosen 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 uded. 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)

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

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

and

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

/.../مسؤوليات الجنسين /.../(TT 2018:3)

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

Musawah's translations of the (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 arranged differently, 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'* could be interpreted as both "sex" and "gender" in addition to "kind", "type", and "sort", however, *an-naw',* can also evoke the notion of "gender" to readers familiar with development and human rights discourses, or social sciences. However, the fact that *Musawah* in two cases in TT 2018 has translated "sex" into *an-naw',* as will be shown in example (40), makes it difficult

to decide how a distinguishing between "sex" and "gender" is made, and also how the movements distinguishes between the meanings of the roots n-w-ʿ, and j-n-s. We now turn to other examples of using "*an-nawʿ"* as equivalent to "gender", and it will be shown that the relatively new loan word *"al-jindar"* in Arabic is sometimes used together with the root *n-w-ʾ,*.

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

In (13), "gender roles and rights" was translated by means of "*jinsayn*" in TT 2018. This is not the case with the complex concept of "gender roles" and the construction "gender roles and rights". 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 (الجندر) يشتبك الفقه اإلسامى و ما إتصل به من قوانين االسرة المسلمة الحديثة مع الارتباط الوثيق بين حقوق و مسئوليات الزوجين و إنعكاسات ذلك على أدوار و هويات الرجل و المرأة الجندرية (TT 2018: 8)

Back translation*: b. Rights and responsibilities and gender/kind/sort/type/form roles (gender) clash with Islamic fiqh and 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.*

Here, the quadriliteral root j-n-d-r, the new Arabisation of the English "gender" is used is used twice, as a noun in parentheses after the second part of a definite *iḍāfa* construction, "*adwār an-nawʿ (al-jindar)",* as an equivalent to "gender roles", and as an adjective describing the identities of men and women in in "*adwār wa-huwīyat ar-rajul wa-l-marʾa al-jindariyya",* showing again how it easily 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.

The next example is difficult to categorise as an actual complex concept, because of the parenthesis, and instead the whole construction, "unequal spousal (and more generally gender) rights within the family and society" is considered. In this example, the word "gender" is also avoided in the TT that tends to be concrete about the identity categories it addresses:

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

/.../غيـاب المسـاواة في الحقـوق بيْن الزوجـيـن في أُسْرة والمجتمع (وغيــاب المسـاواة في الأمـور المتعلقــة بالنســاء بصفــة عامــة). (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'".*

The complex concept of "gender stereotypes" is also translated in various ways, but is in TT 2018 quite consistently translated into *aṣ-ṣuwar 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):

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

الصور النمطية للنوع (TT 2018: 3,4)

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

ST04 2017 mentions "gender" once, in the complex concept of "gender stereotyping", in that way its meaning is related, but not identical to the above example. The context is different, since this is *Musawah*'s own summary of CEDAW without direct references to the articles in the convention, as we saw above. The ST states:

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

تعالج سيداو تَحْدِيداً مسائل متعلقة بالتوصيفات النمطية للجندر, (TT04 2017: 3)

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

Firstly, "gender stereotyping", i.e. "*at-tawṣīfāt an-namaṭīya lil-jindar"* is translated differently in TT04 2017 than "gender stereotypes" in TT 2018, though the use of *an-namaṭīya* is consistent, and. 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 the complex concept as an entity is translated functionally since the two word concept becomes a noun + adjective, "*at-tawṣīfāt an-namaṭiyya"* + the preposition "*li"* (ل) + 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 KVINFO, 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 only 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.

(20), 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 same complex concept and grammatical construction in English, 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 (قولب), 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-namaṭiyya.*

4.4. Complex concepts with “gender” into n-w-ʿ

Before addressing the derivative, which has already appeared in example (3), the analysis provides examples of those concepts that are in most cases translated into the root n-w-ʿ. 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 complex concepts the *n-w-ʿ* root is used consistently, unless “gender” is dismissed in the TT. For example:

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

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

Back translation: *Standards of gender/genre/kind/type/form*

There are two complex concepts only appearing once each: “gender studies” (ST/TT:55/56) and “gender lines”. In both, #gender# is translated into *“an-naw ʿ”*:

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

/.../ دراسات النوع/... (TT 2018: 56)

Back translation: *Studies of gender/kind/sorts/species/genres/types*

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

(23) /.../how such responsibilities can be divided equally instead of along gender lines. (ST 2018: 55)

/.../أن تلك المسؤوليات يمكن تقسيمها بالتساوي بين الطرفين، بدالً من تقسيمها على أساس النوع./... (TT 2018: 56)

Back translation: *That these responsibilities can be divided between the two parties instead of dividing them based on gender/type/genre/form/kind*

The polysemous meaning of the word "*naw'*" has already been addressed, as of why we now move to the section showing more examples of the use of the root j-n-d-r used to create the new loan word "*al-jindar*", which is both used together with the development term "*naw'*", but also on its own. In the complex concept of "gender bias", "gender" is transformed from noun to adjective in the Arabic through the same root n-w-ʿ:

> (24) *Physical care (hadanah[11]), however, has generally always had a gender bias towards women,/.../* (ST 2018: 19)
>
> أمـا الحضـانة، فقد اتسـمت في العـادة بالانحيـاز النوعي تجاه المـرأة، /.../(TT 2018: 19)

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

Here the complex noun + noun concept "gender bias" becomes equivalent to *"inḥīyāz an-naw'ī".* The informal aspect about this is mainly structural since the noun is transformed into an adjective. If the root in n-wʿ in itself is formal or dynamic is difficult to say, considering the polysemous nature of the root. It could be considered quite formal, and possibly incomprehensible or confusing outside of development or social science discourses targeting an audience familiar with English gender-terms. In example (22) 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 (22).

[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.

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

This section shows how “gender” in practice enters into *Musawah*’s Arabic translation as a loan word, both as an adjective as in (12) and a noun together with the root . We start by “gender roles and identities” which is a longer construction than most of the other examples, since “gender” in (25) refers to both “roles” and “identities”, which is also clear

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

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

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

In (25), 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 than an actual simple concept.

4.5.1. “Gender-sensitive” and “gender-neutral”

The complex concepts and 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:

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

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

Back translation: *the laws neutral towards the 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 the complex concept of “gender-sensitive” (ST03/TT03 2017: 3/3)

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

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

These two are translated through a similar strategy, and both construct quite a formal equivalence since *muhāyada* 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-ʿ is used instead of j-n-d-r:

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

/.../حساسـة تجـاه النـوع /.../(TT 2018: 53)

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-ʿ 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.

The next example is from ST/TT 2018, and shows a translation of the derivative "gendered", translated through both "*an-naw'ī"*, as an adjective, followed by "*al-jindarī",* also an adjective derivative of the loan word "*al-jindar"*:

> (29) 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 (الجندري) 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-ʿ, 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-ʿ is here expressed in the definite masculine *nisba*-adjective "*an-nawʿī",* 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-nawʿī* (*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-ʿ , either adjectively (7) or as a noun following the preposition *li* (ل) or *ʿan* (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:

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

/.../الصور النمطية للنوع /.../(TT 2018: 11)

Back translation: the stereotyped (or rigid) images of the gender/genre/type/form/kind. Interestingly this shows that "gendered" in "gendered stereotypes" is translated into Arabic as In a more literal translation "*aṣ-ṣuwar an-namaṭīya lil-nawʿ"* which is the same way as the English complex concept "gender stereotypes" is translated in (ST 2018:. 4, 5, 13, 24, 46, 53, 54, and 56 and TT: 3, 4, 5, 13, 24, 47, 53, 54, 55, and 56), except for one, where *al-mutaʿalliqa bi* (المُتَعَلِّقَة) is inserted between "*an-namaṭiyya"* (النمطية) and "*an-nawʿ"* (ST/TT 2018: 20/19). However, in the following example, a different way:

(31)...gendered stereotypes (ST 2018:46)

التصـورات النمطيـة عـن النـوع (TT 2018: 47)

Again, "gendered" is solved with the root n-w-ʿ and a preposition, but this time, the correspondent to "stereotypes" is *at-taṣauwurāt an-namaṭiyya* instead of *aṣ-ṣuwar an-namaṭīya*, with

consequently can be back translated to stereotypical/rigid imaginations or conceptions of gender rather than images.

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

> (32) 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 مطعلقة بطبيعة المرة والرجل ليقولوا بوجود أدوار محددة لكل منهما (TT03 2017: 1)

Back translation: *Because those who rely on this direction on ideas connected to “the nature” of the woman and the man they say that determined roles exist for both of them.*

Here, “gendered” is not translated by means of: j-n-d-r, n-w-ʿ, nor -j-n-s. Instead, “gendered” as a word is dismissed maybe because the idea is considered to be inherent in the following: “*iḏa yastanid aṣḥāb haḏā al-itijāh ilā afkār mut'alliqa “bi-ṭabī'a” al-mar’a wa-r-rajul li-yaqūlūā bi-wujūd adwār muḥdada li-kulli min-humā*”. I would 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 (30).

> (33) /.../which in turn dictate “fixed” and gendered societal roles for women and men. (ST 2016: 5)

/.../الصفـات "الخاصـة" لـكل منهـا، التـي تمـي بالمقابل أدوار متباينـة عـى كل منهـا. (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 adresses 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. However, the TT has dismissed an Arabic equivalent for “sex” using instead “men and women” (litrally, “man” and “woman”). It is included in the empirical data because it is interesting that both sex and gender is 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. Further, stereotyping is translated differently:

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

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

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

Article 5 refers to 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, quite natural translation, conveying a similar meaning. However, the solution is arguably not the closest equivalent. 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.

4.7.1. “Gender” as a simple concept: Distinguished from “sex”?

The translation of “gender” and 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 cas 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):

(35) 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 a simple concept, 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"*, as also Kamal and Mehrez mentioned. 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, and she states 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:

> (36) 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.(4 :2017 TT03)

Bact 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-ʿadal hiya al-mafāhīm šakkalhā al-mujtamaʿ"*, 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" is not translated into "*al-jindar"*, though it appears here as a simple concept, just as in the above example from the exact same text on the same page:

> (37) 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. (4 :2017 03TT)

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-ʿalāqa bayna-l-jinsayn wa-huqūqhumā mutašakkil bi-zamān wa-makān muʿayīn,* 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 (35) shows:

> (38) 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)

"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 the ST as a simple concept, and hence it is consistent in this specific text, but this consistency is only based on one occurrence, and hence it is difficult to speak about consistency, especially since we have not seen this translation in the other TTs in the data. Though being beyond the purpose of this thesis, 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 singulat form, for example in "marital sex is considered a husbands right" (ST 2016: 6): "*haiṯu yu'tabar al-jins haqqān lil-zauwj"*(حيث يعتبر الجنس حقا للزوج) (TT 2016: 6). "Sex" in this meanig 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-'unf al-*"*jinsī" (* العنف الجِنْسي) (TT 2016: 6).

Leaving "sex" in the meaning of copulation, since it is beyond the purpose of this thesis to investigate it further, the next example return to translations of "sex" in the mening of identity categorisation, since equivalence to "sex" or "sexes" in Arabic is sometimes constructed in the same root as "gender". TT 2016 uses the same root, j-n-s when translating "sexes" and "gender":

> (39) 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 منها، التي تملي بالمقابل أدوارا اجتماعية متباينة على كل منهما. (TT 2016: 5)

Back translation: *The justification of this disparity and its logic is based on assumptions connected to essential differences between the two sexes and distinct attributes to both of them which then dictate disparate social roles for both of them.*

The derivative "gendered" is lexically dismissed, and both structure and meaning are functional in *Musawah*'s translation. I would argue that the main message,, i.e., that it is problematic that there are assumptions about essential differences between women and men, and that these assumptions form fixed roles and disparity, is conveyed in the Arabic without translating the English derivative "gendered", which is arguably a recent neologism in English also. 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 complex concepts.
"Gender", as a simple concept, a complex concept or as the derivative "gendered" appears 133 times in total, whereas "sex" or "sexes" appears 6 times in total as simple concepts, and one in the construction "sex role stereotyping" (ST04 2017). Four of the occurrences as a simple concept, "sex", are in ST 2018, an 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 upaid work:

(40) 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 2018: 38)

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.

It has been shown that 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 the complex concepts of “gender equality” and “gender justice”, and when using the root j-n-s.

In the following examples we will see that *Musawah* in the translaton of ST03 2017 constructs an Arabic equivalent to “sex” with the root j-n-s, used in singular, “*jins”*:

> (41) 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 way as in (38), showing the consistent equivalence constructed in this specific texts, which further to a large dregree 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:

> (42) 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 يطري أدواراً وحقوقاً تكاملية للجندر ولكنها غير متساوية. وفي حين يدعي هذا الأتجاه إنه يأخذ في اعتباره الاختلاف، فإنه في الممارسة يعزز التمييز بإسناده إلى مسلمات قائمة على الجنس والجندر كأساس للقوانين والسياسات والبرامج (TT 03 2017: 3)

Back translation: *Equity favours roles and rights inclusive of gender but not equal. While it claims this direction that takes differences into consideration, in practice it increases discrimination by ascribing to assumptions relying on sex and gender as the basis for laws and policies and programmes.*

In this example we clearly see how the loan word "*al-jindar*" is used twice as equivalent to "gender", while "*jins*" is used as equivalent to "sex" in Arabic. To conclude, the singular noun "*jins"* is in TT03 2017 constructed as equivalent to "sex", which is different from TT 2018 in which "*an-naw'*" was constructed as equivalent to "sex", as shown in example (40). "Gender" as a simple complex is in ST03 constructed as equivalent to *"al-jindar"* in most cases, but "*al-jinsayn*" in one. This is also different from TT 2018, since here, "*an-naw'"* is the preferred equivalent to "gender" as simple concept. In ST/TT 2016 "gender" as a simple concept is translated into "*jins"* the one time it occurred. In ST02 2016, and ST04 2017, neither "gender" or "sex" occurred as a simple concept.

Chapter 4 provided, analysed and discussed 42 examples from the data documenting lexical variation and the functional, yet in some cases slightly formal, orientation to the translation of "gender" in simple and complex concepts, and "gendered". Again, it is noted that the examples are selected based on an aim to show the diversity of translations, and hence one the same concept or derivative was only presented more than once is different solutions appeared in th TTs. The main findings from the different texts in the empirical data will be concluded upon and presented in Chapter 5 where RQ 1, and RQ2, including their subquestions, are approached.

Chapter 5: Findings and Further Research

This final chapter concludes on the purpose and overall RQ, which is:
How is the simple concept of "gender", derivatives of the word, such as "gendered", and complex concepts with gender, such as "gender equality", translated from English into Arabic in knowledge building publications published by the transnational movement *Musawah for Equality in the Family*?

This question is answered by concluding on the analysis provided in Chapter 4 through addressing and concluding on RQ1 and its subquestions, 1.1., 1.2., and 1.3. in section 5.1., followed by section 5.2., which concludes on RQ2 its subquestions, 2.1. Finalising Chapter 5, and the thesis as a whole, section 5.3. provides a sample of suggestions for further research on "gender" and related feminist terminology in Arabic.

5.1. Tables and conclusions on RQ1 and subquestions

First to be addressed is RQ 1 and its subquestions which are:

1. What Arabic roots and words are used as equivalents to "gender" when entering into complex concepts, and how is the derivative "gendered" translated in the Arabic TTs?

   1.1. What complex concepts with "gender" and what derivatives are identified in the STs?

   1.2. How are the identified complex concepts translated in the TTs?

   1.3. What Arabic roots are used when constructing equivalences to the derivative "gendered" in the TTs?

RQ 1.1. has been answered in the table provided in section 4.1. The subsections in this section provide tables for each text, offering an answer to how "gender" as simple and in complex concepts, and the derivative "gendered" is translated differently across and within texts. Further, the tables give an overview of the answers to RQ 1.2. How are the identified complex concepts translated in the TTs? and RQ 1.3. What root or roots are used when constructing equivalences to the derivative gendered in the TTs?

5.1.1. Who Provides, Who Cares? (ST and TT 2018)

"Gender" as a simple or in a complex concept, and the derivative "gendered" occurred 90 times in ST 2018 in total. Sex occurred four times in this ST, and was translated into Arabic two times. 10 times, the simple complex "gender" occurred, while the derivative "gendered" occurred in 15 cases. In 66 cases, the word "gender" entered into a construction we here describe as a complex concept. In cases where it appears as a simple concept the root n-w-ʿ was overtly used. However, in one case the simple concept of "gender" was dismissed and "boys and girls" occurred in the corresponding place in the TT. A similar strategy is also used occasionally when translating the complex concepts. As shown in Chapter 4, sometimes the corresponding paragraph in the TT dismissed "gender", specifying it into something that can be back translated into "the man and the woman", "men and women" or "the boy and the girl" or "boys and girl". However, this strategy is not a strong tendency in TT 2018, which tends to use "*an-naw'",* and generally the the root n-w-ʿ, frequently, sometimes for "gender" as a simple concept and the derivative "gendered", and also in some complex concepts, though not all, as the table 3a and 3b show.

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

Simple concept/derivative	Frequency	Arabic word in TT and pages in ST/TT
Gender	10	*an-naw'* (ST/TT: four times on 19/19, once on 30/30; 34/34, 36/36, 46/47, 56/57)

		In one case “gender” is dismissed (ST/TT: 46/47)
Sex	4	*an-naw'* (ST/TT: 38/38) Twice “sex” occurred in sentences related to two different tabes (ST 2018: 32, 33) not translated into the TT, but kept in English (TT 2018: 33)
Gendered	15	*ila naw'* (ST/TT: 2/2; 45/46) *an-naw'* (ST/TT: 9/9) *li-n-naw'* (ST/TT: 11/11) *'ana-n-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) *'ana-n-naw'* (ST/TT: 46/47) *'ala-n-naw'* (ST/TT: 4/4; 16/15; 46/47) *an-naw'ī (al-jindarī)* (ST/TT: twice on 9/9)

Table 3b: Frequency of complex concepts in ST 2018 and equivalents in TT 2018:

Complex concept	Frequency	Arabic translation(s) and page in ST/TT
Gender equality	16	*al-musāwāh bayna-l-jinsayn* (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) *tasāwī-l-jinsayn* (ST/TT: 57/58) dismissed twice on (ST/TT: 34/34)
Gender stereotypes	16	*aṣ-ṣuwar an-namaṭiyya li-n-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) *at-taṣauwurāt an-namaṭiyya* (46/47) *dismissed once* (ST/TT: 5/5)
Gender roles (once in the construction “gender roles and identities)	10	*adwār an-naw'* (ST/TT: 9/8, 9/9, 41/42, final p./final p.) *adwār an-naw' (al-jindar)* (one time ST/TT: 9/8) *adwār al-jinsayn* (one time ST/TT: 36/37) “Gender roles and identities*”* (ST: 9) *into adwār wa-huwīyat ar-rajul wa-l-mar'a al-jindariyya* (TT: 8)

		Twice “gender roles” is dismissed (ST/TT: table of contents, and 3/3) Once translated by referring to *al-jinsayn* by means of the dual suffix on *adwār, i.e. adwār-humā (* أدوارهما TT 53*)*
Gender gap	6	*fajwa kabīra bayna-l-jinsayn* (ST/TT twice on 53/54) *fajwa bayna-l-jinsayn* (ST/TT: 30/30, 31/32, 38/39) in one case, gender gap in the ST is transformed into: *fajwa at-taʿlīm bayna-l-fatayāt wa-l-fitya* (ST: 29 TT: 29)
Gender relations	5	*ʿalāqāt an-nawʿ* (ST/TT: 3/3) *al-ʿalāqāt bayna-l-jinsayn* three times (TT: 12, 13, 50) Once a section mentioning “gender relations” in the ST is absent from the (ST: 14)
Gender norms	2	*maʿāyīr an-nawʿ* (ST/TT: 41/42; 50/51)
Gender discrimination	1	*tamyīz bayna-l-jinsayn* (ST/TT: 8/8)
Gender justice	1	*al-ʿadal bayna-l-jinsayn* (ST/TT: 9/9)
Gender responsibilities	1	*masuʾūliyyāt al-jinsayn* (ST/TT: 3/3)
Gender studies	1	*dirāsāt an-nawʿ* (ST/TT: 55/56)
Gender lines	1	*taqsimīhā ʿala-asās an-nawʿ* (ST/TT: 55/56)
Gender bias	1	*inḥīyāz an-nawʿī* (ST/TT 19/19)
Gender-sensitive	2	*ḥasāsa tujāha-n-nawʿ* (ST/TT: twice on 52/53)
Gender parity	2	*musāwāh kāmila bayna-l-jinsayn* (ST/TT 34/34) *at-takāfʾu bayna-l-jinsayn* (ST/TT 53/54)

5.1.2. Knowledge Building Brief 02 (ST02 and TT02 2016)

"Gender" did not occur as a simple concept in this text. However, "gender" occurred in "gender relations", and "gender equality". Both are translated by means of the dual form of "*jins*," "*jinsayn"*. Hence, TT 02 2016 is consistent in translating the word "gender" into "*al-jinsayn"*. To conclude on the complex concepts and answer RQ 2 and RQ 2.1., table 4 below is provided.

Table 4: Complex concepts in ST02 2016 and equivalents in TT02 2016:

Complex concept	**Frequency**	**Arabic translation(s)**
Gender equality	1	*al-musāwāh bayna-l-jinsayn* (ST/TT: 4/4)
Gender relations	1	*ʿalāqāt mutasāwiyya bayna-l-jinsayn* (ST/TT: 4/4)

5.1.3. Knowledge Building Brief 03 (ST03 and TT03 2017)

As a simple 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"*. To help answering RQ 1 and RQ2 and subsections, the following tables are provided:

Table 5a: "Gender", "sex", and "gendered" in ST03 2017 and equivalents in TT02 2017

Simple Concept/derivative	Frequency	Arabic translation(s) and page in ST/TT
Gender	5	*al-jindar* (ST/TT 1/1, twice on 2/2, and 4/4) *al-jinsayn* (ST/TT 4/4)
Sex	2	*jins* (ST/TT: 2/2, 3/3)
Gendered (ideas)	1	*afkār mutaʿalliqa "bi-ṭabīʿa" al-marʾa wa-r-rajul* (ST/TT: 1/1)

Table 5b: Complex concepts in ST03 2017 and equivalents in TT03 2017

Complex concept	Frequency	Arabic translation(s)
Gender Equality	12	*al-musāwāh bayna-l-jinsayn* (10 times) (five times on 1/1, four times on 2/2; 3/3, twice on 4/4) Twice the complex concept of "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: *al-musāwāh bayna-l-jinsayn wa-l- ʿadal bayna-humā* (TT 1/1 and 2/2), which can be back translated into: *equality between the two genders/sexes and justice between the two*
Gender norms	1	*al-muʿāyīr al-muṭabaqa ʿalāa-l-jinsayn* (ST/TT: 1/1)
Gender-neutral (laws)	1	*al-qawānīn al-muhāyada tujāha-l-jindar* (ST/TT: 2/2)
Gender-sensitive	1	*ḥasāsa tujāha-l-jindar* (ST/TT: 3/3)
Gender roles and rights	2	*adwārān wa-ḥuqūqān takāmuliyya lil-jindar* (ST/TT: twice on 3/3)
Gender justice	2	*al-ʿadal bayna-l-jinsayn* (ST/TT: 1/1, 2/2)
Gender relations	2	*al-ʿalāqāt bayna-l-jinsayn* (ST/TT: 2/2, 4/4)

5.1.4. Knowledge Building Brief 04 (ST04 and TT04 2017)

"Gender" did not occur as a simple concept in ST04, and neither did the derivative "gendered". This is also the case with "sex" (and "sexes"). However, a construction, which we here consider a complex concept, namely, "sex role stereotyping", appeared once, and this was translated into "*al-adwār an-namaṭiyya li-r-rajul wa-l-mar'a"*. (ST04 2017: 4/4), and hence this solution explicitly mentions "man" and "woman" instead of "sex", whereas "*jindar"* is used to denote "gender" in "gender stereotyping". Hence, there is a distinction between "sex" and "gender", but not as simple concepts, since they do not occur in the text as such.

This is included because it proves that "gender" in "gender stereotypes" was translated differently than "sex" in "sex role stereotyping". Considered this, *Musawah*'s translator(s) did make a distinction between "sex" and "gender". At least when entering into the complex concepts "gender stereotypes" and "sex role stereotyping". However, it is difficult to conclude whether this was an intentional strategy since constructions with both "gender" and "sex" are limited in ST04 2017.

Table 6: Complex concepts in ST04 2017 and equivalents in TT04 2017

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

5.1.5. Musawah Vision for the Muslim Family (ST and TT 2016)

ST 2016 mentions gender nine times, either as a simple or a complex concept. The derivative "gendered" is mentioned twice (ST 2016: 5, 7). One of the nine times is in the simple complex of

"gender" which is translated into the singular noun "*jins"*, while "sexes" is translated into "*al-jinsayn*"

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

Simple concept/derivative	Frequency	Arabic translation(s) and pages in ST/TT
Gender	1	*al-jins* (ST/TT: 13/13)
Sexes	1	*al-jinsayn* (ST/TT: 5/5)
Gendered	2	*adwārān ijtimā'iyya mutabāīna 'ala kul minhumā* (ST/TT: 5/5) *aṣ-ṣifāt "al-ḵāṣṣa" li-kul minhumā, allatī tumlī bi-l-muqābil adwār mutabāyina 'ala kul minhumā* (ST/TT: 5/5)

Table 7b: Complex concepts in ST 2016 and equivalents in TT 2016

Complex concept	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" dismissed (ST/TT: 5/5)
Gender stereotypes	2	*al-afkār an-namaṭiyya 'an ar-rijāl wa-l-nisā'* (ST/TT: 7/7) *afkār namaṭiyya muqawlaba 'an ar-rijāl wa-n-nisā'* (ST/TT: 12/12)
Gender relations	5	"gender" dismissed: *al'alāqāt bayna-r-rijāl wa-n-nisā'* (ST/TT: 2/2, 4/4, twice on 9/9, 13/13)

5.1.6. Conclusion on RQ 1.3.

This subsection answers RQ 1.3. which is: What Arabic root or roots are used when constructing equivalences to the derivative "gendered" in the TTs?

In TT 2018 the derivative "gendered" appeared 15 times in ST 2018, and is translated by means of n-w-ʿ, into either an adjective or a noun with a preposition, if not dismissed. In ST03 2017, "gendered" appears once and is transformed into *al-mar'a wa-l-rajul* in the TT (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-ʾ, 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.

5.2. Conclusion on RQ2: The simple concepts of "gender" and "sex"

Though it should be clear from the tables provided in section 5.1., this section now specifies the conclusions by answering RQ2 and its subquestion, 2.1.

> **RQ 2**: How are the simple concepts "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 to this research question varies again, depending on the publication.

In TT 2018, no consistent distinction is made between the English correlative words "gender" and "sex" by lexical or grammatical means, since "*an-naw'*" was constructed as equivalent to "sex", as in example (40), while the same root and word, "*an-naw'*", was also constructed as equivalent to "gender" in various constructions, though "*al-jinsayn*" was also used in many complex concepts.

The patterns in this text would be regarding certain complex concepts which are translated by means of the same equivalent in nearly all cases, as shown in Chapter 4.

In TT02 2016, “sex” does not occur, and “gender” only occurs in the complex concept of “gender equality”, and in “gender relation”. In both complex concepts, “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 it in this context, because “sex” is not mentioned.

TT03 2017 is different, and here we can conclude that the singular noun “*jins”* is constructed as equivalent to “sex”, which is different from TT 2018. In TT03 2017, the dual of “*jins”*, i.e., “*jinsayn”,* is used to denote the word “gender” in the complex concepts of “gender equality”, “gender justice”, “gender relations”, and “gender norms”, and in one case, this gender-binarism in grammatical dual is used as equivalent to the simple concept of “gender”. The simple concept of “gender” occurs five times in total, and the new loan word “*al-jindar”* (j-n-d-r) is in all other cases constructed as its equivalent. Also, this loan word solution with its quadrilateral root j-n-d-r is used in the complex concepts of “gender-neutral” and “gender-sensitive”, and this is also the case with “gender roles”. “Sex” occurs one time, and is translated into the singular “*jins”.* This means that some kind of distinction between “sex” and “gender” is constructed in translation into Arabic. “Sex” in this text has the equivalent “*jins*”, i.e. the singular masuline noun created from the root j-n-s. “Gender” on the other hand becomes equivalent to “*jinsayn”,* the dual of the same root as the equivalent to “sex”, mainly when used in the complex concepts, “gender equality”, “gender relations”, gender norms, and gender justice, but also once when used as a simple concept. However, *“jindar*” is more frequent for those constructions. or in most cases.

ST04 and TT04 2017 only mention “sex” and “gender” one time each, in “sex role stereotyping” and “gender stereotyping”. The former is translated into “*al-adwār an-namaṭiyya li-r-rajul wa al-mar’a”*, and hence writes “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 not as simple concepts, since they do not occur as such. However, each of them is only mentioned once in ST04

2017, and thus it is difficult to know whether this consistent distinction would continue if each was mentioned several times in the text.

The fact that a distinction between "gender" and "sex" is made in some cases proves the hypothesis that *Musawah* does not distinguish between "gender" and "sex" partly wrong, because a distinction is identifiable in some cases, though this is far from consistent. Overall and across texts, *Musawah* has not constructed consistent equivalents to neither "gender" as a simple concept, nor the word "sex", and does not consistently distinguish between the two. The terms may eventually lead to fixation, or to the development of other alternatives (Kamal 2018:134), and it seems that *Musawah* has established some consistent equivalents to certain concepts in their translations in the knowledge building initiative sponsored by the UN, however, as a simple concept, no consistent interpretation or translation is identifiable.

5.3. Future Research

The possibilities of future research on the topic of translating "gender terminology", or feminist discourses in general, are many. Based on the findings in the present study, and on Kamal's reflection on translating feminist discourses into Arabic, it could be interesting to study and discuss whether translators of feminist productions modify or manipulate Arabic grammar norms, and if so, how. An example could be the words *ar-rajul* (الرجل) and *al-mar'a* (المرأة). Sometimes, but not always, *Musawah's* TTs have transformed these indefinite English plural forms into definite Arabic singulars, which arguably is a semantically formal translation even though there is a functional change in the grammatical forms. The reason is that the generic collective in Arabic is often indicated by a definite singular (Fischer 2002:54). Considering this, it would arguably be more interventionist to Arabic language norms, and possibly more noticeable to a reader, if they were modified into plurals such as *ar-rijāl* (الرجال) and *an-nisā'* (النِساء). It is noteworthy that the noun *al-mar'a* does not have a plural in Arabic, thus *an-nisā'* would be be the most "natural"

choice if using this strategy, which is a feminist translation strategy. According to Kamal, an understanding of 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).

To Kamal, this almost forces a feminist translator into using the plural form in Arabic, since the plural has implications connecting the text to feminist discourse and feminist theory. The example reveals the importance of recognizing the significance of specific words during translation, showing how translation is far from being a mechanical process. Kamal holds that this distinction is a contribution to Arabic knowledge production, practised by herself (2008: 261). It could be interesting to investigate to what extent this or similar modifications are used, and how such modifications are received by language users, or by professional translators.

In general, exploring how other activists use and perceive the different equivalents to the term "gender" identified in the data of this study would be interesting, especially to investigate whether certain preferences towards some equivalents can be linked with ideology and politics. This is often claimed, but to my knowledge, documentation on the matter is lacking. Methodologically, the data could be collected on social media and websites existing in both English and Arabic, and qualitative interviews or quantitative questionnaires could be used to address how the words are perceived.

It could also be beneficial to conduct a study similar to the present on other movements or organisations. These could be other feminist organisations, possibly an organisation like the Tunisian Mawjoudin – we exist (official spelling by the organisation, i.e. not my transliteration) which focuses on LGBTIQ+ rights. In fact, the whole terminology and discourse around queer identities in Arabic would be interesting to include in such a study. Merely to document systematically how they translate "gender" in simple and different complex concepts and compare

the findings with the findings in this study could shed light on “gender” in Arabic translations in a LGBTIQ+ context. This would also be interesting to do on official UN translations. In general, other translations of English terms existing in feminist terminology and discourse would also be relevant to investigate in their Arabic translations. For example, the translation of “patriarchal”, which in *Musawah*’s translation has the constructed equivalent *al-abwiyya* (الأبويــة) (ST/TT 2016: 5/5) derived from the same root as the Arabic word used to signify “father”.

References

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 Isḥāq über die Syrischen und Arabischen Galen Übersetzungen, Leipzig Ḥunayn b. Isḥaq'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.

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.

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 Ottowa: St. Jerome Publishing and University of Ottowa 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).