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Abstract

This paper aims to investigate the frequency of two prevailing translation techniques in the bilingual lexicographic context, which analyzes the Arabic and English writings with a specific focus on Islamic financial and economic terms (IFETs). Furthermore, it attempts to report the preferences of dictionary users who are either translators or translation students. For this purpose, a monolingual dictionary specialized in IFETs was carried out to conduct the analysis, out of which, one hundred terms were randomly selected. These terms were analyzed referentially and technically. Additionally, a search of translational equivalents in two Arabic-English specialized dictionaries was carried out. The IFETs with no entries in the said bilingual dictionaries were rendered into English by using two translation techniques, namely paraphrasing and definition techniques. The results revealed that paraphrasing using a related word was the most frequently used technique than the definition technique. The meanings of 31 terms were adequately conveyed via paraphrasing technique, while only one term was translated with a definition technique. Thus, this study pointed out the pertinent role of the paraphrasing technique in solving the untranslatability of many deeply cultural-bound terms. However, a preliminary survey was conducted to fulfill this study's second aim, which showed that most of the respondents preferred to utilize definitional technique, instead of paraphrasing.
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Introduction

The Arabic language, a semantic language is regarded as the language of the Arab world and the liturgical language of the adherents of Islam, which emerged in the 1st century. Since the 8th century, Arabic has been the
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language of both the state and Islam (Ali et al., 2021). Since, the middle of the 17th century, the expansion and Islamic Empire brought annexation, which comprehended people regarding the Arabic language. Over the centuries, many terms have been developed progressively to express Islamic concepts concerning *fiqh* and financial transactions “The sources of these terms are found in the Quran, the prophetic traditions, and writings of jurists” (Ali et al., 2021, p. 6). The writings of jurists are considered among the major sources for these terms like *ijma’, qiyas*, and *ijtihad*. These Arabic words have no equivalents in English, although one’s having specialized knowledge of Islamic studies would have no difficulty in understanding the Arabic terminologies. Consequently, the untranslatability of such words with a one-to-one corresponding equivalent, can be resolved by employing two translational techniques known as paraphrasing and definitional translation. For instance, Dickins et al. (2017) translated *ijma’* and *qiyas* by saying,

*Ijma’ (الإجماع) is unanimity among Muslim scholars upon specific issues. Qiyas (القياس), ‘analogy’, is the use of deduction to reach an opinion in a case not mentioned in the Quran or Sunna by comparing it with other issues referred to in the Quran and Sunna (Dickins et al., 2017, pp. 269–270).*

As exemplified, the word *ijma’* is rendered by unpacking its technical meaning using a paraphrase with a related word, such as unanimity. The word refers to the unanimous agreement of jurists, not individuals, on a variety of issues. It is worth that jurists have agreed upon a variety of issues. On the other hand, *qiyas* is rendered with a superordinate followed by a definition. *Qiyas* is the fourth source of Sharia and is usually referred to when a direct ruling is not found in the two major sources: the Quran and the Sunnah. A good example is the ruling on stimulant drugs, such as cocaine and opioids where they are always compared with rulings on alcohol.

A non-Arabic reader of a translated text about Sharia in Islam, may encounter a lot of transliterated terms and may find difficulty to understand them, since they are culturally and religiously bound together. However, a target text (TT) loaded with such terms, which has a sense of strangeness may be alleviated by employing translation techniques as shown in the preceding paragraph. The abandonment of transliterated terms in favour of approximate Western synonymous equivalents "would almost certainly
mislead the reader in understanding precisely what is meant” (Dickins et al., 2017, p. 272). While it is relatively easy in translational work “to add [a] definition, paraphrase, expression, or, in some cases, delete” (Mughazy, 2016, p. 3), this is not the case with dictionaries, which serve to communicate as simply, fully, and clearly as possible about various words and concepts used contextually in other texts, which intend to express literal meanings (Alruzzi & Yunus, 2019).

Over the past century a number of scientific studies concerning dictionary research and meanings have been carried out (Adamska-Sałaciak, 2013; Ali et al., 2021; Alruzzi & Yunus, 2019; Baalbaki, 2014; Biel, 2008; Corréard, 2006; El-Zeiny, 2017; Hassan, 2017; Liu, 2018; Svensén, 2009). They were either dictionary reviews, or studies of actual dictionary use, or studies on methods to bridge the lexical meanings in bilingual dictionaries.

Therefore, current paper explores two translational techniques, namely, paraphrasing and definitional approach to address the challenges of rendering Islamic financial and economic terms (IFETs) from Arabic into English language. The Arabic and western financial systems are asymmetrical owing to the fact that the financial jurisprudence in Islam puts a huge emphasis on permissibility, while the Western system seems to neglect this in favour of creating revenues and focusing on individuals’ interests. Accordingly, Islamic financial concepts and their assigned terms, lack equivalence in the English language. To fill this gap, lexicographers and translators often employ paraphrasing and definitional technique to provide a range of meanings of culture-specific terms.

Thus, this paper aims to show that cultural non-commonality, may present the issue of the untranslatability of Islamic financial and economic terms. However, the researchers hypothesized that there is a possible path for a translator or lexicographer to circumvent this challenge, and it is believed that the semantic content in an IFET can be adequately unpacked by providing either a paraphrased or definitional equivalent. Additionally, this study also seeks to provide an overview of bilingual dictionary users’ preferences regarding the use of proposed techniques for various linguistic tasks.
Research Questions

The current study aims to answer the following research questions, which are stated below:

1. Which is the more frequently used/employed translational technique in the samples from the selected Arabic-English bilingual dictionaries?
2. What strategy do the respondents prefer to carry out their Arabic-English translation when encountering undocumented terms?

Research Methodology

This paper briefly discusses the two translation techniques to explicate their various senses and classifications. Baker's operational definition of paraphrase will serve as a framework for discussing the paraphrasing technique employed in the study sample. Additionally, the typologies proposed by Bussmann (2006) and Burkhanov (2010) will be utilised to analyse the definition technique identified in the samples. Secondly, a discussion will be followed by making a comparison of two bilingual dictionaries selected for this study. These two dictionaries are: (i) a specialized dictionary (Qal'ajī & Qunaibi, 1996) and (ii) a general one (Baalbaki & Ramzi, 2008). Additionally, 100 IFETs were randomly selected from a monolingual dictionary called Muʿğamu Almuṣṭalāḥāti Almālīyatī wāl Iqtiṣādyati fī Luğatī Alfuqahā. After the text selection, a thorough search for equivalents for the 100 IFETs was conducted in the aforementioned bilingual dictionaries in order to identify the rendered technique employed for the translation, which can be either a paraphrasing or a definitional technique. Thirdly, to adhere to the the second research question, the findings of a preliminary survey administered among the translators and students of translation will be briefly discussed in the discussion section.

Notably, it was identified that the existing lexical gaps between two languages (Arabic-English) were caused by many factors including culture, religion, and environment. Islam, as a religion that is considered a complete guide to life, which in turn affects most, if not all, aspects of Muslims. This creates a semantic field that contains lexemes laden with religious and cultural nuances. The existence of a similar semantic field in another language, however, does not guarantee readily available, strict equivalents (Newmark, 1988). On top of that, a term may be used to refer to various concepts, although this is not ideal in many cases. For example,
in the Hanafi school, lands and real estate are referred to as عقَار (‘aqār), while in other schools of thought, the word designates lands, construction, and trees (Ali et al., 2021). This linguistic phenomenon is known as polysemy, which is described as the expression of different senses by using one term. This creates a linguistic gap between languages since one-to-one relations between bilingual equivalents are rare, if not non-existent.

Hence, to conduct interlingual and intercultural communication smoothly, such gaps should be filled. A dictionary, for example, is one tool that is used to encode and decode cultural materials between languages (Howland, 2003). A great number of linguists, translation theoreticians, and lexicographers have been exploring the utilization of different translational techniques to facilitate cross-cultural and cross-linguistic communication (Baker, 2018; Corréard, 2006; Enani, 2000; Fengling, 2017; Liu, 2018). Common translational techniques in establishing equivalence to overcome a conceptual gap between languages are definitional and paraphrasing techniques (Bergenholtz & Tarp, 1995; Šarčević, 1989). The following section elaborates on the two deployed techniques.

**Translational Techniques**

Bilingual lexicographers employ different techniques to capture the meanings of head word, and amongst these paraphrasing and definitional techniques are most prevailing. To differentiate between these two techniques, an in-depth understanding of both techniques is thoroughly required, which lacks distinction in previous literature. For example, a paraphrasing approach may be utilized to indicate the use of a definition to explain a term, as indicated in the analysis. Thus, the term ‘paraphrase’ is better studied based on its intralingual and interlingual senses.

**Paraphrasing**

The paraphrasing technique has varied uses, such as: to explain the meaning of a quotation (Bussmann, 2006), to give a short version of a verbal or written speech (Longman, 2019), to provide two or more propositions (Bussmann, 2006), to supply two or more sentences with the same semantic content (Burkhanov, 2010) to express oneself or an idea using language glosses, such as deictic expressions and pragmatic expressions (Bussmann 2006), and the interlingual usage of paraphrases, which is the most significant utilization among all. It refers to the explanation of a single lexical unit that exists in a source language, however,
is not lexicalized in the target language. Cultural or religious lexical units are good examples. For instance, in Arabic *laylatu alqadri* is a religious night that is observed by Muslims on the last ten days of the ninth month of the lunar calendar. Through various countering and over 40 translations of the meanings of the Holy Quran, translators, thereof, seem to provide many translations of the referred term as *Night of Destiny/ Glory/ Decree/ Power/ Predestination/ Majesty, and others*. As indicated, the Arabic term *alqadri* needs conscious paraphrasing to make the meaning attainable for the readers. By referring to several interpretation books of the Holy Quran such as *Tafsir Ibn Kathir*, it becomes obvious that it is a night when the Holy Quran was revealed, so it is said to be especially blessed. It is a night full of blessings and abundant mercy. During this night, the annual decree is maintained to be revealed and entrusted to the angels, who are in charge of conducting it following the divine plan. Thus, an acceptable rendition could be *the blessed and valuable night*. A reader of the translation can better understand that this night is special and has its blessings and valuable status. It seems right to say that this paraphrase conveys a deeper meaning than mere other synonyms could. However, the insertion ability of the suggested paraphrase is lower than that employed by the other translators.

Another good example could be *xenophobia*, which can be defined as a state of suspicion and fear expressed by an in-group against the out-group. It is made up of two morphemes: *xeno-* and *phobia*. The former is a bound morpheme that has two meanings in general: firstly, it is related to people from other regions or countries, secondly, they are not sharing the same origin. The latter, a free morpheme, means an aversion or irrational fear. The concept exists in Arabic, however, it is expressed with two paraphrases *
الخوف من الأجنبي* (alḥawfu min alʾağnaby), which literally means *the fear from the stranger*, or *
كره الأجنبي* (kurhu alʾağnaby), which literally means *hatred [of] the stranger*, to reflect the implied meaning. Both translations are formed with free morphemes. In some Arabic countries, especially Gulf countries, people use *
الوافد* (alwafid), which literally means *the immigrant*, instead of *
الاجنبي* (alʾağnaby) whose literal meaning is *the stranger*, so the translation may be *
الخوف من الوافد* (alḥawfu min alwafid), which literally means *the fear from the immigrant*. The latter Arabic paraphrase, if googled, seems very rare or unnatural.

Paraphrasing is often employed to render certain lexemes that impose difficulties for one reason or another. According to Baker (2018), there are
two types of paraphrasing techniques that can be employed to render lexical units. These two types are as follows:

1- Using a related word in the paraphrase: Some concepts may exist in both languages, considering their source and target languages, but their forms or frequency vary. So, to render the concept, a change in the syntactic form becomes necessary to produce natural stretches of language. For example, the word *information* can easily be equated with معلومة (mʿluwmāh) or its plural form since Arabic has both forms; however, when the English word has prefixes like dis- or mis-, the Arabic equivalence needs to change to indicate the semantic change in the English word. By using Merriam-Webster Dictionary freely accessed on [https://www.merriam-webster.com/](https://www.merriam-webster.com/), a quick review of the meanings of these two lexemes indicated:

A) Disinformation: “false information deliberately and often covertly spread (as by the planting of rumors) to influence public opinion or obscure the truth.” (Retrieved 22 May, 2021, from [https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/disinformation](https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/disinformation))


The word *disinformation* can have multiple interpretations, such as it refers to false information created and distributed to and any harm or change in people’s opinion regarding any issue. Thus, the Arabic equivalent needs to reflect these meanings. By using the freely accessed Almaany.com, disinformation is found to equate with *سوء تفسير المعلومات* (mʿluwmātun muḍalilatun biqaṣdi alʾi ḍrāri ʾaw tḡīrirʾay alnās), which literally means misinterpretation [of] information. Neither of the two senses of *disinformation* is reflected by the Arabic paraphrase, which can be translated back into “wrong interpretation of information.” Accordingly, the English term should be translated in a way that may reflect its senses as much as possible. Significantly, معلومات مضللة بقصد الاضرار أو تغيير رأي الناس (mʿluwmātun muḍalilatun biqaṣdi alʾi ḍrāri ʾaw tḡīrir ʾay alnās), this literally means misleading information with the purpose to damage or change people’s opinion, that may be suitable since its senses match the English senses of *disinformation*. However, if space and economy of words are to be considered, a suitable paraphrase could be used معلومات مضللة متمددة (mʿluwmātun muḍalilatun mutaʾamidatun), which literally means
purposefully misleading information. On the other hand, the English term misinformation refers to the content of the information, which is false and deceptive. Three equivalents are offered at almaany.com, as follows: استعلامات خاطئة; تضليل; سوء الإخبار (astaʿlāmātun ḥāṭiʿah, taḍlīl, and suwʿu alʾiḥbār). The back translation/reverse translation can help show whether these are good equivalents or not.

**Table 1**

**Back Translation of Arabic Equivalents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Arabic Equivalent</th>
<th>Back translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>استعلامات خاطئة</td>
<td>wrong inquiries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>تضليل</td>
<td>misleading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>سوء الإخبار</td>
<td>bad news</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Before the analysis of the above back translations also known as reverse translation, it would be appropriate to remind readers that Arabic has just three parts of speech: nouns, verbs, and articles. Nouns can be used as adjectives or adverbs as stipulated by place and function in the sentence. Based on this information, only equivalent 2 in the above table reflects one sense of misinformation. Therefore, the English term/equivalent needs a different paraphrase to reflect, if possible, its senses more accurately. A paraphrase such as معلومات مضللة أو خاطئة (mʿluwmātun muḍalilatun `aw ḥāṭiʿah), which literally means misleading or wrong information, would be a better one.

In the case of a single concept that is expressed by two or more words in the source language but is not lexicalized in the target language, the translator or lexicographer needs to exert more effort and make a careful decision. For instance, the English phrase *advance directive* means a legal document properly signed by a sick person who may become incapable to take future health decisions due to health or mental incapacity, so this person either specifies what actions are required to be taken or assign to another person to be a surrogate decision-maker. The concept can be expressed by various terms such as *personal directive, living will, medical directive, advance directive,* or *advance decision* with limited differences. In the Arab world, usually, when a sick person is unable to make decisions, it is either the person's father, the eldest brother or son who becomes the guardian and is deemed to have the right to make decisions regarding the person. The absence of the concept of *advance directive* in Arabic requires a lexicographer or a translator to explain it in a short paraphrase, such as
وثيقة التوجيه الطبي المسبق (waṯīqatu altawǧīh alṭaby almusbaq), which literally means *advance medical directive document*. The Arabic paraphrase is not self-explanatory. Thus, it is the job of a translator or interpreter to give a full definition to a sick person or his family when they both live in the West since it is not common in the Arab world. Another example from Arabic is العرق الظلم (alʿirqu aẓālim) literally means *the vein unjust*. It “refers to a situation when a person grows plants or builds a house on another person's land without the permission or approval of the owner to claim a right to possess the land” (Ali et al., 2021). The collocation consists of two nouns. It can be rendered as the *unlawful acquisition of land* or appropriation of land. Both unlawful and appropriation are related words and English equivalents for الظلم (aẓālim).

2- Sometimes the source term or phrase is not lexicalized in the target language and shows a kind of semantic complexity that compels a lexicographer or a translator to unpack its meaning by a paraphrase that has no related word. For example, the term *meme* refers to “an amusing or interesting item (such as a captioned picture or video) or genre of items that is spread widely online especially through social media” (Retrieved 22 May, 2021, from https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/meme ). Since Arabic lacks such a lexeme, a paraphrase may be constructed to reflect the English sense of the word. For example، مادة مسلية تنتشر سريعا على الإنترنت (mādatun musalīatun tantaširu sarīʿan ʿala alintarnit), which literally means an entertaining topic [that] spreads quickly online. The paraphrase indicates the type of the item, amusing, that is characterized with rapid spread. To make the paraphrase shorter, a translator can be used مادة مسلية (mādatun musalīatun), which literally means an entertaining topic, later to refer to the English word *meme*.

In summary, “Translation by paraphrasing is an umbrella category of various translation sub-strategies that involve providing additional information to help readers recognize the referents of the source words in the absence of direct equivalents” (Mughazy, 2016, p. 38)

**Definitional**

In metalinguistic, the term ‘definition’ refers to the provision of the intra-lingual or inter-lingual meanings of a linguistic expression, be it one word, a compound word, or a dictionary entry.
According to Lew (2013), definition in bilingual dictionaries is a more complex phenomena due to the existence of two lemmata systems. Thus, lexicographers may give two definitions for a single entry, which has one sense in the source language but requires different equivalents in the target language. In this case, the user’s point of view is important.

**Bilingual Dictionaries**

The current study has a practical aspect, which is to explore two bilingual dictionaries to render entries therein. *Mu'jam Lughat Al Fuqahā‘*, which is referred to as the ‘*Dictionary of Islamic Legal Terminology*’ (DILT) in English, is a specialized dictionary first produced in 1985 (Qal'ajī & Qunaibi, 1985). Three years later, a second edition was released (Qal'ajī & Sādiq, 1988). Years later, a new edition was published in 1994 where French counterparts were added into it (Qal'ajī & Qunaibi, 1996). The French equivalents in DILT have been excluded from this study, for the researchers’ focus is on Arabic-English equivalents. DILT’s third edition has 4014 Arabic entries, strangely enough with 376 fewer entries than the second edition, and 4518 English entries, with 148 more entries than the second edition. The dictionary was classified as production-oriented (El-Zeiny, 2017) as the focus of the producers was primarily on the quality to optimize performance of the product. Below is a sample of an entry from DILT.

**Extract 1**

*Dictionary of Islamic Legal Terminology (1988, p. 23)*

Father (s) .............................................................
الأب : بالمد ، ج أب وهو الولد ( ر : أب )
- الأصول و يدخل فيها الأجداد / - وقد يدخل فيها الأعمام مجازاً ، ومنه ( قالوا ) نعم الله و الْبُرْثِ أَبَاهُ إِبْرَاهِيم وَإِسْمَاعِيلَ وَإِسْحَاقَ ، مع أن إسماعيل عم يعقوب.
Male parent, Father ........................................
والوادون الذكور ، وعلى هذا يدخل فيها الأجداد

أَبَاهُ : بالمد وكسر الباء ، ج أب : المقيم القياع في المكان لا يبرح.
Wild, Savage, Untamed ..........................
As exemplified by the two extracts, the definition and collocations of the Arabic terms (if found as an entry) are presented before the foreign equivalent. The Arabic definitions in Extract 1 are generally sufficient in supplying some information about the technical meaning of the term. Furthermore, the collocations are listed in sub-entries. The English and French equivalents are then provided as shown in Extract 2.

The preface of the dictionary mentions the target readership that specifically seeks to serve specific audience. According to the compilers, Arabic is considered an international language in international law as Islamic jurisprudence is studied in comparative law research. The current dictionary is a first resort to researchers in general and Arab preachers in particular (Qal'ajī & Qunaibi, 1996).

The second dictionary, *Al-Mawrid: A Modern Arabic-English Dictionary* (Baalbaki, 2009) is a frequently consulted dictionary. Al-Mawrid’s first edition was published in 1978. To date, there have been over 24 editions, which makes it one of the most frequently published dictionaries in the Arabic world. It has acquired its current status owing to the reputation of another dictionary with almost a similar name called *Al-Mawrid: A Modern English-Arabic Dictionary* by his father, Muneer Al-
Baalbaki, first produced in 1967, which has reached over 38 editions (Baalbaki, 2008). Another advantage of Baalbaki’s dictionary is that it comes in different sizes and with multiple names (see https://www.instagram.com/darelilmililmalayin/?hl=en). It also comes in different language pairs: Arabic-Italian, Arabic-German, and Arabic-Spanish. Below is a sample of the presentation of some entries in Al-Mawrid.

**Extract 3**


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arabic Term</th>
<th>English Equivalent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ائتلاف</td>
<td>harmony, accord, accord, agreement, symphony, rapport, affinity; union, unity, coalescence, coalition, entente, coalition (government, cabinet, etc.); harmonious, harmonic, symphonious, symphonic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extract 3 demonstrates that each Arabic term is often matched with several English equivalents. The dictionary users are thus left on their own to figure out the differences between the English equivalents and the sourced Arabic words. Another disadvantage is that this dictionary “gives the least information; it only provides the meaning of the item without mentioning pronunciation, part of speech...” (Alruzzi & Yunus, 2019).

The preface of this dictionary does not specify its readership; however, the compiler mentions that this dictionary is a response to meet the general requirements of the readership and an attempt to bridge the gap in the industry of bilingual dictionaries (Baalbaki, 2009, p. 10).

Unlike DILT, the compiler of Al-Mawrid does not state the number of entries in the dictionary. To estimate them, the researchers attempted to count the first ten pages and Table 2 below shows the average.
Table 2  
*Total Number of Entries on 10 Pages in Al-Mawrid (Baalbaki, 2009)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pages</th>
<th>Entries in Column 1</th>
<th>Entries in Column 2</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>470</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 2, the number of entries in the first ten pages is 407, the average of which is approximately 74 items per page. The multiplication of the average with the total number of pages results in approximately 58233 entries.

A survey to examine the preferences of the users of the said dictionaries with regard to entries being was distributed among Arab translators, translation students on WhatsApp translation groups, and Facebook translation groups, for they are common spaces for translators and translation students to exchange ideas and discussions. Although the researchers kept asking these group participants to take part in the survey, only forty-five (45) responses were secured.

The sample was composed of 45 participants, of whom the percentage of females to males was 44% -56%. Participants fell under different age groups as shown follows.

Table 3  
*Age Group of Participants*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20-30</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 50</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The researchers are of the view that the diversity of the participants’ age would provide significant input to this study. In response to the daily use of a dictionary to carry out a task, 31.1% participants said always, 35.6% said sometimes, 28.9% considered often, and 4.4% choose rarely as their answer. The researchers believed that professional translators less than often seek the assistance of a dictionary to comprehend the meaning of a term. Nearly, half of the respondents (48.9%) demonstrated a preference to use a bilingual dictionary, which provides English definitions, while 40% of the respondents showed their preference to use a bilingual dictionary that supplies paraphrases. In a response to a question on whether they prefer definitions to paraphrases, 48.9% of the respondents were in favor of definitions. The majority of the participants around (84%) stated that they had used Al-Mawrid, whereas only 11% of the participants had used DILT, which proved to have the undeniable popularity other than Al-Mawrid for the reasons stated above.

*English Dictionary of Financial and Economic Terms in the Register of Jurists*’ (Hamad, 2008) is an Arabic monolingual dictionary specializing in Islamic financial and economic terms. It was utilized to select a random sample. The researchers decided to choose *Muʿğamu Almuṣṭalahāti Almāḥati wāl Iqtiṣādyati fī Luğati Alfuqahā* by Nazi Hammad (2008), which translates as ‘*English Dictionary of Financial and Economic Terms in the Register of Jurists*’ (DFETRJ). This medium-sized Arabic dictionary comprises 993 entries, out of which there were only 654 single-word entries, and 339 noun phrases (Ali et al., 2021). Below is a sample of an entry from DFETRJ.

To create a random sample of 100 terms (Ali et al., 2021) from Hammad’s dictionary, two Excel functions, namely *randbetween* and *vlookup* were utilized. After creating the sample, a thorough search for English counterparts in DILT and Al-Mawrid was carried out. The following sections show the findings from each dictionary.
Extract 4
Hammad’s Dictionary (2008)

This specialized dictionary has majority of definitions and paraphrases written in Arabic next to each word, which implies that its target audience is the Arabic readership (El-Zeiny, 2017).

When browsing the worksheet, the researchers came across the following renditions:

1. سَدﱡ اﻟﺬﱠرِاﺋِﻊِ (saddu ḏḏraʾi’): The entry was translated with a paraphrase-prohibition of evasive legal devices- using a related word, such as prohibition as the equivalent of سَدﱡ. The other English words in the paraphrase elucidated the concept, which may have separate sections in jurisprudence books that was allocated to explain and demonstrate the referred meanings with examples.

2. ﺑَﯿﻊُ اﻟﻌَﺮَاﯾَﺎ (bay'u al'rāyā): This Arabic entry was rendered with a paraphrase version indicated as- a contract of barter in dates, of which the related word is barter. This kind of contract or sale is only allowed
for certain types of plants, such as dates and raisins, subject to the condition that it does not exceed a certain limit. Although the English equivalent of these words mention dates (since it is often practiced in the sale of dates from palm trees), its meaning also extends over to other types too, such as grapes, watermelons, and pomegranates.

3. **سَلَم** (salam): The Arabic entry was rendered into English with the paraphrase payment in advance, of which the related word is payment. The Arabic entry is made of one word, while the English rendition is made up of three words. The English equivalent, although is acceptable, which does not show that this kind of payment is only accepted in certain situations for certain commodities. Cotton, iron, dirham, dinars, maize or wheat are common items in sale.

4. **مُوَاﺛَﺒَة** (muwāṭaba): The rendition of this entry was carried out by a paraphrase using unrelated words, such as the prompt assertion of a claim. The concept is semantically complex, which requires a more elaborate unpacking of its meaning. The compilers of DILT have preferred to merely focus on the word’s technical meaning.

5. **غِﺶ** (ġiš): The Arabic entry was matched with the paraphrase false representation, using unrelated words. Representation is a neutral word, however, the addition of the adjective false makes it refer to an act of cheating. The English equivalent of this phrases is indicated as make false representations, which means to consciously supply an inaccurate explanation or description. The Arabic entry means all types of dishonesty considering the internal and external factors of business.

6. **رَﺿْﺢٌ** (radẖ): The translation of the Arabic entry was paraphrased as a paltry gift, using unrelated words. The Arabic term is used to denote what part of spoils from a war is separated for those who hardly fight, such as women and children. The word gift may refer to the act and paltry to the value of the gift in comparison to what soldiers usually receive.

7. **سَاعٍ** (sāʾ): The dictionary provided revenue officer for the Arabic entry associated with zakat collection. The word officer relates to the paraphrase word. The connotation being semantically complex, was sacrificed for a TT equivalent.

8. **ﺧَﺮَاج** (ḫarāǧ): The English rendition of the Arabic entry is transliterated as ḥaraj followed by the paraphrase, land tax. The phrase land tax refers
to the time when people cultivating a certain piece of land needed to make a payment to the state. It is rendered with related words in English as their equivalent.

9. تَعْدِیَل (ta’dīl): This Arabic entry was matched with consent partition. It refers to the division of inheritance based on values, such as fame, proximity to rivers or markets. The technical meaning of the term was captured with a related word, namely partition.

10. ﻧَﺾﱡ (naḍḍ): The Arabic entry means the conversion of commodities into money. In keeping with this meaning, DILT compilers have made use of related words, hard money, as an equivalent to reflect the output of the converting process.

11. اِﺣْﺘِﺷَﺎش (iḥtišāš): The translation of the Arabic entry was paraphrased as cutting the grass. The Arabic word was rendered into English using related words.

12. سَلَﺐٌ (salab): This Arabic entry is expressed as plundering robbery, using unrelated words. Salab that is a permissible act in times of war where personal belongings of a dead soldier, such as rides, weapons, clothes are taken by the victorious party. In contrast, the two word collocation in English evokes negative connotations.

13. ﺟِﺰْﯾَﺔٌ (ǧizyah): The Arabic entry expresses a complex concept that implies the collection of money from non-Muslims as taxes to secure protection from the state. DILT has employed poll tax, also known as capitation or head tax, to convey the semantic meaning of the Arabic entry with a related word, such as tax.

14. اِﻗﺘِﺼَﺎر (iqtiṣār): The phrase to be confined to was used as an English equivalent of this Arabic entry. In Arabic, iqtiṣār means that the ruling is only applicable to a specific situation. The concept is rendered with a related word, such as confined.

15. ﺑَﯿﻊُ اﻟﻨَﺴِﯿﺌَﺔ (bay’u alnasy’h): DILT translates this Arabic entry as delay usury, using related words. However, the English equivalent only matches the denotation meaning of alnasy’h but not with the meaning of bay’u, namely sale.

16. ﻣَضْرِب (tanḍyĎ): This Arabic entry is similar to an already discussed term, entry 10. ﻧَﺾﱡ (naḍḍ). The English equivalent is also the same.
хиyyāru al’ayb: The rendition of this entry is done using related words, namely, *option from defect*. Since cheating is forbidden in Islam, this concept becomes part and parcel of any sale agreement whether it is stipulated or not.

**Al-Mawrid (2009)**

This general dictionary employed a mixed technique (meaning a combination of translation techniques, such as synonyms, superordinates, and subordinates to capture several senses, an Arabic entry may have. As this study only focused on entries rendered via paraphrasing or definitional approaches, the mixed technique was excluded due to certain limitations of this study.

Having less than two entries and sharing three IFE entries with DILT, Al-Mawrid proved to be useful in terms of specialized terminologies. The rendition of fifteen Arabic entries (where 14 were paraphrased and 1 was translated using definitional approaches) are as follows:

1. غش (ġiš): *double-dealing* is a journalistic term that designates cheating and deception (Longman, 2019). The components of the English compound per se never refer to the concept of deception or cheating. Accordingly, it is safe to say that the rendition was done with unrelated words.

2. جزية (ǧizyah): Tax in *poll tax* is the only related word in the English equivalent that provided and corresponds with the Arabic entry.

3. خراج (ẖarāǧ): The English collocation *land tax* has captured the main part of the concept of ḥarāǧ.

4. أصحاب الفروض (āshābu alfurūḍ): Only in this instance a definition can be used to give the meaning of an entry. The definition “those entitled to a statutory or legal portion in the estate according to sura IV:12 of the Koran” gives a clear concept of the Arabic entry and indicates the relevancy of Quranic verse as discussed and entitled by ascendants, descendants, and spouses. This falls under Bussmann’s (2006) real definition or Burkhanov’s (2010) analytical definition provides the superordinate word, *entitled* whereas the reference for more information can be found in a particular Surah, which also offers a descriptive definition.
5. **تَﻜَﺎﻓُﻞُ** (takāful): This Arabic entry provided five English phrases as its equivalents that reflect the different sense of the entry. One sense of takāful, which is *to take care of or look after*, has no equivalent, whereas the other modern sense as found in *التكافل الاجتماعي* atakāful alaġtimāʿ was represented by five English equivalents.

6. **أُﺳْوَاق** (ʿaswāq): The Arabic entry was in the plural form, which is the singular form of *sūq*. The compiler rendered it with related words, such as, *commercial center* and *trading center*.

7. **وَﻛْﺲ** (waks): The phrase *fall in value* was used as an English equivalent of the Arabic entry. The compiler employed a paraphrase with a related word, *fall*.

8. **إِﺟَﺎرَةُ الْذِّﻣﱠﺔِ** (ʾiǧāratu ḏḏ immah): This Arabic entry refers to the rented item/property as stated in the rent or lease agreement, whereas the English equivalent designates the money stipulated in the agreement. No related words were used in the English paraphrase.

9. **سَﻘﱠﺎط** (saqqāṭ): This Arabic entry matched with the English equivalent, *junk dealer*. According to Collins Dictionary, a junk dealer is “a person who buys and sells discarded or secondhand objects” (Collins, 2014). The paraphrased version employed related words.

10. **اِﺑْﺘِﺰَازٌ** (ibtizāz): The Arabic entry was matched with *forcible exaction* and *pilferage blackmail*. The two paraphrased related words in English were employed to convey the sense.

11. **اِﻛْﺘِﻨَﺎزٌ** (iktināz): This Arabic entry is derived from *kinz*, which means treasure. Thus, iktināz refers to the process of heaping up wealth without paying zakat. The English equivalents, *treasuring (up)* and *heaping up*, refer only to the process of hoarding. Related words were used in the English paraphrased version.

12. **ھَﻼََكٌ** (halāk): The English equivalents were *utter destruction*, *(total)* *loss*, and *eternal damnation*, of which the first two equivalents refer to the meaning of the Arabic entry, such as the depreciation of things that they are no longer usable.
14. *اِﺳْﺘِﮭْﻼَك* (*istihlāk*): This Arabic entry is paraphrased as *wear and tear* that refers to the damage that takes place over a period. It is a term also used by insurance companies when paying an insurance claim.

15. *ﻛُﻤْﺒِﯿَﺎﻟَﺔ* (*kumbiyālah*): Although this is a modern term used in international trade, it is also employed in Islamic banking. So, the Arabic entry is conveyed by two familiar English equivalents, such as *bill (of exchange)* and *promissory note*.

**Discussion**

The study has exhibited that among all only two dictionaries provided English equivalents of Arabic language in the form of paraphrases and definitions. Specifically, it has been revealed that for 32 Arabic entries related to IFETs, 97% of the entries in both dictionaries has been expressed using paraphrases.

The rendition of 31 Arabic entries was done by using the paraphrasing technique to achieve a high level of insertability in translation tasks and for the specification of propositional meaning. The two dictionaries shared three Arabic entries, two of which, *ǧizyah* and *ḥarāğ*, were rendered with the same English equivalents, namely *poll tax* and *land tax*, respectively. The third one, *ġiš*, was documented as a *false representation* in DILT, however, in Al-Mawrid it was indicated as *double-cheating*. The rendition of an Arabic entry with the paraphrased approach in English was most prevalent in the above findings. For paraphrasing deploying a non-related word in English, only 4 instances in DILT and 2 in Al-Mawrid were found. Paraphrases occupy less space in a dictionary whereas to definitions this may take up more space. Economically speaking, if the meaning can be expressed with fewer words, it is more appreciated.

The only example identified for the use of a definitional technique to explain the meaning of an Islamic concept that differs a little from other cultures is *āshābu alfurūḍ* in Al-Mawrid. The compiler demonstrated prudence by directing the readership to a specific source within the Koran, which would provide them with additional information regarding the term in question. The expectation of the researchers was high regarding finding more examples of both the paraphrase and definition technique in both dictionaries. However, the definition technique was used once. This proved that compilers prioritized space economy, as definitions would require more
words to deliver meanings, and consequently, the manual dictionary may become inefficiently bulky.

**Conclusion**

Overall, the paraphrases in both dictionaries were adequate in providing the denotative or core meaning/s of the Arabic entries, although some paraphrases in both dictionaries could have been better explicated in terms of their connotative meanings with definitions instead of paraphrases/while both dictionaries contained entries that could have benefited from more comprehensive explanations of their connotative meanings through definitions instead of relying on paraphrases. Nonetheless, as mentioned earlier, economy in writing dictionaries apparently trumped elaboration for logistic reasons.

The responses of the 45 participants are also significant as they highlighted that paraphrases are economical for lexicographers; they are not always sufficient for users who need more when wanting to understand all aspects of a term. As such, it is natural that they prefer definitions, which provide more detailed elaborations that paraphrased version do not offer.

**Limitations of the Study**

The current study was limited to only two bilingual manual Arabic-English dictionaries with thirty-two IFETs, which appeared out of the hundred randomly selected IFETs. Furthermore, comparative studies are recommended on other bilingual manual and digitalized Arabic-English dictionaries, which would reveal the frequency of the use of the two techniques investigated in this research and their efficacy in capturing the semantic load in lexical items that are densely couched in culture. Thereby, future researchers may deploy a corpus analysis for a larger sample size other than the one utilized in this study.
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