

Lexicalized Names and Nouns in Jordanian Arabic: A Sociolinguistic and Translational View

Dr. Bakri Al-Azzam, Assistant Professor, The Hashemite University, bakri_h2004@yahoo.com
Dr. Majed Al-Quran, Associate Professor, The Hashemite University, majidha@yahoo.com
Prof. Marwan Obeidat, Full Professor, The Hashemite University, marwanobeidat@hotmail.com
Dr. Aladdin Kharabsheh, Assistant Professor, The Hashemite University, alakh22@yahoo.com

Abstract

Lexicalization occupies a central place in the development of the lexicon of languages, as it is highly pervasive cross-linguistically. This study addresses lexicalized names and nouns in Colloquial Arabic, as the phenomenon is notably self-evident in the formation of new lexical items through borrowing from either the standard variety of Arabic or from an alien source, mainly Turkish. Taken as stems, words from these lending varieties are lexicalized to coin new words and consequently are institutionalized within the everyday use. These include eponyms from the standard variety and nouns from a foreign source. More specifically, it is an attempt to identify these cases and analyze the morphological restructuring in addition to the encoding system they have gone through at the semantic level. Moreover, it shows that the lexicalized names and nouns have gained enough social understanding, which has helped to preserve them alive among whole social groups. Since most of the borrowed names have culture specific implications, they pose a challenge to their translatability, another major concern of the study.

1. Introduction

The linguistic phenomena of lexicalization and institutionalization play a central role in the lexicon of all languages. Being pervasive cross-linguistically, they strikingly manifest themselves in word formation of Jordanian colloquial Arabic. The related literature provides a number of definitions of the two phenomena in addition to their formal, semantic and extra linguistic consequences as these heavily depend on the regional and social varieties of the language in question. Lipka, et al (2004) refers to the importance of the two in the context of words that have not existed in a language for a very long time and are not yet fully established and accepted by the language community. Lipka (ibid) further raises some questions related to cases of lexicalized and thus institutionalized words. These address issues such as what happens to a new word once it has been formed, coined, or borrowed from another language and is used by a larger number of speakers, the changes it undergoes, and how it finds its way into the dictionary of a language. These are the processes involved in lexicalization and institutionalization, which yield additions to the lexicon.

However, an operational definition or conceptualization of lexicalization might not be easy a task since linguists do not use it in the same way and according to Lipka (1990: 95); there is no single, correct definition of the term. Besides, if not clearly explained, some readers might be confused over the distinction between lexicalization and lexicification, where the former deals with the encoding of meaning to words, while the latter refers to the source and/or processes of creating the words. Ogechi (2005) cites Trask and Silva (<http://www.linguist.org/~ask-ling/archive-1997.10/msg01859.html> 14 Nov 2003) who view the terms alike in that it is the act of creating a word to express some meaning or the process through which concepts are put into words in a given language. As for institutionalization, Bauer (1988: 67) identifies the institutionalization of words as "their coming into general use in the society and so being listed in dictionaries". He further adds that a word is institutionalized when created by a productive morphological process and put into general use in the speech community.

Al-Quran (2006:95-108) in a study of lexical borrowing from Turkish into Jordanian colloquial Arabic reveals that many of these loanwords have been subject to a new grammaticalization process or a morphological restructuring in addition to receiving either an entirely new or a modified semantic representation to attain the new system compatibility. That is, they are lexicalized within the Arabic linguistic system. Then, the institutionalization of the identified lexical items are looked into, i.e., how they are used in everyday conversations, and pragmatically as to how context and situation affect either their new or the modified semantic representation since various aspects of social life impose themselves on these loan words during the process of institutionalization after being lexicalized. Besides, it has been shown that the lexical items or roots are treated as stems in the borrowing linguistic system, i.e. when an item whether a noun or an adjective is taken as a root from the donor code and is then processed within a new derivation and inflection

whereby native affixes are attached to this alien code component. This goes in harmony with what Holmes (1994: 50) states in that borrowed words are adapted to the speaker's first language and are used grammatically as if they were part of his/her first language.

While being aware of Lipka's (1990: 52) argument that word semantics, studied under structural semantics, is not confined to isolated items but focuses on lexical fields and paradigmatic semantic relations between words generally, the writers of this piece largely restrict it to isolated items. In addition to analyzing the morphological restructuring of the concerned lexicalized items, the manipulative procedures they undergo are also explained including how the newly acquired meaning is encoded. Although the present discourse also distinguishes between lexicalization and lexification wherein the former deals with encoding of meaning to words, while the latter refers to the source and processes of creating the words, this article combines all under the morphological and semantic structuring involved in lexicalizing the new items, in addition to how this relates to their translatability.

Since the main aim of the present work is an analytic description of the grammaticalization of the borrowed names and nouns into colloquial Arabic, whether from Standard Arabic or an alien source, further reference is of much relevance to what Al-Quran (2006:101-103) found, which is in full harmony with the findings of the present work, concerning the lexicalization of Turkish nouns and adjectives when colloquialized into Jordanian Arabic. The latter author found that they were subject to both derivational and inflectional processes as Arabic affixes are added to them to acquire the new system compatibility. The borrowed nouns undergo a derivational process whereby their grammatical class changes when the Arabic prefix (y-) is attached to them and hence used as verbs. For example, the Turkish words *tekme* (kick) and *tenkit* (criticism) are changed into verbs and become *ydgum* and *ynnekkit* when colloquialized into Jordanian variety of Arabic. Yet, and strangely enough, part of the word, either the beginning or the end, is deleted and the rest is used as a verb in the past form. For example, if a person criticized or made fun of somebody, a past verb form is made (*nekket*) wherein *te-* is deleted; whereas the *-e* in *tekme* is deleted and a past verb (*degem*) is formed. Semantically, however, these words acquire new properties other than the physical property of kicking in the case of *degem* as it is often used to mean "showed someone before other people that what s/he says is untrue and thus s/he is a liar".

With cultural implications for translation in mind, language and culture are seen as closely related and both must be considered for translation, especially in translating cultural words, names and concepts. Yet, this may cause problems since it may limit the comprehension of certain aspects due to the alien social, economic, political and cultural context as well as the connotative aspects of a more semantic character, as Newmark (1988) puts it. Considering the inevitability of translation loss when the lexicalized borrowed item is culture bound, this can constitute a challenge, similar to what is frequently encountered in literary texts. The translator has to explain or complete such an information gap imposed by a historical or cultural background and which it is very unlikely that a foreign recipient will infer on their own.

2. Statement and Purpose of the Study

The derivational processes involved within the linguistic system of a language are the most common means whereby new words may be added to its vocabulary. However, new words also enter a language in a variety of other ways. In English, for example, the advertising industry has added many words such as Orlon, Nylon and Kodak in addition to specific brand names such as Vaseline, Kleenex and Xerox etc., that are used as the generic name for these different types of products. Roots from another language can be borrowed to provide another means for coining new words. Furthermore, eponyms, words coined from proper names, are another creative way of expanding a language vocabulary, which is a major concern the present article would like to address.

Arabic, is an outstanding case of Diglossia where there are many distinct varieties of the same language, viz., classical Arabic as the High variety with many Low varieties including the Jordanian colloquial one. Arabic expands its vocabulary stock through lexicalizing names and nouns at the vernacular level. In Jordanian colloquial Arabic, in particular, names and nouns are borrowed either from the standard variety of Arabic or from a foreign language. Taken as stems, they are lexicalized to enter the vernacular system as adjectives and then as verbs through the application of the morphological processing rules of the hosting code. Of course, the lexicalized product within the standard variety enters its dictionary, whereas in the colloquial one it is accommodated in the daily use of the language. After being lexicalized, the new items are institutionalized, and thus maintain their existence through a social acceptance of and frequent use by the speech community when the new context is similar to the historical or cultural background associated with them, especially the borrowed names.

Since each name is linked to a story deeply rooted in the history of the Arabic speech community, the present endeavor addresses itself to identifying these cases and analyzing the morphological restructuring in addition to the encoding system they have gone through at the semantic level. Because the historical context encompassing the borrowed items is a shared cultural background among the speech community members, and thus such names have culture specific implications, they pose a challenge to their translatability, another major concern of this study. This stems from the fact that, in reality, it is the historical event which is borrowed. The translational challenge encountered here is approached in the light of the debate over cultural implications in translation. For example, the componential analysis proposed by Newmark (1988:96) excludes the culture and highlights the message. Nida (1964:129), moreover, distinguishes between formal and dynamic equivalence when considering cultural implications for translation. According to Nida (ibid), a "gloss translation" mostly typifies formal equivalence where form and content are reproduced as faithfully as possible and the target language reader is able to "understand as much as he can of the customs, manner of thought, and means of expression" of the source language context. Contrasting with this idea, dynamic equivalence aims at relating the receptor to modes of behavior relevant within the context of his/her own culture without insisting that s/he understand the cultural patterns of the source-language context.

3. Colloquialism and Translation

Since the present paper concerns itself with lexicalizing names and nouns into a colloquial variety of Arabic, colloquialisms or colloquial language are worth defining. As is known, colloquial language is considered to be characteristic of ordinary, familiar and informal speech used primarily within a limited geographical area. Colloquialism is further viewed as a translation strategy which draws on a full nonstandard target language (TL) variety, the colloquial variety of a given language. Unlike lexical colloquialization, this translation strategy can operate at all levels of language (phonology, morphology, lexis and syntax) depending on the dialect markers found in the source language (SL) text. Colloquialization refers to the covert norm of language use and therefore is often used to substitute the SL text dialects such as: Black Vernacular, Southern American English or Cockney as these language varieties are typically associated with the underprivileged, the powerless and the uneducated.

When discussing Arabic colloquialism, we should distinguish between classical and colloquial Arabic. The classical variety is derived from Islam's holy book, the Qur'an, and Islamic studies. It is written but rarely spoken. Modern Standard Arabic, although not spoken by the masses, is the language of modern journalism, used in newspapers and news reports. Colloquial Arabic is a variety spoken differently in each of the twenty-two Middle Eastern countries. Within these nations, there are also many regional dialects that add or subtract letters and words. These spoken varieties of Arabic used throughout the Arab world, differ radically from the literary language. One factor in the differentiation of the dialects is influence from the languages, Turkish for example, previously spoken in the areas, which have typically provided a significant number of new words, and have sometimes also influenced pronunciation and caused a change of meaning. Moreover, the sociolinguistic situation of Arabic in modern times provides an outstanding example of the linguistic phenomenon of diglossia - the normal use of two separate varieties of the same language, usually in different social situations (see Zughoul and El-Badarien, 2004: 447-456; Gumperz 1977; Fishman, 1972; Ferguson, 1959: 325-40). Within the broad social classifications, the daily speech of urban, rural, and nomadic speakers is distinctively different. Differences involved in Arabic colloquialism can be so striking to the extent that different dialectal forms of it are mutually incomprehensible. Thus, illiterate speakers from widely separated parts of the Arab world may not understand one another, although each is speaking a version of Arabic.

To exemplify this mutual incomprehensibility resulting from lexicalizing and colloquializing a foreign item, the Turkish word '*dışarı*' is an outstanding case (Al-Quran, ibid). For example, when the Turkish noun '*dışarı*' (outdoor) is borrowed and colloquialized into Jordanian Arabic as '*dashir*' to negatively mean someone who is always outside his house but jobless not because of unemployment but because of laziness, this is very likely to be unintelligible in another neighboring Arab country. This Jordanian community-specific recognizability of the new term is due to the common usage the lexicalized item, and thus colloquialized into the Jordanian daily speech, has specifically acquired there, not somewhere else in other Arabic-speaking countries. An analytic scrutiny of the new colloquial term *dashir* as compared to the origin *dışarı* provided by the source language can reveal much change at various levels. First, the word witnesses a phonological metathesis or a phoneme movement process whereby the sequence of the vowels (/i/, /a/) in the middle of the word is reordered and thus becomes (/a/, /i/) as appears in the phonologically modified Arabic adjective form *dashir*. It further experiences a segment deletion as it loses the final vowel /i/, which is part of the Turkish origin *dışarı*. As for the syntactic category, it is lexicalized into an adjective to describe someone who spends most of his time without work outside the home.

4. Lexicalization and Translation

Losses that occur during the translation process resulting from misunderstanding and/or misrepresentation of cultural and literary equivalents are a persistent problem in translation activity. When borrowed items like historical names and nouns, whether from the standard variety into the vernacular or from a foreign source, are lexicalized, they bring with them translation challenges pertaining not only to meaning equivalence but also to higher levels of content, context, semantics, and pragmatics. Arabic is a language exceptionally rich in its metaphorical and proverbial wisdom. In order for this wisdom to be clearly reflected in translation, such levels must be considered to bridge the gaps between two distant codes.

Hosted items from different codes can be lexicalized differently across a variety of languages, and thus problems related to structuring or creating a set of sense distinctions are inevitable in language processing applications. As stated by Ide (1999), the most nagging issue for word sense disambiguation is the definition of a word sense as at its base the problem is viewed as a philosophical and linguistic one that is not easy to resolve. Furthermore, lexicalization is viewed by Berezowski (1997), as a translation strategy, which keeps traits of the SL text dialect, but only at the lexical level. Depending on the main features of social deixis, Berezowski subcategorizes lexicalization into rural, colloquial, diminutive and artificial. While rural lexicalization retains in the TL text the nonstandard lexical items which are typical of a given social group living in a particular geographical region, colloquial lexicalization maintains those nonstandard lexical items which characterize social groups such as those of the uneducated, the poor, and the underprivileged whose speech displays a high level of informality. As for diminutive lexicalization, it retains in the TL text those nonstandard lexical items which are typical of very young or very old language users. Diminutive lexicalization places emphasis on the temporal aspect of social deixis, i.e. the age of the speakers. Artificial lexicalization, however, is a strategy that requires a translator to invent completely new lexical items in the target language sounding unfamiliar to a typical recipient of the translation. In order to use the strategy of artificial lexicalization successfully, two requirements must be met. Firstly, the SL text itself must draw on an artificial variety. In this way, by using an artificial variety the translator tries to evoke the same set of associations in the TL text recipients, i.e. confusion, the sense of language barbarism and foreignness. Secondly, the usage of artificial variety should be consistent throughout the whole work so that new lexical items can be acquired by the recipient from the context.

Agirre, E., et al. (2006) cites Lewandowski's (1992) definition of the term lexicalization as the transformation of an element (or a sequence of elements) into a unique lexical or conceptual element. Therefore, the result of lexicalization can be carried out as a lexical element (a word) or a sequence of elements or phrase, i.e. a multi-word expression. Related to the aforementioned transformation process, they further refer to what some authors like Calzolari et al., (2002) point out, that lexicalization has to be understood as a continuum from fully-fledged compositional and productive constructions to fixed and frozen expressions. This is looked at as attributed to the fact that lexicalization is the result of the combination of a number of factors occurring either totally or partially, which include co-occurrence frequency or collocation, fixation, semantic specialization and idiomatization.

5. Idiomatization and Translation

Idioms are culture specific constructions representing experience within a culture. An idiom is defined in the Wikipedia (<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki>) as a colloquial metaphor or a term which "requires some foundational knowledge, information, or experience, to use only within a culture where parties must have common reference". The translation challenges involved in idiomatic expressions stem from the fact that idioms are not considered a part of the language, but rather a part of the culture as they are based in culture-specific conceptual metaphors. Of course, a given conceptual metaphor may be common in one culture but uncommon in another. Besides, translation problems are not limited to the cross-linguistic differences at the level of individual figurative idioms, but extend more to general cross-cultural variations in metaphor usage that may underlie them. In this respect, Boers (2003: 231-238) identifies three types of cross-cultural variation in metaphor usage. The first are differences pertaining to the particular source-target mappings that have become conventional in the given cultures, while the second are ones related to value judgments associated with the source or target domains of shared mappings. The third type is differences with regard to the degree of commonness and frequency of metaphor as such, as compared with other rhetorical figures (for more on deep metaphors and their relationship to human cognition, see Lakoff and Johnson, 1980). Although cultures are typically localized and therefore, idioms are often not useful outside of that local context, some idioms can be more universally used than others, and thus can be easily translated as the metaphorical meaning is more easily deducible.

Moreover, the term *idiomaticity* is used to refer to the semantic property of an idiom, whereas the term '*idiomatology*' (Hartman 1981, cited by Dumitrașcu 2007) roughly corresponds to phraseology, i.e. to the linguistic description of set expressions whose meaning cannot be derived from the meaning of their constituent elements. The lexical family is completed by the term *idiomatic* that refers to "the use of expressions that mean something different from the literal meanings of the words making up the respective expressions" (Lombardo, Haarman, Morley, Taylor 1999: 298, cited by Dumitrașcu, *ibid*). Mention should be made of the fact that the *idiomaticity* of a word group is the result of a diachronic process of *idiomatization*, interpretation of context meanings and of the communicative functions of a set phrase compared to its possible variants. For example, the denotational *idiomatic* meaning of *wet blanket* (informal) is "a person whose low spirits or lack of enthusiasm has a depressing effect on the others". It also has an expressive connotation that implies a negative value judgment as derogatory and a stylistic connotation at the informal, colloquial level. According to Fernando (1981: 19), cited in Dumitrașcu (*ibid*), there are varying degrees of *idiomaticity* correlating with different types of categories of idioms. This classification of idioms is based on the degree of motivation, therefore on semantic intelligibility. Fernando (*ibid*) distinguishes among four categories of idioms:

- "1. *Transparent expressions*, such as *to cut the wood*, *to break the eggs*, which are not idioms, but free collocations with a literal meaning derived from the meanings of the constituent words;
2. *Semi-transparent idioms*, such as *to skate on thin ice*, *to add fuel to the fire*, which can be regarded as metaphors having a counterpart with a literal meaning;
3. *Semi-opaque phrases*, such as *to burn one's boats*, *tarred with the same brush*, metaphor idioms which are not completely intelligible;
4. *Opaque phrases*, such as *to pull somebody's leg*, *to pass the buck* which are full idioms whose meaning cannot be derived from the meanings of the component words."

Lipka (2004) views *idiomatization* in terms of the semantic changes involved in lexicalization manifesting itself through the addition or loss of semantic features. According to him, lexicalization can be *idiosyncratic*, i.e., when the semantic changes are so extreme that the meaning of the whole lexeme can no longer be derived from its parts, which is the origin of idioms. That is, words are said to be *semantically lexicalized* if their meaning is no longer the sum of the meanings of their parts. Synchronically, he concludes, this process results in various degrees of *idiomaticity*.

6. Discussion

The fact that Jordan has come under many social, economic, political, religious and historical impacts has led to lexicalization and institutionalization of many items that have taken many grammatical forms. And since Jordan has embraced many ethnic groups, the lexicalization has witnessed a large number of language varieties, derived, for example, from the influence of the Turkish Empire, the Palestinian and Chechens' migration to Jordan, besides the life patterns of ruralism, and urbanism. This mixture of ethnic groups, added to the economic, political, religious, and social interaction between the Jordanian population sects, has separated many lexical items from their appropriate grammatical system, conventionalized and institutionalized them in another grammar that has taken the same course as the native grammar of the Jordanian community. In the most commonly conventional reproduction, the concepts are converted into words, where the semantic form which is allocated for meaning, is converted into an abstract form that is specified for semantic and syntactic information (how to be semantically and syntactically used). In order to illuminate this linguistic phenomenon, lexicalized named and nouns are exemplified as to clarify the issue under discussion. Moreover, lexicalization of non-existing, borrowed or standardized items, or destandardized ones are analyzed to make clear the fact that lexicalized items do not look exotic, not only among the educated classes, but also among other less educated or the illiterate ones. For purely reasons of space and organization, the analysis and discussion will be based on categorizing the items as lexicalized names, nouns, borrowings, and non-etymological.

6.1. Lexicalized Names

It is axiomatic that some names have been eternalized in history because of denoting persons, who set examples in certain fields, socially approved or disapproved. The coinage and the frequency of such names helped in normalizing them among all social classes, regardless of the educational, economic, political, religious or social discrepancies. The effect that a certain name may create on people differs from one region to another and from culture to culture. This is due to the size of pressure that the person of that name

has produced on the people witnessing blessing or oppression, prosperity or poverty, development or retardation, and peace or uproar. In the following, the fact to be demonstrated is that lexicalized names have a historic depth that has made them very lively among all social classes. Their social function is relayed, sometimes, without drawing the audience's attention to the person after whom names are conceptualized. The lexicalized names *mitfar'in* (v. *titfar'an*), *mitnamrid* (v. *titnamrad*), *mistahbil* (v. *tistahbil*), *mithanbil* (v. *tithanbal*) and *mit'antir* (v. *ti'anter*) have political, religious, social and dictatorial implications. They will be analyzed from social, cultural, linguistic, and translational perspectives in order to investigate the size of incongruence between the Arabic culture and the western culture on the one hand, and the translation unbridgeable gaps on the other.

Pharaoh:

The King of the Ancient Egyptians, Pharaoh, is the title given in modern parlance to the ancient Egyptian kings of all periods. He set a real example of oppressing his people that made him alive, and transmitted from one age to another up until today. He tried to make invidious distinctions between his subjects, which is a dereliction of his kingly duties. Pharaoh and his clique were intoxicated with pride of race and material civilization, and grievously oppressed the Israelites. He declared that all male sons born to his Israelites should be killed, and females kept alive for the pleasure of the Egyptians (cf. Ali 1999:1094). Not only Pharaoh, but also his minister Haman tried to crush the Israelites, a mission that made him as popular as Pharaoh himself. The fact that the king and his minister have this profile gave them unprecedented examples of dictatorship that his name lexicalizes and it became part of the Arabic lexicon despite the historical unbridgeable gap.

What made the name relatively easy to lexicalize is its colloquialism. Lexicalization has derived from the colloquial use, which gave it social and cultural functions that are inherited through generations. It is worth mentioning here that some people use the lexicalized name *mitfarin* without having any historical and dictatorial backgrounds; however, those people use it properly, and in its appropriate setting. The Arabic lexicalized item, *mitfar'in*, can be uttered in a situation where one part tries to dictate himself or his opinion on another part. The dictated upon part tries to defend himself or his view by denoting the other side by saying "*šāyer mitfar'in*" (lit. you are becoming like Pharaoh), or "*lā titfar'an*" (lit. do not become like Pharaoh). The social and the cultural power that the utterances may create is semantically, psychologically, emotively and more importantly socially comprehended. By nature, Arabs are familiar with such settings, whether at the political system level, or at the social or even family level; authority is taken as a means of imposing power over the other, which supports the argument that in order to be blindly obeyed, dictatorship should be used as a method of controlling people. If the lexicalized items are spoken in a situation or a setting where the audiences do not have enough historical, political or social backgrounds, they would sound opaque, nonsense and even funny.

In Western culture, however, such conceptualization does not exist, as all people are the same before the law. This gives the impression that when real democracy is implemented, the social and cultural implications that the institutionalized item may have do not exist; it is the community that familiarizes the unfamiliar, and lexicalizes the unusual. Uttering the term under discussion, in a similar context in the West, would not produce the same effect on the audience, as either the people do not have historical information about Pharaoh and his oppression, or they have not passed through similar experiences in the states of law. This makes it inevitable that enough explanation is required to keep the speaker's face, when he employs the lexicon in a social setting. What makes it intricate in creating a counterpart lexicalized item in the receptive culture is the linguistic disobedience in accepting the same linguistic patterns' modifications that helped in lexicalizing the name in its first but foreign language. Moreover, lexicalization of Pharaoh is a people-resistant phenomenon, as the people do not accept being ruled under similar conditions to those of a Pharaoh's regime.

As far as translation is concerned, preserving the various meanings and implications of the lexicalized Pharaoh is easier said than done. The lexicalization itself is too difficult to achieve in English, a fact that can make the issue even more complicated and translation-resistant. Preserving the lexicalization in translation is hardly attainable if not impossible, as the translation hurdles are doubled. The translation has to go through the same procedures of the source text, in order to create a similar or a clear audience reception; in the first place, the lexicalized item has to be colloquialized and digested in the community, a process that takes a long time. In addition, the lexicalized item should be naturalized and institutionalized by all groups of the community, so as to arrive at a communal agreement on the various implications. This normalization can help in debilitating the linguistic solid skull, which for the first time, rejects the entrance of an alien to its territory. On this basis, the translator has either to render the Arabic 'Fir'awn' as Pharaoh in English, transliterate the institutionalized item in English, and provide enough explanatory details in order to clarify

the historical, social, cultural, psychological, emotive, and more importantly the dictating character of Pharaoh. Another translation loss derives from the fact that Pharaoh is used to designate the ruler of Egypt, whether a male or female, who is entitled with political and religious powers. The gender based meaning is lost in translation, as it is not institutionalized in the source text. The translator has also to be aware of the fact that the nomenclature originally meant the "Great House", as a reference of the king's palace, but this meaning has loosened over time to be an interchangeably used word for king. It is inescapable that the translator should be encyclopedically informed about the whole perspectives of the lexicalized item in order to translate it comprehensively in the target language.

Nimrūd:

Although some historic names have less popularity than others do, they have gained enough reputation because of lexicalization and institutionalization. The fame that such names have gained derives from certain stands, whether positive or negative, sanctimonious or irreverent, or successful or failing. One should be aware of the fact that although some events can denote a certain quality of a person, this quality can become wider in terms of the situational uses and the functions that it might designate. To exemplify, a clear disobedience of God at a certain period of history applies not only to divine disobedience, but these days also to any type of noncompliance of any person. However, this defiance sometimes extends even further to touch upon one's defense of his rights, which is understood as one's rebelliousness, or breaking of the rule against what is customarily known about him.

Nimrod disputed with Abraham over resurrection and causing the sun to rise from the west. Nimrod was confounded because of the strong evidence that Abraham put forward, against which Nimrod declared his impotence. The arrogance, transgression, and defiance of Nimrod are what gave him a disobedient and rebellious character that is lexicalized and institutionalized to connote people enjoying similar behavioral aspects. What helped in the ease of the process and the coinage of the name is its frequency in the community among all social classes. This gives the name more power so as to leak into every corner of the public domain. The name, its colloquialism, its morphological modification, when it is uttered, and why it is uttered have created a socially agreed-upon context that cannot be manipulated in other cultures that lack the same experience. Politically and socially speaking, people of authoritarian leaderships at the state or the family level, have enough awareness and understanding of all the associations of this lexicalized name.

The lexicalized name 'mitnamrid' in the Jordanian colloquial Arabic 'šāyer mitnamrid' (lit. you are becoming like Nimrūd), or its derived form 'lā titnamrad' (lit. do not act or behave like Nimrūd) have clear social and cultural associations and implications in the Jordanian community. They can both be uttered by a supposedly superior part, either before the issue is debated or when the discussion is infuriated. When two parts come under a flaring argument, where one is always reported as obedient, humble, respectful, and unresisting, he is addressed by the lexicalized or the institutionalized concept 'šāyer mitnamrid' or its other form 'lā titnamrad'. The social understanding is relayed in this situational context that leaves no doubt of losing its various repercussions and allusions. Despite many people's ignorance of the historical and religious depth of the lexicalized item 'mitnamrid', they are fully aware of the message that the lexicalized item may convey.

When the lexical item is inter-lingually and inter-culturally dealt with, misunderstanding and miscomprehension arise. To use the lexicalized item for expressing the same semantic values in the west where people are unfamiliar with its connotations can be a source of humor and critique. This can apply to translation, where foreignizing the name for the second time is a new violation against its naturalness, where the depth and the weight of meanings reside. The translator encounters many difficult and unfathomable problems. He has first to unclasp himself of the problems of the lexicalized item in its Arabic discourse setting, which was initially a target one that exerted wearisome efforts. Then he has to invade a new-mined territory that cannot be easily trodden. He has first to find the suitable ground to grow the alien item, promote it in the new community, colloquialize it, and then use it in similar situations of the source language. Despite all such efforts, translation problems remain unbridgeable since many historical, religious, social, cultural, emotive and psychological ramps cannot be completely flattened.

'Antara

In the Pre-Islam era or the Jāhiliyya (lit. the ignorance period), some persons were given an esteem that kept them preserved from any forgetfulness or loss despite the long run of time. The black and the slaved mother son, 'Antara, has been an extraordinary example from that time up till now. The virtues of bravery, platonic love, dignity, abstinence from taking spoils in battles, chastity, among many other themes of his time have immortalized him and caused the mouth to mouth transmission of his noble character. The noble

deeds he documented made his character a real example that awarded him an extraordinary fame and reputation. Thus, 'Antara's historical and cultural importance stems from his performance in battles, amour, horses, his stories with the desert, besides the clear ability for composing poetry to express his experiences in a way that helped him in excelling his counterparts of his time.

The fact that this person had such merits has helped in lexicalizing and institutionalizing his name. The process developed and spread among different community groups and has begun to take a social and a cultural trend, where the name and its forms have become appropriate to be used in certain social occasions or events. The social use of the lexicalized name has helped in its daily-based recurrence and preservation from oblivion. What facilitates the acceptance of the name's lexicalization is the domestication of its morphological modification and patterning, which, in turn, made it easy for coining among all the social groups. Moreover, the Arab rebellious nature has helped in making any event, even a small one, an appropriate occasion for uttering the lexicalized forms of 'Antara. It should be clear that the lexicalized name is semantically loaded as long as it is colloquially used, because understanding its whole meanings and implications is associated with the exclusiveness of the setting. To colloquially exemplify the point, 'lā tit'antar 'alainā', (lit. do not be like 'Antara on us), or 'gālibhā 'antariyyāt' (lit. you are turning it as 'antar-like behaviors) can be spoken on disputable occasions, where the part dictating an opinion or acting oppressively is addressed.

In translating 'Antara's lexicalized forms into English, translation obstacles emerge for many social, cultural, psychological, and linguistic aspects. In order to make rendering the lexicalized name easy, it should be standardized in its source text first, a process that will inevitably result in semantic loss, as the semantics of the name is more plain and informative in its colloquialism. Standardizing the name may not receive the same approval of the community, and may even look awkward, as the process itself can be understood as a new form of an artificial lexicalization. In addition, the impact that the lexicalized forms of 'Antara may create on the source language audience cannot be maintained to the same extent, as the target language reader is not psychologically prepared to endure the forcefulness of the lexicalized item. What can also be important is that the spatio-temporal factor may contribute in bombarding and compressing the item with meanings. Such meanings that are historically and situationally confined cannot be easily transplanted into the culture of the 21st century that enjoys many technological developments. Added to this, the linguistic patterning of the source language does not agree with the linguistic patterning of the target language, as the latter is not flexible enough to accept any conciliation that the linguist or the translator may create or try to implement. Transliteration of the lexicalized name can be the only recourse of the translator to relay in the target language, on condition that provision of enough details is made to support the linguist's or the translator's view.

'Ifrīt

The large, powerful jinn, and reputed to be crafty 'Ifrīt, has power that enabled him to act intelligently and skillfully. 'Ifrīt is noted and known for its strength, cunning and persuasion, and is believed to haunt underground, between mountains, deep valleys, caves, jungles, and frequent ruins and uninhabited places. An ordinary force will not have enough power over this invisible creature that is susceptible to magic and often thought of as wicked and ruthless. Divinely based communities such as the Islamic, the Judaic, and the Christian have the belief that the creature does exist, as it is mentioned in the scriptures. Followers of the three religions are aware of the wickedness of this strange creature, and are convinced that it cannot be overpowered by an ordinary force or power. That is why one's obsession is referred to such-like creatures that can only be governed by religious people reciting parts of scriptures. In western secular communities, however, people do not believe in the creature and they consider the whole issue as myth or allegory, where fictional characters and actions are implemented to describe and express certain aspects, relating to human existence.

'Ifrīt has gained many extraordinary features that has made it an example of wickedness, cunning, deceit, betrayal, craftiness, and skillfulness. This has helped in memorizing the creature, coining its name, and at a later stage, lexicalizing and institutionalizing it as a concept for use in certain social settings. It has taken a social interest and significance as a nomenclature to denote wicked, intelligent, naughty, troublesome, cunning, and sometimes, wise people. Naturalizing the name has caused its exoticism and foreignness to disappear, and has led to a full understanding of many implications. Colloquialism of the name enabled poorly educated people to memorize it and functionalize its forms in settings that are communally agreed upon accepting the utterance of the various forms of the name. To exemplify, 'mit'afrit' the colloquial form of 'Ifrīt', is used to denote someone who behaves badly, and improperly. Socially speaking, people attending the event can understand that the utterance aims at describing the addressed person as troublesome, noisy, an intruder in others' affairs, and crafty in performing approved or unapproved acts. Similarly, 'Afārit', the

plural form of 'lfrīt', is most often used to describe children behaving or acting badly. The plural form, thus, has a function of denoting children, a case that cannot apply to adults or grown up people. Another interesting function of 'šāyer mit'afrit', another applicable form of 'lfrīt', is that of praising somebody for scoring high, or skillfully doing a job he is in charge of, or even doing the duties in a short time. This ameliorative use of the lexicalized item derives from the fact that active, hardworking and industrious people usually perform their task skillfully and quickly.

In turn, translation cannot be away from the context. Many translation problems appear when rendering the lexicalized 'mit'afrit' or its other forms into English. Translation attempts at naturalizing what is alien or foreign in the target environment. This requires exhaustive efforts to familiarize the lexicalized name in the receptive language, and familiarize the audience, with the name, its lexicalized form and the social and cultural function that it conveys in its original setting. Lexicalizing the name should start from its standard form; once the new community becomes familiar with it and its social, religious, mythical, psychological, and historical implication, a new process of colloquializing the name starts. Colloquializing the name in order to lexicalize it and its forms loads it with extra-linguistic meanings that can be acquired by the frequency and the currency in similar occasions and events. People of the target language should be equipped with enough socio-linguistic dimensions in order to grasp sufficient information about the name, its lexicalized forms, and its different functions in order to be similarly bombarded with the various implications, pertaining to the lexicalized name.

Habīleh

The etymological background of the Arabic colloquial lexicalized name 'habīleh' and its forms may trace back to the two sons of Adam, Abel and Cain. Abel, the younger and the innocent, is said to have been working as a shepherd. His elder brother, Cain, however, is said to have been working in agriculture, and was puffed up with arrogance and jealousy, causing him to commit the crime of murder. Innocent and God-fearing, Abel addressed his elder brother in Chapter 5:28 of the Qur'an by saying "If you stretch your hand to kill me, I will not stretch my hand to kill you, for I fear Allah the Lord of all Worlds". This historical event has seeped out and has taken on a social and cultural significance that has made Abel's name an example of any inferior or humble individuals. Though the story of murdering the brother is well known among all social groups, when using 'habīleh' or its other forms such as 'misthabilinī', 'lā titmahbal', 'minhabil', people are unaware of the tight relationship between the lexicalized name and its forms, and the son of Adam 'Abel'.

The Arabic name 'Hābīl', or the English 'Abel' is colloquially used as 'habīleh' in Arabic to designate a defenseless person in quarrels or quarrel-like circumstances. One is denoted as such when he cannot defend his rights from others, and when his rights or properties are regarded as lawful or permissible to everyone. Transgressing the limits and crossing the borders of another's realm is an impression that can be received in communities that suffer from the absence of the state of law. The force is always imposed upon the weak person, who, in addition to losing his rights, is denoted as 'habīleh'. The lexicalized name has a social function to convey, and does not have any misunderstanding possible. All social groups, irrespective of their educational background, have the same degree of comprehension as the name is socially but not scripturally lexicalized; idiomaticity of the noun has come about as a result of its overuse and the currency of the form which succeeded in normalizing it and creating a social forcefulness that derives from the historic depth of the name. Unawareness of the connection between the lexicalized or the institutionalized 'habīleh' in the colloquial Arabic, and the name 'Habīl' or 'Abel' in English is a fact that cannot be denied or ignored. People have taken the name as colloquialized and lexicalized; the coinage has become part of the colloquial bank of lexical items, and once the social function is achieved, there is no need to search for further implications.

The lexicalized name has many social and situational functions. One is denoted as 'habīleh' when he cannot defend himself from others, for example. In a situation like this, people make use of the deeply-rooted incident of the two brothers, where 'Abel' is recalled as a victim of Cain, the victimizer. The lexicalized name can also connote fools, as one is called 'habīleh' if he is fooled by others, considering him to be stupid or silly. Another function of the lexicalized name 'habīleh' is to denote insane or mentally sick people; those who cannot recognize between what is good and what is not. The speaker can also utter 'lā tisthabilinī' if he is targeted by another, to mean 'do not consider me as defenseless' or 'do not fool me as I am fully aware of what you are doing'. The form 'lā titmahbal' is another function of the lexicalized forms of 'habīleh', where the addressee is called 'to stop the pretension that he is fool or unaware of what he is doing' or 'claiming he does not have any idea about a certain event, or situation'. These social functions have been created by the community, in which the lexicalized name is used, and have forcefulness in this particular community, as transplantation of the lexicalized name in another culture may look awkward and opaque.

Translating the lexicalized name or its forms into English is a very hard task, and requires that the translator should exert enough efforts to ensure a reliable translation in the target language. The translator should search for the best settings in which the source language 'habīleh' and its forms are uttered. In the setting of a quarrel, for example, the loser can be denoted as 'habīleh'; the participants and the audience can comprehend the utterance as a description of the losing case. Meanings of loss, defeat, inferiority and humbleness are associated with the Arabic lexicalized name, and cannot be conveyed likewise in the target language. Forms of the lexicalized name can be used to relay similar functions. The form 'lā tistahbilnī' 'do not think I am humble' or 'do not think I am inferior' can be used by a targeted person to communicate to the addressee the fact that the person to be targeted is not easy going, or can not be easily attacked. Another form 'lā titmahbal' "lit. do not pretend you are fool or stupid" can be said to a person who tries to pretend that he is humble, needy, powerless, and sometimes mocking others. These functions cannot be preserved in translation without providing the receptive language audience with a clear grounding of the source language setting.

6.2. Lexicalized Nouns

The multi-function lexicalized nouns in Jordanian Arabic have gained enough popularity in the Jordanian community, due to the variety of situations in which these nouns are used. Unlike lexicalized names, some lexicalized nouns cannot be generalized as having cultural or social references, or etymological backgrounds. The situations in which certain concepts are observed or witnessed are applied to describe new social situations; the new-image portrayals are stimulated from natural or unnatural elements with which the community has been living for a long time. Having a clear image of the concepts has enabled the Jordanians to use them loaded with meanings that made them idiosyncratic and inimitable in other cultures. Even if conceptualized in other social or linguistic environments, a great cultural, social, political and traditional loss is committed as will be shown in the discussion below.

Mitbashwin

As Jordan was one of the Ottoman Empire territories, the Jordanians, were and still are familiar with the honorary title, Pasha, to designate individuals of status, both civilian and military, mainly ministers, provincial governors, army officers and tribe leaders. The status that some people gained because of the given titles has enabled them to occupy a respectable position in the community. The conceptualization and the construction of the lexicalized noun 'Pasha' and its forms derive from its idiomatization in the community, as the communal use of the lexicalized noun is what imposes it and gives it a social and cultural approval. The fact that the noun is frequented by all social groups has helped in its linguistic patterning, which consequently has led to its familiarity.

By nature, man likes authority and some people like to be called by the position they hold. In order to attract people's attention, leaders try to behave or dress in a way that receives a good reception from other sides. It should be mentioned here that the Turkish title 'Pasha' has been lexicalized in the Jordanian Arabic as 'Bāsha', where the voiceless 'p' has been replaced by the voiced 'b' since the 'p' does not exist in Arabic. In addition, the voiced 'b' has the social function of giving the title more power and prestige, in comparison with the voiceless 'p', which looks light and evacuated from the social semantic power. This lexical borrowing of 'Bāsha' from Turkish has revealed that the title has been subject to a morphological restructuring, where a modification has been experienced morphologically in order to attain the new system's compatibility.

The borrowed term 'Bāsha' and its lexicalized noun 'mitbashwin' or verb 'titbashwan' have many social and cultural functions in Jordanian Arabic. The lexicalized noun 'Bāsha' is used to denote and connote the 'general' or 'major general', as high military ranks. The military rank function that the noun has acquired has become familiar to all people, whether in the military service or not. The lexicalized noun can also be used to denote tribe leaders, a title that was given to their ancestors during the Ottoman Empire. The leaders were given authority and power that enabled them to run the district and the people who belong to the district. The honorary title of 'Bāsha' has empowered the tribes' leaders to obtain political power even after the subsidence of the Ottoman Power. The other forms 'mitbashwin' or 'titbashwan' are used to address persons who try to imitate tribe leaders in their dress or behavior. Putting on the same dress style as such leaders may give an indication that the dresser is looking forward to holding a tribe leader position. Brewing the Turkish coffee in the morning on a daily basis can also imply that the person in question looks forward to receiving the title 'Bāsha', as the latter is always busy in preparing such a type of coffee to illuminate prestige. The lexicalized name has also been extended and jargonized among the young generation, where they tend to call each other this to show respect and prestige. This final function has stripped the lexicalized noun from its traditional usages, since the lexicalized noun 'Bāsha' is associated with political power at the social and governmental levels that the jargonized 'Bāsha' lacks.

In translating the lexicalized noun 'Bāsha' and its forms into English, the translator encounters many translation problems. The fact that the noun 'Bāsha' is borrowed from Turkish is not observed by many in the source language audience, let alone, when translated, by target language audiences who might know the noun as Turkish due to the Empire's contact with the West in general, and the English speaking countries, in particular. The lexicalized noun 'mitbashwin' which is used to denote a person claiming the title is also difficult to translate into English. The way it has been grammaticalized in Arabic is inimitable in English, due to the differences in the language patterning systems. Moreover, the emotive power produced on the title-holding person cannot be preserved similarly in the target language, because Arabs in general, and leaders in particular, like to be called by titles that award them importance and attention.

Mitmashyikh

The lexicalized noun 'mitmashyikh' and its other forms 'istashyakh' or 'itmashyakh' derive from the Arabic 'sheikh', the singular of 'shuyukh' as an honorific term used to designate elderly people, religious men, revered wise men, or a tribe leader, and recently, state leaders as in the Gulf States. It generally refers to a male person, though it may rarely refer to female sheikhs. In addition to these political and social functions that the term may hold, it also refers to Muslim scholars who seek and make disciples of others in religious knowledge from the main sources of the Qur'an and Sunnah. The lexicalized forms of 'sheikh' have acquired currency and frequency in the Jordanian community on a large scale, a fact has helped the forms to be easily comprehended and coined among different social groups, in different social settings.

As a tribally based system, the word 'sheikh' in Jordan is used to describe the tribe leader who is supposed to have a political authority over his followers, and a spokesman of his clan with other tribe leaders on happy and sad occasions. This inherited power has helped the descendants to imitate ancestors in behavior, dress, and way of speech in a manner that has created the lexicalized noun 'mitmashyikh'. The setting of the utterance is vital in revealing which function is meant by the speaker, as 'sheikh' and its forms in Arabic are polysemous and have many implications. In a tribal gathering, for example, where people meet to discuss a tribal public issue, the term 'sheik' to mean the tribal leader is the most understood. On similar occasions, its different forms have the same function because the meaning is contextually based.

Lexicalized forms of 'sheikh' have been subject to the linguistic patterning of Arabic; they have been prone to a long-term process that has empowered them with social and communal understanding. What has helped in instilling this communal agreement is the colloquialism of the lexicalized noun, which comes about because of the noun use among all social classes on certain occasions. Thus, the lexicalized noun 'mitmashyikh' can be used to describe a person who claims the 'sheikhdom'. For example, a person claiming this title can be addressed by 'sayer mistashyikh' 'lit. you are becoming like sheikhs' or the form 'lā titmashayakh 'alainā', 'do not behave like sheikhs on us'. Lexicalization and institutionalization of the nouns has led to the same process with verbs because the noun existed before the verb forms, yielding additions to the lexicon. Another function of the lexicalized forms of 'sheikh' is religiously based, where one is connoted as such when he is involved in a religious setting. In this context, the implications of the lexicalized forms are not politically but religiously oriented; thus, an utterance such as 'la titmashyakh 'alainā', 'lit. do not behave like a religious man on us' carries the religious rather than the political implications.

Translation of the lexicalized nouns and verbs of 'sheikh' cannot be free from complexities since the translation process has to come through the same lexicalization procedures. Target language readers should be aware of the various implications of the various lexicalized forms of 'sheikh', on the one hand, and the various settings in which these forms can be uttered. Moreover, understanding the cultural and social contexts is also imperative in order to grasp the connotations of the lexicalized forms of 'sheikh'. More importantly, the emotive power that is produced on the source language audience should be recreated on the target language audience. This cannot be achieved without paving the mentality of such an audience where the political sense of 'sheikh' and its forms may seem nonsense, especially in the state of law where the tribal system does not exist, or is even dismantled. The effect to be produced on the audience of the target text also extends to the religious part, where the reverence and respect of the religious 'sheikh' in the source language is lost in translation, where the 'sheikh' is portrayed as a source of terrorism.

Mitfalsif

According to the Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English (1974), philosophy is defined as "the search for knowledge, especially the nature and meaning of existence; the study of the principles underlying the actions and behavior of men". Unlike other ways of addressing debatable and arguable issues, philosophy is critical, has a systematically-based approach, and is based on a reasoned argument. The one who is philosophically grounded is supposed to be knowledgeable and wise. Borrowed into Arabic,

'philosopher' and 'philosophy' have gained new implications and connotations. While the basic meanings of the terms are knowledge and wisdom, new senses have emerged due to the created functions in the new environment that have resulted in new further encoded meanings.

The structural and grammatical system of Arabic has been rendered to serve the lexicalization of 'philosophy', 'philosopher' and their lexicalized forms. The fact that Arabic has turned to be a receiving language entails that borrowing and naturalization of foreign words have become a main source of Arabic lexicification. This requires that borrowed noun sounds well among the recipients, and is frequented by ordinary or illiterate people on a large scale, as they colloquialize and lexicalize more than the educated ones who tend to use a standard language. The lexicalized noun 'mitfalsif' in 'šāyer mitfalsif', 'lit. you are becoming like a philosopher' has many functions in Jordanian Arabic. It can be used to describe someone who expresses his view, for example, in standard Arabic, as to show the addressee his high education. Thus, he can be ironically addressed by this lexicalization, a critical comment that can cause the audience to laugh. The fact that the public are aware of this social function involves them in the whole scenario.

The other form 'lā tiffalasf 'alainā', 'lit. do not philosophize on us' can be used to relay the meaning of stopping one's speech when an argument is intensified. Known to the public as weak, ill educated, and ill mannered, for example, a person can be addressed thus to quit the speech or comment. Sometimes, the lexicalized form 'bala falsafih', 'lit. without philosophy', is uttered not only to someone who exceeds his speech limit, but also to someone who stretches his hand to beat the speaker or those around him. Besides, the two forms can have a business-related function, where one may use them to ask the shopkeeper to lower the price of commodities. Moreover, they can be used to accelerate doing an action when a command is given to someone to perform a duty, but the social function is conveyed here is a form of pleasantry.

The lexicalized noun 'mitfalsif' and its forms 'lā tiffalsaf', 'bala falsafih', and 'šāyer mitfalsif' are very difficult to relay in the target language, because of the following reasons. First, the lexicalized noun is initially borrowed from English, and foreignizing it again in its source language is inevitably implausible. Second, the linguistic patterning of Arabic, which has been applied on the noun, cannot be applied similarly because of the different if not the contrasting linguistic systems. Third, the sociolinguistic potentials with which the noun and its forms are compressed are too difficult to attain, as the translation challenges involved in the lexicalized and institutionalized nouns stem not only from the language patterning, but also from the culture-specific domains in which they are considered as conceptualized.

Mizzallem

Despite the fact that some lexicalized nouns are etymologically unclear, they have gained enough currency and frequency in Jordanian Arabic to make them sociolinguistically established. The Jordanian lexicalized noun 'zalamah' and its forms 'mizzallem', and 'tizzallam' are used among all social groups with full understanding and awareness of their current contextual functions. Based on the connotations that the noun has gained, one can argue that 'zalamah' may be traced back to the pre-Islamic tradition of 'azlām', which is not mentioned in the Qur'an except as a plural like form. It refers to the divination of ascertaining lucky and unlucky moments, or learning the wishes of the heathen gods. The supposed superstitious powers of the idols could have been used today to denote someone who is well built, brave-hearted, mature, and sometimes well mannered and well trained. The fact that 'azlām' refers to the pre-Islamic heathen idols gave the noun a social and cultural signification to denote someone awarded with awe and reverence. The noun 'azlām' carried religious connotations, where they were, as idols, worshipped and revered by the community of that time, though the noun has acquired new social implications.

To exemplify this mutual incomprehensibility of the noun 'azlām' at its historic time, and the implications it has at the present time, resulting from lexicalizing and colloquializing, it may be true to argue that the Islamic revolt has helped in changing the social understanding and comprehension of the noun under discussion. Thus, the noun 'zalam' is used in Jordanian colloquial Arabic to describe a person who enjoys social merits that enable him to gain the respect of relatives or friends. To exemplify, if one performs a good job that is socially approved, he is connoted by the noun 'zalam', such as winning a fight, an argument or even an opinion. The meaning can also apply to someone grown up and liable to marry, where he is connoted by others as 'zalam', and can be a head of a family, a meaning that derives from the power that the idols gained in the pre-Islamic period. The sense that the noun gains in the Jordanian Arabic of today recalls one of the different senses that it had once and before Islam. Al-Azzam (2005:130) refers to a linguistic universal that in any language there can be numerous lexical items whose range of referents shares some significant features. Such similarity can be based on size, shape or height, among other things.

The other forms of the lexicalized noun have also acclimatized various social functions. For example, 'mizzallim', "lit. you are becoming zalam" is sometimes ironically used to describe someone having the state of proving himself. Also, the form 'lā tizzallam', 'do not think you are zalam' is spoken to someone who is trying to show off, or demonstrating muscles before people thought of as weak and defenseless. The targeted person may shout at his aggressor using this form in order to inform him that he liable to defend himself, and as an attacker, the addressee should stop his subjugation, as he is not feared. It can be inferred that the lexicalization of 'zalam' as a noun, and its forms have been subject to both derivational and inflectional processes as Arabic affixes are added to them to acquire the compatibility of the new system, a process that has taken its time to familiarize 'zalam' and its forms in the modern environment.

Translators of the lexicalized forms of 'azlām' are expected to face many translation challenges, due to their colloquialism and idiomaticity. The translator has to delve deep into the springing point of the term, as a large part of the meaning derives from that point. Enough awareness of the various perspectives of 'azlam' is needed to enhance the translator with social, cultural and linguistic grounds that can help in domesticating what has been chewed up in the receptive language. Not to forget that the target language audience should not be ignored as informing it with the 'plastic surgery' of the noun is helpful in recognizing its lexicalization, idiomaticity, usage, colloquialism, and more importantly the social communality of its different repercussions.

Mitkandir

The influence of the Turkish Empire on Jordan has widened to include the description of one's way of sitting. Over the past decades, very few people were able to buy 'kundura', a loan word from Turkish that means a 'soft shoe'. To see someone wearing this type of 'shoe' indicates his richness, social position and luxury. Thus, sitting on a chair and extending one leg over another has gained a social and cultural significance in Jordanian Arabic. The state of sitting can tell the social position of the person, who can express the prestigious class to which he belongs. In other words, the sitting manner can be considered a telegraphic message to the attendants, as to behave and react in the proper way that suits the scenery. The currency and frequency in Jordanian Arabic have boosted the noun 'mitkandir', which is lexicalized from Turkish, and its other forms to carry further social and cultural significations, despite the inharmonic relationship between the allegedly respected person and the supposedly dirty shoe.

The social functions of the nouns 'mitkandir' or 'imkandir' derive from the communal understanding and the public share of the various implications that the nouns may imply. The noun 'mitkandir' indicates that the person entitled to do a certain duty is not obeying the rules and is putting one leg over another. This state is usually performed by well-dressed people, who try to imitate someone holding a high position, or enjoying potentials that can make them socially prestigious and esteemed. Slightly different from this, 'imkandir' reveals the fact that the person under discussion is folding their hands and is not doing what they are entitled to. It is used to denote or connote a person who is not very likely to obey the rules or do what he is entitled to. It can also be used to refer to a person, sitting in the first seat of the bus, or the first row of a large number of seats on a certain occasion. The place that such a person is occupying should not be his, and as such as described by the lexicalized noun 'imkandir'.

The loanword 'kundura' and its various lexicalized forms have undergone a new grammaticalization process or a morphological restructuring. Moreover, they have come through, either an entirely new or a modified semantic representation to attain the new system's compatibility. In other words, they have not rejected the Arabic linguistic system. As Al-Quran (2006: 95-108) puts it, the institutionalization of the identified lexical items are looked into, i.e., how they are used in everyday conversations, and pragmatically how context and situation affect their either new or modified semantic representation since various aspects of social life impose themselves on these loan words during the process of institutionalization after being lexicalized. Colloquialism and idiomatization of the noun 'kundura' and its lexicalized forms have been coined in the community in a way that could help to preserve them at the colloquial and not the standard level.

In translating the lexicalized nouns of the loan word 'kundura', many translation problems arise. It is very difficult to lexicalize the same nouns in the target language through translation, as the nouns in the status quo might be incompatible with the new linguistic system. Moreover, the community to which the nouns are to be translated is completely different from the people of the Jordanian culture, where many people are careless in doing what they are entitled to. Providing the target language with enough details is the only guarantee to convey a large part of meaning the receptive language audience. The translator should also take into account the fact that the lexicalized noun and its forms are socially and not individually based, which requires the translator to think how to successfully address the illiterate people, who use this linguistic genre more.

Bitṣahwan

Onomatopoeia can be defined as the function whereby the sound of a word imitates a sound occurring in the real world. Ibn Jinnī (1913: 557) maintains that there is an arbitrary relationship between the sounds that make up linguistic expressions and the referents in the physical world. The two lexicalized clauses 'bitṣahwan', 'lit. he is neighing' or 'ibtitṣahwan', 'lit. she is neighing' are a case in point. In the Jordanian culture, to laugh in serious situations is socially unacceptable, and a male denoted as 'bitṣahwan' or a female 'ibtitṣahwan' is disdainfully looked at. The colloquialism of lexicalized items has caused language entries not to be recorded, a feature that distinguishes them from standardized items that have been accommodated by standard dictionary.

What proves the colloquialism of the lexicalized clauses is the new derivation and inflection whereby the morphological modification has been processed on the hosted stem. The sound produced by the horse in Arabic is 'ṣahīl', which ends with the light 'l'. In the lexicalized form of this onomatopoeic sound, this 'l' is replaced by the 'n', a fact that adds to the already existing sociolinguistic complications. Lexicalization in this manner has driven all the social groups to understand the forms ending with 'n' as something ordinary and normal. The forms should be given enough thought in order to link the sound produced by the horse with that more precisely produced by women. It is socially comprehended that laughing for no reason in serious situations is intolerable and offensive, which has led all social groups irrespective of their class to have the same view. The currency and frequency of denoting people behaving in such an unpleasant manner helped in the institutionalization and conceptualization of the noun 'ṣahīl'. The onomatopoeic noun has thus undergone a derivational process, where its grammatical class changes into lexicalized verbs and not lexicalized nouns.

Translating the lexicalized clauses into English is hardly attainable as the translator encounters many translation problems. The social understanding of the various implications of the clauses is a source language and culture specific; the translator is not only concerned with the linguistic dimensions of the text, but also with the social and cultural significations of the lexicalized forms. Another translation problem, which cannot be easily captured, is onomatopoeically related; it is too hard to translate the sounds produced by similar referents when there are no morphological changes or modifications. The problem is intensified when the language modifications and changes are created in order to produce a communal understanding of an utterance in a certain situation or setting. The translator has to prepare the social ground, as the society is the source of creating the lexicalized form and orienting it in the direction planned for it.

7. Conclusion

The study has attempted to investigate the role of lexicalization and institutionalization of concepts in enriching the social understanding of language use and social setting. In other words, it has targeted the proving of the fact that the linguistic phenomena of lexicalization and institutionalization play a central role in the lexicon and word formation of Jordanian colloquial Arabic. The analysis and discussion of the selected examples have succeeded in shedding light on the various procedures of names and nouns' institutionalization, and how clauses are in certain cases lexicalized based on erroneous nouns. The analysis has shown that the social and colloquial context gives the lexicalized nouns and names specifications and implications that cannot be created, when the linguistic context is standardized. The study has also shown that the frequency of the lexicalized names and nouns has helped in preserving them alive and coined in the Jordanian community. Moreover, the study has made clear that the translator of Jordanian Arabic lexicalized names and nouns encounters linguistic and extra-linguistic problems that cannot be overcome, due to the two languages' contrasting systems, on the one hand, and the ways these names and nouns have been processed and hosted in the source language.

References

- Agirre, E., et al. (2006). Lexicalization and Multiword Expressions in the Basque Word Net, in <http://nlpweb.kaist.ac.kr/gwc/pdf2006/13.pdf>.
- Al-Azzam, B (2005). *Certain Terms Relating to Islamic Observances: Their Meanings with Reference to Three Translations of the Qur'ān and a Translation of Ḥadīth*. Unpublished PhD Thesis, University of Durham: UK.
- Ali, A (1999). *The Holy Qur'an: Translation and Commentary*. England: IPCI Islamic Vision.
- Anttila, R. (1972). *An Introduction to Historical and Comparative Linguistics*. New York: Macmillan.
- Bassnett, S. (1991). *Translation Studies*. London: Routledge.
- Bauer, L. (1983). *English word-formation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bauer, L (1988). *Introducing linguistic morphology*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Berezowski L. (1997). Dialect in Translation. Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego, in <http://www.translating-dialects.info/index.php?page=lexicalization>
- Boers, F. (2003). Applied Linguistics Perspectives on Cross-Cultural Variation in Conceptual Metaphor. *Metaphor and Symbol*, 18(4): 231-238
- Comrie, B. (1989). *Language Universals and Linguistic Typology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Dumitrașcu, A. (2007). Patterns of idiomacity in English Italian and Rumanian. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies* 3(1), April 2007, at <http://www.jlls.org/Issues/Volume%203/No.1/amdumitrascu.pdf>.
- Ferguson, C. A. (1959). "Diglossia," *Word* 15: 325-40.
- Field, F. (2002). *Linguistic Borrowing in Bilingual Contexts*. Philadelphia, PA,: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Fishman, J. (1972). *The Sociology of Language*, New York: Newbury House.
- Fromkin, V. et al (2003). *An Introduction to Language*. USA: Thomson Wadsworth.
- Greenbaum, S. and Quirk, R. (2004). *A Student's Grammar of the English Language*. England: Longman.
- Gumperz, J. (1962). "Types of Linguistic Communities," *Anthropological Linguistics* 4(1): 28-40.
- Gumperz, J. (1977). "The Speech Community," in Pier Giglio, ed., *Language and Social Context*. New York: Penguin Books.
- Hatim, B. and I. Mason (1991). *Discourse and the Translator*, London: Longman.
- Haugen, E. (1950). "The Analysis of Linguistic Borrowing". *Language* 26: 210-231.
- Hoffmann, C. (1991). *An Introduction to Bilingualism*. New York: Longman.
- Holmes, Janet. (1994). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. London and New York: Longman.
- Hornby, A.S. et al (1974). *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English*. Great Britain: Oxford University Press.
- Hudson, R. A. (1980). *Sociolinguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ide, Nancy. (1999). Cross-lingual Sense Determination: Can It Work?, in <http://www.cs.vassar.edu/~ide/papers/senseval.pdf>.

- Ibn Jinnī, Abi I-Faṭḥ 'Othmān (1913). *Al-Khaṣā'īs*, Vol 1, Egypt: Maṭba'it I-Hilāl.
- Lakoff, G., and Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lipka, L. (1990). *An Outline of English Lexicology; Lexical Structure, Word Semantics, and Word-formation*. Tuebingen: Max Niemeyer.
- Lipka, L., et al. (2004). *Lexicalization and Institutionalization: The State of the Art, in 2004*, in <http://www.skase.sk/Volumes/JTL01/lipka.pdf>.
- Lyons, J. (1995) *Linguistic Semantics: An introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Matthews, P. H. (1991). *Morphology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Muysken, P. (2001). *Bilingual Speech: A Typology of Code-Mixing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Newmark, P. (1988). *A Textbook of Translation*. New York: Prentice Hall.
- Nida, E. (1964). "Principles of Correspondence." In Venuti, L. ed. *The Translation Studies Reader*. London: Routledge.
- Ogechi, N. (2005). Lexicalization in Sheng. *Nordic Journal of African Studies* 14(3): 334-355.
- al-Quran, M. (2006). Morphological and Semantic Structuring of Turkish Loanwords into Jordanian Colloquial Arabic. *Language Forum*, 32(1-2).
- Spencer, A. (1991). *Morphological theory: an introduction to word structure in generative grammar*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell Publishers.
- Van Hout, R. and Muysken., P. (1994). "Modeling lexical borrowability". *Language Variation and Change*, 6(1): 39-62.
- Zughoul, M. and El-Badarien, M. (2004). "Diglossia in Literary Translation: Accommodation into Translation Theory". *Meta*, 49(2): 447-456.