A Contextual Account of Doublespeak Translation Problems and Strategies

Dr. Anis Behnam Naoum[(*)]

This study is motivated by the excessive use of Doublespeak in news media, especially in the west. It comments on the corruption of thought resulting from the pre-planned misuse of language. This corruption of language (and consequently of thought) is studied in connection with a translation task from English into Arabic.

The problem is how to identify items of Doublespeak in the source text (ST); what strategies should be adopted to overcome translation difficulties raised by this phenomenon; and to what extent could contextual considerations be useful in rendering the language of Doublespeak into the target language (TL).

The study hypothesizes that unless the global context is well-identified, the translators may run the risk of misunderstanding the language of Doublespeak and, consequently misunderstanding the totality of the intended meanings of the ST message into the TL.

A three-fold-translation procedure and interviews have been conducted to analyse and translate Doublespeak. The test-subjects are three newly graduate student translators. The instrument of the

(*) Department of Translation - College of Arts / University of Mosul.

study is an English documentary text to be translated into Arabic-the translators' first language.

The three translations provided each by a translator along the three-fold-procedure are analyzed and compared with each other. The analysis shows that strategies adopted by the translators in their second and third attempts were more successful in exploring meaning in the ST and in rendering it into the TL than their first drafts.

The study concludes that student translators should be trained to activate their mental representations of information relying not only on the linguistic context of the ST (i.e. co-text), but also on their background knowledge and the pragmatic context of the ST.

1. The Concept of Doublespeak

Though humans can communicate by means of different codes, the use of language remains "an integral part of being human" (Aitchison, 1987: 11). Language is a conceptual system which shapes and regulates humans ideas, activities, reactions towards others and, ultimately, their choices of interpretation in communicative acts (Cf. Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis). It is, actually, the mirror which reflects the human mind. Lutz (1987: 104) points out that language, in the sense presented above, becomes the means by which we shape reality and the means by which we communicate

our perceptions of reality to others. Consequently, language can reinforce or twist reality; it can enrich or distort the human thoughts. Therefore, when language is intended to give a truthful appearance to lies and when "there is a gap between one's real and one's declared aims" (Orwell and Angus, 1976: 137), the sort of language produced is Doublespeak.

1.1 Misconception

The real meaning of 'Doublespeak' is often confused in most writings with the term 'euphemism' (Cf. Partridge (1973), Turner (1973), Ebbitt and Ebbitt (1982), Hahn (1989), among many others). Naoum (1995:34) points out that 'euphemism' is an innocent term designed mainly to avoid what is culturally, socially and morally harsh without having any hidden intention or prejudice towards one's feelings and/or interest. Doublespeak, on the other hand, is the language which employs verbal attractions, not to communicate, but to conceal facts. This deceptive language makes the deviated facts easily digested and assimilated by the general public, regardless of the moral responsibility that language should maintain (Cf. Lutz, 1990). For instance, the so-called euphemistic term 'pacification' (used instead of 'military conquest') does not serve to communicate the idea but rather to obscure it, transforming it according to the psychological needs of the individual speaker. In other words, this and many other examples reveal how their coiners try protecting

and justifying their own points of view regardless of the harm that they may cause to their audience. Here are some examples in which "words alter the deed" (Don Miller, 1992: 28). The actual deed is "Killing"; the words are: "servicing the target", "collateral damage', 'unlawful or arbitrary deprivation of life', 'inflicted casualties', 'taking appropriate action', 'rooting out the infrastructure', 'permanently removed from society as a matter of urgency', 'to hose', 'eliminate with extreme prejudice', etc.

1.2 Uses of Doublespeak

The use of Doublespeak is not confined to certain fields of life; it is widely practiced and it has an everyday occurrence in press. However, political (economic and military) Doublespeak are the most common and familiar. Orwell (1976:139), in this regard, points out that "political language... is designed to make lies sound truthful and murder respectable, and to give an appearance of solidarity to pure wind". The same conception is held by others: "politicians select a portion of reality they perceive as a problem and give it a name, perhaps a euphemism" (Hahn, 1989:116).

Such deliberate (motivated and strategic) intention to deceive can be illustrated as in the following examples from the world of politics, economics and military, respectively:

- 'Inoperative statements' and 'terminological inexactitude' for lies!

-     'period of accelerated negative growth', and 'growth going backwards' for recession!

-     'A limited duration protective reaction strike', 'Air support' and 'incontinent ordnance' for bombing civilian targets!

      The three basic kinds of Doublespeak are those of 'jargon' (when used out of its determined limits, i.e. specialized circles, professions, etc), 'Inflated Language' (a style of high-sounding words used to make things seem impressive), and 'Bureaucratese' (playing with words, mostly technical and unfamiliar, without actual explanation). These types of language are usually characterized by redundancy, inaccuracy, ambiguity, poor flow of ideas, etc.

1.3 Doublespeak and Translation

      To the best of the researcher's knowledge, the translation of Doublespeak into Arabic (whether at the level of theory or practice) has not been attempted before. However, we believe that the study of this phenomenon in the field of translation should be based on cognitive, socio-cultural and linguistic considerations concerning the process of translation, the translator, and the text embracing Doublespeak. This implies that the translator should have the ability to explore and, then, mentally represent the writer's/speaker's mental states (e.g. beliefs, emotions, intentions, etc.) from his/her

text. Moreover, the translator should have the ability to weigh translation potentials in case different contextual clues are available.

Such cognitively and / or pragmatically motivated representations require, as a prerequisite, negotiating meaning(s) between the translator and the totality of the text, on the one hand, and between the translator and (the expectations of the intended or probably non-intended) TL reader. However, communicating the notion 'Doublespeak' via translation remains primarily (as the case is with other language-related phenomena) an inferential process, by means of which the translators interpret the SL and reconstruct it in terms of a TL linguistic elements, trying to satisfy at least some of their readers'/listeners' expectations (Cf. Naoum, 2001:16). In turn, the target language readers/listeners, as Gutt (1990, 139) points out, can infer what assumptions the translator intended to convey.

2. *Theoretical Background*

This study is cognitively and pragmatically oriented. Pragmatics is seen as a functional perspective on the use of language as partially determined by the context of society (Cf. Hickey, 1998:4), and as partly governed by one's cognitive system, i.e. the cognitive aspects of the language use (Cf. Kasher, 1991:391). In this sense, the role of the cognitive system is central in determining the pragmatic knowledge required in any cognitive task (including translation). Therefore, we assume that the whole

translation process is determined by how a text is cognitively processed (or interpreted).

In line with distinction drawn by Leech (1983:11) between pragmalinguistics and sociopragmatics, we term the cognitive end of pragmatics 'psychopragmatics'. Psychopragmatics, then, refers to how and to what extent the pragmatic performance is subjected to specific cognitive conditions (Cf. Naoum, 2001:37-8). Such conception may raise this broad question: How the translators infer from the ST and its linguistic context the intended meaning; and how they act upon their understanding in producing a translated version in the TL.

It is conceived from the arguments above that the translator's understanding of a text (or a segment of it) is not based only on what is clearly stated in the text, but also from what is indirectly inferred from the writer's choice of one item (e.g. word, phrase) over another. That is, what is written to what it is (perhaps mutually) assumed or what has been known before.

3. Procedure

3.1 Method and design

The translation task is implemented by three successive translation phases:

  (i) *PHASE I.* Three newly-graduate student-translators were given an English documentary text

(Appendix 1) to translate into English at their earliest convenience and without any specific instructions.

(ii) PHASE II.   The same text was given to the same translators, with some parts of it underlined, to retranslate. They have been informed that the underlined parts of the text embrace instances of Doublespeak. The concept of 'Doublespeak' has been defined, explained and exemplified orally to each one of the three translators. They were also reminded that the use of language should be, first and foremost, a moral issue. Therefore, such moral commitment should be, at least to a certain extent, reflected in their translations.

(iii)PHASE III. The revised texts were given again to the translators to be re-edited (e.g. to add, delete, reformulate or condense expressions) in the light of:

(a) a set of criteria proposed by Hugh Rank (1974:215-34) for identifying and analysing the language of Doublespeak: who is saying what to whom? Under what conditions? Under what

circumstances? With what intent? With what result; and

(b) contextual information (e.g. setting, time, place, etc.)   as well as extracts from the speaker's testimony (Appendix 2). The translators were asked to make their revisions between the lines of their translation at phase II.

In order to assess the truth worthiness of the translators' performance, separate interviews were held with each translator. The interviews concentrated on the renderings of the underlined parts at phase III. The main concern was to detect the role of context in the translator's information processing and his use of strategies at the levels of comprehending the ST and of producing of the TT. Due to the limitation of space. A sample of one interview by translator C is given in section 4 below.

To attain the highest degree of objectivity in our analysis of data, we tried to make the translator do the task himself. The language of the interview was adapted and re-organized to suit the purpose of the study.

3.2 Hypotheses

(a) Building on the fact that thoughts are represented in the mind of language users (including

translators) similarly, we hypothesize that on analysis of Doublespeak in its linguistic and non-linguistic environments may help better understanding (and hence translating) the negative use of the human language.

(b)   As a corollary of point (i), one might hypothesize that   the more the translator knows about what characterizes   the context, the more likely his/her predications   (or interpretations) are reliable (Naoum, 2001:43).

4. Interview: Translator C

Researcher = (R) ; Translator = (T)

R: How do you evaluate the complexity of the task?

T: From the first reading, the language of the text does not seem complex. However, when I started translating, I noticed that this apparent simplicity holds instances of ambiguity, abstractions and inaccuracy. This blocked the processing act at the comprehension level and at rendering it into Arabic... This is why my rendering at phase I lost sight of the language of Doublespeak.... I was mainly concerned with the surface structure; I mean the formal correspondence between the ST elements and their Arabic equivalents.

R: How far were the underlined parts at phase II helpful in the process of translation?

T: To a certain extent, they were helpful; they made me aware of the task itself. This is why I started looking carefully at the lexical items (e.g. their denotations), syntactic structures (e.g. pronouns, modals, passive constructions), presuppositions, style; and how to make all of these cohere in my rendition. However, the problem was still there.

R: What problem?

T: The flow of ideas, I mean the flow of arguments, was problematic. It lacked coherence ... The setting of the text and its thesis were not clearly stated; the speaker's substantiations were not, to my understanding, clear enough to support his claim ... I found the text a matter of piling claims...; and even his conclusion appeared to defy his solution to the problem which, of course, I was not aware of ... was the message intended to convince or to mislead the reader?

R: Do you mean that the semantic display of the speaker's argument was inconsistent?

T: Exactly... and this is what I have noticed in the revision of my translation at phase II.... I could hardly make any actual corrections. Moreover, though some elements of intertextuality were there in the text (e. g. 'references', 'investigation', 'facts'),

these did not trigger a search for them and, hence, remained intelligible to me.

R: Have you tried to link between textual structures (syntactic and/or semantic) and the political dimension of the ST?

T: This is what I have tried to do in my translation at phase III after the pragmatic context (e.g. the background of the event, reactions of the public, etc.) was made available to me... The choice of words (i.e. lexical style and stylistic variation of expression manifested contextual signification... This made me look at the events from the writer's perspective, not from mine as I have done at phase II.

R: Did the context and the whole situation, that were given to you, trigger some of your knowledge structures or past experience?

T: Sure, a direct association with some crimes I had heard about and different (usually contradictory) interpretations given to them by people due to their attitudes towards those crimes .... Stories on how lawyers defend the criminals and set them free, etc... These were helpful in explicating the meaning which was totally implicit.

R: Had all of these facts any influence on adopting specific comprehension and production strategies?

T: Due to the availability of the context at phase III, I have modified some of my previous hypotheses about the actual

meaning of certain words and expressions. I have also, in some instances, changed my assumption about the actual meanings of words, though this resulted in fragmented understanding sometimes... Since the major part of meaning was not stated explicitly in the text, deciphering its code did not yield an adequate understanding. This is why I relied on drawing inferences.

R: You mean one should draw inferences in order to build a model of the speaker's world? What inferences?

T: Textual inferences (e.g. looking forward or backward in the text), associative inferences and sometimes elaborating. These are the main search strategies at the comprehension level. At the production level, I relied on rephrasing (or paraphrasing) my mental translation by possible equivalents, omitting others, and still correcting previously attempted solutions. I also attempted some sub-strategies to weigh interlingual comparisons (e.g. synonyms, connotations, usage) in the light of the global context and situation of the ST.

R: In the light of what you have mentioned so far, can you reevaluate your understanding of the language of Doublespeak in the ST?

T: The language of Doublespeak (characterized by superficial simplicity) used by Mr. Haig aimed at lessening the reaction of

the general public, while keeping facts in mind.... What actually Haig was saying is no more than deliberate lies... One cannot easily assign meaning to his utterances.... His assumptions, tentative hypotheses, and even his conclusion were false; they were designed to hide one fact-viz. raping and murdering innocent American people by Salvadoran soldiers.... This is why his language is full of implications, suppositions and the least degree of assurance about what he is talking about.

R: Can you exemplify what you have said?

T: Haig starts his speech with uncertainty "I'd like to suggest" where, in fact, as holding the most important post in the US government, he had not to 'suggest' but to 'inform'... Even what he had suggested depended on 'some investigations' (why not the C.I.A. or the F.B.I's?); and even these investigations are completely fabricated to 'lead one to believe...'

What I have perceived of his excessive use of 'perhaps', 'may' and 'would and could' (two examples for each in the text) is his intention to mislead the public opinion. The length of the first sentence (65 words, i.e. 59% of the total) with many vague propositions is another indication of the least degree of assurance.

It is obvious that Haig is doing two things at the same time: mitigating the cruel act of the murderers and misleading his audience. This has been done by the skillful use of word order and

passive constructions. For example, in describing the accident, Haig makes the agent role of the criminals less prominent in the text by using passive constructions, whereas the patient role of the victims is given the syntactic subject... The order of the elements of the structure of the sentences, to my understanding, is a deliberate one; this is why I followed the same order in my translation.... I could change the order, but the message of Haig could be spoilt.... For example, I could use 'الجنـاة' for 'those who inflicted casualties', but I didn't since the language of Doublespeak would disappear with this, somehow, neutral Arabic term.

The use of vague pronouns (e.g. 'lead <u>one</u> to believe' who?, 'to cover it up' what?, 'clear enough for <u>anyone</u>' again who?) was also an attempt by Haig to avoid responsibility.

Vagueness of expression, for example 'And this could have been at a very low level of both competence and motivation in the context of the issue itself', does not seem to communicate anything... It is a matter of piling on words... I tried to give my rendition the same sense of nonsense... But if the sentence above had any presupposition, it would not have been other than that the criminal act could have been done 'at a very high level of competence and motivation!'. What I understand of 'competence' is killing, of 'motivation' raping, and of 'context of issue itself'

justification of the murder. After all, 'the facts on this are not clear enough?!'. He needs more evidence that raping and shooting at close rang by Salvadoran soldiers did not take place!

Other vague wordings used by Haig to avoid any direct assertion is the use of expressions like 'who inflicted casualties'. Here, he does not only avoid using the word 'killing' but he implies that the killing was accidental and, hence, justifiable.

Most interestingly, Haig tried, at two points in the text, to make the victims responsible for what happened and to marginalize the crime as if it means nothing to the human rights!; they have 'tried to run a roadblock' (Whose roadblock? No one knows. Why not a military check-point?). Now, when you 'try' something, you intend to do that thing! The victims were also responsible for 'there'd been an exchange of fire'. This implies that the unfortunate nuns were firing at their murderers, though Haig hasn't ever met any pistol-packing nuns at his days!.

5. *Results*

the study revealed that the translators in identifying and translating the language of Doublespeak more significantly in phase III than in phase I and II. The percentage of Doublespeak identification and renditions are given in the table below:

%Doublespeak items identified and rendered as such (10 items-100%)

Test-subject-translators	Phase I	Phase II	Phase III
Tr.A	%	20%	70%
Tr.B	%	10%	40%
Tr.c	%	30%	90%

A look at the table above confirms our hypothesis that accurate translation could be obtained if and only if the translator is aware of the communicative (cognitive and pragmatic) context in which the language of Doublespeak is embedded. The renditions of translator B do not incorporate the contextual and notional dimensions of the items of Doublespeak, nor they ascend to the expectations of the TL reader (who, perhaps, is aware of what is going on in the world). On the other hand, translators A and C exceeded the limitations of the linguistic knowledge; and they approached the ST cognitively and pragmatically.

Our analysis of the subjects' translations at the three phases as well as the interviews revealed the following:

PHASE I. This phase did not show any evidence of the translators' awareness of the language of Doublespeak. The intended blurring of the ST message was (innocently) rendered into the TL not to secure the same goal it was originally set forth, but to achieve formal and/or functional correspondence.

This is an indication that "Doublespeak is the product of clear thinking and is language carefully designed and constructed to appear to communicate when in fact it does not" (Lutz, 1987:115).

PHASE II. This phase revealed slight revisions of the translations at phase I, though the translators were enough acquainted with the nature of Doublespeak (as a language guided by its goal).

The translators' weak performance concerning the underlined instances of Doublespeak could be attributed to the fact that the co-text alone cannot determine the intent of the message. Hence, the translators cannot weigh rendering possibilities: what goes with what, how, why and when? (Appendix III).

PHASE III. This phase, in which the context with the whole situation was available to the translators, revealed a remarkable departure from the literal reading of the text towards identifying textual and contextual clues, highlighting the context-bound nature of the text, and explicating the implications encapsulated in lexical, syntactic and semantic structures. In other words, our test-subjects' reliance on identifying words and sentences in terms of the syntactic and/or semantic features (bottom-up processing) at phase I and II did not only led to misunderstanding but to distortion of the message. phase III, on the other hand, showed that the text has been approached functionally (Appendix IV). That is, translators started

their processing from the function of the text to its surface structure (top-down processing).

The remarkable failure of translator B in identifying and rendering of the language of Doublespeak could be attributed to the fact that he was preoccupied with the meanings of words and sentences in isolation at the expense of context and purpose of the ST. Moreover, the interview with translator B showed his inability to activate or retrieve relevant knowledge which, in turn, can be related to lack of training experience in the field of translation.

6. Discussion

The impact of contextual clues on translating is evident in that translation (to be successful) requires an identification of certain contextual clues and an analytical view of the relations that they may have in common.

The contextual clues required for the interpretation of a text are those clues relevant to the utterance itself (e.g. its linguistic features and function); clues relevant to the specific features of the situation (for each situation has its relevant frame in the mind of the translator); and finally the knowledge of the world (Cf. Dascal and Wiseman, 1987:36; Naoum, 2001:42-45).

In this sense, two basic functions seem to be of paramount importance for a translation take: the conceptual function and the communicative function (Cf Widdowson, 1980: 235). Both

functions, however, are determined by the use of the text in a particular context. The former provides the translator with a background Knowledge on which he conceptualizes relationships that enable him to control the reality of the text. The latter, on the other hand, provides the translator with a means of interacting and communicating with social/ cultural environment (Naoum, 2001:42-45). The meaning of the text (or part of it), therefore, is the function of its use in a given context rather than of its structural constituents (Cf. Jekat and Klein, 1990:15).

7. Conclusions

The main conclusions that one may draw from this study can be illustrated as follows:

- Doublespeak is a matter of saying other than what the chosen words say; it is a matter of playing on words to neutralize, among other things, the probable reactions of the public. Therefore, a comprehensive negotiating of meaning should be conducted by the translator in order to discover the pragmatic specificity and the pragmatic implications (i.e. connotations) of the language of Doublespeak.

- A successful translation should attempt interpreting the speaker/writer's point of view (or perspective) on the ground of the embedded context of the whole situation, including the

psychological needs of the writer. Consequently, different translation strategies could be attempted.

- Though this study is based on a limited sampling (-viz. three newly-graduate-student translators working on one text of specific genre), the renditions and the interviews suggest that our two hypotheses are valid for further studies with translators of different professional levels, with text of different genres, with different modes of translating, etc.

- Finally, Departments of translation and translation training centers could incorporate the results of this study in their training programs. For instance, student translators should be exposed to carefully-selected data and assist them to cope with ambiguity, to approximate the intended meaning of a message by means of hypothesis testing, inferencing, etc., and to improve their choice and application of translation strategies by relying on their actual self-concepts, experience, background knowledge and the global context.

Appendices

Appendix I. The Source Text (cited in Lutz, 1989:8)

As reported by Anthony Lewis of <u>The New York Times,</u> Secretary Haig said to the House Foreign Affairs Committee:

(1)   <u>I'd like to suggest</u> to you that (2) <u>some of the investigations would lead one to believe that perhaps</u> the vehicle the nuns were

riding in (3) <u>may have tried to run a roadblock,</u> or (4) <u>may accidentally have been perceived</u> to have been doing so, and there'd been an (5) <u>exchange of fire</u> and then (6) <u>perhaps those who inflicted the casualties</u> sought to cover it up. And this (7<u>) could have been</u> at a very low level of both (8<u>) competence and motivation</u> in the context of the issue itself. But the (9) <u>facts on this are not clear enough for anyone</u> to draw a (10) <u>definitive conclusion</u>.

*Appendix II. – **Contextual Information*** (cited in Lutz, 1989:8)

In 1981, Secretary of state Alexander Haig testified before congressional committees about the murder of three American nuns and a Catholic lay worker in EL-Salvador. Three of the women had been raped and all four were shot at close range, and there was clear evidence that the crime had been committed by soldiers of the Salvadoran government.

- ***Extracts*** (cited in Lutz, 1989:8-9, brackets added). The next day [after the New York Times' report], before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Secretary Haig claimed that press report, on his previous testimony were inaccurate. When senator Claiborne Pell asked whether Secretary Haig was suggesting that the nuns might have run through a roadblock and that they were firing at the people, Secretary Haig replied, respectively:

- You mean that they tried to violate...? Not at all, no, not at all. My heavens! The dear nuns who raised me in my parochial schooling would forever isolate me from their affections and respect.

- I haven't met any pistol-packing nuns in my day, Senator. What I meant was that if one fellow starts shooting, then the next thing you know they all panic.

Appendix III. Rendering of translator C at phase I and phase II

(Corrections bracketed)

لا يسعني إلا أن أبين لكم أن ثمة تحقيقات تجعل المرء يعتقد أن الراهبات حـاولن بمركبتهن اجتياز نقطة تفتيش [حاجز طريق]، أو استنتج منها البعض أنهن حـاولن القيـام بـذلك، ممـا أدى إلـى حـدوث إطـلاق نـار. وربمـا حـدى ذلك بالجنـاة [بالـذين أوقعوا الخسـائر] التعتيم على الأمر. ولربمـا جرى كل ذلك نتيجـة لضـعف الأداء وتدني الدوافع في سياق الحادثة نفسها. ولكن الحقائق بهذا الصدد ليست واضحة بمـا يكفي لمعرفة الحقيقة [أكيدة لما جرى].

Appendix IV. Rendering of translator C phase III.

(Translator A's rendering bracketed)

أود أن أفتـرض [أشـير إلـى] أن بعـض التحقيقـات قـد تـؤدي بـالمرء إلـى الاعتقـاد [تجعل المرء يعتقد] أن المركبـة التي كانت تستقلها الراهبـات ربمـا حاولت تجاوز حـاجز مـرور، أو ربمـا اعتقـد الـبعض عرضـا [اتفـق وأن اعتقد الـبعض صـدفة]

عرضا أنها حاولت أن تقوم بذلك [القيـام بذلك]. وحدث تبـادل إطـلاق النـار ولربمـا حاول بعدئذ أولئك الذين تسببوا في الخسائر التعتيم على المسـألة. ولربمـا حدث هذا على مستوى متدني من المقدرة والدافع في سياق المسـألة نفسـها [القضية ذاتها]، ولكن الحقائق بخصوص هذا [بهذا الشأن] ليست من الوضـوح [واضـحة] لأي كـان بحيث يمكنه التوصل إلى استنتاجات واضحة محددة [ودقيقة].

References

Aitchison, J. (1987). Linguistics. Teach Yourself Books: Hodder and Stoughton.

Dasscal, M. And Weisman, E. (1987). "Contextual Exploitation of Interpretation Clues in Text Understanding: An Integrated Model". In J. Verschueren and M. Bertuccelli-Papi (Eds.), **The Pragmatic Perspective. Selected papers from the 1985 International Pragmatics Conference.** Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Ebbitt, W., and Ebbitt, D. (1982). **Index to English** (7th ed.) Illinois. Scott, Foresman and Company.

Gutt, E. A. (1990). "A Theoretical Account of Translation- without a Translation Theory". **Target**, 2:135-164.

Hahn, D. (1989). "Political Language: The Art of Saying Nothing". In W. Lutz (Ed.), **Beyond Nineteen Eighty-Four**. Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English.

Hickey, L. (1998). "Perlocutionary Equivalence Marking, Exegesis and Rrcontextualization". In L. Hickey (Ed.), **The Pragmatics of Translation** (pp. 217-232). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters LTD.

Jekat, S. And Klein, A. (1996). "Machine Interpretation". Open Problems and some Solutions". **Interpreting**, 1:1,7-20.

Kasher, A. (1991). "On the Pragmatic Modules: A Lecture". **Journal of Pragmatic**, 16, 381-397.

Leech, J. (1983). **Principles of Pragmatics**. London: Longman.

Lutz, W. (1987). "Language, Appearance, and Reality. Doublespeak in 1984" In P. Boardman (Ed.), **The Legacy of Language** (pp. 103-119). Reno: University of Nevada Press.

_____ (1989). "Notes Toward a Definition of Doublespeak". In W. Lutz (Ed.), **Beyond Ninteen Eighty-Four** (pp. 1-10). Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English.

_____ (1990). "The World of Doublespeak". In C.Ricks and L. Michaels (Eds.), **The State of the Language** (pp. 254-264). Berkeley: University of California Press.

Miller, D. (1992). **The Reason of Metaphor**. New Delhi: Sage Publishers.

Naoum, A.B. (1995). **Euphemism in Arabic with Reference to English.** Unpublished MA Thesis, College of Arts, University of Mosul.

_____ (2001). **A Cognitive-Pragmatic Approach to Translation**. Unpublished Ph.D Thesis, College of Arts, University of Mosul.

Orwell, S. and Angus, I. (Eds.) (1976). **The Collected Essays, Journalism and Letters of George Orwell** (Vol. 4). Berkeley: University of California Press.

Partridage, E. (1973). **Usage and Abusage**. London: Penguin Books in association with Hamish Hamilton.

Rank, H. (1974). "The Teacher-Heal-Thyself Myth. In H. Rank (Ed.), **Language and Public** Policy (p. 219). Urbana III: National Council of Teachers of English.

Turner, G. (1973). **Stylistics**. England: Penguin Books Ltd.

Widdowson, H. (1980). "Conceptual and Communicative Functions in Written Discourse". **Applied Linguistics**, 1:3,234-243.

ملخص

دور السياق في حل إشكاليات ترجمة الكلام الخادع

د . انس بهنام نعوم(*)

تهدف الدراسة الحالية إلى إظهار حالة إفساد الفكر الناتجة عن تعمد وسائل الأعلام، الغربية منها خاصة، إساءة استخدام اللغة واثر ذلك في

_____

(*) قسم الترجمة – كلية الآداب / جامعة الموصل

ميدان الترجمة من اللغة الإنجليزية إلى اللغة العربية. تتناول الدراسة كيفية تشخيص الكلام الخادع Doublespeak (الذي يبدو ذا معنى ولكنه مراوغ أو غامض أو بلا معنى في الواقع) في اللغة الأصل، والستراتيجات الواجب اتباعها للتغلب على صعوبات الترجمة الناجمة عن هذه الظاهرة، ومدى فاعلية الاعتبارات السياقية وفائدتهما في ترجمة الكلام الخادع إلى اللغة الهدف. يفترض الباحث إمكانية إخفاق المترجم في تشخيص الكلام الخادع ومن ثم إساءة فهم المعنى الشمولي المقصود للنص الأصلي وترجمته إلى اللغة الهدف ما لم يحدد المترجم بدقة السياق الشمولي للنص الأصل. لقد تبنى الباحث في تحليل الكلام الخادم وترجمته نهجا إجرائيا يتكون من ثلاث مراحل يترجم فيها ثلاثة طلاب متخرجين في قسم الترجمة حديثا نصا إنجليزيا وثائقيا إلى اللغة العربية (أي يترجم الطالب النص ذاته ثلاث مرات)، تتبعها مقابلات مع كل واحد منهم على حدة. يظهر تحليل ترجمات الطلاب للنص ومقارنتها أن الستراتيجات المتبعة في محاولتي المترجمين الثانية والثالثة اكثر نجاحا من محاولتهم الأولى في تحديد المعنى وتشخيصه في اللغة الأصل وكذلك في ترجمته إلى اللغة الهدف. وتخلص الدراسة إلى وجوب تدريب المترجمين من الطلاب على تفعيل عملية تمثلهم الذهني للمعلومات وذلك بالاعتماد ليس على السياق اللغوي للنص الأصل فحسب وانما على خزينهم المعرفي والسياق البراغماطي للنص الأصل.

98