

Appendix

The pro-Iraqi group argued that the Iranian lobby, largely led by the military establishment, was trapped in a self-defeating circle. True. Iraq's army was no threat to Israel while the war continued, but as the war dragged on Iraq's military skill and experience only increased making it ultimately more of a danger. They asserted that if Iraq emerged from the war with the lesson that Israel was its unremitting foe, then Baghdad had far more incentive to use its forces against that foe at the next opportunity. Precisely because Iraq could play a key role in an Arab coalition, Israel should avoid conveying an impression of implacable hostility. Otherwise, Israel would consolidate the Eastern Front to its much feared.

- 17- Lotfipour-Saedi, K. (1990). "Discourse Analysis and the Problem of Translation Equivalence". *Meta* 35(2) : pp. 289-297.
- 18- Newmark, P. (1981). *Approaches to Translation*. Pergamon Press : London.
- 19- Nida, E. (1977). "The Nature of Dynamic Equivalence in Translating". *Babel* (23) : pp. 99-103.
- 20- Nida, E. (1982). *Language Structure and Translation*. Stanford University Press . Stanford California.
- 21- Nida, E. (1990). " The Role of Rhetoric in Verbal Communication". *Babel* (36) : pp. 143-154.
- 22- Sa'adeddin, M. (1987). " Three Problem Areas in Teaching Translating Native Arabic Literates". *Anthropological Linguistics* 29 (2) : pp. 181-192.
- 23- Shakir , A. and M. Farghal , (1994). " Audience Awareness and The Role of the Translator in Interlingual Communication. *Turjuman*, 3(2): pp. 77-90.
- 24- Shakir , A. and M. Farghal , [Forthcoming in *Meta*]. "When the Focus of the text is Blurred : A text-linguistics approach for analyzing Student interpreters", errors.
- 25- Shunnaq , A. (1992). *Monitoring and Managing*. Irbid : Al Amal .
- 26- Uwajeh, M.K.C. (1996) . "Meaning in Performative Translatology". *Turjuman* 5(1) : pp. 59-80.
- 27- Van Dijk, (1977), " Context and Cognition : Knowledge Frames and Speech Act Comprehension". *Journal of Pragmatics*, (1) : pp. 211-232.
- 28- Van Dijk. (1983). "Discourse Analysis : its development and application to the structure of news". *Journal of Communication pragmatics*. 33(2) : pp. 20-33.
- 29- Wills W. (1982). *The Science of Translation*. Tubingen. Narr.

- 6- De Beaugrande, R. (1981). *Text, Discourse : Toward a Multidisciplinary Science of Texts*. Norwood : Albex.
- 7- De Beaugrande, R. (1984), *Text , production : Toward a science of composition*, Norwood, New Jersey : Albex Publishing Corporation.
- 8- De Beaugrande, R and W. Dressler (1981). *Introduction to Text linguistics*. London : Longman.
- 9- De Waard, J. and E. Nida (1986). *From one language to another : Functional Equivalence in Bible Translating*. Thomas Nelson Publishers.
- 10- Farghal, M. [Forthcoming in *Meta*]. "Lexical and Discoursal Problems in English-Arabic Translation".
- 11- Fathi, S. (1993). *An Investigation into the Effect of Mistranslating Arabic Conjunctives on the Text Typological Focus of Argumentative Texts*. Unpublished M.A. thesis. Yarmouk University.
- 12- Hatim. R. (1984). "A Textlinguistics Model for the Analysis of Discourse Errors : Contributions from Arabic Linguistics". Mimeo.
- 13- Hatim . R.(1991). "The pragmatics of argumentative in Arabic : The rise and fall of a text type". *Text*, (11): pp. 189-199.
- 14- Hatim . R. and I. Mason. (1990). *Discourse and the Translator*. London : Longman .
- 15- Jakobson, R. (1959). "On Linguistic Aspects of Translation " In Prower, R. (ed). *On Translation* . Harvard University Press : pp. 232-239.
- 16- Longacre, R. and S. Levinson. (1978). "Field Analysis of Discourse". In Dressler, W. (ed). *Current Trends in Textlinguistics*. New York : Walter Gruyter : pp. 103-122.

provided by many student translators does not have the same value of the source lexical items. In their inappropriate rendition of the evaluative lexical items, the students violated two standards of textuality "Intentionality and Acceptability". This could be interpreted as the students' unawareness of the pragmatic function of the evaluative lexical items in their discorsal context in which they operate. In this sense, they failed to decode the intended message of the text producer. It is necessary, therefore, for student translators to work with the antire text so that they can recognize how to rener evaluative lexical items effectively in argumentative texts. By doing so, the task of the translator should not be restricted to attaining an equivalent that textulizes with linqustic norms of (TT); but also contextualizes with the text-effect on the reader to whom the text is orignally oriented.

REFERENCES

- 1- Bolinger, D. (1966). "Transformation : Structural Translation". *Acta linguistical Hofnieszia* IX : 130-144.
- 2- Boliver, A. (1992) " The Analysis of Political Discourse , with particular Reference to the venezuelan Political Dialogue". *English for Specific Purposes* 11(2),pp 159-175.
- 3- Catford J. (1965), *A linguistic Theory of Translation* . London : Oxford University press.
- 4- Carter , Ronald (1986) . "Good word, Vocabulary, Style and Coherence in Children's Writing" , In Harris and Wilkonson (eds.) : pp. 93-122.
- 5- De Beaugrande , R. (1980) . *Text, Discourse and Process*. Norwood, New Jersey : Albex . Pupliching Corporation.

elirit. A possible explanation of such inappropriate renditions is that those students retained dictionary meaning, thus dealing with "precisely" as a linguistic device isolated from the context it occurs. The equivalent of this lexical item was skipped by (20%) in the students versions. However, other students (10%) succeeded in finding the appropriate equivalent of this lexical item as (bilfi ' 1, fi' lan etc.). It can be argued that inappropriate renditions of this lexical item make clear that those students could not establish correspondence between the linguistic form and its rhetorical function.

Conclusion :

The analysis and discussion of The preset paper have highlighted the importance of the pragmatic functions of evaluative lexical items and have illustrated how to realize text typological focus of argumentative text. In their versions, as we have observed, a great number of the student translators encountered many difficulties in rendering the evaluative lexical items. Inappropriate renditions of evaluative lexical items can disturb the pragmatic development of argument, thus mitigating the line of argument and make it difficult to detect the main thread of argument , thus mitigating the line of argument and weakening its pragmatic force.

A careful look at this study shows that most of the students attempted to convey the moaning of (ST) into (TT) and not equivalent. Uwajeh (1996 : 70) rightly put it " meaning is context-dependent, but not context- determined". Thus, in the rendition of an evaluative lexical itemm the focus should be placed on communicative/ functional and pragmatic equivalence rather than on meaning and/or formal/grammatical correspondence. We have observed that target equivalence of the evaluative lexical items as

Equivalent", as it was provided by (15%) such as (halaqat al hazimah, fakhkhin). Other students (10%) skipped it. This could be also interpreted as a lack of linguistic proficiency as those students could not find an appropriate equivalent for this expression .

5- True : sahih

This lexical item is typically used in argumentation to introduce a point that is debatable and controversial. In this context, "true" is used to substantiate the thesis cited before it " the pro- Iraqi group argued that ... in a self - defleating circle". The text producer employs this lexical item to create a relationship with his reader. In other words, it signals that not only does the text producer get involved in the text, but also that he takes his reader's anticipations into consideration. The student translators, however, could not retain the communicative function of this lexical item, thus draining the text away. Many of them (80%) provided inappropriate equivalents such as (fil haqqahtin fact , hi l fi 'I: indeed' ilman anna : knowing that). Such equivalents may lead to an inappropriate tone of argument, and decrease the effectiveness of text producer's communication with his readers. Other students (20%) succeeded to find an appropriate equivalent such as (sahih, hadha sahih).

6- Precisely because Iraq : lianna l 'Iraq fi' lan.

The use of this lexical item shows that the text producer is not only concerned with introducing and presenting facts. but also evaluating these facts and why they are introduced. In this sense, this lexical item helps to substantiate the thesis (spe Appendix). In their renderings, most of the students (70%) provided inappropriate equivalents as (bildabt : exactly , hiltahdid taccurately, ala nahwin adaq : to be more accurate etc.). Sich equivalents could lead to blurring the text producer's purposes since they are not intended to be

divorced from its co-text. The appropriate rendition of this lexical item, viz "dragged on" is (tala'amat).

3- They asserted : akkadat

This lexical item indicates that text producer is planning to gear the situation towards his goal. In other words, this lexical item reveals non-neutrality of the text producer's position. However, many student translators (about 45%) rendered this lexical item as (idda'at : claimed, za'amat : alleged etc.). Such inappropriate rendition show that those students did not fully understand the situation as intended by the text producer. Such equivalents are inappropriate though they are evaluative simply because they have negative implications and go against the text producer's intention. Other students (about 55%) have appropriately rendered this lexical item such as (akkadat, shaddadat etc.).

4- Was trapped in a self-defeating circle : awqa'at nafsaha matabbin La makhraja minhu.

This expression sparks off evaluativeness, and it has a provoking -effect on the part of the reader. This aspect, however, does not seem to have been fully grasped by a great number of the student translators, which as the discourse shows, mitigates the impact of the argument. Many student translators (about 75%) rendered this expression in such a way that weakens the persuasive power in the (TT). In their renditions, the student translators provided equivalents such as (halaqatu l hazima , da l'ratu l munhazimin, and hazimah). It seems that those students were looking for a "Cognitive Equivalent" rather than for an "Effect Equivalent" (Koller 1978, cited in Newmar 1983). These equivalents have less expressive power than in the (ST). Thus, the inappropriate rendition of this lexical item makes the text lose its argumentative force. To capture the appropriate equivalent, a translator should opt for the "Effect

equivalents (Jadalat and hajajat) appeared in their versions because they are the most accurate dictionary meaning of the English lexical item "argued", and not the most appropriate equivalents in this context. Although the above renditions have the same factual meanings, they are not necessarily interchangeable because each lexical item is unique in its sense, especially in argumentative text. Mistranslation of this lexical item, viz "argued" was provided by (20%) who rendered it as (bahathat : debated, naqashat : discussed, acabat: expressed). Such translations are semantically anomalous because they cohere neither with the context nor with the context. A successful rendition of this lexical item was provided by (15%) such as (bayyanat, tara and awdahat). Such equivalents are appropriate as they disclose the attitude of the text produces.

2- But as the war dragged on : walakin indama tale(t)
 *(amad) alharb.

The use of this lexical item shows that the text producer tries to produce a hierarchical level through a different use of lexicalization. This evaluative lexical item should be contrasted with the non-evaluative lexical item "continued". In so doing, the text producer can realize balance in the process of arguing. Unfortunately, this lexical item was inappropriately rendered by most of the student translators where (55%) rendered it as (zadat : increased , istamarrat : continued etc.), where as other students 30% provided mistranslations such as (nashabat : broke out, intahat : came to an end etc.). Appropriate translations were only provided by (15%) such as (talat, tala ' amad, italat amad etc.). The failure to capture the appropriate equivalent of "dragged on" could be interpreted for not taking into account the co-text of this lexical item. In this sense, this lexical item was

the open-class consists of “self-defeating –circle”, “true” and “precisely” . These lexical items were the most problematic and serious area for the student translators. For convenience, we will discuss and analyse the renditions of lexical verbs and then the other open-class ones.

1- The pro-Iraqi group argued : awdahat almajmu “ahtu almuwaliyatu lil “ Iraq.

This lexical item, viz “argued” is employed by the text producer on purpose as he intends to support the position of “the pro-Iraqi group” (see Appendix), and incites the reader to follow the flow of discourse. Thus, the communicative function of this lexical item should be attained in the (TT). Although this equivalent seems “neutral” yet it is evaluative in this context (see van Dijk, 1983) as it implicates a positive attitudinal feature, that will be supported by the text producer, In other words, this lexical item indicates that the thesis “The pro-Iraqi group argued ... in a self – defeating circle” was cited to be supported (see Appendix). This lexical item, however, was inappropriately rendered by the student translators. Some students (35%) rendered it as (qalat: said , dhakarar : mentioned, a lanar: announced) as equivalent of “argued”. Such equivalents show that those student translators were “monitoring” the situation (de Beaugrande 1980, Shunnaq 1992), which was not intended by the text producer. In other words, they revealed a reporting rather than arguing tone. In this sense, those students flouted the standard of “Intentionality”. Other student translators (30%) provided a translation which violated the registeral feature of political discourse. The lexical item “argued” was rendered as (jadarar , harjarar). Such equivalents are usually restricted to classical Arabic literature and Islamic religious discourse. In this sense, those students-violated the standard of “Acceptability” . The

items may reveal the attitude of the text producer since they express his ideological point of view towards the relevant situation. This being so, the translator's task is to perceive and recognize how lexical items are employed in the creating of a text in order to grasp and maintain the intended effect, and consequently, to render a communicatively acceptable translation of a text. Thus, textual elements and contextual factors should be analysed by the translator so that he can attain the appropriate equivalent.

As far as translation is concerned, inappropriate rendition of evaluative lexical items should go against the text producer's intentionality and reader's acceptability of the text to be discussed below. It seems that appropriate renditions of the evaluative lexical items uphold two standards of textuality, namely "Intentionality" and "Acceptability" (de Beaugrands and Dressler, 1981). It should be noted that, in the analysis of our study, the issue with which we are concerned is not "correctness" of rendering the lexical items in (TT), but the pragmatic effect on the recipient when rendered in the (TT). The translation of evaluative lexical items was judged as being inappropriate as the students failed to render the pragmatic function of the (ST) lexical element- a case that depletes the force of the argument to the discourse.

The analysis revealed that certain lexical items triggering an element of "tension" (Longacre and Lavinson, 1978) have been inappropriately rendered by a great number of the student translators. The lexical items, according to Carter (1986) are divided into two main types: "closed-class" (eg. auxiliary verbs, pronouns and conjunctives) and "open-class" (eg. nouns, lexical verbs, adjectives and adverbs). Thus in our study (see Appendix) the closed-class consists of "argued, asserted" and "dragged on", whereas

of the text. It plays an important role in producing discursal configurations that disclose a presupposed information between the text producer and reader.

The focus of the argumentative text, with which we are concerned, is placed on evaluation of relations between concepts presented by the text producer. Such evaluation is realized by contextual factors and textual elements that interact to create the text. On the one hand, contextual factors are the translator's source of information about the text producer's intention that should be maintained and reproduced in the (TT). Thus, it could be argued that since contextual factors rely heavily upon the who, when, where, what and why of the particular speech act, a change that may take place in any of these factors will produce a different text, which will lead to a different translation. On the other hand, textual elements such as evaluative lexical items are usually handled from the surface structure perspective. Such evaluative lexical items act as an expressive power to unfold the attitudinal features of the text producer in the argument, and contribute effectively to the overall progression of the text, i.e., text typological focus.

Analysing argumentative text has to take into consideration the pragmatic force of the lexical items used in the discourse. Such lexical items may be studied under the scope of "pragmatics" as they entail the use of language in a certain and practical context of use. The text producer selects evaluative lexical items according to his pragmatic intention. When translating takes place, the translator should be well-aware of the relationship between the text producer's pragmatic selection of lexical items in the (ST) and their pragmatic equivalence in the (TT). It should be also emphasised that specific choice of evaluative lexical

political discourse is that this type of discourse being mainly evaluative in nature, tends to employ a host of evaluative lexical items to serve the purposes of the text producer who aims at convincing the reader or changing his attitude by providing supporting details and producing "impact and appeal" (Nida 1990 : 146) via a strength of the logic of the argument.

The subjects of this study constitute one translation section comprising 25 students of the Department of Translation at Mosul University. They were required to translate a text from English into their native tongue. The text was translated over one session .

The aim of this study is to explore to what extent failure to capture the semantic and pragmatic function of evaluative lexical items may lead to blurring the focus of English argumentative text when translated into Arabic.

Discussion and Analysis :

It could be argued that text type is a point of departure with which the translator should start the process of translating as he attempts to produce "effectiveness, efficiency and appropriateness" in the (TT) (de Beaugrande and Dressler , 1981). Also it has been argued that evaluativeness is the main feature of the argumentative text. For example, de Beaugrande (1980) views that this text type is "conceptual , expository tavaluative" . By the same token. Boliver. (1992) states that evaluation can operate at two levels : " evaluative in language" and "evaluative in text". The former is concerned with lexical items, expressions and conjunctives of which the text producer encapsulates in the text to reveal his own experience and what to do with language. It arouses anticipations relevant to the content and organization of the text. The latter is mainly concerned with macro-structure which determines the overall organization

Thus Nida (1982 :95) defines translation as “reproducing in the receptor language the closest natural equivalent of the message of the source language”.

Recently, translation equivalence has been approached from text analysis perspective. De Beaugrande and Dressler (1981 : 261) highlight the importance of communicative context to perform translation equivalence. The notion of translation, according to them, is “the equivalence in the experience of the participants “. By the same token, (Uwajeh 1996 :62) argues that translation should be regarded as a “context- bound and communicative performance”.

The relationship between text analysis and translation has been examined in a number of empirical and theoretical studies (see, for example, van Dijk 1977, Wills 1982, Hatim 1984, 1991, Sa'adeddin 1987, Hatim and Mason 1990, Fathi 1993, Shakir and Farghal 1994, Shakir and Faghal [forth coming], Farghal [forth coming]. Some of these studies suggest that the “Equivalence Effect Principle” (Koller 1978, cited in Newmark, 1981) may not be realized without taking into consideration textual elements and contextual factors employed by the text producer. More interestingly, a discourse-based model was proposed by Lotfipour-Saedi (1990). The model includes the following factors : lexical items, structure, cohesion, sentence meaning vs. utterance meaning, language varieties, aesthetic effect and cognitive effect. This model, he asserts, should be followed in the translation process as these factors interact with one another to establish target equivalence.

The Present Study:

The study is based on one English text of argumentative function selected from “Middle East Journal, 1988”. The rationale behind choosing argumentative

STUDENTS' PROBLEMS IN TRASLATING EAVLUATIVE LEXICAL ITEMS

Salem Yahya Fathi

Introduction :

Finding an appropriate translation equivalent has been regarded a central question for the theories and practices of translation. In principle, the main task of the translator is to produce the most appropriate equivalent of the source text (ST) in the traget text (TT). Translation equivalence- the main goal of the translator-is attained via transmission of content and intended effect as well from (ST) to (TT).

To bring the discussion into focus, translation equivalence has been approached by theorists and researchers of translation from different perspectives, Most of them, however, argue that the translator should search for the highest degree of closeness between the (ST) and (TT). Catford (1965) views that translation should be realized by formal /grammatical equivalence . Thus, he defines translation as the replacement of textual material in (ST) by equivalent textual material in (TT). Similarly, translation was defined by Bolinger (1966 : 130) as "the rendition of a text from one language to another". Other translation theorists (see, for example , Jakobson 1959, Nida 1964, 1982, de Waard and Nida 1986), speak of translation from the perspectives of information and communication theories. To them, translation is a communucative process from which the translator acts as a decoder of the (ST) as well as encoder of the (TT) . From this point of view. "Dynamic Equivalence" , according to Nida's terminology, is achievable when the mcssage and response which is evoked in the receptor of (ST) and (TT) should be the same.