

## Macro-Level of Translation Pedagogy: A Case of the Libyan Academy, Benghazi

Ramadan Ahmed Elmgrab  
Department of English  
Benghazi University  
P. O. Box 1308 Benghazi, Libya

### Abstract

*The type of text reinforces certain stylistic formats and the contextual focus tends to emphasize certain patterns more than others. Argumentative text type differs from other text types because the problem component begins at a point where reader either challenges the writer with a conflicting view or with a question which elicits the writer's point of view. This paper investigates how the study of translation macro-errors can enhance our understanding of practical translation practice. The analysis is carried out at macro-level, aiming at investigating whether or not the source text type and discourse parameters are represented in the two versions, English and Arabic, i.e. whether or not these features are realized in the students' translations. The main purpose of the analysis of the students' errors is to examine whether each text places different demands on the students; if so, does their performance vary typologically? It is of interest to this study is the way different text-types place different demands on the students and induce specific types and distribution of errors.*

**Keywords:** pedagogy, text type, register, corpus, error analysis, evaluation

### 1. Introduction

Translation is often described as the act of problem solving. The linguistic-textual phenomena are the core of translation as the linguistic analysis will provide us with the basis for making of an evaluative judgment. In House's (2001 p. 255) words

*if we take translation seriously as an object of scientific inquiry, translation must be seen first and foremost for what it is, namely a phenomenon in its own right: A linguistic-textual operation. And the nature of translation as a linguistic-textual operation should not be confused with issues such as what the translation is for, what it should, might, or must be for.*

The concept of translation quality assessment has traditionally been linked to values such as accuracy, appropriate equivalence and fidelity to the ST. Quality assessment requires something that could offer the process greater objectivity. Without explicit criteria on which to base evaluation, the translator/evaluator can only rely on his own view (Colina 2009). As a result, setting up a number of parameters or criteria as a measure for comparing real versus ideal performance could remove a great part of the subjectivity and could lead to a higher inter-rater reliability (Ibid.). Hence, translation quality assessment methods have to be alterable enough to cater for as many situations as possible. Therefore, in order to incorporate a complete evaluation, a comprehensive measurement procedure would be required.

This concept, which is mostly used in the evaluation of translation, has a direct relationship with translation competence. Although there is no agreed-upon definition of translation competence, Palumbo (2009 p. 21) tries to define it as "a set of knowledge, skills, and attitudes that enable a person to translate from one language to the other". Traditional categorization of translation errors has been based on categories like distortion of meaning, misinterpretation, and interference. This traditional categorization is criticized on the grounds that it focuses on the linguistic aspects of translation and overlooks the importance of communicative ones. The first attempt to evaluate translation errors from the function-oriented perspective could be traced back to House (1977) who distinguishes between covert and overt errors. The overt error occurs when the equivalence between the elements of the source and target text does not exist or grammatical deviation happens in the target language (TL).

Covert errors result from a mismatch in one situational dimension, i.e. when the elements in the target text (TT) cannot have equivalence with corresponding elements in the source text (ST) in terms of function, i.e. the social meaning.

Misinterpretation, on the other hand, refers to the errors that result from the misunderstanding of the culture-bound terms. Delisle (1999 p. 174) states that "incorrect meaning refers to errors in which the TT element gains a meaning that is not usually associated within the source language". For him (Ibid.), interference is "a phenomenon in which the decisions of the translator in the morphological, syntactic and lexical levels are affected by the arrangements in the source language". This means that interference is one of the factors that affects style and therefore leads to inappropriate translation. Neubert and Shreve (1992 p. 145) describe translation errors as

*What rightly appear to be linguistically equivalent may very frequently qualify as "translationally" non-equivalent? And this is so because the complex demands on adequacy in translation involve subject factors and transfer conventions that typically run counter to considerations about "surface" linguistic equivalent.*

Their statement shows the complication and difficulty in defining and identifying translation errors. Elmgrab (2013) states that translation error is usually typical of the translation class which reflects a deficiency in translation skills. It is non-binary and can only be assessed in terms of acceptability or appropriateness. The translation pedagogy involves both micro and macro levels: Micro level is linguistic-oriented and often requires formal equivalence between source and the target text. On the other hand, macro-level emphasizes the communicative dimension which includes not only linguistic factors but also cultural, social, and historical factors, i.e. it is function-oriented.

In translation, two major types of error can be distinguished: errors committed at micro-textual level and those at macro-textual level the two of which constitute the standards of textuality of text. First, micro-errors focus on the linguistic aspects of translation. They refer to those deficiencies in the organization of the textual elements in the text, i.e. the way the surface components of text (phonology, morphology and syntax) relate together. Errors at the micro-level are mainly threefold: syntactical, semantic, and stylistic. The idea is an amalgamation of Widdowson's (1979) categorization of equivalence and Kussmaul's (1995) typology of errors.

Second, macro-errors, on the other hand focus on the communicative (pragmatic) aspects of translation. They refer to failures to render the extra-linguistic meaning of the surface components and the communicative functions they perform. Within this contextual aspect of text, two types of error can be distinguished: one relating to situational adequacy and the other to general cultural adequacy. The main concern of this paper is the situational adequacy errors which involve inability to preserve the text type and any of the three discourse parameters of field, tenor and mode of the ST in the TT. However, Larose in (Williams 2004 p. 9) warns us that "every translation must be assessed in terms of the appropriateness of the translator's intention to that of the author of the original, not to the appropriateness of the Translator's intention to that of the evaluator". In making this statement, he emphasizes that translation quality assessment must cater for the readership and other requirements, and goals the translator has endeavored to meet.

### ***1.1 Register (Discourse Parameters)***

Register, or context of situation as it is formally termed, "is the set of meanings, the configuration of semantic patterns, which are typically drawn upon under the specific conditions, along with the words and structures that are used in the realization of these meanings" (Halliday 1978 p. 23). It is concerned with the variables of field, tenor, and mode, and is a useful abstraction which relates variations of language use to variations of social context. Style is often determined by the social relationship that holds between participants in discourse as, for example, between the translator and the TL reader in the case of translation. This interaction between the producer, translator and receiver must also operate, as Hatim (1997 p. 25) points out, "within constraints imposed by the particular *use* to which they [text producer and receiver] put their language". It can be said that a text is related to its situation of occurrence, which will differ in important respects from the situation of the TL audience. Halliday (Ibid.) calls these three functions as Ideational (field), Interpersonal (tenor) and textual (mode). It can be said that register analysis of linguistic texts has received popular application in (critical) discourse analysis and (foreign) language teaching pedagogy. More elaboration on these three variables is as follows:

(i) Field of Discourse. According to Halliday (1978 p. 33) "field refers to the institutional setting in which a piece of language occurs, and embraces not only the subject-matter in hand but the whole activity of the speaker or participant in a setting". It is, therefore, an abstract term which refers to what the text is about.

The field of a text is associated with ideational meaning which is realized through transitivity pattern (verb types, active/passive structures, participants in process). Here, linguistic choices in translation are often determined in terms of the field of discourse. Field also refers to the nature of the social action: what is going on, where what is going on is interpreted institutionally, in terms of some culturally recognized activity.

(ii) Tenor of Discourse. It is the relationship between addresser and addressee, i.e. the interaction between participants in language events according to their social statuses. Thus, the language variation is based on different degrees of interaction between members of the same language community. Halliday (1978 p. 33) explains that "tenor refers to the relationship between the participants, not merely variation in formality, but such questions as the permanence or otherwise of the relationship and the degree of emotional charge in it". Hence, tenor of discourse concerns the relationship between the author of the text and the intended reader.

Misrepresentation of tenor, on the other hand, is often a result of a failure to transfer the interpersonal relationships of the source text. In some particular discourses, tenor is of most significance as it is concerned with the power and status of the participants. The tenor of a text is associated with interpersonal meaning which is realized through patterns of modality (modal verbs and adverbs such as *hopefully*, *should*, *possibly* and any evaluative lexis such as *beautiful*, *dreadful* etc.).

(iii) Mode of Discourse. Text mode is a term used in linguistic studies as a parameter to distinguish one stretch of language from another. It is also associated with textual meaning which is realized through thematic and information structure (mainly the order and structure of elements in a clause) and cohesion. Halliday (1978 p. 33) defines mode of discourse as "the channel of communication adopted: not only the choice between spoken and written medium, but much more detailed choices". Later, Halliday and Hasan (1989) add that mode of discourse is the form of the text concerned with the role language plays in the interactive process. Baker (1992) explains that speakers of each language have certain expectations about what kind of language is appropriate to particular situations. Mode also refers to the rhetorical channel and function of the discourse: what part the text is playing.

In terms of text mode, counter-argumentative text has a distinctive mode. Based on Halliday's (1985) classification, counter-argumentative text being an evaluative discourse is written to be read. Unlike political speech in which a text is written to be read aloud, counter-argumentative text is written to be read silently like those in newspapers, books of various sorts, journals and magazines. Hatim (1997) argues that tenor, perhaps the most determining factor of the translator/receiver relationship because it overlaps with both field and mode resulting in formality and technicality. On the other facet, tenor overlaps with mode giving rise to functional tenor.

## **1.2 Text Typological Model**

Generally, text-typology aims at grouping texts into categories and types. It also aims at identifying and describing linguistic and conceptual features that texts belonging to a particular group have in common. The definition of the term text-type varies somewhat between different linguists: Beaugrand and Dressler (1981 p. 186) define text type as "a set of heuristics for producing, predicting and processing textual occurrences, and hence act as a prominent determiner of efficiency, effectiveness, and appropriateness". Here, they emphasize the importance of text typology for communication purposes. Hatim and Mason (1990 p. 140) also relating this concept to communicative intentions and postulates that "a conceptual framework which enables us to classify texts in terms of communicative intentions serving an overall rhetorical purposes". In such an approach, texts are defined by features which could be described as external to the text itself. These include areas such as text purpose, text producer's intention, audience's acceptances, and medium of communication.

For instance, Fawcett (1997 p. 104) states that "it makes no sense to judge a translated text in the traditional manner of picking out a few items to comment on, we should begin by determining the text type ...since the text type-co-determines the appropriate translation method". House (1977 p. 188) holds almost the same notion when she states that "it has been presupposed that if one can classify texts successfully, then one shall have successfully accounted for differences in translation and theoretical problems surrounding the assessment of translation quality". In this respect, Sager (1997 p. 25) claims that "since text types have been recognized as determiners of the global purpose of a text, recent discussions of translation have also included equivalence of text type as one of the major forms of equivalence to be aimed at". However, one of the problems of text typology is that, however the typology is set up any real text will show features of more than one type. This "multifunctionality is the rule rather than the exception, and any useful typology of texts will have to be able to accommodate such diversity"

(Hatim and Mason, 1990 p. 138). Rhetorical typologists such as Halliday and Hasan (1976) prefer to divide texts according to their rhetorical purposes that characterize every text. Within this model, three major text-types with other branching subtypes can be listed as follows:

First, an expository text is used to analyze concepts with the aim of informing or narrating. In this text category, the contextual focus is either on the decomposition (analysis) into constituent elements of given concepts or their composition (synthesis) from constituent elements. There are three important variants of this kind of conceptual exposition differentiated, namely: descriptive, conceptual and narrative texts. Second, an instructive text is used to direct the receiver towards a certain course of action. Instructional text type is another basic text group. The focus here is on the formation of future behaviour in order to regulate through instructions the way people act or think. Two sub-types have been identified: instructions with options such as in advertising and consumer advice and instructions without options as in contracts, treaties and so forth. Third, argumentative text, the main concern of this paper, is used to evaluate objects, events or concepts with the aim of influencing future behaviour. Beaugrande and Dressler (1981) identify the classification of text type along functional lines. They (Ibid. p. 184) define argumentative texts as

*Those utilized to promote the acceptance or evaluation of certain beliefs or ideas as true vs. false, or positive vs. negative. Conceptual relations such as reason, significance, violation, value, and opposition should be frequent. The surface texts will often show cohesive devices for emphasis and insistence, e.g. recurrence, parallelism, and paraphrase.*

Two sub-types of texts can be identified: first counter-argumentative and second through argumentative. Unlike the through-argumentative text, which is another form of argumentation characterized by an extensive substantiation of an initial thesis followed by a conclusion, counter-argumentative text involves rebuttal of a cited thesis followed by a substantiation and conclusion. The configurations of these two text forms may be diagrammatically represented as follows:

Counter-argumentation	Through-argumentation
i. Thesis cited to be opposed	i. Thesis cited to be supported
ii. Opposition	ii. Substantiation
iii. Substantiation of counter-claim	iii. Conclusion
iv. Conclusion	-----

**Table One: Argumentative sub-types (adopted from Hatim and Mason 1990)**

These differences in handling rebuttal, according to Hatim (1997), are believed to result from many factors, among which are the mismatches between the linguistic systems and conventions of languages. Moreover, different preferences within the same language shall be considered too. Within counter-argumentation, there are two sub-types: balance and explicit concessive. In the former, according to Hatim and Mason (1990), the text producer has the option of signaling the contrastive between what may be viewed as a claim and a counter-claim either explicitly by using an explicit adversative particle like *conversely*, *however* or implicitly by using no explicit adversative particle but rather by using a clause to express the contrast. In the latter, however, the counter-claim is anticipated by using an explicit concessive like *while*, *although*, *despite*, and the like.

The type of text reinforces certain stylistic formats than others. The contextual focus tends to emphasize certain patterns more than others. For instance, in argumentation the topic sentence sets the tone which must be substantiated and would exhibit a pattern like:

**Tone-setter > Thesis substantiated**

On the other hand, an exposition sets the scene which must be expounded and therefore would show a structure such as:

**Scene-setter > Aspects of the scene expounded**

(Hatim and Mason 1990:155-56)

### 1.2.1 Argumentation in English and Arabic

Various argumentative formats appear not to be equally available for all language users to choose from and the preference for one or the other varies within, as well as across, languages and cultures.

Hatim and Mason (Ibid.) believe that the preference for one or the other form is motivated by many factors, such as politeness, ideology, power and so forth. Koch (1983 p. 47) who emphasizes the notion that culture dominates rhetoric conventions, claims that "in contrast to Western modes of argument, which are based on a syllogistic model of proof and made linguistically cohesive through the subordination and hypotaxis, Arabic argumentation is essentially paratactic, abductive and analogical". She (Ibid.) concludes that persuasion in Arabic can be achieved by making its argumentative claims linguistically present: by repeating and paraphrasing them.

In comparison with Arabic which coheres through the high frequency of cohesive devices, English opts for economy in the use of such devices (Renad Abbadi 2014). In other words, each language has a unique set of rhetorical conventions. Thus, the tendency to prefer an argumentative style or format over another does not necessarily mean that the language lacks that style. The more logical interpretation is that for certain reasons, language users tend to favour a certain style.

Hatim (1991) identifies two variants of argumentation in respect of Arabic and English. The first variant is through argumentation which is more typical of Arabic than English. The second is counter-argumentation which is more frequently a characteristic of English and can be divided into two further sub-types: balance and lop-sided. The balance type gives the text-producer the option of signaling explicitly or implicitly his antithesis after the claim to be opposed is made as in Text Two. On the contrary, antithesis in the lop-sided argument is anticipated in advance as the thesis to be opposed is initiated by an explicit concessive (e.g. while, although, despite, etc.). Hatim (1991) then, presented an order of preferences which may be taken as indicative of the general trend of argumentation in each language as follows:

English	Arabic
A. the balance counter-argument	through-argumentation
B. through-argumentation	the lopsided argument
C. the lopsided argument	the balance argument

**Table Two: the format or structure of counter and through- argumentation**

Texts can also have different levels of argumentation which Hatim (1990) identified as macro- and micro-balance. Macro-balance indicates the argumentative format of the entire text whereas micro-balance indicates an embedded argument within the macro-pattern of text.

## 2. Introducing the Data

Before proceeding in the analysis of students' macro-errors, it is worth giving a brief description of the nature of the data. Comparing both texts in terms of House's (1977) overt/covert typology, The Arabic ST One is through argumentation classified as belonging to the overt-type. It is not, therefore, expected to pose serious semantic difficulties due to cross-cultural variation given that the theme of West/Middle East political relations is as much discussed by the Western press and the Arab media. On the other hand, the theme of the *Russian space programme*, ST Two, which is counter argumentation, can be classified as covert type due to the fact that it is not as common for the average Arab readership as the Western counterpart. The lack of sufficient knowledge on this topic is behind some problems Arab students encountered in their translations (see appendix I for full texts).

The two argumentative texts are given as translation tests to ten Arab translation students at the translation section of the Libyan Academy/Benghazi, Libya. They were asked to render Text One from Arabic into English and Text Two from English into Arabic. The testees were made under familiar test conditions and asked to translate each text, consisting of around 300 words, within a supervised time limit of two hours. Bilingual dictionaries were permitted during the performance of the tests. It is worth mentioning that the participants' language proficiency was not examined, but students who enroll for the translation course normally have an upper-intermediate level of English and an advanced level of Arabic. As it is expected, graduate students' proficiency in Arabic is normally higher compared with that in English.

### 2.1 The Analysis

The analysis of the macro-structure of a text can be verified in translation only through the choice and arrangement of its actual linguistic signs because they are the usual feedback that students are provided with. Therefore, syntactic, semantic and stylistic errors are examined in terms of their effect on the macro-textual level of translation.

Though the analysis and discussion focus on difficulties in the translation of argumentation, this does not however, mean that all problems encountered by the students when translating the two texts are exclusively argumentative in nature. They also relate to the general linguistic and socio-pragmatic competence of the students and the demands imposed by the direction of the translation given that testees translated Text One into a foreign language and Text Two into their native language. The nature of the text may only motivate the surfacing of some errors more than others. For example, tense errors can be more frequent when translating an argumentative text from English into Arabic. This is because the narrative in argumentation involves higher temporal shifts according to the type and time of action or event, in addition to the cross-linguistic variation in terms of tense systems between Arabic and English.

### 2.1.1 Mistranslation of Register (Field, Tenor, Mode)

Text one is taken from the Egyptian state-run daily *Al-Ahrām*. Some students find it difficult to grasp some Classical Arabic expressions and vocabulary the matter that affects the level of formality in their translations. For instance, sentence 1 reads:

(1) wa kān almas'ulūn al-mašriyūn mā bariḥū yusawighūn al<sup>C</sup>alāqāt taḥta shi<sup>C</sup>ār jaḍb lībya nahwa al-i<sup>C</sup>tidāl wa al-līn.

(The Egyptian officials *justify* their relations under the emblem of attracting Libya towards moderation and softness)

Participants find it difficult to interpret, let alone to translate, words and expressions from Classical Arabic such as the verb *yusawigh* (justify) in the ST. Here, the writer opted for the archaic alternative to fulfill extra semiotic values associated with this variety of Arabic. The participants did not translate the defective verb *mā bariḥ* which means *still* in this context. Such changes affected the level of formality of the translated text, taking into consideration that the tenor of the ST is very formal due to its structure and jargon.

Discourse parameters and their interface can play an essential role in the quality of translation and can therefore be an important teaching element. Indeed, in the case of Text Two, we notice that the level of formality (tenor) is in fact an interval in that it overlaps in a number of significant ways with the field as well as with the mode of discourse. For instance, due to the use of scientific and technical terms in addition to some French words, tenor and field interact to colour Text Two with a relatively high level of formality, as in Sentence 2:

(2) But last month, the grand promenade to Mars turned into a near earth lob shot, when a booster malfunction sent the spacecraft plummeting back to earth shortly after its launch. For a time it looked as if the craft was going to hit Australia, endangering it not just with debris but also with the 270 grams of plutonium it was carrying as a power source.

The extract above consists of a relatively long sentence and has a high frequency of sophisticated terms which presuppose a readership with more than an average level of education. The translation of sentence 2 cannot keep the same level of formality/technicality for reasons connected with cross-linguistic and cultural variation. For instance, the French expression *the grand promenade* is another illustration of the students' difficulty in maintaining the same level of formality of the expression into the TT. This is because most of the students translated it literally as *al-nuzha al-kabira/al-<sup>C</sup>adhima* (the big/great excursion) which lacks various meaning aspects existing in the ST; the use of French words in the ST is not meaningless, but serves the purpose of irony which the original author intended to achieve. In other words, French terms or expressions are often used in English to mark prestige or greatness. However, the French expression is used here by the author ironically in order to indicate that what was claimed to be the *grand promenade* (notice the use of the polysyllabic Romance word) has turned out to be, in actual fact, an *earth lob shot* (notice parallelly the use of monosyllabic Germanic words).

Generally, Arabic tends to borrow from other languages in the case of a lexical gap while the motive for borrowing (e.g. French words) in English is usually to fulfill a social function rather than to respond to a linguistic need. Technical terms tend to be less common in Arabic compared with English. Therefore, losses at the level of formality are inevitable in this situation. However, the communicative function of these terms within the whole argumentative discourse could be maintained.

For instance, the expression *reconnaissance capabilities* in sentence 3 below could be translated into Arabic as: *al-qudra<sup>C</sup> ala istiḡsa? al-ma<sup>C</sup>lūmāt* (the ability to trace knowledge).

Although the tenor of the translation is not the same as that of the ST, it succeeds in reproducing the ST's sense of irony by the addition of another expression as in Sentence 3a

(3) Leaving the [Russian] military without any space-based reconnaissance capabilities.

(3a) li-taṣila qudratihā <sup>C</sup>alā istiḡsā? l-ma<sup>C</sup>lūmāt ilā mustawa lā tuḡsad <sup>C</sup>alayh

(Its reconnaissance capabilities have left Russia in *an unenviable position*).

Tenor also interacts with mode in terms of language function to regulate or merely to inform through face-to-face encounters or indirectly as between writer and audience. Text One and Two are written to be read which emphasizes the relative formality of the texts and therefore indicates a relative physical distance between producer and receiver as well as between users and subject matter. However, the degree of physical proximity existing in the STs is not the same in the students' translations given the same reasons of cross-linguistic variation.

### 2.1.2 Mistranslation of Text-type Format

The Arabic and English argumentative STs were analyzed by applying Hatim and Mason's (1990) approach to textual analysis of argument structure (see Table One). The results of this structural analysis are displayed in the following representative tables:

#### Text One: (through argument)

##### Thesis to be argued through

##### Substantiation 1

##### Substantiation 2

##### Substantiation 3

##### Substantiation 4

##### Conclusion

#### العلاقات الأمريكية المصرية

يتفق الجميع أن العلاقات الأمريكية-المصرية تمتعت لأكثر من عقد من الزمن بألفة وود مميزين

فالولايات المتحدة تبتت دورا رياديا لمصر منذ اتفاقية السلام الإسرائيلية المصرية

وتتلقى مصر سنويا نحو 2,2 مليار دولار أمريكي من المساعدات الاقتصادية والعسكرية بالإضافة الى نحو

سبع مليارات دولار من الديون التي محتها أمريكا

ويبدي مسؤولون مصريون قلقهم الشديد مما يعتقدون انه حملة مركزة في الصحافة الأمريكية ضد مصر

ودورها في المنطقة

وأقلق أنصار إسرائيل أن قيادة حسني مبارك انتهجت خطأ منفتحا على العالم العربي مما أزال رواسب

خلاقات مرحلة (كامب ديفد).

يعبر الموقف المصري عن إجماع عربي وإسلامي لم يعد يتحمل الصمت الغربي عن السلاح النووي

الإسرائيلي.

#### Text Two: (counter argument)

##### Thesis to be opposed

##### Opposition

##### Substantiation 1

##### Substantiation 2

##### Substantiation 3

##### Conclusion

#### Russia's Space Programme

For the Russian space programme, the comeback was supposed to begin last month.

Ever since the fall of communism, the agency that gave the world Sputnik, Gagarin and the space station Mir appeared to have fallen too.

Russia has been funnelling all its space resources into the launch of its Mars 1996 probe.

But last month, the grand promenade to Mars turned into a near earth lob shot.

Russia sustained a less conspicuous public relations blow when officials admitted that two of the country's spy satellites had recently fallen from orbit.

In the wake of the Mars debacle, this was enough to cause observers inside Russia and out to wonder aloud just how deep the space programme's troubles run and whether any technological solution can fix what ails it.

As to the translation of Text One, most of the students followed the same ST argumentative format. They started with thesis to be argued through: *All agree that Egypt and America are in good terms for more than a decade.* Followed by substantiation 1: *The United States has adopted a leading role to Egypt since the signing of the Egyptian-Israeli peace treaty.* Substantiation 2: *Annually, Egypt receives about 2.2 billion US dollars in economic and military aid in addition to annul about seven billion dollars of debt.* Substantiation 3: *Egyptian officials express their deep concern of what they believe a severe campaign in the American press against Egypt and its role in the region.* Substantiation 4: *Israel supporters are worried about the leadership of President Hosni Mubarak which has pursued an open-door policy towards the Arab World, the matter that removed the disputes of Camp David period.* Conclusion: *The Egyptian position represents the Arab and Islamic consensus no longer bears the Western silence about Israel's nuclear weapons.*

It seems that the students were not aware of the fact that the Arabic ST format is through argumentation which should be changed into counter argumentation in English (see table two). This is because their only concern is to achieve equivalence at the linguistic level even at the expense of functional equivalence.

In Text Two, we have an explicit macro-balance argumentation signaled by the cohesive device *but* at the beginning of the second paragraph and implicit micro-balance argumentation between the second sentence of the first paragraph (Ever since.... underfinanced), on the one hand, and the rest of the paragraph [sentences (i) and (iii)], on the other. In their translations of Text Two, almost all students kept the ST argumentation format. The following is a translation of the first paragraph similar in terms of argumentation structure to those produced by almost all students:

(i) kāna min al-mutawaqqa<sup>C</sup> an yabda? al-šahr al-mādi barnāmaj al-fadā? al-rūsī al-laḏi dāhamahu al-marad mundu fatrah bi-iltiqāt anfāsih. (ii) fa-mundu inhiyār al-šuyū<sup>C</sup> iyya yabdū anna tilka al-wakālah allatī qaddamat li-l-<sup>C</sup>ālam sbūtnik wa-jajārin wa-l-mahatta al-fada? iyya mir qad ašābahā al-šalal aydan bi-sabab al-inxifād al-kabīr fī al-mizāniyya mimma addā ilā tadā?ul<sup>C</sup> adad<sup>C</sup> amaliyyāt al-ittlāq wa-inzi<sup>C</sup> aj al-mujtama<sup>C</sup> al-dawlī min xuṭūrat haḏihi al-rihlāt ruġma qillatihā bi-sabab tamwīlihā al-zahīd. (iii) wa-ma<sup>C</sup> a ḏalik fa-qad<sup>C</sup> akafat rūsyā mu?axxaran<sup>C</sup> alā šabb kull mašādir al-tamwīl al-fadā?ī ladayhā fī mašrū<sup>C</sup> ittālq markabat al-marrix 1996 wa-hya makabah bilā ruwwad tamma tašmīmuḥā li-tadūr ḥawla al-kawkab al-aḥmar wa-li-tursil arba<sup>C</sup> at ajhizat istikšāf ilā sathih, wa la<sup>C</sup> alla ahamm ma fī al-amr huwa muḥāwalat rūsyā isti<sup>C</sup> adat mādhā al-majīd fī riyādat al-fadā?

The Arabic translation above is a formal rendering of the English ST. The native speaker of Arabic is unlikely to perceive an underlying continuity in argumentation especially between sentences (i) and (ii). This is because Arabic rhetoric does not usually allow such formats as that linking sentences (i) and (ii), where a single statement claim is followed immediately and without previous anticipation by a counter-claim. The norm is to follow a description, an explanation or supporting argumentation. The expectation of a support rather than oppose is further highlighted by the use of the cohesive device *fa-* which mainly functions as the English conjunctive *and* or to express a cause/effect relation like *because* or *therefore*. In the case of the translation above, it does not serve either function. Linking sentences (i) to (iii) by the connector *fa-* would be more appropriate in Arabic as one supports the other. As to the macro-balance relation (sentences i and iii to ii), it is best translated taking Hatim's (1991:195) following suggestion into account: "to deal with this case of multi-level argumentation, the micro-balance would have to be transformed into a lop-sided format in Arabic". Hence, a translation of the first paragraph which attempts to render the conceptual relationships more explicitly for the Arabic reader would be as follows:

(ii) ruġma al-šalal allaḏi ašāba wakālat al-fadā? al-rūsīyya al-latī qaddamat li-l-<sup>C</sup>ālam al-qamar alšina<sup>C</sup> i sbūtnik wa-rā?id al-fadā? jajarin wa-l-mahatta mir fī a<sup>C</sup> qāb inhiyār al-šuyū<sup>C</sup> iyya ithra al-inxifād al-ḥād fī mizāniyyatihā al-amr al-laḏi addā ilā taddani malhūdh fī<sup>C</sup> adad al-rihlāt wa-inzi<sup>C</sup> aj al-mujtama<sup>C</sup> al-dawlī min xuṭūrat māā tabaqqā minhā bi-sabab tamwīlihā al-zahīd (i) fa-innahu kāna min al-mutawwaqi<sup>C</sup> an yabda? barnāmaj al-fadā? al-rūsī allaḏi dāhamahu al-marad mundu fatrah bi-iltiqāt anfāsih al-šahr al-mādi (iii) iḏ<sup>C</sup> akafat rūsyā mu?axxaran<sup>C</sup> alā šabb kull mašādir al-tamwīl al-fadā?ī fī mašrū<sup>C</sup> ittālq safīna bilā ruwwād ilā al-marrīx sanat 1996 li-tadūr ḥawl al-kawkab al-aḥmar wa-tursil arba<sup>C</sup> at ajhizat istikšāf ilā sathih wa-rubbamā al-ahamm min ḏalika kullih an tasta<sup>C</sup> id rūsyā makānatahā al-sābiqa fī riyādat al-fadā?...

(despite the fall of the agency that gave the world Sputnik, Gagarin and the space station Mir, (in the wake of the collapse of communism) following the slashing of the agency's budget to fewer launches and the deep concerns of the international community about the dangers of those under-financed missions, the comeback of the Russian space programme was supposed to begin last month for Russia has been funnelling all its space resources into the launch of its Mars 1996 probe, an unmanned spacecraft designed to orbit the red planet, dispatch a quartet of landers to the surface and, perhaps most important, return the country to the spacefaring pre-eminence it once enjoyed).

### 3. Concluding remarks

By way of conclusion, it is necessary to lay emphasis on certain aspects that could represent concrete solutions for some problems that may arise during the foregoing discussion. It is appropriate to take into account how the study of translation errors can enhance our understanding of practical translation practice. It appears clearly from the analysis of Text One and Two that the stylistic format of argumentation in Arabic and English is linguistically variant although the pragmatic goal (persuasion) is the same. Perhaps if students learn how argumentation is linguistically formatted in both languages, they will be more likely to convey convincingly the information and style existing in the ST to the TT audience. In this respect, I concur with Gile's (in Nunez 2014:85) when he emphasizes that



*The point is to raise students' awareness of problems and suggests "good translation principles, methods, and procedures" instead of merely giving students texts to translate and then discussing the translations in class, indicating what is right and what is wrong in the different versions presented.*

The analysis of the students' corpus shows that the structure of argumentation is difficult to handle especially when translating between languages incongruent in their argumentation structure. Therefore, it is essential to acquaint translation students with the argumentative format in each language and the ways variation could be dealt with. To convey the argumentation to the TL reader, the translator must do so within the constraints imposed by the discourse situation of the text. The realization of these constraints, defined as field tenor and mode, can be cross-linguistically variant. In this case, the translator is compelled to work with the constraint framework of the TL but must find at the same time compensating techniques to preserve the pragmatic goal of the ST. The analysis shows a number of errors in maintaining sub-types and discourse parameters. This is because the two texts were hardly negotiated by the students and there was an obvious inclination towards the SL formats and rhetorical functions. Students are not aware of the impact of the TL audience's modes of thought and response on the quality of the translation. Their rendering focuses on the lexical equivalents rather than the functional equivalents which strip out the text from its aesthetic functions and ornamental values. The transfer of content, regardless of the appropriateness of its presentation in the TL, was their only concern. Students should maintain the same register of the ST into the TT. However, there is a disparity between both STs and their translations in discourse parameters due to the changes made to the structure and jargon of the TTs. These micro-errors affect the level of formality and technicality in both translations.

As long as macro-errors are concerned, instructors should pay more attention to the communicative purpose of the ST rather than just comparing its linguistic system with that of the TT. They should teach their students how to prepare a text-map for each ST before any attempt of translation. After thorough reading of the ST, students should go for macro analysis of the ST: first they have to identify its type and subtype, and then specify its discourse parameters. Students should be aware of the fact that field of discourse is different from that of the text type. The former refers to the topic or subject matter of the text whereas the latter refers to the rhetorical purpose that characterizes every text.

In sum, students processed the ST and the TT implications too uncritically and were unable, as a result, to account for those aspects of meaning that could be derived from the immediate meaning of words and sentences. Yet, from among all sorts of errors, some seem to affect the quality of the text more profoundly than others and to determine their gravity will certainly vary according to the view of evaluators and their concept of the whole process of assessment in translation.

## References

- Baker, M. (1992). *In Other Words: A Course Book in Translation*, London: Routledge.
- Beaugrande, de R. and Dressler, W. 1981. *Introduction to Text Linguistics*. London: Longman.
- Colina, S. (2009). *Further Evidence for a Functionalist Approach to Translation Quality Evaluation*. In *Target* 21(2): 215-244.
- Delisle, J, Lee-Janke, H. Cormier, M. (eds.) (1999). *Translation Terminology*. Amsterdam: Benjamins. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1075/fit.1>
- Elmgrab, R. A. (2013). *Evaluation of Translation Errors: Procedures and Criteria*. In DOI:10.7763/IPEDR. 2013. V62. 13.
- Fawcett, P. (1997). *Translation and Language*. Manchester: St Jerome.
- Halliday, M. (1978). *Language as Social Semiotic*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Halliday, M. (1985). *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. London: Harlow.
- Halliday, M. and Hasan, R. (1976). *Semantics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Halliday, M. and Hasan, R (1989). *Language, Context, and Text: Aspects of Language in a Social-Semiotic Perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hatim, B. and Mason, I. (1990) *Discourse and the Translator*. London: Longman.
- Hatim, B (1991) The Pragmatics of Argumentation in Arabic: the Rise and Fall of a Text Type. *Text-Interdisciplinary. Journal for the Study of Discourse*. V. 11, 2, pp 189–200.
- Hatim, B. (1997). *Communication across Culture*. Exeter: Exeter University Press.

- House, J. (2001) *Translation Quality Assessment: Linguistic Description versus Social Evaluation*. Meta: journal des traducteurs/ Meta: Translators' Journal, vol. 46, n 2, 2001, p. 243-257.
- House, J. (1977). *A Model for Translation Quality Assessment*. Tübingen: Narr.
- Koch, B. (1983): *Presentation as Proof: The language of Arab rhetoric*. Anthropological Linguistics 25:1, 47-57.
- Kusmaul, P. (1995). *Training the Translator*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Neubert, A. and Shreve, G. M. (1992). *Translation as Text*. Kent: Kent State University Press.
- Nunez, k. (2014). Some Tips for Designing and Lecturing an Undergraduate Course in Economic, Financial and Commercial Translation. In Garant, M. (ed.) *Current Trends in Translation Teaching and Learning E.VI* pp 85-114. <http://www.cttl.org/>.
- Palumbo, G. (2009). *Key Terms in Translation Studies*. London: Continuum.
- Renad Abbadi, (2014) *The Construction of Arguments in English and Arabic: A Comparison of the Linguistic Strategies Employed in Editorials Argumentum*. 10, 724-746 Debreceni Egyetemi Kiadó.
- Sager, J. (1997). Text Types and Translation. In Trosborg A (ed.) *Text Typology and Translation*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Widdowson, H. G. (1979). The Deep Structure of Discourse and the Use of Translation. In Brumfit, C. J. and Johnson, K. (eds.). *The Communicative Approach to Language Teaching*. pp. 60-71, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Williams, M. (2004) *Translation Quality Assessment: An Argumentation-centred Approach*. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press.

## Appendix I

### Text One Arabic: العلاقات الأمريكية المصرية

يتفق الجميع أن العلاقات الأمريكية-المصرية تمتعت لأكثر من عقد من الزمن بألفة وود مميزين .. فالولايات المتحدة تبنت دورا رياديا لمصر منذ اتفاقية السلام الإسرائيلية المصرية. وتلقى مصر سنويا نحو 2,2 مليار دولار أمريكي من المساعدات الاقتصادية والعسكرية بالإضافة الى نحو سبع مليارات دولار من الديون التي محتها أمريكا إبان حرب الخليج. ويؤدي مسئولون مصريون قلقهم الشديد مما يعتقدون انه حملة مركزة في الصحافة الأمريكية ضد مصر ودورها في المنطقة. والصحيح أن عددا من المطبوعات الأمريكية (مثل مجلة يو أس وورلد أند نيوز ريبورت) نشرت مقالات وتعليقات تحمل عداً ضد مصر ومصالحها. وردت الصحافة المصرية منددة كما أن مستشار الرئيس مبارك أسامه الباز أكد أن مصر ليست تابعة لأحد مديا استغرابه لتوقيت الحملة. أن ما يسمى بالحملة على مصر ليست جديدة. فأنصار إسرائيل ما فتئوا يشكون بضمن صداقة مصر زاعمين أن إسرائيل وحدها هي الصديق الدائم لأمريكا بسبب استقرارها السياسي.

وأقلق أنصار إسرائيل أن قيادة حسني مبارك انتهجت خطأ منفتحا على العالم العربي مما أزال رواسب خلافات مرحلة (كامب ديفد). وكان أنصار إسرائيل يحبذون استمرار العزلة السياسية لمصر لأنها تقلل من استقلاليتها السياسية ومن حرية حركتها التفاوضية... وعزز انفتاح مصر الدور القيادي التي كانت لعبته مرات عديدة في التاريخ العربي المعاصر والقديم... وكانت إسرائيل تعول على عزلة مصر في محاولة لبناء سياسة مزدوجة في المنطقة تلحق فيها مصر بالمصالح الإسرائيلية الإستراتيجية. وهناك عدة عوامل أدت الى الفئور الأخير في العلاقات المصرية-الأمريكية. حيث أن الولايات المتحدة أبدت انزعاجا واضحا للتقارب المستمر بين مصر وليبيا. وكان المسئولون المصريون ما برحوا يسوغون العلاقات تحت شعار جذب ليبيا نحو الاعتدال واللين إلا أن الولايات المتحدة كانت ترغب في ضغط مصري على ليبيا بهدف عزل النظام الليبي عن محيطه العربي. ويعتقد مسئولون أمريكيون أن التقارب الوثيق بين مصر وليبيا لم يعط ثماره بدليل استمرار الرفض الليبي تسليم متهميه في حادث تفجير طائرة (بان أم) فوق اسكتلندا. والأمر الثاني الذي أزعج الأمريكيين في الكونغرس وخارجه هو الالتزام المصري بالحل الشامل لمشكلة الشرق الأوسط. فالأمريكيون كانوا يضغطون باستمرار على الحكومة المصرية لتلبيين موقفها من الحكومة الإسرائيلية. أما ما يتعلق بتأزم العلاقات الأمريكية-المصرية فيتعلق بموضوع السلاح النووي الإسرائيلي. وكانت مصر قد أبلغت الحكومة الأمريكية أنها ترفض بحث سلاحها الكيميائي أو موضوع السلاح الكيميائي في الشرق الأوسط من دون ربطه بالترسانة النووية الإسرائيلية التي لا تقض مضاجع المسئولين الأمريكيين الذين يجولون الكرة الأرضية بحثا عن إثبات وجود أبحاث نووية. ويعبر الموقف المصري عن إجماع عربي وإسلامي لم يعد يتحمل الصمت الغربي عن السلاح النووي الإسرائيلي.

### Text Two: The Russian Space Programme

1. For the Russian space programme, the comeback was supposed to begin last month. Ever since the fall of communism, the agency that gave the world Sputnik, Gagarin and the space station Mir appeared to have fallen too, with slashed budgets leading to fewer launches and worried whispers in the international community that even those missions were dangerously underfinanced. Lately, however, Russia has been funnelling all its space resources into the launch of its Mars 1996 probe, an unmanned spacecraft designed to orbit the red planet, dispatch a quartet of landers to the surface and, perhaps most important, return the country to the spacefaring pre-eminence it once enjoyed.

But last month, the grand promenade to Mars turned into a near earth lob shot, when a booster malfunction sent the spacecraft plummeting back to earth shortly after its launch. For a time it looked as if the craft was going to hit Australia, endangering it not just with debris but also with the 270 grams of plutonium it was carrying as a power source. That disaster was averted when the ship sailed past the continent and plopped ignominiously into the Pacific. A few days later, Russia sustained a less conspicuous public relations blow when officials admitted that two of the country's spy satellites had recently fallen from orbit, leaving the military without any space-based reconnaissance capabilities. What raised eyebrows was not the loss of the satellites but Russia's inability to replace them. In the wake of the Mars debacle, this was enough to cause observers inside Russia and out to wonder aloud just how deep the space programme's troubles run and whether any technological solution can fix what ails it.

**Transliteration**

The following Arabic transliteration system has been employed throughout this paper

Arabic	Transliteration	Arabic	Transliteration
ا	a	ط	<u>t</u>
ب	b	ظ	<u>dh</u>
ت	t	ع	c
ث	Θ	غ	ġ
ج	J	ف	f
ح	<u>h</u>	ق	q
خ	x	ك	k
د	d	ل	l
ذ	<b>ḏ</b>	م	m
ر	r	ن	n
ز	z	ه	h
س	s	و	w
ش	<b>Š</b>	ي	y
ص	<b>Ṣ</b>	ء	'
ض	<u>d</u>		

**Short Vowels**

**Arabic**

اَ

اِ

اُ

**Transliteration**

a

i

u

**Long Vowels**

اَ

يَ

وَ

ā

ī

ū