



## *Distortion of Political Argumentative Texts with Reference to English-Arabic Translation*

**Marwah Ghassan Younis**

**Salim Yahya Fathi**

M.A Student/ Translation Dept / college of Art /Of Mosul

Prof. / Translation Dept / college of Art / University of Mosul

### **Article information**

#### **Article history:**

Received July 30, 2021  
Review August 28, 2021  
Accepted September 4, 2021  
Available online September 1, 2023

#### **Keywords:**

Political argumentative text  
Micro level,  
Macro level

#### **Correspondence:**

Marwah Ghassan Younis  
[marrowg.1999@gmail.com](mailto:marrowg.1999@gmail.com)

### **Abstract**

Micro level and macro go hand in hand to create the argumentative text. Micro level refers to the evaluative elements (verbs, collocations, conjunctive, and modality) that unfold the text producer's attitude towards certain subject matter whereas macro level refers to the strategy (counter- argumentation and through argumentation) that contributes to the macro structure of the argumentative text. This study tackles the problems encountered by the student translators when translation of argumentative texts from English into Arabic is involved. It is assumed that the key problem of this study lies in how to capture the pragmatic equivalence of evaluative items employed by the text producer in order to convey the attitudinal meaning of ST into TT.

This study aims at identifying the evaluative items at the micro level in SL; analyzing these items to recognize their rhetorical functions in the ST depending on the analysis of argumentation strategy at macro level; examining to what extent failure to grasp the rhetorical functions of these items may lead to distorting the focus of English argumentative texts when translated into Arabic; and finding out the most dominant evaluative item that blurs and depletes the text type of argumentative function.

This study hypothesizes that inappropriate renditions of evaluative items at micro level lead to violate two standards of textuality: intentionality and acceptability, and distort the macro level structure of argumentative text. It is also hypothesized that student translators are not well aware of the rhetorical functions of micro level items used in argumentative text, and that pragmatic equivalence is the most appropriate equivalence of evaluative items.

DOI: [10.33899/radab.2023.179925](https://doi.org/10.33899/radab.2023.179925), ©Authors, 2023, College of Arts, University of Mosul.

This is an open access article under the CC BY 4.0 license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

## تشويه النصوص الجدلية السياسية في الترجمة من الإنكليزية الى العربية

\*سالم يحيى فتحي\*\*

مرودة غسان يونس

المستخلص:

يتلزم كل من المستوى الجزئي والمستوى الكلي جنباً إلى جنب لإنشاء نص جدلي. يشير المستوى الجزئي إلى العناصر التقييمية (الأفعال ، ادوات الربط ، القرانن ، الصيغية) التي تتضمن رأي كاتب النص تجاه موضوع معين ، بينما يشير المستوى الكلي إلى الاستراتيجية (الدعم الجدلي او الادحاض الجدلي) التي تساهم في البنية الكلية للنص الجدلي . تتناول هذه الدراسة المشكلات التي يواجهها الطلاب المترجمون عند ترجمة النصوص الجدلية من الإنكليزية إلى العربية ، ويُفترض أن المشكلة الرئيسية لهذه الدراسة تكمن في كيفية الحصول على المكافئ البراكمتي للعناصر التقييمية التي يستخدمها منتج النص لكي يتمكنوا من نقل المعنى المقصود لكاتب النص الاصيلي الى النص الهدف. تهدف هذه الدراسة إلى تحديد العناصر التقييمية على المستوى الجزئي في اللغة الإنكليزية و تحليل هذه العناصر للتعرف على وظائفها البلاغية في النص الاصيلي اعتمادا على استراتيجية التحليل الكلي للنص الجدلي، ثم ملاحظة الى اي درجة قد يؤدي الفشل في فهم الوظائف البلاغية لهذه العناصر إلى تشويه الخاصية الجدلية النصوص الانكليزية عند ترجمتها إلى اللغة العربية ؛ وكذلك اكتشاف العنصر التقييمي الأكثر شيوعاً الذي يضعف النص الجدلي. تفترض هذه الدراسة أن الترجمة غير الصحيحة للعناصر التقييمية على المستوى الجزئي تؤدي إلى خرق معيارين من المعايير النصية: القصد والقبول وتشويه المستوى الكلي للنص الجدلي. يُفترض أيضاً أن المترجمين الطلاب ليسوا على دراية كافية بالوظائف البلاغية لعناصر المستوى الجزئي المستخدمة في النص الجدلي ، وأن المكافئ البراكمتي هو المكافئ الانسب للعناصر التقييمية.

**الكلمات المفتاحية:** النص الجدلي السياسي، المستوى الجزئي، المستوى الكلي.

## 2. The concept of Translation

Translation is defined by many scholars and translation theorists. They search either for transference of meaning or finding equivalence in their definitions. Catford (1965: 20) defines translation as “the replacement of textual material in one language SL by equivalent material in another language TL”. Later on, Newmark (1988:7) describes translation as a “craft consisting in the attempt to replace a written message and/or a statement in one language by the same message and/or statement in another language.” He classifies translation into two types: "communicative and semantic translation" ((1988:46-49). Semantic translation means that the formal and contextual meaning is conveyed from ST to the TT while Communicative translation is “subjective translation” as the translator tries to reproduce an effect on TL reader similar to that experienced by the SL reader (ibid). Further, Hatim and Mason (1997:1) define translation as “an act of communication which attempts to relay, across cultural and linguistic boundaries, another act of communication.”

In addition, Munday (2016) describes translation it "involves changing of an original written text (the source text or ST) in the original verbal language (the source language or

\* طالب ماجستير / قسم الترجمة / كلية الاداب / جامعة الموصل  
\*\*استاذ/ قسم الترجمة / كلية الاداب / جامعة الموصل

SL) into a written text (the target text or TT) in a different verbal language (the target language or TL)". Recently, House (2015, 2) defines translation as "the result of a linguistic-textual operation in which a text in one language is re-contextualized in another language". However, translation is a process by which the translator decodes the message sent by SL text producer and encodes it into TL receiver in a way that similar meaning and intended effects are constructed between the SL and the TL.

The discipline of translation studies changed over time and witnessed many developments according to the diversity of theoretical orientations. In the 1950s and 1960s, the translation studies were linguistically oriented by many scholars (e.g., Catford, 1965; Jakobson, 1959 ; Nida, 1964). The discipline broadly advanced during 1970s, with the development of other branches of linguistics such as pragmatics, semantics, discourse analysis, sociolinguistics, psycholinguistics and communication studies which paved the way for systematic investigation in this field. This period also witnessed development in discourse-oriented translation studies by following and applying Halliday's model of SFL as a new approach to express how the meaning is articulated as a semiotic system through language (e.g., Hatim and Mason, 1997 cited in Al-shunnag, 2014: 103-104).

As it can be seen, the concept of translation has been perceived from different perspectives; however, in terms of this study discourse-oriented translation has been adopted because it could be argued that appropriate equivalence cannot be captured unless textual and contextual levels be considered. Further, translation, as a means of communication across diverse languages and cultures, is only achieved at textual level rather than sentential level.

### **3. The Model Adopted**

Larson's (1984) approach for assessing the good quality of translation is based on three criteria adopted in this study which aims to make the TT appropriate in accordance with the accuracy, clarity and naturalness. This model suggests that appropriateness is achievable if these three criteria are well adopted. Therefore, it is useful to give a brief account of them.

Translation, according to Larson (1998), is the process in which the meaning of SL is reconstructed in the TL by a way of semantic structure. She maintains that translation process includes "studying the lexicon, grammatical structure, communication situation, and cultural context of the source language text, analyzing it in order to determine its meaning ,and then reconstructing this same meaning using the lexicon and grammatical structure which are appropriate in the receptor language"(Larson,1998: 3).

Larson views that translation is appropriate if it is accurate, natural and clear. She states that clarity is achieved when the translated text is readable (it is good writing, it has pleasing style, a good rhythm, and moves along at an acceptable pace) which makes the TT readers understand it clearly. In other words, the forms of the language used in the TT

should be those which make the message of the ST as easy to understand as the ST itself was to understand. Therefore, the translator must correctly understand the message of the ST and communicate it to the TT in an easy way which makes it understood to the TL readers. (Larson, 1998: 531). Accuracy means the meaning of the ST should be similar with TT. A translator should not ignore, add, or reduce the message contained in ST. In other words, intentionality relates to accuracy as it concerns with reproducing as closely as possible the meaning and the content of the source text.

As for naturalness, Larson (1998) states that the form of translated text should be natural and equivalent with the TT. She adds that naturalness is achieved when the meaning in TT uses a standard grammatical pattern and vocabulary and it should represent an ordinary context in TT. Larson (1984) also claims that naturalness is very important to verify whether the form and the style of the translation are natural and appropriate enough to be a good translation. She also gives a list to people who are proper to test the translation. The purpose of such a test is to find out whether the translation of the text is natural and the style the translators used is appropriate enough for the TL readers. It is worth noting that notion of naturalness stems from Nida's (1964a:166) definition of translation as "the closest natural equivalent to the source language message". It seems that the goal of Nida's natural equivalent is to communicate as much of the ST as possible in a way that is usable for the type of the readers that the original author addressed. Acceptability relates to the naturalness of the translation. It means a translation will be acceptable in the target language if the translator can express the meaning of original text naturally. In order to produce an acceptable translation that sounds natural, a translator should apply appropriate techniques, use appropriate expressions in the target language and also adapt the culture with the target language. Larson also argues that representing the meaning of the original text and the use of the natural idiomatic expression in the receptor language are the primary goals of the translation. The translator, as she contends, should be faithful to the meaning of the original text as well as to the structure of the receptor language. Moreover, in a good translation, incomplete, extraneous, or different information must be avoided.

#### **4. Data Analysis and Discussion**

This section analyzes the translations of (17) evaluative lexical items in the SL which are produced by 10 student translators into the TL selected randomly from (20) student translators at the University of Mosul. The translations of each linguistic item are analyzed and discussed. The tables will be provided to show Larson's criteria of appropriate translations done by the students. Then, decision will be made to justify the assessment of whether the translation of a specific lexical item is appropriate or not.

##### **4.1 Analysis of Lexical Verb**

EX.1: Critics argue that the JCPOA imposes insufficient limits on Iran's nuclear enrichment capabilities. (Text1, line: 11)

The text producer used this evaluative lexical verb “argue” to support his attitude according to the JCPOA agreement. He engaged another opinion to support his attitude and also to make the readers follow the flow of discourse. In this counter argumentation the evaluative verb “argue” is used to support the position of “critics” and also to make the readers follow the flow of discourse. This item is considered evaluative as it implicates a positive attitudinal feature that is supported by the text producer. Consider the following table that shows the renditions provided by the students.

T	TL	Clarity	Naturalness	Accuracy	Appropriateness
T1	يحتاج	+	-	-	-
T2	يجادل	+	-	-	-
T3	يزعم	+	+	-	-
T4	يدعي	+	+	-	-
T5	يرى	+	+	+	+
T6	يجادل	+	-	-	-
T7	يقول	+	+	-	-
T8	يرى	+	+	+	+
T9	يقول	+	+	-	-
T10	يذكر	+	+	-	-

**Table (1) Analysis of Lexical verb**

As it can be seen, most of the students could not capture the pragmatic aspect of the meaning of the verb (argue). The translations of this verb into ( يجادل، يحتاج ) done by (T1 , T2 and T6) reveal that they observed the clarity criterion as they are understood by the reader; however, they could not observe the criteria of naturalness and accuracy. The naturalness criterion is violated because these equivalents are unacceptable in this context since they are usually used in classical Arabic literature and the glorious Koran (Farghal, 1995: 58). The argumentative text has its own conventionalized genre that translators must be aware of to render the implied meaning appropriately. In addition, those translators monitored the situation by using the literal meaning of this lexical item whereas managing is obligatory for the acceptability of the translation.

Moreover, the intentionality is violated because they did not manage the situation to achieve text producer’s goals (de Beaugrande and Dressler, 1981). Moreover, such renditions do not cohere with the political argumentative discourse. As a result, the accuracy criterion is violated since the intended meaning is not grasped by (T1, T2 and T6).

The translations provided by (T3 and T4) were ( يزعم , يدعي ). Both translators observed clarity and naturalness as such equivalents are understandable and acceptable on the part of TL reader in argumentative political texts. Also, it seems that (T3 and T4) recognized the text type as they rendered the evaluative item ( argue) into ( يدعي , يزعم) which are

evaluative as they reveal the text producer's stance towards the subject. However, such renditions may distort the text producer's intention because he, in this context, used the critics' stance to support his attitude while their renditions go against his intentionality. In so doing, (T3 and T4) violated the accuracy criterion.

In terms of other renditions which are produced by ( T7,T9 and T10) as ( يقول , يذكر ) such equivalents are inappropriate because those translators neutralized the attitude of the text producer and consequently, depleted the argumentation as such equivalents are non-evaluative and commonly used in expository texts rather than argumentative ones. In this sense, (T7, T9, and T10) observed clarity and naturalness; however, they could not capture accuracy.

The translations provided by (T5 and T8) are appropriate as those translators successfully managed to capture the evaluative verb (argue) into (يرى). Such pragmatic equivalent shows that (T5 and T8) observed all three criteria. In terms of clarity, this equivalent is coherent and understandable for the TL reader; and natural as it is acceptable in the conventions and norms of political argumentative discourse. More importantly, it is accurate as it conveys the contextual and intended meaning of the ST. So, ( يرى ) was the appropriate translation equivalent that achieves the pragmatic equivalence of the evaluative verb “argue” and its rendition appropriately could uphold the two standards of textuality which are the intentionality and acceptability.

EX.2. The idea that Trump will run again is unlikely, given his age. But younger populist heirs are already **jostling** to claim the mantle. (Text 3, Line 12)

The text producer used this evaluative verb ”jostle” as it carries an evaluative meaning. He did not use the neutral verb such as (compete, contend, race or rival) in order to substantiate his opposition towards Trumpism that may be re-elected if the populist heirs would win in the next elections. Consider the following table that shows the renditions provided by the students.

T	TL	Clarity	Naturalness	Accuracy	Appropriateness
T1	يتنافس	+	+	+	+
T2	يتنافس	+	+	+	+
T3	يصر	+	+	-	-
T4	يتجه	+	+	-	-
T5	يتنافس	+	+	+	+
T6	يريد	+	+	-	-
T7	يرغب	+	+	-	-
T8	يتنافس	+	+	+	+
T9	يتزاحم	-	-	-	-
T10	يتزاحم	-	-	-	-

**Table (2) Analysis of Lexical verb**

The translations produced by (T3, T4, T6, and T7) as (يريد، يتجه، يرغب، يصر) were inappropriate since they did not observe the accuracy criterion. These renderings, point to a serious deficiency in the translator's lexical competence, especially when it comes to differentiate between cognitive and/or near-synonyms in terms of correct lexical usage. Those translators did not convey the intended meaning accurately.

The translations provided by (T9 and T10) were also inappropriate. It seems that both of them relied on the dictionary meaning (يتزاحم) rather than textual and contextual meaning. This equivalence could not convey the intended meaning accurately as it contradicts the argumentative text in this context. Therefore, the accuracy criterion is flouted and also clarity and naturalness were not achieved as this equivalent was not acceptable and understandable in this context.

Finally, the appropriate equivalence was established by (T1, T2, T5, T8) who translated the verb (jostling) to its pragmatic equivalence (يتنافس). This equivalence observed all three criteria. It is clear and natural as it is understandable and acceptable in this context and accurate as it conveys the intended meaning. It is accurate as it captured the intended meaning without any addition, omission or change in the meaning.

E.X. 3. Biden has pledged to recommit to some of the Obama-era international agreements that Trump **abandoned**. (Text 1: Line 10)

At the macro level, the text producer used this evaluative verb “abandoned” to evaluate Trump negatively and to express his attitude towards Trump's act in terms of the international agreements. Consider the following table that shows the renditions provided by the students.

T	TL	Clarity	Naturalness	Accuracy	Appropriateness
T1	تتصل منها	+	+	+	+
T2	تركها	+	+	-	-
T3	أغاها	+	+	-	-
T4	تخلي عنها	+	+	-	-
T5	لم يتبناها	+	+	-	-
T6	نقضها	+	+	-	-
T7	تخلي عنها	+	+	-	-
T8	تتصل منها	+	+	+	+
T9	تخلي عنها	+	+	-	-
T10	تخلي عنها	+	+	-	-

**Table (3) Analysis of Lexical verb**

The translations of the evaluative verb “abandoned” to ( ترك ، تخلى ) produced by (T2,T3,T4,T7,T9 and T10) were inappropriate because they violated the criterion of accuracy as such equivalents are non- evaluative. These equivalents are the most accurate

literal meaning of this lexical verb “abandoned” ; however, they are clear and acceptable in the context of talking about Trump neglecting presidency as referred by the text producer. But, accuracy criterion is violated as the intended meaning is shifted from evaluative to neutral and the message of the ST is depleted and weakened in the TT.

Such equivalents could not observe the intentionality of the text. In this regard, Newmark (1991) maintains that in many cases the intended meaning cannot be captured by opting for literal translation. The translations provided by (T5 and T6) as (نقض) (لم يتبنى) were inappropriate. Although they observed clarity and naturalness as they were understood and grammatically appropriate but accuracy criterion was not observed. The translator (T6) could not grasp the semantic field of the evaluative verb ‘abandoned’ in his rendition as (نقض). The meaning of (نقض) refers to announcing to stop doing something (almany.com) while actually, Trump did not commit to these agreements as indicated by text producer. By the same token, (T6) rendered (abandoned) as (لم يتبنى) which also contradicted with the intended meaning of the text producer. In this sense, student translators (T5 and T6) erroneously rendered this lexical item and thus violated accuracy criterion as illustrated in the above table. Two of the translations in the TL done by (T1 and T8) were appropriate. They rendered the evaluative verb “abandoned” as “تتصل”. This is a pragmatic equivalence that coheres with co-text and context and this equivalence is viewed “in terms of communicative value as relating to utterances or kinds of message rather than sentences in isolation”(Farghal et. al,2015: 48). Such equivalent observed all three criteria of appropriate translation. It is clear as it is understood by the reader and natural as it is acceptable on the part of the TL reader. More importantly, it is the accurate equivalent because the intended meaning is achieved in this context.

EX.4. Democrats needed to **muster** a “blue wave” of electoral victories all the way down the ballot. (Text 3, Line 9)

In the second text “it’s Europe turn to reject Trump” the counterargument is explicit concessive argument that is anticipated by “despite”. (Hatim, 1997: 216). In the beginning of the text, the text producer mentioned that Trump's presidency would be ended as a claim cited to be opposed ,then he refuted it when he stated that trump legacy would endure. In the rest of the text he proposed minor propositions to support his opposition and persuade the readers to vanquish Trumpism. The text producer used the evaluative verb “muster” to support his opposition and in order to achieve his goal. Consider the following table that shows the renditions rendered by the students.

T	TL	Clarity	Naturalness	Accuracy	Appropriateness
T1	انجاز	+	-	-	-
T2	تحقيق	+	+	+	+
T3	يستجمع	-	-	-	-
T4	يحدث	-	-	-	-
T5	يجمعوا	-	-	-	-
T6	تحقيق	+	+	+	+

T7	تحقيق	+	+	+	+
T8	يحدث	-	-	-	-
T9	تحقيق	+	+	+	+
T10	تحقيق	+	+	+	+

**Table (4) Analysis of Lexical verb**

The translation of (T1) was inappropriate since it did not observe the naturalness and accuracy criteria of appropriate translation. The evaluative verb “muster” was rendered as “انجاز”, which was clear as it is understood to the target language reader, unnatural as it was unacceptable in the context of elections. Furthermore, this rendition is neutral which means “achieve” ([torjoman.com/dictionary/ar/search/english-arabic](http://torjoman.com/dictionary/ar/search/english-arabic)). Therefore, it violated the accuracy criterion because the intended evaluative meaning was rendered to a neutral equivalence violating the intentionality of the text producer.

The translations that are produced by ( T3,T4,T5 and T8) are also inappropriate as they didn’t maintain all three criteria of clarity, naturalness and accuracy. They rendered the evaluative verb (muster) into its literal correspondence ( يجمع ، يحدث، يستجمع ). These equivalences were not clear because they need to be comprehended by the reader, unnatural and unacceptable in this context .Such equivalents usually used in the other contexts such as (muster troops, muster energy and muster soldiers). ([wordreference.com](http://wordreference.com)). Moreover, these equivalents were inaccurate as those translators could not convey the intended meaning .The literal meaning of this evaluative item reduced and distorted the intended meaning of ST producer. In this sense, acceptability and intentionality were flouted.

The translations that are produced by the students (T2,T6,T7,T9 and T10) were appropriate translations .They rendered the evaluative verb (muster) as (تحقيق). This equivalent could maintain all three criteria. It is clear, natural and accurate as it is the pragmatic equivalence that reproduces the implied meaning of the ST in the TT without any misunderstanding.

EX.5. Biden has **pledged** to recommit to some of the Obama-era international agreements. (Text 1, line: 9).

At the macro level, the underlined evaluative lexical item was used by the text producer to substantiate the preceding counter argumentation. Verbs such as orders and promises are used as they have an evaluative meaning which is necessarily hearer directed . Consider the following table that shows the renditions provided by the students.

T	TL	Clarity	Naturalness	Accuracy	Appropriateness
T1	تعهد	+	+	+	+
T2	وعد	+	+	-	-

T3	تعهد	+	+	+	+
T4	تعهد	+	+	+	+
T5	تعهد	+	+	+	+
T6	تعهد	+	+	+	+
T7	وعد	+	+	-	-
T8	تعهد	+	+	+	+
T9	تعهد	+	+	+	+
T10	تعهد	+	+	+	+

**Table (5) Analysis of Lexical verb**

Student translators (T2 and T7) rendered this evaluative verb as (وعد). Although this equivalent provided clarity and naturalness, it did not observe accuracy as it was reduced the message of the ST. This equivalent neutralized the intended meaning which led to deplete the argument's evaluativeness. Other translations provided by the students were appropriate and they observed all criteria of good translation according to Larson (1998). The equivalent (تعهد) of the evaluative verb "pledged" is clear, natural in this context and the most accurate equivalent as intended by the text producer. It seems that those translators opted for the dictionary meaning and captured the intended meaning. In this sense, the literal translation of this evaluative verb gives the same evaluation in the TL. In addition, in applying the literal translation of this verb, the attitude of the text producer is retained. Thus, the intentionality and acceptability are rendered appropriately. In a few cases, literal translation may convey the intended meaning; this is why those translators captured the appropriate equivalent.

#### **4.2. Analysis of Conjunctives**

Ex.6. After four years of the Trump administration undermining global governance arrangements, President-elect Joe Biden will certainly have his work cut out for him. **Nonetheless**, there are several actions the administration can take immediately to reaffirm America's commitment to multilateral institutions. (Text 2, Line: 3)

T	TL	Clarity	Naturalness	Accuracy	Appropriateness
T1	مع ذلك	+	+	+	+
T2	مع ذلك	+	+	+	+
T3	بالرغم من ذلك	+	-	-	-
T4	بالرغم عن ذلك	+	-	-	-
T5	ناهيك عن ذلك	+		-	-
T6	لذلك	+	-	-	-
T7	لذلك	+	-	-	-
T8	مع ذلك	+	+	+	+
T9	بالرغم من ذلك	+	-	-	-
T10	فضلا عن ذلك	+	-	-	-

The text producer used this adversative conjunctive to assert positively the new actions that can be taken by the new administration to restore multilateralism unilaterally. Van Dijk (1981, 112) argues that some conjunctives as (nonetheless, nevertheless and yet) are linked with positive assertion rather than counter-argumentation. These conjunctives function as concessive. Consider the following table that shows the renditions provided by the students.

**Table (6) Analysis of Conjunctives**

The renditions done by (T3,T4 and T9) were inappropriate. They rendered the conjunctive (nonetheless) as (على الرغم من ذلك ، بالرغم من ذلك ). Those translators provided clarity as they used understandable equivalents to the TL reader but they did not provide naturalness, as they were grammatically inappropriate. These conjunctives used in complex sentences as subordinating conjunctives. Therefore, these equivalents are grammatically unacceptable in this context. As can be seen above ,the sentence here is a simple sentence that has a verb and a subject that can stand alone because it can convey a complete thought as indicated by Quirk and Greenbaum (1973: 166) while the complex sentence contains only one independent clause and one or more dependent clauses that cannot stand alone ,and a complex sentence contains subordinating conjunction such as (although ,after, because etc..) as expounded by Quirk and Greenbaum (ibid: 309). In addition, the accuracy criterion was violated as the intended meaning of the text producer changed from positive assertion to evoke the doubts and expectations of the readers.

The inappropriate rendition of these conjunctives change the argumentation macrostructure from through to counter argument. The equivalents (فضلا عن ، ناهيك عن ) are mistranslation provided by (T5 and T10) were inappropriate as they have different functions. In other words, such equivalents denote additive functions rather than concessive ones. So, the naturalness and accuracy criteria were violated. Furthermore,

student translators (T6,T7) rendered this concessive conjunctive (nonetheless) as (لذلك) which is causal conjunctive. This equivalence also violated naturalness and accuracy criteria because they did not convey the intended meaning accurately.

Three of the students (T1, T2, and T8) translated this conjunctive as (مع ذلك) which is appropriate equivalent as it maintained all three criteria. Such equivalent is understood and acceptable in this context, and conveys the intended meaning

EX.7. True, the US Constitution and those of its 50 states survived and protected American democracy from the worst of Trump’s malign impulses. But the fact that 74 million Americans voted for another four years leaves a chill. (Text2, Line: 19).

As can be seen above, the text producer used this conjunctive “but” between two contrastive sentences in order to oppose and refute the first claim (True, the US Constitution and those of its 50 states survived and protected American democracy from the worst of Trump’s malign impulses). This conjunctive is called adversative as it states the contrast between the two statements. The text producer used this conjunctive as a restriction tool after what has been said. Baker (1992: 190) states that “the use of conjunction does not instruct the reader to supply missing

information either by looking for it elsewhere in the text or by filling structural slots. Instead, conjunction signals the way the writer wants the reader to relate what is about to be said to what has been said before”.

T	TL	Clarity	Naturalness	Accuracy	Appropriateness
T1	لكن	+	+	+	+
T2	لكن	+	+	+	+
T3	لكن	+	+	+	+
T4	الا ان	+	-	+	-
T5	الا ان	+	-	+	-
T6	الا ان	+	-	+	-
T7	الا ان	+	-	+	-
T8	لكن	+	+	+	+
T9	لكن	+	+	+	+
T10	لكن	+	+	+	+

Consider the following table that shows the renditions provided by the students

**Table (7) Analysis of Conjunctives**

In the target language the cohesive device “الا ان” is called حرف استثناء followed by introduced information and refers to the *unabsolute emphasis*. While “لكن” is used for الاستدراك which means that the text producer wants to introduce new information as contrastive to that introduced in the first part and at the same time to evoke the reader’s doubts to follow the text. This can be done by using the conjunctive device” “لكن”.(Fathi,1993:45). Furthermore, the conventionalized rules of argumentation collocate the conjunctive device (لكن) with the evaluative adjective (true) which is used in the sentence preceded the conjunctive device “but” (Hatim, 1991). Therefore, the renditions of the adversative conjunctive “but “ as “لكن” are appropriate renditions and maintained all

three criteria ,in contrast to other students translators who rendered “but” as “الان ” as they violated naturalness criterion. This equivalent was unnatural as it was not the appropriate grammatical structure used in this context.

Ex.8. After four years of Trump, Europeans know what is at stake. **Likewise**, continuing to harbor any illusions about China would be both naive and dangerous. (Text3, Line21).

The text producer here used this conjunctive adverb to support his claim that (it’s a mistake Europeans cede responsibility the transatlantic relationship to the Biden administration) and to add additional information to the previous two statements. Consider the following table that shows the renditions provided by the students;

T	TL	Clarity	Naturalness	Accuracy	Appropriateness
T1	على نحو مشابه	-	-	-	-
T2	على نحو مشابه	-	-	-	-
T3	على نحو مشابه	-	-	-	-
T4	بالمثل	-	-	-	-
T5	بالمثل	-	-	-	-
T6	عل غرار ذلك	-	-	-	-
T7	كذلك ان	+	+	+	+
T8	بالمثل	-	-	-	-
T9	بالمثل	-	-	-	-
T10	بالمثل	-	-	-	-

**Table (8) Analysis of Conjunctives**

Unfortunately, most of the students could not capture the contextual meaning of this item .As indicated above, (T4,T5,T8,T9 andT10 ) opted for a literal meaning of the additive conjunctive (بالمثل) . In addition, other renditions provided by ( T1,T2, T3 andT6) who translated (likewise) as (على نحو مشابه ) had not observed all three criteria. These equivalents are unnatural in this context and also violated accuracy criterion because these equivalents deviated from the attitudinal meaning(addition not simile) of the text producer. Moreover, those student translators are not aware of the argumentation genre. Translation should respect the conventions of argumentation. These conventions or rules such as the purpose of the text and persuading the reader need pragmatic equivalents to reveal the writer's attitude clearly.

Furthermore, the appropriate equivalent of the evaluative conjunctive (likewise) is (كذلك ان) which is provided by(T7). This equivalent has maintained all three criteria. This equivalent is a pragmatic equivalence which is recreating the author's intention and effect

from the SL to the TL in such a way that the translator enables his/her reader to understand the text completely. The rendition “كذلك ان” is clear, natural and render the intended meaning of the writer. It is worth noting here that the addition of the emphatic particle "ان" is very important to achieve an equivalent effect, i.e. the effect that the target text has on the target readers is expected to be similar to that created by the source text on the original readers. In this state, the student translator adopted managing and explicitly connected the propositions of the text in a way that did not distort the propositional content.

Ex. 9.  $\phi$  **Without**

T	TL	Clarity	Naturalness	Accuracy	Appropriateness
T1	علما انه	+	+	-	-
T2	$\phi$	-	-	-	-
T3	و	+	+	-	-
T4	$\phi$	-	-	-	-
T5	$\phi$	-	-	-	-
T6	وبالتالي	+	+	+	+
T7	و	+	+	-	-
T8	$\phi$	-	-	-	-
T9	وبالتالي	+	+	+	+
T10	$\phi$	-	-	-	-

$\phi$  Some changes, the agreement will most likely remain moribund. (Text 1, Line 16) At the macro level, this sentence represents the conclusion of the counter argumentation as indicated by Hatim who stated that counter argumentation “is formed in its simplest forms of a thesis to be opposed or rebutted followed by support of the rebuttal and conclusion”. Many linguists and researchers as Baker 1992; Hatim 1997b; Farghal and Al-Hamly assert that the Arabic language is syndetic in its nature, unlike the English language which is an asyndetic language. Therefore, many conjunctives are used explicitly in Arabic while they do not have corresponds in English as in the above example.

**Table (9) Analysis of Conjunctives**

Some student translators did not explicate the conjunctive device between the two sentences and kept them implicit as used in the ST as done by (T2, T4, T5, T8 and T10). So, their translations are inappropriate; they violated clarity as the TT is not written clearly in a pleasing style, a good rhythm, and moves along at an acceptable pace. They were unnatural equivalents as mentioned above because Arabic tends to use explicit conjunctives rather than implicit which naturalize the flow of discourse smoothly. In addition, the unemployment of the appropriate conjunctives in these renditions violated the accuracy criterion because the intended meaning was distorted and was not conveyed appropriately. The rendition of (T1) who employed the lexical conjunctive (علما انه) is inappropriate, although it is clear and natural but it violated the accuracy criterion as this translator employed inappropriate conjunctive device resulting in the intended meaning was shifted from a concluding proposition to a minor proposition.

Similarly, the renditions of (T3 and T7) who employed the additive conjunctive (و) violated the accuracy criterion. This equivalent was clear and natural but inaccurate. The employment of (و) maintained the rhetorical function of connecting this sentence to what has been preceded but, it changed the argumentative text to an expository one. Thus, the default conjunctive (و) required in this context besides concluding conjunctive is appropriate since the Arabic language employs the additive conjunctive (و) as a default conjunctive at the beginning of the sentence to naturalize and smooth the flow of discourse but not as a concluding conjunctive. (Farghal ,2015: 211)

The appropriate conjunctives were used by (T6 and T9). They employed the conjunctive (بالتالي) with the default conjunctive (و). Those translators observed all three criteria as they rendered the message of the ST clearly in appropriate grammatical structure. They employed the resultative conjunctive (بالتالي) with the default discourse conjunctive (و) to perform the conclusion discourse function. Farghal (2015:222) mentions that “most writers in Arabic prefer to use a more semantically marker (بالتالي) and at the same time keep (و) as an enhancer of the logical relation as well as a cohesive marker”.

EX.10. After four years of President Donald Trump’s bad-faced lies, juvenile bullying, gratuitous cruelty ,and perilous volatility ,  $\Phi$  it was certainly an appealing promise. (Text 1,Line 4)

In the above example, there is an implicit conjunctive device in this ST’s dependent clause. The writer used this proposition as a main claim which is cited to be opposite. In order to render this proposition to the Arabic language (TL), the translators need to use explicit coordinating conjunctive according to the nature of the Arabic language which it is syndetic language and in order to join this clause to the preceding one. Undoubtedly, conjunctives help to render a text cohesive since they represent the semantic and relationships that hold the component parts together. Textual components which are poorly linked tend to be hard to understand and to make them comprehensible. Thus, translators must use appropriate signals of the relationships that interlinked the component ideas. Consider the following table that shows the renditions provided by the students.

T	TL	Clarity	Naturalness	Accuracy	Appropriateness
T1	$\Phi$	-	-	+	-
T2	$\Phi$	-	-	+	-
T3	ف أن	+	+	+	+
T4	$\Phi$	-	-	+	-
T5	ف أن	+	+	+	+
T6	و	-	-	-	-
T7	$\Phi$	-	-	+	-
T8	$\Phi$	-	-	+	-
T9	و	-	-	-	-

T10	φ	-	-	+	-
-----	---	---	---	---	---

**Table (10) Analysis of Conjunctives**

Most of the student translators as (T1, T2, T4, T7, T8 and T10) kept this conjunctive device implicit which may lead the reader astray. They did not observe clarity and naturalness criteria as this proposition was unreadable smoothly to the TL reader and also the grammatical structure used in the TL unnatural and unacceptable in the Arabic language. Accuracy was observed since other student translators employed the additive conjunctive (و) as (T6 and T9), but it was an inappropriate employment of the conjunctive tool because the text producer in this proposition intend to cite a main claim that represents the focus of an argument. Therefore, the employment of default conjunctive as (و) was not required. Those translators seem not to have realized that connection of two textual elements depend in the first place upon the propositions they express rather than the presence of conjunctive. The presence of (و) here violated all three criteria since maybe it was understandable but not readable clearly in a cohesive way to the reader of TT .In addition, naturalness was also violated as the conjunctive (و) is usually used as a default discourse marker and because it is usually used as a default conjunction which practically carries *no\_or little* semantic content when it comes to marking logical relationships as indicated by Farghal (2015:212 ). Finally, the accuracy criterion was also violated, as the focus of argumentation was depleted result in reducing the text producer intentionality.

The appropriate conjunctive is used by two translators (T3 and T5) who employed the causal conjunctive device (الفاء) with the emphatic article (ال).They observed all three criteria. Those students rendered the intended meaning of the ST clearly using appropriate grammatical structure .The function of causal (الفاء) here introduces an information that is related to the first clause by cause and effect relation which indicates the cause of an action or a state of affairs. In other words, it performs a causal relationship between two sentences whereby the second sentence is the cause of the first one. (Farghal et al,2015).

### 4.3. Analysis of Collocation

EX. 11. The idea that Trump himself run again is unlikely, given his age. But younger populist heirs are already jostling to **claim the mantle**. (Text 3, Line 12).

T	TL	Clarity	Naturalness	Accuracy	Appropriateness
---	----	---------	-------------	----------	-----------------

T1	المطالبة بالعباءة	-	-	-	-
T2	لطلب العباة	-	-	-	-
T3	للظفر بالعباءة	-	-	-	-
T4	الترشح للانتخابات الرئاسية المقبلة	+	+	-	-
T5	المطالبة بالرئاسة	+	+	+	+
T6	المطالبة بالعباءة	-	-	-	-
T7	المطالبة بالمنصب	+	+	+	+
T8	المطالبة بالرداء	-	-	-	-
T9	المطالبة بارتداء عباءته	-	-	-	-
T10	المطالبة بالرئاسة	+	+	+	+

In the above example, the collocation in the SL is presented by verb plus noun as a rhetorical device of political discourse. The text producer used this evaluative device to support his opposition that Trump's political legacy will endure (see text 3, Line 2). This rhetorical technique is used by the text producer to organize his text in order to affect people's attitudes and arouse their feelings. Such as these combinations of words are considered an effective strategy to increase the effect of each word and attracts the reader's attention. Consider the following table that shows the renditions provided by the students.

**Table (11) Analysis of collocation**

Many students as (T1, T2, T3, T6, T8 and T9) adopted literal translation of this collocation as (المطالبة بالعباءة، ارتداء العباة، الظفر بالعباءة ، الفوز بالعباءة). They didn't observe all three criteria as these equivalents were unclear, unnatural in this context and also inaccurate because text producer used this evaluative noun (mantle) refers to (a position of responsibility). But those students seem to have used wrong meaning of "mantle" as covering, or a layer of something that covers a surface. Such inappropriate renditions may indicate a lack of communicative competence on the part of those students. As a result, these equivalents violated all three criteria, as they are not understood by the TL reader, unacceptable in this context and also distorted the intended meaning of the text producer. In this sense, a breakdown of communication takes place. Furthermore, the student translator (T4) rendered the collocation (claim the mantle) as (الترشح للانتخابات الرئاسية المقبلة). It seems that he adopted a paraphrasing technique because he didn't find appropriate equivalent collocation in (TL). This equivalent observed clarity and naturalness criteria but it violated the accuracy criterion because there is an addition to the SL text and also in comparing with TL text it was obviously seen that this translation was unfaithful to the SL and to the intentionality of the text producer. Other student translators as (T5, T7 and T10) rendered this collocation as (تولي الرئاسة). They observed all three criteria as they rendered this collocation to the most appropriate pragmatic equivalent clearly.

EX.12. Despite all his **whining and wailing** Donald Trump's presidency will end on January 20, 2021. ( Text2,Line 1)

In this example, we have another type of collocation that is formed by two evaluative nouns. At the macro level this collocation is used by the text producer after explicit concessive device (despite), (see Text 2, Line1) to introduce a thesis of counter argumentation. By using this collocation, the text producer expresses his negative attitude towards Trump. Consider the following table that shows the renditions provided by the students

T	TL	Clarity	Naturalness	Accuracy	Appropriateness
T1	اصرار ومحاولات ترامب الفاشلة لقلب نتائج الانتخابات	+	+	-	-
T2	نحيب و عويل	+	-	-	-
T3	نحيب و صراخ	+	-	-	-
T4	رفض واستياء	+	+	+	+
T5	نحيب و عويل	+	-	-	-
T6	عويل	+	-	-	-
T7	نشيح و عويل	+	-	-	-
T8	سخط واستياء	+	+	+	+
T9	نحيب	+	-	-	-
T10	رفض	+	+	-	-

**Table (12) Analysis of collocation**

Some of the student translators as (T2,T3,T5 and T7) rendered this collocation as (نشيح و عويل، نحيب و صراخ ، نحيب و عويل). Those translators adopted literal translation. Although these equivalents were clear to the TL readers but they violated naturalness and accuracy criteria, as they did not contextualize with political argumentative texts. It seems that those translators adopted literal translation to render this collocation to the TL without paying attention to the co-text and context in which it is said. Other student translators as (T6,T9, and T10) rendered the collocation (whining and wailing) as individual lexical item in the TL as (عويل، رفض، نحيب). They might not be able to find appropriate equivalents to the SL collocations or they concerned with “correctness” rather than “appropriateness”. Furthermore, these equivalents reduced the intended meaning as there is an omission in the ST. These translations may weaken and deplete the evaluativeness of argumentation and its effectiveness. Thus, the equivalents (نحيب ، عويل) were clear, but unnatural in this context and inaccurate translation. Whereas, the equivalent (رفض) maintained clarity and naturalness criteria. Moreover, translator (T1) rendered (whining and wailing) as اصرار ومحاولاته لقلب نتائج الانتخابات. This translator adopted paraphrasing in rendering this collocation. He observed clarity and naturalness criteria as an original text but he did not observe accuracy, as there was a change in the negative attitude of the text producer towards Trump. It is worth noting that this technique (paraphrasing) is the last resort that should be adopted by the translator as indicated by Newmark(1988). Finally, the

appropriate renderings were successfully produced by student translators (T4 and T8) as (سخط واستياء ، رفض واستياء). These students captured the pragmatic equivalence of this collocation which observed all three criteria as they rendered the strong effect and negative evaluative meaning intended by the text producer clearly.

EX.13. After four years of President Donald Trump’s bald –faced lies, juvenile cruelty and **perilous volatility**, it was certainly an appealing promise. ( Text1, Line3).

In this example, collocation is formed by the evaluative adjective (perilous) and evaluative noun (volatility). This collocation is used by the text producer to support his main claim at the macro level of this counter argument. It is obvious that the text producer used this collocation to evaluate Trump negatively in order to evoke the rejections of the readers and persuade them that Trumpism makes America’s normalcy is a delusion. This type of collocation (adjective+ noun) is usually rendered to its identical Arabic equivalent (noun+ adjective). Consider the following table that shows the renditions provided by the students.

T	TL	Clarity	Naturalness	Accuracy	Appropriateness
T1	التقلبات الخطيرة	-	-	-	-
T2	التقلبات الخطيرة	-	-	-	-
T3	المزاجية القاتلة	+	+	+	+
T4	التقلبات المحفوف بالمخاطر	-	-	-	-
T5	التقلبات الخطيرة	-	-	-	-
T6	المزاجية القاتلة	+	+	+	+
T7	التقلبات الخطيرة	-	-	-	-
T8	المزاجية القاتلة	+	+	+	+
T9	التقلبات الخطيرة	-	-	-	-
T10	التقلبات الخطيرة	-	-	-	-

**Table (13) Analysis of collocation**

Most of the student translators adopted literal translation. They rendered this collocation (perilous volatility) as (تقلبات محفوفة بالمخاطر ، تقلبات خطيرة). Those translators did not observe all three criteria as these equivalents were not understood clearly, the reader maybe wonders what is the meaning of volatility, unnatural as those translators used the plural in the TT instead of ST’s singular lexical item and also these equivalents inaccurate as the intended meaning was neutralized and reduced. These inappropriate equivalents, mentioned above, digress the argumentative text because the intended meaning is shifted from evaluative to a neutral one and ,consequently, intentionality and acceptability are violated. In this connection , Farghal (2015 :4 ) states that “Failure to cope with

collocations in the SLT results in mitigating the evaluativeness parameter, thus weakening the line of argumentation in the TLT”. Other translators as ( T3 ,T6 and T8) have successfully rendered this collocation to its appropriate pragmatic equivalence ( مزاجية ( قاتلة).Those translators observed all three criteria. This equivalent was clear, natural and convey the evaluative intended meaning accurately.

#### 4.4. Analysis of modality

EX.14. After four years of President Donald Trump’s bald-faced lies, juvenile bullying gratuitous cruelty, and perilous volatility, it was **certainly** an appealing promise. (Text 1, Line 4)

The text producer used this epistemic modal adverb to assert his main claim and to make judgements for the acceptability of his proposition in a broader sense. Further, the employment of this assertive marker makes the discourse more coherent and reflects the text producer’s view and attitude towards this proposition and his readiness to defend his claim in an argumentative way. Therefore, in the previous proposition he used evaluative adjectives negatively against Trump as evidence to justify his certainty. Whereas in the following proposition (see Text1, Line 3) he used the adversative conjunctive (but) to oppose his claim. So, “certainly” in this example functions as a strong agreement of this proposition. The following table shows how student translators rendered it.

T	TL	Clarity	Naturalness	Accuracy	Appropriateness
T1	من المؤكد	+	+	+	+
T2	من المؤكد	+	+	+	+
T3	من المؤكد	+	+	+	+
T4	لا بد	+	-	-	-
T5	من المؤكد	+	+	+	+
T6	بلا شك	+	+	+	+
T7	بالتأكيد	+	+	+	+
T8	بلا شك	+	+	+	+
T9	Untranslated	-	-	-	-
T10	Untranslated	-	-	-	-

**Table (14) Analysis of modality**

The translation provided by (T4) was inappropriate. He rendered (certainly) as (لا بد). Although this equivalent is one of the emphatic devices in Arabic, yet it is used for necessity rather than certainty (Farghal, 2012: 104). In this state, this translator used a

deontic modality instead of an epistemic one. Thus, the intentionality of the text producer was changed and the accurate meaning was not conveyed accurately. However, this equivalent is clear to the reader and natural in this context. Other student translators (T9 and T10) skipped this adverbial therefore; they did not observe all three criteria, as they did not convey the message of the ST. They violated the accuracy criterion as they ignored and reduced ST message by omission (certainly). Finally, translators (T1,T2,T3T5,T6,T7,T8) have successfully rendered (certainly ) to its appropriate equivalence. They rendered it as (بالتأكيد,من المؤكد,بلاشك) which maintained all three criteria as these equivalents convey the message of the ST to the TT clearly, naturally and accurately.

EX.15. The idea that Trump himself will run again is **unlikely**, given his age. (Text 3, Line 11)

The text producer used this epistemic modal adjective of probability to support his opposition. Probability refers to how likely the sentence is to be true or how the sentence is equivalent to either yes or no. Furthermore, the probability scale represents the degrees of probability as (possible, probable, certain) which means that possibility is the lower degree while certainty is the higher one. In the above example, the text producer intended to evoke the reader's doubts that despite the ending of Trump's presidency, he might be run again in 2024. Halliday (1985) asserts that using epistemic expressions refers to the presence of doubts. Thus, the writer here lessens his commitment to the truth value of this proposition; in other words, using uncertainty epistemic adjective reflects the writer's hedging. Consider the following table that shows the renditions provided by the students.

T	TL	Clarity	Naturalness	Accuracy	Appropriateness
T1	غير مرغوبة	+	+	-	-
T2	من غير المرجح	+	-	-	-
T3	مستبعدة	+	+	+	+
T4	من غير المرجح	+	-	-	-
T5	غير مرغوبة	+	+	-	-
T6	غير محتملة	+	-	+	-
T7	غير ممكن	+	-	+	-
T8	غير محتملة	+	-	+	-
T9	غير واردة	+	+	-	+
T10	مستبعدة	+	+	+	+

**Table (15) Analysis of modality**

Most of student translators as ( T1,T2, ,T4,T5,T6,T7 ,T8and T9) adopted literal translation. They rendered “unlikely” as (غير مرغوبة، غير محتملة، غير ممكنة، )These equivalents were clear but ,unnatural equivalents as they sound unnatural to the reader and unacceptable to the grammarians and specialists of the Arabic language .It seems that they chose literally appropriate equivalent to “probability” term in English. Therefore, they did

not observe the accuracy criterion as the intended meaning is weakened and depleted. Moreover, the translators (T2, T3 and T4) changed the syntactic structure of SL ignoring that this syntactic difference would lead to semantic difference. They rendered the above sentence as *من غير المرجح ان يرشح نفسه ترامب مجددا عام 2024*. This translation leads to violation of accuracy. However, the renditions produced by ( T9 and T10) as *( غير ( واردة، مستبعدة* ) were appropriate renditions as they considered all three criteria .They realized clear, natural, accurate renditions and the appropriate pragmatic equivalence of the epistemic modal adjective “unlikely”. This is what referred by Jarjour (2006:134) that “modal system in Arabic, unlike systems of other grammatical categories like "verbs and nouns", is mostly lexical rather than grammatical; so any expression that holds a modal meaning regardless of its grammatical category can be part of the system such as: particles, verbs, adverbs, prepositional phrases, etc.”

EX.16. The economic trauma **will not** heal overnight ,and without comprehensive assistance at this critical time of need –including support for cash-strapped state and local governments –the pain will be prolonged. (Text 3, Line 14)

In this example, the text producer used the modal verb “will” in this counter argumentation to support his opposition about the resulted deep scars from Trump’s presidency and evoke reader’s doubts about Biden’s ability to confront and solve the problems left by Trump era. The modal verb “will” expresses a high degree of certainty which is closest to factuality (Farghal et al, 2015). It is obvious that the text producer used this certainty modal verb to support the argument and make it more believable. Moreover, he used “will” with “not” to negate far future. Consider the following table to show how students provided it.

T	TL	Clarity	Naturalness	Accuracy	Appropriateness
T1	لم تلتئم	+	-	-	-
T2	لا تلتئم	+	-	-	-
T3	لم تلتئم	+	-	-	-
T4	لا تلتئم	+	-	-	-
T5	لن تشفى	+	+	+	+
T6	لن تختفي	+	+	+	+
T7	لن تلتئم	+	+	+	+
T8	لن تسترد عافيتها	+	+	+	+
T9	لم تلتئم	+	-	-	-
T10	لم تلتئم	+	-	-	-

**Table (16) Analysis of modality**

Student translators ( T1,T2 T3,T4,T9, andT10) omitted “will” and successfully replaced it by simple present form in the TT, but they used inappropriate negation particle

which could not maintain the negation futurity and certainty function of “will”. Those students rendered “will not heal “ as “لم تلتئم ، لا تلتئم ”. They might not have knowledge about the functions of these negation particles in Arabic and their effects in the text . The particle “لا” negates past and present intention and the particle (لم) negates past intention. Such equivalence contradict the meaning of the TT .Thus, they violated accuracy as the intended meaning is distorted and not conveyed accurately.

Other students as ( T5,T6,T7 and T8) rendered (will not ) to the particle of future ( لن ) which is the appropriate equivalence as it negates the future intention and it is much more evaluative compared to ( لا and لم ). In this sense, (لن) could be the most appropriate equivalent that captures all three criteria of appropriate translation.

EX.17. Biden and his advisers **may be** infinitely more competent than Trump, but the future of transatlanticism will depend in no small measure on what Europe-and particularly Germany-does in the coming years. (Text 2, Line 15)

The text producer used this epistemic modal auxiliary to support his claim in the previous proposition, that Europeans could make a mistake when they cede the responsibility for the transatlantic relationship to the Biden. According to the text producer’s view, there is possibility that Biden is more competent than Trump rather than certainty. In other words, by using "may be" the writer is not committing himself to the truthfulness of what he is saying. He does not present it as a “fact”, but as something which possibly or may be true. In this way, the text producer presents informed opinions, rather than objective truth. This rhetorical strategy shows the willingness of the text producer to negotiate with readers who hold a different view. In other words, it could be said that he attempts to show that the proposition is open to other possible interpretations. Indeed, this calls for pragmatic explanation. In the above example, the modal auxiliary “may” followed by the auxiliary verb “ be” which is used for expressing the possibility meaning of modality. In this sense, it functions as epistemic modality of possibility is the weak certainty of epistemic modality according to many authors as (Lyons 1977; Coates 1983; and Palmer 1986, among others) who classified epistemic modals in terms of certainty as “the flight leaves at midnight” and possibility as “the flight may leave at midnight”. (Farghal ,2015:63). Consider the following table that shows the renditions provided by the students

T	TL	Clarity	Naturalness	Accuracy	Appropriateness
T1	قد يكون	+	+	+	+
T2	قد يكون	+	+	+	+
T3	قد يكون	+	+	+	+
T4	من المؤكد	-	-	-	-
T5	سيكون	-	-	-	-
T6	قد يكون	+	+	+	+
T7	من الممكن	+	-	+	-
T8	من الممكن	+	-	+	-

T9	سيكون	-	-	-	-
T10	من المؤكد	-	-	-	-

**Table (17) Analysis of modality**

Unjustifiably, student translators (T4, T5, T9 and T10) rendered “may be” as (سيكون، (من المؤكد). These equivalents violated all three criteria because the text producer in ST used “may be” in order to minimize his commitment to the truth value of the proposition, whereas the translator maximized the text producer’s commitment in the (TL) text. Therefore, these renditions are inappropriate. Student translators (T7 and T8) rendered “may” to its literally meaning "من الممكن" which is inappropriate equivalence as it is although clear and rendered the intended meaning (possibility) but it is unnatural. As mentioned in the previous section (see 3.3: The model adopted) that Larson claimed that naturalness is achieved when the translator used the appropriate style and grammar in the TT. Therefore to render the possibility function of the modal auxiliary (may) the particle "قد" is required. Aziz (1989) indicates that when the particle ( قد) comes with the imperfect verb, it functions as weak possibility modality. In addition, this equivalent reproduces the pragmatic equivalence of ST. Accordingly, student translators (T1,T2,T3, and T6) provided the appropriate equivalence (قد يكون) which was preserved all three criteria of appropriateness.

### **3.5. Findings**

The following findings resulted from the linguistic and functional analysis of the SL and TL micro level items (verbs, conjunctives, collocations, and modality expressions) depending on the three criteria of clarity, naturalness and accuracy suggested by Larson (1984).The appropriateness of TL was examined according to these criteria. The analysis revealed that there are several problematic areas of capturing the pragmatic equivalence of the evaluative items that led to inappropriate translations of the argumentative texts as illustrated in the followings:

1. As for evaluative verbs ,translators' unawareness of the evaluative verbs used in argumentative texts, which are characterized by strong persuasive linguistic items, results in neutralize the text .Some student translators rendered evaluative verbs to a neutral equivalence. They failed to find the appropriate pragmatic equivalence which conveys the evaluativeness of the argumentative text (see ex.1). Other students did not cohere with the co-text and context of situation(see ex. 2).
2. As for conjunctives, several student translators confused linguistic form of conjunctives with their rhetorical function .In other words, they missed the pragmatic meanings of conjunctives (see ex.8). In this sense, they failed to identify the pragmatic force of textual organization. Other students failed to make a distinction between the functions of concluding, adversative, and additive conjunctives (see example, 6). As for implicit conjunctives most of student translators kept them implicit in TT which led to unnaturalness in the TT and disturbance the flow of discourse (see ex. 9 and10).

3. As for collocation, the translators need to have communicative competence in order to render collocation in the SL to its appropriate equivalence in the TL. The analysis of collocation renditions has shown that most translators adopted literal translation which seemed unnatural and weakened cohesiveness of TT and its texture. Further, such translation would deplete the thread of argumentation(see example,1and example,3 ) . Adding unjustifiable expressions by opting for paraphrasing ,which should be the last resort for the translator, of collocation in the TT or omitting one of the collocates in the TT would violate the accuracy criterion (see ex.1).

4. As for modality, adding or omitting modality expressions result in inappropriate rendition of the text producer's intention and attitude (see ex. 1). Furthermore, modality is confusing; some students rendered hedges into certainty markers (see ex.17).

The following table illustrates the statistical percentage of the appropriate and inappropriate renditions of students:

No.	SL	TL	Percentage of Approp. Rendering	Percentage of Inapprop.
1	Argue	يرى	20%	80%
2	Jostling	يتنافس	40%	60%
3	Abandoned	تتصل منها	20%	80%
4	Muster	تحقيق	50%	50%
5	Pledged	تعهد	80%	20%
6	Nonetheless	مع ذلك	30%	70%
7	But	لكن	60%	40%
8	Likewise	كذلك ان	10%	90%
9	ϕ	بالتالي	20%	80%
10	ϕ	الفاء السببية	20%	80%
11	claim the mantle	المطالبة بالرياسة	30%	70%
12	Whining and wailing	سخط واستياء	20%	80%
13	perilous volatility	المزاجية الفاتلة	30%	70%
14	Certainly	من المؤكد	70%	30%
15	Unlikely	مستبعدة	30%	70%
16	will not	لن	40%	60%
17	May be	قد تكون	40%	60%

**Table (28) The Appropriateness and Inappropriateness of the Student's Renditions**

## 5. Conclusions

Based on the detailed analysis, this study concludes the following:

- 1- The factors that affect the intentionality and acceptability of the renditions of micro level elements are the context of situation, text type, and text producer's attitude. The translator should take into consideration all these factors in rendering micro level items to make his/her translation natural, understandable and to convey the intended meaning accurately. Thus, appropriate renditions of micro level elements uphold the standards of intentionality and acceptability.
- 2- The analysis of this study shows that inappropriate renditions of evaluative items (at micro level ) lead to distort and weaken the strategies of argumentative text at macro level. In this sense, Such inappropriate renditions digressed the function of argumentation into exposition .
- 3- Argumentative text has certain strategies which are different from other text types. These strategies organize the whole structure of the text as (main claim, support or refute the claim, conclusion). In turn, micro level items in a text serve the purposes of the way the macro structures are organized. If the translator renders these micro elements inappropriately ,the macro structure of argumentative text will be blurred . In this sense, micro level and macro level go hand in hand .
- 4- Evaluativeness is an important feature of argumentation used by the text producer to convince and change the attitude or stance of the reader. Therefore, the translator's task is to perceive and recognize this feature in order to grasp the intended meaning and , subsequently, to render a communicatively acceptable translation of the text.
- 5- Appropriate rendering of evaluative lexical items in argumentative text is not conditioned by syntactic and semantic equivalence between the (SL) and (TL) , but by the need to produce similar reactions in the TT, to use Hartman's (1980:27 ) terminology, situationally equivalent text. This implies that a translated text which observes the rendition of evaluative lexical items could still be a failure if the relevant pragmatic aspects of that text are not properly addressed. Thus, pragmatics of discourse in the SL should be born in mind with the aim of producing appropriate pragmatic equivalence of evaluative lexical item in the (TL).
- 6- The appropriate rendition of evaluative items lies in the appropriate rendition of propositional content. In this sense, attitudinal meaning is as important as ideational meaning.
- 7-The translation of argumentative text typological function is a problematic area and , consequently , the translators should be well aware of its embedded pragmatic meaning.

#### **References**

- Al-Shunnag, M.(2014). College of Arts and Social Sciences University of Salford, Salford, UK. Ph.D. Thesis.
- Baker, M. (1992). *In Other Words: A Course Books on Translation* .London: Routledge.

- Catford, J. (1965). *A Linguistic Theory of Translation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Coates, J. (1983). *The Semantics of the Modal Auxiliaries*, London: Croom Helm.
- de Beaugrande, R. and Dressler, W. (1981), *Introduction to Text Linguistics*. London: Longman.
- Farghal, M. (2012). *Advanced Issues in Arabic-English Translation Studies*. Kuwait: Kuwait University Press.
- Farghal, M. et al ,(2015). *Papers in Arabic/English Translation Studies 1. An Applied Perspective*. Jordanian Translators' Association(JTA).
- Farghal, M.(1995). "Naturalness and the Notion of Cohesion in EFL Writing Classes". *IRAL*,(30): 45-50.
- Fathy, S(1993). *An investigation into the effect of mistranslating Arabic Conjunctions on the Typological Focus of Argumentative Texts*.(Unpublished M.A. Thesis),University of Yarmouk.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1985) *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Hatim, B (1997). *Communication Across Cultures. Translation Theory and Contrastive Text Linguistics*. Exeter: University of Exeter Press.
- Hatim, B (1991). "The Pragmatics of Argumentation in Arabic: The Rise and Fall of a Text Type". *Text*, 11, pp.189-199.
- Hatim, B., & Mason, I. (1997). *Discourse and the Translator*. London: Longman.
- House, J. 2015. *Translation quality assessment. Past and present*. New York: Routledge.
- Jakobson, R. (1959). *On Linguistic Aspects of Translation*. In Brower, R. (ed.) *On Translation*. Harvard University Press, pp. 232-239.
- Jarjour, M. (2006). *A Relevance Theoretic Account of the Translation of Ideological Assumptions in the Language of the News with Specific Reference to Translation from English into Arabic*. : University of Salford.
- Larson, M. L. 1984/1998. *Meaning-based Translation: A Guide to Cross- Language Equivalence*. Larham: University Press of America.
- Lyons, J. (1977). *Semantics*. Vol. II. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Munday, J. (2016). *Introducing Translation studies, Theories and Applications*, 3rd ed. USA& Canada: Routledge.
- Newmark, P. (1988). *A Textbook of Translation*. London: Prentice Hall.
- Newmark, P. (1991). *About Translation*. London: Multilingual Matters.
- Nida, E. (1964). *Towards a Science of Translating*. Leiden: Brill.
- Palmer, F.R. (1986). *Mood and Modality*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G., & Svartvik, J. (1973). *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. New York: Longman.
- Van dijk, T.A. (1981). *Studies in the Pragmatics of Discourse*. The Hague: Mouton

## **Appendices**

### **Text 1**

#### **America's Normalcy Delusion**

US President-elect Joe Biden made a "return to normalcy" one of his election campaign's

leitmotifs. After four years of President Donald Trump's bald-faced lies, juvenile bullying, gratuitous cruelty, and perilous volatility, it was certainly an appealing promise. But, as Biden himself has admitted, the world is not what it was in January 2017. To be sure, Biden can certainly restore a sense of decorum and decency to the US presidency. But on concrete policy issues – especially foreign-policy issues – the status quo *ante* will be far more difficult, if not impossible, to revive.

Biden has pledged to recommit to some of the Obama-era international agreements that Trump abandoned, beginning with the Paris climate agreement and the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA). Critics argue that the JCPOA imposes insufficient limits on Iran's nuclear-enrichment capabilities, and leaves out critical issues—namely, Iran's ballistic missiles and, more important, its support for the region's anti-Israeli, anti-American forces (like Hezbollah) or regimes (such as in Syria). Without some changes, the agreement will most likely remain moribund.

## **Text 2**

### **How Biden Can Restore Multilateralism Unilaterally**

After four years of the Trump administration undermining global governance arrangements, President-elect Joe Biden will certainly have his work cut out for him. Nonetheless, there are several actions the new administration can take immediately to reaffirm America's commitment to multilateral institutions and the rule of law.

There is so much to celebrate with the new year. The arrival of safe, effective COVID-19 vaccines means that there is light at the end of the pandemic tunnel (though the next few months will be horrific). Equally important, America's mendacious, incompetent, mean-spirited president will be replaced by his polar opposite: a man of decency, honesty, and professionalism. But we should harbor no illusions about what President-elect Joe Biden will face in office. There will be deep scars left from the Trump presidency, and from a pandemic that the outgoing administration did so little to fight. The economic trauma will not heal overnight, and without comprehensive assistance at this critical time of need – including support for cash-strapped state and local governments – the pain will be prolonged. True, the US Constitution and those of its 50 states survived and protected American democracy from the worst of Trump's malign impulses. But the fact that 74 million Americans voted for another four years of his grotesque misrule leaves a chill.

## **Text 3**

### **It's Europe's Turn to Reject Trump**

Despite all his whining and wailing, Donald Trump's presidency will end on January 20, 2021. He will be history; but, sadly, his political legacy will endure. With almost 75 million Americans voting for him (and 82 million for Joe Biden), Trump mobilized an extraordinary and unexpected level of support among a base that will continue to steer the Republican Party toward his brand of nationalist isolationism. Like a revenant, Trumpism will haunt US politics for a long time to come, and some version of it will be on the ballot

again in 2024 – that much is already clear. To vanquish Trumpism, Democrats needed to muster a “blue wave” of electoral victories all the way down the ballot. They didn’t. The idea that Trump himself will run again is unlikely, given his age. But younger populist heirs are already jostling to claim the mantle.

Europeans could make no greater mistake than to lean back comfortably and cede responsibility for the transatlantic relationship to the Biden administration. Biden and his advisers may be infinitely more competent than Trump, but the future of transatlanticism will depend in no small measure on what Europe – and particularly Germany – does in the coming years. Even with Biden in the White House, there will be no going back to the comfortable old dependencies that long defined the transatlantic relationship. After four years of Trump, Europeans know what is at stake. Likewise, continuing to harbor any illusions about China would be both naive and dangerous. There is no better alternative to a renewed transatlanticism. By spurning Trump and electing Biden, America has delivered. As Americans say, the ball is now in Europe’s court.