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Abstract

The present project is a case study of the Arabic version of the international English-language magazine Newsweek, namely of the translation of two constant features: a main column page and a media celebrities news page. The purpose is to examine the two features from a translation assessment perspective over a period of about four months. The selection of the two genres is informed by the type of discourse employed in each, that is, the evaluative vs. the expository type (Hatim & Mason 1990). The corpus will be subjected to a close examination aimed at detecting perceptible errors (Hickey 2003), which, lacking naturalness, draw attention to themselves in the target language. The errors are first divided into general categories such as structural, lexical and discoursal features, then they undergo finer classification and are subsequently assigned to sub-categories like grammatical usage, collocations, cohesive ties, etc. The analysis of the data shows that the Arabic Newsweek version suffers from a variety of local and global perceptible errors relating to lexical, discoursal and grammatical usage. In terms of genre analysis, these perceptible features present themselves more frequently and seriously in argumentative/evaluative discourse than in expository/non-evaluative discourse.
1. BACKGROUND OF STUDY

Traditionally, emphasis has been placed on the translation of authoritative texts such as literary works and religious books (for example, see Nida 1964 and Newmark 1981; 1988). However, with the emergence of translation studies as a legitimate branch of the larger discipline of applied linguistics, the focus has been modified to include a plethora of discourse genres. These include journalistic material (both editorials and news reports), advertisements, and manuals (for example, see Hatim and Mason 1990 and Hatim 2000).

Despite some methodological differences, most authors view translation as transferring the message or meaning of a source text into a target text (Jackobson 1959; Nida 1964, 1969, 1977; Kachru 1982; Newmark 1981, 1988; De Waard and Nida 1986; Larson 1984; Farghal 1993). Notably, the disagreements do not relate to the content but rather to the vehicle (form) by which the message is conveyed, i.e., the type of equivalence which the translator adopts, for example formal (Catford 1965), functional (De Waard and Nida 1986), or ideational (Farghal 1993).

Debates on various types of equivalence soon lose their appeal if they are not supplemented by a theory of context. The option for one type of equivalence rather than another is regarded as a correlative of the dynamic nature of contextual factors, including text type, audience and author. For instance, a creative metaphor should be relayed intact when translating a poem, regardless of the fact that it may be hard to process in the target language. The same metaphor, however, will call for a different treatment when encountered in a newspaper editorial, where the audience rather than the text type comes in as the most relevant contextual factor.

As an act of communication, translation or interlingual communication, just like intralingual communication, involves, ipso facto, the presence of two parties: a producer and a receiver. The receiver, who is either a hearer (in the case of interpreting) or a reader (in the case of translating), may make judgments as to the quality of the oral or written input he/she receives. In most real-life situations, these judgments are passed independently of a source text; that is, the target text is evaluated in its own right as an existing text that communicates meaning autonomously in relevant contexts. Some receivers may not even perceive that what they have heard or read had involved translation activity, simply because the act of communication often overrides, and sometimes even omits, the tacitly superimposed translational intervention.

However, the communicatively suppressed translational action comes to the forefront in scholarly and/or academic endeavors. As a result,
systematic ‘translation quality assessment’ has emerged as an important area in translation studies. Given the nature of translation activity, one may not be surprised by the fact that existing models of translation assessment are source-text oriented (Tirkkonen-Condit 1989). This orientation often manifests itself in correspondence between forms (Catford 1965), effects (Nida 1964), or text-types (Reiss 2000). Taking the source text as a point of reference, Newmark (1988), for example, bases translation quality on the referential and pragmatic accuracy as key parameters of the target text. Similarly, House (1997) offers a model of translation assessment founded on a double-binding relationship between the target text, on the one hand and the source text and the target culture, on the other. Clearly, priority is given to the source text and its cultural environment within these models (for more details, see Burkhanov 2003: 108-113).

Taking the English source text as a point of departure, Abdel-Hafiz (2002) selectively surveys the Arabic Newsweek for translational mismatches. Some of his examples come under imperceptible errors because they sound natural in Arabic despite the fact that they may deviate from the intended meaning in the source text. Some others are wrongly analyzed in the heat of searching for faults with the translation. As for the methodology, it confuses concepts with types of errors, e.g. error analysis sections are presented under rubrics such as formal equivalence, functional equivalence, managing, etc. as well as error types including linkage and grammatical problems. Added to this is the fact that there is no genre and statistical analysis of the data in this study.

In a more practical development, Hickey (2003) presents a model of translation assessment based on potential judgments of lay readers. He divides translation features into imperceptible and perceptible. Imperceptible features escape the attention of the reader either because of their high quality in terms of accuracy and/or appropriateness or because of the reader’s inability to access the original. By contrast, perceptible features are those which a lay reader “would, or could, consciously notice and suspect of being erroneous because they somehow or other draw attention to themselves” (p. 72). Perceptible and imperceptible errors may seem to correspond to ‘overt’ and ‘covert’ errors (House 1977, 1997), but, in fact, they differ from them in that they do not represent a double-binding relationship between the target text and the source text. That is, lay readers can figure out perceptible errors without making reference to the source text. Based on this important distinction, we have opted for Hickey’s rather than House’s dichotomy.
OBJECTIVES OF STUDY
The present study aims to examine media translation into Arabic from a translation assessment perspective. Specifically, the study will examine the Arabic translation of two constant Newsweek features in 15 recent issues of the Newsweek in Arabic (published by Kuwait Dar Al-Watan in collaboration with Newsweek International). The two features, a main column page and a media celebrities news page, are meant to represent argumentative and expository discourse, respectively. It should be noted that the Newsweek news material is essentially evaluative, as this publication is a weekly magazine rather than a daily newspaper, where expository news reporting and news evaluation are quite common. This being the case, the closest segment to expository genre we could find is the media celebrities news page. It is hoped that this contrast, though atypical, will bring out important insights into the type and frequency of perceptible translational errors in the two genres.

The survey intends to examine perceptible translation features as perceived by the two researchers functioning, so to speak, as lay readers. These perceptible errors are assumed to be the cause of the oft-heard complaint made by the Arabic Newsweek readers about the quality of the Arabic used in terms of accuracy and/or appropriateness. The purpose is multi-faceted. First, the perceptible features will be specified and divided into general categories of errors, including grammatical, lexical, and discoursal problems. Second, each general category will be presented in sub-categories, for example, lexical problems will be sub-divided into errors relating to individual word meaning, collocations, and circumlocutions, among other things. Finally, a statistical analysis will be presented to show the frequency of each general category and sub-category in the two genres.

SIGNIFICANCE OF STUDY
Much work has been done on theory building in translation studies in general (Nida 1964; Catford 1965; Newmark 1981; Larson 1982; De Waard & Nida 1986; Hatim & Mason 1991; Bell 1991; Neubert & Shreve 1992; Baker 1992; and Hatim 2000). Similarly, a large amount of research has been conducted with respect to English/Arabic/English translation. In this vein, some studies have focused on researchers’ intuitions, which are based on specific contextualized or de-contextualized material from the two languages (Al-Najjar 1984; Mouakket 1986; Saraireh 1990; and Farghal 1991, 1992, 1993, 1994). Others have drawn insights from empirical data stemming from student translations (Shunnaq & Farghal 1992; Khalil 1993; Shakir & Farghal 1994; Farghal 1995, 2003; Hatim & Mason 1997). Some other studies have had recourse to existing translations, especially literary
ones as a source of translation criticism (see, for example, El-Yasin 1996; Aziz 1999; Farghal and Naji 2000).

Clearly, there has been a great deal of research about theory-oriented translation models and more practice-oriented translation criticism. The presence of media translation in this voluminous literature does not go beyond anecdotal reference to de-contextualized segments from here and there, despite the fact that media translation is probably the most practicable type of translation in this age - the age of technology, news agencies, Internet and globalization. From here comes the serious need for a fully-fledged study on media translation in order to explore its norms and quality. As for the choice of the Newsweek, it need not be explained, for this widely distributed international weekly is one of the more influential magazines in the world.

4. METHODOLOGY

4.1 Material
The input material for this project consists of two constant full-page features: a main column page ‘World View’ written regularly by Fred Zakaria, who is a native speaker of American English and a ‘Media Celebrities News’ page which is anonymously compiled. In the first magazine feature, the picture of the columnist is conspicuously displayed in the top right-hand corner in the English original and in the top left-hand corner in the Arabic translated version. The second feature clearly displays pictures of the media celebrities on top of their news segments. The choice of the first segment is motivated by the fact that editorials of this type usually involve argumentation that necessitates the employment of a language density not required in straightforward news reports.

Therefore, column features, being highly evaluative, are potential ground for translation problems, a prediction that has been confirmed by pilot browsing of some copies of the Newsweek in Arabic by the present researchers. As for the selection of the second segment, it is meant to represent expository discourse in the absence of non-evaluative news reports in Newsweek. The assumption here is that the Media Celebrities News genre, largely being non-evaluative, may involve less language density and subsequently a different picture of perceptible errors.

4.2 Procedure
After the acquisition of 15 recent issues of the Arabic Newsweek along with their English originals, the Arabic corpus was carefully examined for perceptible features, which then underwent categorization and statistical analysis. In the course of analyzing the data, reference was made to the English versions only when need had arisen to strengthen arguments and draw further insights.
Perceptible features were categorized into three main categories: lexical, discoursal and grammatical. Lexical errors included wrong collocations and idioms, wrong words, and circumlocutions and repetitions. Discoursal errors fell within two categories: conjunction errors and phraseology errors. Grammatical errors featured problems with prepositions or pronouns, subject verb agreement, word form, and articles, among others.

4.3. Translator’s Background
Two teams of translators are involved in the translation process; the first is the Washington DC team. This team consists of a group of Arabic native-speakers who are not necessarily based in Washington but are in charge of a first draft translation of *Newsweek*. The second team is based in Kuwait and consists of translators who are also Arabic native-speakers with a bachelor degree in Arabic language and literature. This team is responsible for proofreading/editing the first draft version of the *Newsweek*. Kuwait-based translators are not concerned with the correctness of the English-Arabic translation but more with the correctness/grammaticality of the Arabic text.

5. RESULTS
The number of perceptible errors in the whole corpus was 266. the World View page had 214 (80.45%) errors while the Media Celebrities News page contained only 52 (19.55%) errors. The maximum number of errors per page in the World View data was 22 against 6 in the Media Celebrities News data. A relatively similar ratio obtained regarding the minimum number of errors per page, viz. 7 errors in the World View data against only 1 error in the Media Celebrities News data. The overall breakdown of errors shows that discoursal features were the most frequent at 43.8%, lexical features came in second place at 35.7%, and finally grammatical features accounted for 20.5%. Pie graph 1 shows this distribution.

Overall Distribution of Types of Errors in the Corpus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discoursal errors</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexical errors</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammatical errors</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
However a different pattern of distribution of features obtained across the two genres, both in terms of typology and frequency. Typologically, discoursal features came first in the World View data at 48.13%, while lexical features were the most frequent in the Media Celebrities News data at 48.1%. By contrast, discoursal errors occupied second place in the Media Celebrities News data at 28.86% while lexical errors assumed second place in the World View data at 32.7%. As for grammatical features, they came third in both genres at 19.17% in World View data vs. 23% in Media Celebrities News data.

In terms of frequency in the corpus, features in the three categories are remarkably more frequent in the World View data than in the Media Celebrities News data, viz. discoursal features accounted for 38.72% vs. 5.64%, lexical features for 26.3% vs. 9.4%, and grammatical features for 15.41% vs. 4.51, respectively. The distribution of errors across the two genres is shown in bar graph 2 below.

### Breakdown of Errors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>World View</th>
<th>Stars News</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lexical errors</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discoursal errors</td>
<td>48.42%</td>
<td>42.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammatical errors</td>
<td>48.13%</td>
<td>28.86%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Within the category of lexical errors, wrong collocation/idioms scored the highest frequency at 48.42%, wrong words came second at 42.11%, and finally circumlocution/repetition at 9.47%. Across the two genres, however, wrong words were more frequent than wrong collocations/idioms in the Star News data, viz. wrong words accounted for 56% while wrong collocations/idioms scored 32%. Bar graph 3 below indicates the breakdown of lexical errors across the two genres.
The breakdown of discoursal errors shows two main sub-categories: missing conjunctions and wrong phraseologies. Missing conjunctions were more frequent than wrong phraseologies in the corpus at 69.49% and 30.5%, respectively. Across the two genres, the distribution of discoursal features was quite different, viz. missing conjunctions in the World View data score 66.95% while they only accounted for 2.54% in the Media Celebrities News data. As for wrong phraseologies, they scored 20.34% against 10.17% in the Media Celebrities News data. The bar graph below represents the breakdown of discoursal errors across the two genres.
As for the data on grammatical errors, they contain seven subcategories including a miscellaneous one. Excluding the miscellaneous subcategory, the most frequent type of error involved prepositions at 30.19% and the least frequent error involved pronouns at 7.55%. Across the two genres, wrong/missing prepositions maintained the highest frequency at 29.27% in the World View data against 33.33% in the Media Celebrities News data. Similarly, pronoun errors maintained the lowest frequency at 5.66% in the World View data against 1.89% in the Media Celebrities News data. Bar graph 5 below shows the breakdown of grammatical errors across the two genres.

Finally, a word should be said about zero versus near-zero translatability as represented by citing culture-sensitive material in the source language versus transliteration. The expository text (i.e. the Media Celebrities News page) featured a noticeable employment of zero-translation when the text included names of T.V. programs (e.g. West Wing, The Simpsons, Rock Talk), music albums (e.g. It Had to Be You, 8 Mile, Get Rich or Die Trying), and/or movies (Lion King, Hulk, X Men), as well as titles of books (e.g. When the Women Come Out to Dance) and/or musical plays (e.g. Cabaret, Les Misérables). In some instances, Arabic translation or transliteration would accompany the English text, for example، وَهَلِكَ ‘Pattern Recognition’ would be accompanied with the Arabic translation in brackets، وَهَلِكَ ‘Pattern Recognition’ would be accompanied with the Arabic translation in brackets، and كتاب ‘Halloween’ would be followed by كتاب ‘Halloween’. 

![Breakdown of Grammatical Errors](image-url)
The argumentative text (i.e. World View page), on the other hand, featured the use of transliteration mainly when need arose. Names of magazines, organizations and aeroplanes are all transliterated; for example:

- اخبار وطن، مجلة دي زايت الألمانية، منظمة ميموريان، مؤسسة السافاك، طائرات أف 16 وبريموور

Only two instances of the combined use of both the English and Arabic texts were found in the argumentative text under study, for example:

- كتاب The Gathering Storm was accompanied with
- كتاب Ending the Vietnam war with

6. ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

6.1. Overview

As sampled by the Arabic Newsweek, media translation from English into Arabic suffers from a variety of perceptible errors that seriously affect the quality of translation. Being uninterpretable and/or unnatural, these problematic features draw attention to themselves and, subsequently, cause the target reader to pause and think hard in an attempt to reconstruct the linguistic reality in terms of form and/or content. Alternatively, the reader may opt out by abandoning the engagement altogether. On the one hand, problems in form, despite their being local errors (Hendrickson, 1980), may represent a serious source of annoyance during the decoding process. For example, the employment of a wrong preposition, which is a matter of accuracy, or an odd collocation, which is a matter of appropriateness, in a text may create irritation, confusion or bad impressions in the reader. On the other hand, content problems, being global in nature, often create dismay in readers because the reader cannot come to terms with the meaning of a certain part of the text. In this case, the reader’s inability to figure out meaning is usually caused by the translator’s failure to phrase out or code message properly. In many cases, however, form and content problems interact within some segments, thus effecting more confusion and dismay in target readers.

Looking globally at the data across the two genres, it can be readily observed that evaluative discourse (represented by the World View page) presents more challenging material to media translators than non-evaluative discourse (examplified by the Media Celebrities News page), viz. perceptible errors in the World View page were four times more than those in the Media Celebrities News page (80.45% vs. 19.55). This interesting finding may be attributed to the fact that evaluative discourse involves a language density that correlates with setting the tone rather than setting the scene (as in non-evaluative discourse) for the expression of propositions/ideas. Tone setting, it should be noted, necessitates a heavy
use of conjunctions, collocations and hypotactic structures in an attempt to persuade the reader and bring about a change in his/her attitude. Scene setting, by contrast, is less demanding linguistically, as it mainly involves mere monitoring of states-of-affairs; hence the emphasis is on conveying rather than evaluating information (for more information, see Hatim and Mason, 1990; Renkeman, 1993).

### 6.2 Lexical Errors

Lexical features came in second place claiming 35.7% of the errors in the entire corpus. In terms of genre, lexical errors were the most frequent in the Media Celebrities News data at 48.1%, whereas they scored second place in the World View data at 32.7%. The frequency of sub-types, namely wrong collocations/idioms and wrong words, also differed in terms of genre, viz. wrong collocations/idioms came in first place scoring higher than wrong words which came in second place in the World View data, whereas the reverse obtains in the said sub-types in the Media Celebrities News data. As has been said above, this discrepancy may have to do with the language density across the two genres, where collocations are expected to play a more important role in argumentation or evaluative discourse (for more details, see Johnstone, 1991) than in expository or non-evaluative discourse. The following subsections will illustrate the types of lexical errors committed in the Arabic Newsweek with elaborate examples from the data.

#### 6.2.1. Wrong Collocations/Idioms

Collocations and idiomatic expressions are two important categories of English multi-word units. In fact, they constitute a major element in the make-up of the lexicon and, in effect, a significant part of lexical competence (Alexander, 1978; Aisensadt, 1981; Yario, 1980; Nattinger, 1980, 1988; Cowie, 1981, 1988; Strassler, 1983; Benson et al 1986; Baker and MacCarthy, 1987; Anf Farghal and Obeidat, 1995, among others). In terms of translation, Shakir and Farghal (1992) argue that collocations are more communicatively useful than idioms because they are more common in speech and are rarely replaceable by lexical substitutes, e.g. the collocation 'public support' is only awkwardly paraphraseable. By contrast, idioms are less common in speech and are readily replaceable by lexical substitutes, e.g. the idiomatic expression 'bury the hatchet' is replaceable by the lexical alternate 'end the dispute'. Consequently the translator’s failure to operate the Idiom principle in the target language will inevitably result in erroneous collocations but not necessarily erroneous idiomatic expressions, as lexical substitutes are always there as a workable solution.
in the case of idioms. That is, the Open Choice Principle does work as an alternative in the translation of idioms but it is practically ruled out in translating collocations (for the discussion of the two principles, see Sinclair, 1987).

The results of the present study lend further support to the argument that collocations are more problematic than idioms in translation. As a matter of fact, there were only a few cases of mistranslated idomatic expressions in the data, namely 4 errors out of 38 errors in the World View data and none in the Media Celebrities News data. This being the case, we have decided to combine the two categories.

The most frequent error in collocations is the choice of an inappropriate collocate for a word, which results in an awkward or unnatural combination in the target language. Assuming that translation is done by caring native speakers of the target language, as is the case in the Newsweek, the question that poses itself is: Why would translators sanction the presence of erroneous collocations in their translations? Or more pragmatically: Why would translators not reread their translations and subsequently naturalize such collocational deviations?

The answer to the first question has something to do with the translator’s option for literal translation in cases where it does not work. It should be noted that while literalness remains one of the main methods of translation, it is of little use in the area of collocations, as collocations rarely correspond between different languages. This does not mean that some languages are richer in collocations than others, but it simply indicates that words may choose different collocates in different languages. For example, the [± dense] feature of a drink in English is collocationalized in terms of the features [± strong] and [± weak], hence the presence of the collocations ‘strong tea’ and ‘weak tea’, whereas the same feature is collocationalized in terms of the features [± heavy] and [± light] in Arabic, hence the presence of the Arabic collocations شاي خفيف and شاي ثقيل.

The response to the second question may suggest two further implications. Firstly, it may be the case that translators rarely regard their translations as fully-fledged texts away from the source language texts; hence they overlook such deviations in the heat of considering the translation an immediate reflection of the original in terms of content as well as form. In this case, the absence of appropriate translator training may be to blame. Secondly, it is possible that the translator is not adequately competent in the area of collocations in his first language, i.e., she/he does not possess an adequate feel that enables her/him to call up appropriate/natural collocations in the target language in the context of
translation activity. This does not mean that some native speakers may lack collocational competence as it is part and parcel of general linguistic competence, but rather that this collocational competence may not be optimally functionalized in the process of translating. Thus, the translator’s collocational proficiency should be regarded as part of her/his translational competence rather than her/his linguistic competence in general.

Below are five excerpts from the corpus featuring erroneous collocations as a result of choosing a wrong collocate and one excerpt (No. 6) involving an erroneous idiom. From now onwards, underlined material represents relevant erroneous segments, while bracketed material represents which are not relevant to the discussion at hand (For more examples of erroneous collocations and wrong words, see Appendix 1):

1. فرغم أوسأ ركد اقتصادي منذ جيل، رغم الحكومات السابقة المقسمة والضعيفة، و رغم المعارك الأخيرة بين تركيا وألبانيا، فان تركيا قامت بعملية تحرر اقتصادي واسع النطاق. (November 2002)

2. إن الوقت قصير جدا، فان لتص الامور الى مرحلة المواجهة بعد وقت قصير من 8 ديسمبر، فان الضغط يتجه القيادة عمل عسكري سيئلاسي. كما أن ان يكون سيعمل العمل العسكري أمرًا مستحيلًا حتى المحيط القادم، وأن يكون من السهولة يمكن إعادة لعب هذا الالتماس. (December 3, 2002)

3. كيف يمكن للمرء أن يجب أن الأمور ليست حاكمة (السعود) كما تبدو للوجهة الأولى. (ف) الإهابيون اليوم يشعون بقدر ضئيل من أسابيع الانتشار الجيوبية. فممارسه في موارد بريئة لهن تقارن بالقوى المجمعة للحكومات التي تعمل معه. يعني هذا قد أكبر من العمليات الدولية والتنسيق التكتيكي. (December, 2002)

4. واجب في أحد تقارير ميسيورال: أولئك الذين لم يستطع ذويهم الدفاع كانوا يخوضون إلى خارج القرية، حيث كانوا يتعذر عليهم الضرر والتعذيب بالزбр الكهربائي لساعات طويلة. وكانت الأسلحة الكهربائية تلمع بأعضائهم الجسدية. (November 12, 2002)

5. بدأت مستودع العلاقات العامة ليزي غرومان التي عملت على صياغة الضرر الناجم عن أشخاص يطلبون الدعم لأهاليهم مثل . . . . . . . . (November 5, 2002)

6. وإذا تفاوضت الإدارة بصورة حسنة، ستستخدم مزيجا من العصي والجزر، فان بوسها تحسن اتفاق كاتون، الذي يعني الكثير من نقاط الضغط والنقاط الخطرة، بصورة كبيرة جدا. (November 14, 2002)

Other things neutralized (i.e. ignoring bracketed material which relates to other types of errors), the excerpts in (1) - (5) do not read well because of the erroneous collocations that feature wrong collocates. By way of illustration, the Arabic preposition منذ جيل does not collocate with the noun جيل.
in (1) and similarly the Arabic noun فيلم does not collocate with the verbal noun فيلم in (2). To solve these problems, the translator should have naturalized the two collocations by choosing appropriate collocates such as مند عقود، عشرات السنين، سنوات طويلة etc. for فلم and the verbal noun for فلم. Moreover, naturalizing the collocation in (2) should involve a further step by abandoning the corresponding Arabic collocation altogether for lack of naturalness in the text and subsequently opting for a more function-oriented Arabic collocation such as سياسة العصي والجزء in a way that distorts the flow of discourse and puzzles the target reader.

In some cases, the problem occurs because of the translator’s failure to employ a necessary collocate in the target language. The excerpts below illustrate this:

7. (و) في وقت سابق من هذا الشهر، أدى صدام بحديث صحفي لآفت - وهو الأول (December 3,2002)

8. ومستجد أنظمة الحكم في الشرق الأوسط - وغالبًا أنظمة غير ديمقراطية وغير مصلحة (إصلاحية) إن من الصعب عليها بصورة متزايدة البيض في السلطة إن لم تنفتح. (February 4,2003)

9. وينبغي على واشنطن أن تقوم أخطات التلفزيونية الفضائية، والكثير منها تبث من لوس أنجلوس، والتي أصبحت مصدر معلومات مرسموًا بالنسبة إلى الإيرانيين (December 24,2002)

In each of the underlined expressions above, there is a missing collocate that would not escape the attention of the lay Arab reader. Arabic discourse does not tolerate these expressions without post-modifying collocates, viz. the natural expressions are لآفت للنظر، تنفتح على غيرها (من الأخطات التلفزيونية الفضائية) in (7), (8) and (9), respectively. It is the job of the translator to employ such natural expressions even when the source text segment does not manifest collocational behaviour. To illustrate, consider the English text corresponding to (7) above:

10. Earlier this month Saddam gave a remarkable interview – his first in 12 years - to an Egyptian weekly.

As can be seen, the translator managed to relay the English collocation ‘gave an interview’ correctly into أدى صدام بحديث صحفي but, unfortunately, failed to properly incorporate the attributive adjective ‘remarkable’ into the Arabic text because she/he was unable to call up the collocation that constitutes the natural habitant for the corresponding Arabic adjective, i.e., لآفت للنظر.

In other cases, though fewer in the corpus, the collocational problem
shows a different directionality. To explain, some Arabic expressions in the data feature superfluous collocates, which are an immediate consequence of rendering English collocations literally. Below are two excerpts showing this kind of problem:

11. And highlight the Americans in the middle of the (university for technology) it will reach in the coming years. (February 18, 2003)

12. Is there a trend for small groups in the world of the day to discuss on the events of the day? (December 10, 2002)

It is clear that the erroneous Arabic expressions in (11) and (12) are literal renditions of the English collocations ‘watch...very closely’ and ‘globalized world’, respectively. In other words, the translator was not aware of the constraint that, in contrast with English, the Arabic collocation cannot be modified by an intensifier; in fact, the lexeme, which enjoys no existence in Arabic independently of the above collocation, is inherently emphatic, hence the impossibility of emphasizing it by an intensifier, i.e. the attributive adjective. Similarly, the translator fell victim to the pleonasm instead of the familiar Arabic term.

6.2.2. Wrong Words

Among lexical errors, the use of a wrong word was the second most frequent type of error at 42.11%, which is close to the frequency of wrong collocations/idioms at 48.42%. It may be argued that this kind of error is a clear indication of a deficiency in the translator’s lexical competence. In many cases, this deficiency manifests itself in the translator’s inability to distinguish cognitive and/or near-synonyms in terms of lexical usage. Following are four excerpts involving lexical usage problems:

13. displays the economic aspects. The case of the terrorist groups and the others of the same kind (November 12, 2002)

14. Iraq require strategic (military) planning in the light of the strategic relations of the next period (November 12, 2002)

15. And clearly it is necessary to highlight the differences and the differences in the current situation of the world, the situation of the Middle East and the situation of the US and the blockade and the war, and the situation of the Arab countries, and what is the role of the regional role? (November 5, 2002)

16. And it appears that the GCC has no idea of the difference of the concept of Arab countries and the situation of the Arab countries, and if there is any difference in the Arab countries, they must be taken into account in the future.
As can be noted, the erroneous choice of the underlined words is very clear. The fact that the Russians are the topdog while their subjects, the Chechens, are the underdog renders the use of the Arabic word نفاج in (13) inappropriate – the correct cognitive synonym is صراحة. In (14), the employment of the Arabic adjective رخوة to modify الاستراتيجية سياسية is inappropriate – the correct adjectives in this context are the cognitive and/or near-synonyms متساهلة or مترة. For its part, (14) suffers from an erroneous use of the introductory Arabic verb يشرح، which is a cognitive synonym of the correct introductory verb يجادلون. Similarly, the last excerpt involves a mistaken use of the verb يشكون instead of the correct verb يجادلون; the two verbs may be argued to be near-synonyms. These examples, among others, point to a serious deficiency in the translator’s lexical competence, especially when it comes to differentiating between cognitive and/or near-synonyms in terms of correct lexical usage.

In other cases, the phonological similarity between two Arabic words may be the source of creating confusion in translators. Once again, the translator’s insensitivity to phonological form is a clear indication of premature lexical competence. Consider the following excerpts from the corpus:

In (17) above, the translator mistook the Arabic adverbial أخيراً ‘finally’ for the correct adverbial مؤخراً ‘recently/lately’, which may have been caused by the similarity in phonological form. Similarly, the translator confused the sociological term مصلح/ملحدين ‘reformer/reformers’ with the political term ‘اصلاحي/Ờصلاحيين’ ‘liberal/liberals’ in (18), probably due to phonological similarity. Likewise, the translator employed the Arabic verb أقدمت ‘committed wilfully’ erroneously instead of the correct verb تقريمت ‘approached/came near’ in (19). Once again, phonological similarity may have been a factor. It must be noted that solid lexical knowledge in translational competence should enable translation practitioners to neutralize phonological similarity between Arabic words and subsequently

أوضاع أفضل في العراق.
call up the correct lexical item in the process of translating.

6.2.3. Circumlocution
Circumlocution is a lexical strategy whereby the translator falls short of coding meaning efficiently and effectively in the target language as a result of being unable to maintain lexical specificity between the source and target texts (Brown 2000; Cruse 1986). The resulting rendition, though understandable, is usually awkward and repetitious. In terms of frequency, this type of error accounted for only 9.47% in the data. The two examples below are illustrative:

As can be observed, the messages in (20) and (21) above are coded awkwardly and repetitiously. To illustrate this point, consider the same messages encoded efficiently and effectively in (22) and (23) below, respectively:

Discoursal Errors
Discoursal features were the most frequent in the corpus claiming 43.8% of the total number of errors. They fell within two sub-categories: conjunction errors and phraseology errors. The following sub-sections shed more light on the nature of these types of errors.

6.3.1 Conjunction Errors
Arabic discourse is well known for its explicit paratactic nature, with a heavy use of conjunctions (Kaplan, 1966; Johnstone, 1991). The main function of Arabic conjunctions, wa ‘and’ fa ‘so’ in particular, is to make the text stick together and furnish a natural flow of discourse. Consequently, the translator from English, in which discourse relations are primarily asyndetic and hypotactic, into Arabic should be careful enough to cater for this discoursal mismatch. That is to say, an Arabic translation should feature more conjunctions than the English original and, conversely, an English translation should include fewer conjunctions than the Arabic
original. Apparently, the Newsweek translators were not adequately aware of this rhetorical fact, especially in evaluative discourse where the employment of conjunctions account for 69.49% within discoursal errors. Following are two illustrative paragraphs:

24. يمكن أن يؤدي الحرب إلى استنثاغ (تشجيع) هجوم إرهابي كبير يقوم به صدام أو آخرون. (ف) يمكن تشاعر المسلمين في كل مكان في العالم أن تنهب. (ف) إذا تفجر العراق من الداخل فان المنطقة بسخرها سنعاني اندلاع الاستقرار (February 4, 2003).

25. إن الحل قصير الأمد الوحيد، هو البدء في التحدث إلى كوريا الشمالية عن منافع تخفيف التوتر وبعده علاقة جديدة معها. إننا نريد هذا النظام أن يفعل شيئا أو بالأحرى أن يتوقف عن فعل شيء. (ف) الضغط قد ينجح وكذلك يمكن للحواريز (ف) ليس أمامنا من خيار سوى أن نحزب التهجين (January 21, 2003).

The Arabic-speaking reader will immediately notice the restrained flow of Arabic discourse in (22) and (23) above, as a result of the translator’s failure to optimize the use of conjunctions. Also, the lack of an adequate number of conjunctions constrains the impetus of the evaluative tone and consequently weakens the impact of the argument. To shed more light on the significance of this discoursal mismatch between Arabic and English, let us examine the English paragraph corresponding to (23) above (The null sign ø indicates the place where a conjunction and/or a discourse marker is needed in Arabic):

26. The only short-term solution is to start talking to North Korea about the benefits of de-escalating and starting a new relationship. Ø We want this regime to do something – or rather to stop doing something. Ø Pressure might work, so might incentives. Ø We have no option but to try both. (January 20, 2002).

Clearly, the asyndetic ordering of the sentences in the English paragraph is appropriate and natural, as it conforms to the discoursal norms in English, where it is possible to leave the intersentential relations implicit or suppressed (for more details, see Hatim 2001). In Arabic discourse, by contrast, these suppressed formal features are needed in order to render the discourse natural and appropriate. Note that the translator of (26) as (25) managed to fill the first gap with the emphatic particle إن، which makes up for the lack of a conjunction (e.g. ف cliticized to the pronoun ðى instead of the combination of the emphatic particle and the clitic إن). However, she/he failed to fill in the other two discoursal gaps with the conjunctions ف and respectively and, in effect, offered an asyndetic text which natural Arabic discourse does not tolerate.
6.3.2. Phraseology Errors

In terms of frequency, phraseology errors were less common than conjunction errors (30.5% vs. 69.49%, respectively). However, they can be considered definitely more serious than conjunction errors because as a rule, such errors jeopardize the conveyance of meaning in its primary existence. That is to say, the translator’s failure to code the intended meaning clearly and/or properly may cause a breakdown in communication, whereas his/her failure to employ conjunctions discoursally may only affect the flow and tone of the text, independently of its basic or primary meaning. Consequently, both types of errors affect the text globally but in different ways. To see how serious phraseology errors are, let us examine the four excerpts below:

In (27), the reader may wonder how to interpret or make sense of the Arabic text. It is clear that the translator has failed to convey the intended message given in (31) below, which corresponds to the English text in (32).

In (28), the situation is not any better because the way the intended message is phrased by the translator befogs the editorialist’s attack on the mullas in Iran, as can be seen by comparing with the correct coding of the message in (33) below:

32. Thank goodness for moral clarity. President Bush’s black-and-white picture of the war on terror has apparently made sense of Russia’s complicated struggle with the Chechens.
For its part, the phraseology of (29) is awkward and hard to process by the reader. To see this, compare (29) with the correct coding of the message in (34) below:

Similarly, the last excerpt in (30) suffers from a phraseology problem. Mobi’s words are meant to spell out the motive behind the attack but the translator’s rendition can hardly convey the intended message. Examine the rendition in (35) as a possible coding of the message:

6.4. Grammatical Errors
Grammatical errors were the least frequent in the corpus at 20.5%. Being local in nature, grammatical errors affect the meaning of the text in specific ways and can be readily corrected by the careful reader. The fact that the Newsweek translators make some grammatical mistakes points to a deficiency in their grammatical competence (Canale, 1983). The following subsections throw some light on the types of grammatical errors in the data.

6.4.1. Wrong/Missing Prepositions
The most frequent type of grammatical errors is the translator’s failure to employ a correct preposition by either using a wrong preposition or omitting the employment of a preposition altogether. This kind of error accounted for 30.19% among grammatical problems. Following are some examples from the data:
As can be observed, examples (36) and (37) include wrong prepositions, i.e. Òö/DELû/DC3 should be Òö/DELô« l/DC4 and WO?/ENQUM/DC3 should be WO?/ENQU/NAK s/DC4.

As for (38), the translator has failed to employ a preposition, i.e., j?/BELu?????/SUB?*« should read j/BELu/SUB*« w/DLE.

6.4.2. Agreement Errors

Errors in agreement came second in grammatical errors accounting for 15.1%. Below are two illustrative examples:


In (39), the numerical phrase Ôö/DELû/DC3 does not agree in gender with the head noun Ôö/DELû/DC3, which is [± human] and [± masculine]. To observe gender agreement, the phrase should read Ôö/DELû/DC3 Ôö/DELû/DC3, which is sanctioned in Arabic. However, the number agreement rule must be applied when the agreement is between a verb and a resumptive pronoun; hence the correct forms of the subsequent verbs should be Ôö/DELû/DC3 and Ôö/DELû/DC3, respectively.


In (40), the lexical subject Ôö/DELû/DC3 does not agree in number with the subsequent verbs in the text. Apparently, the translator omitted number agreement on the basis of the absence of such agreement between the verb and its lexical subject in Ôö/DELû/DC3, which is sanctioned in Arabic. However, the number agreement rule must be applied when the agreement is between a verb and a resumptive pronoun; hence the correct forms of the subsequent verbs should be Ôö/DELû/DC3 and Ôö/DELû/DC3, respectively.

6.4.3. Wrong Word Form

Sometimes the translator fails to derive the correct form from a particular word. Errors of this type accounted for 13.21% among grammatical errors. To illustrate, consider the two examples below:


In (41), the passive verb form Ôö/DELû/DC3 is inappropriate; the correct verb form is Ôö/DELû/DC3, which is active in form but passive in meaning (for more details, see Farghal and Al-Shorafat, 1996). As for (42), the error is in the plural form of Ôö/DELû/DC3, which erroneously occurs as Ôö/DELû/DC3, instead of the correct form Ôö/DELû/DC3. In both cases, as we can see, it is a matter of deriving the correct word form by the translator, whether it involves derivational or inflectional morphology.
6.4.4. Wrong/Missing Definite Article

Errors involving wrong or missing definite articles accounted for 9.43% among grammatical problems in the data. To illustrate, below are two examples:


Æ (December 10, 2002)

…dO/EM/DC2 œ«b/SOQ/SOHË 5/ETBœUF/DC3« 5OKz«d/BELù« 5O/NAKb*« b{

Æ (February 18, 2003)

In (43) the translator wrongly used the Arabic definite article with the proper noun denoting the Palestinian Islamic Movement 'Hammas'.

In (44), the translator failed to employ the Arabic definite article with the underlined generic noun, that is, the correct form is 'the majority' rather than 'majority'.

6.4.5. Wrong/Missing Pronoun

Errors in pronouns score 4 occurrences (7.55% among grammatical problems). Consider the two examples below:

w/SYNË ¨/nobreakspaceUMOF/EM/US/DC3« w/DLE W/ETBuCF/DC3« VKD/SOH ÂbI/SUB/DC3« v/DC3≈ UO/DC2d/STX X/SOœ w/SUB/DC3« w/SYN UN/USH/NAK U/SOHË—Ë√ UN/NAK≈ Æ

Æ (November 26, 2002)

X/DC1u/DC3« p/DC3– w/DLE ¡U/EMG/SOH UO/DC2d/STX UN/SUBC/DLE— …u/SOœ

Æ (November 5, 2002)

In (45), the cataphoric resumptive pronoun cliticized to the emphatic particle redundantly duplicates the anaphoric resumptive pronoun; hence it should be deleted. For its part, (46) lacks the pronoun 'he' in the place of the underlined null symbol. Without this pronoun, the text does not sound Arabic.

6.4.6. Miscellaneous Errors

This subcategory contains a mixed bag of grammatical errors which accounts for 24.52% in the data. Among these miscellaneous errors, we find problems relating to tense, negation, punctuation, complementizers, copula, etc. Following are four different types of miscellaneous errors:

d/ETBUM/ETB w/DLE …bzU

Æ (January 28, 2002)

ZOK)« »d/ENQ WOA/SO ¨

Æ (December 10, 2002)

---
In (47), there is a tense problem. The verbal Arabic adjective السائدة can only make a reference to the present time. However, the reference in the text relates to January 1991; hence a finite Arabic verb in the past tense form must be used, viz. أن السائدة. In (48), the placement of the negative particle is awkward and hard-going. To solve this problem, the negative particle may be placed immediately after the complementizer. For its part, (49) features a redundant complementizer – the underlined إن. In order for the text to sound Arabic, the said complementizer must be deleted. Finally, (50) includes a punctuation error – the underlined comma should be replaced with a period.

7. Conclusion and Implications

Based on an examination of the Arabic Newsweek, it is clear that professional media translation from English into Arabic can suffer from a variety of perceptible problems including lexical, discoursal and grammatical errors. These errors, which draw attention to themselves, often create irritation, and even dismay, in Arabic-speaking readers. In terms of seriousness, the errors range between rectifiable local problems such as odd collocations and erroneous grammatical features and more subtle, global problems like the translator’s employment of an unnatural flow of discourse and hard-going, or even uninterpretable, phraseologies. Collectively, such perceptible errors affect negatively the overall quality of translation activity, especially when we are dealing with professional media translation, which, we believe, cannot be represented by a caliber higher than that of the Arabic Newsweek, given the well-known international status of the source English publication.

In terms of genre analysis, evaluative/argumentative discourse proves to be more challenging than non-evaluative/expository discourse as indicated by both the quality and volume of perceptible errors in the corpus. This finding points to the argument that this would be an extremely serious problem in the case of the Newsweek because, in contrast with non-evaluative news reporting which is predominant in daily newspapers, the bulk of the Newsweek material is inherently evaluative. Lagging in time with respect to news coverage, weeklies are built around managing rather
than just monitoring news, which renders their task more taxing in creating and subsequently translating discourse.

What implications can be drawn from this study? First and foremost, native language competence in Arabic should not be taken for granted in Arab translators. The Arabic Newsweek case shows clearly that the Arabic native speaker translators who are employed to do translation activity at two stages (primary translation in Washington and translation editing in Kuwait) are seriously deficient in Arabic language competence at various levels: discourse, lexis and grammar. This may have to do with the special status of Arabic, where a diglossic situation predominates the linguistic scene in all Arab countries. Arabic diglossia involves a low variety (any given local dialect) and a High Variety (Standard Arabic). It can be argued that educated Arabs speak their dialects natively and standard Arabic, so to speak, as a second language which is ‘pseud-natively’ acquired through formal education and continuous contact with spoken and written material within the Arab culture. Vernacular Arabic, therefore, may occasionally interfere with performance in the standard written variety. The degree of competence achieved in standard Arabic may vary greatly from one individual to another and from one Arab country to another. This depends on the efforts exerted by individuals to excel in the standard variety as well as the degree of attention given to the role of standard Arabic in different Arab countries. This being the case, Arab translators’ knowledge of standard Arabic should be carefully checked before entrusting them with translating into Arabic, as is the case with the Arabic Newsweek.

A second important implication is that media bodies should ensure the presence of translator training on the part of candidate translators. It is not enough for a candidate to be a university graduate of a foreign languages department. Prospective translators should receive extensive translator training in order to develop their translational competence at the level of structure, lexis and discourse. It should be noted that translational competence may not replicate general language competence in any language pair. Consequently, a candidate who is highly proficient in Arabic and English may prove a failure in translation activity because interlingual communication involves skills that go well beyond general language proficiency. Such skills, we believe, are the output of professional translator training.

Finally, but equally important, target language texts, which are the output of translation activity, should be treated as fully-fledged texts in their socio-cultural environment. To accomplish this goal, they should undergo optimal naturalization in terms of discourse and diction, independently of
their corresponding source texts at the hands of professional editor translators. At the end of the day, a media translation should not sound as a translation; it should sound as a native text created for a public readership in the target language culture.
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Appendix One

A: More examples of erroneous collocations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wrong Collocation</th>
<th>Correct Collocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>منذ عقود</td>
<td>الفئة الوحيدة</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>الإندفاعة الوحدة</td>
<td>حملة سرية</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>السفر رخيص الشمن</td>
<td>رخيص الكلفة</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>الحقيقة الكثيقة</td>
<td>الحقيقة المرة</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>سلالة طليفة من الإسلام</td>
<td>سلالة معتدلة من الإسلام</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>تدفقات العواطف</td>
<td>تأثيرات العواطف</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>سيطرة موحدة</td>
<td>سيطرة قوية</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>بأعضائهم الجنسية</td>
<td>بأعضائهم التناسلية</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>أهداف ألين وأسهل</td>
<td>أهداف مكشوفة وسهلة</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>العالم المعلوم</td>
<td>العواطف</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>المسح المنتظر</td>
<td>المهدى المنتظر</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>التنسيق الحقيقي</td>
<td>التنسيق الاستخباري</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ليست حالكة</td>
<td>ليست حالية السود</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>تعزز نتائج</td>
<td>يحقق نتائج ملموسة</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ان لم نتفحّك على غيرها</td>
<td>ان لم نتفحّك على غيرها</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>يبتلع هؤلاء كرامتهم</td>
<td>يبتلع هؤلاء غضبهم</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>باستبعاد القيايم بهجوم . . . . عن الطاولة</td>
<td>باستبعاد القيايم بهجوم . . . . من الخيارات</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>لافت</td>
<td>لافت للنظر</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>بأكبر تفصيل</td>
<td>بفصيل أكبر</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>لعب هذا الفيلم</td>
<td>عرض هذا الفيلم</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>سيؤدي تواصل عدم البقين</td>
<td>سيؤدي تواصل عدم البقين</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>المعطشين</td>
<td>المعطشين للمحرية</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## B: More examples of wrong words

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wrong word</th>
<th>Correct word</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>يستخدم / يوظف</td>
<td>أكيد</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>نجت</td>
<td>يبني</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>نتائج</td>
<td>نتائج</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>تطهيرية</td>
<td>دينية</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>يشكون في</td>
<td>يجادلون في</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>كفاح روسيا</td>
<td>صراع روسيا</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>رخوة</td>
<td>مرن</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>أصغاف</td>
<td>مؤخر</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>أخيرا</td>
<td>رخامة</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>رخمة</td>
<td>برهة</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ولهة</td>
<td>أسس</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>بالأس</td>
<td>تشجيع</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>استثناء</td>
<td>الإصلاحية</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>المصلين</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* * *