Republic of Iraq
Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research
Mosul University / College of Arts
Adab Al-Rafidayn Journal

Adab Al-Rafidayn Journal

A refereed quarterly scientific journal
Issued by College of Arts - University of Mosul
Supplement
Vol. Ninety / year Fifty- Second

Rabi al-Thani - 1444 AH / November 1/11/2022 AD

A special issue about the tenth conference of the College of Arts / University of Mosul

The journal's deposit number in the National Library in Baghdad: 14 of 1992

ISSN 0378- 2867
E ISSN 2664-2506

To communicate:

radab.mosuljournals@gmail.com

URL: https://radab.mosuljournals.com

Adab Al-Rafidayn Journal

A refereed journal concerned with the publishing of scientific researches in the field of arts and humanities both in Arabic and English

Supplement Vol. Ninety / year Fifty- Second / Rabi al-Thani- 1444 AH / November 2022 AD

Editor-in-Chief: Professor Dr. Ammar Abd Al-Latif Abd Al-Ali (Information and Libraries), College of Arts / University of Mosul / Iraq

managing editor: Asst.Prof. Dr. Shaiban Adeeb Ramadan Al-Shaibani (Arabic Language) College of Arts / University of Mosul / Iraq

Editorial Board Members

Prof. Dr.Hareth Hazem Ayoub (Sociology) College of Arts / University of Mosul / Iraq.

Prof. Dr. Wafa Abdul Latif Abdul Aali (English Language) College of Arts / University of Mosul / Iraq.

Prof. Dr. Miqdad Khalil Qasim Al-Khatouni (Arabic Language) College of Arts / University of Mosul / Iraq.

Prof. Dr. Alaa Al-Din Ahmad Al- Gharaibeh (Arabic Language) College of Arts / Al- Zaytoonah University / Jordan.

Prof. Dr. Qais Hatem Hani (History) College of Education / University of Babylon / Iraq

Prof. Dr.Mustafa Ali Al-Dowidar (History) College of Arts and Sciences / Taibah University / Saudi Arabia.

Prof. Dr. Suzan Youssef Ahmed (media) Faculty of Arts / Ain Shams University / Egypt.

Prof. Dr. Aisha Kul Jalaboglu (Turkish Language and Literature) College of Education / University of Hajet Tabah / Turkey.

Prof. Dr. Ghada Abdel-Moneim Mohamed Moussa (Information and Libraries) Faculty of Arts / University of Alexandria.

Prof. Dr. Claude Vincents (French Language and Literature) University of Chernobyl Alps / France.

Asst .Prof. Dr. Arthur James Rose (English Literature) University of Durham / UK.

Asst .Prof. Dr. Sami Mahmoud Ibrahim (Philosophy) College of Arts / University of Mosul / Iraq.

Linguistic Revision and Follow-up:

Linguistic Revision : Lect. Dr. Khaled Hazem Aidan - Arabic Reviser

Asst. Lect. Ammar Ahmed Mahmood - English Reviser

Follow-up: Translator Iman Gerges Amin - Follow-up .

Translator Naglaa Ahmed Hussein - Follow-up .

Publishing instructions rules

1. A researcher who wants to publish in Adab Al-Rafidayn journal should enter the platform of the journal and register by an official or personal activated email via the following link:

https://radab.mosuljournals.com/contacts?_action=signup

2. After registration, the platform will send to your mail that you registered on the site and a password will be sent for use in entering the journal by writing your email with the password on the following link:

https://radab.mosuljournals.com/contacts?_action=login

3- The platform (the site) will grant the status of the researcher to those who registered to be able in this capacity to submit their research with a set of steps that begin by filling out data related to them and their research and they can view it when downloading their research.

4-File formats for submission to peer review are as follows:

• Fonts: a "standard" type size is as follows: (Title: at 16point / content : at 14point / Margins: at 10 point), and the number of lines per page: (27) lines under the page heading line with the title, writer name, journal name, number and year of publishing, in that the number of pages does not exceed 25 in the latest edition in the journal free of illustrations, maps, tables, translation work, and text verification, and (30) pages for research containing the things referred to.

- Margins are arranged in numbers for each page. The source and reference are defined in the margin glossary at the first mentioned word. List of references is canceled, and only the reference is mentioned in the first mentioning place, in case the source is repeated use (ibid.)

• The research is referred to the test of similarity report to determine the percentage of originality then if it pass the test it is referred to two referees who nominate it for publication after checking its scientific sobriety, and confirming its safety from plagiarism , and if the two experts disagree –it is referred to a third referee for the last peer review and to decide on the acceptance or rejection of the research .

5- The researcher (author) is committed to provide the following information about the research:

•The research submitted for evaluation to the journal must not include the name of the researcher, i.e. sent without a name.

•A clear and complete title for the research in Arabic and English should be installed on the body of the research, with a brief title for the research in both languages: Arabic and English.

•The full address of the researcher must be confirmed in two languages: Arabic and English, indicating: (the scientific department / college or institute / university / country) with the inclusion of an effective email of the researcher.

• The researcher must formulate two scientific abstracts for the research in two languages: Arabic and English, not less than (150) and not more than (250) words.

•presenting at least three key words that are more likely to be repeated and differentiated in the research.

6-The researcher must observe the following scientific conditions in writing his research, as it is the basis for evaluation, otherwise the referees will hold him responsible. The scientific conditions are shown in the following:

•There should be a clear definition of the research problem in a special paragraph entitled: (research problem) or (problem of research).

•The researcher must take into account the formulation of research questions or hypotheses that express the problem of research and work to achieve and solve or scientifically refute it in the body of the research.

• The researcher works to determine the importance of his research and the goals that he seeks to achieve, and to determine the purpose of its application.

•There must be a clear definition of the limits of the research and its population that the researcher is working on in his research.

•The researcher must consider choosing the correct methodology that is appropriate to the subject of his research, and must also consider the data collection tools that are appropriate for his research and the approach followed in it.

- Consideration should be given to the design of the research, its final output, and the logical sequence of its ideas and paragraphs.

•The researcher should take into consideration the choice of references or sources of information on which the research depends, and choose what is appropriate for his research taking into account the modernity in it, and the accuracy in documenting , quoting form these sources.

•The researcher should consider taking note of the results that the researcher reached, and make sure of their topics and their rate of correlation with research questions or hypotheses that the researcher has put in his research.

7- The researcher should be aware that the judgment on the research will be according to a peer review form that includes the above details, then it will be sent to the referee and on the basis of which the research will be judged and weights will be given to its paragraphs and according to what is decided by those weights the research will be accepted or rejected. Therefore; the researcher must take that into account in preparing his research.

Editor-in-chief

CONTENTS

Title	Page
Assessing the Translation of Quranic Implicit Negation into English **Abdul Rahman Ahmed Abdul Rahman**	1 - 22
Ideological Constraints In Translation **Zahraa Rabie Muhammad Qasim Agha** **Luqman A. Nasser**	23 - 32
The Effect of Mistranslating Arabic Conjunctives on the Argumentative Texts into English **Salem Yahya Fathi**	33 - 54
L'Islamisme caché de Victor Hugo **Mu'ayad A. Abdul-Hasan** **Zahraa Moayed Abbas**	55 – 68
Monde arabe et Occident : Les deux grandes périodes de contact **Magdy Abdel Hafez Saleh**	69 – 94
OSMANLI DÖNEMİ TÜRK EDEBİYATINDA İZ BIRAKAN MUSULLU ŞAİRLER **Ahmed Içli**	95 – 118
TÜRKİYE'DE ARAPÇA ÖĞRETİMİNDE KÜLTÜRÜN ETKİSİ **Badri Aslan**	119 – 128
Arapça Öğretim Metodu: Türkiye Örneği **Mohammed Mekin**	129 – 158
L'humanisme arabisant : la première grammaire de l'arabe publiée en Europe occidentale **Emilie Picherot**	159 – 176
Old Arabic Dialects in the Noble Quran with Reference to Translation into English **Yasir younis Al-Badrany**	177 – 198
L'expatrié entre un abri sûr et une amère nostalgie dans certaines œuvres dramatiques irakiennes contemporaines **Ilham Hassan Sallo**	199 – 220
The Translation of Al-Mushakala (Verbal Similarity) in the Prophetic Hadith into English: Problems and Strategies **Ziyad Anwar mahmood Albajjari**	221 – 240
SUBJECT COMPLEMENT AND ITS GRAMMATICAL REALIZATIONS **Zahraa Ahmed Othman**	241 – 252

La répétition : emplois et motifs dans Frère d'âme de David Diop **Saif Adnan Al-Obaidi**	**253 – 272**
Les programmes audio-visuels comme stratégie pour développer la compétence de la production écrite dans une classe de FLE **Ali Najm Alghanami** **Abdul Rahim Abdul Rahman**	**273 – 310**
L'effet de la littérature orientale du livre des Mille et une Nuits sur la narration française **Fayhaa Hamid Khudair**	**311 – 332**
L'usage des séquences vidéo dans un cours de compréhension orale (cas des étudiants de 4e année/Département du français/ Université de Mossoul/Irak **Qatran Bashar Aljumailie**	**333 – 376**
L'usage du roman-photo dans l'enseignement du FLE **Wadah Khaled Al-Sharifi**	**377 – 390**

CC BY

ADAB AL-RAFIDAYN, Supplement VOL.(90/1) November (1/11/2022)AD/1444AH
A special issue about the tenth conference of the College of Arts

The Effect of Mistranslating Arabic Conjunctives on the Argumentative Texts into English

Salem Yahya Fathi *

تأريخ التقديم: ٢٠٢٢/٩/١٩ تأريخ القبول: ٢٠٢٢/١٠/١

Abstract:

The aim of this study is to examine to what extent failure to capture the rhetorical function of Arabic conjunctive devices may lead to blurring the focus of Arabic argumentative texts when translated into English. The study hypothesizes that inappropriate renderings of the conjunctives digress and deplete the argumentative text and flout intentionality and acceptability ; and that student translators are not well aware of syntactic ,semantic and pragmatic relations that hold between/among the textual components of the text . The material of the study draws on three Arabic texts of argumentative function .The sample constitutes one translation section (comprising 20 student translators) at University of Mosul. Following Halliday and Hasan (1976), the analysis of the translated texts focuses on two kinds of conjunctives : adversative and additive . The findings of the analysis have shown that the conjunctive devices which prove the most problematic area and ,therefore, the least appropriately rendered were adversative conjunctives whereas the additives were not challenging .

Keywords: Political , religious , culture. .

1. Introduction

Textual cohesion has attracted the attention of many linguists and researchers in the past twenty years. Halliday and Hasan (1976), for example, discuss in detail different aspects of cohesion in English. Their suggested model classifies cohesion relations into three kinds, with each reflecting an aspect of relatedness: (1) relatedness of form; (2) relatedness of reference; (3) relatedness of semantic connection (conjunction). The present study is concerned

***Prof/ Dept. of Translation / College of Arts / University of Mosul.**

with the third kind of cohesion and adopts Halliday and Hasan's (1976: pp. 226, 303, and 321) definition of conjunction:

"Conjunction is on the borderline of grammatical and lexical cohesion. Conjunctive relations are not "phoric" but are representatives of semantic (and pragmatic) links between the elements that constitute a text. Contrary to other cohesive types, conjunctive elements are not in themselves cohesive, but they do express certain meanings which presuppose the presence of other components in the discourse."

A further note is due with regard to the above definition. Lexical cohesion differs from conjunctive cohesion. The former depends heavily on some "... patterned occurrence of a lexical item." (Halliday and Hasan, 1976: 288), Conjunctive cohesion, on the other hand, is Potentially cohesive irrespective of the occurrence of a lexical item. For example, if we encounter a conjunctive connective such as 'however', we anticipate an adversative relationship between two ideas.

Grammatical cohesion is also different from conjunctive cohesion in that it is rather clearly identifiable through grammatical relations, i.e., substitution and ellipsis, and through semantic relations, i.e., reference. With conjunctive cohesion, on the other hand, a different type of semantic relation is established, it is no longer any kind of a search instruction, but a specification of the way in which what is to follow is systematically connected to what has gone before". (Ibid.: 227).

In spoken discourse, textual relations signalled by conjunctives may be made clear by the context of situation. However, in the written mode, their presence tends to be more needed for marking the intended relationship. Translators who fail to perceive a conjunctive relationship or misunderstand it may interpret the proposition signalled by a conjunctive as either unrelated, or related in ways not intended by the writer. To realize this important resource in communication, writers are so keen to use them as sign posts that help the reader to understand the organization of the ideas presented in a given text.

The presence of conjunctive devices is important to mark the underlying relationships that bring together the different ideas constituting a given text. Although a proficient reader can perceive such relationships without relying on explicit conjunctives, yet natural and routine discourse does employ them to make reading more convenient. They mark the semantic relations that connect textual components.

Some linguists and researchers (Winterowd, 1970; Bacha and Hanania, 1980; Doushaq, 1986; Illayyan, 1990) claim that conjunctives create coherence, thus equating cohesion with coherence. The present study does not adopt the same view, nor does it argue that conjunctives create coherence. The researcher views that conjunctives facilitate, but do not necessarily cause coherence. Cohesion contributes to creating coherence, and mistranslating a conjunctive connective may lead to distorting the message. It may also lead to drastic changes in the typological focus of the text concerned, i.e., it may lead to blurring the function intended by the SL (Source language) text producer.

2. The Present Study:

The present study deals with the role of conjunctives in realizing text typological focus. Its major concern is to find out the extent to which mistranslating Arabic conjunctives can lead to a distorted message. Distortion of message can be at two levels: the rhetorical level where the translation may fail to retain the intended rhetorical function of the message of the SL text and, consequently, may render a text with a function other than that intended by the writer; and the linguistic level where mistranslation may violate linguistic rules and usage as well as the semantic structure of the target language (TL) (English, in this case).

For the purposes of this study, a sample of Arabic argumentative texts was selected. The choice of argumentative texts is based on the following assumption: by its very nature, an argumentative text employs an extensive variety of conjunctives that serve different purposes. Adversatives, concessive markers, cause-effect markers, addition markers, etc., are naturally used in such texts in the process of arguing and providing evidence for or against a given thesis.

3. Statement of the Problem:

This study deals with a textual area encountered by translators who often find it challenging to handle (Hatim, 1985) in translation process from Arabic into English. This area is conjunctive cohesion. It is believed that the main difficulties for not capturing this area are .Firstly, the multifunctionality of Arabic conjunctive devices (for example the frequent recurrence of 'fa' and 'wa' .Secondly, Arabic uses conjunctive devices which signal different functions at the syntactic, semantic, and stylistic levels. In contrast, English does not rely heavily on explicit marking of semantic relationships among textual components (Kaplan 1966, Williams 1984, Aziz 1990). Thus, according to Leech and Short (1981: 251) it is not necessary to be marked

"because a conjunctive device may "overdetermine relation between two ideas, which is happily vague, like an electric spark jumping a gap."

Thirdly, Arabic tends to prefer paratactic (Koch, 1987) over hypotactic. The English language, however, is "often gauged by degree of subordination rather than coordination" (Kaplan, 1966). Moreover, the distinction between coordinated and subordinated clauses is not as clear in Arabic as it is in English (Williams, 1984).

4. Aims of the Study:

The study aims to analyze, for inappropriate renderings of conjunctives, a corpus of Arabic argumentative texts translated into English by a sample of B.A. (in translation) students. The study, therefore, seeks to categorize inappropriate renderings into most persistent and least persistent in the above mentioned text type..

1. Investigate probable sources or causes of inappropriate renderings of Arabic conjunctives. This should enable us to answer relevant questions, such as:
2. Can inappropriate renderings of Arabic conjunctives be attributed to or interpreted in light of the multifunctional nature of such conjunctives?
3. Can inappropriate renderings of Arabic conjunctives be attributed to or interpreted in light of stylistic features characteristic of Arabic prose where heavy reliance

tends to be placed upon conjunctives, rather than on punctuation marks, for marking sentence and clause boundaries? Or, can they be interpreted in light of the stylistic nature of Arabic prose where, generally, explicitness of relationships among semantic units is favored over implicitness?

5. Review of Related Literature

In this study a survey of the studies which have dealt with Arabic and English conjunctives will be discussed . Cohesion is involved here because the term conjunction, according to Halliday and Hasan (1976) and Halliday (1985), is usually associated with cohesion.

5.1 Studies Related to English Conjunctives:

The notion of cohesion dates back to the nineteenth century when Alexander Bain (1876) stated that the relationship of each sentence to the preceding one should be explicit and unmistakable. Bain's view has been echoed in recent treatments of cohesion where it has been equated with coherence. For example, McCrimmon (1973: 92) defines coherence as follows:

"A paragraph is coherent when the sentences are woven together or flow into each other. The reader then moves easily from one sentence to the next and reads the paragraph as an integrated unit, not a collection of separate sentences."

Winterowd (1970) argues that in any stretch of discourse, perceived as coherent, only seven types of relationships (he calls them transitions) can exist among T-units. He claims that every T-unit must have one of the following seven relationships with the T-unit before it and the one after it: coordination, obversativity (e.g. but), causativity, conclusivity (e.g. so), alternativity, inclusivity (expressed with a colon), and sequentiality (first, second, third). Winterowd's claim was tested later by Sloan (1983) who found that numerous relationships violate Winterowd's system. In his empirical work, Sloan observes that a T-unit may not always be linked to the one before it,

The meaning of conjunctives has been viewed from different perspectives. Halliday and Hasan (1976) suggest that conjunctives have textual meanings which 'reflect' the semantic content of conjoined propositions. Dik (1968) argues that conjunctives themselves have 'semantic values' which restrict what can be bound. Gunter (1984) claims that conjunctions 'impose' meanings between propositions. Zamel (1983) classifies meanings of conjunctives according to their grammatical functions, i.e., coordinating conjunctions such as (and, or ,but) and subordinating conjunctions such as(while, because) and conjunctive adverbs such as (nevertheless ,on the other hand, however).

5.2 Studies Related to Arabic Conjunctives:

Arabic, being different in a number of ways from English, seems to adopt different syntactic and stylistic methods of establishing cohesion by means of employing different types of conjunctives and other cohesive devices. Ancient Arab grammarians divide parts of speech into three categories: verbals, nominals, and particles. They provide thorough description and taxonomy of 'ḥurūf' (particles), like 'al-ḥurūf al- cāmilah' (governing particles), 'ḥurūf al-jazm' (jussive particles), 'ḥurūf al-caṭf (coordinating particles). Ancient Arab grammarians and linguists (Sibawayh cited in Haroun, 1966) are concerned with case inflections in order to determine the functions of such particles.

Systematic studies of cohesion in Arabic are scarce when compared to those of cohesion in English. Ancient Arab rhetoricians, however, give due significance to 'al-faṣli wa L-waṣl' (synthetic and asynthetic). This has been voiced in the popular statement "Albalāγatu hiya macrifatu I-faṣli mina I-waṣl' (Al-Qazwyni, in Khafaji, 1983: 246) (Rhetoric means "discriminating synthetic and asynthetic). Thus, they view that using the right conjunction in its proper place is an essential factor of rhetorical effectiveness of discourse.

Some ancient Arab linguists made an attempt to institutionalize norms of a text. For example, Al-Jurjani (in Khafaji,1969) puts forward nadariyyatu n-nadm' (might be equivalent to cohesion theory). He states "... al-luγah laysat majmūcah mina l-'alfaḍ bal majmūcah mina l-calāqāt" (Ibid.: 11)

"Language is not a (random) collection of expressions, but a combination of relationships".

In their studies of conjunctions, some modern Arabic grammarians have relied on the studies of medieval Arab grammarians, ,centering on the syntactic features of conjunctives and the governing cases they perform over nouns and verbs (Hasan, 1963; Abdul-qadir, 1988).

Al-Batal (1985) deals with conjunctives from textual perspective. He investigates connectives as cohesive devices that contribute to forming a text.

Some non-Arab linguists (e.g. Kaplan, 1966; Koch, 1981; Williams, 1982) claim that parallelism and lexical repetition are prominent cohesive devices in Arabic, and that cohesive conjunctives in Arabic are so 'confusing' to a non-native speaker of Arabic, as each takes on a number of different functions. Koch (1983, 1987) argues that the presence of conjunctives is a way of making truths present in the text; and that the writer of Arabic makes use of conjunctives in persuasive discourse to create presence: he presents his truths by repeating them and calling attention to them with conjunctives.

6. Data collection and sample of the study:

This study is based on two Arabic texts of argumentative function selected from Jordanian newspaper editorials (Al-Sha'b and Al-Rai'). The rationale behind choosing argumentative political discourse is that this type of discourse, being mainly evaluative in nature, tends to employ, perhaps more than text types, a host of conjunctives for purposes of establishing the relationships text producer who aims at convincing the reader or changing his behavior .The sample constitutes one translation section (comprising 20 student translators)

In this study a textual notion *'appropriateness*' is adopted to indicate the extent to which a conjunctive rendered in the TL reflects the semantic and pragmatic content of the SL version. In other words, a TL rendering of an SL conjunctive is considered appropriate in so far as it reflects the intended relationship meant to hold between propositions constituting a text. To this effect, van

Dijk (1977: 191) says that appropriateness is used to mark "pragmatic success".

Since cohesion is viewed as a linguistic system, we can suggest that all conjunctives that turn clauses, sentences, and paragraphs into connected discourse should be taken into account. For the creation of conjunctive cohesion, Halliday and Hasan (1976) exclude intrasentential cohesion achieved by conjunctives occurring between clauses within a sentence because, according to them, such conjunctives connecting clauses can derive their internal cohesive strength from structural relations, whereas conjunctives occurring between adjacent sentences can derive their cohesive power from underlying semantic relations.

In this study, conjunctive cohesion is taken to operate throughout the text to link textual units occurring at clause, sentence, and paragraph boundaries. Conjunctives occurring at intra-sentential level (between clauses) are included in the present analysis because examining only conjunctives that operate across the boundaries of the orthographic sentences would ignore a large number of conjunctive relations between clauses within the sentence (Witte and Faigley, 198 1).

To sum up, since the ultimate goal is to understand the finished product, i.e., the text, all conjunctives occurring across the units mentioned above should be included in the analysis, as the analyst and the translator are, or should be, equally concerned not only with the finished product, but also, and perhaps more importantly, with the process of producing the text wherein the decisions behind the choice of surface features underlying the registeral features, including the choice of conjunctives are made.

Analyzing argumentative texts has to take into consideration the rhetorical function of the conjunctives used in the discourse. Such conjunctives are key markers signalling functional relationships between linguistic units and can largely contribute to the overall progression of the text, i.e., text typological focus. This being so, it is the translator's task to perceive and recognize how they are used in the making of a text in order to grasp the intended meanings and, subsequently, to render a communicatively acceptable translation of the text.

The focus of the analysis in this study is thus placed on the cases of mistranslations of conjunctives which arise from misunderstanding the semantic and pragmatic relations in the text concerned.

In the following sections, the discussion will deal with the role of conjunctives in a sample of Arabic political argumentative texts. The discussion will address the issues introduced in this section, i.e., text typological focus and the role of conjunctives in giving focus to text type. The discussion will, of course, be conducted within the frame of the relationship between/among the above aspects of text and the process of translating. For convenience of reference, the discussion will deal with the main and most frequently recurrent conjunctives in the texts analyzed in the study (additives and adversatives)..

7. Discussion of the Students' Renderings of the SL Conjunctives

In argumentative texts, as has been discussed earlier, the text producer employs conjunctives to indicate the progression of the content of the text and to signal how the parts of the text are connected. When conjunctives are appropriately used by the text producer, they act as sign posts to guide the reader (or the translator) as to the thread of the argument from the writer's perspective.

As far as translation is concerned, inappropriate renderings of the conjunctives would go against the text producer's intentionality and the reader's acceptability of the text. It seems that appropriate renderings of the conjunctives uphold two standards of textuality, namely acceptability and intentionality (de Beaugrande and Dressler, 1981). These two standards are concerned with the text user's attitudes. "Acceptability deals with the relationship between the text and the reader: it subsumes the text receiver's attitude that a language configuration should be accepted as a cohesive and coherent text" (Ibid.: 129) ,while "intentionality deals with the relationship between the text and its producer: it "subsumes the intentions of the text producer" (Ibid.: 113).

The analysis of the sample shows that the text producers employed different types of conjunctives to explicitly interweave semantic and

rhetorical relationships between clauses and sentences as well as paragraph boundaries. In this section, we will investigate the ways in which the student translators failed or managed to render the conjunctives in a manner that reflects their function as intended by the SL text producer in the SL text. We will examine in what ways the students' failure to grasp the rhetorical function of the conjunctives has affected the typological focus of the texts. In addition, we will look into instances in which inappropriate renderings of conjunctives may be attributed to violating syntactic rules of the target language.

7. 1 Adversative Conjunctives

According to Halliday and Hasan(1977: 190), the basic meaning of adversative relations is "unexpectedness" .In other words, adversative conjunctives indicate unanticipated ideas. The following table (1) provides statistical data on the student's attempted renderings of the adversative conjunctives in the texts.

Table 1 : Percentage of Inappropriate Renderings of Adversative Conjunctives in the Sample Texts

No. of Text	No. of Conjunctives	Percentage of Inapprop. Renderings
1	3	40.0%
2	4	33.4%

The following examples illustrate inappropriate renderings of adversatives.

Example :1

لكن هناك سبب رئيسي وبالغ الاهمية وراء هذا الرفض الاسرائيلي....

Proposed translation: However, there is a principal and highly important reason behind Israel's refusal . (Text ,1).

As it can be seen that what comes before "lakin" (however) (see appendix. Tex,t 1) unfolds backgrounding information shared by the text producer with the reader, whereas is given is foregrounding information . In this sense, this conjunctive device represents the text producer's own viewpoint which is contrary to the reader's anticipations . The text producer expects reader's stance and he goes back and forth to counter-argue interpretations and expected .At the end of the day ,he provides his interpretation

marked by ‘1akin’. In this context, ‘lakin’ signals that the text producer involves his reader's anticipations . This cohesive device takes on a concessive function; thus ‘however’ will do the job. The choice of ‘however’ will probably put right any false interpretations on the part of the reader of the flow of the argument in the text.

Inappropriate renderings of the concessive device ‘lakin’ can be quite serious when they involve the global structure of the text. In this context, ‘1akin’ should be rendered as "however" to interlock the argument across the paragraph boundaries to help focus the reader’s attention on particular information, i.e., the information assumed to be unshared by the reader, and bring a certain point into prominence. However, ‘1akin’ was inappropriately rendered by most of the student translators where 30% of them rendered it as (on the other hand, while, whereas); 15% skipped it. These conjunctives give different senses. The conjunctive device "on the other hand" was inappropriately rendered since there is no negative comparison between what is side after ‘lakin’ and what has been said before it. By the same token, the words "while and whereas" were inappropriately rendered since they are adversative contrast markers rather than concessive contrast markers (Farghal,1992: 47). In other words, the ideas presented are not contrastable in this context.

Some of the student translators appropriately rendered ‘lakin’ as (nonetheless, never the less, or yet). Although these conjunctives, can convey the message, some linguists, (e.g. van Dijk, 1981: 112) argue that these conjunctives are somehow linked with "positive assertion" rather than counter-argumentation.

A large number of the students rendered ‘lakin’ as ‘but’. In this context ‘but’ is less appropriate than ‘however’ because it seems that the word ‘but’ can be interpreted as a contrast marker, and it seems also that it is characteristic of simple contrast at the clause level rather than at the paragraph level. Consider the following example:

The glass is thick, <u>but</u> it is very fragile. **(Ibid.114)**

Whose translations ignored ‘lakin’ had given the paragraph an elaborative function rather than a concessive one. While it is true that English language tends to favor implicitness of underlying

relationships between /among discoursal units if propositional content of the text is coherently linked (Koch, 1983; Enkvist, 1985), our example (1) shows that one characteristic feature of concessives is that they are not usually left implicit. (cf. van Dijk, 1981). Only 10% rendered 'lakin' as initial paragraph "however". This rendering is not only contextually demanded but also pragmatically appropriate in argumentation.

A close examination of adversative conjunctives reveals that a great number of the student translators violated grammatical, syntactic, and semantic restrictions of this type. Observe, for instance, the case in example (2) below:

[a]على الرغم من ان القرار الامريكي، بتخفيض الاسلحة النووية في الترسانة الأمريكية قد قوبل بإرتياح عالمي واسع النطاق [b]، إلا ان أثار هذا القرار تبقى محدودة في المنطقة العربية... (Text ,1).

`Proposed Translation : [a] Although the U.S resolution to reduce nuclear weapons in its arsenal has been received with great relief the world over, [b] yet its effect is still limited in the Arab region.

The concessive conjunction ''ala r-rami min' (although) was rendered bluntly: the concessive relationship that holds between the two clauses (a and b) was rendered as a coordinating conjunction (but). The subordinating conjunction was provided by 20% as a coordinating conjunction as in below:

[a] *The American decision to reduce nuclear weapons in its arsenal has been received with great international relief, [b] but its effect is still limited in the Arab region…*

The most appropriate rendering of this relationship could be expressed by subordinating conjunctions like initial (although) . According to their grammatical function, coordinating conjunctions connect independent clauses, whereas subordinating conjunctions transform the independent clauses to which they are appended into subordinate ones. The students seem not to have realized this grammatical restriction, that is, why 'but' and 'although' can not be used to perform the same syntactic functions. Nor do they seem to have realized their semantic restrictions, that is, what relationship

they express and which ones are appropriate in which contexts. Semantically, the main difference between the two renderings is that the information in a subordinate clause presented as presupposed or given rather than asserted as new. In other words, the use of 'although' clause indicates an assumption on the part of the text producer that what follows it is shared information, while the use of but indicates that what comes before it and what comes after it are assigned equal semantic weight and that both are new. Thus, the syntactic inequality of subordination leads to semantic inequality.

Another rendering of '^{c} ala-r-raymi min' made by some of the student translators can be illustrated in below:

[1] <u>Admittedly,</u> *the American decision to reduce the nuclear weapons in the American arsenal has been received with great satisfaction.[2] However, the effects of this decision shall remain limited in the Arab region.*

It seems that this student translator nicely joined the two sentences ([1] and[2]) above. However, the conjunctive adjunct "admittedly" is usually used in argumentation to introduce the point that is debatable and controversial, while the '^{c}ala-r-raym min' (although), in this context is favored as it introduces shared information between the text producer and the audience.

It is important for our discussion to note that the concessive relation is considered indicative of argumentative discourse. According to Hatim (1991), the counter-argumentation above is viewed as "lop-sided" argument: where counter-proposition is anticipated by introducing the proposition with an explicit concessive (i.e.. although) while, the counter-argumentation is viewed as "balance ": where the text producer has the option of signaling the contrastive shift between what may be perceived as a claim and a counter-claim either explicitly (i.e. Admittedly … However) or implicitly (Ibid : 193)

Going back to the rendering of '^{c}ala-r-raymi min', it could be argued that the student translator failed to realize the balance type though he employed appropriate devices usually signaled in this type (i.e. Admittedly … However). In other words, using only formally appropriate devices may not reflect the type of counter-argumentation. More importantly, if these devices are not employed

successfully to serve the text producer's intention and, consequently, to wrongly guide the reader.

Some student translators (about 30%) provided translations which violate syntactic rules of English, as in example below:

[a] *Although the American decision of cutting back the nuclear weapons of the American arsenal was comfortably received all over the world, [b] but this decision has no effect in the Arab region.*

the basic reason of this inappropriate rendering is that English structure can not be both hypotactic (binding of elements of unequal status) and paratactic (linking of elements of equal status), i.e., it is either hypotactic or paratactic . 'But' is a coordinate conjunction which binds two or more grammatically equivalent constituents.

A great number of the students translators could not perceive the real function of adversative conjunctives as intended by the text producer. This may be attributed to lack of awareness of the real semantic relation expressed through propositions in the text concerned. See, for instance, the case in example (3) below:

[1] فالسلام لا يحتاج الى مخازن من الأسلحة توضع تحت يد المعتدين الإسرائيليين(8)
[2] وإنما يحتاج إالى إجراءات.
(Text, 1)

Proposed translation : ***[1] Peace does not require weapon arsenals placed under the control of the Israeli aggressors; [2] rather, it needs serious measures to be taken.***

The relationship between clause (1) and clause (2) lends itself to a contrast-correction function (Halliday and Hassan, 1976). Thus, an appropriate rendering that reflects this rhetorical function can be "rather" as an equivalent to 'innama'. However, most of the student translators (55%) missed this relationship and confused it with purely contrastive one (e.g., on the other hand, whereas). These conjunctives are inappropriate because the proposition presented in (3) above are not contrastable.

The analysis in this section has shown that the adversative conjunctives employed by the text producers in the SL texts have been handled by some student translators in ways which blurred the

nature of the argumentative texts. The student translators were engaged, it seems, in merely translating the information presented by the writer, ignoring the semantic and pragmatic functions of the adversatives. Although many student translators, as has been shown in the discussion, translated most of the SL adversative, they did not retain the semantic and rhetorical function of the adversatives as intended by the writer. In this sense, adversatives signal how the text producer converges with or diverges from his imaginary readers; how he gets involved in the argument against or for a certain attitude; and how he/she deploys all available means to convince, change the attitude or stance of the reader, or refute the views of an assumed reader.

In order for the translator to uncover the different dimensions of such a dialogue, he/she needs to retain the exact relations that hold among the component proposition in the text. Any rendering that diverts the strategies and techniques of the writer from the intended routes would yield a deformed text. Unfortunately, as the analysis has shown, such relationship were misinterpreted, thus turning out texts whose intended argumentative force has been drained away.

7.2.2. Additive Conjunctives

In their model**,**Halliday and Hasan(1976:245)maintain that the major function of the additive relations are to inform the reader that the ideas presented by the text producer have positive connections rather than negative ones (adversatives) . A second idea is marked by an additive conjunctive as "there is yet another point to be taken in conjunction with previous one" (Halliday and Hassan, 1976: 246). The additive relation ,compared to adversative, can be thought of as expected or conjunctive in the discourse compared to, for example, the adversative relation (see section 2-1 above), especially if there is nothing in the preceding discourse that can imply otherwise.

It has been found that a great number of the student translators tend of use additives that hold relationship other than those of addition, thus producing inappropriately linked parts of the

argument, twisting the text producer's intentions and misleading the reader.

Table 2: Percentage of Inappropriate Renderings of Additive Conjunctives in the Sample Texts.

No. of Text	No. of Conjunctives	Percentage of Inapprop. Renderings
1	5	48.0%
2	9	38.4%

To illustrate some of the inappropriate renderings of additive conjunctives, see, for instance, example (20) below:

بل إن اسرائيل ما تزال حتى هذه اللحظة تعتمد على واشنطن في كل شي ....

(Text ,2)

Moreover, Israel still depends on Washington in every thing ....

The additive conjunctive 'bal' (moreover) employed for a claim to be opposed (see Text ,,2) when his viewpoint is introduced.

Analysing the renditions provided by the students , a large number of them failed to make a distinction between the form and the function of th is rhetorical device . It was rendered by 45% as adversatives such as (but, however, on the contrary, on the other hand) and 25% as simple additive (and) or explanatory 'in other words' rather than certainty additive such as like "moreover, furthermore". Such inappropriate renderings can blur the pragmatic progressing of the argumentation, and violates certainty . Considering the context , it is clear that the text producer element built into the adequate conjunctive. While the text producer is intended to uphold the claim "these political circles are justified in their surprise", employing the emphatic additive 'bal', the students rendered it as adversative to oppose the claim. This anomalous interpretation and inappropriate renderings done by the students may be due to retaining dictionary meaning rather than textual one. Hence, their renditions were decontextualized. In other words, the translations provided come as indicators of of their unawareness Hence, their translations comes as indicators of their unawareness of the rhetorical function of this conjunctive in its textual context. Simple additives such as "and", and the explanatory device "in other

words", which were rendered as equivalents to 'bal' tend to drain out the force of the argument. For example, "in other words" is usually employed to clarify rather than to emphasize; "and" is usually used in discourse to add one piece of information to another without necessarily implying emphasis of stance or highlighting a point or even tension. Our suggested translation of 'bal' (sentence initial moreover), on the other hand, retains the element of emphasis and tension aroused by the series of emphatic elements which preceded the one we are dealing with.

The above example shows that the intended function of conjunctive devices can only be determined by perceiving the semantic and pragmatic relationship in the discourse. Since conjunctives assume functions derivable from the meanings of the sentences they connect (Shakir and Farghal,1996), we must be especially careful not to confuse form with function. Many linguists (e.g. Holloway, 1981; Fahnestock 1983; Grombie, 1985) maintain that an understanding of the semantic role of the text can lead to a greater understanding of the relationship between form and function of a conjunctive tie in the discourse. In this context, it is also worth noting that some of the student translators confused the stylistic 'wa' with the cohesive 'wa', thus rendering the first in the form of the second. To illustrate, see the case in (4) below:

وقد إتضح أن إسرائيل غير مستعدة للقبول بقرارات الشرعية الدولية وبمبدأ (٢١) الأرض مقابل السلام.

(Text ,2),

It was clear that Israel was not willing to accept the international legitimacy resolutions and the principal of "land for peace"

The stylistic 'wa' was rendered as a cohesive device by 30% (e.g. and, besides, also). See, for instance the following version below provided by one of the student translators.

And it is clear that Israel is not ready to accept the international legitimacy decisions and the principal of land for peace.

Since the semantic content of most argumentative texts tends to lend itself to a hierarchical structure, we assume that the semantic

relations in a text are related to one another not linearly but hierarchically : they can have a local function and a global function in structuring the text. A close examination of most of the additives rendered by the students revealed an interesting point. In their renderings, many students joined most Ideas of the SL texts by using "and" or "also", thus providing a list-like textual components where each component equals the others in semantic weight and rhetorical function.

The analysis in this section has shown that mishandling the SL additive conjunctives has twisted the argument by diverting the SL writer's intended message. Additive conjunctives proved to be relatively dominant in the student translator's renderings when compared to the frequency of appropriate renderings of the SL conjunctives. Many students interlinked most of the propositions with simple additives such as "and, and also" instead of signalling the sophisticated levels of structure via employing various types of subordination. In so doing, the student translators reduced the logical and other relationship to simplistic and straightforward presentation of ideas - a case quite unintended by the SL writer.

This type of handling conjunctives has revealed that a great number of the student seem to have difficulty in perceiving how the writer moves from topic-idea. They seem to have failed to identify layers of content organized hierarchically in a given text, and thus missing the pragmatics of organizing content in texts, especially in argumentative ones. They rendered the textual at the same semantic level with almost the same weight and relevance. The analysis has also shown that overuse of additive conjunctives in the TL may lead in many cases to rendering a text alien to the reader.

8 .Conclusions and implications

This study has made clear that the rhetorical functions of the cohesive conjunctives play an important role in realizing the use of particular devices in the textualization of argumentative discourse. These conjunctives are an integral part of argumentative discourse where text producers employ them to display, identify, and clarify linkage of ideas. In being so, conjunctives not only assist the readers to follow the thread of discourse, but also to mark shifts in the line

of the argument in it. Readers can perceive such shifts partly through the way conjunctives are deployed in the text.

The analysis and discussion of the present study have highlighted some of the differences in textualization that have an effect on the translation of Arabic argumentative texts into English. As it has been observed earlier, Arabic, for example, tends to employ many conjunctives in order to maintain the thread of discourse - a case not so recurrent in English. However, the presence of conjunctives in Arabic discourse is not a case of redundancy, as they have different purposes. It can be argued, then, that the problem lies not in the presence of conjunctives, but in the decisions the translator takes as regards the functionality of such devices when transferring them into the TL, taking into account the audience's anticipations of how such conjunctives may stand in the conventions of written expression in the TL.

We have observed that mistranslating conjunctive ties reflect misunderstanding the semantic relations, and signal failure on the part of the translator to identify the pragmatic force of the textual organization. It is necessary, therefore, for student translators to understand how to render conjunctives effectively in argumentative texts to capture intentionality and acceptability . To develop this understanding, they need to identify how component macro-elements of the text joined, and to be familiar with the way argumentative discourse is textualized in English in terms of rhetorical function and rhetorical tactics through the use of the conjunctive ties. The student translators should realize that conjunctives can not be rendered appropriately without taking into consideration the discourse contexts in which they operate. This requires work with the entire text rather than individual sentences. Further, the student translators should be trained to identify the given-new aspects of the message, namely the presupposed - asserted information. This may lead to a better understanding of the interaction between the text producer and reader, so that the translator can distinguish between conjunctives that mark presupposed information and those that signal asserted or new information.

We would like to emphasize that this study was not intended to provide the student translators with a list of Arabic conjunctives and their equivalents in English, simply because conjunctives have no inherent significant value when taken out of context. Rather, we want to emphasize the communicative value they assume when functionalized in various context for various purposes. This implies that the translation of conjunctives in argumentative discourse (and other types of discourse) should focus more on communicative/functional and pragmatic equivalence than on formal and grammatical correspondence.

REFERENCES

Al-Batal, M. (1985). **The Cohesive Role of Connectives in a Modern Expository Text**. (Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation). University of Michigan, Ann Arbor..

de Beaugrande, R. (1980). & Dressler, W. (1981). **Introduction to Text Linguistics**. London: Longman.

Fahnestock, J. (1983).“Semantic and Lexical Coherence”. **College Composition and Communication**, 34, pp.400-416.

Farghal, M. (1991). “Evaluativeness Parameter and the Translation from English into Arabic and Vice-Versa”, **Babel**, 37. pp.138-151.

_____ (1992). “Naturalness and the Notion of Cohesion in EFL Writing Classes”. **IRAL**, 30, pp.45-50.

Halliday& Hasan, R. (1976). **Cohesion in English**. London: Longman.

Hass, C., & Flower, L. (1986). “Rhetorical Reading Strategies and the Construction of Meaning”. **College Composition and Communication**, 39 (2) pp.167-183.

Hatim, B. (1985). “**A Text Linguistic Model for the Analysis of Discourse Errors: Contributions from Arabic Linguistics”**. (Unpublished Manuscript), pp.1-13.

_____ (1991). “The Pragmatics of Argumentation in Arabic: The Rise and Fall of a Text Type”. **Text**, 11, pp.189-199

Kaplan, R. (1966). “Cultural Thought Patterns in Intercultural Education”. **Language Learning**, 16, pp.1-21.

Koch, B. J. (1981). **Repetition in Discourse: Cohesion and Persuasion in Arabic Argumentative Prose**. (Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation). The University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.

Koch, B. J. (1987) "Parataxis in Arabic: Modification as a Model for Persuasion". **Studies in Language**, 11, pp.85- 98.

Leech, G. & Short, M. (1981). **Style in Fiction**. London: Longman.

Sloan, G. (1983). "Transitions: Relationship Among T-Units". **College Composition and Communication**, 34, pp.447-453.

van Dijk, T. A. (1977). **Text and Context**. London: Longman.

Williams, M. P. (1982). **A Contrastive Analysis of Text Cohesion and Development in Arabic and English**. (Unpublished M. A. Thesis). University of Leeds.

Winterowd, W.R. (1968). **Rhetoric: A Synthesis**. New York: Holt, Reinhart & Winston.

_____ (1970). "The Grammar of Coherence". **College English,** 31, pp.818-835.

Witte, S. P. & Faigley, L. (1981). "Coherence, Cohesion, and Writing Quality". **College Composition and Communication**, 32,pp.189-204.

تأثير أَخطاء ترجمة أَدوات الربط العربيَّة على النصوص الجدليَّة إِلى اللغة الإنكليزيَّة

سالم يحيى فتحي *

المستخلص

يتفق الباحثون على أَنَّ عملية الترجمة تتأثر بعوامل معينة منها الفكر والثقافة، فالفكر هو علم الأَفكار والمعتقدات والأَنظمة القيمية التي تشترك فيها المجاميع المجتمعية كافَّة، ويتضمَّن الفكر بهذا المفهوم قيمًا ثقافية وتقليدية ودينية تشكل سلوك الأَفراد تجاه الأَشياء، وهو إِطار عمل متعدد الأَوجه يربط المكونات الحوارية والإِدراكيَّة والاجتماعيَّة؛ إِذ يهدف البحث إِلى دراسة الأَنواع المختلفة للمحددات الفكرية التي يواجهها المترجمون اثناء عملية الترجمة ومحاولتهم لتخطي هكذا محددات باستعمال تدخلات مختلفة، وتفترض الدارسة أَنَّ المحددات الفكرية تجبر المترجم على تعديل النص الأَصلي من أَجل تلبية متطلبات القارئ في لغة الهدف، عمليًا، واختيرت عينات من مسرحية يوليوس قيصر وثلاث ترجمات عربية لها لتحلل من حيث مدى تحقيق المترجم للحاجات الفكرية للقارئ.

الكلمات المفتاحية: سياسيّ ، دينيّ ، ثقافيّ.

* أُستاذ/قسم الترجمة/كلية الآداب/جامعة الموصل.