دراسة تداولية للمناورة الاستراتيجية في المقابلات السياسية العراقية مع الاشارة الى الترجمة

A Pragmatic Study of Strategic Manoeuvering in Iraqi Political Interviews with Respect to Translation

أ.م. وفاء دحام محمد

Asst. Prof. Wafaa Dahham Mohammed

جامعة تكريت / كلية الآداب

University of Tikrit/ College of Arts

E-mail: *waffaadaham@tu.edu.iq*

الكلمات المفتاحية: التكييف، التداولية، الفعل الكلامي، المناورة الاستراتيجية، الترجمة.

Keywords: Adaptation, Pragmatics, Speech Act, Strategic Manoeuvering, Translation.

الملخص

يختص البحث بالتداخل التداولي– الترجمي من خلال استقصاء كيفية امكانية استخدام الافعال الكلامية كأدوات للمناورة استراتيجياً. وكذلك كيفية امكانية استخدام الترجمة لتحقيق أهداف المناور. تبنى المناورة الاستراتيجية في النقاش / الجدال السياسي بأستخدام ممارسات لافعال كلامية مختلفة من اجل تجسيد الدوافع الاستراتيجية مما يسبب اشكال وصعوبة في ادراكها وفهمها خارج نطاق الجدال الخاص بها وكذلك التسبب في عدم ملائمتها ثقافيا, انهيار في وسيلة التواصل اللغوي واختلال في العملية التواصلية بين اللغتين في ترجماتها. ولتحقيق هذه الدراسة فقد تم اختيار خمس نصوص من المقابلة الصحفية لرئيس مجلس النواب العراقي في اثناء تقديم طلب قرار استقالته من مجلس النواب العراقي مع اربع ترجمات لها في اللغة الانكليزية كبيانات للدراسة الحالية. ووقد تم اعتماد منهج التحليل الكيفي او النوعي باستخدام العديد من القواعد النظرية والوظائف والتقنيات والاستراتيجيات من اجل تحليل البيانات قيد الدراسة. كما قد تم تطوير مودل انتقائي يتضمن مزيج من قواعد تحليليه من ضمنها فان امرن وغرودن دورست (١٩٨٤) توظيف الافعال الكلامية في المناورة الاستراتيجية, عمر (٢٠١٩) الافعال الكلامية في المناورة الاستراتيجية دراسة الحجاج العربي من وجهة نظر التداولية, امرن (٢٠١٠) في تعديله على تصنيف سيرل للأفعال الكلامية من وجهة نظر البلاغة التداولية في المناورة الاستراتيجية. ومن اهم ما توصلت اليه الدراسة ان الافعال الكلامية هي اكثر التقنيات هيمنة في الاستخدام الدفاعي للمناورة الاستراتيجية في الجدال السياسي والتي تتطلب ترجمتها ادراك عالي للدوافع الاستراتيجية ما وراء النقاش و كفاءة عالية في التكييف التداولي من اجل تكييف الممارسات الاستراتيجية في لغة الهدف.

Abstract

The study is concerned with the pragma-translation amalgam investigating how speech acts can be strategically utilized as manoeuvering tools and how translation can be strategically adapted to achieve the maneuverer's aims. Difficulty in both the strategic manoeuvering perception and rendition is attributed to its maintenance out of its debate and triggers cultural inadequacy, cross-code breakdown, etc., in its renditions. To conduct this study, five argumentations have been selected from the interview of the President of the Iraqi Parliament Council in his issuance of resignation decision with their four renditions as the data. An analytical-qualitative method of various theoretical rules, functions, mechanisms, etc., is utilized to analyze the data under scrutiny. An eclectic model of mixed perspectives is developed involving Emeren and Grootendorst's (1984) employment of speech acts in strategic manoeuvering, Omar (2019) Speech acts of Strategic manoeuvering in the Pragmatic Study of Arabic Argument, Emeren (2010) in his modification of Searles' speech act taxonomy of manoeuvering acts, and Chesterman (2015) pragmatic adaptation strategies. The study comes with the most notable conclusion, which is that speech acts are the dominant manoeuvering tactics defensively utilized in political debates whose translation requires a high degree of awareness of their strategic motives and an adequacy of a pragmatic adaptation strategy for legitimating them strategically in the target language.

Introduction

Due to the pervasiveness of argumentative practices in daily communication of human language in general and the consequences that they affect in cross-cultural communication in particular, strategic manoeuvering has been chosen to be investigated, because it appears to be closely related to human interaction and recent political exchange. Strategic manoeuvering is depicted as an argumentative mechanism of wordplay reasonably used as a means for resolving differences in opinions, effectuating persuasion, and getting certain motives by persuasion. This is done via a variance of speech acts.

In political debate, strategic manoeuvering is upheld via variance speech act practices for actualizing its motives which attribute a difficulty in both their perception out of their debate scope and trigger cultural inadequacy, cross code breakdown, and distribution of communication in their renditions.

Therefore, the paper is conducted to pose the challenges and call into answers to the following questions:

- Can speech acts strategically operate as tactics for manoeuvering achievement?
- To what extent can speech acts be fortunate strategic tools and serve the manoeuvering practices?
- Whether pragmatic adaptation can strategically validate the manoeuvering practices in another language?
- What is the appropriate pragmatic adaptation strategy that can adequately handle strategic manoeuvering rendition into English?

An amalgamation of pragmatics and translation has been embraced owing to the interdisciplinary nature of these two sciences. Besides, the task played by pragmatics in bridging the translation essences. The turn of translation and cross-cultural communication never seems to wane. Thenceforth, this paper is concerned with, on the one hand, how strategic manoeuvering can be realized pragmatically via speech acts and employed at the interactive level of political debate to persuasively resolve differences in opinions, gain acceptance, protect certain positions, guarding against attack, and getting the other parties in argumentative practice to take actions via the power of strategic manoeuvering practice. On the other hand, investigate how pragmatic adaptation can be strategically embraced in cross-cultural communication to address the same speech act strategic function in the target language or to address another function that is performed by the original text that conforms with the target culture.

The paper explores the role of the pragmatics of speech act theory in the manifestation of strategic manoeuvering that is deemed care in handling its importance in Iraqi affairs. Some think that strategic manoeuvering is a matter of resolving differences in opinions. However, this is not always true pertaining to political debate as the manoeuvering practice can be held out to actualise certain attitudes and effect changes in the political situation as a whole.

However, this paper focuses on specific components of strategic manoeuvering—topical potential, presentational devices, and audiences' demands—because tackling all components is too lengthy. Finally, the various triggers, techniques, and strategies highlight the role of pragmatic adaptive translation in political interviews.

1. Strategic Manoeuvering in English

2.1.The Concept of Strategic Maneuvering

The concept of strategic manoeuvring signifies the reduction of the gap between dialectical and rhetorical perspectives by embracing rhetorical insights in the dialectical approach systematically. This approach is extended into and used as pragma-dialectical argumentation theory (Eemeren and Garssen 2009, p. xii) The term "manoeuvring" refers to a procedure issued with a goal; this goal has to be reached by skilful and tactful planning a "strategy"; it has been coined with a purpose that is, in essence, deliberate activity; action design, conception proceeding of an action (Drucker, 1974) and (Moore,1959) in which manoeuvring must be manageably achieved by accurate preparation that impress an optimal balance between rationality and efficacy; and because of this thus the word "strategic" is added to "manoeuvering. Thus, the notion of ‘ strategic manoeuvring’ refers to a planned and careful movement to perform or win something to be done (Eemeren 2017,p.54).

Strategic manoeuvring is a process of making use of the available opportunities in the dialectical situation to direct the discourse rhetorically in the direction that serves the speakers’ own best interest (Eemeren 2017,p.54). Then, it is related to the arguers’ continuous efforts to make a correspondence in their argumentative persuasion. It aims to influence persuasion by being reasonable. The effectiveness of strategic manoeuvring is most significantly determined in terms of the employed communicative strategies to present a communicative intention (2017,p. 54).

In Leech's term (1983, p.147), strategic manoeuvring is explained as the "interpersonal rhetoric model, which blends pragmatics and

rhetorics." This confirms that pragmatics and rhetoric can coexist as strategic manoeuvering.

1.2. Components of Strategic Manoeuvring

In pragma-dialectics, a categorization of essential elements incorporated within the process of manoeuvring is postulated. These strategic elements are put forward to achieve a balance between the two ideals, namely, reasonableness and effectiveness in speech. They are imperative in themselves for identifying how speech can be brought into argumentation. All these three aspects are related to distinct types in the manifestation of manoeuvring choice and the three aspects manifest themselves within a single argumentative move; these are the following:-
1-***Topical Potential***: the option that refers to the viewpoint or thematic perspective based on which the arguer deliberately selects argument in framing strategic manoeuvering or at least part of strategic manoeuvring that he is interested in (Eemeren 2010, p. 96). The topical potential is the contextual frames that provide the implicit material premises that are at the basis of argumentation in making strategic manoeuvering. For instance, in an argument concerned with personal differences, the person picks out from the topical possibilities who the arguer is.; What is his accuse?; and what does the arguer accuse that person of? Then, they are associated with the relevant available alternative options to strategically process manoeuvering at a particular stage to resolve differences (Simons, 1990,p.114).

2-***Audience Demand***: strategic manoeuvring includes a shift to the audience's demand, which means taking into account the audience's preferences and acceptability when planning the arguments. It also meant that the speaker strategically maneuvered in the adaptation of the audience's preferences. It involves the inclinations of the audience members or peruses that a speaker or writer in the conflicting talk for framing it in terms of the addressee's perspective. In a nutshell, the argumentation motions that are made must be strategically adjusted/ accommodated under the viewpoints and frames of reference of the persons who are to be persuaded (audiences) to effectively reach successful manoeuvring (Eemeren and Houtlosser 2009: 6).

3- ***Exploitation of Presentational Devices***: includes the exploitation of certain devices, which refers to the strategic use of the lexical choices that build up the frame of the argument for a specific purpose and adoption of the appropriate discursive forms in argumentation regarding the stylistic choice possibilities such as rhetorical questions, metaphor, indirect speech etc. (Eemeren and Houtlosser 2009: 6). Another strategic function of

presentational devices is to depict things in a given light, define the circumstance in a specific way, one that is appropriate for the speaker's rhetorical goals. Eemeren (2010, p.121) classifies presentational devices into three tiers; these are: syntactic: e.g. repetition, subordination, paratactic and hypotactic constructions, etc.; semantic: e.g. metaphors, metonymy, and repetition, alliteration, analogy and antithesis so on; and pragmatic: e.g. rhetorical questions, idioms, context, etc.

As a matter of course, although these three aspects of strategic manoeuvring are markedly separable, they are fundamentally interdependent and always co-occur. Yet, strategic manoeuvring often manifests in one particular aspect as more prominent than other aspects. By emphasizing certain aspects of strategic manoeuvring use of an argument from authority; for instance, the strategic manoeuvring, in a certain context, may be raised mainly to the fore in the topical choice that is made or by putting overemphasis on adopting audience demand, or by emphatic use of striking presentational strategies (Eemeren 2010, p. 93–127).

2.3.Forms of Strategic Manoeuvring

Based on its target, it seems that people tend to use certain strategies to be persuasive and mobilize and effectively get people to achieve their goals. Eemeren and Peter (2008) characterize the functions of strategic manoeuvering in the following:

1-***Changing the Subject***:- manoeuvering is mostly the exercise of changing the subject matter (viz. topical potential). At any time, there are many differences between people in the public arenas. When a subject matter is possibly harmful and unfolded negativity, it could be potentially strategically manoeuver by redirecting the focus and attention to another subject matter and reorienting it to be more convenient to the arguer's best interest (Mitchell, 2011,p.21).

2- ***Modifying the Relevant Audience***: this form of strategic manoeuvring discerns the modification of the scope of the relevant audience in the communicative argument. It is related to the identification of the nature of the intended audience and their role in allocating manoeuvering direction. Therefore, identifying the scope and the nature of the related audience can effectively raise supporting opinions and have the preferable opportunity to win the argument (Zarefsky, 2008,p.14). This can be done by eliciting the issue of the argument in terms of the perspective of the related audience and reallocating the procedural domain to the concern of their preference.

3-***Appealing to Liberal and Conservative*** highly related to the people's presumptions where arguers strategically manoeuver via appealing to their presumptions and combine elements of conservative and liberal

presumption to successfully enhance their opinions. It concerns the organization and arrangement of arguments that appeal to both the conservative and liberal presumptions. People have the potential to share elements of both liberal and conservative worldviews. For example, people could be conservative (viz. politeness- face-saving act) but publically liberal, or they favour intervention and recognition by others (viz. politeness – face-threatening act).

4-***Using Condensation Symbols:-*** a mechanism whereby arguers strategically maneuver through employing visual or verbal condensation symbols for enhancing their opinions. It equally condenses several meanings into a commonly negative or positive connotation in terms of the people's reactions to the symbol, which will be the same for different reasons. For example, the condensation symbol is used to symbolize/ identify a public matter that is agreeably accepted or rejected by all the people in common. So, people could be positively expected to deal with it or negatively reject it. (Eemeren and Henkemans, 2016,p.56).

5- ***Reframing the Argument Socially***: is another type of strategic manoeuvring that includes determining a comprise of a given argument as far as a social realism is structured instead of 'given' in advance, based on the frame of reference a set of actual statuses can be comprehended in various ways in which they are cast (Kienpointer, 2013).

6- ***Employing the Locus of the Irreparable***: is a type in which the way of manoeuvering is strategically built upon diverse audiences' stands. One of the characteristics of the diverse audience is that a few members will be ready to take action, others may be reluctant, a greater number will be uncommitted, and another category is those who are interested in the standpoint of an arguer. Yet, they are not prepared to do an action. This suggests strategically framing the perspective in a certain way that is in the audiences' best interest to take benefits to resolve differences and gain audiences' acceptance, in which it might lose the chance to do that in another viable way. This shows that politician argumentative discourse, to some extent, is almost taking dormant standards in addition to beliefs to the surface in a way that requires viewers to act even though they may have differing stands on it (Andone,2013,p.45).

7- ***Contextual Framing***: Contextual relations are manoeuving instruments in the choice of the precise strategy pursued by the speaker to justify a position. Contextual framing always involves an interpretation of reality that puts the facts or events referred to in a certain perspective. It vitally activates the current options for making strategic moves at the arguer's

disposal in a certain case and at a particular point in the discourse. There are usually different contextual stages the arguer can choose from for defending his or her standpoint in an argumentative discussion. It affords the arguer some freedom to select the line of defence that suits them best and the values attributed to it (Eemeren, 2010,p. 93-94). Context is connected with cultural premises, which can be used strategically to build up arguments in favor of a certain standpoint. Further, it delicately activates an organization of strategic functions for putting forward a line of defense for a certain standpoint.

2.5.The Pragmatics of Strategic Manoeuvering

Feasibly, in pragma-dialectical theory, strategic manoveuring is typically explored from either a communicative perspective or a critical one. The first perspective is inspired by pragmatic insights from the speech act concept and discourse analysis. The second perspective, on the other hand, is stimulated by using dialectical insights from critical rationalism and logic (Eemeren & Grootendorst, 1984). The focus of this paper is to tackle strategic manoeuvring from the pragmatics of speech act perspective.Strategic manoeuvring is submitted under the rule of normative pragmatics. Jacobs (2002, p.213) defines normative pragmatics as a conceptualization of argumentation efficiency that blends both conceptions of rhetorical techniques with dialectical principles. Pragmatics organizes all language use using inferential and strategic concepts by providing an exploration of the communicative context of the social one. The role of pragmatics in strategic manoeuvring can be materialized in its interpretation, organization, and framing. Some researchers consider strategic manoeuvring to be a multi-disciplinary phenomenon, while others believe that it is a socially pragmatic one.

However, strategic maneuvering differs from many other argumentation theories, because it emphasizes the relevance of context in arguments. Manoeuvering argumentation, according to pragma dialectics, is a social rational communication in which all movements are implicit speech acts intended at settling a disagreement of opinion (Eemeren, 2010; Eemeren & Grootendorst, 1984).

In pragmatic operation, strategic manoeuvring is afforded the role of gaining a standpoint via an argument. It is beneficial via pragmatic resources to decrease the potential tension between effectiveness and reasonableness. People inherently invite certain pragmatic strategies for manoeuvring specifically and effectively. Maneuverers manoeuver not only to present their faces to their audiences but also to achieve their strategic targets (intents). To put it simply, people purposely engage in various pragmatic tactics for the manifestation of strategic manoeuvring such as metaphors, rhetorical questions, indirect speech acts, politeness, etc. as presentational devices, which seem to be

more persuasive and mobilize people to achieve their goals. (Eemeren and Houtlosser, 2000,p. 58). Therefore, pragmatic tactics are manoeuvering devices strategically substantiated as valid instruments for preserving the balance between efficacy and reasonableness. Such an operation will fill a communication gap that exists between a dialectical and a rhetorical approach to argumentation (Leeman, 1992; Toulmin, 2001). Thus, these pragmatic tactics can be employed to bridge this communication gap, indicating that rhetorical and dialectical approaches are complementary rather than competing in that they both aim to achieve persuasion (Krabbe, 2002; Leff, 2002). The idea of the type of communicative activity is offered to support the manoeuvering practices of discourse by providing a better grasp of the argumentative reality.

The pragmatic approach of strategic maneuvering has the heuristic function of directing attention to the explicit or implicit speech acts that are feasibly relevant in the materialization of strategic maneuvering because they are to the resolution process (Eemeren 2010,p. 9). With the knowledge of relevant speech acts, the maneuverer can begin to build a reconstruction of the resolution, which is then compared to determine possible rule violations.

2.4.Speech Acts Gambit in Strategic Manoeuvering:

The pragmatics to strategic manoeuvering in the pragma-dialectical theory provides a normative framework for the analysis and evaluation of argumentation by understanding argumentation as speech acts (Bermejo Luque, p. 60).

Interactively, the varying communicative moves made during an argumentation manoeuvring process are characterized as speech acts. These speech acts enable clarification of the criteria the pragmatic moves should conform to (Eemeren and Grootendorst 1984, p. 62).

Speech acts have a role in the arrangement of the argumentation and strategically operate for resolving a contrast of opinions and bringing audiences' acceptance. They supply a background for the manifestation and the evaluation of strategic manoeuvering (Eemeren & Grootendorst, 2010, p.15).

Eemeren (2010, p.9) stresses the employment of analytically relevant explicit or implicit speech acts in argumentative discourse indicating that it is, essentially, “an instrument for doing justice to the vital intellectual, social and cultural interests that can be at stake in argumentative practice” (van Eemeren 2010, 4).

In view of Searle's (1969) speech act

theory, Eemeren notices that illocutionary acts have a connection between a sentence and the illocutionary point, stressing the importance of illocutionary role in structuring manoeuvering strategically proposing that a single illocution is sufficiently convenient for holding out many sentences together in argumentative corpus wherewithal, a whole strategic manoeuvering practice can be efficiently and reasonably hold out as a single illocutionary act (Eemeren and Grootendorst 1983, p.32).

All argument maneuvers made in the speech acts are targeted for achieving logically effective valences in the pragma-dialectical perspective of strategic manoeuvering. (Eemeren, 2010, p. 39).

Speech act theory, in agreement with the pragma-dialectical principles, grants a reasonable tool for strategically handling verbal communication that is maneuvered via solving a contrast of opinions and ensuring the audience's agreement. In utilizing this theory, "the verbal moves made in the different stages of a manoeuvering to solve a variance of opinion can be depicted as speech acts" Grootendorst (2006, p. 6-94).

In addition, the inclusion of speech acts in pragma-dialectical analysis operates in forming the essence of the manoeuvering, the adopted positions of defender of the standpoint and attacker of the standpoint, determining how standpoints are refuted or justified with the arguments, and how settling a dispute is helped by the use of particular speech acts at different stages of the argumentation process (van Eemeren et al., 1992, p. 38).

2.5.The Taxonomy of Strategic Manoeuvering Speech Acts

In view of Searle's (1969) taxonomy of discourse of actions, Eemeren (2004, p. 37) displays the flawless strategic manoeuvering practically in identifying the type of speech acts conformed to strategically aid the resolution of divergences in viewpoints and guiding others' acceptance as actions will facilitate the issues. In an amalgam of the pragmatic approach of speech acts and the pragma-dialectical approach of strategic manoeuvering, and in agreement with Searle's (1969) well-known taxonomy, Eemeren and Grootendorst (1984, p. 62) agreeably adopt Searle's dominant taxonomy of speech acts. The speech acts are dubbed as instruments for maneuvering criteria for deciding strategic achievement of the value of acts as means for actualizing certain arguing goals; are five categories; are as follows:-

1-***Assertives*** are speech acts that can take place in a critical discussion. They strategically express their opinion on an issue. Assertive speech acts can also be found in most of the stages of the argument (Downes, 1998,p.

378). Those speech acts are actions in which the speaker or writer descriptively modifies the current situational condition of circumstances concerning a specific topic. They serve not only to specify a specific point of view underlies the text or discourse, but to progressively manoeuver the argumentation in the guard of the point of view, or to judge the result of the discussion. Standpoints and arguments that are strategically put forward using assertive speech acts to manoeuver are statements, claims, assurances, predictions, suppositions, negations, and denials (Downes, 1998,p. 378). Eemeren and Grootendorst 1984, p.63). Asssertives may not only comment on the standpoint that is at the center of the argument, but they can also perform it by being a part of defending a standpoint, or they can show how the argumentation process is brought to its conclusion. These acts amount to a majority of collaboratively exploring competing viewpoints that ought to consist of an argument (van Eemeren et. al., 1992, p.28).

2- ***Directives***: these are those speech acts that some, but not all of them are strategically maneuvered via as beneficial instructions in a critical conversation. Those acts involve the speaker's or author's attempts to persuade the listener to do something or give up doing something by using these speech acts, e.g., to ask, request, and prohibit. In some acts of this type, the maneuverer or audience has the authority over one another, thenceforth it is a request or an invitation. Directive speech acts such as orders and prohibitions are essentially excluded from being strategic tools to maneuver in critical discussion. Furthermore, the party who has come up with a standpoint can only be challenged to argue his standpoint; a challenge to a fight, for instance, in the case of the directive is not permitted. In resolving a difference of opinion, the strategic maneuver is based on constructive directives to defend a standpoint and request an explanation or a definition. Although the macro-speech act of directives encompasses several micro-speech acts (for example, command, request, restriction, and advice, to mention a few), not all of them are used as manoeuvering acts (van Eemeren and Grootendorst 1984, 64).

3-***Commissives***: are those acts in the implication in which a maneuverer obligates himself to the audience or reader to do something or to refrain from doing something. Prototypically, commissives are explicit promises, agreeing and accepting. Commissives, such as agreeing to the rules of the discussion, can be favorably performed when the other party is also willing to issue the commissive (Eemeren and Grootendorst 2004, p. 65). Commissives strategically play diverse manoeuvring roles in an argumentative discussion: (Mirza and Al-Hindawi,2016, p. 85); these roles can be clarified in the following:-

(1) to accept or reject a perspective of view.
(2) to accept a challenge in order to defend a position.
(3) to decide to start a debate.
(4) to accept to play the protagonist or antagonist.
(5) to agree on the discussion rules.
(6) Whether or not to accept argumentation; and – if applicable –
(7) Decide whether or not to start a new topic.

5- ***Expressives***: speech acts that communicate a speaker's feelings, attitudes, and emotions. Expressives feelings constitute the following acts: thanking, praising, approval, disapproval, irritation, greeting, regretting, and condemning. The sole expression of a feeling does not directly affect a resolution process, as it does not create a commitment for the speaker. Still, it is an act of strategic maneuvering, whereby, a speaker intentionally issues his feelings to commit an expressive act that can greatly affect the course the resolution process takes. For example, when a speaker expresses his unhappiness with how the discussion is going, he commits the effort of trying to inform that a resolution is pointless and this would certainly affect the listener's way of proceeding in the discussion. Therefore, expressions are not central to resolving differences in opinion. (van Eemeren and Grootendorst 2004,p. 65) Those acts do not participate directly in a critical debate because the purpose of an expression is to convey a sentiment, so they do not directly make a strategic connection to the resolution of a dispute by using this speech act. Expressives do play a minor role in strategic manoeuvring and resolving differences of opinion.

6- ***Declarative: these are those acts type where authorised persons perform certain declarations, with the mere pronouncing of them, making the declarations a reality.*** They are strongly linked to institutionalised contexts (van Eemeren and Grootendorst 1984, 66). Some declaratives cannot take place in rational discussions (van Eemeren and Grootendorst 1984, 109). This subclass of declaratives usage embraces such acts: defining, explaining, suggesting, claiming, stating a fact, providing information, and expressing beliefs. In the performance of declaratives, a maneuverer explains, defines, or specifies something to the audience in order to clarify how a specific speech act should be interpreted whereabouts strategically manoeuver in making a claim, stating a fact, or asserting a belief with a primary purpose of a getting the listeners' persuasion to accept his standpoint. The maneuverer's strategic maneuvering intention is to convince the audience of the validity of his standpoint via a declarative act, which could be valid and the audience become persuaded and affected in terms of the truth of the statement and changes any preconceived notions the listener may have had about

evolution. (van Eemeren and Grootendorst 1984, 66).

In practice, many speech acts are maneuvered implicitly, and all speech acts except for assertives can be indirectly maneuvered via standpoints of arguments (van Eemeren and Grootendorst 1984, 62).

3. Strategic Manoeuvering in Arabic

3.1.The Conceptualization of Strategic Manoeuvering

Strategic manoeuvering is originally instituted in speech communicative bases standardly grounded on descriptive and normative perspectives wherewith the argumentative phenomenon is allocated. It aims the recognition the necessity of harmonizing the discoursal discussion in terms of the existence of actual reality and stipulating speech toward audiences' agreement and preferences in the light of certain efficacy purposes (Omar, 2019,p.181).

Pragmatically strategic maneouvering is a pragma-rhetorical component with analytical and practical dimensions. It procedurally acts in accordance with its creator's discoursal intents and the interactive effects that are intended to be attained (Omar, 2019,p.179).

From a pragma-dialectical standpoint, strategic manoeuvering is an argumentative term that principally refers to the efforts that are made that seek to launch balances in the endeavor of preserving reasonableness on one hand while holding up pragma-rhetorical efficacy in persuasively resolving differences in opinions and gaining the intended audiences' agreement to the current issue on the other hand (Alaioi, 2013,p.975). Strategic manoeuvering is a social communicative activity that refers to the adoption of viewpoints and opinions on a standardized basis from argumentative practices built on pragmatic discerns for informing an argumentative message, bringing forth its persuasive effects, and allocating it in their righteous context (Okasha,2013,p.9).

3.2.Facets of Strategic Manoeuvering

The formulation core of strategic manoeuvering is basically grounded on the relation of the interdependent exchange between three sides; namely:

1-Topical Choices:- include the text or discourse elements that are directly related to the general conceptualization sense and act such as viewpoints, purports, motives, the objective adopted context of the involved parties, discourse baseline, discourse structure, argumentative structure, discourse schemata, etc. (Omar, 2019,p.194-195).

2-Presentational Devices: involve linguistic and stylistic choices through which topical choices are introduced. Presentational devices encompass the linguistic and paralinguistic tools for framing manoeuvering affairs, topics, objectives, items, etc. making use of certain linguistic and stylistic options explicitly or implicitly such as figurative language, rhetorical devices, metaphors, metonyms, pragmatic tactics, etc. which are formulated in accordance with the type of language used, text or discourse elements and moves (Omar, 2019,p 195).

3-Correspondency to the Audiences' Demands:- concerned with this perspective that strategic manoeuvering act should idealistically assume a point of view directed in the light of the intended audience, their attitudes from the argument objective, the values that they believe, the preferences that they favor and approve …etc. Whereupon, the maneuver strategically performs his manoevering practices by selectively culling out selfsameness topical choices and assigning selfsameness presentational devices striving for correspondence with audience demands (Omar, 2019,p.195). Regardless of the unanimous consensus of the opinion in the interdependent and mutual exchanges between the aforementioned strategic manoeuvering facets; nevertheless in each case certain facet has the priority to be emphasized over the others. To put it simply, in some cases the maneuverer puts much more emphasis on the topical potential, in other cases, however, presentational devices are overemphasized, and in some others, correspondency to the audience demands is worthier to be afforded. However, such emphasis is dependently granted in terms of manoeuvering motives and contextual affairs (Omar, 2019,p.195).

3.3.Strategic Manoeuvering and Speech Acts

In the pragma-rhetorical approach, speech act theory has been feasibly opted for framing the theoretical and performative practical grounds of strategic maneuvering actions. In principle, any argumentative act should be delicately positioned in its appropriate context, in virtue of which (the context), it strategically impresses the desired effects or changes. Whereof, speech acts along with contextual factors simultaneously materialized as maneuvering tools for strategic efficacy. In turn, strategic manoeuvering is purposefully targeted for effectuating certain interactional communicative motives far away from the logical approach that constrains strategic manoeuvering to the absolute standards in the uses of texts in terms of formal validity (Okasha,2013,p.9)

The amalgamation between strategic manoveuring and speech acts affects the pragmatic forum of the pragma-dialectical approach to the specification of speech acts in strategic practices. Whereabouts, strategic manoeuvering is decidedly manifested in terms of the speech acts that are permitted to be assumed by the two parties in every level of the discoursal

stage. Such specification plays an important role in allocating directing speech maneuvered acts reasonably for getting audiences' persuasion and gaining their acceptance (Mohammed, 2004,p.102).

The pragmatic forum of strategic manoeuvering is virtually manifested in terms of the speech acts that are permitted to be assumed by the two parties in every level of discoursal discussion. In this specification, speech acts strategically occupy the main role of manoeuvering practices, by being the tools maneuvered via solving differences in opinions and bringing audiences into acceptance on an objective basis (Omar,2019,p.183). The pragmatic materialization of strategic manoeuvering is grounded in speech act theory which, in turn, centered around setting frames of rules for strategic communication; based on two pragma-dialectical principles; namely: efficacy and reasonableness. In practice, strategic manoeuvering is principally enclosed to the benefits embraced from the communicative context, wherewith, the manoeuvering target is not gained from the utterances but from the performed speech acts called forth to coherently correspond to the communicative process of constructing the persuasive aims. On this behalf, speech acts are also verbal depictions in argumentative exchange, whereas arguments per se are speech acts exchanges (Abd Al-Latif,2012). To call this, the maneuverer deliberately elicits appealingly some pragmatic tactics and speech acts to strategically experience (perform) his manoeuvering practices semi-transparently advocating some viewpoints, appealing a correspondence in favor of his audiences. Whereat his manoeuvering utterance is raised with prominent depiction with idiomaticity, rhetoric, stylization, and metaphoricity bringing forth persuasion reasonably along with the manoeuvering motif effectively (Omar, 2020, p. 72).

Taxonomically, strategic manoeuvering is a speech act genre. When the maneuverer issues an invitation commits a promise, asserts an issue declares a commitment or expresses appreciation; he is not simply experiencing a speech act but he strategically attempts to persuade the hearer or the reader and brings and invites him efficacy and reasonably to take actions and responds to him interchangeably/ objectively (Abd Al-Latif, 2012,p.263). Concerning a socio-pragmatic standpoint, strategic manoeuvering is a verbal social activity that takes place in a contextual frame satisfactorily materialized social targets. At its lowest level, it strives to put an effect for getting others' persuasion in acceptableness or non-acceptableness of certain opinions along with guaranteed well-grounded justifications. At its widest level, it seeks to hold up in harmony with others for approving, disapproving, believing, disbelieving, or taking an action in a certain person's best interest (Omar, 2020,p.66).

3.4.Speech Acts in Strategic Manoeuvering Processing

Framing speech acts in strategic manoeuvering sprung from the need for a mechanism that materially enfolded important manoeuvering sides and set its goals objectively; these rules are summarized as follows:-

1)Aims Determinacy:- knowledge of determining the strategic aims of manoeuvering is an essential concern in discerning the way by which the maneuverer strategically rehearses (effectuates). Such limitation is central in shaping manoeuvering intent persuasively procuring its endeavor efficaciously (Olaioi, 2014, p.19).

1) ***Contextual Dependency:***- a great deal of attention should be pointed to the context of strategic practices; whereof, patterns of manoeuvering acts are held out via discourse incident and are inter-conditioned by the limitations imposed upon the manoeuvering practices, permitted prospects granted for the manoeuver and the obstacles that he has faced in the light of submitted situational incidents loci which in their own role regulate manoeuvering communicative patterns. Whereby, two types of manoeuvering communication are postulated; namely: explicit strategic manoeuvering and implicit manoeuvering (Moshelar,2003,p.29).

3.5.Speech Acts Conditions for Materializing Strategic Manoeuvering

Pragma-dialectics believe that strategic speech behaviors of users are conditionally judged from a pragmatic standpoint pertaining to the linguistic use which in their own role advances the linguistic bases of strategic manoeuvering. These rules are judged to be the communicative principles of strategic manoeuvering processing and must be abided by every manoeuvering communication and interaction. These rules are prejudged to expressly conform to manoeuvring acts; these are the following:- 1-Clarity Condition: the maneuverer should not present his manoeuvering motif in incomprehensible speech acts. Whether explicitly or implicitly, the maneuverer must be clear, non-obscure, and consistent. He should legitimately proceed with his defense, reasons, justifications …etc. Conspicuously and evincely (Omar, 2020,p.50).

2-Commitment Condition: this condition includes that the maneuverer should not proceed with unacceptable, insincere, unrighteous, or speech acts upon which he cannot accept responsibility or cannot undertake their consequence. Thenceforth, strategic manoeuvering should be structured upon solid grounds whereby the maneuverer can assume the commitments that he put himself under in uttering his speech act (Omar, 2020,p.50).

3-Efficacy Condition: the maneuverer should not build strategic manoeuvering upon nonsensical, non-relevant, redundant speech acts. That is strategic manoeuvering should effectuate/ influence pragmatic

efficacy and flawlessly go with the communicative setting maneuvered via (Omar, 2020,p.50).

4-Reliability Condition: the speech acts that are strategically reinforced manoeuvering practice should be appropriately conjoined to the aforesaid speech acts of the speaker, writer, even the addressee and legitimately united to the prior context. This also includes that strategic manoeuvering should be inherited via righteous speech acts; wherewithal, those speech acts should validly conform to the context, legitimately directed towards the referenced audiences, bring forth under every condition the acceptableness intended by the maneuverer, stimulating interactive and reactional attitudes in the part of the addressees along with persuasion (Omar, 2020,p.50).

4.1.Pragmatic Adaptation:

To start with, adaptation, in general, is thought to be an inescapable element of the translation process whose aim is consolidating a link between source and target texts, from one side, and source and target audiences, from another side (Volkova and Zubenina, 2015,p. 89).

The term pragmatic adaptation refers to this adaptation of the changes that are made by the translator due to differences between the original and the new communicative situation.

From a pragma-translation standpoint, pragmatic adaptation is a translational processing mechanism that every competent translator made in one situation or another including pragmatic change and pragmatic shift. However, Weizman and Blum-Kulka (1987,p. 61) state that the term pragmatic adaptation or shift is an adjustment to refer to the process whereby the reader of a translated text must make a shift from using one set of pragmatic rules to using another to adequately interpret the text.

From source text orientation, pragmatic adaptation is a concept that refers to the modification of those source text elements "which, translated as such, would not work well in the target language" to make them appropriately and workably meet the needs of the new cultural and linguistic environments (Vehmas-Lehto, 2002 p., 99–100) cited in Ingo (1990: 237). However, pragmatic adaptation may have to be made even if the cultural and linguistic environments are the same. It is also included to work in one target text but does not necessarily work in another target text even if the source and the target language are the same in both linguistic and cultural cases (Konsonen, 2011p.62).

In its target text orientation, pragmatic adaptation includes the changes of the informative meaning of the source text into a certain informative meaning in a target text element due to the different audiences and situational factors (Vehmas-Lehto, 2002p. 100).

In terms of the intended audiences, pragmatic adaptation is the translation of source language elements with reference to the needs of the

target language audience and the needs of the new communicative situation in the translated work. Pragmatic adaptation could be a mere translation, a simplified, or shortened version of the source text (Neubert, Klaudy,2007,p. 229).

4.2.Requirements for Pragmatic Adaptation:

1- Pragmatic adaptations are appealed to due to various differences in the extra-textual factors of the source text and the target text. This adaptation deemed with largely interrelated factors include time, place, and function, as well as the culture, the knowledge, and the (qualitative or quantitative) conventions of the readers. Or because the target text sender wants to give the target text a function that the source text does not have.

2- Pragmatic adaptation is also done due to any difference between the original and the new communicative situation, differences in participants include differences in sender and his/her motive and intention as well as differences in audience and their preference, differences in culture and world knowledge, and differences in medium or text function.

3-Pragmatic adaptation may be done due to differences in the way language is used. Chesterman (in Chesterman and Wagner 2002: 43) that the differences in the conventions of language use between the source and target cultures are a trigger to adapt the text pragmatically Chesterman (in Chesterman and Wagner 2002: 43) (Konsoanan, p.68).

4.3.Triggers of pragmatic Adaptation

Adaptation, in general, is a translation process whose aim is consolidating the link between source and target texts, from one side, and source and target audiences, and making ST fit the variables of the target language. Pragmatic adaptation has various triggers as proposed by Baker and Saldanha (2011: 41):

1-***Cross-code breakdown***: where there is no lexical or any other kind of equivalents in the target language rendition.

2-***Situational and cultural inadequacy***: contexts and views of a source text are not properly meet the target text.

3-***Genre switching***: a switch from one genre to another.

4-D***isruption of a communication process***: addressing a different type of communication other than the one postulated in the source text.

5- ***Information loss:*** leaving the text unchanged would cause the hearer or the reader to get false information for which the original authors are not responsible.

4.4.Pragmatic Adaptation Strategies:-

The modal adopted for analyzing the translation strategies in the translation of the texts under the analysis is Chesterman's major pragmatic adaptation strategies of translation. Chesterman postulates three major strategies; namely: syntactic strategies, which deal with discussing structural change; semantic strategies concerned with the semantics of

meaning focusing on lexical choice of items, figurative and thematic meanings that are suitable for a sentence in certain contexts; and pragmatic strategies deals with the information selection and message change in the target language and is used to eliminate or mitigate a translation problem (Chesterman, 2016) Chesterman and Wagner 2002: 60–63). Out of these types, the third serves the aim of this work. In their own roles, these three strategies may overlap. In their own role pragmatic strategies are subcategorized into the following subcategories:-

1. ***Cultural filtering***: This is also referred to as naturalization, domestication, or adaptation. It includes the adaptation of cultural terms. It describes how source-language items, particularly culture-specific items, are translated as target-language cultural or functional equivalents so that they conform to target language norms.

2. ***Explicitness change:*** this is a strategy that includes changes either towards more explicitness (explicitation) or towards more implicitness (implicitation). Explicitation involves making the meaning of information that is only implicit in the original more explicit and clear in the target. Likewise, making the meaning of the translation more implicit and covert, less explicit, or omitting information that the target readers can be reasonably expected to infer is called implicitation.

3. ***Information change***: includes adapting by changing information by the addition of new non-inferable information that is considered to be relevant to the target readership but is not presented in the source text, or omission of source-text irrelevant information, the substitution of SL information in accordance to the target demands, summarizing concerns with shortening original information that is redundant in the target language, and adjustment of information in terms of the target audience's preferences.

4. ***Interpersonal change***: is a strategy concerned with changes affecting the level of formality and level of informality and degree of emotiveness and involvement

5-***Illocutionary change***: is a strategy concerning changes of speech act, e.g., involving a change of the mood of the performative verb, changes in the use of rhetorical questions and exclamations, changes between direct and indirect speech and change of illocutionary speech act into another in the target language.

6. ***Coherence change***: this is a strategy that entails changes in the logical arrangement of information in the target language text.

7. ***Partial translation***: this is a strategy that concerns summary translation.

8. ***Visibility change***: is a strategy that is deemed with changes in the status of the authorial presence, or concerning the overt intrusion or foregrounding of the translatorial presence, e.g. a change whereby a translator presents footnotes, and bracketed comments such as explanations of puns or added glosses.

Method

This paper is based on the qualitative research method with a pragmatic analysis. The data under scrutiny are represented by (5) strategic manoeuvering extracts derived from the Iraqi political interview of the President of the Iraqi Parliament Council in a debate of issuing resignation decision with their four renditions. The translators of the data are from different nationalities to show veracity. In particular, this paper confided in studying the use of strategic manoeuvering in Iraqi political interviews from two perspectives namely; pragmatics of speech acts and translation of pragmatic adaptation. Other perspectives are not considered.

6. Data Analysis

The analysis of the data is tackled after surveying the most prominent strategic maneuovering practices that serve the aim of this study, by identifying the speech act type that holds out the strategic practice, nominating the manoeuvering motif and its topical potential, determining the audiences' demands, and explicating the strategic (presentational) devices that serve out the strategic topical potential. Then, utilizing pragmatic adaptation to test the strategic manoeuvering text under scrutiny in comparison with its four renditions, if adaptation meets one or more of the aforesaid stressed strategic manoeuvering components in the target language, it is an aid. If it meets non, a case of one of the triggers of pragmatic violation is unfolded.

SLT(1)

Interviewer

-هل انت تستفتي على رئاسة مجلس النواب؟ اذ ان استقالتك استفتاء اكثر من كونها استقالة. انت تستفتي على رئاسة مجلس النواب اكثر مما تستقيل.

-انا امنح الحق للسيدات والسادة اعضاء مجلس النواب لأبداء الرأي فيمن يرأسهم.

Interviewee

TL Texts

1- ***Interviewer***: Are you asking for a referendum on the presidency of the Council of Representatives? As your resignation is a referendum more than that is the article. You are asking for a referendum on the presidency of the Council of Representatives more than you resign.

   - Interviewee: I hereby grant the right and the honorable members gentlemen and ladies of the House of Representatives to express in those who will lead them.

2- ***Interviewer:*** Your resignation is a questionnaire on the parliament presidency more than just a resignation. Isn't it?

   Interviewee: I only let the Parliament members, the ladies and gentlemen, have their right to choose their spoken person.

3- ***Interviewer:*** Are you seeking a referendum on the Presidency of the Parliament? Your resignation seems more like a referendum than a resignation. You are seeking a referendum on the Presidency of the Parliament more than actually resigning.

4- ***Interviewee***. I grant the right to the esteemed members of Parliament to express their opinions on who leads them.

5- ***Interviewer:*** Are you holding a referendum for the presidency of the Parliament, because you are resignation is a referendum more than a resignation? You are holding a referendum more than resigning.

- ***Interviewee***: I just give the right to the ladies and gentlemen members of the Parliament to express their views about the chair they want.

Pragmatic Discussion

In a defense of himself towards the accusation of a referendum to the Presidency of the Parliament Council, the president of the Iraqi Parliament Mohammed Al- Halabosi maneuvers the topical choice in an argument context of difference via a strategic declarative speech act of declaration to persuasively defend himself against the accusation efficiency. However, such manoeuvering practice moderately actualizes two strategic motifs namely; declaring, along with defending himself, with the authority of affording the rights of the Parliament members to be in charge to nominate who presides them in the Parliament Council; and reasonably directing the argument in preference and benefits of the audiences and parliament members. Such strategic maneuvering defensive act is reasonable in persuasively bringing others' acceptance to his action and vital in effectuating changes in politicians' attitudes against him. The manoeuver in this argument exploits contextual conditions as presentational devices for framing his manoeuvering strategically exploiting in this both political context and public attitude in maneuvering the argument in his own best desire.

Translational Discussion:

The translation subjects of the aforesaid argument are tackled from different viewpoints. Translator (1) adopts an explicit change in dealing with the declarative speech act that nominates the manoeuvering act of declare granting by making it more explicit via the explicit performative adverb **"hereby"** along which the translator preserves the strategic manoeuvering function and topical potential effectively. Such an explication procedure affects a case of pragmatic gain in the target language as the adverb '***"hereby"*** is not mentioned in the SL text, but it is part of the target language convention for certifying its commitment. The translator replaces terminologies used in presenting the presentational devices of SL text by concerning the SL items by TL terminologies

including "the honorable members, gentlemen and ladies, of the House of Representatives" which are unparalleled with SLT terminologies, but they bring adapt to the target language terminologies and brought its functional equivalent. Thereof, they would be more pleasant to TL audiences. Such effect is deemed to be a mixed method pragmatic adaption of two procedures of explicit changes and cultural filtering.

The second translation is tackled by the rendition ***"I only let the Parliament members, the ladies, and gentlemen***" along which the translator puts into action a different manoeuvering speech act other than the one that is postulated in the SL argument whereby he turns/changes the speech act from declarative into assertive and alters the manoeuvering practice into a non-manoeuvering practice. The topical potential of the practice is unrevealed. The translator adopts cultural presentational devices of the functional words of " ***ladies and gentlemen***" and " ***their spoken person"*** that conform with the target English cultural norms, but he fails to reproduce the SL strategic manoeuvering act and wrongly indicating a case of illocutionary change which triggers a case of distribution in the communication process in TL. Although the translator holds out pragmatic adaptation of cultural filtering and illocutionary change in materializing the rendition, he fails to bring the essence and the motif of it.

The third translation subject deals with the strategic argument with an absence of pragmatic adaptation. The translator elicits the declarative manoeuvering act of declaration adopting a literal translation strategy with no pragmatic adaptation concerns. He could keep the same wordings, structuring, and the manoeuvering act of declaration along with strategy, but to a lesser extent of effectivity than the translator (1). Such translation could bring the topical potential of manoeuvering practice. The presentational style of manoeuvering assumes Arabic language conventions and terminologies in strategic depiction via the utilization of the phrase "to express their opinion on who leads them" and the Arabic-like terminology "the esteemed members" which are not of English language cultural norms. Such presentational style would influence a gap in the pragmatics of the target language pertaining to the monoeuvering efficacy triggering a case of cultural inadequacy. There is a case of partial pragmatic loss in manoeuvering flavor in the target language which would attribute that manoeuvering statue would not achieve the same effect as those that are introduced by SL manoeuvering. To put it in another term, the translation subject could preserve the manoeuvering status but in lesser degrees than that introduced in the SL argument. Pragmatic adaptation is completely absent in this translation subject which would affect the aforesaid pragmatic efficacy loss. This Arabic flavor in English wording could be unpleasant to the target audience.

The fourth subject of translation tackles the text from a different

perspective in adopting the rendition " I just give the right to the ladies and gentlemen members". This TT shows an employment of two pragmatic adaptation strategies namely; cultural filtering of presentational devices along with the use of the target language functional equivalents " the ladies and gentlemen members" and " the chair they want" and illocutionary change along with the adaptation of the declarative act into an assertive act. The latter strategy (illocutionary change) is typified by altering the strategic manoeuvering structuring into another. Such illocutionary manoeuvering altering finds no reflection in SL argumentative manoeuver. As such triggering a case of distribution of the communicative process. ***SL Text(2)***

Interviewer:

-البعض يرى قرار استقالتك خطوة جريئة. وفي نفس الوقت خطوة لإحراج الحلفاء الجدد (انت تحرج الحلفاء الجدد) كونهم كانوا معترضين على ترشيحك في الولاية الاولى

Interviewee:

- لن افرض وجودي ولن استخدم اي طريقة لفرض وجودي على شركائي السياسيين وعلى اعضاء مجلس النواب او احراجهم. اذ ان العلاقة الطبيعية السليمة يجب ان تبنى بالتفاهم وبمبدأ الثقة والمنطق والعقلانية وفق منطلقات ومشتركات يحكمها الدستور والقانون.

TL Texts:-

1-Interviewer: Take your decision on the new step. At the same time, a step to ban the alliance between the allies (you agree with the allies) since they were chosen over your candidate in the first university.

-Interviewee: We will not assume our presence, but use any method to impose our presence on the boutique companies and members of the House of Representatives or their auctions. Because he naturally agrees, he must agree to the understanding and the principle of trust, logic, and rationality according to the principles and commonalities governed by the Constitution and the law.

2-Interviewer: some people consider your resignation as a bold decision. In the same time, it is an embarrassment for the new allies (you are actually embarrassing them) because they were against your candidature in the first term.

-Interviewee: I won't impose myself on my political partners nor the PMs in any case. The normal relation between us must be based on mutual understanding, trust, logic, and reason depending on the common principles ruled by the Constitution.

3- Interviewer: Some see your decision to resign as a bold move, and at the same time, a step to embarrass your new allies (you are embarrassing your new allies) since they opposed your nomination in the first term.

Interviewee: I will not impose my presence or use any method to impose my presence on my political partners or the members of Parliament or embarrass them. A healthy relationship should be built on understanding, trust, logic, and rationality, based on foundations and commonalities governed by the Constitution and the law.

4-Interviewer Some think that your resignation is a daring set and at the same time a step to embarrass the new allies you are embarrassing the new allies because they objected your nomination in the first term of presidency.

Interviewee : I will never impose myself on others and will never use any kind of way to impose myself on my political Partners and members of Parliament or try to embarrass them as a healthy relationship should be based on mutual understanding, trust, logic, and rationality according to principles and common grounds ruled by the Constitution and Law.

Pragmatic Discussion:-

In the current argument, two strategic manoeuverings are exhibited by the President of the Iraqi Parliament Mohammed Al Halbosi in an argumentative interview in defending himself in the context of difference concerning resignation from the presidency of the Iraqi Parliament. To gain the other parties' (the interviewer and audiences) persuasion, guarantee the politician persuasion and the public acceptance and support in defending his decision, he simultaneously manoeuvers via inherited variance defensive speech acts namely the commissive speech act type of commitment in لن افرض وجودي ولن اســتخدم اي طريقة لفرض وجودي على شــركائي وعلى اعضــاء مجلس النواب او احراجهم السـياسـيين under which he presents topical choice of resignation in his defense and along with the presentational devices of using stylistic choice terminologies including (وجودي ;على شركائي ;او احراجهم) he put himself under obligation that he will not impose himself by force upon the parliament members and the publics. Such strategic manoeuvering of commitment act is both in the audiences' including politicians and the public's own best interest and benefits and would achieve efficacy in the resolution of his political situation. In support of his first manoeuvering practice, a part of manoeuvering practice by Al Halabosi is strategically maneuvered with the expression اذ ان الـعـلاقــة الطبيعية السليمة يجب ان تبنى بالتفاهم وبمبدأ الثقة والمنطق والعقلانية وفق منطلقات ومشتركات يحكمها الدســـتور والقانون. That induces the implicit directive speech act of inviting (calling for) that is held for directing argument in preference of audience in calling for peaceful political relations, understanding, confidence between the parliament members, and reasonability in building

the state. Such manoeuvering part is both justification and responsible evidence of the first manoeuvering commitment resolution practice of the argument and in its per se another moneuvrering depiction of defense of his resignation decision directing the argument in his preference and expense of politicians and the publics best interest (of the audiences'). The presentational devices in the current text encompass the stylistic choice of terminologies interlinked in speech acts of commitment and inviting.

Translation Discussion:

The first target text starts with illocutionary change via the rendition ***" We will not assume our presence***" which turns the manoeuvering commissive act of commitment into assertive speech act of stating. This illocutionary change attributes two matters; these are: the illocutionary change, in fact, changes the status of SL itself, that is the target text rendition does not show that SL text as being a monoeuvering act, instead it makes SL appears as being non-manoeuvering text holding a piece of statement. The second matter influenced by this illocutionary change is intentional change in which the target text postulates an act that is not reflected by source language text as being communicating another intention. When someone undertakes commitment is different from issuing a statement. This pragmatic adaptation makes a difference in the text as a whole attributing a failure in manoeuvering practice via translation triggering a case of code breakdown.

The second strategic monoeuvering of the implicit directive act of requesting finds its rendition with a directive speech act of embracing '***command'*** as a manoeuvering act. It makes the TT as holding out an order and this is unrelated to the source text strategic manoeuvering act. This changes the source text motif as a whole as giving a command is not the same as asking request. Besides, such strategic manoeuvering part is targeted towards audiences' preferences. Thence, this illocutionary change lost the text its essence as the audiences' demands are not gained. In turn, this illocutionary change also affects the interpersonal shift of the degree of formality to informality in postulating an informal level that is not endangered in SL strategic manoeuvering. Such pragmatic adaptation strategy makes the whole text changed triggering a case of cross code breakdown.

The second translator opens his rendition with the commissive speech act of commitment that states clearly the strategic manoeuvering embraced in the source language text. The presentational devices reflected in the target text follow the Arabic language norms represented by the expressions " ***on my political partners"***, " ***the PMs",*** and " ***any case"*** influencing no degree of efficacy required in the target language norms. This degree has been changed with the use of English wordings with Arabic flavor, as when one adapts target language norms not the same as

neutralizing source language stylization. The latter manoeuvering speech act of requesting a healthy relationship and inviting the other parties on understanding has been changed in its role into command bringing in this a pragmatic adaptation strategy of illocutionary change whereby the directive manoeuvering act of 'requesting' is changed into a 'command'. This change makes a difference between the source text and the target text by influencing an act that is not strategically reflected in the source text. Furthermore, this illocutionary change affects the degree of formality communicated between the Parliament President and members via strategic manoeuvering practice. The degree of formality has been changed from formal to informal with the change of the manoeuvering act into a command. Thence, illocutionary change is not profitable in this issue as the text loses its strategic motif of correspondence with audiences' demands completely. This pragmatic adaption is inaccurate; besides it triggers a case of distribution of communication and cultural inadequacy. A more suitable pragmatic adaptation is cultural filtering that proceeds for the sake of making strategic manoeuvering has a tint of request, not a command.

The third rendition of the first manoeuvering act is initialized with the commissive speech act of commitment that states precisely what the SL text embraces, reflecting the strategic manoeuvring act related to the source text. The presentational style is reflected via functional words that conform to the target culture, as it follows the cultural filtering strategy. Hence, the topical potential is actualized and makes the text has the tint of strategic manoeuvering reflected in the SL text.

Concerning the second manoeuvering part, the postulated translation confirms what is immediately followed in the SL strategic manoeuvering act along with the utilization of cultural filtering. It depicts seeking requests as it is reflected by the topical potential of the text. Besides, it relocates manoeuvering target in the same consequences that are persuaded by the source language text.

The first manoeuvering part of the fourth target text is depicted as an act of commitment strategically maneuvered with the same consequences as those that are reflected in the SL manoeuvering effect. The pragmatic technique utilized is explicit change with cultural filtering. Whereabouts, it finds the same manoeuvering reflection and consequences of the source text. The target text shows a higher degree of explicitness than that reflected in the source text along with the utilization of the intensifier adverb ***"never"*** that conforms to the target cultural norms. Thence, the topical potential is actualized. The target text shows a high extent of presentational devices along with the use of functional equivalents that conform to the target language prerequisite. Such a

pragmatic adaptation technique proceeds to match audiences' preferences. No pragmatic triggers justify this text.

A more suitable strategy is followed in the transference of the second manoeuvering part of the text realized by the explicit change of the manoeuvering act with over explicit performative verb and the adverb of intensification "very" to persuade people to seek healthy political relations with trust, confidence, and understanding. Whereof, the topical potential is reflected. Another pragmatic technique is put into use to present the equivalents and source language words in accommodation to the target culture perquisite realized by cultural filtering. It strategically put the manoeuvering act with the consequences as those shown in the SL text. Such pragmatic adaptation does more remedy to the text.

SL Text (3)

Interviewer:

- ان مجلس النواب مقيد و معطل و محاصر كما ذكرت سابقاً ولكن الا تعتقد ان رئيس مجلس النواب (انت) قد ساهم نوعاً ما, لأسباب مختلفة بالتقليل من هيبة هذا البرلمان بالسماح للسلطات الاخرى بالتمادي على هذا البرلمان تحت مسميات مختلفة منها مصلحة العراق والخشية من مواجهات مسلحة؟

Interviewee:

- ان الصلاحيات تختلف لدى مؤسسات الدولة. وان رئيس مجلس النواب ليس لديه السلطة بإصدار اوامر قبض على احد فيما يتعلق بسلطته القضائية. وهل نسهم في صب الزيت على النار؟ ام نترك الامور تصل الى مديات يتفق بها المختلفون؟

TL Texts

1- ***Interviewer***: The House of Representatives is restricted, paralyzed, and besieged as previously mentioned, but I believe that the Speaker of the House of Representatives (you) may contribute somewhat, with a slightly different exception to the prestige of this formation by allowing other authorities to persist in this formation under different names, including the interest of Iraq and the fear of armed confrontations?

Interviewee: The powers have differences in the state. And the Speaker of the House of Representatives does not have the authority to issue orders to arrest anyone in relation to his authority. Do we contribute to pouring oil on the fire? Or do we leave matters to reach their limits for those who differ?

2- ***Interviewer:*** The parliament is paralyzed and restricted as you mentioned before. Don't you think that the speaker of it (you) has partially participated in weakening the parliament by letting other authorities go further little bit on it under different pretenses such as the Iraqi benefit or the fear of armed clashes?

Interviewee: the state institutions have different authorities and the parliament speaker, concerning his judicial authority, has no authority to issue orders to arrest anyone. Should we add fuel to the fire? We are obliged to let things flow normally so that even dispute parties may agree well.

3- Interviewer: The Parliament is restricted, disabled, and besieged as you mentioned earlier, but don't you think that the Speaker of the Parliament (yourself) has somewhat contributed, for various reasons, to diminishing the Parliament's stature by allowing others authorities to overstep on the Parliament under different pretexts, such as Iraq's interest and the fear of armed confrontations?

Interviewee: The powers differ among state institutions, and the Speaker of Parliament does not have the authority to issue arrest warrants in matters related to his judicial powers. Should we contribute to adding fuel to the fire? Or should we let things reach a point where disagreements can be resolved?

4- Interviewer: The Parliament is restricted, malfunctioning, and fenced as you mentioned previously but do not you think that the president of the Parliament (you) has contributed somehow, for different reasons, to belittling of the dignity of this parliament by allowing other authorities to underestimate this parliament under various pretexts such as the interest of Iraq and fear of Armed confrontation?

Interviewee: The authorizations are different according to the state constitution speaker of Parliament has no authority to issue orders to detain anyone about his judicial authority. Is it our duty to add insult to the injury or shall we leave things to reach limits that lead different parties to agree by necessity?

Pragmatic Discussion

Being accused of devaluating the status of the Iraqi Parliament by making it easy to uninhibited the Iraqi Parliament and permitting the other authorities to intervene in its authority and power, the president of the Iraqi Parliament Council Mohammed Al – Hallabosi responded to this attack in defense of his position against this accusation, maneuvers via two assertive speech acts jointly. These are: the explicit speech act of predication represented the topical potential by the argument ان الصـــلاحيات تختلف لدى مؤســسـات الدولة in which he descriptively predicates the authorities of the Parliament Council. The second manoeuvering act is the implicit speech act of denial against the attack directed to him, through which he denies the accuse claiming that he is unauthorized of doing such in his argument وان رئيس مجلس النواب ليس لديه السـلطة بإصـدار اوامر قبض على احد فيما يتعلق بسـلطته

القضـائية along with idiomatic question وهل نسـهم في صـب الزيت على النار؟ and the rhetorical question ام نترك الامور تصـــل الى مديات يتفق بها المختلفون؟. By means of declaring his denial of accusation putting the fact of his irresponsibility and non-authorization; Besides, the idiomatic question هل نصـــــب الزيـت على النـار؟ which is exploited as a presentational device effectuates a vital impact in resolution of the difference in opinion strategically, whereof, idiomatic expression generally carries higher degree of stimulation in effectively bringing audiences' persuasion and acceptance in comparison to other language devices. Concerning the idiomatic question and the rhetorical question, the maneuverer puts the interviewer, the audience, and other parties between two options in an appeal for getting them to advocate his defense. Such idiomatic questions and rhetorical questions are sought in an endeavor and as a pragmatic mechanism for inviting them to choose either of these options; thereupon being part of the resolution and manoeuvering process, to guarantee their acceptance of his defense.

Translational Discussion:

The first target text shows an expansive pragmatic adaptation realized by illocutionary change. It is mainly typified by altering the SL strategic manoeuvering act by a means of changing it from assertion into reporting. Which makes it hints at another intention. Such illocutionary change finds no reflection in the source text, as asserting an issue differs from reporting it. Thence, this pragmatic adaptation triggers topical loss and cross-code breakdown. The rendition intents some other intention that is not intended by the source text. the functional words and terms of the manoeuvering text are reflected with presentational devices embrace Arabic language norms. The idiomatic questions and the rhetorical questions are employed with Arabic-like wordings and stylization. Such employment changes their status as they lose their idiomatic and rhetorical statuses, besides their persuasive and strategic roles are altered into nonsensical in the target language. This type of pragmatic adaptation changes the text as a whole triggering a case of situational and cultural inadequacy. Thenceforth, it is inaccurate to handle this manoeuvering issue via illocutionary change. A more suitable pragmatic technique would be embracing two strategies of explicit change and cultural filtering.

The technique employed in the rendition of strategic acts of prediction and denial in the second target text is realized by explicit change strategy. No pragmatic triggers are impacted. This adaptation could actualize the topical potential of the text as it is reflected in the source text. It has been shown that the two strategic manoeuvering acts of prediction and denial are depicted as far as pragmatic adaptation is concerned. They

are transferred as they are reflected in the source language text. The statuses of idiomatic questions and rhetorical questions are transferred to match the persuasive effects postulated in the source text. thenceforth, correspondence to the audience demand is mainly typified. The presentational devices are satisfied along with the utilization of functional equivalents and target terminologies in the accommodation of target culture.

The topical potential is actualized in the third rendition as reflected by the explicit change strategy, as the presented translation reflects a more explicit basis of the speech act of predication by giving it a more overt status. The defensive manoeuvering act of denial is also preserved by explicit change as the manoeuvering act of defense aroused for protecting the adhered viewpoint. The rendition subsumes the strategic manoeuvering acts that the source text embraced. Besides, this target text is signified by the use of functional equivalents and presentational terminologies that follow the target culture norms. No pragmatic triggers are justified in this text. Thence, this adaptation aids this manoeuvering text.

The fourth target text shows a reflection of the strategic manoeuvering act of prediction as realized by explicit change strategy and an annulment of the manoeuvering speech act of denial. Whereabouts the argumentative text as a whole is altered via partial translation. The topical potential of defense against the attack that built out the text motif is annulled. Thenceforth, directing the argument towards his own benefit finds no reflection. The presentational devices embraced in materializing the topical potential follow Arabic language norms and stylization. Both the idiomatic question and rhetorical question are realized nonsensically along with the use of functional words that do not conform to the target culture. In the result, a case of distribution of communication process is attributed. This pragmatic adaptation does much harm the manoeuvering practices. Explicit change and cultural filtering can be more accurate pragmatic techniques to handle this text. ***SLT(4)***

***Interviewer*:**

– هل ان قرار استقالتك جاء احتجاجاً على وضع الدولة ؟

Interviewee:

– عندما اتحدث عن موضوع استقالتي فأني اسعى الى اعادة مجلس النواب الى وضعه الطبيعي أذ ان هناك بعض الاستثناءات تعصف بهيكل الدولة يجب الوقوف عليها. وعلى القوى السياسية بما فيها المتحدث ان يتعاملوا مع هذه الملفات بشكل اكثر جدية ولاستحقاقها اهتماماً كبيراً وكونها ملفات شائكة وكون المنطقة تمر بمشاكل عديدة.

TL Texts:

1- ***Interviewer*** Did you decide to resign and did they not come to the state of the state?

Interviewee: When I spoke about the subject of my resignation, I was rushing to return the House of Representatives to use, as there are some during the storming of the state structure that must be presented. The political forces, including (must) review these files in a more new way and do not deserve the attention they have, and because they are thorny files and because the region is experiencing many problems.

2- ***Interviewer***: was your resignation an objection to the situation of the state?

Interviewee: When I talk about the subject of my resignation, I hereby seek to re-back the parliament to its normal position, as there are some exceptions plaguing the state's structure that must be taken into account. The political forces, including the speaker, must deal with these files more seriously, given that they deserve great attention, that they are thorny issues, and that the region is going through many problems.

3- ***Interviewer*** Did your decision to resign come as a protest against the state's situation?

Interviewee: When I talk about my resignation, I aim to return the Parliament to its normal state, as there are some exceptions that are disrupting the structure of the state, which must be addressed. The political forces, including myself, must deal with these issues more seriously, as they deserve significant attention, by being complex issues, and given that the region is going through many challenges.

4- ***Interviewer*** Is your resignation a kind of protest against the State situation?

Interviewee: When I talk about my resignation, I seek to reestablish the Parliament to a normal position as there are some exceptions that we have on the framework of the state that must be addressed. Political powers, including the speaker, must deal with these files seriously because these files deserve much interest due to the thorny nature and the region passes through many problems.

Pragmatic Discussion:

In the context of the political crisis of a state, the interviewee the president of the Iraqi Parliament Council Mohammed Al Halbosi faces questionable inquiries pertaining to his resignation decision in schedule whence the state goes along pressing circumstances. In response to these questionable inquiries, he maneuvers in defense of his position differently by bringing out two speech acts strategically with a quite different position. Whereabouts, he instead throws into question the topical potential, directs the argument strategically in his own best interest, and turns the tables. He recalls two manoeuvering speech acts that turn the tables on claiming in

this a different position other than the one proposed by the other parties. Those maneuvering speech acts are the commissive speech acts of commitment in which he declares his claim أني اسـعى الى اعادة مجلس النواب instead of protesting against the State condition. In justification of this, he adopts the circumstances of the state as presentational devices putting on the fact that أذ ان هناك بعض الاسـتثناءات along with figurative language. The second manoeuvering act is a directive speech act of command in which he calls the Parliament members including himself for the necessity to work more seriously via the argument وعلى القوى السـياسـية بما فيها المتحدث ان in cause that يتعاملوا مع هذه الملفات بشكل اكثر جدية. Such directive command is in the audiences' (both politicians and the public) best interest. Thereupon, the maneuverer by means of the commissive speech act of commitment along with contextual framing reasonably succeeds in guarding his position against the antagonist's attack; besides the manoeuvering via directive act along with presentational devices with the metaphorical depiction of the situation ملفات شائكة is put forwards in preference of the audiences and their attitudes towards the country crises.

الى وضـعـه الطبيعي تعصـف بهيكل الدولة يجب الوقوف عليها وكونها ملفات شائكة وكون المنطقة تمر بمشـاكل عديدة.

Translational Discussion

As a matter of fact, the adaptation elicited in the first rendition along with illocutionary change is inaccurate. It renders the commissive manoeuvering speech act "اسـعى" into "I am rushing" reflecting an act of assertion that is not postulated in the source text, as the source text does not mean so. Whereof, topical potential finds no realization in the renditions. The presentational devices are reflected in a stylization that follows Arabic language norms. Functional words and cultural items are realized with the source language flavor, figurative devices find no consideration via the rendition. The strategic manoeuvering motif of guarding the position is attributively unachieved. As a result, cross-code breakdown is attributed. Such a type of pragmatic adaptation does much damage to the text. In the alternative, explicit change and cultural filtering would be more suitable.

The explicit change utilized in the second manoeuvering act of the argument would be more suitable as the source text manoeuvering act is embraced with the implicit directive speech act of ordering that is shown by the explicit speech act of ordering. It satisfies the topical potential employed in the source text. What makes this rendition weak, is the reflection of the Arabic language stylization and norms in the rendition and

the omission of the figurative devices embraced in the source text manoeuvering, such reflection and omission techniques affect the degree of formality by subsuming a lower degree than those assumed in the source text. Besides, the presentational devices are realized by reflection that is unpleasant in the target language along with inconsideration of cultural items and functional words. Thence, a case of cultural inadequacy is triggered. A more suitable pragmatic technique could be handled with two strategies explicit change and cultural filtering.

The attribution of the pragmatic adaptation technique of the explicit change and cultural filtering in the second TT rendition is adequate. The target text preserves the gist of the strategic manoeuvering act as a whole. This is confirmed by the employment of the performative adverb "hereby" which makes the strategic maonoeuvering commitment act more explicit via the procedure of explicit change. Whereof, the topical potential of protecting the position behind the manoeuvering practice could be substantialized. The reflection of presentational devices makes no difference in the target language as the rendition follows the target cultural norms and preserves its functional equivalent and cultural items. The translator tries as much as possible to attribute the defensive position of the source text. No pragmatic triggers are affected.

Although the pragmatic adaptation of illocutionary change in the rendition of the second strategic manoeuvering act of ordering affects the degree of formality of the source text by making it less formal than that of the source text, it could persuasively signify the strategic topical potential motif. The employment of the audiences' preference for the forefront makes no difference with the source language. A satisfaction of presentational strategies has been embraced in conformance with the target language demands. Figures of speech and metaphor have been considered in the target language count. No pragmatic trigger is found.

An inadequate pragmatic adaptation of illocutionary change has been embraced in the third rendition. As it postulates a difference between the text from the strategic text in the source language. This difference is reflected by substituting the strategic manoeuvering act of defense with an act of assertion. This act has changed the argument as a whole as the source strategic manoeuvering text does not mean an assertion. Furthermore, undertaking commitment is not the same as stating an assertion. Thence, the text subsumes a topical potential and has no relation with the source text. The reflection of the presentational strategies has not been affected as they proceed in accommodation to the target language demands. Some of the figurative devices subsumed partial change while some others gave a target culture tint. Such a type of pragmatic adaption triggered a case of distribution in strategic communication. An accurate pragmatic adaptation

technique would be proposed via an amalgam of illocutionary change and cultural filtering.

Concerning the implicit manoeuvering speech act of implicit ordering, it has been rendered explicitly with an accurate explicit change strategy bringing the tone of the strategic practice. A reflection of topical potential in reference to the source text has been actualized. The degree of formality that has been assumed in the source text has been affected by the explicit change by altering it to be less formal than that of the source text. This pragmatic adaptation could suggest a depiction of the text in preference of audiences in relation to those that are proposed in the source text. The transference of the strategic devices is confirmed with functional equivalents and orientation in correspondence with the target language norms. As such, pragmatic adaptation does much gain in target language preference.

So far the explicit change adaptation is adequate in the fourth rendition of the strategic manoeuvering act, the embracement of inaccurate terminology would weaken its adequacy. The adaptation followed in this text abuses the translation of اعادة الى وضــعه الطبيعي into "***reestablishing"***, whereas the source text means ***"backing***". However, such translation does not much harm the text. The topical potential of the commitment manoeuvering speech act could be satisfied as the attitudinal endeavor of turning the argument into the maneuverer interest is signified. A reflection of the presentational devices in relation to the source text and along with target language tone has been found, despite of partial omission of certain figurative devices. A pragmatic consideration is fully satisfied.

No pragmatic trigger is offered in the employment of the explicit change to transfer the second manoeuvering practice from implicit ordering to more explicit. The depiction of rendition in correspondence to the influence of audiences' demands is harmonized. An impact is put forward along with the transference of both strategic devices and figurative devices in relation to the source language and the tone of the target language. Thence, pragmatic adaptation does much gain to the text.

SLT (5)

Interviewer: – هل ســاهمتم وهل كان للعراق دوراً في حل مشاكل الشرق الاوسط؟

Interviewee:

– كيف يمكن ان اســاهم في حل مشــاكل المنطقة ونحن نعاني من مشــاكل داخلية؟ ولا زلنا نتحدث عن دور العراق في حل مشاكل الخارجية والاولى حل المشاكل الداخلية.

1- ***Interviewer***: Did you contribute and did Iraq have a role in solving the problems of the Middle East?

Interviewee - How can we contribute to solving the problems of the region while we suffer from internal problems? We are still fit for Iraq's role in solving external problems and the first is to solve internal problems.

2- ***Interviewer***- Did you contribute and did Iraq play a role in solving the problems of the Middle East?

Interviewee -How can we contribute to solving the region's problems when we are suffering from internal problems? We are still talking about Iraq's role in solving foreign problems, and the first priority is solving internal problems.

3- ***Interviewer:*** Have you, and has Iraq, played a role in solving the problems of the Middle East?

Interviewee. How can I contribute to solving the region's problems when we are suffering from internal issues? We are still talking about Iraq's role in solving external problems, while the priority should be to solve internal ones.

4- ***Interviewer***: Have you contributed to solving the problems of the Middle East and has Iraq had any role in that?

Interviewee: How could I contribute to solving such problems while we are suffering from internal problems ourselves? We still talk about the Iraqi role in solving the external problems while we should solve the internal problems.

Pragmatic Discussion:-

In the present text, the interviewee (maneuverer) presents his opinion of difference of point of view pertaining the topical potential of disapproval via the presentational device in rhetorical question كيف يمكن ان اســـاهم في حل مشـــاكل المنطقة ونحن نعاني من مشـــاكل داخلية؟ in strategically manoeuvering against the interviewer, the audience and the other parties opinions and presents a different point of view which includes inviting the other parties to resolve the Iraq internal affairs instead. Wherewithal he expresses his denial/rejection of the presented existence opinion which is the contribution to the resolution of the Middle East problem at a time when Iraq suffers from unresolved internal problems. However, the rhetorical question generally holds out/ effectuates a high expressive power in bringing audiences effectively, stimulating the audiences' attention attentively, and inviting the other parties to be part of the resolution process of difference of opinion persuasively. The rhetorical question carries out a powerful persuasive force in getting audiences into persuasion and acceptance of an existence viewpoint. Therefore, it is a vital tool in the resolution of differences in opinions in this argument and reasonably winning the audiences' and other parties' acceptance of the

offered point of view effectively by calling them to be part of the resolution process and getting them to change their minds concerningly. Such resolution practice is moderately substantialized/ substantiated by a means of two strategic manoeuveing acts namely; expressive speech act type of rejection/ disapproval along with the rhetorical question كيف يمكن ان اساهم في حل مشاكل المنطقة ونحن نعاني من مشاكل داخلية and the directive speech act of suggesting giving the priority to the Iraq problems to be solved ولا زلنا نتحدث عن دور العراق في حل المشـــاكل الخارجية والاولى حل المشـــاكل الداخلية which operates both as a reasonable justification and reason for the disapproving of his opinion in resolution of difference and suggesting an opinion for solving Iraq internal affairs.

Translation Discussion

The presentational devices that have been embraced in the depiction of the strategic manoeuvering practice of denial in the first target text have been transferred with an accurate cultural filtering strategy. As a matter of fact, the pragmatic adaptation of cultural filtering suggests based on the argument the same cultural rhetorical counterpart of the source language rhetorical question. This depiction, however, brings the utilized topical potential of protecting a position against attack. The functional words and stylization confirm harmony with the target culture. No pragmatic trigger is attributed. Henceforth, the pragmatic adaptation is fruitful.

The explicit change utilized in the rendition of the second manoeuvering act of suggesting aids this text. A signification of the topical potential in speech act is actualized. Explicit change operates as a good strategic tool to manoeuver in translation. The inclusion of a more explicit suggesting act embraces the persuasion and efficacy that have been endangered in the source text. The reflection of presentational strategies has proceeded with a lower degree of efficacy than that of the presentational strategies postulated in the source text. No pragmatic trigger is found.

The pragmatic adaptation includes the rendition of the first strategic manoeuvering act and the second rendition is a cultural filtering strategy. It states clearly what the source strategic manoeuvering act embraces. It follows the topical potential reflected in the source text communicating the same manoeuvering act of denial with the same rhetorical status subsumed by the source rhetorical question. The depiction of the presentational strategies is actualized in correspondence with the source text and in conformance with the target cultural norms. The efficacy of preserving the audiences' acceptance has been matched but to a lesser degree than those of the source text. No pragmatic trigger is impacted. This pragmatic adaptation aids the manoeuvering text.

No pragmatic adaptation is adopted in the rendition of the second manoeuvering speech act of inviting in the second target text. It has been transferred with literal translation which is inaccurate. The maintenance of the strategic manoeuvering act of inviting defaults. The whole text loses its strategic spirit as the presentational devices are adopted following the Arabic language norms. The transference has not satisfied any satisfaction of the audience's demands. As a result, a distribution of communication processes is triggered. Cultural filtering and explicit change can be accurate pragmatic adaptation techniques for the issue.

The pragmatic adaptation of illocutionary change handled in the maintenance of the first strategic manoeuvering speech act of denial in the third and fourth renditions is suitable as it proceeds the manoeuvering speech act in a more overt status than those proposed in the source text. This suggests an adaptation of the topical potential. The transference depiction is confirmed by following what is immediately followed by source language norms as functional words and cultural items are translated in the Arabic culture tone. Thereupon the presentational devices and the rhetorical question find inefficacy in the target language. Less satisfaction with audiences' preferences is realized. Cultural inadequacy is mainly attributed. The pragmatic adaptation matches the strategic manoeuvering speech act but with a lesser degree of efficacy. To put this pragmatic adaptation into work, cultural filtering needs to be amalgamated.

A case of distribution of communication breakdown is triggered along with the inconsideration of pragmatic adaptation in the renditions of the second strategic manoeuvering act of the third and fourth target language texts. The strategy adopted in these transferences is literal which is inaccurate as it translates the texts based on the text wordings and structure, but the text does mean so. This would make the text nonsensical. These renditions confirm a complete absence of the manoeuvering topical potential. The persuasive consequences of strategic the manoeuvering act of inviting are not realized due to the reflection of the presentational devices in conformance with Arabic language cultural norms. No audience's demands are satisfied.

8. Conclusions

1- Strategic Maneuvering is actualized by variance speech acts in political debate encompassing assertives of predication, assertion, and notifying; directives involving requesting, inviting, and ordering; commissives including commitment and promises; expressives involving denial and rejection; and declaratives including declaration. Each of these acts is utilized with certain strategic manoeuvering motives such as gaining public and politicians' persuasion and acceptance regarding certain

issues, resolving differences in opinions regarding a political matter, guarding position, and defending against attack.

2- Most of the speech acts that handle the materialization of strategic manoeuvering in political debate are implicit speech acts which may be attributed to the nature of the political debate language which tends the utilize implicitation as strategic practice for guaranteeing difference resolution.
3- Pragmatic tactics such as idiomatic questions, rhetorical questions, figurative devices, putting on the fact the current circumstances along with the speech acts vitally operate in depicting the strategic manoeuvering in a direction towards confirmation of resolution of difference by inviting the other parties to participate in the resolution via response to them, the maneuverer's best interest by guarding his position against attack, and audiences' preferences by directing the argument strategically in what they favor.
4- Pragmatic adaptation can stand as harm, damage distort, hindrance, or devitalize of the strategic manoeuvering act rather than an aid, if an inappropriate strategy is utilized.
5- Inadequate pragmatic adaptation triggers many translation breakdowns including distribution of communication process, code breakdown, cultural and situational inadequacy, etc. Therefore, it should be handled in correspondence with the requirement of the strategic manoeuvering acts and in harmony with the target culture.
6- The strategic manoeuvering topical potential is materialized if only the manoeuvering act is preserved in rendition; however presentational devices are not reflected unless functional words, cultural items, figurative devices, and metaphorical expressions find their renditions in target tone.
7- The strategic manoeuvering speech acts in political interviews under scrutiny/debate only adequately adapted via two pragmatic strategies namely; illocutionary change and cultural filtering.

References:-

A-English References:-

Andone, C. (2013) Argumentation in Political Interviews: Analyzing and Evaluating responses to accusation of inconsistency. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Chesterman, A. and E. Wagner (2002). Can Theory Help Translators? A Dialogue between the Ivory Tower and the Wordface. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.

Downes, W., & Downes, S. F. W. (1998). Language and society (Vol. 10). Cambridge University Press.

Drucker, P. (1974). Management: Tasks, Responsibilities, Practices. New York: Harper and Row.

Eemeren, F (2017). Argumentative patterns viewed from a pragma-dialectical perspective. Prototypical Argumentative Patterns: Exploring the Relationship between Argumentative Discourse and Institutional Context. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, p.46.

___ (2000). Rhetorical Analysis within a Pragma-Dialectical Framework.Argumentation,14,293-305. http://dx.doi.org/10.1023/A:1007857114100.

_____,(2010) Speech acts in argumentative discussions: A theoretical model for the analysis of discussions directed towards solving conflicts of opinion (Vol. 1): Walter de Gruyter.

_____, (1992a). The Speech Acts of Arguing and Convincing in Externalized Discussions. In W. Benoit, D. Hample and P. Benoit (eds.) Readings in Argumentation. Berlin: Foris Publications.

Eemeren, F. & Garssen B. (2009). Pondering on Problems of Argumentation: Twenty Essays on Theoretical Issues. Springer.

- Eemeren, V. and R. Grootendorst (1984). Speech Acts in Argumentative Discussions. Dordrecht: Foris Publications.

Eemeren, F. H Van and Henkemans, A. F.Sn. (2016). Argumentation: Analysis and Evaluation. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Com

Eemeren, F. H. van, and Houtlosser, P. (2000). Rhetorical Analysis within a Pragma-Dialectical Framework. Argumentation, 14, 293-305. http://dx.doi.org/10.1023/A:1007857114100.

Garssen, B (2010)." Introduction to the Special Issue: Twenty- Five Years of Speech Acts in Argumentative Discussions". Journal of Cogency.Vol.2, No.1, pp.13-21.

Jacobs, S. (2002). Language and Interpersonal Communication. In M. Knapp, & J. Daly (Eds.), Handbook of Interpersonal Communication (3rd ed., pp. 213-240). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Kienpointer, M. (2013). Strategic Maneuvering in Political Rhetoric of Barack Obama.

Language and Politics. Volume 12, PP: 357-37

Kosonen, P. (2011). Pragmatic Adaptation: Skeptics vs. Creations. Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä Publishing.

Leech, G. (1983). Principles of Pragmatics. London: Longman Group Ltd.

Leff, M. (2002). The relation between dialectic and rhetoric in a classical and a modern perspective. In F. H. van Eemeren & P. Houtlosser (Eds.), Dialectic and rhetoric: The warp and woof of argumentation analysis. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic (pp. 53–64).

Leeman, A. D.: 1992, Rhetoric versus Argumentation Theory_, in F. H. van Eemeren, R. Grootendorst, J. A. Blair and C. A. Willard (eds), Argumentation Illuminated, pp. 12–22, Sic Sat, Amsterdam.

Mitchell, G. R. (2010). Higher-Order Strategic Maneuvering in Argumentation. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Mirza, R.F. and Al-Hindawi, F.H. (2016). Strategic Manoeuvring in American Civil and Criminal Courts Trials. PhD. Thesis. University of Babylon. Germany: LAPLAMBERT

Moore, D. (1959). Managerial Strategies. In W. L. Warner, & N. H. Martin (Eds.), Industrial Man: Businessmen and Business Organizations. New York: Harper and Row. Pardede, M. (2008). Unpublished.

Simons, H.W. (1990) 'The Rhetoric of Inquiry as an Intellectual Movement', in H. W. Simons (ed.) The Rhetorical Turn: Invention and Persuasion in the Conduct of Inquiry. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Tonnard, Y. (2008). Comments on: "Strategic Maneuvering in Political Argumentation. Amsterdam: Benjamins Publishing Com.

Toulmin, S. E. (2001). Return to reason. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Zarefsky, D. (2006). 'Strategic Manoeuvring through Persuasive Definitions: Implications for Dialectic and Rhetoric'. In Argumentation, 20. Dordrecht: Kluwer, pp. 399–416.

B- Arabic References

آباسيدي، عليوي، (٢٠١٣) ***التواصل والحجاج: في التداوليات الحجاجية للحوار (التفكير) النقدي، ضمن الحجاج: مفهومه ومجالاته*** (تحرير حافظ إسماعيلي علوي) أبن النديم للنشر والتوزيع وهران, ص ٩٧٥-١٠٤٠.

آن روبول وجاك موشلار(٢٠٠٣) ***التداولية اليوم علم جديد في التواصل***، ترجمة: سيف الدين دغفوس وآخرون بيروت: دار الطليعة.

عبداللطيف, عماد. (٢٠١٢) ***استراتيجيات الاقناع و التأثير في الخطاب السياسي***: خطب الرئيس السادات نموذجاً.

القاهرة الهيئة المصرية العامة للكتاب.

عمر, احمد عبد الحميد (٢٠٢٠) ***دراسة الخطاب الحجاجي من منظور الجدل التداولي***. العدد ١٨٢ابريل – يونيو عالم الفكر.

ـــــــ (٢٠١٩) ***تحليل المناورة الاستراتيجية في الخطاب الحجاجي***. مصر: عين شمس.

عمر، أحمد عبد الحميد (٢٠١٧) ***لغة الجمهور بوصفها ممارسة حجاجية: الهجمات الشخصية ضد مبارك نموذجا ضمن بالغة الجمهور :مفاهيم وتطبيقات*** (تحرير: صالح حاوي وعبد الوهاب صديقي). دار شهريار، بغداد، ص ٢٧.

عكاشة, محمود (٢٠١٣) ***النظرية البراجماتية اللسانية التداولية*** . القاهرة: مكتبة الآداب.

محمد, محمد يونس (٢٠٢٤) ***مدخل الى اللسانيات***. بيروت: دار الكتاب الجديدة