The Objectivity of the Two Main Academic Approaches of Translation Quality Assessment: Arab Spring Presidential Speeches as a Case Study

Thesis submitted for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

at the University of Leicester

by

Mashael Owaidh Lafi Almutairi

Department of Modern Languages

University of Leicester

2018

Abstract

The Objectivity of the Two Main Approaches of Translation Quality Assessment: Arab Spring Presidential Speeches as a Case Study

Mashael Almutairi

2018

Translation quality assessment (TQA) is a controversial area in Translation Studies. Scholars attribute this to the subjective nature of quality, believed to result from the multiplicity of assessment criteria. However, the literature review reveals that translation scholars attribute different reasons to the decreased level of objectivity in current TQA practices. This study hypothesises that although subjectivity in TQA cannot be eliminated, it can be reduced to a more acceptable level if quality assessment adopts the criteria believed by translation scholars to lend more objectivity to the assessment.

The most common approaches used in TQA are either based on error analysis or holistic assessment. As both approaches promise to be objective, this study empirically investigates the differences in the applicability of each with regards to the objectivity criteria proposed by specialists in the field. To this end, four Arab Spring presidential speeches selected for the purpose of this study are assessed by both approaches. Contrastive analysis of these speeches is carried out in order to identify how each approach reduces the subjectivity inherent to TQA.

Furthermore, the error analysis model employed in this study is adapted from the theory of textuality proposed by Beaugrande and Dressler in 1981. Given that the seven standards in the original model do not encompass all the elements of the source text language (Arabic), amending the original model is necessary. In examining the applicability of the proposed adapted model as one that aids translators and evaluators with the assessment of Arabic-English translations, this study resulted in introducing new criteria of assessment in the standards of cohesion, coherence and informativity. This study also contributes to the field by empirically examining the differences between the outcome of the application of the two main approaches of translation quality assessment, i.e., error analysis approach and holistic approach; and identifying how each method reduces the level of subjectivity to quality assessment.

Acknowledgment

First of all, I would like to express my heartfelt gratitude and thanks to Dr. Ahmed Elimam for his support and understanding as he has been a tremendous mentor for me.

I would also like to thank my husband, Mubarak, for his help, encouragement and understanding.

It is my pleasure to also express my appreciation to my family. Words cannot express how grateful I am to my mother, father, brothers and sisters for all of the sacrifices they have made for me. Their prayer for me was what sustained me thus far.

At the end, all my love and thanks to my children, Dhari, Fazzaa, Rimiyyah, Battal and Fakhar for understanding that their mother needed to achieve her goals.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

List of Abbreviations

TQA	Translation Quality Assessment
ST	Source Text
TT	Target Text
SL	Source Language
TL	Target Language
TER	Translation Error Rate

Chapter 1
Introduction

1. Background

Translation quality assessment (TQA) has been described by many researchers as a process whereby a translation critic examines a translated text for the purpose of assessing its quality (Munday, 2001 & Zequan, 2003). For an examination to be valid and reliable, it has to follow determined rules and standards (Williams, 2001). However, establishing criteria for translation quality assessment is a difficult task, and is believed to be "probably one of the most controversial, intensely debated topics in translation scholarship and practice" (Colina, 2009: 236). This can be attributed to the fact that the assessment criteria are still negotiable in the field, as there is little agreement on how to define the concept of translation quality either from a practical or a theoretical viewpoint (Williams, 2001). This can also be related to the relative nature of quality itself, which is believed to be too complex and too context-dependent to be formulated under one definition (Nord, 1997). The existing disagreements among translation scholars regarding quality assessment criteria have been acknowledged by many researchers such as Reiss (1971), Bowker (2000), and Williams (2001). House (1997) explains that such disagreements arise due to the fact that evaluating the quality of a translation depends on the theory of translation used; different theories eventually express different views of translation, adopt different concepts of translation quality, and therefore, lead to different ways of assessing quality.

Despite these disagreements, many researchers do agree that translation quality is connected with various factors and can be observed from diverse angles. These factors, which could be attributed to quality, do not all have the same weight in each translation task, and are therefore not equally measurable or assessable. Quality, for instance, can be regarded as the fulfilment of user needs or expectations, the enhancement of work efficiency, profitability, deadline compliance, resources and tools availability, etc. From the industrial sector, quality can be viewed as the ability to fulfil a client-defined set of parameters (Jiménez-Crespo, 2009). However, in academia, the concept of quality has traditionally been linked to values such as accuracy, correctness and fidelity to the original. Notwithstanding the various theories about the concept of quality, some scholars agree that it is a subjective concept, and that this is the main reason for the lack of consensus when it comes to quality assessment criteria (Horguelin and Brunette 1998; Larose 1998; Parra 2005; Maier 2000). However, this subjective nature should not hinder any attempts to provide an objective assessment of translation quality. The aim of this study is to identify how the approaches that are broadly used to assess translation quality achieve a reduction in the subjectivity inherent to translation quality assessment. This is carried out within the context of political discourse, more specifically, the Arab Spring presidential speeches, where translation played a significant role in the understanding of the political settings and events of the Arab world. Therefore, translation errors can cause unintended consequences, as they can negatively affect the world's understanding of this important junction in modern Arab history.

2. Translation Quality Assessment and Political Discourse

The Arab world experienced exceptional circumstances in 2011 when the "Arab Spring" swept across some of the Arab countries, namely Tunisia, Egypt, Libya, Yemen and Syria. This "Spring" refers to the political demonstrations that occurred during that year against the ruling regimes in those Arab countries. The main reasons behind these demonstrations were poverty, rising prices, social exclusion, anger over corruption and personal enrichment among the political elite, and a demographic bulge of young people unable to find work (Asser, 2011). An unprecedented revolutionary wave of demonstrations in the Arab world began in Tunisia, and spread to other Arab countries specified above. Before the end of 2011, rulers of Tunisia, Egypt, Libya and Yemen were forced to step down from power. In Syria, at the time of writing this work, the revolution is still ongoing.

The Arab Spring revolution created an exceptional political conflict in the Arab world. Following Baker's definition, conflict "refers to a situation in which two or more parties seek to undermine each other because they have incompatible goals, competing interests, or fundamentally different values" (2006: 2). During this conflict, there were numerous incidents of linguistic acts in the form of presidential speeches, meetings, conferences and so on. These linguistic acts needed translating, as each producer of these acts not only intended to broadcast them to the local population, but they also aimed to broadcast them internationally (Schäffner, 2011). Consequently, translation participated in shaping the conflict in the Arab world and beyond, as it was involved during all the stages of the conflict (Baker, 2006); this is where translation plays a significant role in political settings and events (Schäffner, 2011).

Thus, the relationship between language, translation and political activity can hardly be separated. Generally speaking, politics relies heavily on language as a means of affecting others (Chilton, 2004:3). Because of this, politicians typically use their own eloquence and rhetorical skills, or someone else's, to influence others and attract their attention. The same applies to the Arab Spring movements. During these exceptional circumstances, leaders of the afflicted countries delivered several speeches in an attempt to influence the people to stop the demonstrations and restore order. It can be determined that "the political speeches which were delivered during the Arab Spring Revolution have their distinctive features which are different from those features of the usual speeches of these presidents during the normal circumstances" (Al Majali, 2015:35). Consequently, those speeches were also exceptional, as they reflected the criticality of the situation, and were characterised by different linguistic features (as will be explained in Chapters 4 and 5), so as to keep up with the unprecedented circumstances at the time.

The translations of those presidential speeches, especially into English, were no less important than the originals, as they attracted the attention of the international community, which was keen to stay abreast of the events in the Arab world. In most cases, the translations' target audience was never likely to listen or read the original scripts of the presidential speeches. Rather, they pursued the translated versions. It is then easy to see how the quality of the produced translations plays a significant role in the understanding of the content of these speeches, as well as the political situation and recent events (Al-Harahsheh, 2013:100). The researcher has observed that translation specialists would have a lot to comment about regarding the quality of the Arabic speeches' English translations, given that they contain many errors at different levels, as will be explored in Chapters 4 and 5. Such errors may even prevent readers from understanding the intended content and the political situation of the Arab Spring revolution at the time. It is within this context that the decision was made to closely examine some of the English translations of these speeches, in order to assess their quality.

However, as explained above, the quality of a translation can be evaluated using a variety of methods. Most of the established models and criteria for quality assessment evolve around three basic concepts; (1) quality of the producer, (2) quality of the process and (3) quality of the product. These are what Steiskal (2006: 13) terms the "3Ps" of quality assessment. Evaluating criteria and methods are ultimately different for each of the "3Ps". The quality of the producer can only be evaluated by means of certification, which only occurs "under three possible scenarios: certification by a professional association, certification by a government, and certification by an academic institution" (Stejskal, 2006: 13). The quality of the process, on the other hand, is mainly reflected in the basic notion that if predefined processes are followed, good translations will be obtained (Martinez and Hurtado, 2001). This naturally involves following predefined standards, a concept which proves problematic in the field of Translation Studies, as explained earlier. As Secâra (2005: 39) remarks, "The reason why no single standard will suffice is that quality is context dependent". Consequently, current translation quality assessment methods have aimed for a more restrictive view of translation quality by focusing on the product.

Given the above discussion, it is important to first specify the type of quality this research aims to address in order to choose the most appropriate assessment method. By determining that the analysis of the detected errors can be better understood through a textual analysis of the translations and their original texts (House, 1997), the scope of this work is limited to the assessment of the textual quality of the product. Relevant literature suggests that this type of quality is usually examined via two main approaches (Waddington, 2001). Different terminologies have been used to describe the approaches that focus on translation product, however, these can be generally divided into two approaches. The first approach examines the linguistic features of the translated texts at the sentence level, i.e., using an error-based translation evaluation system as the procedure for quantifying quality (Secâra, 2005). In contrast, the second approach focuses on the macrostructure relations of the text as a unit. Waddington (2001) calls the first type quantitative-centred (bottom-up) systems, and the second, qualitative-centred (top-down) systems. According to Williams (2001), the first type is called the quantitative-centred (error counting) systems while the second is the argumentation-centred (holistic) systems. Colina (2009: 237) also uses different terminologies to describe almost the same approaches: the experiential and theoretical approaches, respectively. Among the three quality concepts, the quality of the product (translated texts), is the main focus of this study, as will be explicated in the next chapter.

3. The Objectivity of TQA

Some translation scholars believe that the search for an assessment method that can achieve full objectivity in every situation, context and for every type of text seems illusory (Mateo, 2014:75). Others, in contrast, argue that although subjectivity cannot be entirely eliminated, it can be reduced to an acceptable level if it is based on a set of agreed-upon criteria of objectivity employed as a yardstick for comparing real versus ideal translations (Doyle 2003; Colina 2008, 2009). A survey concerning this particular point reveals that translation scholars suggest the following criteria to ensure a higher level of objectivity. (1) the mark given as a quality index of a particular translation can be justified (Mateo: 2014:80-81), (2) the negative and the positive aspects of the translation are both considered in the assessment of translation quality (Waddington, 2001), (3) the model of assessment is built on scientific theories of translation (House, 1997,2001), (4) the model includes a quantification dimension in the assessment which means that errors are assigned different weights depending on their consequences (Williams, 2001), (5) the assessment follows a multi-perspective viewpoint which means that both micro and macro levels of possible errors (linguistic and nonlinguistic) are covered (House, 2001-2), and (6) the model does not ignore the effect of the text type on the evaluation process which means that text genre is considered in the assessment (Reiss, 1971,2000).

The two main approaches in TQA (error-based and holistic) promise to provide objective assessment of translation quality. However, there is no previous empirical study that discusses which of these six criteria of objectivity is employed by each approach. Notwithstanding the rarity of empirical research on this area, the objectivity in the methods that are based on error analysis is believed to stem from the fact that they can give accurate accounts of both the type and number of errors committed in a translation. This is especially true if they are based on established theories and are equipped with statistical tools which, in turn, can be more reliable and objective than basing the evaluation on subjective judgments (Waddington, 2001). However, some scholars argue that the focus of these methods is only on errors, meaning that they are possibly established on a fallacy, this being: “the overall quality of a translation is equal to the sum of the defects it contains” (Waddington, 2001:21). As a result, error analysis methods only measure the defects in a translation, and ignore any positive aspects in the overall quality assessment of a particular text. It is undoubtedly true that errors undermine the quality of a translation, but it is also true that two translations with the same number of errors may vary in terms of overall quality (Waddington, 2001). Therefore, although methods based on error analysis provide a clear justification of the mark reached, they do not account for positive solutions that are used to solve certain translation problems.

On the other hand, the objectivity of holistic methods, the other assessment approach, stems from considering both the negative and positive aspects of the translation in the assessment process (Waddington, 2001). However, the relevant literature reveals the restricted view of errors in the holistic methods (Pym, 1992). Although they consider both the negative and positive aspects of the translation, as will be discussed in the next chapter, the error detection in this approach is not comprehensively governed by a systematic classification or quantification of errors such as that of error analysis, as holistic assessment mainly relies on the detection of certain types of errors and neglect large areas of potential errors, as will be specified in Chapter 2. Therefore, it then seems reasonable within the context of this study to hypothesise that the approach encompassing most of these six criteria is more likely to reduce the level of subjectivity inherent to translation quality assessment, and achieve a higher level of objectivity.

While each approach takes different considerations into account in the assessment of translation quality, no evidence has been empirically established on the differences between these two approaches when applied to the assessment of translation quality of political discourse. Therefore, this study intends to put both approaches to the test and examine the outcome of applying them to assess the quality of the same political texts, to explore the reasons behind any differences in their applicability, and to identify how they reduce the subjectivity inherent to quality assessment. There may be some assumptions concerning the superiority of one approach over the other, as will be discussed in the next chapter, in terms of providing objective feedback, but with the realisation that there is a rarity of empirical studies in the area of TQA (Colina 2008, 2009; Jiménez Crespo 2001), this study aims to contribute to the field of translation quality assessment by examining the issue in question empirically.

4. Conceptual Framework for the Study

As the main goal of this research is to examine the outcome of applying both approaches to assess the same texts, and identify how each approach reduces the subjective nature of assessment, it is important to ensure that it is based on a strong theoretical framework, so as to be valid and reliable (Pym, 1992). In so doing, two models have to be adapted or adopted, to represent the two main approaches. For the first approach, error analysis, the model used in this study is adapted from the theory of textuality originally proposed by Beaugrande and Dressler in 1981. As for the second, the holistic approach, the selected model is adopted as originally explicated by Waddington in 2001, with no modifications. To elaborate, in order to examine the outcome of applying the methods that rely on error analysis, a representative model has to be selected and examined from those available in the field. Most of the error analysis models are based on the notion of classifying translation errors, which also requires a strong conceptual framework before it can yield any holistic validity (Pym, 1992). Therefore, the selected model has to be comprehensive in order to rule out the possibility that any subjective feedback regarding the translation's quality is due to the restrictions of the model itself.

Attempting to adopt a comprehensive model requires for the model to encompass all the levels of a text where translation problems are expected to occur. It also requires that potential translation problems be classified according to the levels at which they might occur to ensure thorough examination. One of the most comprehensive classification for text levels where translation problems may arise is that of Beaugrande and Dressler (1981). The seven standards of textuality, they propose, provide a comprehensive framework within which all translation problems can be dealt with. These seven standards are: (1) cohesion, (2) coherence, (3) informativity, (4) acceptability, (5) intentionality, (6) situationality, and (7) intertextuality. Cohesion, coherence and intertextuality work at the text level, while intentionality and acceptability deal with the pragmatic level. Informativity relates to the content or information conveyed by a message: lexis, grammatical structures, word order, style and rhetorical means. Finally, situationality is concerned with the contextual and pragmatic factors involved in the production of the text.

Textuality is also regarded as a more comprehensive and practical unit for translation and evaluation; since it reflects how occurrences are connected to the others: through syntactic relations on the surface (cohesion); through conceptual relations in the text (coherence); through the attitudes of the author and reader to the text (intentionality and acceptability); through the transfer of the information (informativity); through the setting (situationality); and through the reciprocal relationship of separate texts (intertextuality). Textuality is induced by the linguistic surface but is not confined to it as the linguistic surface of a text is no more than a pointer to its textuality (Neubert & Shreve, 1992: 70). By investigating the textual surface of a text and also the standards of its textuality via textual analysis, one may be able to unravel the complexity of linguistic features of the surface, analyse the relationships between constituents of the text, and ultimately, learn about the meaning and intention of the text which relate to social and communicative constraints comprised in a given context (Martikainen, 2018).

Based on the notion that textualisation is the global strategy that makes translation possible (Neubert & Shreve, 1992: 133-147), the seven standards of textuality have been used by many translation researchers in developing models for the translation process in general (e.g., Belhaaj, 1998; Bell, 1991; Neubert and Shreve, 1992) and for specific text types (e.g., Aksoy, 2001), as well as in descriptive studies of translation products (e.g., Kruger, 2000). The theory of textuality has also attracted those in the area of translation evaluation, in devising models for quality assessment (e.g., Adab, 2001; Alan, 1994; Xuanmin, 2000). In these models, the seven standards of textuality have been proposed as criteria for assessment (Adab, 2001; Alan, 1994). Although Adab (2001) focuses only on advertisement texts, Alan (1994) does not restrict the use of these criteria to any text type. However, except for a few additions to cohesion in Alan's model (1994), these two researchers do not suggest any kind of modification, as will later be explained in detail in Chapter 2. On the other hand, this study is a step further in this direction, where Beaugrande and Dressler's seven standards of textuality are used to define a set of criteria against which the quality of a translation can be measured. However, unlike previous attempts which adopt the model as it is, the current study suggests some modifications, so as to fit the peculiarity of Arabic, the source texts' language. This will also be further discussed in Chapter 3.

This particular model is selected not only because it provides a comprehensive framework for encompassing and classifying translation errors, but also because it reflects three perspectives; that of: (1) the text itself (in cohesion and coherence), (2) the participants (in intentionality and acceptability), and (3) the broad context (in informativity, situationality, and intertextuality) (Beaugrande, 2004). Besides, the theory of textuality concords with the type of quality that this study seeks to examine - textual quality. House (1997) believes that adopting a textual approach to the assessment of translation quality values the textual quality of the output. Therefore, translation textual quality can best be assessed by means of textual analysis. For the above-mentioned reasons, and due to the fact that the translation quality assessment method must be customised to assess the predefined quality (the textual quality, House, 1997), the seven standards of textuality have been proposed as the theoretical framework and as a model of error analysis for the current study.

To examine the outcome of applying the methods that rely on holistic assessment, a representative model also has to be selected and examined from those available in the field. The holistic method used in this study was designed by Waddington in 2001. This particular model is selected for four reasons: (1) it has been empirically tested, which creates a solid ground for the purpose of using it as a representative model of the holistic approach in order to identify the criteria of objectivity that this approach employ, and (2) it is not a type-specific model and can be applied to all types of texts, (3) it is comprehensive, as the scale in this particular model is unitary and treats the translation competence as a whole, which is the focus of most holistic models, and (4) it considers both the negative and the positive aspects of the translation quality (Khan Mohammad and Osanloo, 2009:137). It is worth mentioning, at the end of this section, that the holistic assessment model is adopted in this study as explicated by its original author, because it can be applied to assess the set of Arabic and English texts without necessitating any amendments. In contrast, the model of error analysis is adapted to fit the peculiarity of the combination of Arabic-English translations, which justifies the lengthy description of the suggested amendments to the original model.

5. Purpose and Significance of the Study

Firstly, the main purpose of this research is to empirically examine the outcome of the application of the two main approaches of assessment which are typically used to assess the quality of translation products, (the error analysis and holistic approaches), when applied to the assessment of the same political texts. Secondly, the study aims to examine the applicability of the proposed model of error analysis that is adapted from the theory of textuality (Beaugrande and Dressler, 1981), as a translation quality assessment measurement tool for Arabic-English translations as one that can assist translators in the process of translation, as well as raters in the process of evaluation, by providing a set of criteria against which quality can be assessed. In the optic of achieving this aim, the original model has been modified in order to cater to the Arabic language (as discussed in detail in Chapter 3). Thirdly, it aims to investigate whether the six criteria of objectivity believed by specialists to provide the assessment process with more objectivity are taken into consideration in the application of each approach; and to identify how they reduce the subjectivity that is inherent to quality assessment.

The significance of this study is based on three grounds. Firstly, the literature review conducted in Chapter 2 reveals the rarity of empirical studies in the area of translation quality assessment (Waddington, 2011:18). For this reason, this study attempts to contribute to the field by empirically examining the differences (if any) between the outcome of the application of the two main approaches of translation quality assessment, i.e., error analysis approaches and holistic approaches; and identifying how each method reduces the level of subjectivity to quality assessment. Secondly, the texts chosen for investigation were delivered in the midst of unprecedented circumstances in the Arab world. Therefore, attention should be paid to the translation of such sensitive texts, as this study is mainly based on House's notion (1997) that studying political discourse from textual linguistic perspectives leads to a better understanding of the political situation, and also helps to study linguistic features in depth. Thirdly, the importance of such a descriptive study further lies in its potential contribution to the descriptive branch of Translation Studies, by providing new data which can in turn help to bring new insights into the field. Moreover, comparative studies of this kind, as Toury (1995) remarks, are likely to yield interesting insights into similarities and differences in the processing of texts, and how translators construct translations.

6. The Main Research Questions

1. What are the criteria of objectivity that the main product-centred assessment approaches take into consideration in the process of providing an objective translation quality assessment?
2. Are there any differences in the outcome of the application of the two methods of translation quality assessment when applied to the assessment of the same texts?
3. How do these two methods of assessment reduce the subjectivity inherent to quality assessment?
4. What are the reasons for as well as the outcomes of adapting the original model of error analysis for the corpus of this study?

7. Corpus of the Study

For the purpose of examining the outcome of the application of the product-centred approaches of translation quality assessment for evaluating political discourse, the texts chosen have to be representative of this genre. As explained above, the texts selected are the presidential speeches given by the leaders of the Arab countries where the 2011 revolutions took place. In terms of the political upheaval in the Arab world, those speeches were particularly important, as they were delivered during unprecedented circumstances in the Arab world, and their translations were equally important, as they aimed to reflect the political situation to the international community.

As many speeches were delivered at the time of the revolutions, refining criteria had to be established so as to choose a manageable number of texts for close examination. As such, two criteria were followed to create the corpus constituting the case study for the analysis and evaluation in this research:

1. Including only the speeches delivered in the countries where the revolution has started and ended in 2011. This excluded only Syria from the five Arab countries (Tunisia,

Egypt, Yemen, Libya and Syria), as the situation in this country is still ongoing. This criteria was deemed necessary for the following reasons:

a) Most of the Arab revolutions began and ended in 2011, as will be explained in Chapter 3.

b) The term Arab Spring was essentially coined to describe the demonstrations that took place in 2011 (McCaffrey, 2012).

2. Including only the speeches that are translated fully, as some of them were either left untranslated or translated partially, as will be explained in the following sections.

A. Source Texts

The speeches abiding by the two selection criteria stated above, and constituting the source texts for the study, were produced in Arabic. The source texts are taken from the versions published in official Arabic news agencies. Therefore, the textual analysis in this research is carried out based on the official published original speeches (in Arabic), and their respective published full versions (in English). In other words, this study is based on a comparative textual analysis between two parallel pairs of texts published in credible sources. Most of the Arab Spring speeches have official versions, but their inclusion to the corpus of this study depended on whether or not they have a published English translation.

B. Target Texts

The target texts in this study are the English translations of the Arab Spring presidential speeches that were delivered in Arabic. As most of the newspapers do not provide full text translations of presidential speeches (Orengo, 2005:168-186), and due to the unavoidable complications of assessing the quality of abridged translations to represent the quality of the whole texts, only those speeches that are fully translated are included in the corpus of this study. As there were several attempts made by fans and crowdsourced to fully translate the presidential speeches, only the fully translated versions of the original speeches published in credible English news agencies such as The Guardian, BBC, and CNN are included in this study. This step was deemed necessary so as to rule out the possibility that (potential) poor quality is due to a lack of expertise or an unfamiliarity with the professional norms of news agencies and publication. This specification, in turn, led to the selection of four speeches as will be detailed in Chapter 3.

8. Research Methodology

To ensure that the analysis is not based upon subjective considerations, it must be built upon the results of an "objective" measurement tool. However, with regards to translation quality assessment, the main argument is that it is a subjective process (Horguelin and Brunette 1998; Larose 1998; Parra 2005). This study is based upon the notion that the recognition of the relative subjective nature of TQA "does not invalidate the objective part of the assessment", rather, "it merely reinforces its necessity" (House, 2001, p. 256). Therefore, in order to assess the quality of a certain translation, following Waddington (2001), three steps should be taken into account: firstly, the concept of quality must be well-defined, because translation quality is traditionally believed to be the one that fits its purpose (Nord 1997, O'Brien 2012). Secondly, the methodology must be chosen precisely, so as to select the assessment method that can successfully measure the defined translation quality. Lastly, the assessment should be carried out in accordance with the predefined notion of quality, and the chosen assessment methodology. In line with these three steps, I will first specify the type of quality that this study aims to address (textual quality), and then will explain the method used to assess this specific quality (textual analysis).

A. Textual Quality

Among the "3Ps" of translation quality, (quality of the producer, of the process and of the product), in this study, assessment focuses on the quality of the product, specifically the textual quality. The view of translation quality in this work equates to the notion that the linguistic choices in the target text should be in line with the source text's standards of cohesion, coherence, informativity, intentionality, situationality, and intertextuality. In other words, quality is considered to be the level of appropriateness of the linguistic choices made in the translated texts to represent the linguistic and nonlinguistic ones of the original texts (Beaugrande and Dressler, 1981). House (1997) believes that adopting a textual approach to the assessment of translation quality values the textual quality of the output. Therefore, the textual quality of a translation can best be assessed by means of textual analysis. With this in mind, the discussion will shift to that of textual analysis and its benefits and appropriateness as a methodology to assess the translation's textual quality.

B. Textual Analysis

Textuality is believed to be "the complex set of features that texts must have to be considered texts. It is a property that a complex linguistic object assumes when it reflects certain social and communicative constraints" (Neubert and Shreve, 1992, p.70). Textuality is also proposed to be the basis of the actualisation (the evolution of a text) and the utilisation of texts (Beaugrande, 1980). Therefore, selecting a textual approach to the study of translation holds great benefit at both theoretical and practical levels. On the theoretical level, applying a textual approach to the analysis of texts and their translations entails emphasising the textual aspect of translation, and also clears the ground for a more sophisticated treatment of translated texts (Neubert, 1996). It can also be insightful on different levels, and can have theoretical and practical implications that would contribute to the general field of translation, as well as that of translation assessment and translator training. On the practical level, the benefits of applying a textual analysis have been highlighted by many researchers. Al-Faqi (2000), for instance, avers that the analysis of separate sentences would yield partial meanings. The meanings of the text as a whole can only be understood by means of textual analysis, whereby the devices and elements that contribute to the emergence of meaning are all explored. Within the context of translator training, Schäffner (2002) also points out that textual approaches to the analysis of translations can highlight specific textual features which might present translation problems, in order to steer translation decisions. As for translation students, she adds, following a textual approach can help them "become sensitized to recognize linguistic structures in texts", and

> "learn to reflect on the specific functions of textual structures for the overall purpose of texts in a communicative context, and based on such reflections they will be able to make informed decisions as to the linguistic structures required for the target text in the new context and culture for new addresses".
>
> (Schäffner. 2002, pp. 6-7)

She concludes that applying a textual approach promotes the development of translation competence, since it "heighten[s] students' awareness of the process involved in translating and in the production of translation" (Schäffner. 2002, pp. 6-7). Moreover, Hartmann (1980) proposes that the grammatical textuality hypothesis may be the guiding principle behind the development of text linguistics. This hypothesis postulates the following assumptions: (1) the linguistic and extralinguistic factors correlate only in texts, (2) a characterisation of the linguistic patterns should go beyond the phrase or sentence level, and (3) textuality is a more realistic notion for capturing communicative events than the narrowly conceived notions of grammaticality, and semanticality. This notion of textuality, as Beaugrande (1980) maintains, is a factor that arises from communicative procedures for text utilisation, and is thus an essential task in the study of the aspects of text linguistics. In fact, Beaugrande (2004) later suggests that text linguistics logically shifted the conceptual centre from "grammaticality" over to textuality, which is characterised by its realistic nature.

According to Beaugrande (2002), textuality should be viewed as a human achievement in making connections wherever communicative events occur, and is not a set of theoretical units or rules, nor is it a linguistic property that a text may or may not possess. Beaugrande (2004) also argues that textuality designates the total relatedness of the text; meaning that the seven standards of textuality interrelate to achieve connections. He believes that cohesion is concerned with the connections among linguistic forms, coherence with the connections among concepts, intentionality with the connections to the speakers' intentions, acceptability with the receivers' engagement to the text, informativity with how new the content is, situationality with the circumstances of the interaction, and intertextuality in terms of relations with other texts, particularly those with a similar text type. By proposing the seven standards of textuality, Beaugrande and Dressler (1981) advocate a procedural approach to the study of texts. In such an approach, all the levels are described in terms of their utilisation. They argue (1994) that in a procedural approach the analyst's task is not restricted to only dividing a text into phonemes and morphemes or analysing its syntactic structures, but also to explore textuality aspects. According to them, this is because exploring textuality aspects activates spheres of significance and relevance between linguistic elements and extralinguistic factors such as culture, society, ideology, emotion, personality, and so on.

Given the above discussion, and as the translation quality assessment method has to be customised to assess the predefined quality, and since adopting a textual approach values the textual quality of the output (House, 1997), the seven standards of textuality are proposed as the basis of textual analysis of the outcomes of the holistic and error-based assessment methods as specified below.

C. Description of the Error Analysis Method

In the proposed model, each of Beaugrande and Dressler’s seven standards of textuality is considered to be a criterion against which the quality of the translation is measured. This means that quality is addressed against seven main potential areas of errors. Errors committed in the translations of the Arab Spring presidential speeches are classified in terms of severity into two groups: major errors and minor errors. Major errors constitutes of the mistakes which completely disregard a certain standard in the model, as described by the two authors, whereas minor errors concern those that only partially disregard the same standard.

Beaugrande and Dressler's seven standards are also used to conduct a contrastive textual analysis of the presidential speeches selected for the study and their respective translations, for the purpose of assessing their quality. Textual analysis of the selected data essentially consists of two main procedures: analysing the ST’s potential area of error, and a comparison of the ST to the TT for assessment. After conducting the textual analysis and classifying the errors, major errors and minor errors will then be counted in order to establish a preliminary quality index for that particular translation. The number of errors compared to the number of words in each text is finally calculated using an appropriate statistical tool (as specified in Chapter 3), to assign a mark out of ten for the quality of each text.

D. Description of the Holistic Approach Method

To ensure that both approaches are treated equally, and since the researcher has tested the method (A) herself, two external evaluators are given the same translations in order to provide a holistic assessment of their quality. These two evaluators are certified from the CIOL (the Chartered Institute of Linguists) as having good experience working in translation, interpretation, and evaluation from Arabic into English and vice versa. According to their profiles, posted in the official website of CIOL, one of them has 38 years' experience working as a UK government linguist and political researcher. Her primary language for over the past 30 years has been Arabic, and she has also lengthy professional experience working from French and Spanish. She is accredited as an ACIL in these languages – as well as from Italian, Farsi, Romanian and Portuguese. The other evaluator is currently a staff translator and she provides Arabic and French to English translations.

To ensure that the assessment is not a reflection of the raters' selected holistic model, they have been provided with the same holistic method. Using the same model (Waddington's model), the raters must assign a mark out of ten for the quality of each translation, provided that the assigned mark is justified in a written feedback. For each of the five levels of quality indicated in the model (Table 1.1), the translation can be graded on a scale of two points against each of the five levels. This allows the rater to award the higher mark to the translation that meets the requirements of a particular level or has some good solutions to translation problems, and award the lower mark to the translation that falls between two levels, but is closer to the upper one and so on. In this model, a translation is assessed based on two main parameters: the accuracy of transferring the ST content and the quality of expression in the TL. Each of these two parameters are further specified to help the rater decides which level best represents the translation quality, as shown below:

Level	Accuracy of transfer of ST content	Quality of expression in TL	Degree of completion	Mark
Level 5	Complete transfer of ST information, only minor revisions needed to reach professional standard.	Almost all of the translation reads like a piece originally written in English. There may be minor lexical, grammatical or spelling errors.	Successful	**9-10**
Level 4	Almost complete transfer; there may be one or two insignificant inaccuracies, requires a certain amount of revision to reach professional standard.	Large sections read like a piece originally written in English. There are a number of lexical, grammatical or spelling errors.	Almost completely successful	**7-8**
Level 3	Transfer of the general ideas but with a number of lapses in accuracy, needs considerable revision to reach professional standard.	Certain parts read like a piece originally written in English, but others read like a translation. There are a considerable number of lexical, grammatical or spelling errors.	Adequate	**5-6**
Level 2	Transfer undermined by serious inaccuracies, thorough revision is required to reach professional standard.	Almost the entire text reads like a translation, there are continual lexical, grammatical or spelling errors.	Inadequate	**3-4**
Level 1	Completely inadequate transfer of ST content, the translation is not worth revising.	The candidate reveals a total inability to express himself adequately in English.	Completely inadequate	**1-2**

Table (1.1): Waddington's Holistic Assessment Model (2001)

After applying both methods of assessment to the same texts, the overall quality index of each method will be compared. By the end of the research, each of the four translated texts will have received two marks: one from the application of assessment method (A), and one from the application of method (B). Finally, both results will undergo close contrastive analysis in order to investigate the differences between the application of each approach, and identify how they reduce the subjectivity inherent to quality assessment.

9. Organisation of the Study

The present research is set out into seven chapters. Chapter (1) introduces the problem addressed in this study, and describes the type of data and the procedure selected for addressing the main research questions. Chapter (2) presents a review of the relevant literature on translation quality assessment, with special reference to the studies that focus on the quality of the translation products rather than that of the translation process or the translation producer. Chapter (3) is devoted to describing the research methodology and procedures used for the creation of this study's corpus. It also provides a detailed description of the proposed model of error analysis. Chapters (4) contains an analysis of the application of Method (A) on the four selected speeches, while Chapter (5) offers a discussion of the researcher's findings. Chapter (6) summerises the results obtained in this study. Finally, Chapter (7) concludes the dissertation by providing a summary and conclusion, implications for practice, and recommendations for future research.

Chapter 2
Literature Review

This chapter will review the literature written on translation quality assessment and its main approaches. For the purposes of this research, the discussion of these studies will adopt the well-established classification of the two broadly used approaches in translation quality assessment, namely: the holistic assessment approach and the error analysis approach. Each is discussed in terms of its application and how it reduces the subjectivity inherent to translation quality assessment.

1. Historical Overview

Translation quality assessment (TQA) has been discussed under the area of translation criticism in Translation Studies. Criticism in translation has been defined in many different ways. This is probably due to the fact that translation criticism is a highly complex process, as it engages with many factors (House, 1997, p.119). Holmes (1972/1988:78) was the first to introduce translation criticism into the map of Translation Studies. Although there have been other attempts following Holmes' to draw a map for Translation Studies, such as that of Toury's (1991), the area of criticism has overall remained unexplored. Pym (1998, p.5) does not discuss translation criticism in his division of Translation Studies, although he discusses historical criticism. Unlike Holmes, who views criticism as an applied extension of the discipline, Pym's neglect of translation criticism can be attributed to his views of this area as "an unfashionable and perilous exercise" (1998, p.5). During Williams and Chesterman's (2002, p. 11, 56) subsequent attempt to update the map of Translation Studies, they relate translation criticism to the area of prescriptiveness and evaluation. More recently, the area of translation quality assessment was introduced to the big picture of Translation Studies by Van Doorslaer (1995), who redrew Holmes' map of Translation Studies, linking criticism with translation evaluation.

After the recognition of translation quality assessment as a branch in the field of Translation Studies, many attempts were made to classify the studies concerned with translation quality assessment. The earliest attempt is that of Baker and Saldanha's (1998), who classify translation quality assessment approaches into three categories: the subjective approach (Anecdotal), the psycholinguistic approach (response-oriented approaches) and the text-based approach. In the first approach, the treatment of quality is subjective in nature in the sense that it does not abide by certain principles of assessment. The psycholinguistic approach, on the other hand, focuses mainly on determining dynamic equivalence proposed by Nida in 1969, and the evaluation relies mainly on assessing whether the effect of the translation on the target receivers is the same as the effect on the original receivers. The third approach is linguistically-based, where pairs of source and target texts are compared in the optic of discovering syntactic, semantic, stylistic, and pragmatic regularities of transfer.

Brunette (2000) also classifies translation quality assessment procedures, and further delimits differences between translation quality assessment, quality assurance and quality control. She distinguishes five different types of assessment procedures based on the following: the status of the target text (whether it is the final version of the translation or not), whether the text is analysed only partly or in its entirety, whether there are explanations provided for any changes or modifications made in the translation, whether a comparison is made between the source text and the target text, and finally, what the aim of the assessment itself is and for which receivers. The five types of assessment procedures suggested by Brunette are as follows: pragmatic revision, quality assessment, quality control, quality assurance and didactic revision.

Another similar classification is suggested by House (2001); according to her, translation quality assessment studies fall into three categories: firstly, there are pre-linguistic studies where subjective statements are the norm. Secondly, psycholinguistic studies, which focus on the translation effect on the receivers. Thirdly, source-text based studies (linguistically-based to describe both the source text and the target text). House (2001) generally doubts the efficiency of psycholinguistic and pre-linguistic models because their arguments and judgments are not based on certain criteria for measurement, but rather on either arbitrary judgments or social preferences, both of which are highly subjective.

2. Translation Quality

Researchers have become increasingly attentive to the significance of quality in translation. Thus, the field of Translation Studies is witnessing a proliferation of studies treating this important aspect. Gouadec (2010, pp.270-275), for instance, distinguishes between extrinsic and intrinsic translation quality. Extrinsic quality relates to the way a translation satisfies the requirements of the applicable situation in terms of audience, purpose, medium, code, and any other external relevant parameters, whereas intrinsic quality relates to the inside of the text content. He suggests different scales for translation quality: (1) rough-cut, (2) fit-for-delivery (although not yet fit for broadcasting), and (3) fit-for-broadcast translation (accurate, efficient, and ergonomic). These three translation quality scales are further characterised by four domains to which quality relates. The first three domains are relevant to any type of material (text, voice, image, video, etc.). They are: (1) the linguistic-stylistic-rhetorical-communicative domain, (2) the factual-technical-semantic-cultural domain, (3) and the functional-ergonomic domain. (4) The fourth domain is when the translated material is compatible with the original. Quality is then regarded as (1) acceptable, (2) good, or (3) excellent across each domain.

On the other hand, Bittner (2011, pp. 76-87) believes that the quality of a translation depends on an intricate network of interrelations. In a flower-shaped diagram, he portrays these interrelations with the target text being in the centre of the flower and all the other factors being the six petals surrounding it. The six factors that affect translation quality are the source text, the source and target texts' respective forms, the agents in the translation process (i.e., the client and the translator) and the culture and politics involved in the translation process. These factors, according to Bittner, signify what the translator should be aware of during a translation task. Attempting to shift the focus from older diagrams, where they describe the translation process based on a dichotomy between the source text and the target text and their respective cultures, with translation coming in between, such as Nord's diagram (1988/1997, pp.38-39), he shifts the focus to the target text as being the main element of the translation process and evaluation. The reason he provides for doing this is that the quality then becomes more manifested.

Although scholars' engagement with translation quality is not always with the aim of developing models for translation quality assessment, as will later be shown, they still provide interesting views on the issue. Rothe-Neves (2002), for instance, believes that the quality of translated texts can be ensured if a "pedagogical approach" is followed, arguing that all parameters used in the assessment process are, in most cases, those used in translation courses. According to him, those who teach translation courses are "experts", since they assess translations based on teaching experience. Chesterman (1997) also argues that the quality of a translation is all about satisfying certain needs which should ideally be set before starting any assessment task. Those needs can either be explicit or implicit. He believes that the most important implied needs in translation are accuracy, as well as the successful communication of the text message to the receivers.

3. Translation Quality Assessment and its Subjective Nature

As explained in Chapter 1, it is clear that the defining criteria for translation quality is that it is a subjective notion. Viewing translation evaluation as a generally arbitrary and subjective practice, and believing that the main task of translation quality assessment is to improve the evaluation process, Holmes (1988, p.78) argues that this improvement can only be ensured if quality assessment is built on objective criteria. This leads the discussion to a notion crucial in this study - objectivity. House (2001) argues that translation scholars can objectively assess a translation by following a multi-perspective viewpoint. If the evaluator carries out the analysis on both micro and macro levels, and at the same time maintains other important elements such as function, ideology, genre, register, and the communicative value of individual linguistic items, then subjectivity may be reduced. The evaluator then would be able to describe the decision-making process more objectively. House concludes by stating that the recognition of the subjective element in criticism "does not invalidate the objective part of the assessment, it merely reinforces its necessity" (2001, p. 256). Other researchers, on the other hand, are skeptical about the possibility of evaluating translation quality objectively. Bittner (2011, pp. 76-87) for instance, believes that even if objectivity is the goal in the assessment of translation quality, it is difficult if not altogether impossible to achieve. He adds that to some extent, the activities of translation evaluation will always elude the grasp of objective analysis. However, he also maintains that closer cooperation between translation scholars and critics could help in reducing the subjective element in translation assessment more effectively.

Translation scholars attribute different reasons for the low level of objectivity in some of the existing models for translation quality assessment. For instance, while presenting his empirical model for translation quality assessment, Al-Qinai (2000) asserts that focusing only on the end product, i.e., the translated text, and ignoring the process of decision making is the reason for the lack of objectivity in translation assessment. Williams (2001), on the other hand, ascribes this lack of objectivity to the ignorance of a quantitative dimension in the quality assessment models. Referring to the models of House (1977, 1981, 1997) and Nord (1992), Williams was the first to suggest that previous models lack a quantitative dimension, asserting that without error weighting and quantification in assessment of texts, measurement criteria cannot offer a convincing judgment. He advocates combining both qualitative and quantitative methods in translation assessment, because quantification "lends objectivity to the assessment" (Williams, 2001, p. 326).

Reiss (1971, 2000), on the other hand, links the low level of objectivity to the ignorance of the text type's effect on the evaluation process. Her book on translation criticism written in 1971 is believed to be one of the earliest attempts to set up objective text typological criteria for the evaluation of all translation types (Hartmann, 1980). Assuming that different text types require different translation methods, they would also need different evaluation criteria; a fact which she suggests translation scholars should take into consideration. Translation scholars should identify the text type in order to avoid using inappropriate criteria for assessment. Therefore, Reiss suggests that establishing a text typology (namely literary, linguistic, and pragmatic) is the first step towards ensuring objectivity in translation quality assessment; a criterion which is also considered in the proposed model of error analysis as will be explained in the next chapter.

Moreover, translation scholars suggest that objectivity can be ensured if the models of assessment are built on scientific theories of translation. In her call for scientific criteria for quality assessment, House (1997, 2001) emphasises that linguistic analysis provides the ground for arguing evaluative judgments, which can in turn lead to an objective model for translation quality assessment. House (1997, p.3) had earlier criticised the anecdotal approaches to translation evaluation mainly for their reliance on the notion that the quality depends largely on the translator's subjective knowledge. Thus, she believes that the assessment of a translation's quality should ideally be based on a more objective criteria, if it stems from a certain theory of translation.

However, other researchers disagree with this line of thought. Rothe-Neves (2002), for instance, believes that in short, there should be sufficient empirical evidence of a certain translation quality theory's success before theorising it, calling for more empirical work before making generalisations. He advocates that the experts' own subjectivity can be avoided if translations are assessed by others, arguing that "external evaluators" are not following a certain theory of assessment because they are not involved in the research process. This notion is not entirely new; it was first introduced by Nida and Taber (1969) under the term "normal readers" as the translation addressees. Rothe-Neves advocates external evaluation for two reasons: firstly, he supports the notion that external evaluators will be more objective if they do not follow a certain analysis system, that is, a certain theory. Secondly, if the external evaluators happen to be translation professionals, then the assessment data could be taken as a portrait of those quality criteria.

Mobaraki and Aminzadeh (2012: 63) argue that the stimulus of moving from one model to another is to objectify the process of TQA more than before so that its findings become more concrete and supportable. However, they say that such an objectivism is becoming more challenging. In their study, they attempt to pay more attention to those challenges and show to what extent this objectivism has been attained. They argue that despite many theoretical studies (e.g. NewMrak 1988, Wilss 1996, House 1997, and Reiss 1977/1989) on TQA, true objective evaluation is not possible. They attribute this to the lack of direct observation and description of personal, social, and discoursal factors of translation. The relative solution to this unattainability, they suggest, is to use a comprehensive and systematic approach to cover the "representations" of these factors (as much as possible), and to manage and take into account all of them properly in order to evaluate them in a valid and reliable way. For this reason, they present a new procedural eclectic model of TQA based on five criteria: systematicity, comprehensiveness, validity, reliability, and objectivity. They conclude that the main reason to introduce this new method was to overcome the shortcomings of the TQA ongoing strategies with regard to the cited criteria.

To evaluate the ever-changing aspects of competence (ranging from bilingual and interlingual to intercultural competence), they addressed them one by one, and proposed appropriate strategies or (combination of them) for any particular stage. That is why their model is entitled eclectic.

Given the above discussion, it seems reasonable to think that the subjective and relative nature of the notion of quality, and indeed of the evaluator (House, 1997), means that translation quality assessment requires the inclusion of all the criteria translation scholars believe would increase the level of objectivity. The recognition of the subjective nature of assessment, once again, does not invalidate the objective element of assessment, it just reinforces the necessity of making serious efforts to develop and adopt more objective criteria. Therefore, although subjectivity cannot be entirely eliminated, it can be reduced if most of these criteria are taken into consideration in the assessment process. The two methods of assessment, adopted in this study, are examined on whether or not they employ the six criteria of objectivity, identified in Chapter 1 (p.15), in order to identify how each method manages to reduce subjectivity. Ultimately, this is what the present study aims to achieve. The examined six criteria of objectivity are: (1) including a quantification dimension in the quality assessment, (2) considering both the negative and the positive aspects of the translation, (3) following a multi-perspective viewpoint which considers both the micro and macro levels of the assessment, (4) considering the text type, (5) building the assessment on scientific theories of translation, and (6) justifying the assigned marks.

4. Assessment Criteria of Translation Quality

Quality assessment encompasses different schools of thought in the field of Translation Studies which, in turn, leads to differences in assessment criteria, making reaching a unified set of assessment criteria almost impossible (House, 1997). Schmitt (1998) argues that regardless of the increased efforts to create unified models for translation quality assessment, translation practitioners are still widely criticising academic approaches for not investigating the subject of quality as much as necessity demands. The same academic approaches are also criticised for their inability to determine the nature of quality and for neglecting the various evaluation situations (Bonthrone, 1998). Lauscher (2000, pp. 149-

168) also argues that the academic models for translation quality assessment could become more applicable in practice if the translation process was integrated into the evaluation procedure, and if the relative nature of this evaluation procedure was further examined.

While referring to the holistic method followed at Leeds University Centre for Translation Studies, Secară (2005: 46) also criticises academic holistic methods believing that

> [u]sually, those academic institutions that offer translation programs produce a set of criteria, usually holistic, against which the validity of a translation task will be evaluated. More often than not, such lists give rise to subjective interpretation, mostly due to the fact that they represent only correcting scale and not a grading scale.

The various approaches for translation quality assessment differ mainly in the aspects they emphasise as quality criteria, however, they share certain assumptions (Horton, 1998). These assumptions can be summarised as follows: the aim of the target text's assessment is mainly to measure the degree of adequacy of that text in relation to the semantic, syntactic and pragmatic features of the source text, as well as in relation to the cultural frame and the linguistic resources of the target language. On the other hand, these approaches diverge with regards to the following: (1) the properties of the text that they believe should remain invariant in the translation process, (2) the analytical models to be applied in the pre-translational analysis process, and (3) the strategies that control the translation process. In these approaches, the assessment of translation quality usually undergoes three stages: (1) source text analysis, (2) comparison, and (3) evaluation (Horton, 1998).

The ultimate aim of most of the existing models of translation quality assessment is to create a conclusive, objective list of parameters that are applicable to all types of translated texts, so as to help evaluators in making prescriptive judgments. In practice, such lists may not be sufficient for determining what a good or bad translation is and, therefore, are also insufficient for assessing quality, as it depends on a wide range of factors. Although many approaches and models for assessing translation quality have not succeeded in producing such a conclusive and objective list, relative agreement does exist on what some of the major parameters are, such as consistency of sense, logical cohesion, correct terminology and so on, as will be discussed when referring to the two main approaches in TQA in the next sections. For the interest of this study, it would be helpful to separately discuss the relevant literature of the application of the theory of textuality before discussing the other relevant studies and models.

5.1 The Application of Beaugrande and Dressler's Theory of Textuality

Beaugrande and Dressler's standards have been adopted by many researchers in the field of Translation Studies to develop models for different purposes, such as the translation process in general, for specific text types, translation evaluation and in descriptive studies of translation products. Neubert (1996, p.95) believes that these studies mark the shift to the "extralinguistic phase".

A. Studies in Translation Process

In an attempt to characterise the process of translation, Bell (1991) integrates the seven standards of textuality within his three part structured model. In the second part, which is concerned with meaning, Bell introduces the seven standards due to the fact that they emphasise meaning as the communicative value of texts and utterances. He maintains that these standards are implicit in the process of translation, and in the knowledge and skills which assist translators in their task. Similarly, Neubert and Shreve (1992) use the seven standards of textuality comprehensively in their model for translation. In fact, their model is mainly based on the seven standards which, according to them, can serve as equivalence parameters. Although they advocate the notion of textual equivalence, they do not seek complete match between textual surfaces. Instead, they stress the interrelationships between textual effect, which is the basic of textual equivalence, and the actual textual formations of the source text and the target text (Zhu, 1999).

Hatim and Mason (1997) also integrate the seven standards of textuality in their context-based strategy of dealing with texts. They believe that "all texts must satisfy basic standards of textuality before acquiring the additional characteristics of being literary, technical, oral, etc." (1997, p.vii). They also add that this textual approach is "both durable and meaningful as a way of developing translation competence" (1997, p.viii). For pedagogical purposes, Belhaaj (1998) investigates in a series of papers, different theoretical and applied aspects of translation, in order to determine the factors involved in the creation a well-structured framework for systematic translation training. In one of these papers, he pinpoints the role of the seven standards as a serviceable tool for translators in the process of translating. He also asserts that these standards emphasise two aspects of texts that are essential to translation as an intercultural activity: the internal grammatical and semantic structure of texts, as well as the communicative nature of texts with its linguistic and social factors.

B. Studies in Translation Products

Kruger (2000) applies the seven standards of textuality in her descriptive-analytic study of drama translation as a product. She aims to identify the textual features that distinguish an Afrikaans stage translation from a page translation of Shakespeare's play, *The Merchant of Venice*. She particularly focuses on the nature and extent of lexical cohesion, believing that page or stage translation has constraining effect on it. Aksoy (2001) also develops her textual-contextual approach to account for the translation of narrative texts on the basis of the seven standards of textuality. She believes that these standards apply to any text type and are defining variables of translation situations. Moreover, she believes that her approach aids the translator in remaining loyal to the source text and the author's style, as well as in creating acceptable format and standard style of equivalent texts in the target culture.

C. Studies in Translation Evaluation

One of the studies incorporating the seven standards of textuality model in its treatment of translation quality assessment is that of Alan (1994). He conducts a contrastive study between some English texts and their Turkish translations. The aim of his work is to single out some of the co-textual, contextual and cultural factors that affect translating, and ultimately, to identify some criteria that can be used in translation criticism. Except for a few additions to Beaugrande and Dressler's characterisation of cohesion necessary to represent the Turkish language, Alan applies all the other standards without any modification. Adab (2001) also integrates the seven standards in a theoretical framework suggested for the evaluation of the translation of advertisements. Her goal is to provide specific systematic and applicable means of justification of choices and of critical evaluation. However, she does not suggest making any modifications so as to adapt these standards for the purpose of her study.

Similarly, Luo Xuanmin (2003) integrates the seven standards in his textual model for analysing and evaluating translation as they are explicated in the original model without any modifications. He maintains that these standards are dynamic, operational, regulative, and complementary to one another. He also proposes that their model has explanatory capacity for reading and writing in teaching language and literature, as well as translation studies. It also has explanatory capacity in text analysis, as it refers not only to the text itself, but also to other elements that activate the text, such as psychological, pragmatic, and aesthetic ones. However, this study, along with that of Alan's, do not emphasise the interaction between the seven standards, and how they may affect each other. Their models also do not promote value judgments on assessed translations.

Zheng and Ching (2012) also make use of the standards to assess and compare the quality of the two translations of Chang Hen Ge, a Chinese ancient poem comprising of one hundred and twenty sentences. The two translations were written by Xu Yuanchong and Gladys Yang respectively. Zheng and Cheng conclude that the seven standards of textuality cannot only be employed to distinguish a text from a non-text, but also as practical parameters in the process of translation assessment. He also adds that they make translation assessment more operational in translation practice.

The only criticism of this textuality model was made by Luo Xuanmin (2003, p.76), who states that "although they claim to be studying texts in dynamic processes, Beaugrande and Dressler's description of the seven standards is not dynamic and systematic, since they separate the seven standards which they argue constitute a unified whole". Although Luo Xuanmin does agree that these standards are dynamic, he believes that Beaugrande and Dressler failed in representing this dynamic connectivity in their model. Having said that, all the above studies indicate that the application of Beaugrande and Dressler's model of textuality to the study of translation can be very useful in exploring translation both as a process and a product. It is also helpful in assessing translation quality, as it creates a structured framework to follow during the assessment process.

5.2 The Application of Waddington's Holistic Model

In 2003, Waddington introduces some new insights to his holistic model that was originally developed in 2011. Within the context of students' assessment, he calls for a more positive approach of TQA. This is because he believes that one of the problems of teaching and assessing students' translation into a foreign language is the number of language errors generated which could be demotivating for the students. He suggests that the best solution to deal with this issue is to follow a positive approach of assessment such as that suggested by Hewson (1995) who distinguishes between purely linguistic errors and major translation problems. Hewson suggests that a reasonable assessment of students' translation must not penalise for the linguistic errors and instead try to give students credit for appreciating and solving the translation problems involved. For this reason, Waddington proposes a double marking scale: negative for clear errors and failure to recognise translation problems, and positive for identifying and solving specific translation problems.

Shahraki and Karimnia (2011) argue that many translation reviewers employ a holistic approach to translation quality assessment due to the non-availability of objective index according to which, reviewers can assess or mark a translation. For this reason, they applied Waddington's model on the Persian translation of George Orwell's 1984, by Baluch. They chose twenty paragraphs randomly and compared and contrasted them with their parallel translations to assess the quality of their translations. After close investigation of the model, they concluded that Waddington's model turned to be incomplete with regard to translation shifts and additions. Besides, they assert that this model is highly academic-bound and cannot be applied to real cases of translation evaluation, outside the academic context. They also criticised the model for being too general which increases the elements of subjectivity, since understanding the evaluation parameters is entirely left for the evaluator with the lack of detailed descriptions. However, they still believe that Waddington's model (2001) is less subjective due to the fact that a translation following this model is assessed according to some pre-set criteria.

As opposing to this view and still within the context of translation students' assessment, Medadian and Mahabadi (2015) explain that most translation teachers still draw on holistic and traditional methods of translation evaluation in their exams due to the fact that most of the available models for TQA are not tailored for a manageable summative evaluation of student translation. They argue that these methods are either too holistic or too detailed and 'complex' for translation evaluation purposes in educational settings. They relate to the subjectivity of holistic approaches in general but they then emphasise that they are more manageable for a teacher than the detailed and quantitative models (error-based). They explain that error-based models are highly demanding, taking into consideration the limited resources of a classroom teacher, but otherwise are considered highly objective. For the purpose of designing a model that is both manageable and objective, their study aims at reaching a compromise between the subjectivity and the complexity of these two approaches to translation evaluation.

Their proposed model draws on the five linguistic equivalences introduced by Koller (1979) and the five level holistic scheme for translation evaluation proposed by Waddington (2001). They proposed a model that includes the five types of equivalences in various linguistic levels as a guideline for a correcting scale and five corresponding error gravities in the grading scale to judge the quality of student translations quantitatively. In their model, 70 percent of total scores is determined by error analysis (following Koller, 1979) and the remaining 30 scores are determined by evaluator‘s holistic appreciation of the quality of translation (Waddington, 2001). The main rationale, they provide, for choosing this combination was to reach a manageable model to evaluate student translation in pedagogical contexts.

Moreno and Valero-Garcés (2017), in a recent study, investigate the validity and reliability of holistic assessment with regard to legal translation. In their study, ten evaluators were required to provide a holistic assessment of a Master's student translation. The results of the holistic assessment reflected great disparity in the evaluators' value judgment which highlight the subjective nature of this kind of assessment. However, Moreno and Valero-Garcés argue that the results obtained from the holistic assessment did not differ much from those obtained when the same translation was assessed following an apparently more objective error-based method. Based on this, they conclude that they have observed that holistic assessment may not seem to be the most reliable method to assess the quality of the translation of a legal text due to the low degree of inter-rater reliability among the evaluators. However, they emphasise that despite the fact that the error-based assessment method is apparently self-explanatory, provides a detailed account of error categories and penalties, and, subsequently, should yield more objective results, there was, too, a lot of variation in the overall results given by the 5 evaluators who assessed the translation following the same method. Therefore, taking into account the benefits of holistic assessment in terms of time and cost, the 'big picture' it provides regarding the output delivered by a translator and the short-comings of (apparently) more sophisticated and objective translation assessment methods, they believe that, if clearly systematised and in conjunction with other methods, the benefits of holistic assessment, not only in terms of efficiency and economy, but also because it allows for a general overview of the translated text, should not be overlooked, and hence could serve as a supplementary mechanism especially useful for assessment in legal translator training.

Mobaraki and Aminzadeh (2012: 66) also support a holistic approach to translation assessment, upon the assumption that evaluation is apparently a qualitative act. This is due to the fact that translation is a multifaceted process that involves problems other than language-bound ones which are relatively concrete and probable and not at the disposal of the translators (and the evaluators as well). As a result, translation examination is an utterly challenging task. Thus, they assert that evaluators have to use their intuition (however subjective this concept may be) and generalise about the quality of those abstruse aspects.

Finally, since the main objective of this research is to examine the applicability of the two main product-centred approaches (the holistic and error analysis approaches) to the assessment of translation quality (Waddington, 2001), the literature on translation quality assessment studies is reviewed according to this classification.

6. The Holistic Approach

Whereas the notion of error is central to the error-based approach, as will be explained in the subsequent section, the notion of equivalence is central to the holistic approach. Following a hierarchal order, prominent and relevant holistic models will be discussed in this section, to investigate the element of objectivity and the extent to which it is upheld in these methods.

6. 1 The Holistic Approach and Equivalence

Within the context of this study, the holistic approach can be defined as the scientific assessment of translation quality based on a certain theory, either from the field of translation or the field of linguistics, that is not entirely based on the notion of errors and their classification or weight. Most of the holistic models for translation quality assessment revolve around the notion of equivalence. Translation assessment has been an on-going activity ever since translation began as an academic discipline. According to Gutt (1991), the assessment criteria used to be based on subjective notions such as faithfulness and fidelity. However, those notions eventually gave way to the term of equivalence in the process of assessing target texts. Thus, equivalence has become a central notion in Translation Studies. Most of the models discussed in this section rely on equivalence as a descriptive and prescriptive category for comparing source and target texts. They only differ in the kind of equivalence they consider to be the yardstick against which the assessment can be made, such as dynamic equivalence (Nida and Taber, 1969), functional pragmatic equivalence (House, 1981), and so on. Therefore, holistic models are traditionally classified into equivalence-based and non-equivalence-based categories (Lauscher, 2000). In the equivalence-based models, as their name indicates, translation quality relies mainly on the notion of equivalence. On the other hand, the non-equivalence-based models rely on other notions to constitute the yardstick against which the quality of a certain translation should be measured, such as text type or text function. Given the type of texts selected for the corpus of this study, I will refer to the appropriateness of the two models of analysis as measurement tools for the presidential speeches at the end of this chapter.

A. Equivalence-Based Models

In terms of a chronological order, only the prominent methods or models that contribute to the examination of the study’s main questions are discussed in this section. Different types of equivalence were proposed for the holistic approach. One of the earliest systematic methods for translation quality assessment that is based on the notion of equivalence is one brought forward by Reiss in 1971. She relies on the concept of optimum equivalence in her model for translation quality assessment (p.91). For her, translating means finding equivalents for the source text items in the target language at the level of the text and the individual text units, whereas evaluating a translation means reversing the translation process and reconstructing the translation strategy. She divides the evaluation process into two steps: (1) an analysis of the target text in order to evaluate the appropriateness of the target language use, and (2) a comparison of the source and target texts based on the analysis of both texts, so as to establish the degree of equivalence between them. In Reiss' model, equivalence is assessed based on three determinants: (1) the text type, (2) the linguistic properties of the source text, and (3) the extralinguistic determinants. She argues that the source text type and function are the two dominant factors in the translation process and evaluation. In her model, a translation is considered as successful if it achieves optimum equivalence, which requires for "the linguistic and stylistic level and the intention of the author, target text, and the target text units [to] have the same value as the text unit in the source language" (p.91). Optimum equivalence is achieved, according to her, if the translator is able to choose the appropriate word from the dictionary by following the three determinant rules: (1) the text type, (2) the linguistic properties of the source text, and (3) the extralinguistic determinants. Reiss also (1971) believes that translation criticism should determine whether the translation requires a goal-oriented translation method or a text-oriented method. The criteria of translation evaluation differ according to the translation method that is applied. In goal-oriented translations, the criteria of evaluation must stem from the functional category of translation criticism. Translation in this type is evaluated against the special function it is supposed to fulfil, instead of the text type. On the other hand, in text-oriented translations, evaluation criteria essentially follow three steps: (1) determining the source text type, (2) analysing the linguistic aspects of the text, and (3) identifying the non-linguistic aspects of the text.

Nonetheless, Reiss' model has been criticised on several grounds. First, House reproved Reiss' work for not offering a practical demonstration of its applicability, and for not being as concrete as expected (1981). Secondly, Lauscher (2000, pp. 149-168) believes that it would be difficult to assess the translation of the creative language use as per Reiss' model. Reiss herself admits that her model cannot be applied to all text types. She explains that the texts which serve functions other than providing an equivalent reproduction of the original text, or which address an audience that is different to that of the original, are not considered as transfers rather than translations in her model (Lauscher, 2000). Reiss also does not consider Bible translations as translations, meaning that they cannot be evaluated using her approach (Reiss, 1971, p.91). Additionally, Reiss' model can be criticised for not defining any objective measurement tools with which to apply her approach (Al-Qinai, 2000). Her model is also not comprehensive enough, as it restricts the concept of quality to signifying the fulfilment of the rendering of the source text type and function only.

Notwithstanding the criticism above, it does not change the fact that Reiss' work has not only been described as a pioneering classic in Translation Studies, that discusses vital issues (Ardo, 2001),but also as a truly seminal work that is timeless, and that will forever remain a classic (Sager, 1989). Nord (1992) praised Reiss' model for being influential as it highlights the active role of the translator, and because it also provides a comprehensive, systematic model of text analysis for both translation and translation evaluation. The three determinants can ensure that both the micro and macro levels of the text are considered in the evaluation process. Lauscher (2000, pp. 149-168) comments that through the extralinguistic determinants, Reiss links the source and target texts to their non-linguistic contexts, and highlights the impact of context on the linguistic make-up of texts.

Moving on to another type of equivalence, Van den Broeck (1985) proposes the adequate equivalent as the basis for his model of translation quality assessment. He starts with discussing the degree of factual equivalence between the source and the target texts, which reflects the degree to which the two texts can relate to each other within the functionally relevant features. He then defines adequate equivalent as the "hypothetical reconstruction of the textual relations and functions of the source text" (Van den Broeck, 1985, p.57). In his model, adequate equivalent is a result of a series of steps. First, he provides the adequate equivalent, before comparing it with the target text. The comparison is done by providing the mandatory and optional shifts observed in the target text based on the results of the contrastive analysis both linguistically and stylistically. He assesses the adequate equivalent based on this comparison, meaning that he compares his translation (the assessor's norms) with the target text (the translator's norms). When the evaluation is done, the assessor tries to account for the reasons of optional shifts in the target text. Assessing the quality of a translation, in this model, means comparing different translations, i.e., the assessor's and the translator's, which advocates that there is no one, best translation.

As in Reiss', Van den Broeck's model acknowledges the role of the translator, as any deviation from the adequate equivalent can be attributed to different linguistic and non-linguistic factors, and cannot solely be ascribed to the translator's lack of necessary skills and competence, or even to his or her intention to manipulate the source text. However, Lauscher (2000, p.156) criticises Van den Broeck's measure of adequate equivalent for being unclear, as it leaves the concept largely undefined, and does not explain how to determine the functional elements of the source text. For the interest of this study, it can also be argued that subjective judgments in Van den Broeck's model are unavoidable, as the strategies he adopts to produce what he thinks is an appropriate translation are not stated clearly and objectively. The model is also arguably vague, as it does not explain how the reasons for the optional shifts should be determined. Moreover, to evaluate a translation, the evaluator must provide what he or she thinks is adequate for the source text and compare it to the translator's. Not only does this requires a lot of effort and time, it also is a subjective process.

Another type of equivalence is proposed by House (1997, 2001) who is also a proponent of using equivalence as a measure of quality. She proposes the 'functional equivalent' as the yardstick for assessing translation quality. Her functional-pragmatic model is based on analysing the linguistic-situational features of the source text and the target text, and on that basis, comparing whether the two texts share the same function and features. She strongly advocates the need for a distinction between linguistic analysis and social judgment in evaluating a translation, two concepts which were later described as error analysis and holistic judgments respectively (Waddington, 2001). She insists that her functional-pragmatic model

> "cannot ultimately enable the evaluator to pass judgments on what is 'good' or 'bad'. Judgments regarding the quality of a translation depend on a large variety of factors that enter into any social evaluative statement". (House, 2001, p.254).

House's (1977-2001) model for translation quality assessment is believed to be a classic in the area of quality assessment. She published her model for translation quality assessment in 1977, and revised versions in 1997 and 2014. According to her, translation is a linguistic procedure that aims for the replacement of a source language text by a semantically and pragmatically equivalent text in the target language. She was the first to introduce the notion of 'scientific treatment' of quality in translation. House argues that in order to treat a given text 'scientifically', translation quality assessment requires a theory of translation, otherwise, the assessment would only be arbitrary, or a social judgment rather than a scientific one. To theorise her model, she proposes the functional equivalent as the basis of her model. To explain further, she defines function as "the application or use which the text has in the particular context of a situation" (2001, p.36). In the optic of designing a better model for translation quality assessment, she further divides function into a primary level and a secondary level function. A primary level function is when the target text is reproducing the source text function, whereas a secondary level function is when the target audience are allowed access to the original text function. House links these two types of functions to two translation strategies - covert and overt translation. Covert translation is "a translation which presents itself and its functions as a second original, i.e. a translation that may conceivably have been written in its own right" (House, 1977, p. 85). Overt translation, on the other hand, is straightforward in nature, and it comprises scientific texts. House (1977) stated that, "in an overt translation, the source text is tied in a specific manner to the source language community and its culture." (p. 66). Lauscher (2000, pp. 149-168) explains that in covert translation, the translator reproduces the source text function by using an empirically established cultural filter to adapt the target text to the target audience's communicative preferences. In overt translation, on the other hand, the translator attempts to reproduce the function of the source text by remaining close to it.

Furthermore, House (1997, pp. 31-32) uses two parameters to operationalise her functional equivalent in order to assess a good translation, these being genre and register. According to Halliday (1985), genre connects texts with the macro context of the linguistic and cultural communities. An identification of the category of genre is important for the purpose of text analysis as a prior step to its evaluation. Register, on the other hand, is the content plane of language, capturing the connection between texts and their micro contexts, i.e., a variation in language dictated by the interaction of language use (Halliday, 1985; Halliday & Matthiessen, 2013).

These two parameters ,i.e., genre and register, are essentially used to determine the linguistic situational characteristics of the source text (1997, pp. 105-110). She further subdivides register into: field, tenor, and mode. Field captures social activity, subject matter or topic, including differentiations of degrees of generality, or specificity (Halliday, 1985).

Mode refers to spoken or written channels, through which the content is communicated, and it also involves the degree to which potential or real participation is allowed between writers and readers (Halliday, 1985). Tenor refers to the nature of the participants, the addresser and the addressees and the relationship between them in terms of social power and social distance, as well as the degree of emotional charge. (Halliday, 1985; Halliday & Matthiessen, 2013). House correlates these three subdivisions with the lexical, syntactical, and textual elements (House, 1997, p. 42). The evaluation, in her model, can be summarised as follows: (1) establishing the source text profile along the above mentioned parameters against which the target text is measured, (2) establishing the function of the source text, (3) comparing the source text profile with the target text, and (4) providing a statement of quality that lists the errors committed in the translation, the matches, and the mismatches along the parameters of genre and register. Several of House's concepts, such as covert and overt translation, have become standard terminology in Translation Studies, and have also proved useful in didactic approaches (Lauscher, 2000, pp. 149-168). In relation to translation quality assessment, similar to Reiss, House attempts to link the concepts of context to the text function. However, House defines text function as a semantic-pragmatic category which can be identified by linguistic properties of texts, such as theme-rheme structure, linguistic means of expressing coherence, etc., something which Reiss does not do (House, 1997, pp. 43-45).

However, some translation scholars disagree with House on the need for a distinction between linguistic analysis and social judgments, particularly those who view translation as a social activity. Furthermore, the practical application of House's model has been criticised as being restrictive, as she allows only for two target text functions, i.e. a target text function that is identical to the function of the source text, or a target text function identical to the function ascribed to the source text by the contemporary source text audience. To elaborate, Lauscher (2000) asserts that the Bible, for example, could neither be translated nor evaluated following House's model, as the target audience's needs go beyond communicative preferences. Lauscher also questions a fundamental issue in House's benchmark of functional equivalent, as she doubts the possibility of consistently determining the text function by relying solely on linguistic means. In this regard, Lauscher raises very important questions such as: is text function inherent in linguistic expression, and do different languages use the same linguistic means to express text function? To answer the first of these questions, Lauscher (p.154) herself refers to the study of Van Dijk and Kintsch (1983), who assert that a text does not exist outside the interpretations of readers and that these interpretations are influenced by cultural, social and other factors that actually lie outside the text itself. Thus, according to them, the text's function does not exist in the text itself but is rather attributed to the text by its readers. This, of course, does not contradict the fact that some linguistic means are typically used to fulfil certain functions, but it does illustrate that the text function cannot be determined by relying solely on linguistic means.

To answer the second question raised, Lauscher (2000, pp. 149-168) employs some of House's examples to see whether different languages use the same linguistic means to express text function. She concludes her argument by asserting that different languages use different linguistic means to express a certain function, and strongly argues that focusing only on linguistic means to determine text function signifies giving priority to the wordings of the source text. That, according to her, explains a series of mismatches in the translations that House provided in her model. In House's opinion, a good translation is one that respects the scientifically established cultural differences between the source and target language, but otherwise seeks to reproduce the source text's linguistic properties as closely as possible. Following House's model, this means that many translations would be considered inappropriate simply because they prioritise target culture and target language conventions; this deprives the model from being applicable to all texts.

Al-Qinai (2000) also presents another empirical model for translation quality assessment, in which dynamic equivalence is the yardstick for comparison. In his model, he does not only depend on the end-product of translation, but also takes the process of decision-making into consideration, as according to him, not doing so can lead to subjectivity in translation assessment. This very notion was originally proposed by Hatim and Mason (1990), who believe that any attempt to evaluate translation with an analytic comparison of the source text and target text can never be considered accurate without taking into account the process undertaken by the translator to resolve problems. Munday (2012) has also recently presented an interesting study that advocates the importance of examining translators' decision-making in translation evaluation. He specifically refers to how a translator's subjective stance can be linguistically manifested in a text. However, his views mainly focus on the translation process rather than the product, which is beyond the scope of this study.

Al-Qinai proposes the following parameters for assessment, based on the parameters originally raised by Newmark (1988), Hatim and Mason (1990), and House (1981, 1997):

1. Textual Typology (Province) and Tenor: the linguistic and narrative structures of both source and target texts, as well as textual function (e.g., didactic, informative, instructional, persuasive, evocative... etc.).

2. Formal Correspondence: overall textual volume and arrangement, punctuation, reproduction of headings, quotations, mottos, logos... etc.

3. Coherence of Thematic Structure: degree of referential compatibility and thematic symmetry.

4. Cohesion: Reference (co-reference, preforms, anaphora, cataphora), substitution, ellipsis, deixis and conjunctions.

5. Text-Pragmatic (Dynamic) equivalence: degree of proximity of target text to the intended effect of source text (fulfilment or violation of reader expectations) and the illocutionary function of source text and target text.

6. Lexical Properties (Register): jargon, idioms, loanwords, catch phrases, collocations, paraphrases, connotations and emotive aspects of lexical meaning.

7. Grammatical/Syntactic Equivalence: word order, sentence structure, cleaving, number, gender and person (agreement), modality, tense and aspect.

Al-Qinai (2000) applies his model on an advertisement text. He argues that the source text is just a core of information and thus, can be manipulated to achieve maximum effectiveness in the target text. Bearing in mind the target audience's cultural norms, concepts of dynamic equivalence, and pragmatic principles of cooperation, the reception of the target text is the ultimate assessment of quality in his model. The feedback received from potential readers is the benchmark against which the success or failure of a certain translation is measured, meaning that the evaluation is not based on a comparison between the source text and target text. Rather, it is based on how effective a translation is from target readers' points of view. He also believes that before releasing a translation to the public, a controlled revision should be carried out to measure certain pragmatic considerations such as impact, image, acceptability, naturalness and fulfilment of expectation for both the ST writer and TT audiences. Though this model is comprehensive, encompassing translation problems expected to occur at all levels, it cannot be applied to sensitive political texts, since it allows for the manipulation of the source text's content, aiming at producing an effective target text at the expense of the original text.

Another attempt to design a model for translation quality assessment based on the notion of equivalence was made by Al-Rubai'i (2000). Adopting Hatim and Mason's (1990) model of context, Al-Rubai'i (2000) differentiates between two kinds of equivalence: functional and non-functional equivalence. Her model consists of two main procedures - analysis of the source text, and assessment of the translation based on a comparison between the source text and the target text. The source text is described contextually in terms of the communicative, pragmatic and semiotic dimensions. Then, in the comparison stage, the two types of equivalence are identified. In the functional equivalence, the source text's communicative, pragmatic, semiotic and figurative properties within the syntactic constraints of the target language are preserved as closely as possible. Therefore, the source text's cultural identity is also preserved. On the other hand, in the non-functional equivalence, one or more of the source text cultural properties are not preserved and/or are distorted through translation. This may be attributed to the linguistic and cultural dissimilarities between the involved languages, and/or the translator's incompetence and/or carelessness.

Al-Rubai'i notes that it is very likely to encounter both types of equivalences in any translation. She emphasises that an adequate and accurate translation is one that uses more functional rather than non-functional equivalence, as she advocates functional over non-functional equivalence. To demonstrate the practicality of her model, she applies it to the assessment of the translation of Faulkner's (1946) 'The Sound and the Fury'. Though her results assert that the proposed model is reliable and consistent, at least within the context of literary work, she decides to adopt Hatim and Mason's model without any amendments, though she promotes the necessity of making some adaptations to the model, so as to cope with modern theoretical views of translation quality assessment.

The argumentation-centred approach of Williams (2001) is also another example of equivalence-based approaches to translation quality assessment. It is, in fact, a textual approach to quality, in which assessment and evaluation are based on argumentation and rhetorical structure. In this model, equivalency is manifested in its basic notion: "a translation must reproduce the argument structure of ST to meet minimum criteria of adequacy" (Williams, 2001, p,336). Thus, the argument structure of the target text must be equivalent to that of the original. However, this is difficult to achieve, given that different languages have different argumentation strategies. Arguments are viewed and treated differently in different cultures, and this renders the possibility of determining equivalence a challenge.

Believing that there is a state of assessment chaos, Williams (2001) proposes his model for translation quality assessment based on the "argumentation theory" from discourse analysis. In his model, he gives more priority to the macro-textual level in the assessment process, with the aim of overcoming the lack of acknowledgement of this level in the existing translation quality assessment models at the time. He believes that other quality assessment models focus only on the micro-textual level of assessment, and neglect to assess the quality and coherence of the text as a whole. Interestingly, Williams was the first to suggest that previous models lack a quantitative dimension which, from his point of view, lends objectivity to translation assessment. He (2001) proposes the application of the argumentation theory in the analysis and assessment of instrumental translations. Williams also draws attention to the difference between his model and the existing models at the time. Whereas those models focus on the categorisation of errors, his is based on analysing both the source and target texts in terms of their argument macrostructures. The results of the analysis form the basis for comparison according to which the quality of the translation is determined. Thus, he proposes the argument structure as a criteria for evaluation which can provide a uniform standard of transfer adequacy.

To elaborate, Williams' model has two components, these being argument schema and rhetorical typology. The argument schema has six elements: the claim (C) (the main point toward which all the other elements of the argument converge), the grounds (G) (information supporting the claim), warrant (W) (statements indicating how grounds are connected to the claim), the backing (B) (the overarching principle governing the issue at hand), qualifier (Q) or moralisers (statements that mitigate the force of the claim), and rebuttal (R) (statements that contradict the supporting arguments). He formulates his general framework for translation assessment as follows: "one of the evaluator's tasks will be to determine whether the basic argument elements (B,W,G,C,Q,R) are accurately rendered in the TT if they are present in ST" (p. 338). This model combines both qualitative and quantitative parameters in assessing translation quality. The quantification element in Williams' model is reflected in assigning a rating scale of two evaluation grades, namely, satisfactory (for translations having no defect that affect the argument schema) and unsatisfactory (for translations having at least one defect affecting the argument schema).

One of the shortcomings of Williams' model is that it is not generalisable to all text types. In fact, he states clearly that his model does not apply to literary, religious or philosophical texts. In other words, it is not applicable to non-argumentative texts, and is probably only suitable for assessing instrumental translations, where aesthetics is not the case. Another issue about this model is the fact that different languages have different argumentation strategies, making it difficult to force the proposed argument schema on different sets of languages. Furthermore, Williams' model does not comprehensively examine quality, as it is restricted to the reproduction of the argument schema only. Lastly, the quantification of errors by assigning two broad measurements such as satisfactory and unsatisfactory is not specific enough.

Recently, Williams presents an updated version of his argumentation-centred model for TQA in 2009. He argues that whereas there is general agreement about the need for a translation to be 'good', 'satisfactory' or 'acceptable', the definition of acceptability and of the means of determining it are matters of ongoing debate. He adds that international translation standards now exist, but there are no generally accepted objective criteria for evaluating the quality of translations. Therefore, in the updated model, he offers solutions for the shortcomings of the other models of TQA. He asserts that his model reflects assessment of both micro-textual and text-level features. Because it is modular and adaptable, he still believes that his model makes it possible to focus the assessment on the criterion or criteria of interest and ensure the validity of assessments across the various conditions of production. To the interest of this study, Williams asserts that with the revised definition of the critical defect to cover the critical components of argument macrostructure, the model provides for the application of standards based on generally accepted industrial and academic theory and practice and, in that sense, it ensures a more objective TQA.

Based on a combination of Colina's functionalist translation assessment model and drawing on definitions of professional standards applied in North America, Williams (2013) designed the new version of his model to rectify some of the perceived shortcomings of the conventional quantitative, error-based marking schemes, which he calls "impressionistic" schemes, and even those of criterion-referenced models. He starts by arguing that the validity of quantitative TQA schemes, which are used to rate a translation according to the number and seriousness of errors detected, has been challenged because they tend to ignore the macro-textual features of the target text and the fact that a translation with more errors than another may nonetheless may of better overall quality and meet the client's requirements more effectively. A satisfactory model, he suggests, must therefore go beyond quantification. At the same time, the validity of criterion-referenced models such as those of Nord (1991) and House (1997) has been called into question because of the difficulty of moving from an assessment against each parameter to an overall quality rating for the translation. He believes that this problem, along with the avoidance of any quantitative assessment, has opened up the resulting engaging in a "holistic-intuitive-impressionistic" method of evaluation (Eyckmans, Anckaert and Segers, 2008, p. 73).

Williams relates to the views of Biggs and Tang (2007: 184-85), who believe that a valid assessment must be of the student's total performance, but at the same time the conceptual framework underlying assessment must relate the whole to its parts. Also based on their views, Williams argues that by establishing a comprehensive set of quality components and criteria and associating with them specific competencies, types of knowledge and indicators, the proposed model can generate an assessment of overall performance and competency (holistic assessment) from an assessment of performance against specific criteria (componential assessment).

In line with his previous studies, Williams asserts that his proposed model does not abandon the quantitative dimension of assessment. It actually combines it with the qualitative dimension by providing for a qualitative assessment of each of the three selected components and, at the same time, including consideration of the number and seriousness of defects in the calculation of component scores and final percentage. Finally, he asserts that any assessment must prove its validity and reliability. For this reason, he asserts that the validity of his model is based on two factors: (1) the alignment of the criteria, indicators and grade definitions with the intended learning outcomes, which helps to ensure that the model assesses what it is designed to assess; and (2) the level of detail in the indicator and grade descriptors, which provides the various actors with useful information about the results of the assessment.

A final note concerning equivalence-based approaches is brought forward by Gerzymisch-Arbogast (2001). Although she does not propose a model for translation evaluation, she does emphasise the importance of certain aspects in translation quality assessment that can be used as equivalence parameters. Gerzymisch-Arbogast asserts that these can be used as criteria for translation assessment in addition to the criteria already proposed by other researchers such as House (1997) and Neubert (1985). The aspects she alludes to are coherence as well as thematic and isotopic patterns. Coherence can be regarded as an equivalence parameter for the translation process because it may be represented differently in the source and target texts. Text topic and thematic patterns can also be used as equivalence parameters since they can be described as the number of the topics in a text, and whether the resultant pattern is type-specific. Given that the term isotopy means connecting recurrent linguistic aspects by a line or a thread, isotopic patterns consist of relational patterns in a text. Various isotopic patterns can interconnect in different parts of a text to form interwoven patterns. These reflect meaning continuity in a text, thus the concept is closely related to coherence. If separate isotopic patterns do not blend together, coherence inconsistency emerges. Therefore, isotopic patterns can be used as an equivalence parameter, as they help in identifying explicit and implicit meaning patterns of a source text, which can be compared with their counterparts in the translated text.

Advocating the use of equivalence as a quality parameter, Gerzymisch-Arbogast (2001) holds positive views about its role in evaluating translated texts. She argues that the criticism directed to the concept of equivalence is “too linguistically oriented” (p.228). She notes, however, that the concept is being re-defined and re-formulated, and explains that it is now viewed as a “concept relative to certain parameters which may vary by individual text (Neubert 1985, Neubert and Shreve 1992) or Halliday’s register-specific categories (House 1997))” (p.228). She attributes the controversial views surrounding equivalence to a misunderstanding of the concept itself. This is also, she argues, the result of using the term on two different levels - the system level and text level. On the system level, the term equivalence neutrally designates the parameters which describe the relationship between the source text and the target text. Thus, it is crucial to any theory of translation, since “translation per se implies two sets of texts which need a standard of comparison” (p.228). On the text level, “equivalence implies the application of these parameters to a specific concrete original and its translation and their evaluation as positive or negative equivalence” (p.228).

B. Non-Equivalence-based Models

Most of the scholars behind non-equivalence models avoid depending on the concept of equivalence in translation evaluation, as they believe that it may not be evaluative in nature, meaning that although it can help yield statements about sameness and difference, it cannot provide prescriptive judgments. The functionalist models generally portray the shift from the notion of equivalence in translation quality assessment to other notions such as text function and translation effect. Functional models do not rely on the concept of equivalence as an assessment parameter, since many researchers discard the concept of equivalence for its inadequacy. Instead, concepts such as text type and translation function replace the concept of equivalence, and constitute major parameters in quality assessment. Gutt (1991, p.9), for instance, quotes Koller (1983:186) who believes that,

> “the concept of equivalence postulates a relationship between source-language text … and target-language text. The concept of equivalence does not yet say anything about the nature of the relationship… The mere demand that translation be equivalent to a certain original is void of content”.

This indicates that equivalence can only be meaningful when it is related to a conceptual framework that clarifies which aspects of the texts are to be compared and under what conditions equivalence can be compared. Instead of equivalence, Gutt (1991, p.9) suggests that resemblance should be the basis for translation assessment. He adds that,

> “one important contextual factor consists in what kind of interpretive resemblance the audience expects there to be between original and translation. The ultimate test for a translation is whether or not it achieves with the target audience what the translator intended it to achieve, rather than whether it conforms to some translation-theoretical notion of equivalence” (p.1).

Reader-response models represent one of the types of non-equivalence methods for translation quality assessment. Carroll (1966), a psycholinguist, was one of the earliest scholars to integrate readers in the area of translation quality assessment. She has suggested the use of a broader criteria, namely, intelligibility and informativeness for assessing translation quality. Reader-response models (e.g., Carroll 1966, Nida and Taber 1969) evaluate the quality of a translation by determining whether the readers of the target translation respond to the text in the same way as the readers of the original text. As far as TQA is concerned, the main defect in Carroll’s model, and reader-response methods in general, is that the overall quality of a translation is reduced to be dependent on only two measures, intelligibility and informativeness, which are not distinctive features of a translation piece, but rather are norms against which the results of any behavioural test are to be judged. Consequently, House (2001) also doubts the validity of using informativeness or intelligibility as criteria for translation assessment. Moreover, restricting the quality of a translation to the readers’ responses raises other issues, including whether it is possible to determine if two responses are actually equivalent, bearing in mind that even texts written in the same language can incite non-equivalent reactions from different groups of readers. Additionally, not all texts are reader-oriented, such as legal texts. These problematic areas in reader-response methods do not underestimate their effectiveness at least to underpin translation effects on an audience as a tool to assess a translation's quality.

The adaptation of the relevance theory in translation quality assessment is another type of non-equivalence model. Taking a new direction in the field of Translation Studies, Gutt (1991, p.8) was the first to call for the adaptation of the relevance theory, essentially developed by Sperber and Wilson (1988), to be the measure for translation accounting and evaluation. This theory is based on the principle of relevance. To consider any given text relevant, it should meet the following conditions: (1) it must provide some new information, as things that are already known are irrelevant, and (2) relevant information must link up with other information one already knows. Information that does not relate to any previous knowledge is also considered irrelevant. These two conditions are captured by the concept of contextual effect, which refers to what Gutt (1991: 2) describes as the:

> change in one's awareness that has been brought about not by the information in the utterance alone, nor by contextual knowledge we already possessed alone, but by the inferential combination of both. To be relevant at all, an utterance must have at least some contextual effects.

Gutt (1991) describes translation evaluation as one of the major problematic areas in Translation Studies that makes the decision-making process and the scientific study of translation difficult to apply. He justifies his point by referring to Steiner (1975) and Newmark (1988), who believe that translation assessment cannot be tackled from a theoretical or scientific perspective, because translation is more of an artistic activity than a scientific one, in their eyes. It is also the reason they believe that the scientific treatment of translation is questionable. In relation to translation quality assessment and evaluation, Gutt proposes his theory of relevance as a "natural basis for an empirical account of evaluation and decision-making" (1991, p.21). However, his model does not advocate the use of scientific treatment of texts, which may increase the element of subjectivity.

Lauscher (2000: 149) also calls for a user-defined approach to quality that consists of different components that may vary according to the situation. She states that:

> The translation process is guided by case-specific values. These values … are set and agreed by the interested parties during the translation process. In order to judge the quality of a translation, the values should be made accessible to the evaluator and operationalised as evaluation parameters. Because the application of evaluation parameters depend on situational and individual factors, translation quality is ultimately a matter of agreement and consensus.

Though this model incorporates equivalence and non-equivalence views of translation, as the notion of quality is governed by the case-and-user-specific values and priorities, the issue with this model, along with other reader-response models, is that they are based on two assumptions. Firstly, they assume that the function of a target text can be adapted to suit the target audience. In this case, the translator has the freedom to be selective with regards to what content should be translated and what should be left out to best serve his purposes, which is a relatively subjective process. Secondly, they assume that having a different audience automatically signifies a different function; this in fact is not always the case.

Another comprehensive model for translation quality assessment is proposed by Brunette (2000). Her model comprises criteria derived from previous models such as those of House (1981) and Nord (1992). She starts with asserting that assessment criteria should be "easy to understand, practical, limited in number, and verifiable" (2000, p.174). Brunette's model consists of the following criteria:

1. Logic: she defines this criterion as the "quality of a text rigorously constructed in terms of form and content" (2000, p.175). She regards this as the most important criterion in her model. She also suggests that coherence and cohesion can be used to examine it. The evaluator explores whether the text is well linked on the semantic level (coherence) and on the formal language level (cohesion) to create an effective text for the target audience. Although she provides some examples, there is no practical outline as to how these two aspects can be examined in her discussion.
2. Purpose: a translated text is examined to establish whether it is appropriate for its intended purpose. The purpose of a text is a crucial factor in deciding what information is to be transferred from the source text. To examine this criterion, Brunette suggests

exploring it in terms of intention and effect. The intention is "the action aspect of communication" (2000, p. 177). It identifies the author's aim of creating a text, whether to inform, announce, explain, recommend, etc. The effect, on the other hand, is "the reaction aspect of communication" (2000, p. 177) and deals with the effect expected from the target text on the audience, whether to interest, convince, etc., as reflected in its tone.

3. Context: evaluating a text in terms of context means considering the non-linguistic factors that affect the translation's production. These factors are: the target audience (their knowledge and interests), the author (his/her personality, history, habits, etc.), the type of the text (prestigious journal, flyer to be thrown away after reading), the time and place of the translation, the socio-linguistic situation, the medium used to disseminate the text, the life span of the translated text, and the ideological circumstances (e.g. political, religious).
4. Language norm: Brunette refers to this in her model as the "absence of interference" (2000, p. 179). She defines this norm as "the rules and conventions of a language set out in authoritative works" such as grammar books, style guides, etc. (2000, p. 180).

The parameters used in this model are generally similar to those of Beaugrande and Dressler's. However, Beaugrande and Dressler's model has the advantage of being coherently structured around one principle, the concept of textuality. On the other hand, Brunette's model assumes that source texts and target texts always have different functions according to the target readership, which is not necessarily the case.

Believing that equivalence-based linguistic models of TQA may not be able to account for using different strategies in different translation situations, Balharith (2002) sought to develop a descriptive-evaluative model for translation quality assessment based on a functional perspective. Her model is devised to be a comprehensive textual model for the analysis of literary works. Its main aim is to explain the reasons for the variations in translation strategies as well as corpora. It also aims to offer solutions to some of the problems surrounding translation equivalence. To achieve this, Balharith suggests that translation should be studied as an inter-discursive phenomenon from a functional perspective. Her model consists of two levels: the macro-level, which is concerned with sociocultural factors (i.e., the situation and status of the source text and the function of the target text), and the micro-level, which relates to the linguistic aspects of the macrostructure (coherence and formal presentation of texts), as well as the micro-structure (i.e., choosing translation type, cultural distance, form and effect, text type focus, fictional characters, and intonation and focus). She mainly focuses on the sociocultural factors that affect translation as a social practice, and assumes that translations have different functions, which determine the strategies adopted in the translation process. Accordingly, one literary work can have different translations when different strategies are employed depending on the functions it assumes. She also suggests that determining the translation function can serve as a guide for both the translator in the decision-making process, and the assessor in the description and evaluation of the translation. It becomes clear from the discussion Balharith provides, that her proposed model is only applicable to literary texts.

Colina (2008) presents another non-equivalence functional model for translation quality evaluation. In her functional-componential model, she evaluates a translation based on the function of the text and the specified audience. She argues that quality evaluation criteria should rely on the translation brief, and asserts that without explicit criteria, evaluators often rely on their own preferences and priorities, which, along with being highly subjective, may or may not coincide with that of the translation requester. She proposes that quality is assessed based on evaluating various components separately, and that the consumer or the requester of the translation must prioritise the components that serve the communicative purpose of the translation. In this attempt, she advocates flexibility with regards to different conditions that affect quality. Colina also maintains that the criteria of quality must reflect those prioritised by the translation user. Given that the assessment is based on user-defined priorities, it can also be regarded as a functional model that incorporates equivalence as a translation requirement. In addition to this, it also includes the non-equivalence notion, in that the user's weighting of components is essentially customised by the translator, depending on the effect that a particular component has on the whole text, which can vary according to text type and function.

On a different note, Garant (2009) argues that a paradigm shift in Translation Studies has occurred concerning the generally accepted grading methods. He asserts that error-based grading, which was the norm, has been replaced across the board by holistic grading methods. He also emphasises that the current translation evaluators tend to see points-based grading systems as suspect while holistic grading tends to be seen to be more related to training future translators for real world tasks. However, he asserts that the focus of his study is only on the assessment of student performance in translation practice courses, not on assessment in general, i.e., assessing translator competence. For the purposes of his paper, he explains that assessment means grading translation assignments and not assessing whole translation programs.

In his study, Garant argues that grading methods were found to vary from teacher to teacher. However, he divided the teachers generally into two groups according to the basis of their grading method. One group had a clear, explicit system whereby they assigned a certain number of points for mistakes. The other group consisted of teachers who did not use a point system. Their approach, which was not error-focused and points-based, is mainly of a ‘holistic’ nature. Garant supports his argument by referring to the views of Beeby (2000: 185) who suggests that many experienced teachers rely on holistic assessment methods because of the seemingly reductionist, time-consuming nature of many marking criteria. He clarifies that the reader must bear in mind that ‘holistic’ does not mean ‘unsystematic’, but rather it refers to a systematic way in which the teacher arrives at an overall impression of the text as opposed to relying on a discrete points-based scale. The teachers in that group had each devised their own, systematic way of evaluating translations. He concluded that translation teachers, who were interviewed, see holistic grading as the best way to train translators. Regardless of the systematic nature of this evaluation, it could not escape the accusation of being relatively subjective. Garant, himself, referred to McAlester’s (2000) who came to a similar conclusion of that of Beeby but goes as far as to say that “often the actual evaluation follows fairly rough guidelines based admittedly in the best cases on experience and common sense, but in the worst on mainly subjective impressions” (2000: 231).

Hague, Melby and Zheng (2011), in their model for TQA, introduce the notion of translation specifications based on a standard set of translation parameters, whose values depend mostly on factors external to the source text, such as audience and purpose. They believe that the specification approach applies to both translation pedagogy and commercial translation practice and goes beyond the customer brief to include documentation of requirements of all stakeholders. For this reason, they call for the use of translation project specifications in all aspects of translator training and education, including exit examinations, as well as in commercial, government and non-profit translation projects.

Discussing a new dimension of TQA, Karoubi (2016) argues that the role of the assessor in the process of assessment has been often neglected by earlier researchers in their assessment models. Although he criticises earlier models for the fact that the responsibility of the assessor in those models (e.g. equivalence-based models) is simply reduced to performing a perfunctory comparison of the textual features of the translated text against a set of allegedly universally valid criteria which invariably ends in fixed results irrespective of the assessment Skopos and many other influential variables, he attributes this to the possibility that earlier researchers presume that in this way the subjectivity factor is minimised. Therefore, he calls for an assessor-centred translation quality assessment approach. He provides a definition for the concept of assessor-oriented definition of translation quality, which is based on the concept of quality as fitness for purpose as follows:

> The extent to which the totality of the features of the translated text meets the stated and implied requirements for the fulfilment of the assessment Skopos as set by the initiator/commissioner of the assessment and understood by the assessor (Ibid: 89).

Karoubi (2016) still argues that the purpose for which the translation being assessed is going to be used, serves as a guideline that directs all the decisions made during the process of assessment at different levels. Therefore, he asserts that a clear description of the assessment Skopos is a prerequisite in every functional model of translation assessment.

6.2 Error-based Models for Translation Quality Assessment

Various automatic error-oriented models for translation quality assessment were proposed in the field of Translation Studies, such as the SICAL, the LISA QA model, the SAE J2450, the Quality Assessment Tool (QAT) and the TAUS Dynamic Quality Evaluation Model. However, since the purpose of this study is to examine the academic error-based models, the area of machine translation and machine translation evaluation is not within the scope of this study. Therefore, only prominent non-automatic methods based on error classification and analysis are reviewed below.

A. Definition of Translation Error

Evaluating a translation usually entails error analysis because the notion of error continues to be central to the translation evaluation in professional and didactic settings (Jimenez-Crespo, 2011, Kussmaul, 1997, Delisle, 2005, and Dunne, 2009). Before reviewing the literature written on this important aspect, it would be pertinent to review how a translation "error" is defined in the field. Pym (1992) defines it as any manifestation of a defect in any of the factors related to translation competence. Nord (1996) provides another general definition of translation error, where she relates the concept to translation problems that a translator encounters and needs to solve during a particular translation task. In line with the Skopos theory, which is based on functionalism, and where a translation is guided by extra-linguistic factors, i.e. the purpose or the function of the translation (Vermeer, 1978, 1989; Reiss & Vermeer, 2014), a text is translated and/or evaluated according to the purpose it is supposed to fulfil, she later offers a detailed definition of a translation error as: "if the purpose of a translation is to achieve a particular function for the target audience, anything that obstructs the achievement of this purpose is a translation error" (Nord, 2001:74).

Backhoff, Solano-Flores and Contreas-Niṅo (2009) broaden the scope of the term's definition so as to include any lack of equivalence between the source language version and target language version. Moreover, Hansen (2010) proposes that if a translation is to be defined as the production of a target text which is based on a source text, a translation error arises from the existence of a relationship between the two. He adds that translation errors can be caused by any misunderstanding of the translation brief or of the content of the source text. According to him, what constitutes an error varies according to the translation theories adopted by the translator, and the evaluator's ethical norms with respect to translation.

B. Classifications of Errors in Translation:

The basic idea of classification is to conceptualise and categorise a certain phenomenon according to similarities and differences (Strauss and Corbin, 1998). In order to describe errors and justify their consequences, there must be criteria of classification of translation errors (Hansen, 2010). This notion is also supported by Pym (1992), who states that classifying translation errors requires a strong conceptual framework before any holistic validity can be insured. In order to quantitatively evaluate a translation based on a classification of errors, which is the most common practice of translation evaluation in most of the existing models, as will be shown in this section, errors must be objectively measured following a pre-established error typology (Jimenez-Crespo, 2011). In other words, to establish an error typology or classification, a theoretical framework has to be adopted to set qualitative measures for errors. Therefore, it would be useful to review the existing classifications of translation errors, as well as the rationale behind them in order to investigate how the concept of error is treated in each model.

C. Reasons for the Classification of Translation Errors:

Most of the definitions provided above for translation errors are very general, which can invite confusion. Classifying these errors undoubtedly contributes to the issue of objectivity with regards to describing errors and the necessary subsequent corrections in the translated texts. In fact, error typologies or classifications play a central role in translation quality procedures, as they serve as a guide for translation evaluators, and the statistical analysis of errors are built upon them (Jimenez-Crespo, 2011). In order to make the notion of translation errors applicable to translation quality evaluation, scholars have contributed a great deal to the development of error typologies, as will be detailed in the following sections. The main shortcoming of most of the suggested classifications is that they have not been validated through broad-scale empirical studies that can lead to more valid and objective measurements (Colina, 2008). Waddington (2001) has previously attributed this lack of empirical studies to the predominant descriptive and theoretical nature of the concept of error.

D. Factors Affecting the Classification of Translation Errors:

Hansen (2010) provides a clear perspective on the factors influencing the process of classifying translation errors. These factors can be summarized as follows: (1) the purpose of the classification (text-oriented, client-oriented, reader-oriented, or business-oriented), (2) the translation theory behind this classification and the ethical rules for translation practice that are believed to be legitimate for translators and evaluators of a certain translation, (3) the evaluation environment (international organization, company, translation agency, free-lance translator, or students' translations), (4) the language pairs involved, and (5) the text type (legal text, technical text, literary text, or other types).

E. Some of the Existing Classifications of Translation Errors:

Pym (1992, p. 281) considers errors in translation as a manifestation of a defect in any factors entering into the skills in translation. He (1992) generally differentiates between two types of translation errors. He classifies them into binary and non-binary errors. He believes that it is not practical to classify errors, as they appear in translated texts where according to him, elements of different types are perpetually mixed, and numerous cases straddle the presupposed distinctions. Instead, he classifies them following his working definition of translation competence which implies that they should all have the same basic form. "A binary error opposes a wrong answer to the right answer", so the question of "right" or "wrong" is the main focus for this type of errors (1992, p. 282). By binary errors, Pym means language errors. "Non-binary errors" means the translation errors, which "requires that the target text actually selected be opposed to at least one further target text, which could also have been selected, and then to possible wrong answer" (1992, p. 282).

In an attempt to present a framework for error analysis for the purpose of translation evaluation, Vilar et al. (2006) proposed a hierarchical structure to classify translation errors. Their classification can be summarized as follows:

No.	Type of error	Definition of type of error	Subcategorisation of type of error
1	Missing words	This error is committed if some words in the generated sentence are missing. Here, a distinction is made between two types of errors. Are the missing words essential for expressing meaning or are they only necessary to form a grammatically correct sentence where the meaning is preserved?	Content words Filler words
2	Word order	This error is committed if some words in the sentence are not correctly ordered according to the grammatical rules of the target language. This could happen at the word level or the phrase level.	Word level Phrase level
3	Incorrect words	This error is committed if the translator fails to find the correct translation of a given word or makes a bad choice of words.	Sense Incorrect form Extra words Style Idioms
4	Unknown words	This error arises due to the use of unknown words (or stems), or unseen forms of known stems.	Unknown stems
5	Punctuations	This error reflects minor disturbances in the target text due to the wrong application of punctuation rules.	Unseen forms

Table (2.1): A Summary of Vilar et al.'s Classification of Translation Errors

The main shortcoming of this classification, in my opinion, is that it completely neglects translation errors committed at the macro level, whether these be pragmatic, cultural, textual, situational or contextual. Instead, it only focuses on the errors committed at the sentence level (micro level). This characteristic could increase the level of subjectivity, as not all of the nonlinguistic factors that contribute to the creation of the meaning are considered in the assessment process.

Moving on to another classification that encompasses both micro and macro levels in error analysis, albeit under different terminology, is the one suggested by Backhoff, Solano-Flores and Contreas-Niňo (2009). With the views that the extent to which a translation is acceptable or unacceptable can be ascertained by the frequency and the severity of translation errors, and that these same errors are multidimensional, they classify translation errors into internal dimension errors and external dimension errors. They then sub-classify these dimensions into smaller units. The following table summarises their classification of translation errors:

No.	**Error type**	**Sub-categorization of error type**	**Definition of type of error**	**Error dimension**
1	Design	Style	The item in the target language is in a style that is not in accord with the style used in textbooks and printed materials in the target language.	Internal
		Format	The format or visual layout of the translated items differ from the original.	External
		Conventions	The translation of the item is not in accord with accepted item writing practices in the target language.	Internal
2	Language	Grammar	The translation has grammatical errors, the syntax is unusual or unnecessarily complex in the language usage in the target language.	Internal
		Semantics	The meaning conveyed in the translation is not the same as in the source text.	Internal
		Register	The translation is not sensitive to the target language's word usage and social contexts.	Internal
3	Content	Information	The translation changes the amount, quality, or content of information critical to understanding what the item is about and what has to be done to respond to it.	Internal
		Construct	The translation changes the knowledge or skills needed to respond to the item correctly.	Internal
		Curriculum	The item does not represent the curriculum of the target culture.	External
		Origin	The item in the source language has flaws that are carried over to the version in the target language.	External

Table (2.2): A Summary of Backhoff, Solano-Flores and Contreas-Niǹo's Classification of Errors

The evaluation in this model is also restricted to the micro-level analysis, which could affect the objectivity of the assessment provided as it does not include all the levels of assessment.

In light of the Skopos theory, where a translation is determined by its Skopos, Lu and Ying (2010) attempted to include what was arguably felt to be missing in the previously mentioned classification - the macro level. Their classification of translation errors is summarized in the table below for convenience and ease of reference:

No.	Type of Error	Definition of Type of Error
1	Pragmatic translation error	This error is caused by inadequate solutions to pragmatic translation problems such as a lack of receiver orientation and the function of the target text.
2	Cultural translation error	This error is caused by an inadequate decision with regards to reproduction or adaptation of culture-specific conventions.
3	Linguistic translation error	This error is due to inadequate translation when the focus is on language structures. It can be regarded as a deviation of target language norms.
4	Text-specific translation error	No definition provided.

Table (2.3): A Summary of Lu and Ying's Classification of Translation Errors

Lu and Ying (2010) do not investigate the last type of error, claiming that the three former types of translation errors proved to appear more frequently in their empirical study. A more objective classification of translation errors for the purpose of quality assessment would be a classification typology that allocates equal value to each type of translation errors, as well as encompasses all the areas where translation problems are expected to occur, even if they have shown to be less frequent.

7. Concluding Remarks:

At the end of this chapter, it can be concluded that several attempts have been made to develop models for translation quality assessment. Most of these stem from different theories of translation and therefore, suggest different criteria for assessment. As far as the main purpose of this study is concerned, non-equivalence models do not provide appropriate means for the assessment of one of the two main approaches in TQA, namely, error analysis approach. This is because the notion of error is very central in this approach, and usually when this is the case, the notion of equivalence becomes similarly important as errors are detected and assessed based on a comparative analysis for a certain equivalency between the source and target texts.

Functional models for evaluation are not relied on solely either as they do not generally provide practical means as to how the process should be undertaken after establishing the function of the translation, which may as well increase the element of subjectivity which does not cope with the study's call for a more comprehensive, objective view of quality assessment. In fact, this criticism is not only exclusive to functional models but it is also true of all other non-experiential models, as they proved difficult to apply in professional and pedagogical settings (Lauscher 2000; Colina 2008). However, functional perspectives are considered in the adopted models in this study, as will be explained in the next chapter, since it is the purpose of the text that determines the effect a translation error might have on the user experience (O'Brien, 2012, p.59).

Reader-response models also do not provide appropriate assessment means for the use of this study, as the quality of a translation is essentially restricted to the readers' response, raising issues such as whether it is possible to determine if two responses are actually equivalent, bearing in mind that even texts from the same language can incite non-equivalent reactions from different groups of readers. As for the relevance theory, relying on the relevance principles alone does not provide a comprehensive analysis to the micro and macro levels where translation problems are expected to occur, thus depriving the model from being satisfactorily objective, meaning that it will not be employed in this research.

Equivalence-based models, on the other hand, are consistent with this study's aim as far as the adoption of equivalence is concerned. Equivalence is a central principle in the two models of assessment selected for this study, as will be explicated in the next chapter. However, it is important to reiterate, at the end of this chapter, that the seven standards of textuality are used as equivalence parameters for the adapted model of error analysis in this research, in an attempt to avoid the non-inclusivity of the above mentioned types of equivalences which increases the element of subjectivity given that they mostly reflect and seek equivalency on certain rather than all aspects of a target text. I will use the textual equivalent at all the proposed seven levels as the benchmark against which to measure quality, due to the fact that together, they comprehensively cover all areas where equivalence between the translated Arab Spring presidential speeches and their originals are expected to occur. It is important to highlight that the notion of textual equivalence does not seek complete identity between textual surfaces. Instead, as asserted by Neubert and Shreve (1992), textual equivalence emphasises the interrelationships between textual effect, and the actual textual formations of source and target texts, which is the basic of textual equivalence.

The adopted holistic model (Method B) also relies on the concept of equivalence in its assessment of translation quality. According to Waddington (2001), the assessment in this model is based on achieving equivalence on two criteria - the accuracy of transfer from the source language and the quality of expression in the target language. For each of these criteria, the model provides five levels based on which equivalence is assessed. In conclusion, the notion of equivalence is very central for the two models of assessment adopted in this study as will be explained in the next chapter.

Chapter 3

Research Methodology and Models of Analysis

As the literature written on translation quality assessment and its main approaches has been reviewed in the previous chapter, this chapter outlines the research method and the proposed models for assessing the translation quality of the Arab Spring presidential speeches. It is divided into two main parts; the first introduces the research method, the corpus of the study, and provides description of the two methods of quality assessment. The second section describes in detail the adapted model of error analysis which is derived from the theory of textuality originally proposed by Beaugrande and Dressler (1981). Finally, the applicability of the suggested model to the present study and its corpus is discussed.

1. Research Methodology

This study seeks to address the research questions outlined in Chapter 1 by using a mixed method. The justification for using such a method is that one type of research, i.e., qualitative or quantitative, is not enough to address the relevant questions. Onwuegbuzie and Teddlie (2003) define mixed research as an intellectual and practical synthesis that incorporates qualitative and quantitative research. They also believes that it is the third methodological research, along with the qualitative and quantitative. They demonstrate how mixed research analysis enhances the interpretation of results, and helps researchers to better contextualise qualitative findings. They also add that although quantitative research is particularly useful for answering questions of who, where, how many, how much, as well as determining the nature of the relationship between specific variables, it is not optimal for answering why and how questions. Mixed research, in contrast, can address both sets of questions within one study. Resorting to both qualitative and quantitative tools to assess the quality of the Arab Spring presidential speeches' translations provided by credible English news agencies provides a better understanding of the research questions than if only one type were employed. Consequently, this study intends to use a mixed method to address the research questions.

However, conducting a mixed research approach does not imply that qualitative and quantitative measures used in the study should be used equally. On the contrary, it indicates that the undertaken research is not entirely qualitative or quantitative. Thus, the method used can be best termed as a qualitative dominant mixed methodology. Onwuegbuzie and Leech (2011), define it as a philosophical stance whereby the researcher assumes a qualitative critical theory, (in this case, Beaugrande and Dressler's theory of textuality and Waddington's holistic model) while also believing that the addition of quantitative data and analysis would address the research questions in more detail, and provide a better insight into the qualitative findings. The quantitative part of this research lies in using a statistical tool to calculate the number and weight of errors committed in the translations, with the intent of determining a quality index for each.

2. The Corpus of the Study

For the purpose of examining the outcome of applying the two product-centred methods of quality assessment on political discourse, the chosen texts must be representative. The researcher has selected the Arab Spring texts in the form of presidential speeches given by the leaders of the countries where the 2011 revolutions took place, and intends to study their translations found in some of the highly influential English news agencies for two reasons:

1. The Arab Spring presidential speeches are exceptional speeches, as they were delivered during unprecedented circumstances in the Arab world. Their translations are equally important, as they have attracted the attention of an international community keen to remain informed about unfolding political events and understand the political situation of those countries. Therefore, attention should be paid to the translation of such sensitive texts, where errors can cause unintended consequences and negatively affect the world's understanding of this important junction in the modern Arab history.
2. Translation errors are further less acceptable if the presidential speeches are translated and/or published by credible English news agencies such as CNN, BBC, and The Guardian. Therefore, this study intends to assess the translations provided by these agencies, where the possibility that translation serious errors result from the translators' lack of expertise and/or unfamiliarity with translation and publication norms is ideally ruled out.

Several speeches were delivered at the time of the revolution, meaning that refining criteria had to be established in order to select a manageable number of texts for the study. These are as follows:

1. Including only the ‘Arab Spring’ presidential speeches that were delivered in 2011. This was deemed necessary so as to maintain that the study refers to the same context of political situation, and also because the term ‘Arab Spring’ was basically coined to refer to the political movements that particularly took place in that year. This excluded only Syria from the five Arab countries (Tunisia, Egypt, Yemen, Libya and Syria), as the situation in this country is still ongoing as illustrated in Table (3.1).

2. Including only the speeches that are translated fully, as some of them were either left untranslated or translated partially.

State	Start of Revolution	End of Revolution	How Revolution ended
Tunisia	17/12/2010	14/01/2011	Zine El Abidine Ben Ali stepped down.
Egypt	25/01/2011	11/02/2011	Muhammad Hosni Mubarak stepped down.
Yemen	11/02/2011	23/11/2011	Ali Abdullah Saleh stepped down.
Libya	17/02/2011	20/10/2011	Muammar Gaddafi killed.
Syria	18/03/2011	Till present	Bashaar Al-Assad still in position.

Table (3.1): Start and End Dates of Arab Spring Revolutions

A. Source Texts

The speeches abiding by the two selection criteria stated above, and that are thus constituting the source texts for the study, were delivered in Arabic. They were taken from the written versions that are published in official Arabic news agencies, which are all attached in Appendix 1. Due to the political circumstances during which this study was conducted, the primary source of the third speech was erased by the time this work reached its final stages. Therefore, and instead of providing the other unofficial versions that are still available online, the researcher provided her own transcription of the original audio. The reason this was deemed necessary is that the transcription privided by the researcher is in fact very similar to the text that the textual analysis and assessment was primarliy based on. Besides, taking the available unofficial versions of the text would not only impact the adopted selection criteri in this study, but would also impact the analysis as such versions are not very accurate to the original audio. The textual analysis in this research is, therefore, conducted between the official published original speeches (in Arabic) and their respective official published full versions (in English). Although most of the Arab Spring speeches have official written versions, their inclusion to the corpus of this study was governed by whether or not they have a corresponding text in English, as will be specified in the next section.

Acknowledging the fact that the orignal source of the source texts in this stdy is audio materils, the reseracher had to review them to ensure that they represent the actual recordings. In so doing, the researcher found no discrepancies between the original audios and the texts chosen in this study except for only two discrepancies in the last speech. These two have been highlighted in the appendix and a footnote explaining their estimated reasons was included. However, it is important to reiterate that these differences do not seem to impact the analysis or the results of this study as they are only typo mistakes.

B. Target Texts

The target texts in this study are the English translations of the Arab Spring presidential speeches that are published in official Arabic newspapers. As explained in Chapter 1, most of the newspapers do not provide full text translations of presidential speeches (Orengo, 2005:168-186), and as this may cause unavoidable complications of assessing the quality of abridged translations to represent the quality of the overall texts, only the speeches that are fully translated are included. As there were several attempts made by fans and crowdsourced to provide full translations of the presidential speeches, which are not within the scope of this study, the target texts selection criteria were further specified to include only the fully translated versions of the original speeches that are published in reliable English news agencies such as The Guardian, BBC, and CNN. This step was deemed crucial to rule out the possibility that the poor quality (if that indeed is the case) is the result of a lack of expertise or an unfamiliarity with the professional norms of news agencies and publication. This specification, in turn, provided four fully translated speeches that found in credible English agencies; they are as follows: Speech No (1) The Egyptian president's second speech translated in (The Guardian) in 01/02/2011, (2) The Egyptian president's last speech translated in the (CNN) in 10/02/2011, (3) The Libyan president's second speech translated in (The Guardian) in 17/03/2011, and The Libyan president's seventh speech translated in 24/08/2011 in the (BBC).

3. The Application of the Two Methods of Assessment

With the aim of answering this research's main questions, I will apply the selected representative methods from the two approaches that are typically used to evaluate translation quality, namely, error analysis and holistic assessment approaches, in the optic of assessing the four selected Arab Spring presidential as follows:

A.The Application of the Error Analysis Method:

In the proposed model, each of Beaugrande and Dressler's seven standards of textuality is considered to be a criterion against which the quality of a translation can be measured. This means that quality is addressed against seven main potential areas of errors. Errors committed in the translations of the selected Arab Spring presidential speeches are classified in terms of severity into two groups: major errors and minor errors. Major errors constitute those that entirely disregard a certain standard in the model, thus affecting the transfer of meaning, as explained by the two authors – these weigh two points. In contrast, minor errors are the ones that disregard the same standard in part, where the meaning is still preserved – these weigh one point. After conducting the textual analysis and classifying the errors, major errors and minor errors will then be counted in order to establish a preliminary quality index for each translation. Finally, the number of errors compared to the number of words in each text is calculated using the statistical tool- translation error rate (TER) (Waddington, 2001), to convert the number of errors into an overall mark out of ten.

B. The Application of the Holistic Assessment Method:

The researcher has tested the method (A) herself, therefore, in order to ensure that both methods are properly examined, two external professional evaluators from the CIOL (Chartered Institute of Linguists) experienced in translating and revising Arabic-English texts, are given the same source texts along with their translations, in order to provide a holistic assessment of their respective quality. Raters have been provided with the same holistic method to ensure that the assessment is not a reflection of the raters' choice of a certain holistic model. As specified in Chapter 1, the holistic model used in this study was designed by Waddington (2001), and has been selected for four reasons: (1) it has been empirically tested, an important aspect as one of this work's main objectives calls for more empirical studies before theorising, (2) it is not a type-specific model and can be applied to all types of texts, including those used in this study, (3) it is comprehensive, as the scale in this particular model is unitary and treats translation competence as a whole, a feature found in most holistic models (Khan Mohammad and Osanloo, 2009:137), and finally, (4) it considers both the negative and positive aspects of a translation in the assessment process (Waddington, 2001).

Using Waddington's model means that the raters must assign a mark out of ten for the translation quality, and justify the assigned mark in a written feedback, so as that the marks can be analysed. For each of the five levels, are two possible marks which can be given, allowing the rater to award the higher mark to the translation that meets the requirements of that particular level, or has some good or creative solutions to translation problems, and the lower mark to the translation that falls between the two levels, but is closer to the upper one and so on. In this model, a translation is assessed based on two main parameters (the accuracy of transfer of source text content, and the quality of expression in the target language). Each of these two parameters are further specified to help the rater decide which level represents the translation quality. The details are as follows (Table 1.1), reproduced below for ease of reference:

Level	Accuracy of transfer of ST content	Quality of expression in TL	Degree of task completion	Mar k
Level 5	Complete transfer of ST information, only minor revisions needed to reach professional standard.	Almost all the translation reads like a piece originally written in English. There may be minor lexical, grammatical or spelling errors.	Successful	9-10
Level 4	Almost complete transfer, with only one or two insignificant inaccuracies, requires a certain amount of revision to reach professional standard.	Large sections read like a piece originally written in English. There are a number of lexical, grammatical or spelling errors.	Almost completely successful	7-8
Level 3	Transfer of the general ideas but with a number of lapses in accuracy, needs considerable revision to reach professional standard.	Certain parts read like a piece originally written in English, but others read like a translation. There are a considerable number of lexical, grammatical or spelling errors.	Adequate	5-6
Level 2	Transfer undermined by serious inaccuracies, thorough revision required to reach professional standard.	Almost the entire text reads like a translation, there are continual lexical, grammatical or spelling errors.	Inadequate	3-4
Level 1	Totally inadequate transfer of ST content, the translation is not worth revising.	The candidate reveals a complete lack of ability to express himself adequately in English.	Completely inadequate	1-2

Table (1.1): Waddington's Holistic Assessment Model (2001)

After applying both methods of assessment on the same texts, the overall quality index of each method will be compared. By the end of the research, each of the four translated texts will have been awarded with two marks: one from the application of assessment method (A), and one from the application of method assessment (B). Once these are determined, both results will undergo deep contrastive analysis in order to investigate the differences in the applications of each method, and identify how each reduces the subjective nature inherent to translation quality assessment.

4. The Theoretical Model of Error Analysis:

The error analysis model used in this study is mainly adopted from Beaugrande and Dressler's theory of textuality (1981). Textuality is proposed to be the basis of the actualisation (the evolution) and utilisation of texts (Beaugrande, 1980). The two authors define texts in terms of textuality as communicative occurrences which meet the seven standards proposed in their book (1981). These seven standards are: cohesion, coherence, intentionality, acceptability, informativity, situationality, and intertextuality. They argue that these seven standards distinguish texts from non-texts, and that if one of these is not met within a piece, then it will not be considered communicative. However, Beaugrande and Dressler (1994), along with Beaugrande (2000) abandon this idea in their later works. Viewing textuality as a complex dynamic disposition that is always operative in every communicative event, rather than a linguistic property that some texts possess while others do not, they conclude that the opposition between text and non-text is no longer considered a valid claim in text grammar (Beaugrande and Dressler, 1994). The reasons for selecting this model are discussed in Chapter 1, what is of relevance in this chapter is the applicability and limitations of each of the seven standards on the corpus of this study. For convenience, the way each standard is examined in this study is first introduced. Each standard is first introduced, followed by a discussion regarding its limitations (if any) and its applicability to the present study.

5. Applicability and Limitations of the Model of Error Analysis:

In this study, each of Beaugrande and Dressler's seven standards of textuality are used to define a set of criteria against which the quality of a translation can be measured. However, unlike the previous attempts which adopt the original unmodified model, the current study suggests some modifications so as to fit the peculiarity of Arabic, the source texts' language, as will be discussed in detail in the subsequent sections.

5.1 Cohesion:

In Beaugrande and Dressler's model, cohesion is concerned with how the elements of a discourse are mutually connected within a sequence. This concept can be discussed both in terms of short and long range. Cohesion in the short range is about connecting elements of grammatical dependencies within a sentence or a small number of sentences. In contrast, long range cohesion involves connecting the elements of the bigger text. Indeed, cohesion is not concerned with the subject matter of a certain text, but rather with the organization of the message and, thus, it contributes to the textual unity of the semantic system. Beaugrande and Dressler assert that the use of various concrete devices that provide a clear understanding of the relations among these elements can sustain cohesion in a discourse. Their treatment of cohesion is mainly adopted from Halliday and Hasan's 1976 model, which is believed to, as Kruger (2002, p.83) indicates, systemise the concept of cohesion "by classifying it into a small number of distinct categories … which have a theoretical basis as distinct types of cohesive relation, but which also provide practical means for describing and analyzing texts". Consequently, cohesion is going to be examined in this study under the same five cohesive devices originally proposed by Halliday and Hasan, namely: reference, conjunctions, ellipsis, substitution, and lexical cohesion.

However, in Beaugrande and Dressler's model, cohesion is English oriented, and since the source texts in this study are in the Arabic language, the English cohesive devices cannot always encompass the description of the Arabic cohesive elements. As Arabic and English are significantly different in terms of their treatment and available sources of cohesion, it proved difficult to identify a unified descriptive framework which can be used to compare cohesive devices used in Arabic and English for the study of cohesion. Thus, in relation to this study's examination of translation errors in cohesion, it felt improper to limit the description of the Arabic cohesive devices to the same descriptive framework suggested for the English language. Therefore, there was a need for an Arabic oriented description of the cohesive devices that cannot be discussed under the five mentioned above. Although within the context of this study, Arabic cohesive devices are discussed under the same devices outlined in Beaugrande and Dressler's treatment of cohesion, they are described according to an Arabic representation, to examine whether they are used in the Arabic language to fulfil cohesive functions, as is the case in English.

Arabic has the potential to express most of the five cohesive functions, but in a different manner; this is the reason behind the fact that they are discussed in this section under the same classification. Moreover, additions are made to other Arabic cohesive elements; namely: parallelism and paraphrasing. The English application of these two devices to express cohesiveness will also be discussed. In short, cohesion in this study is considered in terms of the following cohesive devices: reference, conjunction, ellipsis, substitution, lexical cohesion, parallelism, and paraphrasing. Differences between Arabic and English in the treatment of these devices are illustrated when examining each device separately.

A. Reference:

According to Halliday and Hasan (1976), reference is a term used to refer to certain items that are not interpreted semantically on their own but rather by referring to something else for their interpretation. Reference works as a cohesive device due to the fact that it allows the receiver(s) to trace participants, events, entities, etc. in texts. They classify reference devices into three main categories: personal pronouns, demonstratives, and comparatives.

A.1 Personal pronouns:

Personal pronouns are used to refer to their referents by specifying their function in the speech situation. In this regard, English differentiates between three types of persons: first person, second person, and third person. These pronouns can be in the subject or the object positions whether as personal or possessive pronouns. Compared to English, Arabic has a wide set of personal pronouns given that different variables are involved in their classification: person, gender, number (singular, dual, and plural), case (nominative, accusative, genitive), and pronouns can either be separate or connected pronouns. Arabic pronouns are basically classified into two main categories: explicit and implicit. Explicit pronouns can be separate or connected. Separate pronouns can be described as free morphemes that are not suffixed to other words; they can stand by themselves and still have meaning. Connected pronouns are bound morphemes that have meaning only when they are suffixed to other words, such as the possessive pronoun (ـه) in (كتابه) ‘his book’. Implicit pronouns, on the other hand, are not lexically indicated; they are implied in the verbs only. For instance, the subject of the verb (كتب) in the sentence (كتب الدرس) ‘He wrote the lesson’ is an implicit pronoun that refers to a masculine singular third person. All these pronouns are used to establish a cohesion relationship between sentences in Arabic.

Arabic and English have many differences regarding their use of pronouns. For instance, Arabic does not have the category of some possessive pronouns such as mine, his, yours, etc. Gender distinction appears in English only in the case of the third person singular (i.e., he/she), whereas in Arabic explicit and implicit pronouns, for the most part, show not only gender distinctions but also number distinctions. Arabic pronouns also differ according to their position in the sentence, whether nominative, accusative, or genitive. English, on the other hand, deals with a limited set of pronouns. Another main distinction between Arabic and English pronouns is related to their cohesive function(s). Personal reference in Arabic is typically anaphoric. For instance, Beeston (1970, p.41) states that “a pronoun always refers to a previously mentioned covert entity”. This is a very broad generalisation because Arabic can use some pronouns to refer to, for example, people who are not covertly previously mentioned but rather assumed, or whose presence can easily be discerned by receivers. Moreover, in Arabic, the third person pronoun can also function cataphorically to refer to an entity that will appear later in the text. However, this is not the common practice of Arabic pronouns, which is probably the reason for Beeston’s generalisation. Furthermore, Arabic implicit pronouns, though not outwardly formed in the surface structure, can also perform a cohesive function by making the receivers retrieve their antecedents from somewhere in the text or from shared background knowledge. What is worth mentioning here is that there are other differences between Arabic and English in relation to their use of pronouns, but it is beyond the interest of this study to provide a detailed contrastive description between the two linguistic systems.

A.2 Demonstratives:

Demonstratives are used to refer to location whether in space or time. Unlike those in English, which are classified only in terms of proximity and number, Arabic demonstrative pronouns are classified in terms of person, number, gender, and case. In Arabic, demonstratives are mainly classified into two groups: (1) demonstrative pronouns referring to participants, and (2) the circumstantial adverbial demonstratives. Holes (1995, p.151) classifies Arabic demonstratives in terms of proximity (near and far) into two sets corresponding to Halliday and Hasan’s (1976) classification of English demonstratives, as shown in Table (3.2).

Demonstratives	Gender	Proximal Arabic	English equivalent	Distal Arabic	English equivalent
Singular	Masculine	هذا	This	ذلك أو ذاك	That
	Feminine	هذه أو هذي	This	تلك	That
Plural	Masculine & Feminine	هؤلاء	These	أولئك	Those
Dual	Masculine	هاذان	These	ذانك	Those
		هذين	These	ذينك	Those
	Feminine	هاتين	These	تانك	Those
		هاتين	These	تاينك	Those

Table (3.2): Arabic Demonstratives and their English Counterparts (1)

This classification takes only the participants into consideration. Discussing the other type of Arabic demonstratives, Al-Muradi (1992) adds the circumstantial adverbial demonstratives that refer to the location of processes in space or time. The probable reason for Holes (1995) not discussing circumstantial demonstratives in his work on Arabic demonstratives is that he, among others, does not treat temporal demonstratives (الآن وآنذاك) 'now and then', as demonstrative pronouns, but rather as adverbs of time, though they do correspond to their English counterparts in their textual function. Table (3.3) below presents a classification of demonstrative pronouns in Arabic in terms of circumstances, with their English equivalent demonstrative pronouns. These two classifications of Arabic demonstratives have been compiled based on the works of Al-Muradi (1992) and Holes (1995).

	Place	English equivalent	Time	English equivalent
Near	هنا	Here	الآن	now
Far	هناك	There	آنذاك	then

	Place	English equivalent	Time	English equivalent
Table (3.3): Arabic Demonstratives and their English Counterparts (2)				

From the tables above, major distinctions between Arabic and English demonstrative systems can be noticed. Arabic demonstratives express gender distinctions, whereas in English, "this" and "that" are used to refer to both genders. Arabic also differentiates between singular, dual, and plural demonstrative pronouns, whereas English differentiates between singular and plural demonstratives only. As for the cohesive function of demonstrative pronouns in Arabic, Beeston (1970, p.42) asserts that they resemble pronouns in that they are allusive and require a context to make the allusion understandable. By context, he refers to co-text rather than situational context. Moreover, like their English counterparts, Arabic demonstrative pronouns are typically anaphoric. They do come cataphorically in a sentence, but the common case is that they refer to something previously mentioned.

The last set of demonstrative, according to Halliday and Hasan (1976), is the definite article (the). This English definite article does not encompass all the usages of its Arabic counterpart (ال). For instance, (ال) in Arabic does not only modify nouns but also gerunds and adjectives. However, it is only considered as a cohesive device if (ال) is used to refer to something either previously mentioned in the text or assumed to be easily understood. By being able to modify a larger amount of words than its English counterpart, it increases the number of potential cohesive devices that can be created in a discourse, as illustrated in the following example: (إنه كتاب مفيد. أريد أن أشتري هذا الكتاب) 'It is a useful book. I want to buy this (the) book'. From this, it is clear that English would use either the demonstrative pronoun or the definite article as a cohesive device, whereas in Arabic, the demonstrative pronoun (هذا) and the definite article (ال) are both used as cohesive devices in the same sentence.

A.3 Comparatives:

Comparative forms are the last type of reference believed to create cohesion in a text. They provide indirect reference by means of identity or similarity. Halliday and Hasan (1976) generally classify them into two types: (1) general comparative forms and (2) particular comparative forms. In the first type, things are referred to in terms of their likeness or unlikeness, and are expressed by a set of adjectives and adverbs that are respectively termed as "adjectives of comparison" and "adverbs of comparison". In particular comparative forms, on the other hand, things are referred to in terms of quantity or quality. Arabic does not conform to this classification of comparative forms, as it does not have a definite set of adjectives and adverbs that are capable of expressing this form of comparison. However, this does not mean that Arabic does not have other resources to express it. For instance, all the adjectives and adverbs that show identity of objects can be accommodated in Arabic by means of (نفس) and (مطابق) 'same', adjectives and adverbs used to show similarity can be accommodated in Arabic by means of (مثل) and (مشابه) 'such' and 'similar' respectively, and finally, adjectives and adverbs used to show dissimilarity are expressed in Arabic using (آخر) and (مختلف) 'other and different' respectively. As for the English comparative adverbs, Arabic sometimes express them in one word such as (بالتماثل) 'identically' and other times use an entire phrase to convey them, such as (بطرق مماثلة) 'likewise'. On the other hand, Arabic conforms to the description of particular comparative forms discussed in the original model, as it usually derives the comparative form from its verb root. For example, (أفضل) 'better' is used in Arabic to express particular comparison, but only if it is followed by the particle (من) 'than', as is the case in English. Superlative comparison is also expressed in Arabic in terms of quantity (الأقل) 'the least' or quality (الكبرى) 'the biggest'.

B. Substitution:

Halliday and Hasan (1976) differentiate between reference and substitution in that reference is a relation between meanings, whereas substitution is a relation between linguistic items such as words and phrases, and is simply the act of replacing one element by another. Believing that substitution is a grammatical relation, they argue that the substitute may function as a noun, a verb, or as a clause. Thus, they distinguish three types of substitution that can function as cohesive devices: nominal, verbal, and clausal substitution.

Under nominal substitution, Halliday and Hasan (1976) discuss the substitute 'one' and its plural form ‘ones’. Arabic has different representation of this English nominal substitute. For example, in Arabic, (واحد) corresponds to the English nominal substitution ‘one’, but the plural form of ‘one’, which is ‘ones’, has no equivalent, as it cannot be pluralised. Thus in this case, repetition in Arabic is unavoidable. Other examples of Arabic nominal substitutions are (نفس ومثل وذات), which correspond to only one English counterpart, ‘same’. As for the verbal substitutions, they are achieved in English by using the verb ‘do’. Arabic does not express most of the English usages of this verb. The verbal substitute ‘do’ is only possible in Arabic in certain cases. This could be attributed to the lack of Arabic auxiliary verbs, and to the fact that the verb ‘do’ is not used to form questions in Arabic.

Moving to the last substitution type, Halliday and Hasan (1976) explain two English clausal substitutes ‘so’ and ‘not’. They distinguish between three contexts in which the two substitutes can take place, such as substitution of reported clause, substitution of conditional clause, and substitution of modalized clause. In Arabic, whereas clausal substitution is limited in its usage, negative clausal substitution is even more so. Although Arabic is still capable of expressing some clausal substitution, the norm of Arabic native speakers is to intuitively repeat the same words. This also applies to ellipsis, which will be discussed in the following section.

C. Ellipsis:

Halliday and Hasan (1976) describe ellipsis as deleting one or more elements in a sentence based on the fact that they can be implied as well as mentally supplied by the reader or the listener. They believe that ellipsis is similar to substitution in that both of them are grammatical relations rather than semantic ones. However, unlike with substitution, ellipsis does not require for elements to be replaced by anything. Although both concepts of ellipsis and substitution express the same relation between parts of a text, Halliday and Hasan still believe that they should be examined separately, as they constitute two different types of structural mechanism. As with substitution, they differentiate between three types of ellipses: nominal ellipsis, verbal ellipsis, and clausal ellipsis.

The concept of ellipsis has not been addressed as thoroughly in Arabic as it has in English. When reference is made to ellipsis, it is only discussed within the sentence boundary. This can mainly be attributed to the realisation that Arab grammarians and linguists intuitively allow the omission of a certain element if it can be easily understood. However, Arabic has potential to express the elliptical relations suggested by the original authors, and are thus discussed here accordingly. To begin with, the nominal ellipsis is when the elliptical item is deictic, numerative, an epithet, or classifier. There are many types of English nominal ellipses that cannot occur in Arabic. For example, there is no Arabic equivalent to the following English sentences 'I hope no bones are broken? None to speak of'. However, Arabic still can express certain nominal ellipses.

As for the verbal ellipsis, although it occurs in certain contexts in Arabic, it is very rare. The reason for this was addressed when substitution was discussed. Despite the fact that auxiliary verbs form most verbal ellipses in English, they do not exist in Arabic, and, thus, are not used to form verbal substitution. Lastly, a clausal ellipsis is also limited to yes/no or WH-questions in Arabic. For example, (ماذا كان سيأكل الطفل؟ التفاحة) 'what was the child going to eat? The apple'. It is worth mentioning, however, that unlike in English, both the concepts of substitution and ellipsis in Arabic are quite limited in their usage, as repetition is the norm (Qulqilah, 2001, pp. 190-197).

D. Conjunctions:

In this study, the analysis of conjunctions in Arabic texts has been conducted based on the work of Al-Muradi (1992), as it provides a comprehensive view of conjunction types and functions in Arabic. Conjunctions are classified into two types: (1) coordinating / cohesive conjunctions and (2) subordinating conjunctions. Coordinating conjunctions connect two or more clauses within a sentence in a paratactic structure. In this case, the two clauses have similar structures and equal status; provide information of equal importance and can be independent. On the other hand, cohesive conjunctions relate two sentences together. Subordinating conjunctions, however, relate two clauses within a sentence hypotactically; a sentence that with such a structure usually consists of a main clause and a subordinate clause. Unlike clauses in paratactic structures, hypotactically related clauses do not have equal status; the subordinate clause is dependent on the main one structurally and semantically. To summarise the differences between English and Arabic conjunctions with regard to their cohesive functions, these will be presented along with their English counterparts in the Tables (3.4) and (3.5) below:

Arabic conjunction	**Function**	**English Equivalent**
ف	temporal (sequential)	then
	temporal (sequential and causal)	so
	additive (expository, specification)	a semicolon
	additive (expository, clarification)	a semicolon
	additive (expository, explicative)	a semicolon
أم	additive (alternative)	or
و	Additive	and
	additive (alternative)	or
	adversative (contrastive)	and yet, and at the same time
أو	additive (alternative)	or
	additive (negative)	nor
أي	additive (appositive, expository)	that is, meaning, in other words
بل	adversative (correction of meaning)	on the contrary, in fact, actually
	adversative (contrastive)	but
	adversative (correction of wording)	or rather
ثم	temporal (sequential)	then, after that
أما - إنما	Additive	either … or
لكن	Adversative	but, yet, instead
	Adversative	rather, on the contrary
لذلك لـهذا	causal (reason)	for this reason

Table (3.4): Arabic Cohesive Conjunctions

Arabic conjunction	**Function**	**English Equivalent**
ف	correlative of ‘idhaa separates the protasis and the apodosis, and indicates sequence and causality	a comma, so, then
ل	causal, end result	so that, so as

Arabic conjunction	Function	English Equivalent
و	adverbial	with
	adverbial, temporal	while, when
و	connector	comma
إذ	temporal (events in the past)	when
	temporal (events in the future)	at the time when, when
	causal	as, for, because, since
	temporal (immediate)	when suddenly
إن	conditional	if
أن	causal	so that
	conditional	in case
كي	causal	so that
لو	conditional (hypothetical)	if (had).., would have
	conditional	even if
	conditional (expressing wish)	if only
إذا	conditional	if, in case
	temporal	when
	temporal (expressing immediate and surprise)	then suddenly, and suddenly
كما	comparison (similarity)	as, like
	causal (meaning *kai*)	so as, so that
	comparison (hypothetical)	as if
	causal	because, as, for
إلا	conditional	unless
أما / فأما	conditional (meaning *mahmaa*)	as for
حتى	temporal	until, till
	causal (purpose)	so that
	causal (reason)	so
لولا	conditional (hypothetical)	if it were not ..,

Arabic conjunction	Function	English Equivalent
لوما	similar to *lawlaa*	

Table (3.5): Arabic Subordinating Conjunctions

E. Lexical Cohesion:

Unlike the previously mentioned cohesive devices, lexical cohesion is not a grammatical cohesive device, but rather "its cohesive effect is achieved by the selection of vocabulary" (Halliday and Hasan, 1976, p. 274). This cohesive device is discussed in the original model under two main categories: reiteration and collocation. In the first, the cohesive function is created by reiterating a lexical item in one of the following ways: repetition, use of a general word, synonymy, near synonymy, or use of a subordinate word. Contrastingly, in collocation, creating a lexical cohesion is achieved through associating lexical items that have the tendency to co-occur together. Beaugrande and Dressler (1981) also draw upon other instances of lexical relations that create a cohesive tie between words, such as: antonymy, hyponymy (superordinate vs. subordinate concepts), meronymy (parts vs. whole), and lexical chains (which are related to one person or concept). They believe that all these lexical relationships make the parts of a text cohesively connected.

In Arabic, lexical cohesion is mainly discussed in terms of repetition. Unlike other cohesive devices in Arabic, it has been widely discussed by many researchers. However, there is a varying degree of interest between traditional and modern grammarians when it comes to discussing lexical cohesion in Arabic. Repetition was discussed by traditional grammarians and linguists only as a means of aesthetic devices, i.e., to add poetic flavour to discourse. Traditional grammarians, for instance, discuss two types of repetition in Arabic: a repetition of the same lexical item and a relevant repetition. In the first case, repetition of the same lexical item may be used for emphasis or intensification. The second type, on the other hand, signifies the repetition of different lexical items which are all semantically associated. Conversely, modern researchers study repetition as a lexical cohesion device in relation to another cohesive device, i.e., parallelism. For instance, Al-Jubouri (1983) examines the role of repetition in Arabic argumentative discourse, identifying three levels of repetition: morphological, word, and sentence level. At the morphological level, Al-

Jubouri (1983) asserts that Arabic, being a Semitic language, is characterised by its root system (الجذور) and patterns of the derived form (الأوزان). Consequently, repetition at this level can be in the form of a root repetition or pattern repetition. Repetition at the word level entails either repeating the word itself or the word strings. Beeston (1970, p.113) claims that "if the thought demands the repetition of a concept, Arabic will usually try to avoid repetition of the word by using some synonyms".

This illustrates that, unlike with the English language, if a repetition is deemed necessary for an Arabic writer, it is usually done through the means of repeating the same word rather than by using synonyms. The second means of repetition at word level concerns word strings, which refers to the use of two or more different lexical items strung together to form a group that roughly shares the same meaning. This can be exemplified by (حروب ومنازعات) 'wars and conflicts'. For the interest of this study, it should be explained that Beeston (1970) believes that the effect of using word strings is mainly rhetorical in discourse. If word strings are to be reiterated through an argument, this would create an immediate emotional impact on the receivers of the discourse. The third and last level of repetition in Arabic, according to Al-Jubouri (1983), occurs at the sentence level. Repetition is manifested at this level via two processes: parallelism and paraphrasing. Generally, parallelism is the repetition of form, whereas paraphrasing is the repetition of ideas. These concepts are relevant to the current research, and therefore discussed here under separate sections.

What is worth highlighting before discussing these two cohesive devices in detail, is that lexical cohesion can also be created in Arabic by means of assembling a lexical item and its antonym within discourse. The relationship between these two items conveys a cohesive sense, in turn contributing to the coherence of the discourse as a whole, such as with, (انكم لتكثرون عند الفزع وتقلون عند الطمع) (Al-Sijilmasi, 1980, p.370). Semantically, this translates into 'you are many at the difficult times and few at the times of ease'. In this example, the pairs of lexical items in the first sentence, (تكثرون الفزع) 'many and hard', create a cohesive relation with their antonyms in the second sentence (الطمع /تقلون) 'few and ease'.

F. Parallelism:

Parallelism is both a rhetorical and a textual device (Al-Jubouri, 1983). Cohesion is concerned with connecting parts of the text so as to create a textual semantic unity, and despite the fact that parallelism is also able to create this kind of unity (as discussed by Holes, 1995 and Beeston, 1970), it is not considered in Beaugrande and Dressler's (1981) cohesive devices classification. Al-Jubouri identifies two types of parallelism: complete and incomplete parallelism. Complete parallelism occurs when "there is total, or almost total, coincidence between parallel forms", whereas incomplete parallelism occurs when "there is a partial coincidence between parallelistic forms" (Al-Jubouri, 1983, p.107). Both structures, according to him, make an argument more persuasive and cohesive.

G. Paraphrasing:

Attempting to differentiate between parallelism and paraphrasing, Al-Jubouri (1983, p.110) notes that while parallelism is a repetition of form, "paraphras[ing] refers to a repetition of substance. It involves a restatement of a certain point or argument a number of times". He affirms that in Arabic, this type of repetition reflects the tendency of some writers or speakers to force some assertion. He also differentiates between two types of paraphrasing. In the first type, which he terms "paraphrase type one", is described as "an action or event which is described a number of times from one perspective. It is similar to a rephrasing of a statement". Paraphrase type two, on the other hand, is "an action or event which is described from two opposite perspective". As previously mentioned, although English also regards the process of paraphrasing as a means of creating cohesive relations in the text, it is not included in Beaugrande and Dressler's (1976) model.

5.2 Coherence:

Moving from cohesion to the second standard of textuality, Beaugrande and Dressler (1981) define coherence as the standard that is concerned with how the elements underlying the surface structure, i.e., concepts and relations, are mutually accessible and relevant. In other words, it addresses the point of how a text makes sense to an audience. They differentiate between concepts and relations by explaining that a concept is a knowledge element that can be recovered or activated with unity and consistency in the mind, whereas a relation is what links a concept with one or more concepts in the same text. In that context, Beaugrande and Dressler discuss many important issues in a procedural model that enables us to make sense of texts. These issues include activation, strength of linkage, decomposition, spreading activation, episodic vs. semantic memory, economy, global patterns (frames, schemas, plans, and scripts), inheritance, and control centres (which are explored in terms of primary and secondary concepts) (Beaugrande and Dressler, 1981, pp.86-110). For the interest of the present study, coherence, as discussed by Beaugrande and Dressler, does not encompass the full scope of this textual aspect, as it does not contribute much to the exploration of the logical and semantic relatedness between the text's elements which, in turn, help the reader to make sense of it. To achieve the aim of encompassing all scope of the textual aspects of coherence, use has been made of different approaches to the study of coherence, as will be explained below.

After reviewing the literature on this particular aspect of textuality, it can be asserted that "coherence is a more difficult matter than cohesion" (Dickins, Hervey, and Higgins, 2002, p.128). This is attributed to the fact that "it is not explicitly marked in a text". It has been defined in various ways across the literature, depending on the aspects of coherence considered. Most researchers, however, agree that coherence is mainly concerned with the continuity of sense in a text, which makes a sequence of sentences a coherent unit rather than a chaotic assemblage. When a coherent text is read, its different elements should successfully unite into one overall mental representation. This representation is an organization which, fundamentally, is a reflection of how the content comes together and is stored in the mind (Beaugrande, 1980; Beaugrande and Dressler, 1981; Belhajj, 1997; Dooley and Levinsohn, 2000). Another point that has been stressed by many researchers regarding coherence is that this standard is not an inherited property of texts, but is rather assigned to it by its readers when they attempt to interpret it (Goller, 2001) and (Niska, 1999).

To determine whether a text is coherent or not, scholars have suggested different criteria against which a text ought to be judged. The criteria serve as tools that help readers interpret any text in which they are present. Generally, these can be classified into two main categories: extralinguistic and textual criteria. The extralinguistic criteria reflect the following features: the situational context and historical facts, shared knowledge between the text producer and receiver which includes cultural and pragmatic aspects, knowledge of the world, and the intention of the text producer (Dooley and Levinsohn, 2000). The textual criteria, on the other hand, include the following: cohesion (Dooley and Levinsohn, 2000; Niska, 1999), the syntactic, semantic and pragmatic connectedness of a series of sentences (Bubmann, 1983 and Brinker, 1997 in Goller 2001), continuity, balance, completeness, and non-contradiction (Heberle and Meurer, 1993), the logico-semantic relations (Beaugrande, 1980; Beaugrande and Dressler, 1981; Ozbot, 2001), control centres that can be explored in terms of primary concepts and secondary concepts (Beaugrande, 1980; Beaugrande and Dressler, 1981), the knowledge presented by the text itself (Belhajj, 1997), shared knowledge of textual genres and their conventions between the text producer and the receiver (Belhajj, 1997), relatedness of propositions (Beaugrande, 1980; Beaugrande and Dressler, 1981; Belhajj, 1997; Heberle and Meurer, 1993), and the linguistic context (Dooley and Levinsohn, 2000).

This reveals the interrelatedness between coherence and the other six standards. To verify, coherence interrelates with cohesion and informativity in the examination of the knowledge presented in the text, and control centres 'primary concepts' and 'secondary concepts', as well as the examination of the syntactic, semantic and pragmatic aspects. Coherence also interrelates with intentionality in the examination of the intention(s) of the speaker. With contextuality, coherence interrelates with regards to the examination of the situational context, historical facts, and linguistic context. Finally, coherence interrelates with intertextuality in terms of examining the knowledge of the textual genres and their conventions. Thus, due to the interrelatedness between coherence and the other six textuality standards, the concept is not going to be examined as suggested by the original textuality model, the study of coherence will be undertaken through the use of another classification. To avoid the repetition involved in exploring the same aspect in more than one standard, only the following features will be dealt with in the examination of coherence, as they do not correlate with the other standards: (1) the logico-semantic relations which signal the relatedness of propositions, and (2) continuity, balance, completeness, and non-contradiction. To examine the logical relationships between clauses and sentences that assist readers in making sense of the text, the typology offered by

Halliday (1985: 192-251 and 303-308) was followed, as it is believed to be the most comprehensive and precise classifications of its kind. He classifies logico-semantic relations into three main types: elaboration, extension, and enhancement, all of which are subsumed under expansion. The rest of interrelated elements are discussed along with the other standards.

5.3 Intentionality:

Intentionality, according to Beaugrande and Dressler (1981), is concerned with the text producer's aim to generate a cohesive and coherent text which fulfils his intentions. To analyse and determine the intentions of the text producer, the authors draw on the work of Searle (1969), who developed the Speech Act theory and Grice's maxims of the principle of co-operation (1971). They also discuss three other issues with relation to intentionality: discourse action, situation management, and situation monitoring. Discourse action is a term used to describe when a discourse act changes a situation or the states of the participants, such as the knowledge state or emotional state. This action is usually plan-directed whenever the text-producer is trying to manage the situation toward his goals. This is called situation management. Situation monitoring, on the other hand, is simply reacting to a situation by describing or narrating the available evidence (Beaugrande and Dressler, 1981:113-129). They also add that any producer's intention is not simply to create a text, but also to make a statement, be informative, provide access to knowledge, elicit cooperation, and so on (Beaugrande and Dressler, 1994).

Following Luo Xuanmin's strong assertion that "if the intention of the original cannot be realized in a translation, the translation is not successful" (2003:77), this current study's examination of this standard is done on two levels- general and specific. The general intention of creating the text is firstly identified, after which a deeper examination will be carried out on deliberate linguistic choices that serve the general intention as well as specific and implied intentions. These specific choices can be manifested in the text at different levels, including cohesion, and informativity (represented in lexis, syntax, rhetorical devices, and thematisation).

5.4 Acceptability:

Acceptability is concerned with the audience's attitude towards a text- how they receive a text and how they perceive it as being cohesive, coherent and relevant to them. Text receivers must accept a language configuration as a cohesive and coherent text capable of utilisation (Neubert and Shreve, 1992:129). Acceptability does not necessarily imply that the receiver believe the specific contents of the text (ibid:73). It does, however, require that the receiver be able to identify and extract those contents (ibid:73). According to Beaugrande and Dressler, this depends on factors such as text type, social or cultural settings, and the desirability of goals (Beaugrande and Dressler, 1981, pp. 129-137). Although they do not put forward any ways in which to measure whether the text is acceptable to the reader or not, they suggest three criteria that could govern the translation acceptability, these being intelligibility, naturalness of style, and appropriateness. The functional element in this standard stems from the consideration of target readers; errors that made the translation of a certain part in the target text unintelligible, inappropriate, or if the style does not seem natural for the target reader, those incidents were regarded as errors in acceptability. Therefore, in this study, the standard of acceptability undergoes the same textual analysis, so as to assess the errors that may render the text unacceptable to the readers.

5.5 Informativity:

This standard is concerned with the extent to which sentences in a text are expected or not expected, known or unknown. According to Beaugrande and Dressler, (1981:139-160), less informative texts that present information already known can be disturbing, and may result in unfavourable reactions to the text as a whole from its audience, such as boredom or even rejection. More informative texts, in contrast, are more demanding and interesting. One basic notion explored by the two authors in connection to this standard is that of contextual probability. This is explained by them in terms of three orders of informativity. First-order informativity designates occurrences that are trivial and receive very little attention in a text. Second-order informativity is the normal standard for textual communication, where higher order occurrences attract readers' attention. Third-order informativity describes occurrences which appear to be outside the set of probable options. Such occurrences are comparatively infrequent and demand much attention and processing (Beaugrande and Dressler, 1981, pp. 139-160).

In relation to the examination of informativity in this study, this standard concerns all the elements that convey information in a text. Thus, all these elements are examined on three levels: lexical, syntactic, and rhetorical. Firstly, within the lexical level, lexical items are examined with regards to their semantic ranges in order to determine their specific meanings in relation to the context in which they occur. This is done with the help of classical as well as modern dictionaries of the Arabic language, such as Ibn Manzur (1956), and Al-Askari (2005). Similarly, the meanings of the English words are also examined with the assistance of three dictionaries and a thesaurus: the Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English, The Oxford English Dictionary, Webster's International Dictionary, and The New Oxford Thesaurus of English. Still within the same level, lexical items' semantic ranges are examined against Beaugrande's (1980) typology of concepts and relations. He classifies them into two types- primary concepts and secondary concepts. On the syntactic and rhetorical levels, only the relevant aspects pertaining to the translator's translational decisions will be examined. Finally, thematisation is another textual aspect considered when examining the standard of informativity. This is deliberately included, as thematising certain elements usually entails emphasis and bringing certain elements into focus. Therefore, this aspect should be accounted for when discussing informativity.

5.6 Situationality

This standard is concerned with how a text is made relevant to a situation, and subsumes all the factors that make it so (Beaugrande and Dressler, 1981, pp. 163-179). In this regard, Beaugrande and Dressler focus on two particular issues: situation management and situation monitoring, as well as how they are used as strategies in discourse. As explained when exploring the concept of intentionality, situation management is when the text-producer attempts to manage the situation toward his goals, whereas situation monitoring involves reacting to a situation by describing or narrating the available evidence.

Examining contexts is vital to understanding the meanings of texts and utterances. Thus, all varying contexts contributing to the correct interpretation of meanings must be considered. Different contexts generate different meanings of the same text. Given its importance to the current study's aims, it would be neglectful not to include a definition of context. A review of how the concept of context has been defined over time would highlight the fact that different linguists defined the term from various different angles. Studying reference and inference, Yule (2000, p.128) provides a general definition of context, describing it as "the physical environment in which a word is used". Another attempt to define context was made by Cook (1999, p.24), in which he sees it as just a form of knowledge of the world. This knowledge has two dimensions; in the narrow sense, knowledge refers to the knowledge of the factors outside the text under consideration. In the broad sense, it refers to the knowledge of these factors, as well as to the knowledge of other parts of the text under consideration, which he refers to as co-text. Contrastingly, Widdowson (2000, p.126) focuses his study on language meaning, defining context as "those aspects of the circumstance of actual language use which are taken as relevant to meaning." He further adds that, "context is a schematic construct... the achievement of pragmatic meaning is a matter of matching up the linguistic elements of the code with the schematic elements of the context". Nevertheless, regardless of the differences between these definitions, all the studies of context share a common ground, in which context is always related to outsider environment and factors.

Given that contexts can be classified differently, for the interest of this study, it will be divided into three types: situational context, linguistic context, and cultural context. Linguistic context refers to the linguistic elements surrounding a certain structure or lexical item, i.e., the relationship between the words, phrases, sentences and even paragraphs. Song (2010, p. 876) adds that linguistic context can be explored from three aspects: deictic, co-text, and collocation. Deictic expressions such as now, then, here there, etc., help to establish deictic roles in normal language behaviour. He also highlights the fact that in any discourse, any sentence, aside for the first one, is usually understood by means of the preceding sentence(s), not just the phrases that specifically refer to the preceding text. Situational context, on the other hand, refers to the extralinguistic information in which the text is created, i.e., the environment, time, place in which the discourse occurs, as well as the relationship between participants relevant to it. This context is traditionally approached through the concept of register, which in turn examines it from three basic elements: field, tenor, and mode. Field of discourse refers to the ongoing activity; it can also be said that the field is the linguistic reflection of the purposive role of the language user in the situation in which a text has occurred. Tenor refers to the kind of social relationship enacted in or by the discourse. Thus, the notion of tenor highlights the way in which linguistic choices are affected not just by the topic or subject of communication, but also by the kind of social relationship within which communication is taking place. On the other hand, mode is the linguistic reflection of the relationship the language user has as a medium of transmission, whether it entails immediate contact or allows for deferred contact between participants (Song, 2010, p. 876). Lastly, cultural context simply refers to the culture, customs and background in which the speakers participate.

The standard of situationality is concerned with the location of a text in a discrete sociocultural context in a real time and place (Neubert and Shreve, 1992: 85). Hatim and Mason (1997:20) believe that in pursuing the intended goals, translators (as a special category of text receivers and producers) seek to relay to a target reader what has already been communicated by a text producer and presented with varying degrees of explicitness in the text. Therefore, it is essential for the evaluation of the situationality of a text to know where it happened and what its function was in the situation. The functional element in this standard stems from the consideration that the situationality of the translation may not be similar to that of the source text, and therefore the general strategy of the translator should aim to adjust the text to its new situation (Neubert and Shreve, 1992: 85). Adjustments may involve a variety of translation procedures, including explicitation, compression, recasting, and textual re-arrangements. The modifications are motivated by the need to preserve the intentionality and functionality of the text in its new situation (ibid: 87).

To sum up, the importance of the context of situation lies in the fact that context plays a crucial role in affecting some of the text producer's linguistic choices. Conversely, for a text receiver, the meaning of a word is determined by the surrounding context. As context in Beaugrande and Dressler's model is restricted to the situational context, and in order to comprehensively assess the quality of the Arab Spring presidential speeches' translations, a more comprehensive treatment of this standard is needed, where all other contexts potentially affecting the source texts' interpretation are encompassed. Consequently, the other important contexts are also acknowledged in the exploration of this standard, including situational context, linguistic context, and cultural context. Examining all contexts is deemed necessary in this study as it helps to eliminate any kind of ambiguity, be it lexical or structural. Whereas lexical ambiguity is mostly caused by homonymy and polysemy, structural ambiguity arises from the grammatical analysis of a sentence or phrase. Examining all context also helps in identifying the conversational implicature. This term is usually used to account for what a speaker can imply, suggest, or mean, as distinct from what the speaker is literally saying, and is implied in the conversational meaning of words together with the contexts (Song, 2010). Finally, contexts can help in identifying referents which are usually used to replace some nouns so as to avoid repetition (Song, 2010).

5.7 Intertextuality:

This standard is concerned with the relationship between a particular text and other texts of a similar nature. Discussing intertextuality involves two issues: text types and text allusion. Text allusion is concerned with reference of any kind, in one text to other texts. Although text allusion signifies using or referring to well-known texts, it does not mean that reference can only be made to well-known texts; on the contrary, it can be made to any text. However, reference is usually made to well-known texts because they are more accessible to the receivers. Textual allusion has also been discussed by Arab linguists and rhetoricians. Al-Askari (2005: 36), for instance, states that a poet's quoting of half of or a whole line from another poet's poetry is termed (التضمين) 'inclusion'. Every text allusion is made for a purpose as speakers, especially in the case of political discourse, rely on their eloquence skills to attract the receivers' attention. Regarding text type, Beaugrande and Dressler (1981: 182-205) establish a typology of texts on the basis of some traditional types, which are defined along functional lines. They identify the following types: descriptive texts, narrative texts, argumentative texts, literary texts, poetic texts, scientific texts, and didactic texts. In Beaugrande (1980), an eighth text type is included- conversational texts.

As for the corpus of this study, according to the typology proposed by Reiss (2000), presidential speeches genre falls within the persuasive text type, regarding its main function as appellative, given its aim to attract receivers to government policies and speeches. In terms of the mode of discourse, presidential speeches belong to the audio-medial text type (the content-focused type). The standard of intertextuality, which is concerned with the relationship between a particular text and other texts of a similar nature, is examined from two angles, these being text allusion and text type. As far as this study is concerned, text allusion is examined when a certain presidential speech features any reference to any another speech; and whether this reference is made by using similar wordings or similar ideas. Examination of reference aims at understanding the meanings that it can add to the textual meaning.

The standard of intertextuality is concerned with the way in which the production and reception of a given text depends upon the participants' knowledge of other texts (Beaugrande and Dressler 1992: 182). Therefore, it is likely that the impression that a translation 'sounds wrong' comes from violations of a reader's textual expectations. The functional element in this standard stems from the consideration that target readers have in mind a set of tacit expectations about what the text should be like. This set of expectations is a product of intertextuality (Neubert and Shreve, 1992:117). Intertextuality is a function of a configuration of grammatical and lexical properties. It is a global pattern which the reader compares to pre-existing cognitive templates abstracted from experience. If the translator wants to create a translation that appears natural, then he or she should create a text whose linguistic surface evokes a similar recognition. For this reason, and according to the adopted model, shifts that do not aim at reflecting the intertextuality of the target culture's natural texts (ibid: 117) are considered errors.

At the end of this chapter, it is important to reiterate that the amendments suggested for some of the seven standards are only proposed as means to complement the original model, and in turn create a comprehensive translation quality assessment model for the assessment of Arabic-English translations. The standards that revealed no restrictions, when they were applied to the corpus of this study as they were explicated by the original authors, were used without any amendments. After discussing the adapted model of error analysis, the next two chapters will present its applicability as a translation quality assessment model for some the Arab Spring presidential speeches.

Chapter 4

Application of the Adapted Model of Error Analysis

In this chapter, the translations of the selected presidential speeches are textually analysed and assessed according to the adapted model of error analysis, which is derived from the theory of textuality (1981). The model differentiates between seven potential areas of errors according to the seven standards of textuality: (1) cohesion, (2) coherence, (3) informativity, (4) intentionality, (5) acceptability, (6) situationality, (6), and (7) intertextuality. The chapter begins with providing a brief overview of the situational context during which these speeches were delivered in order to identify why certain translation choices were classified as errors against this specific context. The errors detected in each speech are then analysed and discussed against each of the above-mentioned seven standards.

1. The Context of Situation of the Selected Arab Spring Presidential Speeches

In 2011, thousands of anti-government protesters clashed in different Arab countries demanding that their leaders, at the time, step down from presidency. As explained in Chapter 1, the main drivers of this unrest have been poverty, rising prices, social exclusion, anger over corruption, personal enrichment among the political elite, and a demographic bulge of young people unable to find work (Asser, 2011). During this revolution, leaders of the afflicted countries delivered several speeches in an attempt to influence the people to stop the demonstrations and restore order. The significance of those speeches is that they were exceptional, as they reflected the criticality of the situation so as to keep up with the unprecedented circumstances at the time. The translations of those presidential speeches, especially into English, were also important as they attracted the attention of the international community, which was keen to stay abreast of the events in the Arab world. As such, and due to their political weight at the time, their quality is being assessed, in this study, as translation errors can cause unintended consequences and negatively affect the world's understanding of this important junction in the modern Arab history. As far as the corpus of this study is concerned, four presidential speeches abide by the main selection criterion adopted in this study, this being they are translated fully in reliable English news agencies. The specific context of situation of the selected speeches, four of the Egyptian and Libyan presidential speeches, is reviewed in the following sections.

A. The Egyptian Presidential Speeches[1]

Hosni Mubarak was the Egyptian president from 1981 to 2011. His rule lasted for approximately three decades, and ended when he stepped down and handed power over to the Supreme Council of the Armed Forces (SCAF) in Egypt. During the unprecedented 2011 Egyptian political crisis historically marked out as the 25-January Egyptian revolution, the Egyptian president at the time, delivered three speeches. The significance of those speeches can be ascribed to the fact that it acted as a cornerstone for the politically historic moment of Mubarak's step down as president of Egypt. The speeches represent Mubarak's last attempts to dissuade the revolutionary Egyptian masses from their populist anger at the then-ruling National Democratic Party (NDP), which was headed by Mubarak himself. Interestingly, the political impact that his speeches had on the Egyptian demonstrators, was so negative that on the day following the last speech, the ex-chief of the Egyptian General Intelligence Service Omar Suleiman, announced Mubarak's resignation from power. As such, the present chapter provides a textual analysis and assessment of two of Mubarak's three speeches that abide by the selection criteria adopted in this study- the Guardian and CNN published translations respectively.

B. The Libyan Presidential Speeches

Inspired by the Egyptian revolution, the Libyan revolution took place soon after the Egyptian ex-president Hosni Mubarak stepped down, at the start of 2011. While the demonstrations against the regime in Egypt brought forward a quick transfer of power, in Libya, an uprising against the four-decade rule of Muammar Al-Qaddafi led to a civil war and an international military intervention. The Libyan revolution began in February 2011 with a series of peaceful protests, but later these protests turned into a full-scale civil war between those loyal to Gaddafi's government and the anti-Gaddafi forces. This civil war eventually led to the NATO military intervention, authorised by the United Nations

[1] The full published original speeches and their translations are attached in Appendix (1).

Security Council Resolution, and ended in October of the same year. During this revolution, Gaddafi delivered several speeches, however, most of them were not fully translated in credible English newspapers and agencies. In fact, only two abided by the selection criteria adopted in this study, one is published in the BBC news agency and the other is in the CNN.

The following sections provide a textual analysis and assessment of the errors detected in the four above-mentioned translations according to the suggested model of error analysis, derived from Beaugrande and Dressler's theory of textuality as specified in the previous chapter.

2. Analysis of the First Speech's Errors

Example No. (1)[2]:

Original sentence	إن هذا الحوار الوطني قد تلاقى حول تشكيل لجنة دستورية تتولى دراسة التعديلات المطلوبة في الدستور وما تقتضيه من تعديلات تشريعية
CNN Translation	(53) This nation has already agreed that a committee will be held to study the different constitutional elements and all the requirements that would make those constitutional elements

The context in the original sentence refers to a specific committee that the 'national dialogue', has agreed to hold. This committee is the 'constitutional committee' which is written as (لجنة دستورية) in the Arabic sentence. The use of the indefinite article 'a' before the noun 'committee' in the English translation signifies that this noun is unknown. Generally speaking, nouns can be unknown by being either non-specific or new information. This particular noun is specific in the original sentence, as reference was made to one particular committee, i.e., 'the constitutional committee'. Nonetheless, this specification is not maintained in the translation due to the omission of the word (دستورية), which means 'constitutional', and the use of the indefinite article 'a' instead.

[2] Throughout the analysis of examples, when the phrase 'in Arabic it means' is used, it refers to the researcher's own interpretation not a word-for-word translation.

Type of Error	Description
Cohesion: Lexical cohesion: Specification	Omitting the adjective 'constitutional' in the translation violates the explicit specification mentioned in the original text, and makes the sentence less informative than it is in the source text. This, in turn, affects the transfer of the intended meaning.

Example No. (2):

Original sentence	وأعلنت تمسكا مماثلا وبذات القدر بالمضي في النهوض بمسئوليتي في حماية الدستور ومصالح الشعب حتى يتم تسليم السلطة والمسئولية لمن يختاره الناخبون شهر سبتمبر المقبل
CNN Translation	(29) and at the same time adhere to the decision of shouldering the responsibility in defending the constitution and the national interest of the people until the transfer of power and the transfer of responsibility, which is going to be to the one that the people will choose as their leader.

In this example, the original sentence provides very important information as to when the next elections were expected to take place, i.e., in September. The incompleteness of the translation provided, where there is no mention of when the elections are going to happen, resulted in shielding important contextual information. This generally impacts the completeness of the discourse, which in turn affects the level of the translation's informativity compared to that of the original text.

Type of Error	Description
Coherence: Completeness	By shielding important information that is mentioned in the original text, the completeness of the translation is negatively affected, as is the coherence and informativity.

Example No. (3):

Original sentence	وستظل مصر هى الباقية أقول من جديد .. أنني عشت من أجل هذا الوطن .. حافظا لمسئوليته وأمانته .. هى الهدف والغاية .. والمسئولية ستبقى حتى أسلم أمانتها ورايتها .. فوق الأشخاص وفوق الجميع .. وأرض المحيا والممات وستظل بلدا عزيزا .. لايفارقنى أو والواجب .. بداية العمر ومشواره ومنتهاه .. وستظل شعبا كريما .. يبقى أبد الدهر مرفوع الرأس والراية .. حتى يواريني ترابه وثراه . أفارقه .. والسلام عليكم ورعى شعبه وسدد على الطريق خطاه . حفظ الله مصر بلدا آمنا .. موفور العزة والكرامة . ورحمة الله وبركاته .

Translation	(123) Once again, I say that I have lived for the sake of this country. I have shouldered the responsibility with honesty, and Egypt is going to live above all until I deliver and transfer the responsibility. Egypt will continue to be in my heart until I die and Egypt's people will always be living with pride, with dignity, to the end. God bless Egypt. God bless Egypt, a country of security and stability. God bless the Egyptians, with wise decisions for the sake of their nation.

As far as Arabic is concerned, paraphrasing is one of the techniques that is used to create a lexical cohesion in a text. It refers to the "repetition of substance. It involves a restatement of a certain point or argument a number of times" (Al-Jubouri, 1983, p.110). This type of repetition reflects certain writers' or speakers' tendency to convey assertion. In this example, at the end of his last speech Mubarak asserts certain points by repeating ideas. This sense of assertion is partially lost in the translation, as all the underlined phrases in the original sentences were left without repetition or paraphrasing in the translation. The underlined sentences, (هى الهدف والغاية .. والمسئولية والواجب .. بداية العمر ومشواره ومنتهاه .. وأرض المحيا والممات) 'Egypt is the goal and the ultimate wish. It is our responsibility and duty. It is the beginning of our lives and its end. It is the land that will witness our lives and deaths', (حفظ الله مصر بلدا آمنا) 'may Allah protect Egypt and keep it safe and secure' and (والسلام عليكم ورحمة الله وبركاته) 'may peace and mercy of Allah be upon you' are all deleted in the translation. The deleted sentences were essentially paraphrased items of certain repeated ideas that were mentioned throughout the text as a means of assertion. Therefore, deleting the intentionally repeated parts in the translation negates the assertion and the rhetorical effect that was intended through the use of such a cohesive device.

Type of Error	**Description**
Cohesion: Paraphrasing	Deleting parts of the text distorts the transfer of the intended effects and meaning of the use of paraphrasing as an emphasising cohesive device.

Example No. (4):

Original sentence	يضع أقدامنا على بداية الطريق الصحيح ولقد أسفر هذا الحوار عن توافق مبدئي في الآراء ..

	للخروج من الأزمة ..
CNN Translation	(48) And this national dialogue can result in a near sense of consensus that is going to put our feet on a way out of this crisis

In the original sentence, the main verb (أسفر) meaning ‘led to, resulted in’, is used in its past tense to explain that the national dialogue resulted in a tentative consensus. In the translation, however, the verb that was chosen to convey the past tense was preceded by ‘can’. The word ‘can’ is one of the most commonly used modal verbs in English. It can be employed to express ability or opportunity, to request or offer permission, and to show possibility or impossibility. However, it is never used to indicate past actions. Using ‘can’ in the translation here indicates possibility, which affects the informativity of the sentence in which Mubarak is referring to a dialogue that had already taken place, revealing some of the resultant agreed upon results in the rest of his speech. By using ‘can’ in the translation, the information that the speaker seeks to convey is completely changed with the expression of possibility, as if Mubarak is talking about something that may take place and possibly result in consensus.

Type of Error	**Description**
Informativity: Syntax	A wrong tense choice affects the time frame of the context and consequently, the meaning as a whole.

Example No. (5):

Original sentence	من خلال حوار مسئول بين كافة قوى ويطرح في ذات الوقت إطارا متفقا عليه للانتقال السلمى للسلطة وبأقصى قدر من الصدق والشفافية . المجتمع
CNN Translation	(38) And at the same time put a framework for a peaceful transition of power through respectful dialogue between the different political parties of Egypt and with a sense of honesty and transparency.

In this example, Mubarak uses the phrase (متفقا عليه), which means 'agreed upon', to assert that the proposed framework of action to guarantee a peaceful transition of power will actually be borne from the consensus of all the participant members in the national dialogue. This phrase is ideologically motivated, as he is asserting that the proposed framework of action will not be constructed by himself only, but will be agreed upon by all participant members. Therefore, omitting this phrase in the translation removes the sense of agreement that Mubarak was trying to convey as a way to extract sympathy from the Egyptian people.

Type of Error	**Description**
Coherence: Completeness	Deleting some ST units adversely affects the complete transfer of the intended meaning.

Example No. (6):

Original sentence	تأتى من <u>ومالم ولن</u> أقبله أبدا - أن أستمع لإملاءات أجنبية لكن الحرج كل الحرج والعيب كل العيب - الخارج
CNN Translation	(22) But the embarrassment would only lie in the fact - and <u>I would never permit</u> - is that I would listen to any sort of intervention that would come from outside, from the outside world

In the original sentence of this example, Mubarak refuses to accept the accusation of listening to foreign dictations looking to interfere in Egyptian internal affairs, asserting that not only is this something he has never done in the past, it is not something which he would allow to happen in the future. The particles (لم) and (لن) are used in Arabic to express sentential negation. The particle (لم) expresses a negation in the past whereas (لن) expresses a negation in the future (Alsharif and Sadler, 2009. p.2). In the translation however, both particles were treated to express a future negation only. This resulted in a partial transfer of the intended meaning only, as the negation with regards to not listening to foreign instructions in the future was conveyed in 'I would never permit'. Not rendering the past negation causes a loss of the affirmation that Mubarak conveyed in the original text to assert that he had never listened to foreign intervention in the first instance.

Type of Error	Description
Informativity: Syntax	Not recognising the functions of the Arabic negation particle in this example results in losing part of the intended meaning.

Example No. (7):

Original sentence	وأوجع قلبي ما حدث وأقول لعائلات هؤلاء الضحايا الأبرياء إنني تألمت كل الألم من أجلهم مثلما تألمتم .. لهم كما أوجع قلوبكم
CNN Translation	(10) And families of those victims, that I really felt the pain, I felt that I was in your boots, and my heart really felt for what really happened.

There are two errors within the translation of this example. First, the main verb of the original sentence (أقول), which means 'I say or I tell', is not rendered in the translation. Thus, due to the omission of the main verb, the translated sentence is grammatically incorrect and unintelligible. The second error lies in the omission of the adjective assigned to the word 'victims' in the original sentence. To extract some support from his audience, Mubarak confirms his compassion with the lost victims by describing them as (الأبرياء) meaning 'innocent'. Such use of adjectives is purposely employed in political discourse, and is regarded as one of the main tools for propaganda and persuasion (Nevezhkina, 2008). However, deleting the adjective 'innocent' in the translation of this example decreases the level of emotion and sympathy Mubarak is seeking to reflect through the use of such adjectives.

Type of Error	Description
Informativity: Syntax	The deletion of the main verb in the translation results in incorrect grammatical structure and the translation not rendering the intended meaning.
Coherence: Completeness	Deleting the adjective results in losing part of the intended meaning.

Example No. (8):

Original sentence	ستقف على أقدامها من إنني أعلم علم اليقين أن مصر سوف تتجاوز أزمتها .. لن تنكسر إرادة شعبها .. وسترد كيد الكائدين وشماتة الشامتين جديد .. بصدق وإخلاص أبنائها .. كل أبنائها ..
CNN Translation	(108) I know quite well that Egypt, while fighting should try to go out of this juncture, but at the same time the determination of the people is going to help Egypt across this juncture through the perseverance, the honesty of its people, and is going to be above all.

The error in this example lies in the translation of the main verb in the original sentence. This verb, (تتجاوز) meaning 'overcome', is accompanied in the original sentence by (سوف) 'will'. This Arabic particle is used with verbs to indicate the future tense. The context of the situation in this example sees Mubarak firmly asserting his confidence that Egypt will overcome the critical situation it had found itself in at the time. The future reference is expressed in the sentence by the use of (لن) 'will not', which is a future negation particle, and the use of (س) 'will', also another future indicator particle in Arabic that is used with verbs. Mubarak purposely used this structure as a strategy to assure people that if they allow him to finish his term and stop the demonstration, Egypt will overcome this precarious situation. However, this affirmation is not properly conveyed in the translation, since the whole future declarative sentence structure is changed into an imperative structure with the use of 'should'.

Type of Error	**Description**
Informativity: Syntax	Changing the declarative structure in this example into an imperative one affects the certainty that Mubarak sought to convey. This resulted in changing the intended meaning.

Example No. (9):

Original sentence	ذلك هو القسم الذي أقسمته أمام الله والوطن
CNN Translation	(33) This is the offer that I undertook before Allah almighty and the people

In the original sentence, the word (القسم) ‘oath’ refers to the constitutional oath that Mubarak vowed as a president of Egypt, to respect the constitution and the law, to fully safeguard the interests of the people, and to protect the independence of the nation and its territorial integrity. Translating the word (القسم) as ‘offer’ disregards this contextual background as well as the meaning of the ST word, as the commitment expected from an oath made to ‘Allah’ is not at all compatible with the commitment required from an offer. Moreover, the meanings and connotations of the word ‘offer’ differ from that of the word ‘oath’. Thus, translating the word (القسم) as ‘offer’ violates the denotative and connotative meaning of the original word, seeing as it was purposefully chosen by Mubarak to communicate that his intention to finish the remainder of his term is only part of the commitment he owes to this country and that it is not a personal desire.

Type of Error	**Description**
Informativity: Lexis	The incorrect choice of lexis in this example, namely translating the word (القسم) ‘oath’ as ‘offer’, results in changing the intended meaning.

Example No. (10):

Original sentence	وفق المادة (189) من الدستور, فقد تقدمت اليوم بطلب وبمقتضى الصلاحيات المخولة لرئيس الجمهورية هي المواد 76 و77 و88 و93 و189 فضلا عن <u>إلغاء</u> المادة 179 من الدستور <u>تعديل</u> ست مواد دستورية
CNN Translation	(67) and in accordance to my legislative and constitutional powers, according to Article 189 of the Egyptian Constitution, I have already presented the demand of six articles of the Egyptian Constitution 76, 77, 88, 93, and 198 this in addition to <u>abolishing</u> Article 179

The two key words in the original sentence that represent Mubarak’s actions are (تعديل) and (الغاء) which respectively signify ‘amend’ and ‘abolish’. The first action, (تعديل) ‘amend’, refers to the changes that were deemed necessary, according to the demands of the people, to the specified articles of the Egyptian Constitution. Also following the people’s demands, the second action concerns the ‘abolishing’ of Article 179, which refers to the application of the emergency law in the country. Though these two pieces of information are important, the first piece was not correctly rendered in the translation. In the example, the omission of the main verb in the translation, i.e., (تعديل) ‘amend’ is omitted, leaving the sentence unintelligible, as the change that was made to the specified articles is left unclear.

Type of Error	Description
Informativity: Lexis	The omission of the verb ‘amend’ hinders the intelligibility of the whole sentence, and affects the successful transfer of the intended meaning.

Example No. (11):

Original sentence	ولقد حرصت على أن يأتي تشكيل كلتا اللجنتين من الشخصيات المصرية المشهود لها بالاستقلال والتجرد ومن فقهاء القانون الدستوري ورجال القضاء
CNN Translation	(56) I was very keen that those two committees of people who are known among Egyptians as honest brokers, the constitutional leaders of Egypt and members of the judiciary.

There are two errors in the translation of this sentence. The first error is in the omission of the sentence’s main verb, (يأتي تشكيل), which means ‘formed of’. Due to the unjustified deletion of the main verb, the translated sentence is grammatically incorrect and unintelligible. The second error is in the choice of words for some lexical items in the original sentence. The phrase (من الشخصيات المصرية المشهود لها بالاستقلال والتجرد), which literally means ‘of Egyptian personalities who are known of their independence and impartialities’, was translated as ‘of people who are known among Egyptians as honest brokers’. However, the intended meaning is different, and choosing the word ‘brokers’ violates the intended meaning of the original sentence.

Type of Error	Description
Informativity: Syntax	Deleting the main verb in the translated sentence renders it unintelligible and grammatically incorrect. Any mistranslation that affects the intelligibility affects the intended meaning as well.

Informativity: Lexis	The difference between the denotative meaning of the original phrase and the word ‘brokers’ hinders the transfer of intended meaning.

Example No. (12):

Original sentence	(1) الإخوة المواطنون ..الأبناء شباب مصر وشاباتها ..أتوجه بحديثي اليوم لشباب مصر بميدان التحرير وعلى اتساع أرضها (2) الأبناء شباب مصر .. الأخوة المواطنون .. لقد أعلنت بعبارات لا تحتمل الجدل أو التأويل .. عدم ترشحي للانتخابات الرئاسية المقبلة (3) الأخوة المواطنون .. إن الأولوية الآن هي استعادة الثقة بين المصريين بعضهم البعض .. والثقة في اقتصادنا وسمعتنا الدولية
CNN Translation	(1) Dear citizens, today I am directing my speech to the youth of Egypt, those who are in there in Tahrir Square and the vast areas of the country (2) Dear citizens, I had already announced before that I am not going to run in the upcoming presidential elections (3) Dear citizens, the priority right now is regaining the sense of confidence in Egyptians and a sense of trust in our economy, our reputation

In this text, Mubarak names the addressees three times. His speech begins by addressing three groups of people: (الاخوة المواطنون), meaning 'Dear citizens’, (الأبناء شباب مصر) which means ‘the youth of Egypt’, and (شباب مصر بميدان التحرير) signifying ‘the youth of Egypt at the ‘Liberation Square’. This is a purposeful strategy employed to differentiate between three groups: the citizens in general, the younger generation of Egyptians, and lastly, those who are demonstrating at ‘Liberation Square’. Although these groups can be included under one, they were purposefully separated into categories as a strategy to distinguish between those who are demonstrating and those who are not. Throughout his speech, Mubarak develops this division between the demonstrators and the other citizens. This act of division is ideologically loaded so as to link a certain context to a certain group. Whenever the context and the pretext serve the purpose of highlighting the division between those demonstrating and those not doing so, the division of addressees is made clear. When the context implied that those who look to continue the protests and listen to foreign dictation do not care about the interests of Egypt, Mubarak addressed his audience with (الأبناء شباب مصر) 'the youth of Egypt'. However, when the context of the speech was to play on the notions of patriotism and solidarity, Mubarak addressed the citizens in general with 'dear citizens'. Mubarak aimed to make a division between the citizens and the demonstrators from the very beginning of the speech not only to implicitly discard the demonstrators, but to assign negative qualities to them with the hope that the other citizens would stop supporting them and become skeptical about their intentions. This assumption is further supported by his claim that the demonstrations are going to damage the economy, and that the demonstrators will be the first affected by this damage. Therefore, by naming every addressee, Mubarak's strategy to distinguish between the demonstrators and other citizens was implicitly established throughout the text. In the translation however, the variations of addressees were all subsumed under one group, 'citizens', which disregards all the distinctions that were purposefully employed throughout the speech.

Type of Error	**Description**
Informativity: Lexis	Not appreciating the existing variations in naming the addressees in this speech results in not recognising the intended division established throughout the text, and therefore losing part of the intended meaning.

Example No. (13):

Original sentence	الآن إن المصريين جميعا في خندق واحد
CNN Translation	(90) All of the Egyptian people now are all in one boat, in one corner

This example illustrates a metaphoric expression in the word (خندق), which means 'trench'. This metaphor is politically loaded, as it is war-related and sends many cognitive and emotional messages that alludes to the existence of enemies. War-related metaphors are generally used in political speeches to deepen the positive presentation of supporters and the negative presentation of opponents (Charteris-Black, 2011, p.32). Throughout the speech, Mubarak is implicitly presenting himself in a positive light, while conveying a bad representation of the demonstrators. In numerous sections of the text, he implies that the demonstrators not only listen to foreign dictations, but that they do not care about the interests of their country. This metaphoric expression is only one of the ways in which Mubarak promotes the establishment of this division. By using the term (خندق) 'trench', the notion of enemy is implicitly created in the audience's minds. It can be assumed from a thorough reading of the text that the actions of listening and responding to foreign interference were indirectly linked to the act of demonstrations as a way of implying that demonstrators are the country's enemies. Framing the opponent as an enemy by using metaphors from the domain of war is a strategy used by politicians such as Thatcher, to negatively represent their opponent (Charteris-Black, 2011, p.33). In this case, such metaphors are purposefully employed to evoke the notion of in-group and out-group division that was built up throughout the speech. By implying that the demonstrators are enemies, Mubarak denies their good intention and credibility. This metaphoric expression was rendered in the translation as 'boat', which does not transfer all the connotative meanings associated with the original metaphor. In fact, by using the word 'boat', Mubarak's intention to suppress the revolution by presenting demonstrators as enemies is fully distorted.

Type of Error	**Description**
Informativity: Rhetorical Devices	Not considering all the intended connotative effects from using this particular metaphor results in conveying only part of the meaning, which is 'sharing the same destiny', and losing all the other intended meanings and effects.

Example No. (14):

Original Sentence	(١) لقد طرحت <u>رؤية</u> محددة للخروج من الأزمة الراهنة .. (٢) طرحت <u>هذه الرؤية</u> .. ملتزما بمسئوليتي في الخروج بالوطن من هذه الأوقات العصيبة
CNN Translation	(35) (1) and I would already put out <u>a perspective</u> for coming out of this crisis (41) (2) I have put all <u>those perspectives</u> on the table and out of a sense of commitment of carrying the nation out of this critical juncture

Arabic demonstratives express gender distinctions, whereas in English, ‘this’ and ‘that’ are used to refer to both genders. Moreover, although Arabic differentiates between singular, dual, and plural demonstrative pronouns, English differentiates between singular and plural demonstratives only. The translator in this example created a lexical cohesion by repeating a word previously mentioned in the text. However, the error in reference results from another aspect. By using the demonstrative ‘those’, reference was correctly made to a previously mentioned entity in the text, this being the word ‘perspective’, as an equivalent to the word (رؤية). The error here lies in the use of the demonstrative device itself. The word (رؤية), ‘perspective, vision’, in Arabic refers to a feminine singular entity. Therefore, the corresponding demonstrative in Arabic is a feminine singular proximal demonstrative (هذه), which corresponds to the English ‘this’, as demonstratives in English do not express gender distinctions. However, by using ‘those’ instead of ‘this’, an ambiguity is created, as ‘those’ refers to a plural entity, whereas the previously mentioned lexical item is singular.

Furthermore, (هذه الرؤية) ‘this vision’ has two cohesive devices; the demonstrative pronoun (هذه) ‘this’ and the definite article (ال) ‘the’. The English equivalent, on the other hand, would use either the demonstrative pronoun or the definite article as a cohesive device in this example. This is due to the fact that the Arabic language is capable of using multiple cohesive devices, whereas English cannot combine a demonstrative and the definite article “the” for the same word, as explained in Chapter 3 (page 84).

Type of Error	**Description**
Cohesion: Reference (Demonstratives)	The use of the demonstrative ‘those’ to refer to a precisely defined singular entity causes vagueness in reference, which breaks the cohesive relations that should exist between the text’s items. This naturally affects the transfer of the intended meaning.

Example No. (15):

Original sentence	إنما بات الأمر متعلقاً بمصر.. في حاضرها ومستقبل أبنائها..
CNN Translation	(89) Now Egypt is a top priority. It’s present, it’s future, the future of the coming generations.

Reference is an important cohesive device, as it allows the readers to trace participants, events, entities, etc. found within the text. In the translation of this speech, there is a number of errors essentially due to erroneous referencing between the text's items. In this example, the explicit bound pronoun (ها) in (حاضرها ومستقبل أبنائها), which means 'its present and the future of its generation', works as a possessive pronoun. The equivalent of this Arabic pronoun is a third person, neutral possessive pronoun in English, i.e., 'its'. On the other hand 'it's' can either be the contracted form of (it is) or (it has) neither of which is applicable in this sentence. The main function of the Arabic bound pronoun used in this sentence is to indicate possession, but the use of the apostrophe and 's' never indicates possession in English pronouns. Due to the incorrect rendering of the bound pronoun in the words (حاضرها) and (أبنائها), what the pronoun (it) refers to in "it's present and it's future" is inaccessible.

Type of Error	Description
Cohesion: Reference (possessive pronoun)	The wrong rendering of the possessive pronoun in the Arabic words resulted in vague referencing between the sentence's items, which affects the overall meaning.

Example No. (16):

Original sentence	وحريص كل الحرص على تنفيذه .(١) وإنني عازم كل العزم على الوفاء بما تعهدت به بكل الجدية والصدق دون ارتداد أو عودة إلى الوراء . (٢) وأقول لكم إنني كرئيس للجمهورية لا أجد حرجا أو غضاضة أبدا في الاستماع لشباب بلادي والتجاوب معه, تأتى من ومالم - ولن - أقبله أبدا أن أستمع لإملاءات أجنبية لكن الحرج كل الحرج والعيب كل العيب الخارج أيا كان مصدرها وأيا كانت ذرائعها أو مبرراتها . ستقف على أقدامها من (٣) إنني أعلم علم اليقين أن مصر سوف تتجاوز أزمتها .. لن تنكسر إرادة شعبها .. وسترد كيد الكائدين وشماتة الشامتين جديد .. بصدق وإخلاص أبنائها .. كل أبنائها ..

CNN **Translation**	(13) (1) I am <u>fully determined</u> to fulfil my promise with a full sense of perseverance and honesty and <u>out of a sense of keenness</u> of carrying out the demands without taking any steps backwards. (21) (2) And I tell you here, as a head of state, I do not find any embarrassment at all in listening to the youth of my country, and to satisfying their demands. But <u>the embarrassment</u> would only lie in the fact … (108) (3) I know quite well that Egypt, while fighting should try to go out of this juncture, but at the same time the determination of the people is going to help Egypt across this juncture through the perseverance, the honesty of its people, and is going to be above all.

As explained in Example (1) during the analysis of the first speech, Arabic is a derivational language. The present example also features root repetition at the morphological level, which is employed here to create a sense of emphasis and lexical cohesion. The root repetition is created in three sentences by the re-occurrence of the tri-lateral root of the following words: (عزم), (شمت), (عيب), (كيد), and (حرص). The emphasis that the root repetition creates cannot be reproduced in English using the same mechanism, due to the inherent differences between the two linguistic systems. However, this sense of emphasis could be compensated in the translation via different means such as the use of any adverb of emphasis, or typological devices such as italics. However, each root repetition was treated differently in the translation of this example. In sentence (1), the trilateral root of the words (عزمand حرص), which respectively means 'determination and keenness', has been used twice as adjectives (عازم ، حريص) and twice as nouns (العزم ،الحرص). The root repetition of the word (عزم) 'determination' has been compensated for in the translation through the use of an adverb of emphasis - 'fully determined'. In contrast, the other root repetition of the word (حرص) was not compensated for at all in the translation 'a sense of keenness'. In sentence (2), the root repetition of the words (عيب، حرج), which respectively mean 'embarrassment and shame' was not compensated for in any way in the translation 'the embarrassment would only lie'. The last root repetition in sentence (3), in the words (شمت، كيد), was completely omitted in the translation, meaning that all the rhetorical effects resulting from its use are also missed out. Out of six root repetitions in this example, only the first was compensated for by the use of an adverb of emphasis.

Type of Error	Description
Cohesion: Lexical cohesion (repetition)	Not using any adverb of emphasis or any other mechanism of emphasis to compensate for the effect that is created by the root repetition causes a loss of the rhetorical function, thus affecting meaning as a whole.

Example No. (17):

Original sentence	علينا أن نواصل الحوار الوطني الذي بدأناه بروح الفريق وليس الفرقاء
CNN Translation	(91) We have to continue the national dialogue that we have already started with the spirit of a team.

In the original sentence, a lexical cohesion is created through the use of antonyms. Mubarak sought to create lexical cohesion by exploiting the antonymic relationship that exists between the words (الفريق) and (الفرقاء). The word (الفريق) signifies a 'team' in Arabic, while (الفرقاء) means the 'different parties'. In this speech, Mubarak demands that the people of Egypt continue the newly established national dialogue as one united group concerned about the country, rather than as opposing parties. This antonymic relationship is also strengthened by the fact that the chosen words share the same trilateral root (فرق), though they carry opposing meanings. This lexical cohesion was not successfully rendered in the translation. To begin with, only part of the antonymic words was rendered, i.e., "the spirit of a team", the other part that lies in the word (الفرقاء) 'different parties' was not at all rendered in the translation. Accordingly, the antonymic relationship that exists in the pair of the original words is affected, and is not compensated for in the translation by any other means.

Type of Error	Description
Cohesion: Lexical cohesion (antonymy)	Not rendering the lexical cohesion that was created through the use of antonyms in the original text affects the rhetorical effect that was meant to be present which, in turn, affects the meaning as a whole.

Example No. (18):

Original Sentence	<u>لا ارتداد عنه أو رجعة فيه</u> والثقة في أن التغيير والتحمل الذى بدأناه ..
CNN Translation	(3) (82) Change and transfer that we have already started and <u>that is not going to bring us any sort of step backwards</u>. Egypt is passing through a critical juncture

The underlined phrase in the original sentence is mistranslated. The bound pronoun (ه) in the phrase (لا ارتداد عنه أو رجعة فيه) refers back to the word (التغيير), signifying ‘change’, in the preceding phrase. The meaning of the underlined phrase in the original sentence is that the change must continue, and that Egyptians cannot go back on the change that they have already started. Mubarak also uses the plural bound pronoun (نا) which indicates a plural sense, to assert that he is part of the call for the change as well as the change itself. In the translation however, the meaning is distorted, as the bound pronoun (ه) in the phrase (لا ارتداد عنه أو رجعة فيه) was not rendered correctly to refer to the change. Instead, it was translated as a separate phrase and the pronoun that should connect the two parts of the sentences was rendered incorrectly to its actual referent. The meaning found within the translation is that ‘the change is not going to bring people back’, while the meaning in the original is that ‘people cannot go back on the change they have started and that it has to continue’. Thus, the transferred meaning is not equivalent to that of the original.

Type of Error	**Description**
Cohesion: Reference (Bound pronoun)	The incorrect rendering of the bound object pronoun results in providing irrelevant information and changing the intended meaning as a whole.

Example No. (19):

Original Sentence	وأتابع المضي في طرحت هذه الرؤية .. ملتزما بمسئوليتي في الخروج بالوطن من هذه الأوقات العصيبة .. متطلعا لدعم ومساندة كل حريص على مصر وشعبها ..كى ننجح في تحقيقها أولا بأول .. بل ساعة بساعة .. <u>تسهر على ضمان تنفيذها قواتنا المسلحة</u> تحويلها لواقع ملموس .. وفق توافق وطني عريض ومتسع القاعدة .. لقد بدأنا بالفعل حوارا وطنيا بناء .. يضم شباب مصر الذين قادوا الدعوة إلى التغيير .. <u>الباسلة</u> .

CNN **Translation**	(41) I have put all those perspectives on the table and out of a sense of commitment of carrying the nation out of this critical juncture and I'm following up on the steps held day by day, hour by hour, if I can say, looking forward to the full support of all those who are really keen on Egypt and the Egyptian people so that we would succeed in translating it to action on solid ground, according to a national reconciliation that has strong bases, and that the armed forces with full due respect, can stop and initiate a national dialogue that includes the youth of Egypt and all of the different political parties. And this national dialogue can result in a near sense of consensus that is going to put our feet on a way out of this crisis.

In this example, the underlined part of the original sentence is a mistranslation in the TT. In the original sentence, (تسهر على ضمان تنفيذها قواتنا المسلحة الباسلة) means "courageous armed forces shall ensure the implementation of the proposed vision and translate it into a tangible reality". In the translation however, this meaning is destroyed through an incorrect rendering of the pronouns present in the sentence. Although the bound object pronoun (ها) in the word (تنفيذها), 'implementation of it', refers to the word (رؤية) which means 'vision', it is incorrectly linked to 'the national dialogue', whereas in the original text, the national dialogue was not at all linked to the armed forces. This linkage results in incorrect information being conveyed, as the armed forces were not supposed to stop or initiate the national dialogue, as alleged in the translation.

Type of Error	Description
Cohesion: Reference (Bound pronouns)	The incorrect reference of the bound pronoun results in a complete change of the intended meaning and provides incorrect information.

Example No. (20):

Original Sentence	واقتناعا من جانبي بأن مصر تجتاز وعلى أية حال .. فإنني إذ أعي تماما خطورة المفترق الصعب الحالي .. وأن نضع مصر أولا .. فوق أي تفرض علينا جميعا تغليب المصلحة العليا للوطن .. لحظة فارقة في تاريخها .. اعتبار وكل اعتبار آخر
CNN **Translation**	(106) So Egypt is a top priority now.

The underlined sentences designate the content not rendered in the translation. The error here is not only in the unjustified deletion of more than one original sentence, but also in the breakage of the balance between the cause and effect relationship that exists between the deleted parts and the remaining ones. In the deleted sentences, Mubarak explains that he is fully aware of the critical situation the country finds itself in, and argues that these circumstances demand that everyone prioritise Egypt and its interests above all else. The content conveying Mubarak's reasons as to why Egypt should be the priority reflects the ex-president's sense of responsibility towards the nation; removing it breaks the intended link meant to lead to the consequence (Egypt being a priority). Moreover, starting the sentence with the conjunction 'so' in the translation increases the chances of unintelligibility, seeing as 'so' is essentially an English coordinating conjunction that serves the function of highlighting the consequences of the preceding sentences or phrases. Given that the preceding sentences are deleted in this example, employing 'so' causes unavoidable confusion, as it makes the reasons behind why Egypt should be a top priority unclear.

Type of Error	**Description**
Coherence: Balance	The deletion of the underlined sentences breaks the balance between the cause and effect relationship that exists between the sentence preceding 'so' and the sentence after. Consequently, the intended meaning is also affected.

Example No. (21):

Original Sentence	.. فقد رأيت تفويض نائب رئيس الجمهورية في اختصاصات رئيس الجمهورية ..
CNN Translation	(106) So I thought I would delegate powers to the vice president

There is a syntactic error in the rendering of the main verb in the translation of this example. The main verb in the original sentence is used in its past form (رأيت), meaning 'I have decided'. This verb is not only used in its past tense to indicate reference to a past action, this being 'making the decision to delegate the powers to the vice president' in this case, but it is also associated with (قد), 'have done'. As in the example, when associated with the past tense this particle expresses affirmation. On the other hand, it expresses anticipation if it is associated with a verb in the present tense. Thus, the combination of (قد) 'have done' and the past tense of the verb (رأيت) 'I have decided' conveys that at the time of the speech, the decision to delegate power to the newly appointed vice president was already taken. In the translation, however, this verb was rendered as 'I thought I would'. Thus, due to the use of 'would', the reader may wrongly assume that Mubarak is still considering this decision. This improper rendering of the verb tense affects the degree of certainty between the original context and the translation.

Type of Error	**Description**
Informativity: Syntax	The use of 'would' affects the time reference of the action, resulting in difficulty to understand the intended meaning.

Example No. (22):

Original sentence	(١) ذلك هو القسم الذي أقسمته أمام الله والوطن ... (٢) حفظ الله مصر بلدا آمناً ...
CNN Translation	(33) (1) This is the offer that I undertook before Allah almighty… (127) (2) God bless Egypt.

Although the word 'God' is frequently used as an equivalent to the word (الله)'Allah', the two words vary in many aspects. The word 'God' can be pluralised, and can indicate the female gender through the term goddess. On the contrary, the word (الله) 'Allah' has no gender and can neither refer to male or female gender. Moreover, (الله) 'Allah' is always singular and can never be pluralised. More importantly, each of these words does not refer to the same thing. To Muslims, (الله) 'Allah', refers to the only Almighty God worthy of worship. On the other hand, 'God' to Christians, represents one 'God' in three persons: God the Father, God the Son (Jesus), and God the Holy Spirit, in accordance with the doctrine of Trinity. Indeed, the concept attached to the term 'God' can vary widely across many different religions. Mubarak, who is known for his excessive use of religious expressions, purposely mentions the word (الله) 'Allah' four times in this speech, so as to maintain a religious identity (Abu Hatab, 2013). Thus, translating it into the word 'God' invites different interpretations, thereby increasing the chance for the referential relation to be misunderstood.

The translator seems to be aware of this difference, as he or she translated the first appearance of the word (الله) correctly into 'Allah', as shown in the example above. However, in the second appearance of the same word, the translator renders it as 'God'. The commonality of translating the word 'Allah' as 'God' cannot be the reason for the translator's choice, as they previously opted for 'Allah'. This inconsistency in dealing with the same lexical item which refers to the same thing incites confusion, as readers may consequently incorrectly believe that these two words refer to two different things.

Type of Error	**Description**
Informativity: Lexis	The inconsistency in dealing with the same religious lexical item 'Allah' could result in readers assuming different referential relations than those meant in the original text, and affects the intended meaning.

Example No. (23):

Original Sentence	أما الاقتراح بإلغاء المادة 179 من الدستور فإنه يستهدف تحقيق التوازن المطلوب .. بين حماية الوطن من مخاطر الإرهاب وضمان احترام الحقوق والحريات المدنية للمواطنين
CNN Translation	(76) And the suggestion to abolish Article 179 was maybe a way to achieve a sense of balance between protecting the nation from the dangers of terrorism and at the same time respecting legitimacy and civil freedom of the citizens

The error in this example lies in the translation of the original sentence's main verb, this being (يستهدف), 'intend to'. The abolishing of the Emergency Law in the country seeks to achieve the required balance between protecting the country from the dangers of terrorism and guaranteeing the respect of citizens' legitimate and civil rights. The verb (يستهدف) 'intend to' was translated as 'was maybe a way to' which holds much less certainty. Moreover, the use of 'maybe' in this sentence expresses possibility, which is not intended in the original sentence, where the reasons for abolishing the Emergency Law in the country are clearly outlined.

Type of Error	Description
Informativity: Lexis	The choice of verb in this example is weaker than the original verb, thus affecting the transfer of intended meaning.

Example No. (24):

Original sentence	(١) أقول لكم أنّ استجابتي لصوتكم ورسالتكم ومطالبكم هو إلتزام لا رجعة فيه (٢) إن هذا الالتزام ينطلق من اقتناع أكيد بصدق ونقاء نواياكم وتحرككم وبأن مطالبكم هي مطالب عادلة ومشروعة .
CNN Translation	(12) (1) I tell you that I'm actually opting to satisfy your demands (15) (2) This sense of abiding comes from a sense of convincing from your honest demands and your honest movement, and that those demands are legitimate demands

Demonstratives resemble pronouns in that they are allusive and require a context to make the allusion understandable (Beeston, 1970, p.42). In this particular case, context here refers to co-text rather than the context of situation. Like their English counterparts, Arabic demonstrative pronouns are typically anaphoric. Thus, the two demonstratives - the proximal demonstrative (هذا) which means 'this' and the definite article (ال) which means 'the' in (هذا الالتزام) 'this commitment' - in sentence (2) is expected to refer to something previously mentioned in the text. This is indeed the case with the original sentences, as the two demonstratives refer to the word (الالتزام) 'commitment' found in sentence (1). This word, in its first appearance, was not modified by the definite article (ال) 'the', as is the norm when something is mentioned for the first time in a text. In its second appearance, however, (ال) was used to modify the noun (الالتزام) as it works as a cohesive device, given that it refers to an element previously mentioned, so as to make logical connections between the text's items. However, when the translator used the demonstrative 'this' in 'this abiding' in sentence (2), no sense of cohesion was created, as the word 'abiding' did not previously appear in the text. Therefore, the cohesive relationship that is created in the original sentence through the combination of the demonstrative (هذا), the definite article (ال) and the use of the same lexical item, was not rendered correctly in the translation, as the demonstrative 'this' is linked to a newly introduced lexical item. Consequently, the demonstrative 'this' resulted in creating confusion in the translation, instead of working as a cohesive device.

Type of Error	**Description**
Cohesion: Reference (Demonstratives)	Not maintaining the same lexical item to refer to something previously discussed in the text, and then linking it to the demonstrative "this" causes some vagueness in reference between the text's items, which affects the overall meaning.

Example No. (25):

Original sentence	عدم ترشحي لقد أعلنت بعبارات لا تحتمل الجدل أو التأويل .. الأبناء شباب مصر .. الأخوة المواطنون .. للانتخابات الرئاسية المقبلة
CNN Translation	(25) Dear citizens, I had already announced before that I am not going to run in the upcoming presidential elections.

In this example, the underlined phrase (بعبارات لا تحتمل الجدل أو التأويل) meaning 'in words that bear no controversy or misinterpretation' was omitted in the translation. To reassure his audience that his decision to abstain from running for presidency in the next elections was not a manipulative attempt to dissuade angry protestors, as he asserted in a previous speech, Mubarak reiterated his intentions in this speech. This time, however, he did so with stronger emphasis, so as to leave no room for any misunderstanding, by saying 'in words that bear no controversy or misinterpretation'. Thus, repeating Mubarak's intention and supporting it with the underlined phrase carries functional weight. Unfortunately, this impact is severely weakened in the translation, which negates parts of the intended effects also.

Type of Error	Description
Coherence: Completeness	Based on the contextual analysis of this phrase, the meaning of its emphasis is missed out, due to its unjustified deletion.

Example No. (26):

Original Sentence	فالأخطاء واردة في أي نظام سياسي وفي أي دولة، لكن المهم هو الاعتراف بها وتصحيحها في أسرع وقت ومحاسبة مرتكبيها.
CNN Translation	(17) Mistakes can happen in any political systems and in any country, but at the same time, the most important is to recognise them and trying to put things on the right track as quick as possible, and to punish those who commit crimes.

This example features an error in referencing. The third person bound pronoun (ها) in the three words (الاعتراف بها, وتصحيحها, مرتكبيها), which respectively mean 'admit them', 'correct them', and 'who make them', refers to the same thing, this being the term (الأخطاء) 'mistakes' which is explicitly mentioned in the sentence. In the translation however, this was not correctly maintained in the last bound pronoun, which appears in (مرتكبيها) 'who make them'. Rather than being linked to the original referent 'mistakes', it was incorrectly linked to the term 'crimes', which is not even mentioned in the original sentence, but was assumed by the translator.

Type of Error	Description
Cohesion: Reference (Bound pronoun)	By referring the bound pronoun to an entity that is not present in the original sentence 'the crimes', the relationship between the original two entities 'the mistakes and those who made the mistakes' was entirely distorted, and results in providing irrelevant information and incorrect translation.

Example No. (27):

Original sentence	أصدرت تعليماتي بسرعة الانتهاء من التحقيقات حول أحداث الأسبوع الماضي وإحالة نتائجها على الفور إلى النائب العام ليتخذ بشأنها ما يلزم من إجراءات قانونية رادعة.
CNN Translation	(60) I have given my directives that the investigations will be carried out very quickly concerning the issues that happened last week and that the results would be set up with the prosecutor general's office to take the necessary measures regarding this issue.

The coherent relations in the original sentence are affected in the translation due to the ineffective rendering of the logico-semantic relations signalling the relatedness of propositions between inside and outside the text, which are mainly manifested between clauses and sentences that help readers make sense of the text. Halliday (1985: 192-251 and 303-308) asserts that logico-semantic relations are maintained in the text through three techniques: elaboration, extension, and enhancement, all of which are subsumed under expansion, as explained in Chapter 3 when discussing the model of error analysis. In this particular example, the situational context of the phrase (حول أحداث الأسبوع الماضي), meaning 'about last week's events', refers to the clashes that occurred a few days before this speech between pro- and anti- Mubarak demonstrators, and resulted in the death and injury of many civilians. This background which Mubarak shares with his direct audience at that time, and which may not be known by TT readers, is not present in the translation. However, it could have been included with any of the three techniques offered by Halliday to make up the loss of the logico-semantic relations between the words 'issues' and 'what happened last week'. Moreover, the reference in this example is not accurately rendered by the word choice 'issues', as it could refer to many things, while the contextual reference was referring to particular 'events'. All of this affects the coherent relationships in this text, as it is not as clear as the original version, and the translation's informativity is less than that of its original.

Type of Error	Description
Coherence: Logico-semantic relations	Not employing any technique to make up the loss of some of the logico-semantic relations that exist between the text and its outside background in the original context affects the coherent relations between the translated text and its readers.
Informativity: Lexis	Translating the word (أحداث) to 'issues' while the intended meaning is 'events' in not accurate.

Example No. (28):

Original Sentence	وإنني تجاوبا مع ما تضمنه تقرير اللجنة من مقترحات وبمقتضى الصلاحيات المخولة لرئيس الجمهورية وفق الماده (189) من الدستور...
CNN Translation	(66) And in accordance to the suggestions that have been presented, and in accordance to my legislative and constitutional powers, according to Article 189 of the Egyptian Constitution …

As explained in Example (22) above, sentences in Arabic may start with (و), 'and', using it as a cohesive device mostly given that it adds to the smoothness of discourse progression. As established earlier in Example (6), the relationship between the two Arabic and English cohesive devices is not always one-to-one. Therefore, many of the instances of (و) are normally replaced either by nothing, or by any connecting device other than 'and'. However, the translator rendered almost every instance of (و) as 'and' in this speech.

Type of Error	Description
Cohesion: Conjunction (cohesive device)	Starting a sentence with 'and' does not comply with English grammatical conventions.

Example No. (29):

Original Sentence	وفضلا عن ذلك فإنني- إزاء ما فقدناه من شهداء من أبناء مصر في أحداث مأساوية حزينة أوجعت قلوبنا وهزت ضمير الوطن - أصدرت تعليماتي بسرعة الانتهاء من التحقيقات حول أحداث الأسبوع الماضي
CNN Translation	(58) In addition to that, and owing to the victims that we have lost in miserable circumstances, that really made us feel the pain and really shake the conscience of the nation, and I have given my directives that the investigations will be carried out very quickly concerning the issues that happened last week.

The underlined section in the original text is a parenthetical sentence that is located between the subject and the predicate of the nominal sentence (فإنني أصدرت تعليماتي), which literally means 'I have issued my instructions'. As explained above in Example (2), in both Arabic and English, when parenthetical content occurs in the middle of a larger sentence, it is enclosed between parentheses or commas in such a way that if removed, the remaining sentence is still correct. Despite this, in the above example the translator joined the parenthetical sentence with the larger one, causing interruption in the flow of the cause and effect relationship present in the original sentence. The original parenthetical clause explains that due to 'the loss of some Egyptian victims', Mubarak is 'issuing his instructions to carry out the investigations of these events as quickly as possible'. In the translation however, the effect action is erroneously linked to the previous clause by an 'and', which breaks the cause and effect relationship between the subject and the predicate of the main sentence.

Type of Error	Description
Informativity: Syntax	The non-abidance perpetuated by the parenthetical structure in English, as well as it being linked to the previous clause by an 'and', affects the form of the bigger sentence.

Final Calculation of Errors in this Speech:

Speech	Number of Examples	Total Number of Errors[3]
First Speech	**29**	**32**

[3] Some of the examples contain more than one error. Therefore, this table is created to reflect the actual number of errors.

3. Analysis of the Second Speech's Errors

Example No. (30):

Original sentence	لكنني الآن حريص كل الحرص
The Guardian Translation	(40) I am now determined to …

Unlike English, Arabic is a derivational language that is based on a root system for forming its words, meaning that many words can be derived from the same root. In the example above, there is root repetition at the morphological level. In Arabic, morphological repetition of roots is generally created by the multiple use of the same root within a single clause (Johnstone, 1991). Root repetition is created in this sentence by the re-occurrence of the tri-lateral root (حرص), which generally means (abidance by); (compliance); (with observance); (attention); (care); (concern). It has been used twice, as an adjective and as a noun respectively: (حريص) and (الحرص). The emphasis that is created in the original sentence through the use of the root repetition cannot be rendered due to the inherent differences between Arabic and English. However, it could have been compensated in the translation of this sentence via different means (e.g. the use of an adverb of emphasis [such as certainly, obviously, undoubtedly] or through the use of typological devices such as italics) which are used to give added force or a greater degree of certainty to a particular word in a sentence or to a sentence as a whole.

Type of Error	**Description**
Cohesion: Lexical cohesion (repetition)	Not using any adverb of emphasis or any other mechanism of emphasis to compensate for the emphasis that is created by the root repetition, causes loss of the rhetorical function which contributes to the meaning as a whole.

Example No. (31):

Original sentence	إن هذا الوطن العزيز هو وطني مثلما هو وطن كل مصري ومصرية
The Guardian Translation	This dear nation is my country, it is the country of all Egyptians

The subordinating conjunction, (مثلما) 'as', that is used in the original sentence is a comparison conjunction used in Arabic to reflect a state of similarity between two entities. It is used in this example to communicate a meaning of similarity and comparison between Mubarak and all other Egyptians. Mubarak uses this device to emphasise that Egypt is his country just as it is the country of all Egyptians. In English, this meaning can be reproduced via the use of certain subordinating conjunctions used to reflect a sense of comparison as well as a sense of similarity, such as 'as' and 'like'. Instead, the translator uses a comma in the translation of this subordination conjunction to make it appear as if Mubarak is stating the obvious, i.e., that Egypt is the country of all Egyptians. However, the meaning of this device is not to state the obvious but to remind the Egyptians that he is also a citizen of this country, just as they are. By not using any device that conveys a sense of similarity, obvious and irrelevant information was provided.

Type of Error	**Description**
Cohesion: Conjunction (subordinating conjunction)	The mismatch between the cohesive devices between Arabic and English in this example results in the producing irrelevant information that does not reflect the original meaning.

Example No. (32):

Original sentence	الوطن ... وطني ... وطن... مصر .. المصريين .. مصريا ... مصري ... مصرية ...
The Guardian Translation	nation ... country... Egypt ... Egyptian... citizens ...Egyptians ...

In this approximately 700 words speech, Mubarak mentions the word (الوطن)'homeland' twelve times, and the word (مصر) 'Egypt' eighteen times. This repetition at the word level is characterised by the use of what Al-Jubouri calls "word strings". In Arabic, word repetition is not merely an ornamental device, it has a crucial rhetorical function. It "can have didactic, playful, emotional, artistic, ritualistic, textual, and rhetorical functions” (Al-Khafaji, 2005, p.6). This particular political speech illustrates how word strings can be employed to reinforce and achieve certain political strategies, such as the play on the notion of patriotism to seek sympathy from the people. Nonetheless, this purposeful word repetition is not matched in the translation. Given that English tends to avoid lexical repetition through the use of synonyms, the translator uses the words ‘nation’ and ‘country’ alternately as equivalents to the repeated word (الوطن), and words like ‘Egyptians’ and ‘citizens’ to refer to the word (مصريين). This, however, does not compensate for the loss of the lexical repetition’s rhetorical effect. Although Arabic has many synonyms for the repeated words, the repetition of the above mentioned words was done deliberately by the speaker, which could have been recognised and maintained by the translator.

Type of Error	**Description**
Cohesion: Lexical cohesion (repetition)	The loss of the rhetorical function meant to exist through the repetition of some lexical items leads to the loss of part of the intended effect, consequently affecting the intended meaning.

Example No. (33):

Original sentence	ان الوطن باقٍ والاشخاص زائلون …
The Guardian Translation	The nation remains. Visitors come and go.

There are two errors in the translation of this ST sentence. Firstly, the ST features a lexical cohesion created through the use of antonyms. Here, Mubarak is attempting to create lexical cohesion by using the antonymic relation that exists between the two words (باق) and (زائلون), which mean ‘immortal’ and ‘mortal’ respectively. However, this antonymic relationship was not successfully rendered in English. Instead, the translator used the terms ‘remains’ and ‘come and go’, which do not reflect the antonymic nature of the original words. The antonymic relation that exists in the pair of the original words is not expressed by a similar lexical cohesion, nor compensated in any other way, such as by using the coordinating conjunction ‘but’ to express that the second part of the sentence contradicts what has been stated in the previous one.

Secondly, the word (الأشخاص), ‘a group of people’, was misinterpreted in this example. In an attempt to play on the notion of patriotism by repeatedly referring to Egypt and its interests, Mubarak sought to emphasise that Egypt will remain eternal, and that the people of Egypt will naturally go (as in naturally die), after which new people will come, this being the reason why the interest of Egypt should be given priority over the interests of the people themselves. However, by choosing the word ‘visitors’, which does not correspond to the denotative or the connotative meaning of the original word meaning ‘people’, the translator breaks the comparative image that Mubarak wanted to create between the status of Egypt and its people. The word ‘visitors’ also does not semantically refer to the citizens of Egypt, but to anyone who visits it. The wrong lexical choice resulted in the use of wrong collocations which do not render the meanings of (باق) and (زائلون).

Type of Error	**Description**
Informativity: Lexis	Translating the word (الأشخاص) which means ‘people’ as ‘visitors’ results in a wrong interpretation of the intended meaning.
Cohesion: Lexical cohesion (antonymy)	Not rendering the lexical cohesion that was created through the use of antonyms in the original text causes loss of part of the meaning.

Example No. (34):

Original sentence	حفظ الله هذا الوطن وشعبه والسلام عليكم ورحمة الله وبركاته..
The Guardian Translation	No translation

Some lexical items were unreasonably left out in the translation of this speech. This generally impacts the continuity and balance of the discourse, which in turn affects the coherence relationships that exist throughout the text. This type of error can be seen in the last two sentences of Mubarak's speech, which were omitted from the translation, despite being ideologically and informatively loaded. The first sentence (حفظ الله هذا الوطن وشعبه) is a prayer with which Mubarak intentionally chose to end his speech, in which he prays that 'Allah protects Egypt and its people and keeps it safe and secure'. This prayer is politically and ideologically motivated, as he is seeking to maintain a religious identity and appeal to his audience, so as to gain their emotional support and sympathy. The second sentence (والسلام عليكم ورحمة الله وبركاته), which means 'may peace and mercy of Allah be upon you', is typically used by Mubarak and more generally by Arab and Muslim speakers not only to begin and end their speeches, but also to maintain some sort of religious identity. With the absence of a translation brief, one would expect the translation to remain close to the ST, or at least the inclusion of a closing statement that is as equally common in English. Instead, the ending of this speech's translation is abrupt.

Type of Error	**Description**
Coherence: Completeness	By omitting two sentences that are ideologically and rhetorically loaded, parts of the overall meaning are affected as well.

Example No. (35):

Original sentence	<u>وأقول بعباراتٍ واضحة</u> إنني سأعمل خلال الأشهر المتبقية من ولايتي الحالية
The Guardian Translation	No translation
Suggested TT	<u>I say in clear words</u> that I will work during the remaining period of my current term ….

The situational context of this sentence is that Mubarak was attempting to emphasise his intention to complete the remaining period of his term, and to assert to those who were expecting that he resigns from office, that he was not going to follow their demands. Therefore Mubarak, implicitly referring to this situational context, says (وأقول بعبارات واضحة) which means 'I say in clear words'. Omitting this sentence in the translation makes the succeeding sentence weaker than it is in the source text. This deletion negatively affects both the coherence relationships in this text and its informativity, as the translation makes the text less informative than its original.

Type of Error	**Description**
Coherence/ Informativity	The omission of this sentence results in the loss of an emphasis which, in turn, affects the overall coherence and meaning.

Example No. (36):

Original sentence	فإنني أطالب البرلمان بالالتزام بكلمة القضاء وأحكامه في الطعون على الانتخابات التشريعية الأخيرة دون إبطاء ...
The Guardian Translation	(50) I demand parliament to adhere to the word of the judiciary and its verdicts (51) concerning the latest cases which have been legally challenged.

In the original sentence, Mubarak demands that the parliament adheres to the judiciary's decisions about the appeals against 'the latest legislative elections'. In the translation, however, there is a wrong lexical cohesion in which the specific case that Mubarak is referring to above, was unreasonably generalised to the 'latest cases', which is vague given that it could refer to many incidents, while the intended case is specified in the original sentence. This translation resulted in providing inaccurate information, as opposed to that mentioned clearly in the original sentence.

Type of Error	Description
Cohesion: lexical cohesion	Generalising the specific information mentioned in the original sentence affects the degree of its informativity, and its reference to the overall context and meaning.

Example No. (37):

Original sentence	كي يتم اتخاذ التدابير والاجراءات المحققة للانتقال السلمي للسلطة بموجب ما يخوله لي الدستور من صلاحيات. إنني أدعو البرلمان بمجلسيه إلى مناقشة تعديل المادتين ٧٦ و ٧٧
The Guardian Translation	(44) According to my constitutional powers, I call on parliament and its houses to discuss amending article 76 and 77 …

The underlined clause in the original example (بموجب ما يخوله لي الدستور من صلاحيات), meaning 'according to my constitutional powers', was wrongly linked to the succeeding sentence. In the Arabic version, Mubarak asserts that he will benefit from his constitutional rights to ensure a peaceful transition of power. In the translation, however, these constitutional rights were wrongly linked to his call to the parliament. This error in the linkage between two separate sentences resulted in a wrong transfer of the intended meaning.

Type of Error	Description
Coherence: the logico-semantic relations	This erroneous linkage between the sentence clauses causes a change in the logical-semantic relations that were meant to exist between the sentence parts, thus affecting the transfer of the intended meaning.

Example No. (38):

Original sentence	إنني أدعو البرلمان بمجلسيه إلى مناقشة تعديل المادتين ٧٦ و ٧٧
The Guardian Translation	(44) I call on parliament and its houses to discuss amending article 76 and 77

A distinctive feature of the Arabic language is that it has three numbers categories: singular, dual, and plural. “Dual in Arabic is used whenever the category of 'two' applies, whether it be in nouns, adjectives, pronouns or verbs" (Ryding, 2005, pp.53-54). Arabic uses dual when a reference is made to two individual entities of category (Beeston, A., 1987, p. 109). In this example, the word (مجلسيه) which means ‘its two houses’, refers to two individual entities. If a dual number is mentioned in the original text, this can be conveyed by the addition of the number ‘two’ in English, due to its inability to express the dual number. However, this number specification is not at all rendered in the translation, making it appears as if there are more than two ‘houses’ of the Egyptian parliament, as the word ‘houses’ in English refers to two or more houses. The TT features a close rendering of the ST wording, which results in a confusing English version.

Type of Error	**Description**
Informativity: Syntax	An ambiguous number specification in the translation resulted in providing inaccurate information which affects the intended meaning.

Example No. (39):

Original sentence	وتطرح أمامنا ظروفاً جديدة وواقعاً مصرياً <u>مغايراً</u>
The Guardian Translation	(17) a <u>new</u> Egyptian reality

The word (مغـايرا) which in Arabic denotatively means ‘different, variant’, has been translated as ‘new’ in this sentence. The situational context in which this word appears reflects a state of instability and concern, as Mubarak, in the pretext, is warning the Egyptians that surviving the coming days, according to him, requires a lot of wisdom. The word ‘new’, on the other hand, does not communicate any of these meanings. Moreover, this term usually reflects a state of positive change, which is not the case in the relevant context. Thus, translating the word (مغايرا) as ‘new’ violates the denotative and connotative ranges of the semantic meaning intended by the original word.

Type of Error	Description
Informativity: Lexis	The wrong choice of lexis in this example results in the loss and change of the intended meaning.

Example No. (40):

Original Sentence	وما قدمته للوطن حربا وسلاما. كما أنني رجل من أبناء قواتنا المسلحة
The Guardian Translation	(32) what I offered this country in war and peace just as I am a man from the armed forces

The Arabic conjunction (كما), 'in addition to that, also', is used in here as an additive coordinating device between the two sentences. In the second sentence, Mubarak is adding that he is part of the military forces to the list of his good deeds. However, this additive function has been incorrectly rendered in the translation with the use of 'just as'. The translation does not reflect the additive function but rather conveys a sense of analogy, which does not accurately convey the meaning of addition brought forward by the Arabic coordinating device.

Type of Error	Description
Cohesion: Conjunction (subordinating device)	Mistranslating the Arabic cohesive device causes loss of part of the intended meaning.

Example No. (41):

Original sentence	ومصر عزيزة آمنة مستقرة …
The Guardian Translation	No translation

This sentence is used within the context of Mubarak asserting his intention to finish the remainder of his term. It is functionally loaded, as the ex-president is seeking the Egyptians' approval and sympathy by describing the state in which he would hand over the country if he were allowed to finish his term. Mubarak describes Egypt as (ومصر عزيزة آمنة مستقرة), which means 'whilst Egypt is honourable, safe and stable'. This aims to encourage the Egyptians to permit him to finish his term. However, the entire sentence was omitted in the translation of this speech, leaving some of the intended effects unrendered also.

Type of Error	**Description**
Coherence: Completeness/ Informativity	Based on the contextual analysis of this sentence, the effect that was meant to be created through this sentence is missed out due to its unjustified deletion.

Example No. (42):

Original sentence	أيها <u>الإخوة</u> المواطنون
The Guardian Translation	(19) Dear <u>brothers</u> and citizens

For over three decades, Mubarak's discourse has been characterised by preciseness, brevity and avoidance of extreme metaphors (Abu Hatab, 2013, p.7). He usually begins his speeches with 'ladies and gentlemen'. However, a remarkable change is observed in the inaugurating phrase of the speeches delivered during the Egyptian revolution. All three started with (أيها الإخوة المواطنون), just as shown in this example. It seems here that Mubarak sought to appeal to the majority of citizens by addressing them as 'brother citizens'. Although in this particular speech, the phrase is used twice, its translation differs in both instances. (الإخوة) here does not signify the denotative meaning of the word, which is 'brothers and sisters'. Rather, it is used to affect the audience's emotions and build an intimate relation with them as a means of involving them with the speech. The word (المواطنون), which means 'citizens', is used as a modifier for the word (الإخوة). By using the conjunction 'and' between these two lexical items, the translator violates the modified-modifier relationship that exists between the two terms in the original sentence. Words such as ‘dear’ or ‘fellow’ are generally used in English to modify the word ‘citizens’, as these two words reflect the sense of involvement and intimacy intended in the original phrase. They also maintain the modified-modifier relationship that is meant to exist between the two lexical items. Furthermore, using ‘dear citizens’ or ‘dear fellow citizens’ is more common in similar English speeches. In the second instance the phrase is used, the translator employs the more commonly used English equivalent ‘dear citizens’.

Type of Error	**Description**
Informativity: Lexis	The error in the translation of the first inauguration phrase violates the modifier-modified relationship that exists between the two words.

Example No. (43):

Original sentence	إن مسؤوليتي الأولى الآن هي استعادة أمن واستقرار الوطن
The Guardian Translation	(34) My primary responsibility now is security and independence of the nation

There are two errors in the translation of this sentence. Firstly, the key word in this sentence, which expresses what Mubarak claimed was his utmost responsibility at the time of the speech, is (استعادة), meaning to ‘regain’, and was unjustifiably left out in the translation. This deletion rendered the translated sentence unintelligible, as the word (الآن), which means ‘now’, anticipates the introduction of a new responsibility. Security in itself is always the concern of any president, but given that the situation spiraled out of control during the Egyptian revolution, the primary responsibility was to ‘regain’ the country’s security and stability.

Secondly, the word (استقرار), which means ‘stability’, is mistranslated in this example. Stability is always required after a state of disturbance or turbulence, but it is translated here as ‘independence’ which conveys a totally different meaning, i.e., freedom from control (in the broad sense). Additionally, employing the word 'independence' would erroneously imply that the country was occupied, which was not the case at the time of Mubarak's speech.

Type of Error	**Description**
Informativity: Lexis	The omission of the word 'regain' in the translation causes a change in the meaning of the original text.
Informativity: Lexis	Translating the word 'stability' as 'independence' resulted in a wrong transference of the intended meaning of the original text.

Example No. (44):

Original sentence	… يحقق <u>مَصالِحه</u>
The Guardian Translation	(66) achieve <u>reconciliation</u> …

The word (مَصالِحه) in this example signifies the 'interests of the people', whereas the chosen equivalent, 'reconciliation', means 'the action of making one view or belief compatible with another and the restoration of friendly relations'. The latter reflects a completely different meaning than that of the original lexical item. The translator's wrong choice of words resulted in providing irrelevant information in the translation of this example.

Type of Error	**Description**
Informativity: Lexis	The wrong choice of words resulted in a wrong translation of the intended word meaning.

Example No. (45):

Original sentence	لأبناء الشعب بفلاحيه وعماله، مسلميه وأقباطه، شيوخه وشبابه، ولكل مصريٍ ومصرية
The Guardian Translation	(28) to the people, its Muslims and Christians, old and young, peasants and workers, and all Egyptian men and women

Two errors can be found in the translation of this sentence. Firstly, the word (فلاحيه), which means 'farmers', is translated as "peasants", which carries different connotations than that of the original. Although both words generally refer to people engaged in agriculture, they convey different connotations. The word 'peasant' has a historical connotation that is linked to the feudal past, and in certain countries, reflects a social position. In contrast, the word 'farmers' does not convey a social position, only a profession. The word (فلاحيه) in the original sentence is a neutral word that only conveys profession. Consequently, choosing an equivalent that has different connotations affects the transference of the intended meaning.

The second error lies in changing the order of the list of people which Mubarak mentions in the original version. Any change in the order of the text's elements entails thematising these elements, giving them more emphasis, and bringing them into focus. In the original text, Mubarak starts with 'farmers and workers', however in the translation, the translator amended the order and, consequently, the original theme, starting the sentence with the religious element and therefore - reflecting a rather sensitive division with 'its Muslims and Christians'. This shift in thematisation affects the informativity of the text, as it conveys inaccurate information regarding Mubarak's priorities when listing certain groups of Egyptian people.

Type of Error	**Description**
Informativity: Lexis	Translating the word (فلاحيه) as 'peasants' which carries different connotations than that of the original word affects the transfer of the intended meaning.

Informativity: Thematisation	This shift in thematisation brings different emphasis on certain elements in the text which denotes meanings that are not provided in the original sentence, causing some change in the intended meaning.

Example No. (46):

Original sentence	لم أكن أنتوي الترشح لفترة رئاسية جديدة فِقد قضيت ما يكفي من العمر في خدمة مصر وشعبها
The Guardian Translation	(38) I did not intend to nominate myself for a new presidential term. I have spent enough years of my life in the service of Egypt and its people.

The coordinating conjunction (ف) is used three times in this speech, and fulfils different functions. In this example, the coordinating conjunction (ف) functions as an explicative additive device where, in the second clause, Mubarak provides an explanation for his intention not to re-nominate himself for presidency. Despite its importance, this cohesive device linking the two clauses in the example was unreasonably left out in the translation. The function conveyed by the use of (ف) in the original sentence can be created through the use of a semicolon or any linking device that expresses the sense of explanation, such as (because, as, since, etc.). In the English language, a semicolon is normally used to link two clauses of a sentence, so as to help the readers imply the relationship between the two without it being explicitly stated. It also aids the readers in explicating the cohesive relationships in the text, as it encourages them to make implicit connections. It may also have a more persuasive effect than that of simply stating the causal relationship between the two clauses.

Instead of connecting the two clauses that are already linked in the original sentence, the translator separates them into two sentences with a full stop, which is less helpful in recognising the explicative additive relationship that exists between the two clauses. It is usually the norm in translation to explicitate the implicit logical links between clauses and sentences, so as to make the translation more accessible to the readers. Levy (1965, p.79), for instance, asserts that a translator tends to explicate the implicit logical relation between ideas to “explain away any breaks in thought or changes in perspective, to normalise the expression”, and suggests that this is due to the translator's effort to make the translated text more intelligible to the readers. Sidiropoulou (1995) also asserts that news translators tend to explicitate the implicit cause-effect relationships in the translation of newspaper texts, which suggests that they are likely to render implicit forms more explicitly, regardless of the languages involved. This also supports Baker’s universal rule that translation has the tendency to “spell things out rather than leave them implicit” (Baker, 1996, p.180). Therefore, implicitating the explicit relationships in this example can reverse the logical connections between the parts of the sentence. It can also be argued that without connectives the relationship between the parts of the sentence becomes vague, which affects the transfer of meaning.

Type of Error	**Description**
Cohesion: Conjunction (subordinating conjunction)	Rendering the SL explicative cohesive conjunction with a full stop instead of a semicolon or any other cohesive device of explanation is a mismatch to the function of the original device, which affects the meaning comprehensibility.

Example No. (47):

Original sentence	صب الزيت على النار
The Guardian Translation	(9) to escalate and worsen the situation

There is a metaphorical expression in the sentence (صب الزيت على النار). The literal meaning of this metaphor is to ‘pour oil over the fire’ but according to the context of the situation, it is used here to mean that the outsiders are attempting to worsen the situation in Egypt. This metaphor is used in Arabic when someone’s actions worsen the situation, whether accidentally or on purpose. This use of metaphor is marked in Mubarak’s speech, as his discourse is characterised by the avoidance of extreme metaphors, as stated in Example

(17) in the previous chapter. Therefore, this marked shift has to be recognised in the translation, if possible. Instead, the translator converted the metaphor into its sense. This, according to Baker (1998), should only come before the very last step, which is to delete the metaphor entirely. Baker also asserts that if the original metaphor's image also exists in the target culture, it then has to be reproduced in the target language. Indeed, this metaphor's image does exist in English in expressions such as 'to add fuel to the fire' and 'to fan the flames'.

Type of Error	**Description**
Informativity: Rhetorical Devices	Reducing the metaphoric expression to its sense, in this example, does not comply with the standard steps to deal with metaphors in texts. This affects the text's degree of informativity, as it makes the meaning more explicit than it is meant to be.

Example No. (48):

Original sentence	وبالنظر لهذا الرفض لدعوتي للحوار -وهي دعوة لا تزال قائمة - فإنني أتوجه بحديثي اليوم
The Guardian Translation	(27) in light of this refusal to the call for dialogue <u>and this is a call which remains standing</u> I direct my speech today directly

The underlined sentence is in fact a parenthetical sentence .The sentence (وهي دعوة لا_تزال قائمة) meaning 'and this call remains valid', interrupts the cause and effect relationship that exits between the entire sentence's two clauses. Therefore in Arabic, the sentence that breaks up the flow of the larger sentence is enclosed between dashes. In English, on the other hand, when parenthetical content occurs in the middle of a larger sentence, it is usually enclosed between parentheses. Despite this, the translator instead joined the parenthetical and larger sentence together, causing an interruption in the flow of the cause and effect relationship.

Type of Error	Description
Informativity: Syntax	The non-abidance to the parenthetical structure in English in this example causes some interruption to the cause and effect relationship.

Example No. (49):

Original Sentence	ستخرج مصر من الظروف الراهنة <u>أقوى مما</u> كانت عليه قبلها وأكثر ثقة وتماسكا واستقرارا
The Guardian Translation	(64) Egypt will emerge from these current circumstances <u>stronger</u>, more confident and unified and stable.

The phrase (أقوى مما كانت عليه), meaning ‘stronger than before’, is a comparative form that is used in the original sentence to reflect a state of comparison between Egypt at the time of the speech, and Egypt in the future, once it has overcome the current situation. In the translation, this comparative form is restricted to the addition of -er to the word ‘strong’, despite the fact that in English, ‘than’ is usually employed when the second entity in the comparison is mentioned. This is the case in the original, as Mubarak is attempting to emphasise that Egypt will overcome these circumstances and come out stronger than its status before the crisis.

Type of Error	Description
Cohesion: Reference (Comparatives)	The deletion of the comparative form ‘than’ does not comply with English grammatical conventions.

Example No. (50):

Original Sentence	استهدفت أمن الوطن <u>و</u>استقراره بأعمال اثارة <u>و</u>تحريض <u>و</u>سلب <u>و</u>نهب <u>و</u>اشعال للحرائق <u>و</u>قطع للطرقات <u>و</u>اعتداء على مرافق الدولة <u>و</u>الممتلكات العامة <u>و</u>الخاصة <u>و</u>اقتحام لبعض البعثات الدبلوماسية على أرض مصر
The Guardian Translation	(11) They targeted the nation’s security <u>and</u> stability through acts of provocation <u>and</u> theft <u>and</u> looting <u>and</u> setting fires <u>and</u> blocking roads <u>and</u> attacking vital installations <u>and</u> public <u>and</u> private properties <u>and</u> storming some diplomatic missions.

The conjunction (و), ‘and’, is a connective device in written Arabic and is so frequently employed that it can be seen as a stylistic feature of Arabic texts (Fareh, 1998, p.312). This concords with Arabic grammarians’ belief that Arabic is a syndetic language, in which almost every sentence is linked to the proceeding one with a connective (Anees, 1966, p.312). Therefore, the original text features unavoidable repetitions of the conjunction (و) 'and', which is an acceptable norm in Arabic. However, the relationship between the functions of (و) and 'and' is not always direct or one-to-one. This conjunction may be replaced by more than one English connective, and must sometimes be left out in the translation to avoid it sounding clumsy. In accordance with English writing conventions, commas are the normal substitute for the repetitive use of 'and' (Avants and Benahnia, 2003, p.51). In the translation of this speech however, the translator rendered almost every (و) into 'and', which could have been avoided by the use of a comma.

Type of Error	**Description**
Cohesion: Conjunction (coordination)	The repetition of 'and' violates English grammatical conventions.

Example No. (51):

Original Sentence	وأن شعبها سيخرج منها وهو أكثر وعيا...
The Guardian Translation	(65) And our people will emerge with more awareness …

Another feature of conjunction devices is that in written and spoken Arabic discourses, sentences may start with (و) 'and' as a cohesive device to link any two sentences together, mostly because it adds to the smoothness of discourse progression. Holes (1995, p.217) asserts that (و) is the "indigenous device for sentence concatenation, to be used alongside the full stop, which here is performing the same function of marking the end of one sentence and the beginning of another". Unlike (و), the "English and is rarely used to introduce sentences and paragraphs in written English discourse" (Fareh, 1998, p.309). Therefore, many of the instances of (و) should ideally be either replaced by nothing, or by any connecting device other than 'and'.

Type of Error	Description
Cohesion: Conjunction (cohesive device)	Starting sentences with ‘and’ does not comply with English grammatical conventions.

Example No. (52):

No.	Original sentence	The Translation	Number of synonymy
1	التظاهر السلمي	peaceful demonstration <u>and protest</u>	one-for-two
2	كافة القوى السياسية	all the political forces <u>and factions</u>	one-for-two
3	حرية الرأي والتعبير	freedom of expression	two-for-one
4	سلطة أو جاه	power	two-for-one
5	استعادة الهدوء والأمن والاستقرار	to restore law and order	three-for-two
6	نزاهة وشرف وأمانة	integrity and honour	three-for-two
7	عزة ورفعة وكرامة	pride and dignity	three-for-two
8	انزعاج وقلق وهواجس	concern and anxiety	three-for-two

Synonymy is a type of lexical cohesion in both Arabic and English. There are many examples of its use in the first speech, which is intended to create a sense of lexical cohesion. Abed-Raof (2001, p.50) states that "words which signify the same meanings are synonyms. Synonymy does not mean identical meaning between two words but the two words can be used in different contexts giving a similar meaning". Based on the degree of similarity, Lyons (1981) classifies synonymy into two types: absolute synonymy and near synonymy. Near synonymy refers to words that are more or less similar, but not identical in meaning. Given that a basic function of words is to be semantically unique, it is quite natural to argue that identical synonymy is only symbolic (i.e., exists only in scientific terms), because these terms are precisely delimited and emotionally neutral. The majority of linguists in both languages assert that although synonymy is present in English and Arabic, it is interpreted in different ways (Leabi, 1980: 71). However, it is also believed that Arabic is richer than English in its use (Ali, 2007, p. 10).

The table in this example presents a simple comparative examination of the use of synonymy between Arabic and English in the speech. Examples (2, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8) demonstrate the Arabic language's tendency to use near synonyms to express a similar notion, as the lexical items more or less convey a similar concept. In these examples, the translator reduced the number of synonyms used in the original text to one or two words, which is the typical norm in English. In the examples (1 and 3), on the other hand, the translator added the underlined words as synonyms for the original word. This is an unjustifiable change, as the additions do not enhance the semantic meaning already conveyed by the previous words.

Type of Error	**Description**
Cohesion: Lexical Cohesion (synonymy)	The addition of certain synonyms does not add to the meaning of the TT, and therefore it is unnecessary.

Example No. (53):

Original Sentence	مناقشة هذه التعديلات الدستورية وما يرتبط بها من تعديلات تشريعية …
The Guardian Translation	(47) to discuss these constitutional amendments and the legislative amendments linked to it…

The underlined words in the original sentence, (وما يرتبط بها) which means 'the concerned', works as a modifier that is used to describe the associated noun, i.e., 'the legislative amendments', and makes its meaning more specific. In the translation, this modifier-modified relationship was not accurately rendered according to English grammar conventions, in which a modifier precedes the modified, as with 'the associated legislative amendments', for example. This suggested structure reads more naturally in English than the literal rendering of the original sentence's word order, as in 'the amendments linked to it'.

Type of Error	Description
Informativity: Syntax	The modifier-modified relationship in this example does not abide by English grammatical conventions.

Example No. (54):

Original sentence	القفز على الشرعية الدستورية والانقضاض عليها
The Guardian Translation	(6) to violate the constitutional legitimacy and to attack it

There are two metaphoric usages in this sentence, which are present in the form of an analogy. The first one lies in the phrasal verb (القفز على), which literally means to ‘jump at’. The phrasal verb is a phrase that consists of a verb and a preposition, an adverb or both, the meaning of which is different from the meaning of its separate parts. The second metaphoric usage is present in the word (الانقضاض), which means to ‘attack’. The two metaphoric expressions together express an analogy in which the ones who are behind these protests are compared to a wild animal liable (القفز) and (الانقضاض), i.e., ‘to jump and to attack’. Though such use of rhetorical devices is marked in Mubarak’s speeches, as mentioned above, the two parts of the analogy were not treated with consistency in the translation of this sentence. The analogy was reduced to its sense in the first word (to jump), while the metaphor was maintained in the translation of the second word (to attack), thus breaking the image that the original analogy meant to create, as well as resulting in a wrong collocation in English, as the word ‘attack’ does not collocate with the preceding words.

Type of Error	Description
Informativity: Rhetorical Devices	The inconsistent dealing with the two parts of the analogy causes loss of rhetorical effects which breaks the overall image that was created.

Final Calculation of Errors in this Speech:

Speech	Number of Examples	Total Number of Errors
Second Speech	25	29

4. Analysis of the Third Speech's Errors

Example No. (55):

Original sentence	نحذو بالقبائل يحموا قبائلهم داخل حدود طرابلس لتطهيرها من الجرذان
BBC Translation	(1) They are co-ordinating with the tribes in order to kick out their tribes from the streets of Tripoli

Gaddafi's speech begins with this sentence. From the example, it can be seen that the translation of this speech starts with the pronoun 'they', with no clear indication to what it refers to. In contrast, the antecedent of the pronoun is clearly mentioned in the Arabic original. As pronouns are generic terms holding little meaning on their own, it is difficult to understand the sentence's meaning as a whole if the antecedent which the pronoun refers to is unclear. As a result of this, the opening sentence of the English translation is ambiguous. This also potentially affects the entire text's acceptability, as the meaning becomes inaccessible, given that the succeeding sentences are coherently connected to the first one.

Type of Error	Description
Informativity: syntax	Starting the translation with an ambiguous pronoun obscures the meaning.

Example No. (56):

Original sentence	وأيضا سكان طرابلس من غير قبائلها فهم من ضمنهم نفس الشي تطهير منـاطقهم تطهير منـاطقهم تطهير منـاطقهم تطهير مناطق طرابلس
BBC Translation	(4) People of Tripoli, who are not from those tribes, your mission is the same - i.e., to purge your areas, to purge the districts of the city of Tripoli.

In the original speech, Gaddafi repeated the sentence (تطهير منـاطقهم) 'clear your areas' numerous times. In Arabic, repetition at the word or the sentence levels, as explained in Example (3) when looking at the first speech, "can have didactic, playful, emotional, artistic, ritualistic, textual, and rhetorical functions" (Al-Khafaji, 2005, p.6). Therefore, this kind of repetition is not merely an ornamental device, it plays a crucial rhetorical function. Sentence and word repetition are also part of the political genre's key characteristics and are used as a persuasive technique to emphasise a certain notion or ideology. The sentence repetition found in the above example is employed to reinforce and achieve the political goal of influencing Gaddafi's audience, and to play on the notion of patriotism in the optic of persuading the people of Tripoli that it is their mission to clear their city from occupiers. Despite this, the intentional repetition is not matched in the speech's translation, instead, the repeated sentence was left unrepeated. The phrase (تطهير منـاطقهم) 'clear your areas' was repeated six times in the original speech, whereas in the translation it was only mentioned three times. Not rendering all the persuasive techniques that are purposefully employed in the original speech results in a decreased level of engagement with receivers of the translation compared to that of the original.

Type of Error	**Description**
Cohesion: Lexical cohesion (repetition)	Not rendering the repeated sentence leads to the loss of the rhetorical function from the repetition of some lexical items. This in turn leads to the loss of part of the intended effect meant to be created through the lexical repetition, consequently affecting the intended meaning.

Example No. (57):

Original sentence	يا شباب تاجوره وشباب سوق الجمعة اللي ممكن الجرذان معششين بسبب وحدين مرضى مثل الجرياني الذي كان موجود في تيك المنطقة
BBC Translation	(4)To the youth of Tajoura, Souq al-Jumaa, it is a possibility that the rats are nesting there with the help of some sick people such as [Sheikh al-Sadiq] al-Ghiryani who was present in that area

In this example, Gaddafi is addressing the youth of two cities, namely, those of the city of Tajoura and the city of Souq Al-Jumaa. In so doing, he used the Arabic connective conjunction (و) 'and' to link the two cities in the sentence (يا شباب تاجوره وشباب سوق الجمعة). In the translation, however, the connection is made with a comma instead of a similar connective device. In this case, the use of the comma makes it appear as though Tajoura is part of Souq Al-Jumaa, whereas they are actually two different areas. The same information is mentioned twice in the same speech, but in its second occurrence in the translated text, the two cities are linked with 'and' in "They wanted to destroy Tajoura and Souq al-Jumaa". Therefore, the incorrect use of the comma in this example results in providing confusing and inaccurate information to the reader of the translation.

Type of Error	**Description**
Cohesion: Conjunctions	Erroneously opting to use a comma instead of the connective conjunction 'and' results in providing incorrect information, thus distorting the intended meaning.

Example No. (58):

Original sentence	يالله تشجعوا وخلوا قوتكم من نفس شجاعتكم وإيمانكم واخرجوا للشوارع. هذا واجبكم
BBC Translation	No translation

The contextual situation for this sentence is that, after explaining what the NATO forces will do once they have taken control of Tripoli, Gaddafi asked his people to attack them and restore everything they have taken. In an attempt to raise the enthusiasm of his audience, Gaddafi strengthened his demands by asserting that what he is asking of them is, in truth, ‘their duty’. The sentence (هذا واجبكم), meaning ‘this is your duty’, was deliberately employed in this speech to raise the receivers’ engagement by playing on the notions of patriotism and loyalty that people usually hold for their homelands. However, this intended effect is lost in the translation due to the omission of this sentence, which leaves the translated version less informative and engaging than the original.

Type of Error	**Description**
Coherence: Completeness	Omitting such a functionally loaded sentence distorts the engaging effect that is meant to be created in the original sentence. It also distorts the completeness of the discourse.

Example No. (59):

Original sentence	وانا تمكنت من الخروج متخفي في مدينة طرابلس بدون ما يلاحظوني الناس
BBC Translation	(35)I came out undercover from my home in Tripoli without people seeing me

In the sentences preceding the one above, Gaddafi seeks to persuade his people that Tripoli’s situation is serious, and that they should act quickly. The choice of the verb (تمكنت) ‘manage to come out’ is a reflection of this gravity. In Arabic, this verb in its denotative sense, expresses a state of being able to do something regardless of the surrounding difficulties, in this case, the city being in a state of war. This sense of difficulty that was purposefully conveyed in the original sentence to influence the audience and convince them of surrounding dangers, was not transferred to the translation. The English verb ‘come’ does not reflect any sense of difficulty compared to ‘manage to come out’. This translation choice hindered the transference of the implied meaning from the verb used in that particular sentence.

Type of Error	Description
Informativity: Lexis	The inaccurate choice of lexis in this example results in losing parts of the intended meaning of the original verb.

Example No. (60):

Original sentence	تراهم حيذبحوكم ويمثلوا بجثثكم ويعملوا فيكم الويل ويعذبوكم لو سألتوا الكفار هل بتعذوبهم والا تعاملوهم بالحسنى لقالوا لا احنا بنعذب سكان طرابلس
BBC Translation	(26)They are slaughtering you, disfiguring your corpses, torturing you.

Seeking to convince his audience to follow his instructions, Gaddafi listed a number of frightening things he claimed that the NATO forces would do to the Libyans if they did not act quickly and purge their city. He said (تراهم حيذبحوكم ويمثلوا بجثثكم ويعملوا فيكم الويل ويعذبوكم), meaning 'they will slaughter you, then they will disfigure your corpses and they will torture you'. Given that Gaddafi sought to frighten his audience into swift action, in this example, the verbs he employed indicate a future reference in Arabic. However, there is a complete distortion in the rendering of the verbs' tenses in the translation; instead of being in the future, the verbs in the translation are conjugated in the present continuous. This use of the present continuous therefore distorts the level of informativity present in the translation, as it incorrectly indicates that these actions are happening at the time of the speech. Gaddafi also described a made-up scenario to influence the people of Tripoli in the optic of once again frightening them into following his instructions. He said (لو سألتوا الكفار هل بتعذوبهم والا تعاملوهم بالحسنى لقالوا لا احنا بنعذب سكان طرابلس), which means 'If you ask the infidels: Are you going to torture them or treat them well? They would say: No, we are going to torture the people of Tripoli'. There are two indicators of future reference in these sentences, the first of these being the use of the subordinating conjunction (لو), which means 'if'. This conjunction works as a future hypothetical conditional device in Arabic. Secondly, the other future indicator in this example is the question "Are you going to torture them or treat them well?". In the original sentence, the verbs used solely refer to the future. However, this entire scenario was omitted in the translation, resulting in a less persuasive discourse than that of the original speech.

Type of Error	Description
Informativity: syntax	Changing the verbs' tenses from the future to the present tense gives incorrect information and distorts the intended meaning.
Coherence: Continuity and Balance	This unjustifiable omission affects the continuity and balance of the target text.

Example No. (61):

Original sentence	هذا القذر ماجاء مثل جده اللي استقبل المسلمين وقال طلع البدر علينا من ثنيات الوداع نفس النشيد اللي قابلوا فيه اهل المدينة المنورة النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم في الهجرة, تصوروا انه كان يصلي بيكم لا تلوموهم هذول متربين على الخيانة اهله اغلبهم من الزنادقة والمستعمرين
BBC Translation	(7) that dirty Ghiryani [words indistinct but the gist is insulting Ghiryani's direct family lineage].

Several sentences were left out in the translation of this speech, along with their ideological and rhetorical effects. The original text's paragraph featured in the above example was summarised in one sentence in the translation, with the use of brackets. Although he or she has attributed this decision to the fact that the words were indistinct, it does not justify the shift from full translation to summary translation. More specifically, the reason for this shift could be attributed to the fact that Gaddafi's speeches were delivered in a colloquial Libyan dialect. However, simply summarising the content of the untranslated sentences does not compensate for a full translation, as the omitted sentences are rich in religious and cultural content that is purposefully employed in the text to affect the audience's emotions by reminding them that Ghiryani (ماجاء مثل جده اللي استقبل المسلمين وقال طلع البدر علينا من ثنيات الوداع نفس النشيد اللي قابلوا فيه اهل المدينة المنورة النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم في الهجرة, تصوروا انه كان يصلي بيكم لا تلوموهم هذول متربين على الخيانة اهله اغلبهم من الزنادقة والمستعمرين) 'does not resemble his great grandfathers who have supported the Prophet Muhammed peace be upon him unlike Ghiryani who has betrayed his people'. The translator has left the underlined sentences unrendered, thus affecting the discourse's continuity and balance, which in turn negatively impacts the coherence relationships that exist throughout the text, as well its informativity.

Type of Error	**Description**
Coherence: Continuity and Balance	This unjustifiable omission has affected the continuity, balance and informativity of the target text.

Example No. (62):

Original sentence	وأهل القبائل <u>طهروا</u> مناطقكم من بني وليد تاربونا فيزان سبها من جفارا ومن الجبل القبائل اللي زحفت من خارج طرابلس من خارج قبائل طرابلس
BBC Translation	(12)The tribes are marching from several regions: from Bani Walid, Tarhouna, Fizzan, Sabha, Jufara, from the mountain, tribes are marching in from outside Tripoli.

Gaddafi's speeches, particularly during the Libyan revolution, were teeming with imperatives. Using the imperative form of a verb is a tactical persuasive technique with which the political genre is characterised. It adds assertion to the statement and influences audiences' minds. Politicians usually use the imperative form to ensure that their speeches are audience-centric as well as to encourage the audience to focus on the speaker's words (Chilton, 2004). In this sentence from the original speech, Gaddafi is directly and repeatedly using the imperative form to incite the people of Tripoli to purge their city. He uses the imperative form of the verb (طهر) which means 'clear', to convince his audience that promoting this purge is their duty and mission. By combining the two techniques of using imperatives and also repeating them, Gaddafi is heavily emphasising the need for his audience to carry out the required action. In the translation, however, these imperative forms were brought down to the more neutral and less engaging infinitive form. In this particular example, the imperative form of the verb (طهر) 'clear' found in the original sentence is completely ignored in the translation, which leaves the translated sentence less engaging than its Arabic counterpart, in which Gaddafi was directly addressing his audience.

Type of Error	**Description**
Informativity: Syntax	Replacing the form of the verb from the imperative to the infinitive distorts the expected level of engagement. It also affects the transference of the intended meaning with all its accompanying effects.

Example No. (63):

Original sentence	والغريب انـي لقيت شباب يجوبـوا المنـاطق وعـادي جدا مـا حسـوش ان مدينـة طرابلس فـي خطـر او ان الجـرذان جوهـا. معتبـرين ان هـذي حاجـة بسيطة وان وحدات مكافحـة الشـغب و وحدات مكافحـة الإرهـاب قايمة بواجبها وقاضية على المجرمين.
BBC Translation	(36) I found young people on the streets. To be honest, I did not feel like Tripoli had fallen or that some had marched into it. I consider this a simple thing, just an issue of riot control. Counter-terrorism units are currently carrying out their duties and rounding up criminals.

The situational context of this section reflects the state of comparison that Gaddafi was attempting to establish between two groups of the city of Tripoli's youth after his undercover walk. In this example as well as the next one, the ways in which this entire comparison was incorrectly rendered in the translation will be discussed. To start off with, Gaddafi revealed his shock upon seeing that some of the Tripoli youth were not grasping the seriousness of the unfolding situation at that time. He was surprised to see them roaming the streets, ignoring the danger. In his speech, he says (والغريب انـي لقيت شباب يجوبـوا المناطق وعادي جدا ما حسوش ان مدينة طرابلس في خطر او ان الجرذان جوها. معتبرين ان هذي حاجة بسيطة وان وحدات مكافحـة الشـغب و وحدات مكافحـة الإرهـاب قايمـة بواجبهـا وقاضـية علـى المجـرمين.) meaning "what is strange is that I found some youth hanging out in the streets as if everything is normal. They did not feel that the city of Tripoli is in danger or that the rats have entered their city". He attributed their attitude to the possibility of them thinking that their city's circumstances are just a matter of riot control, and that the concerned authority units are controlling the situation and eliminating the criminals.

In the translation, however, Gaddafi's critical criticism was stripped of its ironic aspect. The reader of the translation would assume that Gaddafi is simply narrating the events occurring at the time. The tone of the ironic criticism and anger, in the original sentence, is levelled down in the translation to a great extent, due to the incorrect interpretation of the use of ironic aspect. Moreover, this entire comparison was not singled out in the translation, leaving the meaning ambiguous. A reader of the translation would not think that Gaddafi was ironically speaking about the first group of youth, nor that he was comparing between two groups at all.

Type of Error	**Description**
Informativity: Lexis	Misreading the connotative meaning of the ironical structure resulted in providing incorrect information.

Example No. (64):

Original sentence	لكن بعد أطراف المدينة مشيت ناحية المدينة السويدية تلاقيت مع شباب سوي عاملين مجموعات بأسلحة كلانشكوف حاجة روعة
BBC Translation	(161) I have met revolutionary young people carrying AK-47s.

In the previous example (63), Gaddafi mocked the first type of youth he met during his undercover walk. In the current example, however, he speaks proudly of the other type of Tripoli youth. The use of the conjunction (لكن) meaning 'but', is a clear indication of an opposite or a different outcome. Despite this, the conjunction was not conveyed in the translated version, making the comparison less obvious. In describing the other type of youth, Gaddafi used the adjective (سوي) which means "good" in the general sense, so as to encourage the people of Tripoli to follow their steps. He believed them to be equipped with the necessary weapons to face the surrounding dangers, unlike the first group who were acting carelessly. This comparison was not successfully rendered in the translation, resulting in the misreading and incorrect transferring of intended meanings. Furthermore, the choice of the word ‘revolutionary’ as an equivalent for the word (سوي) ‘good’ brings more weight to the meaning than that expressed by the Arabic word.

Type of Error	**Description**
Cohesion: Conjunctions	The omission of the cohesive conjunction result in misreading the comparison and thus making the meaning of the sentences less explicit than that of the original.
Informativity: Lexis	The incorrect choice of equivalent to the word (سوي) ‘good’ results in providing an inaccurate translation, which affects the transfer of the intended meaning.

Example No. (65):

Original sentence	وحنتواصل مرة اخرى في الغد
BBC Translation	(17) And tomorrow we will communicate again,

The error detected in this example is the same as the ones found in Examples 22 and 53 above, that being starting the TT sentence with ‘and’. To avoid unnecessary repetition, discussion is only made here to the type of error in this example.

Type of Error	**Description**
Cohesion: Conjunction (cohesive device)	Starting sentences with ‘and’ does not comply with English grammatical conventions.

Final Calculation of Errors in the Speech:

Speech	**Number of Examples**	**Total Number of Errors**
Third Speech	**10**	**12**

5. Analysis of the Fourth Speech's Errors

Example No. (66):

Original sentence	هذول الجرذان انتهوا.
CNN Translation	<u>(1)They</u> are finished

As explained in Example (55), starting a translation, as the case in this speech, with the pronoun 'they', with no clear indication as to what it refers to, creates an ambiguity in the reference between the text's items. Pronouns should distinctly refer to a particular noun that, ideally, comes antecedently; in the original version, the antecedent to this pronoun is clearly mentioned in the same sentence - 'The rats are finished'. As pronouns are generic words that hold little meaning on their own, it is difficult to understand the meaning of the sentence as a whole if the antecedent it refers to is not clear. The ambiguity resulting from this error affects the acceptability of the text, as the meaning becomes unintelligible given that the succeeding sentences are coherently connected to the first one.

Type of Error	**Description**
Informativity: Syntax	Beginning the text with a pronoun that does not clearly refer to a particular entity affects the informativity, coherence and acceptability of the text as a whole, given that the meaning becomes unintelligible.

Example No. (67):

Original sentence	<u>بإذن</u> الله
CNN Translation	(9)With Allah's <u>help</u>.

Quite often, when Muslims refer to the future they preface their statement with the phrase (بـإذن الله) 'with Allah's permission'. It is an acknowledgment that they often express, as they believe that humans do not possess absolute knowledge of future events and outcomes, and can only hope for favourable conclusions; in the end, everything occurs by Allah's will. In this example, Gaddafi, being Muslim, uses this phrasal expression to acknowledge that what he claimed to be his utmost intention in the preceding sentence, dying as martyr for his lands, can only come to pass if Allah wills it to happen. Therefore, the translation of this expression as "with Allah's help" ignores the religious background that Gaddafi shares with his audience. It also gives the wrong indication that such an intention could be fulfilled with the help of Allah, which is not the intended meaning of the original expression.

Type of Error	**Description**
Informativity: Lexis	Incorrectly translating a religious expression results in providing an inaccurate translation of the intended meaning.

Example No. (68):

Original sentence	أولادنا هم اللي دمروا طائراتهم
CNN Translation	(12) Our children are the one's who have destroyed these planes.

There are three errors in the translation of this sentence. First, the explicit bound pronoun (هم) in (طائراتهم) which means 'their planes', works as a possessive pronoun in Arabic. The equivalent of this pronoun in English is a third person possessive pronoun, i.e., 'their'. However, in the translation, it has been incorrectly rendered to the demonstrative 'these', which makes the meaning vague, as the pretext does not suggest any noun to which this demonstrative could refer. The second error lies in the translation of the word (أولادنا) 'youth' as 'children' which does not communicate the intended meaning. The last error is in the translation of the separate pronoun (هم) which refers to the 'youth' and works as a nominal substitute of the same word. However, this pronoun has been translated as 'one's'.

The use of the possessive (’s), instead of the equivalent English nominal substitute ‘ones’ creates an ambiguity in the translation as it is not clear what this possession refers to.

Type of Error	Description
Cohesion: Reference	Translating the possessive pronoun as a demonstrative that does not clearly refer to an entity results in the meaning of the sentence as a whole being unclear.
Informativity: Lexis	Translating the word ‘youth’ as ‘children’ conveys wrong indication that the Libyan children have participated in the civil war, which is not the intended meaning.
Cohesion: Ellipsis	Using the possessive ’s’ instead of the plural form of the nominal substitute ‘ones’ does not convey the intended meaning.

Example No. (69):

Original sentence	هذا هو اليوم المنشود .هذا هو اليوم المنتظر.
CNN Translation	(16) This is the day on which we should liberate the city. We've been looking forward to that day.

Parallelism is a rhetorical and textual device employed in Arabic discourse (Al-Jubouri, 1983). It creates a textual semantic unity which adds to the cohesive relationships that exist between different parts of the sentence and the text. In this example can be found an incomplete parallelism, in which “there is a partial coincidence between parallelistic forms” (Al-Jubouri, 1983, p.107). The parallelistic parts (هذا هو اليوم), meaning ‘this is the day’ are repeated twice respectively. Al-Jubouri (1983) argues that this structure renders the argument more persuasive. However, the translation has stripped Gaddafi’s statements of their persuasive nature by dissolving the structure into ordinary sentences, which results in some loss of the rhetorical effect intended through the use of such a cohesive device.

Type of Error	Description
Cohesion: Parallelism	Failing to recognise the functions of parallelism as a cohesive device resulted in decreasing the persuasive nature of the statement.

Example No. (70):

Original sentence	<u>الله</u> أكبر. الله أكبر .الله أكبر.
CNN Translation	<u>(26) God</u> is great.

In this speech, the phrase (الله أكبر), which means 'Allah is the Greatest', is repeated three times at the end of this speech. This repetition has a connotative meaning for the Libyan people. It was adopted as the official national anthem of the Libyan Arab Republic by the then Libyan leader Muammar Gaddafi, to express his hopes of uniting the Arab World. This phrase replaced the previous national anthem 'Libya, Libya, Libya', which was used before the Gaddafi government. However, when Libya's government was dissolved in October 2011 following the Libyan Civil War and the death of Gaddafi, 'Libya, Libya, Libya' was once again employed as the new national anthem. Therefore, this particular phrase is functionally loaded, as it represents victory and unity, which were both crucial to Gaddafi at the time. However, this intended word repetition was not matched in the translation of the speech, resulting in the loss of some of the lexical repetition's rhetorical effect.

Type of Error	**Description**
Cohesion: Lexical cohesion (repetition)	The loss of the rhetorical function through the repetition of certain lexical items leads to the loss of part of the intended effect that was meant to be created through the lexical repetition, consequently affecting the intended meaning.

Example No. (71):

Original sentence	<u>و</u>سيتم التصويت عليها اليوم
CNN Translation	<u>(3)And</u> they are voting on it tonight.

In the translated version of this speech, the translation of the Arabic connective device (و) 'and' was treated as a one-to-one relationship throughout the text, which does not comply with English grammar as explained in Examples (22), (53), and (65).

Type of Error	Description
Cohesion: Conjunction (cohesive device)	Starting sentences with 'and' does not comply with the English grammatical conventions.

Final Calculation of Errors in this Speech:

Speech	Number of Examples	Total Number of Errors
Fourth Speech	**6**	**8**

In conclusion, the total number of errors detected in the selected speeches is 81 errors. Some examples contain more than one error, and therefore, the total number of errors is higher than the total number of the presented examples, i.e., 71. After the identification of errors according to the adopted model of error analysis, the reflections of these errors on the overall quality index of each speech are discussed in detail in the next chapter.

Chapter 5
Results

In this chapter, the findings will be presented in two stages. Firstly, the results obtained from the application of the two TQA methods detailed in Chapter 3 will be explored. It is important to reiterate here that this study does not aim to prescribe either of these two methods over the other. Rather, it aims to outline the differences in their application, in relation to the subjectivity inherent to TQA. Secondly, the results obtained from the application of the error analysis model, which will have been adapted with the necessary modifications so as to become a more comprehensive assessment tool for the purpose of this study, as well as for Arabic-English translations in general, will be presented. The theory of textuality itself has been adopted in the field of Translation Studies as a model to both describe the process and the product of translation, and to assess the quality of translation (see Chapter 3); it has also provided practical means to comprehensively assess a translation, due to its operative role. Therefore, only the results obtained from the application of the suggested amendments to the original model are discussed in this chapter.

5.1 Differences in the Application of the Two Main Approaches in TQA

A. Justification of the Quality Index

Table (5.1) summaries the differences between the quality indexes given by Method (A) and Method (B) respectively.

Quality Index	Speech No (1)	Speech No (2)	Speech No (3)	Speech No (4)
Error Analysis Method (A)	3.4/10	6/10	4.6/10	5.2/10
Holistic Assessment Method (B)	2.75/10	6/10	6.75/10	7.75/10

Table (5.1): The Overall Quality Indexes from Method (A) and Method (B)

Based on this table, the results acquired from the examination of the justification of the quality index provided by each assessment method as a criterion of objectivity can be summarised as follows:

Translation scholars emphasise that the mark reached at the end of TQA should be justifiable. However, from the application of both methods, it can be noted that the mark obtained with Method (A) is quantitatively justified, as it is a reflection of the number of the errors present in the translated text compared to the total number of words in that translation, whereas the mark reached in Method (B) can only be qualitatively justified. Therefore, it can be concluded that the judgment statements, provided by the raters in this study, were not supported with any quantitative statistics.

Although qualitative statements are hypothetically believed to increase the subjective nature of translation quality assessment given that, for the most part, they do not stem from a predefined set of parameters, but from raters' judgment and estimation, it is worth mentioning that the inter-rater reliability between this study's two external raters is quite high. This demonstrates that there is much consensus in the ratings, which were given independently by the two raters for the same assessment task. This could be considered as a positive aspect of the holistic model adopted.

The TER adopted in this study to render the number of errors detected from the error analysis in Method (A), does not appear to be affected by the length of the translated text. Although one would assume that the quality index would be significantly affected by the number of errors in short texts than in comparatively lengthy texts, the results obtained from the application of Method (A) proves this to be a false assumption. To elaborate, the quality index of the second speech is (6/10), whereas the quality index of the fourth speech is (5.2/10). The number of errors detected in these speeches compared to their word count vary considerably; the second speech has 29 errors, whereas the fourth speech has only 8. The word count in the second speech is (1014 words) compared to (311 words) for the fourth one. This sizeable difference is not matched in the awarded quality index, as the difference between the two values is small. Additionally, the number of errors compared to the number of words in the translated text does not appear to have much impact on the quality index in Method (B), where the quality is determined depending on two assessment criteria.

The quality index in Method (B) is based on the separate scores that raters assign for the two governing criteria in the adopted holistic model (the accuracy of transfer from the original language and the quality of expression in the target language). In Speech No. (3) and (4), the relatively high marks awarded for the second criterion (the quality of expression in the target language) increased the overall quality index of those translations, notwithstanding the low marks assigned for the first criterion (the accuracy of transfer). In other words, the overall mark obtained in Method (B) may not reflect the low mark given for the first criteria, if the mark assigned for the second is relatively high.

B. Considering Translation Negative and Positive Aspects in TQA

The examination of this aspect in the previous chapter reaches the following conclusions:

- The quality index in Method (A) reflects the defects in the translations only. It gives no credit to creative strategies adopted by the translators to solve certain translation problems. Therefore, it can be argued that the view of TQA in error analysis models is restricted, since it focuses only on the negative aspects of a translation, which supposedly increases the element of subjectivity in the assessment.
- The view of translation quality seems to be more comprehensive in Method (B), given that it considers both the negative and positive aspects of quality. Both of the raters who are part of this study have asserted that they have given credit for good translations of certain phrases when awarding the marks. However, the importance of the positive aspects in Method (B) is only roughly estimated by the raters.

C. Building TQA Models on Established Theories of Translation

As for the implementation of this criterion, in the two assessment methods, it can be concluded that:

- Method (A) is built on a linguistic approach to translation that is extracted from the scientific theory of textuality. Beaugrande and Dressler’s seven standards of textuality were used as evaluative parameters to assess the quality of the selected Arab Spring presidential speeches’ translations. Assessment is, therefore, not based on subjective preferences but rather on whether the translated texts fulfil the expectations of the seven standards, as described by the original authors of the theory as illustrated in Chapter 4.

-Method (B) is also based on prominent notions in the field of translation, as it is mainly derived from a verifiable classification of translation adequacy. The assessment in this model is based on two criteria, namely, quality of accuracy of transfer from the SL and quality of expression in the TL, which together are established as verifiable notions of in TQA.

D. Including a Quantification Dimension in TQA

The examination of the way in which this criterion of objectivity is implemented in the two assessment methods revealed that:

- Error quantification is implemented in Method (A), which is based on error analysis. As explained in Chapter 3, quality index is calculated following the adopted TER which basically reflects the total number of errors against the total number of words count in the translated texts.
- Method (B), on the other hand, does not quantify the type of errors or calculate the number of errors committed in a translation. This method does not clearly differentiate between different types of errors, and nor does it include explicit criteria upon which to base the evaluation.

E. Following a Multi-Perspective Assessment

Examining the two methods of assessment in light of this criterion of objectivity exposed the following:

- As far as following a multi-perspective viewpoint of assessment is concerned, Method (A) proved to be comprehensive. This is because it covers most of the aspects of the text that contribute to the creation of meaning and as well as those which can be affected during the process of translation, and therefore can in turn impact the process of transferring the original text’s communicative value.
- The view of translation quality in Method (A), where the error analysis is based on

the textuality theory, is that the linguistic choices in the target text should reflect the standards of cohesion, coherence, informativity, intentionality, situationality and intertextuality of the source texts, and considers quality to be the appropriateness of the linguistic choices in the translated texts with regards to the linguistic and nonlinguistic ones of the original texts. The assessment of quality in Method (A) proved to be based on the appreciation of both the micro level (represented in the standards of cohesion, coherence, informativity, and intentionality) and the macro level (represented in the examination of the standards of acceptability, situationality and intertextuality).

- Method (B) focuses mostly on the micro level of assessment. Assessment in this method is based on the acknowledgement of two main parameters: accuracy of transfer from the original text and quality of expression in the target language. These two parameters are generic, meaning that subjectivity can stem from the sole reliance on certain parameters, and the lack of consideration for other influencing factors.

F. Considering the Text Type in TQA

Considering text type as a criterion of objectivity in the study's two methods of assessment uncovered the following:

- Although considering the text type in TQA is believed to lend the assessment process more objectivity, it is not explicitly implemented in either of the two assessment methods. The style, however, is considered in both methods.
- In Method (A), the effect of the text type on the assessment is acknowledged in the selected model, as the style is considered in the appreciation of the standard of acceptability, where the naturalness of the TT style is regarded as an assessment criterion. Style is also taken into account in the standard of intertextuality, where the relevant target text's style should resemble texts of similar nature.
- Text type is also considered in Method (B). However, it does not specify whether the style should reflect that of the original author, or of the text genre conventions in the target language. Therefore in this case, there is more room left to raters'

preferences and judgments in Method (B) than Method (A).

5.2 Applicability of the Suggested Model

Most of the translation errors detected in this study fall under the standards of cohesion, coherence, and informativity and are therefore firstly discussed in this chapter.

1. The Standard of Cohesion:

With regards to cohesion, the following results were obtained from the application of the amended model:

- Cohesion is one of the important textual features of texts. Cohesive devices (reference, conjunctions, ellipsis, substitutions, lexical cohesion, paraphrasing, and parallelism) are used to connect the parts of a text and bring forth meaning. From the examination of this study’s corpus, it can be concluded that reference and conjunctions, among the other devices, are markedly different in English and Arabic. For instance, there are major distinctions between Arabic and English demonstrative systems. Arabic demonstratives express gender distinctions, whereas in English, ‘this’ and ‘that’ are used to refer to both genders. Arabic also differentiates between singular, dual, and plural demonstrative pronouns, whereas English differentiates between singular and plural demonstratives only. Translators’ unawareness of such differences often results in translation problems, as illustrated in Example (39).
- As far as reference is concerned, some cohesion shifts cause some translation problems, due to the inherent differences between the two linguistic systems. Compared to English, Arabic has a wider set of pronouns. The Arabic explicit and implicit pronouns show not only gender distinctions but also number distinctions. Arabic pronouns also differ according to their position in the sentence, whether nominative, accusative, or genitive. On the other hand, English deals with a limited set of pronouns, and gender distinction appears in the case of the third person singular (i.e., he/she). Lastly, Arabic does not have the category of some possessive pronouns such as mine, his, yours, etc. Consequently, these differences create

reference problems in the translation. The word (مجلسيه) ‘two houses’ in Example (9), for instance, refers to a dual entity. In the translation however, the dual pronoun has been incorrectly translated to ‘houses’. In English, this plural noun could refer to two or more houses, whereas the word in Arabic specifically refers to two. Ambiguous number specification in the translation resulted in providing inaccurate information which affected the transference of the intended meaning.

- Another main distinction between Arabic and English pronouns relates to their cohesive function(s). Personal reference in Arabic is typically anaphoric. Moreover, the third person pronoun can also function cataphorically to refer to an entity that will appear later in the text, although this is not common practice. Furthermore, Arabic implicit pronouns, though they are not outwardly formed in the surface structure, can also fulfil a cohesive function by encouraging receivers to retrieve their antecedents from somewhere in the text, or from shared background knowledge.
- The conjunction (و) ‘and’ is typically repeated in Arabic spoken and written discourses. In the first Egyptian speech for example, it was repeated ten times in one sentence. Not only was repetition unavoidable in that particular sentence, it did not affect its readability, as the statement read normally. This is due to the fact that its structure falls in line with Arab grammarians’ beliefs that Arabic is a syndetic language, in which almost every idea is linked to the proceeding one with a connective. Given that the relationship between English and Arabic conjunctions is not one-to-one, translating every (و) into ‘and’ made the translation sound awkward, as English cannot tolerate such heavy repetition.
- Unlike English, Arabic is a derivational language that is based on a root system. Many words can be derived from the same root, and root repetition is usually created at the morphological level. In Arabic, the morphological repetition of roots is generally created by the multiple use of the same root within a single clause or sentence. For example, the sentence (الحرج كل الحرج والعيب كل العيب) in Example (31), is characterised by its root repetition, which is used to emphasise the expressed meanings. However, this emphasis is difficult to render in the translation, due to the inherent differences between the Arabic and English languages. However, it can be

compensated for via different means such as the use of an adverb of emphasis (like certainly, obviously, undoubtedly), or through the use of typological devices such as italics, which are essentially used to give an added force or a greater degree of certainty to a particular word in a sentence or to the sentence as a whole.

- As for conjunctions, based on the textual analysis conducted in this study, it can be concluded that the most frequently used devices are (و) ‘and’ and (ف) ‘so’, and both are employed as coordinating conjunctions and cohesive devices of different functions, as illustrated in the examples found in Chapter 4. The misinterpretation of their functions creates translation problems on the structural and the informational level, as is the case in Example No. (17).
- Failing to recognise cohesion relationships between sentences leads to confusion about the referent of certain pronouns which, in turn, results in inaccurate translation. The translation of the fourth speech showcases this issue very well, where the translation began with the pronoun ‘they’. The referent that this pronoun alludes to is unclear in the translation, and as pronouns are generic words that hold little meaning on their own, it is difficult to understand the meaning of the sentence as a whole if the antecedent it refers to is elusive. This affects the TT, as the meaning becomes unintelligible due to the fact that the succeeding sentences are coherently connected to the first one.
- Paraphrasing is one of the Arabic devices that is used to create a lexical cohesion in a text. It involves the numerous restatement of a certain point or argument. This type of repetition reflects the tendency of some writers or speakers to force assertion. At the end of his second speech, for instance, Mubarak asserts certain points by paraphrasing ideas: (هى الهدف والغاية.. والمسئولية والواجب.. بداية العمر ومشواره ومنتهاه.. وأرض المحيا والممات) ‘Egypt is the goal and the ultimate wish. It is our responsibility and duty. It is the beginning of our lives and its end. It is the land that will witness our lives and deaths’. This sense of assertion was partially lost in the translation, as most of the paraphrased phrases in the original sentences were left without repetition or paraphrasing, thus affecting the transference of assertion and the rhetorical effect resulting from it.

- Parallelism is a rhetorical and textual device in Arabic discourse. It creates a textual semantic unity which adds to the cohesive relationships that exist between different parts of a sentence and text. Example (69), for example, contained parallelism in which the parallelistic parts, (هذا هو اليوم) 'this is the day', are repeated twice. The use of this structure in Arabic makes the argument more persuasive and also is regarded as a cohesive device. However, the translation stripped Gaddafi's statements of their persuasive and cohesive aspects by dissolving the structure into ordinary sentences, resulting in the significant loss of the intended rhetorical effect.

2. The Standard of Coherence:

Concerning coherence, the following results were obtained from the application of the proposed model:

- Cohesion shifts can result in inaccurate coherence shifts. The coherence relation that exists between two sentences in Arabic depends largely on the conjunction used to link them, provided they are indeed connected by one. Thus, the coherence of the TT is affected by how the Arabic conjunction is translated. The causal relationship that exists between the two Arabic sentences in Example (17) , for instance, is negatively impacted by the use of the comma in the translation, instead of a conjunction such as 'so' or 'because', to render the explicit Arabic conjunction employed in the original text in the optic of reflecting a causal relationship.
- The unjustified deletion of certain sentences in the translation affects the completeness of the original message and, consequently, the coherence of the text as a whole. For instance, the last two sentences in Mubarak's first speech were omitted in the translation, despite being ideologically and informatively loaded. The first sentence (حفظ الله هذا الوطن وشعبه) 'may Allah protect this nation and its people' is a prayer with which Mubarak intentionally chose to end his speech. This prayer is both politically and ideologically motivated as he is seeking to maintain the religious identity that is so appealing to his audience, with the aim of gaining their support and sympathy. The second sentence (والسلام عليكم ورحمة الله وبركاته) 'may peace and mercy of Allah be upon you' is typically used by Mubarak to begin and end his speeches, as well as to maintain a semblance of

religious identity. These two sentences were unreasonably left out of the translation, along with their ideological and rhetorical effects, thus resulting in an abrupt ending. Such a deletion affects the continuity and balance of the discourse, which in turn impacts the coherence relationships that exist throughout the text.

3. The Standard of Informativity:

The following results were obtained from the application of the proposed model with regards to informativity:

- In terms of accuracy, the translation of a lexical item can either be accurate or inaccurate. It is considered accurate if all the aspects of the meaning (the denotative and connotative) are conveyed in the translation. In contrast, the translation is considered inaccurate if the equivalent word conveys a different meaning from that meant by the original, or connotes a meaning that is not originally intended. In Arabic-English translation, certain words are 'habitually' considered to be equivalents. However, a thorough examination of these words' semantic ranges show that the assumed relationship of equivalence could be baseless. Example No. (52) in the second speech demonstrates this, as the word (أحداث) meaning 'events' was translated as 'issues'. The words 'event' and 'issues' reflect two different aspects of meaning, and are not equally equivalent to the original word, as illustrated in Chapter 4.
- The inconsistency in dealing with the same lexical item invites confusion, as receivers of a translation may incorrectly assume that the terms employed refer to different things, when in fact, they both refer to the same word. In Gaddafi's second speech, the translator translated the word (الله) correctly as 'Allah' in its first occurrence, but unexpectedly rendered it as 'God' in its second appearance, potentially implying that these two words refer to two different entities, which is not so in the original text.
- The meaning of some words can only be understood by understanding the context correctly. In Example (10), the word (مغايرا) 'different, variant' has been translated as 'new'. The situational context in which this word appears reflects a state of instability and concern, as Mubarak, in the pretext, warns the Egyptians that surviving the coming days requires a great deal of wisdom. The word 'new', on the other hand, usually reflects a

state of positive change, which is inappropriate in that context. Therefore, translating the word (مغايرا) as ‘new’ violates the denotative and connotative meanings of the situational context in which it appears.

1. The function of the rhetorical devices used in a text should be identified in order to be reproduced. However, it is not always possible to reproduce an Arabic metaphor in English, due to the linguistic and cultural differences between the two languages. As metaphors are essentially used in Arabic to imply certain meanings, it is not recommended for these meanings to be made explicit in the translation unless the translator is certain that there exists no equivalent metaphor. Reducing the metaphoric expression to its sense does not comply with the standard steps to deal with metaphors in texts. For instance, this was done in Example No. (18) with (صب الزيت على النار), despite there being a similar metaphor in English - ‘to add fuel to the fire’. This affects the text’s degree of informativity as it makes the sentence more explicit than it should be.

- Thematisation is introduced in the adapted model as an informative device. The purpose of thematising certain elements in a text should be considered and reproduced in the translation, if possible. In Arabic, all linguistic elements can be thematised (verbs, nouns, prepositional phrases, adverbial clauses of place and time, and nominal clauses). If the thematised element is a verb, the focus is on the process, whereas when the thematised element is a noun, the focus is on the entity. Finally, when the adverbial clause or the prepositional phrase are thematised, the focus is on the circumstantial elements, to prepare the context for the coming information. All these elements can also be thematised in English, with the exception of verbs, as this does not conform with English grammar.
- Shifts in thematisation affect the degree of emphasis that is intended in the original text by placing certain elements in a certain position. Any shift of thematised items found in the text denotes meanings that are not provided in the original sentence, consequently creating changes in the original meaning. In Example No. (16), the error detected lies in changing the order of Mubarak’s list of people in the original sentence. The ex-president started with (فلاحيه وعماله) ‘farmers and workers’, however in the translation, the translator shifted the order and consequently, the theme of said original order, to start with the religious element, which reflects a rather sensitive division - (مسلميه وأقباطه) ‘its Muslims and Christians’. This unnecessary change entailed thematising these elements and giving

them more emphasis by bringing them into focus. This shift affects the informativity of the text, as the translator made it seem as if Mubarak's first priority was the division between Muslims and Christians, which is a rather sensitive division.

4. The Standard of Intentionality:

The following results were obtained concerning intentionality:

- The intended meaning of a word can only be conveyed if the denotative and connotative aspects of the meaning are considered. Conveying only one of these meanings will result in partial rendering of the whole meaning.
- One of the most common features of political speeches is the reliance on rhetoric to speak persuasively, regardless of one's personal beliefs, as it is believed to be the art of persuasion. Therefore, what is said or written in political speeches can carry different implied meanings than that of what is expressed explicitly. Translators dealing with this type of text should be very aware of their producers' explicit and implicit intentions.
- The standard of intentionality is also affected by manipulative language - another common feature of political speeches (Chilton, 2004). These devices frequently used by politicians to enforce manipulation include lexical-semantic devices and rhetorical devices. This means that translators should be able to recognise the goal behind such manipulation, and attempt to convey it via the use of equivalent linguistic devices in the TL, if possible.
- Intentionality operates on two levels of a text, the levels of cohesion and informativity. With regards to cohesion, cohesive devices, apart from being textual connectors, can be employed to serve a specific purpose. For instance, certain devices are used to emphasise a particular meaning. Due to the inherent differences between English and Arabic writing conventions, this extra intended meaning cannot always be reflected in the translation; for example, the repetition of morphological patterns is not tolerated in English in the way that it is in Arabic. Therefore, translators should ideally rely on tools which can compensate for the loss of the intended effect or meaning. As for informativity, thematising, for instance, entails giving information an added focus. The intended meaning of such thematisation should be recognised and reproduced in the thematisation.

Failing to do so results in the partial loss of the intended meaning.

5. The Standard of Acceptability:

- Acceptability is concerned with an audience's attitude towards a text. More specifically, how they receive a text and how they regard it as being cohesive, coherent and whether it holds any relevance for them. This standard is concerned with three factors: intelligibility, naturalness of style, and appropriateness. Errors that make the translation unintelligible, inappropriate or not read well affect its acceptability.
- Errors that violate English writing conventions may make the translation of parts of the Arab spring presidential speeches less acceptable, as the English reader expects well-written translations, particularly if these are published in reputed news agencies such as the BBC, CNN, and the Guardian.

6. The Standard of Situationality:

- Examining context consists of studying certain linguistic choices made by the text producer according to the relevant context. This echoes the standard of intentionality, as both are non-linguistic standards that are only manifested in the text through certain linguistic choices that, in the case of intentionality, serve the intention of the speaker, and in the case of situationality, serve the context.

A. Context helps to identify the conversational implicature; this refers to what a speaker means or implies as distinct from what he or she is literally saying. It also helps to eliminate ambiguity, be it lexical or structural.

All the results obtained from the application of the selected two assessment methods on the corpus of this study were discussed in detail in this chapter, as well as the results of the suggested amendments on the original model of textuality.

Chapter 6
Discussion of Results

This chapter is dedicated to the discussion of the results obtained from the examination of the study's data discussed in Chapter 4. These are presented in accordance with the study's main two objectives: (1) identifying the differences in the application of the two main approaches used in translation quality assessment to the same texts and recognising how each approach reduces the subjectivity inherent to TQA, and (2) identifying the outcome of applying the proposed model of error analysis (described in Chapter 3) as a TQA model for Arabic-English translations. The English translations of the four Arab Spring presidential speeches selected for examination underwent a textual analysis based on the proposed model derived from the theory of textuality, originally established by Beaugrande and Dressler in 1981. For the reasons explained in Chapter 3, the suggested amendments to the original model are necessary given the combination of the languages involved in the corpus of this study (Arabic and English). The discussion will first begin with the differences in the application of the two main approaches in TQA and then shifts to the applicability of the proposed model as an assessment model for Arabic-English translations.

6.1 Differences in the Application of the Two Main Approaches in TQA

One of the main objectives of this study is to empirically examine the differences in the application of the main approaches, namely error analysis and holistic assessment, used in TQA. These are represented in this study by Method (A) and Method (B) respectively. Furthermore, this research intends to identify how each of these approaches reduces the subjectivity inherent to TQA. The literature review conducted in Chapter 2 showed that translation scholars suggest the following criteria to ensure a higher level of objectivity. These are: (1) the mark given as a quality index can be justified (Mateo, 2014), (2) the negative and positive aspects of the translation are both considered in the assessment of translation quality (Waddington, 2001), (3) the model of assessment is built on established theories of translation (House, 1997,2001), (4) the model includes a quantification dimension in the assessment, meaning that errors are assigned different weights depending on their consequences (Williams, 2001), (5) the assessment follows a multi-perspective viewpoint, meaning that both the micro and macro levels of assessment (linguistic and nonlinguistic) are covered (House, 2001-2), and lastly, (6) the model does not ignore the effect of the text type on the evaluation process (Reiss, 1971,2000).

As both approaches promise to be objective, this study empirically investigates the differences in the applicability of each with regards to the above-mentioned criteria of objectivity proposed by specialists in the field. In the following sections, the results obtained from the application of both methods to assess the quality of the selected Arab Spring presidential speeches are discussed, and the manner in which each of these criteria of objectivity are considered in each assessment method is compared.

A. The First Criteria of Objectivity: The Quality Index

A.1 Application of the Error Analysis, Method (A):

	Speech No (1)	**Speech No (2)**	**Speech No (3)**	**Speech No (4)**
Number of Errors	32	29	12	8
TER Weight of Errors	64	58	24	16
Word count	1879	1014	524	311
Quality Index	**(64/1879)*100= 3.4**	**(58/1014)*100= 6**	**(24/524)*100=4.6**	**(16/311)*100=5.2**

Table (6.1): Results of the Application of Method (A) onto the Selected Data

A.2 Application of the Holistic Assessment, Method (B):

		Speech No (1)	**Speech No (2)**	**Speech No (3)**	**Speech No (4)**
First Rater	**Accuracy of Transfer**	3/10	7/10	4/10	7/10
	Quality of Expression	3/10	5/10	9/10	9/10
Average of First Rater		3/10	6/10	6.5/10	8/10

		Speech No (1)	Speech No (2)	Speech No (3)	Speech No (4)
Second Rater	**Accuracy of Transfer**	3/10	6/10	5/10	6/10
	Quality of Expression	2/10	6/10	9/10	9/10
Average of Second Rater		2.5/10	6/10	7/10	7.5/10
Quality Index of both Raters		**2.75/10**	**6/10**	**6.75/10**	**7.75/10**

Table (6.2): Results of the Application of Method (B) onto the Selected Data

As discussed in chapter 2, translation scholars strongly emphasise that following a predetermined set of rules in translation quality assessment is the dividing line between objective and subjective quality assessment (Martinez and Hurtado, 2001). They also add that without a clear perspective based on which translation is assessed, TQA cannot escape the accusation of being a random, subjective practice. Mateo (2014) is one of the translation scholars who believe that one of the important criteria of objectivity that has to be considered in any translation assessment task to reduce its subjectivity is that the mark given by the evaluator as a quality index can be justified. This criteria of objectivity is actually to ensure that the rater of a certain translation task is basically following a predetermined criteria of assessment and, therefore, can justify his/her awarded marks. The following sections will discuss whether the quality indexes given by Method (A) and (B) in this study can be justified.

The quality index of Speech No. (1) is (3.4/10) in Method (A) and (2.75/10) in Method (B). Although both methods allocate low overall marks for this speech's translation, the mark reached in Method (A) is the result of using the translation error rate (TER), a statistical tool which is based on calculating the weight of errors against the total number of words in the translated text. To elaborate, the translation of Speech No. (1) has (32) errors (weighing 64 points). The total weight of errors (64 points) is divided by the total number of words in the translation (1879 words) and this, following the model, justifies the quality index given to that translation - (3.4/10).

In Method (B), on the other hand, as far as the first parameter in the holistic method is concerned (the accuracy of transfer from the original language), the first rater justifies the comparatively lower mark assigned to the first speech's translation (2.75/10) based on the fact that "some whole phrases from the original Arabic have been missed out, and that some sentences that are not present in the source text have been inserted in the translated version." The first rater provides the following examples of said insertions:[4]

4. "(But <u>at the same time</u>, the most important thing is to recognise them). The underlined phrase has been inserted by the translator, it does not appear in the ST".[5]
5. "(I know **quite well** that Egypt, <u>while fighting</u>**, should** <u>try to</u> **go out of this juncture).** The underlined words did not appear in the ST". The bold words, according to the first rater, are "mistranslated and should have been[6] (I am absolutely certain that Egypt will overcome this crisis)".

The first rater also adds that "numerous words have been completely mistranslated and it [i.e. the text] reads as if the translator has no access to a dictionary and has simply guessed the meaning of many words and phrases". The first rater then provides the following examples of the mistranslation of certain words, along with suggested translations:

B. "(**I've retained Egyptian security)** should have been (I have preserved the peace)".
C. "(I was very keen that those two committees of people **who are known** among Egyptians as honest brokers, **the constitutional leaders of Egypt** and the judiciary) should have been (I was very keen that both these committees should be made up of people known to Egyptians as honest brokers, experts in constitutional law and members of the judiciary)".

[4] All the quotes referring to the first rater are taken from their full written feedback, which is attached in Appendix 2.
[5] All the bold and underlined words are emphasised by the raters.
[6] The phrase "should have been" is used by both raters to refer to what they believe to be a better translation.

The second rater[7], who also assigned a low mark to the first speech, explains that "some sentences in the translation make no sense at all. The punctuation and paragraph breaks do not reflect the original, and some chunks of text appear completely out of place. Chunks of the original text have been omitted with no indication from the translator that this has been done". The rater attributes the low level of transfer accuracy to the assumption that "it may be that translators working for CNN are under instructions to omit superfluous verbiage or repetition but I'm surprised that there is nothing to show where this has occurred". The second rater provides the following examples to support her opinion, as well as suggestions of better lexical choices:

A. "(This **sense of abiding**) should have been (this commitment)".
B. "(I tell you **here**, as **a head of state**) should have been (I tell you, as President of the Republic)".
C. "(I do not **find any embarrassment**) should have been (I do not have any objection)".

As for the second parameter in Method (B), which is the quality of expression in the target language, the first rater justifies assigning a relatively low mark (3/10) as follows: "the translation has clearly not been written by a native English speaker". The second rater provides the following examples of incorrect use of English tenses and grammar:

1. "(Those who **had** committed those crimes) should have been (Those who have committed those crimes)".
2. "(Preserving our identity which **is** the main essence of our presence for more than 7,000 years) should have been (preserving our identity which has been the main essence of our existence for more than 7,000 years)".
3. "(The transfer of responsibility, **which is going to be to the one that** the people will choose as their leader in transparent and free elections where guarantees **are going to be there** for full transparency and for freedom) would read much better as (the transfer of responsibility to the person whom the people will choose as their leader

[7] All the quotes referring to the second rater are taken from their full written feedback, which is attached in Appendix 3.

in free and transparent elections with guarantees of complete freedom and transparency".

The second rater allocates a lower mark than that assigned by the first rater, this being (2/10), for the parameter of quality of expression. She ascribes this mark to the "incorrect use of English tenses throughout, misuse of definite and indefinite articles, misuse of prepositions, incorrect word order, and misspellings". The following examples are provided by the rater in support of the given mark and feedback:

D. "The following translation has incorrect use of English tenses and also some mistranslations: (This is the **offer** that I **undertook** before Allah almighty and the **people** and I'm going to keep my promise so that we **would** put Egypt on a path of security and stability, and **would** already **out** a **perspective** for coming out of this crisis) should have been (This is the oath that I took before Allah almighty and the country, and I'm going to keep my promise so that we can put Egypt on a path of security and stability. I have put forward a specific vision for how we can emerge from the current crisis)".

E. "The following translation has incorrect grammar: (trying to put things on the right track **as quick as** possible) should be (as quickly as possible) or (as soon as possible)".

F. "The following translation has incorrect use of definite article: (through **the** wise dialogue) should be (through wise dialogue)".

The quality index of Speech No. (2) is (6/10) for both methods. Although the mark is mathematically justified in Method (A), as shown in Table (5.1), the holistic assessment in Method (B) led to the same result. Twenty-nine errors resulted in a total of (58 points). This number of points against the total number of words in the translated text (1014 words) results in a mark of (6/10) for the quality of that translation. In Method (B), on the other hand, the quality index of a translation is the average of the two marks assigned to the two governing criteria. With regards to the accuracy of transfer for this speech, the first rater justifies the assigned mark (7/10) by arguing that "the content of the source text, for the most part, has been transferred accurately, although several words have been completely mistranslated". The first rater provides the following examples of mistranslation:

A. "(Dear brother**s and** citizens, I took the initiative of forming a new government with new priorities and duties that respond to the **demand** of our youth and their **mission)** should have been (Dear brother citizens, I took the initiative of forming a new government with new priorities and duties that respond to the demands of our young people and their message)".
B. "(My primary responsibility now is *(omission)* security and **independence** of the nation) should have been (My primary responsibility now is to restore the nation's security and stability)".

In agreement with the first rater, the second rater explains that, overall, "the translation represents the meaning of the original speech adequately and some good solutions have been found for tricky expressions that are commonly mistranslated from Arabic into English". The rater adds that "the translation has not always been punctuated and paragraphed in such a way as to accurately reflect the rhythm of the rhetoric of the original text", and provides examples in support of her assessment:

1. "(According to my constitutional powers. I call on parliament and its houses to discuss amending article 76 and 77 of the constitution concerning the conditions on running for presidency of the republic and **it sets specific a period for** the presidential term). This example also contains poor punctuation and bad grammar. It should have been (In accordance with my constitutional powers, I call on both houses of parliament to discuss amending Articles 76 and 77 of the constitution as regards the conditions on running for presidency of the republic and setting a fixed period for the presidential term)".
2. "I ask God to **help** me honour this pledge to complete **my vocation to** Egypt and its people **in what** satisfies God, the nation and its people." should have been "I ask God to grant me success in honouring this pledge to accomplish what I have offered to Egypt and its people in a way that pleases God, the nation and its people."

As for the second criteria of assessment in the holistic method, the quality of expression in the TL, both raters believe that with regards to this speech (Speech No. 3), it falls under level (3)[8], (First rater: 5/10, Second rater: 6/10). The first rater justifies the assigned mark by stating that the translation "does not read as if it has been written by a native English speaker". The second rater, on the other hand, further explains that "there are numerous incorrect uses of definite/indefinite articles, some misuse of tenses, and some incorrect grammar". Both raters provide examples in support of their assessment marks:

A. The first rater provides the following example of incorrect English grammar: "(We are living together painful days) should have been (we are living together through painful days)".

B. The second rater provides the following example of incorrect English grammar: "(I have never ever **been seeking** power and the people know the difficult circumstances **that** I shouldered my responsibility) should have been (I have never sought power and the people know the difficult circumstances in which I shouldered my responsibilities)".

Moving on to the third speech, the difference in quality index marks awarded to the translation of this speech via each assessment method is of approximately two marks. Method (A) assigns (4.6/10), while Method (B) assigns (6.75 / 10). The quality index of Method (A) is obtained by calculating the number of errors. According to the adopted model of error analysis, the translation has 12 errors, which weigh 24 points. The overall number of points, 24 in this instance, against the overall number of words in that translation, which is 524 words, resulted in a 4.6/10 quality index. On the other hand, the relatively high quality index obtained with Method (B) (6.75) is explained by the raters' feedback; they both assigned high marks for the successful rendering of the second criteria of assessment in the adopted holistic method - the quality of expression. To elaborate, the first rater assigned (9/10), arguing that "the translation reads very well – only one or two expressions or incorrect use of tenses betray that it has likely been written by a non-native speaker of English". In support of this argument, the first rater provides the following example:

1. "(I am asking you to come on **pick** up your courage, have courage and come out **to** the streets), a more natural English translation would have been (I am asking you to pluck

[8] According to the adopted holistic model (Waddington, 2001), there are five levels of assigned marks: Level 1 (1-2 marks), Level 2 (3-4 marks), Level 3 (5-6 marks), Level 4 (7-8 marks) and Level 5 (9-10 marks).

up your courage, have courage and come out on the streets)."

The second rater also agreed that "the translated text reads well in English" and this is the main reason for the assigned (9/10). However, both raters acknowledge that the translation reads well in English not because of the successful rendering of the original text, but rather because it "miss[es] out tricky parts of the source text altogether" (the second rater). The first rater also asserts that "some parts have been completely missed out in the translation and others inserted". The high mark assigned to this parameter indicates that the given TT reads well in English as a result of missing out certain tricky SL units which, if translated incorrectly, could have negatively impacted the translation and, therefore, the mark assigned for this particular criterion. Furthermore, both raters assigned lower marks for the accuracy of transfer from the original text. The first rater allocated (4/10) while the second allocated (5/10) for the adequacy of transfer. This signifies that both raters were aware of the low level of accuracy of transfer. Despite the fact that this aspect should ideally be highly present in a successful translation, given that both raters assigned marks as high as (9/10) for quality of expression, it comes as no surprise that the average quality index increased regardless of the lower marks awarded for the accuracy criteria.

Finally, the quality index for Speech No. (4) varies considerably between the two methods. In Method (A), the quality index mark for the translation of Gaddafi's speech is (5.2/10). The translation contains 8 errors which weigh 16 points. A total of 16 points over the word count of the translated text (which is 311 words) results in a quality index of (5.2/10). In contrast, Method (B) assigns a (7.75) quality index for the same translation. This marked difference is once more due to the difference between the marks assigned for the holistic method's two criteria of assessment. The first rater assigned (7/10) for the translation's accuracy of transfer, arguing that "the meaning of the original speech has been almost entirely conveyed". In addition, she provides examples to illustrate mistranslations:

1. "(A small problem **that** has become an international issue) should have been (A small issue has become an international issue)".
2. "(We should come to their **rescue**) should have been (We should come to their aid)".
3. "(I will die for my people. With Allah's **help**) should have been (I will die for my people, God willing)".

4. “(Our children are the **one’s** who have destroyed **these** planes) should have been (Our children are the ones who destroyed their planes)”.
5. “(You are the fifth column within **the** city) should have been (You are the fifth column within this city of yours)”.
6. “(You are capable of **doing it**) should have been (You are capable of defeating them)”.

Contrastingly, the second rater assigned (6/10) marks for the criteria of accuracy, asserting that “there are a few words and expressions that could have been translated better in my opinion, and a few errors that do not make a great deal of differences to the overall meaning”. She specifically refers to the underestimation of the impact created from the employment of a particular rhetorical device – the use of three similar phrases - in the following example:

5. “(No more fear, no more hesitation, **we are no longer reluctant)**. The intended rhetorical impact would have been better conveyed by translating it (No more fear, no more hesitation, no more backing down)”.
6. “There is just one example that I think was a bad choice and reads oddly: (the Libyan people....will be **crawling out.** Massive waves of people will be **crawling out…**). The Arabic verb does indeed mean ‘to crawl out’ but it also means ‘to march or advance’ and either of those words would have conveyed the meaning better, in my opinion”.

The high mark assigned to the second criteria of assessment, which is the quality of expression, is the reason behind the relatively high overall quality index. Both raters assign (9/10) for the quality of expression. As explained when discussing Speech No. (3), a high mark such as this being awarded in one of two parameters will naturally affect the overall calculated average.

At the end of the discussion of this criteria of objectivity, it can be noted that, based on the suggestions of Mateo (2014), none of the raters were able to provide quantitative justifications of the marks they assigned, which Martinez and Hurtado (2001) describe as being highly subjective. This, in turn, values the importance of including a quantitative part of the assessment even if the holistic approach if followed.

B. The Second Criteria of Objectivity: Considering the Negative and Positive Aspects in TQA

As elaborated in chapter 2, the objectivity in the TQA methods that are based on error analysis is believed to stem from the fact that they can give accurate accounts of both the type and number of errors committed in a translation. However, some scholars argue that the focus of these methods is only on errors, meaning that “the overall quality of a translation is equal to the sum of the defects it contains” (Waddington, 2001:21). This resulted in a restricted view of TQA where quality is assessed based only on errors, ignoring any positive aspects in the overall quality assessment of a particular text. Therefore, although the methods based on error analysis might provide a clear justification of the mark reached, as specified in the previous section, they do not account for positive solutions that are used to solve certain translation problems. From the examination of this particular aspect in this study’s corpus, it can be noted that in the error analysis method, the translation quality index is generally a mathematical reflection of the number and weight of errors over the total number of words in the translated texts. However, most of the error analysis methods, including this study’s proposed model, are established on a possible fallacy. These methods only consider the negative aspects of translations in quality assessment. It is without doubt that errors diminish the quality of a given translation. However, having the same number of errors does not imply that two translations are equal in their overall quality. Objectivity can, therefore, be increased if the TQA model considers both the negative and positive aspects of the translation. Nonetheless, this proved not be the norm in error analysis methods.

As for holistic models, their objectivity is believed to stems from considering both the negative and positive aspects of the translation in the assessment process (Waddington, 2001). However, the relevant literature revealed the restricted view of errors in the holistic methods (Pym, 1992). This proved to be true in this study as the examination of this criterion revealed that the adopted model does not specify the elements that govern identifying or assessing the positive aspects of a translation. In the adopted holistic model, raters entirely relied on their estimation to determine what a good or creative aspect in the translation consists of, as there is no pre-established grading system on how to value the positive points compared to the overall number of errors in the model. The first rater, for instance, affirms that she 'considered both the errors made and given credit for good translations of certain phrases when awarding the marks'. However, neither of the raters explains how they have assigned credit for good translations or how this credit is reflected in the overall marks. Therefore, although holistic models are typically believed to consider both the negative and positive aspects of the translation, there was no sufficient evidence of this practice in the adopted holistic model.

C. The Third Criteria of Objectivity: Building Assessment on Established Theories of Translation

Translation Studies witnessed a shift in the use of structural linguistics to functional linguistics, which is represented in the prominent works of Reiss (2000), Nord (1997), Munday (2001), Halliday (1985), House (1997), Baker (1998), Hatim and Mason (1997). As illustrated in Chapter 2, translation scholars emphasise the importance of building TQA models on established theories of translations. Models that are built on untested views of translation are more likely to give inaccurate results, as they do not stem from verified notions. The linguistic approach to translation theory is considered to be a scientific treatment of translation, as it focuses on key issues such as meaning and equivalence. In addition, it is no longer concerned about structure only, but also focuses on the way language is used in a given social context (Baker, 1998). Concerning this criterion of objectivity, both methods in this study are derived from a translation background. Method (A) stems from the linguistic theory of textuality proposed by Beaugrande and Dressler (1981). Method (B) is also derived from verified notions in translation. Actually, one of the important reasons for selecting Waddington's holistic assessment model in this study is that it has been empirically verified in translation studies (Khan Mohammad and Osanloo, 2009:137).

D. The Fourth Criteria of Objectivity: Having a Quantitative Element in TQA

According to translation scholars, quantification is a criterion that can lend TQA more objectivity. Believing that without error weighing and quantification, the measurement criteria may not offer a convincing judgment, some translation scholars advocate combining both qualitative and quantitative measures in translation assessment (Williams, 2001). Generally speaking, most error analysis methods allocate different weights to different types of errors according to the consequences they entail in the target text (Williams, 2001). Method (A), for instance, has a quantification dimension as the total number of errors is calculated against the total number of words of the translated texts to provide the overall quality index. This guarantee that the overall mark given for the overall quality is not randomly awarded.

As for the holistic model, although translated texts are given certain marks following a predefined set of criteria, the marks assigned for each level are too general that it cannot escape the need to rely on the rater's own judgment and evaluation, which may increase the level of subjectivity. Both raters emphasised that different types of errors were considered in the overall assessment. However, without having any clear predefined set of rules, the evaluator can only rely on his or her own view (Colina 2009), which is likely to increase the element of subjectivity. Both assessors differentiate in their feedback between errors that affect the successful transfer of meaning, and those that affect the quality of expression in the target language, without classifying them as major or minor errors every time they encounter them. The raters describe minor errors as those that result from incorrect use of English tenses throughout the text, misuse of definite and indefinite articles as well as prepositions, incorrect word order, and misspelling. Nevertheless, the raters in this study did not explain how they reflected the different type of errors that they have identified in their overall awarded marks.

E. The Fifth Criteria of Objectivity: Following a Multi-Perspective Assessment

Viewing translation evaluation as a generally arbitrary and subjective practice, and believing that the main task of translation quality assessment is to improve the evaluation process, Holmes (1988, p.78) argues that this improvement can only be ensured if quality assessment is built on objective criteria. House (2001) argues that translation scholars can objectively assess a translation by following a multi-perspective viewpoint. If the evaluator carries out the analysis on both micro and macro levels, and at the same time maintains other important elements such as function, ideology, genre, register, and the communicative value of individual linguistic items, then subjectivity may be reduced. If the rater carries out the assessment on both micro and macro levels, subjectivity may be reduced, enabling the rater to then assess the translation quality more objectively. Therefore, adopting a multi-perspective assessment is a criterion that is believed to increase the level of objectivity in the assessment process. Models that reduce the concept of quality to the satisfaction of one or two quality criteria, such as function or translation effect, consequently restrict their view of quality. Thus, subjectivity can be reduced if quality assessment is based on the consideration of both the linguistic and nonlinguistic factors in the process of interpretation of the source text, and the assessment of the equivalent target text.

Method (A) considers both micro and macro levels of assessment, as the concept of textuality itself covers both the micro and macro levels of analysis and evaluation. Altogether, the seven standards of textuality accounts for both the linguistic and nonlinguistic factors that affect the creation of meaning and thus, can prove to be a suitable benchmark for evaluation.On the other hand, Method (B) does not reflect such inclusivity. The first rater stated that she "mainly considered the linguistic aspects of the translations only", and attributes this to the possibility that the translators could be under the pressure of deadlines, and thus concentrate on speed of delivery rather than absolute accuracy. She also justifies that translators "may be under instructions to omit passages they consider superfluous". However, she, along with the second rater, acknowledged that she had not considered nonlinguistic factors as mitigating factors in her assessment.

F. The Sixth Criteria of Objectivity: Appreciating the Text Type in TQA

Reiss (1971, 2000) attributes the low level of objectivity in the current TQA practices to the ignorance of the text type's effect on the evaluation process. Hartmann (1980) believes that Reiss's book on translation criticism, which was written in 1971, is one of the earliest attempts to set up objective text typological criteria for the evaluation of all translation types. Reiss assumes that different text types require different translation methods, and that they would also need different evaluation criteria; a fact which she suggests translation scholars should take into consideration. Therefore, she advocates that translation scholars should identify the text type in order to avoid using inappropriate criteria for assessment. Therefore, Reiss suggests that establishing a text typology (namely literary, linguistic, and pragmatic) is the first step towards ensuring objectivity in translation quality assessment; a criterion which is only explicitly considered in Method (A) as the the text type is considered in the standards of intertextuality and acceptability.

As for Method (B), the model itself does not refer to this particular criterion of objectivity. This resulted in contradicting application of this model between the two raters. The first rater clearly stated acknowledging the effect of the text type in the assessment given, and having been aware that “these are political speeches addressed directly to the populace of the countries concerned, aimed at galvanising, persuading or reassuring them”. She emphasised that the style of the translation should satisfy the style of the original author. The second rater, on the other hand, believes that the style of the text as a whole should be similar to the style expected from presidential speeches in the target language (English). The difference in the appreciation of the text type between the two raters is actually a normal consequence of the vagueness of the holistic model concerning this particular aspect.

6.2 Applicability of the Suggested Model

The second main objective of this research is to examine the applicability of the proposed model (discussed in Chapter 3) as a TQA measurement tool for Arabic-English translations. The present study attempts to propose a model for the analysis, description, and assessment of Arabic-English translation quality. Though it is originally derived from Beaugrande and Dressler’s theory of textuality (1981) as a model of error analysis, some amendments were made to it. The reasons behind selecting this particular model is that it concords with most of the criteria of objectivity discussed in this study; this is explored in more detail in Chapters 2 and 3. To elaborate, the amended model has a quantification dimension in which errors are calculated against the total number of words in the translated texts (Beaugrande and Dressler, 1981). In addition, the model is comprehensive as it encompasses all the levels of a text where translation problems are expected to occur (Neubert and Shreve, 1992), as discussed in Chapter 3. It covers the three perspectives of a text: (1) the text itself (in cohesion and coherence), (2) the participants (in intentionality and acceptability), and (3) the broad context (in informativity, situationality, and intertextuality) which when combined contribute to the creation of meaning. The modified model also considers both the micro and macro levels of analysis and assessment (the micro level is appreciated in the examination of the standards of cohesion, coherence, informativity, and intentionality, whereas the macro level is appreciated in the examination of the standards of acceptability, situationality and intertextuality).

The amended model is also applicable, as it is based on the seven standards of textuality which are believed to be present in every text (as mentioned in Chapter 3). Therefore, even though it is being applied in this study to a specific genre, the adapted model has the potential to be applied to all text types. The reliance on the notion of equivalence, which is believed to be a descriptive and prescriptive category for comparing the source and target texts, is also ensured in the adapted model, as the seven standards of textuality serve as quality parameters in which equivalence is sought. The model is coherently structured around the concept of textuality, which is believed to be the basic element of equivalence (Beaugrande and Dressler, 1981). It seeks to be objective in terms of providing evaluative judgements based on previously set parameters of the classification and types of errors committed in each of the seven standards. Beaugrande and Dressler’s model (1981) is not the only comprehensive and general model; there are other models in the field of translation which cover almost all text aspects, such as those developed by Newmark, (1998), Al-Qinai (2000) and Brunette (2000). However, these models are also functional, as they allow for changes to be made to the target text according to the function it is supposed to fulfil in the target culture. These changes are related to the text type itself. According to Reiss (1971/2000), when dealing with presidential speeches, the translator must remain faithful on the level of content as well as the target languages spoken syntax. Therefore, functional models were not selected to be applied to the assessment of the corpus of this study, as explained in detail in Chapter 2.

Although other comprehensive models exist (discussed in Chapter 2), they are not general, as they are specifically designed to assess certain text types such as literary texts (Al-Rubai’i, 2000; Balharith, 2002) and advertisement texts (Adab, 2001; Al-Qinai, 2000). Despite the fact that some studies have applied the textuality model as proposed by

Beaugrande and Dressler (1981), they either aim to investigate the process of translation (e.g., Bell, 1991) or analyse and describe translated texts (e.g. Kruger, 2000). These studies in fact demonstrate the operative role of the seven standards in investigating translation as a process and a product. As for translation quality assessment, the textuality model has also been proposed as a measurement tool. Adab (2001), for instance, applies it to advertisement texts, whereas Alan (1994) applies it to literary ones. However, these two researchers do not suggest any modifications to the model, except for a few additions to cohesion in Alan's model (1994) (see Chapter 3).

Due to the fact that every language has its own distinctive features, and, as explained in Chapter 3, because the seven standards of textuality revealed some interrelatedness in the examination of some of their aspects, certain changes were deemed necessary to the application of the original model. The proposed amended model in this study differs in a number of points from those in other studies that adopt the seven standards as explicated by the original authors. These changes include the following:

2. Cohesion is modified to be Arabic-oriented, so as to be capable of describing Arabic texts. The treatment of this standard in Beaugrande and Dressler's model stems from Halliday and Hasan's (1976) classification of cohesive devices in English. Arabic also has the potentiality to express most of these devices' cohesive functions. Therefore, Arabic cohesive devices were discussed under the same five cohesive devices suggested in the original model, with the addition of other Arabic cohesive elements - parallelism and paraphrasing. Consequently, in the suggested model, cohesion is discussed in terms of the following cohesive devices: reference, conjunction, ellipsis, substitution, lexical cohesion, parallelism, and paraphrasing. At the end of the empirical study, these additions proved to be indispensable, as the devices in the original model did not encompass all the Arabic cohesive devices. In addition, both parallelism and paraphrasing were distinctive features in the examined speeches. Therefore, if there were no tools to assess these cohesive functions and the success of their transfer, the view of quality assessment would be restricted.
3. Coherence is also modified and given a specific scope to make its application easier, and limit it to function as a tool which accounts for the logical relations between sentences. Based on the literature review, the standard of coherence, as discussed by

Beaugrande and Dressler, does not cover the entire scope of the textual aspect, as it does not much contribute to the exploration of the logical and semantic relatedness between a text's elements which help the reader make sense of it. Therefore, additions were made to the suggested model with respect to the study of coherence. The exploration of relevant studies revealed some interrelated aspects between coherence and the other six standards of textuality. Thus, due to this interrelatedness, and to avoid the repeated examination of the same aspect in more than one standard, this standard was not examined as explicated by Beaugrande and Dressler (1981). Instead, another approach to studying it was proposed. Only the following features were dealt with in the examination of coherence, as they are not subsumed under the other standards: (1) the logico-semantic relations which signal the relatedness of propositions, and (2) continuity, balance, completeness, and non-contradiction.

4. Informativity is modified to include all the linguistic features of the text that contribute to the creation of its meaning; lexical items, syntactic structures, rhetorical devices, and thematisation. This standard is concerned with the extent to which occurrences in a text are expected or not expected, known or unknown. In relation to the examination of informativity in the adapted model, this standard deals with all the elements that convey information in a text. Consequently, all the information elements were examined at three levels: lexical, syntactic, and rhetorical. The only addition to Beaugrande and Dressler's standard of informativity is in the exploration of thematisation. This is deliberately included as thematising is another textual aspect that usually entails emphasis and bringing certain elements into focus, which affects the level of informativity. Without the addition of thematisation, the rhetorical functions that this informative device is supposed to fulfil will be overlooked in the assessment process.
5. The preliminary examination of the standard of intentionality revealed some interrelatedness between the examination of intentionality and the standards of cohesion and informativity. Intentionality, as suggested by Beaugrande and Dressler, is examined through the deliberate linguistic choices that serve the explicit and implicit intentions of the text producer. This study purposes a more systematic way to examine this standard. As discussed in chapter 2, intentionality can be examined at different

levels: the level of cohesion (represented in the correct rendering of the devices of reference, conjunctions, ellipsis, substitution, and lexical cohesion, that serve and maintain the explicit and implicit intentions), and at the level of informativity (represented in the correct rendering of lexis, syntax, rhetorical devices, and thematisation).

In the next chapter, all the results obtained in this study from amending the original model are presented and illustrated. It is important to reiterate, at the end of this chapter, that the obtained results are data-driven, meaning that they are the results derived from the application of the proposed model of error analysis on the English translations of the selected Arab Spring presidential speeches.

Chapter 7

Conclusions, Limitations and Suggestions for Future Research

7.1 Summary of Findings:

The conclusions reached in this chapter stem from results drawn from the empirical research conducted for this study, which examined the applicability of the two main approaches in translation quality assessment within the context of objectivity. The rationale behind this examination lies in the absence of agreement as to what constitutes quality assessment criteria. This lack of consensus is a consequence of the belief that quality is a subjective concept (as illustrated in Chapter 2). However, this subjective nature is not seen as a barrier against TQA practices. Therefore, this study applied the approaches that are broadly used to assess translation quality to the same texts, in order to identify how they reduce the subjectivity inherent to TQA. It is against this background that the current thesis set out to address the following main question:

- What are the criteria of objectivity that the main product-centred assessment approaches take into consideration in the process of providing an objective translation quality assessment?

To answer this question, the study began by identifying the main approaches used for the assessment of translation products. The relevant literature, explored in Chapter 2, suggested that the quality of translation products is mostly examined via two main approaches: error analysis and holistic assessment. The first approach was represented in this study by (Method A), which employs the adapted model of error analysis originally derived from the theory of textuality (Beaugrande and Dressler, 1981). The second approach, illustrated by (Method B), was represented by Waddington's holistic model (2001). Despite translation scholars' view that quality is a subjective notion, both approaches promise to provide objective assessments of translation quality. Nonetheless, this study is based upon the belief that the recognition of the relative subjective nature of TQA "does not invalidate the objective part of the assessment", rather, "it merely reinforces its necessity" (House, 2001, p. 256).

Thus, this study focused on identifying criteria of objectivity that, when properly implemented in the process of quality assessment, reduce the subjectivity inherent to TQA. The relevant literature written on this aspect revealed that there are a number of criteria that translation scholars believe can lend assessment methods more objectivity. These are: (1) building the assessment on established theories of translation, (2) considering both the negative and the positive aspects of the translation in the assessment of translation quality, (3) assigning translation quality indexes that can be justified qualitatively and quantitively, (4) including a quantification dimension in the assessment, (5) following a multi-perspective viewpoint of assessment which means that both micro and macro levels are considered, and (6) acknowledging the effect of the text type on the assessment process. The identification of these criteria leads the discussion to the second question that this study aims to address:

- Are there any differences in the outcome of the application of the two methods of translation quality assessment when applied to the assessment of the same texts?

In the optic of investigating the differences in the application of the two assessment methods specified above, they were employed to assess the same texts. Four Arab Spring presidential speeches were selected for examination, as they adhere to the selection criteria adopted in this study. The final quality indexes provided by each method are summarised in Table (5.1), reproduced below for ease of reference:

Quality Index	**Speech No (1)**	**Speech No (2)**	**Speech No (3)**	**Speech No (4)**
Method (A)	3.4/10	6/10	4.6/10	5.2/10
Method (B)	2.75/10	6/10	6.75/10	7.75/10

Table (5.1): The Overall Quality Indexes from Method (A) and Method (B)

As seen from the statistics in Table (6.3), the application of the two assessment methods revealed different quality indexes. Method (A) assigned lower marks to the third and fourth speeches than Method (B). The latter, on the other hand, designated a lower mark to the first speech than Method (A). Finally, both methods allocated the same quality index to the second speech. These differences can be attributed to the following:

- As illustrated in Chapter 5, Method (A) sets a more systematic and comprehensive approach to the detection of errors than Method (B). However, as it is based on error analysis, it relies on error as the sole defining element of assessment and, subsequently, of related issues such as error type, and severity. Considering error as an absolute notion results in disregarding its functional value (Hurtado, 2001). Therefore, the use of models that rely on identifying and tagging errors in isolation rather than in relation to their context and function within the text (Nord 1997) may result in inaccurate assessment. Although the proposed model of error analysis (as represented by Method A) appreciates the functional value of errors, as each is considered in light of whether it violates the functions of the standard to which it relates, sole reliance on errors is probably one of the main reasons for the differences in the overall quality indexes given by each method. Given that Method (B) is the only one which takes into account both the negative and positive aspects of the translation, the methods' differing outcomes are unsurprising.

- The other main reason for the differences in the two assessment methods' results is that the holistic model adopted in this study focuses only on the micro level of assessment, whereas the error analysis method equally considers both the micro and macro levels. However, this is not the norm in most error analysis models, as they commonly concentrate on the linguistic related issues at the micro textual level, and pay no attention to the extralinguistic levels. Thus, the search for errors is limited to the word and sentence levels, and neglects the larger unit of the text or the communicative context (Nord 1997; Williams 2001; Colina 2008, 2009). The proposed model, however, treats micro and macro levels of assessment equally. The micro level is examined through the standards of cohesion, coherence, informativity, and intentionality, whilst the macro level is explored through the examination of the standards of acceptability, situationality and intertextuality.

Notwithstanding the differences in the application of the two most common TQA practices, both approaches are hugely implemented in real life settings, which brings the discussion to the main question that this thesis aims to explore:

- How do these two methods of assessment reduce the subjectivity inherent to quality assessment?

Although the subjective nature of TQA is widely recognised in Translation Studies, employing objective measures to assess it remains possible. The subjectivity attached to human activity cannot be disassociated from TQA models, since it is ultimately a person who makes the final decisions when it comes to error detection and classification. If successfully accounted for by the raters involved in the assessment process, the afore-mentioned objectivity criteria can yield more objective results for both major TQA approaches (holistic and error-based). Despite the fact that, as agreed by translation scholars, the search for a single method that achieves full objectivity in every situation, context and for every text type seems futile, the adoption of these criteria helps to decrease the subjectivity in TQA. Examining the way in which each assessment method considers the previously specified criteria of objectivity revealed the following:

- Neither Method (A) nor Method (B) fully employ all the criteria presumed to lend objectivity to the assessment process.
- As for the criteria of assigning both qualitatively and quantitively justifiable translation quality indexes, the index reached in Method (A) is quantitatively justified, as the marks given are a reflection of the number and weight of the errors committed in the translated texts. In contrast, the quality index reached in Method (B) is qualitatively justified. Thus, the error-based models focus only on the negative points of a translation. As has been argued in Chapter 1, although errors diminish a translation's quality, sole reliance on error detection cannot provide an objective quality index. This is reflected in the fact that two translations containing the same number of errors can vary in their overall quality. In contrast, although Method (B) looks at both the negative and positive aspects of

translation quality in the assessment process, its appreciation of the positive elements is estimated by the raters. This is because the holistic model used in this study, as with those available in the field, do not provide systematic measures for the assessment of both negative and positive aspects of a translation, so as to attain an overall objective quality index. Without clear guidance on how to assess the positive elements as well as reflect this assessment in the overall process, raters can only rely on their estimation, which is highly subjective.

- As for the consideration of text type as a criterion of objectivity, in the adapted error-based model, text type is not only considered in the standard of acceptability, where the naturalness of style is an assessment criterion, it is also examined in the standard of intertextuality, where the style of the translated text should resemble that of texts of similar nature. The holistic model, on the other hand, does not single out text type as a criterion of quality assessment. Although raters assert that they acknowledge this criterion in their assessment of style, whether the style should satisfy that of the original writer or that of the text's genre in the target language remains unclear. Indeed, the larger the margin for raters' decisions and preferences, the higher the level of subjectivity is in the assessment.
- Quantification is a key feature of quality assessment in the adapted error-based model employed in this research. Errors are calculated against the total words count of the translated texts. This appreciates the fact that not the same number of errors damage a translation in the same manner. The holistic model, in contrast, is not based on the number of errors found, nor on the quantification of error types committed in the translation. Subjectivity can be significantly reduced if the assessment of quality is based on concrete numbers and figures, as opposed to estimation and evaluative judgments lacking referential metrics.
- The assessment of quality in the error-based model used in this study, where error analysis is based on the textuality theory (Beaugrande and Dressler, 1981), is centred on the consideration of the micro level (represented in the standards of cohesion, coherence, informativity, and intentionality) as well as the macro level (represented in the examination of the standards of acceptability, situationality and intertextuality). The adopted holistic model, on the other hand, focuses mainly on the micro level of

assessment. Given that adopting a multi-perspective assessment is believed to increase the level of objectivity in TQA, the consideration of both levels renders the assessment more inclusive, and consequently, less subjective than if it were based solely on one level. This means that by carrying out the assessment on both micro and macro levels, the rater would be able to assess translation quality more objectively, thereby reducing subjectivity.

- The assessment of translation quality is also believed to be more objective when based on an established theory of translation. The linguistic approach to the study of translation, whether structural or functional, is hugely accredited among translation scholars. It can therefore be argued that the error-based assessment model provides objectivity, as it is built on a linguistic approach to translation. The holistic assessment model, though not clearly specified, also stems from a translational background, and the scale in this particular model is unitary, and treats translation competence as a whole.

It can be concluded here that the two assessment methods vary in their implementation and application of the above-mentioned objectivity criteria. Each applies some parts of the criteria more than the other. Method (A), for instance, sets a more systematic and inclusive approach to the detection of errors than the holistic assessment. The more specification the model has, the less room is left for the rater’s preferences and therefore, subjectivity. Method (B), on the other hand, appreciates the inclusion of both the negative and positive aspects of assessment, whereas the other method focuses only on the negative elements, consequently increasing subjectivity. Having said that, the differences in their application of the objectivity criteria does not imply that either method is more objective than the other. This thesis aimed to explore how the criteria of objectivity are implemented in each approach, in the optic of shedding light on various considerations regarding the need to focus more on certain criteria, so as to reach a higher level of objectivity.

The previous three questions are related to this thesis’ first objective, which is concerned with the examination of the applicability of the two common TQA practices, and identifying how each approach counteracts the subjective nature of assessment. In contrast, the last question pertains to the amendments that were made to the original model of error analysis, and is as follows:

- What are the reasons for as well as the outcomes of adapting the original model of error analysis for the corpus of this study?

To answer this question, the study began by applying the original model as explicated by its authors, on one of the selected Arab Spring presidential speeches. Although the seven standards of textuality (from the 1981 theory of textuality) have previously been used as evaluative parameters against which translation quality can be assessed, a thorough search of the relevant literature has shown that this theory has likely not been applied to (Arabic-English) texts. As a Semitic language, Arabic is different to English in many ways. The application of the original model uncovered two important issues: (1) certain Arabic cohesive devices cannot be assessed following the description of the standard of cohesion proposed in the original model, and (2) there is unavoidable repetition in the examination of the textual elements of the standard of coherence as described in the original model. For these two main reasons, adaptations to the original model were necessary to suit the description of the corpus of this study (Arabic-English), and include all the aspects of the texts that must be examined by the original model. Moreover, according to Waddington (2000), in order to carry out a valid assessment, the object of assessment must be specified as much as possible. Therefore, the model itself was adapted to be able to assess the aspects that could not be assessed using the original model so as to suit the description of Arabic as the source language of the examined corpus. The amendments to the original model provided a more inclusive measurement tool for Arabic-English texts. The outcomes of this adaptation can be summarised as follows:

- Cohesion, with the addition of paraphrasing and parallelism, provided a more inclusive measurement tool for the examination of all Arabic cohesive devices that function as connecting devices. Sole reliance on the original model would restrict the examination of all the cohesive devices in the SL texts which, consequently, would affect the comprehensive examination of quality assessment.
- Limiting the assessment of coherence to the examination of: (1) the logico-semantic relations which signal the relatedness of propositions, and (2) continuity, balance, completeness and non-contradiction, provided a more practical measurement tool for the assessment of this textual aspect. The examination of coherence as suggested in the

original model would result in excessive repetition, as many aspects are already discussed in the other six standards of textuality, as illustrated in Chapter 3.

7.2 Limitations of the Study

- In this study, the ratio of the number of errors, which represent translation mistakes, to the number of errors, which illustrate language mistakes, is relatively high. The application of Method (A) resulted in (65) major errors and (18) minor errors, resulting in a relatively high ratio of approximately 4:1. However, this cannot be attributed to the restrictions of the model itself. Given that the translated texts are published in important English news agencies, language mistakes are less likely to be made than translation ones.
- There could have been a greater number of texts included in this study if the non-official versions of the translations had not been excluded. The total word count of the translations used is (3728 words), and the total word count of the original texts is (2866 words). From the 12 presidential speeches delivered in 2011, four adhered to the selection criteria adopted in this study, meaning that they were fully translated and published by reliable English news agencies. The fan and crowdsourced translations were beyond the interest of this study, as they entailed different assessment criteria. As this research's main objective is to examine the differences in the application of two main approaches with regards to their objectivity, the limitation in the number of texts did not prevent the examination of the desired aspects.

7.3 Suggestions for Further Studies:

This study examined the objectivity of the holistic and error-based approaches to TQA, and attempted to identify how each method functions to reduce the subjectivity inherent to quality assessment practices. The conclusions reached in this study were based on the examination of two representative models, one from each approach. However, it would be interesting to apply another set of models from the same approaches to determine whether they generate similar results, to increase the validity of the current conclusions. In addition, it would be worthwhile to explore the identification and implementation of the criteria of objectivity for the assessment of the other two types of translation quality - the quality of the process and the quality of the producer.

Most TQA models rely on rating scales that lack an explicit theoretical base and verifiable empirical evidence, as highlighted by several scholars (Jiménez Crespo 2001; Colina 2008, 2009). This underlying theoretical defect results in a two-fold inadequacy: firstly, it damages the models' value due to the lack of conceptual background and secondly, it prevents them from being re-used to be applied to other contexts or other text genres. This study attempted to propose a model for the TQA of Arabic-English translations based on the adaptation of some of the seven standards of textuality (Beaugrande and Dressler, 1981). Given that in this research, the proposed model was applied to political texts, it would be constructive to apply the adapted model on another genre and explore the outcomes.

References

Abed-Raof, H. (2001). *Arabic Stylistics: A Course Book*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.

Abu Hatab, W. (2013). 'Arab Spring Presidential Speeches and New Social Identities: A Critical Discourse Analysis Study'. *The European Conference on Arts & Humanities*: Official Conference Proceedings 2013.

Adab, B. (2001). 'The Translation of Advertising: A Framework for Evaluation'. *Babel*, 47(2), 133-157.

Aksoy, B. (2001). 'Aspects of textuality in translating a history book from Turkish into English' (1st ed.). *Holanda: International Federation of Translators*.

Alan, A. (1994). 'Textlinguistics and Translation. A Contrastive Analysis of Textlinguistic Elements in Turkish and English for Translation Theory and Criticism'. MA thesis, Hacettepe University, Ankara. Retrieved September, 2014 from http://www.libertasmedia.nl/Alan/master.html.

Al-Jubouri, A. (1983). 'The Role of Repetition in Arabic Argumentative Discourse'. In J. Swales and H. Mustafa: *English for Specific Purposes in the Arab World*, 100-125.

Al-Harahsheh, A. (2013). 'The Translatability of Figures of Speech in Khalid Mashaal"s Political Speeches: A Critical Discourse Analysis'. *International Journal of English Linguistics*; Vol. 3, No. 3; 2013

Al-Khafaji, R. (2005). 'Variation and Recurrence in the Lexical chains of Arabic and English texts'. P*oznan Studies in Contemporary Linguistics* 40, 2005, pp. 5-25 .

Alsharif, A. and Sadler, L. (2009). 'Negation in modern standard Arabic: An LFG Approach'. Proceedings of the LFG09 Conference http://www-csli.stanford.edu/.

Al-Sijilmasi, M. (1980). *Al-manza' l-badi fi: tajni:s 'asali:b l-badi*:. In A. Al-Gazi. Damascus : da:r l-khayr.

Al-Qinai, J. (2000). 'Translation Quality Assessment. Strategies, Parametres and Procedures'. *Meta*, 45(3), p. 497. doi:10.7202/001878ar.

Anckaert, P., J. Eyckmans, and W. Segers. Pour une évaluation normative de la compétence en traduction. (2008). *ITL International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 155: 53–76.

Anees, I. (1966). *Min Asrar Al-Lugha*. Cairo: Anglo-Egyptian Bookshop.

Asser, M. (2011). ‘Q&A: Egyptian protests against Hosni Mubarak’. *BBC*: http://www.bbc.com/news/world-middle-east-12324664.

Baker, M., & Saldanha, G. (1998). *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies* (1st ed.). London: Routledge.

Beaugrande, de R. (1980). *Text, Discourse, and Process Toward a Multidisciplinary Science of Texts*. Norwood, N. J.: Ablex,.

Beaugrande, de R. (2000). ‘Text Linguistics at the Millennium: Corpus Data and Text’, Retrieved May, 2015, from http://beaugrande.com/Textmillennium1.htm.

Beaugrande, de R. (2002). ‘A Brief Survey of Discourse Analysis’. Retrieved June, 2015 from http://beaugrande.bizland.com/survey%20of%20discourse%20analysis.htm

Beaugrande, de R. (2004). ‘A New Introduction to the Study of Text and Discourse’. Discursivism and Ecologism. Retrieved July 10, 2014 from http://www.beaugrande.com/new_intro_to_study.htm

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

Beeby, A. 2000. “Evaluating the Development of Translation Competence”. Schäffner, C. and Adab, B. (eds.) *Developing Translation Competence.* Amsterdam: Benjamins: 185-198.

Beeston, A. (1970). *The Arabic Language Today*. London: Hutchinson and Co.

Belhaaj, A. (1998). *The Process of Translating* (1st ed.). Makkah: Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, Umm Al-Qura University, Institute of Research & the Revival of Islamic Heritage, Social Sciences Research Center.

Bell, R. (1991). *Translation and Translating: Theory and Practice*. London: Longman.

Benjamin, W. (1968). The Task of the Translator. New York: Harcourt.

Biggs, J., and C. Tang. (2007). *Teaching for Quality Learning at University*. 3rd ed. Maidenhead: Open University Press.

Bittner, H. (2011). 'The quality of translation in subtitling' *Trans-Kom*, 4(1), 76–87.

Bonthrone, R. (1998) 'The Quality Wars. Barbarians at the Gate: The Abuse of Translation Quality" in Europe', *Language International* 10(2): 12-15.

Bowker, L. (2000). 'Towards a Methodology for Exploiting Specialized Target Language Corpora as Translation Resources'. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics* 5: 17-52.

Brunette, L. (2000). 'Towards a Terminology for Translation Quality Assessment'. *The Translator*, 6(2), 169-182. doi: 10.1080/13556509.2000.10799064

Carrol, J. B. (1966), 'An Experiment in Evaluating the Quality of Translations' in *Mechanical Translation* (9), 55-66.

Charteris-Black, J. (2005). *Politicians and Rhetoric: The Persuasive Power of Metaphor*. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire, New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Chesterman, A. (1997). *The Memes of Translation: The Spread of Ideas in Translation Theory*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: Benjamins.

Chilton, P. (2004). *Analyzing Political Discourse: Theory and Practice*. London: Routledge.

Colina, S. (2008). 'Translation Quality Evaluation'. *The Translator*, 14(1), 97-134. doi:10.1080/13556509.2008.10799251

Colina, S. (2009). 'Further evidence for a functionalist approach to translation quality evaluation'. *Target*, 21(2), 235-264. doi:10.1075/target.21.2.02col

Cook. G. (1999). *Discourse and Literature*. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.

Delisle, J. (2005). Practical Teaching of Translation. Ottawa: University Press Ottawa.

Dickins, J.; Hervey, S.; and Higgins, I. (2002). *Thinking Arabic Translation: A Course in Translation Method: Arabic to English*. London: Routledge.

Dooley, R. & Levinsohn S. (2000). *Analyzing Discourse: A Manual of Basic Concepts*. SIL International and University of North Dakota.

Doyle, M. (2003). 'Translation Pedagogy and Assessment: Adopting ATA's Framework for Standard ErrorMarking'. *The ATA Chronicle* November/December 2003.

Dunne, K. (2009). 'Assessing Software localization: toward a valid approach'. In *C. Angelelli & H. Jacobson (Eds.), Testing and Assessment in Translation and Interpreting Studies* (pp.185□222). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.

Fareh, Sh. (1998). 'The function of And and Wa in English and Arabic Written Discourse'. *Papers and Studies in Contrastive Linguistics*. Vol.34 p. 303-312.

Garant, M. (2009). "A Case for Holistic Assessment". *AFinLA-e Soveltavan Kielitieteen Tutkimuksia*, 1: 5-17. [Available at: https://helda.helsinki.fi/handle/10138/154545].

Gouadec, D. (2010). 'Quality in Translation', in Yves Gambier and Luc Van Doorslaer (eds) *Handbook of Translation Studie*s, Vol. 1, Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 270-275.

Goller, D. (2001). 'Textual Coherence: The Term and its Linguistic Conceptions. Paper presented at a seminar on the basics of the text linguistics at the Department of Language and Literature- English and American Studies, University of Osnabuck.

Gutt, E.A. (1991). *Translation and Relevance: Cognition and Context*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Hague, D., Melby, A., & Zheng, W. (2011). Surveying translation quality assessment. The Interpreter and Translator Trainer, 5(2), 243-267.

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

Halliday, M. (1985). *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. London: E. Arnold.

Hansen, G. (2010) 'Some Thoughts about the Evaluation of Translation Products in Empirical Translation Process Research', in *Methodology, Technology and Innovation in Translation Process Research*. Copenhagen: Samfundslitteratur, 389-402.

Hartmann, R. (1980). *Contrastive Textology* (1st ed.). Heidelberg: Groos.

Hatim, B., & Mason, I. (1990). *Discourse and the translator* (1st ed.). London: Longman.

Hatim, B., & Mason, I. (1997). *The Translator as Communicator* (1st ed.). London: Routledge.

Holes, C. (1995). *Modern Arabic: Structure, Functions and Varieties*. New York: Longman.

Holmes, J. (1988). *Papers on Literary Translation and Translation Studies*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Horguelin, P. & Brunette. L. (1998). Practique de la Revisión, 3ème Edition Revue et Augmenteé. Québec: Linguatech éditeur.

Horton, D. (1998), 'Translation Assessment: Notes on the Interlingual Transfer of an Advertising Text'in *IRAL*, Vol. (2), p. 95-119.

House, J. (1977). *A Model for Translation Quality Assessment* (1st ed.). Tubingen: Narr Verlag.

House, J. (1981). *A Model for Translation Quality Assessment.* Tubingen: Narr Verlag.

House, J. (1997). *Translation Quality Assessment: A Model Revisited.* Tubingen: Narr Verlag.

House, J. (2001). 'Translation Quality Assessment: Linguistic Description versus Social Evaluation'. *Meta*, 46(2), 243. doi:10.7202/003141ar

House, J. (2014). Translation Quality Assessment: Past and Present. London: Routledge. (1st edition).

Hurtado, A. (2001). *Traducción y traductología. Introducción a la Traductología*. Madrid:Cátedra.

Lu, H., & Ying, T. (2010). 'Study of the translation errors in the light of the Skopostheorie: Samples from the websites of some tourist attractions in China'. *Babel*, 56(1), 35-46. doi:10.1075/babel.56.1.03he

Jimenez-Crespo, M. (2009). 'The Evaluation of Pragmatic and Functionalist Aspects in Localization: Towards a Holistic Approach to Quality Assurance'. *The Journal of Internationalization and Localization* 1: 60-93.

Jimenez-Crespo, M. (2011). 'A Corpus-based Error Typology: Towards a More Objective Approach to Measuring Quality in Localization'. *Perspectives*, 19(4), 315-338. doi:10.1080/0907676x.2011.615409

Johnstone, B. (1991). *Repetition in Arabic Discourse: Paradigms, Syntagms, and the Ecology of Language*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Karoubi, B. (2016)/ Assessor-centered Translation Quality Assessment: a Theoretical Model and a Case Study. Leiden University Press.

Khan Mohammad, H. & Osanloo, M. (2009). 'Moving Toward Objective Scoring: A Rubric for Translation Assessment'. *JELS*, Vol. 1, No. 1, Fall 2009, 131-153 IAUCTB.

Kruger, A. (2000). 'Lexical Cohesion and Register Variation in Translation: The Merchant of Venice in Africaans'. PhD Dissertation, University of South Africa, South Africa.

Kussmaul, P. 1997. 'Text-Type Conventions and Translating: Some Methodological Issues'. In *Text Typology and Translation*. John Benjamins Publishing Company, Amsterdam.

Luo, Xuanmin. (2003). 'A transcultural perspective on foreingnizng and domesticating translation'. *New Focuses in Translation* (pp. 64-67). Hong Kong: Commercial Press.

Lauscher, S. (2000). ‘Translation Quality Assessment: Where can Theory and Practice Meet?’. *The Translator*, 6(2), 149–168. doi:10.1080/13556509.2000.10799063

Leabi, H. (1980). *Al-Taraaduf fi al-lugha*. Baghdad: Dar Al-huriya Press.

Levý, J. (1965). ‘Will translation theory be of use to translators?’. In *Italiaander*, R. (Ed.), Übersetzen. Vorträge und Beiträge vom Internationalen Kongress

Loock, R. (2013). ‘Close Encounters of the Third Code: Quantitative vs. Qualitative Analyses in corpus-based Translation Studies’. *Belgian Journal Of Linguistics*, 27(1), 61–86.

Lyons, J. (1981). *Language and Linguistics: An Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Maier, C. (2000). *Evaluation and Translation* (1st ed.). Manchester: St. Jerome.

Martinez, N., and Hurtado, A. (2001). ‘Assessment in Translation Studies: Research Needs’. *Meta*, 47, 272□287.

Mateo, R. (2014). ‘A Deeper look into Metrics for Translation quality assessment (TQA): A case Study’. *Miscelánea journal of English and American studies* 49 (2014): pp. 73-94 ISSN: 1137-6368.

McAlester, G. (2000). The Evaluation of Translation into a Foreign Language. In C. Schäffner & B. Adab (Eds.), *Developing Translation Competence* (pp. 229-242). *Benjamins Translation Library*, *38*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Medadian, G., and Mahabadi, D., (2015). A Summative Translation Quality Assessment Model for Undergraduate Student Translations: Objectivity Versus Manageability. Studies About Languages. No. (26). P.41-53.

Mobaraki, M. and Aminzadeh, S. 2012. “A Study on Different Translation Evaluation Strategies to Introduce an Eclectic Method”. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 2, (6): 63-70.

Munday, J. (2001). *Introducing Translation Studies* (1st ed.). London: Routledge.

Munday, J. (2012). *Translation Evaluation: Critical Points of Translator Decision-making*. London: Routledge.

Neubert, A., & Shreve, G. (1992). *Translation as Text* (1st ed.). Kent, Ohio: Kent State University Press.

Neubert, A. (1996). 'Textlinguistics of Translation: The Textual Approach to Translation'. *Translation Perspectives* (9), 87-106.

Nevezhkina, N. (2008). 'Adjectives in the Political Discourse'. International Forum. Volume (1), Issue (2).

Newmark, P. (1988). *A Textbook of Translation*. Prentice Hall.

Nida, E., & Taber, C. (1969). *The Theory and Practice of Translation* (1st ed.). Leiden: E.J. Brill.

Niska, H. (1999). 'Text Linguistic's for the Study of Simultaneous Interpreting'. Stockholm University. Retrieved June, 2015 from http://www.someya-net.com/01-Tsuyaku/Reading/TextLinguisticModels.pdf.

Nord, C. (1992). *Text Analysis in Translation: Theory, Methodology, and Didactic Application of a Model for Translation-Oriented Text analysis*. Amsterdam and Atlanta: Rodopi.

Nord, C. (1997). *Translation as a Purposeful Activity*. Manchester, UK: St. Jerome.

O'Brien, S. (2012). 'Towards a Dynamic Quality Evaluation Model for Translation'. *Jostrans*: *The Journal of Specialized Translation* 17. Retrieved from http://www. jostrans.org/issue17/art_obrien.php (Accessed June, 2014).

Onwuegbuzie, A. J., & Teddlie, C. (2003). 'A Framework for Analyzing Data in Mixed Methods Research'. In *A. Tashakkori & C. Teddlie (Eds.), Handbook of Mixed Methods in Social and Behavioral Research* (pp. 351-383). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Onwuegbuzie, A. J., & Leech, N. L. (2011). ‘Validity and qualitative research: An oxymoron: Quality & Quantity’: *International Journal of Methodology*.

Orengo, A. (2005), ‘Localising News: Translation and the 'Global-national' Dichotomy’, *Language and Intercultural Communication*, vol. 5, no. 2, p. 168- 187.

Parra, Si. (005). ‘La Revisión de Traducciones en la Traductología: Aproximación a la Práctica de la Revisión en el Ámbito Profesional Mediante el Estudio de Casos y Propuestas de Investigación’. (Doctoral Dissertation, Universidad de Granada, Spain).

Pym, A. (1992). ‘Translation Error Analysis and the Interface with Language Teaching’. *The Teaching Of Translation*, 279-288.

Pym, A. (1998). *Method in Translation History*. Manchester: St. Jerome.

Reiss, K. (1971). Moglichkeiten und Grenzen der Ubersetzungskritik (1st ed.). Munchen: M. Hueber.

Reiss, K.. (2000). *Translation Criticism: the Potentials and Limitations* (1st ed.). Manchester, U.K.: St. Jerome Publications.

Rothe-Neves, R. (2000). *On Justification in Translation Studies* (1st ed.).

Rothe-neves, R. (2002). ‘Translation Quality Assessment for Research Purposes: an Empirical Approach’. *Cuadernos de Traduçã*.131-113

Ryding, K. (2005). *A Reference Grammar of Modern Standard Arabic (Reference Grammars)*. Cambridge University Press (1ST) Edition.

Sager, J. (1989). ‘Quality and Standards: The evaluation of translations’. In *C. Picken (Ed.), The Translator's Handbook* (pp. 91□102). London: ASLIB.

Schäffner, C. (2002). *The Role of Discourse Analysis for Translation and in Translator Training*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Schmitt, P. A. (1998) ‘Qualitätsmanagement’, in Mary Snell-Hornby, Hans G. Hönig, Paul Kußmaul and Peter A. Schmitt (eds) *Handbuch Translation*, Tübingen: Stauffenburg-Verlag, 394-99.

Searle, J. (1969). *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. London: Cambridge University Press.

Secară, A. (2005) ‘Translation Evaluation – A State of the Art Survey‘‘’ in Proceedings of the millennium Workshop. Retrieved June, 2015 from http://ecolore.leeds.ac.uk/downloads/workshop/.

Shahraki, A. and Karimnia, A., (2011). Waddington's Model of Translation Quality Assessment: a Critical Inquiry. Elixir Linguistics and Translation. Vol. (40). 5219-5224.

Sidiropoulou, M. (1995). ‘Causal Shifts in News Reporting: English vs. Greek press’. *Perspectives: Studies in Translatology*.98–83 ،)1(3 ،

Solano-Flores, G., Backhoff, E., & Contreras-Niao, L. (2009). ‘Theory of Test Translation Error’. *International Journal Of Testing.* Vol. (2), 78-91. doi: 10.1080/15305050902880835

Song, L. (2010). ‘The Role of Context in Discourse Analysis’. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, Vol. 1, No. 6, p. 876-879.

Soudi, A. (2007). Arabic Computational Morphology: Knowledge-based and Empirical Methods. Antal; Neumann, Günter (Eds.), 2007. ISBN: 978-1-4020-6045-8.

Steiner, G. (1975). *After Babel: Aspects of Language and Translation*. Oxford University Press.

Sperber, D. & Deirdre, W. (1988). *Relevance: Communication and Cognition*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Toury, G. (1991). ‘What are Descriptive Studies into Translation Likely to Yield apart from Isolated Descriptions?’. In: Kitty M. Leuven-Zwart and Ton Naaijkens, eds, T*ranslation Studies: The State of the Art*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, pp. 179-192.

Toury, G. (1995). *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*. John Benjamins Publishing.

Van den Broeck, R. (1985) ‘Second Thoughts on Translation Criticism. A Model of its Analytic Function’. *Studies in Literary Translation*. London & Sydney: Croom Helm. P. 54-62.

Van Dijk, T. A., & Kintsch, W. (1983). *Strategies of discourse comprehension*. New York: Academic Press.

Van Doorslaer, L. (1995). ‘Quantitative and Qualitative Aspects of Corpus Selection in Translation Studies’. *Target* 7(2): 245-260.

Vigier Moreno, F., and Valero-Grace's, C. (2017). Shedding Light on the Grey Area of Assessment in Legal Translation: a Case Study Based on a Holistic Method. Available at http://www.researchgate.net/publication/316858757.

Vilar, et al. (2006). ‘Error Analysis of Statistical Translation Output’. *LREC*-2006: Fifth International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation. Proceedings. 22- 28 May 2006, Genoa, Italy. pp. 697-702.

Waddington, C. (2001). ‘Different Methods of Evaluating Student Translations: The Question of Validity’. *Meta*, 46(2), p. 311.

Waddington, C. (2003). 'A positive approach to the assessment of translation errors', en MUÑOZ MARTÍN, Ricardo [ed.] I AIETI. Actas del I Congreso Internacional de la Asociación Ibérica de Estudios de Traducción e Interpretación.

Widdowson, H. (2000). ‘On the Limitations of Linguistics Applied’. *Applied Linguistics*. 25–3 :21.1

Williams, M. (2001). ‘The Application of Argumentation Theory to Translation Quality Assessment’. *Meta* (2), P. 26-44.

Williams, M. (2003). *Translation Quality Assessment*. Ottawa: Ottawa University Press.

Williams, M. (2009). 'Translation Quality Assurance'. Mutatis Mutandis, 2 (1): 3-23.

Williams, M. (2013). 'A Holistic-componential Model for Assessing Translation Student Performance and Competency'. Mutatis Mutandis. Vol. (6). No. (2). P. 419-443.

Williams, J. & Chesterman, A. (2002) *The Map: A Beginner‟s Guide to Doing Research in Translation Studies*. Manchester: St. Jerome.

Yule. G. (2000). *Pragmatics*. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.

Zequan, L. (2003). 'Register Analysis as a Tool for Translation Quality Assessment'. *Translation Journal,* Vol. (3), (7-26).

Zheng, Y., & Cheng, X. (2012). 'The Assessment of the Translation of Chang Hen Ge on the Basis of Textuality'. *Journal Of Language Teaching And Research*, 3(6), 1267– 1271.

Zhu, C. (1999). 'Once More: The Sentence as the Key Functional Unit of Translation'. *Meta*, (3), 429-447.

Appendix 1

First Speech: Accessed in August 27, 2018

Source of the Script: http://www.aljazeera.net/news/arabic/2011/2/10/%D9%86%D8%B5-%D8%AE%D8%B7%D8%A7%D8%A8-%D9%85%D8%A8%D8%A7%D8%B1%D9%83-%D9%84%D9%84%D8%B4%D8%B9%D8%A8-%D8%A7%D9%84%D9%85%D8%B5%D8%B1%D9%8A

Source of the Original Audio: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ySQp73bZA6o

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم

..الإخوة المواطنون، الأبناء شباب مصر وشاباتها، أتوجه بحديثي اليوم لشباب مصر بميدان التحرير وعلى اتساع أرضها، أتوجه إليكم جميعا بحديث من القلب، حديث الأب لأبنائه وبناته ..أقول لكم إنني أعتز بكم رمزا لجيل مصري جديد يدعو إلى التغيير إلى الأفضل ويتمسك به ويحلم بالمستقبل ويصنعه. أقول لكم قبل كل شيء، إن دماء شهدائكم وجرحاكم لن تضيع هدرا، وأؤكد أنني لن أتهاون في معاقبة المتسببين بها بكل الشدة والحسم، وسأحاسب الذين أجرموا في حق شبابنا بأقصى ما تقرره أحكام القانون من عقوبات رادعة .وأقول لعائلات هؤلاء الضحايا الأبرياء :إنني تألمت كل الألم من أجلهم مثلما تألمتم، وأوجع قلبي كما اوجع قلوبكم .أقول لكم إن استجابتي لصوتكم ورسالتكم ومطالبكم هو التزام لا رجعة فيه، وإنني عازم كل العزم على الوفاء بما تعهدت به بكل الجدية والصدق، وحريص كل الحرص على تنفيذه دون ارتداد أو عودة للوراء. إن هذا الالتزام ينطلق من اقتناع أكيد بصدق ونقاء نواياكم وتحرككم، وأن مطالبكم هي مطالب عادلة ومشروعة، فالأخطاء واردة في أي نظام سياسي وفي أي دولة، ولكن المهم هو الاعتراف بها وتصحيحها في أسرع وقت ومحاسبة مرتكبيها .وأقول لكم إنني كرئيس للجمهورية لا أجد حرجا أو غضاضة أبدا في الاستماع لشباب بلادي والتجاوب معه، لكن الحرج كل الحرج، والعيب كل العيب، وما لم ولن أقبله أبدا ..أن أستمع لإملاءات أجنبية تأتي من الخارج، أيا كان مصدرها وأيا كانت ذرائعها أو مبرراتها. الأبناء شباب مصر، الإخوة المواطنون ..لقد أعلنت بعبارات لا تحتمل الجدل أو التأويل عدم ترشحي للانتخابات الرئاسية المقبلة، مكتفيا بما قدمته من عطاء للوطن لأكثر من 60عاما في سنوات الحرب والسلام ..

أعلنت تمسكي بذلك، وأعلنت تمسكا مماثلا وبذات القدر بالمضي في النهوض بمسؤوليتي في حماية الدستور ومصالح الشعب حتى يتم تسليم السلطة والمسؤولية لمن يختاره الناخبون في شهر سبتمبر المقبل، في انتخابات حرة ونزيهة توفر لها ضمانات الحرية والنزاهة ..ذلك هو القسم الذي أقسمته أمام الله والوطن، وسوف أحافظ عليه حتى نبلغ بمصر وشعبها بر الأمان.

لقد طرحتُ رؤية محددة للخروج من الأزمة الراهنة، ولتحقيق ما دعا إليه الشباب والمواطنون، بما يحترم الشرعية الدستورية ولا يقوضها، وعلى نحو يحقق استقرار مجتمعنا ومطالب أبنائه، ويطرح في ذات الوقت إطارا متفقا عليه للانتقال السلمي للسلطة من خلال حوار مسؤول بين كافة قوى المجتمع وبأقصى قدر من الصدق والشفافية .طرحتُ هذه الرؤية ملتزما بمسؤوليتي في الخروج بالوطن من هذه الأوقات العصيبة، وأتابع المضي في تحقيقها أولا بأول، بل ساعة بساعة، متطلعا لدعم ومساندة كل حريص على مصر وشعبها كي ننجح في تحويلها لواقع ملموس، وفق توافق وطني عريض ومتسع القاعدة، تسهر على ضمان تنفيذه قواتنا المسلحة الباسلة.

لقد بدأنا بالفعل حوارا وطنيا بناء يضم شباب مصر الذين قادوا الدعوة إلى التغيير وكافة القوى السياسية، ولقد أسفر هذا الحوار عن توافق مبدئي في الآراء والمواقف يضع أقدامنا على بداية الطريق الصحيح للخروج من الأزمة، ويتعين مواصلته للانتقال به من الخطوط العريضة لما تم الاتفاق عليه، إلى خريطة طريق واضحة وبجدول زمني محدد تمضي يوما بعد يوم على طريق الانتقال السلمي للسلطة من الآن وحتى سبتمبر المقبل .إن هذا الحوار الوطني قد تلاقى حول تشكيل لجنة دستورية تتولى دراسة التعديلات المطلوبة في الدستور وما تقتضيه من تعديلات تشريعية، كما تلاقى حول تشكيل لجنة للمتابعة تتولى متابعة التنفيذ الأمين لما تعهدتُ به أمام الشعب .ولقد حرصت على أن يأتي تشكيل كلتا اللجنتين من الشخصيات المصرية المشهود لها بالاستقلال والتجرد، ومن فقهاء القانون الدستوري ورجال القضاء.

وفضلا عن ذلك فإنني إزاء ما فقدناه من شهداء من أبناء مصر في أحداث مأساوية حزينة أوجعت قلوبنا وهزت ضمير الوطن، أصدرت تعليماتي بسرعة الانتهاء من التحقيقات حول أحداث الأسبوع الماضي، وإحالة نتائجها على الفور إلى النائب العام ليتخذ بشأنها ما يلزم من إجراءات قانونية رادعة .ولقد تلقيت أمس التقرير الأول بالتعديلات الدستورية ذات الأولوية المقترحة من اللجنة التي شكلتها من رجال القضاء وفقهاء القانون لدراسة التعديلات الدستورية والتشريعية المطلوبة .وإنني تجاوبا مع ما تضمنه تقرير اللجنة من مقترحات، ومقتضى الصلاحيات المخولة لرئيس الجمهورية وفقا للمادة 189من الدستور، فقد تقدمت اليوم بطلب تعديل

ست مواد دستورية هي المواد 76و 77و 88و 93و189، فضلا عن إلغاء المادة 179من الدستور، مع تأكيد الاستعداد للتقدم في وقت لاحق بطلب تعديل المواد التي تنتهي إليها هذه اللجنة الدستورية وفق ما تراه من الدواعي والمبررات.

وتستهدف هذه التعديلات ذات الأولوية تيسير شروط الترشيح لرئاسة الجمهورية، واعتماد عدد محدد لمدد الرئاسة تحقيقا لتداول السلطة، وتعزيز ضوابط الإشراف على الانتخابات ضمانا لحريتها ونزاهتها، كما تؤكد اختصاص القضاء وحده بالفصل في صحة وعضوية أعضاء البرلمان، وتعدل شروط وإجراءات طلب تعديل الدستور .أما الاقتراح بإلغاء المادة 179من الدستور فإنه يستهدف تحقيق التوازن المطلوب بين حماية الوطن من مخاطر الإرهاب وضمان احترام الحقوق والحريات المدنية للمواطنين، بما يفتح الباب أمام إيقاف العمل بقانون الطوارئ فور استعادة الهدوء والاستقرار وتوافر الظروف المواتية لرفع حالة الطوارئ.

الإخوة المواطنون ..إن الأولوية الآن هي استعادة الثقة بين المصريين بعضهم البعض، والثقة في اقتصادنا وسمعتنا الدولية، والثقة في أن التغيير والتحول الذي بدأناه لا ارتداد عنه أو رجعة فيه .إن مصر تجتاز أوقاتا صعبة لا يصح أن نسمح باستمرارها فيزداد ما ألحقته بنا وباقتصادنا من أضرار وخسائر يوما بعد يوم، وينتهي بمصر الأمر إلى أوضاع يصبح معها الشباب الذين دعوا إلى التغيير والإصلاح أول المتضررين منها .إن اللحظة الراهنة ليست متعلقة بشخصي، ليست متعلقة بحسني مبارك، وإنما بات الأمر متعلقا بمصر في حاضرها ومستقبل أبنائها.

إن المصريين جميعا في خندق واحد الآن، وعلينا أن نواصل الحوار الوطني الذي بدأناه بروح الفريق وليس الفرقاء، وبعيدا عن الخلاف والتناحر، كي تتجاوز مصر أزمتها الراهنة، ولنعيد لاقتصادنا الثقة فيه، ولمواطنينا الاطمئنان والأمان، وللشارع المصري حياته اليومية الطبيعية .لقد كنت شابا مثل شباب مصر الآن، عندما تعلمت شرف العسكرية المصرية والولاء للوطن والتضحية من أجله ..أفنيت عمري دفاعا عن أرضه وسيادته، شهدت حروبه بهزائمها وانتصاراتها، عشت أيام الانكسار والاحتلال وأيام العبور والنصر والتحرير ..أسعد أيام حياتي يوم رفعت علم مصر فوق سيناء، واجهت الموت مرات عديدة طيارا وفي أديس أبابا وغير ذلك كثير، لم أخضع يوما لضغوط أجنبية أو إملاءات، حافظت على السلام، عملت من أجل أمن مصر واستقرارها، اجتهدت من أجل نهضتها، لم أسع يوما لسلطة أو شعبية زائفة ..أثق أن الأغلبية الكاسحة من أبناء الشعب يعرفون من هو حسني مبارك، ويحز في نفسي ما ألاقيه اليوم من بعض بني وطني.

وعلى أية حال، فإنني إذ أعي خطورة المفترق الصعب الحالي، واقتناعا من جانبي بأن مصر تجتاز لحظة فارقة في تاريخها تفرض علينا جميعا تغليب المصلحة العليا للوطن، وأن نضع مصر أولا فوق أي اعتبار وكل اعتبار آخر، فقد رأيتُ تفويض نائب رئيس الجمهورية في اختصاصات رئيس الجمهورية على النحو الذي يحدده الدستور.

إنني أعلم علم اليقين أن مصر ستتجاوز أزمتها ولن تنكسر إرادة شعبها، ستقف على أقدامها من جديد بصدق وإخلاص أبنائها كل أبنائها، وسترد كيد الكائدين وشماتة الشامتين .سنثبت نحن المصريين قدرتنا على تحقيق مطالب الشعب بالحوار المتحضر والواعي، سنثبت أننا لسنا أتباعا لأحد، ولا نأخذ تعليمات من أحد، وأن أحدا لا يصنع لنا قراراتنا سوى نبض الشارع ومطالب أبناء الوطن .سنثبت ذلك بروح وعزم المصريين، وبوحدة وتماسك هذا الشعب، وبتمسكنا بعزة مصر وكرامتها وهويتها الفريدة والخالدة، فهي أساس وجودنا وجوهره لأكثر من سبعة آلاف عام .ستعيش هذه الروح فينا ما دامت مصر وشعبها، ستعيش هذه الروح فينا ما دامت مصر ودام شعبها، ستعيش في كل واحد من فلاحينا وعمالنا ومثقفينا، ستبقى في قلوب شيوخنا وشبابنا وأطفالنا، مسلميهم وأقباطهم، وفي عقول وضمائر من لم يولد بعد من أبنائنا .أقول من جديد ..إنني عشت من أجل هذا الوطن حافظا لمسؤوليته وأمانته، وستظل مصر هي الباقية فوق الأشخاص وفوق الجميع.

Translation of the First Speech : Accessed in August 27, 2018

Source: http://edition.cnn.com/2011/WORLD/africa/02/10/egypt.mubarak.statement/

In the name of God the most gracious, the most compassionate. Dear citizens, my sons, the youths of Egypt, today I am directing my speech to the youth of Egypt, those who are in there in Tahrir Square and the vast areas of the country I'm addressing you today out of a true and an honest heart from a father to his sons and daughters, and I'm telling you that I really cherish you as a symbol for a new generation for Egypt who are calling for change for the better, and are adamant to achieve this change for a better future. I'm telling you here before anything else, that the blood of the victims will not go unpunished. And at the same time, as I said here, that I will follow all those perpetrators who have afflicted those crimes with full sense of decisiveness. Those who had committed those crimes are going to be punished severely. And families of those victims, that I really felt the pain, I felt that I was in your boots, and my heart really felt for what really happened. I tell you that I'm actually opting to satisfy your demands and I am fully determined to fulfil my promise with a full sense of perseverance and honesty and out of a sense of keenness of carrying out the demands without taking any steps backwards. This sense of abiding comes from a sense of convincing from your honest demands and your honest movement, and that those demands are legitimate demands. Mistakes can happen in any political system and in any country, but at the same time, the most important is to recognize them and trying to put things on the right track as quick as possible, and to punish those who commit crimes. And I tell you here, as a head of state, I do not find any embarrassment at all in listening to the youth of my country, and to satisfying their demands. But the embarrassment would only lie in the fact -- and I would never permit -- is that I would listen to any sort of intervention that would come from outside, from the outside world, whatever the source is, whatever the intention behind them are. Dear youth of Egypt, dear citizens, I had already announced before that I am not going to run in the upcoming presidential elections. I have already given a lot to this country for more than 60 years of my effort, whether during the years of war or years of peace, and I am going to adhere to this decision, and at the same time adhere to the decision of shouldering the responsibility in defending the constitution and the national interest of the people until the transfer of power and the transfer of responsibility, which is going to be to the one that the people will choose as their leader in transparent and free elections where guarantees are going to be there for full transparency and for freedom. This is the offer that I undertook before Allah almighty and the people and I'm going to keep my promise so that we would put Egypt on a path of security and stability, and I would already out a perspective for coming out of this crisis and to satisfy the demands of the youth and the people in a way that respects the constitutional legitimacy and would not restrict it in any way. And at the same time put a framework for a peaceful transition of power through respectful dialogue between the different political parties of Egypt and with a sense of honesty and transparency.

I have put all those perspectives on the table and out of a sense of commitment of carrying the nation out of this critical juncture and I'm following up on the steps held day by day, hour by hour, if I can say, looking forward to the full support of all those who are really keen on Egypt and the Egyptian people so that we would succeed in translating it to action on solid ground, according to a national reconciliation that has strong bases, and that the armed forces with full due respect, can stop and initiate a national dialogue that includes the youth of Egypt and all of the different political parties. And this national dialogue can result in a near sense of consensus that is going to put our feet on a way out of this crisis. We need to continue this sense of dialogue, so that we would go further from the main guidelines into a roadmap that is quite crystal clear and that has a timetable to achieve those issues.

We are moving day after day on the path of a peaceful transfer of power from now until next September. This nation has already agreed that a committee will be held to study the different constitutional elements and all the requirements that would make those constitutional elements. Also an investigative committee will be held to take care of the follow-up of what I had promised the people. I was very keen that those two committees of people who are known among Egyptians as honest brokers, the constitutional leaders of Egypt. and members of the judiciary. In addition to that, and owing to the victims that we have lost in miserable circumstances, that really made us feel the pain and really shake the conscience of the nation, and I have given my directives that the investigations will be carried out very quickly concerning the issues that happened last week and that the results would be set up with the prosecutor general's office to take the necessary measures regarding this issue.

Yesterday I had received a preliminary report concerning the constitutional amendments that are of priority at this stage, as suggested by the committee that we have established. And in accordance to the suggestions that have been presented, and in accordance to my legislative and constitutional powers, according to Article 189 of the Egyptian Constitution, I have already presented the demand of six articles of the Egyptian Constitution 76, 77, 88, 93, and 198 this in addition to abolishing Article 179, this in addition also to expecting a sense of preparedness to adding other amendments to the constitution .

Those constitutional amendments in the first place will facilitate the procedures for the presidency, and would put a certain term for the presidency, and would also ensure that the judiciary would supervise the upcoming presidential election. The judiciary is also going to deal with the issue of the legitimacy of the members of parliament. And the suggestion to abolish Article 179 was maybe a way to achieve a sense of balance between protecting the nation from the dangers of terrorism and at the same time respecting legitimacy and civil freedom of the citizens in a way that is going to open the door further to abolishing the emergency law until when the situation permits in the country.

Dear citizens, the priority right now is regaining the sense of confidence in Egyptians and a sense of trust in our economy, our reputation. Change and transfer that we have already started and that is not going to bring us any sort of step backwards. Egypt is passing through a critical juncture. We should not ever permit that this is going to continue because this affects negatively our economy. Negative repercussions on our economy day after day would lead to a situation where we find those youth who had called for change, they would really be endangered out of the movement. This critical juncture is not at all co-relevant to me personally, it's not co-relevant to Hosni Mubarak, but now Egypt is a top priority. It's present, it's future, the future of the coming generations, all of the Egyptian people now are all in one boat, in one corner, and we have to continue the national dialogue that we have already started with the spirit of a team and away from any sense of animosity and any sense of differences. So that we would overcome this critical juncture, and so that we would regain confidence in our economy and we would retain security and stability on the Egyptian street. I used to be exactly like the Egyptian youth when I was honored to be part of the military, and the sense of loyalty and providing sacrifices for my country. I have spent my life safeguarding the interests of the nation, witnessed wars, and witnessed victories, and I had already lived the years of occupation, I lived also the moments of crossing and the moments of victory. The best moment of my life was when I put the Egyptian flag on Sinai, and I had already endangered my life for the sake of the country. I had never ever been accepting any sort of foreign intervention in Egyptian affairs. I've retained Egyptian security, I exerted efforts for the sake of its people, for the sake of Egyptian civilization, I did not seek any type of forced popularity and I am quite confident that the majority of the Egyptian people know who Hosni Mubarak is.

So Egypt is a top priority now. So I thought I would delegate powers to the vice president, according to the constitution, stipulations of the constitution I know quite well that Egypt, while fighting should try to go out of this juncture, but at the same time the determination of the people is going to help Egypt across this juncture through the perseverance, the honesty of its people, and is going to be above all. We are going to prove that we the Egyptians, our sense of awareness, of the demands of its people through a national dialogue, through the wise dialogue, we're going to prove that we are not followers to anybody, we're not going to take instructions from anybody, and no one is going to take decisions on our behalf, except only the rhythm of the street and the demands of the people. We are going to prove this with a sense of determination of the Egyptian people, and with the sense of unity and solidarity of its people and by putting Egypt's pride and dignity above all, and preserving our identity, which is the main essence of our presence for more than 7,000 years of civilization. The spirit is going to live in us as Egypt is going to long live, with its peasants, with its laborers, with its intellectuals, and its going to be in the hearts of our elderly, in the hearts of our youth, the hearts also, of our kids, and the hearts of Copts and Muslims and all of those who are going to live on this soil. Once again, I say that I have lived for the sake of this country. I have shouldered

124 the responsibility with honesty, and Egypt is going to live above all until I deliver

125 and transfer the responsibility. Egypt will continue to be in my heart until I die and

126 Egypt's people will always be living with pride, with dignity, to the end. God bless

127 Egypt. God bless Egypt, a country of security and stability. God bless the

128 Egyptians, with wise decisions for the sake of their nation. Thank you.

Second Speech: Accessed in August 27, 2018

Source of the Script and Original Audio: http://egypt-blew.blogspot.co.uk/2013/11/1-2011.html

الإخوة المواطنون 1

أتحدث إليكم في أوقات صعبة تمتحن مصر وشعبها وتكاد أن تنجرف بها وبهم إلي المجهول .يتعرض الوطن 2

لأحداث عصيبة واختبارات قاسية بدأت بشباب ومواطنين شرفاء مارسوا حقهم في التظاهر السلمي تعبيراً عن 4

همومهم وتطلعاتهم سرعان ما استغلهم من سعي لاشاعة الفوضي واللجوء إلي العنف والمواجهة وللقفز علي 5

الشرعية الدستورية والانقضاض عليها .تحولت تلك التظاهرات من مظهر راق ومتحضر لممارسة حرية الرأي 6

والتعبير إلي مواجهات مؤسفة تحركها وتهيمن عليها قوي سياسية سعت إلي التصعيد وصب الزيت علي النار 7

واستهدفت أمن الوطن واستقراره بأعمال اثارة وتحريض وسلب ونهب واشعال للحرائق وقطع للطرقات 8

واعتداء علي مرافق الدولة والممتلكات العامة والخاصة واقتحام لبعض البعثات الدبلوماسية علي أرض مصر. 9

نعيش معاً أياماً مؤلمة وأكثر ما يوجع قلوبنا هو الخوف الذي انتاب الأغلبية الكاسحة من المصريين وما ساورهم 10

من انزعاج وقلق وهواجس حول ما سيأتي به الغد لهم ولذويهم وعائلاتهم ومستقبل ومصير بلدهم .إن أحداث 11

الأيام القليلة الماضية تفرض علينا جميعاً شعباً وقيادة الاختيار ما بين الفوضي والاستقرار وتطرح أمامنا 12

ظروفاً جديدة وواقعاً مصرياً مغايراً يتعين أن يتعامل معه الشعب وقواته المسلحة بأقصي قدر من الحكمة 13

والحرص علي مصالح مصر وأبنائها . 14

الإخوة المواطنون 15

لقد بادرت لتشكيل حكومة جديدة بأولويات وتكليفات جديدة تتجاوب مع مطالب شبابنا ورسالتهم وكلفت نائب 16

رئيس الجمهورية بالحوار مع كافة القوي السياسية حول كافة القضايا المثارة للإصلاح السياسي والديمقراطي 17

وما يتطلبه من تعديلات دستورية وتشريعية من أجل تحقيق هذه المطالب المشروعة واستعادة الهدوء والأمن والاستقرار لكن هناك من القوي السياسية من رفض هذه الدعوة للحوار تمسكاً بأجنداتهم الخاصة ودون مراعاة للظرف الدقيق الراهن لمصر وشعبها.

وبالنظر لهذا الرفض لدعوتي للحوار وهي دعوة لاتزال قائمة فإنني أتوجه بحديثي اليوم مباشرة لأبناء الشعب بفلاحيه وعماله مسلميه وأقباطه شيوخه وشبابه ولكل مصري ومصرية في ريف الوطن ومدنه علي اتساع أرضه ومحافظاته.

إنني لم أكن يوماً طالب سلطة أو جاه ويعلم الشعب الظروف العصيبة التي تحملت فيها المسئولية وما قدمته للوطن حرباً وسلاماً كما أنني رجل من أبناء قواتنا المسلحة وليس من طبعي خيانة الأمانة أو التخلي عن الواجب والمسئولية .إن مسئوليتي الأولي ال ن هي استعادة أمن واستقرار الوطن لتحقيق الانتقال السلمي للسلطة في أجواء تحمي مصر والمصريين وتتيح تسلم المسئولية لمن يختاره الشعب في الانتخابات الرئاسية المقبلة .وأقول بكل الصدق وبصرف النظر عن الظرف الراهن انني لم أكن أنوي الترشح لفترة رئاسية جديدة فقد قضيت ما يكفي من العمر في خدمة مصر وشعبها لكنني ال ن حريص كل الحرص علي أن أختتم عملي من أجل الوطن بما يضمن تسليم أمانته ورايته و مصر عزيزة منة مستقرة وبما يحفظ الشرعية ويحترم الدستور .أقول بعبارات واضحة إنني سأعمل خلال الأشهر المتبقية من ولايتي الحالية كي يتم اتخاذ التدابير والإجراءات المحققة للانتقال السلمي للسلطة بموجب ما يخوله لي الدستور من صلاحيات .إنني أدعو البرلمان بمجلسيه إلي مناقشة تعديل المادتين 76و 77من الدستور بما يعدل شروط الترشيح لرئاسة الجمهورية ويعتمد فترات محددة للرئاسة .ولكي يتمكن البرلمان الحالي بمجلسيه من مناقشة هذه التعديلات الدستورية وما يرتبط بها من تعديلات تشريعية للقوانين المكملة للدستور وضماناً لمشاركة كافة القوي السياسية في هذه المناقشات فإنني أطالب البرلمان بالالتزام بكلمة القضاء وأحكامه في الطعون علي الانتخابات التشريعية الأخيرة دون إبطاء .

سوف أوالي متابعة تنفيذ الحكومة الجديدة بتكليفاتها علي نحو يحقق المطالب المشروعة للشعب وأن يأتي أداؤها معبراً عن الشعب وتطلعه للإصلاح السياسي والاقتصادي والاجتماعي ولإتاحة فرص العمل ومكافحة الفقر وتحقيق العدالة الاجتماعية .وفي ذات السياق فإنني أكلف جهاز الشرطة بالاضطلاع بدوره في خدمة الشعب وحماية المواطنين بنزاهة وشرف وأمانة وبالاحترام الكامل لحقوقهم وحرياتهم وكرامتهم .كما أنني أطالب السلطات الرقابية والقضائية بأن تتخذ علي الفور ما يلزم من إجراءات لمواصلة ملاحقة الفاسدين

والتحقيق مع المتسببين فيما شهدته مصر من إنفلات أمني ومن قاموا بأعمال السلب والنهب واشعال النيران وترويع الأ منين .ذلك هو عهدي للشعب خلال الأشهر المتبقية من ولايتي الحالية أدعو الله أن يوفقني في الوفاء به كي أختتم عطائي لمصر وشعبها بما يرضي الله والوطن وأبناءه.

الإخوة المواطنون.

ستخرج مصر من الظروف الراهنة أقوي مما كانت عليه قبلها وأكثر ثقة وتماسكاً واستقراراً .سيخرج منها شعبنا وهو أكثر وعياً بما يحقق مصالحه وأكثر حرصاً علي عدم التفريط في مصيره ومستقبله .إن حسني مبارك الذي يتحدث إليكم اليوم يعتز بما قضاه من سنين طويلة في خدمة مصر وشعبها إن هذا الوطن العزيز هو وطني مثلما هو وطن كل مصري ومصرية فيه عشت وحاربت من أجله ودافعت عن أرضه وسيادته ومصالحه وعلي أرضه أموت وسيحكم التاريخ علي وعلي غيري بما لنا أو علينا .إن الوطن باق والأشخاص زائلون و مصر العريقة هي الخالدة أبداً تنتقل رايتها وأمانتها بين سواعد أبنائها وعلينا أن نضمن تحقيق ذلك بعزة ورفعة وكرامة جيلاً بعد جيل.

حفظ الله هذا الوطن وشعبه.

والسلام عليكم ورحمة الله وبركاته

Translation of the Second Speech: Accessed in August 27, 2018

Source: http://www.theguardian.com/world/2011/feb/02/president-hosni-mubarak-egypt-speech

I talk to you during critical times that are testing Egypt and its people which could sweep them into the unknown. The country is passing through difficult times and tough experiences which began with noble youths and citizens who practise their rights to peaceful demonstrations and protests, expressing their concerns and aspirations but they were quickly exploited by those who sought to spread chaos and violence, confrontation and to violate the constitutional legitimacy and to attack it. Those protests were transformed from a noble and civilised phenomenon of practising freedom of expression to unfortunate clashes, mobilised and controlled by political forces that wanted to escalate and worsen the situation. They targeted the nation's security and stability through acts of provocation theft and looting and setting fires and blocking roads and attacking vital installations and public and private properties and storming some diplomatic missions. We are living together painful days and the most painful thing is the fear that affected the huge majority of Egyptians and caused concern and anxiety over what tomorrow could bring them and their families and the future of their country. The events of the last few days require us all as a people and as a leadership to chose between chaos and stability and to set in front of us new circumstances and a new Egyptian reality which our people and armed forces must work with wisely and in the interest of Egypt and its citizens.

Dear brothers and citizens, I took the initiative of forming a new government with new priorities and duties that respond to the demand of our youth and their mission. I entrusted the vice president with the task of holding dialogue with all the political forces and factions about all the issues that have been raised concerning political and democratic reform and the constitutional and legislative amendments required to realise these legitimate demands and to restore law and order but there are some political forces who have refused this call to dialogue, sticking to their particular agendas without concern for the current delicate circumstances of Egypt and its people. In light of this refusal to the call for dialogue and this is a call which remains standing, I direct my speech today directly to the people, its Muslims and Christians, old and young, peasants and workers, and all Egyptian men and women in the countryside and city over the whole country. I have never, ever been seeking power and the people know the difficult circumstances that I shouldered my responsibility and what I offered this country in war and peace, just as I am a man from the armed forces and it is not in my nature to betray the trust or give up my responsibilities and duties. My primary responsibility now is security and independence of the nation to ensure a peaceful transfer of power in circumstances that protect Egypt and the Egyptians and allow handing over responsibility to whoever the people choose in the coming presidential election. I say in all honesty and regardless of the current situation that I did not intend to nominate myself for a new presidential term. I have spent enough years of my life in the service of Egypt and its people. I am now determined to finish my work for the nation in a way that ensures handing over its safe-keeping and banner ... preserving its legitimacy and respecting the constitution. I will work in the remaining months of my term to take the steps to ensure a peaceful transfer of power.

According to my constitutional powers, I call on parliament and its houses to discuss amending article 76 and 77 of the constitution concerning the conditions on running for presidency of the republic and it sets specific a period for the presidential term. In order for the current parliament in both houses to be able to discuss these constitutional amendments and the legislative amendments linked to it for laws that complement the constitution and to ensure the participation of all the political forces in these discussions, I demand parliament to adhere to the word of the judiciary and its verdicts concerning the latest cases which have been legally challenged. I will entrust the new government to perform in ways that will achieve the legitimate rights of the people and that its performance should express the people and their aspirations of political, social and economic reform and to allow job opportunities and combating poverty, realising social justice. In this context, I charge the police apparatus to carry out its duty in serving the people, protecting the citizens with integrity and honour with complete respect for their rights, freedom and dignity. I also demand the judicial and supervisory authorities to take immediately the necessary measures to continue pursuing outlaws and to investigate those who caused the security disarray and those who undertook acts of theft, looting and setting fires and terrorising citizens. This is my pledge to the people during the last remaining months of my current term. I ask God to help me to honour this pledge to complete my vocation to Egypt and its people in what satisfies God, the nation and its people. Dear citizens, Egypt will emerge from these current circumstances stronger, more confident and unified and stable. And our people will emerge with more awareness of how to achieve reconciliation and be more determined not to undermine its future and destiny. Hosni Mubarak who speaks to you today is proud of the long years he spent in the service of Egypt and its people.

The Third Speech: Accessed in August 27, 2018

Source of the Original Audio: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0r0wPV2udJI

The script does not exist in its primary source any longer (http://www.voltairenet.org/article171359.html). The script below is a transcription done by the researcher.

نحذو بالقبائل يحموا قبائلهم داخل حدود طرابلس لتطهيرها من الجرذان وأيضا نحذو سكان طرابلس من غير قبائلها فهم من ضمنهم نفس الشي تطهير مناطقهم تطهير مناطقهم تطهير مناطق طرابلس .يا شباب تاجوره وشباب سوق الجمعة اللي ممكن الجرذان معششين بسبب وحدين مرضى مثل الجرياني الذي كان موجود في تيك المنطقة، هذا القذر ماجاء مثل جده اللي استقبل المسلمين وقال طلع البدر علينا من ثنيات الوداع نفس النشيد اللي قابلوا فيه اهل المدينة المنورة النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم في الهجرة . تصوروا انه كان يصلي بيكم لا تلوموهم هذول مرتبين على الخيانة اهله اغلبهم من الزنادقة والمستعمرين وانا قلت لكم الامور هذي يا سكان طرابلس عشان تعرفوا انهم يبغوا يخربوا تاجوره ويخربوا سوق الجمعة شباب سوق الجمعة والنَّاس والنساء يالله طهروا منطقتكم من هؤلاء الجرذان وأهل القبائل طهروا مناطقكم من بني وليد تاربونا فيزان سبها من جفارا ومن الجبل القبائل اللي زحفت من خارج طرابلس من خارج قبائل طرابلس هم نفس الشي دخلوها دخلوا المدينة دخلوا الشوارع دخلوا الميادين ويقوموا بالمساعدة في تطهير المدينة كل قبيلة تأخذ منطقة فقط لان همهم نهب و تدمير مدينة طرابلس وتعيش مدينة طرابلس في ظلام ما يهمهم تعيشوا في سعادة او ظلام يخلص بترولكم تخرب ليبيا ما يهمم هذا ابدا الشيطان يوسوس لهم لان الشهيد يعتبر من واجبه يعتبرون ان هذا واجبهم تدمير العرب معتبرين ان احنا كفار ولا لازم يبقى منا احد حي هم اللي كفار هم لا يصوموا ولا يصلوا دخلوا مساجدكم ودمروها يالشيخ المدني طهروا المساجد اي مسجد دخلوه وصخوه ولازم يغسل سبع مرات يجب على كل ليبي موجود في طرابلس من السكان الأصليين من القبائل اللي ساكنه فيها من غير قبائلها من برا من الشباب من الشيوخ من النساء ومن الجحافل المسلحة كلها تقوم باكتساح مدينة طرابلس وتمشيطها والقضاء المبرم على الخونة والزنادقة تراهم حيذبحوكم ويمثلوا بجثثكم ويعملوا فيكم الويل ويعذبوكم لو سألتوا الكفار هل بتعذوبهم والا تعاملوهم بالحسنى فهم قالوا لا احنا بنعذب سكان طرابلس فليش تخلوهم يعذبوكم اهجموا عليهم بسرعة هيا ما ينفع الانتظار هم جاو بالمدافع والدبابات واقلبوا مدينة طرابلس على رؤوسهم ماجاء الجيش وضرب العمارات والنَاس ّهم اللي دخلوا العمارات انتم خشوا عليهم وجروهم من نفس العائلة اللي هم مقتحمين شقتهم هذا واجبكم .يالله تشجعوا وخلوا قوتكم من نفس شجاعتكم وإيمانكم واخرجوا للشوارع انا احيي قناة الرأي اللي مكنتني من بث صوتي بعد ما تم تفجير مبنى القناة الجماهيرية الليبية وانا تمكنت من الخروج متخفي في مدينة طرابلس بدون ما يلاحظوني الناس والغريب اني لقيت شباب يجوبوا المناطق وعادي جدا ما حسوش ان مدينة طرابلس في خطر او ان الجرذان جوها معتبرين ان هذي حاجة بسيطة وان وحدات

مكافحة الشغب وحدات مكافحة الإرهاب قايمة بواجبها وقاضية على المجرمين لكن بعد أطراف المدينة ومشيت 26
ناحية المدينة السويدية تلاقيت مع شباب سوي عاملين ...بأسلحة كلانشكوف ...حاجة روعة نحييهم بهالمناسبة 27
ونحي شجاعتهم واخلاصهم الى الامام 28

Translation of the Third Speech: Accessed in August 27, 2018

Source: http://www.bbc.com/news/world-africa-14648535

1 They are co-ordinating with the tribes in order to kick out their tribes from the streets

2 of Tripoli, which were handed over to the rats of Nato.

3 People of Tripoli, who are not from those tribes, your mission is the same - i.e. to

4 purge your areas, to purge the districts of the city of Tripoli. To the youth of Tajoura,

5 Souq al-Jumaa, it is a possibility that the rats are nesting there with the help of some

6 sick people such as [Sheikh al-Sadiq] al-Ghiryani who was present in that area, that

7 dirty Ghiryani [words indistinct but the gist is insulting Ghiryani's direct family

8 lineage].

9 They were nesting there, taking orders from infidels and colonialists and from the

10 French embassy in Tripoli. They wanted to destroy Tajoura and Souq al-Jumaa. Let

11 all the youth, women and free men march on those areas to purge them from the rats.

12 The tribes are marching from several regions: from Bani Walid, Tarhouna, Fizzan,

13 Sabha, Jufara, from the mountain, tribes are marching in from outside Tripoli. They

14 are inside the city, they have entered it and are now purging it with the help of its

15 residents.

16 I have met revolutionary young people carrying AK-47s. That was amazing. I would

17 like to salute them and salute their courage.

18 The rebels want to pillage and torch the city of Tripoli. They want to destroy it. They

19 do not care if you live miserably in darkness. They will take away your petroleum

and destroy Libya. They do not care [words indistinct]. The infidels have entered your mosques [words indistinct].

Let everyone converge on Tripoli: its original residents, the tribes taking residence there, the tribes coming in from outside of it, the youth, the elderly, the women, the armed combat formations. All of you, sweep into Tripoli and flush it out and exterminate the traitors, infidels and rats. [words indistinct]

They are slaughtering you, disfiguring your corpses, torturing you [words indistinct]. Why do you let them torture? They came in with the guns and tanks to topple Tripoli over your heads. The army did not go into buildings. They were the ones who entrenched themselves with families in their houses. They were the ones to have stormed into flats. So, you should attack them. Take them away from the families whose homes were attacked.

I am asking you to come on pick up your courage, have courage and come out to the streets. I would like to salute al-Rai TV because of this chance to talk since al-Jamahiriya TV was bombed.

I came out undercover from my home in Tripoli without people seeing me and I found young people on the streets. To be honest, I did not feel like Tripoli had fallen or that some had marched into it.

I consider this a simple thing, just an issue of riot control. Counter-terrorism units are currently carrying out their duties and rounding up criminals. [Words indistinct]. I have met revolutionary young people carrying AK-47s. That was amazing. I would like to salute them and salute their courage.

The Fourth Speech: Accessed in August 27, 2018.

Source: https://ar.wikisource.org/wiki/خطاب_معمر_القذافي_للشباب_الليبي_في_22_فبراير_2011

Source of the Original Audio: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=wn-0JlK_UZE

1 هذ[9]ول انتهوا هذول انمسحوا من بكرة حتلاقوا رجالنا فقط. حتخرجوا وتطهروا شوارع بنغازي مشكلة

2 صغيرة تحولت الى قضية دولية .وحيصوتوا عليها اليوم ....لانهم صامدين .ومثل ما قلت من قبل احنا

3 صامدين وحنلاحقهم ونبحث عنهم حي حي شارع شارع .والشعب الليبي كلهم حيزحفوا جماعات كبيرة

4 من الناس حيزحفوا لينقذوا شباب بنغازي اللي بيستنجدوا بينا .علينا نصرتهم .وانا معمر القذافي

5 حاستشهد لاجل شعبي بإذن الله .لا خوف لا تردد لا تراجع دقت ساعة الحقيقة .اذا شفتوا العربات

6 بالسماعات دمروهم، دمروا شبكاتهم اللي بتنشر الاكاذيب لكم

7 آولادنا هم اللي دمروا طائراتهم .مثل ما عمل فرانكو في اسبانيا اللي دخل مدريد مدعوم .ولما سألوه

8 كيف قدرت تحرر مدريد قال لهم كان معي عمود خامس وهم الشعب .انتم العمود الخامس لمدينتكم هذا

9 هو اليوم المنشود هذا هو اليوم المنتظر وحنتواصل مرة اخرى في الغد وستستمر قضيتنا للجنوب

10 جابهنا المخاطر بكل جسارة وواجهنا التحديات الشعب الليبي ما ابتدأ هذا العنف هم اللي بدأوه .وبطبيعة

11 الحال كلامي هذا حيخوف الخونة الكفار .الليلة حيرتعبوا وحينهاروا .انتم قادرين على هزيمتهم قادرين

12 على تحقيق ذلك خلونا نحرر نسائنا وبناتنا من هؤلاء الخونة الله أكبر الله أكبر

Translation of the Fourth Speech: Accessed in August 27, 2018

Source:
https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/michaeltomasky/2011/mar/17/usforeignpolicy-unitednations-libya-it-will-start-fast

1 They are finished, they are wiped out. From tomorrow you will only find our people.

2 You all go out and cleanse the city of Benghazi. A small problem that has become an

3 international issue. And they are voting on it tonight ... because they are determined.

[9] The underlined words were written in standard Arabic in the original script whereas they were said in colloquial Libyan dialect in the original audio. The difference is only in the last letter of the word which should have been kept without inserting the last vowel. This footnote is only to acknowledge the discrepancy between the official text the analysis was based on and the original audio. However, this discrepancy did not affect the results of the assessment of this speech.

As I have said, we are determined. We will track them down, and search for them, alley by alley, road by road, the Libyan people all of them together will be crawling out. Massive waves of people will be crawling out to rescue the people of Benghazi, who are calling out for help, asking us to rescue them. We should come to their rescue.

And I, Muammar Gaddafi, I will die for my people. With Allah's help.

No more fear, no more hesitation, we are no longer reluctant. The moment of truth has come. If you see the cars with loudspeakers, destroy them, destroy their communications points that are spreading lies to you. Our children are the one's who have destroyed these planes.

Just like Franco in Spain, who rolled into Madrid with external support. And they asked how did you manage to liberate Madrid? He said: 'There was a fifth column, the people of the city.' You are the fifth column within the city. This is the day on which we should liberate the city. We've been looking forward to that day. And tomorrow we will communicate again, and our cause will continue towards the south.

With our bare chests and heads we were confronting the dangers, facing the challenge, we did not initiate this violence, they started it. Of course, these words will have an impact on the traitors and infidels. Tonight they will panic and they will collapse.

You are capable of doing it. You are capable of achieving this. Let's set our women and daughters free from those traitors.

God is great."

Appendix 2
First Rater's Holistic Assessment and Feedback
Speech No. (1): Mubarak's First Speech, 11/02/2011 – CNN's Translation

Accuracy of Transfer of ST Content			Quality of Expression in TL			Averaged Mark
Level 2	Mark 3	Inadequate	Level 2	Mark 3	Inadequate	3

Rater's Feedback

6. **Accuracy of transfer:** Whole phrases from the original Arabic have been missed out, others not present in the ST have been inserted. Numerous words have been completely mistranslated (it reads as if the translator has no access to a dictionary and has simply guessed the meaning of many words and phrases).

(Assessor's note: when I say "should have been" in all the following examples, that is shorthand for "a better translation, in my opinion, would have been")

Examples of mistranslation:

"but **at the same time**, the most important is to recognise them" should have been "But the most important thing is to recognise them" ("at the same time" has been inserted by the translator, it does not appear in the ST);

"I know **quite well** that Egypt, **while fighting, should try to go out of this juncture**" should be "I am absolutely certain that Egypt will overcome this crisis" ("while fighting" and "try to" did not appear in the ST);

"**I've retained Egyptian security**" should have been "I have preserved the peace";

"I was very keen that those two committees of people **who are known** among Egyptians as honest brokers, **the constitutional leaders of Egypt** and the judiciary" should have been "I was very keen that both these committees should be made up of people known to Egyptians as honest brokers, experts in constitutional law and members of the judiciary".

7. **Quality of expression in TL:** The translation has clearly not been written by a native English speaker.

Examples of Incorrect Use of English Tenses:

"Those who **had** committed those crimes" should have been "Those who have committed those crimes";

"preserving our identity which **is** the main essence of our presence for more than 7,000 years" should have been "preserving our identity which has been the main essence of our existence for more than 7,000 years".

Examples of Incorrect Grammar:

"the transfer of responsibility, **which is going to be to the one that** the people will choose as their leader in transparent and free elections where guarantees **are going to be there** for full transparency and for freedom" would read much better as "the transfer of responsibility to the person whom the people will choose as their leader in free and transparent elections with guarantees of complete freedom and transparency".

Speech No. (2): Mubarak's Second Speech, 1/2/2011 – The Guardian's Translation

Accuracy of Transfer of ST Content			Quality of Expression in TL			Averaged Mark
Level 4	Mark 7	Almost completely successful	Level 3	Mark 5	Adequate	6

Rater's Feedback

G. **Accuracy of transfer**: For the most part, the content of the ST has been transferred accurately, although several words have been completely mistranslated.

Examples of Mistranslation:

"Dear brother**s and** citizens, I took the initiative of forming a new government with new priorities and duties that respond to the **demand** of our youth and their **mission.**" should have been "Dear brother citizens, I took the initiative of forming a new government with new priorities and duties that respond to the demands of our young people and their message";

"My primary responsibility now is *(omission)* security and **independence** of the nation" should have been "My primary responsibility now is to restore the nation's security and stability".

H. **Quality of Expression in TL**: However, it still does not read as if it has been written by a native English speaker.

Examples of Incorrect English Grammar:

"We are living together painful days" should have been "we are living together through painful days".

Speech No. (3): Qaddafi's First Speech, 24/08/2011 – BBC's Translation

Accuracy of Transfer of ST Content			Quality of Expression in TL			Averaged Mark
Level 2	Mark 4	Inadequate	Level 5	Mark 9	Successful	7.5

Rater's Feedback:

D. **Accuracy of Transfer:** This is an extremely loose translation of the original text. Some parts have been completely missed out and others inserted.

Examples of Omissions:

وانا قلت لكم الامور هذي يا سكان طرابلس عشان تعرفوا انهم

this part of the sentence has not been translated, although it is not obscure

"They are inside the city, they have entered it and are now purging it with the help of its residents" should have been "They have entered it, they have entered the city, they have entered the streets, they have entered the squares and are setting about helping to purge the city."

Examples of Insertions:

"which were handed over to the rats **of NATO**": there is no reference to NATO in the ST (however, it is possible that translators for the BBC are under instructions to add the words "of NATO" to clarify for readers what "rats" usually refers to in Qaddafi's speeches).

E. **Quality of Expression in TL**: The translation reads very well – only one or two expressions or incorrect use of tenses betray that it has likely been written by a non-native speaker of English.

Example that betrays probable non-native origin of translator:

"I am asking you to come on **pick** up your courage, have courage and come out **to** the streets": a more natural English translation would have been "I am asking you to pluck up your courage, have courage and come out on the streets."

Speech No. (4): Qaddafi's Second Speech – The Guardian's Translation

Accuracy of Transfer of ST Content			**Quality of Expression in TL**			**Averaged Mark**
Level 4	Mark 7	Almost completely successful	Level 5	Mark 9	Successful	8

Rater's Feedback:

4. **Accuracy of Transfer:** The meaning of the original speech has been almost entirely conveyed.

Examples of Mistranslations:

"A small problem **that** has become an international issue" should have been "A small issue has become an international issue";

"We should come to their **rescue**" should have been "We should come to their aid";

"I will die for my people. With Allah's **help."** Should have been "I will die for my people, God willing.";

"Our children are the one's who have destroyed **these** planes" should have been "Our children are the ones who destroyed their planes";

"You are the fifth column within **the** city" should have been "You are the fifth column within this city of yours";

“**we** did not initiate this violence, they started it**”** should have been ”the Libyan people did not initiate this violence, they are the ones who started it”;

“these words will have **an impact on** the traitors **and** infidels” should have been “these words will terrify the infidel traitors”;

“You are capable of **doing it”** should have been “You are capable of defeating them”.

I. **Quality of Expression in TL:** The translation reads well, as if written by a native speaker of English. There is one spelling error: “one’s” which should have been “ones”.

Appendix (3)
Second Rater's Holistic Assessment and Feedback

Speech No. (1): Mubarak's first speech, 11/02/2011 – CNN's translation

Accuracy of Transfer of ST Content			Quality of Expression in TL			Averaged Mark
Level 2	Mark 3	Inadequate	Level 1	Mark 2	Totally Inadequate	2.5

Rater's Feedback

G. **Accuracy of transfer:** Some sentences in the translation make no sense at all. The punctuation and paragraph breaks do not reflect the original, and some chunks of text appear completely out of place. Chunks of the original text have been omitted with no indication from the translator that this has been done. (It may be that translators working for CNN are under instructions to omit superfluous verbiage or repetition but I'm surprised that there is nothing to show where this has occurred.)

Examples of mistranslation:

"This **sense of abiding**" should have been "this commitment";

"I tell you **here**, as **a head of state**" should have been "I tell you, as President of the Republic";

"I do not **find any embarrassment**" should have been "I do not have any objection"

3. **Quality of expression in TL:** There is incorrect use of English tenses throughout; misuse of definite and indefinite articles; misuse of prepositions; incorrect word order; misspellings.

Example of Incorrect use of English tenses:

"This is the **offer** that I **undertook** before Allah almighty and the **people** and I'm going to keep my promise so that we **would** put Egypt on a path of security and stability, and **would** already **out** a **perspective** for coming out of this crisis" should have been (it also contains mistranslations) "This is the oath that I took before Allah almighty and the country, and I'm going to keep my promise so that we can put Egypt on a path of security and stability. I have put forward a specific vision for how we can emerge from the current crisis"

Examples of Incorrect Grammar:

"trying to put things on the right track **as quick as** possible" should be "as quickly as possible" or "as soon as possible";

Example of Incorrect Use of Definite Article:

"through **the** wise dialogue" should be "through wise dialogue"

Speech No. (2): Mubarak's Second Speech, 1/2/2011 – The Guardian's Translation

Accuracy of transfer of ST content			Quality of expression in TL			Averaged mark
Level 3	Mark 6	Adequate	Level 3	Mark 6	Adequate	6

Rater's Feedback

H. **Accuracy of transfer**: Overall the translation represents the meaning of the original speech adequately and some good solutions have been found to tricky expressions that are commonly badly translated from Arabic into English. It has not always been punctuated and paragraphed in such a way as to accurately reflect the rhythm of the rhetoric.

Examples of Mistranslation:

"According to my constitutional powers. I call on parliament and its houses to discuss amending article 76 and 77 of the constitution concerning the conditions on running for presidency of the republic and **it sets specific a period for** the presidential term" (this example also contains poor punctuation and bad grammar) should have been "In accordance with my constitutional powers, I call on both houses of parliament to discuss amending Articles 76 and 77 of the constitution as regards the conditions on running for presidency of the republic and setting a fixed period for the presidential term";

"I ask God to **help** me honour this pledge to complete **my vocation to** Egypt and its people **in what** satisfies God, the nation and its people." should have been "I ask God to grant me success in honouring this pledge to accomplish what I have offered to Egypt and its people in a way that pleases God, the nation and its people."

I. **Quality of Expression in TL**: There are numerous incorrect uses of definite/indefinite articles; some misuse of tenses; some incorrect grammar.

Examples of Incorrect English Grammar:

"I have never ever **been seeking** power and the people know the difficult circumstances **that** I shouldered my responsibility" should have been "I have never sought power and the people know the difficult circumstances in which I shouldered my responsibilities".

Speech No. (3): Qaddafi's First Speech, 24/08/2011 – BBC's Translation

Accuracy of Transfer of ST Content			Quality of Expression in TL			Averaged Mark
Level 3	Mark 5	Adequate	Level 5	Mark 9	Successful	7

Rater's's Feedback:

2. **Accuracy of Transfer:** The translation of this speech seems to be a summery translation of the original text message. This is believed to be the case because there are some unjustified additions.

Examples of Insertions:

"They were nesting there, taking orders from infidels and colonialists and from **the French Embassy** in Tripoli": there is no reference to the French Embassy in the ST;
"I have met revolutionary young people carrying AK-47s. That was amazing. I would like to salute them and salute their courage": This does not appear at this point in the ST. It does appear right at the end of the passage, where it has also been included by the translator, so perhaps a cut and paste error.
"I came out undercover **from my home** in Tripoli": the words from my home do not appear in the ST.

3. **Quality of Expression in TL**: The translated text reads well in English and this appears to have been achieved by simply missing out tricky parts of the ST altogether.

Speech No. (4): Qaddafi's Second Speech – The Guardian's Translation

Accuracy of Transfer of ST Content			**Quality of Expression in TL**			**Averaged Mark**
Level 3	Mark 6	Adequate	Level 5	Mark 9	Successful	7.5

Rater's's Feedback:

7. **Accuracy of Transfer:** There are a few words and expressions that could have been translated better in my opinion, and a few errors that do not make a great deal of differences to the overall meaning, but I cannot really understand why those choices were made.

   Examples of Mistranslations:

   The impact of the rhetorical device of using three similar phrases has been undermined in this example: "No more fear, no more hesitation, **we are no longer reluctant**". The intended rhetorical impact would have been better conveyed by translating it "No more fear, no more hesitation, no more backing down".

   There is just one example that I think was a bad choice and reads oddly: "the Libyan people....will be **crawling out.** Massive waves of people will be **crawling out..**." The Arabic verb does indeed mean "to crawl out" but it also means "to march or advance" and either of those words would have conveyed the meaning better, in my opinion.

8. **Quality of Expression in TL:** The translation overall reads well.