"A TROUBLE SHARED IS A TROUBLE HALVED" THE ROLE OF DICTIONARIES AND DISCOURSE ANALYSIS IN TRANSLATION TROUBLES[1]

Abstract: *Translator training has dramatically increased the world over for the past decades. In Palestine, translator-training institutions are singularly increasing in strength to arm the considerably large and robust job market with qualified translators. However, the demand for translators has outstripped the supply of translators, and it continues to thrive. Most embryonic translator training in Palestine traditionally starts under the umbrella of the departments of English Language and Literature whereby a 'one-off' translation module is offered. The present article aims to explore whether or not the student translators are emboldened by the beneficent effects of the application of dictionaries in translation classroom, to reach a saturation point at the discourse level. The article examines randomly selected translations of forty student translators, enrolling on an undergraduate translation course offered on the fringes of Al-Quds University for the school year 2016-2017. The article shows that expected user-friendly dictionaries seem to have turned out to be user-unfriendly in terms of discernible grammatical errors and perceptible discoursal errors, mainly due to a lack of (1) pedagogic issues addressing dictionary use; (2) training on non-translation aspects (e.g., Computer-Aided Translation CAT tools); (3) linguistic and cultural congruity between Arabic and English; and (4) higher-level knowledge in dealing with text beyond the borders of grammar, semantic and pragmatic dimensions.*

Keywords: *semantics, translation, discourse analysis, translator training, dictionaries, Arabic, English*

UN PROBLÈME PARTAGÉ EST À MOITIÉ RÉSOLU. LE RÔLE DES DICTIONNAIRES ET DE L'ANALYSE DU DISCOURS DANS LES PROBLÈMES DE TRADUCTION

Résumé: *La formation des traducteurs s'est beaucoup intensifiée ces dernières décennies. En Palestine, les institutions de formation des traducteurs sont en train d'être consolidées afin de fournir des traducteurs qualifiés au marché du travail qui est un marché considérablement grand et robuste. Cependant, la demande pour les traducteurs a dépassé le nombre des traducteurs existant et elle est de plus en plus grande. Dans la plupart des cas, la formation initiale des traducteurs en Palestine commence dans le cadre des départements de langue et littérature anglaises qui proposent des modules de traduction. Le présent article se propose de voir si l'utilisation des dictionnaires pendant le cours de traduction mène les étudiants-traducteurs à un point de saturation au niveau discursif. L'article examine des traductions produites par quarante étudiants-traducteurs inscrits à un cours de traduction niveau licence offert par l'Université Al-Quds pendant l'année académique 2016-2017. L'article montre que les dictionnaires, censés être faciles à utiliser, s'avèrent être faciles à utiliser dans le cas des fautes de grammaire ou de discours visibles, en raison de (1) problèmes pédagogiques concernant l'utilisation du dictionnaire ; (2) aspects de formation (par exemple, l'utilisation des outils d'aide à la traduction), (3) congruité linguistique et culturelle entre l'arabe et l'anglais ; (4) compétence de haut niveau à travailler sur le texte au de-là des limites de la grammaire, de la sémantique ou de la pragmatique.*

---

[1] Mohammad Ahmad **Thawabteh,** Sultan Qaboos University, mthawabteh@staff.alquds.edu

***Mots-clés**: sémantique, traduction, analyse du discours, formation traducteur, dictionnaires, arabe, anglais*

1. Introduction

Translation can be defined as the transference of meanings across languages and cultures, and the lead-up to the transference would be the employment of 'translator/knowledge tools' (Pym 2006: 123) such as the opportunity to use dictionaries by translators while doing a translation task. Possibly, they would make strenuous efforts not to allow such an opportunity to slip through their fingers, with a view to overcoming the multifarious problems and difficulties enfolding such transference, especially in the case of languages of little linguistic and cultural affinity (e.g. Arabic and English). This is true of students and novice translators who are most likely very obtuse at very early stages of training; to have vexing problems handled as efficiently and effectively as possible, their authority would so often and for so long be gained from different types of dictionaries, mostly with a strong focus on linguistic complexity at the expense of other, less privileged issues. No sooner have they been tasked to translate a given piece of text than they are rushed into using dictionaries. Our pedantry on this point is ascribed to student translators' ineptitude of the use of dictionaries, and the fact that they are really obsessively addicted to them, more often than not, to bilingual ones as if they are feverish 'workaholic' dictionary users. The perception is that in an actual translation classroom, they are so, even readily apparent when compared to young professionals and experts. "The use of dictionaries decreased with increased experience, and when comparing young professionals with the expert group we find that the experts had only half as many dictionary look-ups as the young professionals" Jensen (1999: 113). Theoretically, training to employ dictionaries has been in the annals of translator training for decades. Dictionaries of all types (be bilingual, monolingual, etc.) should then assume enormous value to help the translator cope heroically anterior to a particular translation task, but having examined the translator training for years, within the confines of our teaching translation, we can immediately stake a claim that dictionaries are not doing the job they are presumed to do as the illustrative examples of our data below would show, at least to depart from the sentential level to a more advanced level of training that is precisely based on ways of catering for discoursal problems.

In actual pedagogies, something goes awry for quite a long time now insofar as student translators are concerned. In the present article, we shall then discuss how presumed user-friendly dictionaries turn out to be something of a red herring, i.e., unfriendly (see also Thawabteh 2013: 130), and how different types of translation skill of using these dictionaries are unfortunately gained by osmosis, rather than by a step-by-step incremental process.

It goes without saying that a lexicographer's job is to leave no stone unturned in the search for definitions for continual neologisms in a language that would certainly be of help to translators (be fully-fledged or novice), but at the end of the day, these definitions would appear to be of little avail in translator training institutions. What is actually needed to reward these efforts should be a proper translator training for a more effective dictionary use for the subtleties of words chosen, taking into account how texture, structure and text type focus are "all involved and together reflect deeper underlying meanings that are

essentially discoursal (i.e. serve as the mouthpiece of institutions)" (Hatim and Mason 1997: 33).

The present article will take its point of departure from two assumed efficient tools (yet least taxing on translators' resources) in translator training: training to use dictionaries in a translation classroom and training student translators to effective discourse analysis.

2. Review of Related Literature

It would perhaps be useful at this stage to review related literature on the topic under discussion. The use of (e-)dictionaries in translation classroom abounds in literature. It is oft-truism that the need for dictionaries in translator training is dire as Farghal (2015: 11) puts it:

> One may cite the common belief that translation activity is nothing more than using a bilingual dictionary effectively. To draw on one interesting incident, the chairperson of an English department where an MA translation program[me] is run once assertively banned the use of dictionaries by students sitting for the Comprehensive Examination. He was wondering what would be left of the test if the examinees were allowed to use dictionaries.

Literature on the use of dictionaries and polemic about the student translator's latitude is found to be quite satisfying (see Abu-Ssaydeh 1991; Thawabteh 2013; Elhajahmed 2017; and especially on e-dictionaries, see Jaatinen and Jääskeläinen 2006). Abu-Ssaydeh (1991) points out that English-Arabic dictionaries like Al Mawrid English-Arabic Dictionary, the most common dictionary among English language users and translators in the Arab world, are a blueprint for the general language user and for students at the undergraduate level. These bilingual dictionaries, Abu-Ssaydeh (1991) further states, do not offer convivial contextual meaning of the lexical item. A corollary of this, Abu-Ssaydeh (1991) concludes, language users find it difficult to choose the most salient meaning(s) for a SL item (see also Al-Jarf 2000; Al-Jabr 2008 and Elhajahmed 2017). "The dictionary may furnish several possible meanings for one word, and the translator will be faced with another, more subtle and more intriguing, issue, when he has to choose the appropriate for that word" (Mouakket (1988: 67). It ensues, therefore, that the translator "has to reconcile several possible meanings, including the author's intended meanings, the dictionary definition, and his own interpretation of the word or phrase" (Duff as cited in Mouakket (1988: 67).

Much of literature shows that the use of dictionaries is ubiquitous, but unfortunately awkward translations do exist and unqualified translators still pour into the job market (Atawneh and Alaqra 2007; Thawabteh 2009; Amer 2010; Abdel-Fattah 2011; Thawabteh 2013; Thawabteh and Najjar 2014; Habeeb, *et al*. 2016; Elhajahmed 2017, among many others). However, literature on employing dictionaries by Palestinian student translators is thin and unsatisfactory, to the best of our knowledge (e.g., Thawabteh 2013).

Relating training on the use of dictionaries to a wider context of discourse analysis is also notably absent from literature. True, it is to the fore for the translator to prompt the search for an equivalent for a given SL lexical item but, perhaps more importantly, it is more urgent for the translator to get to grips with macro-level problems in the course of translation. The equivalent selected should by no means be recalcitrant to the overall flow of the text in the Target Language (TL).

At this juncture, we ought to briefly address e-dictionaries for the greater importance they assume these days. As far as e-dictionaries are concerned, Jaatinen and Jääskeläinen (2006: 83) aptly remark that "[t]he way translators work has changed: commissions arrive by email, and translators are expected to use the internet, electronic

dictionaries, translation memory tools, electronic corpora and concordance software, etc. to increase the efficiency and quality of their work."

3. Semantics, Translation and Discourse

Semantics is defined as "the branch of linguistics that deals with the meanings of words and sentences" (Collins Cobuild English Dictionary (CCED) 2003; see also Fromkin and Rodman 1983: 163). Very much related to the above definition, the semantic structure of language consists of "deep structure (semantic) and the surface (grammatical, lexical, phonological) structures of languages" (Larson 1984: 27). Obviously, Larson (1984: 27) provides a decent grounding in translation: "An analysis of the surface structure of a language does not tell us all that we need to know about the language in order to translate. Behind the surface structure is the deep structure, the meaning. It is this meaning that serves as the base for translation into another language."

It ensues, therefore, that a semantic structure legitimately accounts for some of the problems encountered by translators in which they should, or even must, seek to capture two structures in the course of translation: 'surface structure' and 'deep structure' with two layers of meaning: denotative and connotative meaning. Denotation meaning covers dictionary meanings or, in the words of Hatim and Mason (1997: 182). "primary referential meanings of a given lexical item" whilst connotative meaning refers to "additional meanings which a lexical item acquires beyond its primary, referential meaning", both of which "become key terms in the thinking of a certain group of text users, ultimately contributing to the development of discourse." True, language users can never have a successful exchange without being able to decode a message and the two layers of meanings contained in it.

Translation-wise, semantics has been given due attention by virtue of its significance in the translation from one language into another, to give rise to an instance of translation largely sandwiched between two polarities. In this regard, Newmark speaks of two striking methods of translation, namely, communicative versus semantic translation. Conveying a comprehensible message to the target reader is the ultimate goal of the former which also "attempts to produce on its readers an effect as close as possible to that obtained on the readers of the original" (1988: 38). The latter, however "attempts to render, as closely as the semantic and syntactic structures of the second language allow, the exact contextual meaning of the original" (1988: 39). Newmark further adds that semantic translation "tends to be more complex, more awkward, more detailed, more concentrated, and pursues the thought processes rather than the intention of the transmitter" (1988: 40). The translator should (or may be must) understand the remarkable uniformity of underlying relations that contribute to our broad view of the overall meaning of an utterance in a wider socio-cultural setting.

At a more concrete level of analysis, texture, i.e., "aspects of text organi[s]ation which ensure that texts hang together and reflect the coherence of a structure in a context" (Hatim and Mason 1997: 198) should be maintained organised "in support of a given structure format and text type focus" (Hatim and Mason 1997: 20). Three crucial concepts shall be explicated here: texts, genre and discourse. Hatim and Mason (1997: 15) point out,

> Texts involve the language user in focusing on a given rhetorical purpose (arguing, narrating, etc.). Genres reflect the way in which linguistic expression conventionally caters for a particular social occasion (the letter to the editor, the news report, etc.). Finally, discourses

> embody attitudinal expression, with language becoming by convention the mouthpiece of societal institutions (sexism, feminism, bureaucratism, etc.).

It ensues, therefore, that translation goes far beyond merely a dictionary meaning which largely haunts student translators to a more sophisticated level, i.e., discourse in which argumentation (be through-argumentation or counter-argumentation) resides. It is perhaps worth pointing that in the former, the "statement and subsequent substantiation of an initial thesis characteri[s]e through argumentative texts" (Hatim and Mason 1997: 106) whereby "the opponent [is excluded] to exercise power" (Hatim and Mason 1997: 116); in the latter, however, "[c]iting an opponent's thesis, rebutting this and substantiating the point of the rebuttal characteri[s]e counter-argumentative texts" (Hatim and Mason 1997: 106). It may safely be assumed that the more the text is argumentative, the more it tends to be 'persuasive' (Hatim 1990) and evaluative; that is to say,

> a textual orientation which is established and maintained by means of a variety of linguistic devices that singly or collectively signal a move from what has been referred to as situation monitoring towards situation managing. In other words, text producers can opt either for a relatively detached account of a state of affairs or for steering the text receiver in a particular direction (Hatim and Mason (1997: 151).

Insofar as Arabic is concerned, argumentation, as (Hatim 1990: 47) claims, can also be twofold with a preference granted to through-argumentation:

> Modern Standard Arabic (MSA) displays a particular preference for a form of argumentation in which the arguer advocates or condemns a given stance and consequently does not have to make any direct concession to a belief entertained by an adversary. […] more explicitly counter-argumentation procedure, is particularly favoured by languages such as English.

4. Methodology

The problems besetting translator training are multifarious (such has long been the dictionary use). We use data drawn from the translations of forty undergraduate students at Al-Quds University for the academic year 2016/2017, all of whom are enrolled on Introduction to Translation, a three-credit hour compulsory course offered for English major students (usually early in their third year). Prior to beginning this course, students are introduced to major translation theories, and the course ensures opportunities to the general practice of translating different text types from English into Arabic and vice versa. The students should have also been enrolled on several pre-requisite core language, literature and linguistics courses to ensure adequate linguistic and professional competences. The student translators are given a SL text: an original speech in Arabic by Jamal Abdel Nasser, second President of Egypt (see Appendix A) along with a model published translation in brackets next to the Arabic examples (see Appendix B), with a view to comparing it with those renditions opted for by the student translators for a full-scale translation assessment.

4.1. Significance of the Study

It is perhaps true that a large body of literature addresses translator training world-wide but, inadequate attention has been paid to translator and interpreter training in Palestine as shown in few studies by Atawneh and Alaqra (2007), Thawabteh (2009), Amer (2010) and Abedel-Fattah (2011). To our best knowledge, scant attention has been paid to dictionary

use and 'all that aggro' in relation to discourse analysis. Hopefully, this article will make some pedagogical implications that will be of help to both translator trainers and trainees.

5. Discussion and Analysis

In the following section, we examine students' translations, apparently full of horrid pitfalls, perhaps as a result of 'old-fashioned' reliance on dictionaries and heedlessness for the intimate texture bound up with the structure of the text and the context of situation on the one hand, and relating the translations to a more readily macro-level analysis whereby the absent discourse of Arabism, for instance is invoked to be parodied as can be first illustrated in Example 1 below:

Example 1
SL: *'inna ash-sh'aba al-'arabyyī* [Indeed, the Arab people]
TL: 1a. "The Arab world."
1b. "The Arabic people."
1c. "The Arab people."

The first study lexical item *ash-sh'aba al-'arabyyī* ('Arab people'), with such inherent semantic properties and argumentative force, merits close investigation. The total sum of its semantic features is inextricably interwoven in such a way as to respond to a particular socio-cultural context. In Example 1a, the option for 'Arab world' shifts within the text from people, with such emotive overtones (e.g. human feelings, weaknesses, emotions, patriotic feelings, etc.) and a predominantly evaluative texture to an entire geographic and political entity with various subtle shades of meanings, quite different from (and obviously less emotive than) those in the SL phrase. In other words, the translation is only a detached exposition alien to the SL utterance which happens to be argumentative, i.e., 'situation monitoring'.

We shall now return to the matter of preserving denotative aspect of the message semantically, as can be illustrated in Example 1b; the student seems not to take a serious semantic problem in his/her stride. The primary referential meanings of 'Arabic' as explained by CCED (2003) are: "(1) a language that is spoken in the Middle East and in parts of North Africa [....]; (2) [s]omething that is Arabic belongs or relates to the language, writing, or culture of the Arabs […]; and (3) an Arabic numeral is one of the written figures such as 1, 2, 3, or 4." However, (CCED 2003) offers the following definitions for 'Arab': "Arabs are people who speak Arabic and who come from the Middle East and parts of North Africa [and] Arab means belonging or relating to Arabs or to their countries or customs."

Suffice it to say that the translation of 1c seems to be appropriate enough to do the trick. However, the discernible error shown in 1c, i.e., "The Arab people" is presented in expository/nonevaluative discourse whereby the exposition occupies the least evaluative end in the SL text. The sort of problem the student translator is faced with here is tackled by Hatim (1990: 49; emphasis is added) as:

> Expository texts start with a topic sentence whose function is to set the scene. Various aspects of the scene are then presented *unevaluatively*. The aim of such texts is to analyse concepts, to narrate, to describe or perhaps even to combine the three communicative goals. On the other hand, argumentation starts off with a 'tone-setter', whose function is to present a thesis which is then argued *evaluatively*.

The tone-setter aims to create a thesis to be argued for throughout the text, e.g., the use of emphatic particle *'inna* ('indeed'), obviously used here to serve "to sell a debatable idea" (Najjar 2008: 129). The aspects of the scene are then displayed evaluatively, for instance, *min 'ajli is-stqlāli-l-waṭan* ('for the independence for of the fatherland').

In classical Arabic rhetoric, Arab rhetoricians "were quick to observe the intimate relationship between the degree of evaluativeness with which the text producer imbues his utterance and the 'state' of the receiver in terms of his preparedness to accept or reject the propositions put forward" (Hatim 1990: 48). The same must be true for Example 1 above. The SL text displays a predominantly evaluative discourse intended to trigger argumentation. It veers towards being more evaluative by the employment of an emphatic particle *'inna* in Example 1, subtly serving to introduce a topic-comment structure. It needs to be rendered as an adverbial, e.g. 'indeed' in which evaluativeness is respected, or in the words of Versteegh *et al.* (2006: 499), in MSA "the emphatic particle, *'inna* is frequently used to introduce the initial nominal element in a nominal clause, and is thus by definition associated with topic/comment structures;" "it may have the contextual meaning of 'to be certain, convinced; to affirm, confirm', or it may be translated by 'verily, truly', expressing an epistemic modality of certainty" Versteegh *et al.* (2006: 234).

In Example 1a and 1b, it is clear that the student translators seem to have used the dictionary improperly, thus falling victim to the awkward socio-textual practices of 'Arab world' and 'Arabic' respectively. It may be helpful to point out that the translator trainer needs considerable mediation to familiarise student translators with the meanings of adjective of nationalities and the functions and goals involved in an exchange. More importantly, however, student translators should be trained to forge an appropriate interpretation of the text and identify the rhetorical function unfolded by the text, i.e., through-argumentation. Obviously, the text producer advocates or condemns a given stance (i.e., 'Indeed, Arab people fought for the independence of the fatherland') making no "direct concession to a belief entertained by an adversary" (Hatim 1990: 47) by employing a number of substantiators (i.e., 'Indeed, Arab people fought for the independence of the fatherland', 'they were fighting for the unity of the Arab Nation', 'they were fighting for the right of all Asian and African nations', among many others). To more appreciate the problem, take Example 2 below:

Example 2

SL:	*kāna yuḥāribu min 'ajli is-stqlāli-l-waṭan*	[…fought for the independence for of the fatherland]
TL:	2a. "…was fighting for independence of the Arab nations."	
	2b. "….have been fighting for the country's independence."	
	2c. "….have been fighting for the independence of the nation."	

In the sequence of Example 1 above, the emphatic particle *'inna* governs the accusative in the topic of a nominal sentence, i.e., *'inna ash-sh'aba al-'arabyyī* ('Arab people'), and the nominative clause in its comment *kāna yuḥāribu min 'ajl is-stqlāl il-waṭan* ('fought for the independence for of the fatherland'), within which the item *waṭan* ('homeland') is particularly noteworthy. At first glance, the item seems not to be problematic in intercultural communication as it is sufficient for a straightforward thrust and readily lends itself to English. Unfortunately, it is not. Perhaps it would be useful, at this point, to use an analysis for the item in question for more reasoning. Take Table 1 below,

TLs	Layers of Meanings
Arab **nation**	"an individual country considered together with its social and political structures; sometimes used to refer to all the people who live in a particular country" (CCED 2003)
country	a political entity.
fatherland	"If someone is very proud of the country where they or their ancestors were born, they sometimes refer to it as the fatherland" (CCED 2003).

Table 1: Analysis for the renditions of *waṭan*

Other things being equal, the renditions in Examples 2a, 2b, 2c fall short of the original. The Arabic *waṭan* ('homeland') with all its attitudinal overtones as shown in Table 1 above is rendered less emotively— less evaluativeness is realised by the Arabic item and seems to have been recalcitrant to the evaluative tone set at the outset of the utterance (i.e., *'inna ash-sh'aba al-'arabyyī* 'indeed, the Arab people'). It is likely that the student translators do not cater for the shades of meanings unfolding a particular item, clearly discarding 'surface structure' and 'deep structure'. For one reason, a clear-cut misunderstanding of the SL is observed in rendering *waṭan* ('homeland') into 'Arab nations'. As it were, 'poncing around' and/or carelessness on the part the student translator seems to have given rise to such grotesque translation. For another reason, the lexical choice for 'country' is likely to be an indictor of dictionary misuse and incomprehensibility of the overall text. The semantic traits assigned to 'country' are altogether distinct from those assigned to *waṭan* ('homeland'). It is unfortunate that no student could capture 'fatherland' whose recognisable denotational meanings significantly match with those of the SL item. Obviouly, opting for 'the fatherland' can be conducive to orchestrating textual consideration for argumentation from a discourse vantage point. That is to say, the use of *'inna* in sentence-initial position, and select of lexis (including *waṭan* 'homeland') makes explicit the text producer's perspective on the subject matter— to highlight his commitment to a pan-Arabism as a discourse. For more elaboration on other erroneous translations, consider Example 3 below:

Example 3

SL: *wa kāna yuḥāribu min 'ajli ḥaqi dwali āsyya wa 'afrīqyya kulaha fī taqrīri-l-maṣīr.* [and they were fighting for the right of all Asian and African nations, to achieve self- determination]

TL: 3a. "and they were fighting for the right of all Asian and African nations to take to decide their own destiny."
3b. "and they were fighting for the right of all Asian and African nations to take to a decision on their fate."
3c. "and they were fighting for the right of all Asian and African nations to take their own decisions."
3d. "and they were fighting for the right of all Asian and African nations for self-determination."

The other item *taqrīri-l-maṣīr* ('self-determination') may pose a major challenge to the student translator as shown in Examples 3a, 3b and 3c. In Example 3a, the choice for 'destiny' violates the SL overall register provenance (i.e. political) as it has religious and

supernatural connotations, so different from the SL stretch of speech (see Table 2 below for analysis of the items opted for to render *taqrīri-l-maṣīr* 'self-determination'). The student translator is likely to fail to delineate the borderline between politics on the one hand and religion and supernatural force on the other.

TLs	**Layers of Meanings**
To take their own decisions	individual way to choose what should be done
To decide their fate	1. "a power that some people believe controls and decides everything that happens, in a way that cannot be prevented or changed. 2. A person's or thing's fate is what happens to them." (CCED 2003)
To determine their own destiny	1. "A person's destiny is everything that happens to a person during their life, including what will happen in the future, especially when it is considered to be controlled by someone or something else. 2. Destiny is the force which some people believe controls the things that happen to you in your life" (CCED 2003).
self-determination	"is the right of a country to be independent, instead of being controlled by a foreign country and to choose its own form of government" (CCED 2003).

Table 2: Analysis for the renditions of *taqrīril maṣīr* ('self-determination')

Obviously, the analysis in Table 2 above shows the acute differences in the students' translations. In Example 3b the students seem to look up *maṣīr* (lit. 'destiny') in a bilingual dictionary (i.e., Arabic-English dictionary), but fail to properly select the correct lexical equivalent (see also Mouakket, 1988 and Abu-Ssaydeh, 1991). The problem lies in the fact that bilingual dictionaries are expected to be of little help to the translator unless they are concomitantly used with monolingual dictionaries. By the same token, the translation in Example 3c seems to be very poor and in any case no better (in fact significantly worse) than that in Example 3a and 3b.

As for bilingual dictionaries, Roberts (1992: 49) convincingly argues that "the attitude has been, and still is, that if the bilingual dictionary is not the perfect tool for translators, it is the fault of lexicographers. Thus, much attention has been focused recently on better adapting such dictionaries to meet translators' needs." With regard to monolingual dictionaries, Wilkinson as cited in Wilkinson (2007: 111) illustrates how,

> a specialised monolingual [TL] corpus can be of great help to the translator in confirming intuitive decisions, in verifying or rejecting decisions based on other tools such as dictionaries, in obtaining information about collocates, and in reinforcing knowledge of normal target language patterns.

Thawabteh (2013: 130) overtly claim that "complementarity between the two types should set off any blueprint for translator training." Table 2 and Table 3 above, for instance, offer a glimpse of the importance of a monolingual dictionary, namely (CCED 2003). Hopefully, it helps the student translator make his/her own decision on what lexical item should be opted for or out.

At a more discoursal level, the SL displays "[e]valuativeness […] reali[s]ed by the linguistic expression of emphasis (recurrence, parallelism, etc.)" (Hatim and Mason 1997: 114). These two features, among many others, in the words of Versteegh *et al.* (2006: 647-8) are characteristic of Arabic prose:

> Arabic prose exhibits a number of salient features which give it a very distinctive quality, especially when compared to commonly-studied Western languages, such as English. Lexical repetition, structural parallelism, and the prevalence of coordination are some of the most easily noticeable and widely investigated features.

In traditional Arabic public-speaking, Versteegh *et al.* (2006: 669) argue that features such as,

> repetition, assonance, and –paronomasia, add an emotional dimension to the discourse. They are a way of fixing key elements onto the audience's mind. They keep the attention of the listener and are highly appreciated in Arab culture; devices such as parallelism and repetition are ingrained in Arabic discourse.

It is clear that emphasis observed by the legitimately recurrence and parallelism texture of *wa kāna yuḥāribu* ('and they were fighting for') is grafted on to the SL text in three occasions, to establish a 'persuasive discourse' (see also Johnstone 1991, as cited in Versteegh *et al.* (2006: 500). It is also worth noting that the recurrence of parallel clause *wa kāna yuḥāribu* ('and they were fighting for') establishes a kind of semiotic interaction of a number of signs within the boundaries of the text. The text producer makes a thesis statement by means of through-argumentation: "substantiat[ing] a thesis after having cited it" (Najjar 2008: 54); he cites substantiators to enhance the statement, that "Arab people fought for the independence of the fatherland". The substantiators, it should be noted, are not recalcitrant to the text, but they interact with each other to make the whole text more readable and comprehensible. For the sake of more convenience, consider Example 4 below:

Example 4

SL: *fasha'bu-l-Jaza'ir qaddama malyuna shahīd.* [The people of Algeria sacrificed one million martyrs.]

TL: 4a. "Algeria have provided a million martyrs."
4b. "Algeria's people presented a million martyrs."
4c. "Algerians offered the bodies of a million martyrs."

In Example 4 above, the renditions made by students are much less worthwhile to offer evidence of ideology at work. In Example 4, the text producer is ideologically-motivated and is meticulous in his distinct speech style, so he employed, i.e. *fasha'bu-l-Jaza'ir* ('people of Algeria') to make his speech more linguistically eloquent. Semantically, the rendition *fasha'bu-l-Jaza'ir* ('people of Algeria') into simply 'Algeria' may suffice, but having carefully examined the SL speech, we come to know that various shades of meanings are still missing and need to be presented in a far more explicit manner. Furthermore, 'provided a million martyrs', a subsequent sign in the text serves as a useful illustration of non-collocation in English, syntactically speaking. Second, in Example 4b, the segment 'Algeria's people' is less emotive than *fasha'bu-l-Jaza'ir* ('people of Algeria'). Finally, in Example 4c, the student's translation sounds unnatural in the TL as it evokes negative connotations: it implies person's dead body, a translation that does not go in harmony with the SL utterance, indeed. The Algerians are not merely dead bodies, but glorious martyrs to the cause of Algeria as the SL may show. Table 3 is illustrative.

TLs	Layers of Meanings
The people of Algeria	The people who belong to Algeria
Algeria's people	People who belong to Algeria
The Algerian people	1. "belonging or relating to Algeria, or its people or culture." 2. An Algerian citizen or a person of Algerian origin" (CCED 2003).
Algerians	belonging or relating to Algeria, or its people or culture An Algerian citizen or a person of Algerian origin (CCED 2003)

Table 3: Analysis for the renditions of *fasha'bu-l-Jaza'ir* ('people of Algeria')

It is the degree of text evaluativeness observed by *fasha'bu-il-Jaza'ir* ('people of Algeria') that makes us as language users realise the argumentation value; therefore, student translators' renditions restricted to denotational meaning is likely breach the socio-textual practices of the SL. The text producer has made such evaluativeness to steer us towards that value.

Last, but certainly not least, the SL rhyming collocation utterance in Example 5 below is also noteworthy. A less emotive translation is observed in Example 5a. Examples 5b and 5c have deleterious effects on the translation for which blame should largely rest with misuse of bilingual dictionaries. Arguably, employing bilingual dictionaries enhances the tendency among student translators to succumb to the temptation of literalism as is the case in 5d whereby *yusallim* ('give') can be rendered into 'to yield' and 'to shake hands' in accordance with the context of situation. The student translator seems to have picked the first meaning in a bilingual dictionary. In this vein, Thawabteh (2013: 185) states that "[t]he translation students should be meticulous enough not to take the first meaning they come up with. Instead, they should take time to read through the meanings offered slowly and carefully." The translation in Example 5c puts paid to our hopes of optimal translation— a case of negligible semantic loss is observed. Finally, in Example 5b, the student translator opts for the result had someone yielded, which is still a far-fetched equivalent.

Example 5
SL: *walam yusallim walam yastaslim* [They didn't yield or give in.]
TL: 5a. "Algeria didn't give up."
5b. "Algeria didn't escape and give up."
5c. "Algeria never shook hands or gave up."

To further appreciate the segment under focus in Example 5 above, we need to look at the segment as a final substantiator, the interrelatedness of which to the context, structure and texture would help us exceed mere searching a dictionary to acute handling of the overall text ensure optimal semiotic interaction.

6. Conclusions and Recommendations

All in all, the current paper aim primarily at streamlining the use of dictionaries in actual translation classroom as can be illustrated by the translations of forty undergraduate students at Al-Quds University in the Occupied Palestine. And, it evaluates the renditions of these student translators which did not cater for the context of situation, structure and texture, and inevitable semiotic interaction. The following concluding points can be made:

(1) Student translators can use various kinds of dictionaries in a mock training session. In a nutshell, novice translators on a par with professional translators can use dictionaries in view of the multi-functions they are generally designed to do in the course of translation—to enhance quality, increase productivity, etc. Student translators should be encouraged to use dictionaries because they are indispensible for them at this stage. Nevertheless, what is really going on in a classroom translation should be more than using a dictionary searching for a SL meaning at the expense of the overall treatment of the text. That is to say, a text has a rhetorical purpose, i.e., to argue (see Hatim and Mason 1997). Borne this in mind, the meaning being looked up in a dictionary should be negotiated.

(2) Definitely when a student translator stumbles on words that are unfamiliar to him/her, it does seem rational to look for dictionaries that can then be used creatively in conjunction with, among others, Internet search engines, spell checkers, and, perhaps more importantly, when an 'all-you-need-to-know' translation analysis to explore, for instance, the rhetorical and stylistic conventions at work in the SL need to be made.

(3) As far as our study is concerned, two types of dictionaries can be used, namely bilingual and monolingual dictionaries and this goes in harmony with what Farghal (2015: 11) states.

(4) We are in a agreement with Newmark that the translators "should check any word [they] look up in a bilingual dictionary in at least one SL and one TL monolingual dictionary" (Newmark, 1988: 221) and with Thawabteh (2013: 143) that "it would be useful for student translator to start with bilingual dictionaries and, most importantly, to consult monolingual dictionaries for accuracy of their translations."

(5) The translations by the student translators show that skimming through a dictionary should be avoided at this particular stage of training as it may give rise to erroneous translation. However, scanning is "likely to be the suitable reading strategy when it comes to dictionary use" (Thawabteh 2013: 138). Wading through dictionaries seems to be an outlet.

(6) Employing dictionaries is conspicuous as a characteristic of someone's casual translation style that need to be dealt with a more rigorous and comprehensive way. Translation is more than filling in a linguistic, semantic or pragmatic gap between two languages, but it is a discoursal realisation in the final analysis that can be handled the best way possible to reach an optimal translation. The use of dictionaries has exercised the minds of translation theorist and practitioners since decades. It is oft-truism that the introduction of dictionaries to translator training settings is not a magic cure-all for translation problems the students are faced with. Therefore, pedagogies for translator training should be devised to provide the students, who are usually not perspicacious, with the grounds for better understanding of various translation sources. And, the students should be geared towards a more substantial approach to better use different types of dictionaries in concomitant with discourse analysis. It is true that the manifold translation problems come down to dictionary misuse as to our data.

(7) Students have difficulty understanding a text and make no effort to understand it. They should not, simply because their translations would bring no sense. Lack of SL understanding of a context of situation gives rise to grotesque TL translation for which target audience's eyebrows would go up. Student translators are found naïve in their translations; the criticism would certainly destroy them. Naivety borders on obtuseness. The student translator should count his/her chicken before initiate on the use of dictionaries, and go in depth in terms of SL text analysis before make a translation decision. Tolerance is highly needed on the part of translator trainers.

(8) It is paramount to appropriately equip classrooms with all needed to make the use of dictionaries as well as online electronic tools more accessible. Students may use Internet phone software, equipped with a variety of user-friendly dictionaries.
(9) It is important to provide individualised and synchronic support to students in need for extra help in the course of translation to identify problems and find a solution. It is even more important to pursue ways to cover a wider range of students needs, e.g. tailor-made help both face-to-face and/or online sessions. It is finally urgent to encourage students download particular good dictionaries install and interact with these**.**

7. Acknowledgements
Many thanks go out to the undergraduate students enrolled on Introduction to Translation course offered in Fall of the academic year 2016/2017 at Al-Quds University for valuable classroom discussion that was so helpful to bring the current article into being.

References

Abdel- Fattah, M. (2011). Role of contrastive text analysis in teaching translation for language learning purposes: Prepositions as a case. *Forum: International Journal of Interpretation and Translation* 9(2):1-22.
Abu-Ssaydeh, A. (1991). A Dictionary for professional translators. *Babel*, 37(2): 65-74.
Al-Jabr A. (2008). Impact of e-dictionaries on Arab students' translation strategies. *Babel* 54(2): 110–124.
Al-Jarf, R. (2000). Electronic dictionaries in translation classrooms in Saudi Arabia. *Linguistica Communicatio* 10(1-2): 127-134.
Amer, W. (2010). Teaching translation at Gaza universities: Problems and solutions. Available online at: http://www.qou.edu/english/conferences/firstNationalConference/pdfFiles/walid%20Amer.pdf (Accessed June 21, 2018).
Atawneh, A. and Alaqra, M. (2007). An appraisal of the teaching of translation in Palestinian universities. In *Proceedings of the first Conference on the Role of Translation in Dialogue of Civilisations*, 17-34, Najah National University, Palestine.
Collins Cobuild English Dictionary. (2003). Birmingham: HarperCollins Publishers.
Elhajahmed, M. (2017). Lexical and textual translation problems encountered by Palestinian Professional Diploma students at the Islamic University of Gaza. *Journal of Islamic University-Gaza* 25(1): 1-13
Farghal, M. (2015). Basic Issues in translator training: Special reference to Arab contexts. In Farghal, M. *et al. Papers in Arabic/English Translation Studies 1*: *An Applied Perspective*. Amman: JTA, pp. 8-18.
Fromkinm V. and Rodman, R. (1983). *An introduction to language*. New York: CBS Publishing Japan.
Jaatinen, H and Jääskeläinen, R. (2006). Introducing IT in translator training: Experiences from the COLC project, in: Pym, A., Perekrestenko, A. & Starink, B., eds., *Translation Technology and its Teaching (with Much Mention of Localisation)*, Tarragona: Intercultural Studies Group, 83-89.
Jensen, A. (1999). Time pressure in translation. Hansen (ed.). *Probing the Process in Translation:Methods and Results*, Samfundslitteratur Copenhagen, pp. 103-119.
Habeeb A., *et al.* (2016). The impact of a suggested practical programme on improving arts of English seniors' translation competences at the Islamic University of Gaza and their attitudes towards translation. *Arab World English Journal* 5, 261- 280.
Hatim, B.(1990). A model of argumentation from Arabic rhetoric: Insights for a theory of text types. *British Society for Middle Eastern Studies* 17, 1, pp. 47-54.
Hatim, B and Mason, I (1997). *The Translator as Communicator*. Routledge.

Larson, M. (1984). *Meaning-based translation*. Lanham: University Press of America.
Mouakket, A. (1988). *Linguistics and translation: Semantic problems in Arabic-English translation*. Faculty of Arts-University of Aleppo.
Najjar, O. (2008). Discourse Analysis Models in the Training of Translators: An empirical approach. PhD Dissertaion. Heriot-Watt University.
Newmark, P. (1988). *A textbook of translation*. Hertfordshire: Prentice Hall International.
Pym, A. (2006). 'Asymmetries in the teaching of translation Technology', in Pym, A., Perekresenko, A. & Starink, B., eds. *Translation Technology and its Teaching (with Much Mention of Localization)*. Tarragona: Intercultural Studies Group, 113-124.
Roberts, R. (1992). Translation pedagogy: Strategies for improving dictionary use. *TTR: traduction, terminologie, rédaction* 5(1): 49-76.
Thawabteh, M. (2009). Apropos translator training aggro: A case study of the Centre for Continuing Education. *The Journal of Specialised Translation* 12, 165-179.
Thawabteh, M. (2013). Dictionaries lookup strategies for English-Arabic-English translation. *Studies in Contrastive Grammar* 19: 128-144.
Thawabteh, M. and Najjar, O. (2014). Training legal translators and interpreters in Palestine. In S. Shiyab (ed.), special issue of *Arab World English Journal* 5(2): 41-52.
Versteegh, Kees *et al.* (2006). *Encyclopedia of Arabic language and linguistics*. Leiden & Boston: Koninklijke Brill.
Wilkinson, M. (2007). Corpora, serendipity and advanced search techniques. *The Journal of Specialised Translation* 7, 108-122**.**

Appendix A:

إن الشعب العربي كان يحارب من أجل استقلال الوطن، وكان يحارب من أجل وحدة الأمة العربية، وكان يحارب من أجل حق دول اسيا وافريقيا كلها في تقرير المصير. فشعب الجزائر قدم مليون شهيد ولم يسلّم ولم يستّسلم ولكنه صمم أن يرفع علم الجزائر حرة. فيه قرى مات كل رجالها وقرى لم يبق الا النساء والأطفال. فيه قرى جابهت المجاعات حينما اتبع الاستعمار سياسة الأرض المحروقة. حرق المحاصيل.

(Nasser Vol. 4: 16 as cited in Shunnaq 2012: 44-45)

Appendix B

Indeed, Arab people fought for the independence of the fatherland, they were fighting for the unity of the Arab Nation, and they were fighting for the right of all Asian and African nations, to achieve self-determination. The people of Algeria sacrificed one million martyrs. They didn't yield or give in. Instead they decided to raise the flag of free Algeria. In some villages in Algeria all men were killed. In some villages only women and children survived. Some villages in Algeria encountered starvation when colonisers followed the policy of burning lands. They burnt the crops. (Nasser Vol. 4:16 as cited in Shunnaq 2012: 44-45)

THAWABTEH Mohammad Ahmad earned his PhD in Translation and Intercultural Studies from Universidad de Granada, Spain. He is an Associate Professor of Translation at Sultan Qaboos University, Oman. He taught language, linguistics and translation at undergraduate and graduate levels at Al-Quds University (1999-2017) where he was Chair of the department (2011-2012) and coordinator of MA Translation and Interpreting Programme (2010-2013). His research interests include Translator Training, Translation Studies, Pragmatics, Cultural Studies and Discourse analysis.