An Objective Quality Assessment of English into Arabic Translation: An Analysis of Interpersonal Metafunction

Mohamed Amin

PhD holder and Independent Scholar and Linguist, Egypt.

Abstract

Based on the relationship between Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) and translation, and with the aim of resolving the existing dispute over the subjective and unjustified evaluation of translation quality, this study provides an objective approach to the quality assessment of English into Arabic translation. This study uses the interpersonal metafunction of language to assess the quality of the translation. The assessment goal is to check if the interpersonal metafunction of the translated text is equivalent to the interpersonal metafunction of the original text. The tools derived from Halliday's SFL are important in the analysis because SFL is the linguistic branch that deals closely with language functions and social aspects. At the same time, the translation is seen as a whole product as well as a series of processes (Bardi, 2008). The study adopts a descriptive contrastive approach to present the main choices of interpersonal metafunction systems and their realizations in English and Arabic and uses SFL to analyze grammatical realizations of Mood system choices, seeking the Tenor variable of texts represented in context. The objective assessment is based on giving a score for each time there is a success in finding the appropriate equivalent. The texts used are originally published texts in English and their authenticated published translations in Arabic. The texts are taken from single registers, and the analysis was limited to simple clauses.

Keywords: Systemic Functional Linguistics, translation, interpersonal metafunction, English, Arabic, translation quality assessment

An Objective Quality Assessment of English into Arabic Translation: An Analysis of Interpersonal Metafunction

Mohamed Amin

1. Introduction

1.1 Purpose of the Study

The main purpose of choosing this topic is to overcome subjectivity in assessing translation quality and to provide an objective model that governs translation assessment upon dispute.

Translation is a sociolinguistic activity as considering the cultural, textual, linguistic, and socio-political aspects of any communicative exchange is essential. To clarify, "Translation", as a phenomenon by its very nature, is a textual-linguistic process (House, 2017, p. 95). Spoken expression is the conventional medium of translation (Baker, 2018, p.279); communication between speakers of two distinct languages is feasible wherever communication between speakers of one language is possible due to the same reasons because the speaker establishes a link between the linguistic units and their situational context (House, 2006, p.344). A translator works on the verbal record of the communicative act between the Source Language (SL) speaker and listener and seeks to convey the values of the perceived meanings to a group of speakers of the Target Language (TL) in the form of a separate communicative act (Hatim & Mason, 1996).

Juliane House (2014) supposes the fact that it is unlikely to reach a theory in translation without reflecting on the role of one of its most important concepts: namely, "equivalence" (p.1). A language can have the same value (or function) when translated into another language, so the relationship between the first text and the translation is a form of equivalence. Pym (2014) states that "equivalence" may be at the level of form or function, and it does not mean that languages are similar, but rather

the values (p.5). In addition, Bell (1991) reckons that translation is the transfer of a text originally written in one language to an equivalent text in another language while preserving, as far as possible, the message content, formal features, and functional roles of the Source Text (ST) (p.16). According to House (2017), translation is a secondary type of communication, which includes two stages: first, the translator receives and fully understands the original text; second, they render the message perceived from the first stage into a Target Text (TT) (p.1).

House (2017) commends SFL approach in translation assessment because it deals with language as a system for creating meanings, and it lays down a general basis for the possibilities of meanings (p.74). Such a concept is informative in translation in order to benchmark the expressions of each language against that general basis, and then measure to what extent the TT succeeds or fails in delivering the same meaning. Bell (1991) chose SFL in his approach to translation for two main reasons: first, its focus on meaning, which is the basis of translation studies (p.79); second, its focus on the social aspects of language, which are focal to translation studies, especially when considering the SL and TL in situational and cultural contexts (p.13). Baker (2018) recognizes the ease of using Halliday's linguistics as a translation tool because it is characterized by the simplicity possible to be followed and applied (p.156).

Given that the text is a multidimensional unit in a certain context (Steiner & Yallop, 2001, p.3) and that language is the embodiment of experience and interaction and, above all, a resource for the creation of meanings, it is a good

idea to adopt SFL to provide the analysis tools in this study. The importance of SFL is highlighted because it is the branch of linguistics that deals with language and the social aspects of its uses and refers the SL and the TL to their situational and cultural contexts (Bell, 1991, p.13). SFL is also concerned with the way language works and how it is organized. It is a social and contextual linguistic framework in which a language is viewed within culture, and meanings are properly understood by being referred to the cultural environment (Manfredi, 2008, p.37).

1.2 Language Functions in Text and Context

Translation can be defined as the process and product of all forms of rendering spoken, written, or encoded texts in a language (the SL) into texts that are in some ways similar to them in another language (the TL) (Mason & Laver, 2018, p.141). Generally, text is the linguistic form for social interaction, which is a continuous development of meanings composed simultaneously and sequentially (Halliday, 1978, p.113). It is any piece of language for communication, between real people in real circumstances (Bloor & Bloor, 2013, p.9). It is also a linguistic response with a function in the context of the situation (Aronoff & Miller, 2017). Since language is a resource for the creation of meanings, text is the process of creating meanings within the context (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014, p.4). Text is a semantic unit that expresses at the same time the intellectual, interactive, and textual (Eggins, 2004, p.28). Text is analysed from two aspects:

a. as an output with a composition that can be printed or recorded (Halliday & Hasan, 1989, p.12). Therefore, the text is externally constructed in the form of a unit functioning in a context. In text, the structure of the context of a situation, in which this text functions, is reflected (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014, p.42).

b. as a continuous process of semantic selection, a movement through networks of potential meanings, in which each set of choices constitutes the environment of a different set (Halliday & Hasan, 1989, p.12). Therefore, text is internally constructed in the form of patterns of ideational (i.e., experiential and logical), interpersonal, and textual meanings (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014, p. 42).

The relationship between the "text" and the "context" is manifested in what is known as the "register" (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004, p.26). A register is a formation of semantic resources that the individual belonging to a culture usually associates with the type of situation. It is the possibilities of meanings that can be accessed in a given social context (Halliday, 1978, p.111). Additionally, a register is a formation of meanings usually associated with situational categories of "Field", "Tenor", and "Mode" (Halliday & Hasan, 1989, p.12). The description of the values of the variables at any given time of using a language is the register of a text (Eggins, 2004, p.90).

Tenor refers to the relationships of interactors involved in a given context (Teruya et al., 2010, p. 217). According to Halliday and Hassan (1989), 'Tenor' refers to the participants in a situation, their statuses, and their roles (p.12), whereas these roles can be summarized as follows:

a. Status roles mean *power*, either equal or unequal. It is determined by things like age, gender, and degree of experience (Teruya et al., 2010, p.217).

b. Contact roles represent *intimacy* in relationships, varying from strangers to intimate family members and companions. Friends and lovers, for example, are characterized by active involvement, unlike coworkers (Eggins, 2004, p.100).

c. Sociometric roles are divided into neutral or charged, negatively or

positively. The interactors have these roles when there is an emotional charge (Teruya et al., 2010, p.217).

d. Valuation of field is the addition of positive or negative values by a speaker to various aspects of the field (Teruya et al., 2010, p.217).

With regard to the Tenor variable, House (2017) tackles the choices of vocabulary and structures in terms of the relations of social roles, attitudes, and participation (Manfredi 2014, p.14). Moreover, Bell (1991) argues that the choices of style and modality related to the Tenor variable from the context of a situation are language specific as he states, "That is the purpose of the Mood system whose options present the relationships organized as propositions by the Transitivity system and constitute the syntax of a particular language" (pp.134-146). The meanings of the Mood system generally among languages are likely the meanings of the process templates, participants, and conditions. His argument resonates with Halliday's; that is, an exchange is either giving or demanding and an exchanged commodity is either information or goods and services. Languages share expressing commodities as discussed below.

According to Fawcett (2008), the Tenor variable discusses the relationship between the producer of the text and its recipient, and he refers to the "formal" aspect of the relationship that results in the difference between sentences such as: *Please place it in the receptacle provided!* vs. *Bob put it in the bin!* (Fawcett, 2008, p.77). The text is usually replete with signs of "formality" and "politeness" between the text producer and the recipient. Such signs range from the "formality"—sometimes even the rigidity of the staff's language—to the "friendly" apparent in personal conversations (Fawcett, 2008, p.109). To elucidate the distinctions of lexical items resulting from the difference in formality level in English, there is a significant

difference between a) "obtain" and "get"; and b) "large" and "big". The difference between the terms is primarily a difference in the level of formality (Bell, 1991, p.186).

Another example is the use of American children to their parents' first name instead of calling them "Mom/Mother" and "Dad/Father". Such an informal degree is not accepted in many other cultures. A translator must consider this cultural difference and change the discourse according to the normal characteristics of the parents' speech in the TL (Baker, 2018, p.15). According to Bell (1991), 'accessibility' is related to the Tenor variable as follows:

> Accessibility shows the assumptions the sender has made about the knowledge he or she shares with the receiver and assumptions about the universe of discourse. The more the writer assumes is shared, the less needs to be made explicit in the surface structure of the text and the more inaccessible the text becomes to the reader who lacks the assumed shared knowledge. (p.188)

Bell (1991) also added that "Politeness reflects the authority in the addressee relationship between sender and receiver" (p.186). For example, it is achieved in English through the different methods of explicit and implicit requests. It is noted that Arabic does not differ in the methods of request at the synthetic level according to the degree of power. It will be clarified later that the difference between command, request, and supplication is semantic, not synthetic.

In Arabic, an individual recipient can be addressed with a plural pronoun as an honorific to imply superiority (Hassan, 2006). Unlike Arabic, English lacks the use of pronouns for referent honorifics probably because, in English, there is no distinction between the second-person singular and plural pronouns (You);

however, titles and/or positions can be used as honorifics in addressing or speaking of a referent, such as "Sir". Moreover, Thompson (2014) states the following:

> As emphasized previously, one of the main purposes of communicating is to interact with other people: to establish and maintain appropriate personal and social links with them. If we try to view language simply as a one-way system for telling other people things, we end up with a very distorted view of how language works, because we are overlooking the fact that we use it to exchange meanings ,that communication is inherently two-way. We tell other people things for a purpose :we may want to influence their attitudes or behaviour, or to provide information that we know they do not have, or to explain our own attitudes or behaviour, or to get them to provide us with information, and so on. (p.44)

2. Research Methodology

According to Halliday and Matthiessen (2014), the central processing unit is the clause. The integrated structure unites the different meanings (p.9). Furthermore, it is the unit within which the types of ideational, interpersonal, and textual meanings are integrated and merged into one structure. According to them, a clause is, from an interactive aspect, an exchange as it is a transaction or deliberation between a speaker and a listener (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014, p.74).

This study presents an approach to objectively assess the quality of translation from English into Arabic using the interpersonal metafunction. The evaluation aims to verify that the interpersonal metafunction of the clauses of the TT is equivalent to the interpersonal metafunction of the clauses of the ST. The evaluation is objective because it depends on giving a score for each time there is success in finding the appropriate equivalent.

Acceptable and approved translations were selected to test the investigated model and to reveal subtle errors not apparent in the accepted translations. The errors found in the translations were left unmodified, except for cases of typographical errors. The study focuses on micro-sentences represented by Halliday's structure that includes the process, participants, and circumstances, excluding titles and short sentences as they are not included in the scope of the study.

3. Theoretical Framework

3.1 Halliday's Language Functions

Halliday and Matthiessen (2004) sum up the meanings expressed by a language when trying to know what the basic language functions are with respect to the ecological and social environment as follows (p.28):

1. Experience Perception: Language interprets human experience as it coins terms for things, then parses them into categories, and further parses the categories into taxonomies. Halliday (1978) calls this the ideational metafunction. The ideational metafunction represents the meaning potentials of a speaker as an observer. It is the function of content within a language and the component through which a language denotes cultural experience, and a speaker expresses their own experience as a member of a culture. The ideational metafunction expresses the phenomena of the environment: things, living and non-living beings, verbs, events, attributes, conditions, relationships in the world and human consciousness, including the language phenomenon; and things encoded as facts and reports (Halliday, 1978, p.112).

2. Establishment of Social Relationships: Language determines an individual's

personal and social relationships with those around them, and Halliday (1978) calls it the interpersonal metafunction. The interpersonal interaction represents the meaning potentials of a speaker as an outsider. The interpersonal function is the participatory function of a language. It is the component through which a speaker intrudes themselves into the context of the situation, whether expressing their judgments and attitudes or seeking to influence others' attitudes and behaviour. This function expresses the relationships of a role which are associated with a situation. Some elucidations of these relationships are that of questioner-answerer, informer-doubter, and the like, which are determined by the language itself (Halliday, 1978, p.112).

3. Discourse Construction: In addition to conveying human experience and establishing relationships among individuals, language incorporates these two meanings in a continuous discourse. Halliday (1978) calls it the textual metafunction. The textual component represents a speaker's potential for text formation. This component links a language to a context and provides textuality or texture. It differentiates language suspended "in vacuo" from language operating in a context of situation. The textual component expresses the relationship between language and its environment, including both the verbal environment—what has been said or written before—and the situational non-verbal environment. Thus, the textual component has an enabling function. Apparently, what is meant is the enabling function—which is the opposite of the disabling one—in relation to the other two components: the ideational and the interpersonal. (Halliday, 1978, p.113).

Halliday (1978) considers the interaction among people as one of the functions that a language performs within a context. Language is used for interaction, and the first option in an interaction is to decide who initiates the speech. According to Eggins (2004), if people opt for initiating an exchange, they must assume either the role of the speaker providing information or the role of the speaker making a demand. The choices people encounter in their responses can be categorized into two main types: a supportive form of response, as opposed to a confronting form. However, in order to engage in interaction, there must also be something to exchange, which could be information (an intangible, purely verbal commodity) or goods and services (tangible commodities or activities) (p.145-183).

In other words, when a person uses language to interact, it establishes the relationships between the interactors—between the current speaker and the next one. Eggins (2004) points out that whenever people use language to interact, one of the things they are doing with it is establishing a relationship between them : between the person speaking now and the person who will probably speak next. To establish this relationship, people take turns speaking. As they take turns, they take on different speech roles in the exchange (p.144).

According to Halliday (1978), interpersonal interaction represents the meaning potentials of a speaker as an outsider. The interpersonal function is the participatory function of a language. It is the component through which a speaker intrudes themselves into the context of the situation, whether expressing their judgments and attitudes or seeking to influence others' attitudes and behaviour. This function expresses the relationships of a role which are associated with a situation. Some elucidations of these relationships are that of questioner-answerer, informer-doubter, and the like, which are determined by the language itself (p.112).

3.2 Mood System in English and Arabic

Mood is the major interpersonal system of the clause; it provides interactants involved in dialogue with the resources for giving or demanding a commodity, either information or goods-&-services – in other words, with the resources for enacting speech functions (speech acts) through the grammar of the clause: statements (giving information), questions (demanding information). (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014, p.96)

It is worth noting that interpersonal metafunction is manifested in the dialogue between any speaker and listener. "Even these elementary categories already involve complex notions: giving means 'inviting to receive', and demanding means inviting to give" (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014, p.133). In an English clause, the response step choice in interaction is constrained by the preceding initiative step. "Our choice of responding moves is constrained by the initiating move that has just been made" (Eggins, 2004, p.145).

In order for the exchange to continue, a certain part of the speaker's first step is reused, sometimes with some modification. Such part is known as the Mood—terminology-wise, the only distinction is the capitalization as Mood (element of interpersonal clause structure) starts with a capital letter, whereas Mood (primary interpersonal clause system) is written with all upper case (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014, p.141). Mood is the core of the response to the initiative in the interaction. "The essential part of the clause contains the nub of the argument" (Eggins, 2004, p.149). "Component that is called Mood, which realizes the selection of Mood in the English clause" (Teruya et al., 2010, p.146). A clause performs the interpersonal event function through the Mood.

What is happening in these discourses is that one particular component of the clause is being, as it were, tossed back and forth in a series of rhetorical exchanges. The duke's given away that teapot, hasn't he? — Oh, has he? — Yes, he has. — No he hasn't! — I wish he had. — He hasn't; but he will. — Will he? — He might. (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014, p.139)

The Mood system choices are realized in the arrangement between the Subject and the Finite within the Mood. "The Mood is the element that realizes the selection of Mood in the clause; [and it is also the domain of agreement between the] Subject and Finite" (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014, p.142). English expresses a statement by a declarative clause, a question by an interrogative clause, and a command by an imperative clause. These are the three main choices in the English Mood system. According to Thompson (2014), an offer differs as it is not included in the choices of the Mood system but is closely related to the Modality system (p.47).

3.2.1 Subject

According to Halliday and Matthiessen (2014), "It is responsible for the functioning of the clause as an interactive event" (p.146). "The Subject is the element vested with the modal responsibility for the proposition or proposal realized by the clause" (Teruya et al., 2010, p.209). Halliday and Matthiessen (2014) also added that "It is concerned with consensus about validity, and consensus is negotiated in dialogue" (p.146), and "Something by reference to which the proposition can be affirmed" (p.144). "The Subject is interpersonal in nature, being vested with modal responsibility, it interacts with other interpersonal aspects of the clause" (p.147).

A Subject is an entity which a speaker wants to make responsible for the proposition validity that is advanced in a clause or the claim stated by a speaker is valid regarding the entity. The listener can accept, discard, question, or amend the

validity of the proposition/claim by repeating or amending the Finite, "but the Subject must remain the same: if the Subject is altered the exchange has moved on to a new proposition, which represents a new claim" (Thompson, 2014, p.54). In a question, the Subject represents the entity in question.

In a proposal, a Subject determines the one in charge of realizing an offer or carrying out a command. For example, in "*I'll open the gate, shall I?"* (offer) the opening action depends on the speaker; in "*stop shouting!"* (command), it is for you to stop or not (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014, p.145).

3.2.2 Finite

A Finite defines the limits of a proposition or a proposal as it brings them to reality. A good way to make anything arguable is to link it to the context of situation here and now, and that is the role of the Finite element. "If anything, it is the Mood element that embodies the proposition rather than the remainder of the clause" (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014, p.143). "Through the Finite, the speaker signals three basic kinds of claims about the validity of the proposition, each of which in principle is open to acceptance or rejection by the listener" (Thompson, 2014, p.54). It connects and relates these claims to one or more of the following.

3.2.3 Time

According to Halliday and Matthiessen (2014), "This is what the Finite does. It relates the proposition to its context in the speech event (…) by reference to the time of speaking." To elucidate, note the verb "was" in "an old man was crossing the road" (p.143). To further clarify, Thompson (2014) adds "Whether the proposition is valid for the present time and actual situation or for other times – past, future – or for unreal situations" (p.55). Finally, the conclusion that in the temporal deixis, the

validity is made in terms of past, present or future is highlighted (Teruya et al., 2010, p.80).

3.2.4 Polarity

According to Halliday and Matthiessen (2014), "In order for something to be arguable, it has to be specified for polarity" (p.143). It means affirmation and negation. It is also clear that the contrast between affirmation and negation is one of the things expressed by grammar in a language. They also added that "In association with the clause as proposition or proposal" (p.172). In a proposition, x *is* either y or *is not* y; "either 'is' or 'isn't' (proposition), either do!' or 'don't!' (proposal)" (p.143).

3.2.5 Modality

Modality is the restriction in terms of obligation, probability, and abstention, and it indicates that something is probable or improbable— in the case of a proposition— and is desirable or undesirable—in the case of a proposal. Additionally, a proposition or proposal can be arguable by being subject to evaluation in terms of the degree of probability or obligation associated with it (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014, p.143). The Modality system explains the uncertainty between affirmation and negation; "Modality as a resource which sets up a semantic space between yes and no" (Martin & Rose, 2007, p.53).

3.2.6 Residue

The remaining components of a clause are called the Residue. In accordance with Halliday and Matthiessen (2014), "The remainder of the clause we shall call the Residue" (p.142). Also, Thompson (2014) adds that "The rest of clause merely fills in the details" (p.56). As for the RESIDUE component, it is defined by Eggins (2004) as the component "which can be left out or ellipsised" (p.149); it is "that part of the clause which is somehow less essential to the arguabilty of the clause" (p.155).

Table 1

Choices of the Mood System in English (Thompson, 2014, p.155)

Clause Choice	Example
Indicative Declarative	Bears eat honey. Bears don't eat honey.
Yes/No Interrogative	Do bears eat honey? Don't bears eat honey?
WH- Interrogative	What eats honey? What do bears eat?
Imperative	Bear, Eat honey!

Bears	Eat		honey.
Subject	Finite	Predicator	Complement
Mood		Residue	

Bears	don't	eat	honey.
Subject	Finite with negation marker	Predicator	Complement
Mood		Residue	

Do	bears	Eat	honey?
Finite	Subject	Predicator	Complement
Mood		Residue	

Don't	Bears	eat	honey?
Finite with negation marker	Subject	Predicator	Complement
Mood		Residue	

What	Eats		honey?
Subject	Finite	Predicator	Complement
Mood		Residue	

What	do	Bears		eat?
Complement	Finite	Subject	Predicator	
Residue	Mood		Residue	

Bear,	Eat	honey!
Vocative	Predicator	Complement
	Residue	

3.3 Mood System in Arabic

Considering the Mood choices in Arabic, it is apparent that they include, as is the case in English, what preserves the continuity and connectivity of an interaction. Arabic uses the Mood system to perform the interpersonal metafunction among people through the roles of discourse: giving and requesting information, giving and requesting goods/services. Giving information is done by the declarative Mood which is the opposite and only Mood of a non-declarative clause in Arabic (imperative, interrogative, conditional, and subjunctive). Requesting information is achieved by the interrogative clause. Providing goods/services is achieved by an offer composed of the present tense alone or the present preceded by the future prefix "ـس" *will*. Requesting goods/services is achieved by the command function as an imperative clause (Bardi, 2008, p.53).

Bardi (2008) argues that the Mood element in Arabic consists of three components that are repeated in discourse; namely, "the Subject, the Finite and the Predicator" (p.53). In the case of the imperative clause, the Subject can be missing, and so can be the Finite in the case of the verbal clause that has a singular verb. "In a verbal clause the Mood Base is made up of the Subject (either freestanding or bound), and the Predictor, especially when the process is intransitive" (Bardi, 2008, p.55). "When the verb is transitive, there are quite often at least two main participants, one carries out the action (the Subject in an 'active' clause) and the other

either benefits from it or endures it (Complement in an 'active' clause)" (Bardi, 2008, p.56).

If it is a pronoun, the Finite and the Predicator may be missing. "In a nominal clause, on the other hand, the part of the clause which has the responsibility of carrying the exchange forward is made up of the Subject and Complement" (Bardi, 2008, p.208). "An ordinary Adjunct, not a Complement, could be interpreted as being part of the Mood Base". To elucidate, the negation particle "لم" negates the adverb "مسرعًا" not the verb "يخرج" in "لم يخرج الولد مسرعًا" *the boy has not got out rushing* (Bardi, 2008, p.60). The whole Mood element can be missing, and the Residue remains in some cases of the methods of temptation and warning. "The Mood Base may also include both Mood Adjuncts and other particles, because of their contribution to either the system of FINITENESS, or because of their tie to the other subsystems of Mood" (Bardi, 2008, p.210). "The way it is modally loaded, the way it expresses time and most importantly the nature of different clauses which are often a way of manipulating the construal of participants' roles have all contributed to make the Mood Base a complex and dynamic entity" (Bardi, 2008, p.55).

The Finite links the clause to reality by the linguistic tense, polarity, and modality. While the Finite system in Arabic has the same potential to link the clause to reality, which is evident in English. The potential of the Finite system in Arabic is realized differently. "The defining features

of each depend on the scope of the difference in the way each language expresses Tense, Polarity [either affirmation or negation] and Modality" (Bardi, 2008, p.108).

The realization of the Finite in Arabic ranges between the use of verbs and letters that is distributed over the indications of time, polarity, and modality. Verbs and particles are referred to as the Finite when analyzing. Some elucidations of the verbs are *"كان" verb to be* which is an incomplete verb expressing time; *"ليس" not* expressing negation in polarity; "يجب أن" *must* expressing obligation; "يمكن أن" *could* expressing possibility; and "عسى" *hopefully* expressing hope. Examples of

particles are the prefix "ـس" *will* expressing time; "لن" *will not,* expressing future time and negation in polarity; and "رب" expressing possibility; etc. (Bardi, 2008, p.109).

A Predicator is the main verb expressing the process within a clause, and Arabic differs from English when analyzing one-word verbs regarding the Predicator; however, English, when analyzing singular verbs, merges the Finite into the Predicator. As for Arabic, it makes a clause devoid of the Finite and suffices with the Predicator; for example, "خرج محمد" *Muhammad came out* (Bardi, 2008, p.110).

محمد.	خرج
Mohammed	came out.
Subject	Predicator
Mood	

As for the cases of affixes in which some Finite elements of tense, polarity, and modality are added to the base verb of the clause, the Finite appears in the analysis as

in "كانت الطيور تغرد عند طلوع الشمس" *at sunrise, the birds were singing* (Bardi, 2008, p.222).

عند طلوع الشمس	تغرد	الطيور	كانت
At sunrise,	Singing	The birds	Were
Adjunct: time adverbial	Predicator	Subject	Finite
Residue		Mood	

It is worth noting that the attachment of pronouns with the Predicator—and then they appear in the analysis—is divided between their performance of the Subject or Complement function and being considered inflectional affixes that match person, gender, and

number. To exemplify, "زيدًا ضربته" *Zaid whom I hit*, so the subject particle "تـ" is the subject, and the particle "ه" attached to the verb is an inflectional suffix that matches the object "زيدًا." In "زيد ضربته" *I hit Zaid,* the particle "تـ" is the complement, and the particle "ه" is an inflectional suffix.

ه	ت	ضرب	زيدًا
	I	Hit	Zaid whom
Subject		Predicator	Complement
Mood			Residue

ه	ت	ضرب	زيد
	I	Hit	Zaid
	Complement	Predicator	Subject
Mood			

The Mood choices in Arabic are the following:

• Declaration which can either be true or not.

• Interrogation

"It is clear that offer does not rely on one exclusive Mood option in Arabic" (Bardi, 2008, p.222). The offer clause may be a statement, either by using the present tense denoting determination or by using the prefix "سـ" *will* denoting a promise. To elucidate, "أقابلك غدًا" *I will meet you tomorrow*; "سأقاتل العدو" *I will fight the enemy*. It can be interrogative as "هل تتناول الشاي؟" *Would you like some tea?* or imperative as "تفضل!" *Here you are*.

• Imperative, which is the Finite. The command particle in Arabic is the Finite because it has a polarity function in the proposition which is to do the command or not to do it. First, the command particle is followed by the Predicator then the Subject; for example, "لتأكلوا الطعام" *may you eat the food*. The Finite or the Subject—or even both—can be omitted (e.g., "كلوا الطعام" *eat the food;* "لتأكل الطعام يا زيد" *may you eat the food, Zaid;* "كل الطعام يا زيد" *eat the food, Zaid!*). The command particle varies depending on the polarity option. To

illustrate, the positive command particle—which demands the execution of an action—is the particle of demand (لام الطلب), and the negative command particle—which demands not executing an action—is the forbidding particle (لا الناهية) (Bardi, 2008, p.222).

The most common verification of the choice of commanding an addressee is the use of the morphological form "افعل" *do*; for example, "قم" *get up* and "اقعد" *sit down* (Ibn Hisham, Mughni al-Labib, 291-295). It is an abbreviated form of the form the general positive command choice in Arabic—"لتفعل" [*let/may…*]. In commanding an addressee, the present tense morpheme is omitted to be replaced with an indication of the situation and to reduce the abundance of use. Omitting the tense morpheme results in omitting the lam of the demand because the lam is functional, but the verb attached to it cannot be inflected after omitting the tense morpheme (Ibn Ya'ish, 1988, pp.290-294).

To elaborate further, the following example and its abbreviated form are analyzed—"لتأكلوا الطعام" *may you eat the food*; "كلوا الطعام" *eat the food* (Bardi, 2008, p.223).

الطعام	وا	تأكل	ل
the food	You	Eat	May
Complement	Subject	Predicator	Finite: positive command particle
Residue	Mood		

الطعام	وا	كل
the food	Eat	
Complement	Subject	Predicator
Residue	Mood	

Originally, the attached pronouns were used in the same way as the detached pronouns. Ibn Ya'ish (1988) states that in "ضربت" *I hit* and "ضرب" *he hit*, the "ت" is the Subject (pp.3012-3016). Therefore, the attached pronoun is one of the components within the clause just as in the above examples; attached pronouns, however, may appear as inflections upon analysis. With the validity of the attached pronouns to denote the meanings of the detached pronouns, the former can be affixes and means to be used in determining lexical clues such as matching and linking (Hassan, 2006, p.156).

The implicit pronouns do not appear in the analysis, so in "زيد قام" *Zaid stood up*, "قام" indicates the subject. Thus, no need for an implicit pronoun as it is redundant. It is apparent that the verb lexically indicates the subject. To elaborate, the verbs are inflected for the person, gender, and number denoting the subject. The "يـ" in "يعلم" denotes a masculine singular third-person subject. The "أ" in "أعلم" refers to a singular first-person subject. The "نـ" in "نعلم" is used to indicate a plural first-person subject. The "تـ" in "تعلم" denotes a masculine or feminine second-person subject. Hence, there is no implicit pronoun because the verb lexically indicates just as it indicates time (Ibn Mud'a, 1979, pp.81-82)

3.4 An Objective Assessment Sample of Translation Quality

1. The ST and TT are placed in the form of equivalent sentences. In other words, the user of the form has to disassemble the ST and TT into sentences and put each sentence of the TT against its counterpart from the ST. It is useful to add to the ST and TT before disassembling them into sentences placing references linking each sentence to its counterpart on one hand and linking the sentence to its place in the text on the other hand in order to facilitate referring to a sentence in its context within the text.

2. The analysis is carried out on the source and then the translated sentence in terms of the interpersonal metafunction by defining the Subject, the Finite, the Predicator, the Complements, the various Adjuncts, and specifying their roles in terms of Time, Polarity, and Modality, and then determining the sentence Mood choice.

3. Translation success in metafunction will be given a point. Thus, three points are assigned to translation success in the three metafunctions. Every point is divided into two halves; one half for the transfer of what is related to the principal system of the metafunction— the transitivity system of the ideational metafunction, the Mood system of the interpersonal metafunction, and the theme system of the textual function— and the other half for the transfer other matters related to the variable of the context of the situation closely related to the metafunction. Such matters are related to each of the context variables according to the metafunction related to this variable, such as vocabulary in the ideational metafunction; power, intimacy, and the gender of the interactants in the interpersonal metafunction; and matters related to pronunciation and writing in the textual metafunction.

4. It is significant to calculate the percentage of error of the elements to

the total elements in a clause in each aspect of each metafunction, for which half a point is allocated. The elements here mean words, and what is required is to find the ratio of correct and incorrect words to the ratio of words within a clause. To obtain the degree of error from the total of 0.5 points of the total elements, the following cross multiplication is used: degree of error x number of total elements = the number of error elements x 0.5. The scores of each aspect are added up to get the metafunction score to a total of one (1) point.

5. The translation success scores are collected in a table to obtain the translation success score for each metafunction at the text level, and these scores are represented in percentages.

6. A chart highlighting the ratio of correct to incorrect translation is created.

4. Sample Analysis

There are two different corpses from which the analysed sample is driven. The first sample is included in the package insert of Selenium ACE from Wassen International Ltd. The ST and TT are supposed to be distributed together inside the package. The TT used here is to be added to the ST in the consumer medicine information leaflet so it is not extremely essential for the patient as the drug can be taken directly if given to the patient by any nurse in a hospital. The Tenor of this text is a unilateral interaction between the manufacturer of the drug to its user, and the user is an unknown person from the unspecialized public. Discourse is a top-down interaction. One of the manifestations

of this is not using any vocabulary or structures related to courtesy in the matter.

The second sample to be analysed is the one that appears in the user manual of one of LG's LED TVs, and there is no significant temporal gap between the ST and the TT, as the device is expected to be simultaneously introduced into different markets. The function of the language used in this text is secondary, as it aids in accomplishing the physical actions mentioned in the text. The variables of the register for this text can be summarized as follows:

- Field: It involves the television being mounted on the wall, which necessitates physical operations and vocabulary related to the device and its mounting tools.

- Tenor: It is a unidirectional interaction from the guide or instructor to the installer, representing non-specialized customers interested in TV installation. The discourse is a top-down interaction, demonstrated by the absence of terms or structures of politeness in the commands.

- Mode: It is a written monologue in simple language.

(C.1.) Selenium ACE tablets prevent cellular damage by eliminating free radicals, and harmful oxidants through the synergistic effect of selenium, vitamins A, C and E

(د.1.) أقراص سيلينيوم- إيه سي إي المغلفة تمنع تلف الخلايا بالقضاء على الجزيئات الشاردة والمؤكسدات الضارة من خلال تأثير التناغم بين السيلينيوم، فيتامين أ، فيتامين ج وفيتامين ه.

Selenium ACE tablets	Prevent		cellular damage	by eliminating free radicals, and harmful oxidants	through the synergistic effect of selenium, vitamins A, C and E
Subject	Finite	Predicator	Complement	Adjunct: Adverbial	Adjunct: Adverbial
Mood		Residue			

من خلال تأثير التناغم بين السيلينيوم، فيتامين أ، فيتامين ج وفيتامين ه.	بالقضاء على الجزيئات الشاردة والمؤكسدات الضارة	تلف الخلايا	تمنع	أقراص سيلينيوم- إيه سي إي المغلفة
Adjunct: Adverbial	Adjunct: Adverbial	Complement	Predicator	Subject
Residue			Mood	

Here, the TT matches the ST in terms of the interpersonal metafunction.

(A.7.) Brackets, bolts and ropes are not provided.

(ب.7.) الأقواس، المسامير والحبال غير مرفقة.

Brackets, bolts and ropes	are not	Provided
Subject	Finite	Complement
Mood		Residue

غير مرفقة	الأقواس، المسامير والحبال
Complement	Subject
Residue	Mood

The translation matched the ST in terms of the interpersonal metafunction, except that it used a negative adjective " غير مرفقة " instead of the Finite, which is common in Arabic.

(A.8.) You can obtain additional accessories from your local dealer.

(ب.8.) يمكنك الحصول على الملحقات الإضافية من الوكيل المحلي.

You	can	Obtain	additional accessories	from your local dealer
Subject	Finite	Predicator	Complement	Adjunct: Adverbial
Mood		Residue		

من الوكيل المحلي	الملحقات الإضافية	الحصول على	ك	يمكن
Adjunct: Adverbial	Complement	Predicator	Subject	Finite
Residue			Mood	

With the difference between the Mood and the Residue in the TT from the ST, the translation was used to achieve the correct use of the declarative clause in Arabic.

(C.2.) Store in dry place at temperature not exceeding 30°C

(د.2.) يحفظ في مكان جاف عند درجة حرارة لا تزيد عن 30 درجة مئوية.

Store	in dry place	at a temperature not exceeding 30°C
Predicator	Adjunct: Adverbial	Adjunct: Adverbial
Mood	Residue	

عند درجة حرارة لا تزيد عن 30 درجة مئوية	في مكان جاف	يحفظ
Adjunct: Adverbial	Adjunct: Adverbial	Predicator
Residue		Mood

The TT differs from the ST in terms of achieving the choice of Mood. In the TT, a statement using the passive structure is used instead of an imperative clause. Arabic commonly uses declarative statements to imply imperative speech act. This is a well-known rhetorical method in Arabic, so the translator deserves a full score for the interpersonal metafunction.

(C.4.) This product is manufactured in Egypt under the license of Wassen International Ltd in the UK

(د.4.) يتم تصنيع هذا المنتج بمصر بتصريح من شركة واسن العالمية ليمتد بإنجلترا

This product	is	Manufactured	in Egypt	under the license of Wassen International Ltd in the UK
Subject	Finite	Predicator	Adjunct: Adverbial	Adjunct: Adverbial
Mood			Residue	

بتصريح من شركة واسن العالمية ليمتد بإنجلترا	بمصر	هذا المنتج	تصنيع	يتم
Adjunct: Adverbial	Adjunct: Adverbial	Complement	Subject	Predicator
Residue			Mood	

The TT differs from the ST due to the process change. Although the meaning is almost the same between the ST and the TT, the analysis reveals apparent differences. The change of the Predicator and Subject, which led to the appearance of the Complement in the analysis, can be counted as 3 errors in the aspect of the Mood choice.

The error-total ratio of the clause is 3 to 14. To get the error score out of a total of 0.5 points, cross multiplication is used.

The degree of error x 14 = 3 x 0.5. The result is 0.11. This number is subtracted from 0.5, so the score for the Mood aspect of the interpersonal metafunction of this clause is 0.39. Because the translation of the other aspect related to the Tenor variable is correct, the score for the interpersonal metafunction of this clause is $0.5 + 0.39 = 0.89$.

The TT matches the ST in terms of the ideational metafunction.

(E.9.) These pages and groups on social media platforms contain links to other clusters with similar content.

(و.9.) وتتضمن هذه الصفحات أو المجموعات الموجودة على منصات التواصل الاجتماعي روابط لتكتلات أخرى تشبهها في المحتوى.

These pages and groups on social media platforms	Contain		links to other clusters with similar content
Subject	Finite	Predicator	Complement
Mood		Residue	

روابط لتكتلات أخرى تشبهها في المحتوى	هذه الصفحات أو المجموعات الموجودة على منصات التواصل الاجتماعي	تتضمن	و
Complement	Subject	Predicator	Conjunctive Adjunct
Mood			

The TT matches the ST in terms of the interpersonal metafunction. It should be noted here that the Mood includes the Complement, echoing the nominal clauses because the relational processes denote description and definition. A discussion is not right without mentioning the described element and the adjective or the identifier and the identified. This is highlighted in: The book included the image: Yes, it included it; no, it did not include it. Did it include it? The forms of discussion about the proposition revolve around the Subject and the Complement together.

5. Findings

Achieving absolute objectivity remains an elusive goal, particularly given that translation is a fundamentally human activity. Nevertheless, the proposed model attains a high degree of objectivity in evaluation. The objectivity of the assessment increases as the analysis encompasses all aspects of both the source and target languages. Through analyzing texts and understanding the grammatical considerations of various meanings, the study has developed an initial procedural model for objectively evaluating translation quality. This model can be summarized into four axes:

1. Identifying contextual variables.

2. Dissecting the original and translated texts.

3. Analyzing sentences in terms of their different functions.

4. The objective evaluation of translation quality.

During the application of the model, the study identified certain translation errors from English to Arabic, such as being influenced by the source language style, for example, using the passive construction with "by" and other foreign English language features that are not suitable for Arabic. Similarly, inappropriate source language terms were used in the target language, especially evident in scientific terminology or temperature differences, as highlighted by 'Mona Baker'.

On the aspect of directionality, one of the translator's mistakes was failing to determine the gender of the addressee or incorrectly identifying it from the context, as the English system of style and grammatical gender markers may not reveal the gender of the addressee. In terms of form, some errors include the inability to identify the standard structure and marked structure in constructing the topic and

theme between the two languages, as well as determining their different functions, whether they are formal, serving as sentence connectors, or functional, linking ideas within the text.

Based on the initial application of the procedural model, the significance of considering the type of text, whether scientific or literary, becomes evident. This is because literary texts, no matter how they undergo objective methodologies, retain a unique human nature that grants them distinctiveness and variation. The same applies to religious texts with their specific content characteristics. Therefore, it is essential to test the proposed model on a diverse range of text genres and identify the types of texts that cannot be evaluated effectively using the suggested model.

6. Limitations

The study encountered limitations related to functional linguistics on one hand and the nature of the Arabic language on the other. These limitations include:

1. Incomplete systems of text records and their contexts in the English language.

2. The expansive scope of Arabic systems makes it challenging to comprehensively examine them in a single study.

3. Discrepancies among researchers regarding certain Arabic terminologies used in functional linguistics.

7. Conclusion

The study addressed the question: "How does the theory of translation benefit from functional systemic linguistics?" by proposing a conceptual framework for an objective evaluation model of translation quality using analytical tools derived from functional systemic linguistics. To clarify, because of the difference between Arabic and English in the method of realizing the choices of the systems emanating from the Mood system, the semantic agreement in turn-taking is different in both of them. The importance of this semantic agreement is evident when considering translation quality assessment as the aim of this study.

Upon evaluation, it is necessary, on one hand, to consider the realization of the interpersonal movement in the ST and TT, monitor the extent of compatibility between them in the semantic layer, and then evaluate the success of the translation in terms of using the appropriate realization within the language for this used choice. On the other hand, the evaluation procedures must be carried out by a human reviewer because the machine does not yet understand the nuances of using the different realizations emanating from the interpersonal movement in the ST and TT and thus fails to produce an objective evaluation of a translation. Finally, the study recommends investigating the systems emanating from the Tenor variable within the texts in the semantic layer and tracking the realizations of each of the choices of those systems.

References

Aronoff, M., & Rees-Miller, J. (2017). *The Handbook of Linguistics*. Blackwell.

Baker, M. (2018). *In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation* (3rd ed.). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315619187

Bardi, M. A. (2008). *A Systematic Functional Description of the Grammar of Arabic*. Macquarie University.

Bell, R.T. (1991). *Translation and Translating: Theory and Practice* (1st ed.). Longman.

Bloor, T., & Bloor, M. (2013). *The Functional Analysis of English: A Hallidayan Approach* (3rd ed). Routledge.

Eggins, S. (2004). *An Introduction to Systemic Functional Linguistics*. Continuum.

Fawcett, R. P. (2008). *Invitation to Systemic Functional Linguistics through the Cardiff Grammar: An Extension and Simplification of Halliday's Systemic Functional Grammar* (3rd ed.). Equinox.

Halliday, M. A. K. (1978). *Language as Social Semiotic: The Social Interpretation of Language and Meaning*. Arnold.

Halliday, M. A. K., & Matthiessen, C. M. I. (2014). *Halliday's Introduction to Functional Grammar* (4th ed.). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203783771

Halliday, M. A. K., & Matthiessen, C. M. I. M. (2004). *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203783771

Halliday, M.A.K. & Hasan, R. (1989). *Language, Context and Text: Aspects of Language in a Social-Semiotic Perspective*. Deakin University Press.

Hassan, T. (2006). *Arabic Language: Meaning and Structure*. Alam Al-Kutub.

Hatim, B., & Mason, I. (1996). *The Translator As Communicator* (1st ed.). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203992722

House, J. (2006). Text and context in translation. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 38(3), 338–358.

House, J. (2014). *Translation Quality Assessment: Past and Present* (1st ed.). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315752839

House, J. (2017). *Translation: The Basics* (1st ed.). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315101927

Ibn Mada'a, A. (1979). *Response to the Grammarians. Investigation: Muhammad Ibrahim Al-Banna* (1st ed.). Dar AlI'tisam.

Ibn Yaish, M. (2001). *Sharh al-Mofassal, presented to him by: Dr. Emil Badi' Yaqoub* (1st ed.). Dar al-Kutub al-Ilmiyya.

Manfredi, M. (2008). *Translating Text and Context: Translation Studies and Systemic Functional Linguistics* (Vol.1). D.U. Press.

Manfredi, M. (2014). *Translating Text and Context: Translation Studies and Systemic Functional Linguistics* (Vol.2). Asterisco.

Martin, J. R. & Rose, D. (2007). *Working with Discourse: Meaning Beyond the Clause* (2nd ed.). Continuum.

Mason, I., & Laver, J. (2018). *A Dictionary of Translation and Interpreting*.

Matthiessen, C., Teruya, K., & Lam, M. (2010). *Key Terms in Systemic Functional Linguistics*. Bloomsbury Publishing.

Pym, A. (2009). *Exploring Translation Theories* (1st ed.). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203869291

Steiner, E.H., & Yallop, C. (2001). *Exploring Translation and Multilingual Text Production: Beyond Content*. Mouton de Gruyter. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110866193

Thompson, G. (2014). Introducing Functional Grammar (3rd ed.). Routledge.