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Abstract

This research tackles the problems of translating military texts from English into Arabic. It highlights the problems and intricacies that face translators without enough military knowledge. The research uses an evaluative approach to investigate and discuss the intricacies of translating military texts from English into Arabic. The purpose of the study is to display the difficulties of translating military texts, and how they are handled by the English Department Graduates (EDGs).

The current study adopts a qualitative approach in order to recognize and identify the real difficulties behind translating military texts and how they can be approached by EDGs. The data are collected from different sources to guarantee a reasonable scope of variation in the context and military language.
Introduction

Translation is the cornerstone in communication between languages and cultures. Modern technologies are transferred among nations and cultures through translation as it is applicable to all fields of language including religious, literary, legal, medical language, etc. Translation has occupied a special place in the human culture, so, researchers have paid great attention to overcome the intricacies that face the different types of translation. In this regard, (Newmark, 2001), for example, suggests that the trouble with translation of political language is that it is an abstraction of an abstraction. Military translation is considered one of the recently developing trends in translation. It is usually challenging and it requires accuracy, firmness, knowledge and most importantly, understanding of the ideas behind the military term.

(Wiseman, 2000) states that "the technical terms of any discipline represent technical concept. When different writers refer to concepts by different terms (or refer to different concepts by the same term), audience, students and readers are easily confused." (p. 2). The issue of terms is one of the most prominent intricacies that face translators when dealing with specialized, technical or scientific texts, besides the other linguistic and contextual intricacies. “When there is ambiguity, when the writing is abstract or figurative, you have to ask yourself: what is actually happening here? And why? For what reason, on what grounds, for what purpose? Can you visualize it?” (Newmark, 2009, p. 23), if not, you have to acknowledge that you are facing one of these intricacies, and you have to maneuver in order to find the most suitable way to transfer the idea into the TL.

(Hempel, 2009) states that the need to respect the text type conventions of the target culture is considered to be one of the principal factors in translation quality. Even the supporters of functional approaches like Skopos theory, as this is the case with this thesis, usually emphasize that translation should be not only
respecting one side, but it should also respect both the receiver's needs and the conventions of the relative text type. (p. 102). As a type of the technical and scientific translation, difficulties and intricacies of the military translation can arise from the fact that there are no assigned equivalents for the neologisms in the target language while these military neologisms are, most of the time, culturally loaded and not included in the dictionaries. The military terms have their own interpretations, which reflect the terms meaning in the light of the military life. While the understanding of the source text terminology is a vital factor in the process of translation, the coining of the term’s target language counterpart is of equal, if not greater, importance.

1. Context of the Research

The military language, as it refers to the language of military organizations and personnel, as belonging to a discrete category, has been developed since the 1990s (Bell, 2006). The joint combined training exercises among different services (army, navy, air defense, air force) of the same country and armies from different countries have become frequent. In addition, the international alliances and joint combined operations, including peacekeeping missions, have increased this complexity. Due to this complexity, the NATO, as one of its attempts to overcome the problems that may arise from understanding specialized terms, has created an online dictionary, a STANAG (Standardization Agreement) document, for use by member countries.

Although many English-Arabic dictionaries have included the military equivalents of some terms, and some technological supports (CAT (computer-assisted translation) tools) including translation memories, have been developed, many military terms still cannot be found in these sources, and CAT tools may not be helpful in some cases. The reason behind that is that the terms are either new, or because there might not be direct equivalents for them in Arabic language. Moreover, translators may not find compounds and some
abbreviations in English-Arabic dictionaries and other CAT tools. In this situation, the researcher tries to suggest some strategies to overcome the problem of new terms and the problem of non-equivalence.

2. Why military translation

(Kočote, 2016, p. 107) states that military texts have been traditionally seen as a very special type of texts that are composed, translated and disseminated by professionals among professionals. Nowadays, due to the current geopolitical and international situation, there is a growing public concern about the issues of national and transnational security. Many countries around the world increased their expenditure on military projects and training due to the security threats they face, as it is shown in this graph:

![Graph 1.2: World’s Military Expenditure in 2018](image-url)
Publicity ensured to military life, operations, missions and training by mass media, as well as their effect on the national and international interest, have conditioned the growth of the volume of military-related discourse. In this regard, (Jalabneh, 1994) stresses the fact that military translation has a crucial role nowadays. Indeed, it is even more crucial in the modern arena, where the misinterpreting of a sentence or even a word could unleash vast technological destruction.

3. Problems that may arise when translating military texts

In the light of conflicts and wars that are widespread around the world, military translation has become an essential tool in order to share information, tactics and strategies. Military texts have distinct features that affect the process of translation. There might be some intricacies that may confront the translator when dealing with such texts. Here are some of these intricacies:

3.1 Semantics intricacies

Because of globalization, some meanings of language used among nations change every day. (Trask, 1994, p. 128) says that meanings of words change over time, there are always new words and new pronunciations coming into use while the old forms, words, pronunciations are gradually disappearing. (Adika, 2014, p. 1) stresses that the most obvious linguistic form has always been the word. As languages evolve, they not only absorb new material and develop new patterns; they also preserve inherited material in a solid base transmitted faithfully from one generation to the next. Here the research provides an example of the new patterns and euphemisms that were developed during the Gulf War from (Algeo, 1991 and 1992)’s studies and in American Speech. These patterns are noticed to be masked with violence, while in other fields of language they would be described in different ways:
Assertive disarmament: war (ironic)

Assets: weapons

Clean bombing: bombing with accuracy

Coercive potential: military power

Soften up, soften: bomb in preparation for a ground engagement

Techno-war: war fought with advanced technology

Technomilitary: pertaining to the military use of advanced technology

Runaway denial device: Bomb that scatters clusters of cratering bombs over a wide area to destroy air base runaways

Boys of Baghdad; Baghdad Boys: CNN reporters in Iraq

Brilliant weapon: advanced form of a smart weapon

Discriminate deterrence: bombing

Fire and forget: automatically guided missile

Cleansed: cleared (of enemy troops)

Collateral damage: civilian casualties and damage incidental to the bombing of military targets; any incidental, undesirable consequence

3.2 Terms intricacies

The scientific and technological revolution that the world has witnessed has generated new terms and neologisms that can express these new ideas. Therefore, new constructions of these terms emerged. The translators must be aware of such constructions that were a result of these advances. As it is the central language, English has created many terminologies, while many other languages, including Arabic, are just receivers of these neologisms. These neologisms were either translated or transliterated, as an example, the term “logistic support” was transliterated to الدعم اللوجستي aldaam al-logisti, and the
term "cyber-attack" was transliterated to هجوم سيبراني £ogoom Saibarani. (Hanaqtah, 2016, p. 59) argues that in many cases, military terms do not have identical equivalents or corresponding lexical items in the target language, and even if they have, the corresponding items may not have the actual required meaning. The result of the structural differences in the features, vocabulary, and syntax of the two languages involved is a linguistic translation problem.

3.3 Translating Military Neologisms

Translating neologisms of the military language is a problematic issue when translating from English into Arabic. According to (Newmark, 1988, p. 140), neologisms are perhaps the non-literary and the professional translator’s biggest challenge. New objects, equipment and weapons are continually manufactured in the military, followed by new ideas and variations on the use of such equipment, weapons or objects. Then, we are faced by new terms from the technical and social arenas coming into the main stream of language.

Due to these issues, finding the suitable, and the right, equivalent for these neologisms is the true challenge. The difficulty comes from the fact that these neologisms are related to cultural and technical backgrounds. In the meantime, there is a lack of information about these neologisms in dictionaries, which, in this case, are of little, if not no, use, even the most updated or advanced ones. (Matielo, 2007, p. 39) mentions that the difficulties arise because the cross-linguistically action requires a lot of effort to find similar modes of expression and cross-cultural demand for parallel social sets.

3.4 Translating Military slang, acronyms and abbreviations

English military slang terms, acronyms and abbreviations are posing a great challenge in the translation process from English into Arabic, as it is not just an issue of rendering words, but a rendering of other's culture. A problematic task for translators because of the linguistic and cultural differences between TL and SL (Hanaqtah, 2016b, pp. 52-54). Translator needs to decide whether, taking into consideration cultural aspects of the target language and possible recipients.
Transferring the meaning or conveying the same message to the TL which has a different culture will not be easy, especially if the translator insisted on finding slang term used in the TL which has the same meaning or impact.

The military personnel use many unique items and concepts that civilians are not exposed to. It is obvious that military community likes using abbreviations and acronyms. Acronyms are being added to lexicon daily because of the widespread of the military industries. Because of this and the need for expedient and clear communication, the U.S. military launched a new tab in its site (www.military.com) for acronyms and abbreviations used in the U.S. military where the list of terms, jargon, acronyms and abbreviations are updated every week. Similarly, the NATO established a standardized agreement (STANAG) in order to list and standardize the use of acronyms and abbreviations. Translating these acronyms and abbreviations into Arabic is posing a great challenge to translators as there are no equivalents for them in the Arabic language, and the translator has to translate the full form of these acronyms and abbreviations.

4. Military texts as a form of LSP texts

LSP is designed for a specific communicative purpose that is located in a definitive socio-cultural context, most of the time closely related to a particular professional discourse community. This specific communicative purpose is linked to functions performed by the text. These forms are known as genres. Military texts are a type of LSP texts that rigidly follow genre conventions, and they are characterized for a specific audience, i.e. military audience and professionals. This genre is known for its clarity and strictness; they are also intentionally devoid of any expressiveness.

Many universities, institutions, entities, schools and organizations have developed curricula that serve the purpose of qualifying military-related people for being able to successfully deal with the military environment and language and understand its culture. (Juhary, 2013, pp. 1178-1185) attempted in his study
to review the English language courses at the National Defense University of Malaysia (NDUM). The researcher suggested that the future military officers need the university to prepare them to be function effectively during peacekeeping and humanitarian operations. This research focuses on whether students have been undergoing appropriate English language courses for their future needs as officers of the armed forces. The methodology of this paper involves distributing and collecting data from 167 students of the university. Data were then analyzed using Statistical Packages for Social Sciences (SPSS)Version 16. Findings suggest that students are positive about learning English language. Nonetheless, they have raised several issues that must be addressed immediately by the English instructors. As this research is still collecting data from other sets of respondents, suffice to conclude at this point that military vocabulary and concepts will better assist students in English language learning.

One of the biggest institutions that have been dealing with military English for military personnel and civilians who work in the ministries of defense is the Defense Language Institute English Language Center (DLIELC) in Texas, USA. The mission of this institute is to develop English learning programs specifically for military usages to enable US and international students to communicate proficiently in support of ministries of defense security cooperation goals. This institute has been an innovative world class military organization that provides superior English language training around the globe. There are fifteen different courses offered at DLIELC. English instructor courses (train the trainers) and other specialized courses intended for military students who need to improve their proficiency in order to attain minimum standards for the next training site. The military student’s proficiency level determines the length of the training. Retrieved from www.DLIELC.edu/ on March 2\textsuperscript{nd}, 2018.
Analyzing the ST language and style and the situation in which it was used, the translator may be able to identify the functions that the ST sender intended to be attributed to the ST by the source culture recipients, (Nord, 2016, p. 5). Newmark meets Nord in this point as he states that “communicative translation attempts to produce on its readers an effect as close as possible to that obtained on the readers of the original. Semantic translation attempts to render, as closely as the semantic and syntactic structures of the second language allow, the exact contextual meaning of the original” (Newmark, 2006, p. 39). It is obvious that communicative translation focuses on producing an equivalent effect on the target readers. On the contrary, semantic translation remains within the original culture at the author’s level. Newmark’s one major contribution to translation is the communicative translation versus semantic translation, (Wang, 2018, pp. 629-631).

After reviewing the other scholars’ statements, the researcher confirms that in the functional approaches to translation, it is the intention, purpose or function of the TT that decides the translation method. The translator needs to decide on the purpose of the translation first. Then comes the decision about the suitable approach and strategy. (Reiss, 1982, p. 112) mentions that “every text is characterized by one or several basic communication functions. Different text type should require different transfer methods”.

The functionalism theory demonstrates the possible translation procedures and the various arguments pro and against the use of one translation rather than another in a particular context. Translators should accordingly adopt respective appropriate translation strategies and relative approaches, either semantic translation or communicative translation according to different text types.

(Daniel Gile, 1991, p. 190) states that “an act of verbal communication occurring in a professional translation setting is triggered by an aim or intention.
He adds that such aims and intentions are multilayered and explains that at the most superficial layer, an act of communication may aim at informing the Receiver of a fact; at deeper layers, it may aim at scoring a point in an intellectual debate through this information, at convincing the Receiver by scoring such points.” It means that the translation process is not just a mere collision of two languages or a mere replacement of SL words or structures by TL words or structures, but it is rather a collision of two cultures and an act of communication between the surroundings of both the ST and TT.

5. Translation Quality Assessment (TQA)

In an endeavor to describe the changes emerging in repeatedly translated texts, the most challenging task is to find a suitable method to perform that. In addition, the issue of assessing translation quality does not appear to have any clear and definite solution. (Hatim and Mason, 1997, p. 199) point out that the assessment of translation quality and performance is an activity which, despite being widespread, is under-researched and under-discussed. However, the newborn nature of the field has some advantages, too.

The main idea was to establish a system by which a reviewer or senior translator can objectively, and effectively define changes emerging as a result of the process of translation. Many of these systems have already been designed by many scholars. Some of these systems is targeting students (i.e., Waddington, 2001, Nord, 1991, House, 1997, etc.), other systems targeted professionals (i.e., Williams, 1989, etc.). Some of the models are qualitative (i.e., Reiss and Vermeer, 1984, Jean Darbelnet, 1977, etc.) and others are quantitative (i.e., Waddington, 2001, etc.).

There are many approaches and models of Translation Quality Assessment: subjective approaches including neo-hermeneutic approaches, response-oriented and psycholinguistic approaches, and text-based approaches (Baker, 1998, p. 222). It is evident that the most suitable and objective approach
is still the text-based one as it provides a clear set of directions to assess translation. It also focuses more on the TT skopos (function).

(Hanaqtah, 2016, pp. 52-60) states that military sphere has developed tremendously over the last decade. Military terminology is constantly changing and growing day by day. Hence, Military Language is very productive and very flexible and it has influenced the English language in the sense that it has been a source of new words. Military language is occupied with technical terms, internal jargon, acronyms, abbreviations and specialized terminology.

The technology involved in this field is very complex and the terminology is updated constantly. That is why it is very important for the military translator to use the up-to-date terminology of the field to get a top quality translation i.e. one that is accurate and consistent, because military translations are among the most time-consuming and challenging tasks. The military create special terms "to identify their users as members of a specific group" (and, conversely their nonusers as nonmembers), thus creating or intensifying psychological and social unity among the group's members (ibid, p. 54).

6. Characteristics of the military texts

Military translation is a branch of technical and scientific translation. Therefore, military texts have many characteristics in common with scientific and technical ones. In respect of technical translation, there is also an opinion that technical texts are very much confined to the cultural boundaries within which it takes place. (Hempel, 2009) thinks that there are some elements that can prevent effective and efficient translation such as terminology, culture and prestige. In this context, (Argeg, 2015, p. 36) mentioned an example related to that: the word “fighting” could be rendered into Arabic as ڨتنال qitāl or جهاد jihād depending on who is fighting or the reasons of fighting. This is the same case
with the technical and scientific terms, as they are sometimes confined to culture.

Military personnel are especially prone to linguistic creativity," whether soldiers, sailors, or flyers, (Murray, 1986: 126). Military language is very productive because "each crisis creates its own vocabulary" (John Mason in Murray: 126). Military texts are occupied with technical terms, internal jargon, acronyms abbreviations and specialized terminology. "Few specialized vocabularies have been as similarly borrowed, copied, and altered as has the military vocabulary" (Silkett, 1985, p. 13). They include technical manuals, catalogs of aircrafts, warships, armored fighting vehicle and radars. They also include brochures, contracts, sensitive correspondences, power point presentations, electronic database files, articles, statistics, etc. Military language have developed tremendously over the last years for a number of reasons such as: the rapid changing of the military technology. "New terms are rapidly being created and different factions within the military no longer simply adopt the same older terminology" (Murray, 1986, p. 127).

To sum up, military texts are always specific, exact and objective. They tend to use passive voice, nominalized forms with a significant number of acronyms and abbreviations, as acronyms and abbreviations are a general characteristic of English language in general. Terminology is not the only component that controls a military text. One should pay attention to style, grammar and context in order to convey the real message of the ST.

7. Data Analysis
7.1 Target Text 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source Text</th>
<th>EDGs’ translation</th>
<th>Professional Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Text 1</td>
<td>Author is not clear; Objective lexis; Formal, no figurative</td>
<td>Slightly less formal; less positive vocabulary;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
speech;

High degree of originality;

“artillery battery which is capable of mass artillery barrage within a 10-mile radius.”

A lot of abbreviations and acronyms;

“TACAIR”

“Friendly C2”

A lot of terminology (General terms and military terms)

“Helicopter Company”

“Attachment and detachments”

“two Corps”

“division”

“gather intelligence”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Text</th>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Battery capable of mass artillery barrage within a 10-mile radius.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Battery capable of mass artillery barrage within a 10-mile radius.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A lot of abbreviations and acronyms;</td>
<td>Many instances of mistranslating military terms:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“TACAIR”</td>
<td>“TACAIR”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Friendly C2”</td>
<td>“Friendly C2”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A lot of terminology (General terms and military terms)</td>
<td>Many instances of mistranslating military terms:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Helicopter Company”</td>
<td>“Helicopter Company”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Attachment and detachments”</td>
<td>“Attachment and detachments”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“two Corps”</td>
<td>“two Corps”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“division”</td>
<td>“division”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“gather intelligence”</td>
<td>“gather intelligence”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Purposeful translation of Acronyms and abbreviations                        | Functional translation of military terms:                                                                            |             |
| "TACAIR"                                                                     | “TACAIR”                                                              |             |
| “Friendly C2”                                                                 | “Friendly C2”                                                          |             |
| A lot of terminology (General terms and military terms)                      | Many instances of mistranslating military terms:                                                                       |             |
| “Helicopter Company”                                                          | “Helicopter Company”                                                  |             |
| “Attachment and detachments”                                                  | “Attachment and detachments”                                          |             |
| “two Corps”                                                                   | “two Corps”                                                           |             |
| “division”                                                                    | “division”                                                            |             |
| “gather intelligence”                                                         | “gather intelligence”                                                  |             |

| Many unsuccessful translations of abbreviations and terminology             | Many unsuccessful translations of abbreviations and terminology                                                      |             |
| "TACAIR"                                                                     | “TACAIR”                                                              |             |
| “Friendly C2”                                                                 | “Friendly C2”                                                          |             |
| A lot of terminology (General terms and military terms)                      | Many unsuccessful translations of abbreviations and terminology                                                      |             |
| “Helicopter Company”                                                          | “Helicopter Company”                                                  |             |
| “Attachment and detachments”                                                  | “Attachment and detachments”                                          |             |
| “two Corps”                                                                   | “two Corps”                                                           |             |
| “division”                                                                    | “division”                                                            |             |
| “gather intelligence”                                                         | “gather intelligence”                                                  |             |

| Functional translation                                                        | Functional translation                                                |             |
Upon analyzing TT 1, it is noticed that the EDGs faced challenges and found intricacies in the lexis factor when translating the military texts into Arabic. The errors made are minor, major and critical. Minor errors are, from the JP and researcher’s perspective, that which seems strange for the target audience (the TT recipient) but still understood in the overall context. i.e., “deliver nuclear weapons” is translated by some EDGs as “إيصال الأسلحة النووية” which separately can be misunderstood as a delivery of nuclear weapons from a sender to a receiver. But in this context, “deliver nuclear weapons into the Army Command” (the Army Command is a friendly unit, and the unit that can deliver nuclear weapons is an enemy unit), so “deliver” here means “launch”, the meaning which is well conveyed by the JP in its translation to this phrase: " إطلاق أسلحة نووية".

Another example on the minor error would be: “capable of mass artillery barrage within a 10-mile radius” which is translated by some EDGs as "بطارمة مدفعية قادرة على القيام ببومل من المدفعية الجماعية داخل دائرة نصف قطرها 10 أميل". The formality and originality level is slightly less than that of the ST, in addition, the translation "القيام ببومل" is not used that way in either the broader target language or the specific military domain, and the word "بومل" collocates better with " إطلاق"، in case the word "بومل" in the context is even needed. The researcher believes that the PToJP of this phrase "بطارمة مدفعية قادرة على تركيز القصف المدفعي داخل دائرة نصف قطرها عشرة أميل" satisfies the purpose and intent of the text. Moreover, the researcher thinks that using the word "بومل" can be appropriate in literary writing, not in the military style.
Many instances of major errors are also detected in TT 1. (Williams, 1989) proposes that a major error is “likely to result in failure of understanding” of the text by the TT recipients. (P. 23). The sentence “these land forces are supported by a helicopter company” which is rendered by the majority of EDGs to be "تدعم هذه القوات البرية من قبل شركة هليكوبتر" is considered by the JP and the researcher to be a major error that might result in a failure of understanding the idea. The phrase: “the Field Army Units are opposed by two corps” is insufficiently conveyed by some EDGs as "تم معارضة وحدات الجيش الميداني من قبل هينات" where the EDGs render the military term “corps” as "هينات", while it means, according to the Universal Military Dictionary, “فلفق”. The researcher agrees with the JP in considering this error as a major error which affects the text as a whole since this sentence involves a main piece of information in the text and it furnishes the understanding of the threat that the Field Army is facing.

Another minor/major/critical error which is incorrectly conveyed by all the EDGs is the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST</th>
<th>EDGs translation</th>
<th>Professional Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“There will be air parity”</td>
<td>1- سيكون هناك تكافؤ هوائي (major) 2- سيكون هناك تكافؤ الهواء (major) 3- سيكون هناك اعتدال في الهواء (critical)</td>
<td>&quot;سيكون هناك سيطرة جوية على مواقع قواتنا&quot; (functional) Or &quot;سيكون هناك تكافؤ جوي&quot; (proposed by the researcher)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Air parity”, according to Counterair Operations Air Force Doctrine Document 2-1.1. (2008), is defined as:
“a condition in the air battle in which one force does not have air superiority over others. This represents a situation in which both friendly and adversary land, maritime, and air operations may encounter significant interference by the opposing air force.” (p. 3)

Some of the EDGs’ translations "سيكون هناك تكاؤف هوائي" is considered by the researcher and JP as a major error since the meaning can or cannot be elicited from the overall context, and "هوائي" can or cannot be understood as "جوئي" "هوائي" can be assessed as a major error since using the noun "الهواء" instead of the adjective adds ambiguity to the sentence, causing understanding the sentence to be less probable. On the other side, the translation "سيكون هناك اعتدال في الهواء" is assessed as a critical error because it retracts the recipient from the real meaning of the sentence and makes the recipient think of another idea (the weather during the operation). The PToJP "سيكون هناك سيطرة جوية على مواقع قواتنا" fulfills the requirements of the functional translation as it gives the real meaning behind the sentence. The researcher believes the translation "سيكون هناك تكاؤف جوي" is fully functional as well since the meaning is well-conveyed.

As for the acronyms and abbreviations, the EDGs faced real problems in translating them despite the fact that a list of the acronyms and abbreviations in the text and their English meaning was provided for the EDGs in the test. The errors made by the EDGs in the following example are all assessed by the JP and the researcher to be minor errors since the overall function of the phrase can be detected by the TT recipient.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST</th>
<th>EDGs’ translation</th>
<th>Professional Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOPP1</td>
<td>وضع الاحتياط ضد الهجوم الكيماوي رقم واحد</td>
<td>إجراءات الوقاية ضد الضربات</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Generally, TT 1 is not at the same level of formality, register and technicality of the lexical elements as the case in ST 1. The ST author is well acquainted with the norms of the subject matter, and the lexical elements used in the military environment. In addition, the ST author considers the ST recipients’ knowledge and culture, the matter that is not well reflected in the TT since most of the EDGs are not acquainted with the TT recipients’ military culture, target lexical elements or the target military style in writing.

### 7.2 Target Text 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text 2</th>
<th>Source Text</th>
<th>EDGs’ translation</th>
<th>Professional Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factual instructional situation; technical prose style; expository text; formal register;</td>
<td>violations to the military prose style, the formal register, and text cohesion:</td>
<td>fulfills the requirements of the military prose style:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The text is coherent and cohesive; positive lexical elements are prevailing; anaphoric references are dominating the text; the coordinating conjunction (and) is used 14 times, subordinating conjunctions: 3,</td>
<td>&quot;تُعَمَّد قواعد الاشتباك من قبل مجلس شمال الأطلسي وهي تحدد درجة وطريقة استخدام القوة ومصممة لضمان التحكم في تطبيق هذه القوة بعناية.&quot;</td>
<td>conditional mood is</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>conditional mood is</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| (because, even if); verb moods: (indicative: 19, conditional: 4); i.e., “All elements provide notification upon arrival” singular/plural 3rd person; active: 15, passive: 9; i.e., “These land forces are supported by…” present tense prevails: 19, modal verbs: 4 “they define the degree…” | distorted: "حتى لو كان سمح به قواعد الاشتباك" | preserved: "حتى لو كانت تسمح به قواعد الاشتباك"

| There are some deviations from the ST tenses: "حددت درجة..." | Tenses and their indications are maintained: "هي تحدد درجة..." |

In TT 2, the EDGs made some minor and major errors with few instances of critical errors. The formality degree is preserved by some EDGs, with minor errors, while others made major errors that prejudiced the cohesion of TT 2, i.e., adding the word "تُهد", in "حتى لو كان سمح به قواعد الاشتباك"; "لَتُهد قواعد الاشتباك معمودة" affects the formality degree and weakens the expression as clarified in the above chart. Some EDGs also are not able to preserve the factors that structures the whole text as the conjunctions and the conditional mood, i.e., "حتى لو كان سمح به قواعد الاشتباك"; the violation to the structure affects the content factor and prejudices the text cohesion as well. In ST 2, the sender uses the present simple tense throughout the text, while in TT 2, the tenses are not reflected in the way they were meant to express as stated in the above chart. Some of the anaphoric references that dominate the ST
are changed to cataphoric references in TT 2, i.e., “Although each operation is unique, their planning …” is changed to cataphoric reference, which is called "ضمير متقدم" in Arabic as follows: "على الرغم من إنها .....". The researcher agrees that the PToJP successfully rendered the content factor to the TT, as it is the case with few EDGs’ translations.

A critical error, where the content factor is distorted, the purpose is not clear and the idea is lost in the translation process, would be as follows:

ST: “Operations by Allied joint forces are directed at the military-strategic level and planned and executed at the operational and tactical levels.”

TT: "كأن العمليات التي تتم بواسطة قوات الحلفاء المنضمة والمشاركة تم توجيهها بشكل مباشر: مستوى استراتيجي عسكري وتم تخطيطها وتثبيتها بطريقة العمليات والتدريب التكتيكي"

Professional Translation: "تُدار عمليات قوات الحلفاء المشاركة على المستوى الاستراتيجي العسكري وُتُخطّط وتًُنفذ على المستوى العسكري والتدريبي، التكتيكي."

8. Results

It can be concluded that in terms of the lexis factor, most of the parts of the EDGs translations can be considered non-functional due to the excessive major and critical errors that affect the *skopos* of the texts.

In case of judging the functionality of the TT as a whole, the answer depends on the number of errors made in each of the EDGs’ translations. According to the research findings, the majority of errors in the EDGs affect only parts of the translations, while the overall intention and purpose are conveyed in most of the EDGs’ translations.

Generally, the researcher concludes that the EDG’s translations are functional, to a limited extent, depending on the errors’ effect on the overall purpose of the text, which varies from an EDG to another.
The majority of the EDGs have faced real challenges and difficulties while dealing with the lexis factor, and to some extent, the content and sentence structure factors. It is also concluded that most of the critical factors that affect the functionality of the EDGs’ translation is concentrated in the lexis factor is with the highest error percentage of 51% of the overall errors made in the three TTs by all the EDGs. It means that almost half of the inaccuracies are due to lexical errors ranging from minor, major and critical errors. The content factor is ranked the second in the most frequent inaccuracies with an error percentage of 18% of all the errors made in the three TTs by the EDGs, while the sentence structure factor comes the third in the most frequent errors with a percentage of 12% of the overall errors in the three TTs.

As long as the majority of errors are due to lexis and content factors, it can be deducted that the challenges faced by the EDGs are due to the following reasons:

- Most of the EDGs are not able to find functional and equivalent translations for the military-related terms and neologisms.
- Most of the EDGs are not aware of the military organizations and systems.
- The EDGs lack the knowledge of the military texts’ characteristics.
- Some of the EDGs are not experienced enough to find solutions for the intricacies and complexities of the three STs.

9. Conclusion

Someone may think that it is easy to make functional translation of a text if dictionaries are available. In fact, what increases the complexity of texts is their specialty, and the field of this study is of special characteristics for the following reasons:

- The military translation is a subcategory of technical translation which necessitates using special techniques.
- Military-related texts are not frequent to be translated in the public domain.

- To the researcher’s knowledge, the military and specialized dictionaries are not enough to cover the continuously emerging military terms and neologisms due to the non-stop advance of weapons and military equipment, and the outburst of wars and armed conflicts in the world.

- Military texts become hard to translate if the translator is not aware of the military environment, and the military systems and organizations of both the source and target cultures.

- Military texts include different text and message types; for example, in the selected military texts in the current research, the researcher chooses different text types, they included ‘Operation Order’, ‘Standardization Information’, and ‘Military Tactics, Techniques, and Procedures. There are other examples such as training pamphlets, technical manuals, equipment specification booklets, military publications, military cooperation agreements, minutes of meetings, memoranda of understanding, contracts, etc. Hence, the task of the military translator becomes more complicated.

Depending on the abovementioned intricacies and the research results, taking into consideration the areas that pose problems for the EDGs in translating the selected texts, and considering the factors that are the most problematic for the EDGs, the researcher suggests the following solutions and recommendations, within the boundaries of the current study, to further hone the fresh EDGs’ skills in translating military texts:

1- A special attention should be given to the lexis factor by the potential military translators. There must be more focus on the military terminology and the newly emerging neologisms, acronyms and abbreviations.
2- The military translation instructors should pay attention on teaching the military style in writing and its characteristics, and they must attention to teaching the military terminology and culture.

3- The potential military translators should extensively study the source and target military systems and organizations, in addition to the chain of command in each system.

4- The military translators must train themselves on the different military styles and techniques in writing, both in the source and target languages.

5- Being acquainted with the military culture is of great importance, hence, the potential military translators must study, and if possible live in, the military environment in both the source and target countries.

6- Military translators should deeply depend on different sources to get information from; i.e., the modern military dictionaries, the CAT tools, the field manuals, the military publications, the glossaries issued by the defense institutions, etc.
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صعوبات ترجمة المصطلحات العسكرية الجديدة من الإنجليزية إلى العربية

عمرو عنانى، محمد أحمد
باحث بقسم اللغة الإنجليزية وآدابها، كلية الآداب، جامعة حلوان

ملخص

يلقي البحث الضوء على المشكلات التي تواجه المترجمين الذين ليس لديهم خبرة أو دراية كافية بالبيئة العسكرية عند ترجمة النصوص العسكرية. الغرض من البحث هو عرض المشاكل مع اقتراح بعض الحلول والإرشادات حتى يتغلب المترجم على تلك المصاعب في ترجمة هذا النوع من النصوص. يستعرض البحث تقييم نوعي للترجمات التي أجراها خريجين من أقسام اللغة الإنجليزية بالجامعات المصرية المختلفة حتى يتم تحديد وتطبيق المشكلات التي تواجههم.

تشتمل المصادر التي يتناولها البحث على مقتطفات من مكتبة حلف شمال الأطلسي على شبكة الإنترنت (NATO Online E-Library)، وكذا أيضاً مقتطفات من الإصدارات العامة للمؤسسة للجيش الأمريكي المُصرح بها لاستخدام العام والمُنحة على شبكة الإنترنت. الغرض من تنوع المصادر هو ضمان التنوع في الأسلوب والمصطلحات العسكرية المستخدمة في أوروبا أو الولايات المتحدة الأمريكية. يتناول البحث مقارنة ترجمة خريجي أقسام اللغة الإنجليزية للنصوص العسكرية المختارة مع ترجمة احترافية لتلك النصوص للوقوف على الأخطاء التي واجهت المترجمين. يقدم البحث بعض التوصيات التي يجب أخذها في الاعتبار للمترجمين المبتدئين حال تعرضهم لترجمة النصوص العسكرية.