

**TRANSLATION OF ENGLISH MODALITY INTO ARABIC
BASED ON SELECTED UNITEDN ATIONS RESOLUTIONS
ON GAZA WAR**

MOHAMMED H. M. AL AQAD

**FACULTY OF LANGUAGES AND LINGUISTICS
UNIVERSITY OF MALAYA
KUALA LUMPUR
2015**

**TRANSLATION OF ENGLISH MODALITY INTO ARABIC
BASED ON SELECTED UNITED NATIONS RESOLUTIONS
ON GAZA WAR**

MOHAMMED H. M. AL AQAD

**DISSERTATION SUBMITTED IN FULFILMENT OF THE
REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF
LINGUISTICS**

**FACULTY OF LANGUAGES AND LINGUISTICS
UNIVERSITY OF MALAYA
KUALA LUMPUR**

2015

UNIVERSITY OF MALAYA

ORIGINAL LITERARY WORK DECLARATION

Name of Candidate: **Mohammed H. AL AQAD**

Passport No:

Registration/Matric No: **TGC100055**

Name of Degree: **Master of Linguistics**

Title of Project Paper/Research Report/Dissertation/Thesis ("this Work"):

Translation of English Modality into Arabic Based on Selected United Nations Resolutions on Gaza War

Field of Study: **Translation Studies**

I do solemnly and sincerely declare that:

- (1) I am the sole author/writer of this Work;
- (2) This Work is original;
- (3) Any use of any work in which copyright exists was done by way of fair dealing and for permitted purposes and any excerpt or extract from, or reference to or reproduction of any copyright work has been disclosed expressly and sufficiently and the title of the Work and its authorship have been acknowledged in this Work;
- (4) I do not have any actual knowledge nor do I ought reasonably to know that the making of this work constitutes an infringement of any copyright work;
- (5) I hereby assign all and every rights in the copyright to this Work to the University of Malaya ("UM"), who henceforth shall be owner of the copyright in this Work and that any reproduction or use in any form or by any means whatsoever is prohibited without the written consent of UM having been first had and obtained;
- (6) I am fully aware that if in the course of making this Work I have infringed any copyright whether intentionally or otherwise, I may be subject to legal action or any other action as may be determined by UM.

Candidate's Signature

Date: 23th September, 2015

Subscribed and solemnly declared before,

Witness's Signature

Date:

Name: **Dr. Sakina Sahuri Binti Suffian Sahuri,**

Designation: **Supervisor**

ABSTRACT

Multilingualism is one of the basics for working as translator with the United Nations (UN). The translation of UN documents plays an important political, legal and practical role in the functioning of the Organization. Translating UN documents is considered a crucial issue for translators. The translation of English modals into Arabic in the UN resolutions is a very significant and sensitive issue as these modals play a key role in stopping or continuing the Israeli aggression on Gaza and any mistranslation or misinterpretation of these modals may lead to more fights for many years. Moreover, translating UN documents might raise several serious problems in translation; these problems are due to the different translations of modality and the misinterpretations between the intended meanings of modals with their inherent notions, which could result in a certain amount of ambiguity. This study examines the translation of modal expressions from English into Arabic used in the United Nations resolutions during the war on Gaza from 2008 till 2012. The research corpus is based on 30 UN texts selected of a total from 10 UN resolutions. The study employs Coate's (1983) semantic categorization of modal auxiliaries to identify the English modals and their Arabic equivalents used in the UN resolution texts, and Vinay and Darbelnet's modal of translation techniques (1958/1995) to determine the translation techniques/procedures used by the UN translators in translating English modals into Arabic, and display the differences in meaning reflected in both languages. The findings show that the sentence structure in the Arabic translation is changed. Beside, optional and obligatory transposition is used. However, the overall meaning of the sentence is sustained but the details of the message are different from the original text.

Keywords: Legal translation, English and Arabic Modals, UN resolutions, Translation techniques.

ABSTRAK

Penguasaan pelbagai bahasa merupakan salah satu asas Pertubuhan Bangsa-Bangsa Bersatu (PBB). Terjemahan dokumen PBB memainkan peranan politik, undang-undang dan praktikal yang penting sebagai fungsi Pertubuhan ini. Menterjemahkan dokumen PBB dianggap sebagai satu isu penting bagi penterjemah. Menterjemah modus (*modal*) bahasa Inggeris dalam resolusi PBB ke dalam bahasa Arab merupakan satu isu yang penting dan sensitif kerana modus ini memainkan peranan utama dalam menghentikan atau meneruskan pencerobohan Israel ke atas Gaza dan sebarang silap terjemah atau salah tafsir modus ini boleh membawa kepada lebih banyak pertempuran untuk bertahun lamanya. Tambahan pula, menterjemah dokumen PBB mungkin menimbulkan beberapa masalah serius dalam terjemahan; masalah-masalah ini adalah disebabkan oleh terjemahan modus yang berlainan dan salah tafsir di antara makna yang dimaksudkan dengan tanggapan yang didukung oleh modus tersebut, yang boleh mengakibatkan kekaburan. Kajian ini meneliti pernyataan modus dari bahasa Inggeris ke bahasa Arab yang ditemui di dalam resolusi Bangsa-Bangsa Bersatu semasa perang di Gaza dari tahun 2008 hingga 2012. Korpus kajian adalah berdasarkan 30 teks terpilih PBB dari sejumlah 10 resolusi PBB. Kajian ini menggunakan model teknik terjemahan Coate (1983) untuk mengenal pasti modus bahasa Inggeris dan padanannya dalam bahasa Arab yang digunakan di dalam teks resolusi PBB, dan perbezaan makna yang dicerminkan dalam kedua-dua Bahasa, dan Vinay dan Darbelnet (1958/1995) untuk menentukan teknik terjemahan yang digunakan oleh penterjemah PBB dalam menterjemahkan modus Bahasa Inggeris ke dalam bahasa Arab, dan kategori semantik bantu modus (*modal auxiliary*). Dapatan kajian menunjukkan bahawa struktur ayat dalam terjemahan bahasa Arab diubah dan transposisi pilihan wajib dilakukan. Walau bagaimana pun, keseluruhan makna ayat dikekalkan tetapi perincian mesej berbeza dari teks asal.

Keywords: Terjemahan Undang-Undang, Bahasa Inggeris dan Bahasa Arab Modals, resolusi PBB, teknik Terjemahan.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Above all, Alhamdulillah; all praises to Allah for the strengths and His blessing in completing this dissertation. Firstly, I am deeply grateful to my respectable supervisor, Dr. Sakina Sahuri Binti Suffian Sahuri for guiding me in the field of translation studies. I really appreciate her patient instructions, warm encouragements, and enlightening comments in the process of my research writing. Moreover, during the past two years of postgraduate study, she educated me and gave me valuable advices and influenced me with her noble character, indeed thanks Dr. Besides my awesome supervisor, this dissertation would not have seen the sun without the assistance and the support of the Senior Lecturer Dr. Kais Kadhim from FBL, and the Assistant Prof. Dr. Rodney C. Jubilado from University of Hawaii, USA.

Secondly, I would extent my sincere gratitude to my lovely wife 'Lama', family and my friends too. Without their firm support, it would be impossible for me to complete this work.

Thirdly, Life is not all about linguistics! My deepest gratitude goes to my beloved parents; my mother "Hanan" and my father "Hamid" for their permanent support, love and encouragement. Besides my parents, I would like to thank my adorable brothers and sisters in Gaza, whom I miss a lot.

SPECIAL THANKS Go to everyone who helps me to produce this work

DEDICATION

To my beloved homeland; PALESTINE

To my beloved work place and best colleagues at Humanities Research Cluster, IPPP
building, UM under the leadership of the so kind Professor Dr. Azirah Hashim

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	IV
ABSTRAK	V
ACKNOWLEDGMENT	VI
DEDICATION	VII
TABLE OF CONTENTS	VIII
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	XIII
LIST OF TABLES	XIV
CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Introduction	1
1.1.1 Palestinian – Israeli War	1
1.1.2 United Nations resolutions (English)	2
1.1.3 Translation of UN Resolutions into Arabic.....	3
1.1.4 Legal text	4
1.1.5 Legal Translation	4
1.1.6 Aspects of Legal Translation	6
1.2 Modals in UN Resolutions	7
1.2.1 English Modals	7
1.2.2 Arabic Modals	11
1.3 Statement of the Problem	13
1.4 Objectives of the Study	14
1.5 Research Questions	15

1.6	Scope and Limitation of the Study	15
1.7	Significance Of Study	16
1.8	Summary	16
	CHAPTER 2 LITERATURE REVIEW	17
2.1	Introduction	17
2.2	Linguistic Definitions and Expressions of Modals	18
2.2.1	Definition of Modals	18
2.2.2	Modals in General.....	19
2.2.3	Types of Modals	20
2.2.4	Modal Verbs in English.....	25
2.2.4.1	Concept of Modal Verbs.....	25
2.2.4.2	Semantic Features of English modals.....	28
2.2.5	Modal Verbs in Arabic.....	29
2.2.5.1	Concept of modal verbs.....	29
2.2.5.2	Semantic features of Arabic Modals.....	35
2.3	Translation of Modals.....	37
2.3.1	Translation of Studies	42
2.4	Literature Review.....	44
2.5	Summary.....	48
	CHAPTER 3 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY.....	49
3.1	Introduction	49
3.2	Theoretical Background	50
3.3	Theoretical Framework	51

3.3.1 Coates's (1983), Semantic categorization of Modal auxiliaries.....	51
3.3.2 Vinay and Darbelnet's (1958/1995) taxonomy of translation techniques.....	56
3.3.2.1 Direct and oblique translation.....	57
Procedure 1: Borrowing	57
Procedure 2: Calque (Loan-Words)	58
Procedure 3: Literal Translation	58
Procedure 4: Transposition	58
Procedure 5: Modulation	59
Procedure 6: Equivalence	59
Procedure 7: Adaptation	59
3.3.2.2 Techniques and Procedures of Translation.....	60
3.4 Research Design	63
3.4.1 Data	64
3.4.2 Justification of the Corpus Selection	64
3.4.3 Data Coding	64
3.4.4 Data Organization	65
3.4.5 Data Categorization	65
3.5 Summary	68
CHAPTER 4 ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS OF STUDY	69
4.1 Introduction	69
4.2 Data Analysis and Findings	69
4.2.1 Literal Translation Procedure	70
4.2.2 Transposition Procedures	80
4.2.2.1 Optional Transposition	80

4.2.2.2 Obligatory Transposition	89
4.2.3 Modulation Procedures	101
4.2.3.1 Optional Modulation	101
4.2.3.2 Obligatory Modulation	106
4.3 Summary	107
CHAPTER 5 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION	108
5.1 Introduction	108
5.2 Discussion of Key Findings	108
5.2.1 Patterns of Distribution	109
5.3 Discussion of Findings In Relation To Research Questions.....	114
5.3.1 Question One	115
5.3.2 Question Two	115
5.3.3 Question Three	116
5.4 Contribution	117
5.5 Recommendations for Further Studies	118
5.6 Conclusion	118
5.7 References	120
5.8 APPENDIX	126

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ST	Source text
TT	Target text
UN	United Nations
PCBS	Palestinian Central Bureau of Statistics
IO	Israeli Occupation
HAMAS	Palestinian Islamic Resistance Movement
NAKBAH	The Palestinian catastrophe in the year of 1948
LSP	Language for Special Purpose
LLP	Language for Legal Purpose
Sender language	Source Language
Receiver language	Target Language
UNGA	United Nations General Assembly
MSA	Modern Standard Arabic
LGSWE	Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English

LIST OF TABLES

1.1	English Modal verbs.....	9
1.2	Arabic Modal verbs.....	12
2.1	Meanings of epistemic modals.....	22
2.2	Modality in Halliday's view.....	24
2.3	Overview of Modal Verbs in English.....	26
2.4	Translation of the Main Modal Verbs from English into Arabic.....	33
3.1	The semantic meaning of modal auxiliaries according to coate's (1983).....	52
3.2	Negation of modal auxiliaries according to Coates (1983, p.238).....	55
3.3	Vinay and Darbelnet's taxonomy of translation techniques.....	57
3.4	Example of data coding.....	66
5.1	The Pattern and types of English and Arabic Modals in UN resolution texts ..	109

CHAPTER 1

1.1 Introduction

This study is carried out to examine how English modal verbs are used in the United Nations resolution on Gaza war and their equivalents in Arabic, since modal verbs are used in the context of cease fire between Israel and the Palestinian people. This chapter introduces this study by providing readers with background knowledge about the Palestinian – Israeli war, the need for the English version of the UN resolution to be translated into Arabic in order for the Palestinian people to understand resolutions.

1.1.1 Palestinian – Israeli War

The War on Gaza or also called Cast Lead Operation came as a result of futile negotiations to reach a solution to stop conflict between the Palestinian Islamic Resistance Movement (Hamas) and Israel. A compromise initiated by the Egyptians called ‘a truce’, commenced in June 2008 and it maintained peace for six months among the two parties. The truce was breached numerous times by Israel, due to non-compliance of Israel to the truce conditions by opening the borders and lifting the siege which was imposed on Gaza strip. Yet, Hamas refused to extend the truce as it is. On 4 November, 2008 Israel breached the truce agreement once again by executing an air strike on Gaza Strip which resulted in the killing of six members of the Hamas fighters. At this juncture the Palestinian fighters reacted strongly by dropping homemade missiles on Israel and that sparked the war (Al-Haq, 2010). The Israeli operation called Cast Lead begun on Saturday, December 27, 2008 at 11:30 a.m Palestine local time which commenced with the launching of several air strikes attack on Gaza; killing more than 200 Palestinians and injuring 700 others on the first day of the attack. This led the

Palestinians to label the event as the massacre of Black Saturday. The Black Saturday massacre did not stop for three weeks, and this resulted in the killing more than 1449 Palestinians and injuring 4336 others (Al-Mezan, 2010). Nevertheless, the Palestinian fighters confirmed that they killed nearly 100 Israeli soldiers during the battles in Gaza. Yet, the first day of the attack was the grisliest day in terms of the number of Palestinian casualties in one day (Cordesman, 2009). The prolonged Israeli attack on the Palestinians turned the Middle East into a hot spot with regard to daily clashes. This led many Arab countries to intervene in an attempt to establish a compromise of cease fire and stop killing the people but regrettably all these attempts failed. In due course, the intervention of the United Nations (UN) was necessary to stop the fighting and put an end to the serial killings, genocides and displacement carried out by the Israeli army against the Palestinian people. The United Nations came up with something called 'a resolution' which is a formal expression of opinion or intention made, usually after voting, by a formal organization, a legislature, a counsel in order to make a decision (Cordesman and Moravitz, 2005). All UN resolutions are formulated in the English language at first. However, the majority of Palestinians is conversant and understands only Arabic language as it is their mother tongue, and there is a need for the Palestinians to know what is going on in these resolutions with regards to the war. Thereafter, the UN commenced to translate these resolutions into Arabic as Arabic is the predominant and official language in all practices in Palestine. Arabic is also spoken by more than two-hundred and sixty million people throughout the world, and it is the main language for most of the Middle East countries (Al-Krenawi, 2010).

1.1.2 United Nations Resolutions

The United Nations Resolutions define the basic decisions or statements of the United Nations, which is also a declaration of the United Nations General Assembly

(UNGA) which is prepared by individual nations or groups of nations and they are considered as legal documents. These resolutions can be expressive declarations in criticizing the actions of states, or a directive declaration as in calling for a collective action, or in the case of the Security Council, requires imposing economic or military sanctions. Only the Security Council members may impose actions or sanctions on member states (Morris & Collier, 1998, p. 6). Structurally, a resolution basically starts with a single sentence that begins with a preliminary clause on the first page, the issuing date of the resolution and the language of origin, followed by the session number and title of the resolution in bold letters. The second page is the content of the resolution, while the other pages contain the preamble and operative clauses which almost always start with a verb, and is sometimes modified by an adverb. The rest of the pages are made up of modals and conditional clauses. Clarity and precision are vital, and special attention is paid to details such as modals, auxiliary verbs, grammar, style and format. The UN resolutions are translated from English as the source language, into several other languages such as Arabic, French, German, Russian, Chinese, and Spanish cited in (UN official website; <http://www.un.org/en/index.html>).

1.1.3 Translation of UN Resolutions into Arabic

The translation of UN documents plays an important political, legal and practical role in the functioning of the organization. Translation between languages can be difficult as different languages express things differently; the translation of UN texts might be even more critical. The UN resolution is considered more attributable to legal context than political, as it involves conditions, orders and sometimes sanctions (Searle, 1979, p. 19, 20).

The translation of English modals into Arabic in the UN resolutions are very significant and sensitive issue as these modals play the key role in stopping or continuing the Israeli aggression on Gaza and any mistranslation or misinterpretation of

these modals may lead to more fights for many years. The notion of Arabic modals in the United Nations resolutions is considered significant due to their role in determining the conditions of peace especially for the Palestinian people who live under the occupation for decades.

1.1.4 Legal Text

A legal text is something different from an ordinary text. It is highly formulaic or stereotypical in nature elaborate in terms of structure. However, routine legal texts tend to follow a predetermined structure that changes little over time (Tiersma, 2010). A statute, for instance, normally has some or all of the following elements: long title, enactment clause, substantive provisions. As can be seen, legal texts are very rigid texts and written in a legal language which possesses a number of specific features and conceptual elements. It is based on ordinary language but it has its own usage domain and certain linguistic norms which are usually associated with particular phraseology, glossary and hierarchy of terms and meanings (Al-Qaderi, 2004).

Another noticeable feature of legal texts is that they are mostly culture specific and culture-sensitive. This cultural specification and sensitivity is imposed by the legal system which legal language stands for as a means of encoding. Nations and even smaller communities within the same nation vary in the legal traditions and regulations imposed on the members of the community (Harvey, 2002). Legal text is playing a prominent role in our globalized world with the ever-increasing demand for precise legal translation (Cao, 2007, p. 9, 78).

1.1.5 Legal Translation

Legal translation is a critical and authoritative translation produced by legal bodies, is binding for those bodies to apply it, which is different from an ordinary text (Tiersma, 2010), A legal text is a complex text to translate and requires special skills;

knowledge and experience; also, it is a type of special or technical translation. Legal translation is a kind of translation activity that involves special language use, which is, Language for Special Purpose (LSP) in the context of law, or Language for Legal Purpose (LLP) (Cao, 2007). Legal translation will always need special attention all the time (Cao, 2007). There are four different types of legal writing to be distinguished: (a) academic texts which consist of academic research journals and legal textbooks, (b) judicial texts covering court judgments or law reports and (c) legislative or statutory texts consisting of Acts of Parliament, contracts etc. (d) legal texts covering the texts produced or used for legal purposes in legal settings such as; laws produced by the different lawful bodies, and this study focus on the last type (Cao, 2007, p. 9).

One of the requirements for legal translation is preciseness and accurateness. The precise translation as stated by Larson (1985) has to achieve three categories. First, it uses the same language form of the source language, second it communicates as much as possible to the receiver language speaker the same meaning that was understood by the speakers of the source language, third, it maintains the dynamics of the original source language text. This dynamics mean that the translation is presented in such a way that it will evoke the same response as the source text (Larson, 1985).

This is because law is culture-dependent and the translation of legal texts require a multi-cultural translator with an excellent understanding of both the source and target cultures. Moreover, as legal language is used for special purposes, it utilizes a very specialized vocabulary dependent on the branch of law it pertains to. Legal language is also used by a very restrictive group of professionals in formal settings. Hence, it might not be comprehensible to the general public. In addition, legal language has strict rules when it comes to role taking and participation in its realization (Austin, 1962). According to Austin, speaking legal language does not rely on correct use of semantics only. For example, the words we utter are affected by the current situation we are

involved in, which may affect their meaning. This is why sentencing (imprisoning) someone for life, for example, will not have the necessary effect unless it is pronounced in a courtroom by a judge or an authority empowered to pass this sentence (Al-Mukhaini, 2008). Owing to the importance of wording in legal communication, translation in this field differs from other forms of translation, as the target text usually has legal effects.

1.1.6 Aspects of Legal Translation

Legal translation is a subtype of specialized translation, the outcome of which should be documents in the target language (TL) with the same legal validity and effect as the documents in the source language (SL). This criterion is key when evaluating this kind of translation. In other words, a legal document that is valid and operative in its SL must have the same qualities in the TL. Like other types of specialized translation, this sometimes raises the debate whether legal translators should be legal experts. Most current theoreticians (Alcaraz & Hughes, 2002) agree that this is not necessary; however, translators must be highly competent in the legal conventions of the SL and TL texts (Sarcevic, 2001) to avoid some potentially serious ramifications. Therefore, even if translators cannot “produce parallel texts that are identical in meaning, they do expect them to produce parallel texts that are identical in their legal effect” (Altay, 2002, p. 1).

Difficulties facing legal translators do not stem from the specific nature of legal discourse in terms of style, structure and vocabulary only. Legal translators are also expected to convey the meaning not just of words but of the legal system that dictates the writer's choice of those words. This is not an easy task. According to one definition of a good translation, it should have the same impact on the TL audience as the original text has on the SL audience. This is what Nida and Taber (1974) call “dynamic equivalence.” Thus, the translator/interpreter must ask: Who is the intended audience?

What is the purpose of the text? According to Hammond (1995), "this means that what a translated text is going to be used for has much more bearing on how translators should approach the translation than does the foreign-language original" (p. 235). Consequently, when a translator is given a text to translate, s/he must be aware of its intended audience and purpose. Is the translation for information made purposely only, or will it be legally binding in the target language receptor? Is it going to be submitted as evidence in a court of law, or is the translation merely a formality to comply with legal requirements?

As mentioned above, the specific features of SL and TL legal systems often pose considerable difficulties to legal translators. A legal system of a particular nation or a speech community is a reflection of its culture and its institutional traditions and regularities. Because of this close interaction between the legal system and the culture of a nation, legal translation between two languages becomes more difficult. Following Weston (1983, p. 207), "the basic translation difficulty of overcoming conceptual differences between languages becomes particularly acute due to cultural and more specifically institutional reasons". This is particularly true for the translation of legal texts between English and Arabic due to the large amount of differences between the two language legal systems.

1.2 Modals in UN Resolutions

1.2.1 English Modals

Linguists agreed that there are different categorizations of English modality, although they agree on the concepts that make up modal expressions (Householder, 1971, Halliday, 1976, Lyons, 1977, Coats, 1983, Palmer, 1990 and 2001). As a result it has been difficult to find an all agreed-upon classification of these modal meanings and functions. Modal concepts rarely appear in their same places, one key reason for this variation is the fact that modal concepts themselves hold a close relation among

themselves with common overlaps between the modal expressions that are used to express these meanings. Consider the following simple examples where one English modal expresses many different concepts:

1. She can run for quite a long distance without feeling tired. (Ability)
2. You can leave class. You look exhausted. (Permission)
3. That can't be the right answer. (Logical deduction)
4. The Israeli attacks shouldn't target children (Obligation)
5. The resolution should be available online next week. (Expectation)

Modality relates to the speaker's assessment of the validity of what he/she is saying. Modality can be expressed by different elements and different languages express different modals by using different elements or techniques. In English, modality is expressed by modal auxiliary verbs which indicate modality, which is defined as the grammaticalized expression of the subjective attitudes and opinions of the speaker (Lyons, 1977).

In English, there are nine modal verbs. These are: can, could, shall, should, will, would, may, might and must (Romer, 2004). Generally modal verbs in English express possibility or necessity, or even logical deduction. Like other auxiliary verbs, modal verbs appear before the head of the main verb functioning as the predicate. However, unlike other auxiliary verbs, the modal verb always appears at the beginning of the verb phrase in the initial position. For example: *Students should memorize English verbs*, or *He could be here by now*, also *He must be joking*. It should be clear from these examples that the modal verb occupies the first position in the verb phrase, coming before any other auxiliary verb (like have or be) and the main lexical verb (Huddleston, 2008). The issue with each modal verb is that it can have more than one meaning and the interpretation of a particular modal depends heavily on the context in which it is being used. The following table would help to illustrate this point.

Table 1.1: English Modal verbs

Modal verb	Function
➤ Can	➤ Present ability, permission, possibility, request, willingness
➤ Could	➤ Past ability, possibility, request, present/ future permission
➤ May	➤ permission, probability
➤ Might	➤ possibility, probability, suggestion
➤ Must	➤ deduction, logical necessity, obligation, prohibition
➤ Shall	➤ decision, future, offer, willingness, suggestion, legal obligation
➤ Should	➤ less categorical obligation, advice, necessity, prediction, recommendation
➤ Will	➤ decision, future, intention, offer, prediction, promise, suggestion, insistence
➤ Would	➤ Future past, contingent use, invitation, permission, preference, request, suggestion question, probability, willingness

Scholars who dealt with modality have used a number of terms such as necessity, probability, obligatory to express modals. Matthews (2005, p. 228) defines the term modality as “a category covering either of a kind of speech act or the degree of certainty with which something is said.” For instance, the modals ‘may’ or ‘must’ could be used to mean giving permission or express inference as in: ‘You may express your point of view about Gaza war’. The same modal ‘May’ could be used to express a formal request: ‘May I comment on the Gaza war?’ It could also be used to mean a certain degree of certainty: ‘The war may stop tomorrow’.

Other functions of modals include: necessity, obligation, lack of necessity, expression of lost opportunity and advice are shown in the following examples:

The war must stop right now. (Necessity)

I must study today. (Obligation)

You will not have to come early. (Lack of necessity)

This meaning of ‘Must’ is parallel to the modal meaning of ‘May’ in the possibility meaning “...since it implies that the speaker judges the proposition expressed by the clause to be necessarily true, or at least to have a high likelihood of being true.” (Greenbaum and Quirk, 1991, p. 61).

Israel should have gone to the meeting yesterday. (Lost opportunity)

The dual nature of epistemic modality is discussed in Lyons (1977) who claims that there are two types of epistemic modals, subjective and objective. Lyons suggests that the speech act of assertion has two layers of meaning and each one can be modified independently by a modal operator. Thus the first layer is a use of a weak subjective epistemic modal such as ‘might’ indicates that the speaker’s confidence is low and use of a strong epistemic modal such as ‘must’ signals high confidence. The second layer corresponds to how things are in the world and is modified by objective epistemic modals. Thus use of an objective ‘might’ indicates that the speaker claims (with full confidence) that there is an objective possibility and a use of an objective ‘must’ signals an objective necessity.

Furthermore, the statement, “Gaza war may end by this week”, can be read in two ways, either the speaker is stating his (1) uncertainty about Gaza military status, or the speaker is stating, with certainty (2) that there is some chance that the Gaza war will end. On one hand; the subjective reading is core if we imagine a context in which the speaker knows some facts about “the Gaza war “which imply that the war will end this week, e.g. Gazan’s have no more magazines, Israeli army has achieved their targets etc. on the other hand; The objective reading is core if we envisage a context in which the speaker knows the war will come to the end “fact”, For instance; based on the UN Security Council resolution about the war on Gaza. In this matter, the speaker can safely report that there is an actual chance that the war will end. In such case the speaker is fully certain of his/her assertion, based on the objective knowledge. Compare that with

the first reading, which seems more opacity that emerge from the dualistic possible options are exposed of 'May' to adjust – either the speaker's degree of belief or the actual state of events.

1.2.2 Arabic Modals

In Arabic, Modality is a rich semantic concept which involves different meanings according to the contexts in which the different types of modals are used. Probability, possibility, necessity are clusters of these meanings that may be expressed by some verbs in Arabic and English languages. Translating modality from English into Arabic, and vice versa, is rather problematic due to the fact that while modals in English are “grammatical auxiliaries”, in Arabic they are mostly “lexical” (Baker, 2011). Modality is expressed by words that denote to some conditions, or articles such as (قد) "qadd", it is also expressed by modal verbs such as : يمكن , يستطيع , ينبغي , يتعين and particles such as: اذا , لو , لعل , ربما , قد (Darwish, 2010).

Standard Arabic does not have exact equivalents of English modals verbs, but it has words that are used in much the same way including phrases beginning with من الـ. Here's a list (all of these are followed by imperfect-mood verbs, although if you remove the أن, you can follow them with a مصدر) which means modal verbs do exist in Arabic; but most of the time you need to add a preposition to them; like: "يجب ان, ينبغي ان, يلزم ان" should that, could that, must that" (Talaat, 2012).

Table 1.2: Arabic modal verbs

English Modals	Arabic Modals
“can/ could/ be able to” possible/impossible.	(yastaTiiG/ istaTaG/ yaqdir/ qadir /yasmah/ jaayiz/ yajuuz/ yastaHiil/ mustaHiil/ يستطيع \ استطاع \ يقدر \ قدر \ يسمح \ جاز \يجوز\ يستحيل \ مستحيل
“may/ might/ could/ be probable”	(yimkin an/ mn al mumkin an/ yuHtamal an/ muHtamal/ qad) يمكن ان \ من الممكن ان \ يحتمل ان \ محتمل \ قد
“will/ shall/ be going to”.	سوف \ سـ \ (sa-) and (sawfa)
“should/ must/ ought to/ be obliged to/ have to”	(yanbaghi an \ yajib an/ Darori/ yustahsan/ Mn AlMuftarad/ Ala Arjah/ labud/ Yata3ain/ Mn Almuakad an/ yalzam an/ laazim) ينبغي ان \ يجب ان \ ضروري \ يستحسن \ من المفترض \ من الارجح \ لابد \ يتعين \ من المؤكد ان \ يلزم ان \ لازم

Saeed (1997, p. 125) defines Arabic modality as a cover term for devices which allow speakers to express varying degrees of commitment to, or belief in probability, a proposition. In fact, the concept of modality does not figure in any of the standard grammars of Arabic to date (El-Hassan, 1990, p. 164). Therefore, we just need to look into ways and means of expressing modality in Arabic. Basic meanings of words that express modality in Arabic are: possibility (يمكن -could- mumkin), probability, (ينبغي ان), -should- yanbagi an), certainly (يلزم - must-yajib an). This is the same in English but the contrast is how it expresses the indicated meaning (Aziz, 1989, p. 84, 86). It seems reasonable to translate ‘can’ in Arabic such as “بإمكانك” or “يوسعك”, you may, you can“ which share the same semantic associations of ability and permission. Because “ك”,

you" is embedded in this format, the Arabic translation seems to be more formal in both "بامكانك" and "بوسعك", you may, you can", it can then be used as the equivalent of 'may'. Also, the modal 'should' could be used to mean different meanings as in the following example: Israeli Air Forces declared "we should have done a truce with Gaza". Notably that 'should' expresses two different meanings; first, it expresses 'regret' for what has happened and second, it expresses 'possibility' which means it would have been better if they had truce formerly.

Thus, modals sometimes could be confusing for the readers especially when it comes within unfamiliar contexts such as legal context (Peliskova, 2006). The English sentence 'He must be joking' is to be understood as an inference/conclusion, not as an obligation/necessity. Hence, in Arabic it is clumsy to translate that as 'yajib a'anahu yamzah', while the proper translation is: 'laa budda ?anahu yamzah', 'He must be joking'.

Accordingly, Aziz (1992, p. 103) presents a broader scale of modality surrounding six degrees : less probable 'would', probable, 'will', less possible 'might / could', possible 'may / can', less certain 'should / ought to / could not' and certain 'must / cannot'.

1.3 Statement of the Problem

Internationalization and increasing globalization of the social patterns of life have created a situation where the need for legal language utilized in foreign countries and in different legal systems is greater than ever before. There is no doubt that the exchange of information is largely dependent on language, to be intended not only as a system of ciphers, but also as a means of communication (Wittgenstein, 1997). The present study focuses on the UN resolutions pertaining to Gaza war issues. Since the Palestinian people are interested in reading and being informed on what is going on in the chambers of the United Nations General Assembly (UNGA), it is essential that they have access

to documentation about their political and economic situation in Gaza, as the UNGA is an independent and sovereign organization and should be neutral in their decisions.

Arabic translation of English UN resolutions, however, reveals some problematic areas, in terms of English modal subsystems used in United Nations resolutions. First, varied translations of Arabic modals in general, and the different meanings implicated with specific modals in particular, reveal that it may not always be possible to convey the exact meaning of English texts in Arabic. Second, the misinterpretation between the intended meaning of a particular modal with its inherent notions, such as certainty, possibility and probability, might indeed confuse the Palestinian people about their case (Alawi, 2010). This issue arises due to the misunderstanding of modal meaning and its involved verbs used in UN resolutions in English. Finally, as the UN does not translate all English modals in the text of the resolution, the Arabic version seems awkward or sometimes meaningless and this leads to loss of information that might be critical (Farghal and Shunnaq, 1992).

1.4 Objectives of the Study

The aim of this study is to explore the English modals, in the sense of their distribution within the text, and the various ways in which modals are translated into Arabic. The study will employ the modal of semantic Typology proposed by Coates (1983), along with Vinay and Darbelnet's modal of translation techniques (1958/1995).

The goal is:

- 1) To identify the types of translation techniques used in translating English modals into Arabic in the UN resolutions.
- 2) To determine the English modals and Arabic equivalents used in the UN resolutions.

- 3) To analyze the differences in meaning, as reflected in the quality of English and Arabic messages of UN texts.

1.5 Research Questions

The present study is guided by the following research questions:

- 1) What are the types of translation techniques used in translating English modals into Arabic in the UN resolutions pertaining to Gaza war?
- 2) What are the English modals and Arabic equivalents used in the UN resolutions?
- 3) How are the differences in meaning reflected in the quality of English and Arabic messages?

1.6 Scope and Limitation of the Study

This study looks at English and Arabic legal texts in UN resolutions about the war on Gaza from 2008 to 2012 as it was the utmost critical period in the life of Palestinians people after the liberation of Gaza from Israel in 2006. The selected resolutions are written in English and they are compared with their translated versions in Arabic. These resolutions are sourced from the official online website of the General Assembly of the United Nations. <http://www.un.org/en/ga/>

The study will analyze only thirty written legal texts with Arabic version from a total of 10 resolutions on the Gaza war as the selection criteria was based on the significant content and the most number of modal auxiliaries in these resolutions during this period and the copious usage of English modals in each resolution.

1.7 Significance of Study

The importance and value of this study arise from the significant function of modals in creating a coherent and meaningful text through utilizing different types of modals in the text which makes it more meaningful by binding the relationship between sentences and paragraphs.

The study will shed light on the contrasting parts between English and Arabic with regard to modality and the techniques of translation used. To the best knowledge of the researcher, and although to date there has been little of literature is available on it, in each language, little work has been done on modality from a contrastive point of view with reference to the two languages in question. As far as translation is concerned, this study is expected to be of great value in the sub-field of legal translation between English and Arabic as a great deal of modal meanings and functions are found in both languages. The study is significant as any mistranslation of the English modals into Arabic may spoil the communicative meaning of the SL and contribute to a loss of essential information of both texts. Therefore, some translation techniques/activities could help to convey the same message of the original text.

1.8 Summary

This chapter presented an introduction of the current dissertation. It presented a background on legal translation, the role of UN resolutions, language and modality and how they are related and then it explained how modals are translated from English into Arabic. After that, this chapter introduced the terms: translation and translation studies and how it is a cluster under linguistics, legal text, English modals, and Arabic modals, and equivalence in translation. The current chapter demonstrated the statement of problem which this research is going to handle, research objectives and questions which the research is going to find out and answer, the scope of research and the significance of the study.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

In the current research, the researcher went through many books that studied the modals in English and Arabic and how these modals are translated from English into Arabic vice versa. Some studies, which considered the issues of the translation of modals, and the problems within a language or between two or more languages, were purely semantic in nature, while others related the modal issues to the translation. In the present study, the researcher focuses on those studies that are most pertinent to this research, which is aimed at dissecting the different English modals in the texts on the United Nations' Resolutions on Gaza and the Arabic equivalent of these modals, and scrutinizing the differences in meaning reflected in the English and Arabic texts.

With the compatibility with the research questions, this chapter consist of three main sections, the first section discusses the linguistic definitions and expressions of modality in general, the second section reviews (1) a theoretical framework of Coate's (1983) English modals and (2) Vinay and Darbelnet's (1958/1995) translation procedures in order to answer the first and second research question, the third section explain the techniques and procedures of translation and translation of modals to determine the Arabic equivalent of English modals in order to see the differences between English and Arabic modals reflected in the texts, to answer the third research question.

2.2 Linguistic Definitions and Expressions of Modals

2.2.1 Definition of Modals

From the Latin word *modalitas*, the quality of modality relates to manners (a way of acting or speaking), forms (shape, structure), and limits (something that restrains). Linguistic expressions can be used in denoting modality such the use of the adverb “possibly”, the adjective “sure”, and the spelled-out noun “permission”. The expressions of possibility ممكن, probability ربما, certainly يجب in Arabic are parts of manifestations of modality.

In logic, modality is concerned with the spoken language which is related to the fact, that rather than with what purpose, attitude or judgment a speaker has in uttering. It is because of this reason that modality in logic is considered objective modality. While traditional logic has been more concerned with objective modality, which excludes speakers, the speaker’s subjective aspects of thoughts and emotions contribute to the modality, which is often reflected either in writing or speaking. This is reasonable because in everyday conversation and in different contexts, all utterances show the purpose, attitude or assessment of the speaker (Palmer, 2001).

Modality in language is, then, concerned with subjectiveness of an utterance. In subjective modality, speakers express the fact with their own intention or judgment. The subjectivity is seen in different aspects: speaker's commitment toward the reality of what is said, speaker's judgment toward a proposition, whether it is positive or negative, advantageous or disadvantageous etc. It is modality that gives more meanings to utterances. Together with fast development of semantics and pragmatics, modality has received more linguists concerns.

According to Lyons (1977), modality is the “speaker’s opinion or attitude with regard to the proposition that the sentence expresses or the situation that the proposition describes.” According to Frawley (1992), modality semantically reflects a speaker’s attitude or degrees of awareness of the content of a proposition.

Modality belongs to the linguistic category which poses great problems in creating one clear-cut definition that would explicitly describe it. These problems stem from the fact that the criterion on the basis of which modality is construed is not precise. This, in turn, is the result of different perspectives people have on the reality. As Koseska-Toszewa rightly noticed (1995, p. 153) there is one common feature that combines all the definitions of modality. Pointed out, Modality expresses how much the statement producer is convinced about the truthfulness of the statement he or she is producing or how much he or she finds it untrue (Kuczma, 2010).

Kiefer (1994, p. 214) is of the opinion that “modality possesses a different, philosophical viewpoint. He links modality to ‘the relativization of the validity of sentence meanings to a set of possible worlds. Talk about possible worlds can thus be construed as talk about the ways in which people could conceive the world to be different’”. This concept of modality gives reason to perceive modality as a universal linguistic phenomenon, even though it is realized in different means.

2.2.2 Modals in General

Modal expressions can be in the form of necessity, obligation, permission, possibility, probability, and volition in some situations, which Downing and Locke (1999, p. 382-383) categorised these as “basic modalities” and extend the basic concept by adding other notions such as wish, desire, regret, doubt and usuality.

In some instances, types of modal meanings can be expressed by the use of modal verbs (Biber, Johansson, Leech, Conrad, and Finegan, 1999, p. 485-486), referred to as intrinsic and extrinsic, which will be discussed in the following section.

2.2.3 Types of Modals

Types of modality are classified differently according to different linguists. Von Wright (1951, p. 1-2) in “Studying modal logic” distinguishes 4 types: Alethic, Epistemic, Deontic and Existential. Rescher (2000), apart from these types, refers to one more type it is temporal modality. Leech and Startvik (1985, p. 219-221) suggest 2 types: Intrinsic and Extrinsic modality.

Several scholars such as Praninskas (1975), Biber et al. (2004), Halliday (1999), Quirk et al. (1989) have dealt with modal verbs using several different terms to distinguish between their major types, Biber notes that:

...two different types of meaning can be attached to each modal, namely an intrinsic (deontic) and extrinsic (epistemic) meaning. Intrinsic modality has to do with the conduct and occurrences that are under the direct control of humans or other representatives; meanings with regard to permission, obligation, or volition [or intention]. Extrinsic modality has to do the logical significance of occasions in terms of appraisals of prospects, such as possibility, necessity, and prediction.

(2004, p. 485)

Hoffman (1996) stated that root modals can be equated with epistemic modals. As such, epistemic modals, which take the broadest view, are characteristically speaker-oriented, while root modals, which are of the narrowest view, and are subject-oriented (Bybee, Perkins & Pagliuca, 1994). On the one hand, this type of modality includes behaviour and eventual existence that are agentive and volitional by nature. These actions and events are results of permission, obligation, volition or intention.

On the other hand, Perkins, M. R. (1982) states that extrinsic meaning deals with certain degrees of probability in relation to necessity, possibility, and prediction, which is related to what was mentioned by Downing and Locke (1999, p. 383) referring to the speaker's lack of knowledge. Regarding the typical occurrence of modals with extrinsic meaning, the subject is usually non-human and/or the main verb has a static meaning:

Necessity: "...and telling herself that in the end the very strain of his position must wake him" (Wilcox & Wilcox, 1995).

However, the classification made by Sweetser and Palmer (2007), in my opinion, seems to be the most acceptable for its clarity and generalization which can be applied to linguistic studies from different angles: semantic, logic and pragmatic. They are Epistemic & Deontic modality. Analysing such a sentence as "He must be in his office", we can see this may have two interpretations, depending on the modality assigned to the modal verb "must".

In one sense, it means "I am certain that he is in his office" (By my reasoning and judgment). In another sense, it has the interpretation of "He is obliged to be in his office" (He has no choice but to be in his office). In the formal sense, the modal auxiliary "must" is epistemic and in the latter it is deontic.

According to Palmer's (2001), there seem to be few languages that have a system with three markers ' individual suffixes, particles' and inflection, but English is an exception, using the three modal verbs MAY, MUST and WILL: John ...;

John may be in his room now

John must be in his room now

John will be in his room now

The first sentence points out that the interlocutor has no certainty of the John's physical presence in the room. In the second sentence, the interlocutor possesses certain degree of definite and evidence-based conclusion such as that the light is switched on and that other person is physically present in the vicinity. The third sentence shows some commonly known habit of John being at work at eight, and that he has some degree of affinity to his job, among others. Hence, 'must', seems to draw a firmer conclusion than 'will', so the three might be explained in terms of: likely to happen, more likely to happen, and logically to happen.

Lyons (1977, p. 793) (together with other scholars) states: “Epistemic modality does not deal with facts, but it has to do with beliefs, knowledge or opinion. Palmer (1990) considers that epistemic modality in language is often, perhaps always, subjective in the way it is associated with the deduction of the speakers, and not only simply interest in the subjective judgment in the light of reality, whereas deontic modality deals with some degree of possible actions performed by agents. (Lyons, 1977, p. 823). By means of this, speakers intervene in or bring about changes in events.

Epistemic modal: Normal language has the property of epistemic modality involving the interlocutor’s evaluations or suppositions of possibilities and his certain conviction (or lack thereof) of factual truth (Coates, 1983).

Simply speaking, epistemic meaning can be interpreted as how the speaker is confident about he/she is saying. Modal verbs, such as MUST, SHOULD, and OUGHT are associated with assumption, while, MAY, MIGHT, COULD and WILL are related to an assessment of possibilities. All epistemic modals can be roughly placed at the two ends of a scale whose extremes represent confidence and doubt. According to Wen (2013, p. 29), based on Coates (1983, p. 19) she summarizes the meanings of epistemic modal verbs showed in table 2.1.

Table 2.1: The Meaning of Epistemic Modal (1983)

Inferential		non-inferential
MUST (=from the evidence available I confidently infer that.....)	CONFIDENT ↑ ↓	WILL (=I confidently predict that)
SHOULD, OUGHT (=from the evidence available I tentatively assume that)	DOUBTFUL	MAY, MIGHT, COULD (=I think it is perhaps that..)

Table 2.1 clearly shows two parallel scales: one scale presents the confident and doubtful, and the other presents inferential and non-inferential elements. Coates (1983) argues that analysing epistemic meaning has to take account logic inferential and non – inferential. In the figure, it is identified that both modal “MUST” and “WILL” express high value of confidence. However, the use of epistemic “MUST” indicates that the speaker’s confidence in the truth of the proposition is based on a process of logical inference (Coates, 1983, p. 41); while the use of epistemic “WILL” indicates that the confidence is based on common sense, or on repeated experience.

Root modal: Root modality expresses the supposed behaviour of people in the physical and social world that is characterised in the interlocutor’s stance in relation to responsibility, permission, and obligation (Palmer, 1986, p. 47)

Root (non-epistemic) modals are difficult to characterize. In both root category and epistemic category, a continuum from subjective and objective meaning is found, and within root category, an independent but parallel continuum from strong to weak meaning exist (Coates, 1983, p. 21). For instance, the modal verb MUST covers a range of meanings. Obligation just represents the core meaning of root MUST. The meanings relating to root MUST can be shown on a decline form a strong obligation to weak obligation. The strong obligation can be paraphrased as “it is imperative that...”, for example, the mother gives an order to the child by saying “you must come back before 10 pm.”; and the weak obligation can be paraphrased as “it is important to...”, for example “I must finish this work in two days.” In this sense, it is more appropriate to interpret as “t is necessary /important for me to finish a certain work within two days.” In addition, if someone says that “I” must to do something, it means that the speaker has a definite intention to do it in the future.

According to Halliday (1985, p. 85-86), “Polarity is the choice between positive and negative, as in is/ isn’t, do/ don’t. However, the possibilities are not limited to a choice between yes and no. There are intermediate degrees: various kinds of indeterminacy that fall in between, like “sometimes” or “maybe”. The intermediate degrees between the positive and negative poles are known collectively as modality”. See the chart below:

Table 2.2: Modality in Halliday’s View (1985, p. 85-86)

Commodity exchanged	Speech function		Types of intermediacy	
			Modality	Probability (possible/ probable/ certain)
Information	Proposition	Statement question		Frequency (sometimes/ usually/ always)
Goods & services	Proposal	Command	Modulation	Obligation (allowed/ supposed/ required)
		Offer		Inclination (willing/ anxious/ determined)

As can be seen from the chart, in a proposition, the meaning of positive and negative poles is asserting “It is so” and denying “It isn’t so”. He observes two kinds of intermediate possibilities: (1) degree of probability (possible -> probable -> certain) which is equivalent to may be “yes”, may be “no” with different degrees of likelihood attached and (2) degree of usuality (i.e sometimes “yes” sometimes “no”).

In a proposal, there are two kinds of intermediate possibilities: (1) in a command, the intermediate points represent degrees of obligation and (2) in an offer, they represent degrees of described duty.

2.2.4 Modal Verbs in English

2.2.4.1 Concept of Modal Verbs

Language is not always used just to exchange information by making simple statements and asking questions. Sometimes, we want to make requests, offers, or suggestions. We may also want to express our wishes, intentions or indicate our feelings about what we are saying. In English, we do all these things by using a set of verbs called modal verbs or modal auxiliaries. The modal auxiliaries such as can, could, may, might, will, would, must, should and ought to express different types of modal meanings. These modal auxiliaries or modals for short are one of the most complicated problems of the English verbs. Michael Lewis (1986, p. 99) quoted Palmer's remarks about the modals:

There is no doubt that the overall picture of the modals is extremely "messy" and untidy and that the most the linguists can do is to impose some order, point some regularities, correspondences, parallelisms... This subject is not one that lends itself to any simple explanation.

(1986, p. 99)

Semantically, modal auxiliaries allow the speaker to introduce a personal interpretation of the non-factual and non-temporal elements of the event. In other words, modals are one way for a speaker to encode modality into what (s) he says – such ideas as necessity, possibility, obligation, etc. Some of the modals may also express the same kinds of semantic colourings in the subjunctive mood.

In Werner (2006, p. 235), contextual constraints play a role in expressing modality in an utterance independent of the function of lexical modals that contribute to modal meaning, as can be seen in the table below:

Table 2.3: Overview of Modal Verbs in English (Langue and Langue, 1999, p. 121)

Modal	Function	Examples
Can	<p>To show ability</p> <p>To suggest a possibility or give an option</p> <p>To ask for or to give Permission</p> <p>To show impossibility</p>	<p>I can jog 10 kilometres.</p> <p>Students can enrol earlier for classes.</p> <p>Can you phone me?</p> <p>You can go now.</p> <p>It cannot be Jim sitting there.</p> <p>He went for a holiday over the weekend.</p>
Could	<p>To show past ability</p> <p>To ask a polite question</p> <p>To show possibility</p> <p>To show impossibility</p> <p>To suggest a possibility/ opportunity or give an option</p>	<p>I could jog 10 kilometres when I was a youth.</p> <p>Could I phone you?</p> <p>Why isn't Mary present? She could be occupied.</p> <p>He could not attend the party. He was in another town.</p> <p>He could try taking this way.</p>
Might	To show possibility	The lecturer might arrive late for class today.
May	<p>To ask for or to give permission (formal)</p> <p>To show possibility</p>	<p>May I phone you?</p> <p>The lecturer may arrive late for class today.</p>
Should	<p>To show advisability</p> <p>To show obligation</p> <p>To show expectation</p>	<p>You should try the food at the new cafe in town.</p> <p>I should renew my road tax.</p>

		You should receive my reply in a few days.
Ought to	To show advisability To show obligation To show expectation	You ought to have your meals regularly. I ought to register as a voter. You ought to receive my reply in a few days.
Must	To show probability or to make a logical assumption To show necessity To show prohibition	Janice must be out at the moment. She is not answering the telephone. I must phone my mother today. You must not cross the road when the light is red.
Will	To indicate future time To make a promise or to show willingness To state a general truth To ask a polite question	He will leave for the airport at 7 a.m. The federal government will offer aid to the flood victims. The new car manufactured by them will run on either petrol or natural gas. Will you help me lift these crates?
Would	To ask a polite question To indicate a repeated action in the past	Would you help me carry these crates? When I lived by the beach, I would go for a swim every day.

So the debate concerning modals is based on the diverse practical functions of modals employed in a wide range of contextual settings. For example, the modal ‘may’ could be used to denote the giving of permission, as in ‘You may express your opinion’. Then again, the same modal could be used to indicate a formal request: ‘May I say something about these ideas?’ or it could also be used to signify a particular level of

certainty: ‘He may have gone to the library’.

The other functions of modals comprise: necessity, obligation, lack of necessity, expression of lost opportunity, and advice, as indicated in the following examples:

We must go straightaway. (Necessity)

All candidates must be degree holders. (Necessity)

I don’t have to be present at the meeting tomorrow. (Lack of necessity)

We had better put in more effort or we will fail this subject. (Advisability)

He should have attended the meeting yesterday. (Lost opportunity)

2.2.4.2 Semantic Features of English modals

The primary semantic characteristics of modals are that they allow the speaker to express an attitude to the non-factual and non-temporal elements of the situation. This means s/he can introduce elements of modality such as possibility, necessity, desirability, morality, doubt, certainty, etc. For example, in making such a statement as “Mr. Smith must be the oldest person in the village”, the speaker not only gives the fact about Mr. Smith, but also indicates how certain he is about the truth or correctness of the information through the use of the modal must, cited in (Frawley, 2006). In the case of a question, the listener’s opinion is involved, as well as the person obviously referred to by the sentence. “What should I do?” for example, is clearly about the speaker, but is also equally importantly about the listener’s judgment or opinion (Kratzer, 2012). Verb phrases containing a modal, therefore, are not about the facts alone, but also express the speaker’s or listener’s judgment or opinion. Generally speaking, each modal is fundamentally grounded in the moment of speaking, at the point Now. They are present, not in the traditional sense, however, the meaning of each modal may be paraphrased “in the present circumstances, it is possible/ necessary/ desirable that...”.

This is different from the conventional view that, for example could is “the past tense” of can (Kratzer, 2012).

In the consideration of meanings of modals, Palmer (2001) assumes that this is a grey area. While dismissing the idea of the search for a “basic meaning” attributed to each individual modal, he believes that it is possible to search for a set of closely connected meanings: “This must not be taken to imply that we cannot search for a relatively generalized common meaning or a set of closely connected meanings for each modal. It is only when exactness is required or invariance is suggested that the idea of a basic meaning becomes impracticable”.

In another approach to modal semantics, Dixon (1991, p. 170) points out that each modal has a fair semantic range, extending far beyond the central meanings that are indicated. There is in fact considerable overlap between modals. For instance, the central meaning of ‘can’ refers to inherent ability, e.g. John can lift 100 kilos, and of ‘may’ to the possibility of some specific event happening, e.g. we may get a Christmas bonus this year. But both modals ‘can’ and ‘may’ refer to a permitted activity, e.g. John can/ may stay out all night and to some possibility, e.g. The verb ‘shout’ can/ may be used both transitively and intransitively. The best approach to meanings of modals, according to Lewis (1990, p. 103) is to look for a single central meaning while at the same time accepting that this may involve recognizing a number of marginal examples.

2.2.5 Modal Verbs in Arabic

2.2.5.1 Concept of modal verbs

In Arabic, modality is a rich semantic concept which involves different meanings according to the contexts in which the different types of modals are used. Probability, possibility, necessity are clusters of these meanings that may be expressed by some verbs in Arabic and English languages (Abdul-Baqi, 2001).

Modals in Arabic differ from their English counterparts in one major grammatical aspect of categorization. Arabic categorizes some modals as particles and others as main verbs whereas English modals are established grammatically as auxiliary verbs (Jarjour, 2006). According to the leading classical Arabic grammarian of the 14th century, Sibawayhi quoted below in Ibn Faris (1328/1963, p. 95), a particle is a part of speech that is neither a noun nor a verb but is nevertheless meaningful.

“ما جاء لمعني وليس باسم ولا فعل” (ابن فارس, 1995, p.1328)

“What comes for a meaning but is neither a noun nor a verb”.

Ibn Faris also quotes Al-Akhfash (2003) who defines a particle as a part of speech that cannot be conjugated, qualified, or put in the binary or plural form. "مالم يحسن له الفعل ولا التثنية ولا الجمع ولم يجر ان يتصرف فهو حرف".

What is not a subject to a verb nor an adjective, and neither can it be dualised nor pluralized, nor can it be conjugated-then it is a particle", so a particle in Arabic is presented as a grammatical entity that has a meaning in the sentence within which it occurs but is neither a verb since it has no time reference nor a noun because it does not refer to any concrete or abstract object. Another difference between Arabic and English modals is that the Arabic particles which have similar modal functions in the sentence to those of their English counterparts are not formally classified as such, i. e. as modals. In other words, they are not allocated a separate grammatical category based on their modal meaning. In classical Arabic grammatical literature they are explained alongside other particles which do not convey modal meanings but which the classical grammarians used to cluster together as part of the linguistic tradition of the language. Thus, the terms "emphasis", "possibility" and "obligation" as used for the English modals will be used to describe the functions of the Arabic modals which correspond to those modal meanings. A similar kind of grammatical classification of the Arabic modals does not exist in the Arabic linguistic tradition (Jarjour, 2006).

For the purpose of this research, it can be presumed to be of theoretical interest to

establish a semantic categorization for the Arabic modals in order to be able to compare and contrast their modal functions in the Arabic sentence with those which the English modals perform in the English sentence.

Modern Standard Arabic (henceforth, MSA) has at least five verbs which can be classified as modal verbs. These verbs, which are further subdivided into two types, share some semantic and morpho-syntactic properties which make them relatively distinct from other lexical verbs (Althawab, 2009). For the purpose of this current study as well, an attempt is made to identify the Arabic equivalents of the English modal auxiliaries which make up a clear and validated semantic category. Arabic language experts do not recognize modality as a grammatical category, albeit they do occasionally refer to the semantics of specific modal particles like (قد /qàd/) and (ربما /rubbàmaa/).

In fact, the very idea of modality has yet to be found in any of the typical Arabic grammars (El-Hassan, 1990, p. 164).

Comparison between English & Arabic Modals:

Arabic does not have a well-defined set of modal auxiliaries. Suleiman (1999) calls them modal expression rather than modal verbs. By 'expressions' is meant the phrasal modals such as the ones initiated by the prepositions 'min' من (it is necessary). Based on the analysis of a collection of Arabic legal documents, the most frequent lexical modal verbs are يجوز (may), يجب (must); prepositions and particles are also frequent such as لـ ان (for to) which is a short version of: يجوز لـ ان (it is allowed for (somebody(ies)) to) علي ان (on to) which is an abbreviated version of يجب علي ان (it is incumbent on (somebody(ies)) to). The particle قد (may) is also used. All these forms correspond to the English modal verbs shall, must, may and these verbs, among some others less frequent forms take an imperfect clause initiated with ان (to) or as Abdul -Raof puts it 'a verb-first sentence' (2001, p. 35).

The following are examples of modal verbs which are quoted from the UN resolutions:

The Palestinians shall be given the right of return to the lands of 1967.

يجب ان يتم إعطاء الشعب الفلسطيني حق العودة إلى أراضي 1967

(Hamas) no truce shall be executed without agreeing to cease-fire on our terms.

(حماس) لا يجوز تنفيذ الهدنة دون الاتفاق على وقف إطلاق النار على شروطنا

In order to distinguish English from Arabic modals we should take into consideration the following points:

1- In contrast to Arabic, English modals constitute a close system. However, Arabic modals meaning are expressed by particles, prepositional phrases, uninfluenced verbs and regular verbs.

2- Arabic lacks the fine distinction in meaning conveyed by the English modals 'must, have to, should/ought to'. For example, 'must' indicate compulsion by the speaker. 'Have to', external factors, and 'Should', advisability. Arabic has a number of synonymous verbs that convey compulsion but, lacks the distinction conveyed by the English modals. The compulsion Arabic verbs are "yajib", "yanbagii", and "yalzam". Besides these verbs, Arabic has "laa budda" and "allayka".

3- Some English modals have past forms, e.g. 'can/could, may/might, will/would'. The past forms may be used to refer to the present or future time but, with probability gradient for example, the use of 'might' rather than 'may' shows possibility.

I may/might leave tomorrow, قد/ربما اسافر غدا , 'qad /Rubbamma usafiru gadan'

This probability gradient cannot be captured in Arabic which render 'may' and 'might' by the particles 'rubbamma' or 'qad'

4- English 'must' and Arabic 'alayka an' are negated differently

Must + verb

'alayka an' عليك ان + verb

You must go

'alayka an تذهب عليك ان تذهب

Therefore, it is necessary to find ways and means of conveying modality in Arabic. Arabic evidently has the capacity to articulate a broad range of epistemic and deontic modes of modality in its own terminologies. This means that modality in Arabic can be researched without having to refer to English or to any other language for that matter (Abdel-Fattah, 2005). What is vital to determine here is whether modality in English corresponds to Arabic modals or not. Firstly, it is necessary to give some examples translated from English into Arabic to verify whether or not there is anything concerning modality in Arabic (Baker, 1992).

See the following examples:

Table 2.4: Translation of the main modal verbs from English into Arabic (Baker, 1992).

English	Arabic
You may come in	bo wesa'ak / be imkanak / yomkenak \ك\ بوسعك \ بإمكانك \ يمكنك ان تدخل
He may borrow these books again if he wishes	له \ بوسعه \ بإمكانه \ يمكنه ان يستعير هذه الكتب ثانية ان bo wesoah/ - شاء
You can see her now	لك \ بوسعك \ بإمكانك \ يمكنك ان تراها الان yomkenak
You shall meet the president tonight	لسوف تقابل الرئيس هذه الليلة
You shall see the fire of hell	lasawoff لترى الجحيم
And he shall be satisfied	latarawoon ولسوف يرضى lasawoff
You must be more careful in the future	عليك\ يجب ان تكون اكثر حذرا في المستقبل Yajeb / alaek
He must take this medication thrice a day	عليه\ يجب ان يتناول هذا الدواء ثلاث مرات في اليوم Yajeb
He will shift from the office by now	سوف \س\ يغادر المكتب حالا Sawoff
You should / ought to return the book to the library	ينبغي ان تعيد الكتاب الي المكتبة Yanbaghi
He should / ought to call the doctor	ينبغي ان يستدعي الطبيب

I should / ought to resign	Yanbaghi يستحسن / علي ان استقيل Alai / Yostahsan
The manager may be at home	يمكن من الممكن \ يحتمل \ من المحتمل \ ربما \ قد يكون المدير في البيت Yomken / meen al momken / meen al mohtamal / robama
The manager must be at home	من المؤكد \ لابد ان المدير في البيت Meen al moaakan / laa bood an
You must study hard	عليك \ يجب \ يجب عليك ان تستذكر دروسك Alaeeek an / yajeb an / yajeb alaeeek
The manager must have been at home	لابد ان المدير كان في البيت / laa bood
The Arabs must have settled here	لابد ان العرب اقاموا هن laa bood / Yajeb an

Wided (2010) noted that it is not easy to find Arabic equivalents of ‘may’ and ‘can’ since Arabic seems to possess many more expressions to communicate the same meaning, which brings up the issue of different styles. It appears to be logical to translate ‘can’ into Arabic by using بامكانك or بوسعك which share the same semantic connotations of ability and permission. Since ‘لك’ appears to be more formal than both بامكانك and بوسعك, it can therefore be used as the equivalent of ‘may’. According to the translation in the above table, the Arabic equivalents of ‘must’ are ‘علي + pronoun’, whereas the equivalent of ‘should / ought to’ is ‘ينبغي’. In Arabic ‘ينبغي’ denotes the subject’s obligations or duty, very much like ‘should / ought to’ in English. Looking at Table 2.4 as a whole, there is a striking similarity between the grammatical structure of the English expressions and their equivalent in Arabic. In all the Arabic translations there is a modal component, followed by a suggestion, similar to the equivalent English components (Wided, 2010). The multiplicity of the Arabic equivalents is due to the fact that in contrast to English, Arabic does not appear to have a grammaticalized modality; hence a range of lexical items are employed to convey the meaning of a single English modal auxiliary. However, as emphasized by El-Hassan (1990, p. 152), for that to happen, all the paraphrases must not be assumed to be having the exact same meaning

since it is necessary to have more knowledge about the context, despite the fact that they can stand as plausible renderings of the meaning of the English sentence.

The last example in Table 2.4 shows the English expression ‘must + have + past participle’ is translated as to find the Arabic equivalent as follows: ‘لابد ان + past tense’. The Arabic form ‘ربما’ “rubamma” is probably the nearest equivalent of English ‘may’.

2.2.5.2 Semantic features of Arabic Modals

Arabic exhibits a very neat detailed and even complex system of modality. It compensates for its lack of a close class of word called ‘modals’ by means of a variety of lexical, phrases, adverbial and many other means of linguistic expressions. Modality in Arabic is expressed by (a) defective verbs which have modal functions and by (b) other syntactic means known as modal particles which exhibit similar features and functions of the auxiliary verbs in English but not under one syntactic category (Al-Mukhaini, 2008).

First and foremost, Arabic has a considerably large number of dialects showing a wide scale of lexical, syntactic and semantic variation among them. In fact this variation has been found when collecting real life examples for this chapter. On the other hand, there is a variety of Arabic called classical Arabic which exists in the classical writing and speeches of ancient Arab caliphs, public speakers and poets. This variety is also the variety in which the holy Quran is versed. Surprisingly, this variety hardly comes into use nowadays. Between these two extremes comes a standard variety of Arabic. This is the language of present day press, media, legal documents, and everyday communication between Arab citizens coming from different countries and speaking different regional dialects in their homes. It is this variety of Arabic called modern standard Arabic (MSA) from which the researcher has taken his illustrative examples.

The complexity of Arabic modal expression compared to their English counterparts has been discussed. As a matter of fact, modality in the linguistic system of Arabic is dealt with totally by a subfield of semantics and rhetoric known as the science the meaning *ilm al ma'aani* (علم المعاني) (Al-Mukhaini, 2008).

Specifically with regard to English and Arabic, modality falls within both the syntactic and semantic categories in the former, but only within the semantic category in the latter; hence, leaving out the syntactic aspect completely. Otherwise, the comparative analysis will be left without that constant component, which is compulsory if the two languages are to be compared. English and Arabic are good examples of this situation. This is the conceptualization of modality that will be adopted for the purpose of this research. According to the previous discussion, it is crucial that a clearly defined procedural assumption be underscored for the purpose of this research: modality is assumed to mean an abstract universal concept that is shared by all human languages, irrespective of the methods employed for accomplishing it. The proof of this universality is presented in the next section.

In reference to this, Lyons (1977, p. 791) supports this claim: "The ambiguity found in sentences containing 'must' and 'may' is also found in comparable sentences in other languages. This suggests the existence of modality, together with its accompanying difficulties, in most languages. Arabic is not an exception". What this means more specifically is that there are modal qualified expressions in Arabic, just as in English, although both languages differ in the method of categorization.

Bearing in mind the realization of the divergence modality between English and Arabic, the subject will definitely raise problems for translators of English to Arabic and vice versa, especially for those who are tasked with the translation of legal texts in these languages. Simply presenting the various uses and meaning of modal expressions in Arabic and English does not appear to be of much help. Instead, it is necessary to have a

distinct conceptual comprehension which attempts to relate them to the situational and practical meaning. It is believed that this requirement would be satisfied when a representative sample of English legal texts is compared to their Arabic translation.

2.3 Translation of Modals

As mentioned earlier, there are ten main modal auxiliaries in English: 'can, could, may, might, will, would, shall, should must, and ought to'. These modals create several problems of translation into Arabic for two major reasons: (1) they do not have one-to-one single semantic equivalent in Arabic. Moreover, there is no grammatical class of verbs called modal auxiliaries (افعال مساعدة) in Arabic. The so called Arabic 'defective verbs' (افعال ناقصة) are different. (2) They have several complex and complicated functions in English (Quirk, 1989, p. 52:57). You can refer to the short list with the main functions of each of these modals in the previous chapter.

Ghazala (1995, p. 2008 75-76) in his book 'translation as problems and solutions' stated that, the translation of the modal "would" and the combination of the modal "will" and the auxiliary (have) into Arabic is problematic issue, for example: "If you finish work early, I will visit you" the first example represents the future present which is in fact translated in Arabic as: (اذا انهيت العمل باكراً فسوف ازورك) , while the second example "If you finished work early, I would visit you" represents the future past which is translated into Arabic as: (لو انهيت العمل باكراً لزرتك) , also, the third example "If you had finished work early, I would have visited you" which is translated into (لو انك انهيت العمل باكراً , لكنك زرتك) . Somewhat, there are three tenses in Arabic which are present, past, and imperative in addition to the future tense by using (سوف) and (س) + the present verb. The Arabic native speaker depends upon the context to understand the real modal tense where time and style are a part of meaning which may cause problems

for translators. These problems may affect meaning. The degree of certainty or uncertainty, formality or informality is a problem which concerns words and grammar.

According to Ghazala (1995: 18), translation problems can be due to sound, lexis, grammar, and style. Both English and Arabic descend from different language families. While the former is from a Germanic family, the latter is Semitic origin. This results in a wide gap between their grammars which causes serious problems for learners who assume that English and Arabic grammars are identical (Ghazala, 1995).

Modals are complicated and multifunctional in English. Therefore, it is difficult to give one single specific meaning for each of them. Usually, the translators know them by their most common meanings such as; obligation, permission, possibility etc. The problems of translating some of the functions of these models into Arabic are due to the grammatical differences between the two languages for instance; ‘will, shall’ are not verbs in Arabic: These two modals are not even modals in Arabic when they are used to refer to future. They mean the future particle (سـ \ سوف) (for the futures reference of ‘would’ in the past, see the following conditional sentences). They are translated into (سـ) or (سوف), regardless of the possibility of the reference of the latter to the near future, and the former to the far future, for this is not the frequent case in actual use of Arabic. e.g.: “They will forgive us” لنا\ سيسامحونا (سيستغفرون) سوف يغفرون, “We shall delay the meeting” (سوف نؤجل (سنؤجل) الاجتماع) (Ghazala, 1995/2008).

Anyhow, ‘can’, ‘may’, and ‘must’ are usually understood to mean one word each (يجب \ يمكن \ يستطيع) but in this case is not so. The translator has to imply another particle or nuance (ان, Ana) to each of these words. The problem becomes clearer when we translate them from English into Arabic without adding these particles. The previous English modals are translated into the following: (يمكن ان \ يجب ان \ يستطيع ان) in these examples, we will notice that the translator has to add the particle (ان, Ana) because it is

implied in each of these modals. At the same time, grammatically it is obligatory in Arabic. e.g.: “we can walk” (نستطيع ان نمشي) but we cannot translated it as: (نستطيع نمشي) , also “we may walk” (يمكننا ان نمشي) but not (يمكننا نمشي), then “we must walk” (يجب علينا) but not as (يجب علينا نمشي). The second version, (يلزمننا) expresses necessity, which is one of the meanings of ‘must’. Moreover, the same applies to the past tenses of these modals such as; ‘could’, ‘might’, and ‘must’. They are translated into two words each: (وجب (لزم) ان \ امكن ان \ استطاع ان) (Ghazala, 1995/2008, p. 38).

However, ‘shall’ has a special use in the language of law in particular. It is not used to refer to future, but to obligation. In legal texts, ‘shall’ means ‘must’ .e.g. “The defendant shall appear before court now”: (يجب علي المدعي عليه ان يمثل امام المحكمه الان). Usually ‘should’ is understood as the past tense of ‘shall’, and used in English to refer to the future in the past. In fact, ‘should’ is not used in this sense, but in the sense of ‘must’ only. In Arabic ‘should’ equal ‘must’, ‘should’ is always translated into (يجب ان) e. g. “you should say everything”: ((يجب عليك ان تقول كل شي) , or “I should believe my parents” ((يجب علي ان اصدق والدي).

Modalities are, then, problematic. Their main problem may lie in the lack of one single, unchanging meaning for each of them. Understanding the grammatical functions of possibility, permission, politeness, expectancy, and ability 'May help the translators to distinguish the different meanings and functions of modals which could assist in distinguishing the different meanings of modals in Arabic (Ghazala, 1995/2008, p. 40).

Attention should be given to the difference in Arabic between the common meaning and the unusual meaning of a modal. ‘will’ for instance, has a common meaning of referring to the future as (سـ \ سوف) in Arabic. But it has an unusual meaning of (اذا امكن \ بالامكان) to make a polite request. For the sake of illustration and comparison, ‘will’ is translated in the following example into its (1) common, and then

(2) unusual meaning respectively: 'Will you open the window, please; it is too warm'

(1) هل سوف تفتح النافذه من فضلك, فالجو حار \ (2) هل بإمكانك فتح النافذه من فضلك, فالجو حار

Anyhow, the two translations show that the second is more conceivable, as the future is irrelevant here. The same comparison can be helpful with 'could', 'would', 'must', and 'should' in particular. Nevertheless, 'will', 'would', and 'shall' are used to refer to the future, but they are not translated into verbs in Arabic, but then into the future particles (سـ \ سوف). However, consideration should be taken that they have other meanings such as implying a polite request/willingness (i.e. will), a possibility, permission and/or politeness (i.e. would), or an obligation (i.e. shall, should). These meanings have their equivalents in Arabic, as the previous discussion confirms (Ghazala, 2004).

In her book, titled "In Other Words" (2013, p. 206), Baker reveals that it is quite a challenging task to translate modality from English into Arabic, and vice versa, because of the fact that English modals are grammatical auxiliaries, whereas Arabic modals are mainly lexical. English modals can be divided into "action" modals, which express permission, recommendation or prohibition; and "belief" modals, which express the speaker's beliefs about the possibility of a particular situation.

However, the message that the translator intends to communicate may be altered by the use of various grammatical forms in the SL and the TL. Therefore, to convey the message by translating the exact or equivalent meaning of the SL, the translator should take into consideration some types of shifts, for example, addition, omission, or 'transfer' the meaning of the TT (Sarcivic, 2010).

According to Mona Baker (2004), the strategy of translating using a cultural substitution is used to substitute "a culture-specific item or expression with a target language item which does not have the same propositional meaning but is likely to

have a similar impact on the target reader”.

Translating is not to say the same thing in another tongue; it includes the consciousness of various culture and different types of custom and degrees of expressions. A professional translator is not only focus on the linguistic language itself, but also acquiring extensive knowledge from miscellaneous fields.

Palmer, in his book on "Mood and Modality" (2001), stated that it would probably be a contradiction to depict modality as belonging to the 'semantic-grammatical' category unless it refers to a very limited set of modal auxiliary verbs. However, even this set includes cases where semantic and grammatical criteria conflict with, rather than complement, one another. Any attempt to define modality both semantically and syntactically can only end in a predicament. Kiefer (1994, p. 2514) maintains a philosophical view by referring to modality as "the gelatinization of the validity of sentence meanings to a set of possible worlds." Debates about possible worlds can thus be interpreted as debates about the ways in which people could perceive the world to be different. As such, modality is regarded as a common linguistic phenomenon regardless of the way in which it is comprehended.

This specific pattern of describing modality is of unique significance to the current research as it relates modality to a variety of semantic and pragmatic principles which are regarded as pertinent to its definition. This significance originates from the fact that translation generally, and legal translation specifically, has to abide by these principles so as to create the 'dynamic equivalence' necessary for the highest assurance of quality in the translation (Asensio, 2003).

In considering modality from a linguistic point of view, linguists also mention other linguistic and semantic types, such as mood, and aspect, tense (Lyons, 1989, p. Palmer, 1986; Huddleston, 1984). Although this may be true, it is of little significance

to the current work purely because this study is exclusively aimed at comprehending modality in relation to a succession of abstract logical concepts such as subjectivity vs. objectivity, factuality vs. non-factuality, proposition vs. event and possibility vs. necessity, and permission vs. obligation, which are entrenched in legal texts, and which stand for the fundamental aspects of these texts.

2.3.1 Translation Studies

The primary purpose of translation studies is to function as a means of communication among peoples of two languages across cultures. Translation is a need for nations to communicate and interchange their sciences, literatures and cultures. In the past few decades, the act of translation has been further advanced because of the growth in international trade, increased migration, globalization, the acknowledgement of linguistic minorities, and the development of the mass media and technology. Therefore, the translator plays a vital role as a bilingual or multi-lingual cross-cultural communicator of culture and truths by endeavouring to decipher concepts and speech in various texts as dependably and precisely as possible. For language, as Sherry Simon (1996) points out, does not simply mirror reality, but intervenes in the shaping of meaning, translators are directly involved in that shaping process, whether the text they are dealing with is an instructional context, a legal document, a novel or political draft. However, there are some difficulties faced in the translation processes when the concept is transferred from one setting into another due to the divergences between the source language and the target language especially when the two languages belongs to two different families like Arabic and English (Aoudi, 2001).

Most translation scholars, theorists and linguists such as Catford (1965), Baker (1992), Vinay and Darbelnet (1958), Nida and Taber (1969), Pym (2010), Munday and Hatim (2004), and Newmark (1981) agree that translation is a communicative process from a foreign language to the mother tongue and vice versa, which is frequently

considered as the task of transferring meaning from a source language to the target language. It is apparent that this definition is based on two terms, namely, 'transferring' and 'meaning'. The first term points to the translation process, which has to do with two languages, since translation is typically a form of communication between two languages, namely the language we translate from, which is known as the source language (SL), and the language we translate into, which is known as the target language (TL). So, whatever activities we are involved in within the same language fall under what is generally defined as intra-lingual communication. For example, paraphrasing, explanation, and interpretation are intra-lingual and not inter-lingual communication (Zethsen, 2007). The second term in the above definition tells us that the main concern of translators is to capture or convey meaning in inter-lingual communication. Therefore, translation is considered a unique linguistic device which has the very important task of conveying the sense of the text from one language to another. This is what Newmark (1988) calls "service translation." However, the translation process is made up of deciphering the meaning of a text in one language and changing that meaning into another language. Thus, the translation must convey the same message from the original, or source, text into the target text in the other language (Newmark, 1991, p. 27).

Translation is important in all fields of human life mainly in the legal field since it is considered as an essential issue for each individual, group or country in shaping people's lives. People are interested in watching, reading, or listening to what happen around them by different means of media not only in their own language but also in other languages through different translated texts which could be available on online websites, TV shows, newspapers, magazines and books (Baker, 1992). Yet, translating a source text into a target one in a different language is not an easy process, since in translation translators have to change the structure of the source language to adopt the

one in the target language. Consequently, translators must be aware of conveying the communicative meaning of the SL, that is, while translating from the SL to the TL, sometimes the meaning of the SL becomes weak. For example, translators may fail to translate the modals into the TL correctly (Baker, 1995). Thus, translators must comprehend some strategies and techniques which are used to translate the modals from the SL to the TL (Al-Sanjary, 2006). Therefore, this study will examine how the English modals are translated into Arabic and what the translation techniques have been used with reference to UN resolutions.

2.4 Literature Review

Klaudia Gibová (2012) conducted a study titled *Translation Procedures in the Non-literary and Literary Text Compared* (based on the analysis of an European Union institutional-legal text) to examine translation procedures that occur in a similar non-literary and literary text corpus comprised of a particular EU institutional-legal document translated from English into Slovak. The selected translation procedures model by Vinay and Darbelnet (1958/1995) has been presented to prepare the ground for the ensuing corpus text analysis. Moreover, she proposes that when doing a translation from any English text, it is important to steer clear of those passive constructions that are so prevalent in the SL being analysed, which would sound awkward in the TL.

Overall, Gibová (2011) mentioned that the use of Vinay and Darbelnet's modulation procedure in the corpus has been affected by the differences arising from various views concerning the extra-linguistic realities, cultures and language structure between English and Slovak. When making a comparison of English and Slovak (non-) literary texts, it would be impossible to ignore obvious deviations of lexico-syntactic TL components from their original positions in the ST.

In addition, another difference between both texts has to do with the use of modulation. Even though modulation at the syntactic level (purported to be pure modulation) takes place to the same degree in both texts, modulation in the lexicon is more abundant (but typologically less diverse) in the non-literary text, which goes against expectations concerning the nature of literary modulation generally, and Alcaraz and Hughes' hypothesis (2002, p. 185) specifically.

Finally, Gibová stated that the expansion procedures are obviously the outcomes of the legal context (e.g. explicitation of standard legal abbreviations) or are related to an additional repeated specialized term. However, the Slovak language version carried a striking explanation of the legal information that was completely left out of the English text. One possible reason for this could be that the EU translators might have checked with either another language version of the document that has this piece of information (which is the usual practice in the EU situation), or they may have looked for it on their own in order to attain some standard of legal precision. What is important to emphasize after conducting the empirical contrastive text analysis is that translation procedures can be regarded as a universal aspect of any text when making comparisons between languages, given the linguistic and cultural differences between the ST and the TT. To conclude, a comparison of the ST and the TT shows that the TT has a rather poor quality. In addition to that, the reasonable method for legal translation is believed to be semantic translation with the ST's style and format being preserved. Culture cannot possibly be translated because there are no pertinent situational aspects in the TL (Zelenka, 2012).

Nida (1984) introduces a wealth of information with regard to issues on the loss in translation, especially concerning the problems faced by translators when they come across terms or concepts in the SL that are non-existent in the TL. Newmark (1991) has also briefly discussed the divergence in translation. Catford (1965) demonstrates that as

linguistic un-translatability, which is caused by the difference between the Source Language (SL) and the Target Language (TL), whereas Weston (1991, p. 9) indicates that translation problems revolve around surmounting the conceptual variations between the SL and TL.

Givón (1978) clarifies that most of the issues concerning translation are not caused by the expressive power or expressive inability of a given language, but because of the “complexity of constraints involving semantic or syntactic structure, verb classification, case making, noun gender, modals, and other factors,” which the translator has to handle in terms of discourse parallels. There are certain features that are deemed to be challenging, namely word formation, nouns and pronouns, verbs, adjectives, modals, word order, syntax, and particles, which are discussed with regard to their translatability from the ST (Arabic) to the TLs (English, and French).

In her thesis, Wided (2010) investigates how English, French and Arabic translations articulate deontic modality in drug information leaflets and why these concepts are used in these types of documents, and how the translation may affect the content of the leaflets from one language to another. She did a descriptive analysis of a sample of six (6) leaflets, with each leaflet giving a translation of the same version in English, French and Arabic. Finally, she was able to prove that each of the three highlighted languages has its own structures, styles and preferences with regard to the articulation of deontic modality in drug information leaflets, and that the use of deontic modality in these texts is purposely meant to provide information in an ambiguous and indistinct manner. However, there were slight changes in expressing deontic modality among the three languages which Arabic translation dominated on the highest degree of deontic modals then English and the last was French. She also mentioned that despite the notable differences and preferences that apply particularly to each of the three languages, these languages are likely to use expressions of deontic modality to

manipulate changes in the attitude of patients, who generally make use of deontic modality in drug information leaflets to shirk any form of responsibility.

Ouided (2009) in her MA thesis on “Problems in Translating tenses from English into Arabic”, she concludes that the diversity between Arabic and English does not stop at the level of culture but extends to reach the grammatical level and especially tenses and modals which reflect the meaning. So, this diversity obliges linguists and scholars to find the equivalents of sixteen English tenses in Arabic which consists of two tenses only. Consequently, this leads to the creation of subdivisions which called ‘particles’ of these two Arabic tenses in order to suit the English meaning of tenses and modals.

Nadjib (2001) itemized sixteen tenses in English in addition to the imperative, which consist four main tenses which are past, present, future and future in the past or conditional and within each tense of these there are four types which are the simple, the continuous, the perfect, and the perfect continuous. However, there are no precise equivalents in Arabic for various English tenses which somehow impress the semantic and syntactic meaning in Arabic.

As Wang Ning (2002) claims, translation has a dual function in international cultural dialogues in the sense that it is not only a colonizing but also a decolonizing tactic in the changing aspects of cultural representation and interpretation. Translation studies originate from comparative literature and contrastive analysis, and involve the communication of meanings between two different language systems and cultures. As noted by Munday (2013, p. 1), translation, by nature, is both multilingual and interdisciplinary.

2.5 Summary

This chapter describes the theoretical framework which is adapted from Coates (1983), Vinay and Darbelnet's taxonomy of translation techniques (1995), and the methods applied in this study. The discussion focuses on the scale of modal auxiliaries in relation of degree of possibility and degree of obligation by Coates (1983) from one hand, and focuses on the techniques of translating modals from English into Arabic by Vinay and Darbelnet's (1977) taxonomy of translation techniques from the other hand. Also provides readers a better understanding about the concept of Modals between English and Arabic in the UN texts. It is followed by detailed reviewing previous studies about modality and modal auxiliaries and the semantic features of each language. Moreover, this chapter also provides the review of previous studies on analysing the use of modal auxiliaries from different perspectives, aside with translation of modals and translation techniques. The next chapter describes the theoretical framework adopted for this study as well as the methodology.

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3. Introduction

A research methodology is operated as a tool and way of answering the research questions. It also targets to describe the study data, illustrate a sample of the corpus, present the source of the data, expose the data analysis and discuss how they are going to be applied and to be worked to meet the objectives of this study and to find out answers to its questions. As stated in chapter one, this study is an attempt to identify the English modals and Arabic equivalents used in the United Nations resolutions texts during the war on Gaza from 2008 till 2012 due to, the selection criteria were based on the significant content due to involving the utmost number of modal auxiliaries in these resolutions during this specific period and the copious usage of English modals in each resolution.

Section 3.2 recaps the theoretical background adopted in this study. Section 3.3 discusses the theoretical framework which will be explained fully in this Chapter. Section 3.4 provides detailed explanation about research design, in terms of justifications, data collection, data organization and data categorization. The analysis of this section is based on a descriptive and comparative methodology. Therefore; Coate's (1983) Typology of semantic categorization of modal auxiliaries will be employed, to identify the English typology of modals and its semantic meaning with Arabic translation used in UN resolutions. The study will also use Vinay and Darbelnet's model of translation techniques (1958/1995) to identify the Arabic equivalents of English modals and the techniques used in translating the United Nations resolutions.

3.1 Theoretical Background

For the purpose of this study, the United Nations resolutions on Gaza war as mentioned earlier and its translation into Arabic was selected from which the English modal terms were extracted from the source texts and then analyzed. These selected resolutions texts contain numerous examples of modal terms and concepts. Also, all Arabic modal equivalents were extracted from the target texts in units of lexis, phrase, and clause. The procedures and methods applied on the extracted data were examined and in cases that the source language terms do not have a proper equivalent or lacked a translation, alternatives were suggested. Data was classified according to Coate's (1983) typology of modal auxiliaries (Depraetere, Ilse, and Susan Reed, 2006, p. 277) and later the data analyzed according to Vinay and Darbelnet's (1995), cited in Munday 2010: 56) " Vinay and Darbelnet's" modal, also cited in L. Venuti (ed.) (2004, p. 128–37) 'A methodology for translation'.

Coates's semantic categorization of modal auxiliaries (1983) is adapted into the current study. Coates has carried out an investigation of modal auxiliaries in the form of large-scale corpus, both written and spoken. She finds out that certain modal auxiliaries share certain semantic meanings. This finding corresponds with Palmer's suggestion (1979) as cited in Perkins (1983, p. 27), by which he says that "we can look for a fairly general common meaning or a set of closely related meanings for each modal." Coates (1983) present the meanings and function of each English modal with examples in detailed in the previous chapter.

Vinay and Darbelnet's model of translation techniques (1995) is adopted into the present study. The model aims at providing the techniques of translating the modals from the English text into the Arabic text on three different levels: lexis, syntactic structure, and message, or for the discovery of the modal meanings between the TT and

the ST on the same three levels. Given the fact that Vinay and Darbelnet's taxonomy of translation techniques is one of the earliest and one of the widely-accepted and / or discussed lists of translation techniques, it will be discussed in this chapter in full with examples taken not only from French and English but also from Arabic. These examples of translation procedures and techniques are presented abundantly in Table 2.3 in the previous chapter.

3.3 Theoretical Framework

3.3.1 Coates's (1983), Semantic categorization of Modal auxiliaries

In the study of modal auxiliaries, Coates (1983) has made use of the term semantic cluster wherein the modal auxiliaries are categorized based on the semantic structures. Such semantic clusters are distinct and are closely related to semantic concepts inclusive of epistemic possibility, intention/prediction/futurity, obligation/necessity, possibility/probability/ability/permission (Coates, 1983, p. 27). Modals for semantic cluster of obligation/necessity are lexicalized in the modals SHOULD, MUST, and OUGHT. Modals for possibility/ability/permission include CAN and COULD. While the modals for epistemic possibility are that of MAY and MIGHT, according to Wen (2013, P. 45) she presents the meanings and functions of such modal auxiliaries based on Coates (1983) in table 3.1 below.

Table 3.1: The semantic meaning of modal auxiliaries according to Wen (2013) based on Coates (1983)

Semantic Cluster	The modal Auxiliaries	Semantic Meaning	Paraphrase
Modal auxiliaries of ability/possibility/permission	CAN	ability	It is able to...(inherent properties allow x to do)
		possibility	It is possible that...(external circumstances allow x to do)
		permission	It is permissible...(human authority/rules and regulations allow x to do)
	COULD	Epistemic possibility	It is possible that...
		Past of can	
		-root ability	X was able to
		-root possibility	It was possible for
		-root permission	It was permissible for
		Remote of can (conditional)	
		-root ability	X would be able to
		-root possibility	It would be possible for
		-root permission	It would be permissible for

Continued

Semantic Cluster	The modal Auxiliary	Semantic meaning	Paraphrases
Modals of epistemic possibility	MAY	Epistemic possibility	It is possible that...
		Root meaning -root possibility -root permission	It is possible for... It is allowed to...
		benediction	It is hoped that...
	MIGHT	Epistemic possibility	It is possible that...
		Past of MAY -root possibility -root permission	It was possible for x X was allowed to...
		Remote of MAY -root possibility -root permission	It would be possible for x It would be permissible for x

Semantic Cluster	The modal	Semantic Meaning	Paraphrase
Modals of necessity/obligation	SHOULD	Epistemic	I think it is probable that... (based on the facts known to the speaker)
		Root	Weak sense Subjective=advise Objective=describing correct procedure. Strong sense Meaning of moral obligation
		Epistemic hypothetical meaning	Intend to do x (unreal condition)
	OUGHT	Epistemic	I assume that/probability
		Root	I advise you/it is advisable
	MUST	Epistemic	It is necessary for (logic necessity)
		Root	It is obligatory for...

Continued

Semantic cluster	The modal	Semantic meaning	paraphrase
Modals of volition/prediction/futurity	WILL	Epistemic meaning Predictability	I (confidently) predicate that it is the case of p (prediction refers to an event in the present)
		Prediction	I predict that...(event happen in the future.)
		Root meaning Root volition	Someone is willing/wants /intents to do x
	WOULD	Epistemic meaning Past of WILL	
		Predictability	X confidently predict that WAS/ it is predictable that
		prediction	X predicted that y (indirect or free indirect speech)
		Root meaning Past of WILL -root volition	Was willing to/ wanted/intended to x
		Hypothetical meaning	
		-hypothetical of root WILL=volition	Hypothetical form of root WILL=Willing to/intent to
		-hypothetical form of WILL=prediction	If x, you will y (WOULD +infinite)
	SHALL (restricted to first person subject)	Epistemic meaning prediction	 it is predictable that/or interpreted as markers of futurity
		Root meaning	
		-root intention -Addressee's volition -root obligation	-I intent to do x -Do you want me to do x... -It is obligated to do (formal legal text)

Discussion of the negation of modal auxiliary is also included in this study. Coates (1983) has pointed out that if the modal expresses root meaning, the negation effects the modal predication, and if the modal expresses epistemic meaning, the negation effects the main predication. Discussion on the negation of selected modal auxiliaries will imply the relationship between the modal negation and the certain kind of persuasion expressed. As seen in Table 3.2, the negated modals, with the respective paraphrases to show the difference between root and epistemic modality.

Table 3.2: Negation of modal auxiliaries according to Wen (2013, P. 49) based on Coates (1983, P. 238)

O.	Epis temic/root	The negation	Modal prediction	Main prediction
	Epistemic modals	I MAY not do x	It is possible	that I will not do x
		I MIGHT not do x		
		I WON'T do x	It is predictable	that I will not do x
		I SHALL not do x		
		It SHOULDN'T be x	I assume	that I won't be x
		It OUGHT not to be	It is probable	that it is not x
	Root modals	I CANNOT do x	It is not permissible	for me to do x
		I MAY not do x	I am not permitted	to do x
		I CANNOT/CAN'T do x	It is not possible	for me to do x
		I CANNOT/CAN'T do x	I am not able	to do x
		I WILL NOT/WON'T do x	I am not willing	to do x
		I WILL NOT/WON'T do x	I do not intend	to do x
		I SHALL not/SHAN'T do x	It is not advisable for me	to do x
		I SHOULD not do x		to do x
		I NEEDN'T do x	It is not necessary for me	to do x

The rational of adapting Coates's framework (1983) into this study is that, from the researcher's personal view, Coates's semantic indeterminacy approach is more scientific, because it is more consistent with human cognition. An outstanding point of Coates's study is her self-established two large data corpus containing both written and spoken language and formal and informal situations and both quantitative and qualitative analyses are applied into her study, which makes the findings more reliable. Based on her corpora, she accommodates the richness of comprehensible interpretation of each modal verb and also summarizes their syntactic characteristics, which makes a further development in the study of English modal verbs. In addition, Coates' study includes the modal auxiliaries studied in current research. Hence, in this study, her framework is adapted to analyze the meaning and function of modal verbs written in UN resolutions.

3.3.2 Vinay and Darbelnet's (1958/1995) taxonomy of translation techniques

There are seven techniques of translation mentioned in the book *Comparative Stylistics of French and English: a Methodology for Translation* written by Vinay and Darbelnet (1958/1995). Such techniques are divided into two methods, namely, (1) direct or literal translation (which is divided further into three techniques: borrowing, calque, and literal translation) and (2) oblique or free translation (which is divided further into four: adaptation, equivalence, modulation, and transposition). These techniques are presented in Table 3.3 below.

Table 3.3: Vinay and Darbelnet's taxonomy of translation techniques (1958/1995).

Unite 1	Vinay and Darbelnet's Translation Techniques: Direct Translation Techniques 1.1 Borrowing, Adoption or Loan Words 1.2 Calque or Loan Translation 1.3 Literal Translation
Unite 2	Indirect (or Oblique) Translation Techniques 2.1 Transposition or shifts 2.2 Modulation 2.3 Equivalence 2.4 Adaptation or cultural equivalence

3.3.2.1 Direct and oblique translation

Translators can make use of either (1) structural parallelism based on the similar categories found in the SL and TL or (2) metalinguistic parallelism based on the similarity of concepts between SL and TL. In the case of gaps or lacunae, various elements are used. In the event that syntactic and lexical problems arise in translation, oblique translation methods, which are enumerated as follows, are used:

Procedure 1: Borrowing

Borrowing is most often employed in translation due to its cultural significance and semantic load and lends the preservation of linguistic and cultural features of the source language. For example, Arabic language has the words “intifadah”, “nakbah”, “Shariah”, “ummah”, “solat”, “mushawarat”, among others, which are of religious and cultural significance and are deemed untranslatable.

Examples of borrowing from English into Arabic include Radio راديو, Television تلفاز, Bank براندي Brandy, كمبيوتر Computer.etc in Arabic words like ديموقراطي, ديكاتورى, إمبريالية, which are used in politics, are borrowed from the English / French words democratic, dictatorial, imperialism, democratization, bourgeoisie and the words

فونيم, مورفيم, تاكميم, which are used in linguistics, are borrowed from English /French phoneme, morpheme, tagmeme. This phenomenon is known in Arabic as Arabization and such words are called Arabized words.

Procedure 2: Calque (loan-words)

Similar to borrowing, calque is concerned with borrowing the expression from one language to another, and literally translates its features. Calques are in the form of either (1) lexical calque, which respects the syntactic structure of the TL such as حرب باردة (cold war) or (2) structural calque, which borrows expression forms from other language صلب القضية (the heart of the matter).

Procedure 3: Literal Translation

Word for word translation or literal translation refers to the direct transfer of a SL text into structural and semantic equivalence in the TL. This is one of a kind solution particularly done in the languages belonging to one language family and having cultural similarity like the Indo-European languages in Western Europe.

Consider the following two sentences: (1) He *looked* at the map; (2) He *looked* the picture of health (Vinay & Darbelnet). The first one can be translated literally into Arabic as نظر إلى الخريطة or into any other languages but we cannot translate the second sentence in the same way. كان يبدو صورة الصحة is simply meaningless, on the other hand كان يبدو في صحة جيدة " او " كانت تبدو عليه علامات الصحة" is much acceptable.

Procedure 4: Transposition

Transposition is a method that replaces a lexical category according to the syntax of the particular language but not affecting the message. This method has two types, namely, obligatory transposition and optional transposition. An example of transposition is: English “hand written” (noun + participle) becomes in Arabic مكتوب باليد

(passive participle + preposition and accusative noun), and إدارتها ادارة فعالة operating it effectively (obligatory). He heard noise when he got up استيقاظه سمع ضجة عند (optional).

Procedure 5: Modulation

Modulation is a method that deals with the change of viewpoint to prevent unacceptability and ungrammaticality in the TL. Modulation has two types: (1) optional modulation, which deals with the bilingual knowledge of words, terms, and expressions that are frequently used, this type of modulation involve basically two processes: negated contrary, He acted at once لم يتردد في التصرف, impersonal or active for passive modulation, He is said to be serious يقولون بأنه يتحلى بالجدية, and reordering of elements in the sentence, عامله ايدي workers, (2) obligatory modulation, which deals with those words, terms, and expressions that are already used in dictionaries and grammar books such as; if one translates حجة باردة (cold argument) as 'weak argument'.

Procedure 6: Equivalence

Due to differences in stylistics and structures of languages, the equivalences can be used in texts. Translators can make use of morphological equivalences belonging to onomatopoeia or those used idiomatically such as: Birds of a feather flock together الطيور علي اشكالها تقع.

Procedure 7: Adaptation

Adaptation is employed in translation when there is no equivalence in the TL due to the semantic and cultural loads of the word, term or expression in the SL. Some techniques employed are; 'transfer, addition, omission, and compensation' based on Newmark, (1988b, p. 90), and Harvey (2000, p. 5). This technique is valuable in translating cultural-specific terms and expressions 'He shook me by the hand', is conveniently translated into Arabic as " شد علي يدي بحرارة " since the English people rarely shake hands.

3.3.2.2 Techniques and Procedures of Translation

Translation, as described and discussed above with examples, is all about the meaning or message which is communicated from one language (the source) to another (target or receptor). All in all, every translation act depends on techniques or procedures, such as transposition, transliteration or modulation, which may assist the translator to convey the message in a proper way from ST to the TT. As for transliteration, it is an interpretation of one language in form and pronunciation through the use of the alphabet of another language. For instance, 'Alhamdu Lillah' is a transliteration of an Arabic expression by means of the English alphabet. This method is primarily employed for the teaching of a foreign language through the use of the alphabet of the native language of the learner. This is to help the learner for the time being in the pronunciation of the target language until he is able to master the alphabet of that language. Therefore, the main difference between translation and transliteration lies in the meaning and form, where translation has to do with the meaning or message, while transliteration has to do with the form i.e. pronunciation.

Vinay and Darbelnet (1995), summarised translation procedures to seven different ones. They have differentiated two basic translation methods: direct (literal) translation and indirect (oblique) translation. The first three procedures fall into the first categories, borrowing, calque, and literal translation, while the second category falls into four, which encompasses transposition, modulation, equivalence and adoption. This unit will focus on the indirect (oblique) translation, where the expertise of the translator is put to the test. This unit will use translation from English to Arabic as its reference point.

According to Vinay and Darbelnet (1958, p. 61-64), in a literal translation, the source language meaning can be translated entirely into the target language because the meaning has to do with similar types or ideas. Oblique translation is employed when

there are gaps in the target language which have to be filled by some corresponding meaning so that the message or sense is the same for both the source and the target languages. Oblique translation must also be employed when certain structural or metalinguistic differences exist in the language so that the impact of particular styles cannot be communicated without making drastic semantic or lexical changes. Because of the existence of structural or metalinguistic differences between the languages involved in the translation process, the translator has to encounter situations where the impact of certain styles in the source language cannot be transferred into the target language without disturbing its syntax or even lexicon.

To be more precise, the translator must resort to oblique translation if the literally translated message either has a different meaning to the one in the source language, or corresponds to something in the metalinguistic of the target language but not at the same linguistic level. As an example, Vinay and Darbelnet (1958, p. 64/1995) take the following utterances: He looked at the map and He looked the picture of health, of which two examples the first can be translated literally to Arabic نظر إلى الخريطة, or into any other languages but cannot translate the second sentence in the same way for example like كان يبدو صورة الصحة, is simply meaningless, and must be translated more idiomatically "كان يبدو عليه علامات الصحة" or "كان يبدو في صحة جيدة" which more is acceptable. Vinay and Darbelnet's theory of translation procedures is so compact and relatively easy to understand, that there is no need to rephrase it. Next the writer will introduce the seven translation procedures paraphrase Vinay and Darbelnet writing closely.

The concept 'translation shift/transposition' had presented for the first time by Catford (1965) who also had developed a typology of translation transposition/shifts (Baker, 2005). After that, many linguists were interested in this subject and worked out many researchers and studies and then they have developed their own works by the

time, among these scholars; Vinay, Darbelnet, Popovič, Newmark, Leuven-Zwart, Toury and others. Gideon Toury is one important figure in translation studies in the last three decades who has made a comprehensive work on the notion of translation shift in 1980 and then he used the notion of shifts again in his analysis in (1995). However, Catford has the advantage not only being the first presenter of the concept ‘translation shift/ transposition’ but also elaborating and explaining it to some extent Catford (1965). Moreover, Baker (2004) argued that Catford notion on shift is clearly presented in any type of comparison between the SL text and the TL text and thus it is essential in described work in translation studies to practically all product-oriented, including both works that adopt linguistic perspective and the one which does not. However, for Baker, structural shift should not be restricted on.

Newmark (1988) discussed that the main aim of any translation is to accomplish ‘equivalent effect’ that means to create a closest effect, as close as possible, if not the same effect on the readership of the TL as it is achieved in the readership of the TL. ‘Equivalence response’ is another name of equivalence effect which Eugene Nida named it ‘dynamic equivalence’. As Newmark called it, ‘equivalence effect’ is the desirable result and not the target of a translation. Nonetheless, equivalent effect is not desirable but fundamental when translating the vocative texts in communicative translation (Newmark, 1988). It is the measure by which the effectiveness and the value as a result are to be evaluated. Then a percentage of the reader’s response is might be quantified to show the success rate of a translation. Moreover, equivalent effect is wished for informative texts, the SL and the TL culture should not be far away from each other in that the SL culture should be transferred by culturally neutral or generic terms (1988). It is wished that the TL reader reads the text in a parallel manner as the SL reader read the text. Meanwhile, the vocative text should be transferred with paying attention to the TL readership Newmark (1988).

However, one problem which rises in semantic translation is that there are individual readers not readership in case of imaginative literature (Newmark, 1988). One more problem is that although the reader is not the focus but the author's level, translators attempt to transfer the SL effect with the authors' level ignoring any supposed readership. Since the idea of the original text can go farther away any cultural limitation, the more universal the text, the more extensive equivalent effect is possible (1988). Nevertheless, when an authoritative statement is written in public language, translation should target the readership rather than specific readers and it has to present equivalent effect (Newmark, 1988). Finally, the conjectural principal; 'equivalent effect' is an important concept in translation which might be tested, but in vain, however it is helpful to discuss the concept 'equivalent effect' rather than to test it (1988).

Newmark argues that semantic translation and communicative translation are the only methods which fulfil the two main means of translation. The two main means of translation are firstly, accuracy, and secondly, economy (1988). Generally, semantic translation is more considered as an economy than communicative translation but not in case of poor written text (1988). On the one hand, semantic translation is written at the author's linguistic level. On the other hand, communicative translation is written at the readership's linguistic level (Newmark, 1988). Moreover, semantic translation is applied in the expressive texts however communicative translation is applied in the informative and vocative texts (1988).

3.2 Research Design

In this section, the main focus is on discussing data collection, data coding, and data analyzing.

3.2.1 Data

The research data is based on 30 written texts from a total of 10 resolutions about the Gaza war from 2008 till 2012, quoted from the United Nations General Assembly official website. The selection criteria were based on the significant content of resolution and the copious usage of more than 30 English modals in each resolution. English is the source text and Arabic translation is the target text as it mentioned in the first page of every resolution. This study is important as any mistranslation of the English modals into Arabic may spoil the communicative meaning of the SL and contributes to the loss of essential information from both texts, especially in cases related to UN resolutions in which its translation should not contain any mistakes as the nation's fate may rely on their content. Here is the dual websites of English as ST: <http://www.un.org/en/ga/> Arabic as the TT: <http://www.un.org/ar/ga/>.

3.4.2 Justification of the Corpus Selection

A corpus is targeted to represent the research sample which is defined as a group of selected texts which are in return selected carefully to display the importance of its content. Thus, stratified sampling used here to satisfy and cover the main modal which took place at the same time of the research data collection period from 2008 until 2012. Due to limited time frame and facility, electronic data is chosen such as those that can be found in the websites. Furthermore, a range of 30 texts have been chosen which can be accessed and highlighted in order to conduct a comparison between the English source text of UN resolution and its Arabic equivalences.

3.2.3 Data Coding

Data coding is conducted into the following two steps, data organization and data categorization:

3.2.3.1 Data Organization

The purpose of organizing data is to build an index which can easily identify the position of each present modal auxiliary in data corpus. Based on this purpose, researcher carries out three phases within data organization.

Phase One: label the source text as ST. Hence; the first text is labeled as ST1, the second text ST2...till to ST30. Phase Two: label the target text as TT. Hence, the first text is labeled as TT1, second TT2 and so on. Phase Three: label the back translation text as BT, hence, the first text is labeled as BT1, the second BT2 and so on. After these three phases are carried out, the modal verbs found in each text are easily identified accordingly.

In order to find answer to each research question, at first; the researcher will highlight the English modal markers and identify the translation techniques used by the UN translators in translating these modals into Arabic so that to determine the Arabic equivalents used in the UN resolutions, and finally to examine any differences in meaning reflected upon the quality of English texts.

3.2.3.2 Data Categorization

Modal auxiliaries in the selected texts are grouped by Coates's semantic categorization (1983), Vinay and Darbelnet's taxonomy of translation techniques (1995) which has been discussed in section 3.1. The example of how to code data is shown in the following table 3.1:

TEXT 1

ST: 'Israel should release Palestinians detained in Israeli prisons in connection with the occupation'

TT: "بأن تقوم إسرائيل بإطلاق سراح الفلسطينيين المحتجزين في السجون الإسرائيلية فيما يتصل بالاحتلال"

BT: "*that may Israel release Palestinian detainees in prisons Israeli with regard the occupation*"

TEXT 2

ST: ‘The release of children should be an utmost priority. The Mission further recommended that Israel should cease the discriminatory treatment of Palestinian detainees’

TT: وأوصت كذلك بأن يكون إطلاق سراح الأطفال إحدى الأولويات الكبرى في هذا الصدد. كما أوصت البعثة ' بأن توقف إسرائيل معاملة المحتجزين الفلسطينيين معاملة تمييزية

BT: “and recommended the mission that is releasing children one priority most in this matter, as recommended mission that stop Israel treating detainees Palestinians treat discriminatory”

TEXT 3

ST: ‘The rocket attacks into Israel should be ended, which should lead to a full withdrawal of Israeli forces from the area. That was all part of resolution 1860 (2009) and it should be implemented by Israel and Hamas’.

TT: يجب أن تنتهي الهجمات الصاروخية على إسرائيل ، والتي ينبغي أن تقود إلى الانسحاب الكامل للقوات الإسرائيلية من المنطقة. هذا كله كان جزء من القرار 1860 (2009) وينبغي أن ينفذ من قبل إسرائيل وحماس’

BT: ‘Must end rocket attacks on Israel, which should lead to the full withdrawal of Israeli forces from the area. This was all part of resolution 1860 (2009) should be implemented by Israel and Hamas.’

Table 3.4: Example of data coding in the above texts

Text No.	ST (Modal Auxiliary)	TT (Modal Auxiliary)	BT	Change or Retain of the Meaning	Semantic Meaning
1	Should	بأن تقوم	that	Change in meaning	It is probable that\
2		بأن	that	Retain in meaning	It is possible that\
3		يجب ان ينبغي ان	must	Retain in meaning	It is necessary that \

Example of translation procedure.

1. Literal translation procedure

This table 3.4 indicates that the first modal 'should' is identified in the first text (index ST1/TT1/BT1). Based on Coates's description of modal 'should', modal 'should' belongs to the semantic cluster of root necessity and carries the meanings of “root necessity” and “root possibility” and based on Vinay and Darbelnet's taxonomy operation of modal 'should' carry several meanings in Arabic Translation such as يجب ان \ بان \ ينبغي ان \ بان تقوم

The above example indicates that the modal 'should' in the ST sometimes translated into a verb or a particle بان \ يجب ان \ بان تقوم. Moreover, verbs such as recommend or suggest occur with the subordinate clause, this clause normally has 'should' which is a grammatical rather than modal marker. Probably, in many languages, this 'should' may not be explicitly translated.

In terms of epistemic meaning, namely, confident inference, there are several occurrences from modal 'should'. It is easily identified that the highest occurrence belongs to the modal 'should', which signify meaning of weak obligation and necessity. According to Coates (1983, p. 59), unlike modal 'must' which demands an action, modal 'should' is more frequently used to offer suggestions. At its strongest, 'should' take on the meaning of moral obligation or duty. The use of modal 'should' denote obligation and necessity will be discussed in the following chapter. The modal verb identified in each of those selected corpus is presented in Appendices section 1 for English and section 2 for Arabic. Based on what have been mentioned above, it shows how data coding is carried out.

It is noticed from the table above that, each English modals have various meanings in Arabic which sometime attain or change the meaning of the target text. Application of the seven techniques of Vinay and Darbelnet's techniques, which are: (Borrowing, Calque, Literal Translation, Transposition, Modulation, Equivalence, Adaptation).

However, these techniques are used in different levels and expressions in the Arabic texts than English, somehow throughout the prior four texts. Also, it is noticed that Arabic text has more lexical modals than English do, where Arabic text uses varieties of lexical terms to express modality which sometime verb or particle or adverb. It is clear that several of above techniques might be used within the same sentence in order to identify the Arabic equivalent along with the semantic and linguistic structures. Consequently, each text has a number of different techniques/ procedures due to that the same text may be repeatedly analyzed with different techniques/ procedures.

3.4 Summary

This chapter has presented a brief recap on the theoretical background which is adapted from Coates (1983), Vinay and Darbelnet's of translation techniques (1995), and focus on the research design and data collection, data categorization, and data analyses. The following chapter will discuss the findings of the analysis.

CHAPTER FOUR

DATA ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

4.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the data analyses and findings. The analyses cover: (1) the types of translation techniques which occur in the Arabic texts when translating English United Nations resolution into Arabic based on Vinay and Darbelnet's (1995) Modal of translation techniques, (2) the English modals and Arabic equivalents used in the UN resolutions based on Coates's Modal of Semantic Typology (1983). The analyses apply on the research corpus which is 30 selected texts from the English and Arabic version of UN resolutions on Gaza war from 2008 until 2012. Moreover, the findings shed-light on (1) the types of translation techniques which occur in the Arabic texts when translating English United Nations resolution into Arabic, and (2) the English modals and Arabic equivalents used in the UN resolutions, (3) the quality of the target text messages after applying these techniques and the differences reflected in the meaning between English and Arabic in the light of Vinay and Darbelnet's Modal of translation techniques (1995).

4.2 Data Analysis and Findings

Dissimilarities among the grammatical systems of languages necessitate shifts in textual aspects. It requires a transposition (changes) of expression, lexis, and syntactic structure, message, etc (Munday, 2008, p. 58). This section presents the analysis and findings of the 30 texts, under (7) techniques/ procedure of translation based on Vinay and Darbelnet's (1995) Modal. Several of these techniques can be used within the same sentence, due to that the same text may be repeatedly analyzed with different

techniques/ procedures to find out the divergence in meaning. The following example contains the source text and the target text followed by its back translation and transliteration in order to explain the data. A written analysis is applied to figure out and explain the grammatical changes (I.e. syntactic, meaning, ideology) which occur sometimes in the target text.

The researcher has discussed the types of translation procedures based on Vinay and Darbelnet's (1995) Modal in the previous chapter and they would be repeated here for the purpose of guidance along this chapter:

4.2.1 Literal Translation Procedure

TEXT 1

ST: In paragraph 1972 (e) of its report, the Mission recommended that Israel should release Palestinians detained in Israeli prisons in connection with the occupation.

TT: وأوصت البعثة، في الفقرة 1972 (هـ) من تقريرها، بأن تقوم إسرائيل بإطلاق سراح الفلسطينيين المحتجزين في السجون الإسرائيلية فيما يتصل بالاحتلال

BT: 'The mission recommended, in paragraph 1972 (e) of its report, that is required for Israel to release Palestinian prisoners held in Israeli jails in relation with the occupation'.

Transliteration: *Wa Awsat Al-Beitha, Fe Al-Faqra 1972 (H) Min Taqreriha, Be An Taqoum Israel Be Itlaq Saraah Al-Felastineen Al-Mohtajazeen Fe Al-Sejoun A-Israeliya Fema Yata'alaq Be Al-Ehtilal.*

Referring to the previous example 4.2.1 it shows that the translator used literal translation to convey the direct meaning of the source language text to the target language text, but it seems that the lexical “بأن تقوم”, that, *Be An Taqoum*” in the TL text is somehow implicitly convey literal meaning of 'Should' ,doing that, be an taqoum' in the SL text. In English ‘Should’ has direct function to mean indirectly way as “must or have to”, unlike Arabic which is the meaning of 'بأن تقوم' , 'doing that, *be an taqoum*' is optional in the TL and does not functioning as 'يجب' 'must' , indirectly the meaning is

quite same and directly the structure is altered, nevertheless these changes degraded the meaning of modal form from one class into another (necessity into possibility) which (modals) implicitly considers predominant in the structure of Arabic sentence and carries significant information.

For example, the SL sentence shows more authority and stating it is necessity by saying that there is no room for Israel to temporize releasing the Palestinians detained. Unlike the TL sentence which does not necessitate but solicit Israel to release the Palestinian's detained. Anyhow it is obvious from the aforementioned example to see how the task of translation could be problematic and tragic in such significant resolutions among two states. This shows that in English the modal 'should' has only one direct meaning, unlike Arabic which has a variety of meanings such as possibility, probability, and necessity, eventhough many Arabic modals carries different meanings depending on their diacritization. Consequently, the message of the English ST is partially distorted.

TEXT 2

ST: Israel should immediately cease all its military attacks and scrupulously abide by all of its obligations, as the occupying Power, under international law and relevant United Nations resolutions.

TT: وعلى إسرائيل أن توقف فوراً جميع هجماتها العسكرية وتنفيذ جميع التزاماتها، بوصفها السلطة القائمة بالاحتلال، بموجب القانون الدولي وقرارات الأمم المتحدة ذات الصلة

BT: Israel should timely stop all its military attacks and strictly comply with all its obligations as the occupying power, under international law and relevant United Nations resolutions.

Transliteration: *Wa Ala Israel An Touqif Fawran Jamea'a Hajamatuha Al-Askariyah Wa Tataqaeid Be Jamea'a Iltizamatuha, Be Wasfiha Al-Sultah Al-Qaeimah Ba Al-Ihtelal, Be Moujab Al-Qanoon Al-Dawli Wa Qararat Al-Oumam Al-Moutahidah Zat Al-Selah.*

As notice in above example, the translator used literal translation to carry the direct sense of the source language into the target language; nevertheless it seems that some features in the conceptual elements and sentence structure have been affected

during the process of carrying the meaning from ST into TT. First and foremost, the modal “should” in the SL text has translated in the TL text into 'should, وعلي ان, *wa ala An*' which shows that the modal 'should' has been embedded with a preposition ' should, وعلي ان, *wa ala An*' that carried less assertion in the TL.

In English the modal should has obvious function to give indirect meaning as obligation “must or have to”, unlike Arabic which is the meaning of ' should ', وعلي ان, *wa ala An*' is optional in the TL and does not functioning as same as 'should'. Thus, tacitly the meaning is same but apparently the conceptual elements are partially changed due to ' should, وعلي ان, *wa ala An*' in Arabic usually preceded with a verb 'يجب,' such as 'يجب علي اسرائيل', however in the TT it is followed with a noun 'Israel' and omit the precedent 'يجب' to be علي اسرائيل, 'Israel should, *w ala Israel*'. However, the meaning of English modal which reveals obligation in the SL is partially missed in the TL, and replaced with preposition for unknown reason, which may be to achieve the desire of the Arabic style in the TL.

Ideologically, the SL sentence illustrate the UN power and affirming it is compulsory on Israel to immediately cease all military attacks on Gaza without any delay. In contrasting the TL sentence required Israel to cease the military attacks without any sense of obligation or viewing the power of United Nation over Israel. Nevertheless it is clear from the prior example that just how the mission of translation could be manipulated and cause problems more than offering solutions based on meaning.

TEXT 3

ST: "For all of these war crimes, State terrorism and systematic human rights violations committed against the Palestinian people, Israel, the occupying Power, must be held accountable and the perpetrators must be brought to justice.

TT: يجب محاسبة إسرائيل، السلطة القائمة بالاحتلال، على جميع جرائم الحرب هذه وعلى إرهاب الدولة وعلى ما ترتكبه في حق الشعب الفلسطيني من انتهاكات منهجية لحقوق الإنسان، وتقديم مرتكبيها إلى العدالة

BT: Israel must be accountable, the occupying power, for all of these war crimes, State terrorism and the war against the Palestinian people by systematic human rights violations and brought the perpetrators to justice

Transliteration: *Yajib Mohasabit Israel, Al-Soltah Al-Qaie'mah Be Al-Ihtilal, Ala Jamea' Jaraei'm Al-Harb Hazih Wa Ala Irhab Al-Dawlah Wa Alah Ma Tartakibuh Fe Haq Al-Shaieb Al-Filasteeni Min Intihakak Manhajiyah Lihuquq Al-Insan, Wa Taqdem Murtakibiha Ila Al-Adalah*

Discussing the previous example, the translator here employ literal translation technique to convey the direct meaning of the source language text to the target language text, it seems that the modal “must” in the SL is somehow implicitly convey the same meaning of ‘يجب’ must, *yajib*’ in the TL. In Arabic ‘يجب’, must, *yajib*’ has direct function to mean in direct way as “must or have to”. However, in the TT the translator used verbal sentence to show more authority and state the role of UN to brought Israel into accountability for its crimes. Accordingly, the translator sustains the same degree of obligation in both texts.

TEXT 4

ST: International humanitarian law is clear in that the protection of hospitals and medical teams shall not cease “unless they are used to commit, outside their humanitarian duties, acts harmful to the enemy”.

TT: القانون الإنساني الدولي واضح في نصه على أن حماية المستشفيات والطواقم الطبية لا يجوز أن تتوقف "إلا إذا استُخدمت، خروجاً على واجباتها الإنسانية، في أعمال تضر بالعدو"

BT: The International humanitarian law is clear in stating that the protection of hospitals, medical personnel may not stopped unless it is used, out from the humanitarian duties, in acts harmful to the enemy

Transliteration: *Al-Qanoon Al-Insani Al-Dawli Wadih Fe Nasoh Ala Ann Hedayit Al-Mostashfayat Wa Al-Tawaqim Al-Tibiyah La Yajouz Ann Tatawaqaf Ila Iza Istokhdimat, Khrojan Ala Wajibatuha Al-Insaniyah, Fe Aa'emal Tadour Be Aladow*

It has become commonplace to use literal translation technique in translating the English context of UN resolution into Arabic, in order to maintain the source text message and quality as well. The auxiliary phrase of English 'shall not cease' is in a textual equivalence with the verbal phrase of Arabic ' لا يجوز أن تتوقف ' may not cease, *la Yajouz Ann Tatawaqaf* '. Since English is an auxiliary phrase language and Arabic is a verbal phrase language, English auxiliary phrase is possible to be translated into Arabic verbal phrase. The translating of English 'shall not' into ' لا يجوز ', '*la Yajouz*' sustained the same message in the TT.

TEXT 5

ST: No general penalty, pecuniary or otherwise, shall be inflicted upon the population on account of the acts of individuals for which they cannot be regarded as jointly and severally responsible.

TT: لا يجوز فرض أي عقوبة جماعية، مالية أو غيرها، ضد السكان بسبب أعمال أفراد لا يمكن أن يكون هؤلاء السكان مسؤولين عنها بصفة جماعية.

BT: May not impose any penalty, pecuniary or otherwise, against the population because of the acts of individuals, which they cannot be responsible collectively.

Transliteration: *La Yajouz Fard Ayy Auqobah Jamaiah, Maliyah, Aw Ghaeriha, Ded Alsukan Besabab Ae'mal Afrad La Youmkin Ann Yakoun Hao'wla'a Al-Sokan Maso'oleen Anha Be Sefah Jamaei'yah*

The English ST sentence 'No general penalty, pecuniary or otherwise, shall be inflicted', has transferred in the Arabic TT sentence into 'لا يجوز فرض أي عقوبة جماعية، مالية أو غيرها', May not impose any penalty, pecuniary or otherwise, *La Yajouz Fard Ayy Auqobah Jamaiah, Maliyah, Aw Ghaeriha*' as it clear for the English and Arabic sentences, the modal has changed from 'shall' in English into 'may' in Arabic, anyhow both gives the same function in the TT. The English sentence of ST shows a separation gap between the negation and the modal 'No ..., shall be ...', while the Arabic sentence of TT, shows a unity between the negation form and the tense particle, which expresses the equivalent 'لا يجوز', may not, *La Yajouz*'. Therefore, the message of the ST is sustained in the TT.

TEXT 6

ST: No protected person may be punished for an offence he or she has not personally committed. Collective penalties are prohibited.

TT: لا يجوز معاقبة أي شخص محمي عن مخالفة لم يقترفها هو شخصياً ... ونُحظر العقوبات الجماعية

BT: Shall not punish any protected person for violation he has not personally committed, and prohibits collective punishment

Transliteration: *La yajouz moa'aqabit ay shakhs mahmi a'en mokhalafah lam yaqtarifoha hoa shakhsiyan ... wa tohzar al-ouqobat al-jamae'yah*

The literal translation technique is applied on the Arabic sentence of source text of UN resolution in order to convey the nature meaning of the English message. However, this technique certainly makes some changes in the sentence structure due to language differences. The English source text is SVO where it starts with the noun 'No Protected person may be'. Yet the Arabic target text is VSO where it starts with the verb 'لا يجوز shall not, *la yajouz*'. Furthermore, the first sentence of the ST 'No protected person may be punished' demonstrates passive voice, yet the second sentence of the TT 'لا يجوز معاقبة أي شخص محمي' (Shall not punish any protected person, *La yajouz moa'aqabit ay shakhs*) demonstrates an active voice. Accordingly, it is obvious to notice that, the English sentence 'No' protected person may be punished' which start with no protected person as a subject, while the Arabic sentence 'لا يجوز معاقبة أي شخص' which start with 'لا يجوز' shall not, *la yajouz* as a verb. Nonetheless, in the first sentence the modal 'may' focuses on the protected person himself as 'a reason' not to be punished, while in the second sentence the verb 'لا يجوز' shall not, *la yajouz* focuses on the sanction itself as 'a result' which connote deviate in the degree of obligation between the two texts. . Accordingly, the message of the English text is sustained in the message of the Arabic text of the current sentence.

TEXT 7

ST: Israel's Security Cabinet declared Gaza a "hostile territory", and as a result decided that sanctions would be placed on the Hamas regime in order to restrict the passage of various goods to the Gaza Strip

TT: أن المجلس الوزاري الإسرائيلي المصغر للشؤون الأمنية قد أعلن غزة "أرضاً معادية" وقرر نتيجة لذلك فرض عقوبات على نظام حماس من أجل تقييد عبور مختلف السلع إلى قطاع غزة

BT: Israel's security cabinet declared Gaza 'hostile territory', and as a result decided that to impose sanctions on the Hamas regime in order to restrict the passage of various goods to the Gaza Strip

Transliteration: *Ann al-majlis al-wizari al-israeli al-musaghaer llshoa'oun al-amniyah qad a'elan ghaza ardan moa'deiah w qarar natejah lezalik fard aouqobat ala nezam hamas min ajil taqyeed aoubour mokhtalaf al-sela'a ila qeta'a ghaza*

The above example involves parallel structures and concepts between both English and Arabic sentence, in which the English sentence of the source text is SVO, and the Arabic sentence of the target text is SVO too, the English sentence is nominal phrase, beside Arabic sentence is a nominal phrase as well. The Arabic sentence ' وقرر نتيجة لذلك فرض عقوبات على نظام حماس ' as a result decided that to *impose* sanctions on the Hamas regime, *w qarar natejah lezalik fard aouqobat ala nezam hamas*' is the textual equivalence of the English sentence ' and as a result decided that sanctions would be placed on the Hamas regime'. Therefore, the message of the English text is sustained in the Arabic text after applying this procedure.

TEXT 8

ST: Attacks against the UN in Gaza must be investigated

TT: يجب التحقيق في الهجمات ضد الأمم المتحدة في غزة

BT: Must be investigation in the attacks against the United Nations in Gaza

Transliteration: *yajib al-tahqiq fe al-hajamat ded al-oumam al-mutahidah fe ghazah*

The above example represents a literal translation between English and Arabic resolution text. The Arabic predicate 'يجب, must, *yajib*' is a verb and it is the textual equivalence of the English predicate 'must' modal verb. The English resolution text focuses on the reason 'Attacks' while the Arabic resolution text focuses on the result 'يجب التحقيق في الهجمات', *Must be investigation in the attacks, 'ajib al-tahqiq fe al-hajamat'*. Consequently, the meaning of the English text is sustained in the meaning of the Arabic text.

TEXT 9

ST: Israel is using weapons that burns human flesh down to the bare bones and others amputate and sear bodies, leaving shrapnel that cannot be detected by X-ray, which results in the death of patients after doctors treat them for the wounds they can detect.

TT: أن الأسلحة التي تستخدمها إسرائيل تحرق اللحم البشري حتى العظم في حين تؤدي أخرى إلى بتر الأعضاء وتبييسها ، مخلفة شظايا لا يمكن كشفها بواسطة الأشعة السينية، مما يؤدي إلى وفاة المصابين بعد معالجة الأطباء للجروح التي يمكنهم كشفها.

BT: The weapons used by Israel burn human flesh to the bone, while the other leads to amputation and rigor bodies, leaving fragments cannot be detected by X-rays, which leads to the death of patients after treatment for wounds that doctors can detect it.

Transliteration: *anna alasliha alati tastakhdemoha Israel tahreq al-lahim al-bashari hata al-azem, fe hen toadi ukhra ila batir al-a'ada'a wa tayabisuha, mo khalifa shazaya la youmkin kashfoha be wasetit al-ashea'ah al-seniyah, mema youadi ila wafat almosabin baed moalajit al-atiba'a liljeroh alaty youmkin kashoha.*

Referring to the previous example, the translator used literal translation to convey the direct meaning of the ST into the TT. The sentence 'leaving shrapnel that cannot be detected by X-ray' is literary translated into Arabic 'مخلفة شظايا لا يمكن كشفها بواسطة الأشعة السينية', leaving fragments cannot be detected by X-rays, *mo khalifa shazaya la youmkin kashfoha be wasetit al-ashea'ah al-seniyah*' is the textual equivalence of the English sentence. The English sentence begins with SVO while the Arabic sentence begins with VSO. The English source text sentence 'for the wounds they can detect', is literary translated into Arabic 'للعروح التي يمكن كشفها', for wounds that doctors can detect it, *liljeroh alaty youmkin kashoha*'. Consequently, the meaning of the message of the English text is sustained in the Arabic text after applying optional transposition.

TEXT 10

ST: The Mission recommended that the Palestinian Authority and the Gaza authorities should release without delay all political detainees currently in their power.

TT: وأوصت البعثة في تقريرها، بأن تقوم السلطة الفلسطينية وسلطات غزة دون إبطاء بإطلاق سراح جميع المعتقلين السياسيين المحتجزين لديها الآن

BT: The mission recommended that the Palestinian Authority and the Gaza authorities to release without delay all political detainees who are currently in their power.

Transliteration: *wa awsat al-beaithah fe taqririha, be ann taqoum al-sultah al-felisteniyah wa sultat gaza doon ibta'a be itlaq sarah jame'a al-moa'taqaleen al-seyasiyeen al-mohtajazeen ledaiha alaan*

Searching the Arabic language for the most similar and apposite phrase that is analogous in the English language. The above example of searching equivalence through literal translation of the English sentence 'Palestinian Authority and the Gaza authorities *should* release without delay all political detainees ' Arabic translation is

'ينبغي للسلطة الفلسطينية وسلطات غزة ان تفرج عن جميع المعتقلين السياسيين'

whereas the corresponding meaning in Arabic is

'بأن تقوم السلطة الفلسطينية وسلطات غزة بالافراج عن المعتقلين السياسيين', *that* the Palestinian Authority and the Gaza authorities to release, *be ann taqoum al-sultah al-felisteniyah*

wa sultat gaza'. Although the word ' بأن تقوم ' has been limited by some to one particular part of the subject, it seems best to maintain the original and literal meaning. Consequently, the meaning is sustained in both texts but the degree of obligation does not exist in the Arabic sentence.

4.2.2 Transposition Procedures

4.2.2.1 Optional Transposition

TEXT 11

ST: The release of children should be an utmost priority. The Mission further recommended that Israel should cease the discriminatory treatment of Palestinian detainees

TT: ' وأوصت كذلك بأن يكون إطلاق سراح الأطفال إحدى الأولويات الكبرى في هذا الصدد. كما أوصت البعثة أن توقف إسرائيل معاملة المحتجزين الفلسطينيين معاملة تمييزية

BT: It should be the release of children at top priority in this regard. The mission also recommended that Israel halt discriminatory treatment of Palestinian detainees.

Transliteration: *Wa Awsat Kazalik Be An Yakoun Itlaq Sarah Al-Atfal Ihda Al-Awlawiyat Al-Kubra Fe Haza Al-Sadad. Kama Awsat Al-Beitha An Touqif Israel Mou'amalit Al-Mohtajazeen Al-Felistenien Mou'amalah Tameizeyah*

Transposition technique 'involves replacing one word class with another without changing the meaning of the sentence' (Vinay and Darbelnet, 1995, p. 36). for example, the english sentence: 'the release of children should be an utmost priority' can be translated into Arabic in two ways:

1- يجب أن يكون إطلاق سراح الأطفال ذو أولوية قصوى

2- أن يكون إطلاق سراح الأطفال إحدى الأولويات الكبرى في هذا الصدد

The first translation is literal, where no change has occurred in the sentence, while in the second translation an optional transposition has occurred on word class: when the conditional article 'أن يكون' replaced the verb 'should, يجب ان'. Also, the English ST modal

'should' refers to necessity, yet the Arabic TT 'أن يكون' is referring to possibility situation.

Ideologically, the translator applied an optional transposition in Arabic in order to place less emphasis on Israel and not to follow the English style. In terms of meaning, the Arabic TT meaning is partially sustained in the English ST and the message is delivered even though the ST modal 'should' is somehow embedded in the TT.

TEXT 12

ST: Pending such release, Israel should recognize his status as prisoner of war, treat him as such, and allow him ICRC visits.

TT: وينبغي أن تقوم إسرائيل، ريثما يطلق سراحه، بالاعتراف بوضعه كأسير حرب ومعاملته على هذا النحو والسماح له بزيارات اللجنة الدولية للصليب الأحمر

BT: And Israel should, pending his release, recognize his status as prisoner of war and treated him as such and allow him the visits of the International Committee of the Red Cross

Transliteration: *Wa Yanbaghi An Taqoum Israel, Raithoma Youtlaq Sarahouh, Be Al-Eitiraf Be Wadouh K Aseer Harb Wa Mouamalatouh Ala Haza Al-Nahou Wa Al-Samah Lah B Zeyarah Al-Lajnah Al-Dawliyah Llsaleeb Al-Ahmar.*

The previous example manifests that, a slight change in the order of the SL elements when translated into the TL. Moreover, these changes occur at a grammatical level, where the position of modal 'should' in the SL sentence has changed from the midst of the sentence 'Pending that release, Israel 'should recognize his status as prisoner of war' into the beginning of the TL sentence 'وينبغي أن تقوم إسرائيل، ريثما يطلق سراحه، بالاعتراف بوضعه كأسير حرب'. And Israel should, pending his release, recognize his status as prisoner of war, *wa yanbaghi an taqoum Israel, raithoma youtlaq sarahouh, be al-eitiraf be wadouh k aseer harb*'. Therefore, the SL sentence transformed from being interconnected sentence 'Pending that release', into unconnected sentence in the TL 'وينبغي أن تقوم إسرائيل، And Israel should, *wa yanbaghi an taqoum Israel*' as shown in the analysis. The SL sentence refers to the Palestinian prisoner who still in the Israeli prisons, which the United Nations obligate Israel to release him, to maintain him as war

prisoner and allow him Red Cross visits. Unlike the TL sentence which demonstrates that whenever Israel willing to release any Palestinian prisoner 'Israel' has to admit him as war prisoner. Therefore, the meaning of the UN resolution TT is sustained however; the degree of assertion of the English UN resolution ST is partially distorted.

TEXT 13

ST: The rocket attacks into Israel should be ended, which should lead to a full withdrawal of Israeli forces from the area. That was all part of resolution 1860 (2009) and it should be implemented by Israel and Hamas.

TT: يجب أن تنتهي الهجمات الصاروخية على إسرائيل ، والتي ينبغي أن تقود إلى الانسحاب الكامل للقوات الإسرائيلية من المنطقة. هذا كله كان جزء من القرار 1860 (2009) وينبغي أن ينفذ من قبل إسرائيل وحماس.

BT: Must end rocket attacks on Israel, which should lead to the full withdrawal of Israeli forces from the area. This all was a part of resolution 1860 (2009) should be implemented by Israel and Hamas

Transliteration: *Yajib An Tantahi Al-Hajamat Alsaroukhiyah Ala Israel, Wa Alati Yanbaghi An Taqoud Ila Al-Insihab Al-Kamil Lil-Qouwat Al-Israeiliyah Min Al-Mantiqah. Haza Kulah Kan Jouzu'e Min Al-Qarar 1860 (2009) Wa Yanbaghi An Younafaz Min Qibal Israel Wa Hamas.*

Refereeing to the information in the previous example, the TL sentence of the resolution witness a re-categorization of word order due to a change occurs at the grammatical level during translation from SL to TL. The following example demonstrates that ST sentence 'should be ended' has changed in the TT sentence 'يجب أن تنتهي' must end, *yajib an tantahi*', from the example it noticed that a substitution of the subordinate clause has taken place in the ST while a verb phrase 'يجب أن تنتهي', must end, *yajib an tantahi*' in the TT. An optional transposition took place in the TT to emphasize on ending attacks timely 'يجب أن تنتهي', must end, *yajib an tantahi*' which reveals obligation on the Palestinian side to stop the attacks into Israel. Unlike ST which sustains expectation of ending attacks 'should be ended' recommended expectation to reveal that the UN expects the Palestinians to end the attacks into Israel. However, the ST 'should' denote expectation unlike the TT which denote obligation. In the second

and the third sentence ‘which should lead to a full withdrawal of Israeli forces from the area...and should be implemented by Israel and Hamas’ the translator in the TT maintain the categorization of word order slightly the same as ST,

والتي ينبغي أن تقود إلى الانسحاب الكامل للقوات الإسرائيلية من ‘ وينبغي أن ينفذ من قبل إسرائيل وحماس’ المنطقة’ However, the degrees of expectation and obligation in the previous two sentences of the ST have changed in the TT. For instance, in the first sentence of ST ‘should’ is a modal verb which denote to express obligation however, in the TT ‘ينبغي أن’, should, *yanbaghi an*’ is a verb which denote to express expectation (futura). Nevertheless, in the second sentence of the ST ‘and should be implemented by Israel and Hamas’ the modal ‘should’ denote to express expectation, whereas in the TT the verb ‘وينبغي أن’, should, *yanbaghi an*’ denote to express obligation, which reveals absence of some semantic features in the Arabic translation. In general at legal discourse, this modalized preposition denotes commitment, equivalent to the modal shall more than should. Consequently, the meaning of the UN resolution TT is sustained however; the degree of obligation of the English UN resolution ST is partially distorted.

TEXT 14

ST: The peace between Israel country and Palestine cannot be achieved through UN resolutions alone, without negotiations.

TT: لن يتحقق السلام بين دولة إسرائيل وفلسطين من خلال قرارات الأمم المتحدة وحدها فقط ، دون مفاوضات

BT: There will be no peace between the state of Israel and Palestine through resolutions nations united alone, without negotiations

Transliteration: *Lan Yatahaqq Al-Salam Baen Dawlit Israel Wa Falasteen Min Khilal Qararat Al-Oumam Al-Motahidah Wa Ihdaha Faqad, Doon Mofawadat*

The above example represents a re-categorization of word order in the TT due to a change happens at the structural level during translation from SL to TL. The modal “cannot” in the English sentence indicates present negation tense, while in the Arabic

sentence it is translated into 'لن، will not be, *lann*' a lexical particle which indicates future negation tense.

Ideologically, The Arabic sentence begins with 'لن، will not be, *lann*' a lexical particle which express an optional transposition that took place to emphasize on impossibility of achieving peace weather (now or in the future) 'لن يتحقق' , will not be achieved, *lann yatahaqq*' which is not existed in the ST. While, the English sentence begins with 'the peace between Israel and Palestine', which reveals to (the western world) that Israel always seeks for peace thru United Nations. Accordingly, the translator was not successful in applying structural transposition of agent in most cases since this transposition change the meaning of the original message and then affect the quality of the message. Therefore, the meaning of the UN resolution ST is distorted in the TT.

TEXT 3.1

ST: For all of these war crimes, State terrorism and systematic human rights violations committed against the Palestinian people, Israel, the occupying Power, must be held accountable and the perpetrators must be brought to justice.

TT: يجب محاسبة إسرائيل، السلطة القائمة بالاحتلال، على جميع جرائم الحرب هذه وعلى إرهاب الدولة وعلى ما ترتكبه في حق الشعب الفلسطيني من انتهاكات منهجية لحقوق الإنسان، وتقديم مرتكبيها إلى العدالة

BT: Israel must be accountable, the occupying power, for all of these war crimes, State terrorism and the war against the Palestinian people by systematic human rights violations and brought the perpetrators to justice

Transliteration: *Yajib Mohasabit Israel, Al-Soltah Al-Qaie'mah Be Al-Ihtilal, Ala Jamea' Jaraei'm Al-Harb Hazih Wa Ala Irhab Al-Dawlah Wa Alah Ma Tartakibuh Fe Haq Al-Shaieb Al-Filasteeni Min Intihakak Manhajiyah Lihuquq Al-Insan, Wa Taqdem Murtakibiha Ila Al-Adalah*

The sentence structure in the ST is a verbal sentence which transposed in the TT into a verbal sentence too, while the word order of SL sentence is SVO while the TL sentence is VSO, also the tense in the ST is present perfect passive while in the TT is present simple active which shows that the overall ST sentence structure is sustained in

the translated version. Ideologically, it's obvious that the precedents and subsequents of word order has played a significant role in both texts, in ST the sentence focus on the crimes of the war 'For all of these war crimes, ...' which Israel must be accountable for, while in TT the sentence focus on the result of these crimes 'يجب محاسبة إسرائيل', Israel must be accountable, *yajib mohasabit Israel*' which shows clear discrepancy in both texts. Moreover, the modal 'must' is mentioned two times in the source text, while mentioned only one time in the target text and the other time has transposed with a preposition ' و ' and, *wa*. Consequently, the meaning of obligation has applied in the ST 'the perpetrators *must* be brought to justice' while the same meaning of obligation has not applied in the TT 'وتقديم مرتكبيها إلى العدالة', 'and brought the perpetrators to justice, *wa taqdem murtakibiha ila al-adalah*' the replacement of the English modal into a preposition in Arabic ' و ' which consider a subordinate to the first modal 'must', and the reason behind this usage could be to avoid the repetition or to alleviate the obligatory situation. Accordingly, the translator has preserved the meaning of the ST in the TT.

TEXT 15

ST: I reiterate that you can always count on the support of the Non-Aligned Movement

TT: وأؤكد لكم من جديد أن يوسعكم الاعتماد دائما على دعم حركة عدم الانحياز

BT: Assure you once again that you can always count on the support of the Non-Aligned Movement

Transliteration: *Wa O'a'ked Lakum Min Jaded Ann Be Wesoukum Al-E'itimad Dai'eman Ala Da'em Harakit Adam Al-Inhiyaz*

In the above example, there is a grammatical transposition of word order took place under the assumption that the English ST is in textual equivalent with the Arabic TT of the resolution. The optional transposition occurred in the TT ' وأؤكد لكم من جديد أن ' *وَأُؤَكِّدْ لَكُمْ مِنْ جَدِيدٍ أَنَّ* 'Assure you once again that you can, *Wa O'a'ked Lakum Min Jaded Ann Be Wesoukum*' with deletion of the Arabic subject (I) from the TT. Therefore, an optional transposition took place when the SVO sentence structure of ST 'I reiterate that you *can*'

was changed into VSO sentence structure of TT 'وأؤكد لكم من جديد أن بوسعكم', 'Assure you once again that you can, *Wa O'a'ked Lakum Min Jaded Ann Be Wesoukum*'. Thus, the meaning of the English resolution ST is preserved into the Arabic resolution TT with pointing out that the English version of resolution gives priority to the subject yet Arabic gives to verb. Consequently, the message of the English resolution text is sustained in the Arabic resolution text.

TEXT 16

ST: A soldier cannot refuse a demand by a command investigator to provide information, by testimony of other manner.

TT: لا يحق للجندي أن يرفض تقديم أي معلومات يطلبها المحقق على مستوى القيادة، سواء كانت شهادة أو غيرها

BT: The soldier does not have the right to refuse providing any information requested by the investigator at the command level, whether it was by testimony or other.

Transliteration: *la yahiq L ljondi an yarfod taqdem ay ma'alomat yatluboha al-mohaqiq ala mostawa al-qeyadah, sewa'a kanat shehadah aw ghaeriha*

The transposition is usually used when a SL grammatical structure does not exist in the TL. In this case, the translator looks for various options that help in conveying the meaning of the ST including shifts between grammatical categories. The English sentence of UN resolution text indicates that 'A soldier *cannot* refuse a demand by a command investigator to provide information', while the Arabic sentence of UN resolution text indicates that 'لا يحق للجندي أن يرفض تقديم أي معلومات يطلبها المحقق على مستوى القيادة', the soldier *does not have the right* to refuse providing any information requested by the investigator at the command level, *la yahiq L ljondi an yarfod taqdem ay ma'alomat yatluboha al-mohaqiq ala mostawa al-qeyadah*'. Therefore, the English ST modal 'cannot' is transformed into the Arabic TT 'لا يحق', 'does not have the right, *la yahiq*'. Furthermore, the English sentence indicates that the soldier is not allowed to

refuse, which means the soldier will not be convicted if he commit so due to the English word 'cannot' refers to the ability, while the Arabic sentence indicates that the soldier does not have the right to refuse which means the soldier will be convicted if he commit so, due to the Arabic word 'لا يحق' (does not have the right, *la yahiq*) refers to eligibility. In addition to that, the ST express an optional transposition happened when the active voice of the English sentence 'A soldier *cannot* refuse a demand' was translated into the Arabic as passive voice 'لا يحق للجندي ان يرفض تقديم', *not right* to the soldier to refuse providing, *la yahiq L ljondi an yarfod taqdem*'. Therefore, the meaning of TT is sustained in the ST .

TEXT 17

ST: This is an intolerable situation that threatens stability and security in the region that should not be tolerated by the international community anymore.

TT: إن وضعًا كهذا هو وضع لا يطاق ويهدد الاستقرار والأمن في المنطقة و ينبغي للمجتمع الدولي ألا يتسامح معه بعد الآن.

BT: such a situation is intolerable situation and threatens the stability and security in the region, should the international community not allow that anymore.

Transliteration: *Ina wade'a k haza howa wade'a la youtaq wa youhaded al-esteqrar wa al-a'men fe al-mantiqah wa yanbaghi llmojtama'a al-dawli ala yatasamah maouh bae'd al-an*

The English source text begins with 'this is an intolerable situation' however the Arabic target text begins with 'إن وضعًا كهذا هو وضع لا يطاق' such a situation is intolerable situation, *Ina wade'a k haza howa wade'a la youtaq*'. In general, both source and target text sustain the same message, yet the Arabic text is shifted to be in accordance with the Arabic style of legal writing. The English source text modal 'should not' is translated into the Arabic target text 'ألا' 'should, *ala*'. The English ST 'that should not be tolerated by the international community anymore' becomes in the Arabic TT 'وينبغي للمجتمع الدولي 'ألا يتسامح معه بعد الآن', should the international community not allow that anymore, *wa yanbaghi llmojtama'a al-dawli ala yatasamah maouh bae'd al-an*' in the English

sentence the modal 'should' appears in a negative form, while in the Arabic sentence the equivalence of it 'ألا', 'should, ala' appears also in a negative form.

Similarly, in the English sentence the negation form merges with the modal 'should not' while in the Arabic sentence the negation is separated from the word 'ولم يمتنع' 'should not', *wa yanbaghi llmojtama'a al-dawli ala yatasamah maouh bae'd al-an*. Ideologically, the Precedents and supplements of negation order has played a significant role in both texts, for instance the English sentence focuses on the intolerable situation, while the Arabic sentence focuses on the role of the international community. Even though, the English sentence demonstrates a passive voice, while the Arabic demonstrates an active voice. Consequently, the meaning of the English resolution text is sustained in the Arabic resolution text but the message is partially distorted after applying the optional transposition.

4.2.2.2 Obligatory Transposition

TEXT 18

ST: Financial and technical assistance should be provided to ensure adequate medical follow-up to Palestinian patients.

TT: وأوصت كذلك بتقديم المساعدة المالية والتقنية لضمان المتابعة الطبية المناسبة للمرضى الفلسطينيين.

BT: It also recommended that to provide financial and technical assistance to ensure appropriate medical follow-up to the Palestinians patients.

Transliteration: *wa awsat kazalik be taqdeem al-mosa'adah al-maliyah wa altaqniyah le daman al-motaba'ah al-tibiyah al-monasibah lilmarda al-filistineen*

This technique refers to losing a word or words from the ST in the course of translation. In the source language sentence, the modal 'should' is used to express obligation/ binding from the addresser (The United Nation) to the addressee (Israel). In the ST the UN obligate Israel to provide the adequate medical and financial support to the

Palestinian patients in Gaza while, in the TT the UN recommend Israel to do so and so ' ,
 وأوصت كذلك it also recommended that, *wa awsat kazalik'* this transposition of course
 affect the meaning in the TT. Consequently, the quality of message is changed and it did
 not deliver as the author of the source text aimed.

TEXT 19

ST: There can be no lasting peace without respect for human rights and without accountability for human rights violations.

TT: لا يمكن أن يكون هناك سلام دائم دون احترام حقوق الإنسان ودون المساءلة عن انتهاكات هذه الحقوق.

BT: There cannot be lasting peace without respect for human rights and without accountability for violations of these rights

Transliteration: *La Youmkin Ann Yakoun Hownak Salam Dai'em Doon Ihteram Hoqoq Al-Insan Wa Doon Al-Mosae'alah An Intihakat Hazih Al-Hoqoq*

The above example contains a grammatical transposition from present to future tense. Since, the Arabic resolution text is the textual equivalence of the English resolution text, the Arabic word ' لا يمكن ' *La Youmkin*, cannot be, is consequently the textual equivalence of the English word 'can no'. However, the English phrase of UN resolution text ' can be no' denotes present tense, is transposed into Arabic UN resolution text ' لا يمكن ان يكون ' *La youmkin Ann Yakoun*, there cannot be denotes future tense. The meaning of the English resolution present tense ' can be no' indicates that in the current time peace cannot be achieved without respect of human rights ..., yet its Arabic correspondence indicates that the peace will not be achieved without respect of human rights ' لا يمكن أن يكون هناك سلام , there cannot be lasting peace, *La Youmkin Ann Yakoun Hownak Salam'* and this change took place due to the meaning of the English word ' be ' in ' can be no ' indicates future tense in the Arabic resolution text. The English source text indicates passive voice, while the Arabic target text indicates active voice. Furthermore, the translator has preserved the meaning of the ST but the quality of the message message is partially affected.

TEXT 20

ST: The Israeli Supreme Court has demonstrated that it can and will intercede in actual hostilities between the IDF and Palestinian terrorist organizations – including the Gaza Operation.

TT: وقد أثبتت المحكمة العليا الإسرائيلية أنها قادرة على التدخل في الأعمال القتالية الفعلية بين قوات الدفاع الإسرائيلية والمنظمات الإرهابية الفلسطينية بما في ذلك عملية غزة، وأنها تتدخل بالفعل.

BT: The Supreme Court of Israel has proved that it is able to interfere in the active hostilities between the IDF and Palestinian terrorist organizations including 'Gaza operation' and it has already intervened.

Transliteration: *Wa Qad Athbatat Al-Mahkama Al-O'ulya Al-Israeliyah Anaha Qaderah Ala Altadakhul Fe Al-Ae'mal Al-Qetaliyah Al-Fe'liyah Ba'en Qowat Al-Defa'a Al'israeliyah Wa Al-Monazamat Al-Irhabiyah Al-Felisteniyah Bema Fe Zalik A'amaliyet Ghazah, Wa Inaha Tatadakhul Ba-Alfe'il*

The transposition occurred in the English ST sentence of the UN resolution, under the assumption that the English ST is in textual equivalent with the Arabic TT sentence of the resolution. Therefore, the Arabic TT sentence witnesses two elements of changes, first; transform the nominal sentence in the English ST 'the Israeli Supreme Court has demonstrated that it can and will intercede' into a verbal sentence in the Arabic TT 'وقد أثبتت المحكمة العليا الإسرائيلية أنها قادرة على التدخل', *Wa Qad Athbatat Al-Mahkama Al-O'ulya Al-Israeliyah Anaha Qaderah Ala Altadakhul*'; second; transfer the present and future tense in the English sentence 'the Israeli Supreme Court has demonstrated that it can and will intercede', into present participle tense only in the Arabic sentence 'وقد أثبتت المحكمة العليا', the Supreme Court of Israel has proved that it is able to interfere, *Wa Qad Athbatat Al-Mahkama Al-O'ulya Al-Israeliyah Anaha Qaderah Ala Altadakhul*'. Furthermore, the Arabic equivalent of the ST modal 'will' has omitted in the TT. The English resolution text indicates that 'the Israeli Supreme Court, will, interfere in the hostilities between the IDF and Palestinian terrorist organizations'. However, the Arabic resolution text indicates that 'وأنها تتدخل بالفعل', the Israeli Supreme Court has already interfered, *Wa Inaha Tatadakhul Ba-Alfe'il*', which is not exist in the

ST. Consequently, the meaning of the ST is preserved in the TT but the quality of the message is partially affected in the TT.

TEXT 21

ST: The command investigator shall not be limited by the rules of evidence.

TT: المحقق على الصعيد القيادي غير ملزم بقواعد الإثبات‘‘

BT: The investigator at the level of command is not binding by rules of evidence

Transliteration: *Al-Mohaqq Ala Al-Mostawa Al-Qeyadi Ghair Molzam Be Qawa'ed Al-Thbat*

A linguistic shift in the sentence structure occurred in the Arabic text when it was translated from the English under the assumption that, the Arabic sentence is the textual equivalence of the English. Therefore, there is a difference in the meaning between the source and the target texts, the English ST ‘shall not’ is translated into the Arabic TT ‘غير ملزم’, not binding, *ghair molzam*’ which does not carry the same linguistic and cultural features. Furthermore, these changes might be necessary for the naturalness of the translation. Furthermore, the meaning of the message of the English resolution text is partially distorted in the Arabic resolution text after applying word transposition.

TEXT 22

ST: Police officers may be regarded as combatants if they participate directly in hostilities.

TT: يمكن اعتبار أفراد الشرطة مقاتلين إذا شاركوا في الأعمال الحربية بصورة مباشرة :

BT: Police members may be considered as combatants if they take a direct part in the hostilities

Transliteration: *Youmkin E'atibar Afrad Al-Shortah Moqateleen Eza Sharaku Fe Al-Ae'mal Al-Harbiyah B Sowrah Mobashirah*

In the above example, the English source text is SVO where it starts with the noun ‘Police officers’ yet the Arabic target text is VSO where it starts with the verb

‘يمكن اعتبار’ may be considered, *youmkin e'atibar*. However, the above-mentioned obligatory transposition of structure does not change the message of the English source text. Ideologically, the above sentence of the UN resolution refers to the Gazan police during the war on Gaza; which the ST indicates that the Gaza officers who are the ones might be regarded as combatants if they participate in the hostilities due to the police members/soldiers are under 'officers' responsibility, while the TT indicates that, only the police members who are involved in the hostilities might be regarded as combatants. The translator generates a change in the judgment of the message without altering meaning and without generating a sense of inelegance in the reader of the target language text. Consequently, the meaning of the message of the English resolution text is sustained in the Arabic resolution text.

TEXT 10.1

ST: The Mission recommended that the Palestinian Authority and the Gaza authorities should release without delay all political detainees currently in their power.

TT: وأوصت البعثة في تقريرها، بأن تقوم السلطة الفلسطينية وسلطات غزة دون إبطاء بإطلاق سراح جميع المعتقلين السياسيين المحتجزين لديها الآن

BT: The mission recommended that the Palestinian Authority and the Gaza authorities to release without delay all political detainees who are currently in their power.

Transliteration: *Wa Awsat Al-Beaithah Fe Taqririha, Be Ann Taqoum Al-Sultah Al-Felisteniyah Wa Sultat Gaza Doon Ibta'a Be Itlaq Sarah Jame'a Al-Moa'taqaleen Al-Seyasiyeen Al-Mohtajazeen Ledaiha Alaana*

It is obvious that several of translation techniques can be employed within the same sentence, so that it is crucial to classify them; e.g., the translation of 'Should' by 'بأن', that, *be ann* is both a fixed transposition and a fixed modulation. It is a transposition because the modal 'should' is transformed into a lexical expression 'بأن', that, *be ann* to give the same function, to attain the same level and it is a modulation because the nominal phrase in the English ST 'the Palestinian Authority and the Gaza authorities *should* release without delay all political detainees' has changed into a verbal

phrase in the Arabic TT ' بأن تقوم السلطة الفلسطينية وسلطات غزة دون إبطاء بإطلاق سراح جميع ' , that the Palestinian Authority and the Gaza authorities to release without delay all political detainees, *be ann taqoum al-sultah al-felisteniyah wa sultat gaza doon ibta'a be itlaq sarah jame'a al-moa'taqaleen al-seyasiyeen'* which give the impression but does not give the same meaning due to the function of 'should' is implicitly applied in the Arabic sentence. Consequently, the meaning is sustained in both texts but the degree of obligation does not exist in the Arabic sentence.

TEXT 23

ST: ICRC made it clear during the conflict that it must be possible to evacuate wounded at all times.

TT: وقد أوضحت اللجنة الدولية للصليب الأحمر خلال النزاع أنه يجب أن يكون من الممكن إجلاء الجرحى في جميع الأوقات

BT: Has clarified, the International Committee of the Red Cross during the conflict that it should be possible to evacuate the wounded at all times

Transliteration: *wa qad awdahat al-lajnah al- dawliyah llsalib al-ahmar khelal al-niza'a anh yajib ann yakoun min al-mumkin ijla'a al-jarha fe jame'a al-awgat*

In the above example, the English 'ICRC' becomes the Arabic 'اللجنة الدولية للصليب الأحمر' International Committee of the Red Cross, *wa qad awdahat al-lajnah al-dawliyah llsalib al-ahmar* which shows that the English style tends to use more abbreviation and initials than Arabic. The English sentence structure of the ST uses ' must ' to express the obligation, while the Arabic sentence structure of the TT uses يجب have to, *yajib* followed by a particle ' ان ' that, *ann* imperfect tense verb to give the same meaning of obligation in the ST. However, it has become commonplace to distinguish 'passive' from 'active' forms of the English ST and Arabic TT, the English sentence ' ICRC made it clear during the conflict that it *must* be possible ' is an active voice, yet the Arabic sentence ' , 'وقد أوضحت اللجنة الدولية للصليب الأحمر خلال النزاع أنه يجب أن يكون ' , 'Has clarified the International Committee of the Red Cross during the conflict that it should

be possible, *wa qad awdahat al-lajnah al-dawliyah llsalib al-ahmar khelal al-niza'a anh yajib ann yakoun min al-mumkin*' is a passive voice. Furthermore, the use of definite and indefinite articles 'the conflict' are very seldom in the English sentence of the ST, while it is very common to notice a plenty usage of definite articles in the Arabic sentence of the TT 'الأوقات, الجرحى, الممكن, الأحمر, النزاع, للصليب, الدولية, اللجنة' (the committee, the international, the cross, the conflict, the possible, the wounded, the times, *al-lajnah, al-dawliyah, llsalib, al-ahmar, al-niza'a, al-mumkin, al-jarhaa, al-awqat*). Subsequently, the meaning of the message of the English text is sustained in the Arabic text after applying obligatory transposition.

TEXT 24

ST: The Government of Israel must stop its expansion of settlements, which are illegal.

TT: *يجب على حكومة إسرائيل أن توقف توسيعها للمستوطنات، وهي غير مشروعة.*

BT: The Government of Israel must halt the expansion of settlements, which are illegal

Transliteration: *yajib ala hukumit Israel ann towqif tawse'aha lmostawtanat, w he ghir mashroa'ah*

In this example, the English source text 'the government of Israel must stop its expansion of settlements' is SVO while the Arabic target text 'يجب على حكومة إسرائيل أن توقف توسيعها للمستوطنات', the government of Israel must halt the expansion of settlements, *yajid ala hukumit Israel ann towqif tawse'aha lmostawtanat*' is VSO. The Arabic TT begins with obligation 'يجب', must, *yajib*', which emphasizes the verb 'يجب', while the English ST begins with the subject noun 'the government of Israel' which emphasizes the noun itself due to the different language system between Arabic and English. Consequently, the meaning of the message of the English source text is attained in the Arabic target text after applying optional transposition.

TEXT 7.1

ST: Israel's Security Cabinet declared Gaza a "hostile territory", and as a result decided that sanctions would be placed on the Hamas regime in order to restrict the passage of various goods to the Gaza Strip

TT: أن المجلس الوزاري الإسرائيلي المصغر للشؤون الأمنية قد أعلن غزة أرضاً معادية وقرر نتيجة لذلك فرض عقوبات على نظام حماس من أجل تقييد عبور مختلف السلع إلى قطاع غزة

BT: Israel's security cabinet declared Gaza 'hostile territory', and as a result decided that to impose sanctions on the Hamas regime in order to restrict the passage of various goods to the Gaza Strip

Transliteration: *Ann al-majlis al-wizari al-israeli al-musaghaer llshoa'oun al-amniyah qad a'elan ghaza ardan moa'deiah w qarar natejah lezalik fard aouqobat ala nezam hamas min ajil taqyeed aoubour mokhtalaf al-sela'a ila qeta'a ghaza*

The previous example, the English sentence of ST indicates future tense 'would be placed', while the Arabic sentence of the TT indicates present tense 'فرض , impose, fard'. However, the English sentence denotes future expectation which means that the sanction has not imposed yet on Hamas and will be imposed soon, while the Arabic sentence denotes present form, which means the sanction has already imposed on Hamas. Furthermore, the English meaning of the ST modal 'would' has replaced in the TT with a word denotes present tense 'فرض , impose, fard'. Consequently, the meaning of the message of the English resolution text is partially sustained in the Arabic resolution text after applying tense transposition.

TEXT 25

ST: When the evidence establishes a reasonable likelihood that a crime or infraction has been committed, a Military Advocate may order a prosecutor to file an indictment in the Military Courts

TT: عندما تثبت الأدلة وجود احتمال معقول بأن جريمة أو مخالفة قد ارتكبت، يجوز للمدعي العام العسكري أن يأمر النائب العام بتقديم لائحة اتهام أمام المحاكم العسكرية

BT: When the evidence proves the existence of a reasonable likelihood that a crime or offense has been committed, the Military Prosecutor may order attorney general to submit an indictment before the Military Courts

Transliteration: *w eindama tuthbit al-adelah wejoud ehtimal ma'eqoul be ann jarimah aw mokhalafah qad irtukibat, yajouz lmodaa'e al-am al-askari ann ya'emor al-naib al-am be taqdem la'eihat itiham amam al-mahakim al-askariyah*

Under the assumption that the Arabic resolution text is the textual equivalent of the English resolution text, the English resolution text 'a Military Advocate may order a prosecutor', is translated into Arabic as 'يجوز للمدعي العام العسكري أن يأمر النائب العام', the Military Prosecutor 'may' order attorney general, *yajouz lmodaa'e al-am al-askari ann ya'emor al-naib al-am*', the English modal 'May' is an auxiliary verb while it is translated into Arabic 'يجوز', May, *yajouz*' main. Moreover, the English sentence structure of the ST uses 'May' to express the future probability, while the Arabic sentence structure of the TT uses 'يجوز' may, *yajouz* to give the same sense of probability too. Consequently, the message of the English resolution text is sustained in the message of the Arabic resolution text after applying the obligatory transposition.

TEXT 26

ST: At any point when there is a reasonable suspicion of criminal misconduct, the military prosecution may launch a criminal investigation

TT: ويمكن للدعاء الجنائي، في أي وقت تثار فيه شكوك معقولة بحدوث سوء سلوك جنائي، المباشرة بإجراء تحقيق جنائي.

BT: the military prosecution may, at any time when there is a reasonable suspicion of criminal misconduct, launch a criminal investigation

Transliteration: *wa youmkin lledia'a al-jena'ee, fe ayy wakt tuthar feh shokok mae'kolah b hedos selok jena'ee, al-mobasharah b ijra'a tahqiq jena'ee*

In the above example, the English resolution text 'the military prosecution may launch a criminal investigation', is translated into Arabic as 'ويمكن للدعاء الجنائي (...) 'the military prosecution may (...) launch a criminal investigation, *wa youmkin lledia'a al-jena'ee (...) al-mobasharah b ijra'a tahqiq jena'ee*', the Arabic TT sentence witnesses two elements of changes, first; transform the adverbial sentence 'the military prosecution may launch' in the English ST into a verbal

sentence 'ويمكن للدعاء الجنائي' in the Arabic TT, second; the English sentence of ST demonstrates probability 'may launch', while the Arabic sentence of TT demonstrates emphasis 'ويمكن للدعاء الجنائي، في أي وقت تثار ... المباشرة بإجراء تحقيق جنائي' through using phrasal category as coordinator to stress the meaning. Accordingly, the translator has sustained the meaning of the message of the ST in the TT.

TEXT 27

ST: The United Nations, including the Security Council, must uphold its Charter responsibilities to address this crisis and to help the Palestinian people, who are suffering the wrath of an oppressive, brutal military occupation

TT: يتعين على الأمم المتحدة ولا سيما مجلس الأمن، الاضطلاع بما يمليه عليهما الميثاق من مسؤوليات لمعالجة الأزمة ومساعدة الشعب الفلسطيني الذي يعاني من وطأة احتلال عسكري غاشم ووحشي

BT: it is the duty of the United Nations, particularly the Security Council, to undertake the Charter responsibilities to solve this crisis and help the Palestinian people who are suffering from the brunt of brutal military occupation

Transliteration: *yataa'ian ala al-umam al-mutahida wa la seyama majlis al-amin, al-edila'a bema yomlih alihema al-methag min masou'liyat le moalajet hazih al-azmah w mosae'dit al-shae'ib al-felastini al-azi yoani min wate'at ehtilal askari ghashim w wahshi*

In the above example, we have detected two types of procedures obligatory transposition and optional modulation occurred under the assumption that the English ST is in textual equivalent with the Arabic TT of the resolution. Therefore, the English ST 'the United Nations, including the Security Council, must uphold its Charter responsibilities', was translated into Arabic as 'يتعين على الأمم المتحدة ولا سيما مجلس الأمن' , it is the duty of the United Nations, particularly the Security Council, to undertake the Charter responsibilities, *yataa'ian ala al-umam al-mutahida wa la seyama majlis al-amin, al-edila'a bema yomlih alihema al-methag min masou'liyat*, the Arabic TT sentence witnesses three elements of changes, first; the obligatory transposition occurred while transforming the nominal sentence ' the United Nations ' in the English ST into a verbal sentence ' يتعين على الأمم المتحدة ' in the Arabic TT, second; the optional modulation occurred while transferring the active voice in the

English sentence into passive voice in the Arabic sentence, third; also is an optional modulation occurred in the re-categorization of word order from SVO in the English text, into VSO in the Arabic text. It should be noted that these examples are all free translations and their correctness depends on the context. Anyhow, the English modal 'must' is translated into two Arabic word 'يتعين على', it is the duty, *yataa'ian ala'* which indicates the same meaning as 'must'. Therefore, the message of the English UN resolution is sustained and the degree of obligation is achieved too in the Arabic UN resolution.

4.2.3 Modulation Procedures

4.2.3.1 Optional Modulation

TEXT 28

ST: 'family visits for prisoners from Gaza should resume'

TT: 'وَأَنْ تَسْمَحَ باستئناف الزيارات الأسرية للأسرى المنتمين إلى غزة'

BT: 'and allow the resumption of family visits for prisoners affiliated with Gaza'

Transliteration: *Wa An Tasmah Be Iste'inaf Al-Zeyarat Al-Usariyah Lilasrah Al-Mountameen Ila Gaza.*

The translation of the ST into TT declares that the degree of necessity in the ST has been changed in the TT for the reason that 'should' in the English text indicates present tense which it seem has been replaced by future tense in the Arabic text. Furthermore, the degree of necessity in English sentence has changed and replaced into possibility in the Arabic sentence and the translation of 'Should' by 'وَأَنْ تَسْمَحَ', and allow, *wa an tasmah'* is at the same time a transposition, and a modulation, but not an equivalent. It is a transposition because the modal 'should' is transformed into a different lexical expression; a modulation because a statement is converted into a recommendation 'family visits for prisoners from Gaza should resume' by the desire to

sound more natural in the TL. Finally, it is not an equivalent since it is the actual lexical structure that has been translated, rather than the situation.

Besides, the results revealed that Arabic text uses more modal expressions than English text. Arabic is characterized by a rich morphology, due to the fact that the Arabic script usually does not encode short vowels, and the degree of morphological ambiguity is very high. Arabic is a morphologically complex language compared with English, an Arabic word can sometimes correspond to a whole English sentence (Example: the Arabic word 'اتستطيعون' corresponds in English, to the sentence 'would you be able to'). Therefore, the message of the English resolution text is distorted in the message of the Arabic resolution text.

TEXT 29

ST: The Mission recommended that the Palestinian armed groups holding Israeli soldier Gilad Shalit in detention should release him on humanitarian grounds.

TT: وأوصت البعثة ، بأن تقوم الجماعات المسلحة الفلسطينية التي تحتفظ بالجندي الإسرائيلي
جلعاد شاليت قيد الاحتجاز بإطلاق سراحه لأسباب إنسانية

BT: The mission recommended that the Palestinian armed groups holding the Israeli soldier Gilad Shalit in detention to release him for humanitarian reasons

Transliteration: *Wa Awsat Al-Beitha, Be An Taqoum Al-Jamaa't Al-Mosalaha Al-Felastineeyah Alati Tahtafiz B Aljoundi Al-Israeli Gilad Shalit Qaed Al-Ihtijaz Be Itlaq Sarahouh Li-Asbab Insaniyah*

It is clear that many of translation techniques can be used within the same sentence, so that it is hard to categorize them; e.g., the translation of 'Should' with 'بأن', (that, be an) is both a fixed transposition and a fixed modulation. It is a transposition because the modal “should” is transformed into a lexical expression 'بأن', (that, be an) to give the same function and a modulation because the nominal phrase in the ST is converted into a verbal phrase in the TT 'should release him on humanitarian grounds' while the Arabic translation of the same phrase is ' بإطلاق سراحه لأسباب إنسانية ', to release him for humanitarian reasons, *be itlaq sarahouh li-asbab insaniyah*' which seems does

not give the same meaning due to the function of 'should' is implicitly applied in the Arabic sentence. Accordingly, the meaning of the ST is sustained in the TT but the quality of the message message is partially affected.

TEXT 16

ST: A soldier cannot refuse a demand by a command investigator to provide information, by testimony of other manner.

TT: لا يحق للجندي أن يرفض تقديم أي معلومات يطلبها المحقق على مستوى القيادة، سواء كانت شهادة أو غيرها

BT: The soldier does not have the right to refuse providing any information requested by the investigator at the command level, whether it was by testimony or other.

Transliteration: *la yahiq L ljondi an yarfod taqdem ay ma'alomat yatluboha al-mohaqiq ala mostawa al-qeyadah, sewa'a kanat shehadah aw ghaeriha*

This technique focus on a phrase that is different in the source and target languages to carry the same idea such as the ST sentence 'A soldier cannot refuse a demand by a command investigator to provide information', literally means

' لا يمكن للجندي ان يرفض تقديم اي معلومات يطلبها المحقق ' but here translates better as

' لا يحق للجندي ان يرفض تقديم اي معلومات '. It changes the semantics and shifts viewpoint of the source language. Through, the translator generates a change in the judgment of the ST message without altering meaning of the TT. Therefore, this change of the viewpoint in a message is what makes a reader say: 'Yes, this is exactly how we say it in our language'. Consequently, the meaning of the English ST is preserved into the Arabic TT with pointing out that English version give priority to subjects' yet Arabic do to verbs. Consequently, the message of the English sentence is sustained in the message of the Arabic sentence of the current text.

TEXT 30

ST: Under Israeli Supreme Court precedent, a criminal indictment may only be filed where a 'reasonable chance to convict'

TT: بموجب إحدى السوابق التي شكلت أمام المحكمة الإسرائيلية العليا، لا يجوز توجيه لائحة اتهام جنائي إلا عندما يوجد "احتمال معقول بالإدانة"

BT: In accordance with one of the precedents that formed before the Israeli Supreme Court, a criminal indictment may not filed except when there is a 'reasonable chance to convict'

Transliteration: *be mojab ehda al-sawabiq alati shokelat amam al-mahkamah al-israeliyah al-ouliya, la yajouz tawjeh lae'iht etiham jena'e e ilaa eindama yowjad ' ihtimal mae'qoul ba aledanah*

The current text represents a shift of sentence structure of the English ST in the Arabic TT. The English ST clause 'a criminal indictment may only be filed where a "reasonable chance to convict"' is a conditional case, nominal sentence that begins with a noun yet the main Arabic source text clause 'لا يجوز توجيه لائحة اتهام جنائي إلا عندما يوجد 'احتمال معقول بالإدانة', may not file a criminal case except there is "a reasonable chance to convict", ' *la yajouz tawjeh lae'iht etiham jena'e e ilaa eindama yowjad ihtimal mae'qoul ba aledanah*' is a verbal sentence. Also, the English source text is affirmative 'a criminal indictment *may* only be filed' while the Arabic target text is a negative, 'لا 'يجوز توجيه لائحة اتهام', a criminal indictment may not filed, *la yajouz tawjeh lae'iht etiham*'. Accordingly, we can conclude that the meaning of the English text has changed in the Arabic text and thus the message of the English sentence is distorted in the Arabic sentence.

TEXT 6.1

ST: No protected person may be punished for an offence he or she has not personally committed. Collective penalties are prohibited.

TT: لا يجوز معاقبة أي شخص محمي عن مخالفة لم يقترفها هو شخصياً ... وتُحظر العقوبات الجماعية

BT: Shall not punish any protected person for violation he has not personally committed, and prohibits collective punishment

Transliteration: *La yajouz moa'aqabit ay shakhs mahmi a'en mokhalafah lam yaqtarifoha hoa shakhsiyan ... wa tohzar al-ouqobat al-jamae'yah*

The above sentence requires that the translator know the mechanism of source and target languages as well as their respective inherent qualities. Through modulation, the translator generates a change in the point of view of the message without changing meaning and without generating a sense of clumsiness in the reader of the target text. The expressions 'No protected person may be punished for an offence' and 'لا يجوز معاقبة' ' ' are examples of modulation. They both convey the same meaning although they do not have the same stylistic value. This type of change of point of view in a message is what makes a reader say: 'Yes, this is exactly how we say it in our language'. So, the message of the English text is sustained in the message of the Arabic text.

TEXT 8.1

ST: Attacks against the UN in Gaza must be investigated

TT: يجب التحقيق في الهجمات ضد الأمم المتحدة في غزة

BT: Must be investigation in the attacks against the United Nations in Gaza

Transliteration: *yajib al-tahqiq fe al-hajamat ded al-oumam al-mutahidah fe ghazah*

The optional modulation occurred while transferring the English resolution text 'Attacks against the UN in Gaza must be investigated' from verb phrase into noun

phrase in the Arabic sentence ' يجب التحقيق في الهجمات ضد الأمم المتحدة في غزة ', Must be investigation in the attacks against the United Nations in Gaza, *yajib al-tahqiq fe al-hajamat ded al-oumam al-mutahidah fe ghazah*'. Also, the optional modulation occurred in the categorization of word order from SVO in the English text, while VSO in the Arabic text. Ideologically, the English source sentence 'Attacks against the UN' focuses on the attacks on the United Nations offices in Gaza, while the Arabic target sentence ' يجب التحقيق في الهجمات , Must be investigation in the attacks, *yajib al-tahqiq fe al-hajamat*' focuses on the investigation itself. So, the meaning of the message of the English text is sustained in the Arabic text after applying optional transposition.

4.2.3.2 Obligatory Modulation

TEXT 4.1

ST: International humanitarian law is clear in that the protection of hospitals and medical teams shall not cease “unless they are used to commit, outside their humanitarian duties, acts harmful to the enemy”.

TT: القانون الإنساني الدولي واضح في نصه على أن حماية المستشفيات والطواقم الطبية لا يجوز أن تتوقف "إلا إذا استُخدمت، خروجاً على واجباتها الإنسانية، في أعمال تضر بالعدو"

BT: The International humanitarian law is clear in stating that the protection of hospitals, medical personnel may not stopped unless it is used, out from the humanitarian duties, in acts harmful to the enemy

Transliteration: *Al-Qanoon Al-Insani Al-Dawli Wadih Fe Nasoh Ala Ann Hedayit Al-Mostashfayat Wa Al-Tawaqim Al-Tibiyah La Yajouz Ann Tatawaqaf Ila Iza Istokhdimat, Khrojan Ala Wajibatuha Al-Insaniyah, Fe Aa'emal Tadour Be Aladow*

The obligatory modulation occurs during translating the SL text '*shall not*' into TL text '*لا يجوز ان* ' *la Yajouz An*', may not by the desire to sound more natural in the TL. It is noticed that these obligatory modulation preserved the meaning of the English ST in the Arabic TT, and in order to be compatible with the TT style. Although, the emphasis of the English UN resolution text on the verb '*shall not*' is modulated into Arabic UN

resolution text ' لا يجوز ان ' , *la Yajouz An'*, may not the meaning of the English UN source text is preserved in the Arabic UN target text. Therefore, the message of the English UN source text is sustained in the message of Arabic UN target text.

4.3 Summary

The present chapter presented analysis and findings of the research corpus. It analyzed the research corpus in three axes (1) the types of translation techniques/ procedure used in translating English modals of the United Nations resolution texts into Arabic, and (2) the English modals and Arabic equivalents used in the UN resolutions, (3) the quality of the target text messages after applying these techniques and the differences reflected in the meaning between English and Arabic in the light of Vinay and Darbelnet's Modal of translation techniques (1995). In this chapter the analysis applied on the research data which is 30 selected texts from the English and Arabic versions of United Nations resolution published from 2008 until 2012 on Gaza war. Moreover, it is found that the direct and indirect translation techniques proposed by Vinay and Darbelnet's (1995) are applied in English- Arabic translation of UN texts.

CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

5.1 Introduction

This chapter discusses the findings of the study. The findings answer the research questions and achieve the research objectives. A discussion sheds light on the key findings of the English modals and Arabic equivalents used in the UN resolutions, and the types of translation techniques used in translating these modals, in which how those techniques based on Vinay and Darbelnet's Modal (1995) reflect the meaning of the source text and sometimes distort its quality of the message. After that, this chapter discusses the limitations of the study and offers some recommendations for further researchers. Finally, a conclusion is conducted to summarize the current dissertations.

5.2 Discussion of Key Findings

The present research reached to a number of key findings. Those key findings are related to the research objectives. Accordingly, these findings focus on three axes; (1) the type of translation techniques which occur in the process of translating English United Nations resolution texts into Arabic, and (2) the English modals and Arabic equivalents used in the UN resolutions, (3) the quality of the target text messages after applying these techniques and the differences reflected in the meaning between English and Arabic in the light of Vinay and Darbelnet's Modal of translation techniques (1995).

5.2.1 Patterns of Distribution

The following table outlines the findings by presenting the types of translation techniques took place in the research data, differences reflected in the meaning between English and Arabic after applying these techniques on the 30 texts of UN resolutions. The text number starts with the English and Arabic modals occurred (see the appendix).

Table 5.1: Types of translation procedures used in the current study

Text no.	Translation procedures	English modal	Arabic equivalent	ST quality of the message
1	Literal translation	Should	بان تقوم Be-an taqoum Ought to	Partially Distorted
2	Literal Translation	Should	وعلي ان Wa ala ann On that	Partially Distorted
3	Literal translation	Must	يجب Yajib Must	The Message is Sustained
3.1	Optional Transposition	Must	و wa Should	
4	Literal translation	Shall	لا يجوز La yajouz May not	The Message is Sustained
4.1	Obligatory Modulation			
5	Literal translation	Shall	لا يجوز La yajouz May not	The Message is Sustained
6	Literal translation	May	لايجوز La yajouz May	The Message is Sustained
6.1	Optional Modulation			
7	Literal translation	Would	فرض Fard impose	The Message is Sustained
7.1	Obligatory transposition			

8	Literal translation	Must	يجب Yajib Must	The Message is Sustained
8.1	Optional Modulation			
9	Literal translation	Cannot Can	لا يمكن La yajouz May not يمكن La yajouz May	The Message is Sustained
10	Literal translation		بان تقوم La yajouz May not	The Meaning is Sustained however; the Message is Partially Distorted.
10.1	Obligatory Transposition	Should		
11	Optional Transposition	Should	بان Be an To be	Partially Sustained
12	Optional Transposition	Should	وينبغي ان Yanbaghi an Should have	The Meaning is Sustained
13	Optional Transposition	Should	يجب ان Yajib an Must that	The Meaning is Sustained
14	Optional Transposition	Cannot	لن Lan Will not	The Meaning is Sustained however; the Message is Partially Distorted.
15	Optional Transposition	Can	بوسعكم Be Wesoukum Can	The Message is Sustained
16	Optional Transposition	Cannot	لا يحق la yahiq Does not	The Message is Sustained
16.1	Optional Modulation			
17	Optional	Should	ينبغي	The Meaning is

	Transposition		Yanbaghi Should	Sustained however; the Message is Partially Distorted
18	Obligatory Transposition	Should	و Wa And	The Message is Distorted
19	Obligatory Transposition	Can	يمكن Youmkin Can	The Meaning is Sustained however; the Message is Partially Distorted
20	Obligatory Transposition	Can Will	قادرة Qaderah it is able	The Meaning is Sustained however; the Message is Partially Distorted
21	Obligatory Transposition	Shall not	غير ملزم ghair molzam not binding	The Message is Distorted
22	Obligatory Transposition	May	يمكن Youmkin Can	The Message is Sustained
23	Obligatory transposition	Must	يجب Yajib Must	The Message is Sustained
24	Obligatory transposition	Must	يجب Yajib Must	The Message is Sustained
25	Obligatory transposition	May	يجوز La yajouz May	The Message is Sustained
26	Obligatory transposition	May	يمكن Youmkin Can	The Message is Sustained
27	obligatory transposition	Must	يتعين علي Yatazen ala Have to	The Message is Sustained

28	Optional Modulation	Should	وان تسمح Wa an tasmah And permit	The Message is Distorted
29	Optional Modulation	Should	بان Be an that	The Meaning is Sustained however; the Message is Partially Distorted
30	Optional Modulation	May	لا يجوز La yajouz May not	The Message is Distorted

The following is the discussion for the most important findings:

Findings 1: Literal Translation

Literal translation has applied when translating UN English texts into Arabic to convey the direct meaning of the source language text to the target language text, through a direct transfer of a SL text into a grammatically and idiomatically appropriate TL text in which the translators' task is limited to observing the adherence to the linguistic servitudes of the TL. However, the finding of this study shows that literal translation sometimes violates the TL structures or meanings between both sentences English and Arabic, involves slight changes in the TT compared with the ST such as translation of text 10 and 10.1 'should' (بان تقوم\ بان , be an taqoum/ be ann). The following 'Arabic' structures and expressions are, in fact, literal translations from English because they were not attested in Arabic. The use of 'فرض' 'impose(fard) in the contexts in which the word “impose” is not used in English SL as translation of text 7, 'sanctions فرض عقوبات على نظام حماس' would be placed on the Hamas regime". Needless to say that these new constructions and new terms find their legitimacy and importance only if they have no real Arabic equivalents, this is not always the case. An unsuccessful translation can sound extremely unnatural, can cause unwanted wit and

can be taken as evidence of the lack of expertise of the translator in the target language as translation of text 28.

Findings 2: Optional & Obligatory Transposition

Optional and obligatory transpositions were found the most frequent types of techniques applied in the current research data. Optional and obligatory transpositions were applied when there is a syntactic or lexical variation of translation UN English resolution texts into Arabic showing the translators' tendency to sustain the Arabic target language style. Moreover, the optional transpositions sometimes were applied in order to avoid ambiguity of agent in the Arabic resolution and due to the fact that Arabic accepts more repetition of the subject than English, while other times, optional transpositions were applied to fulfill some ideologies of the UN as in the translation of text 3.1, 11, 14, 16, 17. However, optional transpositions were applied when translating UN English resolution texts into Arabic to preserve the meaning of the source text and its quality of the message without using any 'awkward style' such as translation of text 12, 14 and 15. In contrast, the obligatory transpositions in the target text occurred because the target language sometimes has no correspondent item for the source text such as translation of text 18 and 21, or when the translator uses a grammatical structure as a way to fill a lexical gap in the TL, in the course of translation the grammatical structure of the TL is used in a way to compensate for or replace the lexical gap existing in the linguistic system of the TL such as translation of text 19 and 20. In that the present and the past perfect tense in English has no exact correspondences tense in Arabic but they have two possibilities, present/past simple, or present simple with (يجب) , yajib an), future simple (وأن تسمح) , wa an tasmah). Similarly, obligatory transpositions found in the current study are due to the fact that both English and Arabic have different definite article systems as translation of text 7.1. This finding goes in line

with Ghazala (2008) who discussed the differences between the unlike grammatical systems of English and Arabic (see; Ghazala, 2008, p. 28-29).

Findings 3: Optional & Obligatory Modulation

Optional and obligatory Modulation were applied when there is a semantic-pragmatic variation in point of view or a change in degree of certainty of translation UN English resolution texts into Arabic that results from no translation equivalent or the literal translation sounds awkward in the TL. However, optional modulations are not dictated by the lack of equivalence but by the desire to sound more natural in the TL as translation of text 28. Anyhow, this type of modulation involve mostly two procedures: negated contrary, impersonal or active for passive modulation, and reordering of elements in the sentence, which are mostly found in the current research data as translation of text 8.1. In contrast, obligatory modulations are dedicated when there is no translation equivalent or when the literal translation sounds awkward in the TL. Modulations become compulsory when there is a lexical gap in the TL as translation of text 4.1. Nevertheless, this procedure should better be avoided unless it is necessary for the naturalness of the translation TL as translation of text 21.

5.3 Discussion of Findings in Relation To Research Questions

A number of key findings found are discussed in the above sections. Here, the findings will be discussed in relation to the three research questions which reflect the research objectives that the current study aims to achieve (1) identify the types of translation techniques/procedures used in the UN resolutions on Gaza war to translate English modals into Arabic, (2) determine the English modals and its Arabic equivalent used in these resolutions, and (3) investigate the quality of the message after applying these techniques in English-Arabic translation.

5.3.1 Discussion of Findings in Relation To Research Questions 1. What are the types of translation techniques used in translating English modals into Arabic in the UN resolutions in Gaza?

The current research found that not all types of translation techniques proposed in Vinay & Darbelnet's (1995) are used in the translation of the UN resolutions from English into Arabic. Namely, these techniques/procedures are: Literal Translation, Optional Transposition & Obligatory Transposition, and Optional Modulation & Obligatory Modulation. The findings show that the UN translators apply some techniques more than others like; obligatory transposition and literal translation were used more in the process of translating English UN resolutions into Arabic, and these techniques regard as key techniques to this study. The study explained and discussed the reason behind the use of each type of translation techniques applied in the 30 UN texts (see chapter 4). It is found that the transposition, modulation, and literal translation techniques are the frequent three types take place in translation of English UN resolutions into Arabic. The results show that UN translators apply more than one technique of translation in translating UN English resolutions into Arabic, however; the meaning is sustained in a large number of translated texts.

5.3.2 Discussion of Findings in Relation To Research Questions 2. What are the English modals and Arabic equivalents used in the UN resolutions?

As for the current research question, the research findings show that the English modals are grammatical auxiliary, a small class of auxiliary verbs used mostly to express modality (properties such as possibility, obligation, necessity, and assertion etc.). That may include ought to, may, might, will, would, can, could, shall, and should. They are used with other verbs to express ability, obligation, possibility, and so on. The Arabic equivalents for these modals are يمكن, يجب, يجوز, يستحسن, ينبغي ان, يتعين علي, وعلي ان, يمكن, يجب, يجوز, يستحسن, ينبغي ان, يتعين علي, وعلي ان. Can, should, may, preferably, ان تقوم, غير ملزم, بان يكون, وان تسمح, بان, بوسعك, قادر, يحق

'should be, have to, have to, that is, non-binding, allow, that, your best, capable, entitled.' The modals in Arabic are mostly "lexical and phrasal verbs" use expressions that denote the meaning, clearly identifying the meaning and function of the modal used in Arabic. The findings show that the modals of obligation/binding/futurity include the members of 'shall, should, must' have the highest usage among the UN resolution texts. The modal cluster futurity/assertion/possibility includes the members of 'will, may, and can'. The finding reveals that there is a wide disparity between the main function of 'should and shall'. 'Should' is used mostly to denote permission/prediction, while the modal auxiliary 'shall' the main function is to denote obligation/binding (for more details see 5.1.2)

5.3.3 Discussion of Findings in Relation To Research Questions 3. How are the differences in meaning reflected on English and Arabic texts?

As for the research question no.3, the research findings show that UN translators slightly succeed in preserving the meaning of the source resolution text thus partially sustaining its quality of the message in most cases. The findings show also that due to two different systems between English and Arabic, applying Optional and Obligatory Transpositions, Optional and Obligatory Modulations, Literal Translation and Loan Translation are the four main types of techniques based on Vinay and Darbelnet's taxonomy are used to deliver the source text message in a high quality for the Arabic UN resolutions readers. However, the use of these techniques in a way or another sustains the meaning of the source text in the target text (i.e. texts: 3, 3.1, 4, 4.1, 5, 6, 6.1, 7, 7.1, 8, 8.1, 9, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, and 27). The results show that the translators of UN had applied other suggested techniques such as; literal translation and transposition which applied in translation of the English UN resolutions to Arabic in order to somehow sustain the meaning of the source text. The quality of the message and degree of modals are partially distorted in several numbers of texts. These texts are

involved under literal translation, transposition and modulation (i.e. texts: 1, 2, 17, 21, and 28). Finally, the results show that the use of obligatory transposition from passive voice to active voice and modulation from nominal phrase to verbal phrase and negative to positive (i.e. text 19) is distorting the quality of the message in English-Arabic translation since it adds information does not contained in the source resolutions text.

Consequently, verbs such as recommend or suggest occur with the subordinate clause, this clause normally has 'should' which is a grammatical rather than modal marker. Probably, in many languages, this 'should' may not be explicitly translated.

5.4 Contribution

The research findings show that new techniques were found in the current study, which no one has touched before in the translation of United Nations resolution. These techniques are; '*literal translation, transposition and modulation*' based on Newmark, (1988, p. 90), and Harvey (2000, p. 5). It is true that plenty of studies have been conducted to translate the English modals into several languages. However, very little studies have been done so far, which solely focus on translating English modals into Arabic in UN resolutions and the type of translation techniques used in these documents. Moreover, the researcher has yet to come across any detailed investigation on translating of English modals into Arabic in the UN texts. Hence, this current study somehow fills the research gap and makes a further development of study on English/Arabic modals.

5.5 Recommendations For Further Studies

There are still some issues which the current study has not covered and it is suggested that further research can address some of the issues raised here.

Primarily, in this study, the data corpus contains of only thirty the United Nations resolutions on Gaza war from 2008 till 2012. Future studies with larger data corpus would be very much worthy of consideration. It is noted that in this study, modal 'could, might, and ought' are not used. This might be due to the limited data corpus of the current study. It is important for future research to enlarge the data corpus because it would increase the reliability and validity of the findings of this study.

Finally, this study has looked at modal auxiliaries used in the UN resolutions on Gaza war. It is suggested that for future studies, deep semantic and ideological study could be carried out to investigate whether different resolutions use different modal auxiliaries, and whether that ideologies affect the meaning as communicative strategies to persuade readers or not.

5.6 Conclusion

This aim of the current dissertation was to identify the types of translation techniques used in the UN resolutions on Gaza war 2008 till 2013 to translate English modals into Arabic. It is also attempted to determine the English modals and its Arabic equivalent used in these resolutions. Also, to investigated the quality of the message after applying these techniques in English-Arabic translation. Only thirty of the United Nations resolutions were selected as the primary data for the analysis. The research corpus was analyzed according to Vinay and Darbelnet's (1995) Modal of translation techniques, and Coates's Modal of Semantic Typology (1983) in order to accomplish

the research objectives. Moreover, this research offered a theoretical discussion on the translation techniques in legal text of English and Arabic within the UN resolutions. It introduced a link between modality and the translation studies from one aspect and between legal text and translation from another aspect of linguistics. Furthermore, it introduced a summary of English and Arabic modals and modals in legal texts through the previous studies.

After prudent and thorough analysis, it is found that both modals of intention/prediction/futurity and modals of possibility/ability/permission/ obligation are used primarily in the selected resolutions. In addition, it is the 'should' of possibility/ability/permission/ obligation and 'must' of obligation is used most frequently by the UN in their resolutions. Finally, a discussion on the findings was presented to answer the three research questions.

REFERENCES

- Abdel-Fattah, M. (2005). *On the Translation of Modals from English into Arabic and Vice Versa*, Babel, 51 (1): 31-48.
- Abdul-Baqi, A., & Van der Giessen, E. (2001). *Indentation-induced interface delamination of a strong film on a ductile substrate*. Thin Solid Films, 381(1), 143-154.
- Abū-Ḥāmid, G. & Ibn Faris, N. A. (1963). *The Foundations of the Articles of Faith: Being a Translation. with Notes of the Kitāb Qawā'id Al-'aqā'id of Al-Ghazzālī's Ihya'Ulūm Al-Dīn*. Sh. Muhammad Ashraf.
- Abu-Shaqra, F. (2007). *Arabic: An essential grammar*. London: Routledge.
- Al-Ashoor, A. (2009). *The Translation of Modality from English into Arabic*. Tikrit University Journal for Humanities.
- Alawi, N. (2010). *Intertextuality and literary translation between Arabic and English*. An-Najah University Journal for Research, 24(8), 2437-2456.
- Alcaraz, E. & Hughes, B. (2002). *Legal Translation Explained*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.
- Al-Hassnawi. A. R. (2010). *Aspects of scientific translation: English into Arabic translation as case study*.
- Al-Mukhaini, Y.(2008). *Modality In Legal Texts: An Analytic Study In Translation Between English And Arabic*. Universiti Sains Malaysia. Malaysia.
- Althawab, A. (2009). *Arabic Modal Verbs in Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Asensio, R. M. (2003). *Translating Official Documents*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.
- As-Safi, A.B. (2001). *Modalization and Lexicalization of Prepositions in English-Arabic Translation*. IJAES: International Journal of Arabic-English Studies. Vol. 2, Nos.1&2.
- Baker, M. (1992). *In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation*; Psychology Press.
- Baker, M. (2004). *A corpus-based view of similarity and difference in translation*. International Journal of Corpus Linguistics, 9(2), 167-193.

- Baker, M. (2005). *Linguistic models and methods in the study of translation*. In: H. Harald Kittel.
- Baker, M. (2013). *In other words: A coursebook on translation*. Routledge.
- Bhatia, V. & Candlin, C. (2008). *Legal Discourse across Cultures and Systems*. Hong Kong University Press.
- Biber, D. (2004). *Modal use across registers and time*. Topics In English Linguistics, 45, 189-216... 2000.
- Biber, D., & Johansson, G. & Leech, S. (1999). *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English*. Harlow: Pearson Education.
- Bybee, J., & Perkins, R. (1994). *The evolution of grammar: Tense, aspect, and modality in the languages of the world*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Catford, J. C. (1965). *A linguistic theory of translation: An essay in applied linguistics* (Vol. 8): Oxford University Press.
- Chris, H. (2006). *The Language of Jury Trial A Corpus Aided Linguistic Analysis of Legal Lay Discourse*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Coates, J. (1983). *The semantics of the modal auxiliaries*. London: Croom Helm.
- Cohen, A. (2009). *Probability in Semantics*. *Language and linguistics compass* 3.1, pp. 265–281.
- Colina, S. (2002). *New Approach to Legal Translation*. Kluwer Law International. De Hague-London-Boston.
- Cordesman, A. H., & Moravitz, J. (2005). *The Israeli-Palestinian war: escalating to nowhere*. Greenwood Publishing Group.
- Coulthard, M. & Johnson, A. (2010). *The Routledge Handbook of Forensic Linguistics*. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.
- Darwish, A. (2010). *Elements of Translation*. Writescope Publishers.
- Di, J., & Nida, E. (1984). *On translation: with special reference to Chinese and English*. Beijing: China Translation & Publish Corporation.
- Dizdar, D. (1999). “*Skopostheorie*” In: Mary Snell-Hornby: Stauffenburg.
- Downing, A. & P. Locke (1999). *A University Course in English Grammar*. London: Routledge.

- El-Hassan, S. (1990). *Modality in English And Standard Arabic: Paraphrase And Equivalence*. (Presented Paper, J. King Saudi Univ, 1990). Vol 2, Arts (2), Pp. 149-166.
- El-Farahaty, H. (2014). *Arabic-English-Arabic Legal Translation*. Routledge.
- Farghal, M., & Shunnaq, A. (1992). *Major problems in students' translations of English legal texts into Arabic*. *Babel*, 38(4), 203-210.
- Frawley, W. (1992). *Linguistic Semantics*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, New Jersey.
- Frawley, W. (Ed.). (2006). *The expression of modality* (Vol. 1). Walter de Gruyter.
- Ghazala, H. (1995). *Translation as problems and solutions: A coursebook for university students and trainee translators*. Malta: ELGA Publication.
- Ghazala, H. (2004). *Stylistic-semantic and grammatical functions of punctuation in English-Arabic translation*. *Babel*, 50(3), 230-245.
- Gibová, K. (2011). *On Modality in EU Institutional-Legal Documents*. *English Matters* ii, 6.
- Gibová, K. (2012). *Translation Procedures in the Non-literary and Literary Text Compared* (based on an analysis of an EU institutional-legal text and novel excerpt "The Shack" by William P. Young). Norderstedt: BOD GmbH.
- Gipper, H. (1972). *Gibt es ein sprachliches Relativitätsprinzip?*. Fischer S. Verlag GmbH.
- Givón, T. (1978). *Negation in language: pragmatics, function, ontology*. In *Syntax and semantics*. Volume 9: Pragmatics, (ed.) Peter Cole, 69-112. New York: Academic Press.
- Gross, R., Matthews, I., & Baker, S. (2005). *Generic vs. person specific active appearance models*. *Image and Vision Computing*, 23(12), 1080-1093.
- Halliday, M. A. K., & Matthiessen, C. M., & Yang, X. (1999). *Construing experience through meaning: A language-based approach to cognition*. London: Cassell.
- Halliday, M.A.K. (1985). *Spoken and Written Language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hatim, B., & Munday, J. (2004). *Translation: An advanced resource book*. New York.

- Hoffman, K., Svensson, C. (1996). *Chemotherapy improves survival and quality of life in advanced pancreatic and biliary cancer*. *Annals of Oncology*, 7(6), 593-600.
- Huddleston, R. (1984). *Introduction to the Grammar of English*. Cambridge University Press.
- Ibn Faris, A. (1328/1963). *Al-SaaHibi fi Fiqh al-Lugha. - wa Sunan al 'Arab fiKalaamiha*, Beirut: Mu'assasat Badran lil-Tiba'ah wa al-Nashr.
- Jarjour, M. (2006). *A Relevance Theoretic Account of the Translation of Ideological Assumptions in the Language of the News with Specific Reference to Translation from English into Arabic*. (Doctoral dissertation).University of Salford, Salford, UK.
- John, L. Austin. (1962). *How to do Things with Words*.
- Kiefer, F. (1994). *Modality*. In R. E. Asher (Ed.), *The Encyclopedia of language and linguistics* (pp. 2515-2520). Oxford: Pergamon Press. ISBN 0-08-035943-4.
- Koseska, T. (1995). *Groups and Eventualities: A Theory of Aspectuality*. PhD Thesis, Centre for Cognitive Science, University of Edinburgh.
- Kratzer, A. (2012). *Modals and conditionals: New and revised perspectives* (Vol. 36). Oxford University Press.
- Lewis, M. (1986). *The English Verb: An Exploration of Structure and Meaning*. Hove: LTP.
- Lyons, J. (1977). *Semantics*. 2 vols. New York: Academic Press.
- Lyons, J. (1989). *Semantic ascent: A neglected aspect of syntactic typology*. *Essays on Grammatical Theory and Universal Grammar*, Oxford: Clarendon, 153-186.
- Munday, J. (2013). *Introducing translation studies: Theories and applications*. Routledge.
- Nadjib, A. (2001). *Translation of oussous ettarjama mina el inglizia ila elarabia wa bilaks*. Cairo: Ibn sina bookshop.
- Newmark, P. (1981). *Approaches to Translation*. Oxford and New York: Pergamon.
- Newmark, P. (1988). *A textbook of translation* (Vol. 1, p. 988). New York: Prentice Hall.
- Newmark, P. (1991). *About translation* (Vol. 74): Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Newmark, P. (1993). *Paragraphs on Translation*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

- Newmark, P. (1998). *More paragraphs on translation*. Multilingual Matters.
- Nida, E. (1964). *Toward a science of translating* (Vol. 1964): Leiden.
- Nida, E. (1964). *Toward a science of translating*. Leiden: E.J.Brill.
- Nida, E., & Taber, C. (1994). *The Theory and Practice of Translating*. Brill, Leiden.
- Ouïd, S. (2009). *Problems in Translating Tenses From English into Arabic The Present Perfect: A Case Study*. Mentouri University, Algeria.
- Palmer, F. R. (1986). *Mood and Modality*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Palmer, F. R. (1990). *Modality and the English Modals, second edition*. London and New York: Longman.
- Palmer, F. R. (2001). *Mood and modality*. Cambridge University Press.
- Palmer, F. R. (2007). *Mood and modality*. Cambridge University Press. London.
- Papafragou, A. (1998). *Inference and word meaning: The case of modal auxiliaries*. *Lingua*, 105(1), 1-47. Chicago.
- Praninskas, J. (1975). *Rapid Review of English Grammar: A Text for Students of English as a Second Language*. Prentice-Hall.
- Quirk, R., & Greenbaum, G. (1985). *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman.
- Quirk, R., & Greenbaum, G. (1989). *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. Harlow: Longman.
- Rescher, N. (2000). *Realistic pragmatism: An introduction to pragmatic philosophy*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press. 68.
- Sarčević, S. (2000). *New Approach to Legal Translation*. London: Kluwer Law International.
- Stokoe, W. C., & Wilcox, S. E. (1995). *Gesture and the Nature of Language*. Cambridge University Press.
- Sela-sheffy, R., & Shlesinger, M. (2011). *Identity and Status in the Translational Professions*. Benjamins. Amsterdam/Philadelphia.
- Simpson, J. (2011). *The Routledge Handbook of Applied Linguistics*. Routledge.

- Toury, G. (2012). *Descriptive Translation Studies—and beyond*: Revised edition (Vol. 100). John Benjamins Publishing.
- Turvey, B., & Petherick, W. (2008). *Forensic Victimology Examining Violent Crime Victims in Investigative and Legal Contexts*. Elsevier.
- Vermeer, H. (1989/2004). 'Skopos and commission in translatorial action', in L. Venuti (ed) *The Translation Studies Reader*, 2nd ed. New York: Routledge, pp 227 – 238.
- Vinay, J. P., & Darbelnet, J. (1958/1995). *Stylistique comparée du français et de l'anglais. Méthode de traduction, Paris. Didier..Comparative Stylistics of French and English: A Methodology for Translation*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1995. (J. Sager & M.-J. Hamel, Trans.).
- Vinay, J. P., & Darbelnet, J. (1977). *Stylistique comparée du français et de l'anglais: méthode de traduction* (Vol. 1). Didier.
- Vinay, J.P., & Darbelnet. (1995). *Comparative stylistic of French and English: A methodology for translation*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Wen, H. (2013). *A Semantic Analysis of Modal Verbs in Barack Obama's 2012 Presidential Campaign Speeches*. Published Master dissertation, University of Malaya, Malaysia.
- Werner, T. (2006). *Future and Non-future Modal Sentences*. *Natural Language Semantics*, 14. pp. 235-255.
- Weston, M. (1991). *An English Reader's Guide to the French Legal System*: Oxford.
- Wided, B. (2010). *Modality in English, French and Arabic Biomedical Discourse: A Contrastive Study of Drug Information Leaflets*. (Master's thesis, Mentouri University, Faculty of Letters and Languages, Algeria). Retrieved from <http://bu.umc.edu.dz/theses/anglais/BOU1192.pdf>
- Wittgenstein, L. (1986). *Philosophical investigations*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Wolfram, W. (2001). *The Science of Translation: Problems and Methods*. John Benjamins Pub Co.
- Wright, V. H. (1951). *An essay in modal logic*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Zelenka, R. (2012). *Modality in the Language of Legal Documents*. (Bachelor's thesis, Tomas Bata University, Faculty of humanities, Salzwedel, Germany). Retrieved from http://digilib.k.utb.cz/bitstream/handle/10563/20499/zelenka_2013_bp.pdf?sequence=1