

**TRANSLATION ERRORS INDUCED BY FIRST
LANGUAGE INTERFERENCE IN ARABIC-ENGLISH**

TRANSLATION:

A qualitative study.

Dr. Saad Salem Alshamrani

An assistant professor at Shaqra University

Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. Riyadh

P.O 546 King Abdullah Road15431

ABSTRACT

The present research study mainly aims to investigate the first language interference in Arabic-English translation and the potential factors behind such translational practice. The researcher gives a special attention to lexical and syntactical translational mistakes and errors. This includes, on one hand, the lexical errors and mistakes occurred in the collocations, word-choice, and tautology. On the other hand, it investigates syntactical errors and mistakes in terms of punctuations and transitional connectors. To this affect, the researcher utilized two sources of data for reliable and valid outcomes. Therefore, in one hand, he used randomly selected texts made available before being edited, revised, and published at the official website of Islamic Military Counter Terrorism Coalition www.imctc.org albeit claimed finalized and problem-free by seven translators, consisting of more than 12000 words. All selected translated texts were holistically processed to figure out the translational mistakes and the potential reasons for that in order to reflect on the outlined research questions. On the other hand, a self-constructed survey was designed for the purpose of the research. The seven translators of the intended website were individually interviewed in face-to-face discussion. The results revealed that the FL interferences heavily impacted on the lexical errors and mistakes (collocations, word-choice, and tautology) and the syntactical errors and mistakes (punctuations and transitional connectors) for different reasons and factors contributory to producing poor translation. The researcher suggested some points to be considered by existing and potential translation practitioners and academics.

Key words:

Translation, Arabic, English, Translator

ملخص البحث

الأخطاء في الترجمة من اللغة العربية إلى اللغة الإنجليزية بسبب تأثير اللغة الأولى للمترجم (العربية): دراسة كيفية

تهدف هذه الدراسة الى الكشف عن الأخطاء في الترجمة الناتجة عن أثر لغة المترجم الأولى في ترجمته وأسباب ذلك في الترجمة من اللغة العربية إلى الإنجليزية إلى العربية على مستوى الألفاظ والعبارات من جهة وعلى المستوى النحوي من جهة أخرى. وقد أهتم البحث بشكل رئيسي دراسة الأخطاء الناتجة عن ذلك في المتلازمات اللفظية واختيار العبارات المناسبة والحشو وعلى الجانب النحوي فقد قصر الباحث بحثه بنتبع ذلك في استخدام علامات الترقيم وأدوات الربط للجمل ولتحقيق نتائج بحث موثوقة فقد اعتمد مصدرين مختلفين من البيانات للقيام بهذه الدراسة حيث قام الباحث بجمع مدونة عشوائية من نصوص مترجمة من اللغة العربية إلى اللغة الإنجليزية من موقع مركز التحالف الإسلامي لمكافحة الإرهاب بالرياض وهذه النصوص لم يتم نشرها في الموقع ولا زالت تحت المراجعة النهائية قبل النشر واستبانة تم توزيعها على المترجمين السبعة في المركز ومقابلتهم للإجابة على أسئلة الاستبانة وقد قام الباحث بدراسة وتحليل النصوص المختارة للكشف عن الأخطاء الحاصلة في الترجمة على المستويين المذكورين وأسباب ذلك للإجابة على أسئلة البحث ومقابلة المترجمين السبعة كل مترجم على حدة للإجابة على أسئلة الاستبانة المعدة من اجل هذه الدراسة وقد أظهرت الدراسة ان النصوص المترجمة الخاضعة للدراسة متأثرة بشكل واضح بلغة المترجمين الام (العربية) وقد أظهرت الدراسة أن النصوص التي تم تحليلها متأثرة بلغة المترجم الأولى مما تسبب في كثير من الأخطاء على المستوى النحوي ومستوى الالفاظ والعبارات لعدة أسباب تم الكشف عنها في متن البحث. وقد خلص البحث إلى تقديم بعض النقاط التي ينبغي ان يعتني بها المترجمون أثناء ترجمتهم

الكلمات المفتاحية:

الترجمة، اللغة العربية، اللغة الإنجليزية، المترجم

**TRANSLATION ERRORS INDUCED BY FIRST
LANGUAGE INTERFERENCE IN ARABIC-ENGLISH**

TRANSLATION:

A qualitative study.

Dr. Saad Salem Alshamrani

An assistant professor at Shaqra University

Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. Riyadh

P.O 546 King Abdullah Road15431

INTRODUCTION

Language per se is not a stand-alone human phenomenon when acculturation comes into play. Needless to say monolingualism is increasingly becoming rare given the fact that bilingualism, trilingualism, multilingualism, etc. bring languages closer but also create linguistic hegemony. This can be best manifested in the existing translation between two languages that are genetically unrelated such as Arabic and English. The linguistic borderline between the Source Language (SL) and the Target Language (TL) is sometimes blurred or too obscure, making the TL readership uneasy to read the translation. That is why the transfer from SL into TL goes sometimes patchy, scratchy, and bumpy due to the First Language Interference (L1). However, interference between L1 and L2 in translation occurs at different levels, including words, phrases, collocations, word-choice, idioms, similes, proverbs, metaphors, grammatical patterns, culture-specific concepts, or otherwise expressed (Havlaskova, 2010). It is believed that one of the most problematic areas in translation practices is the translator's interference as "it is the learner's language. Failure to recognize interference makes [the translator] look most foolish" (Newmark, 1981: 162).

Language interference in translation can slip into syntax, semantics, stylistics and even metalinguistics, causing interruption to the smooth flow of translation. Errors sneaking in translation stem from different reasons and take different forms of inappropriacy and frequency. Conventional criticism of errors in translation used to dwell most often on wrong word-choice; translation assessment subject-matter experts, proofreaders, and editors used to attribute most translation mistakes to the translator's poor vocabulary reservoir. Now with interdisciplinary translation coming into play, a meticulous attention is attached to pragmatics, stylistics, syntax, textual mechanics, coherence, and cohesion of the Target Text (TT) to best reflect the Source Text (ST). This does not mean that lexicon is brushed aside or backgrounded in translation; rather, translators have become more aware of the subtle nuances of semantics. Translators, proofreaders, editors, and censors run the whole gamut of

wording, including genre, register, word-choice, word frequency, and the like to observe the sensitivity of the ST and the TT and reduce inappropriacy to a minimum. With all these must-observe considerations in translation, many translators still bound themselves to their L1, leaving the door wide open for linguistic interference unknowingly and some other times knowingly.

The current research study seeks to explore different errors and mistakes in Arabic-English translation due to the L1 interference into L2, hence the first language interference (Arabic) into the second language (English) at lexical and syntactical level. Equally important, it also seeks to examine the possible reasons that account for such bi-lingual and bi-cultural interference from Arabic into English.

Literature Review

It stands to reason that “unnatural translation is marked by interference” (Newmark, 1988: 27). In a research study conducted by Al-Qasem (1983), errors at the syntactic and lexical levels were made by native speakers of Arabic primarily due to their mother tongue interference. In a similar vein, Khalil (1989) showed that the L1 dominance caused much interference in the translation produced, mainly in prepositions and prepositional phrases.

Corder (1981) notices that interference takes place between L1 and L2 because many native speakers knowingly or unknowingly insert some lexical, syntactical, and morphosyntactic characteristics of their mother language into their second language. Such errors and mistakes can hugely be related to word-choice, grammatical patterns, syntactical structures, and language-specific rules inapplicable to other languages. The cross-linguistic interference is triggered by the translator’s previous and present linguistic knowledge of L1 and L2, which goes like a pendulum, producing a TT flawed and riddled with linguistic errors and mistakes. For Vannestål (2009), L1 interference takes place when the translator’s poor linguistic knowledge causes lexical and syntactical gaps where L1 and L2 do not overlap. Equally important, a seminal observation also remarked by Vannestål is that the translation of social sciences, humanities and history features more interference than natural sciences, such as mathematics, chemistry and physics.

In a research study drawing on a randomly selected sample of 73 students as native speakers of Arabic collected at the American University of Beirut, Diab (1996) revealed that the students’ L1 (Arabic) caused a high degree of linguistic interference into their L2 (English). As per the linguistic taxonomy, the analysis showed that the sample students made (106) semantic errors, (193) syntactic errors, (217) lexical errors

and (558) grammatical errors. Diab concluded that the errors were made because the students suffered unknowingly lack of linguistic knowledge of L1 and L2, unaware of the specificity of each language. The findings are also emphasized by Newmark who believes that "translator unconscious of SL interference is always at fault" (Newmark, 1998: 80).

In an empirical research study drawing on a randomly selected sample of 26 students as native speakers of Dutch and of proficient English, Bloem et al., (2004) showed that it was semantic interference in translation that caused errors mainly at the lexical level of interference. While at the structural level of interference in translation, Maier (2008) revealed that syntactic interference was flagged up mostly in the L1-to-L2 translation, while syntactic interference was less problematic in the L2-to-L1 translation. The findings highlight what Corder (1981) remarked about the uninformed translator's inappropriate insertion from L1 into L2, which produced awkward and unfortunate translation. This is highlighted by Newmark "Other 'obvious' areas of interference, and therefore unnaturalness, are in the use of the articles; progressive tenses; noun-compounding; collocations; the currency of idioms and metaphors; aspectual features of verbs; infinitives" (Newmark, 1988: 28).

Dweik and Othman (2017) show that the linguistic problems arising from L1 interference (Arabic) into L2 (English) in translation is lexical and grammatical due to the lack of subject-matter knowledge of the SL and the TL. This is true because the similarities and differences of L1 and L2 influence the language transfer processes and transliteral interaction (Mitchell and Myles, 2004). Translators do their best to steer clear of any unfavorable interference because "in fact, interference is the specter of most professional translators, the fear that haunts the translation student; the ever-present trap" (Newmark, 1998: 81).

All the previously cited research studies reveal that interference triggered by L1 in L2 tug-of-war in translation primarily cause mistakes and errors at different linguistic levels and zero interference in translation is almost impossible to realize: "Interference is the chaotic as well as the dynamic element in a language, continually breaking up the system where everything fits, creating too many senses for one word or too many words for one thing. There is no even restricted rule for this problem, but only the translator's one unrestricted rule: mind the sentence, mind the word, and finally mind the sentence. Translated words always lie, but translated texts only lie when they are badly translated" (Newmark, 1981: 163). On a translator's journey, much of L1 is yoked together with L2, causing interference to slip into translation lexically, syntactically, stylistically, or otherwise expressed.

Research Methodology

The current research study aimed to investigate and deeply dig into first language interference (FL) in Arabic-English translation with primary focus on identifying the lexical and syntactical inappropriacy made by the translators. The researcher looked into the translation mistakes at lexical level in terms of collocations, word-choice and tautology. For the syntactical level, the researcher restricted the research to examine the translation mistakes and errors occurred in using conjunctions and transitional connectors. This helped identify the degree and the typology of FL interference in the selected translation. Therefore, the researcher proposed to carry out a qualitative study to investigate such a linguistic phenomenon, using two sources of data to better reflect on the investigated topic and come up with valid conclusion. The first source of data is a linguistic corpus compiled from the materials made available at the official website of the Center of Islamic Military Counter Terrorism Coalition (IMCTC) at www.imctc.org. This center was established in 2015 in Riyadh in Saudi Arabia in the aim of forming a unified pan-Islamic front against terrorism. It operates in three languages: Arabic, English and French. The materials and topics dealt with in the aforementioned website are mostly specialized in political, social and religious issues, which in many ways are unmalleable for translation. This in turn has a profound linguistic impact on the translated materials found in the website in general and from Arabic into English in particular. To this affect, randomly translated texts from Arabic into English made available before being edited, revised and published at www.imctc.org were collected albeit claimed finalized and problem-free by the seven translators. However, given the accuracy, authenticity and reliability of the translated texts, the STs and the TTs were maintained, stored and archived on the portal of the official website for editorial concerns before giving permission to proceed for publication. It was clear that the editorial team members had their doubt that L1 interference has come into play, impacting the overall messages expressed. All stored and maintained texts needed to be meticulously checked and revised before publication. The researcher, nevertheless, was granted an access to such stored materials to collect the needed data for the purpose of the study.

The data, however, were culled over the period of three months from August to October 2020. The collected data comprises more than 12000 words from ST and TT. Such compiled texts deemed appropriate to carry out a linguistic research as emphasized by Alshamrani (2017). However, there are some telling and compelling reasons why the Arabic-English translated texts were selected from this particular website. Previously,

editors at IMCTC complained about why many pieces of translation are almost literal by many Arab translators when it is from Arabic into English. The researcher sought to investigate if FL interference is a factor contributory to awkward translation. Again, the selection of this material is aimed to help the researcher to prove or disapprove the hypothesis that most Arab translators feel more comfortable when translating from English into Arabic than the other way round as it is their mother tongue. Another reason is that the topics translated contain much social, political and religious content that may trigger L1 interference. One more possible reason is that the translators involved have much less exposure to English texts written by native writers as they mostly deal with Arabic and English texts written by Arabic native speakers in the IMCTC located in Saudi Arabia.

The researcher, thereafter, holistically processed the collected data to indicate the mistakes and errors made by the translators due to L1 interference (Arabic). The extracted examples were analyzed to identify the nature of the mistakes in the light of the outlined objectives for the purpose of the study: lexical and syntactical errors. All relevant mistakes were extracted and classified either be lexical or syntactical. To ensure the validity and reliability of the results, the extracted examples were sent to two linguists at AL-Imam Mohammed Ibn Saud Islamic University to get another critical pair of eyes about the categories made by the researcher. They were requested to classify these errors according to their lexical and syntactical features without revealing the classifications made by the researcher. It turned out that the errors tabulated by the researcher were agreed upon with the exception of few examples that were later excluded from the analysis. The researcher, however, while seeking brevity processed some telling and compelling examples in the body of the study to provide a remarkable snapshot of the probed issues because including all of the extracted examples in such a piece of research is not possible. All presented examples were scrutinized along with their provided translation and the translational mistakes and errors were identified and elaborated wherever applicable. Again, the extracted examples were divided into lexical and syntactical errors and each classification was splitted into sub-classifications under these two major taxonomies as detailed in the analysis section below. Nevertheless, it should be made clear that the current research study primarily addresses the errors and mistakes attributable to L1 interference. With the methodology set for the analysis, the mistakes and errors in translation were identified, grouped, and explained in light of the differences and similarities between the SL and the TL and how the translators erroneously assumed that their translations would fit together with the SL.

Therefore, the analysis of the L1 interference in translation will be mainly restricted to the lexical errors (collocations, word-choice, and tautology) and the syntactical errors (punctuations and transitional connectors). Other possible errors and mistakes due to FL interference in translation will be irrelevant given the size of the research study and the brevity required. However, for the qualitative study, the administration of the IMCTC's website was directly contacted by the researcher prior to embarking on the research to get their approval to take part in the study. Hence, the researcher developed a self-constructed survey to better collect background information about the translators involved. The survey highlighted some demographic and professional factors that show their expertise in translation. The seven translators were individually interviewed and requested to answer the constructed survey. The questions were initiated to draw on their nationality and linguistic background as the major factors thought to be the trigger of FL interference. They also were asked about the time given to them to get the texts translated and whether they were professionally trained or given guidelines to operate as translators at IMCTC. In addition, the time given to them to get their works done was at the heart of the survey along with if they were committed to any other heavy duties at the center. Their answers were immediately transferred in the survey's sheet to make sure the researcher did not confuse or misunderstand their answers which may compromise the outcomes of the survey. The researcher, nevertheless, checked each survey with the intended interviewee at the end of every individual session to ensure the accuracy and precision of the answers provided by every individual participant. Their names and ages, however, were not involved in the survey because it deemed irrelevant to the objectives outlined. Their answers, however, were manually processed by the researcher to indicate the key factors behind such interference or any potential answers concerning the ongoing investigation. The survey was conducted this way to better draw on why in many instances of L1 interference they translated the TTs as is. Such short interviews boost the researcher's perception to properly understand how L1 interference slips into the translation of the TTs. The researcher selected randomly many instances of the processed examples and asked the translators in face-to-face interviews why such an item, phrase, word or clause is translated this way. The two-way discussion helped the researcher built a better understanding of how the translators produced their TTs that sound much impacted by their ST, hence Arabic, given L1 interference.

Data Analysis

The analysis of the data is split into two subsections as outlined below.

The survey analysis

The analysis of the survey indicate that the seven translators of the texts are native speakers of Arabic (Sudan and Jordan), and all have Bachelor in the English Literature and Language with core modules in translation. The time given to the seven translators to get the intended texts translated was sufficient as confirmed by them which normally is one week ahead of the deadline of submission. The seven translators were not overloaded with other tasks nor were they new to translation as a profession but perhaps new to the genre of such domains: military ideology that encompasses other key relevant issues. Of note, the seven translators did not receive any relevant training on the translation of such materials, nor they were provided with a dictionary of standard terminology to be used. However, they were referred to the said official website to learn about the industry by the client, but they did not.

The corpus analysis

The analysis of the materials culled from IMCTC's website for the purpose of study was aimed to explore the translation errors and mistakes at lexical and syntactical level. It revealed that the translation errors and mistakes in the processed data were notable with various contributory factors as illustrated below.

Lexical Level

Based on the goals and the objective set out for the purpose of the study, the analysis of the data reveals that the Arabic-English translated texts under investigation were enormously influenced by the translator's first language interference, hence, Arabic at lexical level, namely, collocations, word-choice (mot juste) and tautology. The three categories are more interrelated to each other and are key to translation from the SL (Arabic) into the TL (English).

Word-Choice

Translators from Arabic into English most often fumble for the mot juste when more than one word-choice is possible or when they get lost in meaning couched in the subtle nuances a word may impart: “to be comfortable in another language, you need roughly half of the words you possess in your native language – 25.000” (Gagne and Wilton-Godberfforde, 2020: 7). In translation, word-choice is the best word to be used in a given TT, observing the context, register, genre and frequency of word. The two sampled texts feature many cases of wrong word-choice as cited in the examples:

وقت	era and age
الحقوقية	jurisprudent and civil

الشيطان	demon	and Satan
التيارات	currents	and streams
التكفير	infidelity	and takfir
الأعمال	deeds	and actions

The translators of the two sampled texts provided two alternatives for several words: Satan and demon for (شيطان), era and age for (وقت), infidelity and takfir for (التكفير), deeds and actions for (أعمال), and jurisprudent and civil for (الحقوقية). Using alternatives in such a way is not reader-friendly in translation. Elsewhere in the TT, the translators made many cases of inappropriate word-choice. التيارات (currents) and التكفير (blasphemy) are telling examples of how words are not appropriately chosen. الحاكمة is mistranslated as (governance) and it is also transliterated into English as is in Arabic; the result is a misleading translation. Telling examples of wrong or alternative word-choice show that the translators are uncertain which word is most appropriate for the context. The word شبهة in Arabic is translated into English as [suspicion], which is not the case. شبهة is simply [myth] as it conveys the baseless ideology the word is couched in.

Word-choice in translation, however, is a requisite skill for translators and failing to display appropriate word-choice renders translation ineffective (Baker, 2011). As shown above and in many different examples in the processed data, the two sampled texts are riddled and flawed with cases of wrong or uncertain word-choice, which require thorough and meticulous revision for the entire translation or possible an A-Z retranslation.

Collocations

In translation, a collocation is a natural combination of two words or more in a linguistic environment that creates a smooth flow of meaning. Equally important, “Words which we might think of as synonyms or near-synonyms will often have quite different sets of collocates” (Baker, 2011: 47). In translation, patterning collocations is onerously unpredictable and even misleading. Collocations are set combinations and not improvised: “unlike many other language components, collocations and idioms are not improvised off the cuff or hastily extemporized” (Al-Daqs, 2012: 7). Again, some collocations are language specific and may cause problems when not observed in translation (Abdul-Raof, 2001).

The two sample texts feature several inappropriate collocations. Telling examples include intellectual angles, وجهة نظر فكرية, original suspicion, الشبهة الأصلية, blasphemy of deeds, تكفير الأعمال, tear up social fabric يمزق النسيج الاجتماعي. Notoriously enough, given the overuse of words and attempts of improvisation of some would-be writers, many words are forcibly pieced

together to produce metaphoric and rhetorical textual chunks. Novice translators most often get decoyed by such risible attempts. For instance, التأسيس القانوني is a good collocation in Arabic and is translated [legal rooting], which does not sound intelligible for the English readership.

What sounds a pair of collocation in the SL may not be so in the TL, and translators being unaware of this critically important issue across languages most often produce unfortunate collocations (Baker, 2011; Al-Daqs, 2012). For instance, أولي العلم in Arabic is widely used in literary and religious discourse. In English, however, [rooted in knowledge] as translated sounds too literal and does not make a good collocation. Possibly, a better option can be [well-rounded scholars], [polymaths], or [subject-matter experts]. As stated earlier, the overuse of seemingly good collocations in the SL brings about the misuse of words to make good collocations; ضوابط محترمة is too generic in Arabic and sounds a little more informal. Too much tided to the SL, the translator produces accordingly [respectable controls], which again sounds uncommon in English.

Tautology

In language, tautology is a form of needless repetition of an idea or word (Merriam-Webster Dictionary, 2021). Tautology can be at the word level or the meaning level. A good example of tautology can be the following:

The book will be translated by an English-Arabic translator who speaks Arabic and English.

The procedures will enhance and support law enforcement agencies.

In (A), tautology is marked at the meaning level, which is repeating the fact that the translator is bilingual and speaks Arabic and English. While in (B), tautology is marked at the word level, indicating improvement.

Tautology can be useful for metaphorical and emphatic purposes: “Tautology is usually used for emphasis in the TL but this repetition in the SL also shows that these are two objects to a connotative verb” (Khuddro, 2014: 262). However, it can be a source of verbosity, which overshadows the key messages; therefore, it should be avoided when possible: “reduction can be a useful translation procedure to eliminate a tautology that might otherwise sound too repetitive or awkward” (Rasul, 2019: 121).

The texts sampled for the research study show that the translators exercised tautology in many instances throughout the selected samples. Some of them are illustrated in the table below.

**TRANSLATION ERRORS INDUCED BY FIRST LANGUAGE INTERFERENCE IN ARABIC-
ENGLISH TRANSLATION: A qualitative study.**

TT	ST
Necessities and needs	الضرورات والحاجات
Reinforced and enhanced	معززة ومدعومة
Model and example	نموذج ومثال
Country or homeland	الوطن
Permission or allowance	السماح
Commendable and praised	جدير بالثناء والشكر
Allegiance or loyalty	الولاء
Incumbent or imposed	مفروضة
Condition and state	الحالة والظرف
Decorated or ornamented	مزينة
Intellect or mind	العقل
Decide or judge	يحكم
Explicitness and clearness	الصراحة والوضوح

As shown, some ST items are single words but translated into the TL as two words, creating tautology triggered by the translator's uncertainty and hesitancy of which word to use. Again, the ST is marked with many synonymous words which the translators could not manage to avoid; they kept both synonymous words in the TTs. This will contribute to revealing how much FL interference is there in translation.

Elsewhere, we find مفهوم التطرف is translated as concept of extremism; the term extremism per se means مفهوم التطرف. This is repeated in almost all the words that have مفهوم and the word concept is needless. In a similar vein, شعور التعصب, شعور الاستعلاء, شعور الفخر, شعور الكراهية, are all translated with the word feeling inserted, which is again needless: feeling of hatred, feeling of pride, feeling of superiority, feeling of bigotry. The indecision on the side of the translator produced such tautologies that are not used for emphatic or metaphorical purposes. The tautological pairs cited above also show that some items do exist in the SL (Arabic). Many content writers tend to use synonyms to make their texts look more convincing. Again, the translators used [or] not as a conjunction but to give alternative words as they were not sure of which words to choose. The tautology marked in the TL also shows that the translators fumbled for the mot juste, hence, they misused different words, believing they are the same. This shows that the translators are unaware of the subtle nuances of many seemingly synonymous words in terms of meaning, genre, register, and frequency of words in the TL.

Syntactical Level

At the syntactical level, as set for the purpose of the study, only two syntactical interference problems will be discussed: punctuations and transitional connectors. The two categories are more interrelated to each

other and are key to translation from the SL (Arabic) into the TL (English) when the two languages are genetically unrelated. Given the badly written ST in terms of punctuations and lack of transitional connectors, the TT displays many instances of FL interferences with almost a zero-level intervention on the side of the translators to better improve the TT. The ST is left as it is without adaptation or fusion, and the misplaced punctuations created many TT run-on sentences.

Punctuations

Punctuations mean inserting standardized marks in writing to make the meaning much clearer and produce separate structural and meaningful units (Merriam-Webster Dictionary, 2021). Punctuation marks mainly include, capitalization, full stops, semicolons, commas, question marks, exclamation marks, parentheses, and dashes. Punctuation marks make a difference in translation (Mogahed, 2012). The main role of punctuation marks in translation is to make the TT smooth and seamless: “the primary function of punctuation is to resolve structural uncertainties in a text, and to signal nuances of semantic significance which might otherwise not be conveyed at all or would at best be much more difficult for a reader to figure out” (Parkes, 2016: 1). When punctuations are properly used, translation ambiguities are resolved.

The translators followed the ST in terms of the commas used even though the meaning of the sentence is fully completed; they did not use a full stop; instead, the translators followed the badly punctuated ST, in which commas are notoriously used regardless of the complete meaning of many sentences. Punctuating the TT is of great importance to produce a problem-free translation. A telling example of a badly punctuated text is the following TT alongside the ST:

TT

And affiliation differs in its dispensation according to its motive, so what is meant by significant purposes such as identification and others differs from the other one which means differentiation and religiosity, therefore the first intent principal is permission or allowance, whereas the second intent has two cases, the first case, if it led to a legitimate meaning or a significant, then it is commendable and praised, and it ranges between being obligatory and desirable such as affiliation to Islam and the Sunnah, Almuhajirin (people who moved with Prophet Mohammed (peace be upon him) from Mecca to Medina), and Ansar ((the indigenous citizens of Medina who received and supported Prophet Mohammed (peace be upon him))), and it also means the affiliation to homeland of Islam for the purpose of the legitimate meanings, so it is like that.

ST

والانتماء يختلف حكمه بحسب الباعث عليه، فما يقصد به مقاصد معتبرة كالتعريف وغيرها يختلف عما يقصد به التفاضل والتدين، فالمقصد الأول الأصل فيه الإباحة، والثاني إن أدى إلى معنى مشروع، ومقصد معتبر فهو محمود، ويدور بين الوجوب والاستحباب كالانتساب إلى الإسلام والسنة، والمهاجرين والأنصار، ومنه الانتساب إلى وطن الإسلام للمعاني الشرعية فهو من هذا القبيل.

Looking closely at the above cited TT, we see several punctuations going missing or misplaced. This is due to either the translators' lack of knowledge about punctuation in the SL (Arabic) and the TL (English), or the TT is badly punctuated and the translators too faithful to translation. The second assumption is much less valid in that the translator is expected to produce a well-punctuated TT.

With misplacement or lack of punctuation marks, the TT is a run-on paragraph; the whole paragraph is inflated into one big sentence. The example cited should be broken down to least five separate sentences with full stops and a semicolon.

Another FL interference is the use of a double-bracket parenthesis and a single bracket parenthesis, which is inconsistent. Driven by FL interference, the translator here used [and] at the beginning of the sentence, which is common in the SL (Arabic) but is uncommon in the TL (English).

The badly punctuated ST displays the overuse of commas instead of full stops to separate complete sentences. The translators imitated the same ST faulty punctuation marks as shown above. In several instances, the translators used two punctuations in one place, such as a question mark and an exclamation mark for no clear purpose.

Transitional Connectors

It is stated that the translation connectors create coherence and cohesion of the TT (Loughridge et al., 2006). However, the processed data are riddled with many occasions on which the FL is demonstrated in the form of the misuse of transitional connectors. This, indeed, resulted in poor cohesive and coherent texts. For instance, the connector بل was translated as [rather] at the beginning of the sentence, which is very much uncommon in English. In a similar vein, the translators attempted to be too faithful to the ST to a fault. Unlike English, it is possible in Arabic to start a new sentence with [و], while it sounds odd to do so in English. The following examples show FL interference:

ومن ثم وبهذا التشويش يكون عرضة للانحراف، بل والتجنيد ليكون عدوًا للوطن، وقالوا في عرض الشبهة إن الوطنية جاهلية، لا يجوز الانتماء بها، لأنها من أمور الجاهلية، ومن مظاهر الخروج عن الإسلام الدعوة إليها وتدريبها وربط الناس بها.

And then, with this confusion, he is liable to deviation, and even recruitment to be an enemy for the country or homeland. And they said in the suspicion that

patriotism is ignorance, it is not permissible to belong to it, because it is one of the matters of ignorance. And one of the manifestations of departure from Islam is the call to it, its teaching and linking people to it.

Instead of using [and] at the beginning of a sentence different times, a better option is using, for example, [also], [again], [furthermore], [in the same vein], [by the same token], etc. The translators started several new sentences using [and]. They could have used other conjunctions or transitional phrases to connect the flow and produce better cohesion and coherence. Another telling example can be the following:

... يكون عرضة للانحراف، بل والتجنيد ليكون عدواً للوطن، وقالوا في...

... he will be liable for deviation. Rather, he is liable for recruitment to be an enemy for the country or homeland. And they said in ...

FL interference causes both mistakes and errors. Being unaware of what goes well in which language and what does not is a factor contributory to unfortunate translation. Again, drawing on our previous experiences and assumptions causes translators to make inevitable mistakes and errors (Ellis, 2006; Brown, 2007). Mistakes and errors caused by FL interference are due to the lack of experience of the rules of a learner's second language worsened by assuming that FL and F2 are very much the same (Gass and Selinker, 2001; Ellis, 1998). A telling instance of lack of transitional connectors is the use of [therefore]; the translators used it halfway in the sentence without a semicolon, a full stop or other punctuation marks. In English, [therefore] is used at the beginning of a sentence to introduce a result. *ذلك* or *على ذلك* applies to Arabic almost the same way. In the *فمن ارتكب ناقضاً من نواقض الإسلام فلكل مسلم تكفيره طاعة لله* *ورسوله، ولكل مسلم قتله بناءً على ذلك،*

ذلك is not [therefore]; it is simply [accordingly], which explains why something is judged this or that way. Károly (2017) explains that cohesion and coherence work in tandem to produce a meaningful translation through different factors, and translational connectors help translators to piece the text together as one unit. Of good note, some STs lack transitional connectors, and if translators leave their TTs without such transitional connectors, the flow will be awkward, loose, and bumpy. In the following telling instance, a transitional connector is missing:

[... because it is reprehensible kind of passion, and God has said: "Have you seen him who takes his desires as his god, ..], which reads in the ST as:

﴿أَفَرَأَيْتَ مَنِ اتَّخَذَ إِلَهَهُ هَوَاهُ وَأَضَلَّهُ اللَّهُ عَلَىٰ عِلْمٍ﴾.

Instead of [and God has said], it is advised to place a full stop, start a new sentence, and use [in this regard] as a good transitional connector. This helps to create a better flow, thanks to coherence and cohesion of words and meaning. The translators could have used several phrases for better transitional connection, coherence and cohesion, which help to create a smooth flow of the TT, such as:

Based on this,

As such,

Equally important,

With this in mind,

Taken together,

Of note,

Against this background,

Beyond a shadow of doubt,

In all fairness,

Findings

The findings of the research study reveal several critical points about the FL interference into the TT in terms of lexical and syntactical observations. The translation of the processed texts indicated several notices concerning FL interference and potential caused errors and mistakes which can be summarized in the following:

The translators were overdependent on their mother tongue unknowingly that the linguistics and dynamics of the SL and the TL are not the same.

The translators showed little creativity in terms of the SL and TL word-choice, collocations, tautology, synonyms, punctuation marks, transitional connectors, and the like.

With FL interference coming into play, the translators when interviewed admitted they had much less time to read genuine texts written by native writers to help build their bilingualism.

FL interference at the lexical and syntactical level can be largely due to the linguistic incompetence and unwell-training and experience in translation that leave the door wide opening to such errors and mistakes revealed in the study.

The findings reveal that translated texts are unlikely revised and well-edited and therefore it is highly advised to get translation from the genetically unrelated languages such English and Arabic revised, tweaked, proofread, and edited by subject-matter experts to brush aside or at least reduce FL interference at a minimal.

Taken together, the translators' FL interference is contributory to poor translation. This can be also attributable to their poor reading of and exposure to genuine texts written by native writers. Multidisciplinary

reading can play a vital role in enhancing translation and reducing FL and F2 interferences. This can be a potential research study yet to be conducted in the future by translation researchers.

Conclusion

The present piece of research scrutinized the translation mistakes and errors induced by FL interference in Arabic-English translation. It used two different sources of data to draw on the objectives set out for the purpose of the study: randomly samples culled from the IMCTC website and a self-constructed survey. It mainly attempted to investigate such translational potential exercises at lexical and syntactical levels and the possible triggers causing such linguistic practice to come into play. The study indicated that the processed samples were heavily influenced by Fi interference given the impact made by FL, which increases the translator's lack of linguistics of the SL and the TL. Also, the study indicated that lack of reading of texts written by native writers was found to be another contributory factor behind such mistakes as the translators depend on their rudimentary and residual knowledge of their working languages in translation. Of great note, FL interference at the examined lexical aspects (word-choice, collocations, tautology) and syntactical features (punctuations and transitional connectors) were notably observed. Factors contributory to FL interference can be reduced when a translator displays a deeper level of exposure to the linguistics and dynamics of the SL and the TL.

References

- Abdul-Raof, H. (2001) *Arabic Stylistics: A Pragmatic Analysis*, Germany: Wiesbaden.
- Al-Daqs, M. (2012). *The Role of Idioms and Collocations in Improving English-Arabic*. Unpublished Master Thesis. UK: University of Salford.
- Alshamrani, S, (2017). *English borrowings used in Saudi Arabian newspapers. A case study of three Saudi newspapers*. Unpublished PhD thesis. Aberdeen University.
- Al-Qasem, M. (1983). *An investigation into the syntactic and lexical interference of Arabic*. Unpublished MA Thesis. Jordan: Yarmouk University.
- Al-Zoubi, D. & Abu Eid, M. (2014). *The influence of the first language (Arabic) on learning English as a second language in Jordanian schools, and its relation to educational policy: Structural errors*. *Sino- US English Teaching*, 11, (5) 355-372.
- Antar, S. (2002). *What every novice translator should know*. *Translational Journal*, 6, (3).
- Baker, M. (2011). *In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation*. New York and London: Routledge.
- Benson, C. (2002). *Transfer cross-linguistic influence: Key concepts*. Oxford: Oxford University
- Corder, P. (1981). *Error analysis and interlanguage*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Darwish, A. (2008). *Optimality in Translation*. Australia: Writescope Publishers.
- Diab, N. (1996). *The transfer of Arabic in the English writings of Lebanese students*. *ESP, Sao Paulo*, 18, (1) 71-83.
- Dweik, B. (2000). *Bilingualism and the problem of linguistic and cultural interference*. In L. Al-Harbi (Ed). *Arabic language and culture in a borderless world* (224-237). Kuwait: University Kuwait.
- Dweik, B. and Othman, Z. (2017). *Lexical and Grammatical Interference in The Translation of Written Texts from Arabic into English*. *Academic Research International* Vol. 8(3) September 2017.
- Ellis, R. (1998), *Second Language Acquisition*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Erarslan, A., & Hol, D. (2014). *Language Interference on English: Transfer on the Vocabulary, Tense, and Preposition Use of Freshmen Turkish EFL Learners*. *ELTA Journal*, 2, (2) 4-22.

- Gaber, J. (2005). *A Textbook of Translation: Concept, Method, and Practice*. Al-Ain, UAE: University Book House.
- James Dickins, J., Hervey, S. and Ian, I. (2013). *Thinking Arabic Translation: A Course in Translation Method: Arabic to English*. New York and London: Routledge.
- Károly, K. (2017). *Aspects of Cohesion and Coherence in Translation: The case of Hungarian-English news translation*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Khalil, A. (2010). *A contrastive grammar of English and Arabic*. Amman: Jordan Book Centre.
- Khalil, S. (1981). *Linguistic interference and its impact on Arabic-English bilingualism*. Unpublished PhD Dissertation. Buffalo: University of New York.
- Khuddro, A. (2014). *Arabic - English Syntax in Translation: Equivalence at Word and Sentence Levels*. Al Manhal.
- Newmark, P and Newmark, E. (1988). *A Textbook of Translation*. USA: Prentice-Hall International.
- Newmark, P. (1981). *Approaches to translation*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Parkes, M. (2016). *Pause and Effect: An Introduction to the History of Punctuation in the West*. Routledge.
- Rasul, S. (2019). *Journalistic Translation: Procedures and Strategies in English-Kurdish Translation of Media Texts*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Vannestål, M. (2009). *Linguistic Interference in Translated Academic Texts: A Case Study of Portuguese Interference in Abstract Translated into English*. Sweden: Vaxjo University.

