

Lexical Problems in English to Arabic Translation: A Critical Analysis of Health Documents in Australia

Nidal Alhihi

German Jordanian University in Amman Jordan

Abstract

This study empirically examines lexical translation problems encountered by accredited translators in English Arabic Translations. Its main aim is to identify whether lexical errors occur in professionally translated documents and investigate the type of lexical errors occurring as well as identify the possible reasons for them. Five translated health documents in New South Wales were randomly, lexical errors were counted and then analyzed. The functionalist approach has been adopted in this research. Analysis of the errors was mainly focusing on semantics. The lexical errors found were related but not limited to additions, omissions, compounds, synonyms collocations and inconsistencies. More extensive research is required to identify additional types of lexical errors found in professionally translated documents. This research has many limitations due to the paucity of data and its inability to accommodate for all types of errors and their related factors. Therefore, more research is required in this field in order to improve translation outcomes. The findings affirm the hypothesis that lexical errors are made by accredited as well as student translators. It does not reveal conclusively, however, that errors at the lexical level are due to complex and or new lexical items.

Keywords: equivalence, lexis, semantic, translation errors

Cite as: Alhihi, N. (2015). Lexical Problems in English to Arabic Translation: A Critical Analysis of Health Documents in Australia. *Arab World English Journal*, 8 (1).

DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol6no2.24>

Introduction

As translators, we constantly strive to achieve equivalence at word, sentence and text level. In the process we are often faced with the dilemma of whether to stay loyal to the source text, or sacrifice some features in order to deliver the content accurately. The lexis represents a problem in this process and the lexical items we choose have an impact on the quality of the piece. In an attempt to understand some of the effects of these lexical choices on the target text this study was conducted.

1.1 The Research's Aims

English and Arabic are very diverse language systems and operate differently at word, sentence and text level, a feature which makes the translation process between them complicated and challenging. In an effort to assist translators in this process and contribute to a better understanding of the pitfalls involved in handling the two language systems this study have eventuated. It proposes to identify and investigate lexical translation problems between English and Arabic by critically analysing some professionally translated health documents in New South Wales. The research aims to achieve the following:

1. Identify lexical translation errors made by professional translators in translated health documents in New South Wales and discuss their possible causes.
2. Highlight the types of lexical items which posed problems in these documents.

The hypothesis is that lexical errors are not merely made by student translators but also by professionals because new and complex lexical items cause translation problems between English and Arabic.

1.2 Research Questions

The research questions include the following:

1. Does the lexis pose a problem in the translation of health documents from English into Arabic?
2. What kind of errors are made in translated health documents by professional translators between English and Arabic?
3. What are the possible causes of these lexical errors in the translated documents?

1.3 Methodology

1.3.1 Theoretical Framework

A number of theorists have written about translation. Some like Catford (1965) viewed it in terms of grammatical equivalence while others in terms of communicative or functional equivalence Nida & Waard (1986), and House (cited in Gutt, 1991). Catford, (1965) advocates finding formal equivalence, between languages, by initially focusing on the individual grammatical units then subsequently moving toward the text level. This view lacks practicality because languages vary in their grammatical systems and unless the source text language and target text language are very similar, this cannot be achieved. Nida (2001), focus on the message rather than the form and view translation dynamically, arguing that it is a communicative process. Nida & Waard (1986) discuss 'dynamic' and 'functional' equivalence, which advocates reproducing the source text message in the closest natural way in the target language. This is also the view adopted by House who discusses function under the notion of 'covert translation' (cited in Gutt, 1991, p.45).

Similarly, Dickens, Hervey and Higgins (2002) advocate the importance of purpose in translation. They emphasise the importance of understanding and assessing the salient features of the source text. The functional approach to translation is more appropriate than the pure linguistic approach because it views translation in context and therefore will constitute the basis for discussions in this paper.

1.3.2. Data Collection

The collection of translated documents used for critical analysis comprise of five translated health documents from English into Arabic, which were downloaded from the New South Wales Health Communication Service's website. These documents are information booklets prepared by the government to raise the public's awareness of health issues in Australia. They were chosen for a number of reasons. Firstly, they are accessible and can be conveniently downloaded. Secondly, these documents are the work of accredited translators who are approved by the government. Thirdly, they belong to the plain English types of texts and are written in a simple everyday English style. They generally have a low register and are easy to understand, therefore allowing for the assumption that if lexical translation problems exist in these documents they will most likely exist in more difficult texts.

To identify and investigate lexical problems faced when translating from English into Arabic the empirical data collected is critically analysed and examined for errors. A list of categories of errors is prepared. They constitute errors related to additions, omissions, synonyms, compounds, collocations and consistency.

A combination of quantitative and qualitative methods is used in the analysis of the data. First the errors are identified, categorised and quantified (frequency of occurrence noted) and the results of each document are tabulated. The results are then qualitatively analysed to discuss the errors and establish their possible causes.

The analysis hinges on the functional approach to translation which stresses the importance of context and purpose in translation. Equivalence is looked at primarily from a semantic point of view because it is beyond the scope of this study to include other dimensions.

1.4 Literature Review

A number of researchers Saraireh (2001), Al- Jabr (2001), Baker (1992) Stall & Knight (1998), Bakir (n.d.), Bahumaid (2006), Mohamed (n.d.), and Fargal (1995) have attempted to explain translation difficulties between English and Arabic at lexical level. Some of these studies have focused on examining and analysing work produced by translation students Mohamed (n.d.), Bakir (n.d.), Fargal (1995) and Al-Jabr (2006), while others identified problems by looking at isolated examples produced or collated by the authors Baker (1992), and Saraireh (2001). Therefore, there is a gap and a need for empirical studies like the present one which analyses tangible errors found in translated documents by professional translators in Australia.

The literature identifies a number of issues as problematic in the areas of lexis and they will be discussed under the following categories.

1.4.1. Lexical Inconsistency

The problem of lexical inconsistency in translation between English and Arabic is recognised by Saraireh (2001) and Stalls & Knight (1998). Both studies identify this problem, which is to some extent overlooked in the literature. Saraireh(2001) highlights the difficulty with technical terms that lack equivalence in Arabic and focuses attention on the problem of inconsistency stemming

from this lexical gap between the two languages. He argues that in the absence of equivalence, the translator resorts to borrowing concepts from the target language and establishing signifiers for them, a strategy which can be problematic if not applied consistently. Although Sarairoh (2001) contributes to a better understanding of the pitfalls of translating technical terms, and the consequences of choosing certain lexical items over others, he fails to include two important lexical categories in his study. These are acronyms and proper names, which also constitute a source of inconsistency.

Stalls & Knight (1998), on the other hand, do identify these categories as sources of inconsistencies in translation, but view them merely as drawbacks to the transliteration strategy used in translating proper names and technical terms between English and Arabic. They therefore attempt in their article to solve this problem by creating a model for Arabic transliteration based on sound mapping and algorithm to standardise the process. However, as they concede, their work requires further investigation to resolve identified problems. Despite Stall's & Knight's (1998) failure to produce the 'flawless' model for transliteration between the two languages, their work achieves two purposes. It highlights the problematic nature of the transliteration strategy used for translating names and acronyms, and develops a sound understanding of the different alphabet and sound systems employed in both languages. Both these issues are important and contribute to the reduction of translation problems faced between the two languages.

1.4.2. Synonyms

A number of researchers have identified problems associated with the use of synonyms in translation; Sarairoh (2001), points to its problematic use to signify a borrowed concept in translation and consequently creating ambiguity and inconsistency in translation. Similarly, Bell (1991), in his discussion of "the meaning postulates" approach to translation argues that "synonymy" is problematic because of its overlapping nature and its underlying assumption that synonyms may be used interchangeably in any context (Bell, 1991, pp. 91-92). Baker (1992), on the other hand, does not recognise problems associated with the use of synonyms or what she labels as translating by "more general" or "more neutral" words. She includes these strategies in a section for dealing with non equivalence at word level in her book (Baker, 1992, pp. 26-28).

1.4.3. The lexical Gap between Arabic and English

The problem of finding equivalence at word level in translation is noted by Catford (1965) Sarairoh (2001) and Baker (1992). Sarairoh (2001) identifies a gap between Arabic and English in relation to technical terms and points to lexical items in English which have only partial or no equivalence in Arabic. He argues that this creates inconsistencies and blames Arabic institutions for failing to "Arabicize" and "circulate" new terms in a timely manner (Sarairoh, 2001, p.10). Although Sarairoh (2001) contributes to this area, his article focuses on technical terms and overlooks other types of lexical items.

Catford (1965) similarly recognises that a gap can exist between languages at lexical level and causes problems in translation. He notes that sometimes a source language item may have "nil" equivalence in the target language and that a source language item may also have more than one target language equivalent in the course of one text. He suggests looking at the context in order to solve this problem (Catford, 1965, pp. 29-30).

Baker (1992) adds to the contributions made by Sarairoh (2001) and Catford (1965) in this area by recognising further categories for non equivalence at word level. She includes such things as

the target language lacking “hyponyms” or “superordinates” and differentiating between the “physical or interpersonal perspective” of lexical items (Baker, 1992, pp. 20-23).

1.4.4. Collocations

Collocations are important in translation because they place restrictions on how words can be placed together and add special meaning to groups of words. A number of writers like Catford (1965), Baker (1992) and Bahumaid (2006) have dealt with collocations and their implications on translation. Bahumaid (2006) argues that collocations represent a major obstacle in translation and investigates in particular English and Arabic translations. He identifies and explores two types of collocational translation problems: ‘intralingual problems’ and ‘interlingual problems’. Intralingual, he explains are those about identifying and establishing collocations in a particular language, and interlingual are about dealing with collocations across languages. Bahumaid (2006) contributes to this area as he focuses on this important issue in translation, provides some strategies for translators, and points to the shortage of adequate resources on Arabic collocations.

In her book, Baker (1992) also focuses on a number of important issues such as collocation’s range which relates to the number of collocates for a term which can differ between languages. Another is collocation’s meanings, which includes the ‘attached’ and ‘presupposed’ meaning as well as the meaning of the collocation as a whole and not merely the combination of the individual meaning of each lexical item. She emphasises the need for translators to recognise and interpret the meaning of collocations in order to avoid mistranslation. She justifiably advocates the need for translators to be familiar with terms, concepts and structures commonly accepted and used in the specific language fields they deal with.

1.4.5. Semantics

The various types of meanings attached to lexical items must be taken into consideration when translating between languages if accuracy is to be achieved. Baker (1992) recognises the semantic complexity constituting a problem in translation and rightly remarks that sometimes it is not possible to realise how semantically complex a lexical item is until one has to translate it (Baker, 1992, p. 22). She notes however that “propositional” meaning is the only type that can be challenged by the reader because it relates to the “truth” or “falsehood” of the word whereas others like “presupposed”, “expressive” and “evoked” meanings cannot be accurately analysed (Baker, 1992, pp. 13-17). This may not an accurate view because it can be argued that although not every reader will be able to recognise and identify all the meanings attached to a lexical item, competent language experts will.

Baker (1992) identifies the differences in meanings attached to words as a cause of translation problems at word level when the source and target languages make different distinctions in meanings. Similarly, this is noted by Catford (1965) where he discusses linguistic untranslatability stemming from ‘polysemy’. On the same issue Bell (1991) argues that the problem of finding equivalence at word and sentence level does not lie in finding words that have the same meaning in two languages but in the meanings derived from the relationships between words. Also, Bakir (n.d.) concludes that errors in translating style stem from focusing on words as isolated items. On the same question Al- Jabr (2006) also highlights the importance of meaning in translation stating that “accurate translation does presuppose accurate interpretation and comprehension of the given (ST)” (Al-Jabr, 2006, p. 203).

1.5 Results, Findings and Data Analysis

The findings of the data illustrate that many of the translation problems signaled in the literature are reflected in the corpus. It, also points to new categories like compounds. The following tables reveal the major types of lexical translation errors found and their frequency in each document. The tables are not intended to provide comparisons between texts as this does not serve a purpose in this research.

Table 1. *Why You Should Know about Thalassaemia*

Types of Lexical Translation Errors	Total
Additions	36
Omissions	5
Synonyms	13
Compounds	8
Collocations	10
Inconsistencies	7
Miscellaneous	4

Table 2. *the Myths about Cancer*

Types of Lexical Translation Errors	Total
Additions	28
Omissions	16
Synonyms	7
Compounds	4
Collocations	3
Inconsistencies	8
Miscellaneous	1

Table 3. *How to Enjoy the Outdoors without Damaging Your Skin*

Types of Lexical Translation Errors	Total
Additions	25
Omissions	24
Synonyms	2
Compounds	14
Collocations	1
Inconsistencies	6
Miscellaneous	8

Table 4. When Snoring is a Problem.

Types of Lexical Translation Errors	Total
Additions	19
Omissions	15
Synonyms	5
Compounds	4
Collocations	6
Inconsistencies	3
Miscellaneous	5

Table 5. When is a Headache Caused by Migraine?

Types of Lexical Translation Errors	Total
Additions	29
Omissions	23
Synonyms	4
Compounds	2
Collocations	3
Inconsistencies	4
Miscellaneous	2

As the tables reveal, it was possible to identify errors associated with additions, omissions, synonyms, compounds, collocations and lexical inconsistencies, in each of the translated texts. There were also other types found that could not escape mentioning and were included in a miscellaneous category. It must be noted, however, that the overall number of errors in texts should not be considered as an indication of the quality of the translation. This is because it can be misleading, as some were counted more than once if they belonged to different categories. The following sections discuss each category of errors using examples from the texts.

1.5.1. Additions

Only additions in the texts that were deemed inaccurate or unnecessary were counted as errors for the purpose of this study. Other appropriate additions, used to deal with complex lexical items, were not included. This is because they represent a valid translation strategy accepted by specialists in the field like Baker (1992), and Molina & Albir (2002).

The results reveal that additions represented the highest ranking category of errors. Errors of additions in the corpus were generally of two kinds; alternative translations for lexical items and the addition of new information. The majority of additions were however unnecessary rather than inappropriate. The following are some examples where this has occurred in the texts:

Example 1, from text 1

"Remember that, even if you were born in Australia, your parents' country of origin is what counts". This was translated as " ويجب أن نتذكر أن الإقامة في استراليا لا تعني شيئاً بالنسبة لخطر الإصابة فالمهم

"هو بلد الشخص الأصلي", which back translates as "we must remember that residency in Australia does not mean anything in relation to the danger of being affected, what is important is the person's country of origin". The target text included a number of added lexical items and information which were not present in the source text. This, in combination with the elimination of important items contributed to a major distortion in meaning and deviation from the source text. Semantically, the source text and target text were not the same and they did not communicate the same message. The translator has committed an unacceptable error and violated the requirements of accuracy, faithfulness and objectivity by adding information that was not intended by the original author. Consequently, the authenticity of the information was affected. There were no specific complicated lexical items to vouch for the adoption of the 'free translation' style, which is recognized by a number of writers for dealing with complex items like metaphors, and idioms Dickins, Hervey & Higgins (2002). One can only assume that the translation was done haphazardly for whatever unknown reason. What is puzzling, however, is how such a mistake can be made and pass undetected despite the checking system in place for translated documents in government organisations. This type of distortion to meaning in a sensitive document providing important health information can have serious consequences.

Example 2, from text 2

"...with 75 per cent of children surviving childhood cancer" was translated as "تصل الى 75% ", which back translates as 'reaches up to 75% in relation to some types'. The translator committed a number of errors. Firstly he or she swapped unnecessarily the emphasis placed in English on 'children' with that of 'success rate' in Arabic. Although it can be argued that this may be a matter of style, the important point remains that some shift in meaning has occurred. Secondly, and most importantly, the translator has limited the success rate to only some types of childhood cancer. This constitutes a mistranslation and a major distortion to meaning. According to the source text the 75% success rate is for all childhood cancers and not merely for some. This difference may not seem particularly important, but to those children suffering from cancer and their loved ones, it may mean the difference between hope and despair and can have major ramifications. The purpose of the source text, which is to provide accurate information about cancers, was not achieved. It appears that the translator may have misread the source text and did not clearly identify the divisions between sentences. He or she may have made a mistaken link between this sentence and the previous one which mentions that the success rate for some cancers is very high. This highlights the important and serious problem of mistranslating due to misreading. This is a problem that is often not associated with professional translators and its identification in a professionally translated health document should cause concern and instigate more research into this area.

1.5.2. Omissions

Omission errors in the corpus included deleted lexical items that contributed to a change or loss in meaning or a loss in information. The omitted lexical items were not limited to complex items that could not be rendered easily into Arabic but included items that theoretically should not have posed any translation problems. The following are examples which demonstrate the types of omissions that occurred. The omitted items will be highlighted in the texts for recognition purposes:

Example 1 from text 3

‘The ultra violet rays, which damage skin, are present everyday.’

A whole clause was missing in the target text. The lexical items deleted do not represent complex items on their own or in combination with one another and therefore do not pose translation problems. Hence, it is safe to assume that the translator merely did not perceive it to be of importance. He or she may have presumed it as common knowledge and unnecessary information to add, because it can be deduced from the whole text. The legitimacy of the use of omissions as a strategy is recognised by a number of writers like Nida(2001), Margot & Vazquez (cited in Molina and Albir, 2002, pp.502-504), but none of their justifications for its use applies to this example. Essentially, the basis for its consideration as an error is related to the purpose of the translation. It can be argued that despite the items omitted not changing the meaning of the sentence; their presence would have emphasized the dangerous nature of UV rays. This point would have been part of the communicative purpose of the source text and therefore should not have been deleted.

Example 2, from text 4

‘But some people- especially overweight men over the age of 40- have a different kind of snore.’

The elimination of the highlighted lexical items distorted the meaning of the whole sentence. It excluded women from having these symptoms and that constituted information loss. A female reader of the target text may fail to recognize that she or any female member of her household might have sleep apnoea. This is vital information given that the document is an information booklet, which aims to raise awareness of this health problem.

There is no obvious reason for this omission as the lexical items omitted are simple and could easily be rendered into Arabic. It may be, however, that in the process of rearranging the syntactic structure of the sentence between English and Arabic the translator has mistakenly decided they were unnecessary. In different contexts, this may have been valid because omission is a strategy recognised in the translation field by a number of writer like Baker (1992) and Dickins et al (2002) amongst others. However, what the translator failed to do here is recognizing the importance of this information and wrongly assuming the legitimacy of its elimination.

Example 3, from text 5

“Some people with migraine, for instance, have visual problems before an attack- these include seeing flashes of light and colour, having double vision and even a temporary loss of sight.”

In the sentence, a number of important information has been omitted in the translation. All the visual problems provided by the writer to explain the various symptoms of migraines have been eliminated. This constitutes a translation error and loss. One can argue that the translator may have possibly omitted them because they were complex items. Translating “flashes of light and colour” is somewhat problematic not due to lack of one to one equivalence at word level but because the words ‘flashes’ and ‘colour’ do not collocate in Arabic. It sounds unnatural to use “وميض لون” in Arabic. Additionally, having two nouns attached to flashes- namely light and colour - add to the complexity of the translation. Translating the expression literally would have produced an unnatural target language text that could have caused confusion to the reader. Some manipulation and careful consideration was required to deal with it and in the process the translator would not have been able to stay too faithful to the structure of the source text. A possible rendition may be “رؤية وميض أضواء عادية أو ملونة”، which back translates as “seeing flashes of normal or coloured lights”. For unknown reasons, vital information was sacrificed at the

discretion of the translator. Conversely, ‘double vision’ should not have posed any problems because the expression itself “ازدواجية الرؤية” exist in Arabic. What may be deduced is that because the translator omitted the first items, he or she probably did not see it fit to include the others.

1.5.3. Synonyms

Errors of synonyms occurred in the corpus when translators opted for incorrect or inappropriate choices when there were a number of options available to explain one lexical item. The translators may not have been aware of the connotative and denotative meanings of their choices, or simply did not keep in mind that exact synonymy rarely exist (Nida, 2001, 30). The following are some examples indicative of this in the texts:

Example 1, from text 3

“How can you teach children to protect their skin’ and ‘Is it okay to use sunscreen on small babies”

The highlighted terms were translated as one in Arabic “أطفال” i.e. “babies”. Although “أطفال” is provided by Al Mawrid dictionary for both terms, and they are synonymous, they should not be used interchangeably in this context. This is because “أطفال” is traditionally used for younger children or babies while the term “أولاد” which is more general and can be used for children is more appropriate in this context. Additionally, the use of one word for the two terms created some distortion to meaning. This is because the original intention of the author was to highlight that different age groups can be dealt with differently. The source text differentiated between babies, children and teenagers when providing advice on how to provide protection and education about sun damage. The translator should have established this from his or her pre-reading of the text and catered for it.

Example 2, from text 4

The term “irritability” was translated using the general super-ordinate term “انزعاج” which back translates as ‘annoyance’. Although this is permissible according to Baker (1992) when the target language lacks a hyponym, it is not considered as the correct choice here. This is because, although no one word equivalence exist, the expression “سرعة الغضب” which back translates as quick anger convey the meaning more accurately.

1.5.4 Compounds

Compounds are semantically complex and when there is no one to one equivalent the translator has to resort to other strategies to convey their meaning. The first impression, of the results revealed that errors of compounds were not particularly high and therefore this type of lexical items did not pose problems for translators. A more thorough look at the results and texts however indicated the contrary. The low frequency of these types of errors in three of the texts were merely due to the presence of little compounding in the source text. The other two texts, which had more compounds, had a high number of errors belonging to this category. Errors of translating compounds included their omission and the use of a less appropriate translation. The following are illustrative examples of compounds errors:

In text 3 the term ‘outdoor’ was translated as “خارج المنزل” which back translates as “outside the home”. This can mean anywhere and not necessarily outdoors. Therefore some loss in meaning has occurred which is erroneous in this instance. This loss could have been avoided because

Arabic does have an appropriate expression for it "في الهواء الطلق", which back translates as 'in the open air'. The translator should have been aware of it and used it.

Similarly, in text 3 the term 'indoor' in the expression 'indoor workers' seemed to cause problems for the translator. It was translated as "العاملين داخل المنازل والمكاتب", which back translates as "those working inside houses and offices". This rendering excluded factory workers and other types of indoor workers, which constituted a loss in meaning. The translator could have used the terms "inside" or "inside buildings" to cover more types of indoor workers.

1.5.5 Collocations

In text 4, "now and again" was translated as "بين كل عدد من الشخرات", which back translates as 'between every number of snores'. Arabic has an equivalent expression, which is, "بين الوهلة والا", "خرى". It should have been used instead of the longer version of the target text. The longer rendition, however, indicates that the translator have felt the need to make the target text more explicit. This shift in the level of explicitness is pointed by Shoshana who argue that it is 'a universal strategy inherent in the process of language mediation' used by professional and non professional translators alike (Shoshanna, 2000, p. 294).

In text 1 "some people also have emotional problems..."

This was translated literally as "مشاكل عاطفية". The Arabic rendering collocates but the meaning it portrays is different to that of the source text. Baker (1992) recognizes this problem of first language interference. She points that at times the meaning of the source language collocation may be misinterpreted due to the existence of a similar common collocation in the source language (Baker, 1992, p.55). The Arabic collocation is used in the target language for 'romantic problems'. Its use here alters the meaning of the source text. In the English context, it refers to feeling negative. This is elicited from reading the next sentence in the text, which explains that a person with thalassaemia may at times feel like giving up fighting against the disease. The expression "مشاكل نفسية", which back translates as 'psychological problems', is more appropriate in this context despite its negative connotations. This is because it is used in Arabic to include categories like depression and other negative emotions a person may experience.

1.5.6 Inconsistencies

Errors of inconsistencies in texts mainly resulted from the use of different synonyms to refer to the same item. The inconsistencies did not stem from the terms being technical or new as argued by Sarairoh (2001). The errors, therefore could have easily been avoided had the translators critically reviewed their work. The following are illustrative examples of these types of errors in texts:

In text 3 the term 'adult' was translated throughout the text in three different ways. . It was rendered as "بالغين", which is the correct term for it. It was also translated as "فيما بعد", which back translates as 'later on' and as "كبار" which back translates as big or old. Similarly, in text 1 the term 'disorder' had three varying renderings for it in Arabic. It was translated as "اضطراب", which mean disorder, "اضطراب دموي", which means blood disorder and "مشكلة" which means a problem. Although semantically the translations were not inaccurate, these inconsistencies should not exist in professionally translated documents. The translators should have been able to avoid this, particularly given the simple nature of the terms.

Conclusion

In general, the findings provide empirical evidence that lexical problems exist in translation from English into Arabic. They also support the hypothesis that lexical errors are not merely made by student translators. They do not prove conclusively, however, that errors occurred due to new and complex lexical items. On many occasions the lexical items were not difficult to translate and errors resulted merely from making inappropriate choices. This implies that translators faced difficulty with semantic boundaries and the restrictions of lexical items.

The majority of errors identified in the corpus at the level of lexis do not represent incorrect translations but rather inaccurate use of lexical items. This may have been due to many factors such as time constraints, the competency of the translator, and their individual styles. These elements, however, were not assessed in this study due to its limited nature.

The lexical errors found were related but not limited to additions, omissions, compounds, synonyms collocations and inconsistencies. More extensive research is required to identify additional types of lexical errors found in professionally translated documents.

It is evident that this research has many limitations due to the paucity of data and its inability to accommodate for all types of errors and their related factors. Therefore, more research is required in this field in order to improve translation outcomes.

About the Author:

Nidal Alhihi: I am a qualified Arabic/ English as a second language teacher by the NSW Department of School Education and an accredited interpreter and translator by The National Accreditation Authority for Translators and Interpreters (NAATI) in Australia. I have been working as an ESL teacher as well as a freelance interpreter / translator for more than 10 years. I have completed my master of interpreting and translation studies from the University of Western Sydney and currently work as an English lecturer at the German Jordanian University in Amman Jordan.

References

- Al-jabr, A.F. (2006). Effect of syntactic complexity on translating from /into English/ Arabic. *Babel*, 52(3), 203–221
- Baalbaki, M. (2001). *Al-Mawrid, A modern English- Arabic dictionary* Beirut: Dar El-Ilm Lil-Malayan.
- Bahumaid, S. (2006). Collocation in English–Arabic translation. *Babel*, 52(2), 133-152.
- Baker, M. (1992). *In other words: A coursebook on translation*. London: Routledge.
- Bakir, K. H., & Lazim, H. G. (n.d.). Stylistic problems confronting Arab students in Arabic-English translation [Electronic Version]. Retrieved August, 10, 2008 from <http://faculty.ksu.edu.sa/ahmad/Pages/artic1.aspx>.
- Bell, R. T. (1991). *Translation and translating*. London: Longman.
- Catford, J. C. (1965). *A linguistic theory of translation: an essay in applied linguistics*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Dickins, J. Hervey, S. & Higgins, I. (2002). *Thinking Arabic translation: A course in*

- translation method ,Arabic to English. New York: Routledge.
- Farghal, M. (1995) Lexical and discoursal problems in English- Arabic translations. *Meta*, 40 (1), 54-60
- Gutt, E. A. (1991). *Translation and relevance: Cognition and context*. Oxford: Blackwell
- Mohamed, M. J. (n.d.). The ambiguity of gender in English – Arabic. [Electronic Version]. Retrieved August, 10, 2008 from <http://www.watajournal.com/mag2/archive/1/Researches/13.html>
- Molina, L. & Albir, A. H. (2002). Translation techniques revisited: A dynamic and functionalist approach. *Meta*, 47 (4), 498-512.
- Nida, E. A. (2001). *Contexts in translation*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Nida, E. A. & Waard, J. (1986). *From one language to another: Functional equivalence in bible translating*. Thomas Nelson Publishers.
- Nida, E. A. (1991). Theories of translation. *TTR*, 4(1), 19-32.
- Sarairoh, M. A. T. (2001). Inconsistency in technical terminology: a problem for standardization in Arabic. *Babel*, 47(1), 10-21.
- Stalls, B. G., & Knight, K. (1998). Translating names and technical terms in Arabic text [Electronic Version]. Retrieved September, 10, 2008 from http://www.aclweb.org/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=38&Itemid=35.
- Shoshana, B. K. (2000). Shifts of cohesion and coherence in translation. In Venuti (Ed.), *The translation studies reader*. London: Routledge.

Appendix

List of Texts

<http://www.mhcs.health.nsw.gov.au/publicationsandresources/pdf/language-1/english>

Text 1 “Why You Should Know About Thalassaemia”

Text 2 “The Myths about Cancer”

Text 3 “How to Enjoy the Outdoors without Damaging Your Skin”

Text 4 “When Snoring Is a Problem”

Text 5 “When Is a Headache Caused By Migraine?”