

Introducing the Theory of Norms As A Descriptive Approach in the Translations of English Argumentative Writings to Arabic

التعريف بنظرية المعايير باعتبارها منهاجاً وصفيًا في ترجمات الحجاج من الانكليزية الى العربية

Asst. Lect. Mazin Abduljabbar Reja

Prof. Raheem Ch. Al-Kaabi (PhD)

(PhD. Candidate)

(Supervisor)

م.م. مازن عبد الجبار رجه (طالب دكتوراه)

أ.د. رحيم جلوب الكعبي

(University of Anbar-College

(Mustansiriyah University- College

of Arts-Dept. of Translation)

of Arts- Dept. of Translation)

(جامعة الانبار-كلية الآداب-قسم الترجمة)

(الجامعة المستنصرية-كلية الآداب-قسم الترجمة)

mazin69@uoanbar.edu.iq

raheem_alkaabi@uomustansiriyah.edu.iq

Abstract

The theory of norms has a large extent of applications throughout different human sciences, ranging from Psychology and Sociology to Anthropology, but its great and influential role has been remarkably manifested in Translation within Descriptive Translation Studies. This study entitled "Introducing the Theory of Norms as A Descriptive Approach in the Translations of Argumentative Writings to Arabic " intends to introducing the theoretical framework of the theory of norms as a one of the pioneering theories within the Descriptive Translation Studies. The study explores the effective role of the three translational norms (i.e., preliminary, initial and operational)

in producing adequate and acceptable translations. These norms are proposed by Toury in his descriptive translation studies model (1980/1995). Toury sees that translational norms are influential and effective determinants in governing the behaviour of translators during the act of translation and controlling all their decisions. The study aims at examining whether the explicit and implicit argumentative moves and indicators such as what related to the speech acts and grasping the pragmatic implications have been maintained in translations as intended by the text-producer. It also aims at determining the problems that hinder translating argumentative writings to Arabic appropriately and finding out solutions about them.

Keywords: Theory of Norms, Descriptive translation studies, socio-cultural factors, Descriptive model of norms, Argumentation.

المستخلص

لنظرية المعايير قدر كبير من التطبيقات في مختلف العلوم الانسانية تمتد من علم النفس وعلم الاجتماع الى علم الانسان، بيد أن الدور الكبير والمؤثر للنظرية هو في مجال الترجمة من خلال دراسات الترجمة الوصفية. أن هذه الدراسة المعنونة "التعريف بنظرية المعايير باعتبارها منهجا وصفيا في ترجمات الحجاج من الانكليزية الى العربية" تهدف الى التعريف بالاطار النظري لنظرية المعايير باعتبارها واحدة من النظريات الرائدة في مجال دراسات الترجمة الوصفية. وتستكشف الدراسة الدور الفعال لمعايير الترجمة الثلاثة (المعايير الأولية والتمهيدية والتشغيلية) في اصدار ترجمات وافية ومقبولة. وقدم توري هذه المعايير الثلاثة في العامين ١٩٨٠/١٩٩٥ في نموذج لدراسات الترجمة الوصفية. ويرى توري ان المعايير الترجمة هي محددات فعالة ومؤثرة في التحكم بسلوك المترجمين والسيطرة على جميع قراراتهم في اثناء عملية الترجمة. وتهدف الدراسة الى التحقق فيما اذا كانت التعابير والمؤشرات الحجاجية الظاهرية والضمنية ما يتعلق منها بأفعال الكلام والمضامين التداولية قد تمت ترجمتها مثلما قصدها كاتب النص الاصلي. كما تهدف الدراسة الى تحديد المشاكل التي تعيق ترجمات الحجاج الى العربية وإيجاد الحلول بشأنها.

الكلمات المفتاحية: نظرية المعايير، دراسات الترجمة الوصفية، العوامل الاجتماعية- الثقافية، النموذج الوصفي للمعايير، الحجاج .

1.1 Introduction

It can be argued that the process of translation involves translator's endeavors to render all kinds of writings and texts along with their social, political, cultural, stylistic and linguistic aspects from the source language (henceforth SL) into the target language (henceforth TL). In this respect, (Brodzki, 2007, p. 2) puts that "More than ever, translation is now understood to be a politics as well as poetics, an ethics as well as a normative and an aesthetics as well as a linguistic phenomenon". He also maintains that "Translation is no longer seen to involve only narrowly technical and linguistic procedures, but rather to pinpoint all socio-cultural factors within a kind of the translational norms which restrict the translator's behaviour" (M.Claramonte, 2025, p. 32) (Cited in). In each effort to translate these kinds of writings and texts, a translator's behaviour is restricted by social, cultural and linguistic norms which govern the whole process of translation and decide his/her strategies and choices during the act of translation (G.Toury, 1995, pp. 53 – 69) .

However, any translation process should be oriented within a certain theory in the field of translation studies (henceforth TS). In the TS, different theories and approaches evolve side by side, each of which concentrates on particular aspects, views whether at the process or the product of translation from a certain angle and emphasizes or avoids given terminology. One of the prominent theories that has been used substantially and seen a great development within the field of TS is the theory of norms whose value has been asserted largely thanks to the influential and seminal works by Gideon Toury and Theo Hermans (Schaffner, 1999, pp. 1 – 2) .

The concept of "norms" which constituted the premise of the theory of norms was first mentioned by Jiri Levy (1969) and by Itamar Even-Zohar (1971), but it has mainly been propagated by Gideon Toury and his followers, Hermans and

Chesterman, since late seventies of the last century (Hemans, 1996, pp. 25 – 51) . Toury's development of the concept of "norm" derives from his stance that translating is a learned social activity. In this context, (G.Toury, 1995, p. 53) states that "Translatorship amounts first and foremost to being able to play a social role, i.e., to fulfill a function allotted by a community– to the activity, its practioners, and/or their products– in a way which deemed appropriate in its own terms of reference". This social behaviour is strongly asserted by Toury in performing any translation activity in the presence of a group of norms to produce appropriate translations. In this respect He maintains that "The acquisition of a set of norms for determining the suitability of that kind of behaviour, and for maneuvering between all the factors which may constrain it, is therefore a prerequisite for becoming a translator within a cultural environment"(Ibid). However, (G.Toury, 1995, pp. 53 – 69) described three major categories of translational norms: (1) Preliminary norms, which decide the overall translation strategy and the choice of texts to be translated; (2) Initial norms, which govern the translator's decision to adhere primarily to the source text or to the target culture; and (3) Operational norms, which control the actual decisions made during the act of translation.

In descriptive translation studies (henceforth DTS), translation was seen as a social behaviour. For her part, (Schaffner, 2010, p. 236) maintains that "Both Toury's work and that of DTS in general have opened a view of translation as socially contexted behaviour, thus going beyond a more narrow view of translation as meaning transfer". In this respect, Toury proposes the following three–phase methodology for systematic DTS, incorporating a description of the product and the wider role of the sociocultural system: 1.Situate the text within the target culture system, looking at its significance or acceptability, 2. Compare the source text (henceforth ST) and the target text (henceforth TT) for shifts and 3. Identifying relationships between coupled pairs of ST and TT segments (J.Munday, 2008) (Munday, 2001, pp. 110 – 111) . The theory of

norms situates in the peak of DTS. (Schaffner, 1999, p. 1) maintains that "Research within the TS has been concerned with the description of actual translations, with the formulation of general principles, and with practical applications". She adds "Norms play a role in all these respects since they are related to assumptions and expectations about correctness and/or appropriateness". (Bartsch, 1988, p. xii) defines norms as "the social reality of correctness notions". The idea of norms first extracted by Toury from sociology. In this context, (G.Toury, 1995, pp. 54 – 55) cited in (Hornby, 2006, p. 73) maintains that "Sociologists and social psychologists have long regarded norms as the translation of general values or ideas shared by a community– as to what is right or wrong, adequate and inadequate– into performance instructions appropriate for and applicable to particular situations, specifying what is prescribed and forbidden as well as what is tolerated and permitted in a certain behavioural dimension". However, the relationship between the theory of norms and the translations of different kinds of writings and texts is influential and based on an idea that any translation process has socio–cultural factors which influence and govern the translational behaviour of the translator. The translations of argumentative writings are among the text–typology that are applicable to this theory because both theory of norms and argumentation focus on judgement, behaviour, reasoning and decision–making of the actors involved in any social activity (A. and Hahn, 2013) .

The present study sheds light on a set of major topics relevant to the theory of norms as a descriptive translation approach in translating argumentative writings to Arabic. The first topic is about literature review. The second one highlights the definitions of translation in relation to the theory of norms and the role of translation in communication across cultures, whereas the third topic deals with the theoretical framework of the theory of norms, its application and role in translation as a one of the most prominent theories within the discipline of the TS and the DTS.

1.2 Literature review

In his influential work entitled "Descriptive Translation Studies– and beyond", published in (1995) by (John Benjamins Publishing Company: Amsterdam), Gideon Toury highlights the role of translational norms as intersubjective factors which occupy a broad middle-ground anchored between absolute rules and pure idiosyncrasies in a specific culture. These norms guide and control the translator's behaviour during the act of translation. His theory of norms demonstrates that translations are not only as linguistic transformations from one language to another but are governed and influenced by socio-cultural factors. According to him, every translation activity should have a cultural and social significance and these norms work to shape such significance which can be applied solely to the target culture. In this context, Toury believes that a translator should be qualified to perform a social role and capable of fulfilling a function dedicated by a society. This activity is deemed appropriate if the translator acquires a group of norms which determine the suitability of his behaviour and enable him to manoeuvre between all the factors that may impede it. In his descriptive perspective, the sound use of these norms is viewed as sine qua non for performing the task of translation (G.Toury, 1995, pp. 53 – 69) .

Needless to say, the concept of "norms" in Toury's descriptive model is a key notion which lies behind his descriptive analyses of different kinds of translated texts. Toury's methodology in functioning translational norms to produce adequate and acceptable translations is based on explaining where the norms are positioned in the entire translation process and then he analyses several kinds of norms and their degree, to eventually draw that in the decision-making process, regardless norms, the translator's knowledge of the TL culture, experience and intuition are important as well. In this tripartite-norm model, norms namely (preliminary, initial and operational) would operate as the mediator acting between the "system of potential equivalence"

and the "actual performance" (Toury, 1980, p.50). According to him, "it is norms that determine the type and extent of equivalence manifested in actual translations"(ibid). Even though, the case of equivalence is still controversial among translation theorists. For instance, Functionalist theorists (e.g. Vermeer & Reiss, 1991) view equivalence as a possible relation to be produced broadly in the target-oriented culture (Skopos theory) whereas Descriptive Approaches of which both Hermans and Toury are their pioneers, see translation as the product of translator's behaviour within a social context (Toury, 1980) / Hermans, 1985, cited in (Schaffner, C. Translation and Norms. Publisher: Multilingual Matters., 1999, p. 5) That is, they directed attention far from the vexed concept of equivalence and gave priority to the socio-cultural factors that governing the conventions and choices that determine the connection between the source and target texts and, thus, equivalence has been effectively sidelined (Hermans, 1998). Norms are valid for any translation activity of different text-types since they are changing over time and in the course of events to convoy any potential sociocultural variables that may occur in a society because "cultures are always in a state of flux and norms, being the result of the process of pre-arranged social behaviour, are as dynamic as cultures" (Hermans T. , 1996, p. 59) .

Closely related to the theory of norms is the theory of argumentation which involves the use of arguments and argumentative discourse as well as the ways of translating them within the application of the translational norms. In his work "The Uses of Arguments", published in (2003) in the (Cambridge University Press), Stephen Toulmin views theory of argumentation as one of the prominent argumentation theories that highlighted the role of arguments in making dialogue, standpoint, debates and opinions more persuasive for the TL readership as well as grasping the pragmatic implications of the argumentative discourse adequately. Toulmin identifies a six-part argument structure which includes: (i) Claim/Discovery, (ii) Grounds/Data, (iii) Warrants, (iv) Baking, (v) Qualifier and (vi) Rebuttal/Exception. In Parallel with

Toulmin's work, Frans H. van Eemeren presented his work entitled "Argumentation Theory: A Pragma-Dialectical Perspective", published in (2018) in the (Springer International Publishing AG), in which he highlights the role of argumentation in shaping the social behaviours of individuals. He also highlights the systematic relationship between the normative dimension of argumentation and the descriptive dimension of it. As he believes, both dimensions are connected to produce influential argumentative discourse based on the existence of five interrelated components: philosophical, theoretical, empirical, analytical and practical component. The general purpose of the theory of argumentation is providing theoretical and systematic instruments to evaluate, analyse, and produce argumentative discourse in an appropriate way. On the other hand, Holmes in his work "The Name and Nature of Translation Studies", published in (1988) by (Rodopi: Amsterdam), puts that English arguments are in a close relation to speech acts theory and that argumentative moves and indicators are instrumental in the different phases in realizing the aim of resolving a difference of opinion on the merits. Further, in his work "Communication Across Cultures: Translation Theory and Contrastive Text Linguistics", published in (1997) in the (University of Exeter Press), Basil Hatim views argumentation as social acts and that argumentative texts can be deemed as holders of pragmatic and ideological meanings, a feature which makes them susceptible to changing socio-cultural norms. He distinguishes between through argumentation and counter argumentation where in the former a standpoint is submitted and then challenged while in the later a stand point is submitted and defended. He indicates that argumentation in Arabic dates back to the eighth century AH. (14th century) in the work of Qudaama Bin Ja'fer, in his book Naqd al-Nathr "The Criticism of Prose".

However, both norms and argumentation focus on individual's behaviour during his/her socialization process which imply sanctions: actual or potential as well as negative and positive. Both Toury and Hermans view translational norms as

constraints to control translator's decisions and behaviour during the act of translation. These norms govern the translator's decision to adhere whether to the source text or to the target culture and to choose the overall translation strategy (Toury, 1995, pp. 53–69 / (Hermans, 1996, pp. 26 – 50) .

1.3 Translation

This section highlights a set of translation definitions in relation to the concept of "norms" throughout the history of translation and the TS. It also investigates the role of translation as a socio-cultural activity within a cultural environment through the relationship between translation and culture. In this sense, translation is seen as an ark of communication across cultures.

1.3.1 Definitions of translation as a norm-governed activity

The conceptual framework of translation has passed through several periods of development and positive manipulation across long history of translation as a linguistic phenomenon which according to (Catford, 1965, p. 20) , can be defined as "the replacement of textual material in one language (SL) by equivalent material in another language (TL)". By this definition, translation was seen as an operation of transcoding between the SL and the TL. Although translation was greatly influenced by Applied Linguistics, but it has taken its prominent systematic framework within the evolution of certain influential theories which emerged hand in hand within the field of the TS. These theories such as Polysystem Theory, Theory of Norms, Scopus Theory and so forth have transformed the orientations of translation from the source-oriented into the target-oriented approaches and from faithfulness/fidelity into functionalist equivalence and from complete translation into adaptation as well as from prescriptive studies into descriptive studies which started with the first attempts exerted by Jeri Livey (1969), Holmes (1970/1972), Itamar Even-Zohar (1971/1979) and extended to

Gideon Toury (1979/1995) who pioneered the translation descriptive studies (TDS) and propagated the concept of "norms" into the world of translation within the field of the TS (J.Munday, 2008, pp. 108 – 118). Therefore, to begin with the first broad definition of translation underpinned on the translation norms is (Toury's, 1995, p. 55), which states that "Translation is a kind of activity which inevitably involves at least two languages and two cultural traditions, i.e., at least two sets of norm–system on each level". He also specifies that "Norms can be expected to operate not only in translation of all kinds, but also at every stage in the translating event"(ibid). According to him 'norms' have been described as the reflection of inherent values and common ideas belong to a community and shared by its individuals.

Building on the Polysystem Theory, (Toury, ibid., p. 13) sees translation as a systematic process in the descriptive translation studies which occupies a position in the social, cultural and literary systems of the target culture and thus, this position specifies both translation strategies the translator adopts and translational norms that direct his behaviour during the act of translation. Then, with respect to defining the facets of the relationship between translation and norms, (Hemans, 1999, p. 1) maintains that "norms are only binding to the extent that translators or other participants in the transaction make decisions". In agreement with this belief was Jiri Levy's (1969) definition of translation in which he describes translation as a decision–making process based on social norms predominant in a certain culture. He elaborates: "How a translator must choose one option from a set of alternatives to apply at every level of translation, with the awareness that his/her choices will affect subsequent decisions made at subsequent levels of the translation process. This process is underpinned on decision–making and norms" (Cited in (Hemans, 1999, p. 73). For his part, Popvoic (1976) also defines translation as a decision–making in terms of realizing two kinds of norms that govern the whole process and direct the translator's behaviour by saying: "there are two norms governing the translator's

decision-making: one that was reproductive and concerned with how to represent the original, and one that was productive and concerned with the well-formedness of the new text". In Vermeer's Skopos theory, translation was viewed as "a function depends on the knowledge, expectations, values and norms of the target readers, who are again influenced by the situation they are in and by culture"(1984, p.2). Suffice to say that translation is depicted as a means of communication among different languages and cultures and that the translator is seen as a cultural mediator and communicator armed with inherent social norms acquired during his socialization. In this context (Chesterman, 1993, p. 74) maintains that "the translator, as the expert communicator, is at the crucial centre of a long chain of communication from original initiator to ultimate receiver of a message: a human link across a cultural frontier".

1.3.2 Translation and culture

In the theory of norms, translation is restricted by sociocultural factors. According to (Hermans, 1996, p. 26), translation "Today is increasingly seen as a complex transaction taking place in a communicative, socio-cultural context". This requires that a translator who performs under different circumstances and translating different kinds of texts for various audiences is viewed as a necessary cultural mediator. According to (Brewer, 1988, p. 22), 'Culture' is an umbrella term which "is used to refer to the complex collection of experiences which condition daily life. It includes the history, the social structures, the religion, the traditional customs, ethics, norms and usages of people". The position of culture in translation and the importance of translation to culture are strongly emphasized by Lefevere (2004, p30) who believes that "the basic unit of translation is not words, not sentences, not even chapters, but culture". (.Lefevere, 1990) (Bassnett, 2004, p. 15) also agrees with his belief by saying "the translation is never a purely linguistic act, but is deeply rooted in the culture in which the language embedded, and translation is a means of communication within and

between cultures". She exclusively refers to the predominant status of the translator as manipulator supported by his cultural identity. A translator is driven by his cultural background of both the SL and the TL. This idea is also adopted by in his theory of norms when he pointed out that the translator is performing his task within a complete systematic chain of cultural factors and social norms which operate as cultural constraints that govern any translation activity whether in terms of the source norms realized in the original text or the norms active in the target culture and, thus, translation should be regarded as an important cultural activity. In this respect, the translator acting as mediating the both cultures of the source text and the target text and fulfilling a social role. (Toury, 2000, p. 198).

According to (.Riccardi, 2002, p. 93) "culture is an umbrella term which is used to refer to other disciplines in its constellation whether in humanistic or anthropological fields". It has occupied for a long time the basic interest of other fields such as translation, literature, philosophy, ideology and sociology. Riccardi also stresses that each language has its "cultural heritage" which assists in the refinement some human behaviors via a group of traditions, social norms, inherent habits and customs. For their part, Bassnett and (.Lefevere, 1990, p. 8) believe that the "cultural turn" within the TS made "culture as an operational unit of translation", whereas (Munday, 2009, p. 11) views "cultural turn" as a prolific shift in the field of the paradigmatic research within the TS that has had several major outcomes in dealing with the perpetual dialectic discussion on specific issues of translation such as translational norms, equivalence and cultural differences. However, the shift that occurred in the cultural studies from the end of the 1970s into the beginning of the 1990s and within TS involved two things: first and foremost is the shift from source-oriented theories into the theories that were mainly oriented to the target culture such as the Theory of Norms, which its main goal was to preserve the sociocultural factors in the target culture through the use of a set of translational norms developed and propagated by

Toury (1980/1995) and the Skopos Theory proposed and developed by the two German scholars Vermeer and Reis (1984), which its basic objective was a completion of translations with the translator's subjective intentions in the target culture (Littau, 2007, pp. 14 – 15) . The close and ramified relationship between translational norms and culture is thoroughly envisaged and strongly emphasized by Hermans when he refers to the norms as playing an essential role in cultural transfer which involves procedures such as decisions, choices, alternatives, strategies and goals. Thus, norms are described as cultural and social realities in the same way the term was viewed in Sociology and Anthropology (Hermans, 1996, pp. 26 – 27) One among the other aspects of the relation between translation and culture is what so-called cultural filter which according to House (2006,p.349) "is a means of capturing cognitive and socio-cultural differences to be applied by translators, which is more closely related to the translator's capacity to mediate or re-write the original text". In other words, the translator within a set of the cultural studies in the TS has more freedom in his modifications and re-writings towards the ST and for the goals of the TT which based on cultural considerations.

1.4 Translation studies

Translation studies is an academic discipline which allocates itself with the systematic and scientific study of translation (.Baker, 1995, p. 277)). It is also called the "science of translation" or "translatology" (ibid). However, according to (Riccardi, 2001, pp. 1 – 2), "the term translation studies" has come into being in the mid of the dominance of two approaches in the second half of the twentieth century". In her words, there were on one hand "linguistic approach to translation dominating the 1950s and 1960s with works of Catford and Nida, which on the other hand, shifted to the function and cultural-oriented approaches in the 1970s and 1980s with works of Even-Zohar, Toury and Vermeer". At first, the TS was applied to the

contributions of a set of theorists who involved in studies on literary translation amongst the works of Jiri Levy (1969), but "the term was broadly conceived and pioneered by Holmes in 1972 in his prominent paper entitled "The name and nature of translation studies" (Holmes, 1988/2004). Further, in his "Contemporary Translation Theories", (Gentzler, p. 93) describes Holmes's seminal paper by saying: "It is generally accepted as the founding statement for the field". The Hierarchical design of the TS was constructed with two major branches: 'Pure' and 'Applied' translation studies. Then, the 'pure' areas of inquiry include: theoretical and descriptive areas. Theoretical branch involves two kinds of theories: general and partial whereas descriptive branch includes three translation oriented areas: product-oriented, process-oriented and function-oriented (as illustrated in the figure (1). In practical terms, the Theory of Norms is situated at the very core of the descriptive studies. Needless to say, by the 1990s onwards, the TS has established itself as a general discipline by means of which the broad and multifaceted range of translation phenomena and theories are investigated particularly with pioneering works of Lefevere and Bassnett on cultural studies"(ibid). Basically, within the TS, translation can be studied and investigated in an unconventional way. It is seen as a rewriting of an original text influenced by global culture strategies, identity formation, the concept of norms, ethics and ideology since rewritings can provide novel concepts, notions, genres and devices. Rewriting means manipulation, but in its positive aspect ((Lefevere, 2003, p. 10)

1.4.1 Norms in translation studies

The concept of 'norms' constitutes one of the most significant and fertile areas of inquiry in the TS which dates back to the period of the 1970s and early 1980s, synchronizing with the emergence of descriptive translation studies (DTS) (Toury, 1995/1980). The concept has been presented to the TS to elucidate the regularities

that direct the translator's communicative behaviour during the act of translation (Hermans, 1999). Toury also maintains that "the concept of norms, which is informed by Polysystem theory introduced by Even-Zohar in 1979, facilitated the development of the TS as an independent discipline rather than a branch of comparative literature or linguistics. Its key focus on identifying regularities and predicating appropriate translational behaviour" (Toury, 1995/2012, p.61). For her part, (Schaffner, 1999, p. 2) employed the expression 'linguistic norms' in the TS to refer to the translational norms and she defined it "as a means of translating a linguistic unit by its generally accepted equivalent and that the target-language text was required to be identical to the SL-text in content, style and effect and to respect the rules and norms of the TL".

1.5 Descriptive translation studies

The Theory of Norms is at the forefront of the descriptive translation studies (henceforth DTS). In order to understand the nature and role of translational norms (specifically initial, preliminary and operational) as sociocultural constraints that govern the translators' behaviour to produce adequate and acceptable translations based on the source norms and the target culture norms, it is important first to delve into the nature of the DTS, a concept which was first pioneered by Holmes in 1972 in his prolific paper "The Name and Nature of Translation Studies" (Venuti, 2000, p. 175) and was "redefined famously as a fact of the target culture by Gideon Toury in his pioneering work "Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond (1995)" (Hermans, 2020, p. 143) The DTS is empirical in nature which looks at translation act as product and process as well, as (Pym, 2010, pp. 65 – 66) argues that "DTS is a general paradigm in which scholars have set out to describe what translations actually are rather than just prescribe how they should be". In his emphasis on the necessity to enhance descriptive studies, (Toury, 1995, p. 1), says: "no empirical science can make a claim for completeness and (relative) autonomy unless it has a

proper descriptive branch". Considering the aims of this empirical approach in mind, he urges for "a systematic branch proceeding from clear assumptions and armed with a methodology and research techniques made as explicit as possible and justified within translation studies itself" (ibid, p3). In the midst of this descriptive empirical science, Toury allocates translation norms within the constellation of the DTS as he believes that these norms describe what goes on throughout the act of translation whether as product or process and explain and predicate the translatorial behaviour now and then (ibid, pp. 15 – 16)

In this respect, Toury's definition of the DTS is derived from Holmes's vision of translation as involving three descriptive activities of ("function, process and product-oriented") and to be formulated in his perspective as "the study of what translation DOES involve, under various sets of circumstances, along with the REASONS for that involvement" (ibid, p.15). This emphasizes that translators rendering under different circumstances dealing with various text-types for different levels of audiences and adopting a variety of strategies to extract various products. For his part, (Munday, 2001, p. 112) categorizes three stages of this descriptive empirical model which presents a comprehensive description of both product and process of translation and the broader role of the translational norms and sociocultural system: "(1) Situate the text within the target culture system, looking at its significance or acceptability; (2) Compare the ST and the TT for shifts, identifying relationships between 'coupled pairs' of ST and TT segments and (3) Attempt generalizations, reconstructing the process of translation for this ST–TT pair".

1.6 The theory of norms: Theoretical framework

Historically, the theory of norms also called Toury's theory of translational norms is the most pioneering work of the descriptive paradigm. At the beginning of the 1980s, the discipline of the TS has seen a remarkable shift from a theorization of a linguistic

nature to a theorization of a cultural nature. On the premise of developing and updating the Polysystem theory proposed by his precursor Itmar Even Zohar, Gideon Toury (1980) introduced his theory of translational norms. This theory "is a an essential transfer from prescriptive approaches into descriptive approaches" ((Chesterman, 1997, p. 64), Toury's theory adopts a descriptive methodology and fixing translation in a sociocultural context to be investigated. In Toury's perspective, translators are normally susceptible to three types of norms in their inherent translation behaviours. Firstly, there is the initial norms which indicate the "adequacy" and "acceptability of the translation. Secondly, there is the preliminary norms which refer to the translation policy and the directness of translation. Thirdly, operational norms which encompass matricial norms and textual-linguistic norms. These three types of translational norms are due to be explained thoroughly in the next sections. In an article titled "Gideon Toury and His Translation Theory", Shan Weilong commented that "Toury's theory of translational norms lays a solid foundation for translation to move from traditional prescriptive research to descriptive research, promotes the further development of descriptive translation, and broadens the horizons of translation (studies, 2008, pp. 204 – 206).

1.6.1 Characteristics of the theory of norms

Each theory of translation has its own characteristics and properties which demonstrate its benefits, significance, application, correctness and appropriateness. These characteristics can be categorized as follows:

- 1.The theory of norms is a target-oriented approach, its essence the translational norms are socially and culturally binding, and their breach usually invokes disagreement among a certain community. These norms govern and guide translators' behaviour during the act of translation.

2. Its normative force is built up in the terms of the relationships among authorities of the norm, enforcers of the norm, codifiers of the norms and subjects of the norm.
3. Norms play a holistic role in describing actual translations, formulating common principles and functioning practical applications.
4. Theory of norms constitutes a pioneering shift from prescriptive studies of translation to the descriptive studies of translation.
5. Norms are regularities of the translators' behaviour and sociocultural constraints that guide their performance during the act of translation.
6. Although it is derived from social sciences, the theory of norms has been concentrated from its evolution on cultures and languages with a great interest on the translator.
7. Translational norms focus on awareness of the translator and his knowledge and cognition as an essential mediator, rewriter or positive manipulator of the original text.
8. The theory of norms is primarily based on the idea that sociocultural factors are closely related to the norms of the individual which are acquired during his/her socialization and necessitate sanctions.
9. It describes translation as a decision-making activity and translator as a social agent and cultural transfer.
10. In its methodology, translational norms operate between two focal points: the sociocultural specificity and their major instability.

11. According to the premise of its application, the translations account for adequate if the translator adheres to the norms realized in the source text, and they are acceptable and appropriate if he adopts the norms of the target culture.

12. Toury's translational norms (i.e., initial, preliminary and operational) constitute a tripartite-descriptive model to gauge the cogency of the translators' performance and to analyze their translations as well as a tool for the assessors to evaluate their product.

1.7 The conceptualization of translational norms

The concept of norms was initially and basically associated with the social sciences and was applied to a large extent of the human behaviour of different kinds. Therefore, since translation is a kind of behavioral activity of the individuals as well, the notion of 'norm' was borrowed and conceived to describe given aspects of this kind of human behaviour along with all its properties and constraints. Translation as a sociocultural process and cognitive act is inevitably and permanently susceptible to different constraints of various types and grades of intensity. These several constraints usually go beyond the languages and extend the limits of the texts involved in the translation act. Norms are a reflection of social realities and the binding force in a society. (Ross, 1968, p. 82), "a norm is a directive which stands in a relation of correspondence to social facts". (Hermans, 1999, p. 163) also stresses the directive force of norms and their regulative nature to the human behaviour by saying: "Norm is a regularity of behaviour, together with the common knowledge about and the mutual expectations concerning the way in which members of a group or community ought to behave in certain types of situation. The content of a norm is a value of what is correct. The directive force of a norm guides the behaviour of individuals to secure the content of the norm". (Toury, 1995, p. 54) indicates that

"Sociologists and social psychologists have long regarded norms as the translation of general values or ideas shared by a community". Toury here emphasizes that norms are expressing social facts within a certain society.

1.8 The classification of translational norms

In spite of their prescriptive impact inside communities, norms are analysed and applied as sociocultural constraints by the DTS scholars and researchers. (Toury, 1980, p. 20) stresses that "norms are commonplace and pervasive in the translation practices and they operate prior to the actual event of translation". He also emphasizes the significance of these norms as operative constraints that guide and control the whole act of translation and direct the translators' behaviour as well as regulate their performance in every phase of the process of translation and at every stage of the translation product. According to him, translational norms can be categorized under three major groups due to the perspective adopted towards them and the function they assign in the process of translation. The first group is labeled 'initial norms' which involves adequacy and acceptability. The second group is called 'preliminary norms' which includes translation policy and translation directness. The third group is termed 'operational norms' which consists of two types: (i) matricial norms and (ii) textual-linguistic norm (Toury, 1995, pp. 56 – 59) .

1.8.1 Initial norms

Initial norms refer to the translators' general choices as a basic step taken during the act of translation and determines the direction of the translators' behaviour and their decisions. This step can be illustrated in two procedures: First, translators are able to subject themselves to the norms conceived in the ST and second, translators can subject themselves to the norms effective in the TC or language. If the translator's behaviour and decision directed towards the ST, thus the TT turns

adequate, but if the TC norms prevail, the TT becomes acceptable. Based on this product, compliance to source norms results in a translation's adequacy, whereas adherence to norms active in the TC determines a translation's acceptability (Toury, 1995, pp. 57/1978,p.86) Monday argues that "the poles of adequacy and acceptability are on a continuum since no translation is ever totally adequate or totally (acceptable, 2088, p. 112). The following examples of argumentative writings show whether the relevant Arabic translations are adequate or acceptable.

ST1

"These chemical weapons can kill on a mass scale, with no distinction between soldier and infant, the civilized world has spent a century working to ban them".

<https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/running-transcript>

TT1

"ان هذه الاسلحة الكيماوية تقتل على نطاق شاسع بدون ان تفرق بين جندي ورضيع، فالعالم المتحضر قد ناضل لمدة قرن للعمل على تحريم هذه الاسلحة".

TT2

"ان هذه الاسلحة الكيماوية تهلك الحرث والنسل ولا تذر شيئا ولا تفرق بين جندي ورضيع، فالعالم المتمدن سعى جاهدا لمدة قرن على تحريمها"

Considering the ST1 which includes the underlined arguments, the first translation is adequate in terms of source-oriented approach, whereas the second translation is acceptable in terms of target-oriented approach.

ST2

"American Muslims fear of a new wave of Islamophobia".

<https://www.reuters.com/article/us-usa-electronic-muslims>

TT1

"تنامي الخوف من ظاهرة الاسلاموفوبيا بين اوساط المسلمين الامريكين"

TT2

"يخشى المسلمون الامريكيون من موجة جديدة من رهاب الاسلام"

In the ST2, the argument is focused on the two terms: fear and Islamophobia. Therefore, the first translation is adequate in terms of source-oriented approach, whereas the second translation is acceptable in terms of target-oriented approach.

1.8.2 Preliminary norms

These norms involves two major kinds of considerations which are often in a state of interconnection to each other, "those regarding the existence and actual nature of a definitive translation policy, and those related to the directness of translation" (Toury, 1978, pp. 86;1995,p.58) Considerations concerning 'translation policy' refer to those factors which influence and determine the selection of certain source texts to be translated into a specific culture or language at a specific time in terms of different text-types and genres, different authors and different publishers (ibid). Considerations about 'directness of translation' include the extent of tolerance for rendering via an intermediary language (e.g. German to Arabic through English), i.e. languages instead of the ultimate SL (J.Munday, 2008, p. 112).

1.8.3 Operational norms

These norms can be discerned as "directing the decisions made during the act of translation itself. They affect the matrix of the text– i.e., the modes of distributing linguistic material in it – as well as the textual make up and verbal formulation as such" (Toury, 1978, pp. p.87;1995,p.59), Operational norms govern whether directly or indirectly the connection that would exist between the STs and the TTs. i.e., what's very probably to remain stable under substitution process and what will be changed. These norms can be subdivided into two groups: 'matricial norms' and 'textual–linguistic norms' (Toury & al, 2012, p. 62) .

1.Matricial norms govern the substitution of the TL material for the analogous SL material in terms of the completeness of the translation, its location within the text, besides the textual segmentation. The translated texts also involved omissions, relocation, additions and maneuvers of segmentation.

2.Textual–linguistic norms govern the choice of the TT material. These norms can be either general, and therefore apply to the whole translation, or particular and hence can be confined to a specific text–type and/or method of translation (Toury, ibid; (J.Munday, 2008, p. 112) .

2.1 Defining Argumentation

Argumentation is a logical and persuasive process supported by the use of a certain type of discourse to make audience convince of a standpoint. It is also a kind of rational consideration of reasons addressed by the arguer to defend his/her claims. According to van Eemeren and (van Eemeren, 2004, p. 1) "Argumentation is a verbal, social and rational activity aimed at convincing a reasonable critic of the acceptability of a standpoint by putting forward a constellation of propositions

justifying or refuting the proposition expressed in the standpoint". On this account, argumentation is a linguistic, social and reasonable tool utilizes the use and functions of language. In this respect, Toulmin indicates that argumentation is a rigours practice people use in their daily life and they feel the need to defend their claims by using reasons, which is basically a linguistic (activity, 2003, p. 12) . Argumentation and rhetoric are complementary devices and part and parcel of any argumentative discourse and they both influence different aspects of political, legal, economic and scientific writings whether in the form of debates, speeches, dialogue or conversation. According to (Williams, 2004, p. 335) "Argumentation and rhetoric are not the components of legal and political discourse alone, rather, argumentation is a part of many writings, even in natural sciences where observation objectivity is the dominant norm". More obviously, a political discourse which is mostly of argumentative, logical and reasonable dimensions holds an arguably operative plethora of variable principles and beliefs that need a specific use of language to be unveiled. To be more accurate, argumentative discourse is a kind of a critical discussion on resolving different attitudes of a standpoint on the merits (van Eemeren F. H., 2018, p. 34). In this context, van Eemeren et al. (al., 2007, p. 7) maintain that "argumentation is a regulated exchange of views by which parties try to resolve their differences in order to reach agreement on the acceptability or unacceptability of a standpoint under discussion".

2.2 Argumentation and speech acts theory

Generally, as mentioned earlier, argumentation deals with notions such as opinions, standpoints, claims and propositions to be advanced by the arguer (i.e. protagonist) to convince the audience about a certain idea using all tools of persuasion, logic and reasoning to settle a difference in a reasonable way or to refute doubts and criticisms of the antagonists. Among the argumentation tools or what so called "argumentative

moves or indicators" are the speech acts of which (Searle, 1969, pp. 16;1979,pp.1–29) has distinguished five types of them to be instrumental in different stages of accomplishing the goal of the resolution process concerning a disagreement of opinion at issue. According to van Eemeren et al. (2007), "Argumentative indicators can be defined as words and expressions that refer to any of the moves that are significant to the argumentation process". They add that "depending on the context, argumentative indicators often announce that a particular move is taking place"(pp.1–7). Searle stresses that any of the five speech acts types explicitly conveying argumentative moves which constructively contribute in creating a critical discussion. (Searle, 1969, p. 16) directives, commissives, declaratives and expressives".

All in all, these speech acts are characterized by Searle (1969/1979), van Eemeren et al., (2007) and van (Eemeren, 2018, pp. 38 – 41) as making, asserting, asking, ordering, or giving operative and forceful standpoints and are dealt with as verbal moves in different argumentation stages to make a disagreement of an opinion resolved critically and reasonably.

2.3 Argumentation and translation

As a genre, argumentation has occupied a prominent position within the discipline of the TS approaches when translation has been increasingly seen as a decision-making activity and a cognitive process linked to the 'notion of relevance' (Gutt, 1991, p. 25) . Gutt believes there should be a close connection between effort exerted by the translator and the process of grasping intended meaning during the act of translation. According to him, "Translation as a communicative component tends to address deeper associations such as decision-making, evaluation and cause-and-effect relation (or reasoning) (ibid). Renier (1989) asserts that the role of the translator in rendering arguments is not just to manipulate with words, but also to

extract the intended meanings implied within these words (p.88). In his words, "The translator should not deal with the text as a body of words; rather he/she should treat it following a three-stage process which includes (i) viewing the thesis which the author of the SL text presents, (ii) checking how this thesis is being argued for, and then (iii) achieving a conclusion" (ibid). All in all, this is the process that assists the translator to produce a suitable equivalence in the TL. If the arguments are structured in terms of through-argumentation and counter-argumentation and with the presence of any of the six components of an argument, i.e., "claims, grounds, warrants, backings, qualifiers and rebuttals" (Williams, 2001, p. 337) the translator will find it flexible to render the intended meaning and grasping the persuasive effect of a standpoint concerned (Hatim, 1997, p. 44) ; (Fawcett, 1997, p. 104) . However, translators and the analysts who are interested in assessing translations may encounter a problem of "complex argumentation", which entails a wide understanding to be resolved as the arguer or protagonist needs to advance more than one argument to convince his audience of the acceptability of the standpoint he presents and in this case there will be complex reactions and criticism by the antagonists to deal with. Thus, more arguments may cause complexity of translation (William, 2009, p. 7) This complexity of argumentation is referred to by van Eemeren et al., (2007), by saying "The complexity of argumentative speech or text depends on the reactions the speaker or writer responds to, or which he anticipates. If the protagonist receives or expects criticism about one or more elements of his argumentation, he will bring forward more arguments to meet this criticism" (p.193). (Williams A. t., 2009, p. 7) both argumentation and translation are depicted as complex, cognitive and heterogeneous based on ongoing evaluation process. To Munday (2012), translation can be seen as a continuous evaluative product as it includes constant checking of the TL equivalents that can conform to the SL lexical units until selecting the TL most suitable (equivalents, p. 155) .

Needless to say, translating argumentative texts and writings is not void of difficulties or complexities free. This difficulty or let's say complexity is embodied in terms of the lack of knowledge in pragmatic status of the arguments structure, the use of speech acts specifically the illocutionary and perlocutionary acts, as well as the rhetorical layout of the most argumentative texts (Kearns, 1995, p. 49). Al-Khuli (2001) argues that translating argumentative texts according to their semantic meaning regardless their pragmatic inferences produces non- equivalent translation as well as he stresses that the translator should produce the same perlocutionary effect when rendering from the SL into the TL. He thinks that "obtaining equivalent source and target texts is based on transmitting the same perlocutionary act"(p.8). On the other hand, the awareness of the rhetorical layout or style is contributing in resolving different problems in rendering argumentative writings. In this respect (Kearns, 1990, p. 331) alleges that the reader should be of a clear awareness of the purposed meaning and of the structure of the original text as he says: "Because of the fact that Arabic and English utilize different rhetorical style for conveying their counter-argumentation, the Arabic reader is likely to misapprehend English counter-argument, and vice versa". He goes on by stressing that "the awareness of these rhetorical styles of both languages within the field of argumentation resolves this communicative problem". Needless to say, producing acceptable, adequate and successful translations of argumentative texts requires that the translator should have a thorough knowledge of both the SL and the TL cultural specificity, rhetorical styles, transferring persuasive effect, text-typology and pragmatic interpretation. According to (Kearns, 995, p. 49) "success in persuasion requires more than a knowledge of the language". This explains why translating arguments is not free from complexities as they are "governed by principles of convincing, logic and orderly thinking" (al, 2005, p. 69) Because of the complex structural nature of the argumentative texts, Tirkkonen-

Condit (1986) thinks they are more complex to be translated than other text-types such as narrative, expository or descriptive ones (p.95).

Considering the selection of the text-type as argumentative and determining its function, Fawcett (1997) stresses the significance of characterizing the text typology prior to embark on catching translated units to analyze and comment on because the text typology assists to choose the appropriate translation technique or strategy (p.104). He also affirms that argumentative writings and texts of different forms whether they are speeches, editorials, essays or debates have a persuasive function, then equivalence is produced if the SL texts and their TL translations hold the analogues persuasive impact (ibid,p.106). In Reiss's categorization of text-types (1977/89,p.108-9), argumentative texts are among the operative text-type which has an appellative function seeks to appeal or persuade the audience to accept a certain idea. (Reiss, 1971, p. 74) proposes that identifying the text-type and its function can control the techniques and strategies used in translation. She believes that the translator should use 'adaptation' and 'rewriting' methods to produce an equivalent effect which "inducing behavioural responses among TT readers" (ibid).

2.4 Conclusion

To conclude, the account introduced in this study proves that the theory of norms as a descriptive approach has significance and broad applications for various areas of research covering different forms of writings and text-types. The introduction expounds the importance of the application of the theory of norms to the translations of English argumentative writings. This theory has been substantially employed in different text-types whether in literature, philosophy, argumentation, politics and so forth. Reviewing previous studies shows that the theory of norms has multiplicity of applications ranging from literature and philosophy to politics within different languages. This is because the comprehensive descriptive nature of the theory of

norms to different sociocultural environments, its elastic applicability as a multi-purpose area of inquiry, besides the effect of its normative and binding force which restricts the translators' behaviour and govern their performance during the act of translation.

References

1. . Baker, M. (1995) Corpora in Translation Studies: An Overview and some Suggestions for Further Research. In *Target*, 7 (2): pp. 223–243.
2. . Bartsch, R. (1988). Norms of Language. Theoretical and Practical Aspects: London. Longman.
3. .Beaugrande, R. & Dressler, W. (1981). Introduction to Text Linguistics. London: Longman.
4. .BermejoLuque, L. (2011). Giving Reasons a Linguistic–Pragmatic Approach to Argumentation Theory. Dordrecht: Springer.
5. .Brodzki, B. (2007). Translation, Survival and Cultural Memory. Publisher: Stanford University Press.
6. .Catford, J. C. (1965). A Linguistic Theory of Translation. London: Oxford University Press.
7. .Chesterman, A. (1997). Memes of Translation: The Spread of Ideas in Translation Theory. (Vol.22). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.
8. .Claramonte, M. (2025). Translation and Objects: Rewriting Migrancy and Displacement through the Materiality of Arts. Routledge: Taylor and Francis Group.
9. .Corner, A. and Hahn, U. (2013). Normative Theories of Argumentation: Are Some Norms Better Than Others? CORNTO, <https://philipapers.org>
10. .Eemeren, F. H. (2018) Argumentation Theory: A Pragma– Dialectical Perspective. Springer.

11. .Fawcett, P. (1997). Translation and Language: Linguistic Approaches Explained. Manchester: St Jerome.
12. .Gutt, E. A. (1991). Translation and Relevance: Cognition and Context. Oxford: Blackwell; 2nd ed., Manchester: St. Jerome, 2000.
13. . Hatim, B. (1997) Communication Across Cultures: Translation theory and contrastive text linguistics. Read Hall: University of Exeter Press.
14. .Hermans, T. (1985). The Manipulation of Literature: Studies in Literary Translation. Beckenham: Croom Helm.
15. .Hermans, T. (1996) Norms and the Determination of Translation: A theoretical framework. In: Alvarez, R. and Vidal, M. (eds.) Translation, Power, Subversion (pp.25-51). Multilingual Matters: Clevedon, England.
16. .Holmes, J.S. (1988) The Name and Nature of Translation Studies. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
17. .Lefevere, A. and Bassnett, S. (1990). The Cultural Turn in Translation Studies. London: Pinter.
18. .Mary Snell-Hornby (2006). The Turns of Translation Studies. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Co.
19. .Munday, J. (2008). Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and applications. London and New York: Routledge.
20. .Ross, A. (1968). .Riccardi, A. (2002). Translation Studies: Perspectives on an Emerging Discipline. Cambridge University Press.
21. Directives and Norms. Routledge and Kegan Paul: London. Humanities Press. New York.
22. .Schaffner, C. (1999). Translation and Norms. Publisher: Multilingual Matters.
23. .Schaffner, C. (2010). Norms of Translation. In Handbook of Translation Studies. Edited by: Yves Gambier & Luc van Doorslaer (2010)

- Volume1.(pp.235–245) John Benjamins Publishing Company.
Amsterdam/Philadelphia.
24. .Searle, J.R. (1969). A speech Acts: An Essay in Philosophy of Language: Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
 25. .Tirkkonen–Condit, S. (1989). Empirical Research in Translation and Intercultural Studies. Joensuu: University of Joensuu, Faculty of Arts.
 26. .Toury, G. (1980). In Search of a Theory of Translation. The Porter Institute for Poetics and Semiotics.
 27. .Toury, G. (1995). Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.
 28. .Toulmin, S.(2003). The uses of Argument. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
 29. .van Eemeren, F. H. and Grootendorst, R. (2004). A Systematic Theory of Argumentation: The pragma–dialectic approach: Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
 30. .van Eemeren, F. H. (2018). Argumentation Theory: A Pragma–Dialectical Perspective. Springer.
 31. .Venuti, L. (2000). The Translation Studies Reader. London and New York: Routledge, 1st ed.
 32. .Williams, G. (2005). Translation Quality Assessment: An Argumentation–Centered Approach. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press.
 33. . Williams, G. (2009).Translation Quality Assessment. Mutatis Mutandis.

References

1. .Baker, M. (1995). *Corpora in Translation Studies: An Overview and some Suggestions for Further Research*. In Target, 7 (2): pp. 223–243.

2. Lefevere, A. a. (1990). *The Cultural Turn in Translation Studies*. London: Pinter. .
3. Riccardi, A. (2002). *Translation Studies: Perspectives on an Emerging Discipline*. . Cambridge.
4. A. and Hahn, U. C. (2013). *Normative Theories of Argumentation: Are Some Norms Better Than Others?* CORNTO, <https://philipapers.org>
5. G.Toury. (1995). *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia:: John Benjamins Publishing. .
6. Hatim, B. (1997). *Communication Across Cultures: Translation theory and contrastive text linguistics*. Read Hall:. University of Exeter Press.
7. Hermans. (1996). . *T. Norms and the Determination of Translation: A theoretical framework*. In: Alvarez, R. and Vidal, M. (eds.) *Translation, Power, Subversion (pp.25-51)*. Multilingual Matters:. Clevedon, England.
8. Hermans, T. (1996). *Norms and the Determination of Translation: A theoretical framework*. In: Alvarez, R. and Vidal, M. (eds.) *Translation, Power, Subversion (pp.25-51)*. England: Multilingual Matters: Clevedon, England.
9. Hornby, M. S. (2006). *The Turns of Translation Studies*. . Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Co. .
10. J.Munday. (2008). *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and applications*. London and NewYork: Routledge.
11. M.Claramonte. (2025). *Translation and Objects: Rewriting Migrancy and Displacement through the Materiality of Arts*. . Routledge: Taylor and Francis Group.
12. Schaffner. (1999). *C. Translation and Norms*. Publisher: Multilingual Matters.
13. Toury, G. (1980). *In Search of a Theory of Translation*. Porter : The Porter Institute for Poetics and Semiotics. .

14. Toury, G. (1980). . *In Search of a Theory of Translation*. The Porter Institute for Poetics and Semiotics. .
15. van Eemeren, F. H. (2004). *A Systematic Theory of Argumentation: The pragma-dialectic approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. .
16. van Eemeren, F. H. (2018). *Argumentation Theory: A Pragma-Dialectical Perspective*. .