



ISSN: 1817-6798 (Print)

Journal of Tikrit University for Humanities

available online at: <http://www.jtuh.tu.edu.iq>

**Assistant Lecturer: Varteen
Hanna Shaba**

University of Mosul-College of Arts-Dept. of
Translation

* Corresponding author: E-mail
Varteen.h.s@uomosul.edu.iq
07703854716

Keywords:

translation universals
translated texts
repetition
omission

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 1 Mar. 2020

Accepted 9 Nov. 2020

Available online 2 Mar. 2021

E-mail

journal.of.tikrit.university.of.humanities@tu.edu.iq

E-mail : adxxxx@tu.edu.iq

**Lexical Simplification: a Universal
Feature of Translation**

A B S T R A C T

The present paper explores simplification as one feature of translation universals from English into Arabic. It aims at investigating how much the translators were aware of lexical simplification as a universal feature in the translated texts and discovering to what extent the language of translation is simple in order to preserve the meaning and information to make the translated texts more reader-friendly. This study hypothesizes that the language of translation is assumed to be lexically simpler than that of non-translated target-language texts and characterized by a low level of information flow by reducing lexical density.

This study adopts certain lexical simplification strategies like using more frequent words, methods to avoid lexical repetition and lexical omission of unnecessary word.

The data chosen for analysis in the current study include a test involving 10 English literary texts selected from the famous novel *the Pride and Prejudice* written by Jane Austen in 1813 and translated by six participants as Junior teachers and M.A. students in the Department of Translation – College of Arts – University of Mosul, some of them were provided deliberately with a list of recommended strategies.

© 2021 JTUH, College of Education for Human Sciences, Tikrit University

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.25130/jtuh.28.3.1.2021.20>

التبسيط اللغوي: ظاهرة عالمية في الترجمة

م.م. فارتين حنا شابا/ جامعة الموصل – كلية الآداب – قسم الترجمة

الخلاصة:

يتكشف هذا البحث التبسيط إحدى الظواهر العالمية للترجمة من الانكليزية الى العربية. ويهدف الى التحقق من مدى ادراك المترجمين للتبسيط اللغوي كظاهرة عالمية في النصوص المترجمة واكتشاف الى اي مدى تكون لغة الترجمة بسيطة اثناء الحفاظ على المعنى والمعلومات لغرض تسهيل فهم النصوص

المتجمة للقراء. وتفترض الدراسة أن تكون لغة الترجمة أبسط لغويا عن لغة النصوص غير المترجمة في لغة الهدف وأن تتصف بانخفاض مستوى تدفق المعلومات من خلال تقليل الكثافة اللغوية. وتتبنى الدراسة استراتيجيات معينة في التبسيط اللغوي منها استخدام أكثر المفردات الدارجة وطرق تجنب التكرار اللغوي والحذف اللغوي للمفردات غير الضرورية. وتتضمن بيانات التحليل في الدراسة الحالية عشرة نصوص انكليزية ادبية مختارة من الرواية العالمية المشهورة الكبرياء والهوى لجين اوستن لعام 1813 ترجمها ستة مشاركين اساتذة بدرجة مدرس مساعد وطلبة الماجستير في قسم الترجمة في كلية الآداب في جامعة الموصل. وتم تزويد بعضهم عمدا بقائمة من الاستراتيجيات الموصي بها.

Simplification

Since the 1980's and 1990's, translation universals (TU) and the investigation into these linguistic features have become very topical in translation studies and nowadays.

Many researchers made attempts to identify potential universals of translation and submitted evidence to support their claims. The search for universals is an important area in the descriptive approaches to translation studies (Strědovā, 2009:6), that means to describe the specific characteristic features of a translated text or multiple translations for the same source text according to the norms and constraints of the target language and culture (Kruger, 2002:78)

Translation universals are generally believed to be regularities and recurring patterns in translation, “the features which are common to all translations regardless of which language or text types are involved, occurring irrespective of the particularities of individual translations” (Hopkinson, 2008 in Strědovā, 2009: 8).

They are "the linguistic features typically occurring in translated texts rather than original texts and are thought to be independent of the influence of the specific language pairs involved in the process of translation "(Baker, 1993: 243).

Many linguistic tendencies and features of language have been suggested to be potential universals of translation; Laviosa – Braithwait (1998: 288) lists among such features common to all kinds of translation: simplification, avoidance of repetition present in the source text, explicitation, normalization, discourse transfer and descriptive distribution of lexical items.

The notion of "universal " is closely related to Frawly’s (1984) “third code” as "a product of the negotiation of the translator between the first code of the source text, language and culture and the second code of the target language and culture, a product that differs not just in obvious ways from its source, but also from native texts of the second code" (Frawly, 1984: 250-262).

A feature of translation that has been suggested to be a candidate for a translation universal is simplification (Stredova, 2009: 16). It is conceived as the “idea that translators subconsciously simplify the language of the original text or message or both” (Baker, 1996: 176).

Simplification was first defined and studied in translation studies by Blum-Kulka and Levenstron (1983) in (Laviosa, 2002: 43) of Hebrew-English translations. However Baker (1993 and 1996) commenced formulating the notion of simplification as one of the universals of translation explicitly within a wider discussion which has focused on the occurrence of universal features of translation.

Baker (1996: 181) defines simplification as the “tendency to simplify the language used in translation”. According to Baker (1996: 182) the translator tries to make the source text easier for the reader but that doesn't necessarily mean to make things more explicit. See Kruger, 2000: 145, for similar view.

Nevertheless Toury (1995: 270) refers to the existence of a lower information load in the target texts than the source text, it is because ambiguous information in the original has been removed or made more clear in the translation process.

The indicators of simplification are relatively low lexical density; it means that the number of function words or grammatical words is high, in proportion to the number of lexical words. Lexical words contain more information than grammatical words and using fewer lexical words means that the reader will have to keep track of less information and using less varied vocabulary (Helwegren, 2005: 12). Another possible sign of simplification is punctuation that tends to change in translation. According to Malmakjaer (1997:160) the punctuation is retable on scale from weak to strong in the order comma, semicolon and full stop.

Baker's concept of the universality of simplification in translation stated that simplification is "inherent in translation peers and it is not the cultural and or lexical differences between the two languages in question" (1996: 181).

Nevertheless, Laviosa (2002: 34) argues that simplification cannot be used to indicate a process inherent in translation in general because in this case simplification is a strategy adopted for a particular type of text.

Therefore, the most distinguished research into simplification as translation universal so far was posed by Laviosa (Laviosa-Braithwaite, 1998 and Laviosa, 1998a, 1998b, 2002). The main object of the research made by Laviosa consisted of shifts at sentence level that happen during the process of translation and the influence of simplification strategies on the whole texts.

Laviosa's findings uncover four regular patterns of lexical use in translated English compared to original English and she hypothesized that these "core patterns" are not limited to two text genres, but may demonstrate typical of translated text in general (Laviosa, 1998b: 564).

These regular features or “core patterns of lexical use” are:

1. Lower rate of lexical words versus grammatical words.
2. More increased use of highly frequent words of English.
3. More increased repetition of the most frequent words or "list heads" used in each subcorpus.
4. Use of a lower number of lemmas in the list heads.

The Relation among Simplification, Summarization and Translation Precision

The two tasks (simplification and summarization) have contradictory goals; text simplification attempts to retain content of information while decreasing grammatical complexity. Summarization on the other hand aims to reduce information content, keeping only the most important information

Perhaps the two tasks also have a lot in common, both summarization and simplification comprise transforming a text in a way, therefore Siddharthan (2004: 42) expects "the architecture of a text simplification system closely resembles the architectures used by text summarization system". Text simplification's architecture involves two stages: analysis and transformation, the analysis stage consists of surface level techniques like term frequency, cue phrase and sentence location and the transformation stage involved simple sentence extraction, while summarization system includes three stages; the first stage consists of: identification, interpretation and generation, the second stage involves: interpretation, transformation and generation, and the third stage comprises analysis, transformation and synthesis (ibid.). For example ,Lin and Hovy (2000: 496) adopted the middle stage to convert sentences using topic generations, for instance:

8) *John bought some vegetables, fruit, bread and milk* → *John bought some groceries.*

They used their source of knowledge, and they explain these stages as:

1. Topic identification: identify the most important central topics of the texts.
2. Topic interpretation: to intergrate concepts such as waiter , menu, and food into organized concept “restaurant”.
3. Summary generation: can produce keyword and extract type summaries.

Summarization also contains identifying information that is common amongst sentences taken from different texts which requires an ability to recognize paraphrase (Siddharthan, 2004: 46). Siddharthan (2004: 47) refers to eliminating non-central information from a sentence is a similar task to that of sentence shortening and the trend in summarization is to move towards more elaborate transformation and regeneration stages. Similarly, simplification also requires a third stage (regeneration) in applying sentence-level syntactic transforms to text (Siddharthan ,2004: 47).

Khalussy (1982: 226) refers to summarization in translation as “a precise-translation” which is giving the extraction of the subject by focusing on the essential sentences and phrases, and deleting repetitions. He suggests that the organized summarization should be started with clauses, sentences, paragraphs then chapters, and translates them at the same time, so it is a double process ‘with its types’.

Look at the example below suggested by Khalussy (1982: 228) :

1) *He is plainly a man who has violated his oath of allegiance for his country.*

إنه بكل وضوح إنسان نكث يمين الولاء لبلاده.

The underlined clause can be summarized by one word “traitor” “خائن”:

إنه بكل وضوح إنسان خائن. / أو أنه بكل وضوح خائن.

Lexical simplification

Blum-Kulka and Levenston (1983) cited in Laviosa,2002:43 were the first who presented an empirical study and provided evidence for lexical simplification in translation by carrying out an analysis of Hebrew-English translation. They identified several strategies that are adopted by Laviosa (2002) and will be discussed later which they exemplify from empirical data and explain in terms of lexical and cultural differences between the source and the target language, the translator's commitment to the source language, and the specific task of the translation (ibid.). Laviosa (2002: 43-47) examines each of these strategies as in the following:

1. Source language hyponyms translated by superordinate in the target language which are explained in terms of the existence of “semantic voids” between the source text and the target text.
2. The approximation of the concept expression which does not have the full scale of the source text meaning because there is a lack of cultural matching between the two languages.
3. The choice of replacing infrequent target words with more familiar target language synonyms for achieving greater readability.
4. Lexical transfer of all the functions of a source language lexical item to its assumed target language equivalent. In other words transferring the referential and conceptual meaning, connotation ,collectability and register restriction.
5. Use of paraphrase where there are cultural gaps between SL and TL.

Other scholars have referred to lexical simplification strategies in their studies, Toury (1995: 212-220) gives an example of the type of lexical transfer in discussing “translation-specific lexical items and their lexicographical treatment”;

the word “na’ara” in Hebrew points out essentially to a teenager, but in Hebrew texts translated from English, it has acquired some of the functions of the word “girl”. Toury attributes this phenomenon to the fact that “a verbal formulation of a translation is partly governed by a felt need to retain aspects of the corresponding source text invariant” (1995: 215).

Moreover, in her course book for trainee translators, Baker (1992: 23-44) discusses the different strategies used by professional translators for dealing with non-equivalence at word level and she refers that the effectiveness of this procedure is attributed to the fact that “the hierarchical structure of semantic fields is not language-specific”.

Vanderauwera (1985 cited in Laviosa- Braithwaite, 1998: 288) uses modern colloquial, simple and confidential synonyms vis-à-vis old, formal, affected and high level words in the source text.

Strategies of Lexical Simplification Applied on This Study

Studying meaning semantically and pragmatically has changed from the old perception which regards meanings of words fixed and unchanged towards words getting their meaning according to the context and can be changed through the culture in which they are used (Althibany, 2011: 11).

Numerous linguists have recognized the importance of seeking a proper equivalence during the translation process. Catford (1965: 50) defines translation equivalence as “translation equivalence occur when an SL and TL texts or items are relatable to (at least some of) the same relevant features of situation substance”.

Nida (1964: 159) distinguishes between two types of equivalence: (1) formal equivalence which concentrate on the message itself , its form and content and there should be a close similarity between the ST and TT message , (2) dynamic equivalence which tends to create the same effects on the reader of the TT as those obtained by readers of the ST.

In line with Nida , Newmark (1988: 39) distinguishes between communicative translation (the translator tends to create the same effects on the TT reader as those obtained by the ST reader) , and semantic translation (the translator focuses on the rendition of the textual meaning of SLT according to the syntactic and semantic characteristics of TLT).

Moreover, it is undeniable that Baker (1992) was the most outstanding theorist focusing on equivalence at word level and she claims that a word is the basic meaningful unit in language (Baker, 1992: 9). The following are the suggested strategies:

1.Using More Frequent Words

Nida (1964: 16) posts that the translator should employ the forms of speech in common usage. Even if a particular form does have a clear counterpart in the target language, the frequency at which it is used or the reason for which it is used will differ.

Translation by more frequent words implies sub-other strategies included within this strategy aiming to lexical simplification such as:

1. Translation by a more general word (superordinate) if there are not equivalent hyponyms in the target language

Before discussing this point, it is necessary to shed some light on hyponym's definition. Hyponymy refers to the semantic relations of inclusion. The meaning of a more specific word is included in the meaning of a more general word, i.e. an expression **A** is a hyponym of an expression **B** if the meaning of the two expressions leads to a relation between their denotations, for example, terms like daisy, daffodil, rose, lilac, etc. all contain the meaning of flower, they are all hyponyms of flower (Al-Sulaimaan, 2011: 197-202).

Dickens et al. (2002: 56-57) argues that translation by generalization is one of the most widely used strategies in dealing with various kinds of problems in

translation; the translator normally uses a more general word "superordinate" or a more commonly recognized to replace the more specific one. Similarly, Baker (1992: 23) suggests such strategy to deal with the problems of non-equivalence. Existing certain gaps between source and target languages makes the translator resorts to generalization through the process of translation , that's what Hosseini Maasoum and Davtalab (2011: 1767) report in their research .

There are some words or phrases in one language which are unknown for another language, this phenomenon is called “semantic voids” or lexical “gap”, in some cultures, lexical gap may be observed in a way that people make distinctions between different aspects of a concept, for example, Arabic uses 20 different words to identify different kinds of “camel” and they conceptualize camels, more specifically, however, other languages like English does not make any distinction between different kinds of camel, it is used as a generic word. Consider the following:

- 1) *"They were rather handsome, had been educated in one of the first private seminaries in town".*

The above sentence contains a word ‘**seminaries**’, which refers in Arabic to a specific theological school , but it is possible to be translated by more general word in order to produce a natural translation for the reader, as

بالأحرى كانتا فانتنتين , درستنا في واحدة من المدارس الخاصة الأولى في البلدة.

2. Translation by Familiar Synonyms

The study of synonymy and synonymous words has many aspects in translation studies and studies of translated language before corpus-analysis of translation equivalents and recently in corpus-based studies of translation

universals. Jantunen (2004: 103) refers to the use of common level or familiar synonyms that might account for lexical simplification in translations. Jantunen (ibid.) reports that “the range of synonymous words is not narrower in translations; in some cases, the range of synonymous degree modifies is even wider in translation”.

Logically speaking, the strategy of translation by using familiar synonyms in the target language enhances the translated product to sound more natural and accepted for the target readers.

Consider the following example and its different renderings in Arabic :

2) “*The Longbourn party were the last of all the company to depart*”

كانت مجموعة لونغبورن آخر المغادرين
كان تجمع لونغبورن آخر الجماعات المغادرة.....
كان أعضاء حزب لونغبورن آخر المغادرين.....

As we can see in the first and second translation, the students tended to use common words, while in the third one they tried to render it literally.

2. Avoiding of Lexical Repetition

The issue of lexical repetition is a highly-valued stylistic device in literary texts where it performs generic functions, it may serve as musical, thematic or symbolic device .(Buitkuvienė ,2012: 109).

Although repetition has a major function in literary texts, avoiding repetitions is one of the most recurrent norms of translation, therefore it is referred to it as a universal feature of translation (Ben-Ari, 1998: 69).

In the current paper , certain methods have been applied in an attempt to avoid repetition in a targeted simplified texts, as :

1. Lexical Deletion

Omission is a strategy employed for translating repetition which is termed by Ben-Ari as canceling repetition in order to reduce the number of repetitions in the target text (Ben-Ari, 1998: 72). This can be explained by the following example:

3) *"His sisters were fine women, with an air of decided fashion".*

The above sentence contains a repetition represented by the lexical item **women** for the word *sisters*, which should be avoided by omission because it relates to a previously mentioned lexical unit. 4 students out of 6 translated this sentence simply, for example:

اخواته كن رائعات جدا يملاهن شغف الموضة والازياء
كانتا شقيقتاه طبيبتين ومولعتين بالأزياء

While the two others failed to translate by using simplification, such as:

كانتا اختاه سيدتين جميلتين و منمقتين .

2. Lexical Variation

There are cases where the repetition is acknowledged, though with variations the translation resorts to this strategy when canceling is impossible (Ben-Ari, 1998: 73), or when omitting is implemented at the expense of the intended meaning since the repetition seems to be rhetorically motivated (Nassar, 2008: 42). Consider the following example:

4) *"Dear madam, do not go. I beg you will not go. Mr. Collins must excuse me. He can have nothing to say to me that anybody need not hear. I am going away myself".*

The previous sentence includes a lexical repetition **go** in its third occurrence, therefore translation by lexical variation is useful for such problem . All the subjects tried to avoid this repetition consciously or unconsciously, for example:

اتوسل اليبعيدا. هبي سوف ارحل بعيدا .

3. Pronominalization

The translator can use pronouns or what is called pro-forms in place of a full lexical item (Nassar, 2008: 64). Consider this sentence:

5) *"And upon Elizabeth's seeming really, with vexed and embarrassed looks, about to escape, she added: Lizzy, I INSIST upon your staying and hearing Mr. Collins".*

This sentence contains a lexical repetition represented by the proper names; **Lizzy** and **Mr.Collins** (occurs in other places in the texts), which can be avoided by the following pronominalization strategy. Only one out of 6 students replaced these proper names by suitable pronouns, as in the rendition below:

ولكنها اردفت قائلة بانها تصر عليها ان تبقى وتستمع اليه

But the others reiterate this repetition in their renderings into Arabic, such as:

ليزي , انا اصر ان تبقى وتسمعي من السيد كولنز.

4. Paraphrasing

In this type of avoiding repetition, the translator opts for rendering the ST lexical item by using a paraphrase in TT (Nassar, 2008: 69). Buitkuvienē also adopts this strategy (2012: 110-113) to render lexical repetitions, here is a representative example:

6) *"It was next to impossible that their cousin should come in a **scarlet** coat, and it was now some weeks since they had received pleasure from the society of a man in any other **colour**".*

The lexical item **colour** is considered a repetition because it is a superordinate of the lexical item **scarlet**, therefore is rendered by paraphrasing to avoid repetition which expressed by using different words.

Some students tended to following paraphrasing in their renderings, such as :

كان من المستحيل ان ياتي ابن عمهما مرتديا حلة عسكرية. وقد مضت عدة اسابيع منذ قضائهما وقتا ممتعا بصحبة رجل من غير الضباط .

While the others failed to avoid this type of repetition , such as:

كان اشبه بالمستحيل ان ياتي ابن عمهما مرتديا معطفا قرمزي اللون . وقد مضت اسابيع منذ ان تمتعوا بمجتمع لرجل باي لون اخر .

3. Approximation of the concepts expressed in the source text

Baker (1992: 15) refers to the problems of non-equivalence encounter in translation and suggest solutions to deal with because the choice of suitable equivalents in a certain text depends on many factors, one of these factors is linguistic and the other factors are extralinguistic (the way the author of the source text and the producer of the target text), that is the translator choose to manipulate the linguistic systems in question.

Non-equivalence at word level means that the target language has no direct equivalent for a word which occurs in the source text (ibid.).

Baker (1992: 18) discusses some common problems related to the current strategy of non-equivalence, among them are:

a. Culture-specific concepts

A concept (abstract or concrete) in the source language is unknown in the target language, it may relate to religious belief, a social custom or even a type of food, for example, an abstract concept, “speaker” (of the house of commons) has no equivalent in Arabic, it is often translated into “الرئيس”, another example on concrete concept is “airing cupboard” in English which again is unknown to speakers of most languages .(Baker , 1992: 18).).

b. The source-language concept is not lexicalized in the target language

The source language concept may express a known concept in the target language but there is no word in the target language to express it, for example, the word “savoury” has no specific equivalent in many languages such as Arabic although it expresses a concept which is easy to understand (ibid.: 18-19).

Baker then suggests strategies to deal with such problems among them are:

1. Translation by cultural substitution

This strategy involves replacing a cultural-specific item which does not have the same propositional meaning in the target language by a similar concept that has the same impact on the target reader (Baker, 1992: 29). Baker adds the translator’s decision to use this strategy depends on his purpose in translation (ibid). For example:

7) *"Till Elizabeth entered the drawing-room at Netherfield, and looked in vain for Mr. Wickham among the cluster of red coats there assembled, a doubt of his being present had never occurred to her".*

The above sentence contains a cultural-specific concept ‘**red coats**’ which is unknown in Arabic. It is related to a military uniform, therefore translating with cultural substitution to approximate it to the target readers is an agreeable solution.

Out of 6 students, 3 of them were aware of such problems in translation. They tended to use strategies of approximation of the concepts expressed in the source text, such as :

أخذت تبحث بلا فائدة عن السيد ويكهام بين تجمعات الضباط هناك

However , the other students failed to solve these problems in translation and translated directly, for example:

وفتشت بلا جدوى عن السيد ويكهام بين الجمع المرتدين معاطفا حمراء المجتمعين هناك.
وبحثت بلا جدوى عن السيد ويكهام وسط جمع من ذوي المعاطف الحمر .

Newmark (1988: 82-83) refers to “approximate translation” as translation where a SL cultural word is translated by a TL cultural word.

As-Safi (2009: 59) argues that this strategy endeavours to create balance between the SL cultural values which are acceptable or unacceptable in the TL and only an approximation, rather than complete translation, is possible in order to achieve natural and acceptable rendition.

2. Translation by a more neutral/less expressive word

This strategy is particularly useful when a translator encounters an expressive word and cannot convey the true meaning or even leads to misunderstanding (Binh, 2010: 39). The translator resorts to this strategy when he picks up an equivalent but perceived differently in the target language, therefore, he tends to use a less expressive correspondence in the target language to avoid the risk and to make the translated text more natural. For instance :

8) *"And they were at last obliged to accept the second-hand intelligence of their neighbour, Lady Lucas".*

This sentence contains a concept "**second-hand**" which is not lexicalized in the target language, yet it expresses a known concept in the target language. Thus it is translated by approximating of the concept expressed in the source text i.e. by a more neutral word. All the students' successes in approximating the second item in bold type, such as:

واضطروا أخيرا الاعتماد على ذكاء جارتهم السيدة لوكاس الضعيف.
واجبروا في النهاية الى اللجوء الى جارتهم السيدة لوكاس ذات الذاكرة الضعيفة.

4. Lexical Omission

Omission is defined as the opposite phenomenon to addition ; and in translation is the strategy of omitting words whose meanings might be known or understood in the text (Petruionē, 2012: 46). Petruionē mentions that the motives for such a decision as the translation may find no adequate way to convey the original meaning or it may be reasoned decision when the translator could provide

some kind of paraphrase or equivalent but he does not do so because of the amount of effort , this solution would require on behalf of the translator and the reader.

However, the author posts that these reasons are attributed to traditional omissions which are identified by the failure of the translator to render the necessary translation unit, therefore, the purposes for using omission is to ensure linguistic accuracy and stylistic acceptability and avoiding text redundancy to express the information in a more concise manner.

Also Barik (1971: 200) refers to omission as items present in the original version that left out by the translators. This type of omission is considered clear omission which is different from the other kind that falls under the category of substitutions and errors .Omissions are determined according to the final content of the original message (ibid.).For similar view ,see Ivocovani ,2009. Barik assumes that the type of omission a word or phrase which does not change the grammatical structure of the sentence and results in very little loss in meaning as “skipping omission” (1971: 200).

Omission occurs when the translator has chosen not to include some piece of information from the ST and the effect of deletion is usually that the text has been simplified (Helgegren, 2005: 23).

Consider the following example presented by Baker (1992: 42) :

"The panda's mountain home is rich in plant life and gives us many of the trees, shrubs and herbs most prized in European gardens".

مستوطنات الباندا الجبلية غنية بالنباتات حيث يوجد الكثير من الأشجار والشجيرات والأعشاب التي لا تقدر
بشمن بالنسبة للحدائق الأوروبية.

The source text addresses a European audience and the use of “life” and “give us” highlights the intended orientation.

The Arabic translation addresses different audience and therefore the translator omits these words. As regard to simplification ,omission is a common

strategy used by the translators to simplify a translation and it takes two forms: horizontal omission which is the omission of words (Kruger, 2000: 161-162) and it is our concern in this paper and the other form is vertical omission, i.e. the omission of sentences (ibid.).

Kruger (2000: 216) stresses that omission is the strongest way of simplifying and thus reducing the number and range of lexical items in translated texts which occur in the ST and omitted in the TT.

Omission occurs when the translator has chosen not to include some piece of information from the ST and the effect of deletion is usually that the text has been simplified (Helgegren, 2005: 23). For instance:

9) "*Elizabeth listened in silence, but was not convinced; their behaviour at the assembly had not been calculated to please in general; and with more quickness of observation and less pliancy of temper than her sister, and with a judgment too unassailed by any attention to herself, she was very little disposed to approve them*".

The above sentence contains a lexical item 'calculated', which can be omitted because it is not essential enough to the development of the text .

4 out of 6 students removed this item in their renderings into Arabic ,they were aware to provide an acceptable version for the reader, for example

استمعت إليزابيث بهدوء ولكن لم تكن واثقة من ذلك, فتصرفاتهم في الجلسة لم تكن مرضية في اغلب الأحيان.

أصغت إليزابيث بصمت إلا أنها لم تقتنع بذلك لان سلوكهم بين الحاضرين لم يبهج أحدا بشكل عام.

However, the two others inserted this item in their translations , such as:

أنصتت إليزابيث بصمت ولكن بدون اقتناع لان سلوكهم في التجمع لم يكن المقصود منه إسعاد الجميع

Conclusion

The manual analysis for this type of simplification which is mentioned above, has detected many strategies of simplification, for instance: using more frequent words, avoiding lexical repetition, approximation of the concepts expressed in the source text and lexical omission. The results revealed that the translators sometimes differ or agree in using simplification strategies for the same text. The present study indicated that approximately more than 50% of student translators were more inclined to lexical simplification in their production process. It also showed that 50% of the students are aware of simplification as a universal characteristic of the translated text especially for cleaning away repetitions from translation and non – equivalent problems in translation on the lexical level , while the others tend to use literal renditions.

As a result, even simplification as a universal feature of translation remains highly controversial because it is not fit for all languages and all types of texts, in this analysis ,It is proved that this regularity in translation behavoiur is found to some extent in the selected subjects' translations .

References

- Al-Sulaiman, M.M.D. (2011).** Semantics and Pragmatics. Daar Ibn Al-Atheer. University of Mosul.
- Althibany, A.A.S. (2011).** Achieving Linguistic Equivalence in Arabic. *Andalus for Social and Applied Sciences*, vol 4, no. 7, p.p. 7-24.
- As-Safi, A. B. (2011).** Translation Theories, Strategies and Basic Theoretical Issues. Petra University Press. Jordan.
- Baker, M. (1992).** In *Other Words*. London & New York: Routledge.
- (1993).** Corpus linguistics and translation studies: Implication and application. In M. Baker, G. Francis and E. Tognini-Bonelli, (eds). *Text and technology: In honour of John Sinclair*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- (1996).** Corpus-based translation studies: The challenges that lie ahead. In H. Somers, (ed). *Terminology, LSP and Translation: Studies in language engineering in honour of Juan C. Sager*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins, p.p. 175-186.
https://pe.ug.edu.pl/mdl/file.php/508/Translation_universals/mona_baker_1993.PDF
- Barik, H. C. (1971).** A Description of Various Types of Omissions, Additions and Errors of Translation Encountered in Simultaneous Interpretation. *Meta*, Vol.16, no.4, p.p.199-210.
- Ben-Ari, N. (1998).** The Ambivalent Case of Repetitions in Literary Translation. Avoiding Repetitions : a "Universal" of Translation. *Meta*, Vol. 43, no. 1, p.p.68-78.
- Binh, P. T. (2010).** Strategies to deal with nonequivalence at word level in translation. Graduate Thesis. Hanoi: Hanoi University. <http://web.hanu.vn/dec/file.php/1/Non-equivalent-Binh.pdf>
- Buitkuvienė, K. (2012).** Strategies for Translating Lexical Repetition in Contemporary Novels for Teenagers. *Studies About Languages*. no. 20, p.p. 109- 117. <http://www.itc.ktu.lt>
- Catford, J. C. (1965).** A linguistic Theory of Translation. London: Oxford University Press.
- Crossly, S., Allen, D. & McNamara, D. (2011). Text Readability and Simplification : A Comparison of Readability Formulas. *Reading in A Foreign Language*, Vol.23, no. 1, p.p. 84-102. <http://nflrc.hawaii.edu>
- Dickins, J., Hervey, S., & Higgins, I. (2002).** Thinking Arabic Translation: A Course in Translation Method : Arabic to English . London and New York: Routledge

Frawley, W. (1984). Prolegomenon to a theory of translation. In Venuit, L. (ed). The translation studies reader: New York: Routledge, p.p. 250- 264.

Hellegren, Sofia. (2005). "Tracing Translation Universals and Translator Development by Word Aligning a "Harry Potter Corpus." Undergraduate thesis, Linköping University (Sweden), Department of Computer and Information Science. http://www.diva-portal.org/diva/getDocument?urn_nbn_se_liu_diva-4579-1

Hosseini Maasoum, M. & Davtalab, H. (2011). An Analysis of Culture-Specific Items in the Persian Translation of "Dubliners" Based on Newark's Model. Theory and Practice in Language Studies, Vol. 1, no.12, p.p.1767-1779

Ivacovoni, A. (2009). Translation by Omission. Retrieved from: <http://iacovoni.wordpress.com/2009/02/01/translation-by-omission>

Jantunen, J. H. (2004): "Untypical Patterns in Translations: Issues on Corpus Methodology and Synonymity." Mauranen, A. Kujamäki, P. (eds): Translation Universals: Do They Exist? Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins, p.p. 101-129.

Khalussy, S. (1982). فن الترجمة في ضوء الدراسات المقارنة. Alrashid Publishing House: Baghdad.

Kruger, A. (2000). Lexical Cohesion and Register Variation in Translation: The Merchant of Venice in Afrikaans: PhD thesis. University of South Africa.

-----**(2002).** Corpus – based Translation Research: Its Development and Implications for General, Literary and Bible Translation. Acta Theologica Supplementum, 2, 70-106.

Laviosa – Braithwaite, S. (1998). Universals of Translation. In Baker, M. Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies. London & New York: Routledge, p.p. 288-291.

Laviosa, S. (1998a). The Corpus-Based approach: A New Paradigm in Translation Studies: Meta, Vol. 43, no. 4, p.p. 474-479.

-----**(1998b).** "Core Patterns of Lexical Use in a Comparable Corpus of English Narrative Prose": Meta, Vol. 43, no. 4, p.p. 557-570.

-----**(2002).** Corpus based Translation Studied: Theory, Findings, Application. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Lin, C.-Y. & Hovy, E. (2000). The Automated Acquisition of Topic Signatures for Text Summarization. Proceedings of the COLING Conference. Strasbourg, France, Vol. 1, p.p. 495-501.

Malmkjær, K. (1997) . Punctuation in Hans Christian Andersen's Stories and Their Translations Into English, in F.Poyatos, ed., 'Nonverbal Communication and Translation : New Perspectives and Challenges in Literature, Interpretation and The Media', Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Nassar, A. I. (2008) . Translation Shifts in The Lexical Repetition Chains of Translated Arabic Literary Texts: A Case Study .M.A. Thesis . Petra []]] University: Jordan.

Newmark, P. (1988). A Textbook of Translation. New York and London: Prentice-Hall-International.

Nida, E. A. (1964).Toward a Science of Translating. Leiden: E. J-Bill. <https://books.google.iq>

Petrulionė, L.(2012). Translation of Culture Specific Items from English into Lithuanian: the Case of Joanne Harris's Novels . Studies About Languages .no. 21 , p.p. 43-49.www.cceol.com.

Siddharthan, A. (2004). Syntactic Simplification and Text Cohesion. Technical Report, University of Cambridge.

Strědovā, A.(2009) . Explication and Implication in Non-literary Translations. Master's Diploma Thesis : Masaryk University .

Toury, G. (1995) .Descriptive Translation Studies – and Beyond . Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.