

Translation of Deceptive Language from Ethical Perspectives

ترجمة اللّغة المضللة من منظور أخلاقي

Meriam BENLAKDAR مريم بلقذار

Translation Institute, Algiers 2 University, Algeria
meriem.benlakder@univ-alger2.dz

Received date: 29/08/2021

Revised date: 19/12/2021

Publication date: 31/12/2021

Abstract:

The study aims to determine the practical meaning of ethics in translation and to what extent ethical considerations can be influenced by cultural, religious, and social dimensions when dealing with deceptive language. The study adopted Chesterman's models of ethics for translators (2001) and Toury's translation norms (1995) to analyse some samples of deceptive language in some translated electronic texts. The significance of the study is to explore the boundaries of ethics in translation and the limitations of the challenging task of translating deceptive language in an intercultural context. The results show that deceptive language is based on ambiguity, generalisations, and vagueness. Translation ethics and norms are sometimes observed when translating deceptive language through achieving adequacy and acceptability. Observing ethics in translation might be very challenging since there is no agreement on specific ethical rules. Translators should endeavour to provide high quality translations, achieve accuracy, acceptability, adequacy, and take on social responsibility.

Keywords: Deceptive language; Doublespeak; Norms; Translation ethics; Acceptability.

ملخص:

تهدف هذه الدراسة إلى تحديد المعنى التطبيقي للأخلاقيات في الترجمة ومعرفة إلى أي مدى يمكن أن تتأثر الاعتبارات الأخلاقية بالأبعاد الثقافية والدينية والاجتماعية عند التعامل مع اللّغة المضللة في الترجمة. وعليه، لقد اعتمدنا على نماذج شسترمان لأخلاقيات المترجمين (2001) ومعايير توري للترجمة (1995) لتحليل بعض النماذج من اللّغة المضللة في بعض النصوص الإلكترونية المترجمة. وتكمن أهمية الدراسة في استكشاف حدود الأخلاقيات في الترجمة وحدود المهمة الصعبة المتمثلة في ترجمة اللّغة المضللة في سياق متعدد الثقافات. تظهر النتائج أنّ اللّغة المضللة تقوم أساساً على الغموض والتعميمات

والضبابية. وقد يتم أحياناً مراعاة أخلاقيات الترجمة ومعاييرها عند نقل اللغة المضللة من خلال تحقيق الملاءمة والمقبولية. كما قد يكون التزام بالأخلاقيات في الترجمة صعباً للغاية نظراً لعدم وجود اتفاق على قواعد أخلاقية محددة. وبالتالي، يجب أن يسعى المترجمون لتقديم ترجمات عالية الجودة، وتحقيق الدقة، والمقبولية، والملاءمة، وتحمل المسؤولية الاجتماعية.

الكلمات المفتاحية: لغة مضللة؛ خطاب مزدوج؛ معايير؛ أخلاقيات الترجمة؛ مقبولية.

1- Introduction:

Weasel words and doublespeak are both part of deceptive language and can be used as a means of misleading and manipulating people through hiding the truth, distorting reality, softening meanings, and using language strategically. On the other hand, translation, as a communication act and a cultural fact, contributes to shaping identities, implementing ideologies, and establishing hegemony. It requires some ethical rules that should be considered by translators. When dealing with the translation of deceptive language, several questions of ethics come into play. In this regard, the study attempts to answer the following questions: What is the practical meaning of ethics in translation? To what extent can ethical considerations be influenced by cultural, religious, and social dimensions when translating deceptive language? The significance of the study is to explore the boundaries of ethics in translation and the limitations of the challenging task of translating deceptive language in an intercultural context.

2. Theoretical background:

Deceptive communication can be part of any discourse. According to Snyder and Higgins (1988) “deception...involves distortion in the reporting of information; moreover, this distortion process is motivated by advantages that the individual perceives will accrue to him or her” (p. 237). In other words, deception is a deliberate attempt to mislead or influence others.

Deceptive language is a language that is not truthful which is used in interpersonal communication. Truth, correctness, accuracy, and ethics are not taken into consideration in deceptive discourses. Moreover, cultural

influences should not be neglected when dealing with deceptive communication since they may have important role in shaping conversational styles and formulating words (Kim, 2002). That is, cultural factors may have a significant part in perceiving, detecting, and understanding deceptive language.

Further, deceptive communication is a “general persuasive strategy that aims at influencing beliefs, attitudes, and behaviours of individuals”, it is “highly individualistic, and not subject to simple generalizations” (Miller & Stiff, 1993, pp. 28, 77). Deceptive communication usually aims to falsify, distort, omit, or control information. For instance, deceptive communication is highly used in the fields of politics, advertising, and marketing through adopting inaccurate statements, overgeneralizations, exaggerations, and telling lies.

Doublespeak, weasel words, jargon, emotive expressions, slogans, euphemisms, enthymemes, are all considered to be part of deceptive language that may be used to mislead and deceive people (Miller & Stiff, 1993).

Weasel words are words or expressions which have flexible, variable, and context-dependent meaning (Mellinkoff, 1963). That is to say, weasel words are vague, ambiguous, obscure, and may open the door to different, subjective, and biased interpretations.

The expression of “weasel words” derives from the weasels’ habit of eating eggs. Weasels are animals which have the ability to suck the content out of eggs without seemingly breaking the shell (Collins English Dictionary, 1994). Moreover, “a weasel word is a modifying word that undermines or contradicts the meaning of the word, phrase, or clause it accompanies” (as cited in Douglas, 2018, p. 1). Hence, weasel words cause confusion and ambiguity. At first glance, weasel words seem substantial, but upon closer look, they appear to be meaningless (Schrank, 1988). Thus, weasel words can be misleading, deceptive, and may be used to avoid answering questions or affirming statements.

Rudinow and Barry (2008) state that when the recipients read a message that contains weasel words, they usually focus on the claim rather than those weasel words; they give the example of the weasel word “help” in advertisements, such as “help prevent” and “help overcome” which are directly understood as “prevent” and “overcome” (Rudinow & Barry, 2008, p. 317). This clearly means that weasel words are usually superfluous, add nothing to the meaning, and may even change the meanings of sentences.

In 1972, George Orwell coined the term doublespeak in his novel “Nineteen- Eighty-Four” (1949) which results from the fusion of two terms: newspeak and doublethink (Gibson & Lutz, 1991). Newspeak refers to euphemistic terms and expressions are used in the novel, whereas, doublethink refers to having “two contradictory opinions at the same time and believing in both of them” (Orwell, 2013, p. 22). In other words, the use of euphemisms and doublespeak may result in deceiving and manipulating people.

Doublespeak is a language that is used to deceive, mislead, and influence people’s opinions on the basis of partial or incorrect piece of information (Williams, 1980). This type of language is usually used to distort reality since it lacks integrity.

Lutz (1989) defines doublespeak as a “language which pretends to communicate but really does not. It is language which makes the bad seem good, something negative appear positive, and something unpleasant appear attractive, or at least tolerable. It is the language which avoids or shifts responsibility, the language which is at variance with its real meaning. It is the language which conceals or prevents thought. Doublespeak is the language which does not extend thought but limits it” (p. 67). Doublespeak is quite treacherous because it is used to gain and retain power through introducing vagueness and ambiguity, omitting to provide accurate pieces of information as well as misrepresenting facts.

Hence, doublespeak hinders clear communication, hides realities, sugar-coats the truths, misleads people which makes it very dangerous since there is a great difference between what is said and what is real and truthful.

Further, Herman (1992) states that doublespeak is “the ability to lie, whether knowingly or unconsciously, and to get away with it; and the ability to use lies and choose and shape facts selectively” (p. 3), which means that doublespeak can be a synonym of lying without being held responsible for one’s lies. In addition, doublespeak implies using language strategically to be able to select terms, shape realities, and manipulate people.

Lutz (1989) classifies doublespeak into four main categories namely, euphemisms, jargon, gobbledygook or bureaucratese, and inflated language.

As for euphemisms, they are defined as words or expressions that are used to soften realities and show compassion. For example, the phrase “force packages” is used instead of bombs and “collateral damage” is used to refer to innocent civilians in military situations (Lutz, 1996, pp. 183- 185). These euphemisms distort reality and do not provide accurate information.

Jargon is also considered as a category of doublespeak if it is used to deceive others and intimidate them; it is defined as specialized terminology, related to a specific field such as medicine. It is worth mentioning that the use of jargon among professionals is natural and is considered as a form of professional communication.

Gobbledygook or bureaucratese refers to sentences which tend to be very long and vague, and are used to conceal the truth or confuse the recipients. Bureaucratese and officialese represent a language that sounds official and wordy, and can be deemed as barriers to comprehension and communication (Lutz, 1989).

As for inflated language, it is usually used to exaggerate or embellish facts (Shiyab & Halimi, 2015). It may seem impressive and sophisticated; however, it is loaded with confusing terms and tends to make simple facts look great.

All these categories may not be deemed as a form of doublespeak if they are used with good intentions or among specialists. In addition, they are used as part of everyday language to fulfill various language functions and in many fields such as politics, business, advertisements.

Further, to understand the functions of doublespeak, the contexts should be carefully analysed. In this regard, Lutz states that “meaning is not static but dynamic, words in one context or semantic environment can take on an entirely different meaning in another” (Lutz, 1996 :80). That is, what can be considered as a doublespeak in one context, may not be so in another. Contexts provide the necessary details to understand the meaning of utterances and statements and detect the doublespeak used in sentences.

According to Kalina (2014) “ethics can be defined in very general terms as the respect of certain values, to be achieved by adhering to rules and principles that have developed within a society or were laid down by a group for its members” (p. 65). That is, ethics involve the respect of certain conventional rules and principles that govern a given society or discipline and guide the behaviour and attitudes of people.

Moreover, ethics and norms among members of a profession are called “deontology” which are the guidelines of professional ethics that are part of ethical or professional code of conduct and are established by professional associations (Kalina, 2014, p. 66). In fact, every society, association, establishment, school, university, profession has its own code of conduct which is likely to guide and orient its members.

Chesterman (2018b) defines “Translation ethics” as “the set of accepted principles according to which translation should be done (and, *mutatis mutandis*, interpreting), and hence the norms governing what translations should be like. As translating is a form of linguistic behaviour, translation ethics can also be seen as embedded in an ethics of language or communication more generally” (p. 443). In other words, the concept of translation ethics represents a number of norms, rules, and principles that regulate and guide the translator’s decisions and choices.

In addition, Chesterman considers that “since ideas about ethics have to do with our understanding of the concept “good”, translation ethics overlaps with issues of quality. Some recent work has aimed to expand the notion of “translation quality” to include ethical aspects of a translator’s working conditions, bridging the difference between textual and human

relations” (Chesterman, 2018b, p. 443). That is to say, translation ethics and translation quality are closely linked; ethical questions in translation usually revolve around what is meant by a “good or bad translation” and translation quality is based on many factors such as assessment, proofreading, appropriate translation choices, to name just a few.

In this context, Chesterman distinguishes between four current models of ethics: the ethics of representation (of the source text, or of the author), an expanding ethics of service (based on fulfilling a brief negotiated with a client), a more philosophical ethics of communication (focused on exchanges with the foreigner as Other), and a norm-based ethics (where ethical behaviour depends on the expectations specific to each cultural location). Chesterman further adds an ethics of ‘commitment’, an attempt to define the ‘good’ ideally attained by translation, embodied in an oath that might work as a code of professional ethics for translators (as cited in Pym, 2001, p. 130). It is noteworthy that ethics is used in this classification as a singular noun.

These models may overlap and it may be difficult to draw a clear line between them. According to Hebenstreit (2010, p. 290), these ethics bear the values of “commitment, fairness, truthfulness, trustworthiness, empathy, courage, determination” (as cited in Kalina, 2015, p. 68). Further, Pym states that the ethical question of representation has been the center of translation ethics for so long; it considers that the translator is responsible for representing a source text or an author. However, this representation may be impossible to achieve in some cases. That is the reason why translation was considered by many theorists as an art of sacrifice involving the knowledge of what to keep and what to omit. Therefore, ethics are a kind of sacrifice justification (Pym, 2001, pp. 131-132). Thus, the ethics of representation is about selecting what to translate and what to omit taking into account the lexical, semantic, stylistic, and pragmatic differences between the source and target languages.

As for the ethics of service, it is considered from the Skopos theory perspective; that is the translator renders service to clients by observing the

translation brief formulated by the client. This ethics is common in the localization industry since it fulfills the principles of acceptability (Pym, 2001, p. 132). In other words, the target audience determines the function and purpose of translation, and the translator whose translation respects and achieves the goals set forth by this audience is deemed “ethical”.

Further, the ethics of communication welcomes alterity and the translator should respect otherness in the foreign text (Pym, 2001, p. 134). That is, the translator should preserve the foreign marks in the source text and respect cultural, religious, and social diversity.

As for the norm-based ethics, it is intimately related to the expectations and social norms of the target audience, it is somehow the equivalent of domestication in translation. Thus, the “good” translation is the one that is accepted by the readers of the target culture.

The ethics of commitment is about creating a translation code of conduct according to which translators strive to produce “ethical translations” and undertake full responsibility for their decisions and choices.

The concept of translation ethics represents a number of principles and rules, adopted by translators which may serve to solve moral problems that translators may encounter when translating various types of texts in sensitive contexts to achieve good quality translations and assume full responsibility in this regard. Translation ethics may apply to the act of translating and the behaviour, decisions, choices, and attitudes of the translator.

Gideon Toury believes that “translation can be described as subject to constraints of several types and varying degree”; these constraints go beyond the source text, the differences that exist between languages, and the translator’s knowledge (Toury, 1980, p. 54). In other words, translation is not a mere act of transferring terms and expressions from the source text to the target text; it is a very complex process that requires systems of norms and rules that should be observed by the translator as a mediator.

Toury defines norms in translation as “values or ideas shared by a certain community as to what is right and wrong, adequate and inadequate” and “a category for descriptive analysis of translation phenomena” (Toury, 1980, p. 57). These norms are binding, prescriptive, and clearly determine what is a “good” and “appropriate” or “bad” and “inappropriate” translations. These norms can be acquired during “socialization” and are considered as criteria to evaluate behaviours.

The importance of norms consists in distinguishing the “regularity of behaviour in recurrent situations of the same type”, and in determining social relevance of activities (Toury, 1980, p. 55). Norms help in measuring, predicting, and assessing the possible behaviour and attitude of the translator in a given situation.

In this regard, Toury distinguishes three levels of norms applicable to translation, (i) preliminary norms which are related to the translation policy and directness of translation, (ii) initial norms are related to the choice of the translator whether to subject himself/herself to the norms of the source text and culture which achieve adequacy, or those of the target text and culture in this instance, the norms determine acceptability, and (iii) operational norms which are connected to the matrix of the text, textual structure, and verbal formulation (Toury, 1980, pp. 57-58). Preliminary norms refer to extra-textual factors that determine the choice of the texts to be translated in specific contexts and the tolerance for translating from an original text or a translation. The initial norms determine acceptability and adequacy in translation. The operational norms refer to the decisions made by the translator in the process of translation.

Moreover, Chesterman (1993) distinguishes two types of norms: professional norms (role, relationship between source text and target text, as defined by competent professional translators, and their methods and strategies) and expectancy norms (established by the expectations of the client). Professional norms are subordinate to expectancy norms (as cited in Kalina, 2014, p. 68). Professional norms are related to the purpose, techniques, and strategies of translation in line with expectancy norms.

Expectancy norms are determined by the receivers' expectations of the translation output through conforming to the professional norms established by the receivers' community. Toury's norms are taken as the present study's theoretical framework because they are exhaustive and can lead to regularity of behaviour, bring accuracy, and reduce ambiguity.

3. Methodology:

Data collection includes six samples of English weasel words and six samples of doublespeak and their Arabic translations. These samples have been randomly selected from www.Qantara.de portal, available on the following links:

(<https://en.qantara.de/search/overview/want%20change>),
(<https://en.qantara.de/search/overview/new%20realities>),
(<https://en.qantara.de/search/overview/sustainable%20development>),
(<https://en.qantara.de/search/overview/all-time%20record>),
(<https://en.qantara.de/content/profile-german-turkish-film-director-fatih-akin-the-cutting-edge-of-reality>),
(<https://en.qantara.de/search/overview/Women%20empowerment>),
(<https://en.qantara.de/search/overview/austerity%20measures>),
(<https://en.qantara.de/search/overview/Company%20downsizing>),
(<https://en.qantara.de/search/overview/single%20mothers>),
(<https://en.qantara.de/search/overview/neutralize>),
(<https://en.qantara.de/search/overview/Regime%20change>),
(<https://en.qantara.de/search/overview/Person%20of%20interest>).

A descriptive analytical study is conducted to examine the selected samples. Further, Andrew Chesterman's models of ethics for translators (2001) and Toury's translation norms (1995) are adopted to analyse these samples of deceptive language in those electronic texts. The analysis was limited to the selected samples since the study does not include all the data related to the research and covers a limited scope.

4. Analysis:

In this section, an analysis of the selected samples of weasel words and doublespeak and their translations is conducted.

➤ **Weasel words:**

The following samples are considered:

- A) -“All Algerians want change” “كل الجزائريين يريدون التغيير”
 -“All Arabs want to have good future” “كل العرب يريدون مستقبلا جيّدا”
 -“Arab women want to work” “تريد النساء العربيات العمل”

The verb “want” is widely used, for instance politicians use it a lot during electoral campaigns to support their policies or convince people to vote for them without giving statistical data using over generalisations. In some instances, the verb “want” is considered as a weasel word because it is evasive and does not provide the accurate information. It is usually translated literally into Arabic even if it is sometimes misleading. Thus, the ethics of representation is observed. As highlighted by Rudinow and Barry (2008), when Arab recipients read this message that contains the weasel word “want”, they would focus on the claim rather than this verb and this is the awaited goal.

- B)- “New realities, new opportunities, new data, new challenges, new responses, new perspectives, new approaches, new needs, new risks, new policies, new endeavours, new demands”
 “واقع جديد، فرص جديدة، بيانات جديدة، تحديثات جديدة، استجابات جديدة، آفاق جديدة، مقاربات جديدة، احتياجات جديدة، مخاطر جديدة، سياسات جديدة، مساعي جديدة، طلبات جديدة”

The adjective “new” is largely used in political speeches, press articles, advertisements, as well as economic and social texts. It usually introduces false claims and vague statements. It suggests a timeline that does not reflect reality which can be appealing upon closer look. Most often, the mentioned “realities, opportunities, challenges, demands, needs, perspective...” are not that new; they exist long before they are used in such texts. Hence, this adjective is quite vague and may be misleading in certain contexts since it does not specify the time span. As for the translation, the techniques of literal translation and lexical equivalent are often used to

render this weasel word to comply with the initial norm in order to achieve adequacy in translation and conform to the ethics of representation.

C)- “Sustainable development”

“التنمية المستدامة”

The expression “sustainable development” is considered as a weasel expression because it is open to many interpretations such as eliminating poverty, achieving economic and industrial growth, using modern technologies, the democratisation of institutions, the establishment of the rule of law, and so on. It is vague and unclear although it sounds good and promising. As for the translation, this expression is usually rendered literally using lexical equivalent or literal translation in almost all instances to comply with the norm of adequacy despite the vagueness of meaning.

D)- “All-time record”

“رقم قياسي لكل الأوقات”

The expression “all-time record” is considered a weasel expression because it is superfluous and redundant. The word “record” means a sum of achievements in the past. “All-time” refers to something “being for or of all time, up to and including the present” (all-time, n.d.). This expression is redundant, although it may sound pompous. As for the translation, this expression is usually rendered literally using lexical equivalent or literal translation in almost all instances to comply with the norm of adequacy despite the redundancy of meaning. On the other hand, sometimes the word “all-time” is omitted in Arabic and only the word “record” is translated.

E)- “The cutting-edge reality”

“واقع متطور”

The adjective “cutting-edge” refers to the most advanced “techniques or equipment in a particular field” (cutting-edge, n.d.); that is, a highly innovative or pioneering technology. Using this adjective to describe reality may be ambiguous, since the relevant innovative features may be difficult to determine. Hence, this adjective may introduce vagueness, although it may be high-sounding. As for the translation, the adjective “متطور” is used to render the meaning of the original adjective. However, this translation may be not accurate because the intended meaning is “a new

reality” instead of “an innovative reality”. Thus, the translation does not really comply with the adequacy norm.

F)- “Women empowerment” “تمكين المرأة”

According to Poonam Barhoi (2016), “the concept of women empowerment is vague without their economic empowerment”. Hapke (1992) defines women empowerment as “the restructuring of gender relations within both the family and in society at large and society's recognition of women's equality with men in terms of their worth to society as independent persons“ (p. 18). Further, this concept is complex and multidimensional ; it may be ambiguous in certain contexts. The translation of this expression is literal and renders the meaning of the original. Hence, the translation complies with the norm of adequacy.

➤ **Doublespeak:**

The following samples are considered and analysed:

A) Austerity measures “إجراءات التقشف”

The expression “austerity measures” is generally used in economic contexts and refers to a series of measures to reduce debts, restrain expenditures, and increase taxes. According to Warwick-Booth (2018) : “austerity is a term used to describe a policy and economic style in which governments try to reduce spending by cutting services and increasing taxation” (p. 267). The term can be quite confusing because the decisions taken by governments are usually unclear. The phrase “إجراءات التقشف” is used to render the English phrase through adopting the technique of literal translation. This translation seems adequate and acceptable, since it represents the original phrase and preserves all its apparent and hidden meanings through the use of lexical equivalent.

As for the ethical question that arises in this type of translation, the ethics of representation has been strictly observed.

B)-“Company downsizing” “تحجيم العمالة”

The doublespeak “company downsizing” is often used in some articles to refer to reducing the workload, that is, “fewer people to do the

same amount of work” (Schorr, 1998, p. 20). Companies usually cut down on their employees to reduce costs and save money. In fact, downsizing refers to employees firing. Thus, this phrase can be misleading because it presents this process as a simple issue by hiding its true meaning. The translation “تحجيم العمالة” renders the meaning of the original and may be clearer in some contexts. This translation complies with the initial, operational, and expectancy norms. Further, it is adequate with respect to the source text and fulfills the readers’ expectations.

C)-“Single mothers”

“الأمهات العازبات”

The term “single mother” is considered as a doublespeak because it is misleading and manipulative especially for Arab readers. In Arab societies, woman must not give birth to a child outside formal marriage. It is forbidden by Islamic and civil laws as well as social norms and values. This issue is a taboo; single mothers are stigmatised by society and fear for shame, discrimination, social exclusion, and admonishment because in fact, they are adulteresses. However, this doublespeak can over time legitimate this phenomenon and make it sound acceptable and tolerable. Literal translation technique is often used to render this doublespeak; the Arabic translation reflects the original phrase. Thus, the ethics of representation and the initial norms are observed in this translation. However, when the real meaning as well as the social and religious dimensions of this doublespeak are analysed, this translation can be morally and socially unacceptable for Muslim readers due to its illegitimacy and future consequences.

D)-“To neutralise”

“أبطل”، “أحبط”، “أضعف”

The verb “to neutralise” is largely used in the media; it means “(a) to make ineffective; (b) kill or destroy” (neutralise, n.d.). In military contexts, the verb neutralise is used to refer to killing people instead of using a denotative verb that may sound harsh. Hence, it is considered a doublespeak because the meaning of this verb is vague and evasive in certain contexts. In Arabic, many equivalents are used to render this English verb such as, “أشلى”, “أضعف”, “أبطل”, “أحبط”. However, these equivalents do not mean “to kill”. Therefore, the translator should take the context in which the verb “to

neutralise” is used to be able to translate it adequately. All these equivalents may comply with the initial, operational, and expectancy norms if the situational context is considered.

E)-“Regime change”

“تغيير النظام”

The phrase “regime change” is usually considered as a doublespeak when used in certain political contexts. It may refer to a forced change of governments as a result of a military coup or people uprising. In many Arab Spring countries, protests and revolts against some Arab regimes led to overthrowing the ruling governments and installing new regimes. In this context, the phrase “regime change” may give the impression that the parties in-power wanted to deliberately withdraw from their governments without any pressure or constraints. However, this was not the case. These regimes were overthrown and presidents were forced to surrender their posts. As for the translation, it renders the original, and is quite acceptable and adequate when it refers to a deliberate regime change. However, it may be misleading in the context of Arab Spring countries.

F)-“Person of interest”

“شخص مشتبہ به”

“Person of interest” is a phrase “used by law enforcement to announce the name of a person involved in their investigation but who has not been formally accused or charged with a crime. The term has no true legal meaning, but sounds very flashy for the media and lets the public know that something is being done” (Ubaney, 2016, p. 14). This term may refer to an unknown subject who can be the suspected criminal or the people involved in an investigation. This phrase is intentionally vague. As for the translation, it is not really accurate, and it does not reflect the original, since the ‘person of interest’ can be a witness, not only a suspect. Hence, the translation is not adequate and does not comply with the initial norm.

5. Findings about the study:

The initial and operational norms were generally observed when translating weasel words and doublespeak into Arabic. The ethics of representation, services, and expectancy were also considered and enabled

translators to achieve adequacy and acceptability through conveying the original message and achieving textual equivalence. The techniques of literal translation, lexical equivalence, and transposition were adopted by translators to render the meanings of the original words and expressions. However, some translations were ambiguous and vague, and some features and connotations of the original expressions were lost due to semantic and syntactic differences between English and Arabic. The target readers' expectations were taken into consideration through providing the precise contextual meaning of the original in most instances.

6. Conclusion:

Weasel words and doublespeak are part of deceptive language and are based on ambiguity and generalisations. Further, they introduce vagueness, allow several subjective interpretations, and may serve to perpetuate stereotypes. They can become a source of manipulation, reality distortion, overestimation, underestimation, and elusiveness. A critical approach is much needed to interpret these types of linguistic devices. The practical meaning of ethics in translation can be reflected in achieving adequacy and acceptability as well as meeting the target reader's expectations. However, the concept of "sacrifice" in translation is always prevalent because sometimes it is very difficult to preserve the source text's features and fulfill the expectations of the target readers at the same time. Ethical considerations are greatly influenced by cultural, religious, and social factors. Observing ethics in translation might be very challenging since there is no agreement on specific ethical rules, especially in intercultural contexts. Translators should endeavour to provide high quality translations, achieve accuracy, acceptability as well as adequacy, and take on social responsibility.

References:

All-time. (n.d.). Retrieved 07-12-2021, at 8:40 a.m., from: <https://www.merriamwebster.com/dictionary/all%20the%20time#:~:text=Definition%20of%20all%20the%20time,about%20her%20all%20the%20ti> me.

- Barhoi, P. (2016). Do women really need empowerment?. Retrieved 06-12-2021, at 3: p.m. from: <https://www.indiafellow.org/blog/2016/11/do-women-really-need-empowerment/>
- Chesterman, A. (2018b). Translation ethics. In L. D'hulst and Y. Gambier (eds), *A History of Modern Translation Knowledge. Sources, concepts, effects.* Amsterdam: Benjamins, pp. 443–448.
- Collins English Dictionary. (1994). Glasgow: HarperCollins Publishers.
- Collins English Dictionary. (1994). Sinclair, J. (Ed.). London: Harper Collins Publishers.
- Cutting-edge. (n.d.). Retrieved 07-12-2021, at 8:45 a.m. from: <https://www.collinsdictionary.com/dictionary/english/cutting-edge#:~:text=If%20you%20are%20at%20the,important%20or%20most%20exciting%20developments.&text=If%20someone%20or%20something%20gives,the%20race%20for%20the%20championship.>
- Douglas, E. (2018). Hedging, weasel words, and truthiness in scientific writing. *JSLs, the Society of Laparoendoscopic Surgeons*, 22 (4), pp. 1-4.
- Gibson, W. & Lutz, W. (1991). *Doublespeak: A Brief History, Definition, and Bibliography, with a List of Award Winners, 1974-1990.* NCTE Concept Paper No. 2., Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Hapke, H. (1992). 'An Experiment in Empowerment' in Ranjana Kumari (ed). *Women in Decision Making.* New Delhi: Vikas.
- Herman E. (1992). *Beyond Hypocrisy: Decoding the News in an Age of Propaganda including the Doublespeak Dictionary.* Boston: South End Press. Accessed on 15-04-21 https://archive.org/details/isbn_9780896084360
- Kalina, S. (2015). Ethical challenges in different interpreting settings, *MonTI Special Issue 2*, pp. 63-86. ISSN 1889-4178.
- Kim, M.S. (2002). *Non-Western perspectives on human communication. Implications for theory and practice.* California: Sage.
- Lutz, W. (1989). *Beyond Nineteen-Ninety-Four: Doublespeak in a Post-Orwellian Age.* (Report No. ISBN-0-8141-0285-9). Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

- Lutz, W. (1996). *The new doublespeak: Why no one knows what anyone's saying anymore*. New York, NY: Harper Perennial.
- Mellinkoff, D. (1963). *The language of the law*. Boston: Little, Brown & Company.
- Miller, G. & Stiff, J. (1993). *Deceptive communication*. Michigan: Sage.
- Neutralise. (n.d.) Retrieved 06-12-2021, at 8:45 a.m. from: <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/neutralise>
- Orwell, G. (2013). *Nineteen-Eighty-Four* [Kindle version]. New York: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt. Retrieved from <http://amazon.com> (original work published 1949).
- Pym, A. (2001). The return to ethics in translation studies. Special issue of the *Translator* 7, Universitat Rovira I Virgili, Tarragona, pp. 129-138.
- Rudinow, J. and Barry, V. (2008). *Invitation to critical thinking*. Belmont: Thomson Wadsworth.
- Schorr, J. (1998). *Purchasing in the 21st century : A guide to state-of-the-art techniques and strategies*. USA: John Wiley & Sons.
- Schrank, J. (1988). *The language of advertising claims*. Accessed on 15-04-21: <http://home.olemiss.edu/~egjbp/comp/ad-claims.html>.
- Shiyab, S. M. & Halimi, S. (2015). *Writing business letters across languages: a guide to writing clear and concise business letters for translation purposes*. Accessed on <https://ebookcentral-proquest-com.ezproxy.hamline.edu>
- Snyder, C. & Higgins, R. (1988). Excuses: their effective role in the negotiation of reality. *Psychological Bulletin*. 104: 23-35.
- Toury, Gideon. (1980) *In search of a theory of translation*. Tel Aviv: The Porter Institute for Poetics and Semiotics.
- Ubaney, S. (2016). *Who murdered Elvis?* USA: Westhill Media.
- Warwick-Booth, L. (2018). *Social inequality* (2nd ed.). London: Sage.
- Williams, A. M. (1980). *Looking at...Important Topics in the Social Studies* (Report No.ISBN-0-89994-250-4). Boulder, CO: Social Science Education, Inc Retrieved from ERIC database. ERIC Document 190471.