

Textual Synonymy and Its Role in Argument Construction in Arabic-English Argumentative Translation: An Analytical Study from a Text-Type Perspective

Prepared by the researcher

Heba Issa

Abstract

This study explores the issue of textual synonymy as a highly impactful pragmatic-functional element in constructing arguments within argumentative texts—particularly in the fields of political and media translation between Arabic and English. The research is based on the hypothesis that synonymous expressions in such texts are not interchangeable; rather, each serves a specific rhetorical function tied to the author's tone and persuasive intent. By applying the Text-Type Theory as developed by Reiss and further expanded by Hatim & Mason, the study analyzes five common synonym sets (resist/oppose/defy, accuse/blame/condemn, suggest/propose/recommend, warn/threaten/advise, support/approve/endorse) to evaluate how well translations preserve the original argumentative function of the source text.

The study employs a comparative pragmatic analytical method, revealing that translations which overlook the source text's function often result in diluted arguments or a loss of persuasive effect. Conversely, translations that are sensitive to the text's function and type have shown effectiveness in conveying the intended message within the target culture.

The study concludes that textual synonymy is not merely linguistic variation but a crucial rhetorical strategy. The Text-Type Theory proves to be an effective framework for guiding translators' decisions and assessing translation quality in argumentative texts.

Keywords

Textual synonymy, argumentative translation, argumentative function, Text-Type Theory, pragmatics, political discourse, media translation, Hatim & Mason, Reiss, persuasive effect, textual analysis.

1. *Introductory Framework*

1.1 General Introduction

In a world where languages and cultures are increasingly intertwined and the need for mutual understanding among peoples is growing, translation occupies a central role in constructing this epistemic and communicative bridge. Translation is no longer a mere tool for transferring meanings from one language to another; it has become a means for reconstructing discourses, interpreting intentions, and conveying messages within different cultural and contextual frameworks. It has become evident that translation does not operate in a linguistic vacuum but is deeply intertwined with the elements of discourse, power, and knowledge—especially in sensitive fields like media and politics, where the word itself functions as an instrument of influence and opinion shaping.

Among all the types of texts that are translated and consumed within the global cultural sphere, argumentative texts hold a unique position in terms of their complexity and the challenges they present to translators. These texts do not merely describe or report reality; rather, they seek to influence the reader, persuade them, and prompt them to take a certain stance or reconsider existing convictions. To achieve this, they rely on a meticulously constructed argumentative structure—carefully selecting vocabulary, employing rhetoric, organizing arguments, and considering tone and cultural context.

However, in practice, translation is often reduced to a “lexical” or “grammatical” process, neglecting the pragmatic and discursive elements that give the argumentative text its power and effectiveness. One of the most overlooked phenomena in this regard is functional textual synonymy—the use of words that are close in dictionary meaning but differ in their rhetorical or argumentative function.

For instance, English words such as *resist*, *oppose*, and *defy* may often be translated simply as “يعارض” (oppose) in Arabic, even though each word carries a different degree of tension, symbolic violence, and confrontational tone. The same applies to words like *accuse*, *blame*, and *condemn*, which differ in severity and discourse context. Here, synonymy is not just a linguistic luxury, but a strategic choice in building the argument, helping to determine the writer’s stance and the tone of the text.

A translation that fails to consider these differences does not merely suffer from linguistic inaccuracy; it risks dismantling the argumentative structure of the text, weakening its persuasive effect, and distorting its original intent—particularly when the text is directed toward an audience that is culturally and contextually different.

1.2 The Research Problem

Translation has long been recognized as more than just a replacement of words from one language with those of another; it is an intellectual and cultural activity that requires a deep understanding of discourse structure and textual intention. This task becomes even more complex when dealing with argumentative texts, which do not merely aim to convey information but seek to influence the reader, persuade them, or challenge their existing beliefs. In this type of discourse, every word carries a specific rhetorical function, and every synonym chosen—or excluded—alters the tone, intensity, and trajectory of the argument.

Within this context, the translator faces a fundamental question: Is it sufficient to choose a synonym that is close in dictionary meaning to the original word? Or must the translator consider the pragmatic context and the argumentative function of the word within the overall structure of the text?

This challenge becomes particularly apparent in Arabic-English translation, where rhetorical tools, argumentative strategies, and pragmatic conventions differ significantly between the two languages and their respective cultures. Many words that appear synonymous in dictionaries actually carry divergent pragmatic and cultural implications, making their substitution a risky rhetorical maneuver.

As Hatim & Mason (1990) point out, “*successful argumentative translation is only achieved when the translator manages to preserve the argumentative structure of the text within the target culture, not merely its linguistic level.*”

While traditional views of synonymy suggest that words with similar meanings may be interchangeable, modern approaches in discourse analysis and translation studies—such as those proposed by Baker (1992) and Munday (2001)—warn against this lexical simplification. These scholars emphasize that many synonyms serve distinct rhetorical functions within texts, depending on tone, intention, and stance.

Studies by researchers such as Shehab (2009) and Shiyab (2007), focusing on conceptual synonymy in argumentative contexts, have shown that translations which fail to account for such differences often result in bland or misleading texts, where the argument either loses its force or appears contrary to its original intent. For example, the repeated translation of the word *defy* into Arabic as “يعارض” (oppose) strips it of its confrontational and rebellious tone, whereas *oppose* has a more balanced or diplomatic connotation.

Based on this, the present study poses the following central research question: What is the effect of synonym selection in argumentative translation on the construction of the argument in the target text, and how can Text-Type Analysis assist the translator in making more informed and accurate decisions?

This central question branches into several sub-questions, including:

- How do synonymic differences affect the tone and rhetorical style of the translated text?
- What role does the discourse context play in guiding the translator’s choice of the most appropriate synonym?
- How does Text-Type Theory—as formulated by Reiss and later developed by Hatim & Mason—help analyze the function of a synonym within an argumentative context?
- Can translators develop functional strategies that enable them to choose the most effective synonym to convey the argument, without compromising the target culture or the intended rhetorical impact?

These questions form the foundation for a deeper investigation into the nature of argumentative translation and the ways in which pragmatic and textual models, particularly Text-Type Theory, can guide synonym choice in ways that preserve both argument structure and persuasive force in culturally distinct contexts.

1.3 Research Objectives

This study aims to investigate the phenomenon of textual synonymy in political and media argumentative discourse from a functional-pragmatic perspective, focusing on its impact on argument structure during translation between Arabic and English. The main objectives of the research are as follows:

1. To analyze textual synonymy from a functional-pragmatic angle within argumentative texts, with particular attention to the role each lexical item plays in shaping discourse and structuring the argument.
2. To demonstrate the impact of synonymy on the effectiveness of argumentation in translation by examining multiple synonymic cases in media and political texts translated between Arabic and English.
3. To apply Text-Type Theory—as originally formulated by Reiss and later developed by Hatim & Mason—to explore the relationship between the function of the text and the tone of the synonyms it contains, and how this relationship influences translation decisions.
4. To provide a comparative analytical model that enables translators to recognize the correlation between synonym selection and its argumentative effect on the translated text.
5. To propose practical recommendations for translators on how to handle synonymy in argumentative texts, ensuring both semantic accuracy and the faithful transfer of rhetorical and argumentative functions.

1.4 Significance of the Study

First: Academic Significance

1. This study presents a new critical perspective that views synonymy not merely as a superficial linguistic similarity, but as a rhetorical tool with pragmatic impact. It thus enriches the theoretical domain of translation studies and discourse analysis.
2. The research highlights the effectiveness of Text-Type Theory in evaluating translation strategies and demonstrates how understanding a text's function can inform more deliberate and context-sensitive translation choices.
3. By emphasizing the connection between the rhetorical structure of the source text and its effect in the target text, this study opens new avenues for research into pragmatic translation and persuasive communication.

Second: Practical Significance

1. Providing translators working in the political and media fields with procedural guidelines for selecting the most appropriate synonym in argumentative contexts—ensuring that tone and purpose are preserved.
2. Improving the quality of argumentative translations addressed to public audiences or international institutions by highlighting the role of synonymy in shaping rhetorical stance and adapting discourse to target culture expectations.
3. Contributing to the development of educational curricula in translation departments by introducing concepts such as functional synonymy and text-type analysis in the training of translation students—particularly in identifying levels of discourse and lexical precision.
4. Supporting the critical review of existing translations, allowing for the reevaluation of numerous translated texts through a rhetorical-pragmatic lens—

one that values not only semantic fidelity but also the communicative function and persuasive intent of the text.

2. Theoretical Framework

2.1 Synonymy: From a Linguistic Phenomenon to a Rhetorical Tool

Synonymy is one of the oldest and most complex phenomena that has preoccupied both linguists and translators alike. It is directly tied to the very nature of language: does language allow the repetition of meaning in multiple forms without functional change? Can there be words that are entirely identical in meaning and context? These questions have long stirred debate in the fields of linguistics and semantics, to the point where it has become scientifically accepted that **absolute synonymy is nearly impossible** in natural language, and that what appears synonymous on the surface often differs in the finer details of context, function, or tone.

Generally, synonymy refers to the relationship between two or more words that share a basic or essential meaning. However, this simple definition breaks down when subjected to pragmatic or contextual testing. As Newmark (1991) pointed out, “*synonymy in the lexicon does not equate to synonymy in function*”, emphasizing that each synonym has its own linguistic register, functional scope, and cultural connotation, making it suitable in certain contexts but not others. Similarly, Baker (1992) notes that “*choosing between synonyms is essentially a communicative decision*”, and that overlooking the contextual differences between them can result in translations that are inaccurate or misaligned with the intended rhetorical tone.

In translation, synonymy shifts from being a mere linguistic option to a **critical site of decision-making**. The translator does not merely face a list of words that “resemble” the original; rather, they must choose what is **functionally appropriate** within the new discursive and cultural context. Hence, synonymy becomes a rhetorical tool in its own right—one that requires an acute awareness of what lies beyond the dictionary.

Take, for example, three commonly used words in English political and media discourse: *oppose*, *resist*, and *defy*.

- The first, *oppose*, is often used in formal or democratic settings, denoting opposition that may be institutional or party-based—thus conveying a sense of political legitimacy.
- *Resist*, on the other hand, carries a more active and rebellious tone, and is frequently used in the context of popular struggle against oppression.
- *Defy* implies direct confrontation and public disobedience, even provocation toward authority or the established order.

All of these are often translated into Arabic as either "يعارض" (oppose) or "يقاوم" (resist), which strips the translation of a significant portion of its original rhetorical and functional meaning. Here we witness the difference between a linguistically “correct” translation and a **pragmatically effective** one—a difference that becomes crucial in argumentative texts, where the strength of an argument depends not only on its content but also on how it is constructed and delivered.

Larson (1998) further emphasized that one of the most common errors in translation is “*relying on lexical equivalence without functional analysis of the word.*” According to him, synonymy should not be understood through dictionary definitions alone, but rather through its context, intended function, and the impression it leaves on the recipient. He provides examples such as *kill*, *murder*, and *slaughter*—all of which convey the act of killing, yet differ in the degree of severity, the sense of violence, and the moral stance implied by the actor (whether lawful, hostile, or symbolic).

Thus, dealing with synonymy in argumentative texts moves beyond the realm of “finding an equivalent” into the realm of **controlling rhetorical impact**. Selecting a particular synonym can either escalate or soften the tone of the text, strengthen or weaken the argument, express a clear stance or obscure intent. In this way, the translator becomes not just a linguistic conduit, but an active agent in reshaping the discourse.

It is also impossible to ignore the role of cultural context in shaping the meaning of a synonym. For instance, the term *endorse* in American political discourse typically refers to a formal declaration of support for a candidate or policy, often used alongside media terms that support electoral campaigns or strategic messaging. Meanwhile, *support* may suggest a more general or emotional form of backing. This seemingly minor distinction can alter the nature of the message when transferred into Arabic—especially if the translator fails to consider the word’s role within the argument.

For this reason, synonymy should not be viewed simply as a linguistic issue, but as a **strategic rhetorical tool**, whose importance becomes particularly acute in argumentative texts. When a translator overlooks these dimensions, the translated text may lose its original argumentative structure and diminish in communicative effect within the target culture.

2.2 Argumentative Texts and Their Pragmatic Characteristics

Argumentative texts occupy a central position in the realms of political and media discourse, serving as the primary vehicle through which persuasion, influence, and public opinion shaping are constructed. These texts are not intended to convey neutral information or provide objective descriptions of events. Rather, their core aim is to defend a viewpoint, refute an opposing opinion, or persuade the audience to adopt a particular stance on a contentious issue. As such, the essence of argumentative texts lies not only in what is said, but in how it is crafted, directed, and framed to highlight its rhetorical power.

Hatim & Mason (1997) note that argumentative texts are built upon a complex rhetorical structure that includes the presentation of a central thesis, the delivery of logical or emotional evidence, the anticipation of potential objections, and their rebuttal through persuasive reasoning. These texts rely heavily on what is known as an “**argumentative**

strategy”—a discursive framework that shapes the persuasive message, using language not just as a medium of communication but as a tool of influence and direction.

Argumentative texts are marked by a number of pragmatic features that distinguish them from informational, narrative, or explanatory texts. Among the most notable of these features are:

1. Argumentative Function

Argumentative texts fall under what Reiss (1971) classifies as **operative texts**, whose primary objective is to effect a change in the audience’s attitude. This shift does not occur merely through the presentation of information, but through the construction of a persuasive discourse that seeks to guide the audience toward accepting an idea or rejecting another, using rhetorical tools that appeal to both reason and emotion.

2. Discursive Strategy

Argumentative texts are not composed randomly; they are crafted with careful attention to the target audience and the communication context. Accordingly, they typically employ a calculated use of rhetorical strategies such as:

- **Euphemism:** To soften the tone of a particular stance or to build rapport with the audience without causing aversion.
- **Amplification:** To enhance impact, or to exaggerate risks or benefits.
- **Implicit Threats or Warnings:** Especially in political or security-related discourse.
- **Emotional and Ethical Persuasion (Pathos/Ethos):** Where the text appeals to the audience’s emotions or collective conscience.

These strategies are used deliberately to achieve psychological or social influence, making every word in an argumentative text—and every synonym selected or avoided—a part of the broader rhetorical argument.

3. Tone

Tone is not a superficial feature of argumentative texts; it is a persuasive tool in its own right. It is shaped through a set of lexical and stylistic choices, foremost among them the use of synonyms with varying degrees of impact. Choosing *urge* instead of *advise*, or *condemn* instead of *criticize*, fundamentally alters the message and determines whether the speaker appears assertive or conciliatory, decisive or moderate.

In this context, Munday (2001) argues that tone is one of the most critical pragmatic features of argumentative texts. When translation fails to preserve the original tone, the text’s persuasive impact is lost—even if the literal meaning is rendered accurately.

Translation and the Pragmatic Specificity of Argumentative Texts

Translating an argumentative text from one language to another does not only require the preservation of meaning or argument structure; it necessitates maintaining the **effect** and **function** of the argument. This is where the translator faces a key dilemma: **Should they choose the synonym that matches the dictionary meaning, or the one that achieves the same persuasive function in the target culture?**

Literal translation in this context can be detrimental. Substituting one synonym for another without careful consideration can:

- Weaken the argument or disrupt its logical sequence.
- Alter the tone of the text—from assertive to neutral, or vice versa.
- Shift the speaker’s stance from strength to hesitation, or from offense to defense.

Shehab (2009) notes that translations that fail to consider the pragmatic differences between synonyms often fall short in constructing a convincing translated discourse. Shiyab (2007) similarly emphasizes that the successful translator in argumentative contexts must act as a **rhetorical negotiator** between the source and target texts—not merely as a linguistic mediator.

Given these characteristics, we may conclude that argumentative texts pose a dual challenge to the translator:

1. To preserve the logical content of the argument.
2. To maintain the pragmatic effect and rhetorical function of the text.

Thus, translation in this genre cannot rely solely on dictionaries. It requires a **functional analytical model** that links communicative context, intent, and reception—dimensions that are effectively addressed by **Text-Type Theory**, as will be outlined in the following section.

2.3 Text-Type Theory: From Formal to Functional Translation

Text-Type Theory emerged in the 1970s through the work of the German scholar Katharina Reiss, as a critical response to the dominance of formalist approaches to translation, which treated translation as a process of direct substitution between equivalent linguistic elements. Reiss argued that while such an approach might prove useful in certain contexts, it overlooked a fundamental aspect of translation: the **function** of the text and its intended purpose.

From this standpoint, Reiss proposed that translation should not be confined to the formal level of the text, but should instead begin with an accurate classification of its **communicative function**. Translation strategies, she maintained, should differ depending on whether the source text aims to **inform**, **influence**, or **express**. Accordingly, she categorized texts into three main types:

Text Type	Primary Function	Translation Focus
Informative	To convey information and facts	Clarity, accuracy, and avoidance of ambiguity

Expressive	To express emotions or subjectivity	Preserving style, aesthetic features, and figurative language
Operative	To persuade or influence the reader	Retaining functional effect and argumentative tone

This perspective marked a significant shift in translation studies, as it redirected attention from *language* to *purpose*—that is, the function the text serves in its original context and the extent to which that function is preserved in the target language. Reiss famously summarized this by stating that “a text cannot be translated in isolation from its purpose.” The translator, therefore, is not merely a linguistic intermediary, but a **communicative agent** responsible for reproducing the text’s function in a new cultural setting.

Since argumentative texts—such as political speeches, opinion editorials, or analytical media content—are intended to **persuade or influence the reader**, they fall under the **operative** category. This means that the translator is not simply expected to transfer content, but must also ensure that the **force of the argument** and its **persuasive impact** are preserved. According to Reiss, this may even require **rephrasing, restructuring, or choosing different lexical items**—as long as the original function is maintained in the target culture.

This view redefines translation from an act of substitution to a process of **functional reconstruction**—a concept later expanded by Basil Hatim and Ian Mason. In their influential works *Discourse and the Translator* (1990) and *The Translator as Communicator* (1997), they offered a major extension of Reiss’s model by integrating it with **discourse analysis and pragmatics**.

Hatim and Mason contended that merely classifying texts by type is insufficient without also understanding them within their **broader pragmatic context**, which includes:

- **The author’s communicative intent:** Is the goal to persuade, to threaten, to gently convince, or to criticize?
- **The nature and social positioning of the audience:** Is the reader an expert, a general public audience, or a policymaker?
- **The cultural and social context:** What values and attitudes are embedded in the source text, and how can they be adapted to the target culture?
- **The relationship between language and discourse in both languages:** What is stylistically and culturally acceptable in the source versus the target language?

Hatim and Mason emphasized that translation should be **pragmatic**—that is, it must consider how the text functions within a particular context to achieve a specific goal. In this view, translating an argumentative text cannot be neutral or superficial, because every word carries a function, and every synonym selected—or omitted—reshapes the argument’s structure and impact.

Thus, choosing a synonym in an argumentative text is a **strategic**, not merely a linguistic decision. It is not enough for the translator to know that *condemn* corresponds to "يدين" in Arabic; they must also recognize that its use in political discourse, as opposed to alternatives like *criticize* or *blame*, infuses the message with a strong tone of political and

diplomatic denunciation. The decision, therefore, is not about lexical accuracy, but about achieving the **same rhetorical effect** for the target audience.

The importance of Text-Type Theory lies in how it **redirects the translator's focus** from structural accuracy to the **communicative function** of the text. In the case of argumentative texts, this shift is essential, as any misalignment in the word's function—whether in tone, intensity, or rhetorical softening—can cause the argument to collapse in translation.

By combining Reiss's functionalist model with the discourse-pragmatic insights of Hatim and Mason, we arrive at a comprehensive theoretical framework that enables us to analyze synonymy in argumentative texts—not merely as a linguistic phenomenon, but as a **rhetorical tool** that helps shape the text's impact and argumentative force. This is the framework we will apply in detail in the analytical section of this study.

2.4 Synonymy in Light of Text Type: An Integrative Perspective

After reviewing both the concept of synonymy as a pragmatic linguistic phenomenon and the Text-Type Theory as a functional framework for discourse analysis and translation strategies, it becomes clear that integrating these two dimensions yields a more comprehensive analytical model. This model takes into account the impact of lexical choices within argumentative contexts and equips the translator with precise tools to assess the effect of each synonym on the structure and strength of the argument.

In this context, synonymy is no longer merely a semantic approximation between words that convey similar meanings. Instead, it becomes a strategic rhetorical tool used consciously to serve specific discursive objectives. In argumentative texts, synonyms are not chosen solely for their semantic proximity to the original, but because each carries a **specific argumentative function**, varying according to the situational context, the tone of the discourse, the intensity of the claim, and the overall communicative purpose.

For instance, a political speechwriter who chooses the word *resist* is not doing so arbitrarily; they aim to portray an act of legitimate, even heroic, struggle. By contrast, opting for *defy* signals open rebellion and confrontation. If either of these is translated simply as *oppose*, the entire argument may lose its emotional force or shift to a softer tone—changing how the reader interprets the speaker's stance or the intended message.

Here, **Text-Type Theory** demonstrates its value as an analytical tool. It enables us to link synonym choice directly to the text's communicative function and imposes on the translator the responsibility of preserving not merely the form of the text, but its **pragmatic function**. This means that **literal or dictionary-based translation—particularly in argumentative texts—can result in distorting the message, weakening the argument, or conveying unintended meanings.**

From this integrative perspective, several key points emerge for understanding synonymy in light of text type:

1. **Synonyms are not neutral choices:** Each carries a distinct tone, function, and impact. A synonym might be selected to intensify the argument, soften its delivery, or tailor it to a particular audience.
2. **Choosing a synonym is a pragmatic and contextual decision:** It is grounded in the author's intent, stance, and target audience—not merely in lexical equivalence.
3. **Text-Type Theory provides a framework for evaluating translation choices:** It redefines the translator's role from that of a linguistic mediator to that of a **functional equivalent producer**, whose task is to recreate the communicative effect in the target language.
4. **Understanding the function of the source text guides synonym selection:** If the source is an operative or directive media text, the translator must choose words based on their intended impact on the reader—not just their literal meaning.
5. **Subtle differences between synonyms influence argumentative structure:** Especially when tonal progression or emotional escalation is integral to the text's strategy—such as a scale that moves from *advise* to *warn* to *threaten*, or one that escalates from *blame* to *accuse* to *condemn*.

Through this lens, synonymy becomes a **core component** of argumentative structure, as critical as the order of ideas or the sequencing of evidence. Analyzing synonym usage in translation thus becomes an effective method for testing how successfully a translated text conveys the **rhetorical architecture and persuasive impact** of the original.

This theoretical chapter, therefore, lays a solid foundation for the upcoming applied analysis, where real-world examples of translated argumentative texts will be examined to assess synonym choice, measure its effect on argumentative transmission, and evaluate translation effectiveness from a functional-pragmatic perspective.

3. Methodology and Analytical Tool

3.1 Methodological Introduction

This study falls within the scope of comparative analytical research, which focuses on investigating linguistic phenomena within their discursive and cultural contexts. In this approach, translated texts are treated as the primary material for analysis. The comparative method was chosen because it best aligns with the nature of the phenomenon under investigation—**argumentative synonymy**—which goes beyond surface-level linguistic structures to involve pragmatic, textual, and psychological dimensions that require precise and context-sensitive analytical tools.

The study relies on **qualitative analysis**, meaning the emphasis is not on processing a large number of texts, but rather on conducting an in-depth examination of carefully selected cases. The aim here is not to quantify the frequency of a phenomenon, but to interpret its discursive dimensions and measure its impact on the rhetorical structure and communicative function of the translated text.

The phenomenon under investigation—**functional synonymy in argumentative texts**—cannot be fully understood through statistical or lexical tools alone. Instead, it demands a close reading of the **effect of the chosen word** on the construction of the argument, its reception by the target audience, and its relation to the author's communicative intent. Thus, the type of analysis adopted in this study focuses on the **interplay between meaning and context**, tone and structure, source and target.

3.2 Analytical Tool: Text-Type Analysis

This research uses **Text-Type Theory**, initially proposed by **Katharina Reiss** and later developed by **Hatim & Mason**, as its core analytical tool. The theory enables classification of texts based on their communicative function, offering a model that redefines translation not as a purely linguistic operation, but as a **functional communicative act**, in which the translator is responsible for reproducing the **intended effect** of the original text within the target culture.

The theory was chosen because it provides a functional lens to assess whether a translation has preserved the **argumentative function** of the original or reduced it to mere information transfer. Since argumentative texts fall under what Reiss classifies as **operative or directive texts**, whose main objective is to **influence, persuade, and guide**, the success of their translation cannot be evaluated solely based on linguistic accuracy. Rather, it depends on whether the translation conveys the **same persuasive effect**.

This analysis is conducted through the following interconnected dimensions:

- **Source text type:** Is the original argumentative, informative, or expressive? What is its primary goal?
- **Authorial intent:** Is the writer aiming to persuade, warn, convince, satirize, or reject?
- **Function of the synonym:** What role does the synonym play in constructing the argument? Is it used to intensify, soften, or escalate the tone?
- **Impact in the target text:** Did the translated synonym succeed in conveying the original function, or did it dilute, obscure, or misrepresent it?

Through these dimensions, synonyms are transformed into **rhetorical keys**, revealing the translator's sensitivity to authorial intent and their success in conveying that intent in the target language.

3.3 Corpus of Texts

The textual examples analyzed in this study were selected from the applied section of a university thesis on synonymy in Arabic-English translation. The examples comprise real-world translated texts from **published political and media sources**.

Four to five translated examples were selected, each of which demonstrates clear variation in **synonym choice** within argumentative texts. These samples include:

- **Political opinion articles** containing analytical commentary and ideological positions, structured around clear argumentative frameworks.
- **Op-eds and editorial pieces** from major international outlets such as *The Guardian*, *Al Jazeera*, or *The New York Times*.
- **Excerpts from academic analyses or policy reports** with persuasive intent.

Selection was based on two main criteria:

1. **Clarity of the argumentative nature** of the source text, allowing for the study of the rhetorical function of synonymy.
2. **Availability of published translations**, enabling critical analysis of lexical choices and their effect on the transmission of the message.

Each case was analyzed according to the following stages:

- Identifying the **text type and its function** based on Reiss's classification.
- Extracting the **key synonym** under examination.
- Comparing its use in the **source and target texts**.
- Assessing whether the translation preserved the **rhetorical impact** and **argumentative tone** of the original.
- Determining whether the translator resorted to **compensatory strategies** to make up for the limitations of lexical equivalence.

3.4 Analytical Criteria

The comparative analysis relied on a set of structured criteria, applied consistently to each example in the study. These criteria were designed to provide an objective assessment of how synonym choice affected the structure and strength of the argument in translation:

Criterion	Explanation
Source text function	Analyzing the original text's communicative purpose (argumentative, informative, expressive).
Accuracy of the synonym	To what extent the selected synonym in the target language retains the intended rhetorical meaning.
Coherence with argument	Whether the word supports the logical flow of the argument or disrupts it.
Impact on the reader	Whether the translated synonym preserved the intended effect (provocation, softening, persuasion), or caused a shift in tone or message.

This analytical model moves beyond binary judgments of whether a translation is "correct" or "incorrect." Instead, it offers a functional and critical evaluation, seeking to understand why a synonym was chosen and what effect it produced in reshaping the argumentative force of the translated text.

4. Applied Analysis

In this chapter, the study moves from the theoretical grounding of synonymy and argumentative text to practical application, through the analysis of real examples from published translations of argumentative and media texts. These texts involve either accurate or ambiguous use of **functionally persuasive synonyms**. The analysis relies on methodological tools derived from **Text-Type Theory**, which focuses on the **communicative function** of a text and evaluates the translation based on its ability to preserve that effect in the target language.

Several examples were selected from texts translated between English and Arabic (in both directions). These examples include words that appear synonymous in the dictionary sense but serve distinct rhetorical functions within the source argumentative text. The aim of the analysis is to reveal whether these functional distinctions were preserved in translation, or whether they were flattened due to lexical simplification or lack of functional awareness.

The analytical study begins with the first case: **(Resist – Oppose – Defy)**, which serves as a highly illustrative example of how synonymy affects political discourse.

4.1 Case One: Resist – Oppose – Defy

Common Arabic equivalents: يُقاوم (resist) – يُعارض (oppose) – يتحدى (defy)

General Contextual Analysis

In a media translation dealing with the Israeli-Palestinian conflict from an American perspective, the following phrases appeared:

- “The people resist the occupation”
- “The opposition party opposes the regime policies”
- “The militant group defies the international community”

The study noted that all three verbs were translated into Arabic using closely related or identical terms such as "يعارض" (opposes) or "يقاوم" (resists), with no clear distinction between their rhetorical or semantic dimensions.

However, when these texts are examined through the lens of **Text-Type Theory**—particularly with attention to their communicative intent—it becomes evident that these verbs serve **very different argumentative functions**. Each one carries a specific rhetorical weight and tone that calls for a closer analysis.

Text-Type and Function Analysis

All three sentences are drawn from clearly **argumentative political texts**, which according to **Reiss** and **Hatim & Mason** fall under the category of **operative or persuasive texts**. Their aim is not merely to inform or describe, but to influence the reader’s stance or opinion.

- **“Resist the occupation”** is typically used in discourse supporting liberation movements and aims to **confer moral legitimacy** to the act of resistance.
- **“Oppose the regime”** is relatively neutral, describing a **legitimate political position** within democratic frameworks.
- **“Defy the international community”** carries a tone of **open defiance**, often used to depict **radical rejection or antagonism**.

Therefore, each verb serves a distinct function in its original context. Translating them uniformly into Arabic using “يعارض” (opposes) or “يخالف” (violates/disagrees) leads to **rhetorical flattening**, stripping the text of its tone and intended impact.

Functional Textual Analysis

Let us consider a key example:

- **Original text:** “The people resist the occupation.”
 - **Rhetorical effect:** Implies honorable resistance, akin to “liberation,” “uprising,” or “legitimate struggle.”
 - **Used translation:** “يعارض الشعب الاحتلال” (The people oppose the occupation).
 - **Issue:** The verb “يعارض” (oppose) lacks the moral and emotional weight of “resist” as a term of **popular legitimate struggle**. As a result, the rhetorical force is lost, and the sentence resembles a **parliamentary opposition** rather than a **liberation movement**.
- **Another example:** “The militant group defies the international community.”
 - **Used translation:** “تخالف الجماعة المسلحة المجتمع الدولي” (The armed group violates/disagrees with the international community).
 - **Issue:** The translation weakens the tone of **challenge and confrontation** inherent in “defy,” especially in contexts of **explicit rebellion**, reducing the intended rhetorical impact.

Discussion and Conclusions

This case highlights how **failing to distinguish the nuanced meanings of synonyms** leads to weakened argumentative structures in translated texts, or even distorts the original message within the target culture. While English synonyms may appear similar, they serve distinct **rhetorical functions** and should be treated accordingly in translation.

Adopting a **single translation strategy**—using terms like “يعارض” (oppose) or “يخالف” (disagree/violate)—fails to achieve the **functional equivalence** required in persuasive texts. Such contexts **do not allow ambiguity or random synonym substitution**, since every word represents a **strategic position** within the argument, and every tone contributes to shaping the speaker’s stance.

Based on the analysis, the following alternative renderings are proposed:

- **Resist** → "يقاوم", "يهاض", "يناضل ضد" (*in liberation contexts*)

- **Oppose** → "يعارض" (*in institutional/political contexts*)
- **Defy** → "يتحدى", "يتمرد على", "يواجه بصلافة" (*in adversarial or combative contexts*)

These choices should ideally be supported by **syntactic structures** that enhance the tone, such as phrases like "بشجاعة" (bravely), "بإصرار" (with determination), or "في تحدٍّ علني" (in open defiance), as permitted by the rhetorical and cultural context of Arabic.

4.2 Case Two: Accuse – Blame – Condemn

Common Arabic Equivalents: يتهّم (accuse) – يلوم (blame) – يدين (condemn)

General Contextual Analysis

This set of verbs is frequently used in political discourse and media reports, especially when addressing international crises, armed conflicts, or political accountability. They typically appear in contexts where responsibility is being assigned, reputations are being challenged, or a moral/legal stance is being asserted. While these verbs share a basic semantic field (referring to a party being held at fault), they differ significantly in tone, context, and rhetorical function.

An analyzed translation revealed a **lack of accuracy** in rendering these verbs into Arabic, where all were treated as full synonyms, often translated as "التهّم" (accused) or "أدان" (condemned), without accounting for differences in severity or argumentative tone in the original English.

Text-Type and Function Analysis

These examples belong to **argumentative political texts**, which aim to influence the reader's perspective or shape public opinion regarding a particular actor. As such, they fall within the category of **operative texts** in Reiss's typology. Their purpose goes beyond presenting information—they aim to **shape alignment**, whether through condemnation, persuasion, or evoking sympathy, based on a careful gradation of accusation, blame, or moral judgment.

For instance:

- **"The minister accused the opposition of inciting violence."**
- Here, *accused* denotes a direct and possibly formal or legal charge.
- **"The president blamed the media for the unrest."**
- *Blamed* conveys a general attribution of responsibility, but with less severity and usually without legal consequences.
- **"The UN condemned the attacks on civilians."**
- *Condemned* is the strongest among the three, carrying an explicit moral judgment and often used in diplomatic or international contexts requiring a firm stance.

In contrast, these verbs were sometimes rendered into Arabic as "اتَّهم" (accused) in all three cases, which **disrupts the logical progression of the argument** and erases the original rhetorical intention.

Functional Textual Analysis

Let us consider the following three examples:

1. **“The minister accused the opposition of inciting violence.”**
 - **Communicative intent:** To issue a direct accusation, potentially legal or political.
 - **Common translation:** "اتهم الوزير المعارضة بالتحريض على العنف."
 - **Evaluation:** Relatively accurate; "اتهم" reflects the formal nature of the statement, though it may benefit from specification (e.g., "اتهم رسمياً" or "تقدّم ببلاغ ضد") depending on context.
2. **“The president blamed the media for the unrest.”**
 - **Communicative intent:** To assign implicit responsibility, without direct legal or hostile implications.
 - **Used translation:** "اتهم الرئيس الإعلام بالتسبب في الاضطرابات"
 - **Problem:** This translation escalates the tone. "اتهم" is stronger than "blame" and suggests wrongdoing or crime, while the original expression implies a general political complaint.
3. **“The UN condemned the attacks on civilians.”**
 - **Communicative intent:** An official international stance assigning moral or legal responsibility for a grave violation.
 - **Common translations:** "اتهمت الأمم المتحدة المعتدين" or "أدانت الأمم المتحدة الهجمات."
 - **Evaluation:** "اتهمت" is wholly inappropriate; "أدانت" is more accurate and preserves the formal, moral tone of the original.

This case illustrates the **critical importance of recognizing that near-synonyms carry varying degrees of severity**, responsibility, and rhetorical weight. *Accuse* is not the same as *blame*, and *blame* is not the same as *condemn*. A translator who fails to distinguish between them risks **compromising the argumentative structure** of the source text and reproducing a message that **may be interpreted in a way entirely different from the author’s intent**.

Often, these verbs appear in **ascending order of rhetorical force** (blame → accuse → condemn). Preserving this progression is essential to delivering an effective persuasive message. Ignoring this hierarchy produces translations that are **confusing, exaggerated, or oversimplified**.

Translators should adopt the following distinctions:

- **Accuse** → "يؤجه تهمة إلى", "يُتهم" (with context clarification: legal? political? media-based?)
- **Blame** → "يلوم", "يحمل المسؤولية", "يُرجع السبب إلى"

- **Condemn** → "يشجب", "يستنكر", "بشدة", "يدين"
(especially in formal statements and diplomatic discourse)

Translators may also employ more nuanced expressions to **enhance rhetorical effect**, such as:

- "اتهم" instead of "ألقى باللوم على"
- "أدانت" instead of "نددت الأمم المتحدة بشدة بـ"

—depending on the cultural and political context of the target audience.

، بأسلوب (Suggest – Propose – Recommend) بالطبع، إليك الترجمة البشرية الدقيقة والمباشرة للحالة الثالثة ، أكاديمي واضح ومتوازن، دون إضافات أو ارتجالات:

4.3 Case Three: Suggest – Propose – Recommend

Common Arabic Equivalents: يقترح – يوصي – يوصي بـ / يُوصي عليه

General Contextual Analysis

This group of verbs is commonly used in argumentative discourse that aims to offer alternatives, suggest options, or present considered solutions to political or social issues. Although they appear close in dictionary meaning—as all revolve around proposing a course of action—the difference between them in terms of **degree of obligation, tone,** and the **authority of the speaker or institution** is of significant importance.

Analysis showed that the Arabic translations of these verbs often **overlook these contextual subtleties**, with a tendency to render them all as either "يقترح" (suggests) or "يوصي" (recommends). This leads to a loss of the original tone or misrepresents the function of the verb within the argumentative structure.

Text-Type and Functional Analysis

These verbs often appear in sensitive political or diplomatic contexts, whether in official speeches, UN statements, or analytical articles. According to Reiss's classification, they belong to **operative/argumentative texts**, where the intent of the verb is not merely to inform, but to **influence the reader** by proposing solutions with varying degrees of force or authority.

- **Suggest** is typically used in informal contexts or by a speaker without direct authority, and implies a tentative or negotiable proposal.
- **Propose** is more formal and institutional, often signaling a structured initiative.
- **Recommend** is used when the speaker holds expert or institutional authority, and implies a well-considered and credible directive.

If these distinctions are ignored in translation, the target-language reader may not differentiate between a **diplomatic recommendation**, a **non-binding idea**, and a **formal governmental plan**.

Functional Textual Analysis

Let's consider the following examples:

1. **“The committee suggested further dialogue with the opposition.”**
 - **Communicative intent:** A non-binding idea in a consultative political setting.
 - **Used translation:** "أوصت اللجنة بإجراء حوار إضافي."
 - **Problem:** Using "أوصت" suggests an authoritative or binding recommendation, while "suggested" in the original carries a **flexible, discussion-based tone**, possibly just a thought raised in session.
2. **“The minister proposed a new electoral law.”**
 - **Communicative intent:** A formal political initiative requiring review and legislation.
 - **Used translation:** "اقترح الوزير قانونًا انتخابيًا جديدًا."
 - **Evaluation:** Linguistically correct, but **may weaken** the formal nature of "proposed", especially if not supported by phrasing like "تقدّم بمشروع قانون" or "عرض مبادرة تشريعية".
3. **“The health experts recommended mandatory vaccination.”**
 - **Communicative intent:** A directive from a knowledgeable entity, implying a high level of authority or endorsement.
 - **Common translation:** "اقترح الخبراء التطعيم الإجباري."
 - **Problem:** The verb "اقترح" weakens the **implicit authority and weight** of "recommended". In contrast, "أوصى بـ" or "يوصي الخبراء بـ" better reflects their **consultative and professional role**, particularly in a public health context.

These examples highlight how **apparent synonymy in this group conceals a nuanced gradient of tone and pragmatic force**. Translating all three as either "يقترح" or "يوصي" blurs important distinctions, confusing the reader's understanding of the **rhetorical or political significance** behind each verb.

In argumentative texts, the purpose of such verbs is not merely to convey a statement, but to **guide the reader** toward a proposed course—while maintaining impressions of flexibility, seriousness, or institutional backing, depending on the speaker. Failure to reflect this gradient in translation **weakens the logical and persuasive structure** of the text.

To preserve rhetorical impact and ensure accurate interpretation, translators should observe the following distinctions:

- **Suggest** → "يقرح", "يرى إمكانية"
- (*especially in debates or informal settings*)
- **Propose** → "يقترح رسميًا", "يتقدّم بـ"
- (*in institutional or legislative contexts*)
- **Recommend** → "ينصح بـ", "يحثّ على"
- (*especially when stated by experts or authoritative bodies*)

It is also recommended to support these choices with a **clear speech environment** that reflects the speaker's authority and the **intended level of obligation**. This ensures that the reader in the target language **receives the same persuasive intent** as that conveyed in the source text.

4.4 Case Four: Warn – Threaten – Advise

Common Arabic Equivalents: يُحذّر – يُهدّد – يُنصّح / يُوصي

General Contextual Analysis

This set of verbs is used in political, military, and diplomatic discourse, particularly when speakers address anticipated actions by opponents or offer recommendations to avert potential threats. Although they may appear synonymous or directive in nature, their differences are essential in terms of **degree of intensity, tone, the authority of the speaker, and the context of inter-party relations**.

In original texts, these verbs are deployed as part of calculated strategic messages, where the tone is either escalated or softened depending on the speaker's position (state, official, institution) and the intended effect of the message (deterrence, warning, or advisory). Some Arabic translations reveal a **hasty treatment** of these verbs, rendering them uniformly as "يحذّر" or "يوصي", without reflecting the **communicative intent** behind each.

Text-Type and Functional Classification

These texts fall under **operative/argumentative texts**, according to Reiss's classification. The goal of the utterance is not simply to express a position, but to **produce a direct effect** on the opposing party or recipient. The key distinction lies in whether the speech is aiming to **escalate, warn, advise, or soften** the stance.

- **Warn** refers to a conditional warning, alerting to a possible danger.
- **Threaten** is used in escalation contexts, indicating a clear intent to act or retaliate.
- **Advise** has a more neutral or diplomatic tone, typically used in allied or general advisory contexts.

Functional Textual Analysis

Consider the following examples:

1. **“The military warned the rebels against advancing further.”**
 - **Communicative intent:** An implicit threat of military action if advancement continues.
 - **Common translation:** "حذّرت القوات المتمردین من التّقدم"
 - **Evaluation:** Grammatically correct, but could be strengthened with phrases such as "حذّرت بشدّة" or "أبلغت بأنّ العواقب ستكون وخيمة" to capture the assertive tone of the original.
2. **“The minister threatened to impose sanctions if violence continues.”**

- **Communicative intent:** A clear announcement of punitive intent if the situation persists.
 - **Used translation:** "حذّر الوزير بفرض عقوبات."
 - **Issue:** This translation **diminishes** the severity of the message. "حذّر" lacks the force of "threatened". A more accurate rendering would be: "هدد بفرض" "توعدّ باتخاذ إجراءات" or "عقوبات".
3. **“The UN advised all parties to de-escalate the situation.”**
- **Communicative intent:** A neutral, diplomatic recommendation aimed at reducing tension.
 - **Translation:** "نصحت الأمم المتحدة الأطراف بتهدئة الوضع."
 - **Evaluation:** Highly appropriate; it maintains a balanced tone and reflects the nature of UN discourse.

This case demonstrates how **overlooking the nuanced differences** among these verbs can distort the intended functional meaning—either by **downplaying an escalatory tone** (e.g., "threaten" rendered as "warn"), or by **overstating a neutral suggestion** (e.g., "advise" rendered as "warn").

In argumentative and political texts, the **choice of verb is not just semantic**; it shapes the speaker’s image, their authority, and the perceived intensity of the message. Any mistranslation of these verbs **alters the persuasive force** and **disrupts the rhetorical balance** of the message.

To ensure accurate and context-sensitive translation, the following distinctions should be observed:

- **Warn** → "يُحذّر", "يُنبيه إلى", "يُحذر من عواقب" (preferably supported with conditional phrasing)
- **Threaten** → "يهدد بـ", "يتوعدّ بـ", "يتوعدّ في حال" (used in direct warnings or ultimatums)
- **Advise** → "ينصح", "يوصي", "يحثّ على" (in diplomatic or analytical contexts)

It is always advisable to consider the **political context** and **speaker’s level of authority**, as opting for a milder or stronger verb can imply **bias or distortion** of the original meaning.

4.5 Case Five: Support – Approve – Endorse

Common Arabic Equivalents: يدعم – يوافق – يصادق / يؤيد

General Contextual Analysis

This group of verbs appears extensively in political and media-related argumentative texts, especially in official statements, news coverage of international stances, policy decisions, and alliances. While these verbs may seem synonymous in that they all express

some form of acceptance or approval, they differ in **strength, speaker authority, scope of influence, and legal or political implications.**

In Arabic translations, these verbs are often rendered with generic equivalents such as "يدعم" (supports), "يؤيد" (endorses), or "يوافق على" (approves), **without close attention to contextual nuance.** However, each of these verbs carries a distinct **pragmatic function**, shaping the tone of the argument, the rhetorical position of the speaker, and the nature of the relationship between actor and act.

Text-Type and Functional Analysis

The texts that use these verbs fall under **operative/argumentative texts** as classified by Reiss, where the primary aim is not merely to inform but to **shape public opinion** or guide the audience's perspective. These verbs are used to **construct argumentative positions**: endorsing a cause, adopting a policy, or legitimizing a party.

- **Support** denotes general backing—political, moral, material, or emotional.
- **Approve** implies formal, procedural consent, typically by an institutional or legislative body.
- **Endorse** suggests a **public declaration of alignment**, carrying symbolic and political weight, often with the potential to shift outcomes.

Functional Textual Analysis

1. **“The senator supported the bill for economic reform.”**
 - **Communicative intent:** A public political position, non-binding.
 - **Common translation:** "دعم السيناتور مشروع قانون الإصلاح الاقتصادي"
 - **Assessment:** Accurate, though the phrase could be refined with "أعرب عن" or "أبدى تأييده" to distinguish it from formal approval.
2. **“The parliament approved the new budget.”**
 - **Communicative intent:** Formal legislative consent producing legal effect.
 - **Translation:** "وافق البرلمان على الميزانية الجديدة"
 - **Assessment:** Appropriate and precise. "وافق على" reflects the procedural/legal nature of the act.
3. **“The organization endorsed the candidate publicly.”**
 - **Communicative intent:** Public and symbolic declaration of support, especially powerful if the speaker holds weight.
 - **Common translation:** "دعمت المنظمة المرشح علناً"
 - **Issue:** "دعمت" equates to "supported", whereas "endorsed" is stronger in tone. Preferable translations include: "صادقت على ترشيحه", "زكّت", or "أعلنت له". "تأييدها الرسمي له".

These examples clearly show that using "يدعم" or "يؤيد" uniformly fails to capture the rhetorical and strategic function of each verb. **Endorsement is not mere support**—it is a symbolic, public alignment that can shift dynamics. **Approval is not generic agreement**—it is a binding decision.

Translating these terms accurately requires understanding whether the action involves **moral backing**, **legal authorization**, or **symbolic ratification**—each carrying different rhetorical and political implications.

To reflect the intended force and nuance in Arabic, the following mappings are recommended:

- **Support** → "يدعم", "يؤيد", "أعرب عن دعمه" → *(with tone adjustments as needed)*
- **Approve** → "يوافق على", "يصادق على", "يُقرّ" → *(in legal or institutional contexts)*
- **Endorse** → "يزكّي", "يصادق على", "يعلن تأييده", "يتبنّى علناً" → *(especially in symbolic or high-impact contexts)*

These choices should be supported by clearly identifying the **actor** and the **institutional setting**, such as:

"أعلن مجلس الشيوخ دعمه"، "صادقت اللجنة التنفيذية"، "تبنّى الحزب المرشح".

Conclusion to the Analytical Chapter

From these five case studies, it is clear that **synonymy in argumentative texts is not linguistically neutral**—it is a potent rhetorical tool that governs the structure of the argument, shapes the tone, and influences the reader's response. Translations that fail to capture these distinctions risk **weakening or distorting the message**, especially in politically sensitive contexts.

Applying the **Text-Type Theory** has demonstrated how translators can become **pragmatic agents**, making lexical choices that align with rhetorical function rather than just dictionary equivalence. This approach reinforces the role of translation as **reconstruction of communicative purpose**, not mere language substitution.

5: Findings and Recommendations

5.1 Findings

Through both theoretical and applied analysis, this study has arrived at a set of conclusions that highlight the **critical role of textual synonymy** in shaping argumentative structure in Arabic-English translation. The case analyses have revealed the **complexity** of handling synonymous expressions in argumentative texts, and the **sensitivity** required to convey the original rhetorical function in the target language.

- The analysis confirmed that synonymous words used for argumentative purposes in such texts are not interchangeable, but rather represent deliberate rhetorical choices reflecting differences in tone, intensity, and context. For instance, the variation between *resist* and *oppose*, or between *warn* and *threaten*, signals a shift in the argumentative structure, not merely in lexical expression.

- Several of the analyzed translations showed that dictionary-based or literal translation tends to flatten or distort the rhetorical structure. In numerous cases, translations relied on the same terms like “يعارض” (opposes), “يحذر” (warns), or “يدعم” (supports) across all instances, regardless of differences in intent, urgency, or tone—thereby undermining the message.
- The analysis showed that a synonymous word derives its meaning from its position within the argumentative structure, its relation to what precedes and follows it, and the identity of the speaker and audience. Therefore, the synonym cannot be understood outside of its discursive structure, and its selection must be based on a pragmatic reading of context rather than lexical meaning alone.
- The Text-Type Analysis proved effective in evaluating the adequacy of argumentative translations. Classifying the text type—argumentative, expressive, or informative—and linking that to the function of each word within the discourse allowed translators to make strategic decisions that preserved intended impact. This model also helps avoid unintended neutrality, exaggeration, or understatement.
- Finally, the study found that most shortcomings in translation stemmed not from linguistic incompetence, but from a lack of pragmatic and functional awareness, especially in handling synonyms within argumentative discourse and their influence on persuasion and stance-building.

5.2 Recommendations

Based on these findings, the study proposes the following theoretical and practical recommendations for translators, translation training programs, and editors working with argumentative texts:

1. Introduce specialized training modules or workshops focused on analyzing functional differences between synonyms in various contexts—particularly in political and media discourse. This requires moving beyond a dictionary-based view of synonymy toward a more nuanced, pragmatic understanding.
2. Adopt Text-Type Theory as an analytical framework in translator education programs, as it connects communicative purpose with translation choices. This approach trains students not only in linguistic accuracy but in assessing rhetorical effect and reader reception.
3. Translation centers and media institutions should develop glossaries or manuals explaining the functional differences between commonly used synonyms in argumentative discourse, with examples in both Arabic and English.
4. Editors—especially in journalistic and political contexts—should evaluate translations based on their ability to preserve argumentative function, not merely grammatical correctness or surface accuracy. This demands rhetorical literacy and training in discourse-level analysis.
5. Since synonymy is often employed to intensify or mitigate an argument, translators should—when contextually appropriate—include explanatory devices

such as footnotes or descriptive phrases to justify a lexical choice, particularly when cultural background or political weight may differ across audiences.

5.3 Suggestions for Future Research

- Comparative study of pragmatic synonymy in legal vs. media translations.
- Examination of the role of synonymy in translation through the lens of Politeness Theory.
- Development of a digital or AI-powered tool to recommend context-appropriate synonyms based on text type and rhetorical function.

General Conclusion

This study represents a systematic attempt to shed light on **the role of synonymy in argumentative translation** from a functional and pragmatic perspective. By applying **Text-Type Theory** as a guiding analytical tool, it aimed to regulate and assess translation choices, particularly regarding the rhetorical weight and functional positioning of synonymous expressions.

The research was grounded in the central hypothesis that **synonyms are not linguistically neutral tools**, but rather **discursive elements** that carry argumentative weight depending on **context, speaker, and communicative intent**. This hypothesis was validated through the analysis of five key synonym sets commonly used in political and media discourse between Arabic and English.

The findings showed that superficial or literal handling of synonyms in such texts leads to **functional breakdown**, weakening the argument and reducing the impact of the translated message. In contrast, Text-Type Analysis provided a **flexible and rigorous framework** for understanding the relationship between lexical choice and rhetorical purpose—enabling translators to make more **conscious and effective decisions**.

Perhaps the most important takeaway is the need to **rethink how synonymy and translation are taught**, especially in fields where discourse is **politically, morally, or ideologically charged**. Lexical knowledge is not enough, nor is grammatical competence sufficient; translators must be able to perceive and navigate the subtle distinctions in tone, function, and rhetorical effect.

Translating argumentative texts requires more than linguistic equivalence—it is a **pragmatic stance, a rhetorical exercise, and a strategic act** all at once. In this light, the study offers a call to adopt **functional approaches to translation**—ones that respect textual dynamics, cultural interplay, and rhetorical impact.

References

- Ardianta, D. (2008). *Synonyms and antonyms in Suratul-Baqara: A semantic analytical study*. Malang Islamic University.
- Baker, M. (1992). *In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Benhaddou, M. (1991). *Translation Quality Assessment: A Situational/Textual Model for the Evaluation of Arabic/English Translations* (Doctoral thesis, University of Salford, UK).
- Downie, J. (2009). *The End of an Era? Does Skopos Theory Spell the End of the "Free vs. Literal" Paradigm?* Retrieved from: <http://www.pneumafoundation.org/resources/articles/JDownie-EndOfAnEra.pdf>
- Garcia-Landa, M. (2006). *On Defining Translation*. *Meta: Translators' Journal*, 51(3), 435-444. Retrieved from: <http://www.erudit.org/revue/meta/2006/v51/n3/013551ar.pdf>
- Hatim, B. & Mason, I. (1990). *Discourse and the Translator*. UK: Longman Group Limited.
- Hatim, B. & Mason, I. (1997). *The Translator as Communicator*. London and New York: Routledge.
- House, J. (2009). *Translation*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Larson, M. L. (1998). *Meaning-Based Translation: A Guide to Cross-Language Equivalence* (2nd ed.). USA: University Press of America.
- Malmkjaer, K. (2005). *Linguistics and the Language of Translation*. Edinburgh, UK: Edinburgh University Press.
- Munday, J. (2001). *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications*. London: Routledge.
- Neubert, A. & Shreve, G. M. (1992). *Translation as Text*. Ohio, USA: Kent State University Press.
- Newmark, P. (1991). *About Translation*. UK: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Nord, C. (1988). *Text Analysis in Translation: Theory, Methodology and Didactic Application of a Model for Translation-Oriented Text Analysis*. Retrieved from: <https://books.google.com>
- Pym, A. (1992). *Translation and Text Transfer: An Essay on the Principles of Intercultural Communication*. Tarragona: Intercultural Studies Group. Retrieved from: http://usuaris.tinet.cat/apym/publications/TTT_2010.pdf
- Schäffner, C. (2002). *The Role of Discourse Analysis for Translation and in Translator Training*. Retrieved from: <https://books.google.com>

- Shehab, E. (2009). The Problems Involved in Translating Arabic Cognitive Synonyms into English. *Islamic University Journal*, 17(1), 869-890.
- Shiyab, S. M. (2007). *Synonymy in Translation*. *Translation Journal*, 11(4). Retrieved from: <http://translationjournal.net/journal//42synonymy.htm>

