Journal of Al-Farahidi's Arts, No: 66: p(I): 323-343
Doi: https://doi.org/10.25130/jfa.18.66.1.15

IRAQI Academic Scientific Journals

P-ISSN: 2074-9554 | E-ISSN: 2663-811
Journal of Al-Farahidi's Arts
available online at: fja.tu.edu.iq/index.php/fja

Tikrit University
J.F.A
Journal of Al-Frahedis Arts
College of Arts

Faults of Translating Fallacies From English into Arabic:A Case Study

Israa Ali Hussein
E-Mail: Israa.a.hussein86@gmail.com

CREDIT AUTHORSHIP CONTRIBUTION STATEMENT

The Author writes the original draft, validation, methodology, investigation, analysis, data curation, and conceptualization.

DECLARATION OF COMPETING INTEREST

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

Article history:

Received	25/8/2029
Received in revised form	9/9/2026
Accepted	9/9/2026
Available online	29/9/2026

©THIS AN OPEN ACCESS ARTICLE UNDER THE CCBY LICENSE
http:// creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0

E-mail Jaa@ tu.edu.iq

A B S T R A C T

This research deals with the problems and errors facing the translation of fallacies from English to Arabic, focusing on maintaining the semantic, textual and pragmatic meanings of the source text. Translating fallacies is a particular challenge because it requires not only conveying words and meanings, but also maintaining the structure of the argument, its persuasive strength and its rhetorical and pragmatic effect in the recipient. The study adopted a case study method to analyse four advertising texts in English that include multiple types of fallacies, in addition to their Arabic translations completed by four students from the Department of Translation / collage of Arts /University of Tikrit. The analysis was based on Baker's (2018) framework of translation equivalence, focusing on translation strategies and their success in maintaining the meaning and pragmatic function of fallacies. The main problem is the difficulty of maintaining the logical, pragmatic and contextual meanings of fallacies when translated from English to Arabic. The study assumes that linguistic, logical, and contextual differences may lead to the loss or distortion of the erroneous meaning intended in translation.

Keywords fallacies, English-Arabic translation, pragmatic equivalence, advertising discourse, persuasive language

أخطاء ترجمة المغالطات من الإنكليزية الى العربية

اسراء علي حسين /جامعة تكريت/كلية الآداب / قسم الترجمة

المستخلص:

يتناول هذا البحث دراسة الأخطاء التي تحدث عند ترجمة المغالطات من الإنجليزية إلى العربية، مع التركيز على الحفاظ على المعاني الدلالية والنصية والبراغماتية. تعرف المغالطات بأنها أشكال من التفكير تبدو مقنعة ولكنها معيبة منطقيا، وغالبا ما تظهر في الخطاب الإعلاني. تمثل ترجمة هذه المغالطات تحديا خاصا؛ يجب على المترجم الالتزام ليس فقط بالمعنى الظاهر للنص الأصلي، ولكن أيضا بنية الحجاج وقوته الاقناعية وتأثيره البلاغي والبراغماتي. تستند هذه الدراسة إلى طريقة دراسة الحالة لتحليل أربعة نصوص إعلانية باللغة الإنجليزية تحتوي على أنواع متعددة من المغالطات. كما تقوم بمراجعة ترجماتها إلى اللغة العربية، والتي أعدها أربعة طلاب من قسم الترجمة / كلية الآداب / جامعة تكريت. يركز التحليل على استراتيجيات الترجمة التي استخدمها الطلاب ومدى الحفاظ على وظيفة المغالطة الموجودة في النصوص الأصلية. تم اعتماد طريقة بيكر (2018) للإطار التحليلي لمعادلة الترجمة كمرجع أساسي في هذا البحث.

الكلمات المفتاحية : المغالطات، الترجمة من الإنجليزية إلى العربية، أخطاء الترجمة. الترجمة الإعلانية، اللغة المقنعة.

1.Introduction

Logical and rhetorical fallacies are an important element in the intersection of language, logic, and persuasion. A fallacy is defined as a type of flawed or misleading reasoning that may seem logical to the audience, despite lacking sufficient rationales. These fallacies are widely used in persuasive discourse, especially in the field of advertising, where advertisers resort to various linguistic and rhetorical strategies to influence consumer attitudes and decisions (Walton, 1995,p.255)

Translating advertising discourse is a special challenge; the effectiveness of translation is not limited to conveying the semantic meaning of the text, but also requires maintaining its rhetorical strength, persuasive effect, and pragmatic function. When translating advertisements from English into Arabic, especially those that contain logical fallacies, linguistic and cultural differences between the two languages may lead to changes in meaning, focus, logical relationships, and the communicative effect of the text. Thus, the translation may be linguistically accurate and semantically, but it does not necessarily succeed in reproducing the fallacy strategy and persuasive function contained in the original advertising text

This study aims to investigate the most prominent errors that may face the translation of fallacies from English to Arabic, with a special focus on achieving semantic, textual and pragmatic equivalence. The study adopts the case study method, by analysing four advertising texts in English that include different types of fallacies, and comparing them with their Arabic translations completed by four students from the Department of Translation. The analysis focusses on the translation strategies adopted by the students, assessing their success in maintaining the original meaning of fallacies, as well as their pragmatic function and persuasive effect in translated texts.

The study relies on Baker's approach to translation equivalence as the main analytical framework, focusing on achieving parity at its lexical, grammatical, textual and pragmatic levels. This framework is based on the fact that the translation of fallacies is not limited to the literal transfer of linguistic content, but requires the translator to preserve the structure of the argument, its rhetorical function, and its pragmatic effect on the

target language, in order to ensure the transfer of the persuasive intention of the fallacy and its impact on the recipient closer to the original text.

2.Theoretical Framework

2.1 Fallacies: Definition and Classification

The concept of the fallacy is well-established in both rhetoric and classical logic; Aristotle is one of the first philosophers to provide a systematic taxonomy of fallacious arguments in his book "Sophistical Refuctions" during the Fourth Century BCE. Aristotle distinguished between fallacies that arise as a result of the misleading use of language (in dictione) and those due to factors or issues that go beyond linguistic structure (extra dictionem). Within the framework of the development of the study of fallacies in the modern logic, Hamblin (1970, p. 12) in reviving academic interest in this field through his pioneering book Fallacies, criticising traditional classifications of fallacies and stressing the importance of analysing them in light of the nature and context of the argument. In continuation of this development, contemporary scholars distinguish between formal fallacies, which arise from the violation of the rules of logical reasoning, and non-formal fallacies, in which the imbalance is not related to the logical structure of the argument, but to their content, context or method of employing it in the process of persuasion (Walton, 1995, p17).

> Aristotle's classification of fallacies has been a fundamental frame of reference in the study of this field for many centuries, but subsequent developments in the theory of argumentation has raised questions about the extent to which this traditional classification can explain different types of errors in reasoning. In this context, Hamblin's book Fallacies (1970, p. 12) an important turning point in recent studies of fallacies; He criticised traditional treatments that presented fallacies in the form of separate lists of logical errors, without relying on an integrated theoretical framework that takes into account the nature and function of the argument. Hamblin stressed that the analysis of fallacies should not be limited to their logical structure, but should take into account the dialogue and communication context in which they are found (Hamblin, 1970, p. 12). This presentation contributed to the revitalisation of academic

research in the field of fallacies, and paved the way for the emergence of recent trends in the theory of argumentation that view fallacy as a phenomenon with logical, pragmatic and communicative phenomena, and not just an abstract error in reasoning.

Modern scholars distinguish between two main types of fallacies, namely formal fallacies and non-formal fallacies. Formal fallacies arise when the argument violates the rules of deductive logic, making its logical structure improper. The disclosure of this type of fallacy depends on analyzing the form of the argument, regardless of its content. (Copi, Cohen, & McMahon, 2014, p128). The most prominent examples include the fallacy of confirming the result (Affirming the Consequent) and the fallacy of denying the introduction (Denying the Antecedent).

Recent studies have seen a shift in understanding fallacies, as they are no longer just errors in logical reasoning, but have come to be understood as violations of the norms that govern rational discussion. According to the theory of pragma- dialectical developed by Van Emeren and Grotendorst (1992, p 158), fallacies are defined as maneuvers or dialectical movements that violate the rules of reasonable critical debate, which hinders a rational settlement of differences of opinion (Van Eemeren & Grootendorst, 2004, p 173). This perspective has received increasing attention in the fields of discourse analysis and translation studies, given its focus on the communicative function of fallacies and their pragmatic effects on discourse. From this point of view, fallacy is not studied as a mere disfunction in the logical structure or a violation of the rules of reasoning, but as a rhetorical strategy that performs a certain function within a specific communicative context, and may affect the recipient and the degree of his persuasion of the argument. This perspective is particularly important in translation studies, as the transfer of fallacies from one language to another requires the preservation, as far as possible, of their semantic content, their deliberative function and their persuasive effect in the translated text.

From the perspective of translation studies, the distinction between formal and non-formal fallacies acquires significant importance, as it has direct effects on the process of conveying meaning and the structure of the argument. Formal fallacies often maintain their logical structure when they move from one language to another, while informal fallacies rely

more on linguistic wording, cultural references, rhetorical norms, and the pragmatic dimensions of the text (Baker, 2018; Van Eemeren & Genrootendorst, 2004, pp. 162–173). Therefore, the task of the translator is not limited to conveying the explicit or implicit meaning of the source text, but goes beyond that to maintaining its argumentation and persuasive function, including its misleading effect when it is present. Accordingly, the translator should seek to achieve functional equality in the communicative and argumentative effect between the source text and the target text, taking into account the linguistic, cultural and pragmatic characteristics of the target language audience.

2.2 Argumentation Theory and Fallacies

The study of fallacies extends to deep roots in the history of Western philosophy, as its methodological beginnings date back to Aristotle and his book “Sophistical Refutations”, which is one of the first systematic attempts to classify patterns of false reasoning and reveal the methods of misleading argumentative. This Aristotelian classification contributed to laying the theoretical foundation for subsequent studies on fallacies, and paved the way for the development of modern argumentation's theories that dealt with the nature of the fallacy, its functions and methods of analysing it within logical, linguistic and pragmatic contexts.

In this context, Van Eemeren & Grootendorst, 1992, p. 179) The Pragma-Dialectical Model, which views fallacies as violations of the rules governing critical debate aimed at resolving differences of opinion in a rational manner. According to this perspective, the fallacy is not just a defect in the logical structure of the argument, but is understood as a problematic rhetorical act that can hinder the proper course of discussion and prevent a reasonable solution to the dispute. Therefore, this model focusses on the function of the fallacy within the argumentative process and the interaction between the parties to the discussion, not only on its logical structure.

On the other hand, Walton (1995, 2008) distinguishes between argumentation schemes, as contextual deductive patterns that are acceptable in principle , although refutable, and fallacies that result from the improper use of these schemes or their misuse in inference process . This distinction is particularly important in the field of translation,

because the judgement of a speech as a fallacy is related to cultural and contextual norms that determine acceptable patterns of reasoning, criteria that may vary from one linguistic community to another.

The concept of dynamic equivalence put forward by Nida and Taber (1969, p12) is of particular importance, as it focusses on achieving the same effect on the recipient in the target language, even if it requires moving away from structural conformity with the source text. The importance of this concept is clearly highlighted in the translation of advertising texts, where the response of the text to the target audience is more important than the literal obligation to formulate it. Similarly, Newmark (1988, p 39) distinguishes between semantic translation that seeks to convey the meaning with maximum accuracy, and communicative translation that aims to achieve the same communicative effect on the recipient, a distinction that provides an appropriate theoretical framework for analyzing the translation of discourses that include fallacies, since it requires a balance between maintaining their argumentation structure and transferring its persuasive effect.

2.3 Translation Theory: Key Frameworks

2.3.1 Baker's Approach to Translation Equivalence

This study is based on Baker's model of translation equivalence as the main theoretical framework for analyzing how to translate fallacies from English into Arabic. The Baker model provides comprehensive framework for the study of translation problems at multiple linguistic and communicative levels, as the concept of parity in it is not limited to achieving the formal correspondence between the source text and the target text, but focusses on how the meaning is constructed and transmitted to the recipient through a set of lexical, grammatical, textual and pragmatic choices. Therefore, this model allows to analyse the success of the translator in maintaining the original meaning of the fallacy and its communicative and pragmatic function in the target text (Baker, 2018).

Mona Baker (2018, p 235) discusses the concept of equivalence at multiple interrelated levels, including word-level equivalence, above word level equivalence, textual equivalence, grammatical equivalence, and pragmatic equivalence. These levels are particularly important in this

study, because fallacious discourse often depends on specific lexical choices, logical relationships, grammatical structures, pragmatic semantics and textual sequences. Thus, the translation may be linguistically acceptable, but it fails to maintain the argumentative and fallacious function of the original text.

2.3.2 Equivalence at Word Level

Baker (2018,p 134) points out the challenges faced by translators when there is no word in the source language that has a direct analogue in the target language. Differences in meanings, semantics, and contextual meanings between languages lead to careful decisions to choose words that accurately embody the original meaning, rather than relying on formal conformity. This aspect is very important when translating logical fallacies, where evaluative and persuasive expressions play a big role in the strength of the argument. Using inappropriate words may weaken, amplify, or modify the intended meaning. Therefore, this study focusses on analyzing language choices to see if student translations maintain the semantic structure of the original texts as intended it (ibid).

2.3.3 Equivalence Above Word Level

Baker (2018, p 10-50) also deals with the concept of equivalence above the word level, including verbal syndromes, idiom expressions, and fixed compositions. The meaning is not always derived from single words independently, but words interact with each other within larger linguistic units. Therefore, the translator needs to consider how the expressions work together in the source language, and how to naturally reconstruct the equivalent meanings in the target language.

> This level of equivalence is particularly important when translating fallacious discourse, as the relationships between expressions and linguistic structures may play an essential role in building the misguided argument and directing its interpretation. Any change in these relationships may modify the intended meaning or weaken the argumentative function of the fallacy. Therefore, equivalence above word level is an appropriate framework for analyzing the success of students in maintaining the linguistic relationships between the constituent elements of the argument in the source text when transferred to the target language

2.3.4 Grammatical Equivalence

Grammatical equity deals with differences between languages in the classification of grammatical elements and the construction of compositions and sentences. Baker (2018) explains that languages differ in the way grammatical information is organised, which requires the translator to make accurate decisions about aspects such as aspect, modality, tense, voice, number, person, and word order, ensuring that meaning and grammatical relationships are conveyed appropriately in the target language.

Grammatical and modality choices are especially important in translating fallacies, because they have a direct impact on determining the degree of certainty and enhancing or weakening the strength of the argument. The difference in the use of grammatical compositions and modality tools may lead to a change in the level of commitment to say, and thus influence the persuasive power of the fallacy in the target language. For example, adding an expression such as “perhaps” may reduce the level of certainty in a claim made in the original text as an inevitable fact. Such a change would weaken the pragmatic effect of the fallacy, even if the general meaning of the term remains recognizable. Accordingly, grammatical and modality choices are taken into account when analyzing selected translations, given their role in maintaining the argumentative power and the pragmatic function of the source text (Baker, 2018).

2.3.5 Textual Equivalence

Textual equivalence is concerned with how information is organized and the relationships that connect different parts of the text. In this context, Baker (2018) deals with the thematic and informational structure of the text, along with the concept of coherence, emphasizing the importance of the way in which information is arranged and linked to each other in the target text. This level is particularly important in the current study, since the construction of many fallacies depends on a specific and gradual order of ideas and arguments. For example, the fallacy of a slippery slope is based on a coherent series of expected results, so that omitting an intermediate result or changing its order weakens the argumentative and persuasive effect of the fallacy. Therefore, the analysis in this study focusses on the extent to which students maintain the logical sequence,

textual coherence, and the gradual development of the arguments contained in the original text when transferred to Arabic. Baker (2018)

2.3.6 Pragmatic Equivalence

Pragmatic equivalence is the most important dimension within the Baker framework of this study. Baker (2018) explains that pragmatic meaning is about how phrases are interpreted in their context, and highlights the importance of coherence and implied connotation in translation. Therefore, the pragmatic meaning goes beyond the literal meaning of single words, to include the meanings that readers deduce from the context of the phrase. (Taylor and Francis)

This dimension is very important in translating fallacies, because the effectiveness of a fallacious argument often depends on its implicit meaning and communicative power. The translator may literally rephrase the phrase while weakening its intended persuasive effect, increasing its strength, or removing the intrinsic connotation of the fallacy. Accordingly, this study assesses whether student translations maintain the pragmatic function of the original fallacies, including the degree of certainty, exaggeration, persuasion, and implicit relationships.

2.4 Concept of Logical Fallacies

Logical fallacies are errors in the process of reasoning that may weaken the integrity and logic of the argument, although they may appear convincing and acceptable on their appearance (Walton, 1995; Tindale, 2007). The interest in the concept of fallacy goes back to Aristotle, who dealt with it systematically in his book " Sophistical Refutations" , explaining that some arguments may take a sound logical appearance, while in fact they are based on deception by manipulating language, arousing emotions or employing unjustified assumptions (Aristotle, 1952).

Fallacies are widespread in multiple areas, most notably political discourse, advertisements, debates, and media discourse, where they may be deliberately employed to influence and convince the recipient emotionally or psychologically rather than relying on evidence and logic (Tindale,2007; Walton,1995). Therefore, the translation of fallacies is not limited to conveying its linguistic meaning, but requires the translator to

realize its argumentative nature and pragmatic function, and to maintain as much as possible its persuasive influence in the target language.

There are many types of logical fallacies, the most common of which are the following:

1. **Ad Hominem**: attacking the person instead of discussing the argument .
2. **Slippery Slope**: the assumption that something will inevitably lead to serious consequences.
3. **False Dilemma**: presenting only two choices while ignoring alternatives .
4. **Appeal to Emotion**: persuading people through emotions instead of evidence.
5. **Hasty Generalization**: drawing conclusions from insufficient evidence (Copi, Cohen, & McMahon, 2014, pp. 126–133).
6. **Straw Man:** It consists of distorting the argument of the other party or reformulating it in a weaker or more extreme way than it was presented to it, and then attacking this distorted version instead of discussing the original argument as it is.
7. **Slippery Slope**: based on the assumption that taking a certain step or action will inevitably lead to a series of increasingly serious results, without providing sufficient evidence that these results will actually occur or that the relationship between them is inevitable (ibid)

   Each of these fallacies presents unique challenges in translation, because the effect of persuasion may depend on cultural expectations or rhetorical style .

2.5 Arabic Rhetorical Tradition

Arabic rhetoric theory consists of three main interrelated branches: Ma'ani (Semantics and Meaning), which is concerned with the study of semantics and the organization of meanings; Bayan (clarity and figurative language), which focusses on clarity and means of metaphorical expression; and the science of Al-Bada'I (embellishment and stylistic devices), which is concerned with improvers and rhetorical methods. Although the Arabic rhetorical heritage (Balagha) does not

provide a taxonomy of fallacies that directly matches Western classifications, it establishes the principles of sound argumentation through concepts such as Istidlal (inference), Huija (argument), and distinguishing between Burhani (demonstrative) and Jadali (dialectical) (Al-Jabri, 1986). Therefore, the translator's lack of knowledge of this tradition may lead to the production of Arabic texts that are not consistent with rhetorical standards and do not meet the rhetorical expectations of the Arab reader.

3. Methodology

This study adopts the methodology of the qualitative case study to verify translation errors that appear when translating erroneous advertising discourse from English into Arabic. The qualitative approach is appropriate because the study focusses on identifying, describing, and interpreting translation problems, rather than statistically measuring translation performance.

This study analyses four selected English texts that include different types of fallacies, along with their translations into Arabic completed by four students from the translation department. The analysis focusses on evaluating the success of these translations in maintaining the semantic meaning of the original texts, their interdependence and textual organization, and their argumentative structure, as well as the pragmatic function performed by fallacies in their original contexts.

4. Data Analysis

This chapter presents the discussion and analysis of four selected samples representing the fallacious discourse in order to translate English fallacies into Arabic. Identify the most prominent defects of translation that may affect the argumentative and pragmatic force. These analyses are based on Baker's (2018) approach as a major theoretical framework. These samples were given to four students from the Department of Translation at the college of Arts, the fourth stage, Tikrit University.

Text Analysis (1): Ad Hominem fallacy

ST :

“ You shouldn’t trust his argument about environmental protection because he owns three luxury SUVs”.

The speaker rejects the argument by referring to the speaker’s personal lifestyle instead of evaluating the validity of the argument itself (van Eemeren & Grootendorst, 1992).

TT:

1. لا ينبغي أن تثق بحجته حول حماية البيئة لأنه يمتلك ثلاث سيارات دفع رباعي فاخرة.
2. لا تصدق ما يقوله عن البيئة لأنه شخص منافق ويملك ثلاث سيارات كبيرة.
3. لا ينبغي تصديق آرائه البيئية لأنه يمتلك ثلاث سيارات رياضية متعددة الاستعمالات.
4. لا يمكن الوثوق بحديثه عن حماية البيئة لأنه يملك ثلاث سيارات SUV فاخرة.

Discussion

This sample is the fallacy of personal attack (Ad Hominem), as the claim is weakened or rejected by attacking the person who presents it instead of discussing the content and evidence of the claim. The main challenge in translation is to maintain the clear relationship between the content of the claim and the attack directed at its owner. Any easing of personal sharp in the discourse or turning it into a mere neutral criticism may weaken the fallacy structure and lose its deliberative effect.

Translator (1) provided a literal translation relatively close to the source text, while maintaining a personal attack and its direct relation to the argument at hand. According to Baker's concept of word equivalence (2018), the student succeeded in conveying the most important evaluative expressions while retaining an appropriate degree of their semantic strength. The translation, at the pragmatic level, also maintained the confrontational character and the argumentative attitude of the original text. Accordingly, the translation of student (a) can be considered successful in conveying the meaning and intention of the source text.

Translator (2) provides a clear and generally understandable translation, but some of his linguistic choices contributed to easing the personal attack compared to the source text. Although the argumentative strategy and the features of the fallacy remain clear in translation, the level of personal interaction and the confrontational character has declined significantly. This is a partial pragmatic loss; the translator succeeded in conveying the basic idea, but did not fully maintain the degree of hostility and expressive strength that characterises the source text.

As for the translator (3) adopted a more freestyle of translation, which resulted in the addition of stronger evaluative expressions than what was stated in the source text. Although the translation still maintains the style of personalized attack, the increased sharpness of the expression affects the pragmatic effect of the text. According to Baker's emphasis on the importance of maintaining the communicative meaning, the translation can only be considered partially successful, because it did not accurately maintain the same degree of evaluation found in the original text.

Translator (4) provides a translation that focusses mainly on the individual aspect, omitting or weakening the relationship between personal criticism and the rejection claim. As a result, the target reader may receive the phrase as mere ordinary criticism, rather than recognizing it as a deliberate personal attack that represents a logical fallacy. This modulation leads to a clear loss of the communicative meaning and deliberative effect of the original text, which makes translation less successful in conveying the argumentative function of the fallacy.

Translator	Main Translation Tendency	Effect on Fallacy	Assessment
1	Accurate/literal rendering	Fallacious personal attack retained	Successful
2	Moderate lexical adjustment	Attack slightly weakened	Partially successful
3	Free/reformulated rendering	Attack intensified	Partially successful
4	Meaning shifted toward general criticism	Fallacious structure obscured	Unsuccessful

Text Analysis (2): Straw Man Fallacy

SL: " We should reduce military spending."

"So you want our country to have no army at all."

1. ينبغي أن نخفض الإنفاق العسكري.

إذن أنت تريد أن تصبح بلادنا بلا جيش إطلاقًا.

2. يجب تقليل الميزانية العسكرية.

أنت تطالب بإلغاء الجيش بالكامل.

3. من الأفضل تقليل المصروفات العسكرية.

إذن أنت ضد وجود جيش يحمي الوطن.

4. علينا تقليص الإنفاق العسكري.

إذن تريد إلغاء القوات المسلحة نهائيًا.

Discussion

This sample illustrates the straw man's fallacy, which occurs when someone else's position is reformulated in such a way that it weakens, swells, or distorts, and then criticizes it to that distorted position instead of the original one. Thus, the sensitivity of the translation stands out in the extent to which the degree of exaggeration contained in the source text is maintained. Translation that exacerbates the idea and makes it more extreme than the original may lead to the production of a different

meaning, while translation that reduces the degree of exaggeration may lose the text one of its most important misleading strategies.

Translator (1) maintains the basic logical structure of the text, and conveys the degree of exaggeration contained therein without making any additional claims. Thus, its translation succeeds in preserving the semantic content of the text, along with reproducing the intended argumentative distortion. This largely corresponds to Baker's (2018) perspective , who believes that valence in translation should be measured in light of the function and impact of the text, and not based on formal similarity alone.

The second translator maintains the general meaning, but replaces an important expression with a less sharp Arabic equivalent . The straw man's representation remains clear, but his rhetorical acute decreases. Therefore, the translation is partially successful.

The translator (3) substantially reworded the phrase, adding to it an unclear meaning in the original text. This makes the opponent's position seem more extreme than it was originally. This result embodies excessively pragmatic translation: the student conveys the fallacy but changes its limit.

As for the translator (4), he\she translated the sentence very briefly. Although the target reader can recognize the difference, the intermediate step by which the original situation is distorted becomes blurred. And because this distortion of the straw man's fallacy, this omission minimizes the success of the translation.

Translator	**Main problem**	**Pragmatic consequence**	**Assessment**
1	Minimal intervention	Degree of distortion preserved	Successful
2	Weakened lexical choice	Decreased Exaggeration	Partially successful
3	Added evaluative meaning	distortion intensified	Partially successful

4	Omission/ compression	Strew-man mechanism weakened	Unsuccessful

Text Analysis (3): Appeal to Authority Fallacy

ST: "This herbal supplement must be effective because a famous actor recommends it".

TT:

1. لا بد أن يكون هذا المكمل العشبي فعالاً لأن ممثلاً مشهوراً يوصي به.
2. هذا الدواء العشبي ممتاز لأن نجماً عالمياً ينصح باستخدامه.
3. هذا المنتج فعال لأنه يحظى بتأييد أحد المشاهير.
4. بما أن ممثلاً مشهوراً أعلن عن هذا المكمل، فلا شك في فعاليته.

Discussion

This text represents an appeal to authority fallacy . This fallacy occurs when someone's credibility or status is used as sufficient evidence of the validity of a claim, even if this authority does not logically establish the validity of the claim. Translation must maintain the relationship between the authority figure and the claim, as well as any linguistic indications that make inference seem convincing.

The first translator reformulates the authority reference and hypothesis with minor modifications. The translation is clear and maintains the original relationship between the speaker's claim and the cited authority reference. Therefore, this version achieves a high degree of pragmatic equivalence. While the second translator chooses a natural and cultural Arabic expression for the reference of authority. This choice improves readability, but slightly changes the degree of certainty conveyed by the source. This is a condition in which normal is realized at the expense of a small amount of pragmatic accuracy. Translator (3) clearly enhances the status of authority by using a wording that suggests that it is an absolute source of truth or something indisputable. This addition increases the power of the fallacy and makes it more persuasive than the original source. Although the translation is semantically comprehensible, but pragmatically exaggerated. Translator (4) overlooked the authority-

reliance mark and only kept the proposition. This omission removes an essential element of a logical fallacy. As a result, the target sentence is no longer clearly represented on the basis of authority, and cannot be considered quite equivalent.

Translator	Key strategy	Effect	Assessment
1	Authority relation preserved	Fallacy retained clearly	Successful
2	Naturalized expression	Minor pragmatic shift persuasive	Partially successful
3	Authority intensified	Persuasive force increased	Partially successful
4	Authority marker omitted	Fallacy substantially	Unsuccessful

Text Analysis (4): Slippery Slope Fallacy

ST: "If schools allow students to use smartphones in class, soon no one will study, discipline will disappear, and the education system will completely collapse".

TT:

1. **إذا سمحت المدارس للطلاب باستخدام الهواتف الذكية داخل الصفوف، فلن يدرس أحد قريبًا، وسيختفي الانضباط، وسينهار النظام التعليمي تمامًا.**
2. **إذا وافقت المدارس على استخدام الهواتف الذكية، فسيفشل جميع الطلبة وسينتهي التعليم.**
3. **إذا سُمح باستخدام الهواتف الذكية في المدارس، فسوف يؤدي ذلك إلى تراجع الانضباط وربما تدهور العملية التعليمية.**
4. **إذا سمحت المدارس باستخدام الهواتف الذكية في الصف، فإن النظام التعليمي سيتعرض للانهيار الكامل.**

Discussion

Translator (1) succeeded in maintaining the full sequence of results in the original text. Translation maintained the gradient from allowing the use of smartphones to the reduction of study, the disappearance of discipline,

and the final collapse of the education system. The translator did not add or delete any significant meaning. According to Baker (2018), translation achieved parity at both the textual and pragmatic levels. Therefore, the translation is excellent. Translator (2) changes the original results by replacing the phrase “no one will study” and “discipline will disappear” with the phrase “**سيفشل جميع الطلبة وسينتهي التعليم**.” These changes distort the semantic content and the intersection of the original causal sequence. Although the translation retains the general negative result, it did not accurately convey the logical gradient on which the slippery slope argument is based. According to Baker (2018), this is a deficiency in achieving parity at the semantic and textual levels, given that the gradual relationship between the elements of the argument is not fully maintained. Therefore, the translation can be described as acceptable to some extent, but it does not achieve full parity, the translation is fair

The third translator maintains the general idea of the original text, but enters the word “**ربما**” which reduces the certainty of the expected results. The source text presents the results as an inevitable and sequential series, while this translation makes the results less certain, which weakens the pragmatic power of the fallacy. According to Baker (Baker, 2018), the change in style can affect the achievement of practical parity, so translation can be described as good in general, but it suffers from partial weakness in the transmission of the pragmatic effect. Therefore, the translation is considered fair.

As for the fourth translator, he deleted two basic results, namely “no one will study” and “discipline will disappear”, and simply referred to the final collapse of the educational system. This deletion weakens the cumulative sequence that forms the core of the slippery slope fallacy. Although the general meaning and the end result remain clear, the dialectical structure of the fallacy has lost much of its strength and persuasive effect. According to Baker (Baker, 2018), such omission may lead to the loss of part of the textual and pragmatic valence, because the omission of successive relationships between results changes

From Baker's perspective (Baker, 2018), these differences emphasise that achieving parity in translation should not be limited to the lexical level, but should include various textual and deliberative levels. Translating fallacies requires maintaining style, logical relationships between ideas,

textual sequence, as well as the pragmatic power of argument. Therefore, the translator who only conveys the final result and deletes the previous stages or results may produce a sound and linguistically acceptable translation, but it fails to maintain the communicative and persuasive function of the original text.

Translator	Key strategy	Effect	Assessment
1	Sequential consequences preserved	Fallacy retained clearly	Successful
2	Consequences reformulated	Semantic meaning distorted	Fair
3	Meaning mitigated	pragmatic force weakened	good
4	Intermediate consequences omitted	Fallacy substantially weakened	fair

5. Conclusion

This study concluded the most prominent problems facing the translation of fallacies from English to Arabic, focusing on maintaining their semantic, textual and pragmatic dimensions. The study adopted the Baker framework (Baker, 2018) in translation equivalence as the main theoretical framework, as it allows the possibility of analysing translation at multiple levels beyond lexical equivalence to include the textual structure, logical relationships and the communicative function of the fallacy.

The results of the study showed that translating linguistic fallacies is a multidimensional challenge; as achieving accuracy in their transmission is not limited to preserving vocabulary and grammatical structure, but also requires taking into account the logical relationships between the components of the argument, the semantic context, and expressions of an evaluative nature, as well as the pragmatic dimensions that contribute to shaping the meaning and persuasive effect of the fallacy in the original text. The most prominent difficulties were the use of inappropriate vocabulary, diluting or exaggerating the original meaning, as well as deleting and making structural changes that may lead to hiding the

erroneous strategy or weakening its effect in the translated text. Analysis of translations showed that there is a difference in the extent to which they can accurately convey the meaning and function of the original text. Some translations have succeeded in maintaining the fallacious structure and its basic elements, while other translations have seen the deletion, intensification or weakening of some important elements, which led to partial parity or non-equivalence.

The study concludes that successful translation of fallacies does not depend on the literal transfer of the text, but requires the translator to take into account the linguistic meaning and the pragmatic function of the fallacy at the same time. Therefore, attention to teaching erroneous speech within translation courses should be strengthened, because of its role in developing students' linguistic, analytical and deliberative abilities.

In general, the Baker Framework (2018) has proven its usefulness in identifying and interpreting translation problems contained in the selected data, and in assessing the degree of parity between the original English texts and their Arabic translations.

References

Aristotle. (1952). On Sophistical Refutations. In ʿAbd al-Raḥmān Badawī (Ed./Trans.), Manṭiq Arisṭū: al-Juzʾ al-Thālith. Cairo: Maṭbaʿat Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣrīyah, pp. 737–742.

Aristotle. (2007). On Sophistical Refutations (E. S. Forster, Trans.). In The Complete Works of Aristotle (J. Barnes, Ed.). Princeton University Press. (Original work published ca. 350 BCE)

Baker, M. (2018). In Other Words: A Course book on Translation (3rd ed.). Routledge pp. 370-369.

Hamblin, C. L. (1970). Fallacies. Methuen.

House, J. (2015). Translation quality assessment: Past and present. Routledge.

Nida, E. A., & Taber, C. R. (1969). The Theory and Practice of Translation. Leiden: E. J. Brill.

Tindale, C. W. (2007). Fallacies and argument appraisal. Cambridge University Press.

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

van Eemeren, F. H., & Grootendorst, R. (1992). Argumentation, Communication, and Fallacies: A Pragma-Dialectical Perspective. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

van Eemeren, F. H., & Grootendorst, R. (2004). A Systematic Theory of Argumentation: The Pragma-Dialectical Approach. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Walton, D. (1995). A Pragmatic Theory of Fallacy. University of Alabama Press.

Walton, D. N. (1992). Slippery slope arguments. Clarendon Press.

Walton, D. N. (1998). Ad hominem arguments. University of Alabama Press.

Walton, D. N. (1999). One-sided arguments: A dialectical analysis of bias. State University of New York Press.