Explicitness Between English and Arabic In the Use of the pronouns

Mr. Hussain Hameed Mayuuf (M.A)

1.Personal Pronouns

Halliday and Hasan (1976:48) state that the first and the second pronouns can be explain by the context of situation,the third person pronouns are more cohesive "in that a third person form typically refers anaphorically to a preceding item in the text". English distinguishes three types of the third person pronoun `he`: masculine, `she`: feminine and `it`: neutral, in the singular, and only `they` in the plural whereas Arabic هم : feminine. Their plural is either : هي : masculine and هوdistinguishes only two: : is used for both هما: non-personal. Moreover, the dual هي: feminine or هنmasculine, masculine and feminine.Aziz (1998:93)indicates that Arabic personal pronouns are realized as separate morphemes when stressed, or as suffixes when having weak stress. The subjective pronoun of the third person singular is implied (dummy element)rather than expressed. Aziz (ibid:94)asserts that "the two –way division of Arabic personal pronouns, in contrast with the three –way division in English results in less explicitness (in Arabic)."Aziz`s statement is true as far as the main division is concerned. But the various forms used in the dual and plural have rendered Arabic more explicit than English in this respect.

2.Definition of the Explicitness

A grammar (Gleason,1965:243)may be viewed as "an effort to give explicit account of what it is that the native speaker does, or rather of a certain facets of his behaviour, which we consider to be a language structure." The grammarian`s task therefore is to formulate the language patterns explicitly since the native speaker, despite his excellent command over the language, cannot describe the patterns he uses.

Explicitness is achieved when an utterance directly expresses. Chomsky (cited in Aitchison1987:34),states that a grammar is "a device, which generates all the grammatical sequences of language and none of the ungrammatical ones". For him, this grammar is "perfectly explicit ,in that no thing is left to the imagination."

Beaugrande and Dressler (1981:4)state that when the links between concept which appear together in a textual world are not made explicit in the text, i.e., they are not activated directly by expressions of the surface, language users will supply the necessary relations in order to make sense of the text.Leech et al. (1982:136)distinguish between `typical writing` and typical speech`stating that typical writing can be much more explicit than typical speech since body language may convey extra information. In fact shred knowledge between the speaker and hearer makes explicitness less necessary . Moreover ,the opportunity of feedback to clarify the message is available in speech rather than writing . It is in speech that frequent use of peforms such as ,'it', 'that' ,'this', etc is made hence, reflecting its explicitness. In a telephone conversation however, language need to be more explicit because the visual medium is not available (ibid:140).

3 Explicitness between English and Arabic

Hatim (1997 : 216)indicate that it is an obvious fact that language differ in their explicitness. Some languages "tend to express what is intended in a fairly and direct way" . In such languages, the relationship between meaning and the linguistic expression used to express it is "fairly transparent". Other languages tend to be less direct in expressing what is intended, and ,therefore ,their lexicogrammar tends to be "less transparent " in expressing their communicative intentions .Languages are "inherently explicit or implicit in the kinds of information they convey and the way they convey (it), first through their formal properties and secondly through their stylistic and rhetorical preferences." Therefore, generalizations are dangerous since the degree of explicitness in a language is associated with text types (Seguinot ,1988:108).

Aziz (1993:129)states that an expression is explicit if it satisfies two conditions "it should be detailed and definite", and "it should refer directly".The explicitness of an expression should not be confused with absence of subtlety. Naturally ,in `explicative` languages intentions can be expressed as opaquely as in any of the more `implicative ` ones(hatim,1997:106).As far as English and Arabic are concerned ,Aziz (1993 and 1998) and Hatim (1997) indicate that Arabic is a highly explicit language when compared to English which is an intrinsically implicit language. While losing none of its subtlety, the Arabic language often explicitly marks the finest fluctuations in context, be they related to sociocultural factors, to intentions or to general communication maters such as the formality of a given text .This occurs not only at the lexical /semantic level (rich, flowery lexis to cater for every minute nuance), but also ,and perhaps more interestingly, at the grammatical/ syntactic level (Hatim , Ibid: xiv) In Arabic Word order is highly flexible Thus it is highly motivated and context-dependent activity. This helps to communicate a wide range of added rhetorical effects (ibid). English is an intrinsically implicit language where" uttered meanings are likely to be retrievable only through close scrutiny of what is implied by an utterance "(ibid).

Explicitness between languages is significant in translation since it often influences and determines the choice the translator opts for when constructing the T.T. This , of course ,obtains at different language levels Any "information , implicit in the S L phrase , must be made explicit in many receptor languages ."Nida (1964: 229) The same point of view is adopted by Nida and Taber (1969 :204).They think that when implicit information is available in the message ,it "may need to be explicit for subsequent receptors if they are to understand the message " Nida (1964 :230)clarifies his attitude by pointing out that where there are obligatory and optional categories in the TL ,which are not found in the S L ,"it is obviously necessary to add the obligatory categories and to weigh the desirability of adding optional categories ." He adds that this technique might involve additions . However ,he thinks that there is no "actual addition to the semantic content of the message since "these additions consist essentially in making explicit what is implicit in the SL text" (ibid :231). Explicitness is defined by Sperber and Wilson (1986 :182)as an assumption communicated by an utterance U is explicit if and only if it is a development of a logical from encoded by

U .This is supported by Leech`s(1983:66) Clarity Principle : Retain a direct and transparent relationship between message and text ,and Avoid ambiguity

3.1.The Explicitation Premise

   Nida (1964:230) indicates that in the translator's efforts to deliver the ST message to the TT receiver where the receptor language has obligatory or optional categories which are not available in the S T , the translator adds the obligatory categories so as to make explicit what is implicit in the S T . Such additions, Nida thinks, do not add to the content. They rather simply change "the manner in which the information is communicated " (ibid:230 -31). There is no objection to this according to Weissbrod
   (1992 cited in Vertis,1998:143) if these additions serve the purpose of explicitation.
   The foregoing discussion has a lot to do with the Explicitation Hypothesis adopted and developed by Blum–Kulka (1986). According this hypothesis "the process of interpretation performed by the translator on the ST might led to a TL text which is more redundant than the SL text" (ibid :19). This occurs "regardless of the increase traceable to differences between the two linguistic and textual systems involve " (ibid). This Characteristic, she thinks, is inherent in the process of translation. As a strategy, it is a universal one inherent in the process of language mediation, i.e. it is practiced by both language learners and translators: professional or non–professional.
   The process of translation according to this hypothesis ,entails shifts both in textual and discourse relationships (ibid:18). These shifts are classified into shifts in cohesion and shifts in coherence. The former are subdivided into shifts in levels of explicitness ,i.e. whether the general level of the TT textual explicitness is higher or lower than that of the ST, and shifts in text meaning where the explicit and implicit meaning potential of the ST ,changes through translation.
   Blum –Kulka (ibid:19)points out that shifts in the level of explicitness in translation "have been claimed to be linked to differences in stylistic preferences for types of cohesive markers in the two languages involved ".
On the other hand ,shifts of coherence are subdivided into reader-focused shifts and text-focused shifts .In any case , the translator recourses to explicitation when he feels that if he adds more linguistic structures to the TL, the essential message in the SL will be conveyed appropriately and communication is therefore achieved.
Abdul –Hadi (1999:271) states that there are three cases where additions are required. First, when the text, or part of it, is heavily loaded, some more linguistic structures are required to help the receiver understand the message. Secondly, when there are translational difficulties concerning rare forms, poetic use of language and unusual syntactic structure, the translator recourses to such additions. Thirdly, when there is a preference in the TL for expansion and tautology, while the SL would prefer reduction, such additions are helpful. The latter case is applicable to English –into –Arabic translation where Arabic opts for expansion, especially in its literary usage

    Seguinot, criticizes Blum –Kulka`s  hypothesis, (1988:109) saying that first Kulka`s definition of explicitness is too narrow . For him, explicitness does not necessarily mean redundancy .Secondly most of Blum-Kulka`s evidence can be explained by differences in stylistics of both English and French , the two languages of her study.

Seguinot agrees with Vinay and Darbelnet (1977) that there are two reasons for the preferences of using shorter constructions in a given language .There are differences in structure where a certain language is allowed to express ideas more briefly .There are also psychological reasons that speakers of a certain language prefer to express themselves in a particular manner .

Seguinot (ibid :108) thinks that Blum-Kulka has mixed the normative with the observational in her study . Alternatively , he believes that explicitation in this sense "can only be defined relative to the kind and degree of 'explicitness' ,in a given language ". He believes that languages are inherently explicit or implicit as regards the information they offer and the way they offer it either through their formal properties or through their stylistic or rhetorical preferences .

Seguinot introduces a significant proof for what the present study attempts to prove and establish .It is in fact the nature of the language whether explicit or implicit that affects the process of translation as far as explicitness as a phenomenon is concerned .It is normal that within the same language there are certain categories ,which are more explicit or more implicit compared to their counterparts in another language . The term 'explicitation' in translation studies should be preserved to describe "additions" in a translated text which cannot be explained by structural , stylistic ,or rhetorical differences between the two languages "(ibid).

Seguinot (ibid)states three forms of explicitation : something expressed in the TL but not found in the SL , something implied though the presupposition in the ST and expressed overtly in the TL ,and an element in the ST which is given greater significance in the TT .

The explicitation hypothesis ,however , has been confirmed by a research carried out by Linn Vertis (1998) in English-Norwegian-English translation although "confirmation was stronger in translations from English in(to) Norwegian than in the opposite direction " (ibid:253) .

Weissbrod (1992:155,quoted in ibid :263)remarks that explicitation as well as implicitation occur as a result of an interaction between several factors ,the most important of which is the position of the two languages on the orality / literacy scale , in addition to the other two factors , i.e. the tendency to accompany translation by explicitation , and the translational norms adopted in a given culture at a given time . For him ,these norms may either encourage the tendency of explicitate,or, on the contrary , undermine such a tendency . This , in fact ,has made it possible to explain why explicitation in its intensity and manner varies greatly in translations produced in different literary systems at different times .

As for the aforementioned study , it has shown that the translators` desire to improve on the original may lead to explicitation . It has also indicated that the process of explicitation "reaches beyond contrastive differences " . Hence , the phenomenon of explicictation is a characteristic feature of the translation process , but less illuminating in the translation product (ibid :293). Theoreticians , therefore , are not in complete agreement on whether explicitation is an inherent feature of the translation process . While Blum –Kulka (1986) adopts this point of view , Weissbrod (1992 ,reported in Vertis , 1998 :293), refutes this claim and suggests that explicitation in translation be not only a universal tendency or a function of translation on the orality / literacy scale . Rather , it is "norm dependent and thus changes with historical circumstances and according to the position of translated literature "(ibid) . Seguinot

(1988:108) , on the other hand , believes that languages are inherently explicit or implicit as regards the information they introduce and the way they introduce such information .In conclusion , explicitation as a phenomenon , is a characteristic feature of translation , no matter whether it is inherent or norm dependent .Whether we explicitate or implicitate when we translate , this will affect the explicitness of the TT and , thus ,a criterion is created , against which the explicitness of the SL and that of the TL are evaluated .

4Analysis of the Texts

A careful examination of the Arabic and English texts reveals marked difference with regard to the use of referring expressions . Categorial similarity (e.g. Arabic proper noun rendered by English proper noun) will be considered the norm . Any deviations from this norm which emerge in the texts are important because they indicate certain characteristics of the text . The Arabic text will be taken as the basis for discussion and an illustrative example will be given at the beginning of each pattern .

4.1 Pronouns

Pronouns represent the implicit end of the scale of explicitness. Nine Patterns involving pronouns are attested in the corpus :

1) Pronoun : Into proper noun
2) Pronoun : Into definite article NP
3) Pronoun: Into demonstrative NP
4) Pronoun :Into Possessive pronoun NP
5) Pronoun: Into proper noun possessive
6) Pronoun Deletion
7) Pronoun Addition
8) Possessive Pronoun NP : Into Noun (Proper or Common).

All these patterns indicate greater explicitness in the English text. There are other patterns involving pronouns alone ,viz. Personal Pronoun: Demonstrative Pronoun: in definite Pronoun, Demonstrative Pronoun: Personal Pronoun. However ,as stated before ,these patterns are irrelevant to the present study, since it draws no distinctions in terms of explicitness among sub-types of pronouns.

4.1.1 Proper noun into Pronoun

This is one of the most common patterns in the corpus ; 162 instances are attested . The majority of these examples involve the use of an implied third person pronoun in the Arabic text corresponding to a proper noun in the English text (of . 3,1):

When he was twenty-three years old , Paul sent a landscape to the winter exhibition …(220)

في عامه الثالث والعشرين ,اشترك بإحدى لوحاته في معرض الشتاء ...(153)

The thought of William went through Mrs. Morel like a cold blade. (222)

أخترمتها ذكرى وليام كنصل بارد...(156)

Paul was furious .(p 298)

انتابه غضب جنوني ...(ج3\91)

Dawes wiped his golden moustache with his fingers (P.298)

والأخر يمسح شاربه الذهبي بأصابعه ...(ج3\91)

The opposite is also present as in:
Yes ,and it was worth it (221).

واللوحة تستحق ذلك وأكثر .(155)

They ,too, were work –gnarled now.(222).

فيدها ,كيدي زوجها ,لم تعرفا ألا خشونة العمل طوال حياتهما ....(157)

`Bt who was she ?Do you know her ?

من كانت المرأة ؟هل تعرفها ؟(ج3\90) ولكن

Rendering a proper noun by a pronoun means a shift towards implicit reference .28instances of this shift are attested in the corpus ,which makes the Arabic text more explicit .

4.1.2 Pronoun: Definite article NP

This is represented by:

`But who was she ? Do you know here?`(p.298)

ولكن من كانت المرأة ؟هل تعرفها ؟(ج3\90)

Yes and it was worth it (221).

واللوحة تستحق ذلك وأكثر .(155)

This is a common pattern ,where 151 instances of English personal pronoun are equated with Arabic definite article expressions in the Arabic text . Most of the Arabic expressions comprise general words like الرجل (the man), المرأة(the woman),الشاب (the young man).It seems that the Arabic writer uses these super ordinate items as an intermediate stage before making use of a pronoun .

4,1,3,pronon :possessive NP

They ,too, work-gnarled now .(222)

فيدها ,كيدي زوجها,لم تعرفا ألا خشونة العمل طوال حياتهما ....(157)

31 instances are attested , all of which involve personal pronouns . This pattern gives you the Arabic text greater explicitness

4.1.4 pronoun: Demonstrative NP

Yet she felt it would go wrong (188)

لكنها أحست <u>إن تلك حال</u> لن تدوم .(ج\1:104)

This pattern represents the two ends of the scale explicit-implicit . It is a minor pattern ,which is realized by 5 instances ;3 of the pronouns are demonstrative and 2 personal.

4.1.5 Pronoun: Proper Noun Possessive

This pattern is rare; it is realized by this 1 instances only ,where a suffixed third person pronoun in Arabic corresponds to a proper noun possessive in the English text .

4.1.6 Pronoun deletion

Paul was his own frank self (188)
كان بول على سجيته <u>معها</u> .(ج\1:104)

)He was afraid of her . (220
ازداد خوفه<u></u> وهو يرى تلك المرأة دقيقة الحجم ......(ج\1:153)

4.1.7 Pronoun Addition
As in:
He was glad to have <u>brought</u> such a lucky letter (220) .
أسعده إن يكون قد <u>جاءهم</u> بذلك الخطاب الذي يحمل أخبارا سارة

I gave him his dinner " replied Mrs. Bower (p.30)
<u>فأجابتها</u> مسز باور :"لقد أعطيته عشاءه (ج\1\46)

4.1.8 Possessive Pronoun NP into Noun (Proper or Common)

<u>His wife</u> pretended not to see him …(p.221)
تظاهرت <u>مسز مورل</u> بأنها لم تلحظه ....(ج\2\155)

5. Explicitness in English –Arabic Translation in Practice
5.1 Comparison of the two texts

In this section the Arabic and the English texts will be compared in terms of explicitness . The referring expressions used in the two texts will be examined and the patterns paired , each with its mirror image . The patterns will be arranged from the most to the least explicit , and the number of instances attested for each pattern will point to the trend in the direction of explicitness for the pattern . The following examples are cited to explicate English –Arabic translation:
A. Pronoun Addition
This is the most common pattern this direction of translation .Arabic prefers the extensive use of pronouns while English prefers to use them less:
He was glad to have brought such a lucky letter(220).
أسعده أن يكون قد <u>جاءهم</u> بذلك الخطاب الذي يحمل إخبارا سارة (ج\2\153)

I gave him his dinner "replied   Mrs. Bower (p. 30) .

فإجابتها مسز باور :"لقد أعطيته عشاءه (ج\1\46)

B. Pronoun Deletion

This pattern is reduced to its minimum due to the fact that Arabic prefers the extensive use of pronouns as mentioned in the previous pattern. However , there are some other examples which can be arranged under other patterns :

Paul was his own frank self   (188)

كان بول على سجيته معها .(ج\1:104)

He was afraid of her .(220)

ازداد خوفه وهو يرى المرأة دقيقة الحجم ....(ج\1:153)

Since the use of pronouns represents the least type of explicitness, substituting the pronouns by the other forms means the increase of explicitness .Hence, the TL , i.e. Arabic ,is more explicit than the SL, i.e. English.

C. pronoun into Definite Article NP

This pattern is one of the most dominant   pattern in our data . This shows the increasing explicitness in Arabic:

`Bt who was she? Do you know her?`(P.298)

ولكن من كانت المرأة ؟هل تعرفها ؟(ج\3\90)

Yes and it was worth it(221).

واللوحة تستحق ذلك وأكثر .(155)

Certainty ,The TL ,i.e. Arabic ,is more explicit due to the fact that pronouns are the least explicit type of expressions.

D. Pronoun into Demonstrative (NP)

This pattern ,also, shows that Arabic is more explicit than English :

Yet she felt it would go wrong .(188)

لكنها أحست إن تلك حال لن تدوم .(ج\1:104)

Bibliography

Abdul-Hadi, A. (1990)Analysis of shifts in Translation. Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis .Al-Mustansiriyah University.

Aitchison , J.(1987) Linguistics . Suffollk: Hodder and Stoughtton .

Aziz, y .(1993)Explicit and Implicit reference in Arabic – English Translation .In Babel .Vol .39 ,No.3,pp.129 -50 .

Aziz ,Y.(1998)Topics in translation :With Special Reference to English and Arabic. Libya :The University of Garyounis.

Beaugrande de and W.U.Dressler (1091)Introduction to Text Linguistics .London :Longman .

Blum-kulka,S.(1986)Shifts in Cohesion and Coherence in Translation . In J. House and S.Blum-kulka (eds.)

Crystal ,D(1983)A First Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics . Worcester :Andre Deutsch.

Fillmore,C.J.(1968)The Case for Case .In Bach ,E .Halms ,R (eds .) Universals in Linguistics Theory, New York :Holt ,Rinehart &Winston ,pp.1-90. Gleason ,H.A(1965).Linguistics and English Grammar .New York: Holt, Rinehart &Winston Inc.

Grice ,H.P (1975)Logic and Conversation .In L . Cole and J .L. Morgan (eds) Syntax and Semantics ,3 Speech Acts ,New York : Academic Press . Pp . 41-58 .

Halliday ,M.A.K and Hasan ,R .(1976)Cohesion in English . London :Longman .

Hartman ,R.R.K .and Stork ,F.C. (1972). Dictionary of Language and Linguistics. London :Applied Science Publishers .

Hatam, B. (1997)Communication Across Cultures .Exeter :University of Exeter Press.

Leech ,G .(1983)Principles of Pragmatics . London :Longman

Leech ,G. Deuchar and R. Hoogenraad (1982) English Grammar ror Today. Hamphsire: Macmillan Publishers LTD .

Nida ,E. (1964)Towards a science of Translation .New York :Prentice Hall

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

Sgeuinot ,C.(1988) Pragmatics and the Explicitation Hypothesis .In Acts of the first congress of the Canadian Association of Translation Studies. Quebec :University of Quebec .Pp.106-13 . Sperber ,D. and D. Wilson (1986)Relevance :Communication and Cognition Oxford :Basil Blackwell.

Vertis ,L (1998)In Search of the third Code :An Investigation of norms In Literary Translation In Meta XLII No .4 pp.243-311 .