THE TRANSLATION OF ENGLISH COREFERENTIAL   PRO-FORMS IN HEMINGWAY'S "THE SUN ALSO RISES" INTO ARABIC

Dr. Jaasim M. Hassan[*]
Vian Mikhail Poulis[*]

Abstract

English coreferential pro-forms are one of the most problematic areas facing translators, since they contribute effectively to the type of texture in the text. The main aims of this paper are:(1) to shed light on the areas of failure and success in the translation of coreferential pro-forms of two professional translators of Hemingway's 'The Sun Also Rises',(2) to investigate the syntactic and semantic shifts found in these translations,(3) to propose an appropriate rendering whenever the syntactic structure of these coreferential pro-forms do not coincide with its semantic function.

The study hypothesizes that coreferential pro-forms pose a serious problem for translators of literary text. It is also hypothesized that ambiguity may arise when the translator does not recognize the nature of the relation between the pro-form and its antecedent in the text.

The study concludes that the lack of awareness, on the part of translators, of the functions of coreferential pro-forms in English and Arabic results in failure to recognize the relation between a pro-form and its antecedent. Consequently, this affects the cohesion and coherence of the translated text.

The Problem:

Coreferential Pro-forms as cohesive devices require an adequate knowledge on the part of the role they play in both the texture of the text and the message it carries. However,

---

Assistant Professor.[*]
Assistant Lecturer.[*]

unawareness of the role of coreferential pro-forms in the source text and the target text affects negatively the faithfulness of the translating process and consequently sacrifice communication.

Aims of the Study:

 The paper aims at the following:

1. Investigating the syntactic and semantic shifts which have occurred as a result of the two different translations of the SL text.

2. Pointing out the areas of failure and success in the translation of coreferential pro-forms by two professional translators.

3. Proposing appropriate renderings whenever both translations do not coincide with the semantic function of the given pro-forms.

Hypotheses:

In the present study, it is hypothesized that:

1. Coreferential pro-forms pose serious problems for translators of literary texts.

2. When coreferential pro-forms are translated without recognizing the relation between them and their antecedents in the text, the result is either redundancy or awkwardness in style.

Scope of the Study:

The present Study is confined to a literary written English text(Hemingway's 'The Sun Also Rises') and structural types of coreferential pro-forms according to the way they are tackled by Quirk et al.(1985). Out of(154) coreferential pro-forms, only(18) have been chosen as units of analysis.

Procedure and Data Collection:

The procedure that has been followed in this paper is as follows:

1. Presenting a description of the different types of coreferential pro-forms on the basis of the literature available in books in English and Arabic grammar.

2. Choosing eighteen English coreferential pro-forms in Hemingway's 'The Sun Also Rises' and their Arabic translations by Haqqi(Undated) and Juzeini(1967).

3. Adopting communicative translation whenever the semantic function of the coreferential pro-form differs from its syntactic structure in order to achieve an adequate translation as much as possible and convey the same contextual meaning of the SL text.

What is a pro-form:

A pro-form is defined as "one of the reduction processes by which the structure of a sentence is abbreviated to avoid redundancy of expression(Quirk et al. 1985: 858). They add that there are two kinds of pro-forms taking part in the process of cohesion: coreferential pro-forms and substitute pro-forms(Ibid: 863).this paper is focused on coreferential proforms. Crystal(1990: 172; 1994: 280) affirms that the relation between the pro-form and its antecedent could be either coreference or substitution. Coreference is defined as "features that cannot be semantically interpreted without referring to some other features in the text". Substitution; however, is "one feature that replaces a previous expression".

Pro-forms as Cohesive Devices:

Cohesion is defined "as the set of possibilities that exist in the language for making text hang together: the potential that the speaker or writer has at his disposal."(Halliday and Hasan 1976:18). Quirk et al.(1985: 861-862) point out that cohesion is characterized by two devices: pro-forms and ellipsis. As regards pro-forms, two cohesive devices are recognized: coreference and substitution. To achieve the process of cohesion, the full form of coreference and substitution should be recoverable from the context. Halliday and Hasan(1976:14-19) identify several devices that are used as cohesive devices of which the function is to tie a text together. The cohesive devices fall into five types: reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction and lexical cohesion.

Concerning 'reference', they(ibid.) establish a separation between two different cases: 'exophora' and 'endophora', with

the former being referred to as situational, and the latter as textual. That is, where the interpretation of references lies outside the text, the relationship is said to be exophoric relationship which plays no part in textual cohesion as in(1). However, when their interpretation lies with the text, it is called endophoric relationship which forms cohesive ties within the text as in(2):

(1) For *he's* a jolly good fellow And so say all of us.

(2) Wash and core *six cooking apples*. Put *them* into a fireproof dish.

Endophora is of two types: anaphoric reference(referring to the preceding elements) and cataphoric reference(referring to the following text).

Coreferential Pro-forms in Quirk et al.'s View:

Quirk et al.(1985: 865) classify pro-forms used for coreference into the following:

a. Personal pronouns such as: *he*, *she*, *it*, *they*, *her*, *them*.

b. Reflexive pronouns such as: *myself*, *himself*, *themselves*.

c. Possessive pronouns such as: *my*, *his*, *her*, *mine*, *hers*, *theirs*.

d. Demonstrative pronouns such as: *this*, *that*, *these*, *those*.

e. Definite adverbs of time *then*, and of place *here*, *there*.

f. The definite pronoun and predeterminer *such*.

Types of coreferential Pro-forms:

Coreferential pro-forms will simply be classified according to their types into the following categories:

Pro-Nominals:

The term 'nominal' here means 'noun-like', or 'like a noun phrase'. Accordingly, the best case of a pro-form which refers to or substitutes for a noun or a noun phrase is a pronoun. Semantically speaking, the pronoun functions like a pro-form; but syntactically, it functions as a noun phrase rather than a noun. Morphologically speaking, some pronouns, such as personal, possessive and reflexive pronouns, have distinctions of person(1st, 2nd, and 3rd), gender(masculine, feminine and non-personal), number(singular and plural), and

case(subjective, objective)(Quirk et al.,1985: 335). To clarify, pronominals are classified into the following categories:

Personal Pronouns:

Personal pronouns in English are the following: *I* / *we* / *you* / *he*, *she*, *it* / *they*. English grammarians such as Quirk and Greenbaum,(1973: 102), and Quirk et al.(1985: 346) classify these pronouns according to their distinctions of persons as the following:

1. First person refers to the speaker *I*, or to the speaker and one or more others *we*.
2. Second person refers to the person(s) addressed *you*.
3. Third person refers to one or more other persons or things *he* / *she* / *it* / *they*.

Most personal pronouns have distinction of case, whether they are in subjective case or objective case *I* / *me*, *we* / *us*, *he* / *him*, *she* / *her*, *they* / *them*. However *you* and *it* are exceptional in showing no such distinction.(Quirk et al. 1972: 208).

It is worth noting that the first and second pronouns, "are never pro-forms for noun phrases; they do not substitute for other items but merely replace themselves; while the plural of these pronouns sometimes have as their antecedent a noun phrase and therefore can be considered in such cases as pro-forms".(Ibid: 679)

Fries(1940: 240) claims that the third person pronoun ***it*** is used as a substitute for neuter nouns. Quirk et al.(1985: 348) add that this pronoun is used not only to refer to inanimate objects but also to non-count substances, singular abstraction and even to a singular collection of people. The following are representative sentences:

(3) She made *some soup* and gave *it* to the children.
(4) *The sack of Rome* shook the whole of the Western World: in a sense, *it* was the end of the Roman Empire.
(5) *Parliament's* answer to all awkward problems is to establish a Royal Commission whose finding *it* can then ignore.

Thomas and Kintgen(1974: 232) state that the noun phrase can be replaced by the third personal pronoun when it is

coreferential with its antecedent. Sachs et al.(1960: 91) add that, in such cases, the pronoun should agree with its antecedents in person, number and gender. Consider(6) and(7) below:

(6) *Elizabeth* has cut *her* finger.(Elizabeth's finger)

(7) *John and Mary* stole a toy from my son. *Their* mother told *them* to return the toy, but *they* said *it* was *theirs*.

(Leech and Svartvik, 1975: 163).

Quirk et al.(1985: 347) point out that the identity of the refrents of the third person pronouns can be supplied by the linguistic context. They(Ibid) affirm that one can distinguish between anaphoric and cataphoric uses of these pronouns, according to whether the elements with which they corefer(the antecedent) precede or follow them, as shown in the following sentences:

(8) a. Before *he* joined the Navy, *Gerald* made peace with his family.

b. Before *Gerald* joined the Navy, *he* made peace with his family.

Reflexive Pronouns:

A pronoun object that is coreferential with the subject of the clause in which it occurs must be reflexive. Reflexive pronouns are easy to identify because they end with suffixes –*self* used with singular forms and –*selves* used with plural forms. These suffixes are added to the determinative possessive forms for the first and second person *myself*, *ourselves*, *yourself*, *yourselves*, and to the objective form for the 3rd person *himself*, *herself*, *itself*, *themselves*, in addition to the indefinite generic reflexive *oneself*(Ibid: 355).

Quirk et al.(Ibid: 56) add that these pronouns are used when they can reflect or refer back to another nominal element preceding them in the clause. They should agree with these nominal elements(i.e. their antecedents) in person, number and gender.(Keyser and Postal, 1976: 55), e.g.:(9) *She* saw *herself*   in the mirror.

*himself

Jackson(1985: 23)states that reflexives have two distinct uses: 'reflexive use', and 'emphatic use'. In the latter use, Keyser and Postal(1976: 63) remark that they are merely 'intensive pronouns' and have nothing to do with coreferences.

Concerning the reflexive use(i.e. basic use), Quirk et al.(1985: 356) mention that the reflexive pronoun functions as object or complement and has the subject of its clause as its antecedent. In such cases, this kind of pronoun is obligatory. The following sentences are representatives:

(10) They helped themselves.

(11) He is not himself today.

As illustrated in the above examples, "themselves" functions as a direct object for the antecedent "They" in(10); whereas "himself" functions as a subject complement for "he" in(11).

Possessive Pronouns:

Possessive pronouns combine genitive function with nominal function. In the latter respect, the coreferential item they replace may be in the same clause. Quirk et al.(1972: 213) state that there are two kinds of possessives: the first one is attributive such as *my*, *your*, *our*, *his*, *her*, *its*, *their* which are used before a noun as modifiers and thus they have a determinative function as in:

(12) Bretty lives with her uncle.

The second is predicative such as *mine*, *your*, *his*, *hers*, *its*, *theirs* which have an independent function as a noun phrase.

Quirk et al(1985: 362) add that these pronouns have a quasi-elliptical role, replacing a noun phrase with a determinative possessive, as shown in the following example:

(13) If you need a bicycle, *I*'ll lend you   *mine*.(*my bicycle)*

Hodges et al.(1994: 71) affirm that these pronouns should agree with their antecedent in person, number and gender, as shown in the following examples:

(14) John represents his clients.

(15) The members of the class gave their ideas.

Demonstrative Pronouns:

The demonstrative pronouns *this*, *that*, *these*, and *those* are marked for number(singular and plural) and for proximity(near and distant).(Jackson, 1980: 23).

These pronouns appear without following a noun and they are identical in form with the demonstrative determiners *this / these*, *that / those*.(Klammer, 1977: 73), e.g.:

Jackson(1980: 64) points out that they substitute for nouns and imply a gesture of pointing, either to something in the situational context, or to some previous or following units in language. In other words, Roberts(1964: 383) states that in conversation, the reference of demonstrative pronoun is something pointed at or otherwise indicated. In writing, it may be to a preceding noun phrase(i.e. the antecedent), e.g.:

(16) Harold has *a nice voice*, but *that* wasn't what made him popular.

In(16), "that" has anaphoric reference to the antecedent 'a nice voice". Moreover, the demonstrative pronoun can replace a noun phrase with a human referent only in intensive clauses with a nominal complement, as shown in the following example:

(**17**) **Will you try and help me find *Peter Williams*? *That*'s the man I was telling about.**

'Such' as a Coreferential Pro-form:

The predeterminer and pronoun *such* can be used as a coreferential pro-form for a noun or a noun phrase. Chalker(1984: 71-72) points out that the pronoun *such* can refer anaphorically to the noun phrase preceding it, as in:

(18) He's *a keen stamp collector*, and as *such* he's always pestering me for stamps.

Quirk et al.(1985: 376) argue that *such* as a pro-form is similar to the demonstratives in that It can have anaphoric reference both as a pronoun and as a predeterminer, and also It can occur after indefinite determiners such as, *all, few* and *many* in a rather rare and restricted use

Pro-Adverbials:

Pro-adverbials such as *there, here, then, etc.* are pro-forms that substitute for adverbs or other expressions having an

adverbial function. Liles(1971: 87) points out that *there* can act as a pro-form for an adverbial of place; *then* for an adverbial of time. Halliday and Hasan(1976: 57-58) hold the same view and state that the(adverbial) demonstratives *there*, *then*, and *here* refer to the location of a process in space or time, and they function as adjuncts in the clause, not as elements within the nominal group, e.g.:

(19) We were sitting *in the balcony*, and they were sitting *there*, too.

(20) He saw Tom *yesterday*, and we saw Fred *then,* too.(Liles, 1971: 87).

Quirk et al.(1985: 866-867) in their attempt to analyse pro-adverbs, draw a distinction between *coreference* and *substitution*. According to their analysis, there are two kinds of pro-adverbs: *coreferential pro-adverbs* and *substitute pro-adverbs*.

As regards the first kind, they(Ibid) argue that *there, then* and *here* are coreferential pro-adverbs since they contain definiteness as part of their meaning and can easily be paraphrased by means of noun phrases. Besides, they may lead themselves to situational as well as anaphoric and cataphoric interpretation. Let us consider the following sentences:

(21) *One morning* the captain invited us to the bridge. He told us *then* about his secret orders.

(22) Between London and Oxford there is *a famous inn called the George and Dragon. Here* we stopped for lunch.

(23) If you look *in the top drawer*, you'll probably find it *there*.

Also, the pronoun *it* and the demonstrative *that* which can be paraphrased by *that place*, as pointed out by Quirk et al.(1972: 683), are sometimes used as pro-adverbials when they function as subject and the verb is intensive, e.g.:

(24) They concentrated *in the front of the mountain. It* was where the protection was greatest.

(25) I noticed *where he put it. That* seemed a good place**.**

Pro-Nominals in Arabic:

In Arabic, pronouns are substitutes for overt entity terms, and their use is strongly conditioned by the ability of the hearer/reader to identify the overt entity term to which they refer(Beeston, 1970: 39).

Personal Pronouns:

In Arabic, personal pronouns have distinction of persons(1ˢᵗ, 2ⁿᵈ, 3ʳᵈ), gender(masculine, feminine) and number(singular, dual, and plural). In addition, most personal pronouns have distinctions of case(Hasan, 1975, vol.1: 318-319).

These pronouns are classified into implicit المستترة and explicit الظاهرة. The implicit pronouns are realized on the surface structure, but their meanings and referents can be recovered from the morphological form of the verb and from the context(Ibid;Ibn'aqeel,1965,Vol.1:95-97).

Implicit pronouns, as pointed out by Aziz(1989: 138) are mainly used with the imperfect form of the verb which has a prefix referring to the gender, as well as with the perfect verb, especially with the third person singular. The identity of the referents of the implicit pronoun can be supplied by the linguistic context. To illustrate, Aziz(1998: 93) offers the following example:

(26)   ثم جاء الرسول مسرعا وهو يحمل رسالة من الأمير، وطلب أن يقابل قائد الجيش

(Then the messenger came quickly carrying a letter from the prince. He asked to meet the commander of the army).

In(26), the implied person masculine pronoun(هـو) indicated by the verb "طلب" refers to the subject "الرسول".

Concerning explicit pronouns, Ibn 'aqeel(1965, Vol.1: 97), Hasan(1975, Vol.1: 220-224) agree on that these pronouns are realized on the surface structure and that they fall into two categories: ضمائر منفصلة(*independent pronouns*) and متصلة(*suffixed pronouns*). The former have either subjective case as هو، هي، هما، أنتما، هم، هن،، etc, or objective case as إياه إياها، إياهما، إياكن، إياهم،(etc.).

Hasan(Ibid: 255) observes that the first and the second pronouns can be explained from the extralinguistic situation, since they replace themselves; while the interpretation of the third person pronoun requires referring it to a preceding noun or noun phrase. This pronoun is called by Arab grammarians as الضمير العائد(the resumptive pronoun) which should agree with its antecedent in person, gender and number(Ibid: 259, 263; Cantarino, 1975, Vol.3: 147), e.g.:

(27) فوصل إبراهيم وأخوه إلى ضفاف نهر دجلة بعد رحلة طويلة فعبر هو النهر وغرق أخوه

(Ibrahim and his brother arrived at the bank of the Tigris after a long journey. He crossed the river, his brother drowned).(Aziz, 1998: 93-94).

(28) إن تكلم الشيخ عباس بين أولئك الفلاحين أحنوا رؤوسهم إيجابا

(If Sheikh Abbas spoke to the villagers, they bent their heads in assent). (Cantarino, 1975, Vol.3: 314)

In(27), the independent third personal masculine pronoun "هو"refers back to the noun "إبراهيم"; while the suffixed plural masculine pronoun "وا" refers to the plural noun phrase "الفلاحين" in(28). These pronouns have cohesive relation with their antecedent.

Reflexive Pronouns:

Bishai(1971: 84) states that نفس (*self*) can function both as reflexive and intensive stem to which suffixed pronouns are joined and can be used with transitive verbs which take the object in the accusative, as in:

(29) رأت البنت نفسها في المرآة

(The girl saw herself in the mirror)

And also with those verbs which take a prepositional phrase as an object, as shown in the following sentence:

(30) الثورة استمرت في طريقها واثقة بنفسها

(The revolution followed its course, confident in itself).

As regards the latter function, both نفس and عين are used to express intensive use, and they form one division of that class of التوكيد(corroboration), which the grammarians

name التوكيد المعنوي(the corroboration in meaning),(Ibn ʼaqeel, 1965, Vol.2: 206-207).

Possessive Pronouns:

Possessive pronouns are suffixes attached to the nouns they modify as ي، نا، كَ، ك، كُما،كُم،كنَّ، ـه، ها، هُما، هـم، هنَّ. These pronouns are basically determiners.(Aziz, 1989: 143), e.g.:

(31) سمعت مريمِ هذه الكلمات فاهتزت قامتِها

(When <u>Mary</u> heard these words, <u>her</u> body trembled)

(Cantarino, 1975, Vol.3: 30)

Aziz(1998: 100) adds that Arabic has no equivalents to the pronominal possessive pronouns mine, yours, hers, theirs, his, its. Instead the head noun is repeated, as in:

(32) هذا كتابي 0 أين كتابك؟

(This is my book. Where is yours?).(Ibid, 1989: 143)

Demonstrative Pronouns:

Demonstrative pronouns are divided into two categories: near and distant.(Ibid,1998: 91) points out that these pronouns are arranged not only on the basis of number and distance, as in the case of English, but also according to gender and grammatical case. These pronouns are used exphorically and endophorically. In the former use, they refer to someone in the outside world, as in:

(33) نظرت إلى هذا

(I looked at this). (Bishai, 1971: 89)

While in the latter use, they have anaphoric and cataphoric reference,.g.:(34): أعطاني خالد كتابا عن المسرح ولكن هذا لا يعجبني

(Khalid gave me <u>a book on drama</u>, but <u>this</u> does not interest me).(Bedir,1979:218).

As shown in(34),the near demonstrative pronoun"هذا"has anaphoric reference with the noun phrase "كتابا عن المسرح".

Moreover, the plural distant demonstrative pronoun أولئك is sometimes used in Arabic as an equivalent to the pronominal *such*, e.g.:

إن الذين قالوا ربنا الله ثم استقاموا فلا خوف عليهم ولا هم يحزنون، <u>أولئك</u> أصحاب الجنة خالدين (35) فبها جزاء بما كانوا يعملون.(سورة الأحقاف/12،13)

(Lo! Those who say: Our Lord is Allah, and thereafter walk a right, there shall no fear come upon them neither shall they grieve. <u>Such</u> are rightful owners of the Garden, immortal there in, as a reward for what they used to do).

(Pickthall, 1971)

Pro-Adverbials in Arabic:

There are certain adverbs of place and time such as هنا, هناك/هنالك, and حينذاك which can function both as deixes and pro-forms.

The meaning of these adverbs is related in one way or another to the demonstratives which can be interpreted in terms of proximity to the speaker(Hasan, 1975, Vol.1: 328).

The demonstrative adverb هنا means في هذا المكان(*at this place*), هناك means في ذلك المكان(*at that place*) and حينذاك means في ذلك الوقت(*at that time*). These adverbs have anaphoric reference to the preceding adverbs of place and time. Therefore, they are textually cohesive.(Ibid: 246-247), e.g.:

(36) ترك علي المدرسة <u>عندما مات والداه</u> وكان هو <u>حينذاك</u> في السابعة من عمره0

(Ali left the school <u>when his father died</u> and he was <u>then</u> seven years old).

(37) عندنا حفلة <u>في البيت</u> هذه الليلة وسيأتي <u>هنا</u> جميع الأصدقاء0

(We have a party <u>at home</u> tonight and all my friends will come <u>here</u>).

(38) ثم زحف نابليون الى <u>عكا</u> و أستأنف الحرب <u>هناك</u>0

(Then Napoleon crept forward to Acre and resumed the war there).

(Ziadeh and Winder, 1957: 60)

Text analysis:

Regarding the distribution of the data, eighteen English coreferetial pro-forms(i.e. pro-nominals, pro-adverbs) in Hemingway's 'The Sun Also Rises' and their Arabic translations by Haqqi(Undated) and Juzeini(1967) will be analyzed.

A. Pro-Nominals:

The SL Text:

  1. There's a fight to-night,' Bill said….

'<u>Fight</u>,' said Mike. 'Who's fighting?'

'<u>Leodoux</u> and somebody.'

'<u>He</u>'s very good, Leodoux.' Mike said 'I'd like to see <u>it</u>'. p.92

The TL Text:

1. Haqqi:

وقال "بيل" :
...- يوجد حفلة ملاكمة، هذا المساء
وقال"مايك" :
- ملاكمة<u>!</u> من الذي سيلاكم؟
- "<u>لودو</u>" وشخص آخر
وقال "مايك" :
p.104- ان "لودو" ملاكم جيد. كم أود أن أشاهد<u>ه</u>.

2. Juzeini:

...هناك حفلة مصارعة الليلة
- <u>ملاكمة</u>؟ سأل مايك0 ومن هم المتبارين؟
- <u>لودوكس</u> ضد شخص ما
p. 90   - انه<u>ِ</u> جيد لودوكس هذا، قال مايك0 أحب أن أشاهد <u>ذلك</u>.

Discussion:

Though the first translator has not rendered the personal pronoun "He" into an equivalent one in the TL, he has succeeded in conveying the exact contextual meaning of that in the original text. The second translator has translated the pronominal stated above into its equivalent in the TL, and conveyed the same sense of emphasis as that existing in the SL text.

Concerning the neutral pronoun "it", both translators have misunderstood the antecedent for which this pronoun stands. The first translator has rendered it into the inappropriate suffixed pronoun "ه" referring to the noun "لودو" , whereas the second translator has translated it into "ذلك". As readers, we don't know whether "ذلك" refers to "ملاكمة" or "لودو" or both of them.

Proposed Translation:

أن لودو ملاكم جيد، كم أحب أن أشاهد هذه الملاكمة

The SL Text:

2. The steer was down now, his neck stretched out, his head twisted…p.162

The TL Text:

1. Haqqi:

وانطرحت البقرة على الأرض وعنقها ممدود ورأسها متشنج... p. 182

2. Juzeini:

كان العجل مرميا على الأرض ممدود العنق مكسر الرأس... p. 159

Discussion:

The first translator has misunderstood the gender of the antecedent "the steer" and translated it into the feminine "البقرة" and not the masculine "العجل". This inappropriate rendering has affected the gender of the possessive determiner "his" that should agree with the gender of the antecedent in the TL text also. The second translator has provided a convincing rendering of the antecedent in question; but he has neglected the possessive determiners. Instead he has rendered them into two noun phrases "ممدود العنق" and "مكسر الرأس". As regards the latter, the second translator has failed in conveying the exact contextual meaning of that in the SL text.

Proposed Translation:

أصبح العجل مطروحا على الأرض وعنقه ممدودة ورأسه ملتوٍ....

The SL Text:

3. 'I never liked children much, but I don't want to think I'll never have them'. p.57.

The TL Text:

1.   Haqqi:

'أنني لم أحب الأطفال مطلقا، ولكنني لم أشأ أن أفكر في أنني لن أنجب أطفالا قطْ'... p.64

2. Juzeini:

...'ليس لأنني أحب الأطفال كثيرا، بل لا أريد أن أفكر بأنه لن يكون لدي بعضهمْ' p.56

Discussion:

Despite the fact that there is an equivalent pronoun in Arabic for the third personal plural pronoun *them*, namely the suffixed pronoun 'هم', the first translator has repeated the head noun of the antecedent "أطفالا" in order to make it more explicit to the TL reader. Doing so, he has offered an appropriate rendering since he has conveyed the same contextual meaning of that in the SL text. Nevertheless, there is a shift in cohesion level from coreference to lexical device which is not within the scope of the present study.

The second translator has translated the pronominal in question inappropriately into "بعضهم" which goes far from the exact contextual meaning of that in the original text.

The SL Text:

4. Several people asked questions to hear themselves talk… p.45.

The TL Text:

1. Haqqi:

…وأخذ نفر من الحاضرين يلقون أسئلة لسماع أصواتهم وهم يتحدثون ليس غير p. 49

2. Juzeini:

p. 44…كثيرون منا كانوا يسألون لمجرد انهم يتكلمون

Discussion:

The first translator has rendered the reflexive pronoun "themselves" into "أصواتهم" to refer to the antecedent "نفر من الحاضرين"via the suffixed pronoun "هم". The word "أصوات" does not exist in the SL text, but the translator has used it because it is nearer to the Arabic style than انفسهم.

The second translator has rendered the pronominal stated above into "هم" attached to the particle "ان" which denotes emphasis. This is followed by the clause "يتكلمون" in order to convey the appropriate contextual meaning. However, this translator has provided unconvincing rendering to the antecedent under discussion.

Proposed Translation:

وسأل العديد من الناس أسئلة لمجرد الكلام...

The SL Text:

5. 'No; listen <u>Jake</u>. If <u>I</u> handled both <u>our</u> expenses, would you go to South America with me?' p.16.

The TL Text:
1. Haqqi:
كلا. أصغ يا <u>جاك</u>. إن تحملت عن<u>ك</u> نفقات السفر كلها فهل تصحبني إلى أمريكا الجنوبية؟ p.15
2. Juzeini:
لا. أصغي الي يا <u>جاك</u>. لو أنني أخذت كل تكاليف الرحلة إلى أمريكا على عاتقي ودفعتها من حسابي الخاص فهل ترافقني؟   p.13

Discussion:

Both translators have provided different renderings to the possessive pronoun "our", though there is an equivalent possessive pronoun in Arabic, viz."نا".

The first translator has translated it into the second singular pronoun "ك" attached to the particle "عن". The second translator has neglected it formally, whereas the particle "كل" may convey the meaning of the pronoun "our" but implicitly. However, both of these translations are communicative since they have transferred the same contextual meaning of that in the SL text.

Stylewise, the second translation probably is more appropriate since it is less formal, though the word "امريكا" may confuse the reader because it is "South America" in the SL text.

The SL Text:
6. The wagon and the mules were covered with dust. Close behind was another string of mules and another <u>waggon</u>. <u>This</u> was loaded with lumber. p. 122-123.

The TL Text:
1. Haqqi:
كانت العربة والبغال مكسوة بالغبار... وكانت ثمة بغال أخرى و<u>عربة</u> ثانية تدرج وراءها مباشرة، وكانت <u>هذه العربة</u> محملة بالأخشاب. P.137-138.
2. Juzeini:
كانت البغال والعربة بيضاء لكثرة ما علق بها من الغبار، بغال و<u>عربات أخرى</u> كانت تسير وراءها محملة بالأخشاب. p.118

 Discussion:

Though the first translator has shifted the cohesive relation from coreference to lexical device by repeating the head noun of the antecedent "العربــة" after the pronominal demonstrative "هذه"; yet he has provided an appropriate rendering for the pronominal in question since he has managed to convey the same contextual meaning of that in the SL text; while the second translator has misunderstood the relationship between the pronominal and its antecedent and translated it inappropriately into "عربات أخرى" which is far from the exact contextual meaning of that in the original text.

The SL Text:
7. 'Well, what will you drink?' I asked
'<u>Pernod</u>.'
'<u>That</u>'s not good for little girls.' p.20

TheTL Text:
1. Haqqi:

ـ حسنا، وماذا تشربين؟
ـ كأس(<u>برنود</u>)0
ـ ليس بجيد للفتيات الصغيرات. p. 20

2. Juzeini:

ـ ماذا تأخذين؟ قلت
- <u>برنود</u>
ـ إن<u>ـه</u> لا يصلح للفتيات الصغيرات.p.18

Discussion:

Both translators have provided different renderings to the demonstrative pronoun "that". The first translator has used another type of reduction and cohesion, namely ellipsis which is not within the scope of the present study, while the second translator has rendered the demonstrative in question into another kind of pronominals viz., the personal pronoun "ـه" attached to the particle "إن" in order to convey the same sense of emphasis to the TL reader. Thus the second translation is more appropriate since the translator has maintained the same sense of coreferentiality as that in the SL text.

The SL Text:
8. 'Who are your friends' Georgett asked
'<u>Writers and artists</u>'

'There are a lot of <u>those</u> on this side of the river'.   p.23

The TL Text:

1. Haqqi:

من هم اصدقائك هؤلاء؟

- أنهم <u>كتاب وفنانون</u>.

- أن<u>هم</u> كثيرون، على هذا الجانب من النهر. p.24

2. Juzeini:

من أي خليط أصدقاؤك، قالت جورجيت

- خليط من <u>الكتاب والفنيين</u>

- هناك الكثير من<u>هم</u> في هذا البلد.   p.22

Discussion:

In spite of the existence of an equivalent demonstrative pronoun to "those" in Arabic, viz أولئك, both translators have shifted it into another kind of pronominals namely, the personal pronoun "هم". The difference in this case is purely stylistic. However, the first translator has provided an appropriate rendering, since he has conveyed the same contextual meaning of that in the SL text into the TL text. The second translator has offered an appropriate rendering of the pronominal in question; but he has rendered the noun "artists", exists under antecedent in the table, into "الفنيين" which goes far from the exact meaning of that in the SL text. Naturally, its equivalent in Arabic is "فنانين" and not "فنيين".

The SL Text:

9. 'Is <u>this</u> all we've got?'

   "Only <u>the two bottles</u>."   P.142

 TL Text:

1. Haqqi:

- <u>أهذا</u> كل ما لدينا

- <u>زجاجتان</u>.p.160

2. Juzeini:

- <u>هذا</u> كل ما عندنا؟

- <u>زجاجتين</u> فقط. p.139

Discussion:

Both translators have succeeded in rendering the demonstrative "this" into an equivalent one in the TL text. They have transferred the same cataphoric reference exists between the demonstrative stated above and its antecedent "the two bottles" in the SL text into the TL text. However, the first translation is grammatically more appropriate as the word "زجاجتان" is in the nominative case just like its English equivalence. The second translation shows the same word: the accusative or genitive case "زجاجتين" and this is grammatically incorrect because the word is not governed by markers of these latter cases.

The SL Text:

10. 'I gave <u>Brett</u> what for, you know. I said if <u>she</u> would go about with <u>Jews and bull-fighters</u> and <u>such</u> people, <u>she</u> must expect troubles'. p.233.

The TL Text:

1. Haqqi:

لقد حـذرت "بريـت" كمـا تعلـم() وقلـت لهـا: إنهـا أن ظلـت تسـتمري صـحبة <u>اليهـود ومصـارعي الثيـران</u> وأشخاصـا علـى <u>هذه الشـاكلة</u>، فأن عليهـا أن تتوقـع الكثير من المضايقات.p.265

2. Juzeini:

لقد اضطرت <u>بريت</u> بذلك، وأنت أعلم <u>بهذا</u>() قلت لها أنهـا إذا مـا اسـتمرت تسـاير <u>اليهود الوسخين</u> وترافق <u>المصارعين المتهوسين</u> ستسبب <u>لنا</u> متاعب جمة نحن بغنى عنها.p.233

Discussion:

Both translators have provided the suffixed pronoun "ها" as an equivalent to the pronminal(she)1)), attaching it to the particle "إنّ" which bears a sense of emphasis that does not exist in the SL text.

As regards(she (2)), the first translator has understood perfectly its coreference relation with the antecedent "بريت" and transferred it appropriately into the TL, while the second translator has rendered it in- appropriately into the pronoun "نا" referring to the first person plural which has no antecedent in the TL text. ۞As for the pronominal "such", the first translator has succeeded in conveying the same contextual meaning of that in the SL text. The second translator has added the

adjectives "الوسـخين، المتهوسـين" to the antecedent "اليهـود،
المصـارعين" respectively in order to convey the sense of
disrespect the pronominal "such" implies into the TL. Doing
so, he has presented an inappropriate rendering.

The SL Text:
11. 'Come <u>at lunch time</u>. It's not crowded <u>then</u>.'… p.89

The TL Text:
1. Haqqi:

تعال <u>لتناول طعام الغداء</u>، هنا، فلا يوجد <u>في هذا الوقت</u> كثير من الناس...
P.11

2. Juzeini:

مر علينا <u>في الصباح</u>، وتناول طعام الفطور، فأنك سترتاح كثيرا إذ أنـه ليس هنـاك
من ازدحام
<u>في ذلك الوقت</u>.   p.88

Discussion:

The two translators have rendered the pro-adverb "then"
into "في ذلك الوقت" and "في هذا الوقت" respectively, though there
is an equivalent pro-adverb in Arabic, viz حينذاك. But the
translators may not use it since it is highly formal. In addition,
the first translator has translated the antecedent "at lunch time"
inappropriately into "تنـاول طعـام الغداء" which bears a slight
difference from the exact contextual meaning of that in the SL
text. Doing so, he has spoilt the cohesive relation between the
pro-adverb and its antecedent.

The second translator has mistakenly translated it into "في
الصباح" which is far from the exact contextual meaning of that
in the original text. Consequently, this has affected the
meaning of the pro-adverb "في ذلك الوقت" that stands for it.

Proposed Translation:

تعال في وقت الغداء لأنه لا يوجد ازدحام في ذلك الوقت.

The SL Text:
12. I looked in <u>at the Iruna</u> for the gang and they were not
<u>there.</u>   p.198.

The TL Text:
1. Haqqi:

وبحثت عن جماعتي <u>في مقهى(الاريونا)</u> فلم أعثر عليهم <u>ثمة</u> ... p.223

2. Juzeini:

.بحثت عن الشلة في مقهى الاريونا فلم أعثر لها على أثر … p.193

Discussion:

In spite of that the pro-adverb ''there'' has a straightforward equivalence in Arabic, namely هنـاك; both translators have translated it differently. The first translator has rendered it into ''ثمـة'' which is also an adverb of place, but it does not appropriate in this context, since it is used as an equivalent to *there* when it becomes at the beginning of the sentence as *there is / are* ….

The second translator though has used the prepositional phrase

''على أثر'' which bears expansion rather than reduction, besides it does not have a cohesive relation with the antecedent '' في مقهـى الاريونـا'', his translation is communicative. Thus, the second translation is more appropriate since it is coherent and less formal.

The SL Text:

13. 'There's Roncevalles' I said.

'Where?'

'Way off there <u>where the mountains start</u>.'

'It is cold up <u>here</u>.' Bill said.   P.126.

The TL Text:

1. Haqqi:

هذه هي(رونسوفو)

- أين

هناك <u>حيث تمتد الجبال.</u>

وقال"بيل": لا ريب أن البرد قارس <u>هناك</u>. 141-142 .p

2. Juzeini:

ـ هاهو رونسوفو

ـ أين

ـ هناك، <u>حيث تمتد الجبال</u>

إن البرد سيكون قارسا <u>هناك</u>، قال بيل. p.121

Discussion:

Both translators have used the distant **demonstrative adverb ''هنـاك'' to corefer with the adverbial clause ''where the mountains start''. They have conveyed the contextual**

meaning of the pro-adverb appropriately as that of the SL text, though the writer of the original text has used the near pro-adverb "here" which is used in this context to refer to the place the interlocutors are talking about, and not the place they are in(a moving car). **If the translators** have used 'هنا' as equivalent to "here", their renderings would be inappropriate in this context.

The SL Text:

14. We launched upstairs <u>at Botin's</u>. <u>It</u> is one of the best restaurants in the world. P.284

The TL Text:

1. Haqqi:

p.322 تناولنا الطعام في الدور الأول من   <u>مطعم(بوتان)</u> وكان من أحسن المطاعم في العالم.

2. Juzeini:

p.   تناولنا الطعام في الطابق الأول عند <u>بوتين</u>. <u>إنه</u> من أجمل المطاعم في العالم.
281

Discussion:

The first translator has transferred the tense of the auxiliary verb "is" from present into past as represented by the verb "كان". Consequently, this has affected the rendering of the pro-form "it" from explicit into implicit pronoun indicated by the verb "كان".

The second translator has rendered the pro-form stated above into a suffixed pronoun "ـه" attached to the particle "إن". This bears a sense of emphasis which does not exist in the context of the SL text. Moreover, the translator has translated the antecedent into "بوتين". This may arise ambiguity to the TL reader, since he is unfamiliar with the name of this restaurant.

Proposed Translation:

تناولنا الطعام في الطابق العلوي في مطعم(بوتن)، وهو من أحسن المطاعم في العالم0

Findings and Discussion:

Throughout a detailed analysis of the translation of eighteen   coreferential pro-forms from English into Arabic, the paper has come up with the following findings:

1. Both translators have used semantic and communicative translations with varying degrees.

2. Both translators have failed to convey the same contextual meaning of some pro-forms, see(Text Analysis: Examples 1, 2, 13, 14, only Haqqi) and(Text Analysis: Examples 1, 2, 3, 6, 8, 10, 14, only Juzeini).

3. On the level of cohesion, shifts in cohesive devices have been used by both translators as follows:

a. From coreference to substitution, see(Text Analysis: Examples 3 only Juzeini).

b. From coreference to lexical cohesion,(see Text Analysis: Examples 3, 6, 10, only Haqqi).

c. From coreference to ellipsis, see(Text Analysis: Examples 7, only Haqqi).

4. Both translators have maintained the same reference i.e. anaphoric and cataphoric as that existing in the SL text.

5. Both translators have used formal style, though Hemingway's style in the SL text(i.e. the novel 'The Sun Also Rises') is informal.

Conclusions:

From our discussion in this paper, we have come up with the following conclusions:

1. Since each language has its own syntactic structures, most of English coreferential pro-forms do not correspond to their Arabic counterparts.

2. The linguistic context plays a significant role in the rendering of coreferential pro-forms in written texts.

3. Failure to recognize the relation between the pro-form and its antecedent is due to the fact that the translators are not fully aware of the function of pro-forms in English and Arabic.

4. Inadequate translation of the antecedent affects the cohesion as well as the coherence of the text.

5. Since there is no neutral pronoun in Arabic, ambiguity may arise to translators when the English neutral pronoun *it* precedes by two nouns or noun phrases

6. Arabic, sometimes, prefers shifts in cohesion level in order to convey the exact contextual meaning in the English text.

Failure of translators in following up the events of the literary text affects the translation of coreferential pro-forms.

Recommendations:

On the basis of our findings and conclusions, the following recommendations are put forward:

1. Translators should take into consideration the linguistic context in which coreferentialpro-forms occur in order to give an appropriate rendering for the TL reader as that existing in the SL.
2. A good syntactic knowledge of coreferential pro-forms is needed on the part of the translator in his task of translation.
3. Translators should be well-acquainted with the antecedent of the coreferential pro-forms and how they relate to each other in the surface structure in order to build up an effective texture.
4. Besides their syntactic knowledge of coreferential pro-forms in both languages, translators should know what cohesion and its devices mean in the two languages.
5. It is very important to translators of literary texts to follow up the chain of the events in the SL text in order to convey the exact contextual meaning of coreferential pro-forms into the TL text.

References

.Aziz, Y. Y.(1989). A Contrastive Grammar of English and Arabic. Mosul: Higher Education Press.

(1998). Topics in Translation With Special Reference to English and Arabic. Benghazi: University of Garyounis.

Bedir, B. M.(1979). A Study of Demonstratives in Standard English and Standard Arabic(Unpublished M.A. Thesis). Baghdad: University of Baghdad.

Beeston, A. F. L.(1970). The Arabic Language Today. London: Hutchinson University Library.

Bishai, W. B.(1971). Concise Grammar of Literary Arabic: A New Approach. Dubuque: Kendall/ Hunt Publishing Company.

Cantarino, V.(1975). Syntax of Modern Arabic Prose. Vol.2&3. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Chalker, S.(1984). Current English Grammar. London: Macmillan Publishers Ltd.

Crystal, D.(1990). Rediscover Grammar With David Crystal. London: Longman.

(1994). A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics. 3rd ed. Oxford: Blackwell.

Fries, Ch. C.(1940). American English Grammar. New York: Appleton – Century – Crofts.

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

Hasan, A.(1975). An-Nahwu l-wafi. Vol.1. Egypt: Daru-l Ma'arif bi-Misr.

Hodges, J. C.; W. R. Horner; S. S. Weeb and R. K. Miller(1994). Harbrace College Handbook. Forth Worth: Harcourt Brace College Publishers.

Ibn-'aqeel, B. A.(1965). Sharih Ibn 'aqeel. Vol.1 & 2. Egypt: Al-Maktaba l-Tijaria l-Kubra.

Jackson, H.(1980). Analyzing English: An Introduction to Descriptive Linguistics. London: Pergamon Press Ltd.

Keyser, S. J. and P. M. Postal(1976). Beginning English Grammar. New York: Harper & Row.

Klammer, E.(1977). Sentence Sense: A Basic Grammar. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich Inc.

Leech, G. and J. Svartvik(1975). A Communicative Grammar of English. London: Longman.

Liles, B. L.(1971). An Introductory Transformational Grammar. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Pickthall, M.(1971). The Meaning of the Glorious Qur'an(Trans.). Beirut: Dar Al-Kitab Allubnani.

Quirk, R. and S. Greenbaum(1973). A University Grammar of English. London: Longman Group Ltd.

Quirk, R; S. Greenbaum; G. Leech and J. Svartvik(1972). A Grammar of Contemporary English. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich Inc.

Quirk, R.; S. Greenbaum; G. Leech and J. Svartvik(1985). A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language. London: Longman Group Ltd.

Roberts, P.(1964). English Syntax. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc.

Sachs, H. J; H. M. Brown and P. J. Canavan(1960). A Work Book for Writers. New York: American Book Company.

Thomas, O. and E. R. Kintgen(1974). Transformational Grammar and the Teacher of English. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.

Ziadeh, F. J. and R. B., Winder(1957). An Introduction to Modern Arabic. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Text Analysed
English Text
Hemingway , E.(1969). The Sun Also Rises. London : Jonathan Cape.

The Arabic Renderings
Haqqi , B.(Undated). Sa-Tashriqu l- Shamsu Eidan. Beirut : Dar l-'ilm
LiL-Malayeen.

Juzaini, I.(1967). Sa-Tashriqu l- Shamsu Eidan. Dar l-Katib l-'rabi.

الخلاصة

ترجمة البدائل الشكلية العائدة في رواية هيمنغواي "ستشرق الشمس ايضا" الى العربية

د.جاسم محمد حسن[*]

فيفيان ميخائيل بولص[†]

تعد البدائل الشكلية العائدة في اللغة الإنكليزية واحدة من أعقد المشكلات التي تواجه المترجم بسبب تأثيرها الفاعل في نوعية النسيج النصي والنص ذاته.

تهدف هذه الرسالة إلى:(1) تسليط الضوء على أماكن الإخفاق والنجاح في ترجمة البدائل الشكلية العائدة في نصين مترجمين لرواية هيمنغواي "ستشرق الشمس أيضاً".(2) تبيان التغييرات النحوية والدلالية في هاتين الترجمتين(3) اقتراح ترجمة بديلة كلما اختلف البديل الشكلي العائد مع وظيفته الدلالية. وتفترض الدراسة أن للبدائل الشكلية العائدة مشكلات حقيقية تنعكس على نشاط المترجمين في النصوص الأدبية، وأن الغموض قد ينشأ عندما لا يدرك المترجم طبيعة العلاقات ما بين البديل الشكلي وعائديته في النص. ولذلك فقد أظهرت الدراسة أن عدم معرفة المترجمين لوظيفة البدائل الشكلية العائدة في اللغتين الإنكليزية والعربية يؤدي إلى إخفاق في معرفة البديل الشكلي وعائديته مما يؤثر بالنتيجة على الوحدتين العضوية(النسيجية) والموضوعية للنص المترجم.

[*] استاذ مساعد

[†] مدرس مساعد