ADAB AL-RAFIDAYN vol. (42) 1426 / 2005

Difficulties of Translating Discourse Markers From English Into Arabic

Professor Zuhair G. Farhan, Ph. D. [*]

& Tariq A. FannoushM. A. [**]

1. Introduction

Discourse Markers are words or phrases that Function as indicators of discourse structure. They are characteristics of connected discourse, that is to say they contribute to discourse coherence, which signal the communicative intentions of discourse. Discourse markers which form a heterogeneous class of words and expressions, have been chosen as a basis for analysis in this paper.

This paper aims mainly at examining the difficulties that are likely to be encountered in translating discourse Markers from English into Arabic i.e. translating the **SL** discourse' markers into their **TL** equivalents in Arabic. Fraser's (1999) Model of discourse markers analysis has been chosen for studying discourse markers. Fraser has classified discourse markers into two major classes with

(*) Professor - Department of Translation / University of Mosul.

(**) Department of Translation / University of Mosul.

subclasses. The first is propositional discourse markers while the second is non-propositional discourse markers.

It is supposed that there is a huge difference between English and Arabic in the use of discourse Markers. Moreover, one of the basic difficulties discourse markers present to translators is that any given discourse Marker may have numerous possible translation options. Furthermore, discourse markers have a multiplicity of functions, which means that a discourse marker may have more than one function and thus it can be used to signal a variety of relations between various written discourse segments. Therefore, a translator needs to determine the function a particular discourse marker has in a certain context so as to render the translation adequately.

For instance, Schiffrin (1987: 65), attributes the complexity in investigating discourse markers to three factors:

a. Their multifunctionality.
b. Their optionality, and
c. Their syntactic diversity.

2.Concept and Definitions of Discourse Markers

Generally, discourse Markers form a rather heterogeneous class of words and expressions that signal the communicative intentions of written discourse. In fact, the main concept of discourse markers is that they work as binders of discourse parts. In

addition, a discourse marker is viewed as a word or phrase, for instance, a conjunction such as "and, but", an adverbial "now, then", a comment clause "frankly speaking", interjection "oh, well"--- that is uttered with the primary function of bringing to the reader's attention a particular kind of linkage of the upcoming utterance with the immediate discourse context (Redeker, 1991:1168). In short, discourse markers are those words and expressions which relate discourse segments and indicate the relationship between an utterance, and the prior discourse.

Accordingly, discourse markers have been defined differently by different scholars. In fact, the first definition of the term discourse marker is that of Labov and Fanshel who talked about "well" considering it as a discourse marker. They maintained that it refers backwards to some topic that is already shared knowledge among participants. (Labov and Fanshel, 1977: 932).

The second reference to the definition of the term discourse marker in the literature is that by Ostman (1982, cited in Brinton, 1990 : 48), who states that discourse markers are short items, often phonologically reduced or unstressed, which occur either outside the syntactic structure or loosely attached to it.

Levinson (1983:87-88) considered discourse markers a class worthy of study on their own merits, although he terms them "discourse deictics" not discourse marker. He suggests that there are

many words and phrases in English, and no doubt most languages, that indicate the relationship between an utterance and the prior discourse. Examples are utterance initial usages of "however, but, therefore, in conclusion, anyway, still, on the contrary, etc.".

Schiffrin (1987:31) defines discourse markers as sequentially dependant elements which bracket units of talk. She states that discourse markers serve the role of informing the boundary between talk units and divide text into smaller units and show how each unit relates.

According to Fraser (1990:383) discourse markers are expressions such as "so, now, well, however, and then" which signal a sequential relationship between the current basic message and the previous discourse. Stenstrom (1994:63) states that discourse markers are used to organize and hold the turn and to mark boundaries in the discourse i.e. they help the speaker organize the discourse, they serve to introduce and mark the end of a topic, they serve to start a conversation, they serve to introduce a digression and mark the resumption of the old topic, and they signal the end of a conversation. According to Chalker and Weiner (1998:119) a discourse maker is a word or phrase that helps to signal the direction in which language, particularly in a conversation, is going. For Takahara (1998a:327) discourse markers are those devices which signal a sequential discourse relationship showing the boundaries

within discourse and the degree of cohesion, and decide the flow of information.

In short, discourse markers are the most significant glue or connective element that aid the writer to create both coherence and cohesion in a text while, by the same token, they help the reader see both symmetry and stylistic consistency in the discourse he reads.

3. General Functions of Discourse Markers

In fact, the category of discourse markers is a functionally defined one. The functions of discourse markers are context-dependant which means that they cannot be looked at in isolation. Also, it is commonly agreed that the most recognized function of discourse markers is that they impose a relationship between the discourse segments they introduce and the immediately prior discourse segments. Consider the following instances :

1. I am going to Baghdad. I would like you to watch my house if you wouldn't mind. It won't be difficult. ***However,*** I am only staying for two days there and then come back to Mosul.
2. You want to know how my garden grew this summer. ***In summary,*** the tomatoes grew well. The beans were fair as were the peppers. But the eggplants and carrots were terrible.

In the first instance the item ***"However"*** relates the segments that introduce " I am only staying two days there and then come back to Mosul" with a segment other than the immediately preceding one. In the second instance the item ***"In summary"*** relates the sequence of segments following it to the foregoing discourse.

Meanwhile, discourse markers are problematic because they serve a multitude of functions and because of their universality for many languages have similar sets of discourse markers with ostensibly similar functional capacities. Languages, however, make very different use of functions within the set of structures of discourse markers.

In general, discourse markers fulfill a multiplicity of functions in discourse. In other words, there is no single discourse marker that necessarily fulfills any one or exclusively only one function. In short, they are polyfunctional, i.e. they can have more than one function and relate to more than one level of discourse. Simply, they are diverse. Therefore, they are difficult to subcategorize or be classified even if they are studied in an individual way because they reveal that anyone marker may have a wide variety of meanings and functions which overlap in part with the meanings and functions of other markers.

4.Meaning and Grammatical status of Discourse Markers

In fact, the meanings of discourse markers are context-dependent. This means that they cannot be looked at in isolation. However, Schiffrin (1987:32) states that discourse markers are independent of sentential structure and that the structure and meaning of arguments can be preserved even without markers (ibid:55). They are never obligatory and what this means is that any utterance preceded by a marker may also have occurred without the marker (ibid:64). Schiffirn recognizes that a discourse marker may have, simultaneously, semantic, syntactic, and pragmatic roles and that discourse markers are not structural or semantic components in the sentence (ibid: 190). Many discourse markers are used in ways which reflect their meanings. For instance, conjunctions in particular, have pragmatic effects which are closely tied to their meanings.

Brinton (1990: 47) states that discourse markers are generally considered to have little or no prepositional meaning, or at least to be difficult to specify lexically; they are consequently difficult to translate into other languages. They also reveal that any one marker may have a wide variety of meanings which overlap in part with the meanings of other markers like the discourse marker "well"

(ibid:48). Moreover, every discourse marker has one specific meaning, yet there are synonymous cases which are distinguished by the subtleties of meaning such as "nevertheless, despite that, and in spite of that". For instance, "nevertheless" signals a relationship of unexpected contrast between the prepositional content of segment (2) and an implied proposition associated with segment (1). Examples :

3. Ali felt sick. ***Nevertheless***, he still went to school.
4. Einstein was a great scientist. ****Nevertheless***, he still went to school.

In example (3), it was expected that "Ali" would not go to school but on the contrary he went to school. While in example (4) there is no such an expectation of a great scientist to still going to school. In brief, example (4) is logically unacceptable.

To sum up, generally, for all discourse markers, different invariant meanings were proposed or found.

In the preceding discussion, the nature of discourse marker meaning is discussed. Now, the light is shed on the grammatical status of this rather fuzzy concept of discourse markers. For example, Fraser (1999:943) states that discourse markers do not constitute a separate syntactic category. There are three sources of discourse markers, conjunctions, adverbs, and prepositional phrases. In fact, it is difficult to see how a subset of conjunction, adverbials,

and prepositional phrases could be cobbled together to form a syntactic category, particularly since their individual syntactic patterning follows their obvious syntactic lineage: conjunctions patterns like conjunctions, and so forth. Moreover, the syntactic environments where an expression functions as a discourse marker are different from those environments where it occurs. In fact, the first question that can be raised is whether discourse markers should be treated as variants of their homophonous counterparts, for instance, "still" as a discourse marker versus "still" as an adverb, or perhaps, as a distinct lexical class. As an evidence to this inquiry, there is the obvious point that discourse markers have a procedural meaning that is unique. It specifies a relationship between segment (2) and segment (1). Examples:

5. It's getting awfully late. Do you ***still*** want to go?

6.The class is very industrious. ***All but one*** student read the book assigned.

It seems from these examples that there is a non-discourse marker function and a lack of the relational sense. Therefore, if a discourse marker and, say, an adverb "still" counterpart were to be treated as ambiguous, the ambiguity would not only have to be conceptual but procedural as well. This is similar to the fact of assigning a term with two procedural meanings to two different categories such as the word "Book" as a noun and verb. Eventually,

just as other grammatical categories, have procedural restrictions on their membership, all discourse markers procedurally impose a relationship on segment (2) and segment (1).

5.Fraser's (1999) Discourse Markers Model

In his discourse markers model of (1999:946ff), Fraser has classified discourse markers into two basic classes, both with subclasses:

1. Prepositional Discourse Markers: These markers are used to relate the propositions or messages of the sentences.
2. Non-Propositional Discourse Markers: These markers are used to signal an aspect of discourse structure or topic like organization and management.

In fact, the first class has a number of subclasses, they are as follows:

A. ***Contrastive Markers***: The discourse marker in this type signals that the content of segment (2) contrasts with some aspects of the interpretation of segment (1).

7. Ali weighs 70 kilos. ***In comparison***., Ahmed weighs 75.

This group of markers include the following items:

(But, In contrast, Whereas, In comparison, On the Contrary,

Conversely, Indeed, Instead of, Rather than, In fact, In reality, Otherwise, On the other hand, Alternatively, However, Though, Even though, As though, And though, Although, All the same, Despite, Even so, Except for, In spite of, Nevertheless, Nonetheless, Regardless, Yet, Still, Notwithstanding, But also).

B. ***Collateral Markers:*** The discourse marker in this type signals a quasi-parallel relationship between the explicit content of segment (2) and the explicit content of segment (1).

8. The picnic is mined. The food has turned rancid, the drink is warm. ***Furthermore***, it's raining.

This group of markers includes the following items:

(And, Above all, Also, Besides, Better yet, And yet, Well, For another thing, Furthermore, Moreover, In addition, Or, Aside from, More to the point, On top of it all, To cap it all of, What is more, I mean, In particular, Namely, Analogously, Parenthetically, That is to say, By the same token, Equally, Correspondingly, Likewise, Similarly, That said).

C. ***Inferential Markers***: The discourse marker in this type signals that segment (2) is to be taken as a conclusion based on the explicit proposition of segment (1).

9. It's raining. ***Under those Conditions***, we should ride our bikes.

This group of markers includes the following items:

(So, Of course, Accordingly, As a consequence, Consequently, As a logical conclusion, As a result, Because of, Hence, It can be concluded that, It stands to reason that, Thus, Therefore, In this case, Under these conditions, At any rate, Then, All things considered, In any event, In the light of the foregoing).

D. **Additional Group of Markers**: This group specifies that segment (2) provides a reason for the proposition presented in segment (1), whether it is asserted or is an imperative as in the following sentences:

10. I want to go to the cinema. ***After all***, it's my birthday.
11. Take a bath right away, ***Because*** we have to get going.

This group includes the following items:

(After all, Because, Since).

The second class of discourse markers i.e. non-propositional discourse markers, has also a number of subclasses, they are as follows:

A. ***Discourse Structure Markers***: These markers are used to frame the topic in terms of listing which indicates the

beginning, the middle and the end of the given topic. They determine the organization of the component parts of a given topic.

12. I am glad you could be all here today. ***To start with***, I'll call on Mr. Ali.

This group includes the following items:

(Once again, At the outset, Finally, First/second, Lastly, To start with, In the first place, Next, Moving right along).

B. ***Topic Change Markers***: These markers are used to signal that the utterance following constitutes, in the speaker's opinion, a departure from the current topic.

13. I am glad that is finished. ***To return to ray point***, I'd like to discuss your paper.

This group includes the following items:

(By the way, To return to my point, Back to my original point, That reminds me, Before I forget, Incidentally, Just to update you, Speaking of x, To change to topic, On a different note, While I think of it, With regard to).

C. ***Discourse Activity Markers***: These markers are used to signal the writer's comment on the context of the preceding text or discourse in the sense that the current discourse is to serve a particular activity like explanation, justification, etc.

14. Grammar is not difficult. ***To illustrate***, consider the passive mood.

This group includes the following items:

(For example, For instance, To explain, To clarify, To illustrate, According to, To interrupt, In short).

In fact, this classification clearly shows the different types and subtypes of discourse markers. Therefore, in our view this classification might be considered as an -adequate one for the texts to be analyzed, though it does not list all the words and expressions that are considered sometimes as discourse markers. Thus, in the following analyses, Eraser's (1999) classification of discourse markers will be adopted considering it a typical model of analysis in this paper.

6. Text Analyses

The present paper is reserved for the investigation of discourse

markers according to Fraser's (1999) discourse markers model. Translation and critical discussion of two English texts (Scientific and Journalistic) taken from two English magazines (The Reader's Digest and The Time), conducted by (3) M.A. students of translation, College of Arts, University of Mosul, are given.

The SL Text

1. Electric Cars ?

That was December 1996, ***and*** McCollister, a United Airlines flight attendant, has been driving his EV1 a year now. He enjoys showing it off and loves the way it rides and handles. ***But*** for routine driving? GM says the car has a 70- to 90- mile driving range, ***yet*** McCollister and others have discovered that hills, traffic and rain can reduce these figures. "I bought a cellular phone in case I get stuck," he says.

The cars can cost as much to lease as a new Cadillac. ***Except for*** acceleration and, possibly, braking, they can't match the day-to-day utility of a ten-year-old Chevy Cavalier. ***But*** their drivers swallow hard and keep smiling. That may be ***because*** an EVI driver's "household fleet includes multiple vehicles,"

according to GM. ***In short***, he or she can play with this car rather than depend on it.

(The Reader's Digest, January 1998)

The TL 1st Student Translation

كان ذلك في كانون الأول من عام 1996 **عندما** مضى عاما على اعتبار مك كولستر الذي يشغل وظيفة مرافق في الخطوط الجوية الاتحادية في قيادة مركبته الكهربائية. فهو يشعر بالسعادة عند المباهاة بسيارته ويحب الطريق الذي تطأه وتسلكه. **ولكن** خلافا لتصريحات شركة GM لصناعة السيارات التي تنص على ان هذه السيارة تقطع مسافة تتراوح بين 70 إلى 90 ميل قبل نفاذ طاقتها. **فقد** اكتشف مك كولستر وآخرون بان المرتفعات والأمطار والازدحام المروري يمكن ان تقلل من هذه الأرقام المعلن عنها حتى ان مك كولستر صرح بأنه قام بشراء هاتفاً خلويا ليستخدمه في حالة تعطله عن الحركة.

ان تكلفة هذه السيارات يمكن ان تضاهي ما يكفي لإيجار سيارة كاديلاك جديدة **ولكن فيما عدا** التسارع والفرملة فان هذه السيارات لا يمكن ان تضاهي الآلية المستمرة لسيارة فاخرة مضى على صناعتها عشر سنوات. **لذلك** فان سواق هذه السيارات يبتسمون بامتعاض وربما **يعود ذلك** إلى تعدد أنواع هذه السيارات كما صرحت GM لصناعة السيارات. **وباختصار** فان السائق ان يلهو بهذه السيارة

لا يعتمد عليها كوسيلة نقل.

The TL 2nd Student Translation

كان ذلك في كانون الأول من عام 1996 حيث مضى عاما كاملا على بدء مك كولستر الذي يعمل بوظيفة مرافق في الخطوط الجوية المتحدة، **عندما** قاد مركبته الكهربائية EVI. فهو يتفاخر بها ويحب الطريق الذي تسلكه **ولكن** فيما يتعلق بإجراءات السياقة؟ فان شركة GM لصناعة السيارات صرحت بان السيارة تقطع مسافة تتراوح بين 70- إلى 90 قبل نفاذ الطاقة **لكن** مك كولستر وآخرون اكتشفوا بان المرتفعات والازدحام المروري والأمطار بإمكانها تقليل هذه الأرقام حيث صرح مك كولستر قائلا باني قد ابتعت هاتفا خلويا كي استخدمه في حالة تعطلي عن القيادة.

فهذه السيارات قد تكلف ما يقارب إيجار سيارة كاديلاك جديدة **ولكن فيما عدا** مسألة التسارع والفرملة فان آلية هذه السيارات لا يمكن ان تضاهي آلية سيارة فاخرة مضى على صناعتها عشر سنوات. **لكن** سائقي هذه السيارات يتظاهرون بالسعادة رغم عدم رضاهم وربما **يعود سبب** ذلك إلى تعدد أنواع هذه السيارات كما صرحت شركة GM. **وباختصار** فان سائق هذه السيارة يمكنه ان يلهو بها بدلا من الاعتماد عليها.

The TL 3rd Student Translation

كان ذلك في كانون الأول 1996، ومكولستر، وهو مرافق لرحلات الخطوط الجوية المتحدة، مضى على قيادته سيارته من طراز EVI سنة الآن. انه يستمتع برؤيتها واقفة ويحب طريقة سيرها وقيادتها. **ولكن** فيما يخص السياقة الروتينية؟ تقول شركة جي ام ان للسيارة معدل سياقة 70 – 90 ميل، **إلا أن** مكولستر "لقد

اشتريت هاتفا خلويا لحالات التوقف والصعوبات".

هذه السيارات قد تكلف مبلغا بقدر مبلغ تأجير سيارة كاديلاك جديدة. **فيما عدا** مغير السرعة وربما الكوابح، فان هذه السيارات لا يمكن ان تضاهي الاستخدام اليومي لسيارة فارهة مضى عليها عشر سنوات. **لكن** سائقيها رغم عدم رضاهم فانهم يبتسمون دوما. **وذلك ربما لكون** ان هناك العديد من أنواع السيارات وفقا لتصريح جي ام. **وباختصار** فان السائق او السائقة تستطيع اللهو بهذه السيارة لا ان تعتمد عليها.

The writer's purpose of this text is to convince the reader of the complete uselessness of "EV1" cars and at the sametime stresses by way of hidden advertisement the usefulness and elegance of such cars as "Cadillac" and "Chevy Cavalier". In fact, the text is equally divided between coordinators "and, but" and subordinators "yet, except for, and because" which is used in its inferential sense (Fraser, 1999:946).

The subjects gave the following translations as equivalents to the discourse markers which appeared in the text above.

1. (عندما، ولكن، فقد، ولكن فيما عدا، لذلك، بعود ذلك، وباختصار).
2. (عندما، ولكن، ولكن، ولكن فيما عدا، يعود سبب، وباختصار).
3. (و، ولكن، إلا ان، فيما عدا، لكن، وذلك ربما لكون، وباختصار).

Obviously, most of the Arabic versions given by the subjects mix both coordinators and subordinators, that is between "but",

"and" and "yet" while they backfire in two translations of the discourse marker "because" preserving its inferential meaning that is (^J J_>«j) of subject no. "1" and (jj^i Wj ^j) of subject no. "3". Accordingly, the most acceptable translation of the text and its discourse markers might be that of subject no. "1".

The SL Text

2. The European Disunion

Yet the need for rapid enlargement to a community of more than 20 member states is, ***so*** the paper's authors suggest, a further pressing reason for trying now to consolidate a "hard core" of the E.U. consisting in the first place of Germany, France and three Benelux countries. ***Otherwise*** the E.U. will be weakened to the point of paralysis.

These core states, they suggest, should move ahead to closer integration in all the areas covered by Maastricht - with monetary union as "the cornerstone of political unit," ***but also***, ***for example***, in foreign and security policy. They politely emphasize, ***however***, that Britain, Italy, Spain and the rest would be most welcome to join them ***when (and if)*** they can.

(The Time, September 1994)

The TL 1st Student Translation

لا تزال الحاجة في إجراء توسع عاجل في مجتمع دولي يضم اكثر من عشرين دولة من الأعضاء داعيا ملما لتعزيز مركز الاتحاد الدولي الذي يضم بالمرتبة الأولى كلا من ألمانيا وفرنسا ومجموعة دول البنولكس الثلاثة وإلا ضعف الاتحاد الأوربي وأصيب بالشلل، **حسب** ما يقترحه مسؤولي الصحيفة.

فقد اقترحت الدول القيادية في الاتحاد الأوربي ضرورة الإقدام على تقوية

اندماج الدول الأعضاء في كافة المجالات التي تغطيها معاهدة ماستريخت النقدية والتي تعد بمثابة الحجر الأساس للوحدة السياسية الأوربية. **بالإضافة إلى** الوحدة النقدية، **على سبيل المثال** ، ينبغي ان يكون هناك وحدة في السياسة الخارجية والأمنية. لذلك أكدت هذه الدول **بشكل أو بآخر** على الترحيب الحار بكل من بريطانيا وإيطاليا وإسبانيا وبقية دول أوربا للانضمام إلى المعاهدة متى ما وجدت نفسها مستعدة لهذا الأمر.

The TL 2nd Student Translation

لا تزال الحاجة في إجراء توسيع جداً لمجتمع يضم اكثر من عشرين دولة من الأعضاء داعياً ملحا لمحاولة تعزيز قوة مركز الاتحاد الأوربي الذي يضم في المرتبة القيادية كل من ألمانيا وفرنسا ومجموعة دول البنولكس الثلاثة **وإلا** ضعفت قوة الاتحاد الأوربي لتصل إلى حالة الشلل التام، **حسب** ما ورد في تقارير السياسيين.

فقد اقترحت هذه الدول ضرورة الإقدام على تقوية تلاحم الدول الأعضاء في كافة المجالات التي غطتها معاهدة ماستريخت النقدية والتي تعد بمثابة الحجر الأساس للتوحد السياسي الأوربي فبالإضافة إلى الوحدة النقدية، على سبيل المثال، ينبغي ان يكون هناك وحدة في السياسة الخارجية والأمنية. ومع ذلك أكدت هذه الدول ترحيبها اللائق بكل من بريطانيا وإيطاليا وإسبانيا وبقية دول المجموعة الأوربية للانضمام للمعاهدة متى ما وجدت نفسها مستعدة لذلك.

The TL 3rd Student Translation

ما زالت الحاجة إلى توسيع المجتمع الذي يشمل اكثر من عشرين دولة، **كما** جاء في مقالة الكتب، سببا عاجلا الآن لمحاولة تقوية أساس الاتحاد الأوربي والذي يشمل بالدرجة الأساس ألمانيا وفرنسا ودول البنولكس الثلاثة. **وعكس ذلك** سيكون الاتحاد الأوربي ضعيفا إلى حد الجمود. الدول الأساسية، **كما** يقترحون، يجب ان تسير نحو وحدة اقرب على كافة الأصعدة التي نصت عليها معاهدة ماستريخت مع الاتحاد المالي كحجر أساس لاتحاد سياسي، **ولكن أيضا** ، **وعلى سبيل المثال** في السياسة الخارجية والأمنية. انهم يؤكدون وبلطف، **وعلى أية حال** ، ان بريطانيا وإسبانيا وإيطاليا وبقية الدول سيرحبون اشد الترحيب بانضمامهم (**اذا ما**) **عندما** يستطيعون.

In fact, speaking about ***"Disunion"*** calls for contrastive discourse markers which themselves convey the idea of "opposition and disunion". However, none of the coordinating conjuncts is used in it which just shows whether consciously or unconsciously how much discourse markers can convey the main theme of the discourse all the way through. This text shows the use of discourse markers in their core meaning where they are only used to glue segments of the discourse. The subjects gave the following translations as equivalents to the discourse markers which appeared in the text above.

1. (لا تزال، حسب، وإلا، بالإضافة إلى، على سبيل المثال، بشكل أو آخر، متى ما).
2. (لا نزال، حسب، وإلا، فبالإضافة إلى، على سبيل المثال، ومع ذلك، متى ما).
3. (ما زالت كما، وعكس ذلك، ولكن ذلك، ولكن ايضا، على سبيل المثال، على أية حال، إذا ما "عندما").

In reviewing the Arabic versions given by the subjects, it is noted that there is far less agreement on the translation of the discourse markers "otherwise", "however" and "when and if. This might be due to lack of contextual cues that help subjects determine the exact counterpart to a given English discourse marker. On the whole, none of the versions offered by the subjects could achieve the accurate equivalent of the discourse markers in the text above.

7. Conclusion

It emerges from the discussion pursued above that English style has a clear-cut tendency to the use of discourse markers in more profusion and diversity than Arabic. In fact, the tendency to modify what we say is an outstanding feature of western civilization and it has abundantly reflected in the use of discourse markers in English both written and spoken. In the translation of discourse markers from English into Arabic the main problem, it seems, is that of indeterminacy not only within a given sub-class of discourse markers but also across several sub-classes in that a contrastive discourse marker may be rendered by an inferential one and vice

versa. Moreover, it is noted that the students agree in the translation of the coordinators "but" (oil), and "and" (j), while they face a certain difficulty in the translation of subordinates.

Furthermore, mixing propositions for conjuncts i.e. (discourse markers) and vice versa is another source of ambiguity and mistranslation, for example "as" in the second paragraph of the second text is not a discourse marker but rather a preposition. For example, "As" even in its prepositional meaning it is sometimes confused with the conjunct "like":

e. g. She speaks like a lawyer, "meaning that she is not a lawyer".

e. g. She speaks as a lawyer, "meaning that she is a lawyer i.e. her profession is a lawyer".

Finally, we confirm the fact that discourse markers are of paramount significance for the coherence of any text, they can compare across English and Arabic, and there is a general similarity between markers in English and Arabic regardless of indeterminacy across sub-classes because of the interchangeability among discourse markers belonging to a given class on the one hand and the stylistic flexibility of certain languages i.e. Arabic, on the other hand. However, wrong translation of discourse markers into Arabic would highly detract from the semantic, stylistic, and pragmatic adequacy of the English original.

References

Brinton, L. J. (1990) : " The Development of Discourse Markers in English". In: ***Journal of Historical Linguistics and Philosophy,*** J. Fisiak (eds.) Germany, Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, pp. 45-71.

Chalker, S. and Weiner, E. (1998) :***The Oxford Dictionary of English Grammar*** .Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Fraser, B. (1990) : "An Approach to Discourse Markers". In: ***Journal of Pragmatics,*** vol. 14, pp. 383-95.

--------- (1999) ; "What are Discourse Markers". In: ***Journal of Pragmatics***, vol. 31, pp. 931-952.

Labov, W. and Fanshel, D. (1977) : ***Therapeutic Discourse: Psychotherapy as Conversation***, New York: Academic Press.

Levinson,S. (1983): ***Pragmatics***, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Östman, Jan-ola (1982) : "The Symbiotic Relationship between Pragmatic Particles and Impromptu Speech". In: ***N.E. Enkvist (ed.), Impromptu Speech: a Symposium*** (Abo: Abo Akademi), pp. 147-177.

Redeker, G. (1991) : "Linguistic Markers of Discourse Structure". Review Article of D. Schiffrin's Study "Discourse Markers" (1987): In: ***Journal of Linguistics***, vol. 29, pp. 1139-1172.

Schiffrin, D. (1987): ***Discourse Markers***, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Stenstrom, A-B (1994): ***An Introduction to Spoken Interaction,*** London: Longman.

Takahara, P. (1998a) : "Pragmatic Functions of Discourse Markers in English and Japanese". ***Selected Paper from the 6lh International Pragmatic Conference,***(1998),pp.547-576.

ملخص

فنوش والموسوم

أ.د. زهير غازي فرحان(*)

و طارق إبراهيم فنوش(**)

تقوم واسمات الخطاب والتي هي مفردات وعبارات بوظيفة المؤشرات للتركيب النصي. فهي سمات للخطاب المتصل اي تساهم في تماسك النص والتي تكون مؤشراً لأهداف الخطاب ويهدف البحث بشكل رئيسي على تبيان الصعوبات التي قد تواجه المترجم لهذه الواسمات من الإنكليزية إلى العربية.

فضلا عن أن الصعوبات الأساسية التي تواجه المترجم هي وجود خيارات ترجمية كثيرة لها.

وعلى المترجم أيضا أن يحدد الوظيفة للواسمة في أي سياق لكي تترجم بشكل دقيق.

(*) قسم الترجمة ـ كلية الآداب / جامعة الموصل.

(**) قسم الترجمة ـ كلية الآداب / جامعة الموصل.