Explicitation vs. Implicitation: Discourse Markersin English-into-Arabic Translation

Mohammed Farghal
Kuwait University, m_farghal@hotmail.com

Abdullah Samateh
Ministry of Education Kuwait, manysam2009@hotmail.com

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.aaru.edu.jo/albalqa

Explicitation vs. Implicitation: Discourse Markers in English-into-Arabic Translation

الإفصاح مقابل الإبهام: أدوات الربط في الترجمة بين العربية والإنجليزية

Dr. Mohammed Farghal
Department of English
Kuwait University
m_farghal@hotmail.com

Dr. Abdullah Samateh
Ministry of Education
Kuwait
manysam2009@hotmail.com

Abstract

The present paper aims to examine Blum-Kulka's (1986) claim that cases of explicitation in the target text (TT) correspond to cases of implicitation in the source text (ST). A corpus of three discourse markers (DMs) in an Arabic translation is examined against the DMs in the English ST. The findings show that there are three types of correspondence in DMs: explicitation to explicitation, explicitation to implicitation, and explicitation to zero equivalents. The paper concludes that the syndetic nature of Arabic discourse, unlike the asyndetic nature of its English counterpart, accounts for the presence of several cases of DMs which do not correspond to implicit DMs in the ST and whose sole function is to improvise smooth and cohesive discourse

الملخص

تهدف هذه الدراسة تمحيص طرح الباحثة بلوم-كلكا (١٩٨٦) في أن حالات الإفصاح في المعنى في النص المترجم تقابل حالات من الإبهام في النص الأصلي. وتتكون مادة الدراسة من ثلاث أدوات للربط تمّ استخراجها من ترجمة عربية من أجل مقارنتها بما يقابلها في النص الإنجليزي الأصلي. وتشير النتائُج إلى أن هناك ثلاثة أوجه للتقابل بين اللغتين: الإفصاح مقابل الإفصاح، والإفصاح مقابل الإبهام، والإفصاح مقابل المكافئ الصفر. وتذهب هذه الدراسة إلى أن طبيعة الخطاب في اللغة العربية الذي يعتمد الإفصاح من خلال أدوات الربط بين الجمل على عكس الخطاب في اللغة الإنجليزية الذي يتبنى الإبهام أكثر من الإفصاح في الربط بين الجمل، هو السبب في وجود حالات عديدة من الإفصاح التي لا تقابل حالات من الإبهام في أدوات الربط، والتي تهدف إلى جعل النص أكثر تماسكاً وسلاسةً.

الكلمات المفتاحية: الترجمة، أدوات الربط، الإفصاح، الإبهام.

1. Introduction

Discourse markers (DMs) play a considerable role in communication; «they impose a relationship between discourse segments they introduce and the immediately prior discourse segments,» (Farhan and Fannoush 2005: 5), and thus achieve greater transparency as they «knit the discourse together […] and orient the reader,» (Pym 2005: 33). Baker (1992: 190) also attributes similar values to their presence in discourse; she writes:

Unlike reference, substitution, and ellipsis, the use of conjunction does not instruct the reader to supply missing information either by looking for it elsewhere in the text or by filling structural slots. Instead, conjunction signals the way the writer wants the reader to relate what is about to be said to what has been said before.

Put simply, they are cohesive devices that bind the textual elements and signal logical relationships within the text to ensure a natural and smooth flow of discourse. The translator, therefore, should be aware of their functions and usage, for the absence of such awareness could lead to altering the meaning potentials of translations.

Arabic discourse, being syndetic, abounds in DMs and makes frequent use of them (Baker 1992; Hatim 1997b; Farghal and Al-Hamly, this volume; AlKhfaji 2011; Tahaineg and Tafish 2011; Farghal 2012, among others). Nevertheless, the existing literature tends to show that most Medieval Arabic grammarians devote much effort and space to the *parsing* aspect of DMs and pay scant attention to their textual functions (Abdel Hameed, 1965; Anees, 1966; Ansari, 1979; Hamad and Zu›bi, 1984; Fareh, 1998). That is, they engage themselves in classifying the particles into categories as per their syntactic properties, including *’adawaat al-rabt* ‹connective particles› أدوات الربط, *’adawaat al-‘atf* ‹conjunctions of sequence› أدوات العطف, and *’adawaat al-bayaan* ‹explicative apposition› أدوات البيان, but they largely overlook their semantic and pragmatic aspects. They perceive these DMs as cohesive devices whose sole function is to coordinate units in discourse (Al-Hmouz 2001). Thus, the semantic and pragmatic aspects appear to be played down despite their significance in facilitating information processing for the receiver.

By contrast, the last few decades are marked by particular interest in the study of DMs, thus taking them beyond the borders of grammar and allowing their semantic and pragmatic dimensions to be accorded due attention as well (Al-Hmouz, 2001; Karin, 2005; Johnston,1990; Al-Batal, 1990; Kammensjo, 1993; Hamdan and Fareh, 1999; Muzni, 1983; Zajjaji, 1984; Crew, 1990; de Beaugrande and Dressler, 1981; Halliday and Hassan, 1976; McCarthy, 1991; Schiffring, 1987; Cantarino, 1974, 1975, 1976; Al-Jubouri, 1987; Williams, 1989; Holes, 1995; Stubs, 1983; Saeed & Fareh, 2006, etc). In particular, the Arabic conjunction *wa* ‹and› و has been subjected to elaborate analyses in order to reveal its multi-faceted functions in discourse (Abdel Hameed, 1965; Kamal, 1971; Zajjaji, 1984; Hamad & Zu›bi, 1984; etc.). Al-Jubouri and Knowles (1988) indicate that *wa* and *fa* ‹so› are found to be the most recurring DMs in Arabic discourse.

Cross-linguistically, more research is needed, especially in contrastive studies involving Arabic and English. The underlying reasons why DMs are cross-linguistically understudied is probably because their analysis in English is mainly speech-oriented since they are mainly approached from the perspectives of dysfluencies and language acquisition, etc. (Howell, et al., 1999; Bell, et al., 2009; Chung and Nebaker, 2007; Dworzynski et al., 2004, etc.), while in Arabic the focus is on the structure of written discourse (Tahaineg and Tafish 2011). Lately, however, studies conducted cross-linguistically have yielded significant results, where the functional polysemy of DMs is highlighted. Examples of researchers who have explored the multiple functions a single DM can perform in various

contexts include Cantarino, 1974; Fareh, 1998; Illyyan, 1990; Farhan & Fannoush, 2005; Tahaineg & Tafish, 2011, etc.. With reference to Arabic in particular, it has been reported that the Arabic *wa* is identified with multiple discoursal functions, namely, the resumptive, additive, alternative, comitative, adversative, and circumstantial functions. Likewise, the Arabic *θumma* ‹then› ثم signals meanings of sequence with a span of time, sequence with immediacy or with a short span of time, resumption of discourse, adversative relationships, and consequential function. The Arabic fa has also been shown to encode several syntactic and semantic functions, namely, the sequential, explanatory, causal, resultative/consequential, resumptive, and adversative. It is worth noting that DMs can be single words like the ones cited above or phrases, e.g. *bixtisaar* ‹in short› باختصار , *fiimaa 'adaa* ‹except for› فيما عدا , *muqaaranatan bi* ‹in comparison with› مقارنة بـ etc., which fall beyond the scope of this study.

Given its syndetic nature, Arabic discourse employs DMs lavishly; their recurrence brings about a high degree of textual cohesion and coherence in Arabic writing. By contrast, English can be asyndetic to a large extent, where non-finite phrases and punctuation may signal suppressed logical relations. Consequently, an Arabic translation is expected to outrank its English source in the use of these elements, prompting cases of DMs with zero source equivalents. For example, the cause-result relationship between ‹Arabic syndetic nature› and ‹the lavish employment of DMs› in the first sentence in this paragraph (bold-typed) is suppressed in English, whereas an Arabic translation would make it explicit by the use of a DM like *bimaa 'anna or bi-*

sababi ‹because›. In addition, the English semicolon separating the two main parts of the sentence calls for the use of the Arabic *fa* as a DM, in order to signal commentative material as well as naturalize and smooth the flow of discourse. Moreover, the DM *wa* would be required at the beginning of the sentence as a default DM to maintain a natural flow of discourse. In this way, we would have three explicit DMs in the Arabic sentence corresponding to zero DMs in the English sentence. Semantically, however, the logic of the sentence is based on an implicit cause-result relationship in English, which corresponds to an explicit cause-result counterpart in Arabic, and an implicit commentative relation in English signaled by punctuation, which corresponds to an explicit commentative relation signaled by *fa* in Arabic.

2. Purpose of Study

The purpose of this study is to examine Blum-Kulka's (1986) claim within her oft-cited Explicitation Hypothesis that instances of explicitation in the target text (TT) must correspond to instances of implicitation in the source text (ST). Looking at English and Spanish, Saldanha (2008) finds the claim invalid; she argues that there are instances of explicitation that are not necessarily instigated by implicitation in the ST. Building on the findings of Saldanha, the current study assumes that the same phenomenon might obtain between English and Arabic, as well.

3. Study Material

Instances of explicitation vs. implicitation of DMs are extracted from the first five chapters of the English novel *The Woman in White* by Wilkie Collins (1960/2010, Penguin Books) and its Arabic translation

ðaatu al-ridaa'i al-'abyad (Beirut, Dar Al-Bihar 2003). The choice of the novel is solely motivated by the fact that it is a representative sample of professional fiction translation which is commissioned by a reputable publisher like Dar Al-Bihar. The data consists of 55 examples featuring *fa, 'ið* إذ and *bittaalii* بالتالي employed to introduce causal, resultative, adversative, resumptive, explanatory, and adverbial clauses. It should be noted that the Arabic DM *wa* ‹and› has been excluded from the study data, albeit it is the most common in Arabic, because it is usually used as a default conjunction which practically carries no or little semantic content when it comes to marking logical relationships. In fact, this DM is largely considered too light to carry semantic content independently of other more semantically oriented DMs. Hence, it is mainly used to enhance rather than replace such markers, e.g. it often occurs with *bittaalii* ‹therefore› in *wa-bittaalii* ‹and therefore› to consolidate the logical relation and smooth the flow of discourse. The analysis of the three study Arabic DMs will determine whether or not they always have corresponding elements in the ST, and if not, whether this could be attributed to the fact that Arabic discourse is overwhelmingly syndetic while English discourse is largely asyndetic.

4. Data Analysis and Discussion
4.1 The DM *fa*

The data reveals that *fa* is the most frequently used of the three DMs under investigation, viz. 20 instances, making up 36% of the corpus. According to Al-Afghani (1970), Arabic *fa* can signal both sequential and additive functions. Medieval Bin Hishaam Al-Ansaari (2002/ d.761h) goes even further and argues that *fa* performs six different functions, namely, a coordina-

tive, sequential, resultative/consequential, causal, and combinatory with *sawfa* in فسوف ‹will› as well as with *'in* ‹if› in فإن.

The analysis shows that out of the 20 instances *fa* corresponds to implication in the ST in 11 cases (55%), to explicitation in 3 (15%), and to zero equivalents in 6 (30%). The Arabic extract in example (1) below involves many instances of *fa* which perform different functions, namely, the adversative, explanatory, resultative, causal, and resumptive functions:

(1) «**Except** that we are both orphans, we are in every respect as unlike each other as possible. **My** father was a poor man, **and** Miss Farlie's father was a rich man. **I have** nothing **and** she has a fortune. […] I can never claim my release from my engagement, she went on. ″**Whatever** way it ends it must end wretchedly for me.″

[…] I have been made all the readier to comply with this request by a passage at the end of his letter, which has almost alarmed me.
After mentioning that he has neither seen nor heard anything of Ann   Catherick, he suddenly breaks off […]

″وفيما عدا أنّنا يتيمان، **فنحن** نختلف بعضنا عن بعض في كل الأمور الأخرى اختلافا كبيرا. **فبينما** كان والدي رجلاً فقيرا، كان والد الآنسة فارلي رجلا ثريا. **فأنا** فقيرة معدمة، وهي تملك ثروة كبيرة. [...] لا يمكنني أبدا الإقدام على فسخ الخطوبة، ″ تابعت قائلة، **فكيفما** انتهت هذه المسألة ستكون نهايتها حزينة جدا بالنسبة إليّ. ″
[...]صمّمت على تنفيذ ما طلبه منّي فورا، وبخاصة بعد قراءتي للمقطع الأخير من رسالته الذي أثار الذعر والخوف في نفسي. **فبعد** ما ذكر أنه لم يشاهد أو يسمع أي شيء عن آن كاثريك، توقّف فجأة عن التحدث في هذا الموضوع [...]

It is clear that *fa* in the first mention in فنحن corresponds to neither explicitation

nor implication in the ST. Also, it can be observed that the adversative relationship between the two clauses is, in fact, signaled in the ST as well as the TT by the DM *except that* and فيما عدا respectively in the first clause, which expresses the speaker's adversative attitude in the second one. The *fa* is supposed to enhance that adversative relationship as well as smooth the flow of discourse. Yet, the insertion of *fa* makes the translation sound redundant, due to its immediate recurrence in the following sentence. However, the second instance of *fa* is needed to enhance the contrast DM *bain-amaa* ‹while› by smoothing the flow of discourse and improvising cohesion, whereas the first one may be considered superfluous, for the adversative relation is signaled by *fiimaa 'adaa* ′except that› rather than by the *fa*. Note that the contrast in the source text is signaled by the multifunctional ′and′, but the translator opts for using a stronger contrast marker because he probably feels that *wa* is not semantically strong enough to carry the contrast, it being commonly used as a default DM in Arabic. In fact, there are three instances in the above excerpt where *wa* is employed as a default DM whose sole function is to render the text cohesive rather than mark logical relations, viz. *wa*-fiimaa *'adaa* ′and except that′, *wa-hya* ′and she′, and *wa-bixaassatin* ′and especially′.

Likewise, the resumptive *fa* in فبعد does not correspond to implication in the source text. The preceding paragraph is mainly about a letter from Mr. Hartright in which he prevails on Miss Halcombe to get him an employment outside London. He attributes his request to the fact that he has been watched and followed by some strange men ever since he returned to London. Consequently, his life might be in danger. That

first paragraph concludes with the above sentence *I have been made all the readier to comply with this request by a passage at the end of his letter, which has almost alarmed me*. However, there seems to be a shift of topic in the following paragraph, bearing in mind that it presents new information which revolves around Miss Catherick rather than Mr. Hartright, but still within the context of the same discourse. In other words, the following paragraph is related pragmatically to the preceding one, and the Arabic *fa* is employed to introduce that relationship and, as a result, orient the reader. Thus, the *fa* is employed to naturalize the discourse and render it cohesive.

By contrast, it could be noted that the use of *fa* in فأنا and فكيفما correspond to *and* and the suppressed *thus* in the ST respectively. For example, the *fa* in فأنا introduces the clause that describes Miss Halcombe′s poverty as the result of her father being a poor man, whereas Miss Farlie′s wealth is the result of her father being a rich man. It, therefore, corresponds to an explicit resultative marker *and* in the ST. Similarly, the *fa* in فكيفما introduces a cause-effect relationship between the first and the second clause. In the first sentence, Miss Farlie states that she could not afford to renege on her engagement to Mr. Percival and in the second one she spells out the cause or reason; it would make her life a misery. So, *fa* corresponds to an implicit causal marker *because, thus,* etc. in the ST and it is brought to the surface in the TT to orient the reader and smooth the flow of discourse. The reader would feel that something is missing if it is left out. Below are more examples involving different functions of *fa*.

4.1.1 Adversative fa

(2) The state of my spirit little fitted me for the society of stranger; **but** the meeting was inevitable.

وبالرغم من أنني كنت في حالة نفسية سيئة تجعل من الصعب عليّ الدخول في حديث اجتماعي مع شخص غريب، **فقد** كان ذلك الأمر لا مفر منه.

The *fa* in (2) serves as a coordinating element between the dependent clause and the independent clause whereby it introduces the second clause which stands in an adversative relation to the first one. This is signaled in the ST by the contrast marker *but*. The target text, nonetheless, employs two DMs i.e. the *fa* and بالرغم من *although/despite the fact that*. However, it is the بالرغم من DM that serves as the corresponding equivalent of the ST contrast marker; it can do the job with or without the *fa* marker. The function of the *fa* is to enhance the adversative relation and smooth the flow of discourse; its deletion would only result in a less assertive tone and less cohesive discourse. In this example, therefore, we have a case of explicitation in Arabic بالرغم من corresponding to an explicit English *but,* as well as a case of Arabic explicitation *fa* corresponding to *zero* equivalents in English.

By contrast, the following example (3) involves an instance where TT explicitation corresponds to ST implicitation:

(3) May she not give it in the future?
Never! **If** you still persist it in maintaining our engagement, I may be your
true and faithful wife, Sir Percival, but never your loving wife.

ألا يمكنها منح حبها له في المستقبل؟
أبدا. **فإذا** ما زلت مصراً على الاستمرار في خطوبتنا، فإنني سأكون زوجتك الوفية والمخلصة يا سير بيرسيفال ولكني لن أكون أبداً زوجتك المحبة.

This excerpt conveys the contrasting attitudes of Mr. Percival and Mrs. Farlie.

Mr. Percival anticipates a loving wife in Mrs. Farlie, but the lady cannot just afford to love him. This contrast in their attitudes is signaled in the ST by the suppressed contrast marker *but* or *yet,* and it can be readily worked out by the ST reader. That is, the text might read as *Never! But/Yet if you still persist it in maintaining our engagement, I may be your true and faithful wife, Sir Percival, but never your loving wife.* However, this suppressed concessive marker is brought to the surface as *fa* in the TT in order to enhance the conditional marker and smooth the flow of discourse and, as a result, it renders the text more explicit.

Sometimes, the adversative fa involves an instance where the target explicitation corresponds to zero equivalents in the ST, as can be illustrated in (4) below:

(4) I was struck, on entering the drawing-room, by the curious contrast, rather in material than in color, of the dresses which the ladies now wore. *While* Mrs. Vessey and Miss Halcombe were richly clad, Miss Farlie was poorly dressed in plain white muslin.

لفت انتباهي عند دخولي قاعة الاستقبال التناقض اللافت للنظر بالأحرى في نوعية وليس في ألوان قماش الأثواب التي ارتدتها السيدات. **فبينما** ارتدت السيدة فاسي والآنسة هالكومب فستاتين ثمينين غاية في الأناقة، كان فستان الآنسة فارلي المصنوع من الموسلين.

It is clear that the second sentence in the above example conveys two contrasting ideas; it provides a clear contrast between Mrs. Vessey and Miss Halcombe's elegant dress on the one hand and Mrs. Farlie's unusually poor dress, on the other. The contrast is marked by the ST explicit contrast marker *while* and its counterpart in the TT بينما. However, a degree of explicitness can be observed in the TT in that, while both texts use a corresponding contrast marker, Arabic

employs *fa* along with the contrast marker بينما in order to enhance it and smooth the flow of discourse. So, the fa in this construction has no corresponding equivalent in the ST. However, its presence is necessary as an Arab reader would feel a discoursal gap if *fa* is not prefixed to *bainamaa.*

4.1.2 Explanatory fa

The function of the explanatory *fa* is to signal that the second clause/sentence is an explanation, comment or illustration of the preceding one. Consider the following example:

(5) But my duty did not lie in this direction – my function was of the purely judicial kind.

ولكن واجبي كان مختلفا تماما، **فقد** كان دوري مجرد القيام بدور الحكم.

In this example, the clause *my function was of the purely judicial kind* serves as an explanation of the preceding one. The ST employs an *emdash* to indicate explanation, whereas the TT explicitly uses the DM *fa* to introduce the explanatory clause. In other words, both texts correspond explicitly in that they both use an explicit explanatory marker, yet they differ in the method adopted. While the ST employs a punctuation mark, the TT settles for punctuation along with a DM. This is indicative of the syndetic nature of Arabic discourse which, unlike English, prefers a highly frequent use of DMs to achieve text competence and facilitate the reader's understanding. For instance, if the *fa* is not combined with the Arabic particle قد to which it is often prefixed, the TT would sound unnatural and the reader would feel something is missing.

By contrast, following is an instance where TT explicitation corresponds to ST

implication:

(6) The only sign I detect of the struggle it must cost her to preserve appearances at this trying time, expresses itself in a sudden unwillingness, on her part, ever to be left alone. *Instead* of retreating to her own room, as usual, she seems to dread going there.

والإشارة الوحيدة التي أمكنني ملاحظتها والدالة على ما يعتمل في داخلها، والصعوبة المتناهية التي تواجهه في المحافظة على مظاهر العروس السعيدة، كانت رفضها البقاء بمفردها ولو لحظة واحدة. **فبدلاً** من اللجوء إلى غرفتها كما كانت تفعل سابقاً، كان يبدو عليها أنها كانت تخشى القيام بذلك العمل كلياً.

As can be observed in (6), the second sentence offers an explanation for Mrs. Farlie′s unwillingness to be left alone; she is possessed by fear. The DM *thus/in this way* is left suppressed in the ST, yet it could be perceived by the reader. Thus, the text might be interpreted as *Thus/In this way, instead of retreating to her own room, as usual, she seems to dread going there*. The target text, however, settles for an explicit DM in order to signal explanation and smooth the flow of discourse. Without it, the reader would feel a missing link. Therefore, this is a case where TT explicitation corresponds to ST implicitation.

The following example, by contrast, represents an instance where the DM *fa* has no corresponding equivalent in the ST:

(7) I never saw my mother and my sister together in Pesca′s society, without finding my mother much the younger woman of the two. On this occasion, *for example,* while my mother was laughing heartily over the boyish manner in which we tumbled into the parlor, Sarah was picking up the broken pieces of a teacup, which the

professor had knocked off the table in his precipitate advance to meet me at the door.

أضف إلى ذلك أنه خلال استقبال والدتي وشقيقتي لصديقي بيسكا، كانت الأولى تبدو أكثر حيوية من الثانية بطريقة ترحيبها به وسلوكها تجاهه. **فمثلاً** في هذه المناسبة، كانت والدتي تضحك جذلاً من طريقة تهالكنا على الأريكة، بينما كانت سارة تقوم بلملمة بقايا فنجان شاي تحطّم نتيجة ارتطام بيسكا به وهو يسرع للالتقاء بي عند الباب.

This example indicates that the two texts correspond explicitly in using the explanatory phrase *for example* and مثلاً respectively. However, a degree of explicitness can be observed in the TT in that, while both texts use an explicit explanatory marker, Arabic attaches *fa* to it to enhance the exemplification marker and smooth the flow of discourse. In this way, we have an explicit Arabic DM that corresponds to a zero equivalent in the ST.

4.1.3 Resultative/Consequential *fa*

The resultative *fa* performs a consequential function between two clauses/sentences, whereby the second expresses a state of affairs or action that comes as a result of the first one. Consider the following example:

(8) It is the great beauty of the law that it can dispute any human statement, made under any circumstances, and reduce it to any form. If I had felt professionally called upon to set up a case against Sir Percival Glyde, on the strength of his own explanation, I could have done so beyond all doubt.

إن عظمة القانون هي قدرته الفذّة على تفنيد الإفادات والأقوال البشرية كافة، المصرّح بها في مختلف الظروف ونقضها بأي شكل من الأشكال. **فلو** شعرت ولو لحظة واحدة أن واجبي المهني يدعوني لرفع دعوى ضد السير بير سيفال غلايد، بناء على أقواله، لما لا شك فيه كنت أقدمت على ذلك العمل في الحال.

The employment of *fa* in this example is triggered by implicitation in the ST. It serves as the Arabic equivalent of a ST implicit resultative marker like *as a result, consequently, therefore*, etc. which introduces the resultative proposition. It could be observed that the first sentence presents a set of factors about the law that would naturally result in Mr. Hartright being compelled to set up a case against Sir Percival Glyde. The *fa* is brought to the surface in the TT in order to signal consequence and smooth the flow of discourse. Hence, this is a case of TT explicitation that corresponds to ST implicitation.

By contrast, the following is an instance where the ST and TT correspond explicitly:

(9) The partial cleansing of the monument had evidently been accomplished by a strange hand [...]. The work of cleansing the monument had been left unfinished, **and** the person by whom it had been begun might return to complete it.

تأكّد لي أن عملية التنظيف الجزئي للنصب التذكاري قام بها شخص غريب عن المنطقة [...] <u>**فـ**أغلب</u> الظن سيعود ذلك الشخص لإتمام عملية التنظيف التي بدأها ولم ينهها.

Clearly, the second part of the ST sentence serves as the result of what has transpired in the first one and is introduced by the source resultative marker *and,* which is the equivalent of *so/therefore,* etc. in this context. The TT equally employs the Arabic *fa,* which performs a similar function in this context. So, this is an example where the ST and TT correspond explicitly in terms of the DM. However, the translator opts for *fa* rather than the additive DM *wa,* which formally corresponds to *and* in the ST, in order to highlight the resultative function which would, otherwise, be blurred by the choice

of the often default additive *wa*.

4.1.4 Causal *fa*

The causal *fa* indicates the cause of an action or a state of affairs. That is, it performs a causal relationship between two sentences whereby the second sentence is the cause of the first one. Consider the following example:

(10) I can do little more than offer my humble testimony to the truthfulness of Miss Halcombe›s sketch of the old lady›s character. Mrs. Vessey looked the personification of human composure and female amiability.

وبالفعل لا يسعني إضافة شيء إلى ما قالته الآنسة هالكومب سوى القول إن شهادتها تلك صادقة ومطابقة تماماً للواقع. **فقد** كانت السيدة فاسي تجسيدا حيًا لرباطة الجأش الإنسانية واللطف النسائي.

As can be seen, the *fa* introduces a cause-result relationship between the first sentence and the second one. In the first sentence, the speaker states that he cannot afford but endorse Mr. Halcombe′s account of Mrs. Vessey′s character, and in the second one he spells out the cause or reason for doing so, that is, she embodies serenity and good humor. Therefore, the use of *fa* is triggered by an implicit causal marker like *because* in the ST which is brought to the surface in the TT to orient the reader and smooth the Arabic flow of discourse. The reader would feel something is missing if it is not employed and the cause-result relation would be lost.

4.1.5 Resumptive *fa*

The resumptive *fa,* which mostly occurs paragraph-, clause-, and sentence-initial, establishes a link between the just concluded ideas/thoughts and the following ones. It signals the continuity of discourse,

with a shift of topic whereby the addresser presents the receiver with new information. Thus, it concerns the pragmatic aspect of discourse. Consider the following example:

(11) As soon as Miss Farlie had left the room, he spared us all embarrassment on the subject of the anonymous letter, by diverting to it of his own accord. He had stopped in London on his way from Hampshire […].

ما أن غادرت الآنسة فارلي الغرفة، حتى بادر هو من تلقاء نفسه إلى الإشارة إلى موضوع الرسالة اللغز موفراً على الجميع صعوبة مفاتحته بذلك الموضوع. **فقد** توقف في لندن في طريق عودته من هامبشير [...].

The use of *fa* in the example above is not prompted by implicitation in the source text. Rather, it is employed to smooth the Arabic flow of discourse and make the translation more explicit. In fact, there is a notable mismatch between the ST and the TT when it comes to resumptive *fa*. This could be attributed to the fact that this type of *fa,* as is the case here, indicates the continuity of the discourse with a shift of topic; it presents new information within the context of the same discourse. It could be noted that the example above revolves around the anonymous letter. However, while the first sentence concerns the sense of relief felt by those present when Mr. Percival touches on the issue of his own accord, the second one concerns how he comes to know about the letter itself in London. Thus, the following sentence is related pragmatically to the preceding one. Given the asyndetic nature of English and the use of the past perfect ′had stopped′ in the sentence, the ST reader can easily perceive the connection. However, the *fa* is employed in Arabic to signal the continuity of the discussion, create a logical link between the preceding and following sentences, and smooth the Arabic flow of discourse.

4.2 The DM *′ið*

According to Al-Afghani (1970), إذ may perform a causal relationship and signal suddenness. His claim goes along that of Bin Hishaam Al-Ansaari (2002/d.761h), who also adds adverbial, appositional, and additive functions.

The data analysis shows that إذ is the second most recurring DM of the three in the translation under investigation, viz. 19 instances have been noted, constituting 34.5% of the corpus (almost tying with *fa*). Nonetheless, it has been identified solely with the causal and adverbial function, and it may or may not correspond to implicitation in the ST. Out of the 19 instances, إذ corresponds to implicitation in the ST in 12 cases (63%), to explicitation in 3 cases (16%), and to zero equivalents in 4 instances (21%). Consider the following extract:

(12) I have resolved to prolong our stay for another week at least. It is useless to go back to Limmeridge till there is an absolute necessity for our return. […] but he is obstinate – or let me rather say, resolute. ′Merriman, I leave details to you. Do what you think right for my interest, and consider me as having personally withdrawn from the business until it is all over.′ […] This is sad, but his occasional reference to himself grieves me still more. He says that the effort to return to his old habits and pursuits grows harder […].

قررت تمديد إقامتنا هنا أسبوعا آخر، **إذ** لا فائدة من العودة الى ليميريدج ما لم يطرأ أمر ضروري يحتِم عودتنا. [...] ولكنه رجل عنيد، أو بالأحرى موطَّد العزم، **إذ** قال: «سأترك لك الاهتمام بالتفاصيل يا ماريان. افعل ما تراه ملائما لمصالحي، وإلى أن نتوصل

إلى إتفاق اعتبرني كأنني انسحبت من المسألة بكاملها. [...] شعرت بالأسف جرّاء هذا الأمر، ولكن الذي زاد في حزني عليه ذكره العرضي إلى ما آلت إليه أحواله، **إذ** قال إنه قد صعب عليه كثيرا العودة إلى متابعة أعماله وعاداته المعتادة [...].

As can be noted, the first mention of إذ corresponds to a causal marker *because,* which is suppressed in the ST and brought to the surface in the TT to orient the reader and smooth the flow of discourse. This is an example of Arabic explicitation that corresponds to English implicitation. The second sentence of the ST provides justification for the speaker′s action in the preceding one. That is to say, it gives the reason why the speaker decides to *prolong their stay for another week.* So, the Arabic causal marker إذ, whose nearest equivalent could be *since, because,* etc. in this context, is used here as a corresponding element to the implicit causal maker in the ST.

By contrast, in the second mention, إذ is attached to a reporting clause and does not correspond to implicitation in the ST. In fact, the translation exhibits addition in two consecutive instances; addition of the reporting clause *he said* قال, which is left implicit in the ST and insertion of the adverbial DM إذ, which corresponds to zero equivalents in the ST. The addition of the reporting clause قال ′he said′ is intended for speaker identification, the reason being the lengthy discourse, in which the two lawyers, Mr. Gilmore and Mr. Percival, are the participants, is fairly marked by suppression of speaker identity. It should be noted that the discourse revolves around their respective clients, and they sometimes sound as if they were reporting what their clients say. Thus, the reporting clause linking Mr. Gilmore to the speech in the quotes is supposed to resolve any potential ambiguity regard-

ing his identity. However, it would be better, even more acceptable in this context to substitute the phrase إذ قال by a more appropriate expression like وتابع قائلا to resolve the potential ambiguity. The utilization of إذ قال, which translates into something like *when he said or as he said,* makes the speaker sound as if he were quoting a client and thus failing to resolve the ambiguity, which may lead to altering the meaning potential of translation. This shows an erroneous case of employing addition. It also means that marked (unjustified) explicitation exists even at the level of discourse markers.

In the third mention, إذ equally performs an adverbial function because it may be translated as *when or as,* which is not implied in the source text. Nonetheless, the use of the adverbial إذ is significant in that it smoothes the flow of discourse and renders it more natural. Without it, a gap would be felt in the Arabic text. Below are more examples of the functions of إذ in the data.

4.2.1 Causal *'ið*

The causal إذ introduces a sentence that describes the cause or gives the reason for the action or state of affairs in the preceding one. Consider the following example:

(13) He was evidently in search of me, **for** he quickened his pace when
      we caught sight of each other.

بدا وكأنه كان يبحث عني، **إذ** ما أن شاهدني حتى أسرع نحوي بخطى سريعة.

As can be seen, the second sentence of the ST provides justification for the speaker′s claim in the preceding one. That is to say, it gives the reason why the speaker claims that *He was evidently in search of me.* This clause is introduced by the Eng-

lish causal marker *for.* Therefore, the Arabic causal marker إذ is used here as a corresponding element to the explicit causal maker in the ST. This is a case where the language pair corresponds explicitly in the employment of a DM.

By contrast, the following is an instance of Arabic explicitation that corresponds to implicitation in the ST:

(14) To tell you the truth, I am uneasy about Laura, she has sent to say

she wants to see me directly [...].

أصارحك القول يساورني القلق بشأن لورا. إذ أرسلت في
طلبي على وجه السرعة [...].

It is clear that the causal marker إذ is brought to the surface in the TT to serve as the corresponding equivalent of an implicit counterpart *because, for,* etc. It can be noted that the second clause describes the reason why the speaker feels perturbed by Laura′s request. The ST reader can easily perceive the connection as well as the suppressed causal marker. However, Arabic needs to bring the causal marker to the surface in order to orient the reader and naturalize the flow of discourse. The Arabic text would be incohesive without it. One should note that the translator has erroneously punctuated this DM with a period rather than a correct comma; this DM can only introduce a dependent clause that cannot stand on its own, just like a dependent *because* clause in English.

4.2.2 Adverbial *ʾið*

There is a unanimous consensus among Arabic grammarians that the primary function of إذ is an adverbial one (Medieval Bin Hishaam Al-Ansari 2002/d.761h). This type falls under the category of what (Khalil, 1999, p. 252) refers to as ″adverbial

object, which is a noun, in the accusative case that denotes the time and place of the verb″. Consider the following example:

(15) Mr. Farlie′s answer reached me by return of post, and proved to be wandering and irrelevant in the extreme. ″Would dear Gilmore be so very obliging as not to worry his friend and client about such a trifle as a remote contingency?″

كان جواب السيد فارلي على رسالتي هائماً جداً وبعيداً
تماماً عن صلب الموضوع، إذ قال: ″أيمكن للعزيز
غيلمور أن يتلطّف بحيث لا يقلق صديقه وموكّله بمثل هذا
الاحتمال الضئيل التافه؟″

The clause إذ قال is brought to the surface in the TT to be the corresponding equivalent of a parallel implicit clause in the ST. The reporting clause *he said,* to which قال corresponds, is suppressed in the ST and the adverbial marker إذ, which could be translated as *when or as* is not implied in the ST. The reporting clause is intended for speaker identification by associating Mr. Farlie with the quoted question because Mr. Gilmore′s narration is fairly marked by suppression of speaker identity. Thus, the reporting clause linking Mr. Farlie to the speech in the quote is supposed to resolve any potential ambiguity regarding his identity. The DM إذ, which corresponds to a zero equivalent in the ST, performs an adverbial function and, therefore, helps to keep the flow of discourse cohesive and smooth. However, it would be better, even more acceptable in this context, to substitute the phrase إذ قال by إذ سأل since the following quote is a question rather than a statement. The utilization of إذ سأل is justified here because it makes the reader realize that the speaker is quoting the character he has just mentioned and, consequently, resolve any ambiguity that might arise from identity suppression.

4.3 The DM *bittaalii*

Despite its being a pervasive feature of Arabic discourse, research on the DM بالتالي, which may be translated as *therefore, consequently, thus, as a result,* is almost nonexistent. Review of the existing literature yields no results, except for *Al-Mu'jam-l-ghanni* (E-version) by Abul-Azm. According to this dictionary, this DM communicates the same meanings as، من ثم نتيجة لما سبق and إذ. This indicates that بالتالي only performs the resultative/consequential function, which is, in fact, the only function it has been identified with in the translation under investigation. The data shows 16 instances of this DM, making up 29% of the corpus. It corresponds to implicitation in the ST in 8 cases (50%), to explicitation in 7 cases (43.75%), and to zero equivalent in 1 instance (6.25%).

The resultative/consequential بالتالي functions to either establish a link between two clauses of a compound sentence where the second clause occurs as a result of the preceding one or to introduce a sentence that occurs as a consequence of the preceding one. Consider the following example:

(16) Mr. Gilmore is the old friend of two generations of Farlies, **and** we can trust him, as we could trust no one else.

علماً أن صداقة السيد غيلمور مع أسرة فارلي قديمة تعود إلى جيلين من الزمن، **وبالتالي** يمكننا الوثوق به كليا.

According to Quirk, et al. (1986), the English DM *and* signals multiple textual functions including the consequential one as in the above example. Since the Arabic DMs *bittaalii* and *wa,* which co-occur in the above example, can equally perform the same function, i.e. the consequential function, *bittaalii,* being more semantically ori-

ented, could be seen as the corresponding element to the English DM *and,* while the addition of *wa* is meant to make that function more explicit and the discourse more cohesive. It should be noted that *wa,* which is usually employed as a default DM whose main function is to cater to cohesion in Arabic discourse, can carry the weight of a semantically-loaded DM alone (as in the example above). However, most writers in Arabic prefer to employ a more semantically-oriented DM (*bittaali* here) and, at the same time, keep *wa* as an enhancer of the logical relation as well as a cohesive marker.

By contrast, there are instances where the target DM has no equivalent in the ST. Consider the following example:

(17) There are no such things as ghosts, **and therefore,** any boy who believes in ghosts believes in what can't be.

لا وجود على الاطلاق لشيء يسمّى بالأشباح، **وبالتالي،** فأي ولد يصدق وجود الأشباح، يكون **بالتالي** يصدق أمراً لا يمكن أن يحصل على الإطلاق.

As can be seen, there is optimal formal correspondence between the DMs of the TT and their ST counterparts in the first occurrence. In other words, the target DMs وبالتالي are the corresponding equivalents of the ST DMs *and therefore.* By contrast, the second mention of the DM بالتالي has no corresponding element in the ST. As a matter of fact, it represents an erroneous case of employing this DM, given its occurrence in the immediately previous sentence and, therefore, it makes the translation sound redundant. The first *bittaalii* should be kept, while the second one should be deleted in order to avoid redundancy and offer natural Arabic discourse. A more natural version could be achieved by a rendition like يكون قد صدّق أمراً لا يمكن أن يحصل على الإطلاق,

thus using the Arabic confirmatory particle قد instead to naturalize and smooth the flow of discourse.

5. Conclusion

The argument presented in this paper runs counter to Blum-Kulka's (1986) hypothesis that instances of explicitation in the TT must correspond to instances of implicitation in the ST. Blum-Kulka does not seem to have taken into account the nature of different languages. The data indicates that this claim is valid in some cases but invalid in others, i.e. DMs may correspond to implicitation in some instances but may not in others. The discussion of three Arabic DMs *fa, 'ið* and *bittaalii,* which perform different discoursal functions including the adversative, explanatory, causal, resultative, resumptive, and adverbial function, shows that they may correspond to explicitation, implicitation, and zero equivalents in the ST. The employment of DMs in Arabic discourse ranges between marking purely logical relations and rendering the discourse more cohesive. Apart from its frequent use as a default DM, it is generally felt that *wa* is too light a DM to mark a logical relation; hence, it is mainly used to enhance other semantically oriented DMs.

It can be argued that what obtains between Spanish and English also obtains between English and Arabic, as far as DMs are concerned (Saldanha 2008). This study demonstrates through authentic translational data that Arabic makes frequent use of DMs because of the syndetic nature of its discourse, unlike English whose discourse is equally asyndetic. This being the case, formal correspondence between English and Arabic in terms of DMs cannot be stipulated. Besides naturalizing and smoothing the flow of discourse, Arabic DMs facilitate the reader′s understanding of the text through creating the necessary semantic and pragmatic links. Nonetheless, some erroneous cases of employing DMs in professional translation into Arabic may occur, something which renders the translation redundant and/or unnatural.

References

Abdel-Hameed, S. (1965). Buloogh Al-Arab fi Al Waw fi Lughat Al- Arab. Cairo: Maktabat al-Kulliyah Al Azhariya.

Al-Afghani, S. (1970). Al-Moojaz fi Qawaaed Al-Lughat Al-Arabia wa shawaa hidiha. Beirut: Dar Al-Fikr.

Al-Batal, M. (1990). Connectives as cohesive elements in a modern expository Arabic text. (ed.) Mushira Eid and John McCarthy, Perspectives on Arabic Linguistics II. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Al-Hmouz, M. A. (2001). Al-Rasheeed fi al-nahw al-Arabi. Dar Alsafa›. Jordan: Amman.

Al-Jubouri, A. (1987). Computer-aided categorization and quantification of connectives in English and Arabic. Birmingham: University of Aston.

Al-Jubouri, A. and Knowles, F. (1988). A computer–assisted study of cohesion based on English and Arabic corpora. Proceedings of the12th International ALLC Congress, Geneva, Geneva: ALLC.

AlKhfaji, R. (2011). Essays in Arabic Text linguistics and Translation Studies. Amman: Amwaj for Publication and Distribution.

Anees, I. (1966). Min Asrar Al-Lugha. Cairo: Anglo-Egyptian Bookshop.

Baker, M. (1992). In Other Words: A Course Book on Translation. London: Routledge.

Beaugrande de, R. and Dressler, W. (1981). Introduction to Text Linguistics. London: Longman Group Ltd.

Bell, A., Brenier, J. M., Gregory, M., Girand, C., and Jurafsky, D. (2009). Predictability effects on durations of function and content words in conversational English. Journal of Memory and Language, 60, 92-111.

Blum-Kulka, S.(1986). Shifts of cohesion and coherence in translation. In Lawrence Venuti (ed.), The Translation Studies Reader, 298-313. London and New York: Routledge.

Cantarino, V. (1976). The syntax of modern Arabic in prose. Bloomington: Indian University Press.

Cantarino, V. (1975). The syntax of modern Arabic in prose. Bloomington: Indian University Press.

Cantarino, V. (1974). The syntax of modern Arabic in prose. Bloomington: Indian University Press.

Chung, C. and Nebaker, J. P. (2007). The psychological functions of function words. Social Communication, 343-359.

Collins, W. (1860/2010). The Woman in White. Penguin Books. Translated into Arabic by Dar Al-Bihar, Beirut, 2003.

Dworzynski, K., Howell, P., Au-Yeung, J. & Rommel, D. (2004). Stuttering on function and content words across age groups of German speakers who stutter. Journal Multilingual Communication Disorder, 2 (2), 81-101.

Fareh, S. (1998). The functions of AND and Wa in English and Arabic written discourse. Papers and Studies in Contrastive Linguistics, 34, 303-312.

Farghal, M. (2012). Advanced Issues in Arabic-English Translation Studies. Kuwait: Kuwait University Press.

Farghal, Mohammed and M. Al-Hamly. (2004). Media Translation Assessment: A Case Study of the Arabic Newsweek. Arab Journal for the Humanities 86:265-293.

Farhan, Z. and Fannoush, T. (2005). Difficulties of translating discourse markers from English into Arabic. ADAB AL-RAFIDAYN, 4, 1-27.

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

Hamad, A. and Zu›bi, Y. (1984). Al-Mu›jam Al Wafi fi Al Nahu Al-Arabi. Amman: Arts and Culture Department.

Hamdan, J. and Fareh, S. (1999). The translation of Arabic wa into English: some problems & implications. Dirasat: Human and Social Science, 26 (2), 590-603.

Hatim, B. (1997). Communication across Cultures: Translation Theory and Contrastive Textlinguistics. Exeter: University of Exeter.

Holes, C. (1995). Modern Arabic: Structures, Functions, and Varieties. London: Longman.

Howell, P., Au-Yeung, P., and Sackin, S. (1999). Exchange of stuttering from function words to content words with age. Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research, 42, 345-354.

Ibn-Hishaam, Jamal Al-Deen Ibn Hishaam Ansaari (died in 761h) (2002). Mughni Al-Labiib? an Kutubbi AL-?9aariib,(ed.). Al-Khatib, A.L. Kuwait: Al-Turaath Al-Arabi.

Illyyan, M. (1990). Transitional words and the Arab translator. Irbid-Jordan: Yarmouk University. [MA Thesis].

Johnston, B. (1990). Orality and Discourse Structure in Modern Standard Arabic. In Eid, M. (ed.) Perspectives on Arabic Linguistics I, 215-233. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins,
Kamal, A. H. (1971). Huroof Al-Ma′ni. Taif: Al-Ma′rif Bookshop.

Kammensj, H. (1993). Connectives in MSA and/or ESA: Suggestion for Research. Gothenburg: University of Gothenburg, Department of Oriental Languages.

Karin, C. R. (2005). A Reference Grammar of Modern Standard Arabic. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Khalil, E. N. (2000). Grounding in English and Arabic News Discourse. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Khalil, A. M. (1999). A Contrastive Grammar of English & Arabic. Jordan: Jordan Book Center.

McCarthy, M. (1991). Discourse Analysis for Language Teachers. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pym, A. (2005). Explaining Explicitation. Tinet, 4, 29-43, retrieved on August 15, 2011, from www.tinet.cat /~apym/on-line/translation/explicitation _web.pdf .

Quirk, R. et al. (1986). A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language. Essex: London Group Ltd.

Saeed, A. T. and Fareh, S. (2006). Difficulties encountered by bilingual Arab learners in translating Arabic ′fa′ into English. The International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 9 (1), 19-31.

Saldanha, G. (2008). Explicitation revisited: bringing the reader into the picture. Trans-Kom, 1 (1), 20-35, accessed 18 August from www.trans-kom.eu.

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

Stubs, M. (1983). Discourse Analysis: The Sociolinguistic Analysis of Natural Language. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Tahaineh Y. and Tafish R. (2011). Pitfalls encountered by bilingual Arab learners in translating the Arabic discourse marker ‹θumma› into English. Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 1 (3), 226-238.