

Implicit vs. Explicit Textualization of Conjunctive Cohesion with Reference to Translation

Salim Yahya^(*)

Introduction

In recent years, textual cohesion has attracted the attention of many linguists and researchers in linguistics as one of the components of textuality. Among those are Halliday and Hasan (1976) who discussed in detail in their suggested model different aspects of cohesion in English. They categorize cohesion relations into three types, with each reflecting an aspect of relatedness: (1) relatedness of form; (2) relatedness of reference; (3) relatedness of semantic connection (conjunction). The aim of this study is to highlight the third type of relation i.e., conjunction, focusing on conjunctions to be rendered implicitly or explicitly when translation takes place from Arabic into English conjunctions.

Conjunction, as one means of creating cohesion has been approached by linguists and researchers from different perspectives. Halliday and Hasan (1976, pp. 226, 303, and 321) define conjunction as follows: "Conjunction is on the borderline of

(*) College of Arts / University of Mosul

grammatical and lexical cohesion. Conjunctive relations are not "phoric", but are representatives of semantic links between the elements that constitute a text".

The meaning of conjunctives has been discussed from different points of view. Halliday and Hasan (1976) suggest that conjunctives have textual meanings which "reflect" the semantic content of conjoined propositions. Dik (1968) argues that conjunctives themselves have "semantic values" which restrict what can be bound, while Gunter (1984) claims that conjunctives "impose" meanings between propositions. Zamel (1983) classifies meanings of conjunctives according to their grammatical functions i.e, coordinating conjunctions Subordinating conjunctions and conjunctive adverbs .

Text producers have a wide range of linguistic choices to communicate their thoughts implicitly or explicitly, and negotiate with their receivers according to communicational norms such as those elaborated by Grice (1975). Under standard Gricean analysis Implicitness creates the need for inferencing on the part of the text receiver .In other words, it creates receiver's involvement in the text. By the same token, Fowler (1986:67) suggests that the text producer uses implicit devices to involve his receivers in constant inferencing "to retrieve unstated assumptions". Mason (1998) argues that there are two main motivations for implicitness of conjunctives:

informative markedness and politeness .In the field of translation, some linguists speak of explicitness in translation studies .For example, Gallasher (1995:213) and Quillemin-Flescher (1981:89) suggest that the translator working into English should make the relation within and between sentences explicit by the use of adversative and concessive conjunctives. Blum-Kulka (1986:19) and Baker (1993:243) refer to a marked rise in the level of explicitness in translations compared to specific source texts and to original texts in general.

In Arabic, much attention has been given to implicit and explicit relations for realizing the rhetorical function. Ancient Arab rhetoricians give due significance to ‘al-fasl wa l-was’ (implicit and explicit conjunction). This has been voiced in the popular statement "Al- balaghatu hiya ma<rifatul fasil min al-wasl" (Al-Qazwini, in Khafaji, 1983:246) (Rhetoric is discriminating implicit from explicit conjunctives). A good example to illustrate this relation is taken from the Glorious Quran (Sura II :verses .13- 14)

وإذا خلوا الى شياطينهم قالوا إنا معكم إنما نحن مستهزؤن الله يستهزئ بهم

ويمدّهم في طغيانهم يعمهون". (سورة البقرة: آية 13 - 14)

But when they go privily to their Satans , they say, “We are with you, we were only mocking”. “God shall mock them and shall lead them on blindly wandering in their insolence”. (Arberry 1980 :13).

The clauses of “Allahu yastahziu bihim” must not be connected with “qalu inna ma akum”. because, if it were, the property of mockery would be shared in a similar manner by God and the hypocrites .Here the adversative relation is implicit between the propositions of the discourse to realize a rhetorical function. In other words, using any conjunctive can disturb the pragmatic and rhetorical function of the text. And such implicit device serves to heighten the adversative relation which the producer intends the reader to perceive .

Statement of the Problem

The present study is concerned with a textual area student translators often find difficult to handle in the process of translating. We believe that there are various reasons for this difficulty. First, Arabic tends to rely heavily on explicit conjunctives which perform different functions at stylistic, semantic and syntactic levels. This is partly due to the absence of well- established punctuation system and the use of punctuation according to very flexible rules on the part Arab writers (Kaplan, 1966; Koch, 1981; Williams, 1982; Aziz,1998). Second, the multifunctionality of several conjunctive devices may perform more than one function in the same text .The third reason is that Arabic tends to favour coordination. over subordination (Ibid). by using explicit conjunctives,

We hypothesize that there are several differences in the means used by English and Arabic to achieve textual relation through implicit and explicit conjunctives and such differences may lead to blurring the text when translation takes place.

The focus of analysis is placed not only on the cohesive conjunctive itself as a linguistic item, but also on its functionality in the context and co-text. The analysis, thus, requires that we should perceive how relations interact with the meaning of conjoined propositions to bring about the communicative function of the text.

Discussion and Analysis

In this study, we will examine all the textual units occurring at intrasentential and intersentential levels. Conjunctives occurring at intrasentential level are included in our analysis because examining only conjunctives that operate across the boundaries of orthographic sentences (cf. Halliday and Check, 1976) would ignore a large number of clauses within the sentence (Witt and Faigly, 1981). By the same token, orthographic sentences are often flexible, especially in Arabic as they do not have a well organized punctuation system. The focus of the analysis will be placed on cases when the translator should opt for implicitness or explicitness.

Before embarking on the analysis of the text below, it is to be noted that English does not seem to rely so heavily on explicit

markings of semantic relations among textual components (see Kaplan, 1966; Williams, 1984; Aziz and Lataiwish, 2000). Assuming that the reader will naturally interpret part of the text as a continuation of the preceding unit, English text producers tend to rely on inferred linkage, rather than explicit signals. Thus, it is not necessary, as Leech and Short (1981 :251) say, that every conjunctive relation be signalled because a conjunctive device may " overdetermine the relation between two ideas, which is happily vague, like an electric spark jumping a gap". Now, let us consider the following text taken from (AL-Zaman Iraqi newspaper) of April 10, 2004,

على الرغم من ازدياد الخلافات العربية الراهنة حول انعقاد مؤتمر القمة العربية في تونس، إلا أن وحدة الموقف العربي تبقى القضية الأساسية، فلا يمكن للعرب أن يستعيدوا حقوقهم ويحققوا طموحاتهم و كلمتهم ليست واحدة. و ليس ضروريا الآن أن نحقق وحدة عربية كاملة. فهذا الهدف لم يتم الوصول اليه في الظروف الحالية، ولكن من الضروري أن نسعى الى اتخاذ مواقف مشتركة في خدمة العالم العربي بعيداً عن المصالح الذاتية. فالخلافات العربية لا بدّ وأنها ستزول، فقد عانت الامة من نزاعات كثيرة قبل ذلك و تلاشت بعد فترة من الزمن. و اذا ما اراد العرب تحقيق الوحدة العربية، فـ ينبغي على جميع المنظمات والنفقات أن تكثف جهودها في تحقيق الوحدة الاقتصادية والثقافية والاجتماعية قبل تحقيق الوحدة السياسية. و يمكن أن نقول وحدة الموقف العربي هي ليست مسؤولية القادة العرب وانما هي مسؤولية جميع المنظمات العربية.

As can be observed, there are conjunctives which, when the text is translated into English, can be either retained, deleted or when given other functions or values, depending on the type of relationship holding between the units of the text. A proposed translation of the above text could be the following (the sign Φ represents an implicit conjunctive in the TL).

Although the Arabs differences on holding the Arab Summit Conference in Tunisia have increased. Φ the unity of Arab stance remains the ultimate cause, Φ Arabs cannot regain their rights nor can they achieve their ambitions, as long as their word is not unified. It is not necessary, at the moment, to realize a complete Arab unity. Φ This aim cannot be realized in the current conditions. However, what is necessary is to seek to taking mutual stands in the Arab world to serve the Arab unity , leaving aside self - interests. Φ The Arab differences will inevitably vanish. Φ The Arab nation-suffered from many disputes, vet all died away after a while. Φ If Arabs want to achieve the Arab unity, Φ all organizations and unions should intensify their efforts to realize economic, cultural and social unity before realizing the political unity. Φ We can argue that the unity of Arab stance is not only the responsibility of the Arab leaders, but also the responsibility of all these organizations.

The proposed translation shows that the devices used in the text, such as the recurrent "wa" and "fa" have multifunctional values. The interpretation of such conjunctives in a text leans heavily on the co-text which determines their functional values. The following table illustrates the changes of conjunctives that have taken respectively after translating the text.

No.	SL conjunctive	TL rendering
	Ala alrahmi min	Although
	Il la anna	∅
	Fa	∅
	Wa	Nor
	Wa	As long as
	Wa	∅
	Fa	∅
	Wa lakin	However
	Fa	∅
0	Fa	∅
1	Wa	Yet
2	Wa	∅
3	Fa	∅
4	Wa	∅
5	Wa innama	But also

The table shows that the Arabic conjunctives have different renderings. Some were retained, others disappeared as being stylistic or syntactic and entailed by the nature of developing content progression in Arabic, while others took on values or functions other than those they might take had they been literally translated (e.g. 4, 5, and 11). It also clearly shows that Arabic tends to favour explicitness, while English tends to favor implicitness.

The analysis of the (SL) text shows that the role of Arabic conjunctives can be syntactic or stylistic rather than cohesive. For example, in Arabic the concessive conjunction "ala-alraghmi min (although)" and "ilia anna (but)" can be quite acceptable in Arabic, whereas in English "although and but" cannot go hand in hand because they perform different syntactic functions. According to their grammatical function, coordinating conjunctions such as "but" connect independent clauses, while subordinating conjunctions such as "although" connect dependent and independent clauses. This is why the conjunctive "ilia anna (but)" should be left implicit when rendered into English.

Arabic conjunctives are also used to mark structural divisions across clause and sentence boundaries. For instance, the thirteenth conjunctive "fa" is imposed by syntactic co-occurrence restriction, i.e. "itha... fa" to mark structural relation between the two clauses : (a) conditional clause and (b) main clause. Using "fa" directly after the conditional clause marks the start of the main clause.

A prominent linguistic phenomenon in Arabic is that stylistic conjunctives are used to satisfy what is traditionally termed "polysyndeton". Polysyndetic connection in the case of Arabic tends to be reserved for maintaining the conventional way of presenting content and the flow of the discourse. Thus, it is rare to find a new clause, sentence or paragraph in an Arabic text without being

preceded by a conjunctive e.g. "wa" or "fa" (Kaplan, 1966; Koch, 1988; Aziz, 1999).

The cultural backgrounds of Arabic and English are so different that it is obviously very difficult to find texts in which all these variables are regular for both. It seems that "wa" and "fa" are used to facilitate the discourse flow, with "wa", for example, the text producer informs the reader that his argument is still going on. It could be argued that this conjunction imposed on written discourse, has its roots in oral discourse that was dominant in ancient times; "wa" is used more frequently in oral address than in written one (Kaplan, 1966; Dudley-Evan and Swales, 1980; Shakir, 1991). This phenomenon appears to have developed from the oral to the written channel when the Arabic language began to be realized in the form of written texts.

The (SL) text shows that "wa" and "fa" appear to simply mark continuation of discourse as stylistic devices which may not have serious effect on text-building in the (TL) text because they do not serve any purpose if rendered into English; and if rendered into English, the text would be confused and more difficult to read. However, if these conjunctives were removed, the Arabic text would sound alien to the Arabic reader. This probably reflects the almost omnipresent use of "wa" and "fa" to introduce the majority of clauses and sentences. This suggests, perhaps, a tendency in Arabic

to make the relationship explicit, whereas in English the relationship is frequently left implicit. However, the conjunctives, which bring about the underlying meaning to the surface level, should be explicitly rendered because these conjunctives are used as cohesive devices, making the text more convenient for the reader to understand. This can be shown in the conjunctives underlined above such as the eighth conjunctive "walakin (however)" and the fifteenth one "wa innama (but also)".

In English, it has been argued that the semantic relations should be perceivable without using explicit markers. Readers are often prepared to recognize the presence of a relation of conjunction even when it is not expressed overtly at all (Halliday and Hasan, 1976; 229). Also, Halliday (1985) observes that conjunctives could be either expressed or implied. He rightly puts it, "the presence and absence of explicit conjunction is one of the principal variables in English discourse (and should not be) obscured" (Ibid .309). Arabic discourse, however, tends, as the corpus of the study shows, to explicitly conjoin some parts of the text, serving purposes, different from those of English .

By the same token, many linguists (e.g Holloway, 1981; Fahnestock, 1983; Crombie,1985) maintain that an understanding of the semantic role of the text can lead to a greater understanding of the relationship between form and function of a conjunctive tie in

the discourse. Therefore, if conjunctives in the (SL) text such as (6,7,9,10,12,13,14) had been kept explicit in the (TL), the English discourse will be closer to child language or unplanned for face-to-face communication (de Beaugrande, 1983; Schiffrin, 1987). Moreover, overexplicitness may render a text too specific in the sense of "over-complete" (van Dijk, 1977; 109), and may hamper text efficiency (a text is considered efficient when it is utilized in communicating with the minimum expenditure of effort on the part of the readers (de Beaugrande and Dressier, 1981).

Worthy of note, also, is the fact that in some cases the presence of conjunction may blur rather than clarify the semantic relations in the text because "each connector is in a sense unique" and because connectors are not the usual links , but indicators of the direction to go in constructing them (Dillon, 1981: 76). The use of conjunctives should conform to the purpose of the writer's intention, and should be rendered into English only when needed by the reader because the presence of conjunctives do not impose a meaning that is not already inherent in the meanings of the sentences themselves. In the process of translation, thus, the translator should establish correspondence between the linguistic form of conjunctives and their functions in the (SL) and (TL) so that he can decide when conjunctives should be explicit or left implicit.

Conclusion

The analysis of this study shows that Arabic tends to use explicit conjunctives for different purposes: stylistic, structural, and cohesive, while English tends to implicitness. And the finding marks that overt conjunctives may not be needed when translation takes place from Arabic into English. A number of explicit conjunctivas might not be necessary since the English reader would infer the following idea as the continuation from the preceding one. In other words, the writer's intention can be clear without using too many explicit conjunctives, just enough for the reader to interpret the correct intention. So, The appropriate rendition of explicitness and implicitness requires that the translator should be well aware of the audience needs and interest by considering the audiences' purpose. Moreover, the translator should make a clear cut distinction between stylistic and structural conjunctives in Arabic which should be left implicit when rendered into English, and the cohesive ones which should be explicitly rendered.

References

- Al- Khafaji, M. (1983) *Al-iy thah fi ulm al balagha (Clarification in Rhetoric)*. Beirut.
- Arberry, A. J (1980) *The Koran Interpreted*. London: George Alien and Unwin.
- Aziz, Y. (1998). *Topics in Translation with Special Reference to English and Arabic*, Benghazi: University of Garyounis.
- Aziz, Y. and Lataiwish, M. S. (2000). *Principles of Translation*, Benghazi: University of Garyounis.
- Baker, M. (1993) *Corpus linguistics and translation studies: Implications and Applications*. In M Baker, G. Francis and E. Tognini-Bonelli (eds.) *Text and Technology: In Honour of John Sinclair*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Blum-Kulka, S. (1986) *Shifts of cohesion and coherence in translation* In J. House and S. Blum-Kulka (eds.) *Interlingual and Intercultural Communication: Discourse and Cognition in Translation an Second Language Acquisition Studies*. Tübingen: Narr.
- Crombie, W. (1985) *Process and Relation in Discourse and Language Learning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- De Beaugrande, R. and Dressier, W. (1981) *Introduction to Text Linguistics*. London: Longman.

- De Beaugrande, R.(1983) Linguistic and Cognitive Processes in Developmental Writing. IRAL, (2): 125-141.
- Dik, S (1986) Coordination. Amsterdam: North-Holland .
- Dillon, G.L (1981) Constructing Texts, Elements of a Theory of Composition and Style. Indiana Indiana University Press.
- Dudley-Evans, T. and Swales, J. (1980) Study Modes and Students from The Middle East. EL Document (109): 91-101. London: The British Council.
- Fahnestock, J. (1983) Semantic and Lexical Coherence. College Composition and Communication, (34): 400-416
- Farghal. M (1992) Naturalness and the Notion of Cohesion in EFL Writing Classes, IRAL (30): 45- 50.
- Fowler, R. (1986) Linguistic Criticism. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gallagher, J. (1995) L'Effacement des connecteurs adversatif et concessif en fraçais moderen. In M. Ballard (ed.) Relations discursive et traduction (pp. 201-220) lille: Presses universitaire de lille.
- Grice, H.P. (1975) "Logic and conversation". In P. Cole and J. Morgan (eds) Syntax and Semantics; Speech Acts .New York: Academic Press.

- Guillemin-Flescher, J. (1981) *Syntax comparee du francais de 1 'anglais. Problems de traduction. Paris: Ophrys.*
- Gunter, R. (184) "The conjunctive system of English: A study of and Meaning", *Language Science* , (6) 1-26
- Halliday, M. and Hasan, R. (1976) *Cohesion in English. London: Longman.*
- Halliday, M. (1985) *An Introduction to Functional Grammar .London: Edward Arnold*
- Hickey (ed.) *The Pragmatics of Translation. London: Cromwell Press Ltd.*
- Holloway, D. W. (1981). "Semantic Grammars: How they can help teach writing". *College Composition and Communication* , (32) 205-218 .
- Kaplan, R. (1966). "Cultural Thought Patterns in Intercultural Education". *Language Learning*, (16): 1- 21 .
- Koch, B. J. (1981) *Repetition in Discourse: Cohesion and Persuasion in Arabic Argumentative Prose. Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation. the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.*
- Koch, B. J- (1987) "Parataxis in Arabic: Modification as a Model for Persuasion". *Studies in Language*, (11): 85- 98.
- Leech, G and Short, M. (1981) *Style in Fiction. London: Longman.*

- Mason, I. (1998) Discourse connectives, Ellipsis and Markedness. In L. Hicky (ed.). *The Pragmatics of Translation* (pp. 170-184). Gromwell Press Ltd.
- Pritchard, R. (1980) *A Study of Cohesion Devices in the Good and Poor Compositions of Eleventh Graders*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation University of Missouri.
- Schiffrin, D. (1987) *Discourse Markers*. Cambridge University Press.
- Shakir, A (1991) Coherence in EFL Student-Written Texts: Two Perspectives. *Foreign Language Annals*, (24): 399-411.
- Sloan, G. (1983) "Transitions: Relationships Among T-Units". *College Composition and Communication*, (34): 447-453.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1977) *Text and Context*. London: Longman
- Williams, M. P. (1982) *A Contrastive Analysis of Text Cohesion and Development in Arabic and English*. Unpublished MA. thesis.
- Witte, S. P and Faigley, L. (1981). "Coherence, Cohesion, and Writing Quality". *College Composition and Communication* (32) 189-204.
- Zamel, V. (1983). Teaching those missing links in writing. *ELT Journal*, (37) 22-29.

ملخص

ظاهرة الإضمار والإظهار لأدوات الربط فيما له علاقة بالترجمة

سالم يحيى (*)

يتناول هذا البحث ظاهرة الإضمار والإظهار لأدوات الربط والترجمة من اللغة العربية إلى اللغة الإنكليزية. ويهدف البحث إلى إيجاد الاختلافات في استخدام الإضمار والإظهار بين اللغتين. ويفترض هذا البحث أن هناك عدة اختلافات في الطرائق التي تستخدمها اللغتين في تحقيق العلاقات النصية من خلال هذه الظاهرة. وتوصل البحث إلى أن اللغة العربية تميل إلى الإظهار مقارنة مع اللغة الإنكليزية. ويختتم البحث بتقديم بعض التوصيات بخصوص ترجمة أدوات الربط من اللغة العربية إلى الإنكليزية.

(*) كلية الآداب / جامعة الموصل.