CONFRONTATION ON THE EMIC AND ETIC LEVELS: TRANSLATION AS PART OF CONFRONTATIONAL LINGUISTICS

Rafik SULAIMAN[1]

[1]Associate Prof., PhD, Mardin Artuklu University, Turkey

Corresponding author: Rafik Sulaiman; e-mail: drsulaiman7@googlemail.com

Abstract

We did our best to devote ourselves exclusively to knowledge-based on the Translation to compare some texts in the context of the distantly related Languages and absolutely unrelated Languages . While most approaches to the conformational translation for the natural languages seek ways to translate the source language texts into the target language texts without full understanding of the text, the knowledge-based translations of related and unrelated languages are based on extracting and representing the meaning of the source text. This is of course scientifically the most challenging approach to the task of this type of translation. We seek to compare some texts of translation based on the distantly related Languages and unrelated Languages including challenges and solutions.

Keywords: *Translation, Languages, confrontation, Challenges and solutions.*

1. CONFRONTATION ON THE EMİC AND ETİC LEVELS

1. 1. Translation as part of Confrontational Linguistics

Although languages are not naturally confronted and contrasted as texts, confrontation on the categorical level is forming a much higher level of abstraction, very little is usually said of translation as part of confrontation on the etic level.

It is, therefore, essential to undertake a sufficiently detailed analysis of what usually happens when people confront (translate) fiction, for these are the kind of texts on which the etic stage of contrastive linguistics is usually based.

What is happening when a work of fiction, literary prose, is translated into another language? Usually, it amounts to the retelling of the story by the natural user of the target language in his own words.

In the case of a good translation the retailer or narrator of the story is himself a good enough writer to be able to write well in his own language and has enough talent to catch the spirit of the original, to retell the story plausibly and somehow similarly to its original content. As far as morphology is concerned the state of affairs is even less satisfactory because here the two systems diverge too widely even in cognate languages for the translator to be able to do justice to the structure of the original text.

Having confronted several texts, we have come to the conclusion that translations of fiction cannot be profitably used by confrontational linguistics. Whatever text we take, we can shut our eyes and be sure that we will find exactly the same situation: What is usually called "translation" of a variation on the theme in a different language.

If it is creative work, it is creative work, it is a valuable asset: it is an important part of the general cultural tradition of humanity in general.

But the philological science has no means of defining or investigating literary talent and telling us how the gift of finding the word properly and bringing it together with other proper words, thus, creating images and providing esthetic impacts, is actually achieved, for all this is beyond the pale of a ´lingual stylist.´

Fiction is something that is basically different from what happens when people translate "The English we speak with" or intellective prose. In this case ´translation´ is ´translation.´

The translator is transposing the source text into the target one, as exactly or as closely to the original as possible.

In the case of a literary text, say nothing of poetry, these are completely different things.

The task of confrontational linguistics is to go much more deeply into language than before. You always have to consider the language as a whole with its different aspects, and how they interact.

We have always sought to draw a distinct line between "intellectual information" on the one hand, and the use of language as a poetic device on the other hand, as a means by which to produce an aesthetic impact.

Generally speaking, this division is not only well-grounded, but also necessary, because without it we are completely lost in the sense, that the basis of all linguistic confrontation, translation from one language into another, translation both as a process and as an already existing text, becomes impossible. However, it may be important to draw that distinct line between the two kinds of texts, or the two kinds of written speech. Additionally, it is important to do that in a way, that the actual state of affairs is much more involved, because there are scientists, usually great scientists, who write in a way which it would be extremely difficult to classify it merely as intellectual information.

We can even go so far as to say that some linguists, for example, are great masters of style. Their texts are not merely informative, but also endowed with considerable artful merit.

We should keep in mind that while translating from one language into another we have to remember the connotation and denotation of the given words or expressions, their grammatical meanings, the importance of prosody in the realization of their meanings, including lexical, lexical-grammatical and grammatical categorical meanings.

Extremely important is the rendering of modality (phonological, lexical, grammatical and stylistic) in the spoken and written language, etc.

Translation is far more than a science. It is also a skill, and in the ultimate analysis a fully satisfying translation is always an art.

There are many aspects of translation which admit of purely linguistic approach, and involving two or more languages. It becomes part of comparative linguistics. Translation is a branch of comparative Linguistics.

R. Jakobson in his paper "On Linguistic Aspects of Translation" gives three kinds translation:
1. Intralingual translation or rewording as an interpretation of verbal signs by means of other signs of the same language.
2. Interlingual translation or translation proper is an interpretation of verbal signs by means of some other language.
3. Intersemiotic translation or transmutation is an interpretation of verbal signs means of nonverbal sign systems. The second definition given by R. Jakobson interests us mostly.

There is one more important aspect of the question which we have not tackled so far but which is also significant.

What is the role and place of affinity or lack of affinity between languages? The deeper we go into it, the more sure we become that some languages, either because of genetic or because of certain socio- linguistic, historic and other circumstances are readily confront able, while others are not. It is easier to translate a text from English into Kurdish, French and Romanian, than from English into Arabic. The obvious reasons are the much greater affinity between English, Kurdish and Romanian, than between English and Arabic (NIDA, E. & TABER, C.R., 2003; MEDNIKOVA, 1976; CATFORD, 1965; JAKOBSON, 1966; MELENCIUC, 2012; NIDA, 1975).

1.2. Lexicographic Confrontation

There is no reason why confrontation should be confined to stylistics, phonetics and phonology, morphology and syntax.

Matters are made worse by the different parts of language, its different aspects, being or confronted one by one. Language is thus torn into pieces and each one is subject to confrontation with other languages without any other consideration for what is happening in the immediately adjoining region.

The lexical confrontation is hardly ever included on a wide enough scale, for this is called lexicography and only lexicographers are supposed to concern themselves with it.

This is very strange because it is becoming apparent that stylistics, phonetics, morphology

and syntax cannot be separated from lexicology. There is no real confrontation in any field of linguistics without taking into consideration the types and classes of meanings, the semantic classes of different verbs, for example, those which so obviously affect the function of their grammatical forms.

It is a trusim that no grammatical pattern can be applied without due consideration of the specific lexical peculiarities of this or that word.

It is usually assumed that the lexical confrontation should be based on an analysis of the different meanings of the word in the source language and its equivalents in the target language.

It is also assumed that lexicography has already worked out certain methods by which confrontation may be scientifically effected.

Bilingual dictionaries must be based on a systematic analysis of the two or three lexical systems.

For bilingual lexicography the method consists in systematic bi-directional confrontation, working on the two vocabularies both ways.

The scientific level of bilingual lexicography will not be scientifically raised unless the present organization of lexicographic work is completely overhauled. There are also, as far as bilingual lexicography is concerned, some principles and ideas which have been widely discussed and among these there is one rule which no lexicographer should ever forget: do not split up the word into several meanings unless you have sound scientific grounds for doing so.

Make sure that your division into meanings is really justified, because most of the time this is done very superficially, simply not justified, because most of the time this done very superficially, simply under the influence of arbitrary translation of random sentences into target language. It has been conclusively shown by V.V.Vinogradov that the semantic analysis of words does not consist in splitting it up into so many meanings.

It is first and foremost a question of understanding, discovering and defining what the main nominal meaning of the word is.

All subsequent divisions of splitting up into meanings must be finely based on the unity of colligationally discoverable, which are singled out because there is a particular colligationally which proves that the meanings different, because the difference is overtly expressed by linguistic means. There are collocational connections which also show what the different lexical-phraseological variations of the basic meaning are (AKHMANOVA & MELENCIUC, 1977; VINOGRADOV, 1963).

1.3. Confrontation of Forms

Many people still think that grammar is learnt simply by coming to memory sets of rules, but when we learn by role we forget it the moment we stop thinking of it.

What actually happens is categorization. Thus, for example, if we speak of the present form, the most important thing for us to remember is that it is a categorial form of non-anteriority.

The fact is that objective reality does not depend on language or speakers. We reflect it in our consciousness.

Reality is **bi-unique**:

1. the reality of the world and
2. the reality of the native language, the joint impression of the things around us and of our mother tongue.

It is therefore quite natural for us to apprehend reality in a way which is somehow affected by categories and categorization of our language.

Categorization in grammar is much more complex than in Lexicology:

1. It is compulsory or obligatory,
2. It is much more abstract. The difference between lexicology and grammar then is as follows: the speaker is free to choose words, to take them or leave them.

Grammatical forms are imposed on the speakers. These are laws which the speaker is bound to obey.

For confrontation of forms in different languages to get under way, the first step is to try and understand the specific grammatical categorizations of the languages under consideration.

Suppose they are English, Kurdish, Romanian and Arabic, and the first category to be investigated in "The Morphology of the English

Verb", where it has been entirely clear that confusion of grammar and usage should be avoided at all costs.

All English verbs including the putandi and sentiendi ones can quite properly be used in the continuous aspect.

On the other hand the lexical element in expressing aspectual meaning prevails in Arabic, Kurdish and Romanian.

Hypergrammaticality or the abuse of grammar should be paid attention to while confronting grammatical systems of different languages.

Abuse of grammar may be two kinds:

1. The speaker turns to some very complex and artificial cumbersome structures, because he thinks that they are more literary and will enable him to appear as a highly *educated man*. This is a kind of hypergrammaticality or hypercorrectness which we meet especially frequently in documents and in some varieties of journals ,etc..

2. The formation of complex artificial grammatical forms and structures may depend on meta-semiotic factors, on a desire to achieve a specific stylistic effect. The phenomena of hyepergrammaticality first attracted linguists attention in connection with the extremely interesting paper written by Marcel Cohen (AKHMANOVA & MELENCIUC, 1977; AKHMANOVA & BELENKAYA, 1975; COHEN, 1947; SULAIMAN, 2016).

This outstanding linguist had spent very much time and effort on the normalization of Modern French Grammar.

Among the recommendations, but in also realizing his principles of selection of forms in his famous book "Histoire d' un langue: le Francais."

A good example of hypergrammatical teaching of grammar is the case of future perfect forms, which are used very seldom in British English in colloquial speech and practically not used at all in the American English in everyday speech.

The same phenomenon is observed in Kurdish, Romanian and Arabic. In this connection a number of examples in English, in which perfect future anteriority was used, were given to some Arab speaking people, who could speak good English, to translate from English into Kurdish and Arabic.

The same results were extremely unusual. Being given future perfect forms in the English examples, all the participants in the test were inclined to use anteriority forms in Kurdish (dee/ee-büya = being the marker) in Arabic(qad being marker).

Only in rare cases forms without "dee/ee-bü" and "saufa-an/qad" were used. Thus for example:
- I shall have learned many new words by the end of the year.
= Berî dawiya serê salê, ezê /dê pir gotinên nuh fêrbûbim(fêrbûyebim).

سأكون قد تعلمت كلمات جديدة عديدة قبل نهاية السنة

I shall have finished this work by the end of the week.
= Em ê vî karî berî dawiya haftiyee tekûz bikin(= teküzkirebüyî bin)

.سأكون قد أنهيت هذا العمل نهاية الأسبوع

She will have forgotten everything by week
= Ta hingî, ewê hertiştî jibîrkiribe.
he will have forgotten everything by week.

ستكون قد نسيت كل شيء نهاية الأسبوع

He will have written this article before he leaves.
= Ewê vê gotarê nivîsitbe(=nivîstibûyîbe) berî ku ew biçe.

سيكون قد كتب المقال قبل أن يغادر

But when the translators were asked to translate the example into everyday colloquial Kurdish and Arabic they usually used simple forms were used, were given to Kurdish and Arab speaking people to translate from English into Kurdish and Arabic.

Lexical anteriority was present in each example.

The simple forms in English examples influenced the participants in the test to use form without "bûyî_ in Kurdish and qad"in Arabic.
I shall learn many words by the end of the year.
Berî dawiya salê, ezê gelek gotinan verbibim.

سأتعلم كلمات كثيرة قبل نهاية السنة

I shall finish this work by the end of the week
Berî dawiya haftiyê, ez ê vî karî tekûz bikim.

سوف أنهي هذا العمل قبل نهاية الأسبوع

She will forget everything by then
Berî hingî, ewê hertiştî jibîr bike

.. ‫ذلك قَبل شيء كل تَنسى سوف‬..

He will write this article before he leaves
Berî ku ew biçe, ewê vê gotarê binvîse.

‫يذهب أن قَبل يكتب سوف‬

Only some of the translators used forms with "büyii" and "qad", the rest of them used simple forms without this anteriority marker, but anteriority, all the same, was present in the text, expressed by adverbial modifiers of time or contextual means.

It would be interesting to compare these results with similar tests in Kurdish and Romanian.

Here the process of **ousting** the future perfect forms is even more advanced than in American variant of English.

The first group of students were given the examples with grammatical anteriority forms and they were told about the coincidence of forms in English, Kurdish and Romanian, without telling them about the tendency of the English future perfect to get out of usage.

Quite a number of students, being influenced by the given information, readily translated the English sentence into Kurdish and Romanian, using "berü peeşiya dempeeşee/ berü demapeeş ve" "viitorul anterior"(anterior future):

I shall have learned many words and expressions by the end of the year
= Berî dawiya salê ez ê gelek gotinan û derbrriinan ferbibim(ferbüyiibim)
= Spre sf r/itul anului noi vom fi 'nv/ at multe cuvinte si expresii spre sf r/it de an.
We shall have finished this work by the end of the week.
= Berî dawiya haftiyê em ê vî karî tekûz bikin(temam kiribûyîbin)
= Noi vom fi terminat lucrul acesta spre sf r/it de an.
He will have forgotten everything by then
Berî hingî ewê her tiştî jibîr kiribe(jibiir kirîbûyîbe)
El va fi uitat totul pina atunci. We shall hav finished this text-book by the end of the year.
Berî dawiya salê emê vê teksta pirtukê tekûz bikin(temam kiribûyîbin)

Noi vom fi terminat acest manual spre sfirsitul de an.
He will have written this article before he leaves.
Berî çûne, ew ê vê gotarê tekûz bike(tekûz kiribûyîbe)
El va fi scris articolul 'nainte de a pleca.
In a different group the students were told everything about the tendencies in three above languages not to use any grammatical anteriority future forms.
Practically no future perfect forms (berü peeşiya dempeeşee/ berü demapeeş ve" "viitorul anterior" were used in this case:
We shall have learned many new words by the and of the month
Berî dawiya mihê em ê gelek gotinan fêrbibin (fêrbûyîbin)
Noi vom cunoa ste multe cuvinte catre sfrsitul lunii.
We shall have finished this work by the end of the week.
Berî dawiya vê haftiyê em ê vî karî tekûz bikin (tekûz kiribûyîbin)
Noi vom fi terminat lucrul spre sfrsitul saptaminii.
She will have forgotten everything by then.
Ta hingî ewê her tiştî jibîr kiribe(jibîr kiribûyîbe)
Ea va uita totul pina atumci.
We shall have finished this book by the end of the week.
Berî dawiya haftiyê emê vê pirtukê tekûz bikin (tekûz kiribûyîbin)
Noi vom termina manualul acesta spre sfirsit de an
He will have written this article before he leaves.
Berî biçe ewê vê gotarê nivîstibe(nivîstibûyîbe)
El va scrie articolul acesta inainte de a pleca.

N. Slonimscaia in her dissertation stressed the fact that morphology is taught only as a system of categories.

But although necessary and important, this is only the first stage in language learning.

The results of scientific abstraction must be verified by the actual functioning of the system, the researcher always bearing in mind that a language is in a state of constant change. This is especially important when we confront such related and unrelated languages as English, Kurdish and Arabic.

The study of grammar, the attempts to normalize grammatical usage, the study of the new tendencies and systematic confrontation of these with those falling into disuse, requires a much more serious scientific generalization on the subject than has been done so far.

This is also important because research of this kind will help in doing away with groundless abstraction of grammar.

It follows then that the two basic principles are:

1. To understand the basic underlying system, and
2. On this basis to go on with a profound analysis of English authentic texts and their equivalents in Kurdish and Arabic, for the only way really to learn grammar, to find out the real state of affairs concerning this or that morphological category, is to observe how the different basic theoretical grammatical premises are realized in different languages and different registers (styles).

2. CONCLUSIONS

Translating from one language into another we have to remember the connotation and denotation of the given words or expressions, their grammatical meaning, the importance of prosody in the realization of their meanings, including lexical, lexical-grammatical and grammatical categorical meanings. Of great importance is the rendering of modality (phonological, lexical, grammatical and stylistic) both in the spoken and written language, etc.

Translation is far more than a science. It is also a skill, and in the ultimate analysis a fully satisfactory translation is always an art. Many aspects of translation admit a purely linguistic approach, and involve two or more languages, that become part of comparative linguistics.

The role and place of affinity or lack of affinity between languages.

The deeper we go into the topic the more sure we become that some languages, either because of genetic identity or because of certain socio- linguistic, historic and other circumstances, are readily confrontable, while others are not. It is easier to translate a text from English into Kurdish and Romanian, than from English into Arabic, the obvious reason being the much greater affinity between English, Kurdish and Romanian, than between English and Arabic.

There is no real confrontation in my field of linguistics without taking into consideration the type and classes of meanings, the semantic classes of different verbs, which so obviously affect the function of their grammatical forms.

No grammatical pattern can be applied without due consideration of the specific lexical peculiarities of this or that word.

All subsequent divisions of splitting up into meanings must be finely based on the unity of collocation and col-ligation.

There are certain meanings which are colligationally discoverable, which are signed out because there is a peculiar col-ligation which proves that, the meaning is different, because the difference is overtly expressed by linguistic means.

There are collocational connections which also show what the different lexical- physiological variations of the basic meanings are.

The results of scientific abstraction must be verified by the actual functioning of the system, the researcher always bearing in mind that language is in a state of constant change. This is especially important when we confront such related and unrelated languages as English, Kurdish and Arabic.

The study of grammar, the attempts to normalize grammatical usage, the study of the new tendencies and systematic confrontation of these with those falling into disuse, requires a much more serious scientific generalization on the subject than has been done so far.

References

AKHMANOVA, O. & BELENKAYA, V. (1975) The Morphology of the English Verb, Moscow University Press, Moscow.

AKHMANOVA, O. & MELENCIUC, D. (1977) The Principles of Linguistic Confrontation, Moscow University Press, Moscow.

CATFORD, J.C. (1965) A Linguistic Theory of Translation: an Essay on Applied Linguistics, Oxford University Press, London.

COHEN, M. (1947) Histoire d'une language: le Francais. Hier et Aujoard'hui, Paris.

JAKOBSON, R. (1966) On Linguistic Aspects of Translation. R.A. Brown (ed.), New York.

MEDNIKOVA, E. (1976) Translation as an Aspect of Foreign Language Studies, MSU, Moscow.

MELENCIUC, D. (2012) *Comparative Study of Grammatical, Lexical and Lexical-Grammatical Categories*, University of Moldova Academy of Sciences, Chişinau.

NIDA, E. & TABER, C.R. (2003) The Theory and Practice of Translation, Brill, Leiden.

NIDA, E. (1975) Language Structure and Translation. Essays. Stanford University Press, SUA.

SULAIMAN, R (2016) *A Contrastive Study of the Category of Anteriority (English, Kurdish and Arabic)*, Soran publication, Berlin.

VINOGRADOV, V. (1963) The Main Types of Lexical Meanings of a word, 5.