



بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم

∞∞∞∞

تم عمل المسح الضوئي لهذه الرسالة بواسطة / سامية زكى يوسف

بقسم التوثيق الإلكتروني بمركز الشبكات وتكنولوجيا المعلومات دون أدنى

مسئولية عن محتوى هذه الرسالة.

ملاحظات:

- بالرسالة صفحات لم ترد بالأصل
- بعض الصفحات الأصلية تالفة
- بالرسالة صفحات قد تكون مكررة
- بالرسالة صفحات قد يكون بها خطأ ترقيم

**On Translating Discourse Markers:
The Case of Discourse Markers from
Spoken Syrian Arabic into Spoken English**

An M. A. Thesis

Submitted to

The English Department

Faculty of Arts

Cairo University

Submitted by

Ezdehar Youssef Al Hassan

Under the Supervision of

Dr. Ola Hafez

2001

100

101

102

103

104

105

106

107

108

109

110

111

112

113

114

115

116

117

118

119

120

121

122

123

124

125

126

127

128

129

130

131

132

133

134

135

136

137

138

139

140

141

142

143

144

145

146

147

148

149

150

151

152

153

154

155

156

157

158

159

160

161

162

163

164

165

166

167

168

169

170

171

172

173

174

175

176

177

178

179

180

181

182

183

184

185

186

187

188

189

190

191

192

193

194

195

196

197

198

199

200

الاجازة

أجازت لجنة المناقشة هذه الرسالة للحصول على درجة الماجستير في الآداب

بتاريخ ٢٠١١ / ٧ / ٢٤

بتقدير / بمرتبة ممتاز

بعد استيفاء جميع المتطلبات

اللجنة

الاسم	الدرجة العلمية	التوقيع
(١) د. محمد صالح	أستاذ زائر	محمد صالح
(٢) د. محمد صالح	أستاذ زائر	محمد صالح
(٣) د. محمد صالح	أستاذ زائر	محمد صالح
(٤) / /		

Name : Ezdehar Youssef Al Hassan **Date of Birth :** 1. 1. 1974
Degree : Master in Arts **Place of Birth :** Syria
Supervisor : Dr. Ola Hafez **Area of specialization:** Linguistics
Grade : Excellent **Department :** English
Topic : On Translating Discourse Markers : The Case of Discourse
Markers from Spoken Syrian Arabic into Spoken English

Abstract :

This study aims at translating discourse markers from spoken Syrian into spoken English. Discourse markers are “those expressions whose function is not to contribute to the truth-conditional content of their utterances [but] rather to indicate how the interpretation of one utterance contributes to the interpretation of the other” (Dallie, 1992 : iv).

To fulfill the purpose of the study, naturally-occurring conversations have been collected, transcribed and translated into English. These conversations are diversified in topic, participant and context. Different topics are discussed in the data, ranging from the general to the personal. Participants also differ in age, sex, jobs and level of intimacy as well as level of education. Different contexts are included. Among these are family conversations, telephone conversations, service encounters and radio/television interviews.

Next, a set of discourse markers have been identified from the data, depending on the following criteria . First, discourse markers cannot stand alone or constitute a full utterance because they are part of the tone group of the utterance containing them. Second, discourse markers add nothing to the semantic meaning of their utterances but they do add to their pragmatic meaning, modulating the speaker’s attitude towards topic or hearer or both.

Following the identification of discourse markers, these items were analyzed in accordance with Brown and Levinson's (1987) framework. Brown and Levinson assume that every adult member of a society has "face", a concept derived from Goffman (1967) and means the public self-image that a member wants to claim for her/himself. In the data, speakers have been shown to try to achieve two contrasting goals at one time. They try to say something unfavourable but they try to say it in a way which appears to be polite. So, they defend not only their own face but also each others' face. To avoid face-threatening acts, speakers use certain strategies. "Boosting" and "attenuating" have been identified as two of the strategies used to achieve politeness. While "boosting" is used to increase the force of the speech act, "attenuating" decreases that force.

After that, discourse markers have been translated in terms of Widdowson's (1979) "pragmatic equivalence" which deals with the illocutionary effect of utterances (105). To render discourse markers, it was found that it is necessary to aim at equivalence of pragmatic meaning, which considers context the most important factor in utterance interpretation. This is so because discourse markers are context-sensitive elements and their meaning cannot be accounted for unless considering the context in which they occur.

Finally, two questionnaires have been devised and administered to a group of referees. Their responses have also been analyzed and compared to the researcher's own findings to see whether these findings are plausible or not.

This study fills a gap in discourse analysis since it seems to be the first to examine Syrian discourse markers as politeness devices. It also fills a gap in the field of translation as nearly no study has yet attempted the translation of discourse markers from one language into another.

صالح النور
2005

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to Dr. Saad Gamal who suggested the topic of this thesis. Without his valuable comments and strong encouragement, this thesis would not have been completed.

I am deeply indebted to Dr. Ola Hafez, the supervisor of this thesis. She was very helpful, patient and spent a lot of her time reading this thesis. Any errors that still remain in the thesis are my sole responsibility.

A special thank-you goes to Dr. Ali Ezzat, Professor of Linguistics at Ain-Shams University, for reading a pre-final copy of this thesis and for his insightful remarks.

I appreciate the assistance and help of the referees who participated in the two questionnaires which are fairly lengthy : Dr. N. Shamas; Dr. S. Hadad; Dr. I. El Ghafri; Mr. M. El Abdah; Mr. M. El Nayf; Mz. L. Hiswani; Mz. A. Adham; Mr. A. Bitar; Mr. H. Zaytuna; Mr. K. Ajeb; Miss H. El Maghut; Mrs. N. S'oud; my two aunts : H. and W. Mar'i; and my sister : Ghada.

I would like to thank all those who accepted to be recorded and participated in the naturally-occurring conversations, including all the salesmen and customers; all my friends, especially Miss A. Esa'di; and all my family members, especially my two sisters : Hyam and Ghada.

My deepest gratitude goes to my friend, Wala' Abd El Aziz, for her continuous support and for helping me in the transcription of the Syrian conversations.

Thanks are also due to my family, especially my mother, who were very patient and bore my being away from them while working on this thesis.

Contents

Abstract	i
Acknowledgements	iii
Contents	iv
List of Tables	vii
Transcription Conventions	ix
List of Abbreviations	xii
Chapter One: Introduction	1
1.1 Aim of the Study	1
1.2 Significance of the Study	3
1.3 Translation Theory	3
1.4 Scope of the Study	4
1.5 Distinctive Features of Discourse Markers	5
1.6 Discourse Markers Versus (Parts of) Speech Acts	8
1.7 Conclusion	12
Chapter Two : Literature Review	14
2.1 Locating Discourse Markers within the Area of Discourse Analysis	14
2.1.1 Research on Discourse Markers in English	14
2.1.2 Languages other than English and Arabic	22
2.1.3 Research on Discourse Markers across Languages	25
2.1.4 Research on Discourse Markers in Arabic Dialects	26
2.1.5 Conclusion	29
2.2 Rationale of the Study	29
2.3 Review of Definitions of Discourse Markers	31
Chapter Three: Research Design	37
3.0 Introduction	37
3.1 Data Collection	38

3.1.1 Topic	38
3.1.2 Participants	38
3.1.3 Context	39
3.1.4 Permission to Record	39
3.2 Procedure for Assigning Meaning to Discourse Markers	40
3.2.1 Questionnaire I	40
3.2.1.1 Material	41
3.2.1.2 Referees	41
3.2.1.3 Procedure	42
3.3 Procedure for Examining the Translation of Discourse Markers	43
3.3.1 Questionnaire II	44
3.3.1.1 Material	44
3.3.1.2 Referees	44
3.3.1.3 Procedure	45
3.4 Conclusion	46
Chapter Four: Analysis and Translation of Discourse Markers	47
4.0 Introduction	47
4.1 The Form and Distribution of Discourse Markers	48
4.2 The Framework of the Analysis	49
4.3 Assigning Meaning to Discourse Markers	51
4.3.1 Individual Discourse Markers	51
4.3.2 Conclusion	86
4 3.3 Clusters of Discourse Markers	86
4.4 Conclusion	98
Chapter Five: Analysis of Results	101
5.0 Introduction	101

5.1 Analysis of Questionnaire I	101
5.2 Conclusion	118
5.3 Analysis of Questionnaire II	119
5.4 Conclusion	136
Chapter Six: Conclusion	138
6.1 Summary	138
6.2 Findings	141
6.3 Limitations and Problems	142
6.4 Recommendations for Further Research	144
References	146
Appendices	152
Appendix 1	152
Appendix 2	171
Appendix 3	186

List of Tables

Questionnaire I	Page
Table I 1 : Situation 1	102
Table I 2 : Situation 2	103
Table I 3 : Situation 3	104
Table I 4 : Situation 4	104
Table I 5 : Situation 5	105
Table I 6 : Situation 6	105
Table I 7 : Situation 7	106
Table I 8 : Situation 8	107
Table I 9 : Situation 9	107
Table I 10 : Situation 10	108
Table I 11 : Situation 11	108
Table I 12 : Situation 12	109
Table I 13 : Situation 13	110
Table I 14 : Situation 14	110
Table I 15 : Situation 15	111
Table I 16 : Situation 16	111
Table I 17 : Situation 17	112
Table I 18 : Situation 18	112
Table I 19 : Situation 19	113
Table I 20 : Situation 20	114
Table I 21 : Summary of Responses	115
Table I 22 : Percentage of Convergence : Situation by Situation..	115
Table I 23 : Percentage of Convergence for Each Referee	117

Questionnaire II

Table II 1 : Situation 1	119
Table II 2 : Situation 2	120

Table II 3 :	Situation 3		121
Table II 4 :	Situation 4		122
Table II 5 :	Situation 5		122
Table II 6 :	Situation 6		123
Table II 7 :	Situation 7		124
Table II 8 :	Situation 8		125
Table II 9 :	Situation 9		125
Table II 10:	Situation 10		126
Table II 11:	Situation 11		127
Table II 12:	Situation 12		127
Table II 13:	Situation 13		128
Table II 14:	Situation 14		128
Table II 15:	Situation 15		129
Table II 16:	Situation 16		129
Table II 17:	Situation 17		130
Table II 18:	Situation 18		131
Table II 19:	Situation 19		131
Table II 20:	Situation 20		132
Table II 21:	Summary of Responses		133
Table II 22:	Percentage of Agreement : Situation by Situation. ..		134
Table II 23:	Percentage of Agreement for Each Referee		136