



بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم

∞∞∞∞

تم رفع هذه الرسالة بواسطة / مني مغربي أحمد

بقسم التوثيق الإلكتروني بمركز الشبكات وتكنولوجيا المعلومات دون أدنى

مسئولية عن محتوى هذه الرسالة.

ملاحظات: لا يوجد



Ain Shams University

Faculty of Al-Asun

Department of English

A Corpus-Based Analysis of Connotations in the English Translation of 20 Short Stories

by Naguib Mahfouz (1962–1988)

A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

for the Degree of M.A. in Translation

Submitted by:

Nermeen Mohammed Yousry Mohammed Fayez Mohammed Ibraheem

Under the Supervision of:

Dr. Fayrouz Fouad

Associate Professor

Linguistics

Department of English

Faculty of Al-Asun

Ain Shams University

Dr. Asmaa Amin

Assistant Professor

Translation

Department of English

Faculty of Al-Asun

Ain Shams University

2020

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Dr. Fayrouz Fouad and Dr. Asmaa Amin for the support and guidance they provided. Your effort is much appreciated.

Abstract

Connotative meaning has been discussed in many cross-linguistic studies. However, there is no adequate information on the real extent and nature of connotative differences between languages. This thesis explored connotative differences between Arabic and English, through analyzing the words connoting the three themes prevalent in the selected corpus – dejection, violence, and spirituality. This was carried out by means of combining translation studies and corpus linguistics within a framework of systemic functional linguistics – the framework of attitude set in Martin and White’s appraisal theory – for an integrated, interdisciplinary study. A corpus-based, quantitative analysis was conducted. Afterward, a complementary, qualitative analysis was carried out. The analysis revealed that the connotative difference between Arabic and English – though indeed big – is not as big as what is normally thought. This should undermine such unrealistic image that might discourage translation practitioners and thus hinder the dissemination of knowledge. Whereas most of such connotative differences were of a cultural nature, the linguistic nuances, which could have gone unnoticed if corpus analysis tools were not used, showed that cultural untranslatability – though more dominant than linguistic untranslatability – is not as dominant as expected, drawing more attention to the significance of linguistic untranslatability.

Table of Contents

Cover Page	1
Acknowledgements	2
Abstract	3
Table of Contents	4
List of Tables	8
List of Figures	11
Introduction	12
The Concept of Connotation	12
Objectives of the Study	13
Corpus	13
Methodology	17
Chapterization	19
Chapter 1: Theoretical Framework	20
1.1 Overview	20
1.2 Martin and White's Appraisal Theory	20
1.2.1 Attitude	20
1.2.2 Graduation	25
1.2.3 Application	26
1.3 Connotative Meaning	28
1.3.1 Denotation	29
1.3.2 Connotation	29
1.3.3 Untranslatability	38

1.3.3.1 Cultural Gaps	42
1.3.3.2 Linguistic Gaps	46
1.4 Corpus Linguistics	49
1.4.1 Corpora	49
1.4.2 Scope	52
1.4.3 Procedures	57
1.4.3.1 Frequency	57
1.4.3.2 Concordance	58
1.4.3.3 Collocation	59
1.4.3.4 Keywords	60
1.5 Summary	61
Chapter 2: Corpus-Based, Quantitative Analysis	62
2.1 Building of Corpus	62
2.2 Automatic Processing	63
2.2.1 Frequency Analysis	64
2.2.2 Concordance Analysis	65
2.2.2.1 Words Connoting Dejection	66
2.2.2.2 Words Connoting Violence	82
2.2.2.3 Words Connoting Spirituality	96
2.2.3 Final Output	106
2.3 Summary	108
Chapter 3: Complementary, Qualitative Analysis	109
3.1 General Outline	109

3.2 Story 1: Zaabalawi	109
3.3 Story 2: The Conjurer Made Off with the Dish	117
3.4 Story 3: The Answer Is No	122
3.5 Story 4: The Time and the Place	125
3.6 Story 5: Blessed Night	126
3.7 Story 6: The Ditch	128
3.8 Story 7: Half a Day	132
3.9 Story 8: The Tavern of the Black Cat	133
3.10 Story 9: The Lawsuit	135
3.11 Story 10: The Empty Café	138
3.12 Story 11: A Day for Saying Goodbye	145
3.13 Story 12: By a Person Unknown	149
3.14 Story 13: The Man and the Other Man	156
3.15 Story 14: The Wasteland	158
3.16 Story 15: The Norwegian Rat	165
3.17 Story 16: His Majesty	167
3.18 Story 17: Fear	169
3.19 Story 18: At the Bus Stop	179
3.20 Story 19: A Fugitive from Justice	181
3.21 Story 20: A Long-Term Plan	184
3.22 Summary	188
Conclusion	189
Answering the Questions of the Study	191

Limitations and Recommendations	194
References	196

List of Tables

Table 1:	Metadata for the Corpus of the Present Study	15
Table 2:	Text without Line-Break Alignment: Example from the Selected Corpus	62
Table 3:	Text with Line-Break Alignment: Example from the Selected Corpus	63
Table 4:	Frequency Analysis – Words Connoting Dejection, Violence, and Spirituality	65
Table 5:	Concordance Analysis – Words Connoting Dejection: Despair	66
Table 6:	Concordance Analysis – Words Connoting Dejection: Died	68
Table 7:	Concordance Analysis – Words Connoting Dejection: Tears	70
Table 8:	Concordance Analysis – Words Connoting Dejection: Distress	71
Table 9:	Concordance Analysis – Words Connoting Dejection: Pain	73
Table 10:	Concordance Analysis – Words Connoting Dejection: Funeral	74
Table 11:	Concordance Analysis – Words Connoting Dejection: Suffered	76
Table 12:	Concordance Analysis – Words Connoting Dejection: Fate	77
Table 13:	Concordance Analysis – Words Connoting Dejection: Grief	79
Table 14:	Concordance Analysis – Words Connoting Dejection: Loneliness	80
Table 15:	Words Connoting Dejection: Instances of Translatability; Linguistic Untranslatability; and Cultural Untranslatability Statistically Presented	81
Table 16:	Concordance Analysis – Words Connoting Violence: Blood	82
Table 17:	Concordance Analysis – Words Connoting Violence: Blow	85
Table 18:	Concordance Analysis – Words Connoting Violence: Murdered	86
Table 19:	Concordance Analysis – Words Connoting Violence: Killed	87
Table 20:	Concordance Analysis – Words Connoting Violence: Battles	89
Table 21:	Concordance Analysis – Words Connoting Violence: Fight	90

Table 22:	Concordance Analysis – Words Connoting Violence: Tough	91
Table 23:	Concordance Analysis – Words Connoting Violence: Pushed	92
Table 24:	Concordance Analysis – Words Connoting Violence: Violence	93
Table 25:	Concordance Analysis – Words Connoting Violence: Attack	94
Table 26:	Words Connoting Violence: Instances of Translatability; Linguistic Untranslatability; and Cultural Untranslatability Statistically Presented	95
Table 27:	Concordance Analysis – Words Connoting Spirituality: Koran	96
Table 28:	Concordance Analysis – Words Connoting Spirituality: Fatiha	98
Table 29:	Concordance Analysis – Words Connoting Spirituality: Saint	99
Table 30:	Concordance Analysis – Words Connoting Spirituality: Prayer	100
Table 31:	Concordance Analysis – Words Connoting Spirituality: Religious	101
Table 32:	Concordance Analysis – Words Connoting Spirituality: Bless	102
Table 33:	Concordance Analysis – Words Connoting Spirituality: Mufti	103
Table 34:	Concordance Analysis – Words Connoting Spirituality: Bairam	103
Table 35:	Concordance Analysis – Words Connoting Spirituality: Haunted	104
Table 36:	Concordance Analysis – Words Connoting Spirituality: Rites	105
Table 37:	Words Connoting Spirituality: Instances of Translatability; Linguistic Untranslatability; and Cultural Untranslatability Statistically Presented	105
Table 38:	Words Connoting Dejection, Violence, and Spirituality: Instances of Translatability; Linguistic Untranslatability; and Cultural Untranslatability Statistically Presented	107
Table 39:	Connotations of Violence (Rape) at the Discourse Level	124
Table 40:	Connotations of Dejection – and Relief – (Death) at the Discourse Level	144

Table 41: Examples of Linguistic Untranslatability (Syntax)

186

List of Figures

Figure 1:	Words Connoting Dejection: Instances of Translatability; Linguistic Untranslatability; and Cultural Untranslatability Statistically Presented	82
Figure 2:	Words Connoting Violence: Instances of Translatability; Linguistic Untranslatability; and Cultural Untranslatability Statistically Presented	96
Figure 3:	Words Connoting Spirituality: Instances of Translatability; Linguistic Untranslatability; and Cultural Untranslatability Statistically Presented	106
Figure 4:	Words Connoting Dejection, Violence, and Spirituality: Instances of Translatability; Linguistic Untranslatability; and Cultural Untranslatability Statistically Presented	107

Introduction

This introduction establishes the territory for the present study. The study aims at exploring connotative differences between Arabic and English through analyzing a corpus comprising 20 Arabic short stories written by Naguib Mahfouz and translated into English by Denys Johnson-Davies. The translator selected these stories from eight of the author's short story collections that were published in the period from 1962 to 1988, and the translations were compiled in a single collection that was published in 1995. The analysis is conducted using a quantitative-qualitative methodology within the framework of attitude set in Martin and White's appraisal theory. The rest of the introduction will elaborate on the concept of connotation; the objectives of the study; the corpus; and the methodology, in addition to providing a glimpse on the chapterization.

The Concept of Connotation

Connotation is a feeling that gives color to plain words. Unlike denotation, which is the explicit dictionary meaning, connotation is an implied meaning that differs according to contextual factors. Despite being a crucial component of meaning, connotation was labeled by some scholars as "an extralinguistic feature, referring rather to the real world than to any linguistic analysis" (Bullon, 1988, p. 29). It is likewise stated that connotations were not given due attention because "they are often considered to be subjective" (Ranua, 2009, p. 1).

The fact that connotation refers to the "real world" does not make it an "extralinguistic feature." That is because the "real world" means context – and without context, there is no meaning. For this reason, Me'ayesh (2009) says, in his exploration of connotative meaning, that translators must be vigilant to "the relationship between the text and the reality in which it was produced, as well as the reality to which it is being transferred" (Introduction, para. 2).

Moreover, that connotations are “subjective” makes them worthy of attention. According to Lyons, subjectivity means “self-expression in the use of language” (as cited in Bombelli, Soler, & Waasaf, 2013, p. 268). Online product reviews, for example, involve some kind of subjective language that marketers need to scrutinize in order to attain consumer satisfaction and increase their profits. The issue of subjectivity has its weight in translation as well, due to the cultural and linguistic differences between languages, not to mention the cases of mistranslation and bias.

Objectives of the Study

The study aims at exploring connotative differences between Arabic and English in the selected corpus, and testing the hypothesis that cultural untranslatability is the most dominant source of connotative differences. The study attempts to answer the following questions:

- How far are the connotations of the source text retained in the target text?
- What are the most significant connotative differences between the source text and the target text?
- What is the reason behind connotative differences (e.g., a cultural pattern or a linguistic pattern)?

And at some stage through the analysis, the selected corpus will be treated as a sample, with the population being both Arabic and English in general, regardless of genre, in order to generalize the findings to the greatest extent possible.

Corpus

In the present study, the English translation of 20 Arabic short stories was chosen for the analysis. The stories were written by Naguib Mahfouz and translated into English by Denys

Johnson-Davies. The translator selected these stories from eight of the author's short story collections (Mahfouz, 1988/2006, 1969/2007a, 1962/2007b, 1984/2008a, 1982/2008b, 1979/2009a, 1969/2009b, 1965/n.d.) and the translations were compiled in a single collection entitled *The Time and the Place and Other Stories* (Mahfouz, 1995). The metadata for this corpus is displayed in Table 1 below.

This corpus serves the objectives of the study for a number of reasons. Newmark (1988/2003) points out that outside the realm of literature denotative meaning is usually prioritized over connotative meaning (p.16). Literature is a fertile linguistic environment full of feelings in general and implicit feelings, or connotations, in particular. And the fact that there is more than one piece provides a greater diversity of connotative meanings. This is in addition to the privilege specific to the selected corpus, which is being a product of Naguib Mahfouz and Denys Johnson-Davies.

The privilege of the Arabic part of the corpus lies in the characteristic features of the works of Mahfouz. The events of a literary work by Mahfouz normally take place in an Egyptian setting. Through his depiction of the Egyptian environment, he tackles a variety of themes and portrays characters from different walks of life. Moreover, Mahfouz's writing style is characterized by heavily depending on Modern Standard Arabic rather than the Egyptian dialect. But, meanwhile, his language is not that formal. In an interview published on the YouTube channel of the American University in Cairo (2011), Johnson-Davies says that Mahfouz is not one of those writers who like to show off their skills and use complicated vocabulary and that his language is close to the colloquial language, which is his privilege. This should further enhance the connotative diversity of the corpus, and make it easier to generalize the findings to genres other than literature.