

TRANSLATING THE ENGLISH INTERROGATIVE BETA CLAUSE INTO ARABIC

Muhammed Ibrahim Hamood

University of Mosul

dr-mihamood@uomosul.edu.iq

ABSTRACT: *This study aimed to investigate the translation of wh-interrogative clause functions from English into Arabic. The main purpose of this study to examine the extent to which the English nominal wh-interrogative clause functions in Hemingway's "The Old Man and The Sea" in the Arabic translation by Ali Al- Kasimi have been preserved. In this study, the translatability of the selected text is dependent on linguistic features. To determine the translation of wh-interrogative clause functions in the source text into Arabic has applied Newmark's theory of semantic or communicative translation to finding grammatical equivalence in translation of the literary text. The findings obtained from the analysis show that semantic and communicative the translation, especially; in the selected data was translated flexibly, no more semantically and no more commutative. Significantly, the study further recommends that translators in handling literary texts should be a communicative and semantic Translation.*

KEYWORDS: translation, semantic and communicative translations, wh- interrogative, clause, function.

INTRODUCTION

Generally translation defined by many scholars as the transfer of information from one language to another (Cartford, 1965, Nida, 1965, Newmark, 1981, Munday 2001). As a subject, the possibility of finding one universally acceptable theory or approach that guides the practice of translation is still debatable. Therefore, translators face with many suggestions during the translation process. These suggestions include; direct translation, semantic translation, communicative translation, textual translation and cultural translation. In treatment a text for translation, a translator has many options presented in translating from a source language (SL) to a target language (TL). Therefore, a translator always has a feeling that he needs to create a reproduction in the target language. Reading a translated text and the source text, one should feel that there was a tendency to transfer the target text in all its features, linguistic, cultural and otherwise.

A translation across languages that differs in linguistic systems and cultures poses a big change to the translator. The translator may have the intention to render the linguistic forms of the SL or face the conflicting cultures in a text. As Newmark (1981) in trying to understand the evolution of the concept of equivalence, it may be upon the individual translators to decide what they consider as the virtues of equivalence and hence follow them.

However, we ask first; how far can equivalence go in an accurate text that it to be translated into linguistically different language? Second, to what extent can the field of literature allow deviation as the translators seeks to comply with the culturally acceptable language in the TL? The question of equivalence, both in terminology and meaning, raises serious linguistic issues in the translation of a wh- interrogative clause. Thus, a good practice in translation requires that the translator tries as much as possible to be precise in the transfer of meaning and structure from the SL to the TL.

Accordingly, semantic translation follows the ST closely at syntax level and tends to strive to reproduce the form of the original as closely as the TL norms will allow (Newmark, 1988). Correspondingly, Newmark, (1981) stresses that communicative translation is an attempt to render as closely as the semantic and syntactic structure of the second language and preserve the intended meaning of the original. In contrast, the communicative translation, the translator has the right to correct and improve the original to clarify ambiguities (Newmark 1981: 39). In this case, the translator has restructured the ST into the TT clause structure at the same level in order to translate the text correctly in an attempt to create an effect on the TT readers as close as possible to that obtained on the readers of the original.

The present investigation is restricted to the translation of wh- interrogative clause in “The Old Man and the Sea” translated from English into Arabic by Ali Al-Kasimi (2008). The study is limited to translating wh- interrogative clause function as a subject, object and complement in “The Old Man and the Sea”. The importance of this research is showing some methods for translating the complex clauses into the Arabic language, due to existing syntactic peculiarities and differences between languages which may cause some problems in the process of translating. The underlying assumption of this research is that the translator must have enough knowledge and information about the structures of English and Arabic while translating these clauses in order to translate effectively.

In addition, it is expected that this study has a theoretical significance to researchers since it deals with one aspect of grammar and translation. It is hoped that the investigation will contribute to the understanding and use of the wh- interrogative clause. This kind of study may be helpful Arab translators and translation students in translating English wh-interrogative clause. It is also helpful to the understanding of the English literary text by the Arab readers.

Problem Statement

Up to the 1950s, a lot of research in the area of translation seemed to focus on literary translation. Key references have also been made to the early works of Eugene Nida on Bible translations. Many theoretical approaches have also been proposed by various scholars on the subject of translation across many years. Some of the scholars who have made contributions include Vinay and Darbelnet (1958), Jakobson (1959), Catford (1965), Nida and Taber (1969), House (1997, 1981), Baker (1992), Pym (2010), just to mention but a few (for more discussion see, a section of the literature review). Specialized translation has also received a number of researches. However, no research has focused on the translation of wh-

interrogative clause in “The Old Man and the Sea” translated from English into Arabic by Ali Al-Kasimi (2008). That is what attracted this research as we try to bridge the gap in the mind in this area.

Research Questions

This research was guided by one key the research questions. In this relation the following research questions have been formulated:

1. To what extent have the English nominal wh- interrogative clause functions as a subject, an object and complement in Hemingway’s “The Old Man and The Sea “been preserved in their Arabic translation by Ali Al- Kasimi?
2. To what extent have the English nominal wh- interrogative clause in Hemingway’s “The Old Man and The Sea” been retained in the Arabic translation by Ali Al- Kasimi?

Scope

This paper deals with the translation of English nominal wh- interrogative clause into Arabic and the samples used are extracted from Hemingway’s “The Old Man and The Sea” translated by Ali Al- Kasimi. This study used Newmark’s theory of communicative and semantic in trying to answer the research questions.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Literature on translation give varied views of the writers on the subject. Many theoretical approaches have also been proposed by various scholars on the subject of translation across many years. There are also quite a number of publications on various aspects of translation. Specialized translation has also received a number of works. These include works include Vinay and Darbelnet (1958), Jakobson (1959), Catford (1965), Nida and Taber (1969), Newmark (1988, 1981), Baker (1992, 2011), House (1997), Pym (2010) and Basil Hatim (1985). Although discussion of equivalence has subsided, it still remains a topic that manages to attract a certain amount of attention from some of the translation theory’s leading figures. The linguistic approach to translation strives to define its theory through the linguistic approach.

The linguistic approach to translation theory incorporates the following concepts: meaning, equivalence, shift, text purpose and analysis, and discourse register; which can be examined in the contexts of structural and functional linguistics, semantics, pragmatics, correspondence, sociolinguistics and stylistics. Meanwhile, the emphasis of the structural approach to translation is change towards the end of the 1950s and early 1960s with the work of Vinay, Darbelnet and Catford, and the concept of translation shift, which examines the linguistic changes that take place in the translation between the ST and TT (Munday p. 55). Venuti states that Translation theories are privilege equivalences that must inevitably come to terms with the existence of ‘shifts’ between the foreign and translated texts” (p.148).

Connected to Vinay and Darbelnet in their book *Stylistique comparée du français et de l’anglais*(1958) compare the differences between English and French and identify two

translation techniques that somewhat resemble the literal and free methods (Vinay and Darbelnet in Venuti p.128).

Jakobson indicates meaning and equivalence are linked to the interlingual form of translation, which “involves two equivalent messages in two different codes” (1959/2000: p.114). Jakobson’s theory is connected to grammatical and lexical differences between languages, as well as to the field of semantics.

Catford’s approach to translation considers the relationship between textual equivalence and formal correspondence. Textual equivalence is where the TT is equivalent to the ST, while formal correspondence is where the TT is as close as possible to the ST (Munday p.60).

Eugene Nida establishes the concept of formal and dynamic equivalence. Formal equivalence focuses on the form and content of the message of the ST but dynamic equivalence focuses on functional equivalence. Specifically, Nida’s attempt at a scientific approach was important in the area of correspondence, a linguistic field dedicated to examining similarities and differences between two language systems which he says should be based on linguistics, philology and semiotics (Nida p. 108).

Peter Newmark influenced by the work of Nida, feels that the difference between the source language and the target language would always be a major problem, thus making a total equivalence virtually impossible (Munday p. 44). He replaces the terms “formal equivalence” and “dynamic equivalence” with “semantic translation” and “communicative translation”. Related to Peter Newmark’s theory to ST analysis to examine how language conveys meaning in a literary text. One of the supporters of this approach was Michael Halliday, who bases his work on Systemic Functional Grammar the relationship between the two languages linguistically. Halliday says that the text type influences the word meaning and syntax ((Munday pp89-91).

Juliane House (1997) examines ST and TT register, and expands on Halliday’s ideas of field, tenor and mode. She creates a model for translation, which compares variables between ST and TT before deciding on whether to employ an overt or covert translation (Stockinger p. 18).

Basil Hatim (1990) and Ian Mason (1997) look at the ways that non-verbal meaning can be transferred, such as the change from active to passive voice which can shift or downplay the focus of the action. They also examine the way lexical choices are conveyed to the target culture, for example “Australia was discovered in 1770 by Captain Cook” to an Aboriginal audience (Berghout lecture 12/10/05).

Mona Baker (2011) states the advantage of Halliday’s work raises a number of important issues by examining the textual structure and function and how word forms may vary between languages. Baker (2011) combines both linguistic and communicative approaches to translation by discussing the four types of equivalence; ‘word level’ and ‘above word level equivalence’, which occur when translating from one language to another. Baker (1992) further talks of ‘grammatical equivalence’, which refers to the difference in grammatical

categories across languages. This means that grammatical rules of different languages may be a challenge in finding equivalence in the TT as we had mentioned in the introduction of this paper. Grammatical structure may cause significant change in transferring information to the TT.

Theoretically, these literatures seem to illustrate the strategies, handling, lack of equivalence during translation as we have so far seen. Based on this we seek to use data to show the best approaches in handling literary text. We will also use data to show which techniques may apply to certain complex clauses.

In this respect, Peter Newmark's theory of *semantic translation* and *communicative translation* appears to be more useful in providing a translation process. This may make the translator to avoid omitting the necessary information or adding unnecessary information to the TT. It is for this reason that we seek to preserve the wh- interrogative function in the TT which can help the translator to produce the wh- interrogative function equivalence in the TT.

The Newmark's Theory

The present study applied the Newmark's theory of communicative and semantic translation to achieve the purposes of the study (Newmark, 1981). Newmark (1981:19) states in trying to bridge the gap that existed as scholars argued about where the emphasis should fall in a theory of translation between the target language and the source language, ended up with the communicative and semantic approaches to translation. Communicative translation tries, at most, to produce on its readers an effect as close as possible to that obtained on the readers of the source text. Semantic translation, on the other hand, tries to render as closely as the semantic and syntactic structures of the TL allow, the contextual meaning of the ST. Communicative translation addresses itself solely to the second reader¹ who does not anticipate difficulties or obscurities and would expect a generous transfer of foreign elements into his own culture as well as his language where necessary (Newmark 1981). The translator still has to respect and work on the form of the SL text as the only material basis for his work.

Semantic translation, however, remains within the original culture and assist the reader only in its connotations if they constitute the essential human (non-ethnic) message of the text. One basic feature between these two coexisting approaches is that, where there is a conflict, the communicative approach must emphasize the "force" rather than the content of the message. This is because communicative translation tends to be smoother, simpler, clearer, more direct, more conventional, and conforming to a particular register² and it tends to under translate. A semantic translation, on the other hand, tends to be more complex, more awkward, more detailed, more concentrated and pursues the thought process rather than the intention of the text. It tends to over translate the TT, to be more specific than the ST.

Newmark, however, says that in both approaches, provided that equivalent effect is secured, the literal word for word translation is not only the best, but the only valid way of translation. In that case, Newmark implies that there is no excuse for unnecessary synonyms, let alone paraphrases in any type of translation. On the other hand, both approaches comply with the

usually accepted syntactic equivalents what Vinay and Darbelnet call “transposition2 ” for the two languages involved. In semantic translation, any deviation from SL stylistic norms would be reflected in an equally wide deviation from the TL norms, but where they clash, the deviations are not easy to formulate and the translator has to show a certain tension between the writer’s manner and the compulsions of the TL.

When the writer uses long, complex sentences in a language where the sentence seems literal (carefully worked) style is usually complex and longer than in TL, the translator may reduce the sentence somewhat compromising between the norms of the two languages and the writer. If the translator is in doubt, he should trust the writer and not the language. Semantic translation is, therefore, concrete. Newmark holds the view that each of these approaches has their part to play in translation of religious, philosophical, artistic, and scientific texts. These approaches also coincide in some way because a translation may be more or less semantic or more or less communicative.

According to Newmark, Semantic translation is always inferior to its original form since it involves loss of meaning. Consequently, a communicative translation is comparatively better since it is likely to gain in force and clarity what it loses in semantic content. Unlike in semantic translation, communicative translation has the right to correct the logic; to replace clumsy with elegant or at least functional syntactic structures; to remove obscurities; to eliminate repetitions and tautologies; to exclude the less likely interpretations of an ambiguity; to modify and clarify jargon (to reduce loose generic terms to more concrete components) and to normalize wayward uses of language.

Semantic translation attempts to recreate the precise flavor and tone of the original. The words are “sacred” not because they are more important than the content, but because the form and content are one. The thought processes in words are as important as the intention in a communicative translation. Therefore, a semantic translation is out of time and space where a communicative translation is rooted in its context. A semantic translation attempts to preserve the author’s idiolect, a peculiar form of expression in preference to the spirit of the TL. In semantic translation, every word translated represents some loss of meaning while in communicative translation; every word translated loses no meaning at all. In semantic translation, the syntax is as sacred as the words. In communicative translation, the message is all important and the essential thing is to make the reader think, feel or act. There should be no loss of meaning and the aim is to make the translation more effective as well as more elegant than the ST. A communicative translation works on narrower basis. It is tailor made for one category of readership, does one job, and fulfills one function. A semantic translation is wide and universal (Newmark 1981:49).

Complex Clauses

The term complex clause in English has been defined differently by different scholars. In traditional grammar, a *complex sentence* is defined as a sentence that contains an independent clause and at least one dependent clause joined with an appropriate conjunction

or pronoun. Musser, (2008:4) defines a *Complex Sentence* as consisting of one independent clause and one or more dependent clauses. Each clause must have a subject and a verb and a dependent clause must include hypotaxis relations.

A dependent clause is in a hypotactic relationship in which the clause is a consistent of the sentence as a whole (Halliday, 2014). In other words, a dependent clause consists of nominal clauses and adverbial clause. The nominal clause contains six major categories: That – clause, yes- no question, wh- interrogative clauses, relative clauses, To - infinitive clauses and Ing clauses (Halliday, 2014; Quirk et al, 1985, p. 1049).

In respect to the complex clause in Arabic, Arab grammarians divide sentences into those which have a grammatical case (function) (Al-Jummal Al-laty lahal mahal min al Iirab) and into those which have no a grammatical case (function) (Al-Jummal Al-laty laysa lahal mahal min al Iirab) this classification is based on substitution by smaller units (nouns): and sentences are said to be in the subjective, objective or genitive case because they function as predicate, object, etc. (Yowell Aziz, 1989)

Wh –Interrogative Clauses

Halliday and Matthiessen (2014: 102) state that the nominal wh- interrogative clause introduced, by *who, which, when, where*, in which search for a missing piece of information, the element that functions as subject, object and Complement (Hallidy, 2014: 101). Since the study of nominal wh – interrogative clauses is the aim of this research which are subcategories in nominal clauses, here the syntactic and semantic functions of nominal clauses are mentioned briefly.

The English nominal wh- interrogative clause occurs in the whole range of functions available to the nominal as a subject, an object, and a complement. For example,

- (1) **Why you did that** is still a mystery.
- (2) No one tells me **who broke my car**.
- (3) The question is **where Mary is**.
- (4) Their wishes - **how they can be more beautiful** - never becomes true.
- (5) I am unbelievable **how he can solve it**.
- (6) They argued about **when they made a cake**.

In Arabic grammar, a "*wh*"-clause is introduced by one of the interrogative articles which are: Min ayna من اين (from where), Man من (who), Ma ما (what), Mata (متى) (when), Ayyana ايان (when) (for future time), Kayfa كيف (how), Ayna اين (where), Annaa (how), where from, when, Kam كم (how many), how much, Ayyu اي (which) (of two or more), Maathaa ماذا (what) (Al-Najjar, 2015).

METHODOLOGY

Research Approach

This study used a descriptive qualitative method in nature since it is basically concerned with textual analysis. The data comprised a total of 40 English wh- interrogative clause and their

translated counterparts in Arabic by Ali Al- Kasimi (2008). However, this paper analyses only 18 such examples, which fall under the categories of wh- interrogative clause as subject, wh- interrogative clause as object and wh- interrogative clause as complement.

Data selection Criteria

The data examined were selected according to four criteria: 1) the ST data, termed wh- interrogative clause, constitute an area of challenge in translation, (2) the TT data are the Arabic wh- interrogative clause to providing the functional translation equivalence.

Data collection procedure

In this study, collecting the data required the researcher to read the **The Old Man and the sea** in its original language as the first step to sort out the examples that have wh- interrogative clause. Second, the sorted-out examples were classified according to their functions into three main topics that constitute the interest of this study, namely wh- interrogative clause as subject, wh- interrogative clause as object and wh- interrogative clause as complement. Then, the target versions of these issues are marked out from the selected translations. In short, data collection includes three steps: the first involved identifying the examples of each type of the wh- interrogative clauses; secondly, classifying them into the main issues related to the wh- interrogative clause functions, and finally, outlining the Arabic translations of the wh- interrogative clause in **The Old Man and the sea**.

Data Analysis

The study sheds light on the translation of the interrogative clauses in process of translation from English into Arabic to determine the meaning and function of the wh- interrogative clauses in Hemingway's *The Old Man and the sea*. The data extracted from the Arabic translation was analyzed along with the study of interrogative clauses in both languages. So first of interrogative clauses in both languages were outlined. The next step was to compare and contrast the Arabic translation with their original texts "*The Old Man and the Sea*, by Ernest Hemingway", translated by Ali Al-Qassimi (2008)

The STs and the TTs were analyzed contrastively via comparing them with each other to identify the points of similarities and differences. This methodology is adopted for it is more applicable to the analysis of the translations of the wh- interrogative clauses in the data examined. In other words, the model employed provides the translator with more freedom to opt for the more communicative rendering when it comes to dealing with the unconventionally implied meanings. Finally, the Arabic equivalents used in the TT were also examined in terms whether they have approximate or similar meaning and function of the ST or not for every sample was used in the translations investigated, was identified fully in comparison with the original.

The findings were discussed and some remarks were made. It was evident that to comprehend and translate conditional sentences, one should study purposefully the

structures in both languages. The translations are analyzed to identify the most problematic structures. Finally, the study ends with a number of conclusions.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

In this section, the written Arabic translation of the beta wh- interrogative clauses by Ali Al-Kasimi were assessed through comparative analysis with the ST **The Old Man and the sea**. The analysis aims at finding to what extent the translator has rendered the ST meaning and function. The following discussion divides into three main categories of the wh-interrogative clauses, namely, wh- interrogative clause functions as subject, wh-interrogative clause functions as object and wh- interrogative clause functions as subject complement.

Significantly, Newmark (1981, 1988), separates between *semantic* and *communicative* translation. The semantic kind of translation would look back on the formal values of the source text and retain them as much as possible; the communicative, kind would look forward to the needs of the new addressee, and adapting to those needs as much as necessary.

Translating the nominal beta wh-interrogative clause

(1) ST: How did you sleep old man? (P: 9, L: 21)

TT: كيف نمت ايها الشيخ ؟ (P: 4, L: 65)

In example 1, the nominal beta Wh-interrogative clause *How did you sleep old man?* which functions as a subject in the ST have been translated into the beta Wh-interrogative clause equivalence in the TT كيف نمت ايها الشيخ which functions also as a subject in the TT. The nominal beta Wh-interrogative clause is normally introduced by كيف (kaifa) in Arabic, which is similar to *how* in English that resulted conveyed the intended meaning successfully (see,).

So, the function, structure and content of the ST are remained without adding or omitting any information. Thus, the grammatical competence of the translator played a great role to achieve a semantic equivalence between the two texts as well preserved the function as a subject in the ST that led to convey his intended meaning successfully. Therefore, this translation of the above β nominal wh- interrogative clause is considered acceptable.

(2) ST: I knew exactly what it was? (P: 14, L: 40)

TT: ادرك ما كانت تعني بالضبط ؟ (P: 3, L: 34)

In the above example, the nominal wh- interrogative clause *what it was* in the ST functions as an object which introduced to *what* has been translated into *ما كانت تعني بالضبط* clause with *maa* in the TT functions also as object as well follows the author's intention. Wh- interrogative clause is normally introduced by *ما او ماذا* (maatha) in Arabic, which is similar *what* in English (see,). Additionally, the nominal beta clause of *what it was* in the ST and its translation *ما كانت تعني بالضبط* are equivalent because semantic and syntactic-oriented of the TT (Newmark, 1988). So, the ST function contents and ideas are rendered without

adding new ideas to deviate the translation. The translator competence has succeeded to achieve the semantic equivalence between the two texts to render as closely the semantic equivalence and syntactic structure of the source language to convey the intended meaning of the original text in the TT.

(3) ST: It is what a man must do? (P: 9, L: 12)

TT: هذا ما يجب ان يفعله الرجل (P: 6, L:21).

In example (3), the nominal beta wh-interrogative clause *what a man must do* in the ST functioning as a complement with *what* has been translated into the beta wh-interrogative clause in the TT functions also as complement. Typically, the beta wh-interrogative is in Arabic introduced by ما (maa), which is similar to *what* in English. So this translation is closer to the original text without adding the translator's ideas and thoughts, into the TT during the translation process. Thus, the translator has succeeded in rendering the structural equivalence and semantic equivalence between the ST and the TT. In other words, the translation has succeeded in achieving the semantic equivalence between the two texts, in terms of the semantic equivalence and syntactic function in the TT that resulted rendering the intended meaning of the original text.

(4) ST: why am I so thoughtless? (6,31)

TT: لماذا انا عديم الانتباه؟ (17, 2)

In example (4), the nominal beta wh-interrogative clause *why am I so thoughtless?* in the ST functioning as a subject has been translated into the beta wh-interrogative clause لماذا انا عديم الانتباه؟ in the TT functions also as a subject also. Typically, the beta wh-interrogative is in Arabic introduced by, لماذا which is similar to *why* in English. So this translation is close to the TT with rendering the nominal beta wh-interrogative clause with the verb to its equivalence the nominal beta wh-interrogative clause without verb in the ST with during the translation process. The translator has the right to correct and improve the original text to clear ambiguities (Newmark, 1988). In this translation, the translator biased into target language is to be more accessible to the TT reader structurally without any changing in the intended meaning.

Thus, the translator has succeeded in rendering the wh-interrogative clause function in the ST into its equivalence in the TT. In other words, the translation has succeeded in achieving the communicative equivalence between the two texts, in terms of the semantic equivalence and syntactic function in the TT that resulted rendering the intended meaning of the original in the target text.

(5) ST: I wonder what a bone spur is? (41, 8)

TT: أ تسأل ماهو نتوء العظم؟ (36, 32)

In the above example, the nominal beta wh-interrogative clause *what a bone spur is?* in the ST functioning as a complement has been translated into the beta wh-interrogative clause

ماهو نتوء العظم؟ in the TT functions also as a complement also. Normally, the beta wh-interrogative is in Arabic introduced by *ما* which is similar to what in English. So this translation is close to the TT with rendering the nominal beta wh-interrogative clause with the verb to its equivalence the nominal beta wh-interrogative clause without verb in the ST. The translation adapts and makes the structure and content of the original test more accessible to the Arab reader during the translation process. In other words, the translation biased to the target language syntax with rendering the intended meaning of the ST.

The translation has succeeded in achieving the communicative equivalence between the two texts, in terms of syntactic function in the TT that resulted rendering the intended meaning of the original in the target text successfully.

(6) ST: How is he? (46, 16)

TT: كيف حاله (106, 1)

In example (6), the nominal beta wh-interrogative clause *How is he?* in the ST functioning as a subject has been translated into a group *كيف حاله* in the TT functions also as a subject. Normally, the beta wh-interrogative is in Arabic introduced by *كيف* which is similar to how in English. In this translation the wh-interrogative clause has been translated into its equivalence the nominal wh-interrogative group without verb in the ST. The translation restructured the clause structure differently adapts the structure and content of the original test more accessible to the Arab reader in this translation process.

In this way, the translator has the right to restructure the ST to clarify ambiguities in order to be accepted for Arab readers. In other words, the translation has succeeded in achieving the communicative equivalence between the two texts, in terms of wh-interrogative clause function in the TT that resulted rendering the intended meaning of the ST in the TT successfully.

(7) ST: who is the greatest manager? (7, 31)

TT: من هو اعظم مدير ؟ (18, 21)

In example (7), the nominal beta wh-interrogative clause *who is the greatest manager?* in the ST functioning as a subject has been translated into the beta wh-interrogative clause *من هو اعظم مدير ؟* in the TT functions also as a subject. Normally, the beta wh-interrogative is in Arabic introduced by *من* which is similar to *who* in English. So this translation is close to the TT with rendering the nominal beta wh-interrogative clause with the verb to its equivalence the nominal beta wh-interrogative clause without verb in the ST. The translation adapts and makes the structure and content of the original test more accessible to the Arab reader during the translation process. In other words, the translation biased to the target language syntactically with rendering the intended meaning of the ST. In other words, the translation has succeeded in achieving the communicative equivalence between the two texts, in terms of syntactic function in the TT that resulted rendering the intended meaning of the original in the target text successfully.

(8) ST: who knows how old he is? (17, 34)

TT: من يدري ما عمرها (4, 11)

In example (8), the nominal beta wh-interrogative clause *how old he is?* In the ST functioning as an object has been translated into the nominal beta clause without a verb in wh-interrogative clause *ما عمرها ؟* in the TT functions also as an object. Normally, the beta wh-interrogative is in Arabic introduced by *ما* which is similar to how in English. So this translation is close to the TT with rendering the nominal beta wh-interrogative clause with the verb to its equivalence the nominal beta wh-interrogative clause without verb in the ST.

The wh-interrogative clause structure in the ST has been adapted with its contents to make the TT more accepted by Arab reader. In other words, the translation biased to the target language syntax by the translator's competence render the wh-interrogative clause function in the ST into its equivalence in the TT. However, the translator has the right to restructure the ST to clarify ambiguities in terms of the interrogative function in order to the conveyed meaning will be accepted for Arab readers. In other words, the translation has succeeded to achieve the communicative equivalence in the TT.

CONCLUSION

Based on the above discussions of the data used in this study, we make the following conclusion which is a semantic and communicative translation have been used differently. Specifically the analysis of the data in terms of the the English Interrogative beta clause revealed that semantic and communicative have been adopted in rendering the the English Interrogative beta clause in translating the English Interrogative beta Clause function. Significantly, the both semantic and communicative translation were used flexibly in the rendering the the English interrogative beta clause of the source text into target text to preserve and to achieve the the English interrogative beta clause equivalence.

Fairly, the intended meaning and message have been rendered successfully in the target text through the translator's use the semantic and communicative which have led to restructuring the the English interrogative beta clause in the source text into the target texts. Finally, this indicates the extent of semantic and communicative occurrence in the selected translation. In this regards, in communicative translation, the translator has the right to correct and improve the original the English interrogative beta clause to clarify ambiguities to achieve the English interrogative beta clause equivalence in the target text.

References

- Alhaj, A. (2015). *Using English Novel to Teach English Language in Secondary Schools: A Theoretical Perspective Study: A textbook for Students of Applied linguistics*. Anchor Academic Publishing.
- Al- Kasimi (2008) *Hemingway's —The Old Man and The Sea—Translation* – (Rabat Azzaman,2008).

-
- Angelelli, C. V., and Baer, B. J. (Eds.). (2016). *Researching translation and interpreting*. New Yourk/ London: Routledge.
- Aziz, Yowell (1989). *A contrastive Grammar of English and Arabic*. University of Mosul.
- Baker, M.(1992). *In other words: A coursebook on translation*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Catford, J. C. (1965). *A Linguistic Theory of Translation. An Essay in Applied Linguistics*, London: Oxford University Press.
- Ghazala, H. (1995). *Translation as problems and solutions*. Malta: ELGA Publication. Helsinki: Oy Finn Lectura Ab, 173-87.
- Hatim, B. (2013). *Teaching and Researching Translation*. Harlow: Pearson Education.
- House, J. (1997). *A Model for Translation Quality Assessment*. Tübingen: Gunter
- House, J. (2015). *Translation as communication across languages and cultures*. Routledge. Popular science texts. Target. International Journal of Translation Studies, 27(3), 370-386.
- Hemingway, Enrest (1952). *The Old Man and the Sea*. New York: Charles Scribner's & Sons.
- Halliday (1994). *Functional grammar*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Halliday and Christian Matthiessen (2014). *An introduction to functional grammar* (.). London, New York: Arnold.
- Liu Fengling (2017). *A Comparative Study of Nida and Newmark's Translation Theories*. International Journal of Liberal Arts and Social Science Vol. 5 No. 8 November.
- Jakobson (1959). *On Linguistic Aspects of Translation*’, in R. Brower (ed) *On Translation*, Cambridge M.A.: Harvard University Press.
- Manfredi M. (2008). *Translating Text and Context: Translation Studies and Systemic Functional Linguistics*, Vol. I, Translation Theory, Quaderni del CeSLiC, Functional Grammar Studies for Non-Native Speakers of English (series ed. D.R. Miller), Bologna, Dupress
- Munday, J. (2016). *Introducing translation studies: Theories and applications*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Newmark, P. (1981). *Approaches to translation*. New York: Prentice Hall.
- Newmark, P. (1987). *The use of systemic linguistics in translation analysis and criticism*. New York: Prentice Hall.
- Nida, E. A. (1964). *Toward a Science of Translating*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- Nida, E. A. and Taber, C. (1969). *The Theory and Practice of Translation*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- Pym, A. (1998). *Method in Translation History*. Manchester: St Jerome.
- Pym, A. (2014). *Exploring Translation Theories*, 2nd Edition. London & New York: Routledge.
- Quirk, R., & Greenbaum, S. (1973). *A University Grammar of English*. London: Longman.
- Wei Liu, (2015). *Translation of Films under Newmark's Translation Theory*.
- Young, D. J. (1980). *The Structure of English Clauses*. London: Hutchinson.