

CDU 820.03

Original scientific paper

Accepted for publication on 15th September 1995

## The use of connectives expressing overlapping semantic relationships in the translation process

Zjena Čulić  
Civil Engineering Faculty  
University of Split

This paper deals with the use of connectives expressing overlapping semantic relationships and their translation equivalents in the target language. The most frequent changes occurring in the translation process include the substitution of one connective for another when two semantic categories overlap, such as the substitution of causatives or explicatives for conclusives and vice versa and the change of the connective form, i.e., the substitution of adverbial by sentential connectives. Consequently, it can be concluded that the translation equivalent often reflects the overlapping semantic relationships expressed by the original connective in the source language.

### Introduction

This paper deals with the syntactic and semantic features of connectives which includes systematic relations between sentences and clauses. It is obvious that a serious treatment of connectives requires a preliminary understanding of the nature of the connected objects. For simplicity of reference, such objects will be called **connects**, and the usual conception of connects is that they are **propositions**. In terms of linguistic grammar, it is usual to use category names such as **sentence** or **clause** in order to refer to the connects. Connectives might be also viewed as »connectors« of such objects as **facts, events, states of affairs, actions**, or as **possible worlds/situations/set-ups** etc. Thus, investigating the nature of connects lands us amidst some of the fundamental problems of philosophy, linguistics and logic. (van Dijk 1977; 22)

The connections between sentences range from punctuation (which may differ in SL and TL) to contrastive or accumulative conjuncts.

Discourse analysis may be mainly an essential point of reference for establishing the significance of all connectives and clarifying semantically undetermined expressions. (Newmark 1981:32).

Since natural connectives are essentially sequence-forming particles, not only in complex/compound sentences but also in discourse, the analysis of connectives may only be given in the framework of text grammars. Connectives have received little explicit attention, as text-grammatical research has been directed primarily towards an explication of constraints or co-reference. (T.van Dijk, 1977). The analysis of connectives in scientific prose or academic discourse implies a more general relation between coherence strategies and text genres.

The analysis of connectives in this paper includes two main groups: 1. the substitution of one type (semantic category) of connectives for another, when the semantic relations expressed by those connectives overlap, and 2. changing the connective form, i.e. substitution of adverbial connectives for prepositional, or by sentential connectives.

The changes caused by the substitution of one type of connective for another can be divided into those occurring within a single sentence and those beyond the sentence level.

## 1. Causatives

The first group refers to the translation of clauses expressing cause and result including the following possible changes within the sentence and above the sentence level. Propositions A and B are connected if A is a **sufficient condition for B**; in other terms A may be said to **necessitate B**, i.e., B cannot be false when A is true. Thus, the connected propositions denote **facts which are causally related**.

The structure expressing cause most frequently precedes the clause expressing consequence; however, in the target language this sequence may be reversed.

### (1.1) *Budući da X, Y*

**Y, since X.**

*Budući da su usmjereni prema predmetu/području, ovi INDOK centri nose i oznaku »specijalizirani«.*

*These INDOC centers are called specialized since they are subject oriented.*

The second sub-group includes examples where the cause-result relationship, which was implicit in Croatian, is explicitly expressed in English by using the respective connective, i.e. causative.

(1.2) XY

**Y since X**

*Relativno povoljne mogućnosti dobivanja boksita predstavljaju za Hrvatsku komparativnu prednost prema inozemstvu.*

*Croatia has some competitive advantages with regard to other countries since it has a relatively high possibility of bauxite mining.*

The third sub-group refers to cases when the structure expressing cause and result in the source language is divided into two separate clauses in the target language or vice versa.

(1.3) Razlog za Y, X.

**Y. This can be accounted for by X.**

*Razlog specifičnosti problematike nosivosti fasadnih stijena je u njihovoj funkciji koju ispunjavaju na objektu.*

*Facades display specific features considering their support capacity. This can be accounted for by their function in the structure.*

The cause-result relation often overlaps with the reason-consequence relation. This relationship is most evident when the connective is lexically explicit, such as: *razlog je to što*. T. van Dijk makes a clear distinction between these two relationships. The specific property of **causal implications**, or **causals** expressed by **because**, **since**, etc., is the implicit presence of empirical laws or law-like regularity propositions. In such cases the facts are **causally related** and this relation is often explained in terms of **sufficient condition**, i.e., the truth of the antecedent entails the truth of the consequent. Sometimes, however, no such direct »physical« cause seems to be denoted by the connective which rather specifies that the antecedent is a **sufficient reason** for the consequent denoting actions. Reasons must be construed over knowledge and intention, because reasons are always reasons for actions (or the omission of actions), which imply the notion of intention. Such intentions may be taken up in a **cause-sequence** leading to action.

(1.4) Razlog je to što X, tako Y.

**The reason is Y, X.**

**Razlog je u tome što se radi perifernog shvaćanja ekonomske važnosti takvih struktura usvajaju uglavnom pretpostavke koje su na strani veće sigurnosti čime se znatno pojednostavljuje proračun.**

**The reason is that the calculation is generally simplified due to peripheral considerations of the economical importance of such structures and adoption of regulations which excessively stress safety.**

The next group includes examples in which the causative relationship is expressed by a prepositional structure in Croatian which is translated by a subordinate clause in the target language.

(1.5) Radi (zbog) X, Y.

**Since X, Y.**

**Obično se zbog kompleksnosti statičkog tretmana teško može dokaz nosivosti provesti čisto teoretskim putem.**

**Since the static treatment is complex, it is generally difficult to prove their support capacity only theoretically.**

The last group includes the substitution of one form of the connective for another in the target language. Thus, a sentential connector can be substituted for an adverbial connective in the translation process, or vice versa.

(1.6) S obzirom na X, Y.

**Since X, Y.**

**S obzirom na povoljne karakteristike plodnosti tla i povoljne temperaturne uvjete ovo se područje može koristiti za poljoprivredu.**

**Since the soil is fertile and temperatures exceptionally favorable this area can be used for agriculture.**

**Zbog činjenice što X, Y.**

**Since X, Y.**

**Zbog činjenice što je vrh hidrograma dosta visok i znatno kasni za oborinama koje su ga izazvale, teško je točno izračunati maksimalni protok.**

**Since the hydrograph peak is quite high with a significant lag after the precipitation that caused it, it is difficult to calculate accurately the maximum discharge.**

## 2. Adversatives and concessives

The next group presents an analysis of the relationship between adversatives and connectives expressing concession when these two relationships overlap. Concessive clauses may also imply a contrast but their main role is to imply that the situation in the matrix clause is unexpected in the light of that in the concessive clause. The overlap between these roles is highlighted by the overlapping use of connectives. Two sentences which express opposite meanings, but do not exclude their contents, are connected by *ali* or by *no* and *medutim*. The translation equivalents used for these connectives in English also point to this similarity. In Quirk's example: *He tried hard, but he failed; but* can be substituted by **although**: *Although he tried hard, he failed.* (Quirk 1985)

The meanings expressed by **but**, according to Seligman (1991:13) include **inference corrected and inference denied, inverse inference corrected and conflicting inference**. When the **contrast** meaning is expressed by more versatile expressions, like **however**, the **contrast meaning** is easy to confuse with that of **conflicting evidence**.

A summary list of all the meanings of **but** (Seligman 1991: 23) also includes the **concessive element**, as in: *Granted, she's ugly, but she's also rich*, which brings us to our consideration of the overlapping relationship between the semantic categories of **contrast and concession**. Here, an element of concession is added to conflicting evidence. Ivir et al (1973) treat this variant of **conflicting evidence** as a distinct relator in which:

Relator concedes validity of S1,  
but implies that S2 is valid anyway.

According to T. van Dijk the semantic structure of concessives also seems equivalent to that of the contrastive expressed by **but**, in the following examples:

**Although** *Peter is very clever, he couldn't prove that theorem.*

*Peter is very clever, but he couldn't prove that theorem.*

This semantic relationship can be expressed syntactically as:

(2.1) *X, ali i Y.*

**Although** X, Y.

*Postoje otvoreni vodotoci koji teku preko nekraškog terena, ali njihovi izvori se nalaze u kraškom zaleđu.*

**Although** *some open streamflows flow through non-karst terrains, their springs are located in the karst hinterland.*

In the next sub-group connectives expressing concession are substituted for adversatives. The semantic relationship can be presented as follows:

(2.2) *Iako X, Y*

**X. However, Y.**

*Iako je do sada bilo pokušaja da se i na svjetskoj razini utvrde standardni kriteriji, razumljivo je da se ti kriteriji smiju razlikovati od zemlje do zemlje.*

*There have been attempts to determine standard criteria for the whole world. However, criteria can differ from country to country.*

This similarity was pointed out by Quirk, who classifies the following as »concession conjuncts«: **although, even though**, as well as **however** and **nevertheless**, since all express an unexpected statement in relation to the precedent. Most of these »concession conjuncts« can be paraphrased by a subordinate clause: *He has been in office only a few months. He has, however, achieved more than any of his predecessors. Though he has been in office for only a few months, he has achieved more than any of his predecessors.* (Quirk, 1985)

### 3. Conclusives

The third group includes the analysis of some sub-categories within the semantic category expressing conclusion according to the semantic aspects of two contextually included structures such as: drawing conclusions from explicit or implicit elements in sentence 1, or from segments containing elements with either positive or negative connotations.

Consequently, the category expressing the semantic relationship of conclusion can be further divided into five sub-groups.

The first group includes examples of structures where conclusions are drawn from elements explicitly stated in the first segment.

(3.1) *In the past, U-values have been obtained by a variety of methods: by measurement, by adjustment of measured values or by calculation from the thermal resistance of component parts. As a result, different sources often quoted different values for the same construction.*

The conclusion in S2 is drawn from explicitly stated elements in S1: *different values* result from the application of *a variety of methods*.

In the second group conclusions are drawn from implicit statements contained in the preceding segment.

(3.2) *Već smo pokazali da neutralna os poprečnoga presjeka prolazi težištem presjeka. Iz toga slijedi da uzdužna os štapa, kao skup težišta svih poprečnih presjeka, leži u neutralnom sloju štapa i presječna je neutralnog sloja i ravnine savijanja*

The conclusion conveyed by S2 implies a comprehensive understanding of the relations between the *neutral and longitudinal axes*, implicitly expressed in S1.

The third group includes examples where both segments contain elements with positive connotations, such as *jednak, uravnotežen, pravilan, etc.*

(3.3) *Točke presjeka zbog uvjeta simetrije ne mogu dobiti pomak ni lijevo ni desno, budući da su obje strane potpuno ravnopravne. Prema tome, srednji presjek ostaje ravan i okomit na os štapa.*

The positive connotations of S2 content result from the positive elements in S1 explicitly expressed by adjectives such as: *equal, balanced, etc.*

The fourth group contains examples where conclusions are drawn from a segment which contains elements with negative connotations; the conclusion itself is expressed by negative elements, such as negative suffixes, prefixes.

(3.4) *U točkama b, c brzina cirkulacije tekućine teorijski postaje beskonačna. U odgovarajućem problemu torzije posmična naprezanja u točkama b,c također postaju beskonačno velika. To znači da će se kod elastoplastičnog materijala u točkama b,c i pri neznatnom uvijanju pojaviti tečenje materijala, odnosno kod krhkog materijala i male pukotine.*

The negative elements in S2: *formation of cracks and material failure* result from the negative elements in S1: *extreme velocity and stresses*.

In the fifth group the first segment contains elements with negative connotations, while the second segment expresses correction of S1 content. Thus, the conclusion expressed by the second segment implies an improvement regarding the content of the antecedent.

(3.5) *Since the model has not been developed for the outflow in karst, but for a more homogeneous medium, its application to the karst terrain exhibits some specific characteristics. Hence, these characteristics should be constantly taken into account.*

The negative statement from S1: *the fact that the model has not been developed for karst* is corrected by bearing this fact in mind when applying the model *in non-karst terrains*.

#### 4 Explicatives

The last group of connectives refers to the translation of the same SL connector with different translation equivalents in TL which depends upon the possibility of substituting this connector intralingually by connectors expressing similar semantic relations. Thus, conclusives can be substituted for causatives or explicatives, both intralingually and interlingually. This can be illustrated by the possibility of substituting the causative *zbog toga1* by *zato* in Croatian, with the respective translation equivalents in English: **therefore**, **consequently**, etc. On the other hand, the Croatian connective *zbog toga2* can be substituted by a conclusive *stoga*, when it introduces a logical conclusion drawn from the first segment; in such cases its translation equivalents in English are **thus**, **hence**, **accordingly**, etc.

(4.1) *Sa smanjenjem presjeka cijevi i povećanjem potrošnje vode povećavaju se i gubici pritiska čak i do 50%. **Zbog toga1** je obveza svakog izvođača ovih ispitivanja da prije početka radova pribavi ateste o ispitivanju otpora u vodovima i priboru kojim se ovo ispitivanje izvodi.*

*Reduction of pipe diameter and increase in the pumped quantity of water will reduce the pressure by as much as 50%. **Therefore**, it is required that each contractor, prior to tests of permeability, obtains friction losses for the equipment and pipes to be used in investigations.*

S2 expresses a direct consequence of the cause conveyed by S1.

(4.2) *Istraživački rad u tom području, te razmatranje njegova mjesta i uloge problemu su općeg tipa koji daleko prelaze okvire ovog pregleda. Ograničavamo se **zbog toga2** na prikaz konkretnog doprinosa jedne institucije na programu istraživanja iz informacijskih znanosti.*

*Research in this area, as well as the discussion of its place and role, are general questions far exceeding the limits of this review. We will, **thus**, concentrate on the contribution of one institution on the research programme in the field of information science.*

Unlike the former example, here S2 conveys a logical conclusion drawn from the content of S1 and not its direct physical consequence or result.



## Conclusion

After analyzing different types of connectives and their translation equivalents in English, it can be concluded that the translation process allows considerable flexibility regarding the translation of connectives and the clauses they introduce. These clauses exhibit a number of semantic relationships and very often convey basic similarities of relationship to their matrix clause. Thus, there is often an overlapping relationship between contrast and concession while clauses of result frequently overlap with those of purpose.

Hence, the most frequent changes occurring in the use of connectives in the translation process are, as follows:

1. changing the sequence of sentences in the target language
2. addition or omission of connectives
3. separation of one complex sentence into two clauses or joining two separate clauses into one in TL
4. changing the connective type when two semantic categories overlap, such as the substitution of conclusives by explicatives or causatives and vice versa
5. changing the connective form, i.e. the use of adverbial connectives instead of prepositional or sentential connectives, or vice versa

Consequently, it can be concluded that translation equivalents in the target language often reflect overlapping semantic relationships in the source language. Thus, a conclusive may be translated by an explicative or a causative since these semantic relationships overlap and the same substitutions are performed intralingually.

In conclusion, it can be stated that although connectives are essential for achieving textual coherence, this coherence is not achieved only by connectives, but also by the semantic potential of the segments they connect. However, connectives are not semantically empty and although the text influences the use of a particular type of connective they influence the semantics of the segments they connect. Thus, the area of text-linguistics, cohesion or discourse analysis, i.e., linguistic analysis beyond the sentence is obviously relevant to the translation theory.

Further investigations should be directed towards more complex problems related to the logical relations between sentences and conveying these relations idiomatically in the target language.

REFERENCES

- DIJK VAN, Teun A. (1977). »Connectives in Text Grammar and Text Logic«. In: Research in Text Theory: Grammars and Descriptions, Edited by Teun A. van Dijk and Janos S. Petofi, Walter de Gruyter, New York.
- IVIR V., Mc MILLAN D., MERZ T. (1973): 'S-Relators. A. Reports, Institute of Linguistics, Zagreb.
- NEWMARK, Paul (1981). *Approaches to Translation*. Pergamon Press Ltd.
- QUIRK, R., GREENBAUM S., LEECH G., SVARTVIK J. (1985). *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*, Longman, London
- SELIGMAN, Mark (1991). But: What and how it means, Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of California at Berkley.

ANALIZA SEMANTIČKOG I SINTAKTIČKOG ASPEKTA UPOTREBE KONEKTORA U  
PROCESU PREVOĐENJA

U ovom radu analizira se mogućnost komutabilnosti pojedinih konektora za izražavanje semantičkih odnosa uzročnosti, posljedičnosti i zaključivanja kada se ove semantičke kategorije preklapaju. Također se analizira i promjena oblika konektora kao što je zamjena priložnih konektora frazeološkim ili propozicionalnim konektorima. Na temelju ove analize može se zaključiti kako ne postoje oštre granice među ovim semantičkim kategorijama te postoji mogućnost komutabilnosti ovih konektora i njihovih prijevodnih ekvivalenata.