



Discussing the Translation of Selected English Relative Clauses into Arabic in Green's The Fault in Our Stars

Assist. Prof. Ayad Seleem Mansour, Ph. D
University of Kirkuk-Iraq-Basic Education College

Abstract

The aim of this study is to show the use and meaning of relative clauses in English and Arabic adopting Green's The Fault in Our Stars with its Arabic translation by Basil, 2016. The descriptive and qualitative approach is used to deal with selected relative clauses in the novel The Fault in Our Stars in comparison with its Arabic translation to reveal the uses and meanings of relative clauses. This study offers the data descriptively for it is gathered in the sort of terms and no numbers or statistics are used. This study tries to show the differences and similarities between English and Arabic concerning the use of relative clauses and their antecedents.

It is concluded that it is important to investigate the functions and meanings of relative clauses in English and Arabic for they are obligatory to comprehend the sentence when they are defining or restrictive in which case they cannot be deleted because its deletion distorts the meaning of the sentence. But the relative clauses may only add datum to the nouns or pronouns they precede when the relative clauses are non-defining or non-restrictive in which case they may be deleted for its deletion will not change the meaning required. The researcher concludes that studying the translation of the English relative clauses and their counterparts in Arabic is important to learn their differences and similarities and increase knowledge of the correct translation of them from English into Arabic.

Email:

phonetecs66@yahoo.com

Published: 1- 12-2025

Keywords: relative clauses,
antecedent, comparison

هذه مقالة وصول مفتوح بموجب ترخيص
CC BY 4.0

(<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>)

المخلص

تهدف هذه الدراسة إلى بيان استخدامات ومعاني الجمل الوصلية في اللغتين الإنجليزية والعربية، مقتبسةً من رواية غرين "ما تخبئه لنا النجوم" وترجمتها العربية التي كتبها باسل عام ٢٠١٦. وقد استُخدم المنهج الوصفي والنوعي لدراسة بعض الجمل الوصلية المختارة في رواية "ما تخبئه لنا النجوم" ومقارنتها بترجمتها العربية، وذلك للكشف عن استخدامات ومعاني الجمل الوصلية. وتقدم هذه الدراسة البيانات وصفيًا، إذ جُمعت في شكل مصطلحات، دون استخدام أي أرقام أو إحصاءات. وتسعى هذه الدراسة إلى إظهار أوجه الاختلاف والتشابه بين اللغتين الإنجليزية والعربية فيما يتعلق باستخدام الجمل الوصلية وسابقتها.

نستنتج من ذلك أهمية دراسة وظائف ومعاني الجمل الوصلية في اللغتين الإنجليزية والعربية، فهي ضرورية لفهم الجملة سواء كانت تعريفية أو تقييدية، وفي هذه الحالة لا يجوز حذفها لأن حذفها يُشوّه معنى الجملة. أما الجمل الوصلية، فقد تُضيف بيانات فقط إلى الأسماء أو الضمائر التي تسبقها، وذلك عندما تكون الجمل الوصلية غير تعريفية أو تقييدية، وفي هذه الحالة يجوز حذفها لأن حذفها لا يُغيّر المعنى المطلوب. ويخلص الباحث إلى أهمية دراسة ترجمة الجمل الوصلية الإنجليزية ونظيراتها العربية لمعرفة اختلافاتها وتشابهاتها، وزيادة المعرفة بالترجمة الصحيحة لها من الإنجليزية إلى العربي

Introduction

It is important to investigate the relative clauses showing their uses, types and meanings and in this study, the relative clauses are dealt with according to their uses in Green's novel *The Fault in Our Stars*. This study deals with the English relative clauses in Green's novel and how they are translated into Arabic by Basil to show the differences and similarities between them. Moreover, this comparison is made to find out how the novel translator translates English relative clauses into Arabic and whether we agree with his translation or not. The dependent clauses are not questions when they are preceded by a *wh*-word but relative clauses (Wekker and Haegeman, 1985: 116). Relative clauses are similar to *wh*-clauses in having a component lost within the clause, *wh*-component. But these two clauses differ from each other because *wh*-clauses may frequently function like noun phrases while relative clauses really be found inside noun phrases (Borjars and Burridge, 2010: 196). Relative clauses provide "a means to encode complex adjectival modifiers that are easier to process than complex attributive structures and that are less wordy than two independent clauses" (Celce-Murcia and Larsen-Freeman, 1999: 571). When an adverb or a relative pronoun introduces a dependent clause, the clause is called a relative clause, "e.g. *who is sitting near the window* in *The man who is sitting near the window is my uncle*" (Hartmann and Stork, 1972: 195). The function of a relative clause is to limit the field of semantics dealt with through a syntactic component, in most cases a noun and this kind of clauses is called a restrictive relative clause to differentiate it from a nonrestrictive relative clause which is nearly same in form but its function is not the same (Brown and Miller, 1999: 319).

Three significant constituents must be taken into consideration when talking about relative clauses the noun head, the gap, and a relative adverb or relative pronoun (relativizer). The identical individual or object may be referred back to as the noun head (antecedent) by the relativizer. Relative clauses are continually distinguished by losing a component matching in meaning with the noun head. The structural position of this lost component is mentioned as the "gap" (Biber et al, 1999: 608). Restrictive relative clauses can be utilized to refer back to the antecedent (the noun phrase head), but nonrestrictive relative clauses are utilized to provide extra information not needed "for identification." There is a number of

aspects in which defining and non-defining relative clauses vary from each other, the selection of relativizer, the kind of antecedent, etc. (Biber et al., 1999: 195). Modifying a noun phrase represents the principal function done by relative clauses and this expression is utilized for diverse kinds of secondary clauses which can be joined with the independent clause (Leech and Svartvik, 2002: 265). It is possible to attain this connection by a component, normally a relative pronoun, which can make an anaphoric reference, and these relative pronouns may be “who, whom, whose, which, that, and a zero pronoun (Leech and Svartvik, 2002).

It is always obligatory for a relative clause to come immediately after its antecedent to make it easy to understand the precise significance of the speaker. The suggestion conveyed by “I put the books in the cupboard which you bought yesterday” is that it is the cupboard and not the books that you bought (Close, 1975: 51). But occasionally there is a separation between the relative clause and its antecedent as in “George was the only boy at school that I really liked” in which the entire nominal cluster “the only boy at school” is the antecedent of the clause “that I really liked” when *boy* is the noun head and *at school* functions as a post-modifier. Anyhow, in case of *at school* follows *I liked* the suggestion might be “that I only liked George at school or that I liked other boys out of school.” In an example such as “A war broke out which lasted for forty years”, it is normally to separate the relative clause from its antecedent without causing a misunderstanding.

As it is a must for the relative clause to come immediately after its antecedent, therefore it frequently has the ability to separate “the head word in the subject from the verb” as in “Be careful. The car *that overlook us a few minutes ago* has now been stopped by the police” in which “The car that overlook us...” ought to be referred to as a nominal cluster including *The car* as noun head and *that overlook us...* as a defining relative clause whose function is a postmodifier. A non-restrictive relative clause may be dependent and may separate the clause with which it comes, for example “A red sports car, *which seemed to be doing at least a hundred miles an hour*, shot past us.” (Close, 1975). Both the defining and non-defining relative clauses have an antecedent which may be personal or non-personal and each clause begins with a relative pronoun which can function as subject of the clause, object of a verb, complement, and a prepositional object functioning as an adverbial as in the following examples:

Subject: “They are delighted with the person *who/that/*zero* has been appointed.”

“...the book *which/that/*zero* has just appeared.”

Object: “They are delighted with the person *who(m)/that/zero* we have appointed.”

“... the book *which/that/zero* she has written.

Complement: “She is the perfect accountant *which/*who/*that* her predecessor was not.”

“This is not the type of modern house *which/*that/*zero* my own is.”

Prepositional object as adverbial: “He is the policeman *at whom* the burglar fired the gun.”

“...*who(m)/that/zero*... at.”

“She arrived the day *on which* I was ill.”

“... *that/zero* ... (on).”

“I make the cakes the way *in which/that/zero* my mother made them.” (Quirk et al, 1985: 1248-49). Finally, when substitution and reference are used incorrectly in an oral or written text, this will lead to misleading readers or hearers (Najim, 2012: 2).

Relative Clauses in English and Arabic

Baker and Saldanha (2009: 153, cited in Mansour, 2018: 272) state that “source-target text relations are, traditionally, the basic topic of literary translation studies. Two issues, closely-related, represent the bread and butter of theoretical discussions: equivalence and communicative purpose.” English relative clauses are introduced by relative pronouns such as *who*, *whom*, *whose*, *which*, *that*, and *zero* and they usually function as a post-modification of a noun head or occasionally one more clause “or part of it” (Aziz, 1989: 147). In Arabic, a component in a dependent relative clause can be related to a noun phrase by a relative pronoun called *al-ism al-mawSuul*: الاسم الموصول which is either definite or indefinite (Ryding, 2005: 322). A relative clause in English and Arabic is represented by an adjective phrase with initially relative pronoun. Regarding gender, there is no restriction on the English relative clauses as in “*the boy who, the girl who*”. On the contrary, Arabic takes care of gender when using relative clauses as in “الولد الذي، البنت التي”. As regards number, the English relative clauses are not subject to it as in “*the boy who, the two boys who, the five boys who*”, but the Arabic relative clauses are affected by number as in “الولد الذي، الولدان اللذان، الأولاد الذين”. Concerning humanity, the English relative clauses are affected by it as in “*the boy who, the book which*” (Alkhuli, 2007: 157). There is no concord between the English relative clause and its antecedent in case and definiteness as in “This is the *book which* I read” and “This is a *book which* has to be read” respectively. In the first sentence, there is no case concord because *book* is nominative, and *which* is accusative and there is no definiteness concord in the second sentence for *a book* is indefinite, and *which* is definite. From the other point of view, the Arabic relative clause has clear concord with its antecedent in case as in “الولد الذي، الولدان اللذان” and in definiteness as in “الولد الذي” (Alkhuli, 2007: 157-58). The English relative clause demands an antecedent to precede it as in “*This is the man who saved the boy*”, while it is optional in Arabic to omit the antecedent when it is human as in “رأيت (الولد) الذي كسر النافذة”, but it is impossible to omit the antecedent in the case of being nonhuman “unless contextually indicated” as in “*رأيت التي عليها طير”, “referring to a *tree*”. In English it is optional to omit the relative pronoun in restrictive relative clauses when it is an object or “a completive” of a separated or postpositive preposition as in “*This is the man (whom) you met*” and “*This is the book (which) I told you about*” respectively (Alkhuli, 2007: 158); (Khalil, 1999: 279).

In Arabic, on the other hand, such omission is not acceptable and it will lead to ungrammatical sentences as in “*هذا هو الرجل قابلته” for the function of the relative pronoun is to connect the superordinate clause with the relative clause (Alkhuli, 2007: 159); (Khalil, 1999). Rauf (2015:1) concludes that each one of the English relative clauses is finite and that the pronouns may determine it. At last, there is a clear contrast between English and Arabic about the utilization of the resumptive pronoun called “راجع: ‘aaid or raaji: عائذ” in Arabic, but there is no such a pronoun in English (Aziz, 1989: 153). This pronoun appears in syndetic (definite) and asyndetic (indefinite) relative clauses of prepositions or transitive verbs indicating an object in the independent clause (Ryding, 2005: 324).

Data Analysis

1.

SL	TL
“..., for the sword of Damocles to give him the relief <i>that</i> he escaped to those many years ago when cancer took both of his nuts” (Green, p. 12, l 20-22)	“...، أن يمنحه سيف ديموقليس الراحة/التي لم يحظ بها منذ اعوام كثيرة عندما قضى السرطان على كلتا خصيتيه...” (Basil, p. 13, l. 1-3)

The English relative restrictive clause is introduced by the relative pronoun “that” which is utilized for human and non-human persons/things, and it is used here to refer to the abstract noun head “relief”. There is no case concord between the antecedent “relief” which is accusative and the relative pronoun “that” which is nominative. In contrast, Arabic pays attention to gender and number, therefore, the translator utilized the feminine relative pronoun “llatii: التي” to agree with the feminine singular referent noun “alraahat: الراحة”. As case agreement, except in dual, is irrelevant in Arabic, so the antecedent “alraahat: الراحة” is accusative and the relative pronoun “llatii: التي” is nominative. In both languages the relative clause is restrictive for it defines the meaning of the antecedent, and its deletion will lead to an incomprehensible and ungrammatical sentence.

2.

SL	TL
“He nodded toward the boy, <i>who</i> now had a name.” (Green, p. 17, l. 13-14)	“وأوماً برأسه صوب الفتى الذي بات له الآن اسم.” (Basil, p. 18, l. 17)

In the English text, the writer used the relative pronoun “who” to refer to singular personal antecedent “the boy”. The relative clause is non-defining for it doesn’t define the reference of the noun head antecedent (the boy), and its information is less important than that mentioned in the superordinate clause. As the clause is non-restrictive, so there is no possibility to use the relative pronoun “that” in place of “who” in this case. The translator agrees with the original text by translating the English relative pronoun “who” into “lladhii: الذي” which agrees in number and gender with the referent masculine noun “alfata: الفتى”. The English and Arabic non-defining relative clauses agree with each other in this respect in which the antecedent is a definite head noun, and it is possible, here, in both languages to omit the relative clause without affecting the meaning of the main clause.

3.

SL	TL
“My third best friend was an author <i>who</i> did not know I existed.” (Green, p. 18, l. 32-33)	“أما صديقي الأفضل الثالث فهو مؤلف لا يعرف أنني موجودة.” (Basil, p. 20, l. 18)

The relative pronoun (who) is used in the beginning of the relative English clause to refer to the animate indefinite noun head (an author) for the use of this pronoun in the English relative clause is restricted by the personal and non-personal antecedent. As the relative clause is restrictive therefore the relative pronoun “that” can substitute for the relative pronoun “who” in this respect. On the other side, in Arabic asyndetic relative clause, there is no pronoun (zero pronoun) to be used to introduce the relative clause postmodifying the antecedent because the noun head antecedent is indefinite (an author: mualif: مؤلف). It is impossible, here, for both languages to delete the defining relative clause because it is used to define the head noun (an author: mualif: مؤلف), and it conveys a message to the reader that there is only one author the writer is talking about. As there is no relative pronoun, here, and the referent noun is indefinite, so the relative clause is used for the purpose of description.

4.

SL	TL
“God knows that’s <i>what</i> everyone else does.” (Green, p. 19, l. 23-24)	“والله أعلم بأن ذلك ما يفعله كل شخص آخر.” (Basil, p. 21, l. 11-12)

The writer used a relative clause in the objective case introduced by the relative pronoun “what” to make a semantic connection between the demonstrative pronoun “that” and the verb “does” which indicates the action done by everyone. The translator used the indefinite pronoun “maa” as an equivalent for “what”, and as it refers to the object of the verb, so it is

followed by a resumptive pronoun “-hu” which is suffix personal pronoun “dameer muttasil”. It is impossible to delete the resumptive pronoun in most cases because deleting it will make the meaning of text different, but as the relative pronoun utilized here is “maa: ما: what”, therefore the deletion of the resumptive pronoun “-hu” is possible without affecting the sense of the sentence.

5.

SL	TL
“Mom wasn’t there yet, <i>which</i> was unusual, because Mom was almost always waiting for me.” (Green, p. 24, l. 1)	“لم تصل أمي بعد، وهذا نادر لأنها تنتظرني دائما.” (Basil, p. 26, l. 15)

The writer utilized a non-restrictive relative clause not as a postmodifier because the relative pronoun “which” is used here without connection to the head noun “Mom” in the superordinate clause. The non-defining relative clause which is set off by commas refers to the entire main clause, and it is optional to be omitted. The antecedent of the non-restrictive relative clause, here, is represented by the whole sentence “Mom wasn’t there yet”. In contrast, Arabic did not use a relative pronoun because the antecedent “umiy: أمي: Mom” is indefinite, and a conjunction was used instead. As the relative clause, here, refers to the whole preceding clause, so the conjunction “waaw al-’atf” with the demonstrative pronoun “haadhaa: هذا” are used to indicate a non-restrictive connection. The fact that “Mom wasn’t there yet” represents the reference of the relative clause, for, in such cases, Arabic utilizes a conjunction to join a separate clause.

6.

SL	TL
“..., watching Isaac and Monica, <i>who</i> proceeded apace...” (Green, p. 24, l. 18-19)	“...، نراقب إسحق ومونيكا اللذين واصلا ما يقومان به مواصلة حثيئة...” (Basil, p. 27, l. 7-8)

The English relative clause begins with the relative pronoun “who” which is used when the referent noun is human “Isaac and Monica”, and as there is no dual in English, so this pronoun is used for singular or plural human according to the context required. On the contrary, the Arabic text utilized dual relative pronoun “ladh-ayni: اللذين” to refer to the noun dual “Isaac and Monica” because, in Arabic dual, there must be an agreement between the relative pronoun and its referred noun in number and gender. Both the antecedent “Isaac and Monica” and its relative pronoun “ladh-ayni: اللذين” are in the accusative case.

7.

SL	TL
“His mom was putting chicken into tortillas, <i>which</i> his dad then rolled up and placed in a glass pan.” (Green, p. 31, l. 7-9)	“انكبت أمه على وضع الدجاج في أرغفة التورتيا/التي يقوم والده بلفها ووضعها في إناء زجاجي.” (Basil, p. 36, l. 5-6)

The writer started the relative clause with the relative pronoun “which” to refer back to its antecedent “tortillas”, i.e., there is no case agreement because “tortillas” is accusative, and “which” is nominative. On the other hand, the translator made use of the relative pronoun “latii: التي” to point to the feminine inanimate plural noun “arghifat altortia: أرغفة التورتيا” which is non-human for there are restrictions, in Arabic, on gender and number when using relative clauses, but no such restrictions on human/non-human distinction. As the antecedent is plural, the researcher finds it appropriate to translate it into “allaatii: اللآتي” or “allawaatii: اللواتي” in place of “latii: التي” which was used by the translator.

8.

SL	TL
... , "Kaitlyn, you're the only person I've ever known to have toe-specific dysmorphia," (Green, p. 46, l. 3-4)	"من بين من عرفتهم أنت الشخص الوحيد المصاب بالتشوّه الجسدي في موضع محدد هو أصابع القدم." (Basil, p. 53, l. 1-2)

The writer took advantage of the technique of reduction using the infinitival restrictive relative clause "to have", to make anaphoric reference to the animate antecedent "the only person". The writer left out the relative pronoun "who" and the verb "has" which means "possess" without affecting the meaning of the sentence. On the other hand, the translator deleted the relative pronoun "الذي: ladhii", and converted the verbal construction "usib: أصيب or yusab: يُصاب" into participle phrase "almusab: المصاب" to refer back to the definite masculine antecedent "alshakhs: الشخص: person". Based on the foregoing, the researcher suggests another translation for the relative clause and its antecedent "الشخص الوحيد الذي أصيب بالتشوّه" because the antecedent is definite, and it needs its relative pronoun to convey a complete idea to the reader/s.

9.

SL	TL
"I grabbed my phone from my purse (which was) on the kitchen counter and checked my recent calls." (Green, p. 64, l. 17-18)	"أمسكت هاتفي من محفظتي الموجودة على منضدة المطبخ، وتفقدت ما وردني حديثاً من اتصالات." (Basil, p. 76, l. 17-19)

As the function of the defining relative clause, here, is like adjective phrases, therefore the writer omitted the relative pronoun "which" and the copula "was" to form a reduced relative clause represented, here, by a prepositional phrase. This omission, in English, does not change the reference of the text, and the reader/s are still able to understand the idea intended. However, the translator utilized the participle phrase "almawjudat: الموجودة" to refer to the head noun "mihfazati: محفظتي: purse" to substitute for the English deleted relative pronoun and the copula. The researcher finds that it would have been better for the translator to use the relative pronoun "التي: latii" with the past tense verb "kaan-at: كانت" instead of "almawjudat: الموجودة" because the antecedent is singular feminine, and the idea intended will be clearer.

10.

SL	TL
"I realize that this is the kind of deep and thoughtful question()you always hoped your readers would ask" (Green, p. 69, l. 20-22)	"أدرك أن هذا نوع هو نوع السؤال العميق والمدروس والذي لطالما أملت في أن يطرحه قراءك" (Basil, p. 81, l. 17-18)

The writer used zero relative pronoun in the surface structure to precede the defining relative clause referring anaphorically to the noun phrase in the accusative case "...question", because omitting the supposed relative pronoun "which" or "that" in this text will not change the meaning of it. In Arabic, on the other hand, the translator could not delete the relative pronoun "الذي: ladhii" for the antecedent is definite "alsuwal: السؤال: question", and deleting it will cause misunderstanding in the sense transferred to the reader/s.

11.

SL	TL
"I went downstairs to the tiny windowless gift shop and asked the decrepit volunteer (who was) sitting on a stool behind a cash register..." (Green, p. 74, l. 21-23)	"نزلت إلى متجر الهدايا الصغير الخالي من النوافذ وسألت المتطوعة الهرمة الجالسة وراء الصندوق..." (Basil, p. 88, l. 3-4)

The writer utilized the elliptical defining relative clause which is represented by the present participle phrase “sitting on a stool”. He deleted both the relative pronoun and the copula “who was” when referring to the antecedent “volunteer” to create reduction, because the information intended by the writer to be communicated to the reader/s is perfect. In contrast, the translator used the participle phrase “الجالسة: الجالسة: sitting” to make a reference to the head noun “المتطوعة: المتطوعة: volunteer” without using any relative pronoun. The researcher believes that it was more appropriate for the translator to use the relative pronoun “التي: التي” in addition to the past verb “كانت تجلس: كانت تجلس: was sitting” to make a concord with the feminine antecedent and don’t confuse the reader/s in getting the idea required.

12.

SL	TL
“Tried to say something that a normal person <i>whose brain</i> was not drowning in panic would say.” (Green, p. 93, l. 7-8)	"وحاولت أن أقول شيئاً يقوله شخص عادي لا يُغرق دماغه (Basil, p. 110, l. 8-9) في حالة من الذعر."

The writer created a possessive relative clause “whose brain” preceded by the relative possessive pronoun “whose” to describe the noun phrase antecedent “a normal person”, and as it is a restrictive clause, so deleting it will change the meaning of the text. On the other side, Arabic has no relative possessive clauses, therefore it uses a combination of a regular relative and a genitive construction in place of it represented, here, by the noun “dimagh: دماغ” and the resumptive pronoun “-hu” called the “aaid: عائد or raaji: راجع”. In Arabic, as in English, there is no possibility to omit the relative possessive in this text because the message conveyed to the reader will be incomprehensible.

13.

SL	TL
“..., and how everyone <i>who</i> knew her—everyone—was laid low by her leaving.” (Green, p. 95, l. 6-7)	"... وكيف أن جميع من عرفوها أحزنهم رحيلها." (Basil, p. 112, l. 14)

The writer used a restrictive clause in the nominative case introduced by the relative pronoun “who” to point to the indefinite personal pronoun “everyone”. On the other side, the translator used the indefinite relative pronoun “man: من” to refer to the unspecified noun “jami: جميع” which represents a set of persons. The relative pronoun used here denotes a collection of individuals, but it is frequently regarded “masculine singular” from a grammatical point of view.

14.

SL	TL
“You don’t always get <i>what</i> you want.” (Green, p. 103, l. 22)	"... إذ لا يحصل المرء دوماً على ما يبتغيه." (Basil, p. 122, l. 16)

The writer employed the relative pronoun “what” at the beginning of the relative clause to indicate the antecedent “you”, and it is obligatory, here, to keep the restrictive relative clause since deleting it leads to incomplete idea. Regarding case, there is no agreement because the antecedent is nominative and the relative pronoun is objective. In a similar manner, the translator used the resumptive pronoun “-hi” with the indefinite pronoun “maa: ما” to refer to the noun phrase “almar: المرء: you”, and it is optional, here, to delete the suffix personal pronoun, because the meaning will remain the same. There will be a considerable similarity

between English and Arabic in which case the resumptive pronoun called “aaid: عائد or raaji: راجع” can be omitted from the Arabic clause.

15.

SL	TL
“Shakespeare told us precious little of the man <i>whom</i> he entombed in his linguistic sarcophagus.” (Green, p. 105, l. 13-15)	“لم يخبرنا شكسبير إلا بالقليل القيم عن الرجل الذي يدفنه” (Basil, p. 124, l. 17-18) في ناووسه اللغوي.

The writer begins the English relative clause with the relative pronoun “whom” to indicate the object human antecedent “the man” because English entails an agreement between the relative pronoun and personal/non-personal head noun. From the other point of view, in spite of that Arabic is not sensitive to humanity, but the translator used, as an equivalent, the singular masculine relative pronoun “liladhi: الذي” to refer to the head noun “alrajul: الرجل: man” to agree with the English text in this case. In both languages the relative pronoun and the antecedent are in the accusative case.

16.

SL	TL
“..., and I couldn’t quite figure out (the reason) <i>why</i> the Persians were so evil or the Spartans so awesome.” (Green, p. 138, l. 4-6)	“... ولم أستطع أن أستوعب تماماً لماذا الفرس أشرار إلى هذا الحد والأسبرطيون على هذا القدر من الروعة.” (Basil, p. 164, l. 10-11)

The writer did not use a noun head antecedent in this text, for in which case the relative pronoun is “why”, it is optional to delete the supposed antecedent “the reason” to create “headless relative clause”. In a similar manner, the translator deleted the noun head, for he used the composite term of the preposition “li: ل; for” and the relative pronoun “maadhaa” and there is no need to mention the antecedent “alsabab: السبب: reason” in this case. In both English and Arabic, the omission of the noun phrase in such cases will not have an effect on the message meant to be gotten by the reader/s.

17.

SL	TL
“...,we all piled into a taxi driven by this doughy bald guy <i>who</i> spoke perfect English” (Green, p. 142, l. 12-14)	“وتكؤمنا جميعنا في سيارة تاكسي يقودها ذلك الشخص الشاحب اللون الأصلع الذي ينطق بالإنكليزية بطلاقة...” (Basil, p. 169, l. 9-11)

There is a great similarity between English and Arabic relative clauses in which case there is no resumptive pronoun to be used in Arabic. The writer used the relative pronoun “who” to indicate the personal relativized noun “guy”, because English reveals human distinction. Similarly, the translator made use of the relative pronoun “liladhi: الذي” to refer to the relativized noun “alshakhs: الشخص: person” which is singular and masculine for Arabic pays attention to number and gender. In the Arabic text, the resumptive pronoun is implicit within the verb “yantiq: ينطق: speak” for there is no need for the resumptive pronoun to appear in which case the relativized noun functions as subject.

18.

SL	TL
“They are Augustus and Hazel, the young fans <i>with whom</i> you have been corresponding.” (Green, p. 164, l. 13-14)	“إنهما أغسطس وهازل، المعجبان الشابان اللذان” (Basil, p. 195, l. 1-2) راسلتهم.

The English relative clause “with whom...” functions as an object of preposition, and it is used to refer to the human head noun “the young fans”. The antecedent is nominative, but the relative pronoun is accusative. As the relative pronoun “whom” is preceded by a preposition

“with”, so it impossible, here, to replace “whom” with the relative pronouns “who” or “that”, but in other cases when “whom” is not preceded by a preposition such replacement can be achieved. In contrast, as there is dual in Arabic, the translator began the relative clause with the dual relative pronoun “اللذان: alladhaani” to replace the mentioned noun phrase “المعجبان الشابان: almu’jiban alshaabaan”. Here, both the dual relative pronoun and its antecedent are in the nominative case, and they agree with each other.

19.

SL	TL
“..., I couldn’t imagine <i>how</i> he could drink so much, so quickly, so early in the morning.” (Green, p. 169, l. 17-19)	“... فكيف يمكن شرب هذا القدر، وبهذه السرعة، وفي الوقت المبكر من الصباح.” (Basil, p. 200, l. 19-20)

As the writer used the relative adverb “how”, so it is a must to delete the head noun phrase, i.e., the strategy of antecedent omission is utilized here. In contrast, the translator used the conjunction “faa’: ف” with its resultative or sequential meaning, and, in addition, he utilized the relative adverb “kayf-a: كيف: how” to complete what is stated in the previous text. The researcher suggests another Arabic translation by adding the resumptive pronoun “-hu” to the verb “yumkin: يمكن” to create a close relationship between the pronoun and its reference and make the intended idea clear to the reader/s.

20.

SL	TL
“... Augustus Waters, <i>who</i> was standing there looking at me unblinking, trying to think of a way to extricate himself from the situation politely.” (Green, p. 186, l. 5-8)	“... أغسطس واترز /الذي يقف في المكان ينظر إلي من دون أن يرف له جفن، ويحاول التفكير بطريقة لإخراج نفسه بهذيب من الموقف.” (Basil, p. 219, l. 9-10)

The writer made use of the non-restrictive relative clause “who was...” which does not define the antecedent “Augustus Waters”, but it only describes what is stated in the independent clause. The writer used the relative pronoun “who” because the head noun referred to is human, and the relative clause used here is set off by two commas indicating its possible deletion without creating any confusion for the reader/s. Conversely, the translator employed the defining relative clause introduced by the relative pronoun “الذي: ladhii” to make a reference to the masculine singular proper noun “أغسطس واترز”. The researcher believes that it was more appropriate for the translator to use a non-defining relative clause usually between two dashes “-الذي يقف في المكان...-”, because the event in this clause is subsequent to that mentioned in the superordinate clause, and omitting it will not cause any problem for the reader/s.

21.

SL	TL
“They’d tried to stop him right up until that morning, <i>when</i> I heard him screaming that his body belonged to him.” (Green, p. 194, l. 24-26)	“وقد حاولا منعه حتى ذلك الصباح عندما سمعته يصرخ أن جسمه يخصه.” (Basil, p. 229, l. 7-8)

The writer used a non-restrictive relative clause with the conjunction of time indicator “when” to indicate the antecedent “morning” which expresses time. Similarly, the translator used the adverbial “ind-a-maa: عندما: when” to refer to the time antecedent “الصباح: morning”. In both languages the antecedent is a noun phrase which indicates time, but Arabic used the verb “sami’: سمع: heard” immediately after the adverbial, and English used a subject personal pronoun and then the verb.

22.

SL	TL
"His other hand is draped around Isaac's shoulder, <i>whose</i> sunglasses are turned not quite toward the camera." (Green, p. 205, l. 19-21)	"... وقد لف يده الأخرى حول كتف إسحق/الذي لم تستدر نظّارته تماماً صوب الكاميرا..." (Basil, p. 242, l. 17-19)

The relative non-restrictive clause introduced by the relative possessive pronoun "whose" was used by the writer to refer back to the noun phrase "Isaac's shoulder". However, the relative clause used here may be deleted since the information provided is dependent on that explained in the superordinate clause. Likewise, the relative pronoun "الذي" was utilized by the translator to indicate the masculine singular proper noun "إسحق: aishaq". As there is no possession regarding relative clauses in Arabic, therefore the resumptive pronoun "-hu" was used with the noun "nazaarat: نظّارة: glasses" to refer to "nazaarat aishaq: نظّارة إسحق", and its deletion is impossible here. In both languages the non-defining relative clause may be omitted here because the details stated are lesser than those stated in the independent clause.

23.

SL	TL
"Then I walked up to the podium and unfolded the piece of paper <i>on which</i> I'd printed my eulogy." (Green, p. 232, l. 18-20)	"ثم توجهت إلى المنبر وفتحت الورقة التي طبعت عليها" (Basil, p. 277, l. 12-13)

As it is allowed for the preposition to be positioned before the relative clause, therefore the writer used this technique "on which...", and he connected the preposition to the verb "printed" within the clause. On the other hand, Arabic does not permit for the preposition to be put in a position before the relative clause in which case the preposition is connected to the verb within the clause because such use will lead to ungrammatical sentence. It is impossible to use the relative pronoun "that" in place of "which" in this text since there is a preposition "on" before it. The researcher states that it is also impossible to put the preposition at the close of the relative clause "وُفتحت الورقة التي طبعت نعيي على" because it is ungrammatical and meaningless sentence. To some extent, the translator used the preposition "على: alaa" with the resumptive pronoun "ها: haa" at the end of the relative clause to refer to the feminine antecedent "ورقة: waraqa". As there is no "preposition stranding", in Arabic, therefore the "aaid" pronoun cannot be omitted for the reader/s will obtain futile and ill-formed sentence. The researcher suggests another Arabic translation "... وفتحت الورقة التي طبعت نعيي عليها" represented by putting the preposition at the extreme end of the sentence to refer back to the whole clause "الورقة التي طبعت نعيي", and we still have complete meaning.

24.

SL	TL
". . . (which was) <i>Written</i> by someone I'd never heard of." (Green, p. 236, l. 24)	"...كتبها شخص لم أسمع به قط." (Basil, p. 281, l. 20)

The writer employed the past participle phrase "written by someone" as a reduced restrictive relative clause by deleting both the relative pronoun and the copula "which was" for the meaning is perfect with or without them. However, the translator utilized the past tense verb "katab: كتب: wrote" with the "عائد: aaid" pronoun to refer back to the antecedent, and deleting this pronoun, here, will cause a problem for the reader/s.

25.

SL	TL
----	----

"... , were written by people I'd never met and <i>whom</i> he'd never spoken <i>about</i> , people who were extolling his various virtues now that he was dead, ..." (Green, p. 236, l. 26-28)	"... كتبها أناس لم يسبق لي أن قابلتهم، ولم يتكلم عنهم أناس يثنون عليه الآن، بعد أن مات ويثنون على فضائله المختلفة..." (Basil, p. 281-282, l. 21; 1-2)
---	---

The writer took advantage of the strategy of separating the preposition "about" from the relative pronoun "whom" by placing the preposition at the end of the relative restrictive clause. Moreover, as the relative clause, here, functions as complement of the postpositive or separated preposition, so it is allowed to omit the relative pronoun without any impact on the meaning prepared to be carried to the reader/s. In contrast, Arabic does not permit such detachment between the relative pronoun and its preposition since such technique will create ungrammatical and meaningless sentence. The translator made use of coordination using the conjunction "wa-: و: and" with the negative particle "lam: لَمْ" without using the expected relative pronoun "alladhiina: الَّذِينَ: whom" to refer to the plural animate antecedent "unas: أناس: people". The translator used the preposition "an: عن: about" with the resumptive pronoun "hum: هم: they" without any separation between them to point to the plural head noun mentioned earlier. However, we cannot strand the preposition to the end of the clause, and also, we cannot separate it from its resumptive pronoun "هم ... عن" because the sentence obtained will be unacceptable from a syntactic and semantic point of view.

26.

SL	TL
"The minister called up Isaac, who was much more serious than he'd been at the prefuneral." (Green, p. 243, l. 14-15)	"نادى الكاهن إسحق، الذي بدا أكثر جدية بكثير مما كان عليه في المأتم السابق." (Basil, p. 288, l. 15-16)

The comparative relative clause "who...than..." was used by the writer as a non-restrictive clause to describe the event stated in the independent clause, therefore it can be deleted without having an effect on the idea intended to be conveyed to the reader. Both the antecedent and the relative clause are in the accusative case. Similarly, Arabic used the same technique, i.e., the comparative syndetic clause "liladhi: الذي...mima: مما..." to add information to those mentioned in the main clause which can stand in isolation without the relative clause.

27.

SL	TL
"Mom drove me directly from school to the bookstore attached to the mall, where I purchased both Midnight Dawns and Requiem for Mayhem , ..." (Green, p. 43, l. 24-26)	"أوصلتني أمي بالسيارة من المدرسة مباشرة إلى المكتبة حيث اشتريت كلا من ((بزوغات فجر منتصف الليل)) (Midnight Dawns) و ((رثاء لمايهم)) (Requiem for Mayhem)" (Basil, p. 50, l. 10-12)

The writer used the adjunct term for place "where" in place of a relative pronoun to introduce the non-defining relative clause and make reference to the spatial noun phrase "bookstore". The information given by the relative clause is based on that stated by the main clause. The relative clause for position may be an answer to the question done by "where": "Where did mom drive him directly from school?". In a similar manner, the translator used the adverbial subordinator "Hayth-u" with "invariable *Damma* suffix" to combine the secondary clause with the independent clause and refer back to the definite spatial antecedent "almaktabat: المكتبة: bookstore".

Conclusion and Results Discussion

Email: djhr@uodiyala.edu.iq

Tel.Mob: 07711322852

Arabic pays attention to gender and number, whereas English pays attention only to humanity concerning the relationship between the relative pronoun and its antecedent. As a result, the relative pronoun “that” was used in text 1 to refer to the abstract noun phrase head “relief” which is non-human since “that” may be used for animate and inanimate entities, whereas Arabic used the relative pronoun “lalti: التي” because the antecedent is feminine and singular “alraahat: الراحة”. In a similar manner, the relative pronoun “lalti: التي” was used in text 7 as an equivalent for “which” to refer to feminine singular antecedent “arghifat altortia: أرغفة التورتيا”. Accordingly, the Arabic relative pronoun “lalti: التي” may be used as an equivalent for “that”, “which” and “who” in English because there is no importance for humanity in Arabic. Furthermore, it is impossible to use the relative pronoun “that” instead of “who” in non-restrictive English relative clauses, but there is no such a thing in Arabic as in text 2.

English does not take care of definiteness, but it takes humanity into consideration, therefore, in text 3, the writer used the relative pronoun “who” to refer to the indefinite human antecedent “an author”, but Arabic used zero pronoun because the noun phrase head “mualif: مؤلف: an author” is indefinite.

In text 4, the writer used relative pronoun “what” to connect the demonstrative pronoun “that” with the verb “does” not to refer to specific antecedent, but to refer to the action performed by every person. The translator made use of the indefinite pronoun “maa: ما” which was followed by a resumptive pronoun “-hu”, and as “maa” was used pronominally referring to the object of the verb, therefore using the “aaid” pronoun is very necessary in this case.

Sentential non-restrictive clause introduced by the relative pronoun “which” was employed by the writer in text 5 to refer to the superordinate clause as a whole. On the other hand, Arabic did not use relative pronoun because the antecedent “umiy: أمي: Mom” is indefinite and the conjunction “waaw al-‘atf” in addition to the demonstrative pronoun “haadhaa: هذا” were used to refer to the whole preceding clause.

The relative pronoun “who” may be used for singular, dual, and plural alike as in text 6 as the writer used it to make a non-restrictive relative clause to refer to two persons “Isaac and Monica” because number and gender, regarding the matter of relative pronouns and their antecedents, are not important in English. In contrast, Arabic utilized dual relative pronoun “ladh-ayni: للذين” to refer to “Isaac and Monica” for there must be a concord between the relative pronoun and its antecedent in number.

The technique of reduced relative clauses was used in English and Arabic to get rid of redundancy. The infinitive reduced restrictive relative clause “to have” was used by the writer in text 8 to refer back to the personal noun phrase head “the only person”. The writer omitted the relative pronoun “who” and the verb “has” whose meaning is “possess”, but the meaning of the text is still perfect. In contrast, the translator omitted the relative pronoun “laddhi: الذي” and altered the verbal construction “usib: أصيب or yusab: يُصاب” into participle phrase “almusab: المُصاب” to refer to the definite masculine head noun “alshakhs: الشخص: person”. The technique of reduction, concerning relative clauses, was also used by the writer in text 9 by the prepositional phrase “on the kitchen counter” omitting the relative pronoun and the copula “which was”. For the third time, the same technique of reduction was used by the writer in text 11 through the present participle phrase “sitting on a stool” deleting the relative pronoun and the copula “who was”. For the fourth time, the strategy of using reduced relative clause was achieved by the writer in text 24 through the past participle phrase “written by someone” leaving out the relative pronoun and the copula “which was”. This

technique was used in all of these cases because the meaning intended to be conveyed to the readers is perfect. In contrast, the translator used the participle phrase “almawjudat: الموجودة” to substitute for the English omitted relative pronoun and the copula in text 9. Similarly, as in text 9 the translator utilized the participle phrase “aljalisat: الجالسة” in the absence of any relative pronoun in text 11. However, in text 24, the translator used the past verb tense “katab: كتب” with the “aaid: عائد” pronoun to indicate the antecedent for the absence of this pronoun, here, will lead to imperfect meaning.

The strategy of zero relative pronoun was used by the writer in text 10 to introduce the defining relative clause “...question”, since its absence will not affect the meaning of the text. On the other side, the translator used the relative pronoun “lladhii: الذي” to refer to the definite antecedent “alsuwal: السؤال”, and there is no way to delete it because the meaning will be imperfect. In text 13, the writer used a restrictive relative clause introduced by the relative pronoun “who” to refer to the indefinite personal pronoun “everyone”. In contrast, Arabic utilized the indefinite relative pronoun “man: من” to refer to the unspecified noun “jami: جميع”. As there is possibility to delete the suffix personal pronoun “-hi” in Arabic without violating the meaning, therefore a great similarity appears between English and Arabic as we see in text 14 and text 17 in which there is, originally, no resumptive pronoun. The writer used the relative pronoun “what” to refer to the second personal pronoun “you”. The translator, similarly, employed the indefinite pronoun “maa: ما” with the resumptive pronoun “-hi” to refer to the generic reference “almar: المرء”.

As English does not pay attention to case, therefore, in text 18 the antecedent human noun “the young fans” is nominative whereas the relative pronoun “whom” is accusative. However, as the relative pronoun is preceded by the preposition “with” so there is no possibility to replace it with “who” or “that”. On the other hand, the translator took advantage of the dual relative pronoun “alladhaani: اللذان” to refer to its dual antecedent “almu’jiban alshaabaan: المعجبان الشابان”, and both are in the nominative case. As the writer used, in text 19, the relative adverb “how”, therefore the technique of antecedent omission must be applied here. Moreover, the translator used the conjunction “faa: ف” with its resultative meaning and the relative adverb “kayf-a: كيف” to finish what is given in the preceding text.

There is a great similarity between English and Arabic when formulating headless relative clauses as we see in text 16 in which the translator did not use the noun head “the reason” because the relative pronoun is “why” in which case the omission of the expected antecedent is optional. The translator, similarly, did not employ the head noun “alsabab: السبب” since he utilized the compound expression consisting of the preposition “li: لـ” in addition to the relative pronoun “maadhaa: ماذا”, therefore it is not obligatory to mention the head noun and the meaning will remain perfect. Another aspect of similarity of both languages is when the writer used the expression of time “when” to conjoin two clauses and refer to time antecedent “morning”. The translator, in a similar manner, utilized the adverbial “ind-a-maa: عندما” to refer to temporal noun head “alsabah: الصباح” as in text 21.

As there are no possessive relative clauses, whether restrictive or non-restrictive, in Arabic, so the translator used a mixture of a regular relative and a genitive structure symbolized by the noun “dimagh: دماغ” and the resumptive pronoun “-hu” in text 12, and by the noun “nazaarat: نظارة” and the resumptive pronoun “-hu” in text 22. On the other hand, the writer used possessive relative clause “whose brain” to refer to the antecedent “a normal person” in text 12, and he used “whose sunglasses” to refer to the noun head “Isaac’s shoulder” in text 22.

There is a considerable difference between English and Arabic regarding the matter of using a preposition before the relative clause as we see in text 23 when the writer used “on which...”, and he related the preposition to the verb “printed” inside the clause. There is no possibility to employ the relative pronoun “that” to replace “which” here because we have a preposition “on” prior to it. However, there is no such permission, in Arabic, for the preposition to precede the relative clause since we shall get ungrammatical sentence. Furthermore, the technique of separation between the preposition and the relative clause may be used in English, therefore the writer put the preposition “about” at the end of the relative restrictive clause in text 25. However, such detachment is not permitted in Arabic because it will lead to meaningless and ungrammatical sentence. The translator, instead of separation, attached the preposition “an: عن” to the resumptive pronoun “hum: هم” together. Moreover, the translator used coordination including the conjunction “wa: و: and” in addition to the particle of negation “lam: لم” unaccompanied by the supposed relative pronoun “alladhiina: الذين” to refer to the antecedent “’unas: أناس”.

With respect to comparative relative clauses, there is a substantial correspondence between English and Arabic as we see in text 26 when the writer used the non-defining relative clause “who...than...”. Similarly, the translator used the comparative syndetic clause “lladhi: الذي...mima: مما...” to qualify, as the writer did, the event indicated in the secondary clause.

There is a significant similarity between English and Arabic when using the English expression of place “where” and its equivalent adverbial subordinator “Hayth-u” in Arabic to refer to the spatial noun head “bookstore: almaktabat: المكتبة” as we see in text 27.

References

- Alkhuli, M. A. (2007). *Comparative Linguistics: English and Arabic*. Jordan: Dar Alfalah.
- Aziz Y. Y. (1989). *A Contrastive Grammar of English and Arabic*. University of Mosul.
- Baker, M. & Saldanha, G. (2009). *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Basil A. (2016). *The Fault in Our Stars*. (translated). Beirut: All Prints Distributors & Publishers s.a.l.
- Biber D.; Johansson, S.; Leech, G.; Conrad, S.; Finegan, E. (1999). *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English*. Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.
- Borjars, K. and Burridge, K. (2010). *Introducing English Grammar*. London: Hodder Education.
- Brown, K. and Miller, J. (1999). *Concise Encyclopedia of Grammatical Categories*. Oxford: Elsevier Science Ltd.
- Celce-Murcia, M. and Larsen-Freeman, D. (1999). *The Grammar Book: An ESL/EFL Teacher's Course*. U.S: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.
- Close, R. A. (1975). *A Reference Grammar for Students of English*. London: Longman Group Ltd.
- Green, J. (2012) *The Fault in Our Stars*. USA: Dutton Books/An imprint of Penguin Group Inc.
- Hartmann, R. R. K. and Stork, F. C. (1972). *Dictionary of Language and Linguistics*. Library of Congress: Applied Science Publishers LTD.

- Khalil A. M. (1999). *A Contrastive Grammar of English and Arabic*. Bethlehem University: 23
- Leech G. and Svartvik J. (2002). *A Communicative Grammar of English*. London: Taylor & Francis.
- Mansour, A. Seleem (2018). *The Translation of Some Phrasal Verbs in Joyce's "A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man" into Arabic*. ZANCO Journal of Humanity Sciences, 22(6).
- Najim, Y. (2012). *A Syntactic Study of the Overlap between Substitution and Reference*. Kirkuk University Journal-Humanity Studies, 7(4), 1-33.
- Quirk, R.; Greenbaum, S.; Leech, G.; and Svartvik, J. (1985). *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London and New York: Longman.
- Rauf, A. Jamal (2015). *Relative Clauses in English and Turkish: A Contrastive Study*. Journal of Kirkuk University Humanity Studies, 10(2).
- Ryding, K. C. (2005). *A Reference Grammar of Modern Standard Arabic*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Wekker, H. and Haegeman, L. (1985). *A Modern Course in English Syntax*. London and New York: Routledge. |