Investigating the Supremacy of the Verb over the Noun: A Comparative Study between English and Arabic with Reference to Translation

Fartin Hanna Shaba
Ammar Ahmed Mahmoud

Article Information	Abstract
	In general, the relationship between the subject and the verb is extremely subtle, and the prominence of one over the other is still debatable. Some scholars, the majority to be precise, contend that the verb, not the noun, is the dominant and controlling constituent in a sentence. Others, however, maintain otherwise. Having taken that into account, and due to the profound divergencies between the structures of English and Arabic, realizing an appropriate translation is profoundly hard to attain. The prime goal of the paper is to dig deeply into the topic by pinpointing the characteristics of this subject-verb dichotomy. Additionally, it aims to fill this translation gap by furnishing some hints and guidelines that are meant to be very helpful for translators before commencing this laborious translational enterprise in such a difficult grammatical area. It is hypothesized that translating the entire stretch of the dichotomy poses significant challenges for translators in their attempt to achieve the objectives and that, despite divergencies between Arabic and English, a sound translation can be provided. Along with an explanation of the main types, functions, and characteristics of the relation, a thorough and in-depth account of the dichotomy is given. To validate the hypotheses and achieve the objectives, a body of Arabic-English translation examples is chosen, a translation model is adopted, a delicate data analysis is carried out, and some renderings are proposed. The paper concludes with a few recommendations and suggestions that are meant to be of great benefit.

البحث في أفضلية الفعل على الاسم : دراسة مقارنة بين اللغتين الإنكليزية والعربية مع الإشارة الى الترجمة

عمار احمد محمود   فارتين حنا شابا

المستخلص:

يعد العلاقة بين الفاعل والفعل دقيقة للغاية , ولا تزال أفضلية أحدهما على الاخر موضع جدال. يعتقد بعض الباحثون – وبشكل أكثر دقه غالبيتهم– إن الفعل وليس الاسم هو العنصر المسيطر والمتحكم في الجملة. بيد أنه لدى اخرين اعتقاد مغاير تماماً. إذا ما أخذنا هذا بنظر الاعتبار وبسبب الاختلافات الجذرية ما بين التراكيب القواعدية في الانجليزية والعربية، فان الخروج بترجمة ملائمة هو أمر يصعب تحقيقه.

إن الهدف الاساسي للبحث هو سبر أغوار الموضوع عن طريق تشخيص سمات ثنائية (الفاعل والفعل). ويرمي البحث بالإضافة الى ذلك الى جَسرِ الهوة الترجمية عن طريق تقديم بعض الملوحظات والخطوط العريضة التي يراد منها أن تكون مفيدة للمترجمين قبل أن يشرعوا ببدء مهمة الترجمة المضنية في موضوع قواعدي صعب كهذا. يفترض البحث ان ترجمة الثنائية تفرض على المترجمين تحدياتٍ كبيرة في خضم محاولاتهم الرامية إلى تحقيق اهدافهم. كما ويفترض ان الحصول على ترجمة صحيحة هو أمر ممكن رغم الاختلافات ما بين العربية والانجليزية. وجنباً إلى جنب مع شرح الأنماط الأساسية والوظائف والسمات للعلاقة، فقد تم تقديم تقرير مفصل ومتعمق حول الثنائية. ولأجل التحقق من الفرضيات ولتحقيق الاهداف، تم إختيار مجموعة من أمثلة الترجمة من العربية الى الإنكليزية وجرى إنتقاء نموذج ترجمي وتم القيام بتحليل دقيق للبيانات , إضافة الى إقتراح بعض الترجمات. إنتهى البحث بجملة توصيات وإقتراحات من شأنها أن تكون ذات فائدة جمة للمترجمين.

الكلمات الدالة : أمثلة الترجمة من العربية الى الانكليزية؛ ثنائية (الفاعل والفعل) ؛ والأفضلية والأهمية.

1. Introduction

Despite the fact that Indo-European languages are Indo-Germanic and Semitic languages, respectively, they all appear to share some characteristics, such as syntax and semantics.

In Arabic, there is no distinction between lexical verbs, which carry out meaning-conveying functions, and auxiliary verbs, which carry out grammatical functions like interrogation, negation, preform, and emphasis. Arabic verbs are

thoroughly described by Aziz (1989: 29–34), who also explains that they are typically divided into two categories: basic classes and derived ones. These two divisions are written as follows in Arabic:'المجرد، and 'المزيد، respectively. There is the triliteral root form 'الثلاثي، which is made up of 3 consonants in addition to the quadrilateral root form 'الرباعي، which consists of 4 consonants. These are the basic forms or classes of the Arabic verbs.

The triliteral الثلاثي is the most common Arabic verb root (Aziz, ibid:29). As implied by the name, these verb roots have three consonants. It is crucial to remember that tracing a word's root, whether it be a verb or another word, always points to the verb's triliteral root form. For instance, the word "broke," which has three consonants, is كسر. As was already mentioned, it is the source of all derived forms, or derivatives. In Arabic, a verb's perfect or past tense is known as the root. However, in English, the verb's infinitive form acts as the root; for instance, the verb "to break" and all of its derivatives are derived from the infinitive form "break." Returning to Arabic, almost all derivatives contain these roots along with a few minor surface-level pronunciation changes and additional morphemes. Consider 'إنكسَر، , in which the root 'كَسَر، is noticed with'إن، , e.g., 'إنكسَرَ الشباك، . The Arabic basic verb form varies depending on the tense, aspect, gender, number, person, mood, and voice. As was mentioned earlier, the basic verb tenses that are listed in dictionaries are the perfect tenses. In both Arabic and English, tense and aspect are combined. In this regard, Aziz (1998:12) exemplifies how the English present tense's perfective aspect is expressed by using a construction like "has finished."

The possible translational equivalent, " أنهى," combines the prefect aspect and present tense. The two languages stand in stark contrast when it comes to gender.

No matter what subject comes before it, there is only one past tense in English for the third person singular. Think about these two instances: Sally wrote....and Sam wrote.... Depending on whether the subject is a man or a woman, the form (written) could be translated into one of two possible forms.

The two possible translations are 'كتبَ توم ..... ' with a masculine third person verb form and 'كتبتْ سالي ..... ' with a feminine third person verb form. Given that Arabic has three systems compared to English's two, the two languages' numerical systems are by no means comparable. English uses the singular and plural, while the Arabic number system uses the singular, dual, and plural. (The students wrote..) has two translations. The two sets of sentences can be translated as follows, respectively, because the verb tenses in Arabic are drastically different: ('أدرس، 'تدرسْ' يدرس ') and ('درست، , ' درستْ , ' درستم').Since the two languages don't have a one-to-one correspondence, dealing with the mood system is very challenging. Mood by itself offers countless variations. English verbs, such as "study," have three tenses: indicative (which allows for the use of any verb form that is frequently used in statements), imperative ("study"), and subjunctive ("study"). An Arabic verb(e.g., دَرَسَ), however, has five: the indicative 'يدرس' , the subjunctive 'يدرسَ' , the jussive 'يدرسْ' , the imperative 'أدرسْ' and the emphatic 'يدرسن' . It's important to note that these moods fall under the category of imperfect form (Aziz, 1989:34). The speaker or writer must decide between the active and passive forms of the verb to preserve the integrity of the original propositional meaning. The simplest way to recognize the active voice in a sentence is to look for the agent or action-taker. The actual active object is put in the starting position, where it then becomes the passive construction's grammatical subject.

The scene is drastically different in Arabic. First off, all Arabic verb tenses are simple, and this includes passive verb tenses. Passive Arabic verb phrases are simple, with the exception of the word order change, where the actual active object of the original sentence becomes the grammatical subject. The verb's morphology has changed, which is the only noticeable change. Thus, a sentence like ' دَرَسَ علي الدرسَ ' becomes ' دُرِسَ الدَرسَ ' and ' يَدرُس علي الدرسَ ' becomes ' يُدرَس الدرسَ ' . Overall, there are significantly fewer verb forms than there were. One can easily draw the conclusion that Arabic verb forms are significantly more numerous than those of English verbs after reviewing the information previously presented above.

The relationship between the subject and the verb is very delicate, and it is still debatable which comes first. Chafe (1970) presented his theory in support of the widely accepted belief that the verb is the primary component of a sentence. He wholeheartedly agreed that the verb is the sentence's main structural element. As a result, he challenges any other theory or theorist who contends otherwise, opposing anything or anyone who asserts the superiority of the noun. According to Chafe (ibid., 97), the verb determines how the rest of the sentence will look, what noun or nouns will go with it, and what kind of grammatical relationship the verb has with the noun.

2.Some Basic Criteria of Arabic Clause

The Basri School and the Kuufi School are the two well-known institutions for Arabic linguistics education. They are well known for the ongoing debate over the method of analysis they advise using for the Arabic clause. The question at hand is how to show which base—verbal or nominal—is more dominant than the other. The Basri school divides clauses into verbal and nominal categories,

according to Abuu Muusaa (1979:279). The first kind frequently starts with a lexical verb, like: 'كسرَ علي البابَ' or, 'الباب كسرَ علي'.Because the action and the doer(s) are being highlighted, it is referred to as a subject-prominent type. The latter category, however, begins with a noun or nominal phrase and may or may not include a verbal predicate. For example: 'المعلمون مخلصون' and 'المعلمون يخلصون في عملهم'.Hassan (1973: 193) notes that when there is no verbal component, the nominal phrase does not contain any references to time, even though the nominal predicate modifies the subject. Because it concentrates on the proposition rather than the doer or the action, this type is regarded as topic-prominent. Since the verb governs the subject in a nominative manner, their order must also adhere to the requirements of the cause-and-effect sequence. If the subject is to remain a subject, it cannot come before the lexical verb. When it does, it turns into a topic. Linguists concur that the use of tenses helps readers understand where events are in time, whether they are happening now or in the future, and whether they are finished or still being worked on.

The superiority of one type over the other is the subject of two opposing points of view. The Basris consider the nominal to be the fundamental sentence. On the other hand, the verbal clause, according to Li and Thompson (1976), is the fundamental one. As cited in Al-Duri (1998), Keenan (1976) thinks that verbal clauses in Arabic occur mainly in "interrogation, negation, conditionals, subjunctive structures, jussive structures, etc." The nominal clause, on the other hand, is a variant of the verbal and is pragmatic in nature, keeping in mind that any departure from the fundamental norm is applied in specific circumstances. Arabic Verbal clauses are most frequently found in interrogative, negative, conditional, subjunctive, and jussive structures. It is common to say 'أ يدرس الطالب' but not 'أ الطالب يدرس' and also 'لن يذهبَ علي', but not 'لن عليَ يذهبَ' . It

follows that verbal clauses occur much more frequently than nominal clauses, and they also have the potential for syntactic and morphological changes.

Arabic is a VS or VSO pattern language rather than an SV or SVO pattern language, to wrap up this section. The fundamental clause is the verbal one, not the nominal one. It is best to think of the nominal as a verbal variant.

Think about the following instance:

The president saw the generals. 'قابلَ الرئيس القادة'

S.   V.   O   O.   S.   V.

This straightforward illustration demonstrates the differences between the two languages' sentence word order patterns. In contrast to Arabic, word order is not as rigid as it is in English. It is clear that the English sentence structure (SVO) and the Arabic sentence structure (VSO) are very different from one another. Although the SVO pattern is also possible in Arabic, the VSO pattern is more typical and fundamental.

3.Which Comes First:

The relationship between the subject and the verb is very delicate, and it is still debatable which comes first. Chafe (1970) presented his theory in support of the widely accepted belief that the verb is the primary component of a sentence. He wholeheartedly agreed that the verb is the sentence's main structural element. As a result, he challenges any other theory or theorist who contends otherwise, opposing anything or anyone who asserts the superiority of the noun. According to Chafe (ibid., 97), the verb determines how the rest of the sentence will look, what noun or nouns will go with it, and what kind of grammatical relationship

the verb has with the noun. This straightforward illustration demonstrates the differences between the two languages' sentence word order patterns. In contrast to Arabic, word order is not as rigid as it is in English. It is clear that the English sentence structure (SVO) and the Arabic sentence structure (VSO) are very different from one another. Although the SVO pattern is also possible in Arabic, the VSO pattern is more typical and fundamental.

Arabic verbs mostly rely on internal morphological changes, as opposed to English, where two or more verbs are syntactically combined to form the entire verb phrase. However, according to Aziz (1989:34), traditional Arab grammarians do not advocate combining two verb forms. They do not at all consider كان يلعب to be a single continuum because in situations like this, an implied subject is supposed to be between the two verbs; a more likely realistic use of the subject together with the two verbs would be equivalent to; يلعب كان(هو). This fact ultimately imposes itself that, in contrast to an English verb phrase, an Arabic one is always simple. The only likely exceptions, as demonstrated by (ibid: 72 and 34), occur when some special verbs like كاد and أوشك are used in one continuum together with an imperfect verb, as in كاد ينجح and when كان and يكون are used to show the perfect and imperfect forms of the verbs, respectively. Such uses can be seen in combinations like كان يلعب (He was playing. Or He used to play.) denoting the past and'" (He will play.) denoting future time.

Inflectional units and morphological changes, as asserted by Chafe (1970: 49), are represented by various affixes that are chosen based on their semantic role and in their appropriate grammatical- and lexical-manifestations that are explicitly shown by exploiting these changes on the level of the infinitive form of the verb in order to openly illustrate particular conceptual functions. (Data Analysis is provided below.)

4.English and Arabic: Time, Tense and Aspect

Although time, tense, and aspect have similar meanings in English, most grammarians have agreed that time is a universal concept throughout the history of linguistic studies (see, for instance, Quirk et al., 1972: 85). Abstract ideas can be perceived as having "a beginning, a middle, and an end," the event characteristics that are typically associated with time dimensions. Tense is the name for the verb's grammatical form that goes through morphological changes. The majority of linguists concur that the use of tenses helps readers understand where events are in time, whether they are happening now or in the future, and whether they are finished or still being worked on.

According to Bull (1968: 4), an event is imagined in relation to the point NOW, which serves as the key intersection of the time axis. When an event can be predicted in the future, it is considered to be in the future. It is in the (present) tense when it is currently being experienced. When something is remembered or recalled in relation to a previous time point on the time axis, it is in the past. A lot of ambiguity about the nature of time is clarified by Hornby's (1954:78) perspective, which emphasizes that time is independent of language and that tense, which is language-specific, refers to specific temporal relations in the text rather than time itself.

Aspect looks closely at an action's internal temporal characteristics. According to Aziz (1989: 56), combining verb forms is how the two aspects of English—the progressive aspect and the perfective aspect—are expressed. A thorough analysis of the idea is provided by Ahmed-Izzet (2001: 6), who concludes by stating that "(aspect) is a universal semantic category that alludes to the notions of completion, termination, duration, or habituality." As indicated above, tense is a deictic device that signifies time and is realized through a contrast in verb forms.

In English, the first form essentially denotes the present, whereas the second form essentially denotes the past.

Similar to English, Arabic has two verb tenses—the present and past—that refer to different points in time. As far as verb forms go, the imperfect and the perfect are the two Arabic verb tenses that express time reference. Arabic does not quite have the same systems for encoding tense and aspect as English does, so the two languages approach tense and aspect in different ways. Both are simultaneously encoded by the latter. Aziz (1989:60–62) asserts that the verb forms are used to express tense. The present perfect occurs simultaneously with, before, or after the action in question). This explains why there may be more than one possible English translation for a sentence that has been taken out of its context in Arabic. Consider the English translation of the following Arabic example:

يدرس المعلم التلاميذ

Literally: teach the teacher the pupils.

Literary: The teacher teaches the pupils.

The teacher is teaching the pupils.

The teacher has taught the pupils.

One can see from the example above that tense markers in the two languages are different from one another. Four linguistic markers: the infinitive form + s, to be + ing-participle, and to have + past participle, can be used to translate the Arabic linguistic marker represented by the imperfect verb form يقول derived from the root قال. The Arabic linguistic indicator for the perfect is the verb's root form, which is equivalent to the past tense of any regular or irregular English verb.

Because Arabic has two distinct ways to express the future (along with some minor means), namely by using one of these two linguistic markers, the future is by far grimmer: 'س' ،or'سوف.

5.The Translation of the Arabic Verbal Clause:

Any approach that sees translation as a matter of substituting the equivalent TL linguistic and grammatical units for the ST linguistic and grammatical units is referred to as a linguistic and grammatical translation. "Faithful" linguistic and grammatical translations, according to Nida and Taber (1974), are those that avoid any form of explanatory interpolation or cultural adjustment that cannot be justified on the basis of such translation types and that include components that can be directly inferred from the ST wording. Translation is also envisioned as "a pragmatic notion," according to Gutt (1998: 52). In light of this, translation can be defined as the process of converting meaningful utterances within a particular context in one language into another. The semantics and pragmatics categories would apply to this. How we understand words in context, is referred to as "pragmatic translation." According to Newmark (1988b: 132), clarity, simplicity, and orderly arrangement are essential elements in producing a similar effect. as a result of our earlier discussion, the equivalent-effect principle will be applied as the fundamental guideline when translating Arabic verbal clauses.

6.Factors Affecting the Interpretation of Arabic Clauses:

The translator must typically take a few factors into account in addition to the linguistic factor discussed above in order to determine the prominence of one clause over the other in order to bridge the spaces that exist between the SL and TL languages. The essential components can be traced as follows:

6.1. Stylistic Factors:

Style is the way a statement is made. The subject selection might be to blame for the stylistic problems. Of course, both language and thought have a certain style. Concerns about language usage exist. Look at these things:

1- إنتقل أبي المفدى إلى جوار ربه الكريم

2- توفي أبي العزيز

3- مات أبي

4- مات العجوز

We can plainly see for ourselves that the four statements communicate the same thing, but they do so in four different ways. Any modification to the way one expresses their ideas will inevitably result in a modification to the overall impact on the addressee(s).

Different styles are suitable for various people, audiences, circumstances, and purposes, as is now abundantly clear. For international students, the study of style is a major barrier to success. For instance, a native English speaker would not call the food "grub" in a formal setting (Berry 1977: 108); however, a foreigner might not be able to tell the difference. In terms of style, the selection of words should be given far more consideration than the selection of structural patterns.

6.2.Cultural Factors:

The differences between the SL and TL ideologies may be to blame for cultural considerations and issues. Culture is "the human-made component of the

environment," according to Wilss (1997: 111). Language and culture are "closely interwoven," says Okafor (1989: 263). Culture must be taken into account when dealing with any language barrier. The translators' cultural awareness determines their ability to understand what a word means in a particular cultural context and when to use it (ibid., p. 265). Regarding the idea of culture, Newmark (1988a: 94) asserts that there are two categories of words: universal words and cultural words. He asserts that cultural words may also cause translation issues. Cultural words cannot be translated literally. As Okafor (1989: 264) claims, they would still be unable to accomplish this.

6.3.Pragmatic Factors:

Among other linguistic disciplines, pragmatics is the field that deals with the process of translating Arabic verbal clauses into English. Translation in general is "primarily a pragmatic notion," according to Gutt (1998: 52). We must define broad pragmatics from the very beginning. The difficulties a translator runs into when translating Arabic verbal clauses seem to stem from a variety of pragmatic factors. A translator should be able to recognize any implied meaning in the source text. Grice (1975) uses the Cooperative Principle as the foundation for his theory of implicature. He establishes four sets of guidelines that he refers to as the Conversational Maxims (ibid). The maxims of quantity, quality, relevance, and manner are some examples of these maxims. A translator must also be able to point out the maxim(s) that have been broken. The author adds some additional information (implied meaning) by disobeying a maxim (Hatim, 1998: 179). Thus, the idea of subtext emerges, which is important to the study of pragmatics. According to Newmark (1988a: 77), subtext is "the meaning behind

the meaning." The subtext must be expressed in the target language (TL) in a way that is "equally clear" to the speaker of the target language (ibid).

6.4.Contextual Factors:

The following section is devoted to studying context and other pertinent terms, assuming that a translator does not primarily deal with words but rather whole messages. There are two types of context: linguistic and nonlinguistic. The textual environment is known as the linguistic context (also known as co-text). All aspects of the situation in which language is used are referred to as non-linguistic context (also known as situational context and economic context) (Allan, 1986: 44–53). Shaheen (1990: 44) asserts that a co-text must be taken into consideration in order to fully understand a text. The linguistic context is how he (ibid) succinctly defines co-text. According to Ullmann (1967: 49), co-text, also known as verbal context, can include the entirety of a passage and even an entire book. It is not just what comes before and after the linguistic item in question. As a result, in order to comprehend something completely, like the meaning of a sentence, we also need to comprehend the context in which it was said.

In this case, there is no doubt about the significance of context. In his explanation of the importance of context, Newmark (ibid: 134) asserts that "context determines meaning."

7.The Model Adopted

Since this essay could be viewed as a contrastive study, it makes a concerted effort to identify the variations between the Arabic and English time systems. There are some errors that translators may make as a result of misreading or

misinterpreting the original texts' chronology of events. This section will be largely devoted to discussing how time sequences are connected to particular meanings and, in turn, how much of an impact these time sequences may have on translation from a communicative standpoint. Through Reichenbach's theory of tense (from 1947), the semantic interpretation of time is better understood. For him, tense entails:

A/ 3 times: (SpT) Speech Time, (RT) Reference Time and (ET) Event Time.

B/ (SpT) with (RT) also (RT) with (ET) are two different types of relations between these three times. For present, past, and future simple constructions,

 (RT) and (ET) are the same; they vary with regard to (SpT).

 He plays the piano.   (SpT)= (RT) ----(RT) = (ET) (for both)   يعزف على البيانو

He played the piano.   (SpT)after (RT) ---- (RT) = (ET) (for both)   عزف على البيانو

He will play the piano. (SpT)before (RT) -- (RT) = (ET) (for both) سيعزف على البيانو

Regarding simple constructions, there is a complete one-to-one correspondence between the two languages in terms of time relations. The progressive aspect ignores whether an event ended or not in favor of concentrating on the internal details of the event. Regarding progressiveness, the situation is as follows:

She is teaching English.   (SpT)= (RT) -- (RT) = (ET) (for both)   تدرس الإنكليزية.

She was teaching English. (SpT)after (RT) -- (RT) = (ET) (for both)   كانت تدرس الإنكليزية.

She will be teaching English. (SpT)before (RT)-- (RT) = (ET) (for both) ستدرس الإنكليزية.

When it comes to progressive constructions, there is a one-to-one correspondence between the two languages. The event is the center of the perfective aspect, which examines whether it is completed or not. The relations are explained in the sentences that follow:

He has written a letter.   (SpT)= (RT)and (RT)= (ET) (English)

(SpT)after (RT)and (RT)= (ET) (Arabic)   كَتَبَ رسالةً

(SpT)after (RT)and (RT)after (ET) (Arabic)   كَتَبَ رسالةً قبل قليل

(SpT)after (RT)and (RT)= (ET) (Arabic)   كَتَبَ رسالةً توأ

He had written a letter two hours ago.   (SpT)after (RT)--- (RT)after (ET) (for both)

كَتَبَ رسالةً قبل ساعتين

He will have written a letter.   (SpT)before (RT)--- (RT)after (ET) (for both)

سيكون قد كَتَبَ رسالةً

Regarding perfective constructions, there is inconsistency. Future perfect and past perfect are interchangeable. However, the English present perfect presents a challenge because Arabic lacks an equivalent and complementary construction. The potential Arabic interpretations provided, among others, do not constitute grammatically sound constructions on their own and are thus logically grouped

together under the Arabic perfect form " الماضي." Perfective aspects with three different times—(SpT), (RT), and (ET) —in the past and future are distinct from one another. Keep this example in mind:

After he finished his chores, John went to bed.(ibid:148). Think about the following instance: (Mary welcomed John with a smile.)

8.Procedure and Data Analysis:

The information in this paper is based on Arabic texts and the researchers' parallel English translations. The renderings will be carefully examined, and any errors the translators might have made will be highlighted. The researchers will serve as judges and commentators. They will make suggestions after conducting and analyzing the analysis.

We'll present verbal and nominal sentences. It is discussed how the sentence should be examined in light of the categories that verbs fall under (see Leech and Svartvik, 1994:65, 74–75, and 202–203). Under the heading of (TL text), suggested translations are provided for both literary and literal translations.

Below, there are some examples:

SL text (1): إنكسرَ الشباك

TL text: Word-for-word: Broke the window.

Literary: The window broke.

Literary: The window has broken

Discussion

The Arabic verbal sentence (henceforth VS) shows a 'process'. The verb ' إنكسرَ'
is the perfect form, which is derived from the triliteral perfect root verb
form' كَسَرَ' by means of adding the morpheme ' إن' to highlight the 'process' of
' كَسرْ' . The latter is manipulated by' الشباك' which is the patient. The Arabic VS is
translated into English by means of a declarative sentence having a noun and a
verb for sure.

SL text (2): الشباك مكسور

  TL text: Word-for-word: The window broken.

           Literary: The window is broken.

           Literary: The window was broken.

           Literary: The window has been broken.

Discussion:

The Arabic nominal sentence (henceforth NS) has no verb. This NS implicitly
holds a (verb of state) which is originally taken from a (verb of process).' مكسور
', the predicate, is derived from ' كَسَرَ' , the perfect form , accompanied by the
addition of the morpheme ' و' , ' م ' and with subtle changes as far as
pronunciation is concerned. This form is the p.p. form of the original basic root
الشباك' . ' كَسَرَ ' is regarded as the patient. As such, one can behold a structure
enfolding a verb of a state, which can be taken from a verb that shows a process.
This is fulfilled by adding the morpheme ' و' , ' م ' which reflects the ultimate
result inflicted by the effects that are mirrored through the root form. The
verbless Arabic NS is translated into English by means of a declarative sentence
having a noun and a verb as well.

SL text (3): كَسَرَ أحمد الباب

  TL text: Word-for-word: Broke Ahmed the door.

Literary: Ahmed broke the door.

Literary: Ahmed has broken the door

Discussion:

The Arabic VS contains a verb showing both a 'process'. The verb' كَسَرَ ' which is the root form of the action of ' كَسْر ' which, in turn, has the patient ' أحمد ' . The need for a patient is a necessity for the verb to have. The patient is that part on which the action occurred as well as the agent who is accomplishing the action as far as the verb is transitive. Here, ' البابَ ' is the patient. The Arabic VS is translated into English by means of a declarative sentence.

SL text (4): الباب مكسور

TL text: Word-for-word: The door broken.

Literary: The door is broken.

Literary: The door was broken.

Literary: The door has been broken

Discussion:

The NS implicitly has a verb indicating a 'state'. In the first place, the 'state', in turn, is taken from a verb showing a 'process action'. ' مكسور ', the predicate, is derived from ' كَسَرَ ', the perfect form , accompanied by the addition of the morpheme ' م ' , ' و ' and with subtle changes as far as pronunciation is concerned. This form is the p.p. form of the original basic root ' الباب ' . ' كَسَرَ ' is regarded as the patient. As such, one can behold a structure enfolding a verb of a state, which can be taken from a verb that shows a process. This is fulfilled by adding the morpheme ' م ' , ' و ' which reflects the ultimate result inflicted by the effects that are mirrored through the root form. The agent is omitted since the sentence is of the passive voice type. The verbless Arabic NS is translated into English by means of a declarative sentence having a noun in addition to a verb.

SL text (5): كَتَبَ الطالب الدرسَ

   TL text: Word-for-word: Wrote the student the homework.

               Literary: The student wrote the homework.

               Literary: The student has written the homework.

Discussion:

The VS contains a verb enclosing an activity taking place in a progressive way. The verb form ' كَتَبَ ', which is a triliteral perfect, is the root of ' كِتابة ' . ' كِتابة', is the activity which has agent' الطالب ' . The patient is that part on which the action occurred as well as the agent who is accomplishing the action as far as the verb is transitive. The patient in this sentence is ' الدرسَ' . The Arabic VS is rendered into an English declarative sentence.

SL text (6): الدرس مكتوب

   TL text: Word-for-word: The homework written.

               Literary: The homework is written.

               Literary: The homework was written.

               Literary: The homework has been written

Discussion:

The NS contains a verb indicating an 'activity. At first glance, the 'activity, in turn, is taken from a verb showing the 'action' of ' مكتوب ' . ' كتابة ', the predicate, is derived from ' كَتَبَ ' , the perfect form , accompanied by the addition of the morpheme ' و' , ' م ' and with delicate changes in pronunciation. This form is the p.p. form of the original basic root ' كَتَبَ ' . ' الدرس ' is regarded as the patient. Consequently, one can behold a structure enfolding a verb of a state, which can be taken from a verb that shows a process. This is fulfilled by adding the morpheme ' و' , ' م ' which reflects the ultimate result inflicted by the

effects that are mirrored through the root form. The agent is deleted since the sentence is of the passive voice construction type. The Arabic NS, which contains no verb, is translated into English by means of a declarative sentence having a noun in addition to a verb.

ST text (7): رَكَضَ أحمد

  TL text: Word-for-word: Ran Ahmed

         Literary: Ahmed ran.

         Literary: Ali has run.

Discussion:

The VS has a verb denoting an action. The verb form 'رَكَضَ'is a triliteral perfect having the root of 'رَكضْ' which is the action that is in need of a agent. 'أحمد'is the agent. No patient is needed seeing that the verb 'رَكَضَ' is transitive; this is the reason behind which no NS can be taken from a verbal sentence.

9.Findings and Discussion:

1. The relationship between the subject and the verb is very delicate, and it is still debatable which comes first. This is because some academics—including Chafe (1970)—believe that the verb is the essential component of a sentence, while others disagree.

2. As far as English is concerned, declarative sentences consist at least of a subject and a verb. The two are mandatory elements. The existence of both is a must. The two elements are complementary to each other. As such, English, contrary to Arabic, has a subject and a verb as the obligatory elements. They are both of the same importance; no one is superior to the other, although some scholars, and to be more precise, the majority of them, positively reckon that the verbal clause is the dominant one. Arabic, on the other flip of the coin, has two

types of sentences; namely, nominal sentences (NSs) and verbal sentences (VSs). Nominal sentences are those sentences that comprise المبتدأ and الخبر. Neither of the two of them are verbs. Consequently, nominal sentences are verbless. Verbal sentences, however, have, at a minimum, a subject and a verb. This, ultimately, leads us to the conclusion that the noun is superior to the verb in Arabic, taking into account that nominal sentences do not at all need verbs.

3- There are a lot of different verb forms. One can easily draw the conclusion that Arabic verbs have far more verb forms than English verbs based on what has already been demonstrated. When it comes to tense-aspect, gender, number, person, mood, and voice, the Arabic basic verb form changes.

4- Here, time and tense are discussed at the sentence level. However, it's important to consider the overall setting in which the text is situated.

5- The only type of translation that ensures preserving the full specifics of the text's content in addition to its effect is literary translation, also known as what Nida and Taber (1974) and Newmark (1988) refer to as "dynamic equivalence" and "communicative translation", respectively. The equivalent-effect principle can be easily applied to the English translation of Arabic verbal clauses by using literary translation. However, using a literal translation may distort the SL's meaning and impact.

6- Arabic does not follow the English classification of verbs into lexical verbs, which are in charge of conveying meaning. Auxiliary verbs serve grammatical functions.

7- It is noted that when there is no verbal component, the nominal phrase does not contain any references to time, even though the nominal predicate modifies

the subject. Because it concentrates on the proposition rather than the doer or the action, this type is regarded as topic-prominent. Since the verb governs the subject in a nominative manner, their order must also adhere to the requirements of the cause-and-effect sequence. If the subject is to remain a subject, it cannot come before the lexical verb. When it does, it turns into a topic.

8- It is common to say ' لن يذهبَ ' and also ' الطالب يدرس أ ' but not 'يدرس الطالب أ ', ' علي ' ,but not 'لن عليَ يذهبَ ' . It follows that verbal clauses occur much more frequently than nominal clauses, and they also have the potential for syntactic and morphological changes.

9- There are some errors that translators may make as a result of misreading or misinterpreting the original texts' chronology of events. This section will be largely devoted to discussing how time sequences are connected to particular meanings and, in turn, how much of an impact these time sequences may have on translation from a communicative standpoint. Through Reichenbach's theory of tense (from 1947), the semantic interpretation of time is better understood.

10- With regard to perfective constructions, there is inconsistency. Future perfect and past perfect are interchangeable. However, the English present perfect presents a challenge because Arabic lacks an equivalent and complementary construction. The potential Arabic interpretations provided, among others, do not constitute grammatically sound constructions on their own and are thus logically grouped together under the Arabic perfect form " الماضي." Perfective aspects with three different times—SpT, RT, and ET—in the past and future are distinct from one another.

10.Recommendations:

1-Translators should pay attention to the supremacy of the verb over the subject and act accordingly while translating.

2-Translators should pay attention to preserving and presenting the verb phrase in the right way as much as possible, despite the discrepancies between the two languages.

References

Abuu Muusaa, M. (1979): **Dalaalaat Al-Taraakiib**, Vol. 1. Qaar Younis: University of Qaar Younis.

Al-Duri, A. O. (1998): **A Pragmatic Aspects of Translating Political Texts** (Unpublished Ph. D. Dissertation) University of Al-Mustamsiriya.

Allan, K. (1986): **Linguistic Meaning** Vol. 1, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd.

Aziz, Y. (1989): **A Contrastive Grammar of English and Arabic.** University of Mosul**.**

Aziz, Y. (1998):**Topics in Translation with Special Reference to English and Arabic.** Beghazi: University of Garyounis.

Berry, M. (1977): **An Introduction to Systemic Linguistics**, London: B. A. Batsford Ltd.

Bull, W. (1968). **Time, Tense and the Verb: A Theoretical ans Applied Linguistics with Particular Attention to Spanish,** Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Hassan, T. (1973): **Al-Lughatu Al-Arabiyyatu: Manaaha wa Mabnaaha,** The Egyptian Association Press.

Grice, H. P. (1975): "Logic and Conversation". In: Cole, L. & Morgan, J. L. (eds.) **Syntax and Semantics, Vol. 3: Speech Acts**. New York: Academic Press.

Gutt, E. A. (1998): "Pragmatic Aspects of Translation: Some Relevance-Theory Observations". In: Hickey, L. (ed.) **The Pragmatics of Translation**, Clevendon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Hatim, B. (1998): "Pragmatics and Translation". In: Baker, M. (ed.) Encyclopedia of Translation studies, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 179-183.

Hatim, B. & Mason, I. (1997): **The Translator as a Communicator**, London: Routledge.

Hornby, A. (1954): **A Guide to Pattern and Usage in English,** Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Leech, G and Svartvik, J. (1994): **A Communicative Grammar of English**, Longman Group Limited.

Li, Ch., N and S. A. Thompson (1976): "Subject and Topic: A New Typology of Language". In: Li (ed.) **Subject and Topic**. New York: Academic Press. Pp. 457-489.

Newmark, P. (1976): "The Theory and Craft of Translation". In**: Language Teaching and Linguistics: Abstract**, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press**.**

_____ (1988a**): A Text-Book of Translation**, New York: Prentice Hall.

_____ (1988b): **Approaches to Translation**, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nida, E & Taber, C. (1974): **The Theory and Practice of Translation**, Leiden: E. J. Brill.

_____(1997): "Translators Confrontations with False Ideas about Language". In: **Journal of Terminology and Translation** Vol. 2, pp. 185-189.

Okafor, E. E. (1989): "Role of Cultural Awareness in Translation". In**: Nouvelles de la FIT** Vol. 8, No. 4, pp. 263-273.

Quirk, R. S., Greenbaum, G. N., Leech, G. N. and Svartvik, J. (1972). **A Grammar of Contemporary English,** London : Longman Group Ltd.

Quirk, R. S., Greenbaum, G. N., Leech, G. N. and Svartvik, J. (1972). **<u>A Comprehensive Grammar of English Language,</u>** London : Longman Group Ltd.

Reichenbach, H. (1947): **<u>Elements of Symbolic Logic</u>**, New York: MacMillan.

Shaheen, M. (1990): **<u>Theories of Translation and their Application to the Teaching of English/Arabic</u>**, Amman: Dar Al-Thaqafa Library For Publishing and Distribution.

Ullmann, S. (1967): **<u>Semantics</u>**, Oxford: Basil Blackwell Publishers.

Wilss, W. (1997): "Context, Culture, Compensation: Three Basic Orientations in Translation". In: **<u>Journal of Translation Studies</u>**, No. 1, pp. 109-119.