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The Arabic translation expands the highly reduced English text thorough coordination and subordination means. Expansion has been done through the introduction of ... الخ أنا على ثقة أن لدينا أصدقاء كهؤلاء. في الحقيقة لقد كنا مختلفين لدرجة أنه من الصعبية تصدق أنهما أخوان.

7. To conclude it seems clear that Arabic usually prefers redundancy where English opts for Contraction and, This tendency is explicit in translation (Arabic–English–Arabic), rendering Arabic versions almost always longer than their English counterparts. Differences like these are to be taken into consideration by translators and students of translation if a more accurate translation is Sought.
Acronyms formed on the same principles in Arabic assume wide currency—and have proved to be of potential reduction power, e.g. سانا،وفا... والخ.

But when the case concerns initialism, shortened forms verbalized letter by letter representing a full word, the case is widely restricted. rare attempts are made at transliteration. Up to now Arabic does not have an initialism of its own for the very common term UN, PLO, EEC, IOO, OFAQ, etc., neither has there been an attempt to abbreviated forms of their Arabic equivalents.

What is surprising is the fact that while English freely reduces most translations of Arabic political and administrative institutions, no attempt is made at their reduction in Arabic. A case in point is PLO which still does not have an equivalent initialism in Arabic. Note also ICO, ABSP, RCC, etc.

The situation is almost similar with abbreviations when the shortened form represents elements in compound or just parts of a word. While Dr. has its Arabic reduced form دكتور; TV, Ph.D., D.G etc. retain their expanded forms in translation.

6. Among major means of structure expansion are coordination and subordination. Coordinating and subordinating elements play different roles in Arabic and English. Generally speaking, coordination and subordination means surface more in Arabic than English, while in today’s English the tendency is to reduce these elements as far as possible. An examination of the following English piece from Chaplen (1976: 7) and its Arabic translation proves the point.

"The two brothers were quite different. Bob was tall, fair and slim: John was short, dark, and fat. Bob was like his mother, and John was like his father. Bob was never happier than when he had something practical to do; John, on the other hand, was clumsy when using his hand. Their sister, Mary, was also clumsy with her hands. Bob rarely spoke to other people unless he was spoken to first, but John was always the center of a group, talking and chattering as if his life depended on it. I am sure you have friends like this. In fact, they were so different that it was hard to believe they were brothers".
5. The use of abbreviation as a means to reduce linguistic structures is at peak in today’s English. Newly coined or newly found acronymic terms are widely used in forward-moving activities of science, medicine, military affairs, etc. Even current events are often the cause of abbreviated designations intended as time and space savers or as catchy references to timely topics. Precious inches of newsprint and precious seconds of broadcast time are saved by newspaper editors, radio, and T.V. through the use of these shortened forms.

English distinguishes three groups of reduction in this area. Distinction between the three types, though necessary, is not very clear-cut, since their definition overlaps in many ways. The following definitions, though somewhat simplified, clarify the differences between the three groups of acronymic forms in English (Crowley, 1980:10).

a. An *acronym* is composed of the initial letters or parts of a compound term. It is usually read or spoken as a single word, rather than letter by letter. Examples include RADAR, LASER, etc.

b. An *initialism* is also composed of the initial letters or parts of compound term, but is generally verbalized letter by letter, rather than as a single word. Examples include PO, UN, etc.

c. An *abbreviation* is a shortened form of word or words that does not follow the formation of either of the above. Examples include Ph. D., Dr. Prof. etc.

Though the three types exist in Arabic, their currency is still limited and in cases ad hoc. There is no dictionary of acronyms in Arabic and Arab lexicographers do not bother to include them in their monolingual dictionaries. As far as the knowledge of the present writer goes, there is no study in Arabic on the use of acronyms and their function, despite their growing use in many phases of modern life in the Arab world. It seems that the power of abbreviated forms to reduce and save time and space is not yet fully appreciated.

Acronyms of English origin are perhaps among the most widely used in Arabic out of the three types of abbreviated forms. Pronounced as a sequence of letters, acronyms are not hard for Arab readers to adopt or even accommodate in the language. Note for example the wide-spread use of RADAR, LASER, UNICEF, OPEC, OAPEC, UNESCO, UNRWA, FAO, etc., all read or spoken as single words. Furthermore, the acronyms and the like have been transferred and transliterated into Arabic.
4. Repetitive structures are essential in Arabic for ordinary politeness and emphasis. This is not always the case in English, a language which avoids repetition of structures and words wherever necessary. The exchange of greetings in Arabic, for example, seems redundant, repetitive and stilted when with their English equivalents. It is quite possible for the following general friendes greetings to be exchanged on encounter in Arabic:

- Peace be on you
- On you be peace
- How are you?
- Well praise be to God
- And you how are you?
- Praise be to God, I am well
- How are the children, I wish to the Almighty they are well
- They are well, Praise be to God
- Howi is uncle Ahmad

In colloquial Iraqi Arabic, the informal repetitive greeting phrase «How are you» is often repeated three times by the same speaker, rendering the English version redundant and meaningless. How are you? and How are you? and How are you

It has to be noted however, that repetition in the case of Arabic is expressive of the views the Arabs entertain about the world and their own culture. It cannot be viewed as redundant but part of the language, manifesting itself in several contexts among them grammar. Note, for instances the following examples of the cognitive object, the cognate object, which are highly productive in Arabic:

1. (عدهم عداً), literally, he has numbered them a numbering, (with an exact numbering).
2. (ضربهم ضرباً), literally, he has beaten them a beating, (he beat them severely).
3. (دفنهم دفناً), literally, he has pushed them a push (he pushed them strongly).
that differences between texts can easily be determined by the potentiality of noun phrase for making stylistic contrasts (Crystal and Davy, 1969:55).

When comparing translations of English noun phrases with the Arabic equivalents, differences in style and the way reduction and expansion are expressed become evident. Complex noun phrase with several adjectives and nouns preceding the head are often expanded in Arabic. But rarely an attempt is made to condense structures with complex noun phrases when translating from Arabic into English.

My Students provided expanded Arabic Structures for the following highly reduced complex English noun phrases.

1. The 200 milligram gold tablet drug.
   ان العقار عبارة عن أقراص من الذهب كل قرص يحتوي على 200 ملغ من الذهب.
2. The first permanent artificial heart fitted person, Dr. Barney Clark.
   الدكتور بارني كلارك وهو أول شخص يزرع له قلب اصطناعي دائم.
3. Yesterday's early attacks.
   النوبات التي حدثت في وقت مبكر أمس.
4. Heart surgery patients.
   المرضى الذين تجري لهم عمليات جراحية في القلب.
5. The 37 year-old conservative leader.
   زعيم المحافظين البالغ من العمر 37 عاماً.
6. The 155 page, 44,000 word document.
   الوثيقة التي تضم 155 صفحة و44 ألف كلمة.
7. Our 'Buy British' Sales Campaign.
   حملة المبيعات التي تتما بها من أجل شراء ماهو بريطاني المشا.

In the meantime when given the Arabic version, the students preserved the expanded structures in their translation. No attempt was made to reduce the elements into a condensed complex noun phrase.

1. The drug is an equivalent to gold tablets, each tablet contains 200 milligram of gold.
2. Doctor Barney Clark, who is the first person to have been fitted with a permanent artificial heart.
3. The attacks that occurred early yesterday.
4. Patients who underwent heart surgery.
5. The leader of the conservatives, who is 37 years old.
6. The document which contains 155 pages, 44,000 words.
7. The sales campaign we launched to buy what is made in Britain.
Although reduction may in general be regarded in semantic or pragmatic terms as a means of avoiding redundancy of expression, what kind of reduction and what kind of redundancy are permitted is largely a matter of syntax. Quirk et al. discuss in detail means leading to structure expansion and those that lead to structure reduction. The theoretical framework of this paper is largely based on their syntactic analysis of the grammatical principles governing the processes of structure expansion and contraction.

Coordination and subordination are according to Quirk et al. (1985 867) among major means of structure expansion. Expanded complex pre-and post-modification is another syntactic device leading to expanded linguistic structures. The agent by-phrase, though generally optional in English is also taken by the authors as a structure that can be left out as redundant. The spelling out of acronyms, whenever unnecessary is a redundancy factor. How acronyms come into play in both languages is a matter which causes a great deal of trouble for Arabic – English – Arabic translators.

Reduction as a means of avoiding redundancy is mainly discernable at two levels, e.g. proforms and ellipsis, Reduced relative clauses, complex pre-and post-modification in noun phrases and acronyms are also among the ways leading to abbreviated sentence structures. In the following sections expansion and reduction of syntactic Structures in both Arabic and English will be contrasted, focussing attention on the problems they may cause in English–Arabic–English translation.

3. The capacity of the noun phrase to reduce structures is tremendous. Elements preceding or following the headword exhibit this potential. In the pre-modification structure, strings of adjectives and nouns can precede the headword when expanded this elements usually belong to finite clauses marked with wh-words, Separate phrases or even independent sentences. Similarly, post-modification can be achieved non-finite clauses which are mostly a reduction of wh-finite clauses.

The noun phrase, then, is endowed with a great degree of potential to reduce or expand structures. This ability has led some grammarians to the belief that it can be used to help show differences between texts. Scott et al. (1968: 123) write: “One readily measurable aspect of different passages is the structure of noun phrase. The use of simple or complex noun phrase and the structure of noun phrase will give factors of comparison”. To enhance this position further, other linguists stress the fact
In translation, redundancy plays a positive role. It makes the translated text coherent in meaning and cohesive in structure. It is used to elaborate and clarify what is being translated. It is a common fact among translators that the translated subject is almost always longer than the source. This means that a translator has to expand his translation to overcome ambiguity and to clarify certainty and to explain certain points that new reader might not be familiar with. This, however, does not mean that new information can be added. Redundancy is mainly used to overcome the problem of “communication load” due to the difficulties involved in the translation of rare forms, poetic use of language, unusual syntactic structures and peculiar usage of the source usage. Language according to the peculiar subject or social setting. Madesen and Bown (1978: 159) put it aptly when they say that the use of redundancy presents the information content in a less concentrated form or at a lower rate, thus enabling the reader to assimilate it.

2- A study of redundancy as a linguistic process should originate an analysis of means of structure reduction. Meanwhile, it is difficult to explain the meaning and grammatical status of reduced forms without postulating or reconstructing the unreduced ones. Means of structure reduction in a language and the ways used to recover them are mostly a matter of syntax (Quirk et al., 1985: 858). This paper will be mainly concerned with grammatical redundancy placing special emphasis on the problems it may cause when texts are translated from English into Arabic and vice versa.

Other things, being equal, writers and language users in general follow the maxim 'reduce as much as possible'. This generally means preferring reduction to expansion in writing. But this should not be taken to mean that the expanded linguistic structures are always preferred to contracted ones. For example, reduction is avoided at least in careful written style where it would otherwise lead to ambiguity or some other kind of difficulty for the interpreted language. That, however, does not show the same degree of preference for abbreviated structures. Arabic, as we shall see in the following sections, is a language that opts for expansion, particularly in areas where English would prefer reduction. Such a preference, on the other hand should not be taken as merely a preference for economy. Then sentence structures are abbreviated by reducing items which are shared as given information, attention will be focused on clarity, fresh material or new information.
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1. A wide controversy has been going on among linguists about two contradictory concepts. The first is "economy" in language which means the use of as short as possible structures to convey the message and achieve communication. The second is the use of longer structures to receive the message properly and communicatively. Application of these two concepts differs from one language to another due to some cultural, environmental, social and rhetorical factors. These differences, however, are more noticeable in translation, where the use of redundant structures is often unavoidable.

The use of redundant structures is justified in translation. Additional linguistic structures are needed to convey the message and achieve communication particularly with the presence of longer information pieces. This case, technically known as "communication load," causes the linguistic performance to be redundant. While economy in language can be achieved by the use of shorter linguistic structures with form and meaning being in one to one relation, redundancy requires different forms to account for the same meaning. Redundancy is vital to disambiguate the communicative acts and the linguistic structures (Nida 1974: 205).

Human languages in general tend to minimize uncertainty or ambiguity by maximizing redundancy which is not a waste of effort but a very important reinforcing communication.

Linguists provide more or less similar definitions of redundancy as a linguistic concept. For Nida (Ibid 1964: 125) it is the expression more-than once of the same unit of information. Bolinger (1981: 18) define it as "the surplus of information in the language or the amount of explicitness needed to avoid ambiguity. Madsen and Bown (1978: 6) hold that redundancy characterizes all languages without which communication would be impossible."