CHAPTER SIX

CONCLUSION

6.1 Preliminaries

In the present study, an attempt has been made to approach English and Arabic cohesive devices from a perspective different from that provided by most grammars of English and Arabic. It goes without saying that the role of cohesive devices has been examined not only within the sentence limits but also within the broad framework of the text. The researcher's main emphasis throughout the study has been the general role cohesive devices play in establishing cohesion within the text. To achieve this role, however, the researcher was required to address herself to the linguistic properties of each cohesive device in the text.

The linguist M.A. K. Halliday (1978:136) defined ‘text’ as a semantic unit containing specific textual components, which makes it ‘internally cohesive’ and functioning “as a whole as the relevant environment for the operation of the theme and information system”. Furthermore, Halliday and Hasan's model of cohesion followed in this study has proven to be a valuable tool for the analysis. It has enabled the researcher to discern the wide scope that some cohesive devices assume in the text and to realize the cohesive importance of these devices as text-building elements. It has also provided the researcher with valuable insight into the interaction between some cohesive devices with other cohesive elements within the text and into the rhetorical significance the presence of these devices has in the text. The researcher’s analysis of the text has also shown that such functions and properties of the cohesive devices are not adequately accounted for in the existing dominantly sentence-based treatments of Arabic cohesive devices. This raises a need for the extension of the scope of our linguistic analysis.
beyond the sentence level and for the integration within this extended scope, of syntactic, semantic and discourse analyses.

6.2 Major Findings

1. Some loss of meaning and pragmatic effect can be detected throughout the analyzed material to the extent that the translators, in certain instances, resorted to deleting whole expressions due to lack of equivalence or because they are hard to transfer from SL into TL, which validates hypothesis(1).

2. Many of the cohesive devices employed by Hemingway were rendered into different devices in the Arabic version. It is true that some cohesive devices have equivalent counterparts in the translated text, nevertheless, and due to difference in means of expression of both tongues, lots of shifts were encountered, which validates hypothesis (2).

3. The researcher noticed that the translators of both novels did not adopt literal or one-for-one methods of translation. This reflects their awareness of the impossibility of translating a literary text literally. Instead, functional equivalence was preferred by both translators in order to render cohesive devices into Arabic in an acceptable and effective manner, and this validates hypothesis (3).

4. The tables given in the analysis chapter to highlight the frequency of cohesive devices in both ST and TT prove undoubtedly that the two languages embrace different cohesive devices to express the same idea and this conclusion clearly validates hypothesis (4).

5. A glance at the translated texts of both novels reveals that the translators of both texts attempted various techniques in order to
render as many cohesive devices into Arabic as possible. They tried paraphrases, translation couplet and even deletion, which makes hypothesis (5) a valid one.

6. Meaning, as one of the goals behind using language, needs to be looked at as the concept that is wider in sense than just being a literal and superficial echo of the utterances and words, or just as a set of unlimited names attached to uncountable referents. From the analysis made in chapter five illustrates that word meanings cannot be detected except within context. It is through context that word meaning is fully grasped.

7. Language is not static. It is inevitably prone to change like any other phenomenon in life, and understanding its role in life and communication should be realized in accordance with this fact.

8. In this study, cohesion refers to “the set of possibilities that exist in the language for making text hang together” (Halliday and Hasan, 1976). The ‘hanging together’ of text obtains from the relations between clauses and sentences, and these relations are signaled by the ‘ties’ formed between cohesive devices and presupposed elements that occur in another clause. So, wherever there is an item that has its referent in another clause or sentence, there is cohesion.

9. The only permanent meaning of pronouns and subject markers is number, gender and case, while the demonstratives have an additional meaning of location, time or distance. These reference items cannot be semantically interpreted in their own right, but depend for their interpretation on other elements to which they make reference and which are often located in another clause or sentence. Thus, by definition, reference items are potentially cohesive. The presence of a
reference item means the presence of a relation or tie between it (the reference item) and the element it makes reference to. And when the presupposed element occurs in a clause other than that in which the reference item is, the tie between the two elements becomes cohesive.

10. Not only do reference items bind adjacent clauses and sentences, they also relate clauses and sentences that are separated by sequence of clauses. Reference items, particularly pronouns and subject markers, can leap over a number of clauses to pick up an element that has not occurred in the intervening portion of the text. In such cases, the reference item resumes what was initiated or started earlier in the text, and thus contributing to the ‘hanging together’ of the text.

11. The importance of reference items to the cohesiveness of the text is also evident in the fact that they form cohesive ties not only across clause and sentence boundaries, but also across paragraphs. Most of the texts analyzed contain instances of a pronoun, a subject marker, or a demonstrative that occurs at the beginning of a new paragraph and has its referent in the preceding paragraph. In the two novels under study, the occurrence of the third person pronoun and subject markers at the beginning of paragraphs is very frequent. The same pronoun may form a line of reference that runs through several paragraphs.

12. Reference plays an important role in the cohesiveness of texts regardless of the genre. In the two selected novels, cohesive reference items dominate texts. Reference items are also important to the textuality of a text since they largely contribute to its continuity through the relations they establish at all levels of the text and through the semantic continuity they provide the text with. Reference items are also devices that serve to compact the surface text. They are brief and
semantically empty elements that are used to keep the content of fuller elements, their referents, current (de Beaugrande and Dressler, 1981:63). If in a text all reference items, pronouns, possessives, demonstratives, and concord markers were to be replaced with their referents, the text could become confusing and redundant, especially when the item replaced is a demonstrative or third person singular masculine that has an extended reference. Table 5.5(p.322) shows that personal reference constitutes 37.37% of the total cohesive devices used in *The Old Man and the Sea*, and 32.94 in *For Whom the Bell Tolls*.

13. Unlike reference, ellipsis occurs scarcely in these two novels. In the novels under study, however, ellipsis occurs much more frequently, in the sections that consist of dialogue. But even with the higher frequency in narratives, ellipsis remains much less frequent than reference. The percentage of ellipsis in the first novel (*The Old Man and the Sea*) and the second novel (*For whom the Bell Tolls*) ranges between (7.07%) in the first novel, and (7.20%) in the second novel, of the total number of cohesive devices counted in the texts.

14. Despite its low frequency, ellipsis largely contributes to the cohesiveness of the texts in which it occurs. Like reference items, elliptical forms and statements relate the clauses or, more frequently, the sentences in which they occur to another, usually the preceding one, which contains the presupposed elements. In the two novels selected, almost every sentence in the dialogue either has an elliptical element or is itself an elliptical statement, and depends for its interpretation on a preceding sentence which contains the missing information.
Like reference, ellipsis provides the text with continuity. But whereas the continuity provided by reference is semantic, that provided by ellipsis is grammatical. What is carried over in the elliptical form or statement is a form, a word or structural feature, and this usually occurs in an environment of contrast where the referential meanings are not identical (Halliday and Hasan, 1976:196). The elliptical form or statement provides new information which repudiates or contrasts with parts of or the entire presupposed clause. Only the new information is overtly expressed; everything else is presupposed. This is the basic function of ellipsis: “to create cohesion by leaving out, under definite rules, what can be taken over from the preceding discourse, making explicit only that contrasts with it” (Halliday and Hasan, 1976:196).

Ellipsis is also important to textuality. Like reference devices, it binds a text, usually one that consists of dialogue and provides it with continuity. Furthermore, it contributes significantly to the compactness of a text, making the processing of text by the reader easier by saving him/her time and energy (de Beaugrande and Dressler, 1981: 69). If, for example, the elliptical forms and statements in the passage referred to previously were to be filled out by their presupposed elements, the text would become redundant (repeating information known from the preceding sentences), unnecessarily lengthy, and monotonous. As a result, the processing of the text will demand more time and energy on the readers' part. The condensation that ellipsis provides is “not only economical in production but also respects the needs of the receiver by following Grice's (1975) maxim of quantity; i.e., ‘make your contribution as informative as (but not more informative than) is required’” (Van Dijk, 1977: 80).
17. Ellipsis in Arabic then plays an important role only in narratives. As for substitution, the analysis of the translated texts shows that it hardly contributes to the cohesiveness of the texts. This is illustrated by the low percentages of frequency it has in the analysis. The percentage of ellipsis in the translated text of *The Old Man and the Sea* is (4.44%) and (5.34) in *For Whom the Bell Tolls*, whereas it was (0.74) for substitution in *The Old Man and the Sea* and (0.78) in *For Whom the Bell Tolls*, which is a good indicator of how rarely Arabic users resort to substitution.

18. Ellipsis is a commonly used cohesive device in both English and Arabic. Both languages have three types of ellipsis: nominal, verbal, and clausal. In nominal substitution the two languages use similar elliptical forms (demonstratives, numerals, indefinite quantifiers, etc.). However, there are forms that occur elliptically in only one of the two.

19. Possessive pronouns constitute the one major category of elliptical forms that occur in English but not in Arabic. The reason for this is that Arabic has no separate possessive pronouns that can function as head in a nominal group.

20. Adjectives and relative clauses occur as elliptical forms in Arabic but not in English. In English, only certain adjectives like color adjectives and adjectives like ‘the rich’ and ‘the poor’, which refer to general class of people, can function elliptically. In Arabic, on the other hand, adjectives and relative clauses are frequent as elliptical elements.

21. Cohesion works very much the same way in both English and Arabic though the two languages accomplish some of the same goals in different ways. Although the reference system of Arabic seems to be
more complicated than that of English, reference devices in both languages basically operate in the same way.

22. Although English does not have subject markers, its pronouns cover the function of both pronouns and subject markers. Arabic does not have separate possessive pronouns, but its suffixed pronouns in the genitive case assume the function of English possessive pronouns.

23. In both languages the third person pronouns are typically cohesive. In both, certain reference items like the singular demonstratives can refer to the extended text. Also reference in the two languages is usually anaphoric and cohesive ties range from immediate to remote.

24. Furthermore, reference items in both English and Arabic occur with high frequency in texts and function cohesively at the clause, sentence, and paragraph levels, thus significantly contributing to the cohesiveness of texts.

25. Substitution is the main area in which the two languages differ. Whereas in written English the three types of substitution (nominal, verbal, and clausal) all occur, in Arabic, only verbal substitution, particularly the verbal substitute ‘yafçal’ ‘to do’, is common in written discourse. Nominal substitution is very uncommon in Arabic, especially in essays, and clausal substitution does not occur at all. In places where English uses nominal and clausal substitution, other types of cohesion (lexical, reference, or ellipsis) are used in Arabic. This can be seen when comparing the percentages of occurrence in both the SL and TL. While the frequency of substitution in 'The Old Man and the Sea' is double of that in the translated text, it is four times the same device in 'For whom the Bell Tolls'.
26. Conjunctions in the text appear to be operating at all levels: phrase, clause, sentence, paragraph and discourse. They have been shown to be indicating:

(a) Structural relationships such as coordination and subordination,

(b) Semantic relationships such as adversative, additive, consequential…, and,

(c) Discourse functions such as signaling switches in the flow of the argument.

27. By means of the relationships they signal, the conjunctive items seem to be contributing to the overall cohesion of the text. However, there is a frequent association between conjunctive items and other cohesive devices such as anaphora, ellipsis, paraphrase and lexical cohesion.

28. A successful translation should attempt to restructure the encoder's point of view on the basis of the embodied context of the whole situation including the technical and social needs. The translator should delineate his/her renderings in an acceptable way i.e. the translator has to be not only a bilingual mediator of the discourse but a bicultural with the necessary technical and social requirements.

29. One implication of the present work “Cohesive Devices in English and Arabic with Analysis of Two of Hemingway's Novels and their Translations” is that though the notion of cohesion - as the set of relationships that help a text hang together - could be universal, the system established by Halliday and Hasan for English cannot be considered a universal schema of cohesion, at least not without modification. As the study shows, Halliday and Hasan's works for
Arabic only to a certain extent; it cannot be adopted as it is to describe cohesion in Arabic.

30. Several modifications had to be made, since Arabic differs greatly from English, particularly in the areas of morphology and syntax. For one thing, the fact that the sentence in Arabic does not always have a tight structure and that punctuation in Arabic does not follow strict or fixed rules makes the orthographic sentence an unreasonable unit of analysis for Arabic texts. The structure of the Arabic sentence differs from that of the English sentence, and because Arabic does not have modal and temporal operators, Halliday and Hasan’s categorization of the types of ellipsis had to be modified.

31. Furthermore, nominal and clausal substitutions do not normally occur in Arabic and are therefore, not considered among the viable cohesive devices in Arabic as they are in English. Likewise, certain nominal elliptical forms such as adjectives and relative clauses had to be added, since these forms do not function elliptically in English.

32. Just as certain subcategories of the cohesion types proposed by Halliday and Hasan had to be either eliminated or modified and new ones had to be added to suit the nature of the Arabic language, these and/or other categories may also have to be modified to describe cohesion in other languages. Different languages may favor different types of cohesion or may achieve cohesiveness in a text in ways that are different from those used in English. In inflectional languages, for example, concord (which Halliday and Hasan do not include in their paradigm of cohesive devices in English) is likely to have an important cohesive function.
33. Halliday and Hasan's schema then cannot be used as it is for analyzing cohesion in other languages. It does, however, provide a starting point. How much modification of the schema is needed depends on the differences between English and the language studied. The more differences there are, the more modifications are needed.

34. Another implication of this work is that, the text itself determines to a large extent what cohesive devices are used for, their frequency, and their significance. The purpose of the ‘text’ may also be a factor in determining the type and frequency of certain cohesive items. Two texts belonging to the same genre but with different purposes may resort to different cohesion types. A persuasive essay, for example, is likely to use devices common in poetry (rhythm, repetition, recurring patterns and metaphors, etc,) whereas an explanatory essay probably would not. This study then, must take into account different kinds of texts as well as the purposes of these texts.

35. The translator has to adopt a type of equivalence which specifies the method of translation to be selected for the purpose of conveying, as appropriately as possible, the meaning and function of cohesive devices into the TL. Functional equivalence is the type and free translation is the method that is to be followed to accomplish this mission.

36. The extensive analysis of cohesive devices in the two novels under study, supported by statistical evidence, shows that:

a. Arabic tends to avoid specific deictic reference and substitution.
b. To some extent, ellipsis is not a heavily employed phenomenon in both English and Arabic texts of the sort analyzed. However, English does tend to use it more than Arabic.

c. The addresser and the addressee are given a higher profile in the Arabic texts than in the English texts.

d. English uses more multifunctional connectors than Arabic.

e. In addition, the analysis shows that English technical writing favours greater thematic complexity than Arabic does, and different patterns of thematic connection between sentences.

f. English seems to use a higher proportion of pronouns than Arabic. This is reinforced by table (5-5 and 5-6). English displays a higher proportion of same word/lexical cohesion than Arabic. (cf. Section 5.4)

g. The unmarked clause relation in Arabic is the matching relation whereas the unmarked clause relation in English is the logical sequence relation.

h. Arabic is ‘additive rather than subordinative’. This is supported, although not perhaps proved, by the fact that Arabic has more ‘wa’s’ than English has ‘and’s’. It is also supported by the fact that English has more adverbial clausal elements coming in initial position than does Arabic.

6.3 Pedagogical Implications

On the basis of the results obtained in this research, the researcher thinks that students are continually faced with choices which are motivated by what the translator as the reader of the text understands, i.e. what s/he has interpreted.
The complete comprehension and analysis of the source text are the only ways to a good translation. Teachers have to realize the importance of the skill of reading in translation, to make students get the gist of the text they are going to translate. In classes, an emphasis is laid on the practice of translating word meanings through the knowledge of discourse organizing vocabulary. By making good readings of SL meaning, L2 (Second Language) learners can interpret discourse more precisely and can successfully transmit it into TL. This seems to suggest that, it is necessary to teach students types of cohesion and especially lexical cohesion explicitly in translation, i.e. to teach students to look for clue items in original texts before they start translating. The reading activity that precedes the process of translation encourages the students to collect the necessary information in a text and understand it more accurately by paying attention to its lexical cohesion.

Lexical cohesion can be explained to students when they read. Understanding the semantic relations and tracing the grammatical and textual functions of the lexical ties, as it is believed, will make students interact with the text and succeed in taking accurate decisions. It is, therefore, the teacher's task to point out systematically to such differences and to explain the level(s) at which they are likely to affect the translation process.

The task of the teacher here is to focus on the thorny nature of cohesive devices and refer students to their everyday use so as to make a background for them to be attentive in using them in the future.

6.4 Suggestions for Further Research

The fact that our entire analysis has been based on two novels and their translated texts makes our results tentative and thus necessitates their verification through further research. Such research can be conducted in the
light of a more extensive body of data and can be directed towards forming a better understanding of the role of cohesive devices in textuality, of how and to what extent the absence or presence of cohesive devices influences the reader's identification of a text as such. The outcome of such research will be of utmost importance not only for Arabic and English linguistics in general but also for the teaching of translation to both native and non-native learners.

In view of the present study, the researcher recommends that more attention be paid to the study of cohesive devices especially in Arabic because it is an unexplored area in linguistic studies. This can be achieved by allocating parts of textbooks to throw light on the functions, types and usage of these significant language components, and suggest methods for translating them.

Although the study has tried to present a panoramic view of English and Arabic cohesive devices, many of their concepts were not duly or comprehensively investigated due to the fact that it would be a time and effort consuming process that lies beyond the scope of this work. Hence a number of possible studies can be suggested for further research:

1. An interesting study could be devoted to the investigation of one particular cohesive device such as: reference, ellipsis, etc. with a perspective of translating them into English.

2. Furthermore, the above suggestion might be carried out by selecting one or more specific periods of time, that is, Elizabethan, Victorian, Renaissance, etc.

3. A further research can fathom different kinds of registers or styles, i.e., political, religious, social, etc. which are areas that rarely receive due attention in this respect.
4. The present thesis has investigated cohesive devices in English and their translation into Arabic. Another research could be conducted to investigate the other way round, i.e. from Arabic into English. A full analysis of the Arabic text must be made before attempting to render it into English, to achieve greater accuracy in translation.