ABSTRACT

The present study fathoms cohesive devices like reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction and lexical cohesion in both Arabic and English. It adopts Halliday and Hasan's (1976) model for analysis. It explains how the four types of cohesion function in Arabic and English and how they contribute to the overall cohesiveness and textuality of texts. The thesis further describes how the cohesion types and their frequency vary in the two selected novels and compares the way these devices operate in English and Arabic. The study provides some insights into the nature of cohesion in the two languages, especially in Arabic, on which very little has been done so far.

Two modern English novels written by the well-known 20th century American novelist, Ernest Hemingway, and their Arabic translations are analyzed to see to what extent cohesive devices are mirrored in the translated text and whether or not the same devices are employed. It also seeks to investigate the frequency of using those devices in both languages. The analysis is based on a thorough discussion of three pages from the beginning, the middle and the end of each novel taking English as the Source Language (SL).

The present study aims at:

1. Identifying the most significant cohesive devices in both Arabic and English,
2. Comparing the range of occurrence of cohesive devices in the two languages under study,
3. Classifying systematically the different approaches to the translation of cohesive devices into Arabic,
4. Studying some available translations of English literary texts, novels in particular, into Arabic so as to be able to present an assessment of the
quality of the TL (target language) version, and find out how successful, faithful, and competent the translator was in reproducing those devices into Arabic and putting forward some suggestions and recommendations which can be beneficial for learners as well as translators.

The study is founded on a number of hypotheses which state that:

1. Translating cohesive devices in English literary texts into Arabic is problematic, which implies a certain degree of difficulty and may result in some loss of meaning and pragmatic effect in the TL version,

2. The translation of most English cohesive devices into Arabic results in different syntactic structures, which leads to shifts in translation,

3. Functional equivalence is the appropriate type of equivalence to be adopted in rendering cohesive devices into Arabic,

4. The frequency and range of employing certain cohesive devices in the two languages under focus is expected to be different due to the different means of expression and different morphological and syntactic resources and

5. Due to the aforementioned points, it is hypothesized that the translator would be obliged to, on certain occasions, to resort to other techniques like paraphrasing and footnoting.

The procedure to be followed in achieving the aims of the present study consists of:

1. Defining with elaboration the notion of cohesion in both languages under study and classifying the types of cohesive devices in English and their correspondents in Arabic,
2. Presenting a theoretical background to the notion of 'cohesion' and other related issues and terms by discussing various views regarding this concept,

3. Examining Halliday and Hasan's model on cohesive devices in an attempt to fathom the main and subclasses of these devices. A critical account of this significant model is also given to show the merits and demerits,

4. Selecting a considerable number of sentences with their Arabic counterparts, in order to examine the accuracy of the translation of cohesive devices and whether or not the translator was successful in rendering these devices into Arabic and

5. Stating the conclusions that the present study reached and presenting some suggestions for further study.

The study consists of two parts: theoretical and practical. As far as the theoretical part is concerned, the researcher relies on books, articles, and the internet. Regarding the practical part, the study analyses two of Hemingway's novels (The Old Man and the Sea and For Whom the Bell Tolls), and sheds light on how cohesive ties are used by the novelist and how to translate those ties into Arabic.

The thesis ends with conclusions and suggestions that are thought to be helpful for further research within the fields of translation, text linguistics and discourse analysis. Among the most prominent findings yielded by this study are:

1. One implication of the present study 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 a corollary, Halliday and Hasan’s model for Arabic cannot be adopted as it is to describe cohesion in Arabic. Several modifications have to be made, since Arabic differs greatly from English, particularly in the areas of morphology and syntax. Halliday and Hasan’s schema then can be used as 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.

2. 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.

3. 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.

4. 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.

5. Substitution is the main area in which the two languages differ.
Whereas in written English all the three types of substitution (nominal, verbal, and clausal) are operative, only verbal substitution, particularly the verbal substitute ‘yafça’ ‘to do’, is common in written Arabic 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 preferred in Arabic.

6. 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.

7. 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 not to be only a bilingual mediator of the discourse but also a bicultural, with the necessary technical and social requirements.

8. 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. English seems to use a higher proportion of pronouns than Arabic.

This is reinforced by table (5-1 and 5-2).

The thesis ends with some recommendations and suggestions for further research, in addition to the pedagogical implications for both students and teachers.