CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

1.1 The Problem

In general terms, cohesion is the act or state of cohering, uniting, or sticking together. Something that sticks together needs some element or elements that provide the strength to hold the parts of a whole together. In linguistics, it is the property of unity in a written text or a segment of spoken discourse that stems from links among its surface elements, as when words in one sentence are repeated in another, and especially from the fact that some words or phrases depend for their interpretation upon material in the preceding or following text.

The term cohesion is often thought of as a synonym of coherence. In fact, coherence refers to the logical interconnection. In linguistic terms, it refers to the property of unity in a written text or segment of spoken discourse that stems from the links among its underlying ideas and from the logical organization and development of its thematic content. Cohesion has sometimes been applied to smaller units of language in the text, and coherence, to some general overall interrelatedness in the text.

Coherent texts make sense to the reader. In TEXT AND CONTEXT EXPLORATIONS IN THE SEMANTICS AND PRAGMATICS OF DISCOURSE, Van Dijk (1977: 93-4) argues that coherence is a semantic property of discourse formed through the interpretation of each individual sentence relative to the interpretation of other sentences, with ‘interpretation’ implying interaction between the text and the reader. A text may be cohesive without necessarily being coherent: cohesion does not spawn coherence. ‘Cohesion’, Connor (1996: 83) writes, “is determined by lexically and grammatically overt inter-
sentential relationships, whereas coherence is based on semantic relationships”.

In *COHESION IN ENGLISH*, M. A. K. Halliday and Ruqaiya Hasan identify five general categories of cohesive devices:
1. Reference
2. Ellipsis
3. Substitution
4. Conjunction
5. Lexical cohesion

**REFERENCE** is a term used in semantics for the relationship that exists between a word and what it points to in the real world. The reference of "chair" would therefore be a particular chair that is being identified on a particular occasion. Reference is limited here to the relationship of identity which exists between two linguistic expressions. For example, in *Mrs. Thatcher has resigned. She announced her decision this morning*. The pronoun *she* points to Mrs. Thatcher within the textual world itself. Reference, in the textual rather than the semantic sense, occurs when the reader has to retrieve the identity of what is being talked about by referring to another expression in the immediate context. So, reference is a device which allows the reader to trace participants, entities, events, etc. in a text.

**ELLIPSIS** involves the omission of an item where an item is replaced by nothing. For example, in *John bought some carnations and Catherine some sweet peas, brought* in the second clause is ellipted.

**SUBSTITUTION** and **ELLIPSIS**, unlike reference, are grammatical rather than semantic relationships. In substitution, an item is replaced by another item:

*Do you like movies? I do.*
In the above example, *do* is a substitute for *like movies*. Items commonly used in substitution in English include *one*, *do*, and *(the) same*.

**CONJUNCTION** involves the use of formal markers to relate sentences, clauses, and paragraphs to one another. Unlike reference, substitution and ellipsis, the use of conjunction does not instruct the reader to supply missing information either by looking for it elsewhere in the text or by filling structural slots. Instead, conjunction signals the way the writer wants the reader to relate what is about to be said to what has been said before. Examples of conjunctions, which can typically realize each relation, include:

a) Additive: *and, or, also, in addition, besides, furthermore, similarly*, etc.

b) Adversative: *but, yet, however, instead, on the other hand, at any rate*, etc.

c) Causal: *so, consequently, it follows, for, because, for this reason*, etc.

d) Temporal: *then, next, at once, thereupon, first, up to now, to sum up, etc*

**LEXICAL COHESION** refers to the role played by the selection of vocabulary in organizing relations with a text. A given lexical item cannot be said to have a cohesive structure, but any lexical item can enter into a cohesive relation with other items in a text.

It is well known that English and Arabic belong to two different language families (Arabic is a member of the Semitic family whereas English is a member of the Indo-European one), so it is only natural that the two languages pose challenges for translators, especially for non-experts or beginners.

According to Newmark (2003:39) serious imaginative literature has four principal types, namely: poetry, drama, short story and novel. Translating
literary works is not a simple task; every literary genre has its specific translation problems. For example, central to translating drama is the issue of performance since a play is meant to be performed and not just read. In translating poetry, the difficulty arises from the balance between form and content. Chief among the problems of translating novels is the relative significance of both the SL (source language) culture and the writer's moral purpose to the reader, (Newmark, 2003 :170-171). The conscious and purposeful application of cohesion tools to translation practice has been proved of great use in English-Arabic translation.

**DISCOURSE CONNECTIVES** are cohesive devices signaling logical relations between parts of discourse. Grammatically, they can be connectives like *but*, subordinators, like *because*, adverbial conjuncts, like *however*, and other more or less conventionalized expressions like *my first point is*, *this brings us to*, *the problem is*, *what I meant is*, etc. In a contrastive perspective, connectives raise a number of interesting questions. For example, to what extent do English and Arabic:

* use the same grammatical resources (conjunctions, conjuncts, etc.)?
* express the same semantic relations (contrast, result, etc.)?
* have corresponding sets of connectives (e.g. English contrastive however, still, etc.)?
* have the same positional preferences (clause initial, medial, final)?

When reading about cohesive devices one may realize how bulky and multifarious they are; accordingly it is quite natural to deduce that the process of translating them is problematic and may include pitfalls, misinterpretations and losses. Thus, the main problem facing the translator lies in understanding the precise meaning and use of each device.
1.1.1 Cohesive Devices and Translation

Translating from English into Arabic involves certain morphological, lexical and structural problems. To grasp these problems, a translator has to refer to the social and cultural context of both SL and TL, and try to fathom how these elements might influence the whole process of translation. Since the present study mainly focuses on the usage and function of cohesive devices in the two languages under study, social aspects would be irrelevant. Throughout the study, a profound and detailed discussion of cohesive devices in both languages under study is introduced in order to acquaint the reader with their function and usage.

As far as translation is concerned, the translator has to account for the peculiarities of English structures, particularly cohesive devices. This will be achieved in the present study by examining some excerpts from two of Hemingway's well-known novels with their renditions into Arabic by two different translators in order to add more authenticity to the analysis. Furthermore, statistics are given at the end of the analysis to show to what extent the two languages under study are similar or dissimilar in the use of cohesive devices and the frequency of each device in both the original text and the Arabic translation.

1.2 Objectives of the Study

The present study endeavors to investigate cohesion in English and Arabic. It attempts to fathom the ways adopted by translators in transferring cohesive devices from English into Arabic.

The study aims at achieving the following:

1. Identifying the most significant cohesive devices in both English and Arabic.
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 version, and find out how successful, faithful, and competent the translator was in reproducing those devices into Arabic.
5. Putting forward some suggestions and recommendations which can be beneficial for learners as well as translators.

1.3 Significance of the Study

The study is thought to be significant, in that,

1. It provides the readers with general guidelines of the accurate usage of cohesive devices and explicates the particulars of such uses.
2. It helps users and learners of English as a foreign language at university level use English in a more accurate and natural way.
3. It supplies translators and translators-to-be with solid knowledge on how to render cohesion in both languages under study.
4. It highlights the frequency and usage of cohesive devices in English and Arabic, and shows which devices are the most common.
5. It compares cohesive devices in the two languages under study (Arabic & English) and sheds light on areas of similarities and differences.

1.4 Hypotheses of the Study

The hypotheses that will contribute to resolving the problems stated earlier are the following:
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.

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.

1.5 Scope of the Study

The scope of the study is framed as follows:

1. It is totally concerned with cohesion and cohesive devices in written English and Arabic.

2. The texts under analysis are written by the well-known American novelist, namely Ernest Hemingway. Only two specific novels will taken up to study, *The Old man and the Sea* and *For whom the Bell Tolls*.

3. As far as translation is concerned, it is worth mentioning that the study is unidirectional, i.e., from English into Arabic.
4. The data and examples are chosen on eclectic basis. However, they are confined to a specific genre of literature, i.e., novel, and belong to a certain period of time, i.e., modern novel.

5. In the analysis chapter the strategy adopted in selecting data for analysis is not totally eclectic; the first three pages from the SL text, three pages from the middle, and the last three pages are chosen for analysis with their counter translated texts in Arabic.

1.6 Research Methodology

The procedure followed in achieving the aims of present study consists of the following steps:

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.

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

The study consists of two parts: theoretical and practical. As far as the theoretical part is concerned, the researcher has relied on books, articles, and the internet. Regarding the practical part, the study investigates 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.