

PEOPLES DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF ALGERIA
MINISTRY OF HIGHER EDUCATION AND SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH
MENTOURI UNIVERSITY- CONSTATINE
FACULTY OF LETTERS AND LANGUAGES
DEPARTEMENT OF ENGLISH

Reference as a Device of Grammatical Cohesion
In English Narrative and its Translation into Arabic

Dissertation Submitted as a Partial Requirement for a Master Degree in Applied Language
Studies

Presented by: Miss Lyna Rachel Mokrani

Supervised by: Dr Youcef Beghoul

Examined by:

Academic Year

2009-2010

Dedications

To my shiny moon 'dad' Mohammed Salah, and my lovely star 'Mum' Malika.

To my nephews:

Sami Mounib and Adam Wassim.

To my nieces:

Ferial Youssra, Anissa Nihed, and Soundous Malek.

Acknowledgments

I would like, first to thank my supervisor, Dr Youcef Beghoul, for this support and guidance throughout the various stages of this research work. I am very grateful to him for his insightful feedback and his constant encouragements throughout. I wish to thank him a lot for his constructive comments as well as his professional advice.

I am also grateful to Pr Zahri Harouni, Dr Hacene Hamada, Dr Ahmed Sid and Dr Karima lakhal Ayat for their invaluable contributions to my linguistic and intellectual growth during my studies at the Department of English, university of Constantine.

My special thanks go to Dr Samir Laraba, the head of the department, for this help and encouragements.

I would like to express my love and appreciation to my family especially my parents. Who have prayed for me all the time. I would also like to thank them for their patience and understanding during my studies. Without their support, the completion of my research would have been impossible. My special thanks also go to my brothers Samir and his wife Sandra, and Mohssen, to my sisters Amel, Linda, Sofia, Ahlem and Khouloud whom I love so much .I will not conclude without so many thanks to my small family, Lamia, Fatima and their mother Souad for their support, I love, and care

I am really lucky to have such good friends as: Amira, Leila, Saida, Meriem, and Manel Tir.

Abstract

This study is a textual contrastive analysis of English and Arabic. The focus is on reference as a cohesive device and the shifts that may occur when translating narrative due to differences in the grammatical systems of the source and target languages. It compares the translation strategies that translators use in transferring referential cohesion from an English literary text to its Arabic translation version. To achieve this aim, two paragraphs from an English novel have been translated by an experienced translator, and the two corpuses have been compared to show those shifts. The hypothesis is that the linking devices in English would be a lot more implicit in the target text than in the source one. This is because of the agglutinating and inflecting nature of the target text as compared to the source one. The results show that reference is utterly affected in the Arabic target text.

List of Tables

Table 1: Type of Reference in the Source Text in Paragraph One	14
Table 2: Type of Reference in The Target Text in Paragraph One	15
Table 3: Type of Reference in The Source Text in Paragraph Two	17
Table 4: Type of Reference in The Target Text in Paragraph Two	18
Table 5: Type of Reference in The Source Text in Paragraph Three	19
Table 6: Type of Reference in The Target Text in Paragraph Three	20

List of Abbreviations

SL: Source Language

ST: Source Text

TL: Target Language

TT: Target Text

Transcription

The following tables include the phonetic symbols that will be used in this study. They are adapted from Al-Qahtani¹ (2005: 10-13) to make them readable even to non-specialists.

A. Consonants

Arabic Alphabet	Symbols	Arabic Alphabet	Symbols
ء	ʔ	ض	ʊd
ب	b	ط	ʊt
ت	t	ظ	Dʊ
ث	T	ع	C
ج	Z	غ	^g
ح	ʊh	ف	f
خ	X	ق	q
د	d	ك	k
ذ	D	ل	l
ر	r	م	m
ز	z	ن	n
س	s	هـ	h
ش	S	و	w
ص	ʊs	ي	j

¹ Al-Qahtani, D. M. (2004). *Semantic Valence of Arabic Verbs*. Beirut: Librair du Liban

Publishers.

B. Vowels

vowels	symbols	
short	اَ	a
	اُ	u
	اِ	i
long	اَ	a:
	اُ	u:
	اِ	i:

Contents

INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER I: Cohesion and Coherence and an Overview of Translation	4
Introduction	4
I.1.1. Definition of Discourse Analysis	4
I.1.2. Text and Texture	5
I.1.3. Coherence	5
I.1.4. Cohesion	6
I.1.4.1. Reference	6
I.1.4.2. Conjunctions	7
I.1.4.3. Lexical Cohesion	8
I.1.4.4. Substitution	8
I.1.4.5. Ellipsis	8
I.2. Coherence and Cohesion	9
I.2. 1. Functional Perspective of Cohesion	9
I.3. Overview of Translation	10
I.3.1. Definition of Translation	10
I.3.2. Important Factors of Translation	10
I.3.3. The Basis of Translation	11
I.3.4. Source Language and Target Language	11
Conclusion	12
CHAPTER II: Cohesive Devices and Translation	13
Introduction	13

II.1. Analysis	14
II.1.1. Paragraph One	14
II.1.2. Paragraph Two	17
II.1.2. Paragraph Three	19
II.2. Results	23
Conclusion	25
GENERAL CONCLUSION	26
Bibliography	27
Appendices	

Introduction

Statement of the Problem

Cohesion is considered one of the most challenging aspects of translation, as any language has its own unique manners in which it employs cohesive devices in the creation of a cohesive text.

Each language has its own patterns to convey the interrelationships between persons and events; these patterns may not be ignored in a language if the readers understand what the translator wants to convey. The topic of cohesion has always appeared as the most useful constituent of discourse analysis that is applied to translation. English and Arabic have different grammars and vocabulary structures, and it is only natural that they pose great difficulties and challenges for a translator to deal with, especially in the field of literature.

Aim of the Study

Based on the contrastive analysis of two parallel corpora, an original text in English and its translation into Arabic, this study provides a close analysis of a particular grammatical cohesive device employed in English and its equivalence in the Arabic translation. It aims to study from a quantitative and qualitative point of view the possible shifts of cohesion in translation in a literary text and the solutions adopted in the Arabic translation.

Furthermore, this study compares the translation strategies that translators use in transferring referential cohesion from an English literary text to its Arabic translation. This may pose great difficulties and problems because of the differences between the two languages.

Research Questions

This research aims at addressing the following questions:

- 1) What are the possible shifts of cohesion within the context of translation in the field of literature?
- 2) What are the main problems that may occur in translation through the use of reference?
- 3) What are the solutions adopted in the Arabic translation of a literary text?

Hypothesis

This contrastive study is based on the hypothesis that if cohesive ties are rather explicit in English, in Arabic they are rather of an implicit nature. This is due to the isolating nature of the morphology of English compared to the rather inflecting and agglutinating one in Arabic.

Means of Research

In order to test the hypothesis and illicit data, a translation of an English literary text into Arabic will be provided and analysed. It is a short English text in the area of literature. The text consists of two paragraphs taken from an English short story.

Structure of Research

This research is divided into two chapters. First, there is a descriptive chapter that will define, describe, and classify cohesion in English and outline the importance of cohesion within the context of translation. Second, there is a practical chapter that will analyse the translation of the text from English into Arabic in matter of textual cohesive devices.

The literary corpora in this research are analysed as follows:

1. Identification of the reference devices employed in the first corpus relying on the version of Halliday and Hasan.
2. Location of the parallel linguistic expressions in the second corpus.
3. Analysis of the solution adopted in the Arabic translation.

CHAPTER I: Cohesion and Coherence and an Overview of Translation

Introduction

I.1.1. Definition of Discourse Analysis

I.1.2. Text and Texture

I.1.3. Coherence

I.1.4. Cohesion

I.1.4.1. Reference

I.1.4.2. Conjunctions

I.1.4.3. Lexical Cohesion

I.1.4.4. Substitution

I.1.4.5. Ellipsis

I.2. Coherence and Cohesion

I.2. 1. Functional Perspective of Cohesion

I.3. Overview of Translation

I.3.1. Definition of Translation

I.3.2. Important Factors of Translation

I.3.3. The Basis of Translation

I.3.4. Source Language and Target Language

Conclusion

Chapter I

Cohesion and Coherence and an Overview of Translation

Introduction

A text or discourse is not just a series or combination of sentences for introducing different random topics. It is combining sentences in a logical way, according to their meaning and that helps to create unity for a text. This is what we call cohesion in which sentences stick together to function as a whole. It is related to the broader concept of coherence. In this chapter the relationship between the two will be dealt with by applying these aspects to the study of translation.

I. 1.1. Definition of Discourse Analysis

Discourse analysis is a branch of linguistics that studies language use in relation to social factors that influence our daily interactions. It deals with the way people use language in its appropriate context.i.e, in certain ways to have certain affects; in order to construct versions of their experiences according to Yule (1978:83): “When it is restricted to linguistic issues, discourse analysis focuses on the record (spoken and written) of the process by which language is used in some context to express intention.” The focus of (D.A) is any form of written or a spoken language such as: conversation, dialog, articales, books, and so on.(D.A) is often described as “language-in-use” by means; the way of understanding social interactions, and how written and spoken texts are used in a specific contexts to make meanings. “It tends to focus specifically on aspects of what is unsaid or unwritten (yet communicated) within the discourse being analyzed” (Yule, 1978: 84). So (D.A) is all what people “perceive” or “think” about any given topic.

I. 1.2. Text and Texture

When we talk about any passage be it ‘spoken’ or ‘written’ of whatever length and topic, the question that comes to mind is: what is a text? And what are the characteristics that distinguish a text from a group of unrelated sentences? A text can be one or more sentences which are combined in the meaning. According to Halliday and Hassan (1976), every text has a texture; “a text derives this texture from the fact that it functions as a unity with respect to its environment”. This means that, a text without a texture would just be a collection of isolated sentences that have no relationship to each other as each sentence has its own meaning and different context.

In any given text, sentences follow each other in a form of a series of progression; they are put all together, not at random, because they are linked to each other in a logical way. This progression helps create a context for meaning. “There are certain linguistic features that contribute to textual unity”. Halliday and Hassan (1976)

So, texture is created within text depending on the properties of coherence and cohesion.

I. 1.3. Coherence

Coherence is described as a semantic property, which is very important in the study of discourse. It is created by the interpretation of the whole passage or text. This ‘interpretation’ helps the reader or the listener to infer the general idea of the message that the writer or the speaker wants to convey. Coherence can be divided into two types: The first type is ‘situational coherence’ in which the identification of field, tenor, and mode can be in a certain group of clauses. The second type is ‘generic coherence’ that represents the belonging of the text to a certain genre. Thus, what the reader or the listener has in mind is an assumption of coherence; in the sense that all what is said or written will give meaning in terms of their daily interactions.

I. 1.4. Cohesion

Cohesion is considered as one of the most important aspects in the analysis of textual discourse and translation. Baker (1992) relates cohesion to the study of textual equivalence defining it as “the network of lexical, grammatical, and other relations which provide links between various parts of a text”. Cohesion has the role of building up sentences in any given text. This comes through the linking of different parts of a text to each other so that it gives a structure to a text. It helps in hanging sentences together in a logical way, for having a right meaning. So, cohesion has a relation with the broader concept of coherence.

Halliday and Hasan (1976) give a detailed classification of the cohesive devices in English. They distinguish between grammatical and lexical cohesion. According to them, there are four different grammatical devices, the first of which is reference.

I.1.4.1. Reference

It involves the use of pronouns articles or adverbs to refer backward or forward to an item mentioned in the linguistic or situational text. There are three referential devices that can create cohesion: Anaphoric, cataphoric, and exophoric.

a. Anaphoric Reference

The referent precedes the cohesive device; it occurs when the writer refers back to something that has been previously identified. For example: ‘Mary wakes up earlier; she is always active.’ In this example the pronoun ‘she’ refers back to the person called Mary.

b. Cataphoric Reference

It is a reference forward in discourse. Something is introduced in the abstract before it is identified and the referent follows the cohesive device, like in ‘I want to buy a car. The

car must be red'. The definite article 'the' is used in the second sentence to refer back to the object 'car' that was introduced in the previous sentence as the use of an indefinite article indicates.

c. Exospheric Reference

It's used to describe abstracts without ever identifying them (in contrast to anaphoric and cataphoric references). For example: rather than introducing a concept, the writer refers to it by a generic word such as 'everything'.

Functionally speaking, there are three main types of cohesive references personal, demonstrative, and comparative.

- **Personal Reference:** keeps track of function through the speech situation using noun, pronouns like 'he', 'him', 'she', and 'her', etc. and possessive determiners like 'mine', 'yours', 'his', 'her', etc.
- **Demonstrative Reference:** keeps track of information through location using proximity reference adjectives like 'equal', 'similar', 'different', 'else', 'better', 'more', etc. and adverbs like 'so', 'such', 'similarly', 'otherwise', 'so', 'more' etc.

I.1.4.2. Conjunctions

As opposed to reference, 'conjunctions' do not signal information present in the text, rather they signal, by means of 'formal markers' "the way the writer wants the reader to relate what is about to be said to what has been said before" (Baker, 1991:190) this means that conjunctions are particular expressions that contribute to create discursive connections. For example: 'There was nobody there, and it was night time; but he preferred to wait for them.' 'And' originates an additive conjunctive relation, 'but' does an adversative one.

The identification of these mechanisms is not always completely clear and sometimes more than one device can be attributed to a single linguistic situation.

I.1.4.3. Lexical Cohesion

On the other hand, “lexical cohesion” is achieved by ‘the selection of vocabulary’. For example: ‘At last she finds an empty place in the bus, and she has a seat in it; and her child has a seat next to her.’ In this example ‘has a seat’ is repeated. The device of ‘lexical reiteration’ can be observed in the following example: ‘There is a dog outside. The animal is so dangerous.’ It is noticed that, the nominal group ‘the dog’ is replaced by a superordinate ‘the animal’.

I.1.4.4. Substitution

Furthermore, ‘substitution’ as a device is marked by the use of nouns, verbs or clauses to replace some information previously presented, as in the dialog:

You shouldn’t go to the school today.

But I want to do it.

In this example, the verb ‘to do’ stands for the clause ‘go to the school’.

I.1.4.5. Ellipsis

Finally, the device of ‘ellipsis’ consists of omitting information that is presented previously, without affecting comprehension:

Do you have an extra pen?

Yes, I have.

As we can see, the omission of the noun phrase ‘an extra pen’ in the second sentence is possible because the hearer or reader can infer the meaning of the whole sentence.

I.2. Coherence and Cohesion

In any given text cohesion and coherence are correlated to each other. Cohesion helps in building up the text, by linking sentences to each other, so that it becomes easier for the reader or listener to infer the meaning of what they read or hear. If the text is poorly organized; it will not be more coherent.

I.2.1. Functional Perspective of Cohesion

Cohesion has to do with the structure of the text, whereas coherence is considered as a mental process, both are related to one another. The important difference between coherence and cohesion is the fact that coherence also works without cohesion, but not the reverse even if a speech or a passage with a large amount of cohesive devices can not be necessarily coherent. The following example will clarify things:

The student was at school. School is here. Here is here. Here is there. There was the teacher.

The last word of one sentence is the beginning of the next sentence. We are confronted with repetition, reference to the sentence before, and a cohesive device. However, these sentences together make no sense. It is just a series of sentences without meaning or aim. That is why cohesion does not concern what a text means; it concerns how the text is constructed as semantic ties. It helps to create text and, thus, it is the text forming component of the linguistic system.

I.3. Overview of Translation

I.3.1. Definition of Translation

Translation is a human activity; it is a creative work that is not easy to practice. It is a process of rendering a text from one language into an equivalent text in another language.

Here the text in the first language is the ‘source text’ and its equivalent in the other language is the ‘target text’. Basically, good translation is not just a question of converting a given text from the source language into the target language. As it is not taking the general idea of that text and producing it into the target language; the translator then needs in depth knowledge of both the source and the target language. Since, each language has its own way of articulating or organizing word which is different from other languages. Thus, the difference between languages and the difference between cultures makes this process a real challenge.

I.3.2. Important Factors of Translation

There are many factors that need to be taken into consideration, in order to make it easier for the translator to deal with different texts of whatever length and topics:

- a. Context
- b. The different rules of grammar of the two languages
- c. Writing rules and conventions
- d. Understanding idioms and phrases
- e. The use of punctuation

Beside the above factors, translation requires a complete understanding of the customs and lifestyle of people so as to translate in a manner that introduces the cultures world view.

I.3.3. The Basis of Translation

Translation is based on equivalence between the source text and the target text. This means that equivalencies are considered as an important factor in the process of translation i.e. the target text must be equivalent in a compatible way to the original one. There are

two approaches to translation ‘formal equivalence’ which implies the literal translation, however; it also deals with idioms and grammatical structure that are used in the original text. And ‘dynamic equivalence’ that implies the meaning or the message that the writer wants to convey. Here, the translator focuses on thought rather than translating the text word for word.

I.3.4. Source Language and Target Language

The language of the original text is called ‘the source language’, and the language into which a text is converted called ‘the target language’. Let us consider the following example:

- a. I want to buy a car.
- b. أريد شراء سيارة.

The sentence ‘a’ represents the source language which is English, and the sentence ‘b’ represents the target language which is Arabic. So, the terms ‘source’ and ‘target’ are used attributively.

Conclusion

It is understood that translation is not standing alone without the concepts of cohesion and coherence; as a process of studying the lexicon, the grammatical structure, and the communication situation of the source language text; by analyzing it in order to determine the meaning. Each language might have different systems of cohesive devices that help in creating meaning in relation to the broader concept of coherence, and the relationships expressed should be relevant to each other.

CHAPTER II: Cohesive Devices and Translation

Introduction

II.1. Analysis

II.1.1. Paragraph One

II.1.2. Paragraph Two

II.1.2. Paragraph Three

II.2. Results

Conclusion

Chapter II

Cohesive Devices and Translation

Introduction

As it is suggested in the previous sections, the present paper aims at investigating the issue of cohesion within the context of translation, particularly, the use of reference in both languages English and Arabic.

In order to achieve this purpose, three paragraphs taken from the first chapter of Austin (1994) will be translated into Arabic and analyzed. They are identified as corpus 'A' and 'B' (Appendix). The results of the analysis are as follows:

II.1. Analysis

All the expressions of each paragraph that identify the types of reference and the cohesive devices that produce reference are classified into two tables. They are as follows:

II.1.1. Paragraph One

Reference in the Source Text	Cohesive Device	Type of Reference
Their estate	Their	Anaphoric
Their residence	Their	Anaphoric
Their property	Their	Anaphoric
They had lived	They	Anaphoric
Their surrounding acquaintance	Their	Anaphoric
Who lived	Who	Anaphoric
And who for many years of his life	His/Who	Anaphoric
Had a constant companion and house keeper in his sister	His	Anaphoric
Her death	Her	Anaphoric
Before his own	His	Anaphoric
In his home	His	Anaphoric
Her loss	Her	Anaphoric
He invited and received	He	Anaphoric
Into his house the family of his nephew	His/his	Anaphoric
The person to whom he intended to bequeath it	Whom/it/he	Anaphoric
In the society of his nephew and niece ,and their children	His/Their	Anaphoric
His attachment to them all increased	His/them	Anaphoric
To his wishes	His	Anaphoric
Gave him every degree of solid comfort which his age could receive	Him/his	Anaphoric
The cheerfulness of the children added a relish to his existence	His	Anaphoric

Table 1: Type of Reference in the Source Text in Paragraph One

Reference in the source text	Cohesive device	Reference in the target text	Cohesive device
Their	Their	لها	ها
Their residence	Their	إقامتهم	هم
Their property	Their	إقامتهم	هم
They had lived	They	عاشوا	∅
Their surrounding acquaintance	Their	جيرانهم ومعارفهم	هم
Who lived	Who	وهو	هو
And who for many years of his life	His/Who	لعدة سنين	∅
Had a constant companion and house keeper in his sister	His	أخته رفيقته الدائمة وخدامته	هـ
Her death	Her	وفاتها	ها
Before his own	His	قبل وفاته	له
In his home	His	في منزله	له
Her loss	Her	خسارتها	ها
He invited and received	He	كان يدعو ويستقبل ابن أخته/أخيه	∅
Into his house the family of his nephew	His/his	ابن أخته أخيه	هـ
The person to whom he intended to bequeath it	Whom/it/he	الوريث الشرعي للممتلكات نورلند	∅
In the society of his nephew and niece ,and their children	His/their	في صحبة ابن أخته /أخيه وزوجته وأولادها	هـ / هما
His attachment to them all increased	His/them	وإزداد تعلقه بهم	هم
To his wishes	His	تلبية لطلباتهم	له/هم
Gave him every degree of solid comfort which his age could receive	Him/his	ولكن عن طيبة قلب أثر بالغ في نفسه وهو عجوز هرم	نفسه/هو
The cheerfulness of the children added a relish to his existence	His	كما كان مرح الأطفال يملأ حياته غبطة وسعادة	له

Table 2: Type of Reference in the Target Text in Paragraph One

With regard to reference in paragraph one; the TT tends to present cohesive devices that are equivalent to the ones used in the ST. However, the use of different grammatical words reduces the degree of specificity of the references produced by personal pronouns, like in the following examples:

ST 1- They had lived → عاشوا TT

ST 2- And for many years of his life → لعدة سنين TT

ST 3- The person to whom he intended to bequeath it → الوريث الشرعي لممتلكات نورلند

In the first example, the personal pronoun 'they' is used as a cohesive device in the source text but, in the target text it is understood from the context without mentioning it. In the third example, the personal pronoun 'he' and the relative pronoun 'to whom' are replaced in the target text by 'الوريث الشرعي'; the form of the referent changes completely in the target text, and the pronoun 'it' is replaced by the word 'نورلند'

On the other hand, the use of the 'object pronoun' keeps the original referent of the ST, as in the following examples:

ST 1- their residence → إقامتهم TT

ST 2- her death → وفاتها TT

ST 3- in the society of his nephew and niece, and their children → في صحبة ابن لأخيه/أخته →
TT زوجته وأولادها

The form of the cohesive devices which are identified as 'object pronoun' in these examples takes another form in TT depending on gender number markers (male/female, plural/singular). In example(1), 'their' becomes 'هم', and 'her' takes the form of 'ها'. It expresses duality in the TT and is identified as 'هما'.

II.1.2. Paragraph Two

Reference in the source text	Cohesive Device	Type of Reference
By his present lady, three daughters	His	Anaphoric
Was amply provided for by the fortune of his mother	His	Anaphoric
Which had been large, and half of which devolved on him on his coming of age	Him/his	Anaphoric
By his own marriage.	His	Anaphoric
He added to his wealth.	He/his	Anaphoric
To him therefore.	Him	Anaphoric
As to his sisters.	His	Anaphoric
For their fortune, independence of what might arise to them from their father's inheriting that property.	Their/them/their	Anaphoric
Their mother had nothing	Their	Anaphoric
And their father only seven thousand pounds in his own disposal.	Their/his	Anaphoric
The remaining moiety of his first wife's fortune was also secured to her child and he has only a life interest in it.	His/her/he/it	Anaphoric

Table 3: Type of Reference in the Source Text in Paragraph Two

Reference in the Source Text	Cohesive Device	Reference in the Target Text	Cohesive Device
By his present lady, three daughters	His	وثلاث بنات من زواجه الثاني	هـ
Was amply provided for by the fortune of his mother	His	كان ميسور الحال بفضل ثروة أمه	هـ
Which had been large, and half of which devolved on him on his coming of age	Him/his	التي حضي بنصفها عند بلوغه	هـ
By his own marriage.	His	زواجه	هـ
He added to his wealth.	He/his	مما زاد ثراءه	هـ
To him therefore.	Him	ولهذا	∅
As to his sisters.	His	شقيقاته	هـ
For their fortune, independence of what might arise to them from their father's inheriting that property.	Their/them/their	فمهما بلغ قسطها من ميراث أبيهما	هما
Their mother had nothing	Their	لم يكن بحوزة أمهما شيء	هما
And their father only seven thousand pounds in his own disposal.	Their/his	ولم تكن ثروة أبيهما سوى سبعة الاف جنيهه	هما
The remaining moiety of his first wife's fortune was also secured to her child and he has only a life interest in it.	His/her/he/it	أما ما تبقى من ثروة زوجته الأولى فكان أيضا مؤمنا لإبنها وكان جل اهتمامه به	به/ها

Table 4: Type of Reference in the Target Text in Paragraph Two

In paragraph two, most, if not all, the cohesive devices are ‘object and possessive pronouns’ that are identified in the target text in an equivalent way, like in the following:

ST 1- By his own marriage → زواجه

ST 2 for their fortune, independent of what might arise to them for their father’s inheriting that property → فهمما بلغ قسطها من ميراث أبيهما

This table represents some referential expressions that have absolute equivalents in Arabic. That is to say, they both have the same meaning but different forms.

On the other hand, the personal pronoun ‘him’ has no equivalence in the TT; it is omitted like in the following example:

ST 3-To him therefore → ولهذا

In this example, the cohesive device ‘him’ is not identified in the TT.

II.1.3. Paragraph Three

Reference in the Source Text	Cohesive Device	Type of Reference
His will was read.	His	Anaphoric
He was neither unjust.	He	Anaphoric
As to leave his state from his nephew	His/his	Anaphoric
But he left it to him on such terms as destroyed half the value of the bequest	He/it/him	Anaphoric
For the sake of his wife and daughter than for himself or his son	His/himself/his	Anaphoric
But to his son and his son's son	His/his	Anaphoric
It was secured	It	Anaphoric
As to leave to himself no power of providing	Himself	Anaphoric
For those who were most dear to him	Those/who/him	Exophoric
And who most needed provision	Who	Exophoric
By any sale of its valuable woods	Its	Anaphoric
The whole was tied up for the benefit of this child	This /whole	Exophoric
Who in occasional visits with his father and mother	Who/his	Anaphoric
Gained on the affection of his uncle	His	Anaphoric
An earnest desire of having his own way	His	Anaphoric
Which for year he had received from his niece and her daughters	He/his/her	Anaphoric
He meant not to be unkind	He	Anaphoric
He affection for the three girls	He	Anaphoric
He left them a three pounds a piece	He/them	Anaphoric

Table 5: Type of Reference in the Source Text in Paragraph Three

Reference in the Source Text	Cohesive Device	Reference in the Target Text	Cohesive Device
His will was read.	His	قرأت وصيتها	∅
He was neither unjust.	He	لم تكن وصيته ظلماً	∅
As to leave his state from his nephew	His/his	عندما ترك كل ممتلكاته لابن أخته/أخيه	له
But he left it to him on such terms as destroyed half the value of the bequest	He/it/him	لكن الشروط التي وضعها أفسدت نصف الميراث	له/نفسه
For the sake of his wife and daughter than for himself or his son	His/himself/his	قسط زوجته وبناته أكثر مما يرغب فيه لنفسه أو ابنه	له
But to his son and his son's son	His/his	لكن لابنه ولابن ابنه	له
It was secured	It		
As to leave to himself no power of providing	Himself	لا تترك له صلاحية	له
For those who were most dear to him	Those/who/him	لكي يهب منه إلى أعز الناس لديه	هم/له
And who most needed provision	Who	والى من هم في أشد الحاجة إليه	هـ
By any sale of its valuable woods	Its	عن طريق بيع غاباته الثمينة	هنا الطفل
The whole was tied up for the benefit of this child	This/ whole	كان مقيدا لصالح هذا الطفل	
Who in occasional visits with his father and mother	Who/his	الذي استطاع بزياراته المنتظمة مع والده ووالدته	الذي/له
Gained on the affection of his uncle	His	أن يكسب حنان عمه	هـ
An earnest desire of having his own way	His	ورغبة جادة في أن تكون له طريقته الخاصة	له/هـ
Which for year he had received from his niece and her daughters	He/his/her	وينسيه كل العناية التي تلقاها من ابنة اخته/أخيه خلال كل تلك السنين	هـ
He meant not to be unkind	He	لكنه لم يشأ أن يكون قاسياً عليهن	هـ
He affection for the three girls	His	ولكي يبرهن لهن عن حبه	هن
He left them a three pounds a piece	He/them	ترك لكل منهن ثلاثة جنيهات	منهن

Table 6: Type of Reference in the Target Text in Paragraph Three

In paragraph three, the referent produced differently in the TT like in these examples:

ST 1- For those who were most dear to him → TT من هم في أشد الحاجة إليه

ST 2- Who in occasional visits with his father and mother → TT الذي استطاع بزياراته المنتظمة مع والده والدته

ST 3- The whole was tied up for the benefit of this child → TT كان مقيدا لصالح هذا الطفل

ST 4- His affection for the three girls → TT ولكي يبرهن لهن عن حبه

In example (1), the relative pronoun 'who' is replaced in the TT by the pronoun 'هم'. For example (2), the same relative pronoun 'who' takes the form of a demonstrative pronoun, in example (3) 'this child' keeps the same form in the TT 'هذا الطفل'.

Concerning example (4), the cohesive device 'three girls' becomes 'هن' in the TT, depending on the context.

This study analyses the use of reference in English literature, and its translation into Arabic. The results show that 'anaphoric reference' is the most common type in English. let us consider these examples:

1 The family of Dashwood had been long settled in Sussex, their estate was large.

In this example, the possessive pronoun refers back to "the family of Dashwood"

2 The old gentleman died; his will was read, and like almost every other will gave as much disappointments as pleasure. He was neither so unjust, nor so ungrateful.

This example shows that both possessive and personal pronouns refer backward to 'the old gentleman'. This mechanism i.e. "anaphoric reference" helps in avoiding repetition especially in narrative texts. Concerning "exophoric reference" there are three cases which are:

1 Those who are most dear to him.

2 The whole was tied up for the benefit of this child.

3 Who most need a provision.

These three examples (1), (2), (3) are taken from the last paragraph of ‘Corpus A’; they are all mentioned in the text without ever identifying them, in contrast to anaphoric references.

II.2.Solutions Adopted in the Arabic Translation

As mentioned before, some translation techniques have also been used in ‘Corpus B’ namely those of omission, compensation and transposition.

Starting with ‘omission’ which refers to the situation where a part of the source text is omitted, as in this example:

(ST)..... And who for many years of his life → لعدة سنين (TT) in this example the

The underlined parts have been omitted in the translation.

Concerning the referential cohesive devices, the strategy of compensation is also used; this strategy refers to something that cannot be translated, but the meaning that is lost is expressed somewhere else in the translated text. The following example clarifies things:

(ST) He added to his wealth → مما زاد ثراءه (TT)

Here, the personal pronoun” he “in the source text is not mentioned in the target text; it is omitted however; it is understood from the context of the target text

There is also another technique adopted, which is transposition, the process where parts of speech change their sequence; when they are translated, it is in a sense a shift of word class like in this example:

ST- the cheerfulness of the children added a relish to his existence

TT كما كان مرح الأطفال يملأ حياته غبطة و سعادة

It is obvious that the grammatical structures are often different from one language to another, and this is the case with this example.

Because of the differences between English and Arabic languages the shift from English into Arabic changes the word class; ‘relish’ becomes ‘حياته’ at the end of the

Arabic sentence, and the same thing with the word ‘existence’ which becomes mainly in the middle of the Arabic sentence.

II.3. Summary of the Findings

With regard to reference, the TT tends to present cohesive devices that are equivalent to the ones used in ST. However, the use of different grammatical words reduces the degree of specificity of the referents produced by personal pronouns, like in the following examples:

- 1 **He** invited and received → كان يدعو و يستقبل
- 2 **He** left to them three pounds a piece → ترك لكل منهن ثلاث جنيهات
- 3 **He** was neither unjust → لم تكن وصيته ظلما
- 4 **They** had lived → عاشوا

Notice that in examples (1), (2), (3), the personal pronoun ‘he’ is used as a cohesive device in the source text; however, in the target text it is only understood from the context. As in the last example (4), the personal pronoun ‘they’ is replaced by the verb عاشوا in the target text without affecting the meaning. On the other hand, the use of the objective pronoun keeps the original referent of the ST as in the following examples:

- 5 **His**_ own marriage → زواجه
- 6 **Their** residence, → إقامتهم
- 7 **Her** death → وفاتهم
- 8 **He** left them three pounds a piece → ترك لكل منهن ثلاث جنيهات

The form of the cohesive devices , which is identified as an objective pronoun in examples (5), (6), (7), and (8) take another form in the TT depending on the gender and number markers (male /female, plural /singular); in example (5) ‘his’ becomes هـ and ‘their’ takes the form of هم. ‘Her’ becomes ها and ‘them’ becomes هن depending on the

context. Here, 'them' refers to the 'three girls' in the ST. The results show that 'anaphoric reference' is the most common type used in 'Corpus A' i.e. in the ST. This is in contrast to 'exophoric reference' that occurs only three times, and 'cataphoric reference' that appears nowhere in the whole text.

Conclusion

The analysis of the corpus has revealed how problematic inconsistent knowledge about cohesion in both the source language (SL) and the target language (TL) can be for the translator. The reason for the results achieved in this study can be found in the different natures of these two languages. English is less flexible than Arabic. There are many important aspects that distinguish both languages; on the one hand, English requires the presence of subject in all sentences; this requirement makes the language use mechanisms such as reference more extensively.

On the other hand, the existence of gender markers in nouns and adjectives in Arabic helps establish the referent immediately. These inherent features of the language determine the type of coherent devices that the language can employ.

General Conclusion

The results of the present study illustrate how two different languages such as English and Arabic select different cohesive devices for the same linguistic situation.

Although the analysis of these limited corpora does not provide a conclusive generalization about how reference in English literary works is transferred into Arabic. It is rather important to mention that the scope of the study is not broad enough to verify all previous research. As Mona Baker (1992:190) states “every language has its own devices for establishing cohesive links. Language and Text-type preferences must both be taken into consideration in the process of translation”.

APPENDIX

Corpus A: Source Text

Sense and Sensibility

The family of Dashwood had been long settled in Sussex .their estate was large, and their residence was at Norland Park, in the centre of their property, where for many generations they had lived in so respectable a manner as to engage the general good opinion of their surrounding acquaintance. The late owner of this estate was a single man, who lived to a very advanced age, and who for many years of his life had a constant companion and housekeeper in his sister. But her death, which happened ten years before his own, produced a great alteration in his home; for to supply her loss, he invited and received into his house the family of his nephew, Mr. Henry Dashwood, the legal inheritor of the Norland estate, and the person to whom he intended to bequeath it .In the society of his nephew and niece, and their children, the old gentleman's days were comfortably spent .his attachment to them all increased. The constant attention of Mr. and Mrs. Henry Dashwood to his wishes, which proceeded not merely from interest, but from goodness of heart, gave him every degree of solid comfort which his age could receive; and the cheerfulness of the children added a relish to his existence. By a former marriage, Mr. Henry Dashwood had one son; by his present lady, three daughters. The son, a steady, respectable young man, was amply provided for by the fortune of his mother, which had been large, and half of which devolved on him on his coming of age .By his own marriage, likewise, which happened soon afterwards, he added to his wealth .To him , therefore, the succession to the Norland estate was not so really important as to his sisters ; for their fortune ,independent of what might arise to them from their father's inheriting that property, could be but small. Their mother had nothing, and their father only seven thousand pounds in his own disposal; for the remaining moiety of his first wife's fortune was also secured to her child, and he had only a life interest in it.

The old gentleman died; his will was read, and like almost every other will gave as much disappointment as pleasure. He was neither so unjust, nor so ungrateful, as to leave his state from his nephew; but he left it to him on such terms as destroyed half the value of the bequest. Mr.Dashwood had wished for it more for the sake of his wife and daughters than for himself or his son ; but to his son, and his son's son, a child of four years old, it was secured, in such a way as to leave to himself no power of providing for those who were most dear to him , and who most needed a provision , by any charge on the estate, or by any sale of its valuable woods .the whole was tied up for the benefit of this child, who in occasional visits with his father and mother at Norland had so far gained on the

affections of his uncle, by such attraction as are by no means unusual in children of two or three years old : an imperfect articulation, an earnest desire of having his own way , many cunning tricks, and a great deal of noise, as to outweigh all the value of all the attention which, for years. He had received from his niece and her daughters. He meant not to be unkind, however, and as a mark of his affection for the three girls, he left them a three pounds a-piece.

Corpus B: Target Text

بين العقل و العاطفة

استقرت عائلة داشوود مطولا في ساسكس، كانت لها ممتلكات واسعة تتوسطها إقامتهم في حديقة نورلاندا. عاشوا هناك لعدة أجيال حياة محترمة شهد لهم بها جيرانهم ومعارفهم. توفي صاحب هذه الممتلكات وهو أعزب بعد أن طعن في السن وكانت أخته رفيقته الدائمة وخادمتة لعدة سنين. لكن وفاتها قبل وفاته بعشر سنين أحدثت تغييرا كبيرا في منزله. فلقي يعوض خسارتها كان يدعو ويستقبل ابن أخته/أخيه السيد هنري داشوود الوريث الشرعي لممتلكات نورلاندا والذي كان الشيخ ينوي توريثه. عاش الشيخ حياة مليئة بالراحة والسعادة في صحبة ابن أخته/أخيه وزوجته وأولادهما وأزاد تعلقه بهم. ولقد كان لاستمرار اهتمام السيد والسيدة داشوود به وتلبيتهم لطلباته ليس بدافع المصلحة ولكن عن طيبة قلب أثر بالغ في نفسه وهو عجوز هرم، كما كان مرح الأطفال يملا حياته غبطة وسعادة.

وكان للسيد هنري داشوود ابن من زواج سابق وثلاث بنات من زواجه الثاني. كان الابن فتى هادئا ومحترما وكان ميسور الحال بفضل ثروة أمه التي حضي بنصفها عند بلوغه. ومما زاد من ثراه زواجه الذي حدث بعد ذلك. ولهذا لم يكن يهتم بميراث ممتلكات نورلندا كما كانت تهتم بها شقيقته. فمهما بلغ قسطهما من ميراث أبيهما لم يكن ليكون إلا قليلا. لم يكن بحوزة أمهما شئ ولم تكن ثروة أبيهما سوى سبعة آلاف جنيه. أما ما تبقى من ثروة زوجته الأولى فكان أيضا مؤمنا لابنها وكان جل اهتمامه به.

توفي الرجل العجوز وقُرات وصيته فكانت كغيرها من الوصايا مبعث خيبة للبعض ومبعث بهجة للبعض الآخر. لم تكن وصيته ظلما ولا نكرانا عندما ترك كل ممتلكاته لابن أخته/أخيه. لكن الشروط التي وضعها أفسدت نصف الميراث. كان السيد داشوود يود أن يكون قسط زوجته وبناته أكثر من قسطه وقسط ابنه. وقد كان السيد داشوود يرغب فيه من أجل زوجته وبناته أكثر مما يرغب فيه لنفسه أو لابنه، لكن لابنه وابن ابنه، وهو طفل يبلغ من العمر أربع سنوات، كان الميراث مؤمنا بطريقة لا تترك له أية صلاحية لكي يهب منه إلى أعز الناس لديه وإلى من هم في أشد الحاجة إليه، سواء أكان ذلك عن طريق إيجار بعض الممتلكات أو عن طريق بيع غاباته الثمينة. كان مقيدا لصالح هذا الطفل الذي استطاع بزياراته المنتظمة مع والده ووالدته لممتلكات نورلاندا أن يكسب حنان عمه بطريقة ليست نادرة عند الأطفال البالغين عامين أو ثلاثة سنوات من العمر. فكان كافيا أن يكون للطفل شيء من الانسجام ورغبة جادة في أن تكون له طريقته الخاصة وكثير من الحيل البارعة والضوءاء لكي يستحوذ على حب عمه وينسيه كل العناية التي تلقاها من ابنة أخيه/أخته خلال كل تلك السنين. لكنه لم يشأ أن يكون قاسيا عليهن ولكي يبرهن لهن عن حبه ترك لكل منهن ثلاثة جنيهات.

Bibliography

- AL-Fiqi, S.I. (2000). *Ilm Al-Lugha An-Nasi*. Cairo: Dar Qiba'a
- Al-Qahtani, D. M. (2004). *Sermantic Valence of Arabic Verbs*. Beirut: Librair du Liban Publishers.
- Askoy, B. (2001). *Translation as a Rewriting: The concept and its implications on the emergence of a national literature*. Translation Journal, 5 (3).
- Astin, Jane. (1994). *Sense and Sensibility*. Penguin Popular Classics.
- Ben Hadia, A. And EL Balich, B. (1991). *The New Dictionary*. El Moassassa El Watania Lilkitab.
- Baker, M. (2001). *In Other Words*. London: Routledge.
- Baalbaki, R and M. (2007). *Al Mwrid Al Muyassar* : Dar El-Ilm Lilmalayin.
- Catord, J.C. (1965). *A Linguistic theory of translation*. Oxford University Press.
- Cristal, D. (1989). *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Language*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Dikins, et al. (2002). *Thinking Arabic Translation: A course in translation method: Arabic to English*. (Mehdi Ali, Tras.). London: Routeledge.
- Ghanai, M. (2004). *Fen El Tardjama*. Maktab Loubnane Loundjamane.
- Ghazala, H. (2002). *Translation as Problems and Solution. A Cours Book for university student and trainee. Translators Syria*: Dar EL Kalam El Arabi.
- Halliday, M.A. K & Ruqaiya, H. (1987). *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.

Hmadan, J & S. Fareh. (1999). The Translation of Arabic Wa into English: Some problems and Implications. *Dirasat: Human and Social Sciences*, 26(2).

Hatime B. & J. Munday. (2004). *Translation: An Advanced resource book*. London: Routledge.

McCarthy, M. (2000). *Discourse Analysis for Language Teachers*. London: Cambridge University Press.

Oxford Advanced Learners Dictionary. (2000), OUP.

Palmer, F.R. (1981) *Semantics: A new Outline*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Yowell, Y. Aziz. and M, S, L. (2000). *Principles of Translation*. Benghazi, Libya

Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford : Oxford University.

Résumé

Cette étude a pour objectif une analyse contrastive entre l'anglais et l'arabe. L'accent est mis sur la référence comme moyen de cohésion textuelle ainsi que les changements qui peuvent survenir lors de la traduction à cause des différences entre la langue source et la langue cible. Elle compare entre les stratégies adoptées par les traducteurs pendant le transfert de la cohésion référentielle d'un texte anglais vers un texte arabe. Afin d'atteindre cet objectif, deux paragraphes extraits d'un roman en langue anglaise sont traduits vers l'arabe par un traducteur expérimenté et les deux corpus sont comparés pour montrer le genre de changements au niveau de la cohérence textuelle qui opèrent. L'hypothèse est que ces moyens de cohésions en anglais sont beaucoup plus explicites en anglais qu'en arabe à cause de la nature morphologique de l'arabe qui tend à utiliser beaucoup plus d'inflexion et d'agglutination que l'anglais. Les résultats de l'analyse montrent bien que le phénomène textuel qu'est la référence est totalement affecté par la pratique de la traduction.

ملخص

هذه الدراسة عبارة عن تحليل مقارنة بين اللغة العربية واللغة الإنجليزية. يركز فيها على الإشارة كوسيلة للانسجام الشكلي على مستوى النص والتغيرات التي تطرأ على هذا الانسجام من جراء ترجمة النص الروائي. ويعود ذلك إلى الاختلافات بين اللغتين في مجال البنية النحوية. وتقوم الدراسة بمقارنة الاستراتيجيات المتبعة من قبل المترجمين عند تحويلهم لوسائل الانسجام النصي من نص أدبي باللغة الإنجليزية إلى اللغة العربية. من أجل بلوغ هدف البحث تمت ترجمة فقرتين من رواية باللغة الإنجليزية من قبل مترجم من ذوي خبرة من أجل إظهار هذه التغيرات التي تطرأ على الانسجام النصي. فرضية البحث هي أن وسائل الانسجام ستكون أكثر ضمنية في اللغة العربية من اللغة الإنجليزية وذلك لأن اللغة العربية تستعمل الحركات وتعدد المورفيمات في كلمة واحدة أكثر من اللغة الإنجليزية. وتظهر نتائج البحث أن الإشارة كوسيلة من وسائل الانسجام النصي تتأثر إلى حد كبير بفعل الترجمة.