The Arabic Translation of Cohesive Devices used in "The Midnight Library" Novel

Afrah Mutar Abood *
Translation Department, College of Arts, Tikrit University
Afrah7mutar@gmail.com
&
Asst. Prof. Dr. Marwah Kareem Ali
Translation Department, College of Arts, Tikrit University
Marwakareem16@tu.edu.iq

Abstract

This study deals with English cohesive devices as discourse markers, which are used for various purposes, such as connecting ideas and expressing attitudes. In fact, such devices may cause problems in case of translation, especially when dealing with them in literary works. Therefore, this study aims to identify the English cohesive devices and clarify how the translators translate these devices into Arabic. The study data is collected from the English novel "The Midnight Library" written by Matt Haig. The study sample includes (5) texts extracted from this novel to be translated by (3) MA students in the Translation

* **Corresponding Author**: Afrah Mutar, **Email:** saif.sh@uomosul.edu.iq
Affiliation: Tikrit University - Iraq

Department, College of Arts, Tikrit University. Concerning the analysis of data, the study adopts two models: Halliday and Hasan's (1976) model for identifying the cohesive devices in the novel under study; and Newmark's (1988) model for determining the method of translation. The study reveals that cohesive devices are used to demonstrate a semantic function rather than a communicative one, causing a challenge for translators to translate them into Arabic.

Key Word : Arabic language, cohesive devices, discourse markers, literary works, translation.

الترجمة العربية لأدوات التماسك المستخدمة في رواية "مكتبة منتصف الليل"

افراح مضر عبود

جامعة تكريت كلية الآداب

و

ا.م.د. مروه كريم علي

جامعة تكريت كلية الآداب

الـمستخلـص

تتناول هذه الدراسة أدوات التماسك الإنجليزية كعلامات للخطاب. تستخدم هذه الأدوات لأغراض مختلفة ، مثل ربط الأفكار والتعبير عن المواقف. في الواقع، قد تسبب هذه الادوات مشاكل في حالة الترجمة ، خاصة عند التعامل معها في الأعمال الأدبية. لذلك تهدف هذه الدراسة إلى التعرف على أدوات التماسك الإنجليزية وتوضيح كيفية ترجمتها إلى اللغة العربية. تم جمع بيانات الدراسة من الرواية الإنجليزية "مكتبة منتصف الليل" التي كتبها مات هيغ. تضمنت عينة الدراسة (5) نصوص مستخرجة من هذه الرواية موزعة الى (3) طلبة ماجستير في قسم الترجمة بكلية الآداب جامعة تكريت لترجمتها الى اللغة العربية. وفيما يتعلق بتحليل البيانات، تعتمد الدراسة نموذجين: نموذج هاليداي وحسن (1976) لتحديد أدوات التماسك في الرواية قيد الدراسة. ونموذج نيومارك (1988) لتحديد طريقة الترجمة. وتكشف الدراسة أن أدوات التماسك تستخدم لإظهار وظيفة دلالية اكثر من كونها وظيفة تواصلية، مما يتسبب في مشكلة للمترجمين عند ترجمتها إلى اللغة العربية.

الكلمات الدالة: اللغة العربية، أدوات التماسك ، علامات الخطاب، الأعمال الأدبية، الترجمة.

1. Introduction

Cohesive devices as discourse markers, are of a high importance in linking utterances. Since this linking can have several meanings in the target language, the translator should be careful when translating any content that incorporates them to convey their intended meaning in the target language. So, the translator may face some difficulties in translating English cohesive devices, choosing incorrect equivalents leads to misunderstanding in TL.

The main problem of this study lies in misunderstanding the intended meaning of English cohesive devices, which could result in inaccurate translations. This is due to the various functions and types of these devices that may affect their intended meaning.

Briefly, this study focuses on the difficulties of translating cohesive devices found in the English novel "The Midnight Library" into Arabic. It discusses the various ways of expressing the desired meaning in the translation of cohesive devices into Arabic. Accordingly, the following questions highlight the problem of this study:

1. What are the functions of cohesive devices used in Haig's novel?
2. How do the translators translate these English devices into Arabic?

To answer these questions, the study adopts a descriptive qualitative research method to clarify the issue under study. It follows Halliday and Hasan's (1976) model of cohesive devices as a linguistic model and Newmark's (1988) model of approaches to translation as a translation model.

2. Literature Review

This section reviews the main concepts related to this study as clarified in the following subsections.

2.1 Discourse Markers

Levinson (1983: 87-88) has been among the first linguists who studied the relationship between utterances in a certain text through the use of discourse markers, stating that "there are many words and phrases in English… that indicate the relationship between an utterance and the prior discourse. Examples are *but, therefore…,* indicating… how the utterance that contains them is a response to, or a continuation of, some portion of the prior discourse".

As stated by Schiffrin (1987), discourse markers represent a functional class of verbal and non-verbal devices that provide continuous conversation with contextual coordination. Discourse markers often serve three purposes. They serve as contextual coordinates for utterances by positioning them on one or more discourse planes; they also index neighboring utterances to the speaker, the hearer, or both; and they index the utterance to preceding and/or subsequent discourse. These markers act as a form of discourse connection, integrating ideas across the conversation and promoting coherence. The presence or absence of lower level discourse markers, or "words that speakers use to mark relationships between chunks of discourse, such as so, well, OK, and now," has been found to improve understanding (Flowerdew & Tauroza, 1995: 449).

2.1.1   Cohesive Devices: Definitions

Cohesive devices refer to the relationship between the meaning of one item in a text or conversation and the meaning of another item in the text or discourse. "Cohesion is a term that refers to the relationships of meaning that exist inside a text and is expressed through the text's stratified arrangement..., it arises when the interpretation of one aspect of a text is contingent upon the interpretation of another." Cohesion is defined as the text's internal organization, referring to the ties and connections used in a text. It is a component of a language system; a type of intra-sentence relationship between an item and either the preceding or following item(s) in the text. Cohesion provides insight into how the writer structures the message s/he wishes to transmit during the communication process (Halliday & Hasan, 1976: 4).

Cohesion is concerned with words and phrases that establish a pattern of relationships between lexical components and structures in order to create a logical and connected narrative. Simply, cohesion is the process by which distinct types of words, phrases, or sentences are integrated within the context of a discourse relationship and an appropriate discourse analysis (Trebits, 2009: 203). Cohesion refers to a state of cohesiveness and wholeness. It is a semantic notion that denotes the relationship among the meanings of text elements. Each element is connected to the next in order for the element to be comprehended. That is why cohesiveness is critical in the development of a discourse, as it results in the interdependence of sentences (Aidinlou et al., 2012: 19).

2.1.2   Types of Cohesive Devices

As indicated by Halliday and Hasan (1976: 5), the text cohesiveness is communicated in part through the grammar and in part through the vocabulary. As a result, two types of cohesive devices exist, namely, grammatical and lexical cohesive devices. These types are clarified in the following subsections.

2.1.2.1   Grammatical Cohesive Devices

Grammatical cohesiveness is the unifying force expressed by a language's grammatical system, which includes reference, substitution, ellipsis, and conjunction. Reference is a type of grammatical cohesion in which a given lingual unit refers to the preceding and following lingual units (Kwan & Yunus, 2014: 132). According to Halliday and Hasan (1976: 51), reference can be divided into some sub-categories: exaphoric reference and endophoric reference. An exaphoric reference guides the listener/reader to go to the context of the environment for interpretation and not to place in the text, thus it is the reference of situation (situational). Endophoric reference occurs when a cohesive device depends on other elements within the text for interpretation, thus it is the reference within a text (textual). There are still two types of endophoric reference. When a device refers to something previously mentioned in the text, it is called an anaphoric reference, but when it refers to something mentioned later in the text, it is called a cataphoric reference.

Substitution is a form of grammatical cohesion in which certain elements are replaced by others. This cohesiveness is comprised of two elements, namely the substituted element and the one that substitutes it (Aziz, 2015: 73). There are three types of substitution:

nominal, clausal and verbal. The nominal substitution is often realized by pronouns (one) and (ones) and a nominal phrase (the same). While the clausal substitution is often realized by (so) and (not). The verbal substitution is often realized by the verb (do) (Halliday and Hasan, 1976: 114).

Ellipsis occurs when there is a structural place that presupposes some item to provide a necessary information. This is the same as substitution except that in substitution a lexical item marks what is to be presupposed, but in ellipsis there is no item in the slot. Ellipsis can also be nominal, verbal, or clausal (Halliday & Hassan, 1976:136). Accordingly, ellipsis refers to the omission of some sentence elements. Although these elements are not stated explicitly, their presence can be guessed (Bahaziq, 2016: 114).

Conjunction communicates a specific semantic relationship. Because the sentence is the smallest unit of discourse, the researcher has to study the conjunctions that connect the independent clauses, not the words or phrases (Baryadi, 2002: 15). On the basis of this idea, it may be asserted that a text will be easily comprehended if it possesses cohesive devices like conjunctions. By utilizing its indicators, cohesion will help keep the text connected (Aziz, 2015: 78).

2.1.2.2   Lexical Cohesion

Lexical cohesion is achieved by the selection of vocabulary. There exists the class of general words, which is a small set of nouns having generalized reference, such as names of persons, place, and the like (Halliday & Hasan, 1976: 274). A lexical cohesive relation is performed through reiteration and collocations. Reiteration is a constitute of lexical cohesion which brought the repetition of a lexical item. It applies to the words that have the same or near the same meaning to produce the semantic relation within sentences. Therefore, reiteration decides the semantic connection using the same words. It repeats the words that are used before. Halliday and Hasan (1976: 278) indicates that reiteration has several types, which are: repetition, synonym/ near-synonym, antonym, superordinate and general word.
Halliday and Hasan (1976: 282-284) state that collocation describes associations between words that tend to co-occur. They believe that collocation plays an important role to make the text connected. Collocation is analyzed through the lexical relation or lexical environment. The lexical environment of any item includes not only the words that are in some way or other related to it, but also all other words in preceding paragraph.

2.2 The Concept of Translation

Nida and Taber (1982: 12) indicate that "translation consists of reproducing in the receptor language the closest natural equivalent of the source language message." In fact, this definition is more comprehensive, as the authors indicate that meaning and its equivalence are all directly tied to translation. Newmark (1988: 5) adds that translation refers to "rendering the meaning of a text into another language in the way that the author intended the text". This definition places a strong emphasis on accurately translating the author's intended meaning from the source language text into the target language text.

Moreover, Bell (1991: xv) defines translation as "the transformation of a text originally in one language into an equivalent text in a different language retaining, as far as is possible, the content of the message and the formal features and functional roles of the original text." When the two languages involved are used in different contexts, the translator may face difficulties, particularly when lacking an accurate understanding of text features. Hatim and Munday (2004: 6) describe translation as "the process of transferring a written text from a source language to a target language". In this definition, the authors do not indicate explicitly that the object being conveyed is a meaning or message, but they focus on translation as a process.

2.3 Newmarks' Perspective on Translation

Newmark (1988: 5) defines translation as the rendering of the meaning of work into a different language in the manner intended by the author. There are two different translation techniques, the first of which is communicative translation and the second one is semantic translation.

On the one hand, "semantic translation attempts to render, as closely as the semantic and syntactic structures of the second language allow, the exact contextual meaning of the original" (Newmark, 1988: 39). Semantic translation has a source language bias; it is literal and the loyalty is to the ST author. It is readable but remains with the original culture and assists the reader only in its connotations if they constitute the essential message of the text. It tends to be more complex, more awkward, and more detailed (Newmark, 1988: 60).

On the other hand, communicative translation attempts to produce on its readers an effect as close as possible to that obtained on the readers of the original. Communicative translation has a target language bias; it is free and idiomatic. It attempts to make the reading process easier for the TL reader who does not anticipate difficulties or obscurities, and would expect a good transfer of foreign elements into his own culture as well as his language where necessary (Newmark, 1988: 39). For example:

SL: الحياة مليئة بالالوان
TL/ Communicative translation: Life is as a rainbow/ Life is full of happiness.
TL/ Semantic translation: Life is full of colors.

2.4 Literary Works

A literary text is a piece of writing, like a book or a poem, that is intended to entertain or convey a story, like a fictional novel. Although its primary purpose as a literary work is often aesthetic, it may also convey political themes or ideologies. A literary text can be simply defined as writing that is either prose or poetry (Mersand, 1973: 313). Literature acts as a tool for thought, creativity, and aesthetic artistic expression. Each literary work that is studied or read allows the reader to view the pictures of the society, culture, politics, and economics that the author has reflected by his/her perspective for that particular moment. Additionally, it includes conveying to the readers how individuals feel about specific events. A literary text is defined as "a literary featured result of a finished speech creation process. It is a creative work that is bounded with different lexical, grammatical, logical, stylistic connections", and certain purpose (Galperin, 1981: 38).

Juden (1994: 5) concludes that literature is a book or piece of writing that has also been praised. The use of words in a literary context with good content may persuade the readers to bring delight, consciousness, contemplations, and sensations as intended by the author so that they can more clearly understand the relevance of the literature. Literature suggestions may be understood by admitting that the interpretation of a written text depends on the predictions it conveys.

2.5 Challenges in Translating Literary Works

The task of translation is considered a form of art. The derivative nature of the cultural approach has an important function in deciding how effectively the translated content is turned out. An illustration of cross-cultural communication may be found in the translation of any text into a foreign language. Literary texts on cultures only exist because of texts across languages that may include aspects contradicting the language and cultural norms of the intended audience. The meaning of translation has changed throughout time since the culture has a big impact on how translations are done. The process of translating text from language 'A' into language 'B' should provide the reader with identical associations as the reader who reads the text formulated in language 'A' (Wojtasiewicz, 1992).

The capacity to generate a text that conveys the same meaning as the source text is a skill that the translator is renowned for having. Therefore, in order to preserve the tone and looseness of the source text, literary translators must think about the aesthetic qualities of the translated text. As a result, it is expected that translators should possess both artistic skills and effective language abilities (Fowler & Hodges, 2011). A translator must be extremely skilled in order to successfully translate a text from one language to another. This is a result of the evident reality that the target text, which is ultimately communicated with the target audience, essentially reflects the translator's perceptions and conclusions about the source material. Thus, rather than being seen as a process, translation is recognized and valued more as a final product (Zanettin, Bernardini, & Stewart, 2014).

3. Research Methodology

To answer the questions of this study and achieve its aims, the study followed a qualitative research method to analyze the data, as it is concerned with the translation of cohesive devices in Matt Haig's novel "The Midnight Library" into Arabic. The data was collected from this novel. The study sample was selected based on the availability of cohesive devices in the sentences extracted from the novel. Therefore, (5) texts were used to represent the study sample. These texts were distributed to (3) MA students from Translation Department, College of Arts at Tikrit University, to translate the cohesive devices from English into Arabic. Then, the translation methods employed by these students were discussed. The linguistic and translation models adopted to analyze the data included Halliday and Hasan's (1976) model of cohesive devices and Newmark's (1988) model of translation.

4. Data Analysis

ST Extract 1: "Pressure makes us, though. **You** start off as coal and the pressure makes **you** a diamond."

TT (1):تخلقنا المصاعب تبدو **أنت** كفحم وبالضغط **تصبح** الماساً

TT (2):رغم ذلك تنشأنا الضغوطات اذ تبدأ كالفحم والضغط **يجعلك** ألماسة.

TT (3):يكوننا الضغط رغم ذلك تبدأ كالفحم والضغط **يجعلك** الماساً

The personal pronoun (You) is mentioned twice in the source text. It is translated into Arabic using its equivalent (أنت) by TT (1), while other translators (2 and 3) omitted it in their translations. As for the second (You), which is mentioned in the same sentence, it is omitted in the target text. The translators translated it as an implicit pronoun using (ـت) that are attached to the verbs (تصبح) and (يصبح) in the target text (1) to indicate the second person singular pronoun. While TT (2 and 3) conveyed it by using objective pronoun (كاف المخاطبة) in the target language. The translators (1 and 2) applied communicative method, while translator (3) applied semantic method. It is clear that the subjects applied different methods translation to translate this cohesive device. Though some subjects omitted it from the target text, they translated it implicitly in accordance with the context in which it was mentioned.

ST Extract (2): Actions can't be reversed within a lifetime, **however** much we try.

T (1):لا يمكن عكس الإجراءات مدى الحياة.

T (2):لا يمكن عكس الإجراءات خلال العمر.

T (3):لا يمكن ان نتراجع عن تصرفاتنا في مدى الحياة **رغم ما** حاولنا.

The cohesive device (However) is one of the conjunctive adverbials used to show adversative relation. The meaning of this device differs from the meaning of such adversative conjunctions as but, on the other hand, rather, in any case, etc., as it shows a complete contradiction to what has been said. Only T (3) translated it into (رغم ما). In Arabic, (رغم) is used in its various forms to express a meaning that is contrary to the expectation of the listener or reader. Other translators (1 and 2) omitted it from their translations. As for translation methods applied, T (1) applied communicative method of translation, while T (2 and 3) applied semantic method of translation. It is noteworthy that neglecting the importance of mentioning the cohesive devices in the target text as it is in the source text may affect the resulted translated text and causes ambiguity in relation to both the syntactic and semantic structures of the target text.

ST Extract (3): 'Between life and death **there** is a library,' she said. 'And within **that** library, the shelves go on forever.

TT (1):بين الحياة والموت **توجد** مكتبة ، وداخل **تلك** المكتبة ، الرفوف تستمر إلى الأبد.

TT (2):**توجد** مكتبة بين الحياة والموت ، داخل **تلك** المكتبة رفوف تستمر إلى الأبد.

TT (3):بين الحياة والموت **هناك** مكتبة ، وداخل **تلك** المكتبة ، تستمر الرفوف إلى الأبد.

In this sample, there are two cohesive devices (there) and (that). The first cohesive device (there) is an adverbial pronoun used to indicate a place. In this extract, it refers to "library". As for translation, almost all subjects translated these two cohesive devices. T (1 and 2)

translated (there) into (يوجد), which means the existence of something without referring to place or another thing. T 3 translated it into Arabic as (هنا), which functions as a demonstrative noun in Arabic. As for the second cohesive device (that), it is a demonstrative determiner and pronoun used most commonly to point to a thing or person. It is translated by T (1,2 and 3) into its Arabic equivalent (تلك), which is a demonstrative noun in the target language. The subjects applied different methods of translation to translate these devices into Arabic. In this concern, T (1 and 3) applied semantic method of translation, while T (2) adopted communicative method of translation

ST Extract (4): Every life contains many millions of decisions… **But** every time one decision is taken over another...

TT (1): كل حياة تحتوي على ملايين القرارات. ولكن في كل مرة يتم فيها اتخاذ قرار على قرار آخر

TT (2): كل حياة بها الكثير من القرارات. و في كل مرة يتفوق قرار على آخر

TT (3): تحتوي كل حياة على ملايين القرارات. اذ يتم فيها اتخاذ قرار على آخر في كل مره

In this extract, the cohesive device (but) is an adversative conjunction used for adding a statement different from what has been said before. Instead of operating at the sentence level, it operates at the level of discourse (series of utterances). It is clear that almost all subjects did not translate this device and omitted it from the translated text, except T (1) who translated it into Arabic as (لكن). Concerning the methods of translation, T (1 and 2) applied the semantic method of translation, while T (3) applied communicative translation of translation.

ST Extract (5): Birds – little auks **and** puffins clustered together – huddled against the Arctic wind.

TT (1): تتجمع الطيور الأوك، البفن الصغير معاً متجمعة ضد رياح القطب الشمالي.

TT (2): الطيور، الأوك الصغيرة والبفن متجمعة معا متجمعة ضد رياح القطب الشمالي

TT (3): الطيور، الأوكس الصغيرة والبفين تجمعت معا متقلبة ضد الرياح القطبية الشمالية

In this extract, the cohesive device (and) is an additive conjunction used for connecting words, phrases or clauses. As noted here, the author used a cohesive device (and) between two words for connecting them together. T (2 and 3) translated it into (و), which function as (حرف عطف) in Arabic language the same as in English (additive conjunction). However, T (1) omitted it from the translated text. This omission makes the text weak in terms of linking and thoughts sequence. As for the translation methods applied by the subjects to translate the whole extract, T (1) applied communicative method, while T (2 and 3) applied semantic method of translation.

Conclusions
This study examined the translation of English cohesive devices used in the novel of "The Midnight Library" into Arabic. It concluded that the subjects depend on understanding the functions of cohesive devices in the source text in order to determine the appropriate strategy of translation to translate them. The majority of subjects adopt the communicative

method of translation whereby they have omitted some cohesive devices in their translations. While other subjects use the semantic method of translation. It is noticed that most translators are not aware of the importance of cohesive devices in the source language, so they omit them in the target language. The study recommends that the translator should understand the context when translating the literary works from English into Arabic, since it is quite difficult to understand the intended meaning of an expression out of its context. In addition, the translator must have a background about the setting of the novel, its history and culture, in order to convey the right information when s/he translates the text.

Reference

Aidinlou, N., Khodmard, N. & Azami, J. (2012). The Effect of Textual Cohesive Reference Instruction on the Reading Comprehension of Iranian EFL Students. International Journal of English Linguistics, 2(5), 18-24.

Aziz, A.W. (2015). Scoring Lexical Cohesion and Grammatical Cohesion: Analysis of Paragraphs in Students' Thesis. Indonesian Language and Literature. DIALECTIC: A Scientific Journal of Language, Literature, and Mathematics Education, 1(1), 71–85.

Bahaziq, A. (2016). Cohesive Devices in Written Discourse: A Discourse Analysis of a Student's Essay Writing. English Language Teaching, 9(7),112-119

Baryadi, I. (2002). Fundamentals of discourse analysis in linguistics. Yogyakarta: Gondho Suli Library.

Bell, R. (1991). Translation and Translating: Theory and Practice. London: Longman.

Flowerdew, J., & Tauroza, S. (1995). The Effect of Discourse Markers on Second Language Lecture Comprehension. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 17(4), 435 – 458.

Fowler, C. A., & Hodges, B. H. (2011). Dynamics and languaging: Toward an ecology of language. Ecological Psychology, 23(3), 147-156.

Galperin, I. (1981). Stylistics. USA: Longman Group Limited.

Halliday, M. & Hasan, R. (1976). Cohesion in English. London: Longman.

Hatim, B., & Munday, J. (2004). Translation: An Advanced Resource Book. London: Routledge.

Juden, W. (1994). Contemporary Thai poetry bibliography. Bangkok: Thailand Research Fund (TRF).

Kwan, L., & Yunus, M. (2014). Cohesive errors in writing among ESL preservice language learning (Monograph Series, 4, 1-6).

Levinson, S. C. (1983). Pragmatics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mersand (1973). Contemporary Thai poetry bibliography. Bangkok: Thailand Research Fund (TRF).

Newmark, P. (1988). A TextBook of Translation. New York: Prentice-Hall.

Nida, E., & Taber, C. (1982). The Theory and Practice of Translation. Leiden: Brill.

Schiffrin, D. (1987). Discourse markers. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Trebits, A. (2009). Conjunctive cohesion in English language EU documents – A corpus-based analysis and its implications. J.ESP. 04.004

Wojtasiewicz, O. (1992). Introduction to the theory of translation. Warsaw: TEPIS.

Zanettin, F., Bernardini, S., & Stewart, D. (2014). Corpora in translator education. London: Routledge.