

6 ICLICE 2017-061 Mohammed Farghal

Textual Issues Relating to Cohesion and Coherence in Arabic/English Translation

Mohammed Farghal
Kuwait University 13060
m_farghal@hotmail.com

ABSTRACT

Drawing on the preference hypothesis claimed by Blum-Kulka (1986/2004), Baker (1992) holds that every language has its own stylistic conventions and preferences in using certain textual patterns, mainly involving aspects of cohesion and coherence. Closely and critically examining authentic extracts belonging to different text types in English/Arabic translation, this study has questioned several general textual assumptions about Arabic. In particular, English discourse has been shown to be as lexically repetitive as Arabic discourse and Arabic discourse has been argued to be as hypotactic as English discourse, thus questioning the oft-cited claims that Arabic tends for formal lexical repetition rather than lexical variation and that English discourse is much more hypotactic than Arabic discourse. Also, both languages prove to be pronouns-dense, but they display different profiles in the use of subject vs. other pronominal elements. Arabic discourse, however, proves to be more conjunctions-dense due to the frequent employment of *wa* and *fa* as default markers which carry little semantic content and are mainly meant to smooth and naturalize the flow of discourse. Finally, some key textual decisions, e.g. the use of one conjunction rather another, may result in presenting a different mental image of the state of affairs in question and, subsequently, it seriously affects text coherence in translation.

Keywords: cohesion, coherence, textuality, repetition, parataxis, hypotaxis.

Background

Textuality represents the essential features that qualify a stretch of language to be called a text/discourse. Beaugrande de and Dressler (1981) mention seven standards of textuality, viz. cohesion, coherence, informativeness, acceptability, situationality, intentionality, and intertextuality. However, cohesion and coherence stand out as encompassing attributes of texts that may subsume the other standards and can effectively be employed to describe naturally-occurring discourse (Halliday and Hasan 1976; Halliday 1978; Renkema 2004; Farghal 2012, 2015, among others).

While cohesion is a linguistic manifestation in a text including reference, conjunctions, repetition, ellipsis, etc., coherence is a psychological concept that connects the language user's encyclopaedic knowledge with the content of the text and, subsequently, it determines the global comprehensibility of the text (Bell 1991). In this way, the processing of text/discourse may differ from one language user to another depending on his/her socio-cultural experiences, value systems, cognitive structures, among others. In terms of cohesion, Arabic discourse is often cited for its explicit paratactic structure, with a heavy use of conjunctions whose main function is to make the text hang together and cater for its naturalness (Kaplan 1966; Johnstone 1991; Hatim 1997). Such claims are usually taken for granted; hence, they will be revisited in this paper.

Drawing on the preference hypothesis claimed by Blum-Kulka (1986/2004), Baker (1992) holds that every language has its own stylistic conventions and preferences in using

certain textual patterns, mainly involving aspects of cohesion and coherence. In particular, she argues that Arabic has only few semantically loaded conjunctions, e.g. بل لكن، and بالرغم من، compared with the large array of such conjunctions in English. Thus, Baker deems the most frequently occurring Arabic conjunctions, viz. و *wa* and ف *fa*, as mainly default and cosmetic ones. One should note that while these two conjunctions render Arabic discourse highly syndetic (i.e. conjunction-dense), they do not usually replace semantically-loaded conjunctions but rather consolidate them by pre-attaching to the semantic conjunction if it is employed, e.g. ولكن and فبالرغم من، regardless of whether it marks a paratactic or hypotactic structure. By contrast, English discourse is largely asyndetic (i.e. punctuation alone is sufficient for separating sentences) and claimed to be more hypotactic, which may give rise to textual asymmetries and may, therefore, cause textual mishaps in translation.

Erroneous textualizations may also bring about breakdowns in coherence where a target text (TT) may fail to make sense to the target reader or may make sense to him/her but not in the way intended in the source text (ST) due to a misguided rendition of schematic knowledge (Farghal and Naji 2000; Farghal and Al-Masri 2000; Farghal and Al-Blushi 2012; Farghal and AlMana 2015). Whereas cohesion mishaps usually affect the naturalness and smoothness of the TT and generally maintain the propositional content of the ST, coherence problems normally impair the process of interlingual communication.

A large number of linguists have dealt with the issue of cohesion and coherence (Halliday and Hasan 1976; Brown and Yule 1983; Newmark 1988; Hatim and Mason 1990; Bell 1991; Hoey 1991; Baker 1992; Eggins 1994; Thompson 1996; Stillar 1998; Titscher *et al* 2000; Dickins *et al* 2002; Hall 2008, among others). However, there are only few studies that have drawn on authentic textual data between English and Arabic from a translational perspective. Alkhafaji (2011/chapter 7) addresses English shifts in rendering Arabic lexical repetition which mainly include the employment of synonymy, deletion, paraphrase, formal repetition, expansion, substitution, pronomialization, nominalization, with synonymy accounting for 50% of the cases. This points to the general belief that Arabic prefers formal repetition while English tends to employ semantic repetition, i.e. lexical variation (see also Johnstone 1991, who claims that Arabic argumentation is based on presentation, while its English counterpart is based on syllogism). Al-Batal (1985) and Al-Jubouri (1987) both point to Arabic's heavy reliance on conjunctions to organize discourse, maintain cohesion and preserve the continuity of discourse; hence they outnumber their English counterparts by 157% according to Al-Jubouri's results.

Al-Jabr (1987) points to generic differences in English and Arab cohesion. In particular, he states that Arabic fictional narratives rely heavily on pronominal co-reference, whereas argumentative and scientific discourse mainly invests lexical repetition. Surprisingly, Fareh's (1988) study of Arabic and English expository discourse concludes that English employs more lexical repetition than Arabic, the percentages being 73% vs. 64.8%, respectively. Alkhafaji's results (2011/chapter 6) reiterates Al-Jabr's conclusion, claiming pronominal density for narratives and lexical repetition density for legal and argumentative texts.

Research Questions

The present paper aims to address the following research questions in Arabic/English translation across different text types:

1. Is there one-to-one correspondence in the area of pronominal reference?
2. How is lexical repetition dealt with in translation?
3. Is there one-to-one correspondence in the rendering of conjunctions?
4. How do paratactic and hypotactic preferences affect translation activity?

5. How do textual features affect text coherence?

Methodology

This is a critical, qualitative study. The purpose is to detect general interlingual tendencies across different text types based on individual extracts rather than present quantitative generalizations that can only be based on large-scale corpus-based studies across various text types, which would hopefully be machine-treated in the future. The methodology in this paper belongs to textual research (Chesterman 2005); it only involves the examination of authentic extracts from different text types of existing translations between English and Arabic, including literary, media, scientific, legal, political, etc. Each excerpt will be subjected to a close critical analysis in order to offer insights relating to the research questions above.

Analysis and Discussion

The analysis and discussion section elaborately deals with either individual paragraphs from existing translations (mainly the opening or second paragraph to objectify choice) as an object of study. In total, there will be 8 extracts: 5 from English into Arabic and 3 from Arabic into English, which belong to different text types. Each extract is closely analyzed and critically discussed in light of the research questions.

Extract 1

The narrative Arabic paragraph below is taken from a short story titled *البحث عن قلب حي* (al-Ramli 1997) and translated into *Search for a Live Heart* in English (Al-Manna' and Al-Rubai'i 2009):

في ممر ضيق، داخل أحد المستشفيات، وعلى جانبي الممر أبواب مرقمة، يخرج (هو) من أحدها ماسحاً عينيه، يتقل حركته الألم والحزن الحاد فيستند أحياناً على جانبي الممر ... قلقاً أمام الباب الذي خرج منه والذي يفتحه ليطل برأسه إلى داخله بين الفينة والأخرى وليعود بألم شديد ... وحيد في الممر الطويل ...".

In a narrow hospital corridor there is a succession of numbered doors on both sides. The man comes out of one of these doors rubbing his eyes, his movement weighed down by deep pain and grief; from time to time he leans for support against both sides of the corridor. Anxiously, he stands in front of the door from which he has just come out; he opens the door from time to time to look inside, then turns in great pain ... he is alone in the long corridor.

In terms of a pronouns' count, the Arabic text features only one (redundant) subject pronoun, which is a natural consequence of Arabic being a subject pro-drop language, where explicit subject pronouns occur only in emphatic contexts. By contrast, English phonetically recovers five cases of these implicit subject pronouns. As for clitic resumptive pronouns, the case is quite different, for Arabic usually exceeds English in their use. Hence, the seven Arabic clitics correspond to only two possessive pronouns in English. When it comes to lexicalizing pronouns, we find three cases where a ST pronoun becomes a TT lexical item, viz. the subject pronoun *هو* in the Arabic text becomes *the man* in the English text and two instances of a clitic pronoun have been lexicalized into *door* in English, viz. *أحدها* becomes *one of these doors* and *يفتحه* becomes *he opens the door*.

If we examine formal lexical repetition, the count will be as follows. There are 10 instances of formal lexical repetition in the Arabic text involving *ألم*, *أبواب/باب*, *ممر/الممر* and *جانبي*, whereas there are 15 cases of such repetition in the English translation involving *corridor*, *door*, *pain*, *from time to time*, and *both sides*. Contrary to the general belief that Arabic, in contrast with English, favors formal lexical repetition to lexical variation, the translated extract above presents a completely different picture where English invests more

formal lexical repetition than Arabic in terms of a number of instances as well as word count. In a book review of Johnstone's book *Repetition in Arabic Discourse* (1981), Farghal (1990) argues that Johnstone's own discourse in the book is as lexically repetitive as the Arabic texts she is analyzing (and criticizing).

As for conjunctions, the Arabic text features 5 instances of the conjunction *و*, only three of which are of discursive significance, marking circumstantiality, addition, and a combination of cause-result and contrast, viz. *والذي* and *وليعود* and *وعلى*, respectively. The remaining two are one which conjoins two common nouns, viz. *الألم والحزن* and another which is phraseological, viz. *بين الفينة والأخرى*. It also features an instance of a resultative *ف*. The English translation, by contrast, merely uses punctuation, namely the semicolon, to mark the logical relation of cause-result and addition, respectively (see the English text above) and an erroneously explicit temporal marker (then) for the combined Arabic conjunction involving *و* (which marks cause-result) and *ل* (which introduces a nuance of contrast). Thus, the density of conjunctions in the Arabic text far exceeds that of the English text, which conforms to the widely-held belief that Arabic discourse, unlike English discourse, is conjunction-dense, a fact which renders Arabic texture explicative and easier to process than its English counterpart, which is largely implicative (see Hatim 1997 for more details).

Notably, the textualization of propositions in terms of parataxis and hypotaxis in the Arabic text is maintained in the English translation with the exception of dispensing with a relativized structure by investing a semicolon, viz. *Anxiously, he stands in front of the door from which he has just come out; he opens the door from time to time to look inside* replaces *Anxiously, he stands in front of the door from which he has just come out and which he opens from time to time to look inside*, thus turning the TT less hypotactic than the ST. This translational finding shows that English punctuation may be employed to replace some Arabic hypotactic structures, a fact which works in favor of Arabic regarding the hypotaxis-paratactic parameter.

As concerns finite vs. non-finite clauses, the English translation maintains the non-finiteness of two Arabic clauses, viz. *rubbing his eyes* for *ماسحاً عينيه* and *to look inside* for *ليطل* *برأسه إلى داخله*. However, it has changed one of the finite clauses, viz. *يتقل حركته الألم والحزن* into an English non-finite clause, viz. *his movement weighed down by deep pain and grief*. Whereas rendering the English TT less hypotactic than the Arabic ST goes against the general claim that English is more hypotactic than Arabic, increasing the number of nonfinite clauses in the TT conforms to alleged preferences between the two languages. One should note that finite-nonfinite axis functions independently of the hypotaxis-paratactic one, i.e. both finite and non-finite structures may be used hypotactically and paratactically.

Finally, in terms of coherence the English translation generally preserves the propositional content of the ST. However, the translators have mistakenly interpreted the combined conjunction in *وليعود*, which doubly marks a cause-result and contrast relation, as a temporal one, thus weakening the thread of discourse intended in the ST. To capture the subtle function of the combined Arabic conjunction, one could offer: *Anxious, he stands in front of the door from which he has just come out; he opens the door from time to time to look inside, but only to experience greater pain ... he is alone in the long corridor.*

Extract 2

Following is the second paragraph, which is mostly argumentative, from the novel titled *The Fault in our Stars* (2012) by John Green, alongside its Arabic translation (The novel is translated into *ما تخبئه لنا النجوم* by Intwan Baseel (2015/2nd edition):

Whenever you read a cancer booklet or website or whatever, they always list depression among the side effects of cancer. But, in fact, depression is not a side effect of cancer.

Depression is a side effect of dying. (Cancer is also a side effect of dying. Almost everything is, really.) But my mom believed I required treatment, so she took me to see my Regular Doctor Jim, who agreed that I was veritably swimming in a paralyzing and totally clinical depression and that therefore my meds should be adjusted and also I should attend a weekly Support Group.

يجد المرء، كلما قرأ كتيباً عن السرطان أو قرأ في موقع على الإنترنت أو ما شابه، أنهم يصنفون الاكتئاب على الدوام واحداً من التأثيرات الجانبية للسرطان. لكن الاكتئاب ليس، في الواقع، تأثيراً جانبياً للسرطان، بل هو تأثير جانبي للاحتضار. (السرطان أيضاً تأثير جانبي للاحتضار، كما هو، حفاً، كل شيء تقريباً). لكن أمي اعتقدت أنني في حاجة إلى علاج، فأخذتني لرؤية طبيبي المعتاد، جيم، الذي اتفق معها على أنني أعوم فعلاً في حالة تامة من الاكتئاب السريري المحبط، وهو ما يتطلب تعديلاً في أدويتي، ويوجب عليّ حضور اجتماع أسبوعي مع مجموعة دعم.

The pronouns' count picture in extract 2 is similar to that of extract 1, but in the reverse order. On the one hand, the English ST includes 6 subject pronouns, while the Arabic TT contains only three. Interestingly, none of the 3 Arabic pronouns corresponds to subject pronouns in the ST. That is, one is an emphatic pronoun used to support a contrast conjunction, viz. *بل هو* and the other two are complements of addition conjunctions, viz. *كما هو* and *وهو*. On the other hand, the English ST features only 4 other pronominals (3 possessive (my) and 1 objective (me)), while the Arabic TT includes 9 resumptive pronoun clitics. So, again, the number of Arabic clitics far exceeds non-subject pronominals in the English ST. In terms of lexicalizing pronouns, there is only one instance where the impersonal subject pronoun (you) in the first sentence is lexicalized into *المرء* in the TT. In fact, there is another impersonal subject pronoun (they) in the first sentence which should have been lexicalized into *الناس*, but the translator has decided to use a pronoun clitic that functions exophorically the way the English subject pronoun does.

Examining lexical repetition, one notes that the ST and the TT almost exhibit the same degree of formal lexical repetition (16 vs. 17 cases respectively). For example, the word *cancer* السرطان and the phrase *side effect(s)* تأثير جانبي are formally repeated 4 times in both texts. Again, contrary to the common belief that Arabic is more lexically repetitive than English, the English ST proves to be as lexically repetitive as its Arabic translation.

With regards to conjunctions, there is almost one-to-one correspondence in terms of addition conjunctions featuring *also* and *and* in the English ST which correspond to *كما هو*, *وهو* and *أيضاً* in the Arabic TT. The English contrast conjunction *but* is semantically rendered into its Arabic correspondent *لكن*. Notably, the translator has chosen not to consolidate this contrast marker with the default *و*, viz. *ولكن*, which may sound more natural in Arabic. As for the cause-result conjunctions *so* and *therefore*, the former is semantically rendered into the Arabic resultative marker *ف*, while the latter is done away with because its addition would sound redundant in the Arabic text, viz. *وهو*, لذلك، ما يتطلب تعديلاً في أدويتي. Finally, there is a contrast relation between the second and third sentences which obtains through the use of punctuation (separating the two sentences by a period), while the Arabic TT makes this contrast relation explicit by the use of the Arabic conjunction *بل*, which is something already observed in the discussion of Extract 1.

In terms of paratactic vs. hypotactic textualization of propositions, the translator has practically maintained a one-to-one correspondence between the ST and TT. For example, it would be inconceivable for the translator to render the hypotactic structure in the first English sentence paratactically as *يقراً المرء كتيباً عن السرطان أو موقعاً في الإنترنت أو ما شابه ويجد/فيجد أن الناس ... يصنفون الاكتئاب واحداً ...* because this would affect the meaning of the textualization in the ST. However, one may find cases where an English hypotactic structure may be replaced with an Arabic paratactic structure. For example, the hypotactic structure *and that therefore my meds*

should be adjusted may be rendered paratactically in Arabic, viz. يتطلب تعديلاً في أدويتي. [Lit. and it, therefore, requires adjusting my meds]. It should be noted that this is also possible when working from Arabic into English (see section 4.1 above). One should note also that the ST does not feature any nonfinite clauses, hence the preference for changing some English nonfinite clauses into finite ones in Arabic is not relevant here.

Finally, the translator has managed to offer a coherent Arabic translation of the English ST. It generally reads smoothly and coherently. The only small problem that could be pointed out in relation to coherence has to do with the translator's failure to lexicalize the English impersonal pronoun *they*, which would stop the Arab reader in an attempt to figure out to whom it refers. One should note that while English tolerates the exophoric use of the pronoun *they*, the Arab reader finds this quite odd, hence its lexicalization is called for in the Arabic translation.

Extract 3

The following analytic extract is taken from Al Gore's (2013) book *The Future: Six Drivers of Global Change*, along with its Arabic translation (Adnan Gergeos 2015):

ENDANGERED GROUNDWATER AND TOPSOIL

For example, where topsoil and groundwater are concerned, there is a disconnect between the frenzied rate of exploitation of both these resources on the one hand, and the extremely slow rate with which either resource can be regenerated on the other. Renewable groundwater aquifers fill back up, on average, at the rate of less than one-half of one percent per year. Similarly, topsoil regenerates naturally – but at the agonizingly slow rate of approximately 2.5 centimeters every 500 years. (p. 183)

المياه الجوفية والتربة السطحية المهددة بالزوال

على سبيل المثال، وفي ما يتعلق بالتربة السطحية والمياه الجوفية، هناك انفصال بين المعدل الجنوني لاستغلال هذين الموردتين من جهة، والمعدل البطيء جداً لإعادة توليد (تجديد) أي مورد منهما من جهة أخرى. مستودعات المياه الجوفية المتجددة تمتلئ من جديد، في المتوسط، بمعدل أقل من نصف واحد في المائة سنوياً. وبالمثل، فإن التربة السطحية تتجدد بشكل طبيعي - لكن بمعدل بطيء على نحو بئس يصل إلى ما يقرب من 2.5 سنتيمتر كل 55 سنة.

Being a sample of analytic and/or semi-academic writing, both the ST and TT are empty of subject pronouns, that is, only lexical subjects are employed in both texts. The same almost holds for other pronominals, viz. there is none in the ST and there is only one clitic in the TT, namely in *منهما*. Note that the English text has opted out of using pronominals albeit there are two possible sites, viz. *there is a disconnect between the frenzied rate of exploiting both of them, on the one hand, and the extremely slow rate with which either one of them can be regenerated on the other*. The Arabic text has opted for pronominalizing the latter instance, which, again, reflects the fact that pronoun clitics are more common in Arabic discourse. In general, the text type here contrasts clearly with fictional narration (even when it is argumentative), where there is usually a heavy use of pronouns (4.1 and 4.2 above).

Moving to lexical repetition, and apart from the one instance of pronominalizing in Arabic, the two texts basically reflect a similar degree of repetition, viz. groundwater المياه الجوفية (2 times), topsoil التربة السطحية (2 times), rate معدل (3 times), etc. This again proves that formal lexical repetition is an inherent feature of both Arabic and English discourse across different text types. Therefore, any variance between the two languages may be attributed to the user's literacy level and amount of apprenticeship in the varied modes of expression in both languages for varied communicative purposes.

In terms of conjunctions, the English text features two main logical relations: the first is an explicit adversative contrast through the use of the discontinuous *on the one hand ... on the other* and the second is an implicit explanatory relation through the use of punctuation, namely the period at the end of the first sentence which, here, performs the function of an otherwise explicit discourse marker such as *that is* or a lexical marker such as *to explain*. While the Arabic text has succeeded in capturing the first logical relation by using the discontinuous contrast marker *من جهة ... من جهة أخرى*, it has failed to render the second implicit relation explicitly in Arabic by invoking the explanatory discourse marker *ف*, which is supposed to attach to the first word in the second sentence, viz. *فمستودعات المياه الجوفية ...* to coherently mark this logical relation. The way it is, the competent Arab reader would immediately feel a logical gap after the first sentence. Thus, what may be accomplished by punctuation in English may necessitate the use of an explicit conjunction in Arabic. Apart from this mishap, the translator has competently employed the Arabic conjunction *و* in several cases to naturalize the flow of discourse, viz. *وبالمثل* and *وفي ما يتعلق*, and probably one more is needed before *لكن* after the dash. Also, there is an instance of the discourse marker *ف* in *فإن*, which merely naturalizes the use of the emphatic *إن* in Arabic. One should note that this is uncalled for because the proposition in the English text is unmarked; hence it translates straightforwardly into *وبالمثل، تتجدد التربة السطحية بشكل طبيعي ...*

Examining the structuring of the two texts, one can readily note that they are overwhelmingly paratactic. The only hypotactic clause is found right after the exemplification marker at the beginning the text and is hypotactically maintained in the Arabic text. One could imagine dispensing with the hypotactic structure by manipulating lexical cohesion in English, viz. *على سبيل المثال، هناك انفصال بين المعدل الجنوني لاستغلال التربة السطحية ... والمياه الجوفية من جهة ...* However, translators usually exert every effort to reflect the ST's network of relations in the TT in order to preserve not only the content but also the texture of discourse.

Finally, and most importantly, the Arabic translation fails to make sense at one key juncture in text coherence. To explain, the translator has mistranslated the key word *disconnect* by rendering it into *انفصال*, which can hardly make sense in this context. Apparently, the translator has based his rendition on the primary sense of the word in a context where a secondary sense of that word discursively comes into play, namely, *huge gap*, which should be translated into the Arabic word *هوة*. Gore's intended meaning is to point out a total lack of communication between two states of affairs. For such a text to be coherent, it should read: *على سبيل المثال، وفي ما يتعلق بالتربة السطحية والمياه الجوفية، هناك هوة بين المعدل الجنوني لاستغلال هذين الموردتين من جهة، والمعدل البطيء جدا لإعادة توليد (تجديد) أي مورد منهما من جهة أخرى. Only then will the text redeem its text coherence.*

Extract 4

The following argumentative Arabic ST, along with its English translation (Calderbank 1990), is taken from Dickins, *et al.* (2002: 123):

ولما كان الأقوياء بطبيعتهم لا يقبلون الطاعة العمياء للمرشد العام الإمام الشيخ حسن البنا بل ويقومون بمراجعته فيما يراه من أمور فإنه قد ألقى بهم صفة الخبيث بل وعمد إلى إقصائهم عن الجماعة بحيث لم يبق حوله سوى الإخوان الذين من فرط ضعفهم لا يقدرّون على الاختلاف مع الإمام الأمر الذي جعله يصفهم بالأمانة!!

Since the strong by their very nature did not accept blind obedience to the Supreme Guide the venerable Hasan El Banna, and indeed, actively attempted to question some of his judgments, he termed them 'malicious', and went so far as to expel them from the Brotherhood. As a result, the only remaining members of El Banna's inner circle were those whose extreme

weakness meant that they were unable to oppose him. These people he called 'the trustworthy'.

The pronouns' count reaffirms the observations made in the fictional extracts (1 and 2 above): three subject pronouns (*he/twice* and *they/once*) are recovered in the TT, which only correspond to implicit pronouns in the ST, whereas the 10 pronoun clitics in the ST are reduced by half, viz. only 5 possessive and objective pronominals show in the TT.

Looking into logical relations in the ST, one can detect mainly four relations: cause/result *ف ... ولما*, contrastive *بل* (twice), and resultative *بحيث*. Similarly, the TT features four corresponding logical relations, albeit with some twisted logics, viz. causative (since), additive (and indeed), additive (and), and resultative (as a result). This simply means that the translator is aware of these semantically-loaded conjunctions and has attempted to relay them in the TT, though at varying degrees of success (see paragraph on text coherence below).

The paratactic/hypotactic axis is a little different in the two texts. While the Arabic text is predominantly hypotactic; it expresses a network of complex logical relations in technically one unpunctuated sentence. By contrast, the translator has split the Arabic text into three sentences, thus rendering two subordinate clauses as main clauses. This being the case, the English text is more paratactic than its Arabic counterpart, which, again, contradicts the general claim that Arabic writing is more paratactic than English writing. One should note that many Arab writers tend to write very long sentences involving complex logical relations, a fact which usually calls for unpacking a long Arabic sentence by splitting it into several English sentences, thus practically rendering the English text more paratactic than its Arabic counterpart in most cases. This asymmetry between Arabic and English argumentative discourse renders the English TT more paratactic than the Arabic ST.

Finally coming to text coherence, the English text reads smoothly and coherently. However, the question is: Does this coherence mirror the intact logic expounded by the Arabic text? Unfortunately, the answer is not completely in the affirmative. To explain, the two contrastive relations expressed by *بل* are relayed as additive relations, thus missing an emphatic contrastive nuance. To appreciate the discrepancy between the translation above and a translation that captures the two contrastive relations, consider the suggested rendition below:

*Since the strong by their very nature did not accept blind obedience to the Supreme Guide the venerable Hasan El Banna, **but rather** actively attempted to question some of his judgments, he termed them 'malicious'. He **even** went so far as to expel them from the Brotherhood with the result that the only remaining members of El Babnna's inner circle were those whose extreme weakness meant that they were unable to oppose him - 'the trustworthy', he called them.* In addition to capturing the contrast nuances, the suggested translation splits the Arabic text into two rather than three sentences, which brings it closer to its Arabic structuring in terms of the paratactic/hypotactic axis.

Extract 5

The following is the first paragraph extracted from a *Scientific American* (2012/307) article titled 'Quiet Little Traitors' along with its Arabic translation in *Majallat AlOloom* (2013/29/Kuwait):

Quiet Little Traitors

Cells that permanently stop dividing have long been recognized as one of the body's defenses against cancer. Now they are also seen as a sometime culprit in cancer and a cause of aging.

In 1999 Jan M. Van Deursen and his colleagues at the Mayo Clinic in Rochester, Minn., wanted to see whether mangled chromosomes cause cancer. So they engineered mice

deficient in a protein that helps to maintain chromosomal integrity. The rodents' coils of DNA were duly deranged. Surprisingly, though, the animals were not particularly tumor-prone. Instead they developed a strange grab bag of ills, including cataracts, dwindling muscles, rapid thinning of fat under the skin and progressive spinal curvature, that made them look like one-humped camels. They also tended to die young.

خونة نوعاً ما

ظلت الخلايا التي تتوقف عن الانقسام بصفة مستدامة بمثابة إحدى الطرق الدفاعية للجسم ضد السرطان. أما الآن، فينظر إلى تلك الخلايا أيضاً كمتهمة بإحداث السرطان وكسبب للتشيخ.

في عام 1999، أراد فان دويرسن وزملاؤه (في مستشفى مايو كلينيك في روشستر مينيسوتا) أن يعرفوا ما إذا كانت الصبغيات (الكروموسومات) المشوهة تسبب السرطان. ولذلك قاموا بهندسة فأر يفتقر إلى بروتين يساعد على الحفاظ على سلامة الصبغيات. وكانت لفائف الدنا DNA لدى تلك القوارض مشوهة على نحو كاف. ومع أن الحيوانات لم يكن لديها استعداد خاص للإصابة بالسرطان، كانت المفاجأة إصابتها بمجموعة غريبة من الأمراض المزعجة، مثل الساد cataract والضمور العضلي، وترقق النسيج الشحمي تحت الجلد، وازدياد مترق في انحناء العمود الفقري، مما جعل الفئران تبدو وكأنها جمالٌ وحيدة السنام، كما أصبحت تنزع إلى الوفاة المبكرة.

To start with pronouns, there are four subject pronouns (they) in the English text, which refer back to lexical subjects, viz. *cells*, *Deursen and his colleagues*, and *the animals* (two times). The first is lexicalized as تلك الخلايا, while the second and the fourth are suppressed as Arabic subject pronouns. As for the third, which refers to *the animals*, it is realized as an object pronoun clitic in إصابتها, due to the semantics of the English verb *develop*, i.e. being active in form but passive in meaning. The other pronominals in the ST (two pronouns: one possessive and one objective) correspond to four pronoun clitics in the TT, which maintains the same observation made so far.

The deployment of lexical repetition is largely similar in the two texts although (see preceding paragraph) the Arabic TT is a little more lexically dense, for example, there is one instance of pronoun lexicalization and the word cancer, which is formally repeated three times in the ST, is repeated one more time in the TT, which corresponds to lexical variation in the ST, i.e. the use of the word *tumor* instead of *cancer*. However, the lexical chain *mice - rodents - animals* is kept intact in the Arabic text as الفوارض - الحيوانات. One should note that the extra cases of lexical repetition in the ST can readily be done away with by employing a pronoun clitic in the first case, viz. فينظر إليها can be naturally relayed as إليها and the fourth instance of للإصابة بالسرطان can be replaced with بالإصابة بالأورام. Hence, this extra density of lexical repetition in Arabic is translator- rather than language-motivated.

In terms of conjunctions, the English text features four explicit conjunctions: cause-result (*so*), contrast (*though* and *instead*), and addition (*also*). In addition, it uses punctuation to suppress the contrast marker *but* between the first and second sentences. As expected, the Arabic text renders the implicit contrast relation accomplished by punctuation in English explicit by the employment of the discontinuous marker أما ... ف. As for the conjunctions *so* and *also*, Arabic uses ولذلك to render the cause-result relation and كما to mark the addition relation. The remaining two contrast markers (*though* and *instead*) are combined into one concessive marker ومع أن by joining the propositions in the two consecutive sentences (Surprisingly, though, the animals were not particularly tumor-prone. Instead, they developed a strange grab bag of ills, ...). One should note that although the translator has offered a coherent rendition, he does not maintain the same logic, viz. the surprising element has to do with the animals not being tumor-prone rather than they're developing some ills as the translation shows. To capture the intended logical relation, Arabic would employ two contrast markers بل and إلا أن. viz. بل، إلا أن من المدهش أنه لم يكن لدى الحيوانات استعداد للإصابة بالأورام، بل.

إنها أُصيبَت بمجموعة غريبة من الأمراض المزعجة. This translation, as can be seen, captures the logics of both English contrast markers, something which is missing in the Arabic text.

Examining the paratactic-hypotactic axis, one can readily observe that the translator has generally followed the same paratactic-hypotactic structuring of the English text. There are no traces of hypotactic structures that have been rendered as paratactic. Surprisingly, however, we have two paratactic structures that have been rewritten using a hypotactic structure, viz. ومع أن الحيوانات لم يكن لديها استعداد خاص للإصابة بالسرطان، كانت المفاجأة إصابتها بمجموعة غريبة من الأمراض المزعجة relays *Surprisingly, though, the animals were not particularly tumor-prone. Instead they developed a strange grab bag of ills, ...* Thus, the Arabic translation proves to be more hypotactic than the English text. Also, there are instances of nonfinite clauses that have been rendered as finite. In fact, there is only one nonfinite clause which is headed by the verbal *including*. However, instead of opting for a finite clause in Arabic, the translator has employed an exemplification marker مثل rather than a containership finite Arabic verb such as تتضمن، which is more appropriate here. One should note that the use of a nonfinite clause headed by a verbal such as متضمنة sounds unnatural in this context.

Finally, let us come to text coherence. Apart from the title, the Arabic translation reads quite smoothly and coherently despite the technical nature of the discourse. What about the title, which is supposed to tune with the content of the article, whether literally or metaphorically? Let us first admit that the metaphorical wording of the title renders it so challenging to translate into Arabic. Therefore, the translator has to unpack the allusions in the title in order to attempt a translation that sounds coherent, something which is far from being met by the existing title. So, what are the little traitors? They are *the cells*; they are *little* in size and they are treacherous by causing damage in the body. But why are they *quiet*? Because they do not divide anymore.

How can this metaphorical portrait be encapsulated in an Arabic title? It is very taxing but it is worth trying. The translator has reduced the metaphor to the head word *traitors* خونة، but, unfortunately, has missed the gender of the referent (the cells). To explain, the gender of the plural noun خونة (singular خائن) is masculine, while the gender of خلايا in Arabic is feminine, hence the correct form is خائنات (singular خائنة). This mismatch in the referent's gender is a serious coherence problem. Now, if we back-translate the Arabic title, we get *Traitors to some extent*. One wonders how the title coheres with the first adjective *quiet* in the English title? Did the translator read it as *quite*, so he came up with this approximating phrasing? Regardless of what actually happened, a title needs to cohere in one way or another with the text? The following translation is a mere attempt at a metaphorical rendering: خائنات صغيرة تعمل بهدوء [Little Traitors working quietly].

Extract 6

Following is an extract from a legal text (the Security Council's resolution 242 following the 1967 Arab-Israeli War), along with its Arabic translation:

**Resolution 242 (1967)
of 22 November 1967**

The Security Council,

Expressing its continuing concern with the grave situation in the Middle East,

Emphasizing the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by war and the need to work for a just and lasting peace in which every State in the area can live in security,

Emphasizing further that all Member States in their acceptance of the Charter of the United

Nations have undertaken a commitment to act in accordance with Article 2 of the charter,

1. *Affirms* that the fulfilment of Charter principles requires the establishment of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East which should include the application of both the following principles:

(i) Withdrawal of Israel armed forces from territories occupied in the recent conflict;

(ii) ...

قرار 242 التاريخ 7 يونيو 1967

إن مجلس الأمن:
إذ يعرب عن قلقه بشأن الوضع في الشرق الأوسط، وإذ يؤكد عدم جواز الاستيلاء على الأراضي بالحرب، والحاجة إلى العمل من أجل سلام دائم وعادل تستطيع كل دولة في المنطقة أن تعيش فيه بأمان، وإذ يؤكد أيضاً أن جميع الدول الأعضاء بقبولها ميثاق الأمم المتحدة، قد التزمت بالعمل وفقاً للمادة 2 من الميثاق،
1- يؤكد أن تطبيق مبادئ الميثاق يتطلب إقامة سلام عادل ودائم في الشرق الأوسط ويستوجب تطبيق كلا المبدأين التاليين:
أ- انسحاب القوات المسلحة الإسرائيلية من أراضي احتلتها في النزاع الأخير.
ب- ...

The English extract above, being a part of an incomplete sentence, features only one lexical subject with no subject pronouns. In fact, the whole resolution is technically a one-multiply-compound/complex sentence, which is a characteristic feature of legal discourse in English (Crystal and Davy 1969; Bhatia 1983; Danet 1985; Goodrich 1990). Apart from punctuation and layout (see Farghal and Shunnaq 1992), the Arabic translation similarly does not contain any explicit subject pronouns. This kind of similarity in subject pronouns' utilization is due to a generic constraint relating to legal discourse in English. We have already seen that English subject pronouns far outnumber Arabic ones (which are only emphatic or phraseological in nature, Arabic being a pro-drop language) in several types of texts (e.g. fiction in sections 4.1 and 4.2 above). As for other pronominals, the English text contains two possessive pronouns (*its* and *their*), while the Arabic translation features 4 resumptive pronoun clitics, thus maintaining a similar kind of ratio as in fictional discourse. Notably, the issue of lexicalizing subject pronouns does not occur in the TT simply because there are no subject pronouns to lexicalize and the lexical subject governs both the nonfinite clauses in the preamble as well as the finite ones in the main text.

If we exclude the repetition of the circumstantial Arabic conjunction *إذ*, lexical repetition in the English text is exactly mirrored in the Arabic TT, viz. there are 13 instances of word and phrase repetition in both texts, a fact which is necessitated by the authoritative nature of legal discourse, where lexical variation is strictly avoided in order to ensure utmost clarity and explicitness.

Regarding conjunctions, while the English text mainly relies on punctuation for its textual cohesiveness, namely the comma for separating nonfinite clauses and the semicolon for setting apart finite ones, the Arabic TT employs punctuation (the colon, the comma and the period) as well as conjunctions (namely the addition conjunction *و* and the circumstantial conjunction *إذ*). The addition conjunction is used to both support the comma, which separates the clauses in the preamble, and naturalizes the flow of discourse, which is a general function of this conjunction. As for the circumstantial conjunction, it is a common discourse marker of preamble clauses in Arabic UN resolutions whose main function is to avoid the use of Arabic nonfinite clauses in favor of finite clauses, which is a general tendency in Arabic discourse. Thus, the finite clause *إذ يعرب عن قلقه بشأن الوضع في الشرق الأوسط* duly replaces the less-preferred nonfinite clause *معرباً عن قلقه بشأن الوضع في الشرق الأوسط*, which literally renders its English

counterpart. In legal preambles, therefore, the translator needs to be aware of this important cohesion mismatch where English solely employs punctuation, while Arabic may utilize both punctuation and conjunctions.

Apart from the paratactic conjunction **و**, which introduces the hypotactic clauses in the preamble and naturalizes the flow of discourse, the Arabic translation corresponds to the structuring of the English text in terms of parataxis and hypotaxis. In fact, the option for Arabic finite paratactic structures in the preamble would seriously damage the packaging of information in the text, that is, what is meant to be a subordinate proposition in a hypotactic structure would hold the status of a main proposition in a paratactic structure. Notably, inexperienced or student translators may not be aware of this feature of legal discourse (Farghal and Shunnaq 1993). To Explain, the first hypotactic clause **إن مجلس الأمن: إذ يعرب عن قلقه بشأن الوضع في الشرق الأوسط** would be the first in a series of paratactic clauses, viz. **إن مجلس الأمن يعرب عن قلقه بشأن الوضع في الشرق الأوسط**. In this way, it would hold the same informational status as a main clause, viz. **إن مجلس الأمن يؤكد أن تطبيق مبادئ الميثاق يتطلب ...**. Therefore, this generic property of legal preambles needs to be highlighted in English/Arabic translator training.

The English text's layout also plays a key role in its cohesion and coherence, viz. the presentation of nonfinite clauses in the preamble as if they were separate paragraphs along with highlighting the verbal nouns by capitalization and italicization. The Arabic translation, by contrast, has dispensed with these layout features by presenting the series of the corresponding finite clauses in the preamble in paragraph form. However, apart from capitalization (which does not exist in Arabic) and italicization (which is not used), the Arabic translation maintains the highlighting of the main clauses and their subsections by numeration.

Moving to text coherence, there has emerged a formidable problem which was and is still debated until today between the Arabs and Israel regarding the absence of the definite article before the word *territories* in *Withdrawal of Israel armed forces from territories occupied in the recent conflict*. While the English text tolerates both an exhaustive and a partitive reading, Arab countries have been insisting on an exhaustive reading, while Israel has been promoting a partitive interpretation. Whether this coherence mishap is a premeditated trick or a mere oversight does not really make a difference insofar as the reality of the matter is concerned, that is, it is something which has turned into a *de facto* situation.

Extract 7

Following is Article 2 from a legal Saudi employment contract:

مادة 2 - يسري هذا العقد لمدة عام وتبدأ هذه المدة من التاريخ الذي يغادر فيه المتعاقد موطنه متوجهاً إلى المملكة على ألا تزيد المدة بين مغادرة الوطن أو التقدم لمباشرة العمل وفقاً لتعليمات الوزارة على ثلاثة أيام أو من اليوم الذي يتقدم فيه المتعاقد لمباشرة العمل وفقاً لتعليمات الوزارة إذا كان مقيماً في البلد الذي توجد فيه الوظيفة ووقع فيه العقد.

Article Two

The Contract shall be valid for a period of one year, commencing as of the date on which the Contracted Party leaves his home country for the Kingdom, provided that the period between departure from his country and his reporting for duty in accordance with the regulations of the Ministry does not exceed three days, or from the day the Contracted Party reports for duty in accordance with the regulations of the Ministry if he is residing in the country in which his post is and in which the contract is signed.

To avoid repetition regarding legal discourse, let us just comment in this section on lexical repetition and the structuring of the two texts in terms of parataxis and hypotaxis. With reference to the former, one can readily observe that lexical repetition is practically identical in the two texts, viz. *contracted party* المتعاقد (repeated 2 times), country موطن/الوطن (3 times), Ministry الوزارة (2 times), in accordance with وفقاً (2 times), etc. One case where there is a discrepancy is when the relativizer *which* الذي is repeated in the English translation (the country **in which** his post is and **in which** the contract is signed), which renders the text more explicit in English. One should note that ellipsis can apply in English here, viz. *the country in which his post is and the contract signed*, but the translator has opted for explicitation. Also, one should note that the repetition of the word *المدة* at the beginning of the Arabic ST is uncalled for and is, subsequently, avoided in the English TT (see paragraph below).

Regarding the latter, one can note that the paratactic and hypotactic structure is generally preserved, for example, coordinating clauses by *and* and *or*, which correspond to *و* and *أو* in the Arabic text, as well as subordinating clauses by *which* and *provided that*, which correspond to *الذي* and *على أن* in the Arabic text, are maintained in both texts. The only instance where a paratactic Arabic structure is replaced by a hypotactic structure is at the beginning of the English text where a nonfinite clause (commencing as of the date ...) replaces the Arabic paratactic clause ... وتبدأ هذه المدة من التاريخ. One should note that the option for a paratactic structure in Arabic is somewhat repetitive; it is more appropriate to employ a hypotactic clause, viz. ... يسري هذا العقد لمدة عام تبدأ من التاريخ, hence the English rendition is an improvement on the original. Once again, the Arabic writer's level of literacy and expertise may play a key role in the choice between hypotaxis and parataxis.

Extract 8

The following extract is taken from Noam Chomsky and Andre Vltchek's book *On Western Terrorism* (2013) and presented along with its Arabic translation (Fatima Mirza 2016):

Concealing the Crimes of the West

I have statisticians working with me, trying to establish the number of people who vanished after World War II as a result of colonialism and neo-colonialism. As I said at the start of our discussion, it looks to be between 50 and 55 million. However, the exact number is probably irrelevant, whether it is 40 million or 60 million. The magnitude is so tremendous, although somehow Western culture manages to get away with these crimes, and still keeps the world convinced that it has a sort of moral mandate; that it has the right to dictate its own values to the world through its organizations and its media. How are they achieving this?

إخفاء جرائم الغرب

أندريه فلتشك

يعمل إحصائيون معي في محاولة لتحديد عدد الأشخاص الذين هلكوا بعد الحرب العالمية الثانية نتيجة الاستعمار والاستعمار الجديد. وعلى ما يبدو أن ما بين 50 و 55 مليون إنسان لقوا حتفهم في تلك الحرب كما أسلفت في بداية نقاشنا. غير أن العدد الدقيق ربما يكون غير مهم، سواء كان 40 أو 60 مليوناً. فالعدد هائل جداً، لكن الثقافة الغربية أفلتت بطريقة ما من العقاب لارتكابها هذه الجرائم، ولا تزال تقنع العالم بأن لديها نوعاً من التفويض الأخلاقي في أن تملي على العالم قيمها الخاصة من خلال منظمات ووسائل إعلام تابعة لها. فكيف لها تحقيق ذلك؟

The pronouns profile in the two text does not change, viz. the 7 seven explicit subject pronouns in the English text have all been suppressed in the Arabic text, whereas the number other English pronominal elements (5) corresponds to 8 pronoun clitics in Arabic, thus maintaining the presence of more pronoun clitics in Arabic discourse. Likewise, the picture

of lexical repetition is similar, viz. the words *crimes* and *colonialism* are repeated twice in both texts. The only case where there is a mismatch works in favor of Arabic, viz. the word *million* is repeated 3 times in English, while it occurs only 2 times in Arabic. To explain, whereas the English text ellipses the word *million* in the two coordinate structures only once, the Arabic text ellipses in both cases.

In terms of conjunctions, the English concessive makers *however* and *although* are both maintained in the Arabic text by employing *غير أن* and *لكن*, respectively. However, the translator has chosen to relay the hypotactic marker *although* paratactically by using the paratactic maker *لكن*, which preserves the concessive but not the hypotactic structure. The question here is: Is the hypotactic option available? The answer is definitely in the affirmative because the paratactic marker *لكن* can be readily replaced with the hypotactic marker *على الرغم من* or *بالرغم من*, which both preserve the meaning and the structure. As a matter of fact, the hypotactic rendition sounds more emphatic than its paratactic one in Arabic despite the fact that they are both semantically coherent within the text. Besides, the Arabic text's argumentative thrust is enhanced by the use of the conjunction *ف* twice, whose absence would create discourse gaps that seriously weaken the line of argumentation due to the syndetic nature of Arabic discourse. Finally, the appropriate deployment of conjunctions in the Arabic text has contributed significantly to producing a coherent Arabic text. The reader can easily follow the argument presented in terms of logic and cohesion.

Conclusions

Many important conclusions can be drawn from the close analysis and critical discussion of the 8 extracts in this study. First, if we exclude legal discourse, the deployment of pronominal reference in English and Arabic discourse shows contrastive profiles at varying degrees. While Arabic subject pronouns are categorically suppressed in unmarked structures, their English counterparts are phonetically realized in such structures, which is an immediate consequence of Arabic being a subject pro-drop language. Arabic subject pronouns occur only for emphatic or discursive purposes. By contrast, Arabic resumptive pronoun clitics, which, among other things, may correspond to object and possessive English pronouns, are much more densely deployed in Arabic discourse across different text types. In both languages, narrative discourse is generally the most dense in the investment of pronouns, while legal discourse is the least dense in this regard. Taking these discrepancies into account, one can argue that both languages are pronoun-dense.

Second, the textual data shows that the two languages exhibit a consistent behavior when it comes to employing semantically loaded conjunctions to relay the unfolding logic of discourse. However, Arabic also heavily invests the conjunctions *و* *wa* and *ف* *fa* to smooth and naturalize its discourse, while English usually relies on punctuation to fulfill that purpose. This mismatch is of key significance when translating between the languages. The syndetic nature of Arabic discourse entails the use of more conjunctions when rendering English discourse, which is noticeably asyndetic in nature. Conversely, several Arabic conjunctions should go for punctuation when rendering Arabic discourse into English. One should note that this discursive aspect largely operates independently of semantically-loaded conjunctions and may, sometimes, be employed to consolidate them, e.g. *ولكن* 'and but' and *فبالرغم من* 'although'. This observation contradicts Baker's claim (1992) that English is more varied in the distribution of semantically-loaded conjunctions than Arabic. As a matter of fact, the textual data has shown that Arabic is as varied as English in semantic conjunctions, and it proves to be much more conjunctions-dense due to its syndetic discourse.

Third, the textual data in this paper clearly disproves the widely held claim that Arabic is more lexically repetitive than English. Across all the text types examined, English

emerges as much lexically repetitive as Arabic. The individual mismatches in the data are insignificant and mostly work against this claim. Therefore, the often-echoed claim (see Section 1 above) that Arabic is more repetitive than English and that augmentation in Arabic is based on presentation (i.e. lexical repetition) rather than syllogism (i.e. progressive coherence) needs to be seriously questioned. It may be the case that the feature of progressive coherence, which is thought to be typical of English, is not an inherent characteristic as such, but rather a matter of tendency among language users who have been apprenticed to use language that way. Therefore, in the hands of competent writers Arabic discourse is expected to be as syllogistic as its English counterpart. The future examination of large interlingual corpora as well as intralingual corpora in the two languages may unfold more solid evidence in this regard.

Fourth, the examination of the paratactic-hypotactic parameter in the structuring of discourse indicates that both languages equally feature parataxis and hypotaxis. This finding refutes the general assumption that Arabic discourse is more paratactic than English discourse, and, inversely, that English discourse is more hypotactic than Arabic discourse. The interlingual textual data in this study generally shows that what is paratactic or hypotactic in either language remains so interlingually. The few individual mismatches in the data are merely a matter of translator preference and may, in fact, be more appropriately rendered using the same structure. This new insight clearly points to the often-neglected rich aspect of hypotaxis in Arabic, which is mainly based on anecdotal evidence and is consolidated by the lack of systematizing the linguistic data the way it is done in English. Any haphazard look at an Arabic or an English text in translation would readily show that both languages invest the two structuring axes at a comparable degree.

Fifth, the interlingual data in this study shows a noticeable tendency for Arabic discourse to change several English nonfinite clauses to finite ones in translation and, inversely, for English discourse to change some Arabic finite clauses to non-finite ones across all text types. This tendency is most implemented when translating English legal texts into Arabic, e.g. UN documents, where highlighted English non-finite clauses in the preamble are usually rendered into Arabic finite clauses without changing their hypotactic structuring. This does not negate the possibility of sometimes opting for Arabic verbal nouns to head non-finite clauses but the general tendency is to prefer finite to non-finite clauses in Arabic. One should note that English employs non-finite clauses much more frequently than Arabic, a fact which requires the translator to pay utmost attention to this discursive mismatch.

Finally, textual cohesion proves to be a significant contributor to the production of coherence. Any coherence mishaps, whether accidental or premeditated, will in most cases have serious repercussions in the processing of discourse. Coherence problems, e.g. the choice of one article rather than another or the employment of an erroneous semantically-loaded conjunction, usually have far-reaching consequences at the reception level and may create irreparable damage. The incidentally chosen interlingual data in this study has fortunately instantiated some subtle textual problems which have been shown to affect the coherence of the translation at varying degrees. It is important that the translator fully understands the ST in terms of content and textualization before considering TT candidate counterparts.

*** This work was supported by Kuwait University, Research Grant No. [AE01/16].**

References

- Al-Batal, M. (1985). *The Cohesive Role of Connectives in a Modern Expository Arabic Text*. Unpublished PhD Dissertation, University of Michigan.
- AlKhafaJi, R. (2011). *Essays in Arabic Text Linguistics and Translation Studies*. Amman: Amwaj for Publication and Distribution.
- Al-Jabr, A. (1987). *Cohesion in Text Differentiation: A Study of English and Arabic*. Unpublished PhD Dissertation, University of Aston, Birmingham.
- Al-Jubouri, A. (1983). The Role of Repetition in Arabic Argumentative Discourse. In J. Swales and H. Mustafa (eds.), *English for Specific Purposes in the Arab World*, pp. 99-117. Birmingham: University of Aston Language Studies Unit.
- Al-Manna', A. and Al-Rubai'I, A. (2009). *Translating Arabic Literature: A Bilingual Reader*. London: Sayyab Books.
- Al-Ramili, M. (1997). *البحث عن قلب حي (Search for a Live Heart)*: Collection of Short Stories. Madrid.
- باسيل، أنطوان. (2015). ما تخيئه لنا النجوم (ترجمة لرواية جون غرين 2012). بيروت: شركة المطبوعات للتوزيع والنشر.
- Baker, M. (1992). *In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation*. London/New York: Routledge.
- Bhatia, V. (1983). *An Applied Discourse Analysis of English Legislative Writing*. University of Aston, Birmingham.
- Blum-Kulka, S. (1986/2004). "Shifts of Cohesion and Coherence in Translation". In L. Venuti, (ed.), *The Translation Studies Reader*, pp. 290–305. London/New York: Routledge.
- Beaugrande, R. de and Dressler, W. (1981). *Introduction to Text Linguistics*. London: Longman.
- Bell, R. (1991). *Translation and Translating: Theory and Practice*. London/New York: Longman.
- Brown, G. and G. Yule (1983). *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Calderbank, T. (1990). *Translation Strategies from an Arabic Political Argumentative Text*. Unpublished MA Dissertation, University of Salford.
- Chesterman, A. (2005). Consilience in Translation Studies. *Revista Canaria de Estudios Ingleses* 51: 19-32.
- Chomsky, N. And Vltchek, A. (2013). *On Western Terrorism: From Hiroshima to Drone Warfare*. London: Pluto Press.
- Crystal, D. and Davy, D. 1969. *Investigating English Style*. London: Longman.
- Danet, B. (1985). Legal Discourse. In T. A. Van Dijk (ed.), *Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. London: Academic Press, pp. 273-291.
- Dickins, J., Hervey, S. and Higgins, I. (2002). *Thinking Arabic Translation*. London/New York: Routledge.
- Eggins, S. (1994). *An Introduction to Systematic Functional Linguistics*. London/New York: Continuum.
- Fareh, S. (1988). *Paragraph Structure in Arabic and English Expository Discourse*. Unpublished PhD Dissertation, University of Kansas.
- Farghal, M. (2012). *Advanced Issues in Arabic-English Translation Studies*. Academic Publication Council, Kuwait University, Kuwait.

- Farghal, M. and Shunnaq, A. (1992). Major Problems in Students' Translations of English Legal Texts into Arabic. *Babel* 38(4): 203-210.
- Farghal, M. and Najji, R. (2000). Translational Miscues in Arabic Verse: A Case Study. (2000). *International Journal of Arabic-English Studies* 1(1):53-72.
- Farghal, M. and Al-Masri, M. (2000). Reader Responses in Quranic translation. (2000). *Perspectives* 8(1):27-46.
- Farghal, M. and Bloushi, N. (2012). Coherence Shifts in Quran Translation. (2012). *Sayyab Translation Journal* 4: 1-19.
- Farghal, M. and Al-Manna, A. (2015). *Contextualizing Translation Theories: Aspects of Arabic-English Interlingual Communication*. London: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Farghal, M. et al. (2015). *Papers in Arabic-English Translation Studies*. Jordanian Translators Association's Publications.
- Hall, M. F. (2008). *Discourse Analysis of Fictional Dialogue in Arabic to English Translation*. Unpublished PhD thesis: University of London.
- Halliday, M. and R. Hasan. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.
- Halliday, M. (1978). *Language as a Social Semiotic*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Hatim, B. (1997). *Communication across Cultures: Translation Theory and Contrastive Text Linguistics*. Exeter: University of Exeter Press.
- Hatim, B. and I. Mason. (1990). *Discourse and the Translator*. London/New York: Longman.
- Hoey, M. (1991). *Patterns of Lexis in Text*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Goodrich, P. (1990). *Legal Discourse: Studies in Linguistics, Rhetoric and Legal Analysis*. London: MacMilan.
- Gore, Al. (2013). *The Future: Six Drivers of Global Change*. New York: Random House.
- Green, J. (2012). *The Fault in our Stars*. New York: Dutton Books.
- Johnstone, B. (1991). *Repetition in Arabic Discourse*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- جرجس، عدنان. (2015). *المستقبل: ستة محركات للتغيير العالمي: الجزء الثاني (ترجمة لكتاب آل غور 2013)*. سلسلة عالم المعرفة، الكويت.
- Kaplan, Robert. (1966). Cultural Thought Patterns in Intercultural Education. *Language Learning*, Vol. 16 (1+2), pp. 1–20.
- Mirza, F. (2016). *An Arabic Translation of "On Western Terrorism: From Hiroshima to Drone Warfare" by Noam Chomsky and Andre Vltchek with an English Introduction*. Unpublished MA Thesis, Kuwait University.
- Newmark, P. (1988). *A Textbook of Translation*. London: Prentice Hall.
- Renkema, J. (1993/2004). *Discourse Studies*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Stillar, G. R. (1998). *Analysing Everyday Texts: Discourse, Rhetoric and Social Perspectives*. Thousand Oaks/London/New York/New Delhi: Sage Publications.
- Stipp, D. (2012). Quiet Little Traitors. *Scientific American* 307: 68-73 (translated into Arabic as *خونة نوعا ما*. *Majallat Al-Oloom* (2013/29), Kuwait.
- Thompson, G. (1996). *Introducing Functional Grammar* (2nd edition). London: Arnold.
- Titscher, S. Meyer, M. Wodak, R. And Velter, E. (2000). *Methods of Text and Discourse Analysis*. Thousand Oaks/London/New York/New Delhi: Sage Publications.