

Speech Acts and Implicatures in Literary Translation: A Comparative Pragmatic Analysis of Two Arabic Translations of Hemingway's *A Farewell to Arms*

Ahmad Ali Albtoosh¹, & Mohamed Abdou Moindjie²

¹ Phd Candidate, School of Languages, Literacies and Translation, Universiti Sains Malaysia, Malaysia

² Senior Lecture, School of Languages, Literacies and Translation, Universiti Sains Malaysia, Malaysia

Correspondence: Mohamed Abdou Moindjie, School of Languages, Literacies and Translation, Universiti Sains Malaysia, Malaysia.

Received: November 18, 2025

Accepted: February 26, 2026

Online Published: April 7, 2026

doi:10.5430/wjel.v16n5p1

URL: <https://doi.org/10.5430/wjel.v16n5p1>

Abstract

This paper explores the translation of speech acts and conversational implicatures of two Arabic versions of *A Farewell to Arms*, which may face a longstanding problem in literary translation in terms of the translation of pragmatic meaning achieved by using ellipsis, hedging, rhythm, and turn-taking. The analysis is based on the Speech Act Theory and Gricean pragmatics, and it is operationalized following the translation procedures presented by Vinay and Darbelnet. The samples are fifty pragmatically salient interactions identified in dialogic passages. Data in the form of source-text exchanges were coded by illocutionary force, type of implicature, form of carriers of inference (e.g. ellipses, hedges, clipped turns) and data in the form of target-text renderings were coded in terms of translation procedures (literal, equivalence, modulation, adaptation) and operations (reduction, amplification, omission, explications). There was a four-dimensional evaluative rubric consisting of meaning adequacy, illocutionary preservation, implicatures retention, and style/register. The results suggest that the strategy profile where literal or equivalence procedures are mandated with controlled reduction is more reliable in maintaining illocutionary contours and form-bearing implicatures. However, another profile marked by amplification and modulation or adaptation, commonly involving explications and some omissions, neutralized the hedges and resolved productive ellipses and high register, which have reconstructed pragmatic force. The study has practical implications on Arabic translation of minimalist prose because emphases have been found upon formal carriers of implicatures and dialogic rhythm by preserving structures of directive and permission where they are pragmatically motivated, avoiding unjustifiable overexplicational. Future studies are recommended to focus on reader reception to determine how translational choices can affect interpretive uptake.

Keywords: Conversational implicature, Illocutionary force, English–Arabic literary translation, Speech Act Theory, Vinay and Darbelnet, Descriptive Translation Studies, Hemingway

1. Introduction

Pragmatic meaning concerns what speakers actually do with words, and what they deliberately omit, and therefore, it provides a long-standing challenge to literary translation. The nature of meaning in pragmatics is seen as not merely that which derives from propositional content, but as the outcome of inferential processes triggered by contextual cues, including ellipsis, brevity, hedging, and turn-taking (Grice, 1975; Levinson, 1983). Empirical studies have demonstrated that readers are dynamically engaged in calculating conversational implicatures and that variation in these cues can substantially influence interpretation and affective response (Marty et al., 2024). When such cues are altered in translation, even the lexical meaning may be reshaped, and the pragmatic meaning may likewise be affected.

The recent translation studies literature is increasingly requiring pragmatically explicit models that traverse beyond word-level equivalence and the explanations of how implicature, ambiguity and discourse form are interacting across the source and target texts (House, 2014; Francesch & Payrató, 2024). In this respect, pragmatic meaning is mutually defined through linguistic form (e.g. ellipses, clipped turns, hedges), local discourse background, and reader inference. It is hence important that what is unsaid be maintained as an object of analysis in order to assess translational adequacy. The issue is especially relevant when translating fiction by Ernest Hemingway, where the calculative economy and understatement are also involved in the dialogue, and any minor changes in the form can significantly change illocutionary power and the inferences the reader makes.

In the framework of translation research, both literary and audiovisual sources show that the disposition of maxim flouts, violations, and other mechanisms activated by implicatures systematically conditions equivalence relations and audience interpretation (Vallauri et al., 2022; Wang and Xin, 2024). These observations highlight the need to retain formal vehicles of implicature, i.e. ellipsis, hedging, rhythmic brevity in the target language. In this light, the idea of equivalence, in this case, is not considered as a matter of semantic identity but rather as the maintenance of inference-facilitating form and illocutionary force. Operationally, the study implies considering the

representation of ellipses and dashes, hedged causation, adjacency-pair timing and two-beat dialogic cadence in Arabic, as these attributes permit the English source text to license a specific set of conversational implicatures.

Based on this orientation, this study extends an application of Speech Act Theory and the theory of conversational implicatures to understand how two Arabic translations of *A Farewell to Arms* implement illocutionary force (e.g., prohibition-permission shifts and directive contours) and conversational implicatures (e.g., hedged causation and aborted utterances). The relevance of attending to figurative, implicit, and pragmatically loaded meaning within the framework of historical, literary, and technological contexts is also reinforced by the recent developments of the study of Arabic translation. Indicatively, Khasawneh et al, (2025) reveal that the diachronic changes in translation strategy, whether in classical Arabic poetry, have an impact on the translation of figures of speech, and the sensitivity of inferred meaning and formal and cultural mediation. At the same time, studies aimed at the examination of machine-aided and audiovisual translation show that literal transfer is not possibly the sole requirement to maintain pragmatic and idiomatic power when both metaphor and implicature interact (Alsharif and Khasawneh, 2025). These results, combined with each other emphasize the necessity of translation models that are both pragmatic and procedural profiling, which is particularly significant when translating minimalist literary dialogues such as Hemingway's, where meaning is often conveyed through that which is not said. The profile of translator decisions is based on the translation processes of Vinay and Darbelnet, which permit the systematic comparison between the pragmatic structure of the source text and the realizations of state-text. The paper answers three questions: (i) what is the speech acts-implicatures structure of the dialogic scenes in Hemingway; (ii) how are these pragmatic elements translated in each Arabic translation; (iii) why are there some shifts in meaning and force.

The research addresses a gap in the intersection of pragmatics and English-Arabic literary translation. Although studies of pragmatic equivalence, implicatures, and translational strategies have been performed before (e.g., Farghal and Almana, 2014; Sipayung, 2018; He and Gao, 2020), there are very few studies analyzing pragmatic equivalence, implicatures, and translation strategies comprehensively and applying them to a literary corpus, especially in Arabic. The relationship between pragmatic form, stylistic minimalism, and translational procedure has not been studied extensively, and the existing literature has tended to concentrate on either non-literary texts or individual pragmatic phenomena. By examining *A Farewell to Arms* via a combined pragmatic and descriptive perspective, the current work makes a contribution to a finer-grained comprehension of the manner in which an informed interpretation, as well as illocutory interactions, are rebuilt across languages and cultural backgrounds. The implications of the findings include the training of translators, practice in literal translation and pragmatics-based translation analysis, especially in academic and professional translation in Arabic-speaking world.

2. Literature Review

Descriptive Translation Studies (DTS)

Descriptive Translation Studies (DTS) is situated within a broad view of translation as a multifaceted activity serving different purposes and audiences—from literature, where meaning is outline contrasting orientations and techniques: Larson's form-based vs. meaning-based (idiomatic) translation (Larson, 1977; Maskuri Srilistyanto & Sutop 2016), Brislin's pragmatic/aesthetic-poetic/ethnographic/linguistic types (Choliludin, 2009; Maskuris, 2016), Catford's extent/level/rank divisions, and Newmark's eight methods, ranging from word-for-word to adaptive translation (Catford in Maskuri Srilistyanto & Sutop, 2016; Newmark, 1988; Syafrizala & Rohmawatia, 2018). The early descriptive categories provided a valuable background to subsequent descriptive strategies, as they predetermined the diversity in translational practice instead of one best practice. Against long-standing debates on meaning, equivalence, and translatability, the current study adopts a descriptive stance that observes translators' actual choices rather than prescribing ideal ones. Translation studies consolidated as a discipline with Holmes's "map," which distinguishes pure (theoretical/descriptive) from applied branches and provides a program for systematic inquiry (Munday & Vasserman, 2022; Munday, 2022; Barkhordar, 2018). Within the descriptive branch, DTS is target-oriented, empirical, and interdisciplinary, tracing how translations function in cultural history (Rosa, 2016). The three pillars are: product-oriented DTS (comparative description of ST–TT pairs or multiple TTs to write a history of translation), function-oriented DTS (the role, impact, and value of translation in the target context, later engaging the sociology of translation), and process-oriented DTS (translator cognition; think-aloud protocols) (Pradita, 2016). Munday argues that descriptive study seeks general principles by comparing transformations; Holmes's applied branch includes training, aids, and criticism, and Toury integrates function→product→process in a hierarchy where target-culture function conditions textual make-up and strategy (Munday, 2001; Salamah, 2021; Toury, 2012).

The significance of DTS lies in formulating, testing, and refining translation norms in specific cultural settings through a blend of humanistic interpretation and empirical rigor, ensuring reliability and validity (Dai, 2019). In this context, the texts translated become the cultural facts, the formal and pragmatic characteristics of which display target-system restrictions and expectations. As an inherently social activity, translation is seen to foster cross-cultural communication and communal understanding; promoting descriptive translation supports community interaction and accessibility (IvyPanda, 2020). Practically, DTS challenges fixed norms, informs decision-making and operative norms, and serves both theory and training by offering pattern awareness and transferable skills; it also opens space for multicultural, non-divisive perspectives on practice. By examining textual and contextual variables together—products, processes, and functions—DTS yields robust generalizations about how and why translators act as they do, advancing translation studies beyond prescriptive method lists to evidence-based explanations anchored in target-culture realities (Dai, 2019; Pradita, 2016; Rosa, 2010; Munday, 2001). Recent studies on the Arabic-centered DTS indicate that the change of translation norms may have a crucial influence on figurative and implied meaning translation in historical and literary settings (Khasawneh et al, 2025).

Speech Acts and Conversational Implicatures

Pragmatics frames translation as meaning-in-context, centering the speaker's intended action rather than surface form (Levinson, 1983; Fitriana, 2015). Building on Speech Act Theory, Austin distinguishes locutionary (what is said), illocutionary (what is done by saying it), and perlocutionary effects (what it causes), while Searle classifies core illocutionary types as Representatives, Directives, Commissive, Expressive, and Declarations; effective translation therefore targets illocutionary preservation and anticipates perlocutionary outcomes, not merely propositional content (Austin, 1962; Searle, 1976). Translationally, pragmatic misalignment can be due to the failure to preserve illocutionary force in the appearance of semantic equivalence. Complementing this, Grice's theory treats implicatures as meaning implied by saying something else and separates conversational from conventional types; conversational implicatures are diagnosed via the Cooperative Principle and the maxims of Quantity, Quality, Relation, and Manner, including patterned non-observance (flouting, violating, opting out, infringing) that cues inference (Grice, 1975). Conversational implicatures further divide into generalized and **particularized**, and exhibit defeasibility, calculability, and context-dependence (Rett, 2015). Such properties render implicatures particularly translologically delicate, especially in literary conversation. For English–Arabic literary dialogue, attending to carriers of inference (ellipsis, hedging, brevity, turn-taking/beat) helps preserve force and reader uptake; rendering only locution risks literalism, whereas capturing illocution tends to enhance idiomatic acceptability (Al-Azzawi, 2019).

Conversational implicatures and speech acts in literary works have been discussed by various scholars. The aim was to arrive at the aims of their employment and how to infer their meanings. Additionally, their conveyance in other languages during the process of translation has been investigated as well. The implied or intended meanings conveyed by these two pragmatic mechanisms impose burdens on both readers and translators. For example, Qordawi (2021) qualitatively chart conversational implicatures in Hemingway's *The Old Man and the Sea*, showing frequent generalized and particularized implicatures serving functions such as conveying/entertaining information, self-defense, power, and etiquette; Fethallah and Armouche (2022) use a DTS lens on Mahfouz's *Palace Walk*, finding translators routinely deploy explicitation, deletion, and preservation to carry implied meaning; and Abualadas (2019) documents systematic explicitation in two Arabic translations of *A Farewell to Arms*, which heightens informational load and reader guidance while reflecting euphemistic/politeness norms, though it treats implicatures only and in selected chapters. Recent literature takes pragmatic issues to machine-aided and comparative translation, and demonstrates that translation strategies have a direct impact on preserving figurative and inferred meaning (Alsharif and Khasawneh, 2025). The present paper advances this literature by (i) analyzing both pragmatic mechanisms—Speech Acts (illocution/perlocution) and Conversational Implicatures—within a single English corpus and two Arabic translations; (ii) systematically mapping Vinay & Darbelnet procedures and operations (e.g., Literal/Equivalence vs. Modulation/Adaptation; Reduction/Amplification/Omission/Explicitation) to pragmatic outcomes (illocution preserved/resaped; implicature retained/neutralized); (iii) focusing on Hemingway's minimalist dialogue to test whether Arabic TTs preserve carriers of inference (ellipsis, hedging, clipped turns/beat) and directive/permission force; and (iv) extending coverage and adding a transparent evaluative rubric (meaning adequacy, illocution preservation, implicature retention, style/register) to yield a replicable, DTS-grounded account of English→Arabic literary translation.

3. Methodology

Analytical units were bounded exchanges (one or more adjacency pairs) appearing in the ST and both TTs. Each exchange was first coded in the ST for speech-act type (representatives, directives, expressives, commissives, declarations where applicable), implicature type (generalized/particularized) and implicated maxims (quantity, quality, Relation, Manner), and the carriers of implicatures (ellipsis, hedging, repetition, beat/timing, deadpan imagery). The corresponding TT renderings were then coded for translation procedures (borrowing, calque, literal, transposition, modulation, equivalence, adaptation), with analyst tags for Reduction, amplification, omission, and explicitation (Chesterman, 1997). Pragmatic fidelity was evaluated on a four-dimension rubric—meaning adequacy, illocutionary force, implicature retention, and style/register (3+3+3+2; total 11)—to enable systematic comparison across translators and scenes. Multi-criteria rubrics of this kind are standard in translation assessment (House, 2014).

This rubric was operationalized before the analysis (dimension definitions, score descriptors, and decision rules) and then applied in a systematic way to all the chosen exchanges in TT1 and TT2; the resulting scores appear in the Results section per dataset. This operationalized rubric was applied to all selected exchanges in both texts and reports an analysis and findings are provided in explicit reporting sections. To establish that scoring was based on similarity of decision rules, and not on impressionistic scoring, every exchange was scored at the end of ST pragmatic coding and TT procedure coding, and borderline cases were repeated using the same rubric descriptors to ensure cross-case consistency. Close reading and memoing governed the procedure: identification of candidates in the ST; parallel extraction in TT1 and TT2; sequential ST coding; TT procedure coding; and synthesis linking procedure patterns to shifts in force and implicature. To enhance rigor, coding criteria and exemplars were pre-specified and ambiguous cases were resolved by comparative checks across scenes; where applicable, a subsample may be double-coded to estimate agreement (e.g., Cohen's κ). In the current research the following procedures of rigor were employed: (i) the use of coding sheets that identified categories and decision rules was carried out throughout; (ii) analytic memoing was applied during the coding process to record the inferential grounds by which given classifications were arrived at and (iii) ambiguous cases were resolved by systematic cross-scene comparison and re-coding in such a way that the same pragmatic configurations were handled consistently across the corpus. The study uses published texts and involves no human participants. Its scope is limited to one novel and two translations; future work should broaden the sample and test reader reception empirically, especially the effects of preserving ellipsis, hedging, and beat structure on inferential processing in Arabic. Because of the qualitative,

product-oriented design and the use of one primary coder, formal inter-rater reliability statistics (e.g., Cohen κ) could not be determined, so reliability was ensured by defining the categories explicitly, engaging in repeated recoding, and ensuring that readers have access to the derivation of each judgement in the analysis process.

The data collection and analysis in this study were performed manually by systematic close reading of the source text (ST) and the target texts (TT1 and TT2). From the novel's dialogic passages, approximately fifty pragmatically salient exchanges were purposefully sampled where speech-act force or implicature is concentrated (e.g., prohibition→ permission pivots, clipped refusals, ellipses/dashes, hedged causation). Selection was directed by representative samples of implicatures and speech acts utilized in the original text and their corresponding equivalents in the translated texts. The implicatures and speech acts picked from *A Farewell to Arms* are chosen based on their definitions by Austin and Grice, or according to criteria established by critics and theorists who have examined the narrative. In accordance with the qualitative approach to translation analysis, the texts were comprehensively examined, and all pragmatically significant interactions were identified, categorized, and analyzed for their speech-act functions, implicature types, and translation procedures. Baker (2018) and Munday (2016) contend that manual analysis is crucial in pragmatic and discourse-oriented translation research, since it facilitates interpretive sensitivity to variations in meaning, stylistic nuances, and contextual inferences that automated techniques fail to capture.

To increase the methodological transparency, the analysis reports of each dataset the following: (a) the ST pragmatic classification (speech act and implicature type); (b) the TT procedure profile; and (c) the rubric-based evaluation analysis, thus making clear that the connection between procedures and pragmatic effect is explicitly recorded, rather than assumed.

This study adopts a qualitative, product-oriented textual analysis situated within Holmes' Descriptive Translation Studies, with a light process perspective to explain observed choices. Austin's Speech Act Theory and Grice's theory of implicature provide the pragmatic lens for modeling illocutionary force and inference in the English source text (ST), while Vinay and Darbelnet's taxonomy is used to profile procedures in the Arabic target texts (TTs). The corpus comprises Ernest Hemingway's *A Farewell to Arms* and two published Arabic translations (Naseem, 1972; Baalbaki, 1977).

4. Results

Data set number one:

The hallway scene encodes grief and agency through minimalist turns, repeated refusals, and aborted lines (e.g., "I cannot tell you", "The operation proved"). In Austin's terms, the doctor's utterances mix Directives (offers to escort) and Representatives/Expressives (helpless sympathy), while Henry counters with Directives (refusals; topic-closure: "I do not want to talk about it") and terse Representatives ("There's nothing to say"). Gricean particularized implicature (PCI) arises from ellipsis and dashes, with strategic pressure on Quantity (extreme brevity), Relation (topic refusal), and Manner (broken, disfluent lines), inviting the reader to infer an unsayable tragic outcome and Henry's demand for solitude.

TT1 tends toward amplification/explicitation and register elevation (e.g., "... فقط تسمح لي", rights-based "ليس من حقك", added plea "أرجوك...", stage direction "نحو المصعد"), and it resolves the ST's suspended utterances into full statements. This dampens the PCI of ineffability and diffuses illocutionary force (e.g., "بإمكانك جميعاً أن تخرجن" replaces two sharp imperatives). TT2 largely preserves brevity, ellipsis, and cadence (e.g., "... برهنت العملية الجراحية ...", "... لك", crisp "شكراً"; imperative pair "أخرجي... ولتخرج"), thereby maintaining the implicature of grief-closure and the directive force of Henry's agency.

Procedure-wise (Vinay & Darbelnet):

- TT1: Literal base with frequent Amplification (AMP)/Adaptation (ADAPT)/Modulation (MOD); a notable Omission of the aborted "operation proved—" thread; MOD shifts nurse's procedural "can't now" into deontic "not your right," altering force and tone.
- TT2: Predominantly Literal/Equivalence with controlled Reduction (RED); ellipses mirror the ST's dashes, and imperatives are retained, conserving illocution and implicature.

TT1 = 6/11 (Fair) vs TT2 = 11/11 (Excellent). TT2 better recreates the ST's illocutionary profile and Gricean implicatures, while TT1's explicitation and register lift reduce the inferential workload intended by Hemingway's style.

Data set number two:

The bedside scene encodes stoic acceptance and fragile agency through minimalist turns and a pivotal Directive→Directive reversal in the touch exchange ("Don't touch me." → "You ... touch me all you want."). In Austin's terms, Catherine alternates Representatives/Expressives ("I'm going to die ... I hate it.") with Directives (prohibition then permission), while the narrator supplies Expressives/Representatives of reassurance ("You're all right, Cat"). Gricean particularized implicature (PCI) arises from brevity and micro-reversals: calm assertions plus the swift permission invite the reader to infer composure alongside aversion to death; the late coda ("I'm not afraid. I just hate it.") sharpens the stance as non-fear vs. dislike, without explicit commentary.

TT1 tends toward amplification/explicitation and occasional force drift: added pleas and vocatives ("أرجوك ألاً تبكي", repeated endearments) heighten sentiment; crucially, Catherine's permission is recast as a declarative prediction («سوف تلمسني كثيراً»), weakening the illocutionary punch of the ST's permission. TT1, however, retains the closing stance contrast ("... لست خائفة ... أمقت"), albeit with a romantic adaptation

(«أن أفرقك»), which reframes the implicature toward separation rather than existential aversion.

TT2 largely preserves brevity, cadence, and directive shapes: reassurance remains economical; the prohibition→permission sequence is kept as prohibition + explicit permission («... بإمكانك أن تمسني ما شئت» → «لا تمسني»), conserving agency and rhythm; the “letter” line is rendered idiomatically with restraint. The principal drawback is an omission of the final line (“I’m not afraid. I just hate it.”), which slightly narrows the pragmatic contour otherwise sustained by the translation’s minimalism.

Procedure-wise (Vinay & Darbelnet):

- TT1: Literal base with frequent Amplification (AMP)/Modulation (MOD)/Adaptation (ADAPT); one salient force shift (permission → declarative); minor lexical slip (الشعوب ↔ الشحوب).
- TT2: Predominantly Literal/Equivalence with Reduction (RED); imperatives and turn length mirrored; a single Omission (final stance line).

TT1 = 8/11 (Good) vs TT2 = 10/11 (Very good). TT2 better preserves the ST’s illocutionary profile and implicature-driven minimalism, while TT1 contributes full propositional coverage at the expense of over-explication and a weakened permission act.

Data set number three:

The delivery-room exchange encodes reassurance, pain, and veiled bad news through clipped turns, nurse-imposed silence (“Sh— don’t talk”), and a crucial incongruity: the narrator’s upbeat Representative (“He’s fine”) is immediately shadowed by “the nurse look[ing] at me strangely,” which invites a particularized implicature (PCI) that all is not fine despite the assertion. In Austin’s terms, the scene interleaves Directives (hushing; “Don’t talk”) with Expressives/Representatives (Catherine’s pain, the narrator’s reassurance) and closes on a darkly comic descriptive Representative (“like a skinned rabbit with a puckered-up old man’s face”) that sustains Hemingway’s affective restraint. Gricean pressure falls on Quality (possible mismatch between truth and reassurance), Relation (nurse’s look as a relevance cue), and Manner (economy and deadpan simile), prompting the reader to infer concealed trouble beneath phatic comfort.

TT1 tends toward amplification, rephrasing, and additions that reframe the scene: it inserts extra vocatives, questions, and instructions (e.g., asking the narrator to leave or eat), upgrades reassurance to emphatic praise (“رائع جداً”), and omits/muddles the key dark-humor simile. Speaker attributions occasionally blur, and the nurse’s concise hushing expands into noisy stage business. These choices resolve Hemingway’s ellipses into explicit sentiment, dampen the Quality-based implicature (by overselling “fine”), and diffuse illocutionary force (the simple hush becomes a cluster of added moves).

TT2 largely preserves brevity, cadence, and force: nurse Directives remain terse; the narrator’s reassurance is economical; the nurse’s “strange” look is retained as a cue; and the closing simile is rendered faithfully («أرنب مسلوخ... وجه متغضن كوجه العجائز»), maintaining the scene’s deadpan register and inferential load. Minor padding (“...متعباً جداً”) and one slightly odd reassurance collocation (“بخير كثير”) do not materially alter the pragmatic profile.

Procedure-wise (Vinay & Darbelnet):

- TT1: Literal base with frequent Amplification (AMP)/Adaptation (ADAPT)/Modulation (MOD), Transposition/Reordering, and salient Omission (the skinned-rabbit simile/attenuation). Additions and sentimentality raise register and neutralize PCI.
- TT2: Predominantly Literal/Equivalence with light Reduction (RED); simile and hush Directives retained; minimal stylistic lift.

Scores: TT1 = 4/11 (Weak) vs TT2 = 10/11 (Very good). TT2 better reproduces the ST’s illocutionary profile and Gricean implicature (reassurance shadowed by suspicion; deadpan imagery), whereas TT1’s additions, sentimentality, and omission of key imagery flatten the inferential texture intended by Hemingway’s minimalist style.

Data set number four:

The corridor exchange stages the incremental disclosure of the baby’s stillbirth through clipped Q&A and two key cues: the nurse’s “Didn’t you know?” and, later, “I thought you knew.” In Austin’s terms, the sequence interweaves Representatives (facts about breathing and the cord), Directives (“May I speak to you?” → moving to the hall), and soft Expressives (“It’s such a shame”). Gricean PCI is driven by Relation/Quantity/Manner: the nurse’s surprise and hedging (“...or something”) invite the reader to infer prior miscommunication and clinical uncertainty while the information is revealed gradually (alive? → dead? → cause/attempts → evaluative lament).

TT1 skews the pragmatics by front-loading and over-writing: “لم يكن حياً كما ظنوه للوهلة الأولى” adds an inference not in the ST; the hedged causation and cord detail are omitted (“كان الحبل السري... أو شيء من هذا القبيل” disappears), and the death is intensified via repetition (“.. ميت.. ميت”). The nurse’s closing line is replaced with an invented directive (“...الأفضل أن تعودى”)—erasing the ST’s crucial “I thought you knew” cue that carries the miscommunication PCI. Register is raised (“فاجعة محزنة... صيباً فاخراً”) and reassurance oversold earlier (“رائع جداً”), which together flatten the stepwise revelation and neutralize hedging-based implicature.

TT2 largely preserves the ST’s cadence and staging: hall movement, stepwise Q&A, and the cord + hedging (“كان الحبل السري يطوق عنقه أو”) are retained; “ظننت أنك عرفت” keeps the surprise PCI intact. There is some register lift (“وأسفاه! غلاماً ضخماً رائعاً”) and one added, minor instruction at the end, but these do not materially disturb the illocutionary profile or the gradual disclosure. Overall, the Representative content, the nurse’s Expressive, and the Manner hedging survive, sustaining the intended inference of prior misunderstanding and clinical contingency.

Procedure-wise (Vinay & Darbelnet):

- TT1: Literal base with heavy Amplification (AMP)/Adaptation (ADAPT), Omission (cord + hedging), Modulation (added “اللوهلة الأولى”), and Insertion of a closing directive—collectively compressing revelation and weakening PCI.
- TT2: Predominantly Literal/Equivalence with light Reduction (RED); hedging and cause retained; mild AMP in lament; a small added instruction post-reveal.

Scores: TT1 = 5/11 (Weak/Fair) vs TT2 = 9/11 (Good). TT2 better preserves the ST’s stepwise disclosure, hedged causation, and miscommunication implicature, whereas TT1’s omissions and additions blunt the scene’s inferential architecture.

Data set number five:

This bedside exchange stages oscillation between death-anticipation and reassurance, punctuated by an urgent imperative (“Give it to me quick”). In Austin’s terms, Catherine alternates Representatives/Expressives (“I’m going to die... I get so tired of it”) with a final Commissive (“I won’t let myself die”), while the interlocutor counters with Directives/Expressives of reassurance (“You won’t. You can’t.” / “I won’t let you.”). The scene’s Gricean PCI hinges on Manner (staccato turns; repetition), Quantity (minimal reasons but strong claims), and the unspecified object of the imperative (“it”), which pragmatically points to immediate relief (analgesia/anaesthesia) without naming it—heightening urgency while keeping the referent implicit.

TT1 leans into amplification and sentiment: it adds end-stopping and vocatives (“يا كات العزيزة”), recasts fatigue as finality (“أحس أن كل شيء”), and specifies the implicit “it” as “الغاز”—an explicitation that removes the ST’s purposeful indeterminacy. It also compresses the dual reassurance (“You won’t. You can’t.”) into a single line and slightly reorders the conditional (“ولكن، ماذا لو مت؟”). These choices soften illocutionary punch (less emphatic prohibition via two-step reassurance) and reduce implicature by explaining what the ST leaves inferred, though the closing self-Commissive (“لن أدع نفسي تموت”) is retained.

TT2 largely preserves sequence, brevity, and force: the reassurance remains a two-beat prohibition (“.لا. لن تموتي. أنت لا تستطيعين أن تموتي”), the conditional is faithful (“ولكن ماذا لو فُذِر لي أن أموت؟”), and the urgent imperative keeps the unspecified object (“أعطني إياه في”)—(سرعة)—matching the ST’s implicitness. Diction is slightly elevated (“أستشعر”) but maintains the scene’s cadence; the final Commissive is intact.

Procedure-wise (Vinay & Darbelnet):

- TT1: Literal base with Amplification (AMP)/Modulation (MOD) and salient Explicitation/Adaptation (naming “الغاز”), plus Reduction of the two-part reassurance to one. These moves erode PCI and trim the emphatic rhythm.
- TT2: Predominantly Literal/Equivalence with light Reduction (RED); preserves turn order, the two-step reassurance, and the implicit object, thus conserving both illocution and implicature.

Scores: TT1 = 7/11 (Fair/Good) vs TT2 = 10/11 (Very good). TT2 better sustains the ST’s illocutionary profile (distinct prohibitions, urgent directive, final self-commitment) and the implicature carried by the unspecified “it,” whereas TT1’s explicitation and tonal lift diminish Hemingway’s minimalist effect.

5. Discussion

This study examined how two Arabic translations render the speech acts and conversational implicatures of Ernest Hemingway’s *A Farewell to Arms*, using Austin’s Speech Act Theory, Grice’s theory of implicature, and Vinay & Darbelnet’s translation procedures as the analytical lens. Across the five datasets, the English source text (ST) consistently encodes meaning through minimalist turns, clipped cadence, ellipses/dashes, hedged causation, and repetition—devices that shift interpretive work to the reader. In this stylistic ecology, illocutionary force (e.g., a prohibition, a permission, a refusal) and particularized implicature (PCI) frequently arise not from what is stated but from how it is said (brevity, broken lines) and what is left unsaid (aborted clauses, ellipses, hedges).

Speech acts in the ST and their translation

Across scenes of grief, delivery, disclosure, and bedside crisis, the ST interleaves:

- Directives (e.g., hushing, refusals, prohibitions → permissions),
- Representatives (clinical states, outcomes, factual updates),
- Expressives (tenderness, fatigue, pain), and
- Momentary Commissives (self-pledges to survive; vows to protect).

The analysis shows that preserving illocutionary type and strength is decisive. When the ST shifts Directive → Directive (e.g., “Don’t touch me.” → “You ... touch me all you want.”), the reader experiences a fast restoration of agency. Where the translation rephrases a permission as a declarative prediction, the illocution weakens and the scene’s dramatic pivot blurs. Similarly, where the ST stages two-beat prohibitions (“You won’t. You can’t.”), collapsing them into one beat dilutes the emphatic cadence that underwrites the reassurance.

Thus, the patterns for translation were:

1. TT2 tends to preserve directive shapes, cadence, and turn length, maintaining the illocutionary profile.

2. TT1 frequently elevates register and adds sentiment/vocatives, and occasionally shifts force (e.g., permission → declarative), which softens the pragmatic effect.

Implicature and the reader's inferential work

Hemingway's implicature arises chiefly from calibrated ellipsis and economy (Manner/Quantity), with topic pivots (Relation) and reassurances tinged by doubt (Quality). The main carriers are aborted or hedged statements ("I cannot tell you—"; "the cord ... or something") and minimalist refusals whose stoic cadence invites inference. Preservation is strongest when translations retain ellipses, dashes, hedges, and clipped two-beat assertions, sustaining ambiguity and rhythm. Losses occur through explicitation or amplification (naming the indeterminate, adding causes or stage directions), omission of key hedges or stance lines ("I'm not afraid. I just hate it."), and register lift or romantic padding that recast existential stoicism as melodrama. Overall, TT2 largely maintains ellipsis, hedges, staccato cadence, and unspecified objects of urgent imperatives, preserving the reader's inferential role, whereas TT1 tends to front-load and sentimentalize, resolving designed ambiguities and thereby neutralizing implicature.

Translation procedures and their pragmatic effects

Using Vinay and Darbelnet's procedures, the evidence shows a tight link between technique and pragmatic fidelity. Literal or Equivalence—often coupled with Reduction—best preserves particularized conversational implicature (PCI) when the source text hinges on economy and ellipsis. In these cases, translators maintain turn boundaries, directive contours, hedges, and deadpan imagery, thereby retaining Hemingway's calibrated silences and rhythmic minimalism; this profile predominates in TT2.

By contrast, Amplification, Adaptation, and Modulation can aid idiomatic fit, but when deployed to explain the unsaid, elevate register, or inject sentiment, they weaken PCI, blur illocutionary force, reframe and scene patterns frequent in TT1. Omission is most harmful when it removes implicature carriers (ellipses, hedges, key stance lines) or the beats that create emphatic rhythm, since these deletions dismantle the inferential work the text assigns to the reader.

Cross-dataset synthesis

Across datasets, a consistent pattern emerges: TT2's formal economy and procedural restraint preserve Hemingway's implicature, while TT1's explicitation and register lift tend to flatten it. In Dataset 1 (hallway) and Dataset 4 (disclosure), TT2's retention of ellipses and hedges sustains grief-closure and stepwise revelation; TT1's added directions and explanatory phrasing foreclose inference. Dataset 2 (bedside touch) shows TT2 maintaining the Directive→Directive reversal and verbal economy, whereas TT1, despite keeping the final stance line, weakens the texture of permission and reframes the implicature by importing romantic color. In Dataset 3 (delivery room), TT2 preserves the deadpan simile and the nurse's hush, keeping the Quality-based tension taut; TT1 introduces sentiment and stage business that mute the pragmatic charge. Dataset 5 (death anticipation) again demonstrates TT2's restraint, keeping the unspecified object of urgency and two-beat reassurance, while TT1 names it ("gas"), collapsing purposeful indeterminacy. Taken together, these results indicate that Literal/Equivalence paired with Reduction better conserves both illocution and implicature in Arabic renderings of minimalist Hemingway.

These findings carry specific implications for Arabic literary translation. The pull of Arabic discourse norms, vocatives, politeness formulas, explanatory additions, and register lift can inadvertently reallocate meaning from implicature to explicit statement, altering reader experience in prose architected by silence, hedges, and rhythm. Editors and translators should therefore preserve carriers of implicature (ellipses/dashes, hedges such as "... أو شيء من هذا القبيل", clipped refusals, two-beat patterns), and guard illocutionary force by keeping imperatives as imperatives, maintaining permissions, and retaining sequential beats (e.g., "You won't. You can't."). They should avoid unnecessary explicitation that names implicit referents or over-explains causes, match register to scene to prevent stoicism from drifting into melodrama, and allow idiomatic adjustments only when they recreate force and implicature (Equivalence/Modulation), not when they explain them away.

Convergence and divergence with previous studies

The current research conclusions are not only consistent with the past studies in the area of pragmatic meaning and literary translation, but also relate to the past studies in the field that are interested in implicature, explicability, and pragmatic equivalence in English-Arabic translations. Consistent with previous studies, the findings support the thesis that Arabic literary translations usually place an emphasis on explicitation, register elevation, and at the cost of conversational implicature and pragmatic subtlety. The pattern has been observed over and over again in the research on Arabic translation of Hemingway and other minimalist prose. In the example of Abualadas (2019), systematic explicitation exists in Arabic versions of *A Farewell to Arms*, stating that translation participants often address the problem of ellipsis and implied meaning to clarify and direct the reader better. The current results are consistent with this observation, particularly in TT1, where amplification, adaptation, and omission neutralize the application of ellipsis-based implicatures and dilute the strength of illocutionary force time after time.

On the same note, current findings can be compared to those found by Qordawi (2021) on conversational implicature in *The Old Man and the Sea*, which show that Hemingway uses brevity, silence, and inference as fundamental aspects of the dialogue, placing a large interpretive burden on the reader. The current paper affirms that the same pragmatic strategies can be found in both works, *A Farewell to Arms*, and that the same strategies, namely, ellipsis, clipped turns, hedging and two-beat cadence, are fundamental to *A Farewell to Arms* and that their maintenance or failure determines meaning in translation. In that regard, the study overlaps with the prior pragmatic

research where implicature is seen as a central stylistic and communicative aspect of the Hemingway narrative discourse. Meanwhile, the results contrast with previous pieces of literature in a number of significant ways. Unlike most of the previous studies that may research conversational implicature or Speech Act separately, with a tendency to study selected chapters or specific pragmatic phenomena, the given research conducts a combination of Speech Act Theory and Gricean implicature into one interconnected analytical framework, charting translation processes (Vinay and Darbelnet) onto pragmatic consequences. This synthesis shows that pragmatic loss in translation is more than an incidental consequence of cultural or linguistic disparities, but is tightly connected to particular procedural decisions, like the production of the directives into the declaratives, how to resolve aborted utterances or the naming of the intentionally implicit referents. In this sense, this study expands on the work by Abualadas (2019) by showing that explicitation influences not only implicature but also illocutionary setup and interactional processes.

Furthermore, although past research tends to suggest that literal translation is prone to pragmatic insufficiency, the current results balance such a misconception. The constant superiority of TT2 points to the possibility of Literal/Equivalence processes with the choice of controlled Reduction preserving pragmatic force and inference even better than the strategies based on amplification or adaptation. This finding contradicts the works that identify pragmatic adequacy with explicative or adaptative strategies first (e.g., Farghal & Almann, 2014), and it adheres to the more current claims in pragmatics-oriented research in translation that adherence to form, rhythm, and silence may be functionally communicative (House, 2014; Francesch & Payrató, 2024).

Lastly, the results are echoed in more recent Arabic-specific studies of figurative and implicit meaning transfer, including Khasawneh, Moindjie, and Kasuma (2025) and Alsharif and Khasawneh (2025), which point to the idea that changes that happen in the norms of translations (be they diachronic or technological) have a direct influence on the treatment of inferred meaning. The current work fits in this body of work by demonstrating that procedural restraint as opposed to procedural richness, is commonly the source of pragmatic fidelity in the literary dialogue. Thus, it enhances extant descriptive explanations and provides a sharper explanation of how and why pragmatic meaning is maintained or neutralized in English-Arabic literary translation.

6. Conclusion

The study shows that pragmatic fidelity in translating *A Farewell to Arms* hinges less on lexical equivalence than on preserving the architecture of saying and not-saying: illocutionary shapes, elliptical form, hedged causation, beat structure, and register.

Across the corpus, the translation that favored Literal/Equivalence with Reduction (TT2) more consistently recreated Austinian force and Gricean implicature, whereas the translation characterized by Amplification/Adaptation/Modulation (TT1) tended to flatten implicature, shift illocution, and raise register, thereby altering the reader's inferential pathway and the novel's tonal signature.

Although these results explain the procedural-pragmatic connection in the corpus being studied, it is important to note several limitations. First, the research is only limited to one novel and two Arabic translations; hence, findings cannot be generalized to all the English Arabic literary translation contexts. Second, it is a qualitative, product-based study with a single coder. Even though reliability was established by the use of explicit coding sheets, repeated recoding and cross-scene consistency checks, the formal inter-rater statistical measures were not calculated. Third, the evaluative rubric, as a systematically applied framework, is based on a theoretically motivated framework that might need some adjustments when applied to different genres or stylistic traditions. Lastly, the experiment is pragmatic in the presence of textual analysis of the pragmatic effect against empirical reader-response data; therefore, the consequences of the study are analytically reconstructions, and are not experimentally determined.

The paper has practical implications as well in terms of practice to both translators and educators. The findings stress that Arabic literary translators need to retain formal vehicles of implicature, including an ellipsis, hedge, a two-beat dialogic form, and the directive/permission shift. As for minimalistic prose, translators ought to endeavor procedural modesty, and specify minimum expression of clarification that serves to address deliberate ambiguity or move beyond the tonal cost of the source text to a higher register. In the context of translation pedagogy, the incorporation of pragmatic profiling in the classroom setting can enhance the student awareness of the illocutionary force and implicature retention. Analytical accuracy and professional skill may be improved through training exercises in which the speech-act types, translation processes to pragmatic implications, and the extent to which amplification or diminution changes inferential load must be identified.

Future studies can take this investigation in a number of directions. The corpus might be extended with other works of Hemingway or other minimalist writers in order to test the reliability of the relationship between procedure and pragmatic fidelity. A comparative study across time of Arabic translations might offer insight into whether the change or changes in translation normativity contribute to a systematic change in the implicature preservation. Further experimental reader-response research could be done into the role of differences in ellipsis, hedging, and dialogic rhythm on interpretive processing in Arabic. Lastly, more interdisciplinary solutions, such as intrinsic corpus-based techniques and pragmatic analysis, may streamline the definition of implicature carriers and can offer finer modeling of pragmatic loss and retention in literary translation.

Acknowledgments

Not applicable

Author Contributions

Ahmad Ail Albtoosh and Mohamed Abdou Moindjie were responsible for the study design and revisions. Ahmad Ali Albtoosh was

responsible for data identification. Ahmad Ali Albitoosh drafted the manuscript, and Mohammad Abdou Moindjie revised it. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Funding

Not applicable

Competing interests

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper

Informed consent

Obtained.

Ethics approval

The Publication Ethics Committee of the Sciedu Press.

The journal's policies adhere to the Core Practices established by the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE).

Provenance and peer review

Not commissioned; externally double-blind peer reviewed.

Data availability statement

The data that support the findings of this study are available on request from the corresponding author. The data are not publicly available due to privacy or ethical restrictions.

Data sharing statement

No additional data are available.

Open access

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

AI Use Disclosure

A language editing tool with the help of AI was employed to enhance clarity, grammar, and style consistency of the manuscript. The authors performed all research design, data selection, coding steps, analysis, interpretation and reference verification. The authors have assured that the sources cited were all personally consulted and verified, and they uphold the responsibility of the accuracy, integrity, and scholarly accountability of the work to meet the AI policy of the journal.

References

- Abualadas, O. A. (2019.). Systematic shifts in implicatures in two Arabic translations of Ernest Hemingway's a farewell to arms. *International Journal of Comparative Literature and Translation Studies*. Retrieved from <https://journals.aiac.org.au/index.php/IJCLTS/article/view/5675>
- Al-Azzawi, K. (2019). Pragmatics - Implicature. University of Mosul. <https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.29133.77284>
- Alsharif, B., & khasawneh, R. (2025). Beyond the Literal: Machine Translation Performance and Strategies in Rendering Audiovisual Political Idioms. *Research Journal in Advanced Humanities*, 6(2). <https://doi.org/10.58256/4442fg06>
- Alsharif, B., & Khasawneh, R. (2025). Startegies of Rendering Metaphor from Arabic into
- Austin, J. (1962). *How to do things with words*. Oxford: University Press.
- Baalbaki, M. (1977). *Wadā'an lil-silāḥ* [وداعًا للسلاح] (Arabic translation of *A farewell to arms*). Dar Al-Ilm Lil-Malayin.
- Baker, M. (2018). *In other words: A coursebook on translation*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315619187>
- Barkhordar, S. Y. (2018). The Assessment of Machine Translation According to Holmes' Map of Translation Studies. *Translation Journal*, 21(1).
- Chesterman, A. (2012). *Memes of translation: The spread of ideas in translation theory*.
- Dai, L. (2019, June). Empiricism and hermeneutics in descriptive translation studies. In *3rd International Conference on Economics and Management, Education, Humanities and Social Sciences (EMEHSS 2019)* (pp. 233-236). Atlantis Press. <https://doi.org/10.2991/emehss-19.2019.47>
- Farghal, M., & Almanna, A. (2014). Some pragmatic aspects of Arabic/English translation of literary texts. *Jordan Journal of Modern*

Languages and Literature, 6(2), 93-114.

- Fitriana, I. (2015). Pragmatic's role for properly translating expressive speech acts in Woods' *Big Romance Novel*. In *Prasasti: Conference Series* (pp. 478-482).
- Francesch, P., & Payrató, L. (2024). Pragmatic Ambiguity, Implicatures, and Translation 1. *Studia Linguistica*, 78(1), 156-185. <https://doi.org/10.1111/stul.12219>
- Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In *Speech acts* (pp. 41-58). Brill. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004368811_003
- He, G., Gao, Z., Jiang, Z., Kang, Y., Sun, C., Liu, X., & Lu, W. (2020, July). Think Beyond the Word: Understanding the Implied Textual Meaning by Digesting Context, Local, and Noise. In *Proceedings of the 43rd international ACM SIGIR conference on research and development in information retrieval* (pp. 2297-2306).
- House, J. (2014). *Translation quality assessment: Past and present*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137025487_13
- IvyPanda. (2020, July 1). *Descriptive Translation Studies Benefits and Limitations*. Retrieved from <https://ivypanda.com/essays/descriptive-translation-studies-benefits-and-limitations/>
- Khasawneh, R. R., Moindjie, M. A., & Kasuma, S. A. A. (2025). Diachronic translation of figures of speech in Antara's Mu'allaqa. *World Journal of English Language*, 15(3), 290-302. <https://doi.org/10.5430/wjel.v15n3p290>
- Larson, M. L. (1997). *Meaning-based translation: A guide to cross-language equivalence*. Bloomsbury Publishing PLC.
- Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511813313>
- Marty, P., Romoli, J., Sudo, Y., & Breheny, R. (2024). Implicature priming, salience, and context adaptation. *Cognition*, 244, 105667. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2023.105667>
- Maskuri Srilistyanto, D., & Sutopo, A. (2016). *Translation Analysis On "Laundry Guidelines" Of Samsung Wf 8692 Nfv* (Doctoral dissertation, Universitas Muhammadiyah Surakarta).
- Munday, J. (2001). *Introducing translation studies: Theories and applications*. Routledge.
- Munday, J. (2016). *Introducing translation studies: Theories and applications* (4th ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315691862>
- Munday, J., & Vasserman, E. (2022). The name and nature of translation studies: A reappraisal. *Translation and Translanguaging in Multilingual Contexts*, 8(2), 101-113. <https://doi.org/10.1075/ttmc.00089.mun>
- Naseem, R. (1972). *Wadā'an lil-silāh* [وداعاً للسلاح] (Arabic translation of *A farewell to arms*). Dar Al-Adab.
- Newmark, P. (1988). *A textbook of translation* (Vol. 66, pp. 1-312). New York: Prentice hall.
- Ozolins, U. E. (2009). Cholibudin. 2006. The Technique of Making Idiomatic Translation. Bekasi: Kesaint Blanc.
- Pradita, I. (2012). An introduction to translation studies: An overview. *Journal of English and Education (JEE)*. <https://doi.org/10.20885/jee.v6i2.4433>
- Qordawi, M. (2021). *A study of conversational implicature In The Old Man And The Sea novel written By Ernest Hemingway* (Doctoral dissertation, Universitas Islam Riau).
- Rett, J. (2015). Measure phrase equatives and modified numerals. *Journal of Semantics*, 32(3), 425-475. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jos/ffu004>
- Rosa, A. A. (2012). Descriptive translation studies (DTS). In *Handbook of translation studies* (pp. 94-104). John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Salamah, D. (2021). Translation competence and translator training: A review. *International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Translation*, 4(3), 276-291. <https://doi.org/10.32996/ijllt.2021.4.3.29>
- Searle, J. R. (1976). A classification of illocutionary acts1. *Language in society*, 5(1), 1-23. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500006837>
- Sipayung, K. T. (2018). The impact of translation shift and method on translation accuracy found at bilingual history textbook. *Humaniora*, 30(1), 58-66. <https://doi.org/10.22146/jh.27754>
- Syafrizal, S., & Rohmawati, C. (2018). Translation methods in a walk to remember novel translated into kan kukenang selalu. *Journal of English Language Studies*, 3(2), 139-154. <https://doi.org/10.30870/jels.v3i2.3449>
- Toury, G. (2012). *Descriptive translation studies: And beyond*. <https://doi.org/10.1075/btl.100>
- Vallauri, E. L., Cominetti, F., & Masia, V. (2022). The persuasive and manipulative power of implicit communication. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 197, 1-7. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2022.04.015>
- Vinay, J. P., & Darbelnet, J. (2000). A Methodology for translation in venutti (ed.). The translation study reader. Wang, G., & Xin, Y. (2024). An analytical framework for corpus-based translation studies. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 11(1), 1-12. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-024-04250-4>

Appendix

Data set number one

Data Excerpt (ST)

Outside the room, in the hall, I spoke to the doctor, "Is there anything I can do to-night?"

"No. There is nothing to do. Can I take you to your hotel?"

"No, thank you. I am going to stay here a while."

"I know there is nothing to say. I cannot tell you--"

"No," I said. "There's nothing to say."

"Good-night," he said. "I cannot take you to your hotel?"

"No, thank you."

"It was the only thing to do," he said. "The operation proved- -"

• "

"I do not want to talk about it," I said.

"I would like to take you to your hotel."

"No, thank you."

He went down the hall. I went to the door of the room.

"You can't come in now," one of the nurses said.

"Yes I can," I said.

"You can't come in yet."

"You get out," I said. "The other one too."

Translation 1 (TT1)

الطبيب : وفي الرواق خارج الغرفة سال

على هناك ما يمكن أن أقدمه لك ؟

. لا .. لا شيء أبدا ، اذا كنت فقط تسمح لي بإيصالك إلى الفندق

. لا ، أشكرك ، أريد البقاء هنا فترة أخرى

. اعرف انه لا يوجد ما يقال

. فأنا لا أستطيع أن أخبرك

.. ارجوك ، لا اريد السماح عنها

أفضل أن أحملك معي إلى الفندق

. لا - شكرا

. وخطا نحو المصعد ، بينما اتجهت أنا إلى الداخل

- ليس من حقك الدخول إليها السيد .
خاطبتني إحدى الممرضات .
- بلى من حقى . لا ، ليس من حقك .
بإمكانك جميعا ان تخرجن .

Translation 2 (TT2)

خارج الغرفة في الرواق، تحدثت إلى الطبيب:

هل ثمة شيء علي أن أفعله هذه الليلة؟-

« لا . ليس ثمة ما تفعله. هل أستطيع أن أوصلك إلى فندقك؟»

« . لا . شكراً . سوف أبقى هنا فترة قصيرة.»

« أنا أدري أنه ليس ثمة ما يقال أنا لا أستطيع أن أقول لك»

« .. فقلت : «لا . ليس ثمة ما يقال

وقال: «إلى اللقاء.» ثم استدرك : «ألا أستطيع أن أوصلك إلى فندقك؟

» . لا . شكراً»

.... قال : «لم يكن ثمة وسيلة غيرها . لقد برهنت العملية الجراحية

» .. فقلت : «أنا لا أريد أن أتحدث عن ذلك

» . إني مستعد لإيصالك إلى فندقك»

» . لا . شكراً»

. مضى لسبيله مجتازاً الرواق ومضيت أنا نحو باب الغرفة

« قالت إحدى الممرضات : «أنت لا تستطيع أن تدخل الآن

» ولكني أريد أن أدخل»

« ليس في استطاعتك أن تدخل الآن »
« .. أخرجني أنت من هنا . ولتخرج الممرضة الأخرى أيضاً »

Data set two :

Data Excerpt (ST)

Catherine looked at me and smiled. I bent down over the bed and started to cry.
"Poor darling," Catherine said very softly. She looked gray.
"You're all right, Cat," I said. "You're going to be all right."
"I'm going to die," she said; then waited and said, "I hate it."
I took her hand.
"Don't touch me," she said. I let go of her hand. She smiled.
"Poor darling. You touch me all you want."
"You'll be all right, Cat. I know you'll be all right."
"I meant to write you a letter to have if anything happened, but I didn't do it."
"Do you want me to get a priest or any one to come and see you?"
"Just you," she said. Then a little later, "I'm not afraid. I just hate it."

Translation 1 (TT1)

(الشحوب=)يا حبيبي المسكين» قالت بصوت أقرب إلى الهمس، ووجهها أشد ما يكون من الشحوب»
« لا تخافي يا كات العزيزة. أنت في حالة حسنة... أرجوك ألا تبكي»
« إني مائتة يا فرد... كم أمقت أن أموت يا فرد المسكين»
« لا تلمسني يا فرد... ثم: «سوف تلمسني كثيراً»
«... لا يا كات العزيزة، سوف تتحسنين قريباً»
« أردت أن أكتب لك رسالة قبل أن تصل، ولكني لم أستطع»
« هل ترغبين في إحضار كاهن لرؤيتك؟»
«... لا، فقط أنت يا... (وغصت) لست خائفة من الموت ولكني أمقت أن أفارقك يا فرد»

Translation 2 (TT2)

«... قالت كاترين في رقة بالغة: أيها الحبيب المسكين! لقد بدت رمادية»
« أنت بخير يا كات. إنك تستردين عافيتك»
« ساموت» ثم: «أنا أكره ذلك»
« لا تمسني... » «يا حبيبي المسكين، لا بأس، بإمكانك أن تمسني ما شئت»
« سوف تستردين عافيتك يا كات. أنا أعلم أنك سوف تستردين عافيتك»
« كنت أعتزم أن أكتب لك رسالة خشية أن يحدث شيء، ولكني لم أفعل»
« هل تودين أن أستدعي كاهناً أو أي شخص آخر لكي يراك؟»
« لا أريد غيرك»

Data set 3 :

"Hello, you sweet." "What sort of baby was it?" "Sh--don't talk," the nurse said. "A boy. He's long and wide and dark." "Is he all right?"
"Yes," I said. "He's fine." I saw the nurse look at me strangely. "I'm awfully tired," Catherine said. "And I hurt like hell. Are you all right, darling?" "I'm fine. Don't talk." "You were lovely to me. Oh, darling, I hurt dreadfully. What does he look like?" "He looks like a skinned rabbit with a puckered-up oldman's face."

صبي، إنه طويل - : مرحبا يا حبيبي أي جنس هذا الشقي الصغير؟ صة . لا تتكلمي . أجابتها الممرضة . بينما قلت أنا - . مرحبا يا عزيزي، قالتها بصوت ضعيف متهدج : T1
هل أنت مسرور يا عزيزي؟ نعم، ولكن لا تتكلمي . عريض اسمر اللون . هل هو في حالة حسنة؟ نعم، رائع جدا؟ ورأيت الممرضة تنظر الى امارات الدهشة تم كل وجهها
ان يا عزيزي لقد كنت نبيلاً جداً طيلة حياتك معي ، اني احس بالالم يشتد ، أه، الله يكاد يصر عني . من يشبه الصبي؟ صاحت الممرضة ثم التفتت نحوي : - لا تتكلمي . - الان
اذهب وكل بعض الشيء يا عزيزي . كما تريدن . ارجوك أن تغادر الغرفة الان-

صبي. إنه طويل، « . هـ! لا تتكلمي» : من أي نوع كان ذلك الوليد؟ فقالت الممرضة « هـ! هـ! أيتها الحبيبة» . « كان صوتها ضعيفاً جداً، متعباً جداً ! هـ! هـ! يا حبيبي» - T2
بخير؟ أنا متعبة إلى حد مخيف . وقالت كاترين . ورأيت الممرضة تنظر إلي وعلى وجهها انطباع غريبة » . نعم . إنه في حالة ممتازة : فقلت « أهو بخير؟ » - . عريض، أسمر
إنه يبدو أشبه شيء بأرنب مسلوخ الجلد ذي -كيف شكله ؟ . لقد كنت رقيقاً بي . أه يا حبيبي، إنني أتوقع توجعاً رهيباً.. بخير كثير . لا تتكلمي - إن الالام تمزقني تمزقاً . هل أنت
وجه متغضن كوجوه الجانز . . »

Data set 4 :

"May I speak to you?" I said to the nurse. She came out in the hall with me. I walked a little way down the hall. "What's the matter with

the baby?" I asked. "Didn't you know?" "No." "He wasn't alive." "He was dead?" "They couldn't start him breathing. The cord was caught around his neck or something." "So he's dead." "Yes. It's such a shame. He was such a fine big boy. I thought you knew."

T1: اكان ميتا؟ لم يتمكنوا من جعله - . لم يكن حيا كما ظنوه للوهلة الأولى -الم تعلم؟ - أحدث شيء للصبي؟ . هل يمكن ان اسألك أمرا فتبعيني الى الخارج ، الى عتبة الباب : T1: الأفضل ان تعودي الى جانب السيدة هنري . نعم ، انها فاجعة محزنة ... لقد كان صبيبا فأخرا ، قوي البنية-يتنفس اذن فهو .. ميت .. ميت

T2: لقد ولد ميتاً - . لم يكن الطفل حياً - - لا . « ألم تعرف؟ » ما علة الطفل؟ - : وسألتها . فخرجت معي إلى الرواق ومشيت بضع خطوات « هل أستطيع أن أقول لك كلمة؟ » عرفت . نعم ، وأسفاه! لقد كان غلاماً ضخماً رائعاً. ظننت أنك « . إذن فهو ميت- .. لقد عجزوا عن حمله على التنفس. كان الحبل السري يطوق عنقه أو شيء من هذا القبيل-«؟ (. لا ، لم أعرف من الأفضل أن ترجعي وتبقي إلى جانب السيدة- : فقلت

Data set 5 :

"Because I don't want to die and leave you, but I get so tired of it and I feel I'm going to die." "Nonsense. Everybody feels that." "Sometimes I know I'm going to die." "You won't. You can't." "But what if I should?" "Iwon't let you." "Give it to me quick. Give it to me!" Then afterward, "Iwon't die. Iwon't let myself die."

T1: اني أحيانا اشعر كاني . ما هذا يا كات العزيزة . كل انسان يشعر كذلك . لاني لا اريد ان اموت وادعك وحيدا . أه ، ولكني .. احس ان كل شيء قد انتهى .. أشعر بقرب للنهاية : T1: ما ، الغاز اعطني الغاز . لا ! لن اموت ، لن ادع نفسي تموت . أموت ، ولكن ، ماذا لو مت ؟ لن ادعك تموتين

T2: أنا أدرك في بعض - . هراء كل امرئ يستشعر ذلك-« . الأني لا أريد أن أموت وأفارقك. ولكني سئمت هذه الحال إلى أبعد الحدود، وأنا أستشعر أني سوف أموت : T2: ثم أضافت « ! أعطني إياه في سرعة. أعطني إياه-« . لن أدعك تموتين-ولكن ماذا لو قدر لي أن أموت؟ -« . لا . لن تموتي . أنت لا تستطيعين أن تموتي-« . الأحيان أني ساموت « . بعد ذلك: لن أموت. أنا لن أدع نفسي أموت