Norms of Substitution in Translation: A French–English Case Study

Mohamed Abdou Moindjie

School of Languages, Literacies and Translation, Universiti Sains Malaysia, 11800 Gelugor, Penang, Malaysia

ABSTRACT

Substitution is a discoursal grammatical cohesion; it replaces an element with a substitute with the same structural function as the substituted element. This paper investigates the language norms and translation norms of substitution in the literary text; it describes the occurrence of substitution and its structural effect in translation. The investigation is done on two novels, *Madame Bovary* by Gustave Flaubert and *Strait is the Gate* by André Gide. This study follows Halliday and Hasan's theory (1976) of cohesion and Catford's (1965) theory of translation shifts. First, the whole text is read; then, data are identified, categorized, and analyzed. The investigation reveals that English uses substitution in cases where French uses other cohesive ties like reference, ellipsis, and repetition. The shift category used to achieve substitution cohesiveness is a class shift determined by language peculiarity norms of the source and target languages. The research, therefore, reveals that the translator's invisibility and the inviolability of language norms enhance the literariness and acceptability of the target text.

Keywords: Cohesion, French-English translation, language norms, shifts, substitution, translation norms

INTRODUCTION

Translation has become more important after World War II. Therefore, linguists have considered translation one of the most important linguistic studies (Wilss, 1982). It has become an independent discipline thanks to the paper presented by Holmes in 1972 in Copenhagen. Holmes points out that the map of translation studies presents complex

problems related to "the phenomenon of translating and translations" (2000, p. 173). Therefore, descriptive translation studies (DTS) can be product-oriented, function-oriented, or process-oriented (Munday, 2016). This study is a product-oriented DTS in that it describes translation phenomena for establishing general principles. Jones (1997) points out that translation problems can be semantic, grammatical, syntactic, or metalinguistic. In the same vein, Malmkjær (2011) argues that translation is an activity that aims to render meaning from one language to another. Therefore, this paper investigates the structural and semantic problems of substitution.

The objective of descriptive studies is to investigate phenomena in translation to specify the norms that regulate and determine language translation (Lambert & van Gorp, 1985; Toury, 1985). Moreover, Lambert and van Gorp point out that translated texts "can be studied from different points of view, either in a macro-structural or in a microstructural way, focusing on linguistic patterns of various types, literary, codes, moral, religious or other non-literary patterns" (1985, p. 46). For Munday, translation studies have developed to the extent that it moves from translational operations to new approaches to "put together systematic taxonomies of translation phenomena" (2016, p. 50).

This paper investigates discoursal translation problems related to substitution because there are problems concerning language norms and translation norms, which determine the occurrence of substitution in translation. Therefore, the study will be done to describe the occurrence of substitution in terms of language and translation norms in translating literary texts from French into English.

The objectives of the paper are:

a. to investigate the function of substitution in translation
b. to describe language and translation norms of substitution
c. to assess the effect of substitution in translation.

The significance of this paper is justified by the literature review, which has shown that there is a gap in knowledge concerning the language and translation norms of substitution from French into English. The literature review shows that no research has been done on the language and translation norms of substitution from French into English. Therefore, this study intends to fill in some insights into the translatability of substitution. The paper is also intended to give some knowledge about the language norms and translation norms of substitution to linguists, translators, interpreters, students, and freelance translators. This paper's problems, significance, and objectives could not be determined without reviewing related literature on the research topic.

Literature Review

Translation Norms. Translating requires that the translator has a translation competence, which "represents knowledge

from a variety of cognitive domains acquired, stored and organized in a translator's long-term memory" (Shreve, 2012, p. 1); this competence will enable the translator to deal with norms**.** However, there is a difference between language norms and translation norms. The former are the options and restrictions of a given language, whereas the latter are the options in terms of methods, procedures, and strategies that the translator can use.

Translation and norms are related to descriptive translation studies, which describe phenomena, functions, and translators' manipulation. "Norms … perform a channeling, funneling role in that they refer problem tokens, i.e., individual utterances and occurrences, to problem types, to which a given norm can be applied" (Hermans, 1991, p. 165). For Chesterman (2017), the problems of norms are terminological problems in terms of meaning and methodology of investigation. However, Bartsch (1987) argues that there is a difference between product norms and production norms. The former deals with how a product must look in terms of linguistic correctness and appropriateness, whereas the latter deals with the methods and strategies u

In translation studies, linguistic norms are linguistic aspects that describe two linguistic systems' linguistic phenomena. Along similar lines, Catford defines translation as "the replacement of textual material in one language (SL) by equivalent material in another language (TL)" (1965, p. 20). It has brought about three

different approaches and perspectives. First, differences in language systems and language norms lead traductologists like Vinay and Darbelnet (1995), Newmark (1988), and Friederich (1969) to compare the function of linguistic norms in the source language (SL) and target language (TL). Secondly, translation theorists like Neubert (1985), Neubert and Shreve (1992), Reiß and Vermeer (1991), Göpferich (1995), and Hatim and Mason (1997) deal with translation norms beyond the sentence. Second, they are more concerned with norms and conventions of text types and genres, which the translators must consider to avoid mistranslating the textual norms and conventions. Thirdly, translation theorists like Nida (1964), Koller (1979), House (1977), and Toury (1980) consider translation as a relationship between the source language and the target language; this relationship is termed equivalence. Finally, for Aulia, strategies are used in translation when there is no equivalence in the target language (TL), believing that "the consistency of the translator in using the strategy for one term in the text translated is one of the important things during doing translation" (2012, p. 9).

However, translation quality is a question of "the accuracy of the rendition or the competence of the translator" (Domínguez et al., 2015, p. 80). Toury (1995) suggests a tripartite model embodying the norm, mediating between competence and performance. In this model, norms are defined as "strategies of translation which are repeatedly opted for, in preference to

other available strategies, in a given culture or textual system" (Toury, 1995, p. 54). This model, dealing with a text, has three hierarchical stages: initial norm, preliminary norms, and operational norms, which are interrelated to render the translated text communicative.

These theories and models have brought about many questions, which "continue to provoke controversy" (Schäffner, 1999, p. 8). The continuing interest in studying translation phenomena paves the way for new questions that must be considered in traductology.

Cohesion. There is a difference between coherence and cohesion, which are the aspects that make a text a semantic unit. The former is "a network of conceptual relations which underlie the surface text," whereas the latter is "the network of surface relations which link words and expressions in a text" (Baker, 2018, p. 235). For Gutwinski (1976), cohesion is about sentences and clauses inter-relatedness, which compose a text's semiologic structure in paragraphs that must be developed from a key sentence. Furthermore, Hoey states that "cohesion is a property of the text" (1991, p. 12), whereas coherence is related to the reader evaluation. Like Hoey (1991), Swales (1990) argues that cohesion deals with features of a text, which can be recognized throughout the text, whereas coherence deals with logical organization and connectivity of the concepts and ideas, which help the reader's evaluation and understanding. Other linguists point out that cohesion and coherence are inseparable because they are interrelated. It is because cohesion deals with the text's surface structure to signal participants' relations, and coherence is logical guidance for the reader's understanding (Baker, 2018; Bosch, 1989; Charolles, 1978; Halliday, 1985; Wales, 1998; Yunxing, 1996). Halliday and Hasan (1976) categorize cohesion into reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction, and lexical cohesion.

Substitution is a cohesive device. It is about replacing one item with another. Halliday and Hasan mention that substitution is "a relation within the text. A substitute is a sort of counter used in place of the repetition of a particular item" (1976, p. 89). Substitution does not function as a meaningful unit concerning meaning *per se*. It, therefore, deals only with the lexico-grammatical aspects to put it more clearly. There are three types of substitution: nominal substitution, e.g., one, ones, and same; verbal substitution, e.g., do/n't, does, did/n't, done, doing; clausal substitution, e.g., so, not.

However, Károly (2017) states that the translation's quality and quantity of cohesion shifts are related to systemic differences between two languages and genres. For Blum-Kulka (2000), cohesion shifts are necessary for translation because of grammatical and stylistic reasons which are specific to each language and text type; she emphasizes the importance of dealing with coherence efficiently in translation since shifts in coherence will have serious effects on the potential meaning of the target text. In addition, different understandings

of culturally different audiences can cause such coherence shifts. For Catford (1965), cohesion translation has no equivalence because it necessitates the application of shifts because of language specificity. He categorizes shifts into structure shifts, class shifts, unit shifts and intra-system shifts at the level of phonology and graphology. However, Halliday and Matthiessen state that "the organization of a text is semantic rather than formal"; it is, therefore, "the process of instantiation" (2004, pp. 524-525).

Related Studies. As far as substitution is concerned, some studies have been done in translation. For example, Liu and Hwa (2016) have carried out a study on phrasal substitution for idioms, using automatic metrics and human judgments. The study reveals that the "proposed method produces grammatical paraphrases that preserve the idioms meanings, and it outperforms other methods such as sentence compression" (Liu & Hwa, 2016, p. 371). However, some studies are also investigate cohesive substitution. For example, Farghal (2017) studies textual issues relating to cohesion and coherence in Arabic-English translation. He argues that cohesion and coherence depend on the language norms, which can be affected by the translator's unnecessary preferences. Therefore, translators must "understand the ST in terms of content and textualization before considering TT candidate counterparts" (Farghal, 2017, p. 46).

Moreover, Zhang et al. study the problem of unknown words in the substitutional translation-restoration framework "to handle the unknown words in statistical machine translation" (2013, p. 907) from Chinese into English, testing the distributional semantic model and bidirectional language model. Their study reveals that the "distributional semantic model and the bidirectional language model can both improve the translation quality" (p. 917). Correspondingly, Izwaini and Al-Omar (2019) investigate the translation of subtitling and ellipsis in Arabic subtitling; this investigation reveals a considerable number of shifts and that repetition and substitution are used more than ellipsis by the translator. In the same vein, Arhire finds, in her study about cohesive devices in translator's training, that "it is only the stylistic effect that ultimately matters" (2017, p. 174).

Even though French and English are two languages of the same family, Indo-European languages are characterized by different language norms. However, the literature review and related studies show a gap in knowledge about the language and translation norms of the cohesive textual substitution of literary texts from French into English. Therefore, the researcher has followed the following methodology to achieve the research objectives.

METHODOLOGY

The translation is "the result of a linguistic-textual operation in which a text in one language is re-contextualized in another

language" (House, 2015, p. 2). It indicates that a suitable research methodology is needed to investigate the function of textual and linguistic features. Specifically, the methodology of this study is textual analysis research (see Chesterman, 2005). Bordens and Abbott (2011) point out that research can be done using a qualitative method, a quantitative method, or both qualitative and quantitative. This idea is also supported by Saldanha and O'Brien (2014) in analyzing translation quality assessment. Saldanha and O'Brien (2014) consider research on translated texts as product-oriented research. They argue that "research on translated texts can be carried out with a descriptive/ explanatory or an evaluative approach in mind" (p. 50). This study, therefore, is descriptive qualitative research whose findings will be deduced from textual analysis of a particular text-type, novels.

This study is limited to the occurrence of cohesive substitution across sentence boundaries. Halliday and Hasan argue that "it is the inter-sentence cohesion that is significant, because that represents the variable aspect of cohesion, distinguishing one text from another" (1976, p. 9). Therefore, the investigation will be done manually; the source and target texts are wholly read. Then the data related to substitution translation are identified, collected, categorized, and analyzed. Since humans do the translated texts, a back-translation of the substitution occurrences is applied by using Google Translate to investigate if there are stylistic variant effects (see Vinay & Darbelnet, 1995).

Saldanha and O'Brien (2014) justify this data collection approach by stating that "one might wish to randomly select sentences from a large corpus of text, or it may be more appropriate to select coherent passages of text, or text that demonstrates specific linguistic features" (p. 105). Therefore, the whole texts are read, and data are identified and collected manually from 13 extracts of texts, which demonstrate specific linguistic features of substitution. These extracts are found on Madame Bovary, pages 114, 121, 124, 172, 237, 238, 382, and 408 of the source text, which corresponds to pages 85, 91, 94-95, 144, 212, 213, 366, and 394 of the target text; *la Porte Etroite* on pages 519, 539, 522, 547, 559 of the source text, which correspond on pages 35, 63, 41, 74, and 92 of the target text.

Data analyses on substitution, discussed by Moindjie (2003) in his M. A. thesis, are used to show the norms of substitution in translation. The theory used to support this research is Halliday and Hasan's (1976) theory on cohesion in English and Catford's (1965) theory on translation shifts. First, the data are compared to identify differences and similarities. After that, the researcher evaluates the translatability and effects of substitution. Finally, some extracts embodying the phenomena of substitution are produced in the discussion; the page numbers of related occurrences of the language and translation norms of substitution in the translation are provided in the discussion. The source text is labeled FST, and the target text is labeled ETT.

The corpora of this study consist of two novels and their translations. They are Flaubert's *Madame Bovary* (1965 & 1957), translated by Francis Steegmuller, and Gide's *La Porte Ėtroite* (1958), and *Strait is the Gate* (1952), translated by Dorothy Bussy. The two novels are opted to carry out this study; the choice of *Madame Bovary* and *La Porte Ėtroite* is not made at random. They are chosen because they are literary masterpieces of modern French literature whose contributions to French literature are greater than any other novels. This research methodology is effective; it has resulted in the following results.

aspects norms of substitution following Halliday and Hasan's (1976) theory of cohesion and Catford's (1965) theory of translation shifts. The results reveal that cohesive ties like reference, ellipsis, and repetition are used in ST rather than substitution. In contrast, another cohesive tie, substitution, is used in the TT to achieve cohesiveness. In addition, the category of shift that is found to function with substitution is a class shift, which is determined by language norms rather than translation norms. The research also reveals that the translator's invisibility and inviolability of language norms enhance literariness and acceptability. These results are fully discussed in the following discussion of this paper.

RESULTS

Table 1 and Table 2 show the results of the French and English language cohesive

Table 1

Cohesive norms and cohesive substitution norms in Madame Bovary

FST	Cohesive norms	ETT	Substitution cohesive norms	Category of translation shift
***Il en** est de même*	Personal pronoun	Mountain scenery does **the same**	Nominal substitution	Class shift
Acheter un autre	Ellipsis	Another **one**	Nominal substitution	Class shift
Celui-là	Demonstrative	this **one**	Nominal substitution	Class shift
C'est vrai!	Demonstrative	I feel **the same**	Nominal substitution	Class shift

Table 1 *(Continue)*

FST	Cohesive norms	ETT	Substitution cohesive norms	Category of translation shift
***Cette** acquisition*	Demonstrative	The new **one**	Nominal substitution	Class shift
C'est vrai	Demonstrative	I feel **the same**	Nominal substitution	Class shift
*Comme **celui-ci***	Demonstrative	The husky **ones**	Nominal substitution	Class shift
La dernière	Ellipsis	Every last **one**	Nominal substitution	Class shift
***Il** est vrai*	Personal pronoun	It **does**	Verbal substitution	Class shift
C'est comme moi	Demonstrative	**So** would I	Clausal substitution	Class shift
C'était dans…	Demonstrative	**So** it says	Clausal substitution	Class shift

DISCUSSION

Summary of Madame Bovary

Madame Bovary is a story about Charles Bovary and his wife Emma, a beautiful farm girl raised in a convent; Emma is a victim of her sentimental imagination. Although she is married to a kind, educated, unambitious doctor, she still hankers for the romantic adventures she used to read about in sentimental romantic novels. She becomes bored and unhappy with the middle-class life in which she lives. Therefore, she starts having disastrous love affairs with young men, Rodolphe and Léon, who are compatible with her romantic imagination. She borrows much money for her new love adventures. However, her love affair with Rodolphe and Leon is unsuccessful because they abandon her after exploiting her. Such a sentimental deception increases her boredom and depression. Unable to pay her debts, she decides to commit suicide by swallowing arsenic, and she dies a painful death. Her husband is grieved for her sudden death; he struggles to pay her debts and take care of their child, Berth. However, after discovering his wife's secret love affair letters, he cannot withstand such behavior; he dies of grief, leaving their child a complete orphan.

Substitution in Madame Bovary

This section discusses the norms of substitution cohesiveness. The analysis is done on three substitution sub-categories: nominal, verbal, and clausal.

Nominal Substitution. In investigating this category, it is found that substitution is seldom used in the ST. Moreover, other cohesive ties like demonstrative reference and repetition are often used in the ST instead of substitution, which is mostly used in the TT, for example:

Mais ils vont me déchirer le tapis, continuait-elle en les regardant de loin, son écumoire à la main.

- Le mal ne serait pas grand, répondit M. Homais, vous en achèteriez un autre !

- Un autre billard ! Exclama la veuve.

- Puisque celui- là ne tient plus, madame Lefrançois; je vous le répète, vous vous faites tort! Vous vous faites grand tort. (Flaubert, 1965, p. 114)

"But they're going to ruin my table," she said, staring over at them across the room, her skimming-spoon in her hand.

"That wouldn't be much of a loss," replied Monsieur Homais. "You'd buy another **one**."

"Another billiard table!" cried the widow.

"But this **one**'s falling apart, Madame Lefrançois! I tell you again; it's shortsighted of you not to invest in a new one! (Flaubert, 1857/1957, p. 85)

Back translation
« Vous en achèteriez un autre. »

« Mais celui-ci est en train de s'effondrer ... »

The underlined words on the above extracts revealed that different cohesive ties are used in the ST like ellipsis and demonstrative reference, e.g., "*un autre*" and '*celui-là,*' which cohere with '*le tapis.*' On the other hand, the TT could cohere with the word 'table' using the nominal substitute, 'one.' It replaces the occurrence of the same noun outside its sentence. So, the relations of the cohesive ties are different in that in the ST, the relation is semantic, whereas, in the TT, it is lexico-grammatical. The Google back translation justifies that the ST used cohesive ties, ellipsis, and demonstrative reference are retained, which indicate that there is no stylistic variant. The following is another example:

Mais Hippolyte, n'osant à tous les jours se servir d'une si belle jambe, supplia Mme Bovary de lui en procurer une autre plus commode. Le médecin, bien entendu, fit encore les frais de cette acquisition. (Flaubert, 1965, pp. 237-238)

But Hippolyte didn't dare use such a beautiful leg every day, and he begged Madame Bovary to get him another that would be more suitable. Naturally, Charles paid for the new **one** as well. (Flaubert, 1857/1957, pp. 212- 213)

Back translation
Naturellement, Charles a également payé le nouveau.

It is found that a reiteration on the form of a general word, 'acquisition,' is used in the ST

to cohere with '*jambe,*' but the substitution, 'one,' is used in the TT. However, the Google back translation replaces the substitution with an ellipsis which is not used in the ST; this stylistic variant does affect the meaning of the ST. Such cases occur elsewhere on pages 124, 172, and 408 of the ST, corresponding to pages 95, 144, and 394 of the selected passages. The investigation of the selected passages reveals that no nominal substitution has been found in the ST, whereas it occurs in the TT. It indicates no word-for-word translation of this sub-category of substitution from French into English; a class shift is used due to language norms and peculiarity to achieve the cohesive function.

Verbal Substitution. This category is found to occur only in the TT. There is one occurrence of verbal substitution, and that shows that this subcategory is used sparingly, for example:

> *Madame sans doute, est un peu lasse? On est si épouvantablement cahoté dans notre Hirondelle!*
>
> *- Il est vrai, repondit Emma; mais le dérangement m'amuse toujours; j'aime à changer de place.* (Flaubert, 1965, p. 121)
>
> Madame is a bit tired, I presume? Our old Hirondelle <u>does</u> such a frightful lot of bumping and shaking!"
>
> "It **<u>does</u>**," Emma answered. "But I always love travelling anyway. I enjoy a change of scene." (Flaubert, 1857/1957, p. 91)

Back translation
«C'est vrai,» répondit Emma.

It is found that agreement is expressed in the French text differently. It is done using a personal pronoun, '*il est vrai,*' which can be alternatively written *c'est vrai.* In this case, the second speaker of the above extract agrees. That idea cannot be expressed using the verb, '*faire.*' The personal pronoun, '*il,*' coheres with the preceding sentence, '*on est si épouvantablement <u>cahoté</u> dans notre Hirondelle!*' In comparison, in the TT, the verb "does" is substituted by the auxiliary "does" in the second sentence. Therefore, the lack of an oral substitute that can play the role of an auxiliary in French is the cause of the non-utilization of verbal substitution in the ST. The Google back translation accurately replaces the verbal substitution of the ST with a demonstrative reference, '*ce;*' this is, of course, a cohesive aspect that does not affect the meaning. A demonstrative reference replaces the personal reference since both can convey the same meaning and cohesive function. A class shift is used due to language norms and peculiarity to achieve the cohesive function in the TT.

Clausal Substitution. The last category, the causal substitution, exists in the ST and the TT. There is one occurrence of clausal substitution in the ST, found on page 122, corresponding to page 93 of the TT, in which the word *le même* is used as a substitute. By contrast, three clausal substitutions on pages 94 and 366 are found in the TT. In any case, the TT is found using more

clausal substitutions, compared to the ST, for example:

> *Ma femme ne s'en occupe guère, dit Charles; elle aime mieux, quoiqu'on lui recommande l'exercice, toujours rester dans sa chambre, à lire.*
>
> *- C'est comme moi, répliqua Léon…* (Flaubert, 1965, p. 124)

"My wife never gardens," said Charles.

"She's been advised to take exercise, but even so she'd much rather stay in her room and read."

"**So** would I," said Léon. (Flaubert, 1857/1957, p. 94)

Back translation
« Moi aussi », dit Léon

In the ST, it is found that there is a pronoun that coheres, in the bottom sentence, with the preceding sentence. In this case, "*ce*" is not a substitution for a clause, but it is a reference that refers to the previous sentence. The Google back translation does not contain the demonstrative reference used in the ST; this stylistic variant is because there is more than one option in the French language norms as far as this case is concerned, which is a semantically equivalent set expression of agreement, *'moi aussi.'* It occurs elsewhere on pages 121 and 382 of the ST, corresponding to pages 91 and 366 of the TTS, where a reference is used instead of substitution in the ST. On the other hand, there is a clausal substitute in the TT that coheres, in the bottom sentence, with

the top sentence. 'So,' in this case, is not a reference, but it is a substitute that replaces its previous clause. It also happens in the following example:

> *- On ne songe à rien, continuait-il, les heures passent. On se promène immobile dans les pays que l'on croit voir, et votre pensée, s'enlaçant à la fiction, se joue dans les détails ou poursuit le contour des aventures. Elle se mêle aux personnages; il semble que c'est vous qui palpitez sous leur costumes.*
>
> *- C'est vrai! C'est vrai! Disait-elle.* (Flaubert, 1965, p. 124)

"I am absolutely removed from the world at such times," he said. "The hours go by without my knowing it. Sitting there I'm wandering in countries I can see every detail of—I'm playing a role in the story I'm reading. I actually feel I'm the characters—I live and breathe with them."

"I know!" she said. "I feel **the same**!" (Flaubert, 1857/1957, p. 95)

Back translation
« Je ressens la même chose!»

Ce' is a personal reference used by the second speaker in the above source extract to cohere with what the first speaker said. The second speaker confirms that by using a cohesive demonstrative reference tie. Nevertheless, it is found that there is no word-for-word translation of clausal substitutions. The second speaker confirms

what is said using a clausal substitution, 'the same.' The confirmation of the second speaker in the TT is stronger than the one of the ST because what is said by the first speaker is true and shows that he has the same sentiment as him. The Google back translation retains the same meaning by using repetition instead of the demonstrative reference used in the ST. This stylistic variant does not affect the meaning since another equivalent is given due to the language norms of the French language. So, the use of clausal substitutes in the TT instead of certain reference occurrences of the ST is one of the factors that may cause the frequent use of substitution in the TT. In brief, as far as translation is concerned, the shifts that occur in the form of substitution in the TT are not a factor that distorts neither

the meaning nor the cohesion of the text since it is within the norms of the languages and since it achieves a cohesive function.

The objectives of this study are substitution function, norms and effects. The substitution function is cohesiveness, but in French, this category of cohesiveness is realized by different cohesive devices like reference, ellipsis, and repetition due to the lack of cohesive substitution devices. In addition, the category of shift that is found to function with substitution is a class shift, which is determined by language norms rather than translation norms. The effect of the translator's invisibility and inviolability of language norms has enhanced literariness and acceptability.

Table 2

Cohesive *norms and cohesive substitution norms in "La Porte Etroite," "Strait is the Gate*

FST	Cohesive norms	ETT	Substitution cohesive norms	Category of translation shift
***Il** est de même*	Personal pronoun	The same	Nominal substitution	Class shift
*… tu lui parles de **cela**?*	Demonstrative	…when you speak to her **so?**	Clausal substitution	Class shift
*Je ne lui parle jamais de **cela**!*	Demonstrative	I never speak to her **so**	Clausal substitution	Class shift
*Il me **l**'a dit*	Personal pronoun	She told me **so**	Clausal substitution	Class shift
***Cela** ne te paraît peut-être pas…*	Demonstrative	you don't think **so**	Clausal substitution	Class shift
*Je sens que **cela** vaut mieux*	Demonstrative	I feel it better **so**	Clausal substitution	Class shift
*Déjà je m'**en** doutais…*	Personal pronoun	I had already begun to suspect **so**	Clausal substitution	Class shift

Summary of La Porte Etroite (Strait is the Gate)

The novel is about lost love; the characters are Alissa Bucolin, Jerome Palissier, and Juliette. Alissa and Juliette are two sisters who fall in love with Jerome, their cousin. Although Alissa rejects sentimental love and worldly life, she loves Jerome. Therefore, she tries to spoil the sensual love between Jerome and Juliette by trying to convert Jerome to sainthood and then making a Platonic love with him. Furthermore, she marginalizes education, culture, and literature; she focuses only on religious readings. Finally, she enters seclusion until her death. Nevertheless, Jerome still loves Alissa, and Juliette still loves Jerome. However, the concretization of such expected love for either Alissa or Juliette is impossible because Alissa is dead, and Juliette is already married with five children. This love failure is because Jerome cannot recognize Juliette's real love for him.

Substitution in La Porte Etroite/Strait is the Gate

This section embodies nominal, verbal, and clausal substitution, investigated in *Strait is the Gate*. However, two cohesive substitution ties, nominal, and verbal substitution, are not found in the ST and TT.

Nominal and Verbal Substitutions. No verbal substitution has been found to occur in *Strait is the Gate*. Therefore, the writer and the translator have not used it. According to language norms, nominal and verbal substitution do not occur in French because they are not among the cohesive ties of the language. Instead, they are used in English and among the cohesive norms of the language.

Clausal Substitution. The substitution occurrences are found in this book to be more in the TT than in the ST. It is also found to happen in *Madame Bovary*. The investigation of substitution in *La Porte Ėtroite* does not reveal any substitution occurrences in the ST. Therefore, there is no need to sub-categorize it here. However, one subcategory of substitution, a clausal substitution, is found to occur in the TT. It is because the ST is found to use other cohesive ties rather than substitution, for example:

> *Mais, je suspends tout mon avenir après* *elle, mais tout ce que je pourrais être* *sans elle, je n'en veux pas…*
> _ *Qu'est-ce qu'elle dit lorsque tu lui* *parles de cela?*
> - *Mais je ne lui parle jamais de cela!*
> (Gide, 1958, p. 519)

> "Why, it is upon her that I hang my whole future.
> Why, I want none of the things that I might be without her-"?
> "And what does she say when you speak to her **so**?"
> "I never speak to her **so**!" (Gide, 1909/1952, p. 35)

Back translation
« Et que dit-elle quand tu lui parles alors?»
« Je ne lui parle jamais ainsi!»

A demonstrative cohesive reference tie in the above examples, '*cela*' is used to cohere the sentences of the second speaker with that of the first speaker in the ST. By contrast, it is found that the substitute 'so,' which substitutes a clause, is used by the translator. The google back translation has failed to translate the clausal reference, 'so' because it cannot recognize the context since 'so' has many meanings. The Google back translation translates 'so' into '*alors*' and '*aussi,*' whose meanings in this context are not convenient. In the above context, the meaning of 'so' is 'like this,' which is in French '*de cette manière.*' This Google stylistic variant affects the meaning due to the context. For more clarification, take, for example:

> *« Mais, Jérôme, cela ne se peut pas. Mais elle ne l'aime pas! Mais elle me l'a dit ce matin même. Tâche de l'empêcher, Jérôme! Oh! Qu'est-ce qu'elle va devenir?»* (Gide, 1958, p. 539)

> "Oh, Jerome! It mustn't be. She doesn't love him! Why, she told me **so** only this very morning! Try to prevent it, Jerome! Oh what will become of her?" (Gide, 1909/1952, p. 63)

Back translation
« Pourquoi, elle ne me l'a dit que ce matin même!»

In the above French example, there is a personal reference cohesive tie, *'l'* used in the third sentence to refer to the second sentence. Nevertheless, a different cohesive tie, a substitution, is used to cohere with the other sentence in the target extract. 'So' is used to substitute for the occurrence of the second sentence, and it is thus cohesive. The Google back translation retains the personal reference used in the ST and has not shown any stylistic variant. It is found that such an occurrence does not affect the meaning and coherence of the text. Instead, it enhances them using different surface cohesive ties. Such cases occur elsewhere in the text on pages 522, 547, and 559 of the ST, corresponding to pages 41, 74, and 92 of the TT. In short, the phenomena concerning the function and norms and substitution are found to occur also in both corpora of this investigation. A class shift is used due to language norms and peculiarity to achieve a cohesive function.

The objectives of this study are substitution function, norms, and effects. The above discussion reveals that all the objectives have been achieved. The function of substitution is to use cohesive devices are cohesive; however, in French, substitution does not exist, and cohesiveness is realized by different cohesive ties like reference, ellipsis, and repetition. In addition, the category of shift that is found to function

with French cohesive devices and English substitution is a class shift, which is determined by language norms rather than translation norms. Finally, the translator's invisibility and inviolability of language norms enhance literariness and acceptability. The discussion on all the corpora used in this research has, therefore, revealed a consolidated conclusion.

CONCLUSION

The analyses in *Madame Bovary ST and TT* and *La Porte Ètroite ST and Strait is the Gate TT* denote that substitution is used only in the English target texts; other cohesive ties like ellipsis, and repetition are used in the French source texts. The category of shift the translators have used is a class shift, determined by language norms.

In the description of substitution language norms, the investigation reveals that the lack using substitution in the ST is caused by the French language norms, which use cohesive ties like a personal reference, demonstrative reference, and repetition instead of substitution due to the French language norms for formulating tags, agreement/ disagreement, and additions to remarks. It indicates that the translator must consider some language norms because the shifts of cohesive ties are determined by language norms and not by translation norms in translating from French into English. Thus, the study shows no word-for-word translation occurrences in translating some cohesive ties from French into English in most cases. The shift is required by the English language norms, whose substitution

cohesive ties are various compared to French. Therefore, the translator must be aware of the language norms of substitution, which require the use of shifts.

The objectives of this paper are achieved because this study has contributed to the notion that language norms rather than translation norms determine substitution shifts. The study indicates that translators use the cohesion shift category as a class shift. It also reveals that the French language is more demonstrative than English which is more substitutional. These stylistic variants which occur are found not to affect the meaning since the translators have not abused the language norms of both languages; the translator's invisibility and inviolability of language peculiarity norms enhance the literariness and the acceptability of the TT. Therefore, this study does not support the cohesion concept described by Arhire (2017), asserting that what matters in translating cohesion is the stylistic effect. This study refutes that and asserts that what matters in translating cohesive ties, namely substitution from French into English, is language norms (the options which the language allows), which prevail over the translator's style.

Even though the two aspects are both cohesive aspects, the findings also reveal that, in translation, Halliday and Hasan's (1976) theory of cohesion cannot be applied systematically and literally because some of its co-hyponyms and, in this case, demonstrative reference, ellipsis, repetition, and substitution depend on language norms and not on translation norms in

French-English translation. However, the research reveals that class shift, which is one of the categories of translation shifts of Catford's (1965) theory functions well with substitution in translating from French into English. Since this is a case study on the translation of novels from French into English, the study recommends that other studies be done on other text types to get a general concept of the function of substitution in translation.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

REFERENCES

Arhire, M. (2017). Cohesive devices in translator training: A study based on a Romanian Translational learner corpus. *Meta*, *62*(1), 155-177. https://doi.org/10.7202/1040471ar

Aulia, D. (2012). The application of translation strategies to cope with equivalence problems in translating texts. *Polingua, 1*(1), 1-9. https://doi.org/10.30630/polingua.v1i1.43

Baker, M. (2018). *In other words*. Routledge.

Bartsch, R. (1987). *Norms of language*. Longman.

Blum-Kulka, S. (2000). Shifts of cohesion and coherence. In L. Venuti (Ed.), *The translation studies reader* (pp. 298-313). Routledge.

Bordens, K. S., & Abbott, B. B. (2011). *Research design and methods*. Mc Graw Hill.

Bosch, P. (1989). Coherence and cohesion: Comments on Roger G. Van de Velde's Paper "Man, verbal text, inferencing, and coherence". In W. Heydrich, F. Neubauer, J. S. Petöfi & E. Sözer (Eds.), *Connexity and coherence* (pp. 219-227). Walter de Cruyter. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110854831.218

Catford, J. C. (1965). *A linguistic theory of translation.* Oxford University Press.

Charolles, M. (1978). Introduction aux problèmes de la cohérence des textes [Introduction to the problems of texts coherence]. *La Journale de La Langue Française, 38,* 7-38. https://doi.org/10.3406/lfr.1978.6117

Chesterman, A. (2005). Consilience in translation studies. *Revista Canaria de Estudios Inglese, 51,* 19-32.

Chesterman, A. (2017). *Reflections on translation theory.* John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Domínguez, C., Saussy, H., & Villanueva, D. (2015). *Introducing comparative literature: New trends and applications*. Routledge.

Farghal, M. (2017). Textual issues to cohesion and coherence in Arabic/English translation. *Jordan Journal of Modern Languages and Literature, 9*(1), 29-50.

Flaubert, G. (1957). *Madame Bovary* (F. Steegmuller, Trans.). Modern Library. (Original work published 1857)

Flaubert, G. (1965). *Madame Bovary*. Editions Rencontre Lausanne.

Friederich, W. (1969). *Technik des Übersetzens. Englisch und Deuttsch* [Technique of translation-English and German]. Hueber.

Gide, A. (1952). *Strait is the gate* (D. Bussy, Trans.). Vintage Books. (Original work published 1909)

Gide, A. (1958). *La porte étroite. Dans Romans: Récits et sotises*, *oeuvres lyriques* [Novels, tales and soties, lyrical works]. Editions Gallimard.

Göpferich, S. (1995). *Textsorten in naturwissenschaft und technik. Pragmatische typologie kontrastiering-Translation* [Types of texts in science and technology. Pragmatic typology contrasting- translation]. Narr.

Gutwinski, W. (1976). *Cohesion in literary texts*. Mouton.

Halliday, M. A. K. (1985). *An introduction to functional grammar*. Edward Arnold.

Halliday, M. A. K., & Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English.* Longman.

Halliday, M. A. K., & Matthiessen, C. M. I. M (2004). *An introduction to functional grammar.* Arnold.

Hatim, B., & Mason, I. (1997). *The translator as communicator*. Routledge.

Hermans, T. (1991). Translational norms and correct translations. In K. M. van Lauven-Zwart & T. Naaijkens (Eds.), *Translation studies: The state of the art* (pp. 155-169). Rodopi. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004488106_015

Hoey, M. (1991). *Patterns of lexis in text*. Oxford University Press.

Holmes, J. S. (2000). The name and nature of translation studies. In L. Venuti. (Ed.), *The translation studies reader* (pp. 172-185). Routledge.

House, J. (1977). *A model for translation quality assessment*. Narr.

House, J. (2015). *Translation quality assessment: Past and present*. Routledge.

Izwaini, S., & Al-Omar, H. (2019). The translation of substitution and ellipsis in Arabic subtitling. *Journal of Audiovisual Translation, 2*(1), 126-152. https://doi.org/10.47476/jat.v2i1.14

Jones, M. H. (1997). *The beginning translator's workbook.* University Press of America.

Károly, K. (2017). *Aspects of cohesion and coherence in translation*. John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Koller, W. (1979). *Einführung in die Übersetzungswissenschaft* [Introduction to translation studies]. Quelle and Meyer.

Lambert, J., & van Gorp, H. (1985). On describing translations. In T. Hermans (Ed.), *The manipulation of literature: Studies in literary translation* (pp. 42-53). ST. Martin's Press.

Liu, C., & Hwa, R. (2016). Phrasal substitution of idiomatic expressions. *Proceedings of NAACL-HLT* (pp. 363-373). https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/N16-1040

Malmkjær, K. (2011). Meaning and translation. In K. Malmkjær and K. Windle (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of translation studies* (pp. 108-122). Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199239306.013.0009

Moindjie, M. A. (2003). *An Investigation into the aspect of coherence and cohesion in translation: A case study* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Universiti

Munday, J. (2016). *Introducing translation studies: Theory and applications*. Routledge.

Neubert, A. (1985). *Text and translation*. Enzyklopädie.

Neubert, A., & Shreve, G. (1992). *Translation as text*. Kent State University Press.

Newmark, P. (1988). *A textbook of translation*. Prentice Hall.

Nida, E. (1964). *Toward a science of translating: With special reference to principles and procedures involved in Bible translating*. E. J. Brill.

Reiß, K., & Vermeer, H. J. (1991). *Grundlegung einer allgemeinen Translationstheorie* [Towards a general theory of translation action]. Niemeyer.

Saldanha, G., & O'Brien, S. (2014). *Research methodologies in translation studies*. Routledge.

Schäffner, C. (1999). The concept of norms in translation studies. In C. Schaffner (Ed.), *Translation and norms* (pp. 1-8). Multilingual Matters.

Shreve, G. M. (2012). Bilingualism and translation. In K. Y. Gambier & L. V. Doorslaer (Eds.), *Handbook of translation studies* (pp. 108-122). John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Swales, J. (1990). Nonnative speaker graduate engineering students and their introductions: Global coherence and local management. In U. Connor & A. M. Johns (Eds.), *Coherence in writing* (pp. 189-207). TESOL.

Toury, G. (1980). *In search of a theory of translation*. The Porter Institute.

Toury, G. (1985). A rationale for descriptive translation. In T. Hermans (Ed.), *The manipulation of literature: Studies in literary translation* (pp. 16-41). ST. Martin's Press.

Toury, G. (1995). *Descriptive translation studies and beyond*. John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Vinay, J., & Darbelnet, J. (1995). *Comparative stylistics of French and English: A methodology for translation* (J. C. Sager & M. J. Hamel, Trans.). John Benjamins Publishing Company. https://doi.org/10.1075/btl.11

Wales, K. (1998). Cohesion and coherence in literature. In J. L. Mey (Ed.), *Concise Encyclopedia of pragmatics* (pp. 134-136). Elsevier Science.

Wilss, W. (1982). *The science of translation*. Gunter Narr Verlang.

Yunxing, L. (1996). The sentence group: The key discoursal level in translation teaching. In C. Dollerup & V. Appel, (Eds.), *Teaching translation and interpreting 3* (pp. 111-117). John Benjamins Publishing Company. https://doi.org/10.1075/btl.16.17yun

Zhang, J., Zhai, F., & Zong, C. (2013). A substitution-translation-restoration framework for handling unknown words in statistical machine translation. *Journal of Computer Science and Technology, 28*(5), 907-918. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11390-013-1386-5