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Abstract—The paper aims to consider the translation process by drawing light on the use of language from a cognitive stylistic perspective. It looks at translators’ performance as a cognitive process to understand the stylistic devices of texts. The paper clarifies the multiple stylistic devices, their applications, and how they are used to attract the receiver’s attention to a specific element more than others by analyzing twenty-four Arabic translations according to stylistic functions, effects, and cognitive interpretations of twelve texts from the book "A Brief History of Time" by Hawking (1988). It demonstrates that using cognitive stylistic devices enhances cognitive operations and interpretation, and produces a creative and motivated text with more emotional effects.
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I. INTRODUCTION

Cognitive stylistics is a multidisciplinary theoretical approach that aims to provide a stylistic framework to obtain greater explanatory power for texts. It provides an essential means to infer a clear view of text, beliefs, context, and knowledge. Also, it helps to understand how a literary style is formed. Cognitive stylistics explores how certain types of metaphorical constructions can be understood only by using the participants’ knowledge, beliefs, and inferences. Furthermore, it reflects on the cognitive mechanisms by which receptors respond to specific aspects of texts. It aims to capture how receptors interpret literary texts by employing their real-life schematic knowledge. The literary text contains triggers that stimulate aspects of receptors’ prior knowledge to aid them in constructing a mental representation of the world of the text. Many scholars in the discipline of cognitive stylistics expand the border of linguistic analysis of the literature by using different theories such as schema, text-world, and foregrounding. These theories produce frameworks for the analysis of literature and concentrate on reading and cognition (Piniés, 2005; Kristiansen et al., 2006; Areef, 2016).

A. Schema Theory

Schema is "a data structure for representing the genetic concepts stored in memory" (Rumelhart, 1980, p. 34). It is an abstract knowledge structure. Cognitive linguists use the term schema to describe how people process, organize, and store information in their minds (An, 2013). Schema reflects attitudes, conceptual understanding, experience, skills, and strategies towards a particular situation within a text. It aids people to make sense of events, specific stimuli, and situations and make use of them later. Furthermore, it does not carry the meaning by itself, but the reader conjures up culture, emotion, information, and knowledge. The understanding of a text relies on how much-related schema the reader has, i.e., reading is a visual process, and more information is added by the reader via his schemata. Schemata matches the contents of the text to what the reader cognizes about people, culture, world, and the universe. It shows how inferences by using general knowledge are made to interpret particular parts of a text (Zaghlol, 2019).

B. Text-World Theory

Human communicative processes are the main interest of text-world theory (TWT). TWT is a model of human language processing that is found on the notion of mental representation. It is the mental representation that participants form to comprehend linguistic communication. TWT is a conceptual space that is constructed through the combination of linguistic cues and the participant’s knowledge and inferences. It is interested not only in how a certain text is built, but also how the context surrounding that text impacts its production and reception (Werth, 1999; Gavins, 2007; Whiteley, 2011). Relevant general or specific knowledge upon which a further inference with regard to the elements of the text-world space may be established, is activated by linguistic cues. Propositions of world-building within a text provide deictic and referential information which establish partially the situational variables of the text-world such as space, time, entities, and interrelationships. The text-world is a total construct that requires an understanding of memory and imagination rather than direct perception (Simpson, 2004).

C. Foregrounding Theory

Foregrounding is the bringing of effective and essential features of a text to the receivers’ attention. Foregrounding refers to the property of perceptual prominence that a particular thing has against the backdrop of other, less noticeable
things. It is seen as a cognitive effect that draws the viewer’s attention by generating certain facets of emotions (Burke, 2014; Jones, 2016). The foregrounding model refers to the special act of interpretation to figure out what otherwise would seem unmotivated. Foregrounding asks implicitly the question of what should have prompted the author to express himself in such an exceptional manner? Like stylistic variants and parallelism, foregrounded features are spotted on various levels of the code: tropes, such as a metaphor which refers to an implied and indirect comparison between two dissimilar objects, a simile which is a direct comparison between two dissimilar objects (Abu Libdeh, 2015), and Synecdoche is the use of a part to represent the whole, or it may use a whole to represent a part (Ali, 2015), chiefly being related to category violations (on the levels of syntax and semantics). Therefore, tropes are matters of content and matters of expression. Foregrounding, then, is how certain aspects of a text can be made to stand out or appear eminent through forms of textual patterning (Leech, 2013; Leech & Short, 2013; Burke, 2014; Gibbons & Whiteley, 2018).

(a). Parallelism

Parallelism presents foregrounding in a text by drawing the reader to seek meaningful connections among parallel structures. It is “the use of the same pattern of words for two or more ideas having the same degree of importance arranged in successive lines and in a balanced manner” (Almehmdawi, 2018, p. 272). It is “the use of words, phrases, clauses, or sentences that are similar in structure, sound, or meaning” (Almehmdawi, 2018, p. 277). The meaning repetition is known as semantic parallelism, and the repetition of actual words is described as lexical parallelism (Burke, 2014). Semantic parallelism occurs when pairings or groupings of elements “can be interpreted to have parallel meanings” (Fabb, 1997, p. 139). Parallel meaning involves a field of possibilities. The most common varieties are similarity and opposition of meaning (Abdulameer, 2020). Such meanings can be summarized in the following two categories:

1. Synonymy: it covers the juxtaposition of paralleled synonyms, i.e., words that have related senses (Synonyms).
2. Antithesis: it refers to the repetition of paralleled antonyms, i.e., words that have opposite senses (Opposites).

(b). Deviation

Any divergence from the familiar and acceptable norms of language is called deviation. It refers to a sentence, phrase, or other unit that deviates from the usual use of language and appears grammatically, phonologically, or even semantically. As an attempt to draw the readers and emphasize particular ideas by violating the usual rules, such as placing verbs in subject positions, using elliptical subjects, and misplacing adverbial phrases (Khawaldeh & Neimneh, 2017; Mansoor & Salman, 2020).

II. METHODOLOGY

A procedure whereby two translations of twelve cases are taken from the book “A Brief History of Time” by Hawking (1988) is adopted in the study. The first translation is for “Mustafa Ibrahim Fahmi”, while the second one is for “Mohammed Basil Al-Hadithi”. The study follows the application of the model of Gutt (2000). Gutt distinguishes between direct (interpretive) and indirect (descriptive) translation. The direct translation “attempts to preserve not just what the source text said but also how it said it” (Ghazala, 2018, p. 20). Contrary to the indirect one, which does not actually resemble the original text, in which “the translator gathers the source text (ST) communicative intentions by means of extracting relevant information” and making the necessary justifications so that the produced text obtains the receiver’s expectations (Martínez, 1998, p. 176). The resulting translations were analyzed aiming the following:

1. How theories and devices are exploited in the field of cognitive stylistics and their impacts.
2. Observing the performance of the translators and their tackling of the text-world and the schemata they have for what they are recognized.
3. Are using cognitive stylistic devices facilitate and enhance the interpretation.

III. DATA ANALYSIS

Source language (SL) Text (1): “No one has ever seen a giant tortoise with the earth on its back, but then, no one has seen a superstring either” (Hawking, 1988, p. 189).

Target language (TL) Texts:

1. "فلم ير أحد قط سلحفاة ضخمة وهي تحمل الأرض على ظهرها، إلا أن أحدًا كذلك لم ير أيضًا وترًا فائقًا" (Fahmi, 2016, p. 293).

Discussion and Analysis:

In numbers 1 and 2, a direct translation is pursued. Whereas a parallelism, which is a property of perceptual prominence that something has against the backdrop of another which is a less noticeable thing, is adopted in the conceptual structures "فلم ير أحد قط سلحفاة ضخمة وهي تحمل الأرض على ظهرها، إلا أن أحدًا كذلك لم ير أيضًا وترًا فائقًا" and "فلم يشهد اي واحد منا سلحفاة ضخمة وهي تحمل الأرض على ظهرها ولم يشهد اي واحد منا الأوتار العظمى أيضاً" for "No one has ever seen a giant tortoise with the earth on its back, but then, no one has seen a superstring either", in order to preserve attracting the receiver attention.
SL Text (2): “None of this would have been possible without the support for my research and medical expenses that has been supplied by Gonville and Caius College, the Science and Engineering Research Council” (Hawking, 1988, p. xi).

Discussion and Analysis:
The translator in number 1 resembles the original text, and a direct translation is followed. The conceptual structure (None of this would have been possible) is interpreted as (وأما كان ممكن إنجاز أي شيء من هذا دون الدعم المقدم لي). The philosopher's steps by producing the referential information (هذا). The translator follows the author's steps by producing the referential information (هذا).

SL Text (3):

“...”

Discussion and Analysis:
In number 1, the translator resembles the original text, and a direct translation is adopted. He interprets directly the concept of “maybe time and space together formed a surface that was finite in size” as it is said as “ربماتكون معا سطحاً من حيث الحجم وأنه ليس له أي حد”.

An indirect translation is adopted in number 2, where the translator describes the concept of “time and space together formed a surface that was finite in size” as “قد تكون معا سطحاً من حيث الحجم وأنه ليس له أي حد” to clarify it to the reader.

SL Text (4): “On the other hand, the people whose business it is to ask why, the philosophers, have not been able to keep up with the advance of scientific theories” (Hawking, 1988, p. 193).

Discussion and Analysis:
The translator in number 1 focuses on resembling the original text, and a direct translation is chosen. He preserves the construction “On the other hand” and reproduces it as “وعلى الجانب الآخر”. He recognizes the conceptual structure “the people whose business it is to ask why, the philosophers” as (فإن الأفراد الذين كانت مهمتهم أن يسألوا "لماذا").

In number 2, the translator adopts an indirect method of translation. He deviates from resembling the original text by transcending the condition (On the other hand) in an alert to the translator's intentionality to draw attention to a particular communicative clue in the conceptual structure "وعلى الجانب الآخر لؤهم أي الفلاسفة معهم عابد من فضائل الفلاسفة والعلوم" where the translator uses the parallelism in "وعلى الجانب الآخر لؤهم أي الفلاسفة معهم عابد من فضائل الفلاسفة والعلوم" and turns over between thoughts by focusing on strengthening certain points in order not to distract the receiver’s attention.

The relativity in thinking between the two translators appeared obviously in producing the original text, whereas each one of them differs in interpretation. This is because each one of them has his comprehension phase, schemata, experience, reasoning, and problem-solving, moreover, how to make sense of the world. In number 1, the construction “the people whose business it is to ask why, the philosophers, have not been able to keep up with the advance of scientific theories”, is rendered as "وعلى الجانب الآخر لؤهم أي الفلاسفة معهم عابد من فضائل الفلاسفة والعلوم", contrary to number 2 where it is cognized as "وأما كان ممكن إنجاز أي شيء من هذا دون الدعم المقدم لي".

SL Text (5): “What is it that breathes fire into the equations and makes a universe for them to describe?” (Hawking, 1988, p. 192).

Discussion and Analysis:
The text in number 1 (What is it that breathes fire into the equations and makes a universe for them to describe?) is interpreted as (ما الذي يوحي للعادات والعجم من أجل العناصر) in an alert to the translator's intentionality to draw attention to a particular communicative clue in the conceptual structure. The first translator conceives of those people as philosophers, while the second translator comprehends those people as "людей, которые могут сказать..." added to them, the philosophers. This difference in interpretation occurs because each one of the two translators has his schema and experience, moreover, his way to make sense of the world.
Discussion and Analysis:

In number 1, the translator produces the metaphor "breathes fire" directly as "ينفث النيران", here, the translator establishes a conceptual mapping between the two entities "الكون" and "النيران", by preserving the same semantic and linguistic layout, which is "fire", in an attempt to resemble the SL text.

In number 2, the translator deviates from resembling the SL text, and an indirect translation is embraced. The translator presents the metaphor in a unique way where he links between "الله" and "الحياة". This metaphor is poured into the lexical item "العالم". This choice reflects the religious background of the translator.

The metaphorical constructions "breathes fire", "ينفث النيران" and "الحياة", reflect each of the transmitters' beliefs, knowledge, and inferences within the exploration of cognitive stylistics.

SL Text (6): "This has not been found to agree with experience, unless that turns out to be the explanation for the people who are supposed to have disappeared in the Bermuda Triangle" (Hawking, 1988, p. 189).

Discussion and Analysis:

A direct translation is pursued in number 1. The translator reproduces the construction "agree with experience" directly as it is said as "يتفق مع الخبرة".

In number 2, the translator adopts the descriptive way in the transferring process, and an indirect translation is opted. He reproduces the construction "agree with experience" as "يتفق مع الخبرة المتوقعة", by adding new contextual effects. Also, he adds the lexical item "الله" that uncovers his religious background.

Discussion and Analysis:

The translator in number 1 resembles the SL text and follows a direct translation. The referential information (my assistants and my team of nurses) is rendered as ( الموحدين ...) by preserving the referent items. The translator in number 2 reproduces the SL using an indirect way. He transcends the referent items in ( الموحدين ...) as ( الموحدين ...).
synonyms, which is the repetitions of words having related ideas with the same degree of importance produced in a balanced manner, to achieve a certain impact on the receiver's attention.

SL Text (10): “Maxwell’s equations predicted that there could be wavelike disturbances in the combined electromagnetic field, and that these would travel at a fixed speed, like ripples on a pond” (Hawking, 1988, p. 21).

Discussion and Analysis:
A direct translation is selected in numbers 1 and 2, where the simile in the original is reproduced in underlined cases in number 1 and number 2, marked by "". Here, the outcome of this simile is image- semantic understanding, aiming to simplify the cognizing process and facilitate the apprehension.

SL Text (11): “But perhaps his real reason was different: to quote him again, "Equations are more important to me, because politics is for the present, but an equation is something for eternity” (Hawking, 1988, p. 196).

Discussion and Analysis:
A direct translation is pursued in number 1. The translator follows the steps of the original text-producer in rendering "to quote him again" as "" and "" directly.

In number 2, the translator adopts an indirect way in transferring "to quote him again" as "" by using a synecdoche to make it more eminent.

SL Text (12): “Newton is reported to have declared that he had taken great satisfaction in “breaking Leibniz’s heart” (Hawking, 1988, p. 200).

Discussion and Analysis:
A direct translation is pursued in numbers 1 and 2. The translators in the underlined cases refer to “Leibniz himself” by naming his part “Leibniz’s heart”. They reproduced in the TL the same foregrounding tool, namely, the synecdoche of the SL text, to preserve the power of emotional effects.

IV. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

In accordance with the analysis of the twelve cases, it is discovered how translation is processed and then meaning is constructed in the target text concerning choices of cognitive stylistics, interpretation, and effects they might have, as well as how they are conceptualized. The result is a difference in the product due to differences between the translator’s building of the text —world, schemata, ideology, inferences, and previous experience. Foregrounding enables translators to attract and engage the receiver through successful communication. Results show that using cognitive stylistic devices facilitates and enhances cognitive operations and interpretation and produces a creative and motivated text with more emotional effects.
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