

Investigating Grammatical Cohesive Devices: Shifts of cohesion in translating narrative text type

Saeed Parazaran, Ph.D. Candidate, Translation Studies, Islamic Azad University, Central Branch, Tehran, Iran

saeedparazaran@gmail.com

Seyyed Masoud Motahari, Assistant Professor of Translation Studies, Islamic Azad University, Central Branch, Tehran, Iran

masoud1353@hotmail.com

Abstract

This study focused mainly on the shifts of the grammatical cohesion in texts translated from English into Persian. It aimed to identify the grammatical cohesive devices (GCDs) in ST and TT separately, based on Halliday and Hassan's Model (1976), determine the number of occurrences of GCDs in two texts and finally, illustrate types of shifts of grammatical cohesion and strategies used in TT. To achieve these aims, a mixed-method (comparative and descriptive model) research design was used to spot cohesive shifts in TT due to translation, together with the employed strategies. To this purpose, the book, *Oral Reproduction of Stories* was investigated, with its translation. 39 different stories by different writers were selected as the sample of analysis. The results showed that the TT adopted all the three types of GCDs except verbal and casual substitution, with verbal substitution in Persian being carried down by reference, ellipsis and lexical cohesion. The occurrence of GCDs in the TT was more frequent than that of ST. Regarding the general analysis of the cohesion shifts, the study showed that three types of shifts (i.e. establishment of new cohesion, elimination of cohesion and change of type of cohesive features) occur in translation. Finally it was revealed that the translation strategies undertaken by the various translators are motivated and influenced by three factors (i. e. systemic language differences Baker (1992), stylistic preferences and the translation process itself (Blum- Kulka, 1986).

Keywords: cohesion, shift, tie, grammatical cohesion, translation strategies

Introduction

Nowadays, the need for translation is especially acute in our modern world. The translation of a language will allow us to open the doors to an unknown cultural and linguistic world. Translation can act as a bridge among nations. Newmark believes that “we do translate words, because there is nothing else in a page to translate” (1988, P: 193). Put in the other words, you translate a text because Halliday & Hassan state that a text is a semantic unite and it has internal logic relation and they emphasis that this unit can be a drama or a sentence and even a word (1976, P:3-5). Halidday & Hassan say that a text has a texture (organization of a text), and this is what distinguishes it from something that is not a text and in other side, parts of texture are cohesion and coherence (1976, P: 2-3).

The term 'cohesion' refers to the surface links in text. Cohesion has a vital role in creating the unity of text. A non-cohesive text may result in the reader or listener losing their concentration. The recipient will not be able to obtain the message in tended if the information conveyed to him/her is not linked together. This in turn will lead to a lack of communication. Cohesion carries the receiver forward. So, according to Halliday and Hassan, “cohesion: occurs where the interpretation of some elements in the discourse is dependent on that of another” (1976, P: 4). Cohesion has always appeared as the most useful constituent of discourse analysis that is applied to translation. English, and Persian have different grammars

and vocabulary structures, and it is only natural that they pose great difficulties and challenges for a translator to deal with. So if a translator wants to provide a cohesive and comprehensive text for his/ her clients, s/he should know and recognize the cohesive devices in any text in according to text style and then translate or change in view of cohesive patterns in TT.

On the other hand, translation is carried down by occurrence of shifts which is an unavoidable phenomenon. Shifts in cohesion are inevitable in translation for having a natural text. Some of the shifts are mandatory and some are optional. Mandatory shifts result from a systematic dissimilarity between the source language and the target language while optional shifts are carried out by the translator's personal preferences (Peckkanen, 2007, P: 3). For Hatim (2001), shifts in translation are seen as positive consequences and not considered as errors. In fact, shift of cohesion is one of important challenging factors in translation that translators encounter. Accordingly, in this study, the researchers sought to investigate grammatical cohesive devices in narrative texts and their translation. Furthermore, they focused on the translation strategies used to translate cohesive devices in such texts. Thus, the following research questions were posed:

Q.1. What grammatical cohesive devices establish the cohesive relations in the translation of the narrative text type based on Halliday and Hassan's model (1976)?

Q.2. What specific shifts and strategies are used in translating grammatical cohesive devices of narrative texts?

Background to the study

Before explaining cohesion, this study talks about any passage, "spoken" or "written", of whatever length and topic, and about the characteristics that distinguish a text from a group of unrelated sentences. According to Halliday and Hassan (1976, P: 3-5), a text is a semantic unit and it has an internal logic relation and a crucial attribute of every text is its unity. The unity that it has is a unity of meaning in context, a texture that expresses the fact that it relates as a whole to the environment in which it is placed. Being a semantic unit, a text is replaced in the form of sentences and this is how the relation of text to sentence can best be interpreted. A set of related sentences, with a single sentence as the limiting case, is the realization of a text. So they believe (1976, P: 2-3) that prerequisite to be a text is semantic relation among sentences that distinguishes it from something that is not a text, this relation is called texture. They (ibid) believe that every text has a texture and any texture has properties of coherence (external; context of situation) and cohesion (internal), outside of the apparent grammatical structure of the text. Coherence refers to links beyond the text. It is out of scope of this study; therefore, this study takes consideration into cohesion.

Cohesion

Cohesion has a vital role in creating the unity of text. Cohesion is a regulator in a text. Halliday and Hassan state that "the concept of cohesion is a semantic one; it refers to relations of meaning that exist within the text, and that define it as a text. This occurs where the interpretation of some elements in the discourse is dependent on that of another. The one presupposes the other, in the sense that it cannot be effectively decoded except by recourse to it" (1976, P: 4). They stated (1976) when the element presupposes the other, it means the element can only be decoded by recourse to it, a relation of cohesion is set up, and the elements, the presupposing and the presupposed, are thereby at least potentially integrated into a text. Halliday and Hasan (1976: 18) also say: Cohesion defines the set of possibilities that exist in the language for making text hang together: the potential that the speaker or writer has at his disposal. Halliday and Hassan (1976) stated that cohesion is expressed partly through the grammar and partly through the vocabulary, therefore they divide them into

categories involving grammatical cohesion (reference, substitution and ellipsis) and lexical (lexicon and conjunction) cohesion. The grammatical cohesion and their sub-categories will be discussed under the following headings, respectively: 1-Reference 2- substitution 3- ellipsis.

Reference

Reference, according to Halliday and Hassan, is a term used to “refer to certain items which are not interpreted semantically in their own right but rather "make reference to something else for their interpretation; by this they distinguish between semantic reference, i. e. the relationship between a word and what it points to in the real world, and reference as the relationship of identity which holds between two linguistic expressions” (1976, P: 31). Halliday and Hasan believe that there are certain items in all languages that have the property of reference. In the English language, for example, these items are: personal, demonstrative, and comparative.

Table1: Summary of Reference categories

1			
Personal			
1-1	Personal pronoun	He, him, she, her, I, me, We, us, they, them	John has moved to a new house. He had it built last year.
1-2	possessive determiners	his, her, my, your, our, their	John's house is beautiful. His wife must be delighted with it.
1-3	Possessive Pronoun	His, hers, theirs, its, mine, ours, yours	That new house is John. I didn't know it was his .
2			
Demonstratives			
2-1	demonstrative, near	this/these, here	We're going to the opera tonight. This will be our first outing for months.
2-2	demonstrative, far	that/those, there	They broke a Chinese vase. That was valuable.
2-3	definite article	the	Last year we went to Devon for a holiday. The holiday we had there was the best we've had.
3			
Comparatives			
3-1	General Comparison (identity, similarity, difference)		They've given us special places in the front row. Would you prefer the other seats?
3-2	Particular Comparison (terms of quantity, terms of quality)		Apparently Brown resigned, when his proposal was rejected. I wish he could have acted less precipitately.

Substitution

According to Halliday and Hassan, substitution, unlike the main cohesive category 'reference', which is a relation between meanings, is a relation between linguistic items such as words or phrases. A substitute is a carrier of some information which differentiates the instance in which it occurs from the other instance to which it relates by cohesion. A

substitution is sort of counter which is used in place of the repetition of a particular item (1976, P: 90-95).

Substitution is used precisely where the reference is not identical, or there is at least some new specification to be added. This requires a device that is essentially grammatical rather than semantic; the presupposition is at the grammatical level. Halliday and Hasan (1976: 90) believe that "since substitution is a grammatical relation the substitute may function as a noun, as a verb, or as a clause". Hence they distinguish three types of substitution: nominal, verbal, and clausal.

Table 2: Summery of Substitution Categories

1			
Nominal Substitutes			
1-1	For noun Head	One/ones	These biscuits are stale. - Get some fresh <u>ones</u> .
1-2	For nominal Complement	The same	I'll have two poached eggs on toast, please. I have <u>the same</u>
1-3	For Attribute	So	John felt it was disappointing. He said <u>so</u>
2			
Verbal Substitutes			
2-1	For Verb	Do, Be, Have	Does Granny look after you every day?- She can't <u>do</u> at weekends
2-2	For process	Do/Be so	Shall I make an announcement? You can <u>do so</u>
3			
Clausal Substitutes			
3-1	Positive	So	They've failed. then?- I regret <u>so</u>
3-2	Negative	Not	Has everyone gone home? - I hope <u>not</u> .
Substitute Clause functioning as:			
Conditional	Everyone seems to think he's guilty. If <u>so</u> , no doubt he'll offer to resign.		
Reported	Is this mango ripe? -It seems <u>so</u> .		
Modalized	Would you like cats if you were me? " <u>Perhaps not</u> ." said Alice.		

Ellipsis

Ellipsis is said to be a special case of 'substitution', in which an item (or items) is substituted by zero (0- item)" (1976, P: 142). The idea of omitting part of sentences on the assumption that an earlier sentence will make the meaning clear is known as ellipsis. In other words, if something is ellipsis, then there is a presupposition in a sentence that something must be 'understood' or reconstructed There is nominal, verbal and clausal ellipsis (ibid, P: 142-13).

Table 3: Summery of Ellipsis Categories

Nominal ellipsis	1.1. Deictic as Head	specific Deictic (possessives, demonstratives, the)	Ask Janet how to polish the brassware. Hers sparkles.
		non-specific Deictic (each, all, both, every, some,	The men got back at midnight. Both were tired out.

		either, no, neither, any)	
		Post-deictic (a, the, any + other determiner)	I've used up these three yellow folders you gave me. Can I use the other <u>X</u> ?
	1.2. Numerative as Head	ordinal	Smith was the first person to leave. I was the second <u>X</u> .
		cardinal	Here are my two white silk scarves. I used to have three.
		Indefinite(much, many, more, most, lot, several, few)	Can all cats climb trees?-They all can; and most <u>X</u> do.
	1.2.3.Epithet as Head	superlative	They are fine actors. That clown is the finest <u>X</u> I have ever seen.
		comparative	Mrs. Jones always uses Bliss. Her clothes are the whiter <u>X</u> .
		others	I like strong tea. I suppose weak <u>X</u> is better for you. Here are my two white silk scarves. Can you see any black <u>X</u> ?
	Verbal ellipsis	2.1. lexical ellipsis (from right)	total (all items omitted except first operator)
partial (lexical verb only omitted)			Can all cats climb trees?-They all can <u>X</u> The cat won't catch mice in winter. It will <u>X</u> in summer
2.2. Operator ellipsis (from left)		Total (all items omitted except lexical verb)	What have you been doing? - Being chased by a bull.
		partial (first operator only omitted)	
Clausal ellipsis	3.1. Propositional ellipsis	Total (all Propositional element omitted)	
		partial (some Complement or Adjunct present)	
	3.2. Modal ellipsis	Total (all Modal element omitted)	
		partial (Subject present) [rare]	
	3.3. General ellipsis of the clause(all elements but one omitted)	WH- (only WH- element present)	We have made so far a boat, garden dibber, teapot stand. What else?
		Yes/ no (only item expressing polarity present)	Can I tell you about the time when I screamed? Yes, do.
		other (other single clause element present)	But you'd better look at it. Mrs. Birling: Very well.
	3.4. Zero		

	(entire clause omitted)		
	elliptical clause functioning as		
	yes/no question or answer	'reported' element	They generally carry knives. I know.
	WH- question or answer	otherwise	

Shift

Hatim (2001, 9:167) state that the term 'shift' is used in the literature to refer to changes which occur or may occur in the process of translation. The applied strategies and decisions taken by translators, when different codes are involved, is the omission of one (or more) item in the ST, the modification of the ST, the addition of an item in the ST, and/or the retaining of an element on-fitted in the ST, etc. This act of mediation taken or imposed on the translator necessarily entails certain patterns of change. Such changes on the part of the translated text are known by contemporary translation descriptive studies as 'Translation Shifts' (2001). Shifts in translation are seen as positive consequences and not considered as errors (2001). Blum-Kulka (2004) believed that shifts "occur due to the communicative function of the translated text in adjusting the text to the expectations of the target readers". Shifts on the part of a translation can occur at any levels (e. g. syntactic, semantic, stylistic, pragmatic, and etc. Shift in cohesion is inevitable element in translation for having natural text some of shifts are mandatory and optional (2004).

The prescriptive undertone has completely disappeared, and shifts are now recognized as a "phenomenon inherent to translation" (van Leuven-Zwart 1990b: 228) or even "a defining feature of translation" (Toury 2004: 22), which makes them a suitable object of investigation within descriptive translation studies and the empirical corpus-based approach. She does not describe what translators could and should do or not do, but simply observes and describes what they actually have done.

Method

The present research is based on a descriptive and comparative analysis. The comparative model is complementary to the descriptive model and is designed for the identification of shifts of cohesion in ST-TT text pairs that occur through translation by means of comparison. The descriptive model is used to provide the theoretical basis and insights needed for examining and describing the results of the comparative analysis (i. e. the shifts identified in cohesion). Following Toury (1980: 112-113), an indispensable prerequisite for any comparison of two objects to be systematically and adequately carried out is the establishment of unified units of comparison. So, sentence with full stop is regarded as a yardstick or unit of comparison in the analysis of data.

Corpus

In order to investigate GCDs in ST and TT separately and shifts of grammatical cohesion in TT as well as the strategies used through translation, the book, *Oral Reproduction of Stories* (Birjandi and Nowruzi, 2004) was selected as the source text, along with its Persian translation by the same authors.

Data Collection

The selected text in the corpus is, according to Newmark (1998), judged as representative of the text-type category called Narrative. To maintain the quality and

effectiveness of the research, the first page of each story together with its translation, totally 39 pages with their translations, was selected as sample for the analysis of the data. For the ease of reference, each story with its translation was accorded a table.

Procedure

In order to achieve the goals of the study, it was necessary to follow three main procedures respectively: finding grammatical cohesive devices in ST and TT according to the model mentioned in the previous section, determining the frequency and percentage of GCDs, and finally identifying shift cohesive markers and describing the likely consequences of shifts and strategies used in the translated text as follows:

Method of Identifying Grammatical Cohesion in ST&TT and shifts of GCDs

For the ease of reference, each story with its translation was accorded a table. Thus, a table is divided into two main columns, one column is related to ST and the other is related to TT. To find GCDs, each main column is divided into four columns named NS= number of sentence, cohesion type, cohesive item and presupposed item respectively. Then, rows are created under title of cohesion for the sentences establishing the cohesive relations. Finally, at the end of each table the number of occurrence of GCDs in ST and TT is shown. In order to identify shifts of GCDs and strategies used in the translation the following was done: The excerpts of the pairs of units under discussion (i. e. ST units and their TT equivalent units at which shift had occurred) were quoted and displayed in a row of the same table under the title, Analysis of Cohesive Shift. So, each illustrative excerpt under discussion has a reference for the pairs of comparable units: for example, "ST5=TT8 and TT5" means sentence No. 5 in source text is compared with sentences No.5 in the translated text as in the table below:

Table 4: Method of identifying cohesion types and shifts of cohesion

Source Text				Translation Text			
Glove				دستکش			
NS	Cohesion Type	Cohesive Item	Presupposed Item	Presupposed Item	Cohesive Item	Cohesion Type	N S
1		The schoolmaster was watching the two men climb toward him.			مدیر دو مردی را که بسوی او بالا می آمدند می نگریدست.		۱
2		<u>One</u> was on horseback, the other on foot.			یکی سوار اسب و دیگری پیاده بود.		۲
Cohesion 2	SN	one	Two men (sentence1)	دو مردی	یکی	SN	۲ انسجام
5		From time to time <u>the</u> horse stumbled.			گاه گاه اسب سکندری می خورد.		۵
Cohesion 5	RDA	<u>The</u> (horse)	Horse (sentence 1)	-	-	-	۵ انسجام
Analysis of Cohesive Shift							
Reference of the excerpt of the pair of comparable units: ST5=TT 5							
Shift of Cohesive Marker			Shift Type		strategy		

The (horse) = اسب	Elimination of cohesion / change of cohesive tie			Substitution of grammatical cohesive relation into lexical cohesive relation (Reference to Lexical) Repetition of اسب in sentence 2					
Distribution of Occurrence of GCDs in the Excerpt of Table									
	Reference			Substitution			Ellipsis		
	RP	RD	RC	SN	SV	SC	EN	EV	EC
ST									
TT									

Results and discussion

The results obtained from the analysis of cohesion (appendix1) indicate that the TT adopted all the three types of GCDs except verbal and clausal substitution, with verbal substitution being carried down by reference, ellipsis and lexical cohesion, despite the considerable difference regarding their frequencies in the text. Table 5 below indicates the number of each grammatical cohesive type which occurred in ST and TT. With the total number of devices 613 in ST and 680 in TT, both the texts adopted all three types, except the sub-type of substitution (the verbal substitution and clausal substitution in ST and TT).

The results of the GCDs show that distribution of occurrence of the grammatical cohesive devices motivated cohesive relation in the translated text (53%), more than that of the source text (47%). The table also demonstrates that GCDs depended highly on Reference, as it represents 94.44% in ST and 96.76% in TT of the total cohesive relations generated. In the second place appears Ellipsis with 5.07% in ST and 2.94% in TT, while substitution comes third, with 0.49% in ST and 0.29% in TT, respectively.

Table 5: The frequencies and Percentages of the GCDS

Corpus	Reference		Substitution		Ellipsis		Total	
Source Text	577	94.44%	3	0.49%	31	5.07%	611	47%
Translated Text	658	96.76%	2	0.29%	20	2.94%	680	53%

The results show that reference is the most dominant category utilized in the same text type and ellipsis and substitution are scarcely exploited, corresponding to Halliday and Hassan (1976) who assert that they occur more frequently in language.

Regarding the analysis of shifts (appendix 2), the results show that three types of shift occurred in translation, with the most frequent shift type being change, elimination and new cohesion, respectively. These shifts result from translation strategies such as addition, omission, substitution and modification of structure, and all cohesive shifts can be attributed to language systematic differences Baker (1992, P: 80), to differences in stylistic preferences (Blum- Kulka, 1986, P:19) and to the translation process (Blum- Kulka, 1986, P:19). It is clear that some shifts with their strategies are optional and some are obligatory. This study demonstrates three shifts that correspond to Khalid Hadi Al-Amri's study (2005) about shifts of cohesive markers in Arabic translation of argumentative texts.

The relationships between the types of shifts and the kinds of the translation actions that have affected them are presented as follows:

A new cohesion relation

This type of shift in cohesion involves the establishment of a new cohesive relation not present in the source text, but created through translation. It is affected by various kinds of translation actions or strategies implemented by the translators, including:

- Paraphrasing / Breaking down sentence
- Modification and Adjustment of structure of a sentence
- Substituting

Elimination of cohesion relation

This type of shift involves the elimination of a ST grammatical cohesive relation, partially or wholly through translation. It is affected by various kinds of translation actions implemented by the translator as follows:

- Embedded Sentence (Structural incorporation/information collecting)
- Modification and Adjustment of structure of a sentence (Explicitness of Cohesive Marker or omission of cohesive marker)
- Substitution of grammatical cohesive relation into lexical cohesive relation

Change of cohesion

This type of shift involves changing the type of the cohesive tie and explicating of cohesive marker by maintaining cohesive relation used in the ST in translation by means of substitution. It is affected by the translation strategy of substitution as the following:

- Substitution of sub -type cohesive tie (Reference to Ellipsis, substitution, or verse each other).
- Explicitness of cohesive marker with maintaining grammatical cohesive relation.
- Substitution of cohesive marker).

Conclusion

The conclusion drawn from the present study is that the TT applied all grammatical cohesions according to the model, except the sub-type of substitution; verbal substitution is carried down by reference, ellipsis and lexical cohesion. The results of the GCDs show that the distribution of occurrence of the grammatical cohesive devices motivated cohesive relation in the translated text (53%) more than that of source text (47%). It also demonstrates that GCDs depended highly on Reference, as it represents 94.44% in ST and 96.76% in TT of the total cohesive relations generated. In the second place appears Ellipsis with 5.07% in ST and 2.94% in TT. Regarding the analysis of the shifts, this study shows that the three types of shift occurred through translation and most shift types occurred is change, elimination and new cohesion, respectively. These shifts result from translation actions such as normal strategies (addition, omission, substitution and modification of structure) in translation, and all cohesive shifts can be attributed to language systematic differences Baker (1992, P: 80), to differences in stylistic preferences (Blum- Kulka, 1986, P:19) and to the translation process (Blum- Kulka, 1986, P:19). It is clear that some shifts with their strategies are optional and some, obligatory. This study also demonstrates three shifts corresponding to Khalid Hadi Al-Amri's study (2005) about shifts of cohesive markers in Arabic translation of argumentative texts.

Reference

- Baker, M. (1992) *In Other Words: A Course Book on Translation*. London: Routledge.
 Birjandi, P & Nowruzi, M.(2004) *Oral Reproduction of Stories*, 14 th , Samt, Tehran.
 Blum-Kulka, S. (1986) 'Shifts of Cohesion and Coherence in Translation'. In I. House and S. Blurn-Kulka (eds) *Interlingual and Intercultural Communication: Discourse and*

Cognition in Translation and Second Language Acquisition Studies. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag. 17-35.

Blum-Kulka, S. (2004). Shifts of Cohesion and Coherence in Translation. In L. Venuti (Ed.), *The Translation Studies Reader* (2nd ed., pp. 290-305). New York: Routledge.

Halliday, M. K. and Hasan, R. (1976) *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.

Hatim, B. (2001) *Teaching and Researching Translation*. Essex: Pearson Education limited.

Khalid hadi al-amri (2005), *Shifts of cohesive markers in Arabic translation of argumentative texts*. Durham University

Leuven-Zwart, K. van (1990) 'Translation and Original: Similarities and Dissimilarities, 2', *Target*, 2: 1.69-95.

Newmark, P. (1988) *A Textbook of Translation*. London: Prentice Hall.

Newmark, P. (1991) *About Translation*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters,

Pekkanen, H. (2007). The duet of the author and the translator: Looking at style through shifts in literary translation. *New voices in translation studies*, 3, 118.

Toury, G. (1980) *In Search of a Theory of Translation*. Tel Aviv: Tel Aviv University Academic Press.

Toury, Gideon. (2004) "Probabilistic Explanations in Translation Studies: Welcome as they are, would they qualify as Universals?" In: Mauranen, Anna & Pekka Kujamäki (eds.) 2004. pp. 15-32.

Appendix 1
The Results of GCDS in ST and TT

Total of Occurrence of GCDS in Source text																	
RP		Reference						Substitution			Ellipsis						
		RD			RC	SN	SV	SC	EN	EV	EC						
RD	RDA	RDE															
He	1 2 4	It	2 3	T H E	110	this	1 0	safe r	1	o n e	3	First mate <u>X</u>	1	Do n't <u>X</u>	1	Ye s <u>X</u>	4
his	5 3	Th is	4			that	3	othe r	1			the Underg round <u>X</u>	2	Did n't <u>X</u>	1	No <u>X</u>	7
him	2 9	Th at	1 1			It	9					Nazis <u>X</u>	1	It was <u>X</u>	1	W hat <u>X</u>	2
Yo u	2 9	Th os e	3			the se	1					The great actor <u>X</u>	1	Can 't <u>X</u>	1	W hy <u>X</u>	1
She	2 5	Its	2									Any <u>X</u>	1			All rig ht <u>X</u>	1
her	2 5	H er e	1									Elder <u>X</u>	2			We ll <u>X</u>	1
I	2 4	Th er e	6									Young er <u>X</u>	1			No w <u>X</u>	1
The y	2 2	Th es e	3									Yours <u>X</u>	1				
we	9	Th e m	2														
My	8																
The m	8																
The y	7																
The ir	6																
Me	5																
our	4																
you r	3																
Us	2																
Yo urs	2																
The ir	1																
It	1																
RP	RD						RC	SN	SV	SC	EN	EV	EC				
387	188						2	3	0	0	10	4	17				
Reference							Substitution			Ellipsis							
577							3			31							

Total of Occurrence of GCDS in Translated Text

Occurrence of GDS in Translated Text									
Reference			Substitution			Ellipsis			
RP	RD		RC	SN	SV	SC	EN	EV	EC

		RD		RDA		RDE																
Ø	18 7	این	2 0	ک ه	7	آن	1	تر	3	هم	1					<u>X</u> هردو	1	کل جمله	1	<u>X</u> آري	3	
اش	99	آن	2 4	را	1 5	این	1 5	مثل	2	يك ي	1					<u>X</u> كمك اول	1			<u>X</u> نه	6	
ند	56	آنها	4			اینطور	1	هماني	1							<u>X</u> نهضت	2			خيلي خب <u>X</u> خب/ خب	2	
ام/م	48	آنجا	8			اش	1	اینقدر	1							<u>X</u> نازي	1			<u>X</u> بله	1	
او/اون وي	40	اینجا	3			Ø	1	آنقدر	1							<u>X</u> هنر پيشه بزرگ	1			<u>X</u> چه	1	
ي/ايد	22	اش	5			آنها	1	ديگري	1													
يم	16	Ø	4			اینجا	1															
شان	14	آنچه	1																			
من	11	کدام	1																			
شما/نو	11																					
آنها	10																					
ما	7																					
ت	5																					
مان	4																					
تان	3																					
همديگر	2																					
آن که	1																					
RP		RD					RC			SN	SV	SC	EN		EV		EC					
536		113					9			2	0	0	6		1		13					
Reference									Substitution			Ellipsis										
658									2			20										

Appendix 2

New cohesion

This type of shifts in cohesion involves the establishment of a new cohesive relation not present in the source text but it is created through translation. This type of shifts is affected by various kinds of translation actions or strategies implemented by the translators, including:

Paraphrasing / Breaking down sentence

When a sentence in ST is divided into two or more in TT is called Paraphrasing/ breaking down sentence. In this strategy, it sometime causes the item whose cohesive relation is structural or within the sentence (ST) to be changed into cohesive semantic relation between sentence.

Source Text				Translation Text			
Two loaves of Bread				دو قرص نان			
N	Cohesion	Cohesive	Presuppo	Presuppo	Cohesive	Cohesion	N
S	Type	Item	sed Item	sed Item	Item	Type	S
2		Miss Martha was forty, her bank-book showed a credit of two thousand dollars, and she possessed two false teeth and a sympathetic heart.			خانم مارتا چهل ساله بود و دفترچه بانكي اش حسابي دو هزار دلاري را نشان مي داد.		۳
	Embedded Sentence			دو دندان مصنوعي و قلبي پرترحم داشت.			۴
Cohesion	-	-	-	خانم مارتا ميشام (جمله ۳)	Ø (داشت)	RP	انضمام
Analysis of Cohesive Shift							
Reference of the excerpt of the pair of comparable units: ST2=TT 4							
Shift of Cohesive Marker			Shift Type		strategy		
she = Ø (داشت)			New cohesion		Paraphrasing / Breaking down sentence		

Modification and Adjustment of structure of a sentence

The principle of modification and adjustment of structure of sentence involves expanding and compressing or diminishing structural and information a sentence within itself (without breaking a sentence into two or more and vice versa) while translating text. In this case if the translated text is inserted a grammatical element (with a cohesive function) or a new information unit that is not present in the source text, hence, TT establishes a new cohesive relation.

Adding grammatical information unit

This strategy is diverged from structural expansion/ information and it is referred to the translation strategy of addition involves adding to the source text new information unit(s) conveyed by structural units such as phrase or clause functioning cohesive.

Source Text				Translation Text			
The Emperor's New Clothes				لباس هاي جديد امپراطور			
NS	Cohesion Type	Cohesive Item	Presupposed Item	Presupposed Item	Cohesive Item	Cohesion Type	N S
5							5
They gave themselves out as weavers, and said that they knew how to weave the most beautiful stuffs imaginable.				آنها خودشان را نساج جا زدند و گفتند كه مي دانند چطور زيباترين پارچه هاي قابل تصور را ببافند.			
10							10
Yes, I certainly must order some of that stuff to be woven for me.				آري! مسلما بايد سفارش بدهم تا مقداري از آن پارچه را براي من ببافند.			
Cohesion	-	-	-	نساج	ند (ببافند)	RP	انسجام ۱۲
Analysis of Cohesive Shift							
Reference of the excerpt of the pair of comparable units: ST10=TT 12							
Shift of Cohesive Marker	Shift Type			strategy			
- (ند) (ببافند) = -	New cohesion			Modification and Adjustment of structure of a sentence. structural expansion/information splitting (Or change of grammatical structure)			

Adding a grammatical cohesive element

The strategy is also diverged from structural expansion/information splitting created by the translation strategy, this is, to insert in the translated text a grammatical cohesive element (with a cohesive function) that is not present in the source text, hence, TT establishes a new cohesive relation.

Source Text				Translation Text			
An Old Man				پير مرد			
NS	Cohesion Type	Cohesive Item	Presupposed Item	Presupposed Item	Cohesive Item	Cohesion Type	N S
2							۲
The new spa at Rondelis offers all the advantages desirable for a lengthy stay or even for permanent residence.				چشمه ي آب معدني جديد در ((روندیس)) تمام امتيازات دلخواه براي اقامتي طولاني مدت و يا حتي سكونت دائمي را ارائه مي كند.			
6							۶
And the public came along in droves.				و مردم گروه گروه راهي آنجا شدند.			

Cohesion 6	-	-	-	روندیس(جمله ۲ (آنجا	RD	انسجام ۶
Analysis of Cohesive Shift							
Reference of the excerpt of the pair of comparable units: ST6=TT6							
Shift of Cohesive Markers	Shift Type			Strategy			
- = آنجا	New cohesion			<u>Modification and Adjustment of structure of a sentence</u> (adding a cohesive item (lexicon)).			

Substitution

The translation strategy of substitution refers to translate a ST element (with no cohesive relation) by a TL translational-equivalent element (with a cohesive relation), hence, TT establishes a new cohesive relation.

Source Text				Translation Text			
Charles				چارلز			
NS	Cohesion Type	Cohesive Item	Presupposed Item	Presupposed Item	Cohesive Item	Cohesion Type	N S
7			Laurie regarded his father coldly.			لري به سردی به پدرش نگاه کرد	۱۰
11			“The teacher spanked a boy, though,” Laurie said, addressing his bread and butter.			در حالی که به نان و کره اش اشاره می کرد گفت: ((امروز معلم یک پسر را سخت تنبیه کرد.))	۱۲
Cohesion ۱۱	-	-	-	لري(جمله ۱۰)	(گفت/کرد) ∅	RP	انسجام ۱۲
Analysis of Cohesive Shift							
Reference of the excerpt of the pair of comparable units: ST11=TT12							
Shift of Cohesive Markers		Shift Type		Strategy			
Laurie = (گفت/کرد)∅		New cohesion		Substitution (Pronominalization (to replace a noun or noun phrase with a pronoun) or to use conjugating ending (argument of verb))			

Elimination of Cohesion

This type of shifts involves the elimination of a ST grammatical cohesive relation partially or wholly through translation. This type of shifts is affected by various kinds of translation actions implemented by the translator:

Embedded sentence

When two or more than sentences in source text are combined into one sentence in translated text, it is referred to as Embedded Sentence. In this case, the grammatical cohesive relation in ST may be omitted in TT through this action (translation strategy) as in:

Source Text				Translation Text			
Two loaves of Bread				دو قرص نان			
N S	Cohesion Type	Cohesive Item	Presupposed Item	Presupposed Item	Cohesive Item	Cohesion Type	N S
5							6
6				Embedded sentence			
Cohesion	RP	he	a middle-aged man	-	-	-	انسجام
Analysis of Cohesive Shift							
Reference of the excerpt of the pair of comparable units: ST6=TT6							
Shift of Cohesive Markers			Shift Type	Strategy			
He = -			Elimination of cohesion	Embedded Sentence (Structural incorporation/information collecting)			

Modification and Adjustment of structure of a sentence

The principle of modification and adjustment of structure of a sentence involves expanding and compressing or diminishing structural and information unit a sentence within itself (without breaking a sentence into two or more and vice versa) while translating text. In this case if translator omits a grammatical element (with a cohesive function) that is present in the source text or makes it explicit in TT, therefore; TT eliminates a grammatical cohesive relation as follows:

Explicitness of Cohesive Marker

The translation strategy of omission involves explicating a source text cohesive marker in the translated text through translation without maintaining the grammatical cohesive relation. It is usually done by clearing the referent (presupposed item) of the ST cohesive item without having a role of the cohesive relation, as in:

Source Text				Translation Text			
The Ugly Duckling				جوجه اردك زشت			
N S	Cohesion Type	Cohesive Item	Presupposed Item	Presupposed Item	Cohesive Item	Cohesion Type	N S
9							10
10							11
Cohesion	RP	They	Egg	-	-	-	انسجام
Analysis of Cohesive Shift							

Reference of the excerpt of the pair of comparable units: ST10=TT11		
Shift of Cohesive Markers	Shift Type	Strategy
they = جوجه ها	Elimination of cohesion	Explicitness of A Cohesive Marker

Omission of Cohesive Marker

There is another translation strategy of omission involves omitting some lexico-grammatical units of the ST through translation. This is done by collecting structural and information unit without maintaining a grammatical cohesive relation, for example:

Source Text				Translation Text			
All the Years of Her Life				همه سال هاي زندگي او			
NS	Cohesion Type	Cohesive Item	Presupposed Item	Presupposed Item	Cohesive Item	Cohesion Type	NS
9			What is it Mr. Carr?" <u>he</u> asked.		پرسيد: ((چه شده آقاي كار؟)).		10
12			"What do <u>you</u> mean? Do <u>you</u> think I'm crazy?" Alfred blustered.		آلفرد به هارت و پورت افتاد.		13
Cohesion ²	RP	You(2)	Sam Carr (s2,6,9)	-	-	-	13

Analysis of Cohesive Shift

Reference of the excerpt of the pair of comparable units: ST12=TT13		
Shift of Cohesive Markers	Shift Type	Strategy
you = -	Elimination of cohesion	omission of a cohesive device

Substitution of grammatical cohesive relation into lexical cohesion

This strategy of translation involves omission of the grammatical cohesive relation that may be not existence TL exact transitionally-equivalent element and in order to compensate cohesion, TT uses lexical cohesion or repetition of the item, this type of shifts is also affected by the translation strategy of substitution of grammatical cohesive relation into lexical cohesive relation. Nida's view is advocated by Baker (1992: 180), who maintains that different grammatical structures in the SL and TL may cause remarkable changes in the way information or a message is carried across. She affirms, "These changes may induce the translator to add or to omit information in the TT because of the lack of particular grammatical devices in the TL itself. Amongst those grammatical devices that might create problems in translation include person number and gender, tense and aspects, voice, etc."

This strategy involves omitting source text cohesive marker in the translated text through translation, as in the following illustrative examples:

Cohesion 7	EV	Don't	splash around in the water(s6)	آب به اطراف بپاشند(جمله ۸)	این (کار)	RD	عناصر
Analysis of Cohesive Shift							
Reference of the excerpt of the pair of comparable units: ST7=TT9							
Shift of cohesive devices		shift type		Strategy			
Don't = این کار را نکن		Change of Cohesion		Substitution of sub -type cohesive tie (Ellipsis to Reference)			

Explicitness of cohesive marker with maintaining grammatical cohesive relation

In the strategy, TT makes the cohesive marker clear but maintains grammatical cohesive relation by using cohesive item which is not equivalent to that of used in ST.

Confessions of Gallomanica				اعترافات يك گالومانياك			
NS	Cohesion Type	Cohesive Item	Presupposed Item	Presupposed Item	Cohesive Item	Cohesion Type	NS
4	Nor could this communication problem be solved by any of the commercial or academic methods that I had available for use.			این مشکل ارتباط را نمی شد به کمک هیچ روش تجاري و يا دانشگاهي که براي استفاده در اختيار داشتم حل کرد.			۴
5	They either was too slow or else led in directions that I did not wish to follow.			این روش ها يا خيلي کند بودند و يا آنکه به مسيري منتهي مي شدند که بدان ها متمایل نبودم.			۵
Cohesion 5	RP	They	Methods (s4)	روش تجاري يا دانشگاهي (جمله ۴)	این (روش ها)	RD	عناصر
Analysis of Cohesive Shift							
Reference of the excerpt of the pair of comparable units: ST7=TT9							
Shift of cohesive devices		shift type		Strategy			
they= این (روش ها)		Change of cohesion		Explicitness of cohesive marker with maintaining grammatical cohesive relation			

Substitution of Cohesive Marker

The translation strategy of substitution involves rendering a ST cohesive element (with cohesive relation) that exist in TT two forms of which , one of them is obligatory and the other is optional so if TT uses the form of option there is no shift but if TT applies to the obligatory form , shift of substitution. In the other words, in the linguistics when two or more items in the native language become coalesced (come together) into one item in the target language is called Coalescence so for example in the Persian the argument of verb and its pronoun is coalesce into one item (subject pronoun) in English. According to above, argument of the verb is obligatory and pronoun is optional in sentence of Persian. This type of shifts is mainly

affected by structural mismatch and translation strategy of substitution. This strategy involves changing the type of the cohesive markers used in the ST through translation,

Little Girls Wiser Than Old Men				دختران کوچک زیرک تر از مردان پیر			
NS	Cohesion Type	Cohesive Item	Presupposed Item	Presupposed Item	Cohesive Item	Cohesion Type	NS
3							4
6							8
Cohesion 6	RP	They / their	Two little girls (s3)	دو دختر کوچک (جمله 4)	شان (بنظرشان) /ند(بیاشند)	RP	شان
Analysis of Cohesive Shift							
Reference of the excerpt of the pair of comparable units: ST6=TT8							
Shift of cohesive devices			shift type		Strategy		
They/their= اند/شان			Change of cohesion		Substitution of Cohesive Marker		