

In the Name of God



Shahid Bahonar University of Kerman

Faculty of Humanities & Letter

Department of Foreign Languages

Investigation of Cohesion Shifts

in

the Translations of Hemingway's *The Sun Also Rises* into Persian

Prepared by:

Nooshin Zabeti

Supervisor:

Dr. Masoud Sharififar

Advisor:

Dr. Nezam-al-Din Moin Zade

**A Thesis Submitted as a Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Master of Science in Translation Studies (M.Sc.)**

July 2013

Dedicated to:

My Mother and My Husband, For Their Love and Encouragement

Acknowledgement

The present portion is the most formidable part of my thesis as I attempt to state my most appreciation to the dear people who helped me to direction of preparing it, from its start to the end. First of all, I am extremely thankful to the Almighty without whom anything can reach its own specific goal. I am sincerely indebted to my dear supervisor Dr. Sharififar for his encouragement with this project and for his detailed comments and suggestions on my thesis. My thanks also go to Dr. Moinzade, my great advisor for his support during the writing of this research. Finally, warm thanks to my family and friends who have had to put up with me writing away on the computer instead of relaxing with them, especially to my husband, whose love and help were so important during the writing of this thesis.

Abstract

A wide interest has grown up recently in the application of textlinguistics theories on translation studies. It was this tendency that has promoted the researcher to carry out the study of cohesion shifts in translation. The present study addressed the recurring problems in translating cohesive devices from English into Persian . It was concerned with the phenomenon of cohesion shifts in translation. The study aimed at testing the comprehensiveness of Halliday & Hasan's model of cohesion and identifying areas of cohesion shifts at the textual level according to Shlesinger's model, as they appear in two Persian translation versions of Hemingway's "*The Sun also Rises*". It attempted also to explain the frequency of cohesion shifts and how certain shifts were motivated by the translators more than the others were. These shifts were related to the system divergences of the SL and the TL (obligatory shifts) or to the stylistic and aesthetic considerations (optional shifts). The analysis showed a great and distinctive difference between the rate of the ST and the TT cohesive ties due to three possible shifts to maintain text cohesiveness in translation. These were the retention, omission and addition of the cohesive ties. In view of the findings of the data analysis, the study presented some general conclusions, the most important of which was that cohesion shifts were frequent in translation due to language divergences or the translators' subjective preferences of the lexical items. The study also revealed that omission of the cohesive ties is the most common type of shifts across categories except for the case of conjunction and lexical- cohesion, which are characterized by the retention of cohesive ties. Yet, omission is modified by the replacement of some other lexical cohesive ties.

Key words: cohesion , cohesion shifts, omission, addition, retention.

Table of Contents

Chapter One: Introduction

1.1. Introduction	1
1.2. Statement of the Problem	4
1.3. Objective of the Study and Research Questions	6
1.4. Significance of the Study	7
1.5. Theoretical Framework	8
1.6. Definition of Key Terms	15

Chapter Two: Review of Literature

2.1. Introduction	16
2.2. Approaches of Translation Shifts	17
2.2.1. Catford`s Linguistic Approach of Translation Shifts	17
2.2.2. Vinay & Darbelnet`s Approach	20
2.2.3. Newmark`s Shifts/Transpositions	24
2.2.4. Van Leuven Zwart`s Model	25
2.2.5. Other Writings on Translation Shifts	26
2.2.6. Hassnawi's Model of Shifts Analysis	29
2.3. Cohesion shifts in Translation	37
2.3.1. The Concept of Cohesion	37
2.3.2. Cohesion & Coherence	40
2.3.3. Categories of Cohesion	45
2.4. Models on Cohesion Shifts in Translation	58
2.4.1. Blum-Kulka's Model	58
2.4.2. Shlesinger's Model of Cohesion Shifts	63
2.5. Studies done in Iran	

Chapter Three: Methodology

3.1. Introduction	68
3.2. Procedure	68
3.3. Data Collection	69
3.4. Data Analysis	69

Chapter Four: Results	
4.1. Introduction	71
4.2. The Analysis of ST and TT	71
Chapter Five: Discussion	
5.1. Introduction	112
5.2. Summary of the Study	112
5.3. Response to the First Research	113
5.4. Response to the Second Research Question	125
5.5. Conclusion	127
5.6. Implications of the Study	129
5.7. Limitations of the Study	130
5.8. Further Research	130
Bibliography	131

List of Tables

Table1.....	50
Table2.....	52
Table3.....	57
Table4.....	64
Table5.....	125
Table7.....	128
Table8.....	130

List of Columns

Column1	32
Column2	32
Column3	33

List of Figures

Figure 1.....	123
Figure 2.....	126
Figure 3.....	127
Figure 4.....	129
Figure 5.....	131

List of Abbreviations

ST.....	Source Text
TT.....	Target Text
SL.....	Source Language
TL.....	Target Language
RL.....	Receptor Language
SG.....	Systemic Grammar
TG.....	Transformational Grammar

1.1. Introduction

Development in textlinguistics studies has its effective contribution to the rise of translation studies. Early grammatical theories have held the sentence as the largest grammatical unit of analysis (Bloomfield, 1933; Chomsky, 1957) and have made no provision to study long stretches of text. In the late sixties, textlinguistics started to develop, where a new perspective has emerged to deal with language beyond the sentence level. One of the central issues the linguists concentrated on is how sentences interconnect to form larger units or texts. Various theoretical textlinguistics studies have appeared, among which Halliday & Hasan (1976) and de Beaugrande & Dressler (1981) are related closely to the current study.

Halliday & Hasan's (1976) have drawn attention to the linguistic relations that make the text hang together. This subject is concerned with the relations between two units (sentences, paragraphs, etc.) and the particles that serve as formal markers of those relations. Concepts of texture, textuality, cohesion and coherence are keywords of this approach. Halliday and Hasan (1976) ensured that various cohesive devices (reference, substitution, ellipsis,

conjunctions and lexical cohesion) are used to refer anaphorically or cataphorically to entities in a text to establish logical relations in that text.

De Beaugrande and Dressler's (1981) provided standards and principles of textuality. According to this approach, texts are viewed as communicative occurrences or “*vehicles of purposeful interaction*” (ibid P.81). A text, oral or written has to meet seven standards of textuality namely cohesion, coherence, intentionality, acceptability, informativity, situationality and intertextuality. If any of these standards are not satisfied, the text is not considered communicative. As it was mentioned, the starting point of the seven standards is cohesion, which concerns the components of the surface text and rests upon grammatical dependencies. Coherence is the second standard as identified by De Beaugrande & Dressler (1981), which concerns the components of the textual world and rests upon propositional dependencies. It is the configuration of concepts and relations underlie the surface text. Cohesion and coherence are text-centered notions since they designate operations at the text materials (cf. Alan, 1994: 4, De Beaugrande & Dressler, 1981: 3-15 and Leech & Short, 1981: 243).

The present study of cohesion shifts in English-Persian translation is designed to test the application of Halliday & Hassan's model of cohesion (1976) as one of the most influential models of textual analysis in translation. With reference to the perspective of the current study, translation studies is no longer viewed as a subfield of linguistics; rather they have become the sun around which language sciences orbit (Jakobson, 1987). With regard to cohesive elements, Newmark (1988) defined them as the features that bind sentences to each other grammatically and lexically. Newmark (1991) examined cohesion in his discussion of text analysis and described it as the most useful constituent of textlinguistics applicable to translation. He added that it is important for a translator to know how cohesive devices operate in the source language (henceforth, SL) and the target language (henceforth, TL).

In their discussion of discourse texture, Hatim & Mason (1990) described cohesion as an integral component of a text for it displays connectivity between the surface elements. They added that the translator has to be aware of how cohesive devices operate differently across languages. They stated that there is a difference in the range of cohesive devices available in the SL and TL. Hatim & Mason (1997) also considered that the analysis of cohesion is essential for achieving

a desired equivalence in translation. Understanding the texture of the source text (henceforth, ST) provides better understanding of the lexical and grammatical choices for the target text (henceforth, TT).

Having introduced the relevance of textlinguistics to the translation studies, it can be said that cohesive devices constitute the thread that keeps text continuity. Translators must be aware of how they operate in both the SL and the TL. Failure to recover these cohesive devices in translation leads to incorrect rendering and miscomprehension of the TT.

1.2. Statement of the Problem

In the territory of translation, problems are proven to be many – folded. These problems can be diction, writing, style, register, grammar, etc. According to De Beaugrande and Dressler's (1981) a text, oral or written has to meet seven standards of textuality. If any of these standards are not satisfied, the text is not considered communicative. The starting point of the seven standards is cohesion, which concerns the components of the surface text and rests upon grammatical dependencies.

The problem of translating cohesive devices significantly shows itself in translation of literary texts. Anyone who wants to study the

meaning of a literary text must consider the semantic unity of the text as a whole in addition to the meaning of the words and sentences in it. This is especially true for translators. But it is observed that many translators do often lose sight of this part of the meaning of the text. Therefore translators must be aware of all times of the cohesive elements that carry unity in texts in both SL and RL.

With regard to meaning, Blum-Kulka (1986) pointed out that cohesive ties do much more than providing continuity to the text as they also create semantic unity for that text. Selecting the types of cohesive markers used in a particular text can affect the texture as well as the style and meaning of that text. In the same way, unnecessary retention of cohesive devices from the ST to the TT will also affect the text. Shlesinger (1995), like Blum-Kulka (1986), discussed the importance of cohesion in the process of translation in a study that is based on the assumption that cohesion shifts have been postulated as one of the universals of language mediation. She pointed out that cohesive devices serve a crucial function in text interpretation in that they define links and relationships between primary textual elements. Failure to reproduce these links in a translation can significantly alter text reception and meaning.

The next stumbling block is the importance of Lexical cohesion as a cohesive device in literary texts and must be highlighted in translation due to its significant contribution to establishing the aesthetic effect of the text. For example, Repetition, as a lexical cohesive device, is considered as a strategy of dramatization in literary texts and, thus, must be maintained in translation.

1.3. Objective of the Study and Research Questions

The wide interest has grown up recently in the application of textlinguistics theories on translation studies. It is this tendency that has promoted the researcher to carry out the study of cohesion shifts in translation and to base her thesis upon scrutinizing “Hemingway's greatest work” (Meyers, 1985, p. 98-99), “*The sun also rises*”.

Translators may maintain, add or delete some portions of a text to keep text cohesive. A case which gives a complete picture about the fact that cohesion shifts are inevitable in translation and that explication is not always favorable. Due to such reasons, the study aims at identifying areas of cohesion shifts at the textual level according to shlesinger’s model as the first objective. It means that the cohesive devices in the original version will be compared with the two TTs in order to find which cohesive shifts types have the highest

frequency and how certain shifts are motivated by the translators more than the others. The two translation versions are from two translators namely, Hanife vand moghadam (1362) and Lame (1389). The other target of the present study is to explain the comprehensiveness of Halliday and Hassan's model of cohesion (1976) in translation studies.

Therefore, according to the mentioned aims, the following questions can be posed:

1. Which of Shlesinger's cohesion shifts have the highest frequency in two versions? Are there certain shifts motivated by the translators more than the others?
2. To what extent is the application of Halliday and Hassan's model of cohesion is comprehensive on translation studies?

1.4. Significance of the Study

This study is expected to establish a basis for the formulation of the adequate techniques in translating cohesive devices. In addition to determining areas of explicit cohesive shifts in the TT, the study is designed to distinguish between two types of cohesion shifts. The first one occurs due to the linguistic contrast between the two languages in issue (obligatory shifts). The second

type is related to the stylistic preferences of the translators (optional shifts).

Additionally, the study has relevance to translation teaching since it contributes to the development of tools and methodologies to indicate explicating shifts in general and explicating cohesion shifts in particular. It is expected that a description of such phenomenon in translation will provide a better understanding of translation as a cross-cultural communication and provide some insight for researchers, teachers and students of translation on the translation strategies in translating cohesive devices. It is hoped that this study will pave the way for deeper and more comprehensive investigation about translation shifts.

1.5. Theoretical Framework

The present study is eclectic, as a result theoretical frameworks should be proposed both in linguistic and translation.

A variety of linguistic approaches of discourse and textual analysis techniques have been developed on studying texts and what makes them cohesive and coherent, or what are the properties of a text. The scope of the study restricts us to review the most influential and inspiring approaches. Among them is the cohesion theory by

Michael Halliday & Ruqaiya Hassan (1976) model of cohesion in English for analyzing cohesive ties and Shlesinger's (1995) methods to serve as guideline for analyzing cohesion shifts in translation.

Halliday & Hasan (1976) proposed two main categories of cohesion namely syntactic and lexical cohesion. Syntactic cohesion includes reference, substitution, ellipsis, and conjunction. As for lexical cohesion, it includes reiteration and collocation.

The following is an illustration of categories of cohesion.

1.5.1. Syntactic Cohesion:

In the following sections, different types of syntactic cohesion as put forward by Halliday & Hassan would be discussed. (1976). Reference is the first starting point.

1.5.1.1. Reference:

Reference is regarded by Halliday & Hassan as the specific nature of information that is signaled for retrieval. Reference as a cohesive device has to do with the introduction of a new item in the text and the