

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my deep gratitude to my kind, generous and knowledgeable supervisors, Professor Mashudi Kader and Dr. Haslina Haroon who patiently contributed much through their successive comments to the completion of the present thesis.

I am also indebted to all Iranian friends and schoolmates who tolerated my tough and aggressive disposition and encouraged me to resist all hardships of solitude and solicitude during my research far away from my dear family and beloved homeland.

My thanks also go to all Universiti Sains Malaysia (USM) compassionate lecturers and staff who humanely treated me in all occasions with respect to clerical matters, and putting their available sources at my disposal in time of needs.

Finally, I would like to heartily say a special thank you to my altruist best part, life time companion, and best friend, Akram, for her immeasurable patience and for the numerous sacrifices she made to well take care of our children, dear Anahita and Armita and their education during my absence. If she were not of this help and selflessness, the completion of the dissertation would come to naught. May The Almighty God endow her the deserved reward.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	i
TABLE OF CONTENTS	iii
KEY TO APPROXIMATE SOUNDING OF PERSIAN TRANSLITERATION	viii
LIST OF FIGURES	ix
ABSTRAK	x
ABSTRACT	xii
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION	
1.0 Introduction	1
1.1 Statement of the Problem	1
1.2 Objectives of the Study	18
1.3 Research Questions	19
1.4 A Hint on the Theoretical Framework	19
1.5 An Introduction to Persian Cohesion	20
1.5.1 Reference	20
1.5.1.1 Personal Reference	20
1.5.1.1.1 Personal Pronouns	20
1.5.1.1.2 Suffixed Pronouns	21
1.5.1.1.3 Personal Endings	22
1.5.1.2 Demonstrative Reference	22
1.5.1.3 Comparative Reference	23
1.5.2 Ellipsis	23
1.5.2.1 Nominal Ellipsis	23
1.5.2.2 Verbal Group Ellipsis	24
1.5.2.3 Ellipsis of Single Elements within the Clause	25
1.5.3 Conjunction	26
1.5.3.1 Types of Conjunction Expressions	26
1.5.3.2 Types of Conjunctive Relations	27
1.5.3.2.1 Additive	27

1.5.3.2.2	Adversative	28
1.5.3.2.3	Causal	28
1.5.3.2.4	Temporal	29
1.5.4	Lexical Cohesion	29
1.5.4.1	Lexical Reiteration	29
1.5.4.2	Lexical Collocation	31
1.6	The Scope of the Study	31
1.7	Data	32
1.7.1	A Brief Synopsis of <i>Animal Farm</i>	32
1.7.1.1	Biography	34
1.7.1.2	Theme Analysis	35
1.7.1.3	Metaphor Analysis	36
1.7.1.4	Character Profiles	39
1.7.2	A Short Comment on the Three Persian Translations of <i>Animal Farm</i>	48
1.8	The Significance of the Study	49
1.9	Definitions of Terms	50
1.10	Organization of the Study	59
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW		
2.0	Introduction	61
2.1	Discourse	62
2.2	Text	63
2.2.1	Cohesion	70
2.2.2	Coherence	73
2.3	Translation	79
2.3.1	Untranslatability	86
2.3.2	Translatability	90
2.3.3	Translation Equivalence	99
2.3.4	Discourse Analysis and Translation	104
2.3.5	Text and Translation	106
2.3.6	Shifts or Transpositions in Translation	107
2.4	Conclusion	118
CHAPTER THREE: THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND METHODOLOGY		
3.0	Introduction	119

3.1	Theoretical Framework	119
3.1.1	Text	120
3.1.2	The Functional Approach to Text	120
3.1.3	Texture	123
3.1.4	Tie	124
3.1.5	Cohesion	125
3.1.5.1	Reference	130
3.1.5.1.1	Personal Reference	133
3.1.5.1.2	Demonstrative Reference	133
3.1.5.2	Substitution and Ellipsis	134
3.1.5.2.1	Types of Substitution	136
3.1.5.2.2	Nominal Substitution	136
3.1.5.2.3	Verbal Substitution	138
3.1.5.3	Ellipsis	138
3.1.5.4	Conjunction	139
3.1.5.5	Lexical Cohesion	140
3.1.6	Coherence	150
3.1.7	Literal / Free Translation and Shifts	153
3.1.8	Shifts of Cohesion and Coherence in Translation	158
3.2	Methodology	162
3.2.1	Assessment of Data	164
3.2.2	Comparative Analysis	164
3.2.3	Corpus	164
3.2.4	Data Collection Procedure	165
3.2.5	Analysis	166
3.2.6	The Process of Analysis	167
3.2.7	Componential Analysis	168
3.3	Conclusion	170
CHAPTER FOUR: SYNTACTIC COHESION IN TRANSLATION		
4.0	Introduction	171
4.1	Syntactic Cohesion	171
4.1.1	Reference	172
4.1.1.1	Personal Reference	172
4.1.1.2	Demonstrative Reference	182

4.1.1.3	Comparative Reference	192
4.1.2	Substitution	196
4.1.2.1	Verbal Substitution	198
4.1.2.2	Clausal Substitution	201
4.1.3	Ellipsis	203
4.1.3.1	Nominal Ellipsis	203
4.1.3.2	Clausal Ellipsis	206
4.1.4	Conjunction	209
4.1.4.1	Additive	209
4.1.4.2	Adversative	213
4.1.4.3	Causal	219
4.1.4.4	Temporal	221
4.2	Conclusion	225
CHAPTER FIVE: LEXICAL COHESION IN TRANSLATION		
5.0	Introduction	227
5.1	Lexical Cohesion	227
5.1.1	Simple Repetition	227
5.1.2	Complex Lexical Repetition	236
5.1.3	Simple Paraphrase	238
5.1.4	Complex Paraphrase	250
5.1.5	Superordinate and Hyponymy	252
5.2	Collocation	255
5.2.1	Translation of Collocation	256
5.3	Conclusion	277
CHAPTER SIX: COHERENCE IN TRANSLATION		
6.0	Introduction	279
6.1	The Impact of Translatability and Untranslatability of Cohesive Devices on Coherence of the Message in the Persian Texts	279
6.1.1	Cohesive Syntactic Devices and Coherence	279
6.1.2	Lexical Cohesion and Coherence	299
6.2	Conclusion	327
CHAPTER SEVEN: CONCLUSIONS		
7.0	Introduction	330
7.1	Summary and Overview of Findings	331

7.2	Contributions	341
7.3	Further Research	342
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	344
	Texts	344
	References	344
	Appendices	355
	Appendix I	356
	Appendix II Some Samples of Source Text (ST)	390
	Appendix III Some Samples of Target Text 1 (TT1)	401
	Appendix IV Some Samples of Target Text 2 (TT2)	412
	Appendix V Some Samples of Target Text 3 (TT3)	423

Key to approximate sounding of Persian transliteration

Persian sound	English words having the equal sound	IPA symbol
b	as in <u>b</u> e, ri <u>b</u>	/ b /
d	as in <u>d</u> ay, roa <u>d</u>	/ d /
f	as in <u>f</u> ine, roo <u>f</u>	/ f /
g	as in <u>g</u> ood, bi <u>g</u>	/ g /
h	as in <u>h</u> elp, a <u>h</u> a (intrj)	/ h /
j	as in <u>j</u> oin	/ dʒ /
k	as in <u>k</u> ee <u>p</u> , pea <u>k</u>	/ k /
l	as in <u>l</u> ight, ki <u>ll</u>	/ l /
m	as in <u>m</u> oon, roo <u>m</u>	/ m /
n	as in <u>n</u> ight, moo <u>n</u>	/ n /
p	as in <u>p</u> ut, loo <u>p</u>	/ p /
r	as in <u>r</u> ight, ri <u>v</u> er	/ r /
s	as in <u>s</u> ite, bo <u>ss</u>	/ s /
t	as in <u>t</u> op, ro <u>t</u>	/ t /
v	as in <u>v</u> ery, <u>e</u> ven	/ v /
w	not a Persian speech sound, sometimes used in onomatopoeic items as /kwāk/, a duck's sound	
x	equal to Arabic /خ/	
y	as in <u>y</u> es	/ j /
z	as in <u>z</u> ero, bu <u>zz</u>	/ z /
a	equal to Arabic ا	
ā	equal to Arabic آ	
e	as in <u>e</u> n	/ e /
i	as in <u>i</u> m	/ i /
o	equal to Arabic او	
u	equal to Arabic او	
ch	as in <u>ch</u> oose, <u>ch</u> urch	/ tʃ /
sh	as in <u>sh</u> ip, <u>sh</u>	/ ʃ /
gh	equal to Arabic ق or غ	
ʔ	glottal stop	

* In the case of two identical sounds in vicinity gemmination (□) happens, e.g. ghaddi, hatta, amma

LIST OF FIGURES

	page
Figure 2.1: Presence of Coherence without the Presence of Cohesive Elements	75
Figure 2.2: Perfective and Imperfective in Russian and English	109
Figure 3.1: Cohesive Relations	127
Figure 3.2: Types of Reference	131
Figure 3.3: The Cohesive Relations of the Linguistic Levels	135
Figure 3.4: The Relation of Two Lexical Items	144
Figure 3.5: Simple Lexical Relation	145
Figure 3.6: Complex Lexical Repetition	146
Figure 3.7: Paraphrase Link	147
Figure 3.8: Paraphrase	149
Figure 3.9: Contrasting Semantic and Communicative Translation	153
Figure 3.10: The Diagrammatic Outline of the Methodology	163

SATU ANALISIS KOHESI DAN HOHERENS DALAM *ANIMAL FARM* DAN KEBOLEHTERJEMAHANNYA DAN KETIDAKBOLEHTERJEMAHANNYA KE DALAM BAHASA FARSI

ABSTRAK

Tesis ini mengkaji kebolehterjemahan kohesi dan koherens sebuah novel bahasa Inggeris ke dalam bahasa Farsi. Kajian ini dibahagikan kepada 7 bab.

Kajian ini berpandukan model kohesi oleh Haliday dan Hassan (1976) untuk mengkaji dan menganalisis peranti kohesif sintaksis dan hubungan kolokasi dalam tiga teks bahasa Farsi. Kajian ini turut menggunakan model yang diajukan oleh Hoey (1991) untuk mengkaji peranti kohesif leksikal dalam bahasa Farsi. Selain itu, idea yang diutarakan oleh Newmark (1988) tentang terjemahan literal/bebas dan terjemahan melampau atau terjemahan kurang serta idea Blum-Kulka (1986) tentang anjakan kohesi dan koherens turut digunakan.

Kajian ini bertujuan mencari jawapan kepada tiga persoalan kajian, iaitu a) Apakah perbezaan dan persamaan utama pada peranti kohesif sintaksis dalam bahasa Inggeris dan bahasa Farsi dan apakah jenis peranti kohesif sintaksis yang menjadi penghalang atau penyumbang kepada kebolehterjemahan? b) Apakah bentuk peranti leksikal yang menghalang atau menggalakkan kebolehterjemahan? dan c) Bagaimanakah kebolehterjemahan dan ketidakbolehterjemahan kohesi mempengaruhi kekoherenan mesej yang terdapat dalam teks Farsi? Kajian ini mendapati bahawa terdapat beberapa ketidakselarasan pada sistem kohesi linguistik antara kedua-dua bahasa ini dari segi *rujukan*, *elipsis* dan *konjungsi*. Dapatan yang paling signifikan ialah berkaitan *penukargantian*. Bahasa Farsi tidak menunjukkan sebarang kes *penukargantian*, maka kebolehterjemahan unsur kohesif ini daripada bahasa Inggeris kepada bahasa Farsi turut tersekat. Kajian ini juga mengenalpasti kes-kes yang menghalang kebolehterjemahan

hubungan leksikal daripada bahasa Inggeris kepada bahasa Farsi. Yang paling banyak ialah kes ketidakbolehterjemahan hubungan parafrasa kompleks. Untuk mengekalkan kohesi teks sumber dalam teks sasaran, para penterjemah berkecenderungan menggunakan peranti lain. Pada amnya hubungan leksikal jenis lain dapat diterjemahkan. Kajian ini juga menunjukkan bahawa terjemahan peranti leksikal dan sintaksis secara literal daripada bahasa sumber kepada bahasa sasaran menyebabkan berlakunya perubahan atau kehilangan makna. Untuk menghindari perubahan atau kehilangan makna ini, penterjemah terpaksa melakukan perubahan peranti untuk menyampaikan mesej. Kajian juga mendapati bahawa terjemahan peranti sintaktik dan leksikal kepada peranti kohesif yang sama dalam bahasa Farsi menghasilkan teks yang kohesif dalam teks sasaran. Oleh itu, pada amnya kekoherenan teks sumber dapat diterjemahkan ke dalam teks sasaran dengan jayanya.

Kajian ini membuktikan bahawa model Halliday dan Hassan adalah inklusif dan sesuai untuk menangani peranti kohesif sintaksis dalam bahasa Farsi. Model yang diajukan oleh Hoey juga kelihatan mempunyai kepadaan untuk menganalisis hubungan leksikal yang sama dalam bahasa Farsi. Kajian ini juga mendapati bahawa dalam sebilangan kes, perubahan kohesi dan koherens menyumbang kepada keperincian mesej selaras dengan idea-idea Blum-Kulka (1986).

AN ANALYSIS OF COHESION AND COHERENCE IN *ANIMAL FARM* AND THEIR TRANSLATABILITY AND UNTRANSLATABILITY INTO PERSIAN

ABSTRACT

The present study is an attempt to investigate the translatability of cohesion and coherence of an English novel into Persian. It is organized in seven chapters.

The research draws on the model of cohesion in English by Halliday and Hasan (1976) to study and analyze the syntactic cohesive devices and collocational relation of three Persian texts. It further draws on the model of Hoey (1991) to study lexical cohesive devices in Persian. Newmark's (1988) ideas of literal / free and over- / under-translation, and Blum-Kulka's (1986) ideas on shift of cohesion and coherence are also employed.

The study attempts to provide the answer to the following three research questions: a) What are the main differences and similarities in the syntactic cohesive devices in English and Persian, and what types of cohesive syntactic devices are hindrances or contributors to translatability? b) What types of lexical devices block or promote translatability? And c) How does translatability and untranslatability of cohesion affect the coherence of the message in the Persian texts? The study finds some mismatch between the two linguistic cohesive systems related to *reference*, *ellipsis*, and *conjunctions*. The most significant finding is in the case of *substitution*. Persian does not represent cases of *substitution* as such; so the translatability of this cohesive element is to a high percentage blocked from English into Persian. The study also finds cases of untranslatability of lexical relations from English into Persian. The most prevalent one is the untranslatability of complex paraphrase relation. In order to maintain the cohesion of the source text in the target texts the translators tend to employ other lexical devices. Other types of lexical relations are more or less translatable.

The study further finds that literal translation of the lexical and syntactic devices from the source to target language leads to losses or changes in the messages. To prevent this loss or change, the translators resort to shifts of devices in order to transfer the message. The study also finds that the translation of the syntactic and lexical devices to the corresponding cohesive devices in Persian results in cohesive texts in target texts. Therefore, the coherence of the source text is by and large translatable into the target texts.

The study has shown that Halliday and Hasan's model is inclusive and is adequate to handle the Persian cohesive syntactic devices. Hoey's model also seems to be adequate to analyse the lexical relations in the corresponding Persian versions. It is also found that the change of cohesion and coherence in some cases have led to explicitness thus conforming to the ideas of Blum-Kulka (1986).

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.0 Introduction

In this chapter after providing a setting for text-linguistics in 1.1 below, it mainly focuses on the statement of the problem. In this section, a few problems that have their roots in the linguistic and cultural levels are mentioned, then exclusively the problems of cohesion and coherence and their translation from English into Persian is stated *via* examples. The remaining part of the chapter enumerates the objectives of the study, offers the research questions of the study, a hint on the theoretical framework, an introduction to Persian cohesion, the scope of the study, data, puts forward the significance of the research, provides the definition of all the terms used throughout the study and mentions the organization of the research.

1.1 Statement of the Problem

According to Abdulrahman (Yemen Times. Issue: (711), volume 13, from 12 February 2004 to 15 February 2004), though translation is as old as the contact of a language with alien speakers, the emergence of text linguistics in the 1970's marked the beginning of a new interest in translation as a subject worthy of serious academic studies . Snell-Hornby (1988: 69) argues vehemently that both text linguistics and translation are basically concerned with the text, not as a chain of separate sentences but as a complex, structured whole, whereby coherence, cohesion, focus and progression are of primary importance.

Abdulrahman further states that text-linguistics focuses primarily on text-theory and discourse analysis. He also says that its advocates argue that sentence grammars are incapable of describing all the relevant aspects and mechanisms of language. de Beaugrande and Dressler (1981: 3) define a text as a "...communicative occurrence which meets seven standards of textuality". These are *cohesion, coherence, intentionality, acceptability, informativity, situationality, and intertextuality*.

Abdulrahman suggests that since the rules of textual cohesion and progression of thoughts (coherence) vary from one language to another, some changes of these rules are probable in the process of translation. He further stresses that part of these changes may affect the quantity and the quality of the original message in the Source Text (ST) to the Target Text (TT). He further suggests if any change of this type happens, the source text is untranslatable.

Moreover, the translation process¹ can be described simply as decoding the meaning of the source text, and re-encoding this meaning in the target language. It is suggested here that to decode the meaning of a text the translator must first identify its component "translation units", indicating that the segments of the text is to be treated as a cognitive unit. It is suggested further that a translation unit may be a word, a phrase, a sentence, or a text; and behind this seemingly simple procedure lies a complex cognitive operation. In addition to decoding the complete meaning of the source text, the translator must consciously and methodically interpret and analyse all its features: cohesion, coherence etc. It is also stressed that this process requires a thorough knowledge of the grammar, semantics, syntax, idioms and the like of the source language, as well as the

¹ <http://translation-process.iqnaut.net/>

culture of its speakers. Further, it is noted that the translator needs the same in-depth knowledge to re-encode the meaning in the target language, but most of the time the translator is caught in enigma and the translation becomes very complicated and hence the source text turns to be untranslatable.

Catford (1965: 93-106) distinguishes two types of untranslatability, which he terms as *linguistic* and *cultural*. On the linguistic level, he mentions that untranslatability occurs when there is no lexical or syntactical substitute in the target language for a source language item. He uses a German example: “*Um wieviel Uhr darf man Sie morgen wecken?*” and a Danish example: “*Jeg fandt brevet*”. These sentences are linguistically untranslatable because both involve structures that do not exist in English. For example;

a (ST): German: *Um wieviel uhr darf man sie*

b) English Glosses: At how much o'clock may we you
morgen wecken?
tomorrow wake up?

c) Target Translation: At what time may we wake you up tomorrow?

a (ST): Danish: *Jeg fandt brevet.*

b) English Glosses: I found letter.

c) Target Translation: I found the letter.

Bassnett (1991: 32) mentions that both can be adequately translated into English once the rules of English structure are applied. She hints that a translator would readily render the two sentences as “What time would you like to be woken tomorrow?” and “I found the letter”, restructuring the German word order and adjusting the position of the post-positive

definite article in Danish to conform to English structural norms. So as it seems, the problem is linguistic.

Callow (as discussed in Baker 1992) explains that Hebrew, unlike English, prefers to use proper names to trace participants through a discourse. He notices that where English would normally use a pronoun to refer to a participant who has already been introduced provided there is no possibility of confusing reference, Hebrew is more likely to repeat the participant's name. Similarly, she goes on to explain, for the Bororos of Brazil the normal pattern is to refer to a participant by using a noun several times in succession before eventually shifting into a pronominal form.

Callow also mentions that, unlike English which tends to rely heavily on pronominal reference in tracing participants, Brazilian Portuguese generally seems to favour more lexical repetition. In addition, he mentions that Portuguese inflects verbs for person and number and such grammatical features provide additional means of relating process and actions to specific participants without the use of independent pronouns. The following example (as discussed in Baker 1992: 184) is from an article on Akio Morita, Chairman of the Portuguese editions of *Playboy* magazine. References to Akio Morita are highlighted (bold) in both extracts, with the exception of verb inflections in Portuguese.

Example:

a. English text:

Surrounded by the toys and the gadgets of **his** calling – tape recorders, mini television sets, world-band radios – **he** is the quintessential Japanese combination that has conquered the world: a thinker turned businessman.

As the **eldest son** of a wealthy sake and soy-sauce producer in conservative Nagoya, **he** was expected to take over the family business – and perhaps become the 15th generation of Morita Mayors in the local community. Instead, **he** spent **his** time taking apart clocks and listening to Western classical music and preferred the study of physics to business. During World War Two, **he**

went into naval research as a lieutenant, working on a thermal-guided missile and other projects, and it was there that **he** met **his** future partner, Ibuka. After the war, the two set up a business after a false start in the home-appliance market – manufacturing rice cookers. Total production: 100. Total sales: 0.

b. Portuguese Text:

*Produto de uma cultura que valoriza a sutileza e as maneiras indiretas, **Morita**, com **seu** jeito franco, é a ponte ideal entre o Japão e o Ocidente.*

***Filho mais velho** de um próspero produtor de óleo de soja e de saquê, em Nagoya, os pais de **Morita** esperavam que **ele** assumisse o controle dos negócios da família. Ao invés disso, **Morita** passava o tempo desmontando relógios, ouvindo música clássica ocidental e preferindo estudar Física a **se** meter em negócios. Durante a Segunda Guerra Mundial dedicou-**se** à pesquisa naval, como civil, e foi nessa época que fez a sociedade numa fábrica de panelas de cozinhar arroz. Produção total: 100 panelas. Total de vendas: 0.*

c. Back-translation:

Product of a culture that values subtlety and indirect manners, **Morita**, with **his** frank way, is an ideal bridge between Japan and the West.

The eldest son of a prosperous producer of soya oil and saki, in Nagoya, the parents of **Morita** expected that **he** should take over the control of the family business. Instead of this, **Morita** spent the time taking clocks apart, listening to Western classical music and preferring to study physics to putting **himself** into business. During the Second World War <he> dedicated **himself** to naval research, as a civilian, and it was in this period that <he> made a partnership in a factory of rice cooking pots. Total production: 100 pots. Total sales: 0.

a. Surrounded by the toys and the gadgets of **his** calling – tape recorders, mini television sets, world-band radios – **he** is the quintessential Japanese combination that has conquered the world: a thinker turned businessman.

b. Produto de uma cultura que valoriza a sutileza e as maneiras indiretas, **Morita**, com **seu** jeito franco, é a ponte ideal entre o Japão e o Ocidente

Baker (1992: 185) discusses that the first sentence in each of the above extracts, as shown in (a-b) above, normally occurs at the end of the paragraph and is immediately before the one that is being examined. For her these two sentences are not 'equivalents' of each other; they are simply quoted here to show that, the last mention of the particular participant being traced is by pronominal reference in the English version (e.g. he, his ...)

and by a proper noun (e.g. *Morita*) in the Portuguese version. That is, English still prefers to pick up the reference in the new paragraph by means of a pronoun while Portuguese prefers lexical repetition. Baker also notices that within the main paragraph under examination, Portuguese further repeats *Morita* twice while English persists in using pronominal reference. She notes further that the finite verbs in the Portuguese text establish additional cohesive links with *Morita* because they are marked for person.

In another area, Baker also mentions that the ability to identify references to participants and entities is essential for drawing inferences and for maintaining the coherence of a text. To her, a proper name or even a reference to a type of food or gadget which is unknown to the reader can disrupt the continuity of the text and obscure the relevance of any statement associated with it. An example from *A Hero from Zero* is given below:

a) French source text:

*Il y avait nombre d'années qu'on avait pas entendu parler de lui. Et voilà que dans son numéro du 7 Mars 1988. Le Magazine Américain 'forbes' le campe sous son vrai visage. Le qualificatif 'd'aventurier oriental' que lui avait collé un journal Haitien édité par des membres de la diaspora à New-York n'est rien au regard de ce qu'il représente vraiment. En vérité, il ferait pâlir **Arsène Lupin** (Baker, 1992: 231).*

b) English Translation:

It's been quite a few years since we have heard him mentioned. And then, in its 7th March 1988 issue, the American Forbes Magazine painted his true picture. The description of 'oriental adventure' given to him by a Haitian paper edited by members of the Diaspora' in New York is nothing in relation to what he really is. Indeed, he would frighten even **Arsene Lupin (A French version of Boris Karloff.)** (Baker 1992: 231).

According to Baker (1992: 231), Arsene Lupin is virtually unknown to an average English reader. So she suggests that the English translator attempts to bridge the gap between the textual world and the world of the target reader by explaining the unfamiliar

(Arsene Lupin) in terms of the familiar (Boris Karloff). It is claimed that the strategy itself is fine, but Arsene Lupin has very little in common with Boris Karloff. It is further suggested that the former is the hero of a series of French detective-type stories: a thief; flamboyant, resourceful, and elusive, but nevertheless a thief while the latter is a British actor associated mainly with horror films.

To Catford (1965: 93-106) the category of linguistic untranslatability is straightforward. Linguistic untranslatability, as was pointed out above, he argues, is due to differences in the source language (SL) and the target language (TL), whereas cultural untranslatability is due to the absence in the TL culture of a relevant situational feature for the SL text. He quotes the example of the different concepts of the term *bathroom* in an English, Finnish and Japanese context, where both the object and the use made of that object are not at all alike. He says there may be texts in which *bath* or *bathhouse* would be an adequate translation equivalent, but to him the Finnish and the English institutions are certainly different. Catford stresses that a *sauna* is not always a separate building - it may be a room in a house, hotel, or ship. He says that in the latter case, the obvious English equivalent *bathroom* would probably be evaluated by any translator as inappropriate. He puts the issue as follows:

It is a curious fact that the Japanese lexical item *huro(-ba)* seems to be more easily translatable as *bath* or *bathroom* than the Finnish *sauna*. And yet the Japanese bath(room) is in some respects as different from an English bath(room) as is the sauna – and both of the non-English institutions have non-English features in common (Catford, 1965: 99).

To discriminate between the institutions he further says:

As distinct from English bath, which is normally a solitary activity, the Finnish and Japanese baths are, or may often be, communal. The Finnish and Japanese 'bathrooms' are, each in its own way, quite differently constructed and furnished from an English bathroom (1965: 99).

Catford emphasizes that the *sauna*, however, differs still more from the English *bath* or *bathroom* because it has more non-English situational features. To him, it involves neither immersion in hot water, nor washing the body. He also says that the Japanese institution, like the English one, which involves immersion in hot water, and washing the body, is an integral part of the bath-taking and is performed inside the bathroom itself, though before actually entering the water to soak. To him it looks, therefore, as if equivalence of material aspects of the institution is less important than equivalence in its major personal or social function (washing the body and soaking in hot water) in promoting translatability.

In agreement with Catford, Nord (1991: 159) mentions that the structural differences between two languages, particularly in the lexical and sentence structures, give rise to certain translation problems which occur in every translation involving this pair of languages, no matter which of the two serves as source and which serves as target language.

Nord (1991: 159) also claims that in translating from one particular culture into another, certain translation problems occur which are the result of the difference in culture-specific (verbal) habits, expectations, norms and conventions concerning verbal and other behaviour, etc.

Bassnett-McGuire (1988) suggests that sociocultural, linguistic, literary, religious, philosophical, or methodological barriers often cause the problem of untranslatability. She stresses that the scope of translatability should be considered as a dynamic category varying with the type of the text, method of translation, and the linguistic and cultural

differences between the two languages involved. On the linguistic and methodological barriers, Bassnett-McGuire (1988: 80) says, "The degree to which the translator reproduces the form, meter, rhythm, tone, register, etc. of the SL text, will be as much determined by the TL system as by the SL system and will also depend on the function of the translation."

Based on the above claims, it can be perceived that no two languages are merely identical; so, it is impossible to produce a target language version identical to that of the source language. According to Garcia-Landa (1990: 478 as discussed in Nord, 1991), whatever we call equivalence is an approximation to the original version. He suggests that practically, to achieve equivalence at all levels (formal, dynamic / semantic, and functional / communicative) is not possible. He also notes, however, that the relative equivalence can exist for the overall communication; a speaker who reports what he or she 'thinks' or 'means', or what someone else has said or written, has to decide what is 'close enough' for the purpose. He also says that total translation may be impossible, but so is total communication; he further emphasises that there will always be room for multiple interpretations.

By and large, from the comments and examples provided thus far, it seems that any change in the process of translation, and in the elements of textual cohesion will result in alteration of textual cohesion and this change may cause the shift in text meaning (message). Some of the deficient translations from English into Persian which overlook this importance (textual cohesion) are illustrated by examples as in (a-d) below:

- a. Ali is my friend. He is a nice man.

- b. **?ali duste man ?ast. ?ali marde xubi ?ast** (in Sa'edi, 1992: 116) (TL-transliteration)
- c. **?ali duste man ?ast. ?u marde xubi ?ast** (suggested translation)
- d. Ali friend my is. He man nice is (English gloss)

To be a mini-text, the above mentioned sentences should be tied together to meet one of the requirements of textuality.² The English mini-text in (a) above consists of two sentences that are tied together by cohesive element 'he' at the beginning of the second sentence. This cohesive factor refers backward to an antecedent in the previous sentence which functions as the subject of the first sentence. **Ali** as the subject of the first sentence is not cohesive because it is exophoric; it refers to somebody in the world outside the text, namely, situational context; but the linguistic element **he** (pronoun) functions as a tie to bind the first and the second sentences together. Through this process a cohesive text is created because the reader, in order to establish a semantic interpretation for the word **he**, will refer to the preceding part of the text. Similarly, the linguistic element **?ali** in the first sentence of Persian translation (b) above functions as the subject of the sentence. This subject is considered as exophoric because it has no antecedent in the linguistic context; to interpret it as to whom it refers one should go beyond the linguistic context or the world outside. The second sentence again begins with **?ali** which is the identical repetition of the first **?ali**. The status of this element is not similar to the first one because here it refers to the first element mentioned at the beginning of the first sentence which is a part of linguistic context, hence anaphoric because it can refer to its antecedent in the previous part of the text. As such, it has to be replaced by a pronominal referential element rather than a noun. Should the noun be maintained in the second sentence the interpretation

² Here, Cohesive ties, such as reference, substitution, ellipsis, are linguistic elements that are considered as requirements of textuality (Halliday and Hasan, 1976: 6-7).

may be something else. Some may ‘read’ it as a second **?ali** and a second subject referring to a second entity in the world outside. To block these other probable misinterpretations the translator has to bind the sentences together by cohesive factors. The best way to do this is to replace the pronoun form for the repeated element. Concerning the textual cohesion in this mini-text, the Persian equivalence (c) is deficient because, instead of the pronoun **?u** in (d) for the subject position in the second sentence, the translator has repeated the noun **?ali** ; as a result the tie which binds the preceding sentence to the following sentence is ignored, and hence, a clumsy Persian translation is produced.

Now consider the example in (a-e) below:

a. - *I'll have two boiled eggs. - I'll have the same.*

b. **man do tā toxme morgh-e ?āb paz mixoram. man ham do tā**

c. I two egg boiled eat. I too two

toxme morgh-e ?āb paz mixoram (in Sa’edi, 1992: 116) (TL-translation)

egg boiled eat. (back-translation)

d. **man do tā toxm-e morgh-e ?āb paz mixoram. man ham hamintor.**

(suggested translation)

e. I two egg boiled eat I too (English gloss)

In the English mini-text above the phrase “the same” is semantically interpreted by referring backward to the phrase “two boiled eggs” in the first sentence. This process of going to the preceding text to clarify the meaning of the expression in the second sentence signifies the power of the cohesive element to create a cohesive text. The dependency of the semantic interpretation of the second sentence on the first sentence is a well-defined

case of togetherness; so the English text is very cohesive. The Persian translation of this English text in (b) is also deficient because the translator has failed to create a correspondingly cohesive (substitution) Persian equivalent. In a cohesive text not only the interpretation of some part is dependent on the other part, but also a kind of language economy is expected. In the Persian version neither of these two principles is observed. First, the interpretation of the second sentence is independent of the first sentence; and second, the last sentence has used full linguistic elements so that no appropriate pro-forms are used to exhibit any sign of language economy. In a cohesive text, ties are responsible to bring about togetherness among the elements (Halliday and Hasan, 1976: 2-3). In the suggested translation the structure **ham hamintor** signifies the whole preceding verbal construction; therefore, the repetition of the identical verbal construction rather than the substitution in the second sentence denotes the weak knowledge of the translator on the power and importance of the cohesive factors.

Consider other examples in (a-e) below:

a. - *I take strong tea. - I suppose weak is better for you.*

b. **man chāye porrang mixoram. man tasavor mikonam chāye**

c. I tea strong drink. I suppose tea

kam rang barāye shomā behtar ?ast (in Sa'edi, 1992: 116) (TL-transliteration)

weak for you better is. (back-translation)

d. **man chāye porrang mixoram. man tasavor mikonam kam rang**

e. I tea strong drink. I suppose weak

barāye shomā behtar ?ast. (suggested translation)

for you better is. (English gloss)

The English mini-text (a) above also seems cohesive because the word **weak** in the second sentence is interpreted in relationship with the word **strong** in the preceding sentence. Both of these linguistic elements are adjectives; they modify something. The word ‘strong’ in the first sentence modifies the noun **tea**; so the same noun is modified in the second sentence by the adjective ‘weak’, but it is elliptic for the sake of cohesion. The omission of the lexical elements binds the two sentences together and guarantees the idea of togetherness. Because the interpretation of the adjective or adjective phrase in the second sentence is dependent on the first sentence. In this example, the Persian equivalence is also problematic simply because the translator has failed to create a cohesive text by not using proper cohesive devices. He has translated the implicit device explicitly. This explicitness reduces the power of dependency; so the target text is not tightly wrapped to make a cohesive whole. Here, the omission of noun phrase before epithets in Persian is customary because it is easily recoverable from the preceding sentence(s).

Consider another example in (a-d’) below:

a. *Do you mind if I open the window?*

It has been rendered into (b):

b. “?eterāz dār- id ?agar panjare ro bāz kon- am?” (TL translation)

c. (do) object you if window (object marker) open I ?
(English Gloss)

In this example, a part of sentence (three or four first words), namely ***Do you mind if***, can be taken as an independent semantic unit. If so, its Persian equivalence will be ‘?eshkāli nadārad’ literally ‘don’t you see any problem?’ Equivalent to ‘do you mind if’ or ‘?ejāze

midahid' literally 'do you allow me?'. Consequently the suggested or preferred translations can be as in (d) or (d') below:

d. “**?eshkāli nadārad panjare ro bāz konam?** literally 'don't you see any problem if I open the window?' Or:

d'. “**?ejāze midahid panjare ro bāz konam?**” literally 'do you allow me to open the window?'

In the suggested translated versions the whole underlined English string is rendered into more conventional expression in Persian, that is, shorter than English equivalent in form. From the given evidences above, it is noted that in the above case the unit of translation is not a fixed or constant quantity; instead, it varies throughout the act of translation. In some cases the equivalence is in the structural level while in others they vary according to the intent of the writer (Sa'edi, 1992: 7). In fact, this may be related to the distance of the two languages in contrast; for example, in scientific text translations, the unit of translation is mostly word, but in plays and novels, translators essentially switch to phrase, clause or sentence as a unit in order to make the trend of translation as natural (Sa'edi, 1992: 11).

Consider next the English extract in (a) below:

a. (ST) **For myself I do not grumble, for I am one of the lucky ones**” (Orwell, 1945: 5).

The text in (a) is both cohesive and coherent. The cohesiveness of the mini-text is due to the use of cohesive factors **for** (causal), and **ones** (referential). The item **for** gives the reason why the speaker says 'I do not grumble'. In the second part of the expression the item 'ones' refers to something before itself to be meaningful. Its antecedent is “pigs” which is displayed somewhere before it (When Major saw that they had all made themselves comfortable and were waiting attentively he cleared his throat and began:

‘Comrades, you have heard already about the strange dream that I had last night...’And even the miserable lives we lead are not allowed to reach their natural span’. The exophoric pronoun **I** is one member of the pigs or animals. So the exact meaning of **ones** is guaranteed in the preceding local part of the text. This syntactic relatedness of the text to its parts for the sake of meaningfulness is mostly the responsibility of the binding factors that are termed, here, as cohesive factors. This mini-text is also coherent in English because the first and the second propositions are logically related to each other. In the first part of the proposition the apparent speaker, Major (the old pig), says “**I do not grumble**”. This means that the conditions that he has been in have not been so bitter for him as an animal to have any feeling of dissatisfaction. The lack of this feeling is obtained by the use of ‘for I am one of the lucky ones’. It is clear that the luckiness is what the speaker (Major) is not grumbling for. The act of grumbling happens when the conditions are not appropriate for the subject. Therefore, the two propositions well precede and follow each other to offer the idea of togetherness linguistically and semantically.

The given text in (a) has been translated in Persian as in (b) below:

b. (TT) ‘**man barāye xodam shekve nemikonam va neminālam chunke**

c. (Eng. Gloss) I for myself grumble do not and do not groan for

man jozve xoshbaxt-hā nistam (Firoozbakht, 1983: 11).

I belong lucky - ones not.

This translation version is apparently cohesive because the words **chunke** literally ‘for, because’ and the dependent element **-hā** literally ‘them’ are syntactic elements that are responsible for the cohesiveness of the text in Persian. Together they act as ties to secure different parts of the text together and unite them as a whole because the interpretation of these binding elements needs the reader to consider the linearity of the text to find

semantic and linguistic relationships between them. Be that as it may, this translation is not coherent because the propositions, namely, **man barāye xodam shekve nemikonam va neminālam** and **chunke man jozve xoshbaxt-hā nistam** do not follow each other as a reader would expect it to be. While somebody is not feeling happy or lucky, there is a place for him or her to grumble and complain because people or living beings grumble and groan when they are not satisfied and lack a necessity or suffer from something. If somebody, however, says: “I am not lucky and I do not grumble” people will reject his claim or at least have some difficulty to understand what he or she says. So, this means that the two propositions (**man barāye xodam shekve nemikonam va neminālam** and **chunke man jozve xoshbaxt-hā nistam**) are not logically arranged and hence incoherent. The preferred translation might be of the form as in (d) below:

d. (suggested translation) **?az lahāze xodam shekāyati nadāram, che man**

e. (Eng. Gloss) for myself grumble do not for I

?az jomle xoshbaxt-hā bude?am (Orwell, 1945:13).

belong to lucky - ones -ed (present perfect)

In this translation the cohesive elements **che** (for, because) and **-hā** (them) are responsible for binding the different parts as linguistic items; and the first and second propositions are logically responsible for the coherence of the mini-text. In the first part of the translation the expression **shekāyati nadāram** ‘do not grumble’ seems logical and acceptable because, in the second part, the speaker is not feeling unlucky because he says: “**?az jomle xoshbaxt-hā hastam.**” The lack of the unluckiness of the speaker is because of his satisfaction from the assumed situation.

Another case of untranslatability can be attributed to the lexico-grammatical cohesive elements of a text. This may be exemplified as in (a) below:

a. (ST) **“After a moment, however, Snowball and Napoleon butted the door open with their shoulders”** (Orwell, 1945: 14).

In this sentence the adversative contrastive **‘however’** relates its sentence to the previous sentences as: **“Then they filed back to the farm buildings and halted in silence outside the door of the farm house. That was theirs too, but they were frightened to go inside.”** The contrastive situations are the time when the animals were frightened first and the time when they butted the door open with their shoulders. The cohesive factor, however, properly binds the sentences together to establish the idea of contrastiveness. If it were not so displayed the sentences would not have been so related in this respect.

Notwithstanding that, as far as the translation of this cohesive factor is concerned, it is not translatable in Persian. If in any case the translator shows any insistence to render the word literally among others the translation would seem clumsy and hence unacceptable; for example (b) below:

b. (TT) **vali pas ?az lahze?i ?esnobal va nāpel?on dar rā be zure shānehāye xod bāz kardand** (Amirshahi, 2001: 29).

In this piece of translation the word **vali** which stands as an equivalent for the English word **however** is not needed to be translated because its rendition destroys the smoothness of the Persian translation. The main reason of this violation is due to the word **vali** ‘but’ in the previous sentence of the translation which precedes (b). That **vali** ‘but’ can establish the idea of contrastiveness needed in this piece of text. This sentence can simply be translated in Persian as in (c) below:

c. (suggested translation) **pas ?az lahzāti ?esnobāl va nāpel?on bā feshāre shāne-hāhye-shān dar rā bāz kardand.**

Noticeably, the chronology span can pay for the cohesion of the text and binds this sentence to the previous one; and the previous sentence possesses the cohesive element **vali** 'but' to establish the contrastiveness. Therefore, the word **however** in the English sentence (ST) is not translatable into the Persian equivalent.

As we observe from the above evidences, most of the time communication between languages fails because of linguistic problems. From a linguistic point of view the text consists of grammatical and lexical elements that are the primary essentials to transfer concepts and meanings. According to Larson (1984) the greatest amount of mismatch between languages probably comes in the area of linguistic devices which signal cohesion and prominence. She goes on to suggest that only the correct receptor language devices will result in a natural and easily understood translation, and also indicates that a misrepresentation of prominence in the translation can distort the meaning intended by the author, as well as make the translation sound unnatural.

The problems stated above in translation that particularly relate to syntactic and lexical cohesion and their effect on the coherence of the text justify this endeavour to study the case from English source text to Persian translations in a comparative study.

1.2 Objectives of the Study

In view of the problems of translatability narrated in 1.1 above, the objectives of this study are as in (a-c) below:

- a. to compare and contrast two language systems so as to investigate the similarities and differences of the syntactic cohesive devices in English and Persian

through translation, and to investigate and identify those syntactic cohesive devices that hinder and promote translatability.

b. to investigate the lexical devices that hinder or promote translatability.

c. to see the importance of the cohesive devices (syntactic and lexical) on the coherence of the text, firstly in English and secondly in the Persian translation.

1.3 Research Questions

The above objectives shall be achieved *via* discussing and finding answers to the following research questions in (a-c):

a. What are the main differences and similarities in the syntactic cohesive devices in English and Persian, and what types of cohesive syntactic devices are hindrances or contributors to translatability?

b. What types of lexical devices block or promote translatability?

c. How does translatability and untranslatability of cohesion affect the coherence of the messages in the corresponding Persian texts?

1.4 A Hint on the Theoretical Framework

Although in the process of analysis the study may make use of some of the concepts from other linguists and translation theoreticians, Jackson (1998) and Bell's (1991) componential analysis, this study principally draws on the ideas of Halliday and Hasan (1976) on *Cohesion in English*, Hoey (1991) on *lexical cohesion*, Blum-Kulka

(1986) on the *Shifts of Cohesion and Coherence in Translation* and their effect on discourse structure of the target text, Snell-Hornby (1988) on top-down approach, and Newmark (1988) on semantic and communicative, over- and under-translation, and literal and free translation.(See chapter three for details).

1.5 An Introduction to Persian Cohesion

In Persian, like English, there are some linguistic devices that are responsible for the cohesion of the text. In this section the study attempts to give a short account of such linguistic resources. The description is based on the model of Halliday and Hasan (1976).

There are altogether four types of cohesive devices in Persian that tie different sentences and propositions of the text. These linguistic elements are classified as: *reference, ellipsis, conjunction , and lexical relations.*

1.5.1 Reference

Reference is of three types in Persian: personal, demonstrative, and comparative.

1.5.1.1 Personal reference

This kind of reference is reference by means of function in the speech situation through the category of 'person' or 'role'. The personal system in Persian consists of three subcategories as: *personal pronouns, suffixed pronouns, and personal endings.*

1.5.1.1.1 Personal pronouns

These kind of pronouns differ from suffixed pronouns and personal endings in that they have separate forms. Since in Persian there are no separate nominative, accusative,

dative, or possessive forms, personal pronouns may be used in all cases (Noormohammadi, 1988). The system is as follows:

Speech roles:

Speaker only: **man** literally 'I' before the direct object marker **rā**, **man** may lose its final consonant and the resulting form becomes **marā**.

Speaker plus: **mā** literally 'we';

Addressee (singular): **to** literally, 'you'; the polite substitute for **to** is **shomā** literally 'you';

Addressee (plural): **shomā** literally 'you'; in colloquial style, **shomā** may take the plural marker **-hā** and become **shomāhā**.

Other roles:

Human (singular; male or female): **?u**, **vey** literally 'he or she';

Human (plural): **?ānhā**, **?ishān** literally 'they';

Non-human (singular): **?ān** literally 'it';

Non-human (plural): **?ānhā** literally 'they'.

1.5.1.1.2 Suffixed pronouns

These pronouns, as the name implies, are bound morphemes. They are used to express the possessive, the dative, or the accusative cases.

Speech roles:

Speaker only: **-am** literally 'my, me';

Speaker plus: **-mān** or **-emān** (formally) literally 'our, us';

Addressee (singular): **-at**, **-et** literally 'your, you';

Addressee (plural): **-etān**, **-etun** (informal) literally 'your, you'.

1.5.1.1.3 Personal endings

A morphosyntactic characteristic of the verbal group in Persian is that it has the feature 'person', expressed by the personal endings, as **-ad** as in **dārad** literally 'he / she / it has' or **-am** as in **dāram** literally 'I have.'

The personal ending system in Persian is as follows:

Speech roles:

Speaker only: **-am** literally 'I';

Speaker plus: **-im** literally 'we';

Addressee (singular): **-i** literally 'you'; the polite substitute for **-i** is **-id** or **-in**. The imperative consists of **-Ø**.

Addressee (plural): **-id** literally 'you.'

Other roles:

Human (singular): **-ad**, **-Ø** literally 'he, she';

Human (plural) **-and** literally 'they';

Non-human (singular): **-ad**, **-Ø** literally 'it';

Non-human (plural): **-and** literally 'they.'

1.5.1.2 Demonstrative reference

There are two types of demonstrative words in Persian: simple and compound.

Simple demonstrative words:

?in literally 'this,' **?inhā** literally 'these'; **?ān** literally 'that,' **?ānhā**, **?ānān** literally 'those';

hālā, **?aknun**, **?alān** literally 'now'.

Compound demonstrative words:

?injā literally 'this place, here', **?ānjā** literally 'that place, there', **?āngāh**, **?ānvaght**,

?ānzamān literally 'that time, then', **hamin** literally 'this very, the same', **hamān** 'literally

'that very, the same', **?intowr** literally 'in this manner, in this way, such', **?āntowr** literally

'in that manner, in that way, such', **hamintowr** literally 'in this same manner, so', **hamāntowr** literally 'in that same manner, so', **?ingune** literally 'this sort of, such, in this manner'.

1.5.1.3 Comparative reference

There are only a few comparative reference items in Persian that indirectly refer to an element in the text (Noormohammadi, 1988). The following items may be included in the comparative reference system in Persian:

digar literally 'other, different, else, more';

?axir literally 'the last, the latter';

?āxarin literally 'the last'.

1.5.2 Ellipsis

Ellipsis, as a cohesive device, is vastly utilized in Persian texts. In the following, some aspects of ellipsis in Persian are mentioned

1.5.2.1 Nominal ellipsis

The structure of the nominal group in Persian is that of head with optional modifiers. The modifiers either precede the head or follow it. The post-modifiers are linked to the head by the **?ezāfe**, which is usually indicated by a formative **–e**.

The following are some of the most common modifiers in Persian which may function as head in the elliptical nominal group:

i) deictics:

kodām literally 'which', **har kodām** literally 'each one, every one', **hich kodām** literally 'none, no one', **kodām yek** literally 'which one', **hich yek** literally 'none, no one', **?in** literally 'this', **?ān** literally 'that';

ii) numeratives:

yeki literally 'one', **?in yek** literally 'this one', **?ān yek** literally 'that one', **dotā** literally 'two ones', **setā**, literally 'three ones,', **?in do** literally 'these two', **?ān do** literally 'those two', **chandtā** literally 'how many', **cheghadr** literally 'how much', **hamin ghadr** literally 'this much', **kami** literally 'some', **xeqli** literally 'much, many'.

iii) epithets (especially colour terms and the comparative forms of adjectives):

sabz literally 'green', **sabze** literally 'the green', **zard** literally 'yellow', **zarde** literally 'the yellow', **?in sabze** literally 'this green one', **bozorgtar** literally 'the bigger', **bozorgtare** literally 'the bigger one', **bozorgtarin** literally 'the biggest'.

1.5.2.2 Verbal group ellipsis

Verbal ellipsis is ellipsis within the verbal group. This kind of ellipsis is not very frequent in Persian (Noormohammadi, 1988). The verbal group in Persian is usually either ellipted entirely or expressed in full. In the following example, (b) is ungrammatical (the verbal group is underlined):

?āyā **?u** **xāhad** **?āmad ?**

English Gloss: question marker he / she will come

A: **bale,** **xāhad** **?āmad.**

English Gloss: yes, will (3rd singular) come (3rd singular)

B: **bale,** **xāhad.**

English Gloss: yes, will (3rd singular)