

A Comparative Study of Reference and Conjunction As Cohesive Devices in Two English Texts , Their Translated Versions , and Two Original Arabic Texts

Azhar Hassan Salomee

Abstract

This paper is a comparative analysis of two English texts ,their Arabic translated versions and two original Arabic texts . The focus is on reference and conjunction as cohesive devices and the shifts that may occur when translating literary texts due to differences in the grammatical systems of the source (English) and the target (Arabic) language . It shows the translation strategies that translators use in transferring referential cohesion and conjunctions from an English literary text to its Arabic translated version . Also, it identifies the frequency of occurrence of both reference pronouns and conjunctions in all those six texts . To achieve these aims , two English texts have been translated by a professional translator , Safaa Kalusee, who is a well – known translator in Iraq .The first corpus is " A Letter of Condolence " by Charles Dickens and the second is Milton's poem " Lycidas " . The four texts have been compared to show those shifts in translation .Also , two original Arabic texts have been analysed in terms of reference and conjunction . The first text is A Letter of Condolence and the second is a poem written by AL- Mutanaby. In addition , a statical study is made to show the difference in the frequency of reference pronouns and conjunctions in all six texts . The first hypothesis is that the linking devices are more implicit in the target text (Arabic) than in the source one (English) . This is because of the agglutinating and inflecting nature of the target text as compared to the source one .The second hypothesis is that the two cohesive devices in the target texts are less common than those in the source texts and their frequency in the original Arabic texts is unequal . The results have shown that reference and conjunction are utterly affected in the Arabic target text and their frequency in the original texts depend on the type of the text it self i.e whether it is a poem , a letter , a novel , etc.

1.Introduction

The term "Cohesive " is defined in Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English as an adjective, connected or related in a reasonable way to form a whole .Eminent scholars like Halliday and Hassan (1976 : 3) and VanDijk (1992 : 46) are concerned with the principles of connectivity which bind a text together and force co-interpretation.

It is generally believed that a text whether written or spoken is meaningful when the various segments are brought together to make a unified whole .Osisanwo (2005:31) remarks that a text is said to be cohesive when the linguistic means by which a text function is held together as a single unit. Hoey (1991:3)defines cohesion as the way certain words or grammatical features of a sentence can connect that sentence to its predecessors (and successors) in a text . A text is in part organized , in part created , by the presence in each sentence of these elements that require the reader to look to the surrounding sentence for their interpretation.

Halliday and Hassan (1976:4) opine that texts achieve their status and communicative events through the use of cohesive devices . According to them , "The primary determinant of whether a set of sentences do or do not constitute a text depends on the cohesive relationships within and between the sentences , which create texture ". These authors explain that cohesive relationships within a text are setup where the interpretation of some elements in the discourse is dependent on the other . The one presupposes the other in the sense that it cannot be effectively decoded except by recourse to it ([http// www. Slideshare net](http://www.Slideshare.net)) . In the opinion of Olarund (2002 : 317) , Cohesion is interested in relating the internal organization of language to the functions of language , and to the social situation of language

The Term " Cohesion " is sometimes confused with " Coherence " which has to do with sense. It is described as a semantic property , which is very important in the study of discourse. It is created by the " interpretation " of the whole passage or text . This interpretation helps the reader or the listener to infer the general idea of the message that the writer or the speaker wants to convey. Coherence can be divided into two types : situational coherence in which the identification of field , tenor and mode can be in a certain group of clauses. The other type is "generic coherence " that represents the belonging of the text to a certain genre. Thus, what the reader or the listener has in mind is an assumption of coherence ; in the sense that all what is said or written will give meaning in terms of their daily interactions. (Widdowson, 2007 : 45).

Two differences between cohesion and coherence can be noticed. The first is that cohesion deals with the structure of the text ; it helps in building up the text by linking sentences to each other. In doing so , it becomes easier for the reader or listener to infer the meaning of what they read or hear. Coherence, on the other hand , is a mental process which refers to what a speaker has in mind (his knowledge). So, it has to do with sense rather than structure. The second important difference is the fact that coherence works without cohesion, but not the reverse even if a speech or a passage with a large amount of cohesive devices cannot be necessarily coherent (ibid). the following example will clarify things :

***The student was at school. School is here. Here is there. There was the teacher.**

The last word of one sentence is the beginning of the next sentence . we are confronted with repetition , reference to the sentence before and other cohesive lexical devices. However, these sentences together make no sense. It is just a series of sentences concerned with what a text means , it concerns how the text is constructed as semantic ties ; it helps to create text and , thus, it is the text forming component of the linguistic system.

One of the most challenging aspects of translation is cohesion as any language has its own unique manners in which it employs cohesive devices in the creation of a cohesive text. Each language has its own patterns to convey the interrelationship between persons and events ; these patterns may not be ignored in a language if the readers understand what the translator wants to convey. The topic of cohesion as always appeared is the most useful constituent of discourse analysis that is applied to translation. English and Arabic have different grammars and vocabulary structures , and it is only natural that they pose great difficulties and challenges for a translator to deal with, especially in the field of literature.

The paper provides a close analysis of particular grammatical cohesive devices, reference and conjunction , employed in two English texts, their equivalence in the Arabic translation and two original Arabic texts . It aims to study from a quantitative and qualitative point of view the possible shifts of cohesion in the translation of two literary texts and the solutions adopted in Arabic translation. In addition, this paper compares the translation strategies used by translators when transferring referential cohesion and conjunction from an English text to its Arabic equivalence. This may pose great difficulties and problems because of the difference between the two languages. Thus , the paper aims at addressing the following questions :

1. what are the possible shifts of cohesion within the context of translation in field of literature ?
2. what are the main problems that may

occur in translation through the use of reference and conjunction ?
3.what are the possible solutions adopted in the Arabic translation of a literary text?

The paper depends in its comparative analysis on the hypotheses that the cohesive ties are rather explicit in English whereas they are rather of an implicit nature in Arabic and their frequency in the original texts depends on the type of the text it self. This is due to the isolating nature of the morphology of English compared to the rather inflecting and agglutinating one in Arabic.

The literary corpora in this paper are analyzed as follows :

1. Identification of the reference devices employed in the corpus (A) relying on the version of Brown and Yule (1983)and conjunction ones relying on the version of Halliday and Hassan (1976).

2. Location of the parallel linguistic expressions in the target language for the same corpus (A).

3. Applying the same method (steps 1 and 2) with the second corpus (corpus B) and just step 1 with corpus (C) and (D)

4. counting the frequency of occurrence of both cohesive devices in corpus (A) , (B) , (C) ,and (D) .

5.analysis of the solutions adopted in the Arabic translations .

To test the hypotheses and illicit data , a translation of two English literary texts into Arabic will be provided and analyzed .The two texts have been translated by a translator of experience (Safa Kalusee) .The first text is "A letter of Condolence " written by Charles Dickens , the second is "Lycidas" , a poem written by John Milton for the death of Edward King "Lycidas " . Also, two Arabic original texts have been chosen for the analysis. The first is " ALetter of Condolence " written by Ishak Bin Al – kattab and the second is a poem written by AL-Muttanaby for the death of Um Saif AL- Dwllaa AL- Hamadany.

2- Types of cohesion

For Halliday (1978:21) and Osisanwo (2005:36) , the organization of text (which they term texture) is made up (in large part) of relationships amongst items in the text , some semantic , some grammatical , which they refer to as cohesive ties . Accordingly , the main cohesive devices which bind a text together are of two main categories : Grammatical and lexical devices. The kinds of grammatical cohesive ties discussed by Osisanwo (ibid) are reference , substitution , Ellipsis and Conjunction. Cohesion is maintained not only by grammatical cohesion but also by lexical one. Hoey (1991 :21) insists on the importance of lexical patterning and believes that much of coherence as well as cohesion of a text is created by lexical ties of individual words with each other. It includes reiteration and collocation.

3. Reference

Reference is a grammatical cohesion device in a text that can only be interpreted with reference either to some other parts of the text or to the world experienced by the sender and the receiver of the text (Finch, 2000 : 24). Mathews (2007 : 93) explains that the co-referential forms are forms which instead of being interpreted semantically in their own right, make reference to something else for their interpretation. When the interpretation is within the text , this is an "endophoric " relation but in a situation where the interpretation of the text lies outside the text, in the context situation , the relationship is "exophoric ". However , exophoric relations play no part in textual cohesion. Endophoric relations, on the other hand , form cohesive ties within the text. Endophoric relations are also of two types , these which look back in the text for their interpretation (anaphoric relations) and those which look forward to the text for their interpretation (cataphoric relations) (ibid). Salkie (1995:66) shows the use of reference in the following sentences:

1.All this year's students passed. It was very gratifying [anaphoric]

2.Jill washed the clothes and then ironed them. [anaphoric]

3.He was aggressive. My boss [cataphoric]

4.He made tremendous impact. The provest. [cataphoric]

The word 'it' in the first example refers to 'All this year's students passed' and in the second sentence 'them' refers to the 'clothes'. The pronoun 'he' in the third and fourth examples is given first and then its identity is revealed later which is here 'my boss' and 'the provest'.

Referring expressions help to unify the text and create economy because they save writers from unnecessary repetition. Reference includes three types : personal , demonstrative , and comparative. Personal reference is reference by means of function in the speech situation , through the category of person. Demonstrative reference is reference by means of location , on a scale of proximity. Comparative reference is indirect reference by means of identity or similarity (Hamer , 2004 :24). What is known as personal reference is dependent on the use of personal pronouns (I, he, she, it, they , me , them, . . . etc), possessive adjectives (my, her , your . . . etc) , and possessive pronouns (mine , hers , yours , . . . etc). Concerning demonstrative reference , it is dependent on the use of determiners (this , these , that , those) and adjuncts (here , now , then , there) . The last type of reference is the comparative reference which is achieved by the use of adjectives like 'same , other , identical , better ' or their adverbial counterparts , 'identically , similarly , less ' to forge links with previously mentioned entities. The following examples clarify things : (Jhonstone , 2008 : 118)

5.The women lost her son's bike at the market . She became very sad.

6.Look at those women . [demonstrative reference]

7.It is the cow as the ones were seen yesterday. [comparative reference]

4- Conjunction

Crystal (1985: 66) indicates that conjunctions are terms used in grammatical classification of words or morphemes to refer to expressions that link linguistic units. According to Halliday(1985:325), these elements stand in particular way to encode semantic relations which are referred to as conjunction, for example (but) as a conjunction in (He came but didn't stay). Conjunction is rather different in nature from the other cohesive relations, from both reference , on the one hand, and substitution and ellipsis on the other . That is , it is not simply an anaphoric relation but they are explicit makers of connective relations . (Wikipedia, 2006: 34) They have the function of the realization of cohesion, and therefore, they are text forming agencies (ibid). Quirk etal (1985: 632) refer to these elements as a class of adverbials used by the speakers to express " his assessment of how he views the connection between two linguistic units " . In this sense, these elements perform the role of connectives between one unit and another which has already been introduced. Farrokhpey (1999: 282) has identified four types of conjunctive meanings:

A.

Additive : It is a text forming component of the semantic system. In general, the relation is, therefore, a semantic one. Halliday and Hassan (1976: 8) in turn divide the additive type into :

- 1 Simple such as, and , nor, or,etc.
2. Complex such as, in addition, alternatively ,..... etc .
3. Complex (de-emphatic) such as, by the way , incidentally,....etc.
4. Comparative such as, by contrast, similarly,etc.
5. Exemplificatory such as, for instance, and for example .

B.

Appositive or Adversative : This relation has the meaning contrary to the expectation . This expectation is derived from the context of what is being said or from the relation that can be expressed by communicative process . For example however, but,etc.

C.

Causal : Notions such as reason, result, and purpose are expressed by this relation. The elements used to express this relations are: So, if, for this reason,.....etc.

D.

Temporal : This is a relation of sequence in successive sentences. One sentence is in sequence to the other in time . In addition, the presupposing sentence may be temporally cohesive not because it stands in particular time relation to the presupposed sentence , but it indicates the terminal of

some process or series of processes. Thus, this meaning does not involve only sequence relation, but also conclusive and summary relation. The elements used to indicate this relation are ; then finally,....etc.

5- The Basis of Translation

The equivalence between the source text and the target text is the basis for translators. This means that equivalencies are regarded as an important factor in the process of translation i.e. the target text must be equivalent in a compatible way to the original one. There are two approaches to translation , "Formal equivalence " which implies the literal translation; however, it also deals with idioms and grammatical structure that are used in the original text. The other approach is the "Dynamic equivalence " which implies the meaning that the writer wants to convey. Here , the translator focuses on thought rather than translating the text word for word. (Ilyas, 1989 : 53).

6- Source Language and Target Language

The "Source language " refers to the language of the original text and the language into which a text is converted is called " The target language'. One can consider the following example for illustration :

A. I want to buy a house

B. أريد شراء بيت

Sentence (a) represents the source language which is English , and sentence (b) represents the target language which is Arabic . So , the terms "source " and " target " are used attributively.

7. Analysis of Corpora

7.1 Analysis of Corpus A : " A letter of Condolence "

| Reference in the source text | Cohesive device | Types of Reference |
|--|-------------------------|--|
| You must read this letter | You / This | Anaphoric/ Cataphoric |
| If you have hurried | You | Anaphoric |
| I rely on your turning back | I / Your | Cataphoric/ anaphoric |
| There is nothing in her appearance | Her | Anaphoric |
| You would suppose her | You / her | Anaphoric |
| I am sure she is | I /she | Cataphoric/ anaphoric |
| I cannot encourage myself with much hope of her recovery | I / myself/ Her | Cataphoric/cataphoric/anaphoric |
| I don't like to leave home | I | Cataphoric |
| I don't think her recovery | I / Her | Cataphoric/ anaphoric |
| I can do no good here | I / here | Cataphoric/ anaphoric |
| I think | I | Cataphoric |
| You will not like to be away, I know | You / I | Cataphoric/ anaphoric |
| I cannot reconcilit to myself to keep you away | I / It / Myself/ You | Cataphoric/ anaphoric Cataphoric/ anaphoric |

| | | |
|--|------------|------------------------|
| Forester with his usual affection for us | His / us | Anaphoric / Cataphoric |
| Bring you this letter | You / This | Anaphoric / Cataphoric |
| I cannot close it | I / It | Cataphoric/ anaphoric |
| Injunction upon you | You | Anaphoric |
| We never can expect | We | Cataphoric |
| Our many children | Our | Cataphoric |
| When you come | You | Anaphoric |
| I should even have to say to you | I / you | Cataphoric/ anaphoric |
| Our little baby | Our | Cataphoric |
| You are to do duty | You/your | Anaphoric |
| To show yourself worthy | Yourself | Anaphoric |
| The great trust you hold in them | You / Them | Anaphoric / Exophoric |
| You will only read this | You / This | Anaphoric |
| In your doing | Your | Anaphoric |

Table (1) : Type of Reference in The Source Text of Corpus (A)

Total : Anaphoric: 22

Cataphoric:18

| Reference in the source text | Cohesive device | Reference in the target text | Cohesive Device |
|--|------------------|--|-----------------|
| You must read this letter | You / This | تقرئي هذه الرسالة | ي هذه |
| If you have hurried | You | فأذا كنتِ قد اسرعتِ | تِ |
| I rely on your turning back | I / Your | فأنا اعتمد عليك في ان تعودي | أنا ، ي |
| There is nothing in her appearance | Her | ليس في مظهرها | ها |
| You would suppose her | You / her | الانسان ليظنها | ها ، Ø |
| I am sure she is | I / She | لكني متأكد من انها | ي ، ها |
| I cannot encourage myself with much hope of her recovery | I / Myself / Her | لا استطيع ان أمني نفسي بأمل كبير في شفائها | ي ، نفسي ، ها |
| I don't like to leave home | I | لا اريد ان اترك البيت | Ø |
| I don't think her recovery | I / Her | لا اعتقد بأن شفائها | ها ، Ø |
| I can do no good here | I / here | انني لا استطيع | ي |

| | | | |
|--|-----------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------|
| I think | I | فأعتقد | Ø |
| You will not like to be away , I know | You / I | أنا اعلم انه لن يعجبك | أنا ، كِ |
| I cannot reconcile it to myself to keep you away | I / It / Myself / You | ولا استطيع ان اروض نفسي على ذلك | Ø ، ذلك ، نفسي ، Ø |
| Forester with his usual affection for | His / Us | سيأتيك فورستر الذي عودنا على مودته | نا ، هِ |

| | | | |
|----------------------------------|------------|--------------------------------------|---------|
| us | | | |
| Bring you this letter | You / This | ليبلغك رسالتي هذه | ك ، هذه |
| Bring you home | You | ليصحبك الى البيت | ك |
| I cannot close it | I / It | ليس بوسعي ان انهي هذه الرسالة | ي ، Ø |
| Injunction upon you | You | واطلب اليك | ك |
| We never can expect | We | وهو اننا لا يمكن ان | نا |
| Our many children | Our | اطفالنا | نا |
| When you come | You | عند مجيئك | ك |
| I should even have to say to you | I / You | لو قلت لك | ت و لك |
| Our little baby | Our | طفلتنا الصغيرة | نا |
| You are to do your duty | You / Your | ينبغي عليك ان تقومي بواجبك | ي ، ك |
| | | | |
| To show yourself worthy | Yourself | وانك جديرة | ك |
| The great trust you hold in them | You / them | الثقة التامة التي تملكينها في نفوسهم | ها ، هم |
| You will only read his | You / This | قرأت هذه الرسالة | ت ، هذه |

Total: 46

Total : 38

Table (2) : Type of Reference in The Target Text of Corpus (A)

With regard to reference in corpus (A) , The TT (target text) tends to present cohesive devices that are equivalent to the ones used in the ST (source text) . That is to say , they have the same meaning but different forms as in the following examples :-

ST 1. I rely on  TT فأنا اعتقد

ST 2. I know → TT انا اعلم

ST 3. This letter → TT هذه الرسالة

ST 4. Our children → TT اطفالنا

However , the use of different grammatical words reduces the degree of specificity of the references produced by personal pronouns like in the examples below :

ST 1. You would suppose her → TT الانسان يظنها

ST 2. I don't think → TT لا اعتقد

ST 3. I don't like → TT لا اريد ان

ST 4. I cannot reconcil it to myself → TT لا استطيع ان اروض نفسي

ST 5. I cannot close it → TT ليس بوسعي ان انهي هذه الرسالة

In the first example , the personal pronoun (You) is used as a cohesive device in the ST but , in the TT it is replaced by the word (الانسان) ; the form of the referent changes completely in the TT . The same happens with the pronoun (it) in the fifth example which is replaced by the phrase (هذه الرسالة) . In the second , third , fourth , and fifth examples , the person pronoun (I) is used as a cohesive device in the ST but, in the TT , it is understood from the context. On the other hand , the use of " possessive pronouns " and " object pronoun " keep the original referent of the ST , as in the following examples :-

ST 1. Our little baby → TT طفلنا الصغيرة

ST 2. You hold in them → TT تملكينها في نفوسهم

ST 3. Her recovery → TT شفائها

ST 4. His affection → TT مودته

The mechanism of " anaphoric " reference helps in avoiding repetition especially in prose texts. The occurrence of both types "anaphoric " and "cataphoric " reference in corpus (A) may be related to the nature of the text itself which is a letter . So , it is natural in such case to have cataphoric reference as the addressor (writer of the letter) occurs at the bottom of the text (letter).

Concerning conjunction , table (3) below shows the absence of temporal type of conjunctions which may be due to the nature of the text itself . That is , Dickens , perhaps , has no need to show consequence

of events or describe his wife s situation before and after their daughters death. In addition , the frequency of conjunctions in the TT is less than those occurred in ST which may be related to the fact that some conjunctions are omitted in the TT since such process has nothing to do with the meaning of the sentence.

| The conjunction in the ST | Type of Conjunction | Frequency | Percentage | Conjuncts in the T T | Frequency | Percentage |
|---------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------|------------|----------------------|-----------|------------|
| 1. And | additive (simple) | ٩ | %٤٧ | وَ Ø | ٦ ٣ | %٦٠ / |
| 2 . As | additive (comparative) | ١ | %٩ | Ø | ٠ | / |
| ٣. But | Appositive | ٤ | %٢٢ | لكن Ø | ٢ ٢ | %٢٠ / |
| 4. If | Causal | ٤ | %٢٢ | فإذا Ø | ٢ ٢ | %٢٠ / |
| | Total | ١٨ | | Total | ١٠ | |

Table (3): Conjunction Device in Corpus (A)

7.2 Analysis of Corpus (B) : "Lycidas" by John Milton

| Reference in The Source Text | Cohesive Device | Type of Reference |
|--|-----------------|------------------------|
| O ye (you) laurels | Ye (you) | Cataphoric |
| Ye Myrtles | Ye (you) | Cataphoric |
| I come to pluck your berries | I / You | Cataphoric / Anaphoric |
| Shatter you leaves | You | Cataphoric |
| Compels me to disturb your season | Me / Your | Cataphoric / Anaphoric |
| Dead ere (before) his prime | His | Anaphoric |
| Hath not left his peer | His | Anaphoric |
| Who would not sing Lycidas ? | Who | Exophoric |
| He knew himself to sing | He / Himself | Anaphoric / Anaphoric |
| He must not float his watery bier | He / His | Anaphoric |
| With lucky words favour my destinedurn | My | Catahoric |
| As he passes turn | He | Anaphoric |
| Fair peace be to my sable shroud | My | Catahoric |

Total: **Anaphoric: 8**
 Cataphoric: 6

Table (4) : Type of Reference in The Source Text of corpus (B)

| Reference in The source text | Cohesive Device | Reference in The target text | Cohesive Device |
|------------------------------|-----------------|------------------------------|-----------------|
| Ye (You) Laurels | You | يا شجيرات الغار | يا |
| Ye (You) Myrtles brown | You | ايثها الرياحين المربدة | ايثها |
| I come to pluck your | I / Your | جئت لاقطف ثمرك | ت، لك |

| | | | |
|--|--------------|---|------|
| berries | | | |
| Shatter you leaves | You | اوراقك | ك |
| Compels me to disturb your season | Me / Your | توغماني على ان اقلق فصلك | ي، ك |
| Dead (ere) his prime | His | قبل عنفوانه | ه |
| Hath not left his peer | His | دون ان يخلف نظيراً | Ø |
| Who would not sing for Lycidas ? | Who | فمنذا الذي لا يرتك الشعر من اجل ليسداس | الذي |
| He knew himself to sing | He / Himself | فقد كان يُحسن انشاء الشعر | Ø |
| He must not float his watery bier | He / His | ينبغي الا يطفو فوق نعش من ماء | Ø |
| With lucky words facour my destinedurn | My | بألفاظ تدفعها المصادفة الطيبة فتزدان بها محرقة الموتى | Ø |
| As he passes Turm | He | عندما يمر التفتن | ي |
| Fair peace be to my sable shroud | My | واقران التحية على ثوب الحداد الذي انسجه له | ه |

Total : 17

Total : 11

Table (5) : Type of Reference inThe Target Text of Corpus (B)

Relatively , most , if not all , the cohesive devices accurred in corpus (B0 are " Subject and Possessive " ponouns.Most of them have been omitted in the target text but their meaning is understood. The followingexamples illustrate things :

ST 1. He knew himself to sing فقد كان يُحسن انشاء الشعر **ST 2. He must**

not float his watery bier من ماء ينبغي الا يطفو فوق نعش

In both examples, the pronoun (he) in the ST is omitted in the TT but its meaning is understood from the context of sentence. Since corpus (B) is a poem , it is expected that the personal pronoun " You" in the ST is omitted but replaced by the Arabic vocative forms " يا " and "أيتها" in the TT. The following sentences show the case :

ST 1. O ye (you) Laurels → يا شجيرات الفار

ST 2. Ye (you) Myrtles brown → أيتها الرياحين المريدة

Also , to express his attitudes , emotions and feelings , the poet (Milton) naturally tends to use pronouns like (I , me , my) in ST which are either omitted in the TT or expressed by the presence of the letter (ي) in the word (ترغماني). Concerning the most common possessive pronoun " his " , in the ST of corpus (B) , it takes either its original form in the TT which is (هـ) or omitted as in the following examples :-

ST 1... . dead ere (before) his prime. —————> قبل عنفوانه

ST 2... . and hath left his peer —————> دون ان يخلف نظيرا

Table (3) shows that "anaphoric " reference is more frequent in use than "cataphoric" reference in corpus (B). That is , there are just three cases of cataphoric reference in the poem :

ST 1. O Ye (You) Laurels.

ST 2. Ye (You) Myrtles

ST 3. Shatter you leaves.

It is not surprising for a peiece of literanture like Milton's poem " Lycidas " to display an " exophoric " reference as the poets usually use their active imagination to express their emotions towards the addressee especially if the addressee is a king like Edward Lycidas. Lets us consider the following exmaples :

ST 1. Who would not sing for Lycidas ?

TT فمندا الذي لا يرتل الشعر من اجل ليسداس

The pronoun (who) refers to all other poets in world.

Regarding the conjunction device , table (6) below identifies the types of conjunction occurred in the poem as wellas their frequency . The table shows the presence of all types of conjunction which may be due to the subject of the poem itself and the poet s style . Milton , perhaps , tends to convey his deep feelings of sorrow for the death of his friend , Lycidas, through describion , showing consequence , comparing two situations ,etc. and this can be achieved by using all these types of conjunction . Also, the conjunctions ,as in corpus (A), are less common in the TT than those occurred in the ST which may also be related to the translators tendency to omit them as their absence keeps the sentence meaning .

| The conjunction in the ST | Type of Conjunction | Frequency | Percentage | Conjuncts in the T T | Frequency | Percentage |
|---------------------------|---------------------|-----------|------------|----------------------|-----------|------------|
| 1. And | additive (simple) | 11 | %٧٣ | وَ Ø | ٦ ٥ | %٦٦.٤ |
| 2 . Yet | appositive | ١ | %٦.٨ | Ø | ٠ | / |
| ٣. then | Temporal | ١ | %٦.٨ | ثم | ١ | %١١.٢ |
| 4. before | Temporal | ١ | %٦.٨ | قبل | ١ | %١١.٢ |

| | | | | | | |
|--------|--------|---|------|-----|---|-------|
| 5 .for | Causal | ١ | %٦.٨ | لأن | ١ | %١١.٢ |
|--------|--------|---|------|-----|---|-------|

Table (6): Conjunction in Corpus (B)

7.3. Solutions Adopted in The Arabic Translation

Some translation techniques have been used in both Corpus (A) and Corpus (B) namely those of omission , compensation and transposition starting with " omission " which refers to the situation where a part of the source text is omitted , as in these examples :-

ST 1. To show yourself worth of the great trust

TT وانك جديرة بالثقة

ST 2. With lucky words favour my destined urn -----

بألفاظ تدفعها المصادفة الطيبة فتزدان بها محرقة الموتى

The underlined parts have been omitted in the translation. Concerning the referential cohesive devices , The strategy of compensation is also used, this strategy refers to something that cannot be translated , but the meaning that is lost is expressed some where else in the translated text . The following examples clarify things:

ST 1. You would spose her quietly asleep

TT وان الانسان ليظنها نائمة بهدوء

ST 2. Fair peace be to my sable shroud

واقرأن التحية على ثوب الحداد الذي انسجة له

Here , the personal pronoun " you " in the first example is not mentioned in the TT but its meaning is understood by using the word (الانسان); the translator's choice for the word (الانسان) depends on the context of the text and the same happens with the pronoun "My" in the second sentence which is understood by the translator's use of the phrase (الذي أنسجة له)

Another technique adopted in just corpus (B) is known as transposition ; the process where parts of speech change their sequence or class when they are translated. It is in a sense a shift of word class or sequence like in the examples :-

ST 1. You will not like to be away , I know

TT انا اعلم انه لن يعجبك المكوث بعيدة عني

ST 2. Forester , with his usual affection for us , comes down

سيأتيك فورستر الذي عودنا على مودته

Beause of the differences between English and Arabic languages , the shift from English into Arabic changes the word class or postion . Here , the phrase " I know " which occurs at the end fo English sentence becomes " انا اعلم " at the beginning of the Arabic sentence . Also , there is a shift in the phrase " his affection " in the second example . It occurin the middle of the ST but it becomes (مودته) at the end of the Arabic sentence.

7- 4 An Analysis of Reference and Conjunctions in The Original Arabic Text(OAT) (Corpus C)

Concerning the referential devices used in corpus (C) which is a letter of condolence written by Ishak Bin Al- Kattab to his friend for the death of his father , Table (6) shows that they are the least in number in this corpus . That is , they are (46) in the ST and (38) in the TT of corpus (A) whereas they are just (35) in the OAT (corpus C) .However, the conjunctions are more frequent in use than those in both ST and TT of corpus (A).This may reflect the writer's tendency to add, describe , compare, give reasons, show contrast etc which can only be achieved by using these types of conjunction .

| Reference cohesive device | Type of Reference | Frequency | conjuncts | Type of Conjunction | Frequency |
|---------------------------|-------------------|-----------|-----------|---------------------|-----------|
| هذا | Dem. | ١ | وَ | additive | 20 |
| ذلك | Dem. | ٢ | | | |
| ٠ | Poss. | ٢٠ | | | |
| هم | Per. | ٢ | | | |
| ك | Per. | ٣ | | | |
| نا | Poss. | ٥ | | | |
| انت | Per | ١ | | | |
| | Total | ٣٥ | | Total | ٢٠ |

Table (7): Reference and Conjunction in Corpus (C)

7.4 An analysis of Reference and Conjunction in The Original Arabic Text (OAT) (Corpus D)

Table (8) below shows that the referential pronouns in corpus (D) , unlike those in corpus (c) , is more common (20) than those occurred in ST (17) and TT (11) of corpus (B). Such high frequency may be related to the fact that the poet , AL- Mutanaby , has used these pronouns to emphasize and clarify his deep sorrow for the death of Um Saif AL- Dwlaa AL- Hamedany. Conjunctions , on the other hand , are less (12) than those used in ST (15) and more than those occurred in TT (9) of corpus (B) . This difference in frequency , perhaps, is due to the nature of the text itself and the poet's tendency , AL- Mutanaby , to use no many conjunctions as such process reveals how he is able to tie his words together without using many conjunctions and this in its turn reflects how he is a clever and creative Arabic poet .

| Reference cohesive device | Type of Reference | Frequency | conjuncts | Type of Conjunction | Frequency |
|---------------------------|-------------------|-----------|-----------|---------------------|-----------|
| ي | Per. | 4 | وَ | additive | 11 |
| نا | Poss. | ٦ | لأن | Causal | ١ |
| ت | Per. | ٤ | | | |
| انت | Per. | ١ | | | |
| هم | Per. | ١ | | | |
| ك | Poss. | ٤ | | | |
| | Total | ٢٠ | | Total | ١٢ |

Table (8): Reference and Conjunction in Corpus (D)

Conclusion

The analysis of the six texts reveals the following conclusions :

1. All types of reference (exophoric , anaphoric , and cataphoric) are used . However, the anaphoric reference is the most common one (22 in corpus (A)and 8 in corpus (B) and this may be related to two reasons. First , anaphoric reference saves the writers in general from creating a rather boring text through avoiding repetition. Second , the poet usually tends to convey his message through being away from ambiguity which may be achieved by referring to something forward or to something outside the text. Avoiding these types of reference (cataphoric and exophoric) lessens the reader's effort for interpretation
2. The target text tended to present cohesive devices that were equivalent to the ones used in source text. However, the use of different grammatical words reduced the degree of specificity of the referents produced by personal pronouns. That is , the personal pronouns were used as cohesive devices in the source text but they were omitted in the target text and their meanings were understood from the context. On the other hand , the use of possessive pronouns kept the original referent of the ST depending on the gender and number markers (male /female , singular , plural). This is achieved by using (ها ، نا ، هم ، ه).
3. Translators usually use certain strategies such as omission , compensation and transposition in transferring referential cohesion from an English literary text to its Arabic translated version.
4. The reference as a cohesive device was more implicit in the TT (Arabic language) than in the ST (English language) because of the inflecting and agglutinating nature of the Arabic language . Thus , the reference is utterly affected in the Arabic target text.
5. The frequency of referential cohesive devices in corpus (c) is less common than those occurred in ST and TT of corpus (A) whereas the opposite can be said about those in corpus (D) compared to those in ST and TT of corpus (B) .
6. The frequency of conjunction cohesive devices in the TT is less than those used in ST in both corpus (A) and (B). In addition, the conjunctions in the original Arabic text (C) is higher than those occurred in ST and TT of corpus (A) whereas conjunctions in the original Arabic text (D) are higher than those used in just TT of corpus (B).

Suggestions for further study

Another paper may be a study of reference and conjunction as cohesive devices in an English narrative text and its translation into

Arabic . Another one may be a study of another cohesive device in an English text and its translated version.

Bibliography

Brown, G. and YULE , G. 1983. Discourse Analysis . Cambridge : Cambridge university press.

Crystal, D. 1985 . Cambridge Encyclopedia of Language . London : Longman

Farrokhpay , M. 1999. Fundamental Concepts in Linguistics . Tehran : Sokhan

Finch , T. 2000. Cohesion and Coherence . London : Longman

Halliday , M. A. K. 1978. Language as Social Semiotic . London : Edward Arnold

..... . 1985. An Introduction to Functional Grammar. London : Edward Arnold

Halliday, M. A. K. and Hassan , R. 1976. Cohesion in English . London : Longman UK Group Limited .

Hamer, B. 2004. Studies in Discourse. London : Longman .

Hoey, S. 1991. Textual Cohesion . London : Macmillan publisher, Ltd.

Ilyas, I. 1989. Theories of Translation . Iraq: Mosul . Ministry of Higher Education press.

Jhonestone , B. 2008. Discourse Analysis . Black Wall publishing Ltd . Australia .

Mathews , P. H. 2007 . Concise Dictionary of Linguistics . Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Olatunde , J.A. 2002. " Cohesion as an Aspect OF Textuality in Vacancy Advertisement" in Newspapers, in Babatunde, S. T. A nd Adeyanju , D. s (ed s) . Language , Meaning , and Society . Ilorin : Hytee press & publishing . pp : 312-313

Osisanowo , W. 2005 . Introduction to Discourse Analysis and Pragmatics . Luganville : femulus fetop publishers.

Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S. , Leech, j . and Svartvik , J. 1985. A Comprehensive Grammar of The English Language. London : Longman

Salkie, R. 1995. Text and Discourse Analysis . T. J. International Ltd. Padstow , Cornwall, London .

Van Dijk, A. T. 1992. Text and Context Explorations in the Semantics and Pragmatics of Discourse . London : Longman

Widdowson, H. G. 2007. Discourse Analysis . Oxford : Oxford university press.

Wikipedia . 2006. Linguistics . London

http://www. Slideshare net / cupidlucid / cohesion .

الخلاصة

هذا البحث عبارة عن تحليل مقارنة لنصيين ادبيين في اللغة الانكليزية، نسخهم المترجمة في اللغة العربية ونصين اصليين في اللغة العربية . يركز البحث في تحليله على الاشارة وادوات الربط كوسائل للانسجام الشكلي على مستوى النص والتغيرات التي تطرأ على هذا الانسجام من جراء ترجمة النصوص الادبية ويعود ذلك الى الاختلافات بين اللغتين في مجال البنية النحوية . يبين البحث الاستيراتيجيات المتبعة من قبل المترجمين عند تحويلهم لوسائل الانسجام النصي من نص ادبي في اللغة الانكليزية الى اللغة العربية وكذلك الفرق في اعداد ضمائر الاشارة وادوات الربط في النصوص قيد الدراسة . من اجل بلوغ هدف البحث تمت ترجمة نصيين ادبيين باللغة الانكليزية من قبل مترجم ذو خبرة (صفاء خلوصي) وهو مترجم مشهور في العراق وكان النص الاول عبارة عن رسالة نعي للكاتب جارلس ديكنز والآخر قصيدة للشاعر جون ملتون (ليسيداس) وتمت مقارنة هذه النصوص من اجل اظهار التغيرات التي تطرأ على الانسجام النصي وكذلك تم عمل دراسة احصائية لبيان الاختلاف في اعداد الضمائر وادوات الربط في كل النصوص . فرضية البحث هي ان وسائل الانسجام ستكون اكثر ضمنية في اللغة العربية من اللغة الانكليزية وذلك لان اللغة العربية تستعمل الحركات وتعدد المورفيمات (الاحرف الملتصقة) في الكلمة الواحدة اكثر من اللغة الانكليزية وكذلك اعداد ضمائر الاشارة وادوات الربط غير متساوي بكل النصوص وتظهر النتائج ان الاشارة كوسيلة من وسائل الانسجام النصي تتأثر الى حد كبير بفعل الترجمة وان التفاوت باعداد ضمائر الاشارة وادوات الربط يعتمد على نوع النص قيد الدراسة .