

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I : INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 INTRODUCTION.....	2
1.2 STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM.....	3
1.3 SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY.....	3
1.4 OBJECTIVE OF THE STUDY.....	4
1.5 RESEARCH QUESTIONS.....	4
1.6 LIMITATION AND DELIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY.....	4
1.6.1 Limitation Of The Study.....	4
1.6.2 Delimitations Of The Study.....	5
1.7 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK.....	5
1.8 DEFINITION OF KEY TERMS.....	6
CHAPTER II : LITERATURE REVIEW.....	7
2.1 INTRODUCTION.....	8
2.2 TEXT.....	8
2.3 THE CONCEPT OF TRANSLATION.....	9
2.4 TRANSLATION AND EQUIVALENCE.....	10
2.5 THE MEANING OF COHESION.....	10
2.5.2 Lexical Cohesion.....	11
2.5.2.1 Reiteration relations by Halliday and Hasan (1976).....	12
2.5.2.2 Repetition.....	13
2.5.2.3 Synonymy or Near-Synonymy.....	13
2.5.2.4 Super ordinate.....	13
2.5.2.5 General noun.....	14
2.5.3 Collocation.....	14
2.5.4 Reiteration relation by Tanskanen (2006).....	14
2.5.4.1 Simple and Complex repetition.....	14
2.5.4.2 Substitution.....	14
2.5.4.3 Equivalence.....	15
2.5.4.4 Generalization.....	15
2.5.4.5 Specification.....	15
2.5.4.6 Co-specification.....	15
2.5.4.7 Contrast.....	15
2.5.5 Collocation relations.....	16
2.5.5.1 Ordered set.....	16
2.5.5.2 Activity-related collocation.....	16
2.5.5.3 Elaborative collocation.....	16
2.6 COHESION AND TRANSLATION.....	17

2.7 LEXICAL COHESION AND TRANSLATION.....	17
2.8 PREVIOUS STUDIES.....	18
CHAPTER III : METHODOLOGY	20
3.1 INTRODUCTION.....	21
3.2 DESIGN OF THE STUDY	21
3.3 RESEARCH MATERIAL.....	21
3.4 RESEARCH PROCEDURES.....	21
CHAPTER IV	23
DATA ANALYSIS & DISCUSSION.....	23
4.1 INTRODUCTION.....	24
4.2 REITERATION IN PRIDE AND PREJUDICE AND ITS RENDERINGS.....	24
4.3 THE FREQUENCY OF REITERATION CATEGORIES IN ENGLISH AND ITS PERSIAN TRANSLATIONS	25
4.4 TRANSLATION PROCEDURES	29
4.5 THE FREQUENCY OF TRANSLATION PROCEDURES USED BY EACH TRANSLATOR.....	54
4.6 DISCUSSION.....	66
CHAPTER V.....	67
SUMMARY & CONCLUSION	67
5.1 SUMMARY	68
5.2 CONCLUSION	68
5.3 SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER STUDIES	70
REFERENCES	71

TABLE OF TABLES

Table 2.1: Categories Of Lexical Cohesion In Halliday And Hasan (1976), Tanskanen (2006).....	12
Table 4.1 : English Reiterations And Their True, Wrong And Non Persian Renderings ..	24
Table 4.2 : The Frequency Of Translation Procedures Used By Mosaheb	54
Table 4.3 : The Frequency Of Translation Procedures Used By Rezaei (2006).....	58
Table 4.4 : Comparison Of The Frequency Of Translation Procedures Used By Two Translators	62

TABLE OF FIGURES

Figure 4.1 the frequency of english reiteration categories	25
Figure 4.2 the frequency of true persian translation by rezaei and mosaheb	26
Figure 4.3 the frequency of wrong persian translation by rezaei and mosaheb	27
Figure 4.4 the frequency of non persian translation by rezaei and mosaheb	28
Figure 4.5 the frequency of true translation procedures used by mosaheb (2001)	55
Figure 4.6 the frequency of wrong translation procedures used by mosaheb (2001)	56
Figure 4.7 the frequency of non-translation procedures used by mosaheb (2001)	57
Figure 4.8 the frequency of true translation procedures used by rezaei (2006)	59
Figure 4.9 the frequency of wrong translation procedures used by rezaei (2006)	60
Figure 4.10 the frequency of non-translation procedures used by rezaei (2006)	61
Figure 4.11 comparing the frequency of true translation procedures used by the two translators.....	63
Figure 4.12 comparing the frequency of wrong translation procedures used by the two translators.....	64
Figure 4.13 comparing the frequency of non translation procedures used by the two translators.....	65

ABSTRACT

The present study aimed to determine some lexical cohesion elements in Jane Austen's *Pride and Prejudice* and those elements which are used by two different translators in rendering their concepts into Persian. Lexical cohesion is one of the central devices for making texts hang together. Lexical cohesion which gives the most substantive contribution to the text, is the way to know what is the relationship between one word and another word in a text. The main purpose of this study is to use eclectic model, according to Halliday and Hasan (1976) and Tanskanen (2006) theories, to investigate how two translators-by the use of lexical cohesive elements- translate words to make semantic logical relationship between sentences of *Pride and Prejudice* Persian translations and also to what extent were successful in translation of words. In addition, it is the other aim to find out the best translator to create lexical cohesion through the sentences of Persian translations. In this regard, the researcher used the first 30 parts of English version of *Pride and Prejudice* as well as two Persian translations. Lexical cohesion elements in English version were classified into some of reiteration namely: repetition, synonymy, general nouns according to Halliday and Hasan (1976) and simple repetition, complex repetition, equivalence, generalization and specification according to Tanskanen (2006). Then, these lexical cohesion elements in two Persian translations were specified. The researcher tried to find out the elements of lexical cohesion that are used in two translations, are more similar to which of the Halliday and Hasan (1976) and Tanskanen (2006) theory, the frequency of strategies in two Persian translations-by Rezaei and Mosaheb and comparison of two translators' translations were examined with the purpose of determining better translation. The last, the data were appeared on a diagram according to SPSS software. It seems that in these translations, the translators' translations are more similar to Tanskanen (2006) theory and simple repetition element of this theory is used more than others. This study shows that depending on the importance of each lexical element, none of the translators are successful in making cohesion in texts. This may lead us to the problem of non-understanding.

Key terms:

Cohesion, Lexical Cohesion, Reiteration, Translation

CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction

Throughout the history, human beings have tried to use different tools to communicate with each other, and also have tried to transfer their meaning. Tools such as the smoke signals, the whistle, large drums, etc were used by human beings, failed to comprehensively fulfill until creature managed to invent a much better device to fulfill the comprehension.

Language has proved to be the best tool for communication with the purpose that human beings can utter most of their feelings, attitudes, experiences, needs, no matter how complex, and at the time the most suitable tool to convey the message not only for the most people of the same speaking community, but for other nations as well.

The problem, on the other hand, is that all people don't share the same language but different languages across the world. They try to communicate and understand other nation's languages. So how could one society communicate with others by different languages? At this point we need translations which open the way for the people to have access to different languages used across the world; and the translators who know at least two languages, make it possible for each society to communicate with others.

So, translation is observed as an act of communication that is essentially related to at least the linguistic and discourse systems holding for the two languages involved in the process of translation that is source text (ST) and target text (TT).

Cohesive devices contribute to texture and are motivated by the linguistic as well as the communicative factors of both ST and TT languages. Halliday and Hasan (1976) mention that using cohesive devices create the semantic unity of text and that the selection of types of cohesive markers used in a particular text affects its meaning. The same thing in the process of translation, the selection of the cohesive devices by the translator to re-create the ST message will also affect the TT meaning. As Yule (2006: 12) asserts, cohesive devices may cause, or be the source of, difficulty in translation, so cohesive devices are so important aspect of language that translators should take into account. To achieve depth in the analysis, this research investigates lexical cohesion devices in ST and TT.

The current study has been set out to analyze English novel and its two Persian translations from linguistic point of view. Linguistic point of view especially discourse analysis here means about how the words, phrases and sentences of the novel can relate each other and how the sentences, paragraphs and parts of novel has unity from one sentence to another sentence or from one part to another part. The instrument to relate and to unite from one sentence to another sentence in discourse analysis is called cohesion. Many theorists divided cohesion into two kinds which are grammatical and lexical cohesion. But in this present study the researcher just focuses on lexical cohesion according to Halliday and Hasan (1976) and Tanskanen (2006).

Lexical cohesion is a group of words which is lexically cohesive when all of the words are semantically related; for example, when they all concern the same topic (Halliday and Hasan, 1976). Lexical cohesion can also form relational patterns in text in a way that links sentences to create a feature of coherence with the reader. It is also a strategy that helps us in understanding words and words phrases and then sentences. Specifically, we use our awareness in order to make the connection between words,

word phrases and at last sentences. This understanding of how the content of sentences is linked helps to identify the central information in texts and at last, what the text is about.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

It is obvious that many words are general and have similar concepts in most communities. Translating source language (SL) into an appropriate form of target language (TL) is a part of translator's role in communication. The differences of two languages make gaps in translation. So the difficulty of recognizing and successfully dealing with the words is a stable challenge to the translator and one which claims some translation decisions if the same or similar concept of the words is to be achieved in the target text (TT) as is present in the source text (ST). These decisions are those choices that might lead a translator achieves appropriate products in the target language (TL) and the reader cannot identify that this text is a translation of an original text. Discussing the problem of corresponding in translation is such as the greatest problem which is the translator is posed by specific words and concepts which may not have exact equivalent in the target language or s/he may not transfer the meaning of the ST; because the translator is not completely aware of discourse features and the differences between languages or because of the culture difference. The other problem is that as Catford (1965) proposes two major types of shifts in translation which are level shift and category shift, the translator may also translate the word at a different level e.g. grammar to lexis or translate the SL item into different class in the TL, e.g. translation of a verb by a noun; which this changes in translation may not create lexical cohesion between sentences or he may translate a unit at one rank in the SL into a unit at a different rank in the TL. Baker (1992) states that different grammatical structures in the SL and TL may cause changes in the way a message is carried across. She states that "the grammatical structure of the target language may require the translator to add or delete information" (Baker 1992: 206) or make some changes in "the meaning" of some lexical terms; so in general it may change the meaning of some sentences that eliminates lexical cohesion of those ones; that is another problem. So translators should decide how to solve these problems in many cases.

This study deals with the strategies the translators of the English novel "Pride and Prejudice" have applied during the translation of the novel. The novel consists of some lexical cohesion devices, which two different translators have translated them into Persian. However, in some cases the translators of Pride and Prejudice used unacceptable strategies in rendering lexical cohesion items. This might lead to misunderstanding on the part of Persian readers. For example Rezaei used "او، او"، for translating "he, he" in repetition, but Mosaheb used "او، دارسی" for rendering the word "he, he".

1.3 Significance of the Study

"Pride and Prejudice" English novel, like other novels, is a type that lexical cohesion of text is so important. Since cohesion in text, especially in translated text, is of great importance, the translator's theoretical and practical knowledge about lexical cohesion

categories results in natural text and helps the reader to understand better and in many cases, it prevents bad understanding and the transmission of false concepts about the text. So it is supposed that the result of the study will give both theoretical and practical contribution.

Theoretically, the result of this study is expected to be useful to the discourse analysis study. It means that the emphasis will be on some patterns i.e. the notion of “text”, “cohesion”, and “lexical cohesion”. A full description of some lexical cohesion markers in English, as they are presented by Halliday and Hasan (1976) and Tanskanen (2006), along with some categories of lexical cohesion that they suggested, will be discussed and illustrated to be useful for translators.

Practically, it is expected that this study will be useful for the English translation study’s students and people who are interested in studying translation. For English translation students and those who are interested, this study is provided in order to determine how to translate the novels according to lexical cohesion elements and its quality assessment for better understanding. The students also can obtain some information about other kinds of lexical cohesion used in this novel. So that way, they can study more from it and it is expected that they will consequently be able to apply their knowledge. The last, this study contributes to the next researcher for supporting the following studies especially in the study of lexical cohesion on other novels.

1.4 Objective of the Study

The present study aims to determine some lexical cohesion devices of Jane Austen’s “Pride and Prejudice” and the strategies used by two translators in rendering their concepts into Persian. The objectives can be summarized as follows:

1. To find out the elements of lexical cohesion that are used in two Persian translations
2. To find out the frequency of lexical cohesion strategies in each two translations. And the most frequent strategy.
3. To find out which translator is more successful in creating lexical cohesion through the sentences of the translations.

1.5 Research Questions

Accordingly, the writer conducted this study with the aim to answer these following questions:

1. What strategies did the translators use for keeping lexical cohesion in their translations?
2. What is the frequency of lexical cohesion strategies in the two Persian translations?
3. Which translator is more successful in creating lexical cohesion?

1.6 Limitation and Delimitations of the Study

1.6.1 Limitation of the study

1. Lack of prior research studies on the topic
2. Lack of access to translators for possible questions about translations