ORIGINAL REVIEW

Study on Variability of Cohesive Devices in Idioms and Proverbs

Tooba Mardani [1]
Young Researchers and Elite Club, Isfahan (Khorasgan) Branch,
Islamic Azad University, Isfahan, Iran.

Cohesion, as a standard textual element in discourse analysis, consists of various cohesive devices that provide links between different parts of a text. These cohesive devices are categorized into grammatical and lexical types. This study aims to comparatively analyze English and Persian literary texts in terms of the number and degree of utilization of sub-types of lexical cohesion markers, namely conjunction, reference, and collocation in proverbs and idioms. To achieve this, these markers were meticulously identified in both the Persian source text and the English target text, and then contrasted. The analysis of cohesive relations in a bilingual corpus of dialogues in English and Persian reveals that there is no significant similarity or correspondence between them. Finally, some recommendations are proposed to enhance the accuracy and neutrality of the translated texts.

Keywords: Cohesion, Literary Text, Translation, Proverb, Idiom.

---

[1] E-mail: mardani_mars@yahoo.com

Introduction

Cohesive device has an important place in the text since it provides surface proof for the text unity and reveals the continuity that exists between one part of linguistic elements and the others. Cohesive device distinguish a text from a non-text and contributes to the texture and. A text is not just a string of sentences; in other words, it is not only a large linguistic form and grammatical and structural unit.

Cohesion, coherence, and genre are investigated in relation to discourse organization. Berzlanovich studies relationships between the lexical cohesion and organization of discourse, and illustrates how lexical cohesion contributes to the organizing features segmentation and centrality of discourse units.

Fatemi,Kafi and Shahriarpour (2014) investigated cohesive devices and stated that among Halliday & Hassan's model of cohesion, referencing principle, especially demonstrative ones, played a remarkable role for establishing meaning & texture in the newspaper.

According to Van Dijk (1972) and Gutwinski (1976), there are the principles of connectivity in the text that bind discourses together (Akindele, 2011, p. 100). One of the prominent factors that contribute to the discourse organization is cohesion which is composed of three main components; referential cohesion (lexical chains), relation cohesion (connective and ellipsis), and lexical cohesion that influences the ideational (semantic) structure of discourse (Martin, 1992).

As for lexical cohesion and genre, he added that genre is the common pragmatic knowledge on conventionalized class of communicative event with common communicative aims by members of discourse community (Swales, 1990). Berzlanovich mentions, "This shared knowledge concerns standard default elements in text of particular genre." He also discusses on the lexical cohesion and coherence in persuasive and expository genres.

Now in this study, the following research questions are formed:

Q1: Is there any relationship between number of cohesive ties used in an English translationversion and as that of its corresponding Persian translation?

Q2: Is the frequency of occurrence for all cohesive devices used in English novels and their corresponding Persian translation the same?

Theoretical Foundations

Hananta & Sukyadi (2015) studies on the use of cohesion in students' argumentative writings in terms of its frequency and function show that the occurrence of grammatical cohesive devices slightly more frequent than the lexical ones. The distribution of its subtypes, however, suggests otherwise, because reiteration appears as the most-frequently-used cohesive device, followed successively by reference, conjunction, collocation, substitution, and ellipsis.

It is worth to note that relation of coherence between the text parts are derived into semantic and ideational relation and presentation (pragmatic or interpersonal) (Taboad and Mann, 2006).

While semantic relation rose from the elocutionary meaning of the text parts, pragmatic relation results from the illocutionary meaning of the text parts. However, it is problematic that one want to draw an obvious and clean-cut line between the semantic and pragmatic relation.

Ahmadi & Rezaei (2015) researched the textual cohesion in "Munajat Namih" by Khajih Abd-Ollah Ansari, the poet and mystic in ninth and tenth century, based on Halliday and Hasan (1985,1976). Having selected 30 cases of Munajats from Munajat Namih. Halliday and Hasan (1985, 1976) to discover cohesive devices, they have calculated the frequency of their functions and concluded that the most basic cohesive devices in it are personal pronouns. Repetition of the same word is ranked in the second place, and additives are ranked in a third place. Furthermore, collocation and verbal ellipsis are from among important cohesive devices in Munajat Namih.

The impact of textual cohesive conjunctions on the reading is very important that is some researcher's favorite field of study. Assumption of Innajih's study was that the conjunction influences student's reading comprehension positively. He investigates impact of textual cohesive conjunction on the reading comprehension of Libyan university students that were studying English as a foreign language. Pre-test and post–test for all subjects and only post-test experiment for treatment group was conducted. One hundred subjects participated in programs. They were fourth-year English students in two Libyans universities.

There are relationships between textual cohesive conjunctions and reading comprehension skills, which has been explored in translation studies, linguistics, and psycholinguistics (Stood, 1972; Hoey, 1991).

Frank (1993) has defined conjunction as "a particular kind of connecting relationship between parts of speech." According to Nuttall (1996) conjunctions as cohesive devices play a pivotal role in the reading comprehension to foreign language readers. Based on these theory and other researches, Innajih begin to teach some conjunctive types that were useful in reading comprehension.

Some researchers delved and analyzed the use of cohesive devices in various genres and texts and found relationships between them (ESCOBAR, 1999; Crossley et al, 2010; Teich and Fankhauser, 2005; Dastjerdi and Samian, 2011; Akindle, 2011; Kafes, 2012).

Some researchers have considered and conducted comparative study of cohesive devices, (Fakuade and Shardama 2012; Lauder, 2010, Mirzapour and Ahmadi 2011; Roshan and Armion, 2009; Duczmal, 2008; Shabani, 2008). A Swales, (Taboad and Mann, 2006).Stood, 1972; Hoey, 1991Frank (1993) Nuttall (1996) Ahmadi 2011; Roshan and Armion, 2009; Duczmal, 2008; Shabani, 2008). A number of researchers also show the robust correlation between cohesive devices and translation (Quer, 2005; Mokrani, 2010; Laybutt, 2009; Djamila, 2010; Vahid Dastjerdi & Taghizadeh, 2006; Lotfipour-saedi, 1997; Yazdani, 2004; Najafi,Asadpour, Yazdani (2008). One particular scope to study cohesion is the effective role of cohesive devices in improving reading comprehension and writing skills (Sinicrope (2007), Wu (2010), Sirdinha (1997), Ting (2003), Olateju (2006), Azzous (2009), Kim and Na (2009).

Model of analysis

Data for the Study

One hundred and fourteen proverbs and idioms randomly was chosen as the original text, and its Persian translation was selected for comparison with the original work.

Instrumentation

The instrument used to answer the research questions was Halliday & Hasan (1976) framework of cohesive devices. According to Johnston (2008) the best-known treatment of cohesion is that of Halliday and Hasan (1976) and the framework seems to be the most comprehensive one (Behjat 2009).

Procedure

To observe if the number of cohesive devices in an English version is the same as that of its Persian translation, and to examine whether the frequency of occurrence of all cohesive devices is the same in both texts, phrase of proverbs and idioms along with its Persian translation was taken into account.

For the purpose of this study four main types of cohesive devices were selected which include:

1) Reference: the use of pronoun to refer an entity mentioned elsewhere in the discourse.

2) Conjunction: This type divided into four categories:

      Additive: and-also-beside-

      Adversative: but-yet-however-although

      Temporal: then-next-before-after

      Causative: so-therefore-because- as the result

3) Collocation: this type related to net of words which have relationship among them in term of meaning and structure.

4) Repetition: this includes reiteration of words in general or partial way.

Data analysis

The following examples can be considered that show cohesive devices and ties in proverbs and idioms play a prominent role for conveying meaning. Correct transferring surely is one of the important factors to avoid distortion of both in meaning and structure. It is essential to consider to achieve natural and accurate translation.

Analysis of frequency rate of cohesive devices	
1) **People who lives in glass house should not throw stones.** **Collocation: glass, stone and people, live**	چشم بر عیب خود بستن وعیب دیگران را دیدن
2) **The early bird catches the worm** **Collocation: bird, worm**	سحرخیز باش تا کامروا باشی
3) **If the shoe fits, wear it** **Reference: it, Conjunction: If**	زیر بار حرف حساب رفتن

Analysis of frequency rate of cohesive devices	
4) Get off some one's back Collocation: get off back	دست از سر کسی برداشتن
5) Take the bull by the horns Collocation: bull, horn	استین همت بالا زدن
6) Easy come, easy go Repetition: easy, Collocation: come, go	باد آورده را باد میبرد
7) No pain, no gain Repetition: no, Collocation: pain, gain	نابرده رنج گنج میسر نمی شود
8) Strike while the iron is hot Collocation: hot, iron	تا تنور داغ است نان را چسباندن
9) Too many cooks spoil the broth Collocation: cook, broth, spoil	آشپز که دوتا شد اش یا شور میشود یا شور
11) he who laughs last, laughs best Repetition: laugh	شاهنامه آخرش خوش است
12) No news is good news Repetition news, Collocation: no	بی خبری خوش خبری
13) The grass is always greener on the other side of the fence Collocation: grass, green, fence Reference; other	مرغ همسایه غازه!
14) Action speak louder than words Collocation: action, words and speak	دو صد گفته چون نیم کردار نیست

First, each tie of text was specified across the sentences; then the number of cohesive devices was ascertained in terms of quantity. Types of cohesion ties were also assigned and arranged that are involved in terms of reference, conjunction, repetition, and collocation.

These cohesive devices were identified and specified in each one of the five texts and all stories one by one. Finally, frequency of each element and cohesive devices calculated and were shown in the following table and charts.

Type of cohesion	Persian	English
Collocation	72(49%)	80(51%)
Reference	8(6%)	20(13%)
Conjunction	28(19%)	18(12%)
Repetition	35(26%)	38(24%)

Figure1: The number of cohesive devices

With regard to collocation, as it can be seen in the charts, there is no striking difference between the original texts and target text. The results suggest that there is high frequency of collocations in Persian (49%), and in English versions (51%). This signaled that no significant difference is established between languages

Data analysis for repetition also shows that there is a significantly high occurrence in Persian texts with 26%, and 24% in the English texts. These data reveal that the number of these cohesive devices used in the translation is lesser than that of the original and English texts use almost the same number or more.

With respect to conjunction, original text has employed it with 12% and Persian texts have employed 19%. The findings of this study show that Persian text uses the highest frequency of occurrences of conjunction.

In relation to "reference", as charts show, English text uses far more frequent occurrences of it than Persian text: 13% vs. 6% respectively. The significant difference is clear.

Conclusion

The current study examines cohesion and aims to explore the relationships between the frequency of cohesive devices in the source and target texts. It also investigates the one-to-one correspondence between each cohesive device and considers the tendency of English translators to transfer them. These devices include reference, conjunction, repetition, and collocation, which are essential tools for maintaining cohesion to produce effective and meaningful translations.

The significance of the study lies in the fact that each language has its own preferences in terms of cohesive patterns to convey relationships between structures, sentences, and words in texts. In line with this, the study aims to propose a general pattern regarding the aforementioned cohesive devices in literary texts.

1- There are relationships among cohesive devices in proverbs and idioms (literary texts) in English and their Persian translation versions in terms of frequency of use.

2- There is not a one-to-one correspondence between each cohesive device in terms of quantity in the source text and the target text; this necessitates translators to pay close attention to the cohesion of texts and the types of genres and registers when transferring cohesive devices.

3- There is not an exact equivalence between a given device in Persian and English texts, which is why a cohesive device may not always serve the same function in terms of meaning in translation across any text. The translator must provide a detailed analysis of cohesion in each specific genre, context, etc.

Reference

Ahmadi,S. Rezaei, V. (2015). Cohesion in Munajat Namih by the Saint of Harat. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, Vol. 5, No. 1, pp. 111-118, January 2015 http://dx.doi.org/10.17507/tpls.0501.15

Berzlánovich, I. (2008). Lexical cohesion and the organization of discourse. *Center for Language and Cognition Groningen: University of Groningen.*

Akindele, J. (2011). Cohesive Devices in Selected ESL Academic Papers. *African Nebula, 1*(3).

Crossley, S. Salsbury , T.,& McNamara, D. (2010). The Role of Lexical Cohesive Devices in Triggering Negotiations for Meaning. *Journal Issue: Issues in Applied Linguistics, 18*(1). Department of Applied Linguistics, UC Los Angeles. http://escholarship.org/uc/item/0n180736

Dijk.T.V. (1977). *Text and Context*. London: Longman.Gutwinski, W. (1976). *Cohesion in Literary Texts*. The Hague, Mouton.

ESCOBAR, Á. F. S. (1999). Teaching textual cohesion through analyses of Defoe's Moll Flanders and Swift's Gulliver's Travels. *Cauce: Revista Internacional de Filología, Comunicación y sus Didácticas*, (22), 557-570.

Fatemi, M. A., Kafi, Z., & Shahriarpour, N. (2014). Texture in text: a discourse analysis of Tehran Times Newspaper using Halliday an Hassan's Model of Cohesion. *International Journal of Language Learning and Applied Linguistics World (IJLLALW) Volume, 7*(3), 356-378.

Hananta, N., & Sukyadi, D. (2015). The use of cohesion in students' argumentative writings. *Rangsit Journal of Educational Studies, 2*(1), 37-65.

Martin, J. R. (1992*). English text: System and structure*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing   Company.

Rajab Taghi. H. (2013). *1000 English and American Idioms*. Jungle Publication

Teich, E., & Fankhauser, P. (2005). Exploring lexical patterns in text. *Interdisciplinary studies on information structure: ISIS; working papers of the SFB 632*, (2), 129-145.

Dastjerdi, H. V., & Samian, S. H. (2011). Quality of Iranian EFL learners' argumentative essays: Cohesive devices in focus. *Mediterranean journal of social sciences, 2*(2), 65-76.

مطالعۀ متغییرهای عوامل انسجام در اصطلاحات و ضرب‌المثل‌ها

طوبی مردانی‌[1]©

باشگاه پژوهشگران جوان و نخبگان، شعبه‌ی اصفهان (خوراسگان)،
دانشگاه آزاد اسلامی، اصفهان، ایران.

انسجام به عنوان یک معیار متنی یکی از عناصر تحلیل گفتمان است که هر زبان الگوی خاص خود را
دارد. این پژوهش با هدف تحلیل تطبیقی متون ادبی انگلیسی و فارسی از نظر تعداد و میزان بهره‌گیری
از عوامل انسجام واژگانی در نشانگرها، یعنی؛ ربط، ارجاع و ترکیب در ضرب‌المثل‌ها و اصطلاحات
می‌پردازد. بدین منظور، ابتدا به طور دقیق متن فارسی به عنوان متن اصلی و متن انگلیسی به عنوان متن
هدف که در تضاد بودند، شناسایی شدند. نتایج تحلیل روابط منسجم در مجموعه گفتگوهای دوزبانه
(انگلیسی و فارسی) و یافته‌ها نشان می‌دهد که هیچ شباهت و مطابقت قابل توجهی بین آنها وجود
ندارد. در نهایت توصیه‌هایی جهت صحت و بی‌طرفی متون ترجمه شده ارائه می‌شود.

واژه‌های کلیدی: انسجام، متن ادبی، ترجمه، ضرب المثل، اصطلاح.

---

[1] E-mail: mardani_mars@yahoo.com