Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

1.1 Introduction

In this study, shifts of cohesion in translation are examined. Translated texts are analysed, focusing on cohesive devices. The translation of cohesive elements is observed for retention, omission, or the introduction of new cohesive devices not present in the source text.

The web of cohesive elements running through the source and target texts are examined in this study to ascertain the extent to which explication occurs in the translation output of students of translation as a language transfer strategy. Shifts of cohesion such as omission or retention of cohesive elements are monitored in order to determine if in fact explication is a feature of translation which involves language transfer, as has been indicated by Blum-Kulka (1986). By observing if shifts of cohesion occur in translation, conclusions can be drawn about the translation strategies used by student translators and how these may vary according to level of language competence.

The broad approaches adopted in the present study are those of Halliday & Hasan (1976) for examining cohesive ties in the categories
of reference, conjunction, substitution and ellipsis, and Hoey (1991) for analysing lexical cohesion. The methodological and theoretical framework of two specific studies which examine shifts of cohesion in translation and interpreting, those of Blum-Kulka (1986) and Shlesinger (1995), respectively, are applied and discussed below.

A definition of key terms used in the study is provided at the beginning of this chapter, while in the major part, the aims, justification, scope and hypotheses of the study are introduced.

1.2 Background

Translation in Australia is largely practised to serve the needs of the non-English speaking background citizens, although there is a small but steady market in the domains of film, television and literary works; and a growing market in the commercial realm, including technical translation. Community translation nonetheless, encompasses all services provided to the community at large and as such is the principal source of work for local translators.

In Australia, both interpreting and translation started out as public community services. These professions are widely practised in over 100 community languages in a range of settings. Most practitioners of interpreting and translation are migrants who speak English as a foreign language (Laster & Taylor, 1994).
Unlike the more common and recommended model of translation into one's mother tongue (Nida, 1964; Vazquez-Ayora, 1981; Wilss, 1982), the domain of translation practice in this country covers both directions: from a first language (L1) into a second language (L2) and vice versa. English must always be the source or target language.

From a pedagogical perspective the phenomenon of bidirectional translation practice poses at least two problems for translator educators. First, much of the translation theory available perceives translation as a discipline to be practiced from the L2 into the L1 only; which means educators need to adapt the existing body of literature to accommodate translation practice into a L2. Secondly, translator education necessarily has to cater for the disparate levels of language competence of students, be it English in the case of migrants, or the community language in the case of second generation or second language speakers of community languages.

1.3 Definition of key terms

1.3.1 Translation and Interpreting

Translation entails a process whereby a text in a source language (henceforth referred to as SL) is transposed into a target language (henceforth referred to as TL), maintaining content and register within
a pragmatic, communicative framework. This is the view of translation that is taken in the present study, that of translation studies within a socio-cultural domain of communication. Interpreting on the other hand, is defined as the oral translation of a message from a SL into a TL. Translation, like interpreting, deals with discourse in a communicative setting. The principal difference between the two is the mode of discourse. In the case of the latter, the discourse is in the oral mode or spoken language, while translation deals with written language.

1.3.2 Discourse

Discourse has been defined as a group of words, sentences or utterances related to form a whole (Coulthard, 1985).

A definition of discourse that encompasses written texts is proposed by van Dijk (1985):

... discourses usually consist of sequences of sentences that express sequences of propositions. ...a discourse is not just a set of sentences but an ordered sequence, with conventional constraints on the possible orderings if it is to be meaningful and if it is to represent certain fact structures, for example, episodes (van Dijk 1985: 108).
1.3.3 Cohesion

Cohesion is what makes text hold together; it is the web of grammatical and semantic relations between words, sentences, paragraphs and even chapters, that connects text to form a whole (Halliday & Hasan, 1976).

De Beaugrande's and Dressler's (1981) definition of cohesion is comparable to that offered by Haliday & Hasan (1976)

...the ways in which the components of the surface text, ie. the actual words we hear or see, are mutually connected within a sequence. The surface components depend upon each other according to grammatical forms and conventions, such that cohesion rests upon grammatical dependencies (De Beaugrande & Dressler 19981)

It is clear from these definitions that cohesion is a property of texts and as such it is of paramount importance in translation because translation deals with decoding texts from a SL and then encoding them into a TL.

1.3.4 Explication

Explication is said to be a universal strategy in any language transfer (Blum-Kulka, 1986). It relates to a rise in the level of explicitness of
discourse in the process of language mediation. The notion of explication is discussed in more detail in 3.2

1.3.5 Shifts

Catford (1965) defines shifts as changes which must be accommodated in the process of translation:

By 'shifts' we mean departures from formal correspondence in the process of going from the SL to the TL (Catford 1965: 73)

He identifies two main types of shifts: level shifts and category shifts. By level shifts Catford means a shift in linguistic level, where a SL marker at one linguistic level (lexis, for instance) has a TL equivalent at a different level (grammar). Category shifts are defined by Catford as:

...departures from formal correspondence in translation...Changes of rank (unit-shifts)...changes of structure, changes of class, changes of terms in systems... It is changes of these types which we refer to category-shifts (Catford 1965: 76)
1.4 Aims and justification of the study

1.4.1 Aims

One of the aims of the study is to identify shifts of cohesion in the translation work of a cohort of advanced translation students, some of whom are native speakers of Spanish and others native speakers of English, with a view to validating Blum-Kulka’s (1986) proposal that explication is a universal strategy in translation.

Another aim of the study is to examine how cohesive devices are deployed across an ability range of students and to establish whether there are systematic differences in their deployment. The study will also attempt to establish whether the levels of language competence of informants account for specific shifts of cohesion in translation and whether certain shifts of cohesion are motivated by the style of the source and target texts.

The study will attempt to provide a methodological framework for further research in the realm of community translation.

1.4.2 Justification

The study has been designed to address recurring problems which students of translation encounter in the course of their training,
mainly as a result of insufficient competence in the target language, in this case English. The study focusses especially on discourse competence as reflected in the use of cohesive devices.

The outcomes of this study will help to throw light on the identification of current problems faced by students of translation who translate from L1 into L2. It will attempt to provide some insights for translator educators on translation strategies adopted by learners in the translation of cohesive devices, with a view to designing instructional material to help learners attain a professional level of translation competence.

While this investigation aims to examine shifts of cohesion in translation from Spanish to English, it may well provide insights into the strategies used in other language pairs.

1.5 Hypotheses

It has been postulated that there is a tendency to explicate in translation (Blum-Kulka, 1986), and that explication is a universal strategy in language mediation. Our study attempts to validate this hypothesis by analysing Spanish-English translation.

We also test the hypothesis that explication will be introduced in the translated texts across most categories of cohesion, and that our sample
includes informants with varying degrees of bilingualism, most of whom have a non-native command of English. In addition we test the hypothesis that stylistic differences in source texts motivate variation in the extent of explication.

1.6 The setting

The present investigation is set in the context of translator training from L1 into L2.

Halliday's & Hasan's discussion of cohesion (1976), and Hoey's work on lexical cohesion (1991) form the broader methodological and theoretical framework of the study. The methodologies and postulates put forth by Blum-Kulka (1986) and Shlesinger (1995) comprise the framework for our discussion of explication.

1.7 Scope of the study

The scope of the present investigation is limited to community translation in an Australian context. This implies that translation is practised bidirectionally, and levels of bilingualism in the Australian community at large cover a wide spectrum of language proficiency.
The study is limited to translation from Spanish into English and the outcomes of the investigation will not necessarily apply to translator training in general. However the methodology is widely applicable to other languages. In this sense, the study has wide applications.

1.7.1 Limitations

The two major limitations of the present study are the size of the sample and the genre of the two source texts used to generate the translation data. The study is a pilot investigation which could be used as the basis of studies using larger samples, different genres and different language pairs.

A further limitation to the study is the number and type of cohesive ties available in the two source texts. For instance, Text 1 does not have instances of substitution or ellipsis. Text 2 has only limited instances of lexical repetition. Hence, our discussion of these types of cohesive devices will be discussed in relation to one text only. Where cohesion markers are common to both texts, they will be discussed for both texts. All the data will nonetheless be presented in the study.

Sample size

The size of the sample is limited to ten informants. These informants constitute a cohort of undergraduate students completing their final
year of a three-year Bachelor degree course in Interpreting and Translation. The size of the cohort is typical of any given cohort of students enrolled in this undergraduate course and is representative of the population of translation students for any one year.

The range of students is also typical of the population of students enrolled in community translation courses in Australia. This range comprises native and non-native speakers of Spanish and native and non-native speakers of English. The level of bilingualism of these students varies according to age, age at arrival in Australia (for migrants), number of years of formal study in the foreign language and domains of use of the two languages.

*Text types*

The two texts used to derive the translations in the sample are each of approximately 250 words in length, as prescribed by the accreditation body in Australia, the National Accreditation Authority for Translators and Interpreters (NAATI) for professional level translation examinations (cf; Appendices 1 and 2).

Both texts are narratives. Text 1 is characterised by a journalistic style, aimed at a wide, non-specialist audience. It is an informative text written in an impersonal style. Text 2 is an excerpt of a novel written in a personal tone and includes pieces of dialogue which are
intertwined in the body of a text which abounds in colloquialisms and regionalisms.
Chapter 2

DISCOURSE, COHESION AND TRANSLATION

2.1 Introduction

This chapter discusses the importance of discourse analysis to the field of translation studies with particular reference to the role that cohesion plays in creating discourse. It examines cohesion in English texts in the light of Halliday's and Hasan's (1976) analysis of cohesion in English. The same approach to identifying cohesive devices in text is followed in the present investigation. Hoey's (1991) methodology for the analysis of lexis in text is likewise applied in this study, namely the identification of central and marginal sentences, and simple and complex lexical repetition. The methodologies of Blum-Kulka (1985) and Shlesinger (1995) on shifts of cohesion in translation are also followed in this work.

2.2 Discourse Analysis and Translation Studies

Linguistics involves the description of languages as systems. The more specific area of linguistics known as discourse analysis investigates
language in action, in communication, as social interaction. Pragmatics, macrostructures of texts, speech act theory and text linguistics are all fields of this dimension of linguistics.

Harris (1956) introduced the concept of discourse analysis to linguistics when he attempted to differentiate a text from a random set of sentences. He postulated that text constituted any 'utterance' which could be a clause, a sentence or a whole text.

In the seventies, Van Dijk (1977) applied the theory of generative grammar to the analysis of discourse. He introduced the concept of macro and micro structures of text as a way of describing the textual features of discourse with a focus on literary texts. Macro structures refer to the overarching links in text (or coherence). Microstructures, on the other hand, refer to the smaller units of text that help provide continuity (cohesion). Cohesive devices are what help create texture. Other studies (Rieser, 1977, Fries, 1994, De Beaugrande, 1985) have also discussed text as a unit of meaning, or as a unified whole.

De Beaugrande and Dressler (1981), in their discussion of text linguistics, define text as a "communicative occurrence which meets seven standards of textuality". They propose that a text will not be communicative unless every one of these standards has been satisfied. The first standard of textuality is cohesion "...and concerns the ways in which the components of the surface text are mutually connected within a sequence" (1981: 3). The second standard is coherence and is
concerned with "the configurations of concepts and relations which underlie the surface text... Concepts refer to the configuration of knowledge... relations are the links between concepts" (1981: 5). The third standard of textuality is intentionality and it concerns the "...text producer's attitude that the set of occurrences should constitute a cohesive and coherent text instrumental in fulfilling the producer's intentions" (1981: 7). The fourth standard is acceptability and it refers to "...the text receiver's attitude that the set of occurrences should constitute a cohesive and coherent text" (1981: 7). The fifth standard is informativity and is concerned with "...the extent to which the occurrences of the presented text are expected vs. unexpected" (1981: 9). The sixth standard of textuality is called situationality and concerns "the factors which make a text relevant to a situation of occurrence" (1981: 9). The seventh standard of textuality is intertextuality and it refers to "...the factors which make the utilization of one text dependent upon knowledge of one or more previously encountered texts... [it] is responsible for the evolution of text types as classes of texts with typical patterns of characteristics" (1981: 10).

Cohesion and coherence within the theories of text grammars are two of a number of indispensable elements of text, (van Dijk, 1980, De Beaugrande and Dressler 1981, De Beaugrande, 1985) which combine or are linked in some way to create texture in discourse.

In the last fifteen years numerous studies on translation have been conceived within the discourse analysis paradigm (see House, 1977,

The emergence of discourse analysis in the field of linguistics contributed significantly to the field of translation studies: "...the most fruitful interaction between linguistics and translation theory came with the pragmatic reorientation of the 70's". (Snell-Hornby 1991:68). A text was no longer viewed as a string of sentences or clauses or even paragraphs but in its entirety. This brought new insights to the field of translation, those of the communicative function and situational context of texts. Approaches were developed by linguists (De Beaugrande, 1985, Dressler, 1978, Petöfi, 1982, van Dijk, 1980, Halliday 1985) to analyse text as global units and these have been widely adopted in the field of translation.

With the development of text-linguistics and the gradual emergence of translation studies as an independent discipline is its own right, there has been an increasing awareness of the text. (Snell-Hornby 1991:69)

Wilss (1982) also recognises the relevance of discourse analysis in translation. He writes:

Linguistic communication always appears in textual form. Texts are the primary form of linguistic manifestations. Texts show different conditions of origin, different structures, functions and they are designed for different recipients or target groups.
Translation therefore is a text-oriented event" (Wilss 1982: 112).

2.3 The Notion of Coherence

Coherence is related to logicality and relevance, i.e. whether the information presented in discourse is in logical order or not and whether this information is topic-related or relevant.

But not only is the ordering of propositions in a discourse constrained by rules of meaningfulness; their content, that is, their conceptual meanings and reference, is also subject to certain principles or rules. In general, then, the proposition sequence underlying an acceptable discourse must satisfy various conditions of what is called 'coherence'. (van Dijk 1985: 108)

De Beaugrande and Dressler (1981) define coherence as a 'configuration' of concepts and relations underlying a text; these concepts and relations are activated by the meanings conveyed by the expressions appearing in the text. They propose that the network of relations is the link which demarcates the concepts to be used in the understanding of a text:

A text "makes sense" because there is continuity of senses among the knowledge activated by the expressions of the text ...We would define this continuity of senses as the foundation of coherence... (De Beaugrande and Dressler 1981: 84)
Studies on cultural differences in narratives suggest culturally specific knowledge can affect discourse comprehension and production. Differences in coherence in which cross-linguistic variation occurs can lead to misunderstandings. With reference to cultural aspects which may impinge on discourse comprehension, Odlin writes:

...discourse that presupposes some familiarity with another culture may seem incoherent when listeners or readers lack sufficient knowledge of the culture. In other cases, audiences may not have problems with the content of the discourse but with the presentation of information. For audiences unfamiliar with certain patterns of organisation, the information presented through those patterns may prove difficult or even impossible to understand (Odlin 1989: 58).

If we apply this concept of coherence to translation, the translator must be sensitive to cultural differences in the process of translation as the coherence of discourse can be lost if information in the target language is presented following the patterns of the source text. Some problems are extensively discussed in Duff (1981). He deals with the most common recurring instances of unpragmatic language use in translation. He examines in detail various complexities of the English language as a TL in translation, and provides examples from a range of languages to illustrate common faults in translation from the first to the second language. Some of these examples include the translation of metaphors, cultural differences, lexical problems, styles, genres and meaning.
While we acknowledge that coherence and cohesion are closely linked, the focus of this study is cohesion; coherence will be dealt with only tangentially in the remainder of this work.

2.4 The Notion of Cohesion and Categories of Cohesion

Halliday and Hasan (1976) suggest that "the concept of cohesion is a semantic one; it refers to relations of meaning that exist within the text and that define it as a text" (Haliday & Hasan 1976: 4). They describe four categories of cohesive elements in texts: reference, substitution and ellipsis, conjunction and lexical cohesion. These constitute the grammatical and semantic relations that enable one part of the text to be connected with the other parts to produce a whole.

Cohesive ties, like other elements of the semantic system, are realised through lexicogrammatical resources. Reference, substitution and ellipsis are grammatical in form, they involve 'closed systems' while lexical reference and conjunction are relations between meanings rather than between linguistic forms.

In the following sections, we describe the four categories of cohesive devices.
2.4.1 Reference

Reference is described as a semantic relation although it is expressed via grammatical means. Reference refers to both endophoric and exophoric reference, that is, the semantic relations that occur within the text and those that occur in relation to the wider context of situation in which the text is embedded. In English, reference elements are personal pronouns, demonstratives and comparatives. These markers are described as directives by Hasan & Halliday (1976: 31). They are substitutes for information which is retrieved from elsewhere.

There are three categories of reference: personal, which is characterised by the first person singular; comparative reference, which refers to likeness between things; and demonstrative reference, which is a form of verbal pointing, where the speaker identifies the referent by locating it according to proximity.

Reference is thus characterised by the specific nature of the information that is signalled for retrieval. Cohesion in reference is realised by the continuity of identification of an marker that enters into the discourse a subsequent time.

Examples of reference according to Halliday and Hasan are:

a. Three blind mice, three blind mice.

See how they run! See how they run!
b. Doctor Foster went to Gloucester in a shower of rain.
   He stepped in a puddle right up to his middle and never went there again.

c. There were two wrens upon a tree.
   Another came, and there were three.
(1976: 3)

In (a) they refers to three blind mice; in (b) there refers to Gloucester, he refers to Doctor Foster and his to Doctor Foster; in (c) another refers to wrens.

2.4.2 Substitution

Substitution is a relation within the text. It refers to the wording rather than the meaning, in the substitution of words. Haliday & Hasan describe a substitute as a token which is used in place of the repetition of a given word, for example, in:

   a.) My axe is too blunt. I must get a sharper one.
   b.) You think Joan already knows? - I think everybody does.
(1976: 89)

where one and does are substitutes for axe and knows.
There are three categories of substitution: nominal substitution, which presupposes an entire noun group; verbal substitution which is characterised by the verb *do* in English, and clausal substitution, which, as the name suggests, is a substitute for a whole clause.

2.4.3 Ellipsis

Ellipsis, like substitution, refers to the substitution of a word but by an empty category. That is to say, ellipsis entails the omission (as opposed to substitution) of information which is implicitly referred to and identified by the reader or listener from the context of situation. As Halliday & Hasan state with regards to ellipsis:

"Like substitution, ellipsis is a relation within the text, and in the great majority of instances the presupposed marker is present in the preceding text. ... ellipsis is normally an anaphoric relation (Halliday & Hasan 1976: 144).

There are three categories of ellipsis: nominal ellipsis in which a nominal group is omitted, verbal ellipsis which involves the verbal group and clausal ellipsis which relates to ellipsis within a clause.
2.4.4 Conjunctions

Conjunction establishes a relation between what follows with what has gone before. Therefore, it is not just an anaphoric relation, but rather a specification of how what follows is systematically related to what has preceded: "... conjunctive elements are cohesive not in themselves but indirectly, by virtue of their specific meanings" (Halliday & Hasan 1976: 247).

According to Halliday & Hasan, conjunctive elements can be classified grammatically while some conjunctive expressions involve lexical selection, eg: moment in from that moment on. (Haliday & Hasan, 1976).

There are four types of conjunctive elements: additives which are characterised by and; adversatives, expressed in their simplest form by the word yet; causal conjunctions which are expressed by the words thus, so, etc.; and, temporal conjunctions which express a time relation between events in discourse. These conjunctive elements are expressed by words such as then.

2.4.5 Lexical Cohesion

Lexical cohesion refers to the 'lexical chains' that link sentences to form text (Hoey 1991: 3).
Halliday & Hasan (1976) note that lexical cohesion, especially collocations, is subtle and difficult to judge and that cohesive relations of lexical markers can be established only in reference to the text. They further state that each lexical marker carries with it its own textual history that will provide the context within which the marker will be incarnated on a particular occasion (1976: 289). Collocation and reiteration are the two broad categories of lexical cohesion identified by Halliday & Hasan. Reiteration refers to the repetition of a lexical marker either through the use of a synonym, near-synonym or superordinate. Collocation is loosely defined by Halliday & Hasan (1976) as any systematic meaning relationship holding between lexical markers tending to share similar contexts.

Hoey argues that lexical cohesion is the single most important form of cohesive tie as it is the most frequent in texts; it forms multiple relationships and thus is dominant in creating texture (Hoey 1991: 10). He postulates a methodology for graphing lexical chains and repetition nets to create a cohesion profile of texts. This is further discussed in Chapter 4.

Hoey (1991) categorises repetition into simple lexical repetition, complex lexical repetition, simple paraphrase, complex paraphrase, superordinate, hyponymic and co-reference repetition, and distinguishes between text-forming and 'chance' lexical repetition.
Simple lexical repetition refers to the naming of a lexical marker that has occurred in a text in order that new information be added. Hoey defines lexical repetitions as: "...when a lexical marker that has already occurred in a text is repeated with no greater alteration than is entirely explicable in terms of a closed grammatical paradigm." (1991: 53). An example of a closed grammatical paradigm is the plural and singular forms.

Complex lexical repetition is very similar to simple repetition; it occurs when:

...two lexical markers share a lexical morpheme, but are not formally identical, or when they are formally identical, but have different grammatical functions...Two markers can be said to form a relationship of complex lexical repetition if they can be paraphrased in the context if the text in which they appear is such a way as to ensure that the paraphrase of one includes the other (Hoey 1991: 55).

Regarding simple paraphrase Hoey writes: "it occurs whenever a lexical marker may substitute for another in context without loss or gain in specificity and with no discernible change in meaning" (1991: 62).

Hoey (1991) defines collocation as: "the relationship a lexical marker has with markers that appear with greater than random probability in its (textual) context " (1991: 8).
2.5 Cohesion and Translation Studies

Turning our attention to the application of cohesion to translation studies, Newmark describes cohesion as "the most useful constituent of discourse analysis or text linguistics applicable to translation" (Newmark 1991: 69).

Newmark refers to Halliday and Hasan's work on cohesion and applies it to translation. He suggests that there are external variables that provide texture in texts and illustrates how these vary from language to language. Newmark stresses that it is important for the translator to have a notion of how cohesive devices operate in both the SL and TL, especially when the TL is a foreign language "...it is a matter of looking carefully at the connectives or missing connectives between sentences, both notionally and in their linguistic substance" (Newmark 1991: 69).

Newmark (1981) examines cohesion in his discussion on text analysis. He describes ten cohesive devices, of which reference, substitution and conjunction are based on Hasan (1968). Other elements include theme and rheme, opposition, comparatives, punctuation, and are based on Halliday (1985). Newmark (1988) stresses the importance of applying discourse analysis to translation. Cohesion and coherence are described as vital constituents of text. With regard to cohesive elements,
Newmark defines them as: "...the features that bind sentences to each other grammatically and lexically" (Newmark 1988: 54).

Newmark perceives coherence as the "notional and logical unity" of a text. He argues that while a text is conceived as a whole in its relations, it cannot be perceived as a unit of translation as has been suggested by W. Haas (Newmark 1988: 54).

Newmark (1988) suggests that "...the more cohesive, the more formalised a text, the more information it, as a unit, affords the translator" (Newmark 1988: 55) and, ultimately, the target audience. He suggests that the structure of a text, be it a thesis or an evaluation, is useful to the translator because it "is marked concretely by pointers; eg. chapters, headings" (1988: 56), and the translator should "...consider if the structure will be appropriate in the translation setting, and will conform to its house style" (1988: 56).

Hatim and Mason (1990) in their discussion of discourse texture, describe cohesion as an integral component of text, together with coherence and thematisation. They describe cohesion in texts as that which "displays connectivity between... surface elements" (Hatim & Mason 1990: 192). They suggest that the translator needs to be aware that cohesion operates differently across languages and that knowledge of the way cohesive devices are used in both the source and target languages is necessary in translation. They state: "there is a difference
in the range of cohesive devices available in SL and TL for signalling ...
value" (Hatim & Mason 1990: 207).

Hatim and Mason (1990) also consider that the analysis of cohesion is
essential for achieving a 'desired equivalence' in translation. They
believe however that cohesion alone is insufficient in achieving
desired equivalence insofar as there are other elements of texture
operating in text. These are coherence and thematisation.

Clues for underlying coherence exist in every language. They are bound to be present in one way
or another...Taking them into consideration is therefore a basic requirement for achieving the
desired equivalence... conditions of equivalence
can only be met when elements of texture are
analysed in terms if their basic function as
reflectors of higher level intentions and signs
(Hatim & Mason 1990: 212).

The importance of texture in translation provides a link between
understanding the ST and making lexical and grammatical choices for
the TT. The third element, that of thematisation refers to the way
topics are introduced in a given text. Thematisation works 'in harness'
with cohesion.

Hatim and Mason write:

...a cohesive and coherent text is one which
successfully responds to indications of field, mode
and tenor, pragmatic intentions, their value as
signs and a specification of a given text-type focus
(Hatim & Mason 1990: 210).
It can be said then that if cohesive devices constitute the thread that keeps continuity of meaning in text, it is vital that translators be aware of how these devices operate in both the source and target texts. This is especially important if the target language is a foreign language. Communication may be impeded if cohesive elements are used inappropriately. One way that this could occur is for the translator to retain the ST cohesive ties in the TT without taking into account differences in usage between ST and TT. This is a common problem area in translation for foreign language translators. This may manifest itself in incoherence, incorrect punctuation, faulty syntax, odd collocations and literal translation of metaphors and idiomatic expressions.

Baker's (1992: 180) discussion of textual equivalence is based on the work of Halliday and Hasan; Baker describes cohesion as a 'network' of lexical, grammatical, and other relations that link together to create text.

Vazquez-Ayora (1977) discusses internal coherence and external coherence in his section on revision and evaluation of translations. Internal coherence and external coherence refer to what Halliday and Hasan (1976) call cohesion and coherence. Internal coherence (or coherence) is described as "el espíritu que anima a todo el texto original" [the spirit that keeps the source text together] (Vazquez-Ayora 1982: 392); and external coherence (cohesion) as that which encompasses all occurrences of language that lead to intelligibility of
texts. Vázquez-Ayora (1977) perceives texture as an important feature of texts and consequently, a key to translation studies. The analysis of texture is used in Vázquez-Ayora to describe parallel texts in Spanish and English.

Schlesinger (1995: 195) analyses shifts of cohesion of simultaneously interpreted texts and concludes that failure to recover cohesive links in translation can result in a text which does not hang together tightly and may lead to miscomprehension.

2.6 Concluding Remarks

In this chapter we have discussed discourse analysis highlighting its relevance to translation studies. We have shown that in the last fifteen years translation theorists have adopted ideas from discourse analysis into translation studies.

We have introduced the notion of coherence, and have described cohesion in detail defining the categories of cohesive elements. We have further discussed the relevance of examining cohesion in the process of translation.

In the following chapter we review two studies that examine shifts of cohesion; one examines shifts of cohesion in translation, and the other shifts of cohesion in simultaneously interpreted speech.
Chapter 3

RESEARCH FINDINGS ON
SHIFTS OF COHESION
IN TRANSLATION

3.1 Introduction

The two studies discussed below have been selected for their methodological and theoretical framework which are applied in the present investigation. Both studies are based on the assumption that in language mediation, shifts are necessary to accommodate the linguistic, cultural and social differences holding between languages.

3.2 Shifts of Cohesion in Translation

In her discussion on shifts in cohesion and coherence in translation, Blum Kulka (1986) begins from the premise that the process of translation necessarily involves shifts in textual and discursive relationships. Her argument is based on the perception that translation is an act of communication and, as such, differences related to both linguistic and cultural aspects holding between two languages must be considered (Blum-Kulka 1986: 18).
Reference to a number of studies on cohesion is made in her discussion, indicating that differences in levels of explicitness through translations have been attributed to differences in stylistic preferences for types of cohesive devices in the two languages involved in translation. Similarly, Blum-Kulka mentions another study that examined the written work of language learners which found that some cohesive markers tend to be overrepresented in the learner data.

She postulates that in translation a trend towards explication, especially in the work of non-professional translators, is to be expected and that the less experienced the apprentice translator the more his or her "process of interpretation" of the SL might be reflected in the TL (Blum-Kulka 1986: 20). She includes a table that illustrates the difference in length between an English source text and the French translations; the result in all cases is an increase in the level of explicitness.

A further example is presented in her discussion, in this case an excerpt of a professional translation from French into English. The result is the same: a rise in the level of explicitness. She then concludes that explication is

...a universal strategy inherent in the process of language mediation, as practiced by language learners, non-professional translators and professional translators alike (Blum-Kulka 1986: 21).
As regards meaning, she argues that if cohesive markers create the semantic unity of the text, then the selection of types of cohesive markers used in a particular text can affect the texture as well as the style and meaning of that text. In the same way, unnecessary retention of cohesive devices from source to target texts will also affect the texture.

Blum-Kulka’s discussion of shifts of cohesion and coherence in translation derives from two basic assumptions: first, that translation is a process that operates on texts and hence translations need to be studied within a framework of discourse analysis; and second, that translation is an act of communication and so it must be studied within the methodological framework of studies in communication (Blum-Kulka 1986: 32).

The discussion on shifts in coherence has not been included in this review given that the scope of the present study does not encompass coherence.

3.3 Shifts of Cohesion in Simultaneous Interpreting

In this section, a brief review is made of a study of shifts of cohesion in simultaneous interpreting. There are of course vast differences between simultaneous interpreting and translation. The main difference is the mode of discourse. Another major difference is the
fact that the interpreter is exposed to the text in small portions at a time, as opposed to the translator who is exposed to the whole text \textit{a priori}, whether a short poem or an entire book. A further difference is the time element. The simultaneous interpreter is under pressure to produce the oral translation within seconds of hearing the text in the source language, whereas the translator has time to consult reference books and even experts in the field to ensure that suitable terms are chosen and the style is appropriate.

Shlesinger (1995), like Blum-Kulka (1986), discusses the importance of cohesion in the process of translation. Her study is based on the assumption that shifts of cohesion have been postulated as one of the universals of language mediation and that failure to recover cohesion in translation can result in miscomprehension. She argues that marked changes that occur in the distribution or functions of cohesive devices in translation alter the very nature of the text (Shlesinger 1995: 193).

Her study investigates shifts of cohesion of simultaneously interpreted texts, and attempts to identify shifts which may be characteristic of the two main modes of oral translation: i.e., simultaneous and consecutive interpreting. She identifies three significant constraints intrinsic to simultaneous interpreting: first, the time constraint which refers to the time available to the interpreter to hear and process the input whilst
speaking at the same time. Second, the linearity constraint which refers to the interpreter having to focus on small units of language as opposed to having access to the whole text, as in the case of written translation. The last one is the (un)shared knowledge constraint which refers to difficulties for the interpreter posed by impromptu speech and by the assumed knowledge that a speaker expects from an intended audience, which is not always available to the interpreter.

The principal focus of her study was to determine if shifts of cohesion introduced in simultaneous interpreting affect the receiver of the message, and whether these shifts affect the listener's ability to make sense of the text, compared to a listener of the original version. The broader question addressed by the study was to examine how listeners in general extract markers of information which serve as clues to understanding the discoursal relations among different parts of a text.

Shlesinger argues that the 'retention' of cohesive devices does not necessarily mean that the function of that device is also retained and that "it is possible to reproduce the surface elements of the original text without activating the same semantic system in the reader or listener" (Shlesinger 1995: 195). In other words, formal equivalence does not necessarily translate intended meaning.
The results of the study of shifts of cohesion in simultaneous interpreting show that significant shifts of cohesion occur in all categories. A substantial proportion of shifts were evident for reference, whilst there was a tendency to replace substitution and ellipsis by lexical cohesion. Conjunctions were mainly retained,

especially causal and additive conjunctions whilst temporal, dismissive and emphatic conjunctions were omitted, a tendency to focus on informative elements contributing to the informative content of the message. Collocations manifested the most dramatic shifts, which Shlesinger attributed to insufficient knowledge of the situational and textual context. The overall results indicate that the most common type of shift was omission for all categories of cohesive devices and that low-frequency markers and markers perceived as not essential to the informational context were omitted.

In this particular study, Schlesinger was able to show that while there were shifts of cohesion across most categories of cohesive devices, the most common shift noted was that of omission. These results indicate that explication is not a feature of simultaneous interpreting, as was proposed by the findings of Blum-Kulka's study reviewed earlier, which clearly show that explication is evident in translation. This dissimilarity in shifts of cohesion could be attributed to the mode of discourse variable; oral versus written. In oral language (speech),
information is more loosely packed and reiterative than written language.

In the light of these two studies, we would expect that the student translator would tend towards explication and to shift across categories of cohesive devices. This tendency would be a consequence of the mode of language mediation.
Chapter 4

METHODOLOGY

4.1 The Sample

The sample in this study comprises translations made by a cohort of ten final year translation students completing an undergraduate course in interpreting and translation. The students' language background include first and second generation speakers of Spanish and non-Hispanic background speakers of Spanish.

The level of proficiency in English and Spanish of these students varies substantially from one to the other. Some students in the sample have English as L1 and others have Spanish as L1. All informants in the sample have varying degrees of proficiency in their respective L2. Informants 1, 3 and 6 are native speakers of Spanish who migrated as adults. Informants 2, 5 and 7 migrated at an early age and were educated in Australia. Informants 4, 8, 9 and 10 are non-Hispanics who formally learnt Spanish as a second language. Informants 4 and 10 lived in Spanish-speaking countries for a number of years, while Informant 8 is a native speaker of English and has never been to a Spanish-speaking country, but married a Spanish-speaker. Informant 9 is a native-speaker of English and German and lived in Mexico for around 5 months.
The sample was selected at random from archival files containing final translation examinations. The cohort of students for the year 1989 was selected.

4.1.1 The data

The data for the present study were generated from two 250-word source texts written in Spanish. These data derived from final translation examinations from Spanish into English of a cohort of ten students enrolled in an undergraduate degree course in Interpreting and Translation. The examinations yielded twenty translated texts from Spanish into English.

The translations were categorised into Text 1 and Text 2. Hence, for each student of translation there was a translation of Text 1 and one of Text 2.

Each translator was assigned an informant number from 1 to 10, hence, informant 1, informant 2, and so forth. Therefore, each translation had a translation number and an informant number, e.g., Informant 6 Text 1.

The translations, which were hand-written by the informants, were transcribed in preparation for the analysis stage. The transcription involved wordprocessing the written texts for manageability and accessibility. The translations were transcribed with no editing.
The data were word-processed and saved in separate files called Text 1 informant 1, Text 2, informant 1, etc., to enable the identification of informants, as well as to be able to differentiate between the texts involved.

The data were searched for all occurrences of cohesive markers. These markers were identified and collated in tables by category of cohesive elements, in order to obtain frequencies and cross-tabulations. The translations were compared with the SL texts in order for cohesion to be identified.

4.2 Test Instrument and Administration

The instrument used in the study is a test designed by the staff of the Division of Languages and Linguistics, at the University of Western Sydney, Macarthur, to assess the level of translation proficiency of students.

It is a translation test at professional level, designed and administered under university examination conditions by the University of Western Sydney Macarthur. The guidelines of the National Accreditation Authority for Translators and Interpreters (NAATI) are followed by the university, in line with the requirements of accreditation.
Students in the NAATI accredited undergraduate Interpreting and Translation degree course, from which our sample was taken, were required to sit for a final translation examination at the completion of three years of study, which they had to pass with a minimum pass mark of 70 per cent, in order to gain NAATI accreditation as professional translators.

The guidelines required that students translate two passages of approximately 250 words in length in two hours. In addition to the two hours allocated to the translation task, students were given ten minutes reading time for both passages. The use of dictionaries and thesaurus in the examination was permitted and no consultation among students was allowed.

4.3 Analysis Design

The analysis design for the present study used four separate methodologies: First, the data were searched for quantity and type of cohesive tie, by informant, for the source and target texts. Cohesive ties were identified in this study on the basis of the categories established in Haliday & Hasan (1976). Second, lexical chains were identified for each text by informant, using Hoey's (1990) methodology. The third and fourth methodologies implemented in this study were those of Blum-Kulka (1986) and Shlesinger (1995) for analysing shifts of
cohesion in translation. These methodologies identify shifts of cohesion in translation by noting the omission, substitution or introduction of new cohesive markers in the translated text.

4.3.1 Lexical Cohesion

Lexical cohesion was analysed following Hoey (1991). In Hoey's methodology a given sentence must have a minimum of three links with another occurring either before or after, for it to be counted as having a lexical link. The two source texts as well as the twenty translations were analysed for lexical connections between sentences.

A further analysis of lexical cohesion included identifying all occurrences of simple and complex repetition, and of simple paraphrase and collocations in the data. This analysis was done for the two source texts and then collated in a table, along with the corresponding translations of all cohesive markers in the ST, by informant. The analysis examined differences in the number of lexical ties, comparing source texts with target texts for lexical redundancy, simple and complex paraphrase, lexical connections or bonds among sentences, and the identification of central and marginal sentences. This information was collated in a table showing the source text elements and the corresponding translations by informants.

4.3.2 Shifts of Cohesion in Translation
Shifts of cohesion in the target texts were measured by firstly looking at all instances of cohesion by category in the source texts, and examining how cohesive markers were translated in the TT. This information revealed all shifts that obtained for the sample. The results are discussed in the light of the studies of Blum-Kulka (1985) and Shlesinger (1995). Examples of all categories of cohesive devices which occur in the two source texts were selected to examine shifts of cohesion in translation. These examples are discussed one at a time indicating whether markers are retained or shifted in translation. Shifts of cohesion are then discussed.

4.5 Scoring of tests

The translation examinations were marked by two examiners, following the NAATI and University requirements. According to these, students were penalised for ungrammatical usage of the target language including spelling and punctuation mistakes; mistranslations; omission of information; inappropriate register; unacceptable overall written expression, unpragmatic usage of the language, literalness and for semantic deviation from the source text.

The final result of the translation examination determined whether students pass the course and obtain accreditation as professional translators or whether they fail the course. Students were given a grade for their overall performance in the examination.
Chapter 5
ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

5.1 Introduction

This chapter discusses the results of the analyses conducted in the present study. As mentioned in Chapter 4, the data were firstly transcribed for manageability and then analysed within a theoretical framework that encompasses four methodologies for analysing cohesion in texts; two that deal with the identification of cohesive ties in texts, and the other two with shifts of cohesion in translation.

The first analysis concerned the two source texts in terms of number and type of cohesive devices. This is discussed in sections 5.2.1 and 5.2.2 below.

The second analysis entailed the identification and categorisation of cohesive devices in the target texts. Again, all cohesive elements were recorded by category and results for each informant were compared; first, against the two source texts to identify language differences between Spanish and English, and second, the translations were compared among informants to observe individual differences in the number and types of cohesive elements in their translations. The
results were collated into two tables and are discussed in the sections that follow.

The third analysis observed the number of shifts of cohesion made by the informants in their translations. These shifts were noted and discussed in the light of Blum-Kulka's discussion on shifts of cohesion in translation (1986).

5.2 Frequency and Types of Cohesive Ties

5.2.1 Source Text 1 Conocimiento y Defensa del Idioma (Knowledge and Defence of the Language)

Source text 1 which is transcribed below, makes extensive use of lexical cohesion, including simple and complex repetition, simple paraphrase and collocation. It also has instances of conjunction, substitution and reference.

As for register, the text is written for a lay audience; the tenor is formal, and the mode is a written piece of journalism. The text comprises five paragraphs and seven sentences. Below is a transcription of Source Text 1.
Text 1
Conocimiento y defensa del idioma
(Knowledge and defence of the language)

1. Al clausurar el reciente Congreso de Academias de la Lengua Española, los representantes de los veintitrés institutos existentes acordaron recomendar que el periodista tenga una formación universitaria que garantice su buen conocimiento del idioma y le capacite para prescindir de vocablos extranjeros en las publicaciones y anuncios.

2. Se logró llegar a niveles de consenso sin precedentes una vez finalizados los debates sobre el uso del idioma en radio y televisión, tema que quedó comprendido en la ponencia titulada "El español y las nuevas técnicas de difusión masiva". Es urgente piensan los académicos, que se asiguen nombres en castellano a las nuevas realidades científicas y tecnológicas descubiertas en países donde no se hable este idioma.

4. Se recomendó, asimismo, que las academias de la lengua española admitan la constitución de comités científicos y técnicos, cuyo objetivo sea proponer las palabras españolas que han de designar tales descubrimientos realizados fuera del mundo hispánico.

5. Algunas academias estimaron que la integridad del español está amenazada por la llamada "colonización lingüística" de idiomas dominantes -como lo es el inglés- en los que actualmente tienden a darse los hallazgos científico-tecnológicos.

6. Se reconoció que la lengua española atraviesa por graves aprietos en Filipinas, Puerto Rico, Estados Unidos y Australia. La gravedad del caso no recae en los anglicismos sueltos, incorporados al idioma por los hispanohablantes, sino más bien en la alteración de la propia sintaxis castellana, lo cual supone haber cedido ante el inglés circundante y perdido ciertos elementos psicológicos, lógicos e ideológicos inherentes al idioma.

Figure 5.1: Source Text 1
Cohesive Ties in Source Text 1

Table 5.1 illustrates the frequency and types of cohesive ties in Source Text 1. Lexical cohesion is by far the most common of all cohesive devices which occur in this text, followed by reference and conjunction. There are only two instances of substitution in ST1 and none of ellipsis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohesive Ties</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Conjunction</th>
<th>Lexical Links</th>
<th>Substitution</th>
<th>Ellipsis</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>64.4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.1: Frequency and Type of Cohesive Tie for Text 1

Lexical Cohesion in Source Text 1

The results for Source Text 1 indicate that lexical cohesion is the most prevalent category of cohesion. Examples of simple lexical repetition, complex lexical repetition and simple paraphrase were found throughout ST1. These are listed below and shown in context in Figure 5.2.
A. Simple lexical repetition

Las academias de la lengua española [line 1]/ las academias de la lengua española [line 14]
español [line 8]/ español [line 18]
inglés [line 20]/ inglés [line 26]
idioma [line 4]/ idioma [line 7]/ idioma [line 12]/ idioma [line 19]/ idioma [line 24]/ idioma [line 28]

B. Complex lexical repetition
descubiertas [line 11]/ descubrimientos [line 17]
graves [line 22]/ gravedad [line 23]
inglés [line 20]/ anglicismos [line 24]/ inglés [line 26]
países [line 11]/ mundo [line 17]

C. Simple paraphrase

representantes [line 2]/ académicos [line 10]/ academias [line 18]
realidades [line 12]/ descubrimientos [line 17]/ hallazgos [line 21]
vocablos [line 5]/ nombres [line 10]/ palabras [line 16]
 lengua [line 22]/ idioma [lines 4, 7, 13, 19, 24 & 28]
hispánico [line 17]/ hispanohablantes [line 25]/ españolas [line 16]/ español [line 18]/ española [line 22]/ castellano [line 10]/ castellana [line 26]
D. Collocations

periodista [line 3]/ publicaciones [line 4]/ anuncios [line 5]/ radio [line 7]/ televisión [line 7]/ difusión masiva [line 9]
formación [3]/ universitaria [4]/ conocimiento [4]/ capacite [[5]/ académicos [10]
idioma [lines 4, 7, 13, 19, 24 & 28]/ sintaxis [line 26]/ vocablos [line 5]/ palabras [line 146]/ lengua [line 22]/ lingüística [line 19]
científicas [line 12]/ tecnológicas [line 12]/ científico-tecnológico [line 21]
científicos [line 15]/ técnicos [line 15]
colonización [line 19]/ dominantes [line 20]
congreso [line 1]/ debates [line 7]/ ponencia [line 8]
Conocimiento y defensa del idioma
(Knowledge and defence of the language)

1 Al clausurar el reciente Congreso de las Academias de la Lengua Española, los representantes de los veintitrés institutos existentes acordaron recomendar que el periodista tenga una formación universitaria que garantice su buen conocimiento del idioma y le capacite para prescindir de vocablos extranjeros en las publicaciones y anuncios.

6 Se logró llegar a niveles de consenso sin precedentes una vez finalizados los debates sobre el uso del idioma en radio y televisión, tema que quedó comprendido en la ponencia titulada "El español y las nuevas técnicas de difusión masiva". Es urgente piensan los académicos, que se asignen nombres en castellano a las nuevas realidades científicas y tecnológicas descubiertas en países donde no se hable este idioma.

14 Se recomendó, asimismo, que las academias de la lengua española admitan la constitución de comités científicos y técnicos, cuyo objetivo sea proponer las palabras españolas que hay de designar tales descubrimientos realizados fuera del mundo hispánico.

18 Algunas academias estimaron que la integridad del español está amenazada por la llamada "colonización lingüística" de idiomas dominantes -como lo es el inglés- en los que actualmente tienden a darse los hallazgos científico-tecnológicos.

22 Se reconoció que la lengua española atravesía por graves aprietos en Filipinas, Puerto Rico, Estados Unidos y Australia. La gravedad del caso no recae en los anglicismos sueltos, incorporados al idioma por los hispanohablantes, sino más bien en la alteración de la propia sintaxis castellana, lo cual supone haber cedido ante el inglés circundante y perdido ciertos elementos psicológicos, lógicos e ideológicos inherentes al idioma.
The extensive use of simple paraphrase, or in Hasan's terms synonymy used in this text is quite typical of academic writing in Spanish (representantes [line 2]/ académicos [line 9]/ academias [line 16], where simple repetition is reduced to a minimum (Las academias de la lengua española [line 1]/ las academias de la lengua española [line 12] español [line 8]/ español [line 16])

The author of the source text also made use of complex lexical repetition although to a lesser degree (descubiertas [line 10]/ descubrimientos [line 14] graves [line 19]/ gravedad [line 20]). The deployment of collocations is evident throughout the text (periodista [line 3]/ publicaciones [line 4]/ anuncios [line 5]/ radio [line 7]/ televisión [line 7]/ difusión masiva [line 8]).

In the Spanish text anaphoric reference is marked throughout the text for gender (una formación universitaria [lines 3-4]/ finalizados los debates [line 7]), the outcome of which is a slight rise in redundancy compared to the English translation. The following example displays sentence 7 of the Spanish source text and two versions of the English translations. The 48 word target text is a very literal attempt at translation of the Spanish source text, whereas the second target text version, has resorted to explication and has risen the level of explicitness of the Spanish text. The word length of this translation is 70 words as opposed to 47 words.
Central Sentences in Source Text 1

As Hoey (1991) points out, there are central sentences which are crucial to the development of the theme(s) of a text and thus make a number of connections with the rest of the text. There are also the peripheral or marginal sentences that contribute less information to the text and have fewer links with the rest of the text.

...treating the sentences [in a text] as interrelated packages of information, connected ...by multiple repetition, we might expect these sentences that are germane to the development of the theme(s) of a text (...central) to make a number of connections with other sentences. We would expect a marginal sentence to have low
information that is not directly needed or made much use of within the text (Hoey 1991:43)

Hoey's notion of central and marginal sentences is evident in our analysis of Source Text 1 *Conocimiento y Defensa del Idioma*. Sentence one makes ten connections with sentence two, four with sentences three and four, three with sentence five, none with sentence six and five with sentence seven. Likewise, sentence three makes eleven connections with sentence four, five connections with sentence five, six with sentence six and four with sentence seven. Hence, sentences one, three, four and five constitute the central sentences of Source Text 1.

The links of each sentence with preceding and following sentences are shown in Table 5.2 and are displayed in context in Figure 5.3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sentence Number</th>
<th>Number of links</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sentence 1</td>
<td>(-,5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sentence 2</td>
<td>(1,0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sentence 3</td>
<td>(1,4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sentence 4</td>
<td>(2,3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sentence 5</td>
<td>(3,2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sentence 6</td>
<td>(0,0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sentence 7</td>
<td>(4,)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.2 *Lexical Links in Source Text 1*
Conocimiento y defensa del idioma  
(Knowledge and defence of the language)

1Al clausurar el reciente Congreso de las Academias de la Lengua Española, los representantes de los veintitrés institutos existentes acordaron recomendar que el periodista tenga una formación universitaria que garantice su buen conocimiento del idioma y le capacite para prescindir de vocablos extranjeros en las publicaciones y anuncios.

7Se logró llegar a niveles de consenso sin precedentes una vez finalizados los debates sobre el uso del idioma en radio y televisión, tema que quedó comprendido en la ponencia titulada "El español y las nuevas técnicas de difusión masiva". Es urgente piensen los académicos, que se asignen nombres en castellano a las nuevas realidades científicas y tecnológicas descubiertas en países donde no se hable este idioma.

14Se recomendó, asimismo, que las academias de la lengua española admitan la constitución de comités científicos y técnicos, cuyo objetivo sea proponer las palabras españolas que ha de designar tales descubrimientos realizados fuera del mundo hispánico.

18Algunas academias estimaron que la integridad del español está amenazada por la llamada "colonización lingüística" de idiomas dominantes -como lo es el inglés- en los que actualmente tienden a darse los hallazgos científico-tecnológicos.

22Se reconoció que la lengua española atraviesa por graves apretios en Filipinas, Puerto Rico, Estados Unidos y Australia. La gravedad del caso no recae en los anglicismos sueltos, incorporados al idioma por hispanohablantes, sino más bien en la alteración de la propia sintaxis castellana, lo cual supone haber cedido ante el inglés circundante y perdido ciertos elementos psicológicos, lógicos e ideológicos inherentes al idioma.
The above figures clearly reinforce Hoey's notion of central sentences. Sentences one, three, four, five make five connections with other sentences in the text and thus are the central sentences of ST1.

Conjunctions in Source Text 1

In Source Text 1 there are twelve instances of conjunctive markers, the majority of which are additive: y (8 times), e (once only) and asimismo (once only). There is one temporal conjunction in the text, una vez, and an adversative one, sino más bien. Conjunctions in Text 1 are discussed in more detail in 5.4.5.

5.2.2 Source Text 2 - Sáenz Peña

This text, like ST1, was analysed in terms of frequency and type of cohesive ties. The text makes extensive use of pronominal references and conjunctions. To a lesser degree, the cohesive categories of ellipsis, substitution and lexical cohesion are also present.

In terms of register, the text is a narration in regional Peruvian Spanish, the tenor is informal and colloquial, the mode is an excerpt from a novel. Because it is an excerpt, the macro context of the text is unknown to the translator. The text comprises one long paragraph with 23 sentences. Source Text 2 follows.
Text 2
Sáenz Peña

1. Yo estaba en el Sáenz Peña y a la salida volvía a Bellavista caminando.
2. A veces me encontraba con Higueras, un amigo de mi hermano, antes que a Perico lo metieran al Ejército.
3. Siempre me preguntaba: <<¿qué sabes de él>>.
4. <<Nada, desde que lo mandaron a la selva nunca escribió.>>
5. <<¿A dónde vas tan apurado?, ven a conversar un rato.>>
6. Yo quería regresar a Bellavista lo más pronto, pero Higueras era mayor que yo, 7.me hacía un favor tratándome como a uno de su edad.
7. Me llevaba a una chingana y me decía: <<¿qué tomas?>>
8. <<No sé, cualquier cosa, lo que tú.>>
9. <<Bueno, decía el flaco Higueras; chino, dos cortos!>>
10. <<Y después me daba una palmada: <<cuidado te emborraches.>>
11. El pisco me hacía arder la garganta y lagrimear.
15. Hablábanos de fútbol, del colegio, de mi hermano.
16. Me contó muchas cosas de Perico, al que yo creía un pacífico y resulta que era 18.un gallo de pelea, una noche se agarró a chavetazos por una mujer.
17. Además, quién hubiera dicho, era un enamorado.
18. Cuando Higueras me contó que había peñado a una muchacha y que por poco 21.lo casan a la fuerza, quedé mudo.
19. <<Sí, me dijo, tienes un sobrino que debe andar por los cuatro años.
20. ¿No te sientes viejo?>>
21. Pero sólo me entretenía un rato, después buscaba cualquier pretexto para irme.
22. Al entrar a la casa me sentía muy nervioso, qué vergüenza que mi madre pudiera sospechar.
23. Sacaba los libros y decía <<voy a estudiar al lado>> y ella ni siquiera me contestaba, apenas movía la cabeza, a veces ni eso.

Figure 5.4: Source Text 2
Cohesive Ties in Source Text 2

Table 5.3 below shows the frequency and type of cohesive markers in Source Text 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohesive Ties</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Conjunction</th>
<th>Lexical Links</th>
<th>Substitution</th>
<th>Ellipsis</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>46.8%</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.3: Frequency and Type of Cohesive Tie-Text 2

Source Text 2 overall has fewer cohesive ties than Text 1, especially in the category of lexical cohesion. Text 1 makes extensive use of reference and lexical cohesion. By contrast, Source Text 2 is written in a very colloquial, regional Peruvian Spanish and abounds in reference and conjunctive links.

Lexical Cohesion in Source Text 2

There is less lexical cohesion in Source Text 2 compared with Source text 1. According to Hoey (1991) lexical cohesion in texts accounts for
around 40 percent of all cohesive devices. It is possible that should the whole novel be analysed for lexical cohesion, the end result would yield around 40 percent of all cohesive ties in the text. Because this analysis is only dealing with a 250 word excerpt of a long piece of discourse there is little evidence of lexical repetition, other than the use of collocation (6 instances); simple repetition (four instances); and complex lexical repetition (two instances).

There are some instances of lexical links in the text, but there are insufficient connections between sentences to establish these repetition links as significant. According to Hoey (1991) a given sentence must share a minimum of three connections with another sentence for it to be counted as a link. The following instances of lexical cohesion found for Source Text 2 are shown below and shown in context in Figure 5.5.

**Simple lexical repetition**
Bellavista [line 1]/ Bellavista [line 6]
Higueras [line 2]/ Higueras [line 6]/ Higueras [line 10]/ Higueras [line 20]
Perico [line 3]/ Perico [line 17]
mí hermano [line 2]/ mí hermano [line 16]

**Complex lexical repetition**
mujer [line 18]/ muchacha [line 20]
Perico [lines 3 & 17]/ mí hermano [lines 2 & 16]
Collocations

libros [line 30]/ estudiar [line 30]/ colegio [line 17]
fúmate [line 16]/ cigarrillo [line 16]
preñado [line 22]/ muchacha [line 22]
pisco [line 13]/ limón [line 14]/ cortos [line 11]
chingana [line 9]/ tomas [line 9]/ emborrachas [line 12]
gallo de pelea [line 19]/ chavetazos [line 19]/ agarró [line 19]
Sáenz Peña

1Yo estaba en el Sáenz Peña y a la salida volvía a Bellavista caminando.
2A veces me encontraba con Higuera, un amigo de mi hermano.
3Antes que a Perico lo metieran al Ejército.
4Siempre me preguntaba: <<¿qué sabes de él?>>.
5<<Nada, desde que lo mandaron a la selva nunca escribió.>>
6<<¿A dónde vas tan apurado?, ven a conversar un rato.>>
7Yo quería regresar a Bellavista lo más pronto, pero Higuera era
8mayor que yo, me hacía un favor tratándome como a uno de su edad.
9Me llevaba a una chingana y me decía: <<¿qué tomas?>>.
10<<No sé, cualquier cosa, lo que tú.>>
11<<Bueno, decía el flaco Higuera; chino, dos cortos!>>
12Y después me daba una palmada: <<cuidado te emborraches.>>
13El pisco me hacía arder la garganta y lagrimear.
14El decía: <<chupa un poco de limón.
15Así es más suave.
16Y fímate un cigarrillo.>>
17Hablábamos de fútbol, del colegio, de mi hermano.
18Me contó muchas cosas de Perico, al que yo creía un pacífico y resulta
19que era un gallo de pelea, una noche se agarró a chavetazos por una
20mujer.
21Además, quién hubiera dicho, era un enamorado.
22Cuando Higuera me contó que había preñado a una muchacha y
23que por poco lo casan a la fuerza, quedé mudo.
24<<Sí, me dijo, tienes un sobrino que debe andar por los cuatro años.
25¿No te sientes viejo?>>
26Pero sólo me entretenía un rato, después buscaba cualquier pretexto
27para irme.
28Al entrar a la casa me sentía muy nervioso, qué vergüenza que mi
29madre pudiera sospechar.
30Sacaba los libros y decía <<voy a estudiar al lado>> y ella ni siquiera me
31contestaba, apenas movía la cabeza, a veces ni eso.

Figure 5.5: Lexical Cohesion in Source Text 2
Conjunctions in Source Text 2

Source Text 2 makes extensive use of reference and conjunctions to create texture. There are also two instances each of substitution and ellipsis. Below are some examples of conjunctions appearing in Source Text 2:

a) Yo estaba en el Sáenz Peña y a la salida volvía a Bellavista caminando. A veces me encontraba con Higuerras, un amigo de mi hermano, antes que a Perico lo metieran al Ejército. Siempre me preguntaba <<¿qué sabes de él?>>

b) <<Bueno>>, decía el flaco Higuerras, <<chino, dos cortos>> Y después me daba una palmada <<cuidado te emborraches>>

c) Además, quién hubiera dicho, era un enamorado. Cuando Higuerras me contó que había preñado a una muchacha y que por poco lo casan a la fuerza, quedé mudo.

In all three examples, sentences are linked through the use of conjunctive ties. In a), the simple additive conjunction y connects the first two clauses (Yo estaba en el Sáenz Peña, y a la salida volvía a Bellavista caminando). The temporal conjunction a veces gives continuation to the sentences that follow, while antes is used to specify the preceding information that is to follow. Again, the temporal conjunction siempre, is used to provide a link with the preceding sentence and also to specify the information that is to follow.
In b) the conjunction y *después* again has an additive value of connecting the preceding sentence with what is to follow, while at the same time specifying the new information to be introduced.

In c) the additive conjunction *además* joins the preceding sentence with what follows. The temporal conjunction *cuando* used here at the beginning of the sentence sets the scene for what is to follow and the additive conjunction *y* is used here to tie the two clauses which comprise sentence 18.

5.3 Frequency and Types of Cohesive Ties in the Target Texts

Table 5.5 below, provides a summary of cohesive devices for ST1 and ST2. The table shows the ST cohesive elements for both source texts and their corresponding translations by informant. The categories included in this table are those of reference, substitution, ellipsis and conjunction, but not lexical cohesion. Lexical cohesion is analysed separately in 5.4.6.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference ST1</th>
<th>Source Text</th>
<th>Inf1</th>
<th>Inf2</th>
<th>Inf3</th>
<th>Inf4</th>
<th>Inf5</th>
<th>Inf6</th>
<th>Inf7</th>
<th>Inf8</th>
<th>Inf9</th>
<th>Inf10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>su</td>
<td>its</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>any</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d[e]l</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>idioma</td>
<td>language</td>
<td>language</td>
<td>language</td>
<td>language</td>
<td>language</td>
<td>language</td>
<td>language</td>
<td>language</td>
<td>language</td>
<td>language</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>le</td>
<td>him/her</td>
<td>him/her</td>
<td>him/her</td>
<td>him/her</td>
<td>him/her</td>
<td>him/her</td>
<td>him/her</td>
<td>him/her</td>
<td>him/her</td>
<td>him/her</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d[e]l</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>idioma</td>
<td>language</td>
<td>language</td>
<td>language</td>
<td>language</td>
<td>language</td>
<td>language</td>
<td>language</td>
<td>language</td>
<td>language</td>
<td>language</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>este</td>
<td>other</td>
<td>this</td>
<td>this</td>
<td>this</td>
<td>this</td>
<td>this</td>
<td>this</td>
<td>this</td>
<td>this</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>idioma</td>
<td>languages</td>
<td>language</td>
<td>language</td>
<td>language</td>
<td>language</td>
<td>language</td>
<td>language</td>
<td>language</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>las</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>las</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tales</td>
<td>such</td>
<td>such</td>
<td>such</td>
<td>such</td>
<td>such</td>
<td>such</td>
<td>such</td>
<td>such</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>en los que</td>
<td>on those</td>
<td>in which</td>
<td>in which</td>
<td>in which</td>
<td>in which</td>
<td>in which</td>
<td>in which</td>
<td>which</td>
<td>which</td>
<td>which</td>
<td>which</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d[e]l</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>caso</td>
<td>matter</td>
<td>matter</td>
<td>situation</td>
<td>matter</td>
<td>case</td>
<td>case</td>
<td>case</td>
<td>case</td>
<td>problem</td>
<td>situation</td>
<td>situatopm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>idioma</td>
<td>language</td>
<td>language</td>
<td>language</td>
<td>language</td>
<td>language</td>
<td>language</td>
<td>language</td>
<td>language</td>
<td>language</td>
<td>language</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lo cual</td>
<td>which</td>
<td>giving way</td>
<td>which</td>
<td>which</td>
<td>which</td>
<td>which</td>
<td>which</td>
<td>which</td>
<td>which</td>
<td>which</td>
<td>which</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>idioma</td>
<td>language</td>
<td>language</td>
<td>language</td>
<td>language</td>
<td>language</td>
<td>language</td>
<td>language</td>
<td>language</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference ST2</td>
<td>yo</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>me</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lo</td>
<td>Perico</td>
<td>him</td>
<td>Perico</td>
<td>Perico</td>
<td>Perico</td>
<td>he</td>
<td>Perico</td>
<td>Perico</td>
<td>they</td>
<td>he</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>me</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>my</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>él</td>
<td>him</td>
<td>him</td>
<td>him</td>
<td>him</td>
<td>him</td>
<td>him</td>
<td>him</td>
<td>him</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lo</td>
<td>he</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>he</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>he</td>
<td>they</td>
<td>they</td>
<td>they</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>me</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>su</td>
<td>his</td>
<td>he</td>
<td>his</td>
<td>his</td>
<td>his</td>
<td>his</td>
<td>his</td>
<td>his</td>
<td>he</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>me</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lo</td>
<td>whatever</td>
<td>whatever</td>
<td>anything</td>
<td>anything</td>
<td>whatever</td>
<td>whatever</td>
<td>whatever</td>
<td>whatever</td>
<td>anything</td>
<td>anything</td>
<td>whatever</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tú</td>
<td>you</td>
<td>you</td>
<td>you</td>
<td>you</td>
<td>you</td>
<td>you</td>
<td>you</td>
<td>you</td>
<td>you</td>
<td>you</td>
<td>you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>me</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>él</td>
<td>he</td>
<td>he</td>
<td>he</td>
<td>he</td>
<td>he</td>
<td>he</td>
<td>he</td>
<td>he</td>
<td>he</td>
<td>he</td>
<td>he</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>es</td>
<td>it is</td>
<td>it'll</td>
<td>it</td>
<td>it is</td>
<td>it</td>
<td>he</td>
<td>he</td>
<td>it's</td>
<td>it is</td>
<td>it is</td>
<td>it is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mí</td>
<td>my</td>
<td>my</td>
<td>my</td>
<td>my</td>
<td>my</td>
<td>my</td>
<td>my</td>
<td>my</td>
<td>my</td>
<td>my</td>
<td>my</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>me</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al</td>
<td>whom</td>
<td>whom</td>
<td>whom</td>
<td>whom</td>
<td>whom</td>
<td>whom</td>
<td>whom</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>who</td>
<td>whom</td>
<td>who</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yo</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>era</td>
<td>was</td>
<td>was</td>
<td>was</td>
<td>he was</td>
<td>was</td>
<td>was</td>
<td>was</td>
<td>was</td>
<td>was</td>
<td>was</td>
<td>was</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>era</td>
<td>was</td>
<td>was</td>
<td>was</td>
<td>he was</td>
<td>he was</td>
<td>he was</td>
<td>hw was</td>
<td>he was</td>
<td>he was</td>
<td>he was</td>
<td>he was</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>me</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lo</td>
<td>they</td>
<td>they</td>
<td>they</td>
<td>he</td>
<td>they</td>
<td>they</td>
<td>they</td>
<td>they</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mí</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ella</td>
<td>she</td>
<td>she</td>
<td>she</td>
<td>she</td>
<td>she</td>
<td>she</td>
<td>she</td>
<td>she</td>
<td>she</td>
<td>she</td>
<td>she</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>me</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eso</td>
<td>that</td>
<td>that</td>
<td>that</td>
<td>that</td>
<td>that</td>
<td>that</td>
<td>that</td>
<td>that</td>
<td>that</td>
<td>that</td>
<td>that</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Substitution ST1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>tema que quedó</th>
<th>topic that was</th>
<th>this subject was</th>
<th>a subject that was</th>
<th>a topic that was</th>
<th>a topic which was</th>
<th>a theme which was</th>
<th>the topic which was</th>
<th>This topic was</th>
<th>which topic was</th>
<th>a theme that was</th>
<th>the gravity of the situation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>la gravedad del caso</td>
<td>the importance of the matter</td>
<td>the severity of the situation</td>
<td>the severity of the matter</td>
<td>the severity of the case</td>
<td>the seriousness of the case</td>
<td>the graveness of the case</td>
<td>the seriousness of the case</td>
<td>the severity of the problem</td>
<td>the seriousness of the problem</td>
<td>the gravity of the situation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Substitution ST2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>así es</th>
<th>that was</th>
<th>it'll</th>
<th>that</th>
<th>it</th>
<th>that was</th>
<th>that way</th>
<th>that way</th>
<th>that way</th>
<th>that way</th>
<th>that way</th>
<th>that way</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>eso</td>
<td>that</td>
<td>that</td>
<td>that</td>
<td>that</td>
<td>that</td>
<td>that</td>
<td>that</td>
<td>that</td>
<td>that</td>
<td>that</td>
<td>that</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ellipsis ST2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>nada</th>
<th>nothing</th>
<th>nothing</th>
<th>nothing</th>
<th>nothing</th>
<th>nothing</th>
<th>nothing</th>
<th>nothing</th>
<th>no</th>
<th>nothing</th>
<th>nothing</th>
<th>no</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>no sé</td>
<td>I don't know</td>
<td>I don't know</td>
<td>I don't know</td>
<td>I don't know</td>
<td>I don't know</td>
<td>I don't know</td>
<td>I don't know</td>
<td>I don't know</td>
<td>I don't know</td>
<td>I don't know</td>
<td>I don't know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lo que tú</td>
<td>whatever you have</td>
<td>whatever you have</td>
<td>the same as you</td>
<td>whatever you are having</td>
<td>whatever you are having</td>
<td>whatever you're having</td>
<td>whatever you're having</td>
<td>whatever you're having</td>
<td>whatever you're having</td>
<td>whatever you're having</td>
<td>whatever you're having</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conjunction ST1**

<p>| al | at | upon | at | at | at | at | at | when | with | at |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>y</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>y</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>una vez</td>
<td>once</td>
<td>once</td>
<td>once</td>
<td>once</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>once</td>
<td>once</td>
<td>once</td>
<td>once</td>
<td>and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>y</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>y</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>y</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>asimismo</td>
<td>also</td>
<td>likewise</td>
<td>likewise</td>
<td>likewise</td>
<td>in the same way</td>
<td>in the same way</td>
<td>likewise</td>
<td>likewise</td>
<td>likewise</td>
<td>likewise</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>because</td>
<td>as</td>
<td>such as</td>
<td>such as</td>
<td>like</td>
<td>such as</td>
<td>such as</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>such as</td>
<td>such as</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>y</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>y</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sino más bien</td>
<td>but</td>
<td>but instead</td>
<td>but rather</td>
<td>but rather</td>
<td>but rather</td>
<td>but more</td>
<td>but more</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>but rather</td>
<td>but rather</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>due to</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>y</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conjunction</td>
<td>ST2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a veces</td>
<td>sometimes</td>
<td>sometimes</td>
<td>sometimes</td>
<td>sometimes</td>
<td>sometimes</td>
<td>sometimes</td>
<td>sometimes</td>
<td>sometimes</td>
<td>sometimes</td>
<td>from time to time</td>
<td>sometimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>antes</td>
<td>before</td>
<td>before</td>
<td>before</td>
<td>before</td>
<td>before</td>
<td>before</td>
<td>before</td>
<td>before</td>
<td>before</td>
<td>before</td>
<td>before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>siempre</td>
<td>always</td>
<td>always</td>
<td>always</td>
<td>always</td>
<td>always</td>
<td>always</td>
<td>always</td>
<td>always</td>
<td>always</td>
<td>always</td>
<td>always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>desde</td>
<td>since</td>
<td>since</td>
<td>since</td>
<td>since</td>
<td>since</td>
<td>since</td>
<td>since</td>
<td>since</td>
<td>since</td>
<td>since</td>
<td>since</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pero</td>
<td>but</td>
<td>but</td>
<td>but</td>
<td>but</td>
<td>but</td>
<td>but</td>
<td>but</td>
<td>but</td>
<td>but</td>
<td>but</td>
<td>but</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>y</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bueno</td>
<td>okay</td>
<td>well</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>well</td>
<td>okay</td>
<td>alright</td>
<td>okay</td>
<td>alright</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>alright</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>y después</td>
<td>then</td>
<td>after that</td>
<td>then</td>
<td>then</td>
<td>and then</td>
<td>and afterwards</td>
<td>and then</td>
<td>afterwards</td>
<td>and then</td>
<td>then</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>además</td>
<td>besides</td>
<td>on top of it all</td>
<td>anyway</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>besides</td>
<td>besides</td>
<td>what's more</td>
<td>also</td>
<td>what's more</td>
<td>not only that</td>
<td>but</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pero</td>
<td>but</td>
<td>but</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>but</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>después</td>
<td>then</td>
<td>afterwards</td>
<td>and then</td>
<td>and then</td>
<td>afterwards</td>
<td>afterwards</td>
<td>after that</td>
<td>then</td>
<td>afterwards</td>
<td>and then</td>
<td>then</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>y</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>y</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>después</td>
<td>sometimes</td>
<td>sometimes</td>
<td>sometimes</td>
<td>sometimes</td>
<td>sometimes</td>
<td>sometimes</td>
<td>sometimes</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>at times</td>
<td>sometimes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.4: Overview Cohesive Devices Texts 1 & 2
The data collated in Table 5.4 illustrates evidence of shifts of cohesive markers in the translations. This information supports Blum-Kulka's postulate that shifts of cohesive markers "seem to affect translations in one or both of the following directions: a. Shifts in level of explicitness is higher or lower than that of the source text. b. Shifts in the text meaning(s); i.e. the explicit and implicit meaning potential of the source text changes through translation" (Blum-Kulka, 1986: 18).

5.3.1 Text 1

The results of the analysis of frequency and types of cohesive markers in the translations of the informants in this study indicate that the overall number of ties was substantially lower than that of the Source Text. Informants 2 and 8 were the only two to have increased the total number of cohesive markers in their outputs. This result goes against the predicted increase of cohesive markers, characteristic of explication.

The same categories of cohesive devices occurred in the ST and TT. While shifts of cohesion appear obvious from these results, where markers were either substituted or omitted, the categories of cohesive ties remained constant across the sample. This can be explained by the fact that in translation the translator is bound by the textual elements in the Source Text; and although shifts of cohesion are likely to occur due to linguistic, cultural and social differences between languages, the
introduction of new cohesive categories, such as ellipsis or reference, would inevitably alter the texture of the original text.

Reference markers were generally lower in the translations than in the Source Text, although informant 5 retained all 20 reference markers of the Source Text. The tendency to omit reference markers in translation can be attributed to the Spanish use of the definite article, which is so common in Spanish but is not used with the same frequency in English. It should also be noted that a translator cannot explicate using reference because the number of referents is fixed and therefore explication is impossible. The only way additional reference can be made in translation to create cohesion is when a pronominal referent is changed for the lexical term it stands for. Therefore, in the case of reference, the same quantity of cohesion is to be expected, except for omissions dictated by obligatory rules in the TL.

A comparative study by Stemmer (1981)\(^1\), quoted in Blum-Kulka (1986: 19), which analysed the use of cohesive devices in German learners' of English, found that reference linkage such as pronominalisation, was underrepresented in the learner data, while she found that lexical cohesion and conjunctions were overrepresented in the learner data. The investigation revealed that English native speakers tended to prefer reference over lexical cohesion, substitution, ellipsis and conjunction (Blum-Kulka 1986: 19-20).

---

New conjunctive ties were introduced in the translations by the majority of informants, except for informant 8 who retained the conjunctions of the source text. A translator is able to explicate using conjunctions by making implicit links explicit. This outcome could explain why the number of conjunctive markers in the outputs is greater than that of the two source texts. A further reason for the overrepresentation of conjunctions in the translations in the degree of language competence of informants in the target language English, as Stemmer’s (1986) study suggests.

The two instances of substitution in Text 1 were retained in the translations by all the informants. The retention of substitutive links can be attributed to the very nature of substitution which is to implicitly provide information for the target audience that can be extracted from the context.

Lexical links were reduced by most informants. Lexical links refer to the number of links a sentence has with preceding and following sentences. On a textual level, this result can be attributed to the stylistic preferences for types of cohesive devices of the source and target languages. The fact that one informant, Informant 10, was the only informant to have more lexical connections in his/her translation than in the Source Text also suggests that language competence in the target language is another variable that ought to be considered. It should be noted that this informant had the largest number of cohesive ties across most categories. A translator is able to explicate
using lexical cohesion to provide extra nuances and shades of meaning to obtain pragmatic equivalence or to make general ideas more specific. From these results, lexical cohesion does not seem to be used extensively by all informants. In fact, only one informant used lexical cohesion to explicate and had more lexical cohesive ties than the Source Text. By and large though, the results for word count indicate that the translations yielded longer texts across the sample than the two source texts. This suggests that explication is a strategy used by most informants in the sample, but that it did not necessarily manifest in the deployment of cohesive devices in translation.

Table 5.5 summarises the cohesive ties deployed by informants in the translation of Text 1. Reference was generally reduced although one informant, Informant 5, retained all instances of reference in the translation. Substitution and ellipsis were retained by all informants, while for conjunctions the trend was to introduce new conjunctions in the English target text. There was a common strategy in the group to reduce the frequency of lexical links in the translations. The overall result for Text 1 is that the total number of cohesive devices in the translations was generally reduced compared to the source text. This is to be expected given that Spanish resorts to other linguistic devices to maintain cohesion in discourse (eg. anaphoric reference in gender agreement). This finding corroborates those of a similar study that
compared the grammatical resources available in Source and Target languages. The language pair being French-English\(^2\).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informant</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>T1</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substitution</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conjunction</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexical links</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>944</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.5: *Frequency and type of cohesive tie by informant for Text 1*

5.3.2 Source Text 2

Unlike the outcomes of the analysis of frequency and types of cohesive ties in Source Text 1, the total number of cohesive devices in Text 2 is lower than that of Text 1. However, if the translations are observed for frequency of cohesive markers, the result reveals that in fact most informants had more or less the same number of cohesive markers as

the source text. Only four informants had marginally fewer ties than the original Source Text.

Reference was the category of cohesive device with the highest frequency in Source Text 2. In the translation output, these referents were either retained or in some instances decreased slightly.

The few instances of substitution and ellipsis in the text were retained in the translations. This is to be expected, given the nature of these cohesive elements which is to omit information and make it available to the reader implicitly from the context.

Conjunctive elements were mostly increased in the translations, except in the translations of three informants who omitted one conjunctive marker each. This marker may have been replaced with another cohesive element or omitted altogether.

Although there are some instances of simple repetition and collocation in Source Text 2, there were insufficient lexical connections to reveal any significant information about the contribution of lexical links to the texture of the text. It is for this reason that Table 5.6 below shows no occurrence of lexical cohesion for Text 2.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informant</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>T2</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substitution</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellipsis</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conjunction</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>52</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>533</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.6: Frequency and type of cohesive tie by informant-Text 2

5.4 Shifts of Cohesion in Translation

An analysis of shifts of cohesion in translation was carried out for every category of cohesive marker in the translation of each informant. The results of the analysis are discussed below.

It was found that the greatest number of shifts was made in the categories of Reference and Conjunction. Table 5.7 illustrates this finding. It shows the number of cohesive markers added or omitted by each informant in their translations, for Reference and Conjunction, for ST1 and ST2.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Inf1</th>
<th>Inf2</th>
<th>Inf3</th>
<th>Inf4</th>
<th>Inf5</th>
<th>Inf6</th>
<th>Inf7</th>
<th>Inf8</th>
<th>Inf9</th>
<th>Inf10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ref Add</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref Omit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conj Add</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conj Omit</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref Add</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref Omit</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conj Add</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conj Omit</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.7: Shifts of Reference and Conjunction in Translations for Texts 1 & 2
The results reveal that for the category of Reference, the main shift was that of omission, while for Conjunction the most common trend was to introduce new conjunctive ties in the translations. Here once again, these results corroborate those of the study conducted by Stemmer (1986) which suggest that learners of English as a second language tend to have an overrepresentation of conjunctions in their output, whilst native speakers of English resort more to the use of reference over conjunction and lexical cohesion.

5.4.1 Findings

The outcomes of the analysis indicate that shifts of cohesion obtained for all informants in the sample for most categories. The categories in which no shifts of cohesion were registered are ellipsis and substitution.

Shifts of cohesion obtained for conjunction, reference and lexical cohesion. For conjunctive markers, a common strategy was to introduce new conjunctions in the translations. In the category of reference, there was a general decrease in the number of referents in the translations. Lexical cohesion was substantially reduced in the translations of the majority of informants. Only one informant actually introduced new lexical cohesive ties in his/her translations.
5.4.2 Reference

Reference refers to a marker in a text which has already been introduced and is referred to by the use of a determiner or pronoun.

Reference markers in the source text were generally retained by informants in their translations; definite articles were items that tended to be omitted, presumably because English can omit the article in certain environments where Spanish requires one.

It was further found that a referent in Spanish was sometimes replaced by some informants through repetition of the noun in the target language; that is by lexical cohesion. The effect of resorting to lexical repetition in the TT achieved more cohesion in the translation than would have the mere retention of the referent.

Tables 5.8 and 5.9 below illustrate these findings. These tables show an overview of referents which occur in ST1 and ST2, and the corresponding cohesive markers used by individual informants in their translations. The hyphens in the table indicate that the referent from the Source Text was omitted in the translation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inf</th>
<th>el</th>
<th>su</th>
<th>d[el]</th>
<th>idioma</th>
<th>le</th>
<th>d[el]</th>
<th>idioma</th>
<th>este</th>
<th>idioma</th>
<th>las</th>
<th>las</th>
<th>tales en los que</th>
<th>d[el]</th>
<th>caso</th>
<th>al</th>
<th>idioma</th>
<th>lo cual</th>
<th>al</th>
<th>idioma</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>its</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>language</td>
<td>him/her</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>language</td>
<td>other</td>
<td>languages</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>such on those</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>matter</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>language</td>
<td>which</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>a</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>language</td>
<td>him/her</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>language</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>non-Spanish speaking language</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>such in which</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>matter</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>giving way</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>language</td>
<td>him/her</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>language</td>
<td>this</td>
<td>Spanish speaking language</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>such in which</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>situation</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>language</td>
<td>which</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>the</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>language</td>
<td>him/her</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>language</td>
<td>this</td>
<td>language</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>such in which</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>matter</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>language</td>
<td>which</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>language</td>
<td>him/her</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>language</td>
<td>this</td>
<td>language</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>those in which</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>case</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>language</td>
<td>which</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>their language</td>
<td>them</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>language</td>
<td>that</td>
<td>language</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>such in which</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>case</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>which</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>the language</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>language</td>
<td>this</td>
<td>language</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>such in which</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>case</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>language</td>
<td>which</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>the language</td>
<td>them</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>language</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>these which</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>problem</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>language</td>
<td>which</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>Spanish language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>any</td>
<td>his</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>language</td>
<td>him/her</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>language</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>such in which</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>situation</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>language</td>
<td>which</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>language</td>
<td>him/her</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>language</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>these which</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>situation</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>language</td>
<td>which</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>Spanish language</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.8: Overview Reference - Text 1
Table 5.8 provides an overview of reference ties which occur in Text 1 and the corresponding translations. The results collated in the above table indicate evidence of omission and substitution of referents in the outputs for every informant, but there are no instances of addition. Three informants (1, 2 and 8) retained all 29 referents, while the preferred shift for the sample was that of omission. On average, between 1 and 4 referents were omitted in the target texts.

Table 5.9 below shows an overview of reference markers for Text 2 and the corresponding translations. The results illustrate a greater tendency to retain referents from the source text than in Text 1 above. There are a number of omissions in the translations which reveal that omission was a common strategy adopted by the informants, for Text 2. On average, from two to four referents were omitted for Text 2. However, most referents appear to be retained for Text 2.
| Inf | Yo | me | lo | me | él | lo | me | su | me | me | lo | tú | me | él | es | mi | me | al | yo | era | era | me | lo | me | me | mi | ella | me | eso |
|-----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| 1   | I  | I  | Perico | me | him | ne | he | ne | his | me | ne | ne | whatever you | me | he | it is | my | me | whom | I | was | was | me | they | me | I | ny | she | me | that |
| 2   | I  | I  | him | me | him | they | I | he | me | ne | ne | whatever you | me | he | it'll | my | me | whom | I | was | was | me | they | me | I | ny | she | me | that |
| 3   | I  | I  | Perico | me | him | they | I | his | me | - | anything you | me | he | it's | my | me | whom | I | was | was | me | they | - | I | ny | she | me | that |
| 4   | I  | I  | Perico | me | myself | him | he | I | his | me | ne | ne | anything you | me | he | it | my | me | whom | I | he | he | me | he | - | I | ny | she | - | that |
| 5   | I  | I  | Perico | me | him | he | I | - | me | ne | ne | whatever you | my | he | it is | my | me | whom | I | was | was | me | he | - | I | ny | she | - | that |
| 6   | I  | I  | they | - | him | they | I | his | me | - | anything you | me | he | it is | my | me | whom | I | was | was | he | me | they | - | I | ny | she | - | that |
| 7   | I  | I  | he | ne | him | they | I | his | me | - | whatever you | me | he | it | my | me | whom | I | was | he | - | they | - | I | ny | she | me | that |
| 8   | I  | I  | Perico | me | him | they | me | his | me | me | ne | ne | whatever you | me | he | it's | my | me | whom | I | was | he | me | they | me | me | ny | she | me | that |
| 9   | I  | I  | they | ne | him | they | I | his | me | - | anything you | me | he | it is | my | me | whom | I | was | he | me | - | - | I | ny | she | me | that |
| 10  | I  | I  | he | me | him | they | I | he | me | - | whatever you | me | he | it is | my | me | whom | I | was | he | me | - | - | ny | she | me | that |

Table 5.9: Overview Reference - Text 2
The three examples that follow highlight the shifts of reference which occurred in the translation outputs for Texts 1 and 2.

*Example 1- Sentence one Text 1*

Four reference markers occurred in Sentence one Text 1: su [his/her], el (idioma) [the language], le (capacita) [enable him] and el (periodista) [the journalist].

**Source Text 1**

> Al clausurar el reciente Congreso de Academias de Lengua Española, los representantes de los veintitrés institutos existentes acordaron recomendar que el periodista tenga una formación universitaria que garantice su buen conocimiento del idioma y le capacite para prescindir de vocablos extranjeros en las publicaciones y anuncios.

**Informant 1**

> The representatives of the twenty-three existing institutes agreed to recommend that the journalist should have an university degree to assure its language knowledge and to enable him/her to omit foreign terminology on publications and advertisement; at the closure of the recent "Congreso de academias de la lengua española" (Spanish language academies congress).

**Informant 2**

> At the closure of the recently held Congress of the Spanish Language Academies, the representatives of the twenty-three existing institutes agreed to recommend that journalists must have a university education which would guarantee a proper knowledge of the language and would enable him/her to do without foreign words in publications and advertisements.

**Informant 3**

> Upon closing of the recent Spanish Language Schools Conference, the representatives of the twenty-three existing institutes agreed to recommend that the journalist should have a university education that will guarantee good knowledge of the language and that will enable him or her to do without foreign words in publications and announcements.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informant 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At the closure of the recent Conference of the Spanish Language Academies (Congreso de Academias de la Lengua Española), the representatives of the existing twenty-three institutes decided to recommend that journalists have an university education that would guarantee the proper knowledge of the language and that would train him/her to omit the foreign words in publications and advertisements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informant 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At the closure of the recent congress of the Spanish Language Schools, the representatives of the twenty-three existing high schools agreed to recommend that a journalist must have a university education that will guarantee him a good knowledge of the language and will train him to disregard foreign words in publications and advertisements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informant 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At the closing of the Spanish language Academies congress, the representatives of the twenty-three existing institutes agreed upon recomending tertiary training to journalists, so as to garanity a good knowledge of their language, and for them to be able to dominate foreign words that appear in publications and announcements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informant 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At the closing ceremony of the recent Conference of the Spanish Language Academies, the representatives of twenty-three existing institutes agreed to recommend that journalists have university training that guarantees a good understanding of the language and an ability to omit foreign words in publications and advertisements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informant 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>When the recent Congress of Spanish Language Academies closed, the representatives of the twenty-three existing institutes agreed to recommend that journalists receive university training to guarantee a sound knowledge of the language and to train them to dispense with foreign words in publications and advertisements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informant 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With the close of the recent Conference of Spanish Language Academies the representatives of the 23 existing institutes agreed to recommend that any journalist have university training which would guarantee his thorough knowledge of the language and enable him to do without foreign words in publications and news reporting.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informant 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At the close of the recent &quot;Congress of Spanish Language Academies&quot;, representatives from the twenty-three existing institutes agreed to recommend that a reporter should have a university background that would guarantee a good knowledge of the language and would enable him to avoid the use of foreign words and terms in his stories and advertisements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reference marker *su*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference marker su</th>
<th>No. of Informants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retained</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>his</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>its</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>their</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omitted</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.10: *Shifts of Reference marker ‘su’ in the Translations- Text 1*

Table 5.10 shows that only two informants retained the cohesive reference marker *su* in translation. A further two replaced it by *its* and *their*. It can be deduced that Informant six used *their* to agree with the plural form of *journalist* whilst the obvious explanation for Informant five using the incorrect pronominal reference is due to a lack of understanding of which referent is more appropriate. Informant 5 uses *him* and *its* in the same sentence.

The two informants who replaced the reference marker by *its* and *their* actually translated the clause not as to guarantee their knowledge of the Spanish language but as to guarantee knowledge of their language. This alters the meaning of the original text in that it assumes that all
journalists only speak Spanish, when in fact they could also speak a number of other languages and their mother tongue may be Catalan, Basque or German for that matter. This change created an implicit ambiguity in the translation.

Reference marker *el*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference marker <em>el</em></th>
<th>Number of Informants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retained</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omitted</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.11: *Shifts of Reference marker ‘el’ in the Translations - Text 1*

The definite article *el* was retained by eight of the informants. The two informants who omitted it used *its* and *their* to create cohesion. Thus, it can be said that a cohesive marker was retained by all informants in this instance.
Reference marker *le*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference marker <em>le</em></th>
<th>Number of Informants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retained</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>them</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>their</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omitted</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.12: Shifts of Reference marker 'le' in the Translations - Text 1

In the above example, seventy percent of informants retained the reference marker *le* in translation, while a further twenty percent resorted to the plural versions *their* and *them* to agree with the plural form. It can thus be concluded that the cohesive marker was in effect retained by ninety percent of the informants. Only one informant omitted the reference marker altogether.

Reference marker *el*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference marker <em>el</em></th>
<th>Number of Informants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retained</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>indefinite article</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plural construction</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>any</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.13: Shifts of Reference marker 'el' in the Translations - Text 1
The results of the analysis suggest that there were a number of shifts in the translations. Seven out of nine informants seem to have understood the notion that *el periodista* means journalists in general, and in effect used three different strategies to render the message accordingly in the target language. Five informants resorted to the use of the plural form, two opted to use the indefinite article 'a'; while yet another informant explicitly used the term 'any' to convey the same meaning. As for the two informants who retained the cohesive referent *the*, it can be said from observing the rest of their translation that their approach to translation was generally literal, and that they probably did not understand the force of *el* in this context. In this sense, language competence in the target language was a strong variable that contributed to the retention of this cohesive marker in translation.

*Example 2 - Sentence 13 Text 2*

Two reference markers occurred in Sentence 13 Text 2: *el [the]* and *es [it is]*. Below these markers are showed in context for every informant in the sample.
11. El pisco me hacía arder la garganta y lagrimear.

Informant 1
The pisco brandy would make my throat sting and tearful.
He would say: suck a bit of lemon.
That way it is much milder.

Informant 2
The pisco brandy was burning my throat and made my eyes water.
He would say "chew on a bit of lemon, it'll be milder"

Informant 3
The 'pisco' (a strong liquor) made my throat burn and brought tears to my eyes.
"Suck a little lemon, that makes it smoother."

Informant 4
"The "pisco" made my throat burn and made me shed tears.
He used to tell me: 'suck some lemon to make it milder"

Informant 5
The "pisco" burnt my throat and made me tearful.
He would say: "suck on a bit of lemon.
It is smoother that way"

Informant 6
The Pisco brandy would burn my throat and would bring tears to my eyes.
He would say: "Suck on a bit of lemon, that way it is smoother"

Informant 7
The liquor burnt my throat and brought tears to my eyes.
He said: "Suck a bit of lemon, that makes it easier to swallow."

Informant 8
The strong liquor burned my throat and brought tears to my eyes. He said "Suck on a bit of lemon. It's smoother that way."

Informant 9
The pisco would burn my throat and bring tears to my eyes.
He'd say, "Suck on a piece of lemon, it's smoother that way."

Informant 10
The booze made my throat burn and brought tears to my eyes.
He said, 'Suck on some lemon. It is smoother that way.'
The referent, *el*, in example 2, was retained by the whole sample because it was providing anaphoric reference to the preceding information (drinks had been ordered by Higueras when they got to the tavern). In this case, the definite article had identical applications in the target language, as it did in Spanish; that of anaphora.

In Spanish the referent *it* is omitted, leaving only the inflected verb form. In example 2, *es*, the referent *it* was introduced in the English versions.

*Example 3- Sentence 3 SourceText 2*

Two reference markers: *me preguntaba* [of me he asked] and *él* [he] appear in sentence 3 Text 2. These are shown in context in the data that follows, as well as their corresponding translations.
Informant 1
He always asked me: "Have you heard from him?"
Nothing.

Informant 2
He would always ask: "What do you know about him?"
Nothing.

Informant 3
He always asked me: "Have you heard from him?"
Nothing.

Informant 4
He would always ask me: "What do you know about him?"
Nothing at all.

Informant 5
He always asked me "have you heard from him"?
Nothing.

Informant 6
He always asked me: "What have you heard about him?"
Nothing.

Informant 7
I always asked myself: "what do you know about him?"
No.

Informant 8
He always asked me "What do you know of him?"
Nothing.

Informant 9
He would always ask me, "Any news of him?"
Nothing.

Informant 10
Higueras would always ask me "Have you heard from him?"
No.
a) Me preguntaba (Of me asked him)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference marker me</th>
<th>Number of Informants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reference (he) Retained</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repeated (Higueras)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference (he)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mistranslated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.14: Shifts of Reference marker 'me' in the Translations - Text 2

In the preceding example, the pronominal referent me was retained by eight informants, while one opted to substitute the referent by simple repetition of the proper noun. The informant who opted for lexical repetition in this instance, in effect resorted to explication by naming the participant. This shift of reference disambiguated the third person pronominal referent and identified the participant.

The remaining informant mistranslated the referent me for the first person pronominal referent I. It can be said that this mistranslation was a result of miscomprehension because a) me occurs in what is the subject position for active sentences, and b) the suffix -aba applies to
both first and third person subjects. The first person interpretation is pragmatically impossible in the given context.

b) "¿qué sabes de él?" [what know you of him?]

All ten informants retained the third person singular él in their translations. None resorted to the repetition of the proper noun it stands for.

5.4.3 Substitution

...Substitution is the replacement of one marker by another. The distinction between substitution and reference is that substitution is a relation in the wording rather than in the meaning. (Halliday & Hasan 1976: 88)

Substitution, like ellipsis, is the replacement of information that has been previously introduced in the text with another marker. Its function is to convey meaning indirectly, by what is not mentioned explicitly. Hence, no explication is expected in translation when substitution occurs in the Source Text.

Tables 5.15 and 5.17 provide overviews of substitutive ties present in Text 1 and Text 2, and their corresponding English translations. Table 5.16, Example 1, *tema que quedó*, illustrates the substitutive marker *tema* as standing for the information content of the preceding
sentence. In this example, the obligatory rules of the target language, dictated that an article be placed before the noun 'topic' to enable it to cohere with the preceding sentence. Informant 1 was the only informant to render a literal word for word translation of the Spanish Source Text. The introduction of an article before the noun -an additive shift of reference- can be said to be an example of explication in translation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inf</th>
<th>tema que quedó</th>
<th>la gravedad del caso</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>topic that was</td>
<td>The importance of the matter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>This subject was</td>
<td>The seriousness of the matter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>a subject that was</td>
<td>The severity of the situation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>a topic which was</td>
<td>The severity of the matter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>a topic which was</td>
<td>the seriousness of the case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>a theme which was</td>
<td>The seriousness of the case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>the topic which was</td>
<td>The graveness of the case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>This topic was</td>
<td>The seriousness of the problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>which topic was</td>
<td>The seriousness of the situation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>a theme that was</td>
<td>The gravity of the situation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.15: Overview Substitution- Text 1
Table 5.14 shows that a shift of cohesion obtained in the translation of the above instances of substitution. A determinant was added before the noun "tema" by ninety percent of informants in order to accommodate the stylistic preferences of the target language.

Example 1 - Sentence 2, line 6, Text 1

a) *tema* [el uso del idioma en radio y televisión] *que quedó*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informants</th>
<th>Determiners added</th>
<th>Translations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>topic that was</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>subject that was</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>topic which was</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>topic which was</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>theme which was</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>theme that was</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>topic which was</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>this</td>
<td>subject was</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>this</td>
<td>topic was</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>which</td>
<td>topic was</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.16: Addition of a Determiner in the Target Texts
Substitution in this instance was retained by one hundred percent of informants in the sample although different strategies were used to deploy the subsituitive tie in the TT. Fifty percent of informants introduced in the translation the cohesive referent a to create cohesion with the information previously introduced [the use of the language on radio and television]. Twenty percent of the informants opted to create a new sentence starting with the referent this to create cohesion with the immediately preceding information. One informant failed to use a referent and thus produced an uncohesive translation topic that was. This informant provided a word for word translation of the Source Text. The result was a poor, almost incoherent translation. Another informant appropriately used the referent which to make the new sentence cohere with the previous one.

Example 2 - Sentence 7, line 18, Source Text 1

a) Substitution 2 - la gravedad del caso [he gravity of the matter]

One hundred percent of informants retained the second instance of substitution appearing in Source Text 1. All informants kept the definite article 'the' of the source text, in their translations. The only difference among the renditions were the nouns used to translate the term caso (case, situation, problem, matter).
Table 5.17 provides an overview of substitutive links for Source Text 2. There are only two instances of substitution in Text 2 and both appear to be retained by all informants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informant</th>
<th>así es</th>
<th>eso</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>that way</td>
<td>that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>It'll</td>
<td>that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>that</td>
<td>that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>it</td>
<td>that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>that way</td>
<td>that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>that way</td>
<td>that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>that</td>
<td>that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>that way</td>
<td>that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>that way</td>
<td>that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>that way</td>
<td>that</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.17: *Overview Substitution - Text 2*

No comment is to made here other than the general trend in translation for this occurrence of substitution was retention.
5.4.4 Ellipsis

It has already been stated that the size of the sample and the genre of the source texts are a limitation to the present study. The source texts present few occurrences of ellipsis, although it is acknowledged that ellipsis only constitutes a small percentage of cohesive devices in texts, in general. Ellipsis tends to abound in certain genres where there is dialogue, for instance.

Given the nature of ellipsis (ie, to provide implicit meaning in texts), or as Halliday & Hasan (1986) put it: to substitute information by zero, it would be expected that substitution would not contribute to explication. The results shown below indicate otherwise.

Table 5.18 collates the translations in the data for all occurrences of ellipsis in Text 2. Text 1 registered no instances of ellipsis therefore ellipsis is discussed only in reference to Text 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informant</th>
<th>nada</th>
<th>no sé</th>
<th>lo que tú</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>nothing</td>
<td>I don't know</td>
<td>whatever you have</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>nothing</td>
<td>I don't know</td>
<td>whatever you have</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>nothing</td>
<td>I don't know</td>
<td>the same as you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>nothing at all</td>
<td>I don't know</td>
<td>what you are having will do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>nothing</td>
<td>I don't know</td>
<td>whatever you are having</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>nothing</td>
<td>I don't know</td>
<td>same as you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>I don't know</td>
<td>whatever you're having</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>nothing</td>
<td>I don't know</td>
<td>whatever you're having</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>nothing</td>
<td>I don't know</td>
<td>whatever you're having</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>I don't know</td>
<td>whatever you're having</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.18: Overview Ellipsis - Text 2
In example 1, *nada* is replacing *no sé nada de él*; in example 2, *no sé* is replacing *no sé que tomar*, while in example 3, *lo que tú* is replacing *lo que tú vayás a tomar*.

Of the three instances of ellipsis occurring in Text 2, it can be observed that in example two there were no shifts of cohesion in the translations. No informant supplied the ellipsed material in translation. In example 1, informant 2 added the words at all, as in: *nothing at all*; informants 7 and 10 were more pragmatic in their translations than the rest of the sample, rendering the Spanish *nada* as *no*, to coincide with the question. It is in example 3 that there is evidence of explication for eighty per cent of the sample. Informants 3 and 6 were the only two to translate the ellipsis of the ST in their translations. The rest of the informants added the ellipsed material: *vayás a tomar* (what ever [you have], whatever [you're having], [what you are having will do]).

The only other observation to be made here is in relation to the translation of the word *nada* [nothing]. Of the ten informants, fifty per cent (Informants 1, 3, 5, 7 and 9) translated the term *nada* as nothing. This translation failed to convey the ST message pragmatically in that no account was taken of the preceding question [*have you heard from him?*]. The point here is that explication was required and was not achieved.
5.4.5 Conjunction

Conjunctive elements are cohesive not in themselves but indirectly, by virtue of their specific meanings; they are not primarily devices for reaching out into the preceding (or following) text, but they express certain meanings which presuppose the presence of other components in the discourse. (Haliday & Hasan 1976: 227)

Of the five cohesive categories that are examined in this study, conjunction is the one type of tie which has been introduced in translation to provide cohesion. In this category, there was an increase of conjunctive ties in the translations for the majority of informants.

Conjunctions such as and (additive), but (adversative), once (temporal) and sometimes (temporal) appear to be translated directly by all subjects. Table 5.19 provides an overview of conjunctive ties for Text 1.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inf</th>
<th>At</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>una vez</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>Asimismo</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>sino más bien</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>c</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>once</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>also</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>because</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>once</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>as</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>also</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>as</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Upon</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>once</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>likewise</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>as</td>
<td>and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>At</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>once</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>likewise</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>such as</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>At</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>once</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>in the</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>like</td>
<td>and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>At</td>
<td>so as to</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>in the same way</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>such as</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>but</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>At</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>once</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>likewise</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>such as</td>
<td>and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>When</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>once</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>likewise</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>With</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>once</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>likewise</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>such as</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>At</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>once</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>such as</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.19: Overview Conjunction- Text 1
The immediate observation to be made here from the above table concerns the additional conjunctive markers that have been introduced in the translations. Of all the informants in the sample, only one informant, informant 8, did not increase the number of conjunctions in the TT. These findings suggest that conjunctions lend themselves to explication in translation, as was expected; but it also indicates that not all informants deploy cohesive elements in the same way. The following examples of shifts of cohesion of conjunctive ties illustrate this.

Example 1- Sentence 2 Text 1

Of the three instances of conjunction appearing in Sentence 2 Text 1, *Una vez* (once) is discussed here.

Source Text 1

Se logró llegar a niveles de consenso sin precedentes *una vez* finalizados los debates sobre el uso del idioma en radio y televisión, tema que quedó comprendido en la ponencia titulada “El español y las nuevas técnicas de difusión masiva”.

Informant 1

1.An unprecedented consent was reached *once* the debates about the use of the language on radio and television finished; topic that was presented as: “The Spanish language and the new techniques of massive broadcasting”.

Informant 2

2.Consensus levels without precedence were reached *once* the debates held on the subject of the use of the language on radio and television were finalised. This subject was well understood as was proved by the report titled “the Spanish Language and the new techniques of mass broadcasting”.
Informant 3

3. Consensus levels without precedents were achieved once the debates regarding the use of language in broadcasting and television concluded, a subject that was left comprised in the report titled “Spanish and the new techniques of mass diffusion”.

Informant 4

4. It was possible to reach a level of consensus without precedents once the debates about the use of the language in radio and television were finalized; a topic which was included in the report titled “The Spanish Language and the new techniques of mass broadcasting” (El Español y las nuevas técnicas de difusión masiva).

Informant 5

5. Levels of consensus, without precedents, were successfully attained once the debates over the use of the language over the radio and on television were finalized, a topic which was included in the report named “Spanish and the new extensive broadcasting techniques”.

Informant 6

6. They reached a point of unprecedented consensus, at the closing of the debates which touched upon the use of the language in radio and television, a theme which was left to be understood in the report entitled: “El Español y las nuevas técnicas de difusión masiva” (The Spanish language and the new large scale techniques of transmission).

Informant 7

7. They were able to arrive at a level of assent without precedence once the debates were finalized, over the use of the language on the radio and in television; the topic which was included in the report titled, “Spanish and the New Techniques of Mass Circulation”.

Informant 8

8. Unprecedented levels of consensus were achieved once the debates concerning the use of the language were completed. This topic was included in the paper entitled: “Spanish and the new techniques for massive diffusion”.

Informant 9

9. They succeeded in reaching unprecedented levels of consensus once the round of debates on language use in radio and television had been concluded, which topic was included in the report entitled “Spanish and new techniques of mass communication”.

Informant 10

10. They reached previously unprecedented levels of agreement, once the debates were finalised, concerning the use of the language on radio and television, a theme that was expounded in an article entitled “Spanish and new Techniques of Mass Information”.
una vez (once)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conjunction marker una vez</th>
<th>Number of Informants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retained</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omitted</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.20: Shifts of Conjunction marker 'una vez'
in the Translations - Text 1

The conjunctive tie *una vez* was retained by nine informants with the remaining one opting to omit the tie altogether. *Una vez* [once] was omitted and replaced by the preposition *at*, as in *at the closing*. The informant's strategy was to translate the source text participle *finalizados* as a gerund. This is summarised in Table 5.20 above.

Every informant, except informant 6, retained the temporal conjunction of the ST (*una vez, once*), hence there was no shift of cohesion in translation registered here.

*Example 2 - Sentence 4 Text 1*

The two instances of conjunction occurring in sentence 4 Text 1 are *asimismo* and *y*. These are discussed below.
Text 1

Se recomendó, asimismo, que las academias de la lengua española admitan la constitución de comités científicos y técnicos, cuyo objetivo sea proponer las palabras españolas que han de designar tales descubrimientos realizados fuera del mundo hispánico.

Informant 1

It has also been recommended that the Spanish language academies accept the organization of scientific and technical committees. They target will be to propose the Spanish terms that will correspond to such discoveries reached out of the Hispanic world, some academies realised that the integrity of the Spanish language is threatened by the so called "linguistic colonization" of the predominating languages, such as English, because most of the scientific and technological discoveries are made on those languages.

Informant 2

It was also suggested that the Academies of the Spanish language admit the constitution of scientific and technical committees whose objective would be to propose the Spanish words that should represent such discoveries made outside of the Spanish-speaking world.

Informant 3

It was recommended, likewise, that the Spanish Language Schools should recognize the constitution of scientific and technical committees, whose objective will be to suggest the Spanish words that will be assigned such discoveries that will take place outside the Spanish world.

Informant 4

Likewise, it was recommended that the Spanish language academies recognize the constitution of scientific and technological committees, whose objective would be to propose the Spanish words that are to name such discoveries achieved outside the Hispanic world.

Informant 5

It was recommended, in the same way, that the Spanish language Schools accept the establishment of scientific & Technical Committees, whose objective will be to propose the Spanish words which are to represent those discoveries accomplished outside the Hispanic world.

Informant 6

In the same way, it was recommended that the Spanish language academies accept the constitution of scientific and technical committees, whose aim it is to suggest Spanish words which describe such discoveries conducted outside the Spanish speaking world.

Informant 7

Likewise, it was recommended that the Spanish Language Academies allow the constitution of scientific and technical committees, whose objective would be to propound the Spanish words that would be used to designate such discoveries found outside the Spanish-speaking world.
Informant 8

Likewise, they recommended that Spanish language academies allow the formation of scientific and technical committees, whose purpose would be to propose Spanish words to describe these discoveries occurring outside the Spanish speaking world.

Informant 9

It was likewise recommended that Spanish language academies allow the establishment of scientific and technical committees whose objective will be to propose the Spanish words which are to designate such discoveries made outside Hispanic countries.

Informant 10

It was also recommended that Spanish Language Academies create "Scientific and Technological Committees", whose objective it would be to propose Spanish terms to describe those discoveries made in countries where Spanish is not spoken.

a) asimismo (likewise)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conjunction marker asimismo</th>
<th>Number of Informants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retained</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>simple paraphrase (also)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>simple paraphrase (in the same way)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.21: Shifts of Conjunction marker 'asimismo' in the Translations- Text 1

The conjunctive marker asimismo was retained by five informants. The remaining five used a phrasal conjunction to convey the ST
The conjunctive marker *asimismo* was retained by five informants. The remaining five used a phrasal conjunction to convey the ST message in the TL. In other words, a shift from word to phrase was made to translate the original cohesive device. The effect of this shift induced a change in register, since *also* and *in the same way* are less formal than *likewise*.

Example 3 - Sentence 4, line 11, Text 1

The additive conjunction *y* (and) was retained by all informants in translation.

Table 5.22 displays an overview of all conjunctive devices occurring in Source Text 2. It is evident from this information that additional conjunctive markers have been added to the translations by some informants. These 'shifts' are examples of explication in translation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>and sometimes before</td>
<td>always</td>
<td>Since</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>but</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>okay</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>then</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>besides</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>but</td>
<td>then</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>and sometimes before</td>
<td>Always</td>
<td>Since</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>but</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>well</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>after that</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>on top of</td>
<td>it</td>
<td>all</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>but</td>
<td>afterwar</td>
<td>ds</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>and sometimes before</td>
<td>Always</td>
<td>Since</td>
<td>but</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>but</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>then</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>anyway</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>and then</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>and sometimes before</td>
<td>Always</td>
<td>Since</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>but</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>well</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>then</td>
<td>then</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>but-</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>but</td>
<td>and then</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>sometimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>and sometimes before</td>
<td>Always</td>
<td>Since</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>but</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>okay</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>and then</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>but</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>besides</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>afterwar</td>
<td>ds</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>sometimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>and sometimes before</td>
<td>Always</td>
<td>Since</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>but</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>alright</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>besides</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>after that</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>sometimes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>and sometimes before</td>
<td>Always</td>
<td>Since</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>but</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>okay</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>then</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>but</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>what's more</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>but</td>
<td>then</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>and sometimes before</td>
<td>Always</td>
<td>Since</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>but</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>alright</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>what's also</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>but</td>
<td>afterwar ds</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>and from time before</td>
<td>time</td>
<td>Always</td>
<td>Since</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>but</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>what's more and</td>
<td>not only</td>
<td>that</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>but</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>then</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>and sometimes before</td>
<td>Always</td>
<td>Since</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>but</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Alright</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>then</td>
<td>then</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>but</td>
<td>as well</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>but</td>
<td>then</td>
<td>once and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.22: Overview Conjunction - Text 2
**Example 1 - Sentence 17, line 20, Text 2**

The additive conjunction *Además* [besides] occurring in Sentence 17, line 20, Text 2 is discussed here.

| Informant 1  |  |  |
|--------------|  |  |
| **Además**, quién hubiera dicho, era un enamorado.  | **Besides** who would have said, he was a lover.  |  |

| Informant 2  |  |  |
|--------------|  |  |
| **Además**, quién hubiera dicho, era un enamorado.  | **On top of it all**, who would have said that he was in love.  |  |

| Informant 3  |  |  |
|--------------|  |  |
| **Además**, quién hubiera dicho, era un enamorado.  | **Anyway**, who would have said he was a lover.  |  |

| Informant 4  |  |  |
|--------------|  |  |
| **Además**, quién hubiera dicho, era un enamorado.  | **Besides**, Who would expected it, he was in love.  |  |

| Informant 5  |  |  |
|--------------|  |  |
| **Además**, quién hubiera dicho, era un enamorado.  | **Besides**, who would have said he was a lover.  |  |

| Informant 6  |  |  |
|--------------|  |  |
| **Además**, quién hubiera dicho, era un enamorado.  | **Besides**, who would have believed it, he was in love.  |  |

| Informant 7  |  |  |
|--------------|  |  |
| **Además**, quién hubiera dicho, era un enamorado.  | **What's more**, who would have thought he was a romantic.  |  |

| Informant 8  |  |  |
|--------------|  |  |
| **Además**, quién hubiera dicho, era un enamorado.  | **Also**, who would have thought it, he was in love.  |  |

| Informant 9  |  |  |
|--------------|  |  |
| **Además**, quién hubiera dicho, era un enamorado.  | **Not only that, but** it seems he was a bit of a Romeo as well!  |  |

| Informant 10 |  |  |
|--------------|  |  |
| **Además**, quién hubiera dicho, era un enamorado.  | **What's more, and** who would have said so, he was in love.  |  |
The translations of the conjunction *además* are illustrated above in context, and the table below registers translation shifts present in the data. *Además* an additive conjunction, was retained by sixty per cent of the informants. These informants resorted to simple repetition to translate it (*besides, also, on top of it all, what's more*), while ten per cent replaced it with an adversative conjunction (*anyway*), a further ten percent replaced it with a contrastive conjunction (*not only that but*), and the remaining ten percent omitted the conjunction altogether.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conjunction Item <em>además</em></th>
<th>Number of Informants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retained</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>simple paraphrase (what's more)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>simple paraphrase (also)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>simple paraphrase (On top of it all)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>simple paraphrase (anyway)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>simple paraphrase (not only that but)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omitted</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.23: *Shifts of Conjunction marker 'además' in the Translations - Text 2*
5.4.6 Lexical Cohesion

Unlike conjunction, reference, substitution and ellipsis, the range of lexical cohesion in texts, according to Hoey (1991), are in the first place markers of lexical relation and only secondarily of textual relation (Hoey 1991:7). In translation, lexical cohesion is important because an omission or substitution of a lexical cohesive element in a text may alter its texture as well as its meaning. As Blum Kulka (1986) points out as regards cohesive markers in general:

...the choice involved in the types of cohesive markers used in a particular text can affect the texture (as being "loose" or "dense") as well as the style and meaning of that text. Particularly in literature, the choice of cohesive markers can serve central functions in the text. It follows from this that shifts in types of cohesive ties through translation may alter these functions (Blum-Kulka 1986: 21).

Using Hoey's methodology for identifying lexical links in texts, the two source texts and the corresponding translations were analysed to determine whether these connections were retained from Source Text to TT. Due to the fact that Text 2 is an excerpt from a longer text, fewer than three lexical links were found between sentences. Hence the analysis of lexical links is limited to Text 1 only.
5.4.6.1 Central and Marginal Sentences

As pointed out earlier, any two sentences are connected if they share at least three points of reference. Table 5.24 shows the central and marginal sentences for Text 1 and the corresponding translations, as determined by the number of links with preceding and following sentences, where (-, 5) means that there are no links with earlier sentences and five links with those that follow. Similarly, (1, 2) means that there is one link with the preceding sentence(s) and two with those that follow.

The general observation is that shifts of lexical cohesion were made by every informant. There was a general decrease in the number of links connecting sentences in the translations, as opposed to the Source Text. Of all the informants only informant 2 had the same number of links in his/her translation as in the Source Text, although these are distributed differently throughout the translation.

The sentence order of the translations was identical to that of the Source Text, for the majority of informants. Informant 2 is the only informant to have distributed the text into 8 sentences, as opposed to 7 sentences like the ST.

Sentences 1, 3 and 5 in the ST, which register a greater number of links with other sentences, are thus identified as key sentences central to the development of the theme(s) running through the text, have been
retained as central sentences in the translations. In all but one of the translations (that of Informant 3) who retained sentences 1, 3 and 5 as central sentences, the central sentences were reduced to two sentences. Sentences 1 and 5 became the central sentences in the translations for the rest of the informants. Informant 1 had sentences 1 and 3 as central sentences.

Informant 8 is the only informant to have only one central sentence in his/her TT. Sentence 1 which has 5 links with the sentences that follow is the only central sentence in this informants’ TT. Sentences 2, 4, 5 and 7 have only two links each with other sentences.

Overall, the data suggests that the lexical pattern of the ST as far as central and marginal sentences is concerned was shifted in the TT. The distribution of central sentences for Text 1 was reduced from three to two. Informant 2 is the only one in the sample to have arranged the TT into eight sentences, as opposed to seven, the consequence of which was a different pattern of central and marginal sentences. Sentences 1 and 6 became the central sentences in this informant’s translation, as opposed to 1 and 5.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sentence</th>
<th>ST1</th>
<th>Inf1</th>
<th>Inf2</th>
<th>Inf3</th>
<th>Inf4</th>
<th>Inf5</th>
<th>Inf6</th>
<th>Inf7</th>
<th>Inf8</th>
<th>Inf9</th>
<th>Inf10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(.5,)</td>
<td>(.4,)</td>
<td>(.6,)</td>
<td>(.5,)</td>
<td>(.4,)</td>
<td>(.5,)</td>
<td>(.5,)</td>
<td>(.5,)</td>
<td>(.5,)</td>
<td>(.5,)</td>
<td>(.5,)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(1,0)</td>
<td>(1,0)</td>
<td>(1,1)</td>
<td>(1,0)</td>
<td>(1,0)</td>
<td>(1,0)</td>
<td>(1,0)</td>
<td>(1,1)</td>
<td>(1,0)</td>
<td>(1,0)</td>
<td>(1,0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(1,4)</td>
<td>(1,4)</td>
<td>(2,0)</td>
<td>(1,3)</td>
<td>(1,2)</td>
<td>(1,2)</td>
<td>(1,2)</td>
<td>(1,2)</td>
<td>(1,2)</td>
<td>(1,2)</td>
<td>(1,2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>(2,2)</td>
<td>(1,0)</td>
<td>(1,2)</td>
<td>(2,1)</td>
<td>(2,1)</td>
<td>(2,1)</td>
<td>(2,1)</td>
<td>(1,1)</td>
<td>(2,1)</td>
<td>(2,1)</td>
<td>(2,1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>(3,1)</td>
<td>(2,1)</td>
<td>(2,1)</td>
<td>(3,1)</td>
<td>(3,1)</td>
<td>(3,1)</td>
<td>(3,1)</td>
<td>(2,1)</td>
<td>(2,1)</td>
<td>(3,1)</td>
<td>(3,1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>(0,0)</td>
<td>(0,0)</td>
<td>(3,1)</td>
<td>(0,0)</td>
<td>(0,0)</td>
<td>(0,0)</td>
<td>(0,0)</td>
<td>(0,0)</td>
<td>(0,0)</td>
<td>(0,0)</td>
<td>(0,0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>(2,-)</td>
<td>(2,-)</td>
<td>(0,0)</td>
<td>(2,-)</td>
<td>(2,-)</td>
<td>(2,-)</td>
<td>(2,-)</td>
<td>(2,-)</td>
<td>(2,-)</td>
<td>(2,-)</td>
<td>(2,-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>(2,-)</td>
<td>(2,-)</td>
<td>(2,-)</td>
<td>(2,-)</td>
<td>(2,-)</td>
<td>(2,-)</td>
<td>(2,-)</td>
<td>(2,-)</td>
<td>(2,-)</td>
<td>(2,-)</td>
<td>(2,-)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.24: Central and Marginal Sentences in the Translations- Text 1
5.4.6.2 Simple Paraphrase

Whereas in Spanish it is considered unacceptable in academic writing to repeat the same terms throughout a stretch of text (a common strategy is to use synonymy or complex lexical repetition), in English, the use of synonymy can sometimes obscure and even lose the thread of the message. It is for this reason that simple repetition or the use of hyponymy tend to be the preferred option in English.

The examples discussed over the page, illustrate the extensive use of simple paraphrase in Text 1. Table 5.25 shows the corresponding lexis used by the informants for each instance of simple paraphrase.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST1</th>
<th>Inf 1</th>
<th>Inf 2</th>
<th>Inf 3</th>
<th>Inf 4</th>
<th>Inf 5</th>
<th>Inf 6</th>
<th>Inf 7</th>
<th>Inf 8</th>
<th>Inf 9</th>
<th>Inf 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>hispánico</td>
<td>hispanic</td>
<td>Spanish-speaking</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>Spanish-speaking</td>
<td>Spanish-speaking</td>
<td>Spanish-speaking</td>
<td>Spanish-speaking</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>Spanish is not spoken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>españolas</td>
<td>Spanish the</td>
<td>Spanish the</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Spanish The Spanish</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[el]español</td>
<td>Spanish the</td>
<td>Spanish The Spanish</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Spanish The Spanish</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>castellano</td>
<td>Spanish language</td>
<td>Spanish language</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Spanish language</td>
<td>Castilian -</td>
<td>Castillian Spanish</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Castillian Spanish</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>castellana</td>
<td>Spanish language</td>
<td>Spanish language</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Spanish language</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Castillian Spanish</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Castillian Spanish</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lengua</td>
<td>language names</td>
<td>language names</td>
<td>language names</td>
<td>words</td>
<td>language names</td>
<td>words</td>
<td>language names</td>
<td>words</td>
<td>language names</td>
<td>words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>idioma</td>
<td>language names</td>
<td>language names</td>
<td>language names</td>
<td>words</td>
<td>language names</td>
<td>words</td>
<td>language names</td>
<td>words</td>
<td>language names</td>
<td>words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nombres</td>
<td>vocabulary</td>
<td>vocabulary</td>
<td>vocabulary</td>
<td>terms</td>
<td>vocabulary</td>
<td>terms</td>
<td>vocabulary</td>
<td>terms</td>
<td>vocabulary</td>
<td>terms and terms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vocablos</td>
<td>terms</td>
<td>words</td>
<td>words</td>
<td>words</td>
<td>words</td>
<td>words</td>
<td>words</td>
<td>words</td>
<td>words</td>
<td>words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>palabras</td>
<td>terms</td>
<td>words</td>
<td>words</td>
<td>words</td>
<td>words</td>
<td>words</td>
<td>words</td>
<td>words</td>
<td>words</td>
<td>words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>realidades</td>
<td>facts</td>
<td>discoveries</td>
<td>discoveries</td>
<td>realities</td>
<td>discoveries truths</td>
<td>facts</td>
<td>discoveries realities</td>
<td>discoveries</td>
<td>discoveries truths</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>descubrimientos</td>
<td>discoveries</td>
<td>discoveries</td>
<td>discoveries</td>
<td>discoveries</td>
<td>discoveries</td>
<td>discoveries</td>
<td>discoveries</td>
<td>discoveries</td>
<td>discoveries</td>
<td>discoveries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hallazgos</td>
<td>discoveries</td>
<td>findings</td>
<td>findings</td>
<td>findings</td>
<td>findings</td>
<td>findings</td>
<td>findings</td>
<td>findings</td>
<td>findings</td>
<td>findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>representantes</td>
<td>discoveries</td>
<td>findings</td>
<td>findings</td>
<td>findings</td>
<td>findings</td>
<td>findings</td>
<td>findings</td>
<td>findings</td>
<td>findings</td>
<td>findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>academias</td>
<td>academics</td>
<td>academics</td>
<td>academics</td>
<td>academics</td>
<td>academics</td>
<td>academics</td>
<td>academics</td>
<td>academics</td>
<td>academics</td>
<td>academics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>académicos</td>
<td>academics</td>
<td>academics</td>
<td>academics</td>
<td>academics</td>
<td>academics</td>
<td>academics</td>
<td>academics</td>
<td>academics</td>
<td>academics</td>
<td>academics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.25: Simple Paraphrase - Text 1
Three examples of simple paraphrase taken from the above table are discussed below.

*Example 1: realidades/descubrimientos/hallazgos*

Four informants opted to translate the simple paraphrase of the ST in their translations, while the remainder resorted to the strategy of simple repetition to translate simple paraphrase.

Informants 3, 6, 7 and 9 retained all three markers of simple paraphrase in the TT (realities, discoveries, findings/ truths, discoverings, findings/ facts, discoveries, findings/ realities, discoveries, findings); while informants 1, 2 and 4 retained one of the simple paraphrase markers in the TT and opted for simple repetition for the other two instances of this word (facts, discoveries, discoveries/ discoveries, discoveries, findings/ realities, discoveries, discoveries).

Informants 5, 8 and 10 on the hand, used the same term to translate the three instances of simple paraphrase (discoveries, discoveries, discoveries/ discoveries discoveries, discoveries/ discoveries and revelations, discoveries, discoveries). Informant 10 resorted to explication here through the introduction of an additive conjunction 'y' and the term *revelations*.
Example 2 Idioma/lengua

This second example further substantiates the above comments that whereas in Spanish there is a general tendency to use simple paraphrase in academic writing, in English the trend is to repeat or reiterate the same information through the use of simple repetition, thus providing cohesion and maintaining the thread of meaning in a text. All informants translated idioma and lengua as language/language.

Example 3 vocablos/palabras/nombres

In Example 3, Informant 1 was the only one who retained the use of simple paraphrase in the translation (names, terminology, terms), while informant 6 opted to use simple repetition as a strategy to deal with simple paraphrase (words, words, words). The rest of the informants retained an instance of simple paraphrase in their translation and resorted to simple repetition for the other two instances, in order to achieve cohesion (names, words, words). Informant 10 again resorted to explication here by introducing an additive conjunction 'y' and an additional word 'terms' (words, words and terms, terms).
5.4.6.3 Repetition Links

Table 5.26 below contains an overview of all repetition links which occur in Source Text 1 and in the translations of the informants. As is evident from the results of this analysis, the most common shift of lexical cohesion registered by all informants was a reduction in the number of explicit lexical links from 65 to as low as 43. One informant, informant 10, increased the frequency of lexical links from 65 to 76 links, as a direct result of the strategy of explication which is evident throughout her/his translation. Yet informant 2, reduced the number of lexical links only slightly from 65 to 60 links.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Linked sentences</th>
<th>ST</th>
<th>Inf1</th>
<th>Inf2</th>
<th>Inf3</th>
<th>Inf4</th>
<th>Inf5</th>
<th>Inf6</th>
<th>Inf7</th>
<th>Inf8</th>
<th>Inf9</th>
<th>Inf10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total links</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.26: Repetition Links by informant - Text 1
The principal observation to be made here is that for all informants, except informants 2 and 10, the total number of lexical connections or links in the translations was substantially lower than those of the ST. Informant 2 had five links fewer than the ST, as opposed to the other informants, who had from 13 to 22 links fewer than the ST. Informant 10 was the only informant to have 11 links more than the ST. The greater number of links may be due to the greater recourse this informant makes to explication in translation. In fact, the total number of words per sentence in the TT of this informant, as compared to the original text, is substantially greater. Excerpts from two translations, one with the most links, that of informant 10, and another with the least links, that of informant 1, are displayed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The representatives of the twenty three existing institutes agreed to recommend that the journalist should have an university degree to assure its language knowledgement and to enable him/her to omit foreign terminology on publications and advertisement; at the closure of the recent &quot;Congresso de academias de la lengua espanola&quot; Spanish language academies congress).</th>
<th>At the close of the recent &quot;Congress of Spanish Language Academies&quot;, representatives from the twenty-three existing institutes agreed to recommend that a reporter should have a university background that would guarantee a good knowledge of the language and would enable him to avoid the use of foreign words and terms in his stories and advertisements.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>54 words</td>
<td>56 words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The academics think that it is urgent to appoint Spanish names to the new scientific and technological facts that are discovered in countries where other languages are spoken.</td>
<td>The Academics believe it is a matter of urgency to employ Spanish words to express and explain new scientific and technological discoveries and revelations which emanate from countries where Spanish is not the common language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 words</td>
<td>35 words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The importance of the matter is not the English terms that the Spanish speaking people add to the language, but mainly the alteration of the Spanish sintaxis itself, which could have lost use due to the English and lost some psicological elements, obvious and ideologicals to the language.</td>
<td>The gravity of the situation is not due so much to the use of 'Loose Anglicisms' being incorporated into the language by Spanish-speakers, but rather to the altering of proper Spanish syntax, which is presumed to be caused by people being surrounded by English in their daily lives, and by giving way to that influence, they have lost certain psychological, logical and ideological elements inherent in the Spanish language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 words</td>
<td>70 words</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The analyses of lexical cohesion reveal first, that shifts of lexical cohesion were observed for all informants. Second, that the number of lexical cohesive links were fewer in the translations than in the ST for all but one of the informants. Third, that simple paraphrase in Spanish was generally substituted for simple repetition in the translations. Fourth, that central sentences were reduced in translation as compared with the source texts. Fifth, that although the results of the analyses of central and marginal sentences and simple paraphrase reveal a reduction in number of textual markers across the sample, the total number of words of the translated texts was found to be greater than that of the source texts. This increase in number of words is evidence of explication and it suggests that explication at lexical level is a strategy widely used by student translators in the sample. It would be more difficult to ascertain if explication occurred in translation had the source and target languages been reversed. Translations into Spanish
are generally longer than the English source text mainly due to stylistic preferences.

5.6 Explication

It was stated earlier that one of the universals of language mediation was explication and that one aim of this thesis would be to validate the postulate that explication is a feature of translation.

Here the level of explication in the translations of informants is examined by tabulating the total number of words of the two source texts and comparing them individually with those of the translations. The results for Text 1 indicate that the number of words in the translations exceed that of the ST for all informants with the exception of informant 8, whose translation has one word less than the ST, principally because a whole sentence was omitted in the translation produced by this informant. Informant 10, followed by informants 6 and 2 had the greatest number of words for Text 1.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informant</th>
<th>Total number of words - Text 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>258 (3.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>275 (10.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>263 (5.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>260 (4.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>267 (7.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>281 (12.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>261 (4.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>248 (-.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>253 (1.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>303 (21.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source Text 1</strong></td>
<td><strong>249 (100%)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.27: Total Words by Informant for Text 1

The results for Text 2 also validate the notion of explication in translation. In this case, all informants exceeded the original number of words by at least 40 words (16.1%). Informant 10 had over 100 words more than the ST (37.5%), followed by informants 2 and 5, respectively. Explicitation is more prominent in this text because of its register, which requires that implicit meanings which are culturally-bound be made explicit in the TT.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informant</th>
<th>Total number of words - Text 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>334 (20.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>343 (23.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>319 (15.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>322 (16.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>340 (22.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>323 (12.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>331 (19.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>323 (16.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>332 (16.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>381 (37.5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source Text 2 277 (100%)

Table 5.28: *Total Words by Informant for Text 2*

In summary, there is clear evidence of explication in translation for this sample. The word count of the translations, suggests that explication is a strategy used by all the informants, although the degree of use of this strategy varied substantially among them. It was also found that there was more explication for Text 2 than for Text 1. This indicates that the genre and register of texts dictates the strategies to be adopted in translation. It also shows that cultural differences affect the level of explication required in translation, where regional or highly culture-specific information tends to be standardised in translation through this strategy.
Chapter 6

INDIVIDUAL DIFFERENCES AMONG STUDENT TRANSLATORS

6.1 Introduction

The final stage of analysis investigated the individual performance of informants in the sample, in an attempt to measure the translation performance of student translators in relation to each other, and determine if certain strategies -like omission or retention of a SL cohesive device- are common to all or some students in translation in tackling the translation of cohesive elements.

6.2 Methodology

Mean ranks, standard deviation scores and a dissimilarity matrix were calculated to determine informants' translation performance in relation to each other following the procedures found in Campbell
(1998: 105). This information will tell us how consistently informants
tackle the translation of cohesive devices from a SL to a TL.

6.2.1 Mean Ranks

For every cohesive device in the categories of reference, conjunction,
substitution and ellipsis appearing in the source text, a match or a
mismatch in the TT version was recorded for that given informant, in
relation to the translations of every other informant in the sample.
Mean ranks were calculated by adding the number of matches and
mismatches, for each cohesive marker, and each category, by
informant.

Mean rank scores refer to how close to the group norm informants
performed. A high score represents an aberrant performance and a
low one indicates a close to the norm performance. Table 6.1 shows
the mean ranks for all four cohesion categories combined which
include reference, conjunction, ellipsis and substitution.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informant</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Mean</strong></td>
<td><strong>5.38</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.1: *Mean Ranks for the Sample*

The results indicate that informant 10 with a mean score of 8.5 ranks as the most *aberrant* of the sample. As shown in the preceding discussion on shifts of cohesion, this informant resorted to adding more cohesive elements in his/her translations and also to omitting others, especially in the reference category. In summary, s/he resorted to explication selectively, making shifts of cohesion which resulted in a less faithful translation but a more pragmatic one. Informants 4 and 2 with mean ranks of 7.2 and 6.1, respectively, also registered more shifts of cohesion compared to the rest of the sample.

In contrast, informants 1, 3 and 9 scored a mean total of 4.2, the lowest of the sample. These informants with low scores retained ST devices in the TL and therefore are at the other end of the continuum in the
'close to the norm' category. The translations produced by these informants closely follow the ST in text structure and texture.

6.2.2 Standard Deviation

Standard deviations were calculated for the sample to measure the level of consistency of each informants' translation strategies.

For every reference, conjunctive, substitutive and elliptical cohesive marker in the text, by informant, a standard deviation score of matches and mismatches was obtained to measure how consistent each informant’s performance was across the categories of cohesive devices. Each match and mismatch was counted for every informant. A dissimilarity count was made by calculating the proportion of matches and matches. Thus, if there were 20 cohesive devices and Informant 1 scored 13 matches and 7 mismatches, this informant would register a score of 13/20.

In addition, a dissimilarity matrix was constructed for each category of cohesive device, following Campbell (1998: 105-7) and Woods et al., (1986: 252-4) to observe each category separately and be able to see which of these appear more difficult or easy to grasp by the informants.

Below are discussed the results of the standard deviations which were calculated for the category of reference and conjunction only. The
results of the standard deviations carried out for substitution and ellipsis are not included here because of insufficient data. These categories only occurred twice in Text 2.

6.3 Consistency in Translating Conjunctions for ST1 and ST2

Table 6.2 below contains values for each informant that indicate how different informants behaved in relation to each other. That is, how different their strategies were for handling conjunctions in translation. For instance, informants 2 and 10 appear as the most aberrant of the sample with scores of .39 and .32, respectively. The average mean for sixty per cent of the sample was below .29. This indicates that informants 2 and 10 adopted similar strategies, that of omission, retention or addition, compared to the rest of the sample. Conjunctive markers were retained or substituted by a simple paraphrase, that is, by another conjunction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.2: Dissimilarity Matrix Conjunction Text 1
The table that follows shows a ranking of the ten informants from highest to lowest, where a high score indicates an aberrant performance in relation to the rest of the group, and a low one means quite the opposite; a 'close to the norm' performance. Informants 2, 10, 1 and 6 scored above the average score of .28, with informant 2 scoring the most aberrant for the sample (.39). Conversely, informants 3, 4 and 9 scored well below average: .23, .23 and .22, respectively. Student translators with an aberrant performance registered a greater number of shifts that included the introduction and or omission of new cohesive ties in translation, compared to the rest of the informants who tended to retain those of the source text.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inf</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>aberrant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>close to norm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.3: Ranking of Informants Shifts of Conjunction for Text 1
The results of the dissimilarity matrix for the category of conjunction in Text 2, shown in Table 6.4, suggest that informants 10 and 9 were the most aberrant of the sample. These informants introduced new conjunctions in their translations or omitted them while the rest of the sample retained the conjunctive markers of the ST. Informant 1 scored the lowest mean rank and thus was the one closest to the norm for this category and text type. This means that s/he retained the ST conjunction in his/her translation.

\[ \begin{array}{ccccccc}
1 & 0 \\
2 & 0.19 & 0 \\
3 & 0.27 & 0.31 & 0 \\
4 & 0.27 & 0.27 & 0.31 & 0 \\
5 & 0.23 & 0.23 & 0.31 & 0.35 & 0 \\
6 & 0.23 & 0.23 & 0.31 & 0.35 & 0.23 & 0 \\
7 & 0.23 & 0.27 & 0.31 & 0.35 & 0.23 & 0.35 & 0 \\
8 & 0.27 & 0.19 & 0.31 & 0.31 & 0.27 & 0.23 & 0.23 & 0 \\
9 & 0.38 & 0.35 & 0.38 & 0.38 & 0.38 & 0.42 & 0.42 & 0.27 & 0.27 & 0 \\
10 & 0.27 & 0.38 & 0.5 & 0.38 & 0.5 & 0.42 & 0.46 & 0.42 & 0.58 & 0.00 \\
\end{array} \]

Table 6.4: Dissimilarity Matrix Conjunction Text 2

Here once again, the informants have been ranked from highest to lowest to show who performed aberrantly and who scored 'close to the norm' in their translation strategies of conjunction for Text 2. Informant 10 scored .08 points above the average score of .35. The rest
of the sample scored below average, with Informant 1 scoring .09 points below average. The main point to be made here is that once again Informant 10's performance was aberrant and Informant 1's performance was close to the norm.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inf</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>aberrant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>close to norm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.5: Ranking of Informants Shifts of Conjunction for Text 2

The overall results for the category of conjunction reveal that Informant 10 was consistent in translating conjunctive devices, scoring aberrantly in Texts 1 and 2. Informant 2, on the other hand, was inconsistent in translating conjunctions. S/he performed aberrantly in
relation to the rest of the sample for text 1, while for Text 2 her/his performance was close to the norm. This discrepancy in performance for Informant 2 suggests that different strategies are being employed by this informant but that s/he is at a stage where these strategies are not deployed consistently. In Text 1, Informant 2 resorted to addition, while in Text 2 retention was the preferred option. It can be inferred that given the level of formality of Text 1 explication was resorted to in order to convey the source message effectively in translation. Text 2, on the other hand, lends itself to explication because of its culture-specific flavour, however Informant 2 failed to pick this up.

Similarly, Informant 1 performed aberrantly in relation to the rest of the group for Text 1, and close to the norm for Text 2. Informants 3, 4, 9 and 7 used similar strategies for translating conjunctions. In Text 1, they scored .22, .23, .23 and .24, respectively; and in text 2 they scored .33, .33 .34 and .30, respectively. These results suggest that these student translators are employing similar strategies to translate conjunctions and their performance in relation to rest of the sample is consistent.

Informants 5 and 8 maintained their positions in relation to the rest of the group with scores below average for both texts. Their scores were ranked as not close to the norm nor aberrant.
6.4 Consistency in Translating Reference for ST1 and ST2

The results in the dissimilarity matrix below illustrate how informants rank in relation to each other for shifts of reference in the translations of Source Text 1 and Source Text 2. As indicated earlier, there was an overall reduction of referents in the translations. The most common shift in this category was that of omission.

Informants 10, 8 and 6 have the highest scores in the sample and are thus classified as aberrant. These informants made shifts of cohesion that were different from those made by the rest of the sample. Informants 4 and 7 ranked as close to the norm for this type of cohesive marker.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.6: Dissimilarity Matrix Reference Text 1
Informants 10 and 8 scored identically for the category of reference for Texts 1 and 2. This suggests that their performance in translating reference was consistent, and both opted for similar strategies. These two informants' performance was ranked as aberrant in relation to the rest of the sample.

Informants 6 and 1 adopted similar strategies for translating reference for Texts 1 and 2. They each scored aberrantly in Text 1 and below average in Text 2, while informant 2 scored slightly above average for texts 1 and 2, with scores of .43 and .28 (average scores were .4 and .27).

Informant 4 scored the lowest in Text 1 and the highest score in Text 2. These results reveal an inconsistent performance in translating reference. Informant 5 scored just below average in Text 1 (.37) and slightly above average in Text 2 (.29). Informants 7, 3 and 9 all scored below average for both texts 1 and 2. These informants' performance falls within the category of 'close to the norm' in relation to the rest of the group.

Table 6.7 below, displays a ranking of the ten informants from highest to lowest for text 1. Informants 10, 8 and 6 scored the highest with a score of .46 or above, while Informants 7 and 4 scored .32, the lowest for the sample.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inf</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>aberrant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>close to norm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.7: Ranking of Informants shifts of Reference for Text 1

Table 6.8, shows that Informant 4 scored the highest mean rank for the sample for shifts of reference in the translation of Text 2. This informant was closely followed by informants 10, 8 and 5 who scored a mean of .29. Informant 3 scored the lowest mean of .22, and was thus categorised as having a close to the norm performance for translating reference.
Table 6.8: Dissimilarity Matrix Reference Text 2

Table 6.9 displays a ranking of the ten informants from highest to lowest in relation to each other, for the category of reference for Text 2. These results clearly show that Informant 4 scored the highest of the sample with a score of .32. It is noted though, that the mean for this category was .3, ranking Informant 4 as only marginally above average. Informants 10, 8 and 5 scored .29, just below the mean, while Informant 2 scored .28. Informant 3 scored the lowest for the sample with .1 points below the highest score of .32, ranking as closest to the norm for the category of reference for Text 2. Informants 1, 6, 7 and 9 registered scores of .26, .25, .25 and .24, respectively.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inf</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>Aberrant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>close to norm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.9: Ranking of Informants Shifts of Reference for Text 2

6.5 Comments

The overall results indicate that some informants tend to make fewer shifts of cohesion in translation than others. They tend to retain source text cohesive elements in their translations. In this way, the structure of the ST is retained in the translation.
Those informants who made more shifts of cohesion through the strategy of explication, in effect provided added cohesion and better translations. Those whose translations resembled the source texts, or kept to the norm, produced less cohesive translations.

Informant 10 who made the greatest number of shifts of cohesion in her/his translation scored as the most consistent of the sample with a standard deviation of 1.1: cf; Table 6.9. This low score indicates that the informant was consistent in making shifts of cohesion in the TT to maintain functional and pragmatic equivalence. It follows from this that informant 10 appears to have a better command of the target language.

Informant 3, on the other hand, scored lowest in the mean rank and was categorised as being close to the norm, s/he performed highest in the standard deviation ranking. This indicates that informant 3 made few shifts of cohesion in translation and that when a shift was made, it was inconsistent in relation to her/his overall performance.

The informants who made more shifts of cohesion using explication, in effect provided added cohesion and better translations. Those who stuck to the Source Texts or kept to the norm, produced less cohesive translations.

Informant 4 who scored very high in the aberrant performance category was the exception, scoring high on the consistency scale. This
suggests that this informant is making shifts of cohesion in translation but is inconsistent in her/his strategies compared with the rest of the group.

Table 6.10 shows results for standard deviation and mean ranks for the sample. Informants 8, 7, 5, 9, 1 and 3 all scored below 5, with informants 9, 1 and 3 scoring the lowest mean of 4.2 and thus falling into the category of closest to the norm.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Mean rank total</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Stand.Dev. total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.10 *Standard Deviation and Mean Ranks by Informant*
In observing the consistency or lack thereof in overall performance of informants in using and handling cohesive devices, the immediate feature that stands out is a difference between the overall number of ST cohesive devices and those of the translations. The translations contain a greater number of cohesive devices, principally in the category of lexical cohesion and, to a lesser degree, in the number of conjunctions. This difference could be attributed to the fact that, in translation, there is a tendency to explicate. In other words, a shift in the level of explicitness obtains in translation when motivated shifts of cohesive markers affect a translation's explicit and implicit meaning potential (Blum-Kulka, 1986: 18).

Similarly, a difference in the number of cohesive devices in the translations could indicate linguistic differences between the languages involved when languages differ both grammatically and stylistically, and where one is possibly more explicit cohesively than the other, as is the case of Spanish when compared to English, the evidence in the sample would indicate both transfer and explication.

In Spanish, cohesion is maintained -even in long stretches of text- through gender agreement, a device not available in English. In translation from Spanish into English, it is necessary to introduce new cohesive elements to match the gender of the referent, especially in literary texts. Hence a shift occurs to accommodate a linguistic feature of the target language. Repetition of nouns or referents is a strategy used in English for maintaining cohesion. The use of conjunctive
links is yet another strategy for maintaining cohesion in English (Halliday & Hasan, 1986).

It would appear from the results of this study that more skilled students in translation -those able to convey a message pragmatically in the TL- tend to be more sensitive to the linguistic differences between two languages and are thus able to make the necessary shifts to preserve cohesion. It follows from this, that they are able to pick up the subtle nuances or meaning potential of texts both stylistically and pragmatically and translate messages accordingly. On the other hand, the student in translation working from the mother tongue, is bound to transfer SL features literally.

A translation which is longer than the original could produce a change in register, meaning potential, politeness, explicitness, level of conceptuality; whereas a translation which is shorter than the original can alter the level of familiarity or proximity. This could result in a text with a more formal register, added conceptuality and less explicit information.
Chapter 7

CONCLUSION

7.1 Recapitulation and Discussion

It has been said in the discussion so far that cohesion is one of a number of key elements of discourse. We have also stated that in any language transfer there is a tendency to explicate. This strategy has been postulated as a universal of language mediation by Blum-Kluka (1986). The study has revealed that cohesion is an area where explication can be observed.

It has also been discussed that while translation studies theorists, such as Wilss, postulate that "the natural preponderance of the native tongue over foreign languages means that normally a translator is better qualified for L2/L1 translation than vice versa" (Wilss, 1982), in Australia, translation is practised bidirectionally and this carries with it an additional burden to translators.

A study of shifts of cohesion in translation from Spanish into English has shed some light on the dynamics of translation into English as a
second language. In the first instance, it has shown that shifts of cohesion are evident in translation, and that these shifts vary from one translator to another, according to level of translation competence and degree of mastery of the TL. Some informants merely retained ST cohesive markers, while others introduced new cohesive elements in their translations. Some of these shifts of cohesion were motivated by semantic choices and thus produced pragmatic translations, while other necessary shifts were overlooked resulting in unclear translations.

Secondly, it was observed in the study that shifts of cohesion are not evident in every category of cohesive device. The greater number of shifts occurred in the categories of conjunction, reference and lexical cohesion.

The results of the study suggest that explication is a variable in acquiring translation competence and that cohesion is one area where explication is evident, although not every category of cohesion lends itself to explication. Lexical cohesion and conjunction are two cohesive devices where explication is possible, whereas reference, for instance, is not because referents are fixed.

The results also reveal that there are differences in the quantity and type of cohesive markers in the two texts from which the translation outputs were generated. Text 1, had a high frequency of lexical cohesion (64.4%) as opposed to Text 2 that had fewer instances of
lexical cohesion (19.4%). Instead, it relied more on reference to maintain the thread of meaning in the text. The percentage of reference in Text 2 was 46.8% compared to 19.8% for Text 1.

It was found in the study that the frequency of reference ties was reduced in the translation outputs and this was greatly attributed to the linguistic differences holding between Spanish and English, principally, as regards the functions of the definite article, discussed above. It was also found that the number of conjunctive ties in the translations was increased and, at the very least, retained. This increase in number of conjunctive ties was attributed to explication. Conjunction was found to be one way of explicating in translation.

It was further found that both ellipsis and substitution were always retained in the translations. The retention of these cohesive markers in translation was attributed to the nature of these devices which is to make information implicit and available to the reader from the macro context of the text. However, the comments to be made here are by no means conclusive given the few instances of substitution and ellipsis in the data. An analysis of a larger corpus of texts would need to be made to corroborate this finding.

As far as lexical cohesion is concerned, the results for central and marginal sentences suggest that the frequency of lexical links was generally reduced in the translations (by ninety percent of informants), when compared to the ST. Thus, the general shift in this category was
omission. Only one informant in the sample had the same number of lexical ties in his/her translation, as that of the original, although these were distributed differently in the TT. The central sentences of the ST were reduced from three to two sentences in all but one of the translations. Only one informant in the sample reduced the three central sentences to only one. Informant ten is the only informant to have introduced new lexical elements in his/her translation. In fact, this informant had the highest number of cohesive markers in his/her translations of the two texts than any other informant.

Notwithstanding the outcomes of the study for cohesive links and central and marginal sentences, the results for word count of the translations was substantially higher than that of the two source texts. This difference in source text and target text length suggests an overall tendency towards explication. The increase in word count for Text 2 was substantially higher than for Text 1. This result can be attributed to Text 2 being far more culturally-bound than Text 1.

The overall results of the study corroborate the studies of Blum-Kulka (1985) that explication is characteristic in translation, especially where there are explicit regional-cultural elements in the source text, as was the case with ST2, that required standardisation or disambiguation in the TT.

The outcomes of the study support the notion that in translation shifts of cohesion obtain, although not across all categories of cohesive
markers. In the categories of substitution and ellipsis there was no evidence of shifts in the translations. The range of shifts present in the data included omission, addition and retention of ST cohesive devices. The results have also highlighted that cohesion is dependant on text type, that is, different genres have different cohesive markers that create contribute to the text's texture.

7.2 Some Implications for Translator Training

The study sought to prove whether explication could be observed in the deployment of cohesive elements from a ST to a TT. Likewise, whether shifts of cohesion obtained in translation; and if so, which elements tended to be translated well by the whole sample and which elements were handled well by only a few informants. The focus of the study was on linguistic differences holding between Spanish and English; and individual differences among the group of informants, as manifested in translation. This was done with a view to observing strategies for translating cohesive devices from a SL into a TL.

The applications of this study are found specifically in translator training, while also in language acquisition studies.

Through being able to identify the shifts of cohesion that take place in translation into a second language, inferences can be made about translation strategies used by informants to translate cohesive
elements. For instance, it can be proposed that explication is evident in translation, however this strategy is not employed with the same frequency and for the same cohesive categories, by all the informants in the sample. A large scale study could prove useful in identifying other common strategies adopted by student translators.

The study illustrates some of the common shifts that occur in translation, and indicates how some shifts are motivated by obligatory rules of the TT, while others are motivated by individual differences. An understanding of how cohesive devices operate in texts, and how these cohesive devices are shifted in the process of translation, may prove useful to translator educators. Exercises could be designed to test the competence of student translators in handling cohesion in the process of translation.

Another interesting application of the study of cohesion as applied to translation, is its usefulness in the revision of translations. Vázquez-Ayora (1977) proposes that by observing cohesion in the ST and then checking the translation of these devices in the TT, the translator is able to focus on specific textual elements to ensure that there is agreement, identification of the participants in the text, and general cohesion in the TT.
7.3 Suggestions for Further Research

The identification of cohesive devices in texts, the monitoring of shifts of cohesion in translation, and the study of explication in translation, were all made possible through the use of discourse analysis methodologies. These methodologies have proven useful instruments in this study, and could be used in similar research projects.

Given the size of the sample used in this study, it is envisaged that the same study could be carried out, on a larger sample, to corroborate some of the findings revealed so far. Likewise, different language pairs could be studied to observe how cohesive devices are deployed in translation, and observe the factors that control textual cohesion in translation.

A further investigation could observe shifts of cohesion in consecutive interpreting, following Schlesinger's work on simultaneous interpreted speech (1995) to corroborate her findings. The results of such a study could prove useful in identifying the variables that contribute to the accurate rendering of a message in a target language, where the processing of information resembles more the work of a translator in that the consecutive interpreter is exposed to the whole text before interpreting takes place, and s/he is aided by the process of note-taking to help trigger the memory.
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APPENDIX 1

SOURCE TEXT 1 Conocimiento y Defensa del Idioma
Source Text 1
Conocimiento y defensa del idioma
(Knowledge and defence of the language)

1. Al clausurar el reciente Congreso de Academias de la Lengua Española, los representantes de los veintitrés institutos existentes acordaron recomendar que el periodista tenga una formación universitaria que garantice su buen conocimiento del idioma y le capacite para prescindir de vocablos extranjeros en las publicaciones y anuncios.

2. Se logró llegar a niveles de consenso sin precedentes una vez finalizados los debates sobre el uso del idioma en radio y televisión, tema que quedó comprendido en la ponencia titulada "El español y las nuevas técnicas de difusión masiva". Es urgente piensen los académicos, que se asignen nombres en castellano a las nuevas realidades científicas y tecnológicas descubiertas en países donde no se hable este idioma.

4. Se recomendó, asimismo, que las academias de la lengua española admitan la constitución de comités científicos y técnicos, cuyo objetivo sea proponer las palabras españolas que han de designar tales descubrimientos realizados fuera del mundo hispánico.

5. Algunas academias estimaron que la integridad del español está amenazada por la llamada "colonización lingüística" de idiomas dominantes -como lo es el inglés- en los que actualmente tienden a darse los hallazgos científico-tecnológicos.

6. Se reconoció que la lengua española atraviesa por graves aprietos en Filipinas, Puerto Rico, Estados Unidos y Australia. La gravedad del caso no recae en los anglicismos sueltos, incorporados al idioma por los hispanohablantes, sino más bien en la alteración de la propia sintaxis castellana, lo cual supone haber cedido ante el inglés circundante y perdido ciertos elementos psicológicos, lógicos e ideológicos inherentes al idioma.
APPENDIX 2

TRANSLATIONS
SOURCE TEXT 1 Conocimiento y Defensa del Idioma
Informant 1 Text 1

The representatives of the twenty three existing institutes agreed to recommend that the journalist should have an university degree to assure its language knowledgement and to enable him/her to omit foreign terminology on publications and advertisement; at the closure of the recent "Congreso de academias de la lengua espanola" Spanish language academies congress).

An unprecedent consent was reached once the debates about the use of the language on radio and television finished; topic that was presented as: "The Spanish language and the new technics of massive broadcasting".

The academics think that it is urgent to appoint Spanish names to the new scientific and technological facts that are discovered in countries where other languages are spoken.

It has also been recommended that the Spanish language academies accept the organization of scientific and technical committees.

They target will be to propose the Spanish terms that will correspond to such discoveries reached out of the hispanic world, some academies realised that the integrity of the Spanish language is threaten by the so called "linguistic colonization" of the predominating languages, such as English, because most of the scientific and technological discoveries are made on thos languages.

It was realise that the Spanish language is endangered in the Philippines, Puerto Rico, USA and Australia.

The importance of the mattar is not the English terms that the Spanish speaking people add to the language, but mainly the alteration of the Spanish sintaxis itself, which could have lost use due to the English and lost some psicological elements, obvious and ideologicals to the language.
Please note:

PAGES 165, 168, 170 are missing from the original thesis.
Informant 3 Text 1

Upon closing of the recent Spanish Language schools Conference, the representatives of the twenty-three existing institutes agreed to recommend that the journalist should have a university education that will guarantee a good knowledge of the language and that will enable him or her to do without foreign words in publications and announcements.

Consensus levels without precedents were achieved once the debates regarding the use of the language in broadcasting and television concluded, a subject that was left comprised in the report titled "Spanish and the new techniques of mass diffusion".

It is urgent, the academics think, that they should give themselves Spanish names according to the new scientific and technological realities discovered in countries in which this language is not spoken.

It was recommended, likewise, that the Spanish Language Schools should recognize the constitution of scientific and technical committees, whose objective will be to suggest the Spanish words that will be assigned such discoveries that will take place outside the Spanish world.

Some schools estimated that the integrity of Spanish is threatened by the so called "linguistic colonization: of dominant language - as English- in which currently the scientific technological findings are found.

It was recognized that the Spanish Language experiences serious difficulties in the Philippines, Puerto Rico, United States and in Australia.

The severity of the situation does not fall back on the lose anglicisms, added to the language by Spanish speakers, but instead in the alteration of the very Spanish syntax, which supposedly has ceased before the surrounding English and lost certain psychological, elements logical and ideological pertaining to the language.
Informant 4 Text 1

At the closure of the recent Conference of the Spanish Language Academies, the representatives of the existing twenty-three institutes decided to recommend that journalists have an University education that would guarantee the proper knowledge of the language and that would train him/her to omit the foreign words in publications and advertisements.

It was possible to reach a level of consensus without precedents once the debates about the use of the language in radio and television were finalized; topic which was included in the report titled "The Spanish Language and the new techniques of mass broadcasting".

The appointment of Spanish names to the new scientific and technological realities discovered in countries where this language is not spoken is a matter of urgency, academics believe.

Likewise, it was recommended that the Spanish language academies recognize the constitution of scientific and technological committees, whose objective would be to propose the Spanish words that are to name such discoveries achieved outside the Hispanic world.

Some academies estimated that the integrity of the Spanish language is threatened by the so called "linguistic colonization" by dominant languages -such as English - in which the scientific and technological discoveries presently seem to prevail.

It was recognized that the Spanish language is going through critical difficulties in the Philippines, Puerto Rico, United States and Australia.

The severity of the matter does not fall on the loose anglicisms, incorporated into the language by the Spanish-speakers, but rather on the alteration of the spanish syntax itself, which supposedly has yield before the surrounding English and has lost some
At the closing of the Spanish language Academies congress, the representatives of the twenty-three existing institutes agreed upon recomanding tertiary training to journalists, so as to garantry a good knowledge of their language, and for them to be able to dominate foreign words that appear in publications and announcements.

They reached a point of unprecedented consensus, at the closing of the debates which touched upon the use of the language in radio and television, a theme which was left understood in the report entitled "El Español y las nuevas técnicas de difusión masiva" (The Spanish language and the new large scale techniques of transmission).

The academics think that it is urgent that spanish words be assigned to the new scientific and technological truths found in countries where that language is not spoken.

In the same way, it was recommended that the spanish language academies accept the constitution of scientific and technical committees, who's aim it is to suggest spanish words which describe such discoverings conducted outside the spanish speaking world.

Some academies considered that the integrity of the spanish language is threatened by the so called "linguistic colonisation" of dominating languages -such as english - in which scientific and technological findings are presently occuring.

It was recognized that the spanish language is going through an awkward situation in the Philippines, Puerto Rico, the United States and Australia.

The seriousness of the case does not fall back on the loose anglicismes which are found incorporated by the spanish speakers, but more in the alteration of the spanish syntax, which is suppose to have been transfered before the english surrounding and which lost certain psychological aspects, particularly logical and ideological to the language.
When the recent Congress of Spanish Language Academies closed, the representatives of the twenty-three existing institutes agreed to recommend that journalists receive university training to guarantee a sound knowledge of the language and to train them to dispense with foreign words in publications and advertisements.

Unprecedented levels of consensus were achieved once the debates concerning the use of the language on radio and television were completed.

The topic was included in the paper entitled "Spanish and the new techniques of massive diffusion".

The academics feel that it is imperative that such names be given to new scientific and technological discoveries originating in countries where Spanish is not spoken.

Likewise, they recommended that Spanish Language academies allow the formation of scientific and technological committees, whose purpose would be to propose Spanish words to describe these discoveries occurring outside the Spanish speaking world.

Some academies estimated that the Spanish language is going through serious difficulties in the Philippines, Puerto Rico, the United States and Australia.

The seriousness of the problem is not in the isolated Anglicisms incorporated into the language by Spanish speakers, but more in the alteration of the actual Spanish syntaxis, which has supposedly given way to the surrounding English language and lost certain psychological, logical and ideological elements inherent in the Spanish language.
Informant 9 Text 1

With the close of the recent Conference of Spanish Language Academies, the representatives of the twenty-three existing institutes agreed to recommend that any journalist have university training which would guarantee his thorough knowledge of the language and enable him to do without foreign words in publications and news reporting.

They succeeded in reaching precedent levels of consensus once the round of debates on language use in radio and television had been concluded, which topic was included in the report entitled: "Spanish and new techniques of mass communication".

Academicians think it is urgently necessary to assign Castilian names to the new scientific and technical realities brought to light in countries where this language is not spoken.

It was likewise recommended that Spanish Language Academies allow the establishment of scientific and technological committees whose objective will be to propose the Spanish words which are to designate such discoveries made outside Hispanic countries.

Some academics thought that the integrity of Spanish is being threatened by so-called "linguistic colonization" from dominant languages -such as English- in which scientific-technical findings are currently tending to occur.

It was recognized that the Spanish language is experiencing grave difficulties in the Philippines, Puerto Rico, Australia and the United States.

The seriousness of the situation does not concern isolated Anglicisms incorporated into the language by Spanish speakers, but rather in the change to Castilian syntax proper which is supposed to have yielded to the English surrounding it and lost certain psychological, logical and ideological elements inherent in the language.
Informant 10 Text 1

At the close of the recent "Congress of Spanish Language Academies", representatives from the twenty-three existing institutes agreed to recommend that a reporter should have university background that would guarantee a good knowledge of the language and would enable him to avoid the use of foreign words and terms in his stories and advertisements.

They reached previously unprecedented levels of agreement, once the debates were finalised, concerning the use of the language on radio and television, a theme that was expounded in an article entitled "Spanish and New Techniques of Mass Information".

The Academics believe it is a matter of urgency to employ Spanish words to express and explain new scientific and technological discoveries and revelations which emanate from countries where Spanish is not the common language.

It was recommended that Spanish Language Academies create "Scientific and Technological Committees", whose objective it would be to propose Spanish terms to describe those discoveries made in countries where Spanish is not spoken.

Some academies were of the opinion that the Spanish language is being threatened by the so-called 'Linguistic Colonization' by 'Dominant Languages' such as English, which is, at present, the language in which scientific and technological discoveries, in the main, are expressed.

Recognition was given of the fact that Spanish is experiencing a dangerous period of decline in such countries as The Philippines, Puerto Rico, the United States of America and Australia.

The gravity of the situation is not due so much to the use of 'Loose Anglicisms' being incorporated into the language by Spanish-speakers, but rather to the altering of proper Spanish syntax, which is presumed to be caused by people being surrounded by English in their daily lives, and by giving way to that influence, they have lost certain psychological, logical and ideological elements inherent in the Spanish language.
APPENDIX 3

SOURCE TEXT 2 Sáenz Peña
Sáenz Peña

1. Yo estaba en el Sáenz Peña y a la salida volvía a Bellavista caminando.
2. A veces me encontraba con Higueras, un amigo de mi hermano, antes que a Perico lo metieran al Ejército.
4. <<Nada, desde que lo mandaron a la selva nunca escribió.>>
5. <<¿A dónde vas tan apurado?, ven a conversar un rato.>>
6. Yo quería regresar a Bellavista lo más pronto, pero Higueras era mayor que yo, 7 me hacía un favor tratándome como a uno de su edad.
7. Me llevaba a una chingana y me decía: <<¿qué tomas?>>.
8. <<No sé, cualquier cosa, lo que tú.>>
9. <<Bueno, decía el flaco Higueras; chino, dos cortos!>>
10. Y después me daba una palmada: <<cuidado te emborraches.>>
11. El pisco me hacía arder la garganta y lagrimear.
15. Hablábamos de fútbol, del colegio, de mi hermano.
16. Me contó muchas cosas de Perico, al que yo creía un pacífico y resulta que era un gallo de pelea.
17. Una noche se agarró a chavetazos por una mujer.
18. Además, quién hubiera dicho, era un enamorado.
19. Cuando Higueras me contó que había preñado a una muchacha y que por poco 21 lo casan a la fuerza, quedé mudo.
20. <<Sí, me dijo, tienes un sobrino que debe andar por los cuatro años.
21. ¿No te sientes viejo?>>
22. Pero sólo me entretenía un rato, después buscaba cualquier pretexto para irme.
23. Al entrar a la casa me sentía muy nervioso, qué vergüenza que mi madre pudiera sospechar.
24. Sacaba los libros y decía <<voy a estudiar al lado>> y ella ni siquiera me contestaba, apenas movía la cabeza, a veces ni eso.
APPENDIX 4

TRANSLATIONS
SOURCE TEXT 2 Sáenz Peña
Informant 1 Text 2

I was at Sáenz Peña and on the way out I was walking back to Bellavista. Sometimes I would meet Higuera, a friend of my brother's, before Perico was taken into the army.
He would always ask me: "What do you know about him?"
"Nothing, ever since he was sent to the jungle he never wrote."
Where are you going in such a rush?, come and talk for a while."
I wanted to return to Bellavista as soon as possible, but Higuera was older than I, he would do me a favour by treating me like someone of his own age.
He would take me to a tavern and say to me: "What would you
'I don't know, anything, whatever you have."
"Okay, skinny Higuera would say; two nips Curly!"
He would then pat me: "be careful not to get drunk."
The pisco brandy would make my throat sting and tearful.
He would say: suck a bit of lemon.
That way it is much milder.
And smoke a cigarette."
Would spoke about soccer, school, and of my brother.
He told me many things about Perico, whom I believed was pacific and it turned out that he was a fighting cock, one night he got into a knife fight because of a woman.
Besides who would have said, he was a lover.
When Higuera told me he had got a young girl pregnant and that they almost forced him to get married, he was left speechless.
"Yes, he said to me, you have a nephew that must be around four years old.
Don't you feel old?
But I would only entertain myself for a while, then I would find any excuse to leave.
When entering the house I would feel very nervous, how shameful that my mother could suspect anything.
I would take my books out and say "I am going to study next door" and she would not even answer me she would hardly move her head, sometimes not even that.
Informant 2 Text 2

I was in Sáenz Peña and on leaving I walked back to Bellavista. Sometimes I would bump into Higueras, a friend of my brother's, before they took Perico into the Army. He always asked me "have you heard from him"? "Nothing since they sent him to the jungle, he has never written." "and where are you going in such a hurry?" come and talk to me for a while."

I wanted to get back to Bellavista as quickly as I could, but Higueras was older than me, and he was kind enough to treat me as one who was the same age as he was. He would take me to a tavern and he would say: "What are you drinking?" "I don't know, whatever you have". Well, the skinny Higueras would say; Curly, two shots! After that he would give me a slap "Careful, don't get drunk". The pisco brandy was burning my throat and made my eyes water. He would say "chew on a bit of lemon, it'll be milder, and smoke a cigarette". We would talk about football, school, my brother. He told me many things about Perico, a person whom I thought to be a pacifist and he was actually a gamecock.

One night, he threatened a woman. On top of it all, who would have said that he was in love. When Higueras told me that he got a young girl pregnant and that they were nearly married by force, I was stunned.

Yes, he told me, "you have a nephew who should be about four years old." "Doesn't that make you feel old?". But that would only amuse me for a while, afterwards I would look for any excuse, in order to go.

When I would walk into the house I would be very nervous, how embarrassing if my mother could suspect it. I would take the books out and would say: 'I'm going to study next door' and she wouldn't even answer me, she would only slithy move her head, and sometimes she wouldn't even do that.
Informant 3 Text 2

I was in the Sáenz Peña (a folk club) and as I left I walked back towards Bellavista. Sometimes I would meet up with Higuera, a friend of my brother, but that was before Perico was sent to the Army.
He always asked me: "What have you heard about him?"
"Nothing, he's never written since they sent him into the jungle."
"Where are you going in such a hurry, come and chat for a while."
I wanted to get back to Bellavista as quickly as possible, but Higuera was older than me and did me a favour by treating me as someone of his own age.
He took me to a tavern and said: "What do you want to drink?"
"I don't know, anything, the same as you."
"OK," said skinny Higuera, "Curly, two shots!"
Then he slapped me on the back, "careful you'll get drunk."
The 'pisco' (a strong liquor) made my throat burn and brought tears to my eyes.
"Suck a little lemon, that makes it smoother and smoke a cigarette," he said.
We talked about football, school and my brother.
He told me lots of things about Perico whom I thought was placid.
It turns out that he was 'cocky'; one night he got into a knife fight over a woman.
Anyway, who would have said he was a lover.
When Higuera told me that he had left a girl pregnant and that they almost forced him to get married I became speechless.
"Yes," he said, "you have a nephew round about four years old.
Don't you feel old?"
I only waited a little while longer and then I found some excuse to leave.
When I arrived home I felt very nervous, what a disgrace if my mother could have guessed.
I took my books out and said, "I'm going next-door to study."
She didn't even answer, hardly moving her head, sometimes not even that.
Informant 4 Text 2

I was at "the Saenz Peña" and on the way out I walked back to Bellavista.
Sometimes I met Higuera, my brother's friend, before Perico was sent to the army.
I always asked myself: "what do you know about him?".
"Nothing at all.
He never sent a letter since he was sent to jungle."
"Where are you going in such a hurry?"
Let's chat for a while.
I wanted to go back to Bellavista as soon as possible, but Higuera was older than me and he made me a favour treating me as if a were his age.
He used to take me to a tavern and asked me: "what are you drinking?";
"I don't know, anything, what you are having will do".
"Well, Higuera then said: "Curly, two nips."
He then slap me on my back "watch it, don't get drunk".
"The "pisco" made my throat burn and made me shed tears.
He used to tell me: "suck some lemon to make it milder and smoke a cigarett."
We used to talk about soccer, studying and about my brother.
He told me many things about Perico, whom I regarded as a pacific person, but he really was a fighting cock.
One night he had a knife fight over a woman.
Who would expected it, he was in love.
I was speech less.
When Higuera told me that he got a girl pregnant and he was nearly forced to marry her.
"Yes, he said, you have a nephew, he may be four years old by now"; "don't you feel old?".
But I was there only for a short while and then I used any excuse to leave.
I was very nervous when I walked into the house, what ashame if my mother would suspect anything.
I took the books and said "I'm going to study next door", and she did not even answer back, only moved her head, sometimes not even that.
Informant 5 Text 2

I was at the Sáenz Peña and on the way out I was returning to Bellavista on foot. Sometimes I would meet Higuera, one of my brother's friends, before Perico was sent to the Army.
He always asked me: "have you heard from him?".
"Nothing, he has never written since he was sent to the jungle".
"Where are you going in such a hurry?, lets talk for a while."
I wanted to return to Bellavista as soon as possible, but Higuero was older, he pleased me by treating me as one of equal age.
He was taking me to a tavern and he would say: "what are you going to drink?".
"I don't know, anything, whatever you are having".
"Okay", said skinny Higuero; "¡Curly, two shots!"
And then he would slap my back: "careful don't get drunk". The "pisco" burnt my throat and made me tearful.
He would say: "suck on a bit of lemon.
It is smoother that way, and have a cigarette".
We would talk about soccer, school, my brother.
He told me many things about Perico, whom I thought was peace-loving but so it happens that he was a fighting cock.
One night he was involved in a knife fight because of a woman.
Besides, who would have said he was a lover.
When Higuero told me that he had a left a young woman pregnant and that he was almost forced to marry her, I was left speechless.
"Yes", he said, "you have a nephew that must be around four years old.
Don't you feel old?"
But I was only delayed for a while, afterwards I would look for any excuse to leave.
As I walked into the house I felt nervous, it would be a shame for my mother to suspect such a thing.
I would take the books and I would say "I am going next door to study" and she would not even reply; she would hardly move her head, sometimes not even that.

* TRANSLATOR'S NOTE
PISCO - A Latin American strong liquor.
Informant 6 Text 2

I was in the bar Sáenz Peña and on my way back, I would return to Bellavista on foot. Sometimes I would meet Higueras, a friend of my brother’s, before they sent Perico to the army. He would always ask: “what do you know about him?” “nothing, since they sent him to the jungle, he’s never written.” “Where are you going in such a hurry?, come and have a talk for a while.”
I wanted to go back to Bellavista as soon as possible, but Higueras was older than me, he was doing me a favour treating me like someone of his own age. He would take me to a club and would say: “what will you have?” “I don’t know, anything, same as you:” “alright, said skinny Higueras; “curly 2 nips!” and afterwards he would give me a slap careful you don’t get drunk”. The Pisco brandy would burn my throat and would bring tears to my eyes. He would say: “Suck on a bit of lemon. that way it is smoother, and have a smoke.” we would talk about football, school, my brother. He told me lots of things about Perico, whom I thought was so quiet and as it turns out he was a real fighting cock, one night he picked up a fight with a knife over a woman. Besides who would have believed it, he was in love. When Higueras told me he got a girl pregnant and they nearly forced him to get married, I remained speechless. “Yes, he said, you have a nephew that must be around four. “Don’t you feel old?” I would only stay for a while, after that I would feel very nervous. How shameful if my mother would only suspect. I would take out my books and I would say “I am going to study next door” She would not even answer, she would hardly move her head, sometimes not even that.
Informant 7 Text 2

I went to school at Sáenz Peña, and when it was finished for the day I used to walk back to Bellavista.
Sometimes I bumped into Higuera, a friend of my brother Perico from before he had to join the army.
He always asked me: "Have you heard from him?"
"No. Since they sent him to the jungle he hasn't written".
"Where are you going in such a hurry?"
"Come and talk for a while"
I wanted to get back to Bellavista as quickly as possible, but Higuera was older than me and he humoured me by treating me as if I was his age.
He took me to a tavern and said "What'll you have?"
"I don't know, anything, whatever you're having".
"Okay", said skinny Higuera, "Mate, give us two straight ones".
And then he gave me a slap on the back: "Careful you don't get drunk!"
The liquor burnt my throat and brought tears to my eyes.
He said: "Suck a bit of lemon, that makes it easier to swallow."
And smoke a cigarette".
We talked about football, school, my brother.
He told me lots of things about Perico whom I thought was a pacifist but turned out to be a fighting cock.
One night he got into a fight with a knife over a woman.
What's more, who would have thought he was a romantic.
When Higuera told me he had gotten a girl pregnant and that they were nearly forced to get married I was dumbfounded.
"Yes", he said, "you have a nephew that must be about four years old, don't you feel old?"
But he only amused me for a while, then I looked for an excuse to leave.
When I got home I was really nervous, I was scared that my mother might suspect something.
I got out my books and said "I'm going to go and study" and she wouldn't even answer me, she barely moved her head, sometimes she didn't even do that.
Informant 8 Text 2

I was in Sáenz Peña and when I left I used to return to Bellavista on foot. Sometimes I ran into Higuera, a friend of my brother’s, before Perico was conscripted into the army.
He always asked me, "What do you know of him?"
"Nothing, since they sent him to the jungle he hasn’t written."
"Where are you going in such a hurry? Come and chat for a while."
I wanted to return to Bellavista as soon as possible, but Higuera was older than I and did me the favour of treating me as if I were his age.
He took me to a tavern and said to me, "What are you having?"
"I don’t know, anything, whatever you’re having."
Alright said thin Higuera, "Mate two nips!" and afterwards he slapped me on the shoulder saying, "Careful you don’t get drunk."
The string liquor burned my throat and brought tears to my eyes.
He said, "Suck on a bit of lemon. It’s smoother that way, and smoke a cigarette."
We talked about soccer, school and my brother.
He told me many things about Perico, who I thought was a peaceful man but actually was a bit of a fighter.
One night he got into a knife fight over a woman.
Also, who would have thought it, he was in love.
When Higuera told me that he got a girl pregnant and that they were almost married but force I was struck dumb.
"Yes", he told me, "you have a nephew who must be about four years old.
Don’t you feel old?"
But he only held me up for a while, afterwards I would find any excuse to go.
When I arrived home I felt very nervous, what a feeling of shame that my mother might suspect.
I took out the books and said, "I’m going to study over here", and she didn’t even reply, barely moving her head, sometimes not even doing that.
Informant 9 Text 2

I used to be at Sáenz Peña and on leaving I would go back to Bellavista on foot. From time to time I would meet Higueras, my brother's friend, before they put Perico in the army. He would always ask me, "Any news of him?"

"Nothing, he hasn't written since they posted him to the jungle."

"Where are you off to in such a hurry? Come and talk for a while."

I wanted to get back to Bellavista as quickly as possible, but Higueras was older than me and he was doing me a favour by treating me like someone his own age. He would take me to a tavern and ask, "What are you having?"

"I don't know, anything really, whatever you're having."

And then he would give me a pat on the back, "Take care you don't get drunk."

The booze made my throat burn and brought tears to my eyes.

He said, "Suck on some lemon. It is smoother that way. And smoke a cigarette."

We would talk about football, college, my brother. He told me many things about Perico, who I thought was a peaceable fellow but it turns out he was a fighting cock, one night he even fought at knifepoint over a woman. What's more, and who would have said so, he was in love. When Higueras told me that he had got a girl pregnant and nearly had to get married, I was dumbfounded.

"Yes", he told me, "you've got a nephew who must be going on for four. Don't you feel old?"

But I would only spend a short time and then I would be looking around for a pretext to get away. On getting home, I used to feel nervous about what shameful act my mother might suspect me of. I would take my books out and say, "I'm going to study next door", and she never even asked me any questions, she would scarcely move her head, at times not even that.
Informant 10 Text 2

I was at Sáenz Peña, and when I left, I would make my way back to Bella Vista on foot. Sometimes I would meet Higueras, who was a friend of my brother, Perico, before he was drafted into the Army.

Higueras would always ask me "Have you heard from him?"

"No, since they sent him to the jungle, he hasn’t written" I’d reply.

"Where are you rushing off to? Come and chat for a while," he’d say.

I really wanted to get back to Bella Vista as soon as I could, but Higueras, being older than me, was really doing me a favour by treating me as an equal, as if I were the same age as he.

He would take me to an inn and say "What would you like to drink?"

"I don’t know, anything; whatever you’re having" I’d say.

"Alright" Skinny Higueras would say, then to the waiter he’d call out: "Two shots, my old china!"

Then he’d slap me on the back and say "Careful you don’t get drunk!"

The pisco would burn my throat and bring tears to my eyes.

He’d say, "Suck on a piece of lemon, it’s smoother that way; and have a cigarette".

We’d talk about soccer, school, and about my brother.

He told me a lot about Perico, who’d I’d always thought was peace-loving, but it turns out he was a bit of a goer, like a fighting cock!

One night, apparently, he got into a knife fight over a woman!

Not only that, but it seems he was a bit of a Romeo as well!

When Higueras told me that he’d got a girl pregnant and nearly had a "shotgun wedding", I was speechless.

"Yes", said Higueras, "you have a nephew who would be about four years old; how old does that make you feel?"

But I only found his stories entertaining for a while, then I’d look for an excuse to get away.

Once I got home, I’d feel nervous.

What if my mother were to suspect anything of the sort?

How shameful that would be!

I’d get out my books and say "I’m going next door to study", and she wouldn’t even answer me; she’d hardly even move her head in acknowledgment; sometimes she wouldn’t even do that.
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