

Contrastive Analysis of Cohesive Devices in English Source, Korean Target and Comparable Korean Texts

Kirk, Sung Hee
(Sookmyung Women's University)

1. Introduction

Translation could be defined as a textual process. Text has distinct features which differentiates it from non-text. These distinct features constitute standards of textuality, and when these standards are violated, the text sounds unnatural and foreign. Cohesion is one of the standards of textuality: it is mainly concerned with mutual connectivity of items in the surface structure of a text.

Every language has its own set of cohesive devices and preferred means for creating cohesive harmony (Hasan 1985). As a result, shifts in cohesion inevitably occur in translation. The objective of this study is to examine potential shifts in cohesion patterns between a set of English source texts and their Korean translations and to explore the nature of motivations behind these

shifts. Two types of shift are expected to occur: language-oriented cohesion shifts, motivated by systemic differences between the two languages; and translation-oriented cohesion shifts, caused by the translation process. Identification of language-oriented cohesion shifts presupposes the recognition of intrinsic cohesion differences between Korean and English. In the absence of comprehensive research documenting such differences, this study attempts to address the issue by comparing a number of original (i.e. non-translated) English source texts and a number of original Korean comparable texts.¹⁾

This study sets out to examine a number of hypotheses. The main hypothesis is that there are shifts in cohesion patterns between English source texts and their translated Korean texts. These hypothesized shifts may be motivated by:

- intrinsic linguistic differences between English and Korean and translators' attempt to abide by the target language textual norms and expectations
- the nature of the translation process.

It has been observed by many translation scholars that translated texts tend to exhibit a range of characteristics which set them apart from their source texts as well as texts originally written in the target language, irrespective of the language pair involved and the direction of translation. Identification of these special features across a variety of corpora, it is argued, may help us establish 'laws' of translation behaviour, the identification of which Toury argues is the ultimate aim of translation theory (1995: 259-279). Toury defines 'laws' as theoretical formulations purporting to state the relations between all variables which have been found relevant to a particular domain (ibid:259). They have the following general form:

1) Korean comparable texts are texts originally written in Korean within the same genre and time span as the Korean translations used in this study.

If X, then the greater/the lesser the likelihood that Y (ibid:265).

Toury discusses two exemplary laws (ibid:267; 279): (a) the law of growing standardization; and (b) the law of interference. The law of growing standardization states that in translation, textual relations obtaining in the original are often modified, sometimes to the point of being totally ignored, in favour of [more] habitual options offered by a target repertoire (ibid:268). In other words, special textual components of the source text, i.e. textemes, tend to be replaced by prevalent institutionalised conventional items from the target culture repertoire, i.e. repertoremes. The law of interference, on the other hand, states that in translation, phenomena pertaining to the make-up of the source text tend to be transferred to the target text (ibid:275). According to Toury, there are two types of transfer: negative and positive. Negative transfer occurs when the translated text contains deviations from normal, codified practices of the target system, while positive transfer occurs when the translated text contains features which do exist in and are used by the target culture (ibid:275). Toury states that while interference itself is a universal feature and represents the external manifestation of a general cognitive law, tolerance of it depends on socio-cultural conditions. As he puts it, tolerance of interference and hence the endurance of its manifestations tend to increase when translation is carried out from a 'major' or highly prestigious language/culture, especially if the target language/culture is 'minor', or 'weak' in any other sense (ibid:278).²⁾ In addition to the Toury's two laws, there is a range of features deemed typical of translated texts which have been observed by other translation scholars. Most notable among these are: (a) explicitation; and (b) the tendency to avoid repetitions. Blum-Kulka (1986:21) notes the possibility of explicitation being a universal strategy inherent in all processes of language mediation,

2) A discussion of weaknesses in Toury's formulation, including his problematic characterisation of languages and cultures as 'minor' or 'weak', fall outside the scope of this study.

including translation. This tendency to explicitate in translated texts is also noted by Baker (1993) and Klaudy (1996). Baker states that a marked rise in the level of explicitness is one of the universal characteristics of translated texts (1993:243-4). Klaudy analysed original Hungarian texts, their English translations, and their back-translations into Hungarian and concluded that explicitations introduced in the translated English text tend to be preserved in the back-translation and that the tendency for explicitation may be stronger than the tendency for implicitation (1996:99-114). Another posited universal feature of translated texts is the tendency to avoid repetitions. Toury (1991:188) states that one of the most persistent, unbending norms in translation in all languages studied so far is that of *avoiding repetitions*. Baker (1993:244) also lists this as one of the main translation universals.

The secondary hypothesis in this study is that translated Korean texts display patterns of cohesion which are different from those evidenced in a comparable collection of non-translated Korean texts. These patterns may be motivated by the translation process (rather than intrinsic systemic differences between English and Korean) and may be explainable in terms of the various laws and 'universal' features described in the literature, including source language interference and the tendency towards explicitation. This hypothesis is in line with the position adopted by several translation scholars (e.g. Blum-Kulka 1986, Toury 1995, Baker 1993, Olohan and Baker 2000), who note that translated texts display features which are different from both their source texts and comparable texts in the target language. More specifically, Blum-Kulka (1986:33) notes the possibility of that cohesive patterns in the translated texts are neither target language nor source language norms oriented, but form a system of their own.

2. Analytical Tool

A new cohesion model which is used as the analytical tool in this study is developed building on the cohesion model of Halliday and Hasan (1976) and Halliday & Hasan (1989 [1985]).³⁾ This model tries to accommodate linguistic features of Korean as well as English and the aim of this study: to compare and analyze variances and changes in patterns of cohesion between a set of English source and their Korean target texts; and to isolate the motivations behind them.

The basic unit of analysis is the lexical unit, which includes idioms, phrasal verbs, phrasal compounds, single lexical co-referential units as well as single words. Conjunctions and non-content words such as auxiliaries, negatives and certain articles are excluded from the analysis. Since cohesion is a notion which is developed primarily to explain the relationship between sentences, cohesive links occurring only within a single sentence are not counted. On the other hand, cohesive links that occur both within and across sentences, i.e. intrasentential as well as intersentential cohesive links, are counted. In addition, only *text-forming* cohesive links are included.⁴⁾

Text 1 below is an excerpt from *Costume Drama*, one of the pieces of data analysed in this study. It is an article in *Vogue* about the process of costume designing in the movie *Moulin Rouge*, directed by Baz Luhrman (numbering added).

3) It is assumed that the readers of this paper are familiar with the cohesion models of Halliday & Hasan (1976) and Halliday & Hasan (1989 [1985]). For detailed explanation of the model, refer to Halliday & Hasan (1976) and Halliday & Hasan (1989).

4) Hoey (1991) proposes two kinds of repetition: *text-forming* repetition and *chance* repetition. The decision as to which category a repetition belongs depends on the existence of common reference and context.

Text 1

0. Costume Drama

With *Moulin Rouge* as their inspiration, Nicole Kidman and fashion's brightest talents come together for a good cause

1. April 2000: Nicole Kidman is on the set of *Moulin Rouge*, the Baz Luhrmann movie-musical extravaganza, wearing an exaggerated costume that involves a corset and a bustle made of pink ostrich feathers. 2. How odd! she says, laughing, as she sits down to talk. [...] 8. The first time I saw myself in this costume from behind on the video monitor, I said to Baz, I look like a huge pink bird. 9. Is that OK? 10. And hes like, Yes, of course! 11. The exquisitely decadent costumes in *Moulin Rouge* were inspired by everything from cancan girls to Madonnas Jean Paul Gaultier period.

12. So in the spirit of inspiration—from fashion to costume and back again—*Vogue* commissioned Oscar de la Renta, Helmut Lang, Donatella Versace, Manolo Blahnik, Dolce & Gabbana, Karl Lagerfeld for Chanel, John Galliano for Christian Dior, and Nicolas Ghesquiere for Balenciaga to design dresses (and one pair of boots) with Luhrmanns *Moulin Rouge* as their source. [...]

Cohesive links can be divided into two categories: *general lexical links* and *text-and-reader-bound links*. Cohesive relations that form *general lexical links* are lexical units that generally form relations regardless of their textual situation, such as identical words, synonyms and antonyms.⁵⁾

5) What is meant by the general formation of cohesive links is that the two lexical units are considered to form a relationship of synonymy, antonymy, hyponymy, meronymy, etc in the dictionary sense. Of course these relations perceived to exist

Cohesive relations that form *text-and-reader bound links* are those confined to the text, for example, 'Nicole Kidman' and 'she' in sentences one and two in text 1 above, or links relying on readers' world knowledge, for example 'Margaret Thatcher' and 'the iron lady'.

2.1 General Lexical Links

General lexical links are categorized into two parts: *same unit repetition* and *different unit repetition*. Cohesion links under *different unit repetition* include *synonymy*, *antonymy*, *hyponymy*, *meronymy*, *co-class*, *extension* and *compound*. Each category under general lexical repetition is further broken down to *simple* and *derived*. Simple repetition involves the reiteration of the same word with possible inflectional differences while derived repetition involves words with derivational differences. Inflectional differences refer to all those possible changes in the lexical unit that produce syntactically motivated variants of the same lexeme. Examples of inflectional changes in English are number differences (singular and plural distinction), the usual verb form differences, declension differences (whose, whom, who) and comparative forms. Examples of inflectional change is: 'costume' and 'costumes' in sentences zero and eight in text 1. Derivational difference refers to all those possible changes when the root morpheme remains identical, but a derivation affix (including zero affixes) is added, which typically (though not necessarily) includes a change in the syntactic category of the lexical item. 'Inspiration' in the title and 'inspired' in sentence eleven of text 1 would be one such example.

2.2 Text and Reader Bound Links

Text and Reader Bound Links (TR) are cohesive links that are instantial to

in the dictionary sense may not apply to specific texts since the final decision depends on the meaning in the text.

the text. There are two subcategories: *Instantial Lexical Cohesion* (ILC) and *Grammatical Cohesion* (GC). Instantial Lexical Cohesion is a relationship of lexical co-reference. There are two kinds of instantial lexical cohesion: one relies on the reader's knowledge of the world, as in 'Tony Blair' and 'the Prime Minister of the U.K.'; the other is provided in the text as in 'fashion's brightest talents' in the title and 'Oscar de la Renta, Helmut Lang, [...] and Nicolas Ghesquiere for Balenciaga' in sentence twelve of text 1 above.

Grammatical Cohesion in the taxonomy used in this paper includes most of the items included in Halliday & Hasan (1989) with the exception of *ellipsis*.⁶⁾ *Reference* occurs when the text user can find the identity of an item by referring to another as in 'Nicole Kidman' in sentence one and 'she' in sentence two in text 1. *Substitution* happens when one item is replaced by another. Both *reference* and *substitution* occur at word level (GCW) and above word level (GCP). GCW is when a single lexical unit is referenced or substituted. A relationship of GCP happens when more than one lexical unit is referenced. 'That' in sentence nine in text 1 refers to the quotation in sentence eight 'I look like a huge pink bird.' This is a good example of GCP. This method of analysis is summarized in Table 1 below.

3. Data

In this study, five English articles from *Newsweek*, *Popular Science*⁷⁾, and *Vogue*⁸⁾ and their Korean translations are analyzed. Two are from *Newsweek*,

6) Ellipsis is excluded because it is not a surface structure.

7) *Popular Science* is a monthly magazine published by Time4 Media Company, a subsidiary of AOL Time Warner. *Popular Science Korea* is published by *Hankookilbo*, one of the four leading daily newspapers in Korea. The first issue was published in June, 2000.

8) *Vogue* was first published in 1892 in New York. *Vogue Korea* is the 10th overseas edition following *Vogue* U.K., France, Germany, Spain, Australia, Brazil, Mexico, Singapore, and Canada.

Table 1 Types of Cohesive Devices

		Types		ABR
General Lexical Link [GL]	Same Unit Repetition [SUR]	simple [TSR]	whole	SWR
			partial	SPR
			abbreviation	SAR
			derived	DSR
	Different Unit Repetition [DUR]	synonymy [TSN]	simple	SSN
			derived	DSN
		antonymy	simple	SAN
			derived	DAB
		hyponymy	simple	SHN
			derived	PHN
		meronymy	simple	DHN
			derived	SMR
		co-class	simple	DMR
			derived	SCC
		extension	simple	PCC
			derived	DCC
		compound	simple	SXT
derived			HXT	
		simple	DXT	
		derived	SCP	
		derived	DCP	
Text and Reader Bound Link [TR]	Instantial Lexical Cohesion	lexical co-reference		LCR
	Grammatical Cohesion	reference	Word Level	GCW
			Above Word Level	GCP
		substitution	Word Level	GCW
			Above Word Level	GCP

two are from *Popular Science* and one is from *Vogue*. For Korean comparable texts, three articles from *The Musical*⁹⁾, *Sisapress* [*Sisa Cene*]¹⁰⁾, and *Economist* [*Ikhnomisuthu*]¹¹⁾ are examined.

9) The English name used by the publisher is used throughout this study with the romanized Korean name in brackets when first introduced.
 10) *Sisapress*, which was first published in October 1988, is one of the leading weekly news magazines in Korea with the largest circulation and subscription.

Because the hypotheses of this study relate to the whole text, it was deemed important to analyze the entire text. In order to make the data analyses more manageable, texts below sixty sentences are selected. In addition, the data are selected from well-known published texts, under the assumption that published texts better represent the current state of translated or original texts in Korea. The best candidate for these two requirements turned out to be magazine articles. With the aim of securing less biased research, articles from three magazines covering different subject areas are chosen.

4. Procedures of Analysis

As explained above, five English sources, five Korean targets, and three Korean comparable texts are analyzed. At the first stage of analyses, the data are analyzed individually. Then comparisons are made between the source and the target pair and the results are combined and compared collectively. In an attempt to explore motivations behind shifts (or lack thereof) in patterns of cohesion between source and target texts, the figures of Korean comparable texts are combined and averages are calculated for various figures and compared with those from source and target texts.

In the first step of the analyses, cohesive devices are identified and categorized according to the analytical schema outlined in table 1 above. Then, a table of cohesive chains is prepared for each lexical unit that generates cohesive chains. For each cohesive chain, the base unit is chosen. It is usually the lexical unit which has the highest number of repetitions. When there are two or more candidates with the same number of repetitions, a noun is chosen as the base unit. When there are two or more nouns with the same number of repetitions, the first noun appearing in the text is chosen. When the base unit appears for the first time in the text, it is marked with underline as 'costume'

11) This magazine is one of the leading weekly business magazines in Korea and also affiliated with *JoongAng Daily*. It bears no relation to the well known British magazine *Economist*.

in sentence 0 in Table 2 below. When it appears for the second time, it is marked with 1 because this is the first cohesive link. In example below, there are ten SWRs, four SSNs, five SHNs, one LCR, and four GCWs in the cohesive chain for 'costume'. Therefore the total number of cohesive links for the lexical unit 'costume' is 24.

Table 2 Sample Table of Cohesive Chain: 'COSTUME'

costume							
SN	SWR	SSN1	SSN2	SHN1	SHN2	LCR	GCW
0	costume						
1	costume 1						
[...]							
12	costume 4	dresses 1					
13	costume 5	dresses 2					
[...]							
26			clothes 1				
[...]							
31		dress 3					them 2 one 3
[...]							
ST	10	3	1	4	1	1	4
T	24						

By summarizing the table of cohesive chains for the entire text, a summary list of cohesive chains is drawn as in tables 3 below.

Table 3 Summary List of Cohesive Chains: *Costume Drama SOURCE*

SOURCE		SUR	DUR	LCR	GCW	GCP	TCL
	Number	112	35	8	73	6	234
	%TCL	47.9	15.0	3.4	1.2	2.6	100.0
		GL		TR			Total
	Number	147		87			234
	%TCL	62.8%		37.2%			100.0%

Comparisons are then made between the source and target pair and the results are compared for each pair and collectively across the whole set of source and target texts. In the next step of the analysis, the results of analysis of individual Korean comparable texts are combined and averages are calculated for various figures and then compared with the results from source and target texts.

5. Findings

The comparison of different kinds of cohesive device shows that there are differences between the original English texts and the original Korean texts in terms of percentages of different kinds of cohesive device in relation to **the total number of cohesive links in cohesive chains (TCL)**. The figures for the different kinds of cohesive device for translated Korean texts fall somewhere between source and target texts for most categories.

One of the salient features of the three types of text under examination concerns differences in the percentage of general lexical links and text-and-reader-bound links to the total number of cohesive links in cohesive chains. The average percentages of **general lexical links** to the total number of cohesive links in cohesive chains are 76.3 for source texts, 87.0 for target texts, and 93.2 for Korean comparable texts. The fact that the figure for target texts lies somewhere between those of the source and comparable texts suggests that both source text interference and the tendency of translators to normalize or standardize by adapting to the norms of the target language/culture (see Toury 1995:267-295; Baker 1993:243-245) offer plausible explanations for these documented differences.

There are two sub-categories under general lexical links: same unit repetition and different unit repetition. While the average percentage for **same unit repetition** in target texts again falls between those of source and comparable texts, the average percentage for **different unit repetition** is highest in target texts. This may be explained in terms of the documented

tendency of translated texts to avoid repetitions (Toury 1991; Baker 1993). Toury states that one of the most prevalent ways of reducing the number of repetitions in translation is to replace them with other items, most notably near-synonymous ones (ibid:188).

The average percentages of **text-and-reader-bound links** to the total number of cohesive links in cohesive chains are as follows: 23.7 percent for source texts, 13.0 percent for target texts, and 7.1 percent for comparable texts. If these figures are set against the average percentages of different kinds of cohesive links to the total number of cohesive links in cohesive chains in the source and comparable texts (23.7 percent and 7.1 percent respectively), it becomes clear that the average percentage of text-and-reader-bound links of the English source texts is much higher than that of Korean comparable texts.

As explained in 2. Analytical Tool, there are three sub-categories in text-and-reader-bound links: lexical co-reference, grammatical cohesion at word level, and grammatical cohesion above word level. Examination of the figures for each of these categories reveals that the substantial difference between the source and comparable texts in relation to text-and-reader-bound links is mainly attributable to difference in percentages of **grammatical cohesion at word level**: 19.3 percent for source texts and 2.8 percent for target comparable texts. This is worth examining more closely.

There are two kinds of grammatical cohesion at word level: reference and substitution, reference being the far more frequent form of grammatical cohesion at word level. In both English and Korean, there are items which have the property of reference. Personal pronouns 'he', 'she', 'it' in English and 'ku [he]', 'ku nye [she]' in Korean are good examples. But the use of pro-forms is much less frequent in Korean than in English. This is partly because in Korean, the use of pro-forms is optional. As a result, there are cases where repetition of the antecedent is more natural than the use of pro-forms (Suh 1996:772-3).¹²⁾ In addition, it is not compulsory to have an explicit surface subject, object, or predicate in a Korean sentence, and reference items are

often omitted when the omitted item is clear from the context. Suh (ibid:772) explains that "the second characteristic of Korean pro-forms is omission, especially when the antecedent is not far from the pro-form and when the meaning is clear from the context" (ibid:772). What then are the guidelines for choosing between reiteration and omission of referenced items in Korean texts? Kim (1992) states that *chocem* (hereinafter focus) elements cannot be omitted while *hwankyeng* (hereinafter circumstance) elements can, and often are, omitted. Let's look at example 1 below.¹³⁾

Example 1

영수가 영화를 때렸다. [Yeng Swu hit Yeng Huy.]

The information value of the above sentence is determined when the particular situation is defined. The following are possible situations.

(1) A: What happened?

B: 영수가 영화를 때렸어. [Yeng Swu hit Yeng Huy.]

(2) A: What did Yeng Swu do?

B: (영수가) 영화를 때렸어. [(Yeng Swu) hit Yeng Huy.]

(3) A: Who hit Yeng Huy?

B: 영수가 (영화를) 때렸어/ 영수요. [Yeng Swu hit (Yeng Huy)/ Yeng Swu]

(4) A: Whom did Yeng Swu hit?

B: (영수가) 영화를 때렸어./영회요. [(Yeng Swu) hit Yeng Huy./ Yeng Huy]

Each item of information in parenthesis in the above example is *circumstance* and can and often is omitted, while each underlined item of information is *focus* and cannot be omitted. As is evident from the above examples, the decision as to which item is to be treated as focus depends on the situation.

The average percentage of grammatical cohesion at word level to the total

12) Translations of Korean texts into English in this study are mine unless otherwise specified.

13) Example from Kim (1992:193).

number of cohesive links in cohesive chains in target texts falls between those of source and comparable texts, i.e. 9.3 percent. From this, we might speculate that translators try to abide by target text textual norms with respect to the frequency of grammatical cohesion at word level, but there are still traces of source text interference here. The situation is somewhat different, however, for **grammatical cohesion above word level**. The average percentage for grammatical cohesion above word level is 2.5 percent for source texts, compared to 3.5 percent for comparable texts. We might then tentatively conclude that texts originally written in Korean tend to use a higher percentage of grammatical cohesion above word level than English texts. On the other hand, the average percentage of grammatical cohesion above word level is lower in the target than in the source texts, and much lower than in the comparable texts. Since the percentages of both grammatical cohesion at word level and grammatical cohesion above word level are reduced approximately by fifty percent in target texts, i.e. from 19.3 percent to 9.3 percent for grammatical cohesion at word level and from 2.5 percent to 1.2 percent for grammatical cohesion above word level, we may entertain the possibility that translators do not recognize differences in the frequency of use of grammatical cohesion at word level and grammatical cohesion above word level in Korean texts. Table 4 shows average percentages of each kind of cohesive device to the total number of cohesive links in cohesive chains (TCL) in English source, Korean target, and Korean comparable texts.

Table 4 Comparison of Percentage of Different Kinds of Cohesive Links to TCL: Source Text Mean-Target Text Mean-Comparable Text Mean

%TCL	SUR	DUR	GL	LCR	GCW	GCP	TR
Source Mean	57.2%	19.1%	76.3%	2.0%	19.3%	2.5%	23.7%
Target Mean	62.9%	24.1%	87.0%	2.5%	9.3%	1.2%	13.0%
Comparable Mean	76.8%	16.1%	93.2%	0.8%	2.8%	3.5%	7.1%

5. Conclusion

The objective of this study was to examine potential shifts in cohesion patterns between a set of English source texts and their Korean translations and to explore the nature of motivations behind these shifts.

Chesterman states that "[a]ny rigorous academic discipline progresses by way of hypotheses: first discovering and proposing them, then testing them, then refining them (2000:21). According to him, there are four standard kinds of hypotheses, namely interpretive, descriptive, explanatory and predictive. He further states that "among the three basic models used in translation studies (comparative, process and causal model), the causal model is the most fruitful model because only this model can accommodate all four types of hypotheses" (ibid:15-27).

This study adopted a causal model in that it attempted to explore the nature of motivations behind cohesion pattern shifts of translated texts translated from English into Korean. Two types of shifts were expected to occur: language-oriented cohesion shifts, motivated by systemic differences between the two languages, and translation-oriented cohesion shifts, caused by the nature of the translation process.

Stoddard states in the preface of *Text and Texture: Patterns of Cohesion*, that when she asked her students to draw the wine bottle on the desk in front of her freshmen composition students, they all ended up drawing a bottle from the same angle. None of her students, like the many students before them, used his or her power to imagine the bottle from a different angle. The point of her lesson is as follows: "Until we have exhausted all the perspectives from which we can view phenomena in our world, we will not understand what those phenomena are all about" (1991:xiii) Thus viewing the same phenomenon from different angles helps us understand its nature. In the case of this study, the phenomenon under investigation is cohesion pattern shifts in Korean target texts translated from English source texts. The two types of shifts proposed here, i.e. language-oriented cohesion shifts and translation-oriented cohesion

shifts, are like two different views of the same phenomenon observed from two different angles. Figure 1 below shows pictures of a juice can taken from two different angles, one from the top, and the other from the side.

Figure 1 Two Different Images of the Same Can



View from Top



View from Side

Just as the same object observed from different angles displays different shapes, explanations of cohesion pattern shifts in English-Korean translations observed from different angles can appear quite different. In other words, both the intrinsic linguistic differences and shifts motivated by the translation process can explain the changes documented in the same phenomenon at the same time. For example, the analysis revealed that the percentages of grammatical cohesion at word level to TCL in target texts are in between those of source and comparable texts. Looking from the "intrinsic linguistic difference" angle, this phenomenon can be said to be motivated by nature of the English and Korean linguistic systems: given that the percentages of grammatical cohesion at world level to TCL in English source and Korean comparable texts are 19.3 percent and 2.8 percent respectively, it is reasonable

to conclude, at least on the basis of the data used in this study, that English and Korean behave very differently in this respect and consequently explain the percentages observed in translated Korean texts in systemic terms. At the same time, looking from the "translation process" angle can suggest that this phenomenon is a consequence of source text interference since the percentages of grammatical cohesion at word level to TCL are higher in target texts than in comparable Korean texts.

Toury argues that documenting special features of translated texts across a variety of corpora may help us establish 'laws' of translation behaviour, the identification of which is the ultimate aim of translation theory (1995: 259-279). As explained earlier, Toury defines 'laws' as "theoretical formulations purporting to state the relations between all variables which have been found relevant to a particular domain" (ibid:259). Of the two exemplary laws he observed, i.e. the law of growing standardization and the law of interference (ibid:267-279), the latter accounts for the claim made here that Korean target texts translated from English source texts exhibit traces of interference. In addition to Toury's two laws, there is a range of features deemed typical of translated texts. One of them is the tendency to avoid repetitions (Toury 1991:188, Baker 1993:244). This feature is also found in translated texts translated from English into Korean. Thus the findings of this study provide evidence for both interference and avoidance of repetition as two of the potential universal features of translated texts.

References¹⁴⁾

Baker, Mona. 1993. 'Corpus Linguistics and Translation Studies', in Mona

14) For the names of Korean authors, Yale romanization method is used. When the Korean author's usual romanization is known, that romanization is used with Yale romanization in brackets ([]).

- Baker, Gill Grancis and Elena Tognini-Bonelli (eds) *Text and Technology: In Honour of John Sinclair*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 233-150.
- Berber Sardinha, A.P. 1996. 'Patterns of lexis in original and translated business reports: textual differences and similarities', in Simms, K. (ed.) *Translating Sensitive Texts: Linguistic Aspects*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 147-153.
- Blum-Kulka, Shoshana. 1986. 'Shifts of Cohesion and Coherence in Translation', in Juliane House and Shoshana Blum-Kulka (eds) *Interlingual and Intercultural Communication: Discourse and Cognition in Translation and Second Language Acquisition Studies*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr, 17-35.
- Chesterman, Andrew. 2000. 'A Causal Model for Translation Studies', in Maeve Olohan (ed), *Intercultural Faultlines: Research Models in Translation Studies I Textual and Cognitive Aspects*. Manchester: St. Jerome, 15-28.
- Halliday, M.A.K. and Ruqaiya Hasan. 1976. *Cohesion in English*. London & New York: Longman.
- Halliday, M. A. K. Ruqaiya Hasan. 1989. *Language, Context, and Text: Aspects of Language in a Social-semiotic Perspective*. 2nd Edition, Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hasan, Ruqaiya. 1984a. 'Coherence and Cohesive Harmony', in James Flood (ed.) *Understanding Reading Comprehension: Cognition, Language, and the Structure of Prose*. Newark: International Reading Association, 181-219.
- Hasan, Ruqaiya. 1984b. 'What Kind of Resource is Language?', *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics* 7(1), 57-85.
- Kim, Mi Heyng. 1995. *Hankwuke daymyengsa*. Seoul: Hanshin.
- Klaudy, Kinga. 1996. 'Back-Translation as a Tool for Detecting Explicitation Strategies in Translation', in Kinga Klaudy, Jose Lambert, and Aniko Sohar (eds) *Translation Studies in Hungary*. Budapest : Scholastica, 99-114.
- Klaudy, Kinga & Krisztina Karoly. 2000. 'The Text-organizing Function of

- Lexical Repetition in Translation', in Maeve Olohan (ed.), *Intracultural Faultlines: Research Models in Translation Studies I Textual and Cognitive Aspects*. Manchester: St. Jerome, 143-157.
- Lottfipour-Saedi, K. 1997. 'Lexical cohesion and translation equivalence,' *META* 42 (1), pp. 185-192.
- Shlesinger, Miriam. 1995. 'Shifts in Cohesion in Simultaneous Interpreting', *The Translator* 1(2), 193-214.
- Sohn, Ho-Min. 1999. *The Korean Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Stoddard, Sally. 1991. *Text and Texture: Patterns of Cohesion*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corporation.
- Suh, Cheong-Soo. 1996. *Hyenday kwukemunpeplon*. Seoul: Hanyang University Press.
- Toury, Gideon. 1991. 'What are descriptive Studies into Translation Likely to Yield apart from isolated Description?' in Kitty M. van Leuven-Zwart and Ton Naaijken (eds) *Translation Studies: The State of the Art. Proceedings of the First James S. Holmes Symposium on Translation Studies*. Amsterdam and Atlanta: Rodopi, 179-192.
- Toury, Gideon, 1995. *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

K C I

[Abstract]

Contrastive Analysis of Cohesive Devices in English Source, Korean Target and Comparable Korean Texts

Kirk, Sung Hee
(Sookmyung Women's University)

Translation could be defined as a textual process. Text has distinct features that differentiate it from the non-text. These distinct features constitute standards of textuality, and when these standards are violated, the text sounds unnatural and foreign. Cohesion is one of the standards of textuality; it is mainly concerned with mutual connectivity of the items in the surface structure of a text.

Every language has its own set of cohesive devices and preferred means for creating cohesive harmony (Hasan 1989). As a result, shifts in cohesion can and do occur in translation. The objective of this study is to examine shifts in the cohesion patterns between a set of English source texts and their Korean translations and to explore the nature of the motivations behind these shifts. Two types of shifts might occur at this level: language-oriented cohesion shifts, motivated by systemic differences between the two languages; and translation-oriented cohesion shifts caused by the translation process. Identification of language-oriented cohesion shifts presupposes the recognition of intrinsic cohesion differences between Korean and English. This will be attempted by comparing the original English (source) and the original Korean (comparable) texts. After identifying the intrinsic linguistic differences between the two languages, Korean target and comparable texts are compared to identify the differences between the original and the translated texts. The data

collected consist of five articles from *Newsweek*, *Popular Science* and *Vogue* and their published Korean translations. In addition, three Korean articles are chosen as comparable texts from *The Musical*, *Sisa Press* [*Sisa CeneI*] and *Economist* [*Ikonomisuthu*].

The analysis reveals that there are differences between the original English texts and the original English and Korean texts in terms of the percentages of different kinds of cohesive devices in relation to the total number of cohesive links in cohesive chains (TCL). The figures for the different kinds of cohesive devices for translated Korean texts fall somewhere between the source and target texts in most categories.

►Key Words: cohesion, cohesive chains, types of cohesive device, translation, translation shifts

K C I