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ABSTRACT

Translation is a way of communicating meaning from one language into another. In this bidirectional communicating tool, the translators should be aware of the two languages and also should have good command of them so as to be able to convey accurate meaning as natural as possible. For this to occur the translators should take different issues into considerations such as linguistic and cultural ones especially when the two languages are not close to each other. Thus, the purpose of the present article was to identify the most frequent shifts of coordinate and correlative conjunctions in translations from English to Persian. To reach this aim, four original English texts and their Persian translations were selected and all cases of English coordinate and correlative conjunctions identified and then compared with their Persian equivalents. The findings indicated that the most frequent strategy applied in the translation of coordinate conjunctions was equivalent substitution, and for correlative conjunctions, unit shifts and equivalents substitution were the most frequent used strategies.
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1. Introduction

Translation has different meanings. According to Munday (2001) it can refer to the general subject field, the act of producing a translation, or the text that has been translated. Translating from one language into another isn’t an easy task and translators should have good command of both source and target languages. English and Persian languages are syntactically different from one another. Therefore, when translators aim to translate a text from English to Persian, they should take the differences into account so that the translated text is understandable and meaningful to the Target Language (TL) readership. Coordinate and correlative conjunctions are among devices which connect sentences, and clauses to each other and make the text cohesive and comprehensible. The purpose of the present research was to consider shifts that occur in coordinate and correlative conjunctions in the process of translating an English text into Persian. Catford (1965/2000) identified formal correspondence and textual equivalence and argued that a formal correspondent is “any Target Language (TL) category (class, unit, element of structure, etc.) which can be said to occupy, as nearly as possible, the same place in the economy of the TL as the given Source Language (SL) category occupies in the SL.” (p.27) In connection with a textually equivalent text, he argued that it is any TL text which can be said to be the equivalent of a given SL text.

In Catford’s (1965/2000) estimation any type of departure from formal correspondence in the process of translation from SL to TL creates translational shifts. He identified two kinds of shifts: (a) level shift, (b) category shift. Level shifts occur when something is expressed by grammar in one language can be produced by lex in another language. Catford (1965/2000)
further divided category shifts into the following four subdivisions: (a) structural shifts, which are the most frequent shifts and include any changes in the grammatical structure of SL when translated into TL; (b) class shifts which occur when in the process of translation one part of speech changes into another one; (c) unit or rank shifts which occur when during translation from SL to TL, one unit is turned into another one; and finally (d) intra-system shifts which are related to cases where SL and TL have the same system but in the act of translation translators utilize non-corresponding elements. This study has adopted Catford's classification of shifts aiming to investigate the shifts in coordinate and correlative conjunctions in translations from English to Persian.

1.1 Statement of the problem

When translating from one language into another, translators should have enough knowledge of the two involved languages so as to produce a natural and coherent translation which would be acceptable to the target readership. Therefore, during the translation process between two different languages translators should change the original text into the target text based on grammatical, lexical, and cultural aspects of the TL. Additionally, finding suitable strategies to adequately translate from SL to TL is predominantly important for translators and language learners. The present research focused on identifying how Persian translators practically translate English conjunctions into Persian. In other words, what practical strategies they apply when translating English conjunctions. Since English and Persian are grammatically different from each other, many problems may arise in the process of translating from English into Persian. One of these problems is the translation of coordinate and correlative conjunctions. Since they don’t have one-to-one correspondence in Persian and in some cases they have no equivalent at all, finding strategies to solve such issues are significantly important for translators and English students. Accordingly, this research sought an answer to the following question:

What are the most frequent strategies used by translators when translating English coordinate and correlative conjunctions into Persian?

As mentioned above, shifts are departures from formal correspondence occurred in the process of translation from one language into another. Therefore, having what was stated before, this study is based on Catford (1965/2000)’s theoretical framework of shifts.

2. Review of the Related Literature

Shifts are changes which occur during the process of translation from SL into TL. Conjunctions are words which connect sentences to each other and create coherent and natural texts. So, here, in this section shifts in conjunctions are considered from both theoretical and practical aspects.

2.1 Translation Quality Assessment

Different translation scholars studied the field of translation quality assessment and defined it differently. One of these outstanding figures is House. She (2001b) who studied translation quality assessment and identified three categories for it: (a) pre-linguistic studies which had subjective views about the quality of translations, (b) psycholinguistic studies which considered the quality of translation based on its effect on the TL receptors, and (c) source-text oriented studies which mentioned linguistic features for describing translation quality. Her model has taken the function of the text into account. House (2001a) mentioned that for a translation to be adequate in the TL the function of the SL text should be equivalent to that of the TL text. She further argued that two aspects of meaning including semantic and pragmatic ones should be preserved in the translation to have an adequate translation. In this regard, she identified two types of translations: (a) overt translation, and (b) covert translation. In the first one, the TT is overtly translated and it is visible that TT is a translated text, but in the latter, the translated text sounds natural as if it is an original text. House (2015) also argued that “in order to make qualitative assessment about a translation text (TT), TT must be compared with the source text’s (ST) textual profile which determines the norm against which the appropriateness of TT is judged” (p. 31).

2.2 Coordinate and correlative Conjunctions

Conjunctions are elements that are used to create a natural and comprehensible text. “Coordinating conjunctions are used to build coordinate structures, both phrases and clauses.” (Biber, Johansson, Leech, Conrad, Finegan, 1999, p.79). They also mentioned main coordinators as "and", "but", and "or", with the meaning of addition, contrast and alternative respectively. From Biber et al., (1999)'s perspective "but" does not have a wide
distribution like "and", and "or", and mainly connect clauses. "or" is used with its negative counterpart, "nor" and is applied after negative clauses. The more complex conjunctions are correlative conjunctions: both..., and, neither...,nor, not only...,but also, and either,... or. These correlative conjunctions also express the meaning of addition, alternative, or contrast (Biber, et al., 1999). They also mentioned some other terms which sometimes behave like coordinators. "so", "yet" and "neither" function like coordinators since they are fixed at the clause level and they also function like linking adverbial since they can easily combine with coordinators. In the case of but, it has other functions and can be used as a preposition, an adverb, and part of a complex subordinators:

As they put it there are significant differences in the use of coordinators in different registers. They conducted a corpus-based study and concluded that: And is used with the highest frequency in all registers; And is significantly used with more frequency in fiction and academic prose than in other registers such as news or conversation; But is another coordinate conjunction which is used most frequently in conversation and fiction, and has less frequency in academic register; Or is employed with more frequently in academic prose; And has a very different grammatical function, in conversation, for example, it has the role of clause-level connector, but in academic register it functions as a phrase-level connector. They also assert that the high frequency of but should be seen in conjunction with the high frequency of negatives in conversation. Since negation and contrast are closely related concepts, so the speaker can use But to modify a statement and addressee can use it to express a contrary opinion, refute a statement by the interlocutor, reject a suggestion, etc.(p. 82). According to the findings of Biber et al., (1999) all coordinators have low frequency in conversation except But. In connection with correlative conjunctions they argue that these coordinators are more common in written genre especially in academic register. Swan (2005) mentions that conjunctions connect sentences to each other and also show how meaning of clauses are connected to each other. Badalamenti and standchina (2000) also simply put that And, But, So, and Or connect complete sentences and are used to show addition, contrast, result and choice respectively. Coordinate and correlative conjunctions show different relationships between sentences such as negative, alternative, and additive; but correlative conjunction express emphasis. (Eyring and Frodesen, 2000). In Persian language also conjunctions are used to connect words or sentences to each other. Based on Roberts et al. (2009) the associative conjunctions in Persian are as follows: /ne, o/ “and”, /ja/ “or”, /ja ... ja/ “either... or”, /næ...næ/ ‘neither... nor’. Here, these conjunctions are the same as English ones in their functions and show connectivity between sentences.

2.3 Shifts in Translation

Catford (1965/2000) introduced the concept of shifts in translation studies and defined them as any changes which occur during the process of translation from SL into TL. After that other scholars develop this notion especially Van Leuven-Zwart (1989/1990). She introduced a model of shift analysis in translation. This model consisted of two parts: (a) a comparative model, and (b) a descriptive one. The first one considered microstructural shifts, i.e. sematic, syntactic, pragmatic, etc. shifts between ST and TT; the latter considered the effects of macrostructural shifts on the macro structural ones. In Van Leuven-Zwart (1990)’s model, word order change and cohesion are two cases where microstructural shifts are visible. So, Munday (1998) highlighted that “shift analysis is not directed at exposing translation errors or flaws, but is a means of getting at the norms which govern the translation process” (p.3).

This article aimed at considering shifts in conjunctions about which some researches have been conducted. Pesaran Sharif (1993) studied the application of shifts from English into Persian and vice versa during the translation process. He selected two English novels and their Persian translations. To identify the role of shifts he chose 30 students in TEFL at M.A. level to translate some parts of these two novels. Then, he compared their translations and concluded that the application of shifts was mostly based on their intuition and most translators made shifts intuitively. Another study was done by Karimpour Natanzi (2011). She considered explicitation devices employed by Persian translators in the translation of conjunctions in the Kite Runner novel. She studied one-third of this novel and compared it with its Persian equivalent to identify shifts in conjunctions. In the end, she concluded that the Persian translator...
had explicitated conjunctive relations in his translation and adopted two devices: (a) the addition of conjunctions, and (b) the replacing punctuation marks with conjunctions. Moradan (1995) also considered the role of conjunctions in student’s writing. He selected 60 students to identify whether students’ knowledge of conjunctions helps them to produce more coherent writing or not. To reach the goal of the study, he divided the students into two groups: experimental and control group. He provided formal instruction on conjunctions to the experimental group and at the end administered posttests to both groups. The results of his study indicated that student’s awareness of the form of conjunctions helped them to produce more coherent writing texts. Soltani Bajestani (2016) studied conjunctions in Khayyam’s Quatrains and their English translation. He found conjunctions in Persian text and compared them with their English translations and concluded that additive conjunctions were used with most frequency in English translation of Quatrains. Moini and Kheirkhah (2016) also considered conjunctions in children and regular literature. For this aim they studied children and regular literature and compared the use of conjunctions in these works. Finally, their study indicated that there is a significant difference between children and regular literature in the use of conjunctions.

3. Methodology

Regarding the method of the study, this research is a descriptive one in nature and uses quantitative analyses to calculate frequencies and percentage. As mentioned before, the purpose of the study was to identify the most frequent shifts in the translation of coordinating and correlative conjunctions from English to Persian. These conjunctions are classified based on Biber et al. (1999)’s categorization. To achieve this goal, the following books were chosen as the corpus of the study:

1. Animal Farm by George Orwell, translated by Saleh Hosseini & Massumeh Nabizadeh
2. The Little Prince by Antoine de Saint-Exupery, translated by Abolhasan Najafi
3. Everlasting Reflections by Gibran Khalil Gibran, translated by Massiha Barzegar
4. Gnostic Reflections by Gibran Khalil Gibran, translated by Massiha Barzegar

These books were studied chapter by chapter and all instances of coordinate and correlative conjunctions in both English and Persian texts were identified and then individually compared with their direct translations.

The objective of the study was to identify the most frequent shifts in coordinate and correlative conjunctions when translating from English to Persian. To reach this goal, the above-mentioned materials were studied and all cases of coordinate and correlative conjunctions were identified. Then, they were compared with their Persian versions to find the most frequent translational strategies which were applied in their translation from English to Persian language and they were categorized based on Catford’s shifts. In the end, the frequency and percentage of the translation strategies which were utilized by the translator were calculated.

4. Analysis and Discussion

To fulfill the aim of the study and provide an answer to its research question, in this section the results of the study are presented in the form of descriptive statistics displayed in tables and figures.

After analyzing the English texts chosen for the purpose of this study, the researcher found ‘one hundred’ coordinate conjunctions and ‘twenty-five’ correlative conjunctions. The details are displayed in table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coordinate conjunctions</th>
<th>Frequencies</th>
<th>Correlative conjunctions</th>
<th>Frequencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>And</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Not only…but also</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>But</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Neither…nor</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Or</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Either ……or</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yet</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Both ……..and</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the table 1, regarding coordinate conjunctions, “and” and “but” had the highest frequencies in the original corpus, and “or” and “so” had the lowest. As for correlative ones, “neither…..nor” had the highest frequency and “either… or” had the lowest.

In the next stage, the frequencies of translation strategies for conjunctions have been presented to identify shifts in their translations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Frequencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equivalent</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omission</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class shift</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on table 2, equivalent strategy had the highest frequency in the translated corpus. So, Persian translators used this strategy with most frequency when translating coordinate conjunctions. Omission strategy had the lowest frequency. Class shift was used with intermediate frequency. The objective of this research was to identify the most frequent shifts in the translation of coordinating and correlative conjunctions when translating from English to Persian. To reach this goal, the above-mentioned materials were studied and all cases of coordinate and correlative conjunctions were identified. Then, they were compared with their Persian versions to find the most frequent translational strategies which were applied in their translation from English to Persian language and they were categorized based on Catford’s shifts. In the end, the frequency and percentage of the translation strategies which were utilized by the translator were calculated.
strategy in most cases to convey meaning and may be the original style in the target language. Thus, the percentages are presented as follows:

Figure 1: Percentage of translation strategies for coordinate conjunction

As figure 2 shows 78% of coordinate conjunctions were translated without any shift (equivalent strategy), 14% were omitted, and 8% were translated using class shift.

Table 3 shows the frequencies of translation strategy for correlative conjunctions in the translated corpus.

Table 3: Frequencies of Translation Strategies for Correlatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Frequencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unit shift</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class shift</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equivalent</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omission</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on this figure, unit and class shifts have the highest frequencies. Figure below represent their percentage

Figure 2: Percentage of translation strategies for correlative conjunction.

According to figure 2, as for correlative conjunctions, 36% were translated without any shift, 36% were translated using unit shift, 24% were translated using class shift, and 4% were omitted. So, based on these figures most coordinate conjunctions were translated into their Persian versions, and in the case of correlative conjunction unit shift and equivalent translation showed the highest percentage (36%); this may be because of the following reasons: (a) Persian translators wanted to present natural and communicative translation for their readership, or (b) they might have wanted to preserve English style in their translations. (c) Persian language had the equivalents of these English conjunctions so the translators tried to convey them into their direct equivalent in Persian. So, it can be stated that the equivalents of English conjunctions exist in Persian, and these two languages have similarity in this case. However, using the equivalents of the conjunctions during the translation process is one of the many choices which translators can apply, other options may also be used by different translators depending on the text types, purpose of the translation and the readerships. The results of this study is in agreement with that of other studying considering shifts in conjunctions, especially the one conducted by Karimpour (2011). Based on what was stated earlier regarding shifts, translation strategies which were employed by the Persian translators were as follows:

(1) Equivalent (literal translation): any element in the SL has the formal equivalent element in the TL. So, there is not any shifts in the translation of such elements.

(2) Omission: the SL element is omitted in the TL.

(3) Unit shifts: Catford (1965/2000) mentioned that when the equivalent of one unit (a phrase, or clause, a word, etc.) in the TL is at the different rank to the SL.

(4) Class shift: this kind of shift occurs when linguistic category of a word changes in the process of translation from SL into TL. These are based on Catford’s shifts and Baker’s strategies for sorting out problems of translations at the word and above word level.

5. Conclusion

As was stated earlier, the purpose of the study was to find the most frequent strategy in the shift of coordinate and correlative conjunction from English to Persian. After data collection and data analysis, it was identified that the most frequent strategies which were applied by the Persian translators in the translation of English coordinate and correlative conjunction were equivalent or literal translation and unit shift respectively. So, based on the findings of the study when dealing with coordinate and correlative conjunction, it is estimated that in most cases there is correspondence between these two languages and hence, for the most part equivalent as a translation strategy is used in translating conjunctions from English into Persian. This research covered conjunctions both coordinate and correlative ones, and their Persian translations. It is hoped that this study
practically be helpful for the translators, especially those who deal with conjunctions, for English teachers, and for students of English. It also provides useful strategies for translations of conjunctions from English into Persian.

References


Shifts in Coordinate and Correlative Conjunctions

Nahid Yarahmadzehi & Masoumeh Yazdani Moghadam

FOR Sentence

1. I saw my much forall. fig. it was becoming clear to me that the boundless of my land was extremely serious.
2. So shall I be the star of times fig. I was evidently sad.
3. Let the suns that is here, fig. it is very shining.
4. It has been and long time, fig. the song is remembered.
5. Come away, fig. I can become weary of time.
6. I said the love, fig. it was started in good.
7. If you long for much, fig. it is but another to the light in the days.
8. You shall surpass my thought, fig. it is to live in the houses.
9. Neither did I see a great magnificent was because the moon of the day.
10. To know the I, fig. magnificent are raised above in a religious according.

CORRELATIVE CONJUNCTION Sentences

1. There is neither refrigerate an fig. science beyond.
2. Neither he neither he, fig. it would not be the case.
3. The house he the house, fig. we are supposed to in a house.
4. I shall neither seen nor my eyes because great the sky had became small.
5. Neither magnificent was, fig. I am a dreamer.
6. I had present that you and desired are fig. you are neither more fine, fig. tree for fine.
7. I am would nothing lower it, fig. you could are the light of my soul.
8. I shall neither ride nor be greater.
9. You can neither good fig. could with me.
10. I say as never more we profile list henceforth.

Note: This text is a sample of the translations and shifts in coordinate and correlative conjunctions as discussed in the article by Nahid Yarahmadzehi & Masoumeh Yazdani Moghadam.