

## The Cohesiveness of Personal Reference in Translation: A Case Study of French and English

Mohamed Abdou Moindjie\*

School of Languages, Literacies and Translation, Universiti Sains Malaysia, Malaysia

Corresponding Author: Mohamed Abdou Moindjie, E-mail: mohdmoindjie@usm.my

### ARTICLE INFO

#### Article history

Received: March 17, 2019

Accepted: May 21, 2019

Published: July 31, 2019

Volume: 8 Issue: 4

Advance access: June 2019

Conflicts of interest: None

Funding: None

### ABSTRACT

Personal reference is a co-hyponym of textual cohesion; it deals with the first, second and third persons singular or plural; it can occur exophorically, or endophorically as anaphora or cataphora. The present paper is a descriptive study on the cohesiveness and translatability of personal reference; it describes its occurrence and cohesiveness in translating from French into English. In doing so, the analyses are done on literary texts, *Madame Bovary* and *Strait is the Gate*. The data related to personal reference are identified and collected throughout reading the whole texts under study; then the data are analyzed. The findings indicate that English language uses more cohesive personal reference than French language due to language peculiarities like abstractness, prolixity in French language; concreteness and conciseness in English language. The research reveals that some shifts which occur in translating personal reference from French into English are obligatory in that they are required by language peculiarities, whereas some shifts which are required by language norms are found to be under the translator's latitude. The cohesiveness of personal reference, therefore, depends on language peculiarities and language norms of both French and English, which are the determinants of the translation methods of personal reference in translating from French into English.

**Key words:** Cohesion, Personal Reference, Language Peculiarities, French Language Norms, English Language Norms, Translation Norms, Translation Procedure Determinants

### INTRODUCTION

The word coherence and its inflections, coherency, cohere, and coherent, are consistent with the French word, *cohérence* and its inflection: *cohérent*, derives from the Latin word *cohaeratia*. Moreover, the word cohesion and its inflections: cohesive, cohesively, cohesiveness derive from the French word *cohésion* which is derived also from the Latin word, *cohaesionem*.

Cohesion is, linguistically, the overt structure of coherence; both cohesion and coherence deal with discourses characterized by three features, semiologic, morphologic and phonologic aspects (Gutwinski, 1976: 52). Semologic features deal with meanings of signs and symbols of a language and how they can be used to convey appropriate meaning. Cohesion, therefore, deals with the lexicon itself. Morphologic features deal with grammar and syntax. Their function is to change the forms and combine them into sentences. However, phonologic features are features that examine patterns of sounds. Vinay and Darbelnet (1995) state that there are three features appropriate for a written language: the lexicon, the syntactic structure and the message. Like Vinay and Darbelnet (1995), Nida (1964: 34) mentions that logicians study meanings through three principle parts in determining meanings: semantics, syntactics and pragmatics.

In every feature of the above-mentioned characteristics of discourse, coherence and cohesion play a big role.

The main concern in this study is the semiological and grammatical features. They are semantically and linguistically interrelated in forming a text. This is proved by Halliday and Hasan's (1976) concept of cohesion. They believe that cohesive ties are semantic relations that play both surface structure and deep structure roles at the same time. That is, their surface construction reflects the underlying meaning of the whole texture.

However, the literature review on this aspect has shown that there is a gap of knowledge in that no research has been done to investigate and determine the language peculiarities, language norms, and translations norms, which determine the semantic relations of personal reference in translating French language into English language.

Owing to such a gap in the literature, the objectives of this paper are:

- i. to describe the cohesiveness of personal reference in translating from French into English;
- ii. to compare differences and similarities;
- iii. to describe language peculiarities, language norms, and translation norms.

This paper is intended to show translators, interpreters, and linguists how personal reference functions and how it

is handled in translation. The corpus of this investigation is composed of two novels written in prose. Being a literary genre, this corpus is considered to be convenient for this investigation because the literary genre embodies a high quality of coherent and cohesive aspects that can be reflective of all other genres.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

### Language Peculiarities and Norms

Peculiarity is the characteristic features that are unique to a language perception. French is intellectual, abstract, analytic and précised, prolix and parsimonious (Hajjar, 2002; Hechaïmé 2002). Unlike French, English language is more concrete and concise language (Vinay and Darbelnet, 1995).

Language norms are the options and strategies that a language offers whereas translations norms are the decisions taken by the translators in the use of the norms offered by the source language (SL) and the target language (TL). Toury (1995: 54) defines norms as “strategies of translation which are repeatedly opted for, in preference to other available strategies, in a given culture or textual system.” For Baker (1993:240), norms are aspects that influences translators’ decisions. But Hermans, (1991: 165) believes that “ norms... perform a channelling, funnelling role in that they refer problem tokens, i.e. individual utterances and occurrences, to problem types, to which a given norm can be applied.”

### Coherence and Cohesion

Coherence and cohesion are the pillars of a network of relations that make up a text. Unlike coherence which is “a network of conceptual relations which underlie the surface text” cohesion is “the network of surface relations which link words and expressions in a text.” To put it more clearly, since cohesion is the surface structure of coherence, cohesion must reflect an underlying conceptual relation; otherwise the mere linking of words, sentences and paragraphs with cohesive ties would create non-sense (Baker, 1992: 218). Lemire (2001) argues that the framework of organic relations in which words, phrases, sentences and propositions are arranged and interwoven, which assures coherence. He believes that the continuity of the text depends on its structure. It is like telling a story whose beginning, middle, and end is easily recognized. Thus, the semantic relations, within the lexico-grammatical framework, have to follow the above-mentioned logical order. Gutwinski (1976: 26-7) consider cohesion as the interrelatedness of sentences and clauses, which reflects the semiologic structure of a text, and coherence as the relationship of sentences within a paragraph that depends on a key sentence. However, Hoey (1991:12) points out that “cohesion is a property of the text”, whereas coherence depends on the reader evaluation.

Moreover, in the same vein, Swales (1990:189) states that cohesion is a *sine qua non* aspect of a text, and it is easily recognized throughout the text, whereas coherence depends on the reader. For Enkvist (1990) cohesion deals with surface signals that helps the reader to see the coherence of

a text. Other linguists consider that cohesion and coherence cannot be separated because they are interrelated. The former signals relations of participants, whereas the latter is a logical guidance for the reader to understand the text (Charolles, 1978; Bosch, 1989; Wales, 1998; Yunxing, 1996; and Baker, 1992/2011; Halliday, 1985).

However, Blum-Kulka (2000: 313) mentions that cohesive shifts can be considered in translation for grammatical and stylistic reasons specific for many languages. That is, cohesion is a text specific property. However, he emphasized the importance of handling properly coherence in translation. This is because shifts of coherence will affect seriously the potential meaning of the target text. These are reader- based shifts caused by different understandings of culturally different audiences and text-based shifts caused by an incompetent translator. Catford (1965: 73-82) says that there is no equivalence in cohesion as far as translation is concerned. The only solution is the use of shifts at the levels of grammar and lexis and vice-versa. There is another kind of shift known as category shift that embodies structure-shifts, class-shift, unit-shifts and intra-system shifts despite the fact that phonology and graphology defy translation.

### Halliday and Hasan’s Concept Personal Reference

Halliday and Hasan (1976) classify cohesion into grammatical, lexico-grammatical and lexical ties whose cohesive semantic relations play a big role in creating a meaningful text. Textually, cohesive ties are features which cohere the surface structures of the semantic relations. They are, therefore, non-structural. Cohesion is categorized into reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction, and lexical cohesion.

Reference is defined by Trask (1997) as “the relation between a noun phrase and the person or thing it picks out in the world.” For Halliday and Hasan(1976), reference is used similarly but in a more strict way. It does not show a direct relationship between the words and extralinguistic objects, reference is restricted to “identity relationship which holds between two linguistic expressions”. Textually, reference is used at the time that the reader feels necessary to get back the identity of a person or thing. This happens by referring to another in the context. Every language has its specific ways of using and understanding reference ties which can direct the reader to refer to other words in order to understand and interpret them. The most useful reference in English and in a lot of other languages is the pronoun which can refer to an entity mentioned before or after in the text. There are other pronouns that play the same role. These are “the, this, and those”, which are used to link expressions in a given text. Baker (1992: 190-196) mentions that reference behave according to language specificities and is more relevant with languages that have “number and gender distinctions in their pronoun system.”

Halliday and Hasan (1976), classifies reference into situational reference, exophora, and textual reference, endophora. An exophoric reference depends on the context; it refers to items that are context-bound. Unlike the exophora, the endophora refers to another item within the text *per se*. It is composed of anaphora which refers to an item back-

ward, and cataphora which refers to an item forward. They divide reference into three types: personal, demonstrative, and comparative.

Personal references are either personal pronouns like I, me, she, her, etc. or possessive adjectives/pronouns like my, mine, their, theirs, etc. These reference items refer “to something by specifying its function or role in the speech situation”. This kind of reference is named person not because it refers to a person but because it refers to a person or an object, whose function is relevant in the speech situation (Halliday and Hasan, 1976: 33).

## METHODS

This study is a case study carried on the translations of two novels from French into English. This study is qualitative because it focuses only on the semantic relations of personal reference. As reference is a superordinate of three co-hyponyms (personal reference, comparative reference and demonstrative reference), this study limits its self to be done only on one hyponym of reference, personal reference.

The investigation is done manually; some data analyses on personal reference, which have been done on the Researcher M.A. thesis, Moindjie (2003) are used to show the relevance and functionality of personal reference in translation. In doing so, the research is supported by following Halliday and Hasan’s theory (1976) on cohesion in order to systematically investigate the occurrences and cohesiveness of personal reference in translation.

The two original novels are all read from the beginning to the end to identify data; the translations are also all read from the beginning to the end to identify data. The data in the original texts and target texts are identified, collected, and analyzed. After that the researcher evaluates and compares the meaning and occurrences of personal reference. Some extracts related to the phenomena of personal reference are produced in the discussion. Page numbers of other occurrences of the same function are given in the discussion.

The corpora used are novels. They are chosen for convenience. They consist of two novels entitled *Madame Bovary* (1965), translated *Madame Bovary* (1957); and *La Porte Étroite* (1958), translated *Straight is the Gate* (1952). Two different novels are used and the reason is to justify and consolidate more the findings.

## FINDINGS

### Madame Bovary

The study has revealed that the cohesiveness of personal reference is characterized by some similarities and differences, which are related to language peculiarities and norms. It is found that personal reference is more used in the TL than in the SL due factors of the following language peculiarities:

#### French

- Abstractness reduces the occurrences of personal reference in the French text.
- Prolixity makes the personal reference play an internal role in the sentences, which is not cohesive.

#### English

- Concreteness allows personal reference to surface cohesively in the English text.
- Conciseness makes the personal reference play a cohesive role with other sentences.
- Translators have choices of decisions with personal reference occurrences, which are not determined by language peculiarities.

### Straight is the Gate

The results in *Straight is the Gate* and *Madame Bovary* coincide. The research reveals that the cohesiveness of personal reference is characterized by some similarities and differences, which are related to language peculiarities. It is found that English uses personal reference more than French due to the following language peculiarities and norms:

#### French

- Abstractness reduces the occurrence of personal reference in the French text.
- Prolixity makes the personal reference play an internal role in the sentences, which is not cohesive.

#### English

- Concreteness allows personal reference to surface cohesively in the English text.
- Conciseness makes the personal reference to play a cohesive role with other sentences.
- Translators have choices of decisions with personal reference occurrences, which are not determined by language peculiarities.

## DISCUSSION

### Madame Bovary

Madame Bovary is a story about a woman who falls victim of her imagination. Despite the fact that she is married by a kind educated person, she aspires for romantic adventures like the ones she used to read in sentimental romantic novel. She becomes bored and unhappy with her middle-class life. She, then, starts making romantic relations with young men, Rodolphe and Léon, who suit her romantic imagination. She borrows a lot so as to embellish herself and to spend on the two men. However, her sentimental relation with these two men are unsuccessful because they have left her in the lurch.

Her deception increases her boredom and depression. Unable to pay her debts she decides to commit suicide by swallowing arsenic and dies a painful death. Her husband, unaware of his wife romantic affairs, is grieved for her sudden death; he struggles to pay her debts and take care of the child, Berth. He has died suddenly by a heart attack upon discovering his wife love letters with her boyfriends, Rodolph and Léon.

### Cohesiveness similarities and differences of Personal reference

It is found that the TT uses reference ties more than ST. The reasons of the frequent use of personal reference in the TT,

compared with ST, can emerge from three main factors. The infrequent use of personal reference in the French text compared to the English text is caused, also, by three factors. To begin with, the occurrence of personal reference in the source and target texts is not proportional. The frequent use, for example, of personal reference can be noticed in the following sentences:

*Il se baisa pour la reprendre. Un voisin la fit tomber d'un coup de coude; il la ramassa encore une fois* (p.36).

He bent over for it. A boy beside him sent it down again with his elbow. Once again he picked it up (p.5).

All the underlined personal references refer back to other items outside the sentences. Comparing the occurrence of the personal references, it is found that the ST is less than the TT for two reasons: the word, *voisin*, is used, in the French extract, to denote within its sense nearness; but there is no cohesive tie between the word, *voisin*, and the doer of the action of the first sentence. Here you are left to infer the cohesive link abstractly. The second reason is that the translator coordinates the second sentence with the third one. The occurrence of abstractness is frequent in the ST. The following is another example of such an occurrence:

*Le lendemain fut, pour Emma, une journée funèbre. Tout lui parut enveloppé par une atmosphère noire qui flottait confusément sur l'extérieur des choses; et le chagrin s'engouffrait dans son âme avec les hurlements doux, comme fait le vent d'hiver dans les châteaux abandonnés. C'était cette rêverie que l'on a sur ce qui ne reviendra plus...* (p.167)

The next day was a funeral one for Emma. Everything appeared to her as though shrouded in vague, hovering blackness; and grief swirled into her soul, moaning softly like the winter wind in a deserted castle. She was prey to the brooding brought on by irrevocable partings... (p. 139).

In the ST, the last sentence contains the idea of abstractness by the use of a general word referring to the whole text. That is the word "*cette rêverie*". It is up to the reader to infer that this "*rêverie*" occurs in Emma's mind or refers to her. By contrast, the English text in the last sentence uses a personal reference "she" which refers concretely to Emma. Therefore, it is understood directly through the reference tie that Emma is the patient of the action of brooding. The cohesive aspect in the TT is that there is a personal reference that links the first sentence with the second sentence through the use of 'she', which refers back to Emma in the first sentence. The factor of concreteness versus abstractness apropos of reference occurrences is found to take place on pages 35, 36, 37, 43, 45, 47, 51, 52, 53, 67, 104, 113, 120, 123, 125, 151, 167, 168-9, 176, 210, 211, 238, 243-4, 253-4, 280, 281-2, 285-6, 351-6, 373-4, and 410 of the ST, which correspond to pages 3, 5, 6, 7, 12, 14, 16, 20, 21, 22, 23, 37, 74, 84, 90, 93-5, 122, 139, 140-1, 148, 184, 214, 218-9, 229, 230, 257-8, 263-4, 333-6, 338, 356-8, and 396 of the TT of the selected passages. However, concrete reference occurrences are also found to occur in the ST, for example:

<<Dans vingt-quatre heures pour tout délai.>> *Quoi donc?*

<<Payer la somme totale de huit mille francs.>> *Et même, il y avait plus bas: Elle y sera contrainte par toute*

*voie de droit, et notamment par la saisie exécutoire de ses meubles et effets>> (p. 350).*

"Within twenty-four hours." What was this? "Pay the total amount of 8,000 francs." And lower down: "There to be subjected to all due processes of law, and notably to execution of distraint upon furniture and effects." (p. 332)

In the ST the referent, 'elle', refers back to Emma, and 'y' refers back to *la somme*. So the cohesiveness is concrete in that there is no inference. By contrast, there is no reference cohesive tie in the TT. The reader is left to infer abstractly that the person talked about here is Emma. Such concrete reference occurrences occur in the ST on pages 286 and 369, but they are found to occur in the TT abstractly on pages 264 and 352. But concrete reference occurrences in the ST are very few, compared with those occurrences in the TT. Also abstract reference occurrences are few in the TT, compared with those of the ST.

Apart from the abstractness and concreteness, there is another factor, which may cause infrequency or frequency of personal reference; that is coordination. The research reveals that the ST depends more on coordinating than the TT; and this brings the cohesion to an internal function in the ST in that it plays only a role inside the coordinated sentences that are linguistically considered as one sentence, for example:

*Il était ganté de gants jaunes, quoi qu'il fût chaussé de fortes guêtres; et il se dirige vers la maison de médecin, suivi d'un paysan marchant la tête basse d'un air tout réfléchi* (p.171).

His dressy yellow gloves contrasted with his heavy gaiters, and he was approaching the doctor's house. Behind him was a peasant who followed along with lowered head and decidedly pensive expression (p. 143).

In the source text, the second sentence is coordinated with the first sentence by the coordinating conjunction, 'et' and the third sentence also coordinated by a comma. In comparison, even though coordination is used in the TT, it is used sparingly compared to ST. In the above example, the translator seems to prefer not to coordinate the last sentences from the others, and that goes hand in hand with the brevity aspect of the English language. Such cases of coordination and non-coordination are found to take place on the following pages: 36, 38, 42, 48, 52, 54, 57, 104, 122, 124, 130, 151, 168-9, 171, 175, 238, 242, 250, 254, 255, 371, 375, 383, and 408, which correspond to pages 5, 7, 12, 17, 21, 23, 27, 74, 93-5, 101, 123, 140-1, 143, 147, 213, 218, 225, 229, 231, 354-5, 358, 367, and 393 of the TT.

The analysis shows that subordination is another factor that may cause less reference cohesive ties. Subordination is found to limit the personal reference ties inside the sentence. Although it is used in the TT, there is a preference of independent sentences rather than subordination in the TT, compared to ST, for instance:

*Elle était sans cesse en courses, en affaires. Elle allait chez le avoués, chez le président, se rappelait l'échéance des billets, obtenait des retards; et, à la maison, repassait, cousait, blanchissait, surveillait les ouvriers, soldait les mémoires, tandis que, sans s'inquiéter de rien, Monsieur continuellement engourdit dans une somno-*

lence boudeuse. dont il ne se réveillait que pour lui dire des choses désobligeantes, restait à fumer au coin de feu, en crachant dans les cendres (p.39).

She was always busy, always doing things. **She** was constantly running to lawyers, to the judge, remembering when notes fell due and obtaining renewals; and at home she was forever ironing, sewing, washing, keeping an eye on the hired men, figuring their wages. Monsieur, meanwhile, never lifted a finger. **He** sat smoking in the chimney corner and spitting into the ashes, continually falling into a grumpy doze and waking to utter uncomplimentary remarks (p.7-8).

It is obvious that the third sentence in the ST is coordinated and subordinated at the same time, and this makes it be one sentence. The length of the ST sentences reflects also the French language nature of prolixity, a sign of sounding intelligent in French language. In the TT, if we compare, it shows that the third sentence, though coordinated, is not subordinated with the last sentence. This is because of the conciseness of the TT sentences, which is a characteristic of the English language. These cases occur on pages 39, 103, 109, 122, 173, 243, and 407 of the ST and pages 8, 74, 79, 93, 145, 218, and 392 of the TT. In short, the analysis shows that these phenomena occur because of some specificities of each of the two languages. Although there is no equivalence in cohesion, the personal reference coheres with items externally in the TT more than the ST which is more characterized by internal references.

### Language and translation norms

It is found also that there are few personal reference shifts that are determined by the norms of the French language and English language. Therefore, their occurrences inside the sentence or outside the sentence depend on the norms of the SL and TL, for example:

*Quoiqu'elle fût laide, sèche comme un cotret, et bourgeonnée comme un printemps, certes Mme Dubuc ne manquait pas de parties à choisir. Pour arriver à ses fins, la mère Bovary fut obligée de **les** évincer tous...* (p. 44)

Ugly though she was, and thin as a lath, with a face as spotted as a meadow in springtime, Madame Dubuc unquestionably had **plenty of suitors** to choose from. To gain her ends Madame Bovary had to get rid of all the **rivals**... (p. 13)

A reference is used in the ST to cohere the bottom sentence with the top one, but the TT does not follow that cohesive approach. Instead of that, a reiteration by a synonym is used to cohere the sentences in the target text. This occurrence depends on the choice of the translator. This is because it would still sound English if a pronoun is used instead of reiteration, e.g. "To gain her ends Madame Bovary had to get rid of all" of them. "Them" refers then to suitors. Since such occurrences are not dictated by the language specificity, they depend on the choice of the translator, and that does not cause problem to the meaning and coherence of the text. Such occurrences are found to take place on pages 37 and 58 of the ST, corresponding to pages 5, and 27 of the

TT. So the finding here shows that the translator must take into consideration that sometimes there is no word-for-word translation of personal references and that shifts of cohesive ties and position of cohesive ties may occur.

### Straight is the Gate

The novel is about the dichotomy between appearance and reality. The novel embodies a futile quest for sainthood and salvation; the characters are Alissa Bucolin, Jerome Palissier and Juliette. Alissa and Juliette are two sisters and Jerome is their cousin. Rejecting sentimental love and worldly life, she manages to spoil the sensual love between Jerome and Juliette and tries to convert Jerome to sainthood and make a Platonic love with him.

Alissa has marginalized intelligence, education, culture, and literature; she focuses only on religious readings. Finally, she enters in seclusion until her death. However, her diary after her death reveals that her love for Jerome is strongly sensual; she is a single-minded hypocrite who instrumentalizes religion to spoil the love relation between Jerome and Juliette. She, therefore, died unsaintly without the consolation of faith.

### Cohesiveness similarities and differences of Personal reference

It is found that personal references occur in the ST and TT. In the first investigation presented in *Madame Bovary*, concerning the personal reference occurrences, the investigation has revealed that personal references are more used in the TT than in the ST. The same happens in our investigation in *La Porte Étroite*. The reasons are again found to be the language peculiarities, and translator's choice, for example:

<<J'éclaircirai ça... **Surtout n'annonce pas notre arrivée: il faut surprendre ta cousine et ne pas lui laisser le temps de s'armer.**>> (p. 523).

"I'll soon get to the bottom of it. Mind you don't let **them** know we're coming; you must take your cousin by surprise and not give her time to arm herself" (p. 42).

In the above source extract, there is no reference tie which refers back to an item. The writer leaves the reader to infer abstractly the persons concerned about the announcement. By contrast, the translator in the target extract coheres the sentence with items previously mentioned by the use of a personal reference, and this clarifies concretely to the reader the participants in the discourse. This also happens in the following examples:

<<Enfin quoi! t'es-tu **déclaré**? Parviens- je à lui demander entre deux effusions.>> (p. 528).

"Well, what? Have you proposed to **her**?"

I managed to ask between two bursts of excitement (p. 48).

In the above source extract, there is no concrete reference that refers to a person whom the declaration is made. So the reader has to infer abstractly and according to the context that the declaration is concerning Juliette. But in the target extract, there is a personal reference. The use of 'her' coheres concretely with Juliette that occurred earlier in the passage

on pages 527 of the ST, corresponding to pages 47 of the TT. Such cases are found to occur elsewhere on the selected passages on pages 521, 523, 528-9, 540, 551, 557, and 563 of the ST, which correspond to pages 39, 41-2, 48-9, 64-5, 80, 89, and 98 of the TT. In fact, it is found also, as in *Madame Bovary*, that abstract occurrences occur in the target text, but they are very few compared with the ST, for example:

*- vous devez être bien heureux, monsieur le Pasteur, du beau succès de votre fils! Il a répondu, un peu confus: - Mon Dieu, je n'en suis pas encore là - Mais vous y venez! vous y venez! (p. 551).*

'You must be very happy, Pasteur, over your son's wonderful success!' he answered, rather abashed: 'Oh! I haven't got as far as that yet!' 'But you will! But you will' (p. 81).

In the above source extracts, there is a personal reference used in the disagreement sentence to refer back to what is said before in the ST, which is 'y'. The personal pronoun, 'y', refers to the whole precedent sentence. But in the target extract, there is no cohesive reference used in the disagreement sentence. The reader is left to infer that Pasteur will get the information about his son's success later.

Another factor that makes the TT use more references than the ST is coordination with or without coordinators, which turns the cohesion to an internal function. As found in *Madame Bovary*, the factor of coordination and non-coordination are found in *La Porte Étroite* to be the same factors, for example:

*D'ailleurs, moi, personnellement, je n'approuve pas beaucoup les longues fiançailles; cela fatigue les jeunes filles... (p. 531).*

Moreover, personally I don't approve of *long engagements*. **They**'re trying for young girls, though sometimes it's very touching to see... (p. 52).

'Cela' coheres the second sentence with the first one, it does not refer to an item but to the whole sentence; but that cohesion in the source text is internal in the sense that it links items inside the coordinated sentences. But in the TT the cohesion functions to link items outside the sentence and therefore cohesive. The pronoun, 'they', refers back to engagements, and this clarifies more the meaning to the reader.

Coordination is, by the way, found to occur in the TT. But it is found to be very few, compared with the ST, for example:

*Je descendie chez ma tante Plantier. Elle n'était pas à la maison quand j'arrivai. Mais à peine avais-je eu le temps de m'installer dans ma chambre qu'un domestique vint m'avertir qu'elle m'attendait dans le salon (p. 530).*

I was to stay with aunt Plantier. She was not in when I arrived, but I had hardly had time to settle in my room when a servant came to tell me that she was waiting for me in the drawing- room (p. 52).

In the above examples, there is no coordination in the French extract, whereas in the English extract there is coordination. That coordination turns the personal reference, 'she', at the bottom sentence into an internal function, which is not cohesive. However, looking closely, it is found that the coordination is not necessary and it depends on the translator's choice. This is because '*mais*' is, in the French extract, an adversative conjunction, whereas in the English extract it is a coordinating conjunction. But still it can be changed into an adversative conjunction in the target extract.

Although there are few occurrences of subordinations in *La Porte Étroite*, subordination in the ST is another factor that is found to contribute to the infrequent use of personal reference in the ST, for example:

*Nous rentrions; nous retrouvions au salon ma tante qui ne sortait Presque jamais avec nous... (p. 496- 7)*

When we came in we found my aunt in the drawing-room. **She** hardly ever went out with us. (p. 5)

In the above extract, the writer uses relative subordinate clause, and that reflects to the nature of French language, which is characterized by the aspect of prolixity. In comparison, the translator in the TT divides the sentences into two independent sentences. This impels the use of some cohesive ties to cohere the sentences together. Therefore, the personal pronoun, 'she' refers to the noun, 'aunt' and it is, therefore, cohesive. Such cases appear elsewhere on pages 496, 501, and 551 of the ST, which correspond to pages 5, 11, 80 of the TT.

### Language and translation norms

The translator's choice plays sometimes a role in determining the cohesion, but it, as it has been found in *Madame Bovary*, depends on the language norms possibilities. As far as reference is concerned, the translator may decide the presence, absence or shift of the personal reference, for example.

*Dans la suite de ma lettre, protestant contre son jugement, j'interjetais appel, la suppliais de nous faire crédit d'une nouvelle entrevue... Le silence seul précéderait cette fois notre rencontre... (p. 560)*

In the rest of my letter I protested and appealed against her judgement, imploring her to grant us the opportunity of another interview... This time **it** should only precede only by silence (p. 94).

In the source text, the top sentence coheres with the bottom sentence by the use of reiteration by a synonym, *rencontre*. By contrast the translator utilizes a personal reference instead of reiteration. This is not compelled by the language peculiarity since it sounds English and coherent if a reiteration is used in the TT and is translated, "This time our meeting must only be preceded by silence." Such cases are found to take place on pages 496, 500- 501, 505, 528, 539, and 562 of the ST, which correspond to pages 4, 11, 16, 48, 63, and 97 of the TT.

### CONCLUSION

The study in *Madame Bovary* and *Strait is the Gate* shows that the personal reference is the most used cohesive tie that coheres items horizontally and vertically. This cohesive tie exists in the two languages, English and French. However, it is found that the position of the reference ties changes, sometimes, according to the word order of the TL. The analyses show also that the personal reference is less used in French compared to English.

It is found that the infrequent use of the personal reference emanates from some peculiar aspects of the French language related to abstractness, coordination and subordination. Both coordination and subordination are found to turn the reference cohesiveness into internal functions, which make it incohesive. The investigation reveals that the absence of some

personal reference occurrences and some internal reference occurrences are caused by the French language peculiarities, which are abstractness and prolixity.

By contrast, the analyses show that English language uses more personal references as cohesive ties than French language and that reflects some peculiarities of the English language. Unlike French language, the investigation shows that the English language is a language that is characterized by brevity and concreteness. These two aspects permit the English language to use more reference cohesive ties in that the personal reference coheres with items outside the sentences to enhance the texture.

The investigation reveals that the personal reference cohesive ties cannot be always translated word-for-word. This is because there are some shifts which are required and which are determined by the peculiarities of the French language and the English language. To avoid mistranslation and incohesive occurrences, the research shows that the translator must not only know the French and English languages, but also he/she must know and must be aware of the peculiarities of both French language and English language. It is found that the personal reference enhances the cohesion and coherence because it does not change the order of the propositions and paragraphs among which the personal reference ties cohere with items; instead, it signals the relation and the cohesiveness of items occurred in their environment.

Thus, the personal reference ties, in translation, are necessary and should be tackled properly according to the peculiarities of the French language and the English language, by using appropriate translation methods. The research contribution is that language peculiarities and language norms are determinants of translation methods and the translator's latitude in terms of translation decision in translating personal reference from French into English.

## REFERENCES

- Baker, M. (1992, 2011). *In other words*. London and New York: Routledge
- Baker, M. (1993). "Corpus Linguistics and Translation Studies: Implications and Applications". In *Text and technology: In honour of John Sinclair*. (Mona Baker, Gill Francis and Elena Tonghini-Bonelli, eds.), p. 233-250. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins publishing Company.
- Blum-Kulka, S. (2000). Shifts of Cohesion and Coherence. In *The translation studies reader*. (Venuti, L., ed.), p. 298-313. London and New York: Routledge.
- Bosch, P. (1989). Coherence and Cohesion: Comments on Roger G. Van de Velde's Paper "Man, Verbal Text, Inferencing, and Coherence". In *Connexity and coherence*. (Heydrich, W., Neubauer, F., Petöfi, J. S. and Sözer, E., eds.), p. 219-227. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- Catford, J. C. (1965). *A Linguistic theory of translation*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Charolles, M. (1978). Introduction aux Problemes de la Coherence des Texts. *La Journal de la langue française*. **38**, 7 - 38.
- Enkvist, N. E. (1990). Seven Problems in the Study of Coherence and Interpretability in *Coherence in writing*. (Connor, U. and Johns, A. M., eds.), p. 11-26. Alexandria and Virginia: TESOL.
- Gutwinski, W. (1976). *Cohesion in literary texts*. The Hague and Paris: Mouton.
- Hajjar, J. (2002). *Traité de traduction*. Beyrouth: Dar-Machreq.
- Halliday, M. A. K. and Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1985). *An Introduction to functional grammar*. London and New York: Edward Arnold.
- Hechaïmé, C. I. (2002). *La Traduction par les textes*. Beyrouth: Dar El-Machreq.
- Hermans, Theo (1991) "Translational Norms and Correct Translations". In *Translation studies: the state of Art* (Kitty, M. van Leuven-Zwart & Ton Naaijken, eds.), 155-169. Amsterdam: Editions Rodopi.
- Hoey, M. (1991). *Patterns of lexis in text*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lemire, G. (2001). Application à la langue française de la theorie de M.A.K. et de R. Hasan. *Langue française, vision systematique*. WWW. Voila.fr: File://A:/vision systematique, June 2001.
- Moindjie, M. A. (2003). *An investigation into the aspect of coherence and cohesion in translation: a case study*. MA diss., Universiti Sains Malaysia.
- Nida, E. A. (1964). *Toward a science of translation with special reference to principles and approaches involved in bible translating*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- Swales, J. (1990). "Non-native Speaker Graduate Engineering Students and Their Introductions: Global coherence and Local Management". In *Coherence in writing*. (Connor, U. and Johns, A. M., eds.), P. 189-207. Alexandria and Virginia: TESOL.
- Toury, G. (1980). *In search of a theory of translation*. Tel Aviv: The Porter Institute for Poetics and Semiotics.
- Trask, R. L. (1997). *A student's dictionary of language and linguistics*: London: Arnold.
- Vinay, J. and Darbelnet, J. (1995). *Comparative stylistics of French and English: a methodology for translation* (J. C. Sager and M. J. Hamel, Trans.). Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Wales, K. (1998). Cohesion and coherence in Literature. In *Concise encyclopedia of pragmatics*. (Jacob, L. M...), p. 134-136. Amsterdam: Elsevier Science.
- Yunxing, L. (1996). The Sentence Group: the key discorsal level in translation teaching. In *Teaching translation and interpreting 3*. (Dollerup, C. and Appel, V., eds), p. 111-117. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

## NOTES (CORPORA USED)

- Flaubert, G. (1957). *Madame Bovary*. Translation by Steegmuller, F. Newyork: Modern Library.
- Flaubert, G. (1965). *Madame Bovary*. Editions Rencontre Lausanne.
- Gide, A. (1952). *Strait is the Gate*. Translation by Bussy D. Newyork: Vintage Books.
- Gide, A. (1958). *Romans: Récits et Sotises, Oeuvres Lyriques*. Editions Gallimard.