

## CHAPTER 7

### CONCLUSIONS

#### 7.1 Introduction

This research addresses one of the key issues of translation: how the shifts of cohesion and coherence in Chinese texts translated from English affect textual continuity and connectivity, and the consequences of both. As stated earlier, the data is a set of argumentative writings by political commentator Karim Raslan, and their translations were done by two editors of *The Sin Chew Daily* at the time when the translation was being commissioned.

Employing Top-down (see Section 5.3.1, Chapter 5, p.154) and Bottom-up approaches (see Section 5.3.3, p.167), in Chapter 6 an extensive analysis of the research data was carried out, with findings essentially answering all the 14 questions which concern the shifts of cohesion and coherence. Research questions 1 – 4 (Section 7.2) point to specific aspects pertaining to the use of Third Person Pronouns; while research questions 5 – 8 (Section 7.3) focus on specific aspects concerning the use of Conjunctions. Questions 9 – 14 (Section 7.4) highlight the specific aspects affecting the coherence, and the shift of it, as supported by the contrastive study of 27 source texts and their target language texts in Chapter 6(see Section 6.4, p.220-396)

#### 7.2 Reference : Third Person Pronouns

*Question 1-4: Are there any differences in the number and types of third personal pronouns being used in the TT compared to its ST? How*

*is pronominalization used in Chinese translated text compared to that used in the original English text? Are adjustments made in the use of third person pronouns in the translated texts reflect target-language preferences or do they conform to the source-text patterns? Does the use of third person pronoun in the TT cause shifts of cohesion or coherence of the text?*

Reference as a cohesive device either facilitates understanding and appreciation of a discourse, or creates unintended confusion, depending on appropriate usage of the means of reference, such as pronouns. Chapter 6 reveals findings that do not approximate the norms of target language text – there is a noticeable difference in the number and types of third personal pronouns employed (see Section 6.2, Chapter 6, p. 170).

It is a known fact that for the Chinese language, a zero anaphora is preferred if it can be inferred on the grounds of logic or context (see Section 4.4.1.5.2, p.104); however, the patterns of pronoun usage in the Chinese texts researched upon are neither target-language nor source-language norm-oriented, but form a system of their own, possibly indicating what Blum-Kulka (1986:33) has suggested as ‘a process of explicitation’. While excessive use of pronouns in the Chinese texts do not impact on the content, eliminating them could make the reading more pleasant to the ears.

What matters most is the translator’s inability to understand the referential chain in the source text, resulting in the misuse of pronouns. In the course of reading, readers have to retrieve the identity of a pronoun by referring to a noun in the immediate context. By failing to render the pronouns correctly, as shown by examples 12, 13, 14 and 15 (see

Section 6.2.2 and Section 6.3.3, Chapter 6, p.182-191), the translation leads to two consequences: first, it causes misunderstanding of the meaning of the stretch of text concerned; second, it undermines the calculability of implicature as a whole as intended by the text producer.

### 7.3 Conjunctions

*Question 5-8: Are there differences in **the number and types** of logical connectors being employed in the TT compared to its ST? Does any adjustment made in the use of logical connectors affect the **interpretation and rhetoric** of the text? Do logical connective patterns in TT reflect norms of ST or do they **approximate the norms** of TT in the same register? Does any adjustment made in the use of logical connectives in the TT **affect the coherence** of the text?*

Conjunctions have a well-defined role in textual organization. When used correctly, they help readers along by illustrating interrelations among chunks of information; otherwise, conjunctions will lead to momentary disruption in the course of reading, and possibly, misinterpretation. As the findings in Chapter 6 show, the patterns of logical connectives neither reflect the norms of target language texts nor those of the source language texts. While the English language is widely known to employ significantly more logical connectives than does the Chinese language (see Section 4.4.1.6.2, Chapter 4, p.115), the findings (Table 6.1, p.194) in this study however reflects a much higher use of conjunctions showing additive, adversative, continuatives, hypothetical and causal relations in the Chinese target texts. Examples 1-6 in Section 6.3.1 (Chapter 6,

p.196) illustrate the fact that conjunctions in the Chinese texts concerned are overworked.

It can be said that, similar to the use of reference, the use of logical connectives are neither TL nor SL norm-oriented, but form a system of its own, possibly indicating 'a process of explicitation' (Blum-Kulka 1986). Logical connectives offer one of the principle means of achieving continuity, coherence, and clarity in any kind of writing. This work, however, when only the right conjunctions are used where appropriate. Meantime, excessive use of logical connectives may be a source of annoyance and distraction from the content.

In Examples 7-14 (see Section 6.3.2, p.202), relations between ideas are stated more overtly in the Chinese target texts than in the English source texts. The use of stance adverbials in Examples 7, 8 and 10 (see Section 6.3.2, p.202-204) might have sprung from the stylistic preference of the translator. However, a translator must bear in mind that when inserting stance adverbials, the major consideration is whether the text producer intends to do so because stance adverbials convey the text producer's comments on the accompanying element. In the said examples, the stance adverbials involved are not used in the source text; as such, the translator does not seem to have a sound basis to employ them in the target text.

Nonetheless, for future research initiatives, it is worth considering studies which establish independently: (1) the preference for stance adverbials (or evaluative disjuncts, the term use by Thompson and Zhou (2003)) in argumentative texts in English and Chinese; (2) the shifts in the use of stance adverbials in Chinese argumentative texts

translated from English and vice versa; and (3) the effect of the shift on the cohesion and coherence of the text involved.

#### 7.4 Erroneous Translation and the Shifts of Coherence

*Questions 9-14: Does rechunking take place in the translated text – if so, does it affect the relations between ideas in the text? Do text-based shifts of coherence affect the **intended meaning** of the text? Do text-based shifts of coherence convey **unintended implicatures**? Do text-based shifts of coherence affect **the calculability of implicatures** in the target text? In what ways do text-based shifts of coherence affect the **macro-structure of the text**? Do any instances of text-based shifts affect **the drift of the argument** being put forward by the text producer?*

Text-based shifts of coherence in the course of translation are often linked to differences between linguistic systems (Blum-Kulka 1986:32). However, the findings of this study support Blum-Kulka's view that most of the serious shifts are due to the specific choices made by the translator.

As discussed in Chapter 6, the mistranslation of a lexical item, the omission of the ST lexical item without justifiable reasons and heedless rechunking and rewriting coupled with the failure to understand functions of certain punctuation (for example see Table 6.3, Text 1, p.220 and Table 6.28, Text 26, p.381) have caused text-based shifts of coherence which have affected *the* relations between ideas in the text, the intended meaning of the text, conveyed unintended implicatures, affected the calculability of

implicatures in the target text and last but not the least, affected the macro-structure and the drift of argument put forward by the text producer.

The analysis in Chapter 6 revealed that three intertwining factors have contributed to some serious shifts of coherence. Firstly, the translators do not have sufficient knowledge of the English language system. Many errors committed in the TT can be traced to the comprehension of the source language. Secondly, the translators have focused on the surface meaning of words and failed, in many instances, to go deep into the meaning intended by the text producer. As a consequence, words rather than meanings are conveyed. Thirdly, in many instances, words are omitted without justifiable reasons and chunks of discourse are rewritten willfully.

#### **7.4.1 Substituting Words by Searching for Synonyms**

As shown by most of the examples discussed in Chapter 6, instead of taking words as part of a complete discourse embedded in a particular context or situation, it appears that the translators are searching for synonyms and substituting words by their Chinese dictionary equivalents. It should be borne in mind that translation from one language into another is neither a simple word for word conversion, nor is it merely a sentence to sentence rendering. It requires 'the consideration of the linguistic surface of a text and semantic rendering (implicit meaning), plus the preservation of the internal truth-consistency of the text' (Jiang Ping Fan 1999:1). As such, one should never translate isolated words. Words must be viewed or treated as the building blocks of a larger text (Newmark 1988, Baker 1992).

An example of a fixed expression which was translated on an item-to-item basis is ‘*God-forbid*’(E18) which was rendered as ‘阻挠神旨’(impediment of God’s will) in Text 17 (see Table 6.19, p.322). Apparently the translators are not aware that the example quoted is a fixed expressions which is to be taken as one unit to establish meaning. In terms of idioms used, *head-to-head* in Text 19 (E4) and *blank cheque* in Text 12 (E11) (see Table 6.21, p.339) could have been rendered correctly in the Chinese text if the translator has taken time to check or consult the dictionary (*blank-cheque* can be found on p.134 in *OALECD 4<sup>th</sup> ed* and on p.159 in *OALECD 6<sup>th</sup> ed*; *head-to-head* is not in the 4<sup>th</sup> ed but could be found on p. 813 in the 6<sup>th</sup> ed).

Another example is the translation of the phrase ‘*turned out in force*’ (E3) in Text 2. The wrong translation of the phrase ‘*turned out in force*’ in the target text as ‘勉为其难的表现他们出对这位伟大战后英雄的崇敬’(forced to show their respect) has significantly undermined the logical development of the entire text and to a great extent has disrupted the connectivity of the text (see Table 6.4, p.224). The *Oxford Advanced Learner’s English Chinese Dictionary* extended 4<sup>th</sup> edition and the 6<sup>th</sup> edition explain the phrase as ‘(of people) in large number’. Judging from the translation, however, it is highly likely that the translator has taken the phrase ‘*in force*’ as meaning ‘to force oneself to do something unwillingly’.

Even mistranslation of one lexical item in the Substantiation might gravely affect the reasonableness of an argument put forward. The mistranslation of the item ‘*retribution*’ in E(3), Chunk II in Text 18 (see Table 6.20, p.333) as ‘天谴’ (the wrath of God) has distorted the intended meaning, disrupted text coherence and changed the author’s tone. This example testifies to the idea that it is of utmost importance to pick the right target

language equivalent because a source language term usually has a few target language dictionary equivalents.

Words can pose a translation problem if the translator does not understand them. However, in non-literary texts, translation correspondence is usually close (Baker 1992, Newmark 1988). In dealing with unfamiliar or difficult words, a bilingual dictionary should be consulted as suggested by Newmark (1988:29): ‘the bilingual dictionary is the translator’s single, first and most important aid, and a translator who does not consult one when in doubt is arrogant or ignorant or both’. Nonetheless, a bilingual dictionary, as pointed out by Fraser (1999:27): ‘can only ever give *a range* of possible TL equivalents for any SL term’. Though bilingual dictionaries are indispensable, ‘they normally require checking in at least two TL [target language] monolingual dictionaries and sometimes in SL [source language] monolingual dictionaries’ (Newmark 1988:174). This is understandable because ‘a polysemous item in the source text will rarely have an equivalent with the same range of meanings in the target language’ (Baker 1992:253).

In English as well as in Chinese, there are restrictions on co-occurrences of words. As such, recognizing whether or not a collocation is coherent, natural and acceptable in a certain context is one of the most important task confronting a translator (Newmark 1998, Baker 1992). Many examples in Chapter 6 highlight the fact that more often than not, words are dealt with in isolation and not as part of a text in communication. In reality, however, the meaning of any word depends largely on its pattern of collocation, not something that the word possesses in isolation. When translating, the translator should make a rigorous analysis of the word in question and then select the most appropriate choice according to the co-text and context in order to keep a text coherent.



Taking into account the collocational meaning rather than substituting individual words with their dictionary equivalents is crucial when the translator is interpreting the ST; that is, at the first stage of translation (Baker 1992:53). One important rule to be observed by a translator is: never replace any word in isolation. The absurd and unnatural collocation thwarts readers and causes a momentary disruption in their process of reading. The translator should bear in mind that ‘readers’ tolerance to unnatural and incoherent rendition is not limitless’ (Ka Xiaoyun 2003:4).

#### **7.4.2 The Omission of Words and the Willful Rechunking or Rewriting**

Many examples in this study have shown that ignoring and omitting any content word without compensating it within the same discourse unit labeled as ‘text’ may affect or sabotage the cohesiveness created by the lexical chain, and greatly compromise the intended meaning of the text producer. One salient example where the omission of a single word has gravely compromised the cohesiveness and coherence of a text is provided by Text 2/E13 (see Table 6.4, p.226). The omission of the term *Separation* in Chunk III is unwarranted. The lexical chain of the stretch of language in Chunk III is reproduced here:

historical and emotional aspect → revisiting the scene → greatest failure  
→ Malaysia → enormous step forward → wound that is *Separation* → healed.

The item *Separation* is of utmost importance in conveying and enhancing the rhetorical purpose of the stretch of language where it occurs: to substantiate the claim that Lee Kuan Yew’s trip is laden with historical and emotional feelings. With the omission of

this item, readers of the Chinese text are deprived of the linkage to interpret the meaning of ‘revisiting the scene of his greatest failure’ and ‘the wound that is Separation’ in the stretch of discourse concerned.

It should be noted that a writer does not throw words into sentences at random; he orders them according to a grammatical system (Morenberg 2002). He builds constituents and relates them to one another. In short, in an utterance, words are grouped together into meaningful units. As Newmark (1988:213) had pointed out: ‘Grammar is the bones of a text. Collocations are the nerves, more subtle and multiple and specific in denoting meaning, and lexis is the flesh’. Since the basic thought-carrying element of language is its grammar and grammar is expressed in words, a translator has to avoid translating words as though they are context-free and be extremely careful when he decides to omit any word from any stretch of language in a text.

As shown in the analysis of Text 4 (see Table 6.6, p.238), Text 12 (see Table 6.14, p.293), Text 20 (see Table 6.22, p.343) and Text 26 (see Table 6.28, p.381), some of the serious shifts of coherence occur because words in a stretch of language are being substituted on an item to item manner and some are omitted altogether (not translated at all) for no justifiable reasons. It is generally agreed that omission is allowed in translation; for example, one may omit an idiom which has no ready equivalent at the point where it occurs in the ST, but it should be introduced elsewhere in the TT to make up for any loss of meaning or stylistic effect (Newmark 1998, Baker 1992). However, in the examples quoted above, those words being omitted are not compensated. The consequence is that the target text fails to display a sufficient level of lexical cohesion in its own right, and the information or content presented in the source

text is distorted. Logical relations between ideas change drastically, and the intended meaning of the text producer is lost and ultimately this causes a shift in the whole layer of meaning in the stretch of language involved.

This unwarranted word omission may be caused by the fact that the translators know the meaning of the words but not the entire utterance. In other words, they do not know the grammar of the sentence. Since they do not know the grammar of the sentence where words are put into meaningful units, they are unable to analyze those units and the relationship among them. As a result, the translators try to substitute isolated words with their Chinese dictionary equivalents and thus fail completely to render the utterance as a meaningful unit as desired by the author of the original text to the TT readers. Below is an example taken from Text 23 (see Table 6.25, p.364) where words are being treated as though they are context-free:

### **Text 23**

**ST:** (4) As deeply committed Muslims, they approach the Holy Koran with enormous respect, intense piety and intellectual rigour.

**TT:** (4) 身为敬虔的穆斯林，他们遵照可兰经的教导，对人极尽恭敬、善良孝顺，严格要求本身的知识涵养。

**BT:** (4) As deeply committed Muslims, they observe the teaching of the Holy Koran, are respectful, pious and kind-hearted, {and} are critical of their own knowledge and self-cultivation.

(4) As deeply committed Muslims, they approach the Holy Koran

敬虔的                      穆斯林                      可兰经

with enormous respect, intense piety and intellectual rigour.

极尽恭敬                      善良孝顺                      知识涵养

This example has fully exposed the translator's inadequacy in mastering English grammar. There are many more similar examples in Chapter 6. Obviously, words and sentences are translated as though they are context-free. It is not enough to know what the corresponding lexical items are between the source and the target language. Words cannot be randomly translated as one likes because in English (as well as in Chinese), words in a sentence are arranged in order into constituents. In other words, they are ordered according to a grammatical system (Morenberg 2002). In the example quoted above, the adverb phrase *with enormous respect, intense piety and intellectual rigour* is added to the main clause *they approach the Holy Koran*. The adverb phrase puts the content of the sentence into proper context: it tells the reader in what manner the Koran is being approached by the liberals. The translators need to recognize the function of the adverb structure and the relationship it specifies. There are certainly differences between source language syntactic structures and target language syntactic structures, but one has to recognize first the function and relationship of every constituent in the English sentence before rendering it with an appropriate structure in the TT.

In the above example, the intended meaning of the ST is lost. This stretch of translated text may appear flawless in terms of sentence structure, but it does not say what it is supposed to mean. At the end of the day, readers are deprived of the meaning embedded in the ST. They will never come to the right understanding unless they compare the ST

with the original text; but obviously, the majority of the readers do not read a translated version for the purpose of comparing it with the original one!

### **7.4.3 The Role of Grammar in Making Sense of Texts**

As Yu Guangzhong (余光中), a renowned poet, translator and scholar, once said (2003): ‘Nobody reads poems for their grammar, but without going through grammar, there is no way to enter the realm of poetry. Grammar is thus the watchdog at the entrance to the poetic garden’. This is said about the appreciation of English poem. As for argumentative texts, perhaps this could be said: ‘Nobody reads an argumentative text to find out how rhetorical conventions work in the source language, they read to follow the drift of the argument being put forward’. And a translator, like any other reader, does not read an argumentative text for its grammar, but similar to the reading of poems, ‘without going through grammar, there is no way one can enter the realm of an argumentative text. Grammar is thus the watchdog in the entrance of any argumentative text, too’. It just goes to show that without a good command of the words and structures of the source language, as shown by many examples quoted above, the translator will not be able to grasp the meaning of the text and recreate it in the target language without causing any serious shifts in the text’s coherence.

In short, it can be said that to achieve the ultimate purpose of the translation of an argumentative text, that is, to lead readers of the receptor language into following the drift of the argument being put forward and to convince them that the views of the text producer are worth considering because they are supported by sound reasons, a good command of the words and grammar of the source language is one of the essential prerequisites. And to do justice to the text producer and the target language readers, the

final draft of any translated text should at least be revised by another person or a team. The number of mistakes highlighted in Chapter 6 could have at least been brought down substantially if vigilance and careful revising was carried out.

### **7.5 The Overall Effect of Micro-level Coherence to Macro-level Coherence of Argumentative Texts**

Perhaps it is worth reiterating that readers read an argumentative text to follow its drift of argument, and to see that the views held by the author are worth considering because they are supported by reasons. As such, the major shifts that occur in any text due to the mistranslation of words and structure will affect the thoughtful argument being put forward by the ST author and its worthiness of a reader's attention.

As shown in Chapter 6, how badly the shift affects the coherence of an argumentative text depends on where the problem occurs (that is, in the thesis, substantiation, opposition or conclusion) and the consequences it bear on a text depends on whether the element involved is pivotal to the understanding and development of the text. Table 7.1 in the following page shows where a back-translation or a segment of the translators' version produce a segment of text differing from the original segment. These differing segments affect the coherence of the text in varying degrees.

**Table 7.1: The Segment of the Text Where Shifts of Coherence Occur**

Text	Thesis	Opposition	Substantiation	Conclusion
T1	√			
T2	√		√	
T3			√	
T4			√	
T5		√	√	√
T6	√		√	
T7			√	
T8				√
T9		√	√	
T10			√	
T11			√	
T12	√		√	√
T13			√	
T14	√		√	
T 15				√
T16			√	
T17	√		√	
T18			√	√
T19			√	
T20	√		√	
T21	√		√	
T22			√	
T23			√	
T24	√			
T25			√	
T26	√			
T27	√		√	

### 7.5.1 Shifts of Coherence in the Thesis Statement

The thesis statement is the main idea in an argumentative text. It ‘makes the claim that the author wants the readers to accept or act on’ (Fowler and Aaron 2007:201). The claim is the backbone of an argument which supports the thesis statement (see Section 3.4.3.2, p.71, Chapter 3). In the 27 English argumentative texts used as data in this study, the claim is mostly stated outright in a thesis.

When mistranslations or errors occur in the thesis statement as shown in T1, T2, T6, T9, T12, T14, T17, T20, T21, T24, T26 and T27, they affect the thesis in a number of ways. In Text 1 (See Table 6.3, p.220), the mistranslation in the general thesis is due partly to the failure on the translator's part to appreciate the function of the dashes (employed to set off an unfinished thought) and this has affected the underlying assumption between the general thesis for the text and the enhancer: 'it doesn't matter what the comment is, as long as it comes from Senior Lee, it is sure to spark off a diplomatic incident'. The mistranslation has limited the interpretive options of Chinese readers; the intertextual link provided by the ST is not made available to the TT readers.

In Text 2 (see Table 6.4, p.224), the mistranslation has significantly undermined the logical development of the entire text. In Text 6 (see Table 6.8, p.251), it exaggerates the claim in the thesis. In Text 9 (see Table 6.11, p.268), it has significantly altered the meaning of the thesis. In Text 14 (see Table 6.16, p.305), it has affected the calculability of implicatures in the TT. In Text 17 (see Table 6.19, p.322), the mistranslation of the whole utterance (E3) has changed the intended effect of the enhancer and has rendered Chunk I, which contains the claim of the author, incoherent.

In Text 20 (see see Table 6.22, p.343) and Text 24 (see Table 6.26, p.369) the thesis are summarized at will. As such, the thesis is completely different from what the author has intended, and readers of the TT are not only deprived of an otherwise reasonable, well-connected and convincing argument but are wasting their time trying to make sense of the stretch of language involved. In Text 26 (see Table 6.28, p.381), omission coupled with failure to observe English grammatical rules has created a thesis containing no claims because there is no underlying semantic relations between the propositions in the stretch of language which acts as the thesis of the text. In Text 27 (see Table 6.29,



p.387), the misinterpretation and mistranslation of the phrase *no reason* has subjected readers to wrong expectations momentarily.

### **7.5.2 Shifts of Coherence in the Opposition**

Two Counter-argumentative texts contained errors in the Chunk which is the Opposition. In Text 5, failure on the part of the translators to recognize the elliptical element 'moral' in the phrase '*moral legitimacy and supremacy*' in E(13) (see Table 6.7, p.245) has directed the focus of the thesis statement off on a tangent. In Text 9, the mistranslation of the lexical item '*practice of Islam*' in E(8) in the ST as '伊斯兰的教义' has changed the intended meaning of the utterance in particular and the overall meaning of the Opposition (see Table 6.11, p.268).

### **7.5.3 Shifts of Coherence in the Substantiation**

Substantiation contains evidence which demonstrates the validity of the writer's claim. Questionable evidence will jeopardize readers' acceptance of the claim put forward. Mistranslation found in the substantiation affects validity of the claim in varying degrees, depending on the significance it bears on the emerging coherence and cohesion of the text. As shown by Table 7.1, except in Text 1, Text 14, Text 15, Text 24 and Text 26, significant shifts of coherence occur in Substantiation in all the other 22 texts. A few examples are shown again in this section to illustrate how shifts in this part of an argumentative text affect the drift of argument being put forward.

For instance, in Text 3 (see Table 6.5, p.231), the wrong translation of the word *only* in the phrase *only after years* in Chunk II E(6) has gravely affected the reasonableness of

the stretch of language. The mistranslation of E(9) in the same Chunk has upset the calculability of implicature in the TT and caused the loss of the irony manifested in the ST.

In Text 4 (see Table 6.6, p.238), a serious shift occurs when the translators interpreted the utterance in E(5) and E(6) and presented their own opinion about Chinese education in Malaysia. In other words the translators are substantiating the thesis of this text by putting ideas into readers' heads that is not from the text producer. In Text 16 (see Table 6.18, p.317), the many mistranslations that occur in the Substantiation have not only given rise to interpretations not derivable from the ST but has made the textual flow illogical and senseless.

In Text 10 (see Table 6.12, p.278), the mistranslation of the clause *occupy key position in Indonesia* in E(5) has seriously affected the assumptions underlying the argument and thus the validity of the writer's claim. It has also disrupted the sense of continuity between the Opposition and the Substantiation thus affecting the drift of the argument put forward by the text producer. Lack of alertness to intentional parallel structures in E(7) in the ST has also eroded the impact of the message contained in the Substantiation and significantly affected the consistency in tone and meaning.

In short, a unified chunk in the Substantiation, that is, where all details and examples hold together, will spare readers the irritation of having to frequently stop and reread. It will certainly avoid the feeling of being taken around in circles before getting to the central idea in the stretch of language involved. In other words, mistranslations that occurred in the Substantiation will affect the way utterances relate to each other and in some cases, making the substantiation irrelevant to the thesis statement.

#### 7.5.4 Shifts of Coherence in the Conclusion

This happens in Text 15 (see table 6.17, p.312), the conclusion of the text contradicts the thesis being put forward. As a result, a clear, complete, convincing argument which is supported by reasons in the ST has become unclear, incomplete and unconvincing in the TT. In short, the reasonableness of the whole argument is at stake.

Another example is the mistranslation of the collocation *critical mass* (E14) in Text 10 (see Table 6.12, p.278). This has changed completely the intended meaning of the author and subsequently weakened the carefully structured argument put forward by the author. The mistranslation has also affected the logical relations between the sequence of ideas and the inference that can be drawn by target text readers.

As can be seen, a significant number of examples discussed in Chapter 6 has demonstrated that misinterpretation, mistranslation and omission occur in the same stretch of language (for instance in Text 2, Text 6, Text 9, Text 12, Text 14, Text 17 and Text 21), thus badly affecting the coherence of the target text. Consequently, the soundness of the thesis, the reasonableness of the substantiation and the impact of the conclusion are considerably weakened. This has defied the purpose of the argumentative text in convincing readers to accept the writer's opinion. Halliday and Hasan's view about non-text in actual life may well sum up the many texts analyzed in chapter 6:

The nearest we get to non-text in actual life, leaving aside the works of those poets and prose writers who deliberately set out to create non-text, is probably in the speech of young children and *in bad translations (emphasis mine)*.

(Halliday and Hasan, 2001:24)

## **7.6 The Role of Back Translation**

In this study, Back Translation has been proven particularly effective in analyzing issues pertaining to textual comprehension, which inevitably lead to discourse processing, and eventually to translation problems. These range from problems of lexical cohesion which involved mistranslation or inappropriate translation of words, collocations, phrases, fixed expression, idioms, and rechunking which would require, in most cases, knowledge of rhetorical devices, a good command of the source language, and above all, the ability to fill potential gaps in understanding the source language text.

## **7.7 Future Directions for Research**

This research has attempted to look at cohesion and coherence of English argumentative text translated into Chinese and to answer the questions presented at the outset of the study. As a piece of practically-oriented research, it has enriched the theory used by testing out theoretical assumptions against authentic data and thus provides evidence which supports the theory. The research has also generated other questions that may be the basis of further research in related areas for both linguists and translators in our effort to make translation a recognizable profession.

In terms of cohesion, the present research does not deal with all the five devices outlined by Halliday and Hasan (1976). Nonetheless, the researcher recognizes that the three devices not dealt with in this study do have a bearing on the cohesion and coherence shifts of argumentative texts. Thus, it is worth while for future research to deal with these three devices. In terms of coherence, this study is based on contrastive textual analysis. Nonetheless, as suggested by Blum-Kulka (1986:34), from an empirical point of view, the analysis of texts should be followed by an investigation involving two sets of readers : the SL readers and the TL readers. For example, the study of possible shifts in the intended meaning or the inference that can be drawn by the target text readers in translation should be established (ibid): (a) the interpretations agreed on with regard to a particular text by a homogeneous group of readers in the source language text; (b) the interpretations agreed on by a parallel group of readers in the target language text. If the results indicate a different interpretation of the intended meaning and the inference between these two groups of readers, these in turn might confirm that either reader based or text based shifts of coherence have taken place.

## **7.8 Recommendations**

An in-depth study of the problems encountered in the translation of argumentative texts from English into Chinese in Chapter 6 has uncovered a multitude of problems which could have been avoided if care was taken to choose the right translator for the job as well as an editor who is well-versed in the languages concerned. The following are thus recommendations to ensure that translation works can be more efficiently accomplished.

### **7.8.1 The Selection of Translators**

There are indeed certain criteria to be considered in selecting a suitable translator. The translator must possess the following qualities:

- Mastery of the source and target languages is a must. They need to possess the linguistic competence which includes the ability to write naturally and proficiently in the target language. A good command and comprehension of the source language is a prerequisite. They need to have the ability to analyze and interpret source language texts in terms of textual structure and meaning and reformulate the text according to the writer's intention and the appropriate norms of the target language. Linguistic proficiency in both source text language and target text language and the ability to read critically remains two key ingredients in the translation business.
- Extensive knowledge of the relevant subject area and a deep familiarity with the field of specialization are necessary to succeed in the field of translation. For instance, if the translator is working on editorials and commentaries, he or she must have a solid background in the field and must read extensively in order to be updated on current issues either domestically or internationally. In short, he/she need to maintain and upgrade his/her knowledge in his/her area of specialization.

### **7.8.2 The Need for Quality Control**

The many mistakes committed by the translators in this particular study has revealed one thing: the party who is commissioned to carry out the translation work has the responsibility to ensure that the end product meets the required standard. The required standard of any piece of translated text depends on a variety of factors. For the translation of argumentative texts, there is a need to have a reviser who is also an expert in the target language and an experienced translator who is familiar and well-versed in current issues either domestically or internationally. A reviser must ensure that:

- the content must be true to the original text;
- the target text meets the standards of the target language;

- the readers of the target language are able to follow the drift of the argument in essentially the same manner as original readers do

Important steps such as editing, reviewing, proof-reading and revising must be taken based on the original text to ensure that the end product is devoid of any linguistic mistranslation. A translation which has mistakes at the word, phrase and clause levels, either intentionally or unintentionally, can seriously misrepresent or distort the content of the original text, ideas and intention of the text producer. This therefore explains why quality control is of paramount importance in translation.