

Cohesion and Translation in *Si Phaendin: A Stylistic Study*

Sunanta Wannasin Bell

สุนันทา วรรณสินธ์ เบล

Abstract

This research paper attempts to address the question of equivalence in the translation of *Si Phaendin (Four Reigns)* by means of stylistics and comparative linguistics, and in so doing aims at promoting stylistics as an indispensable tool in text analysis and translation. In its comparative study, the research employs Halliday and Hasan's (1968) cohesion framework and compares cohesive devices in the text and its translation in order to reach a conclusion on equivalence of cohesive devices in Thai and in English and to account for adaptation in the translation. The study finds that the translation shortens the text by omitting certain features of the text and finds other textual devices to maintain its cohesion and equivalence to the original text.

บทคัดย่อ

บทความวิจัยนี้มีวัตถุประสงค์เพื่อศึกษาความเท่าเทียมกันของตัวบทและบทแปลของ “สี่แผ่นดิน” (*Four Reigns*) โดยใช้กรอบความคิดตามแนวทฤษฎีวรรณคดีและภาษาศาสตร์เชิงเปรียบเทียบ เพื่อเป็นการพัฒนาองค์ความรู้ทางทฤษฎีวรรณคดีให้เป็นเครื่องมือสำคัญในการวิเคราะห์ตัวบทและในการศึกษาด้านการแปล งานวิจัยชิ้นนี้ได้นำกรอบความคิดด้านความต่อเนื่องของข้อความของฮาลิเดย์และฮาซัน (1968) มาศึกษาเปรียบเทียบตัวบทและบทแปลของ “สี่แผ่นดิน” เพื่อหาข้อสรุปเรื่องความเท่าเทียมกันของความต่อเนื่อง

ของข้อความในภาษาไทยและภาษาอังกฤษ งานวิจัยนี้ศึกษาพบว่าบทแปลทำให้ข้อความสั้นลงโดยการละลักษณะบางประการของต้นบท และใช้กลวิธีการภาษาอื่น ๆ เพื่อสร้างความต่อเนื่องและเท่าเทียมกันของต้นบทและแปล

Introduction

This research starts with a simple question of quantity and equivalence. A crude observation reveals that the English translation of Si Phaendin is much shorter than the original Thai text. The original is divided into two volumes, with a total page count of 1,287, while the translated version comes in a single volume, containing 656 pages. This leads to the question of adaptation, transformation and omission, hence the reflection on the equivalence and ‘truthfulness’ of the translation as a whole.

As a more detailed study ensues, it becomes apparent that the organisation of ideas and order of narration are different. To compare the two texts and evaluate the translation in these aspects, one needs to look at the organisation and continuation of ideas as in the cohesion of the discourse. The omissions and alterations in the translation can be examined through the comparative study of cohesive devices in the two texts.

The practice of stylistic analysis is rarely found in studies of Thai literature, which are typically grounded in impressionistic interpretations. However, with the need to appraise translated literature, standards or criteria need to be developed. Stylistics can and should be included in the studies of translation as it is a thorough study of a text and its structure and as the translator needs to analyse and interpret the text, both at the semiotic and stylistic level.

Objectives

1. To analyse the text and the translation of *Si Phaendin* through a stylistic framework: namely, cohesion.
2. To account for the adaptations and omissions in the translation.
3. To compare cohesive devices used in the Thai and English texts.

Limitations

The research applies cohesion (Halliday and Hasan, 1976 and Chanawangsa, 1986) in the comparative analysis of Pramoj's (1953) *Si Phaendin* and Bunnag's (1981) *Four Reigns*.

Literature Review

Stylistics (Simpson, 2004 for instance) is the textual study of texts, particularly literary ones. It is an application of science, the rigorous systematic methods of linguistics, to the arts of literary language. This corresponds with the notion of translation as both art and science. Stylistics can lend itself as one of the indispensable tools in literary studies and in translation.

Stylistics employs a vast array of linguistic frameworks to textual analysis to account for the reading and interpretation of a text. All aspects of the text, however, cannot possibly be examined with a reasonable degree of thoroughness of scrutiny in a single study. Therefore, this research focuses itself on cohesion because it best addresses

the problem arising from the general observation of the quantitative discrepancy and because it is a new addition to the study of translation equivalence.

Cohesion is an integral property of text, as opposed to disconnected sequence of language. It is a semantic relation which “occurs when the interpretation of some element in the discourse is dependent on that of another” (Halliday and Hasan, 1976: 4). Cohesion, according to Halliday and Hasan, is not a structural relation, as it is not restricted by sentence boundaries. “Cohesion is defined as the set of possibilities that exist in the language for making text hang together: the potential that the speaker or writer has at his disposal. This is a purely relational concept...” (ibid: 18-19). In other words, cohesion is a semantic relation realised through lexico-grammatical devices such as reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction and lexical cohesion.

Reference is “the relation between an element of the text and something else by reference to which it is interpreted in the given instance” (Halliday and Hasan, 1976: 308). The linguistic items classed under reference are not interpreted semantically in their own right, but refer to something else for their interpretation, hence link the two lexical items together. Reference words in both Thai and English are *pronominals, demonstratives and comparatives*, though pronouns in Thai include zero-pronoun and pronominally-used nouns such as kinship terms, personal names and titles.

While reference is a semantic relation, **substitution** is a grammatical one. “Substitution is subject to a very strong grammatical condition”; it works only with the same class as the item for which it substitutes (Halliday and Hasan, 1976: 32). Substitution in English is

categorized according to the unit of language for which it substitutes: *nominal, verbal and clausal substitution*. However, nominal and verbal substitution does not feature in Thai; repetition and deletion are more common devices.

Substitution and ellipsis are very similar. **Ellipsis** can be seen as a kind of substitution, that by zero. Ellipsis occurs in “sentences, clauses, etc. whose structure is such as to presuppose some preceding item, which then serves as the source of the missing information. An elliptical item is one which, as it were, leaves specific structural slots to be filled from elsewhere” (Halliday and Hasan, 1976: 143). It differs from substitution in that the latter “requires an explicit linguistic form such as do, one, etc. to form a place-marker for the presupposed item, whereas in ellipsis nothing is inserted into the slot” (Chanawangsa, 1986: 83). Due to this similarity, they can be used interchangeably in some contexts.

Conjunction is different from the other cohesive devices. It is not cohesive in itself. It expresses “certain meanings which presuppose the presence of other components in the discourse” (Halliday and Hasan, 1976: 226). It generally links clauses, sentences or even paragraphs while reference, substitution and ellipsis mostly link elements of different clauses or sentences together (Chanawangsa, 1986: 167). Extensive in the original work, the 16 types of conjunctions in Chanawangsa’s thesis are additive, enumerative, alternative, comparative, contrastive, exemplificatory, reformulatory, causal, purpose, result, conditional, inferential, temporal, transitional and continuative. Halliday and Hasan’s (1976) categories of conjunction claims that the four basic types of *additive, adversative, clausal and temporal* provide sufficient scope for subclassification within them.

Lexical cohesion, however, involves lexical items, which are of the open class. It creates cohesion by repeating and confirming the preceding texts. Lexical cohesion can be formed through *reiteration or collocation*. Within reiteration, repetition is pervasive in Thai (Chanawangsa 1986: 139), though it is thought to reduce informativity. It is used to avoid confusion of reference and to compensate for the lack of noun and verb substitutions. Halliday and Hasan (1976) focus on word repetition and class this cohesive device under lexical relationship. On the other hand, Chanawangsa expands this category to include structure (parallelism) and meaning (paraphrase) as repetition in Thai occurs at the phrase and clause levels as well as the word level.

To conclude on cohesion, according to Halliday and Hasan (1986) in their studies of cohesion, there are three kinds of relation in language: 1) relatedness of form (substitution, ellipsis and lexical cohesion), 2) relatedness of reference (reference and reiteration), and 3) semantic connection (conjunctions). There is some overlapping in their classification. However, this does not present a problem as: “the purpose of the present study is to make it easy to analyse and compare texts in respect of their cohesive properties” (76). One should bear in mind that “the different forms of cohesion are nowhere sharply set apart one from another” (87). To interpret an item as belonging to one category or another does not fundamentally affect the study of cohesion.

Cohesion is a necessary feature of language in that it provides texture to text. Speakers use cohesion to signal texture and to give clues to addressees in their reaction and interpretation of text. It signals boundaries of texts; where a text or topic ends and another one begins. Cohesion studies by Halliday and Hasan (1976) and Chanawangsa

(1986) are employed in looking at the cohesive relationships within the two texts and how the Thai text undergoes transformation in the translation to maintain cohesion as in the English text.

Contrastive analysis, as employed in this research, can be used to explain difficulties in translation or strategies used to deal with them (Nida, 1964 and Baker, 1992) though more commonly done in language teaching (cf. Kaplan, 1966; Bloom, 1981 and Krzeszowski, 1990). It is based on the idea of *tertium comparationis*, that the texts compared must have comparable traits, something in common (Hoey and Houghton, 2001: 47) which coincides with the notion of equivalence in translation (See below). The fact that there exist cohesion studies in Thai (Chanawangsa, 1986) and English (Halliday and Hasan, 1976), with the former based on the latter's framework, demonstrates that cohesion is a linguistic feature present in Thai and in English and that the two languages have comparable traits. However, one criticism of contrastive analysis, possibly of stylistics and other forms of text analysis, is that it rather focuses on the text as a product. Kaplan (1988) refutes this by arguing that, in doing so, it does not ignore the process of translation (289). This study, aware of such criticism, looks at discourse, defined as the way a text is put together (Sinclair and Coulthard, 1975), the way in which the text hangs together in negotiative and interpretative procedures. Moreover, according to Halliday and Hasan (1976: 328), "The linguistic analysis of literature is not an interpretation of what the text means; it is an explanation of why and how it means what it does". This demonstrates that stylistics focuses on the process as well as the product of interpretation and translation.

The notion of **equivalence**, a relationship between the source and the target text, is developed to evaluate a translation. Equivalence is one of Retsker's (1974) three forms of correspondence analogy and adequacy being the other two (qtd. in Fawcett, 2001: 122). According to Kenny, "equivalence is variously regarded as a necessary condition for translation, an obstacle to progress in translation studies, or a useful category for describing translation" (2001: 77). It is introduced in Nida and Taber (1969), and advanced in Pyon (1992), Baker (1992 and 1994) and Koller (1989 and 1995) to name a few. The term "stylistic equivalence" appears in grammar-translation in English language teaching to mean something beyond grammatical and lexical equivalent (Cook, 1989: 117). Koller (1989) in his study of pragmatic equivalence examines whether the source and target texts produce the same effect on their respective readers. Pragmatic equivalence is possibly theoretically the most accountable for evaluation of translation. A translation is successful when it carries all the meaning of the original text and produces the same effects in the readers. However, reader-response is difficult, if not impossible, to account for. Therefore, this study can be viewed as a continuation from Baker's (1992) study of textual equivalence in the similarity in the information flow and the cohesive roles which the source and target texts play in their respective texts.

Results and Discussion

From the comparative analysis of cohesion in Thai and in the English translation, equivalence of cohesive devices in Thai to those in English can be summarised as follows:

Thai	English
Pronominally used nouns Zero pronoun	Personal pronouns Pronoun reference Nominal substitution Gapping of the subject in compound and complex structures
Clausal substitution	Omission and Reiteration
Nominal ellipsis	Nominal substitution
Verbal ellipsis	Reiteration
Clausal ellipsis	Omission
Repetition	Pronoun reference Substitution Reiteration Omission

The English translation uses personal pronouns in place of pronominally used nouns. Zero pronouns in Thai are filled out by various cohesive devices such as pronoun reference, nominal substitution and gapping of the subject in compound and complex sentences. Clausal substitution is replaced by an extreme opposite of either omission or reiteration. The cohesion of nominal ellipsis is made more explicit through nominal substitution; verbal ellipsis by reiteration. However, clausal ellipsis in Thai is often considered redundant and is, therefore, omitted in the translation. Repetition, which is a prominent feature in Thai, is equivalent to reference, substitution, reiteration and omission in English. The other devices not included in the table are the same in both languages.

Below are examples to illustrate these instances of equivalence.

Pronoun Reference

Pronominally used nouns (such as kinship terms, titles and names) and zero pronouns are special features in the Thai language, which denote socio-cultural attitude in the speaker. They can pose a problem in translation into English. In the translation of *Si Phaendin* (henceforth, *SP*) into *Four Reigns* (*FR*), the translator uses personal pronouns in place of pronominally used nouns and zero pronouns.

Most of the *SP* is told from the point of view of Phloi the main character. The character “แม่” is called thus as it is the second-person address form used by Phloi. This kinship term, however, is interpreted as a third person in the translation. Also, “แม่” can be used as a first-person pronoun in a direct speech. The following excerpt is an instance where a kinship term (แม่) and a personal name (พลอย) is changed into personal pronouns (“you” and “me”).

“พลอยไปกับแม่” เสียงแม่พูดอย่าง แค้นใจ ใบหน้าของแม่อาบไปด้วยน้ำตา “เมื่อท่านไม่เลี้ยงแม่แล้ว แม่ก็จะไปตาม ยถากรรม เขาก็คนมีชาติมีสกุลเหมือนกัน ใครจะไปยอมให้กดหัวกันอย่างข้า พ่อ เพิ่มเป็นลูกผู้ชายต้องอยู่ทางนี้ เจ้าคุณพ่อ ท่านไม่ยอมให้แม่เอาไป... (<i>SPI</i>: 24)	“<u>You</u> are coming with <u>me</u>, <u>Phloi</u>,” Mother said. “Since it’s quite clear that he doesn’t want <u>me</u> under his care and protection any more, <u>I</u> must go. Let the course of karma take <u>me</u> where it will. Better than to stay and be trampled on like a bonded slave... But <u>you</u> have to stay, <u>Phoem</u>. His Excellency refuses to let you come with <u>us</u>. ... (<i>FR</i>: 9)
--	---

“แม่” here is used as a first-person pronoun, “I” and “me” in English. Personal names can be used as second-person pronouns. In English Phloi and Phoem are referred to as “you”, followed by their names.

Zero pronoun also poses a challenge to translation of Thai into English. The most common strategy to cope with zero pronouns is to fill them out with the appropriate personal pronouns. In the example below, when the subject pronoun referring to “Khaeks” is omitted (as signified by Ø), the English text uses the pronoun “they”. The translation also uses the complex structure of present participial with omitted agent nouns as equivalent to the zero pronouns in Thai.

แม่จำ พี่ฉันเมาคลื่นใหญ่ พอ ๘ ออกจากสิงคโปร์ ๘ กินนอนหน้าเหลืองมาใน เรือ ๘ ไม่กินอะไร ๘ กินแต่ลัมกับน้ำ แต่ เดี๋ยวนี้ ๘ หายแล้ว ๘ บอกว่ายัง ๘ เพื่อยอยู่ ออดไม่เมาคลื่นเลยเขียนจดหมายมาก่อน เมืองนี้เขาเรียกว่าโคลัมโบ มีแต่<u>แขกดำ</u>เต็ม ไปทั้งเมือง ๘ เหม็นสาบด้วย ๘ พุดเอะอะ ๘ ร้องตะโกนกันไป ... (SPII: 102)	The letter was from Ot, telling her that <u>An</u> was still feeling weak, Ø having been seasick and Ø unable to swallow anything solid for days. “The name of this town is Columbo,” he went on to inform her. “<u>Khaeks</u> (Indians) are all over the place. <u>A lot</u> <u>of them</u> come up to the boat. <u>They</u> smell mouldy and Ø make a lot of noise. .. (FR: 349)
---	--

Substitution

Clausal substitution in Thai is replaced by either omission or reiteration, depending on whether the translator considers the substitution redundant or needing to be made explicit. In the example below, the clausal substitution is not translated. It considers the link to Khun Sai’s previous utterance not necessary. The response “Oh no!” seems to be sufficient.

“...เชื่อว่าเจ้าคุณพ่อท่านพูดว่าหมอดู เขามาแต่เกิดว่าจะมีบุญ ท่านส่งเข้ามาอยู่ ในวังก็เพราะท่านอยากเป็นขรัวตาจะได้ มีหลานเป็นพระองค์เล็ก ๆ ไว้เล่น” แม่หัวเราะงอหาย “เขาพูดอย่างนั้น เทียวหรือคุณ?” (SPI: 60)	“...‘My father looks forward to having royal highness as grand- children,’ she used to say.” “Oh no!” Mother cried, scan- dalized yet laughing at the same time. (FR: 32)
--	--

On the other hand, in the next example the substitution is made explicit through reiteration. “ถ้ายังงั้น” refers to the fact that Phloi is not coming out to Meet Phi Nuang, which is not realised explicitly in the text. Therefore, the English translation makes an explicit statement “if you don’t come”.

“โห่ พลอยก็ ออกไปหน่อยเถอะน้ำ! สงสารแก!” ซ้อยอดแทนพี่ของตัว “ออก ไปหน่อยนะ คนดีคนดี สงสารแกหน่อย เถอะ แกไม่เคยหอรอกเรื่องพรรคยังงี้ ฉัน รู้จริง ๆ นะ” แต่พลอยก็ยืนกรานอยู่นั่นเอง จน ซ้อยอ่อนใจ เห็นว่าจะเอาชนะยังไม่ได้จึง เปลี่ยนเรื่องพูด “ถ้ายังงั้นจะสั่งเสียออกไปว่ายังไง ก็ได้ หรือฝากอะไรไปให้แกเสียหน่อย เดี่ยว แกคลั่งขึ้นมาไปผูกคอตายฉันไม่รู้ด้วยนะ หมูนีตาแกยิ่งขวาง ๆ อยู่ด้วย” (SPI: 174, italics mine)	“...You still don’t want to see him?” No, not yet. “Well, if he goes and hang himself, don’t blame me.” <i>Oh no! How could Choi say such a thing even in jest?</i> “<u>If you don’t come</u> you’d better send a message or something. He’s in a bad way, believe me.” (FR: 95, italics mine)
--	--

It is remarkable that substitution in Thai is not equivalent to that in English. This, however, could be due to various textual and contextual factors of the spoken discourse. Choi's insistent request in Thai is made more explicit through the dialog sequence in the translation with the narrated speech in the second paragraph of *SP* being transformed into Phlois's free direct speech in *FR* (for further discussions, cf. Wannasin Bell, 2008)

Ellipsis

The English text tends to use substitution in place of nominal ellipsis in Thai to make the cohesion more explicit. In the Thai text, “องค์เดียว” and “หลายองค์” are instances of nominal ellipsis with the quantifier “องค์” as head. In English the substitution form “the one” for “one queen” is used. Nominal ellipsis (“several”) and reiteration (“entourages”) are also used.

“แผ่นดินนี้ท่านเห็นจะมีแต่<u>องค์เดียว</u> หรอกแม่พลอย” คุณเปรมพูด “ท่านไปเรียนเมืองนอกเมืองนาแต่ทรงพระเยาว์ ผู้ดีอังกฤษเขาไม่มีเมียกันหลายคนหรอก” “ก็ฉันไปว่าอะไรละ” พลอยตอบ “ท่านอาจมี<u>องค์เดียว</u>จริงอย่างคุณเปรมว่าก็ได้ ถ้าอย่างนั้นจริง ฉันก็ยิ่งเห็นว่ไม่ต้องถวายเป็นเลย ถ้ามีหลายองค์เสียอีก บางทีจะต้องเลือกว่าจะถวายเป็นองค์ไหนดี... (SPII: 109)	“I think this reign will have only <u>one queen</u>, Mae Phloi. He has been educated in England and the English <i>phudi</i> (well-born; of noble birth) do not have several wives.” “I’m not arguing with you, Khun Prem. He may be going to have just <u>the one</u> as you say. If so, all the more unnecessary for me to go and present myself to her. For if there were to be <u>several</u> [...], perhaps as wives of the king’s servants we might be called upon to choose among different <u>entourages</u>... (FR: 356)
---	---

There are many instances where the English translation uses other cohesive devices in place of verbal ellipsis in the Thai text. The excerpt below is an example of such instances. The verbal clause “ทรงละคร” appears three times; hence, in the Q-A sequence, total ellipsis is used. Only the new information is supplied in the response. Repetition of the word “tickets” serves as a cohesive tie in the English text; however, the main point of discussion seems to shift from “ทรงละคร” in Thai to the fact that “tickets” can be bought for the performance. The information about who is performing in the play is explicitly supplied by Khun Prem. Clausal substitution, marked by “so”, is used. This confirms Halliday and Hasan’s (1976) statement regarding the interchangeability of ellipsis and substitution.

“อยากเห็นนะ เห็นจะได้หรงแม่พลอย” คุณเปรมตอบ “ท่านจะทรงละครทั้งสององค์เร็ว ๆ นี้ ฉันจะไปซื้อตั๋วพาแม่พลอยไปดู” “ใครทรงละคร ซื้อตั๋วอะไร?” พลอยถามอย่างงง ๆ “ก็ในหลวงกับพระวรวงศ์เธอ [ทรงละคร] นะสิ ท่านจะทรงละครเป็นตัวละครเอกนางเอกเสียด้วย ส่วนตัวที่ต้องซื้อนั้นก็เพื่อเก็บเงินบำรุงเสือป่า” (SP11: 111)	“You’ll see for yourself, Mae Phloi. I’m getting <u>tickets</u> for this play Nai Luang is staging. He’s acting in it and so is Phra Worakanya.” “<u>Tickets</u>, Khun Prem?” “Oh, yes, <u>tickets</u> are being sold to the public and the proceeds will go to help maintain the Wild Tigers.” (FR: 358)
--	--

Like nominal ellipsis, verbal ellipsis is omitted in the translation when there is sufficient informativity in the preceding texts. The translated text may use other devices such as repetition or reiteration to create the cohesive tie in the text—which entails that the main focus or the ‘theme’ of text may be changed.

Since ellipsis presupposes the information supplied in the previous text, the English translation sometimes treats this as a repetition and redundancy, as in the excerpt below:

ทั้งสามคนนั่งกินข้าวอยู่สักครู่หนึ่ง ช้อยก็คลานกระโดดกระเดกเข้ามาในห้อง มือหนึ่งถือกระทงใบใหญ่ “ช้อย! ไปเอาอะไรมา” คุณสายร้อง ถาม “[...] ข้าวสุก” ช้อยตอบหน้าตาเฉย “ไปเอาข้าวสุกมาทำไม” คุณสายร้อง ถามอย่างฉงน “ข้าวที่นี่ก็เป็นกอง” (SPI: 72)	She entered the room only a few moments after the meal had started, carrying a <u>krathong</u> of boiled rice and wearing a sorrowful expression on her face. ...0 0 0... “Why the rice?” inquired her astonished aunt. “There is enough of rice here for everybody.” (FR: 39, italics in original)
---	--

The Thai excerpt depicts the use of clausal ellipsis in the Q-A sequence. On the other hand, in the translation the information of what Choi has brought is supplied in the narrated speech. Therefore, the Q-A sequence, which does not advance the conversation, is omitted.

Repetition

The English translation uses many other cohesive devices in place of repetition in Thai. In the example below, the Thai text is marked by the repetition of the verb “ร้อง” while the word “cry” (also

“cried”) is repeated only three times in the translation. Verbal substitution (“do” and “did” for “to cry”) and synonym (“shed one tear”) are used instead to avoid repetition.

“ว้าย! อย่ากรั๊องก็กรั๊องไปเถิด ไม่มีใครเชื่อว่าหรอก” คุณเชยว่า “ฉันเองนาน ๆ ก็กรั๊องเสียที่เหมือนกัน” “อ้าว! อย่างคุณเชยกับคุณอุ้นไม่เหมือนฉันนี่” ซ้อยแก่ “คุณอุ้นเธอแก่แล้วและเป็นพี่เมีย กรั๊องเท่าไรก็กรั๊องได้ อย่างคุณเชยก็อีก จะบีบน้ำตากรั๊องให้สักเท่าไรก็ไม่มีใครสงสัย เพราะมีคุณหลวงคอยคำประกันอยู่ ส่วนแม่พลอยเขาก็เป็นธรรมดา ถ้าไม่กรั๊องก็ต้องตีให้กรั๊อง เพราะกลัวตาย ฉันคนเดียวเท่านั้นที่ลำบาก กระอักกระอ่วน เพราะฉันยังสาวแล้วก็ตัวเปล่า ขึ้นดัดจริตไปกรั๊องเข้า คนเขาก็สงสัยว่ายังงี้ ๆ เสียกรรมัง!” (SPII: 258)	‘But why?’ Khun Choei asked. ‘Why not <u>cry</u> when you feel like it? <u>I do</u>, I can’t carry on like Khun Big Sister Un, that’s all’ ‘Listen, my dear,’ Choi said. ‘You and Khun Un can <u>cry</u> as hard as you like. Khun Un’s old enough and you are happily married to your dear Khun Luang, and both you are Phloi’s sisters. And if Phloi hadn’t <u>cried</u> we’d have had to beat her until <u>she did</u>, wouldn’t we? People expect you to be stricken when your husband dies. But me, if I <u>shed one tear</u> too many, people would start asking: What was Khun Prem do to that woman anyway? ... (FR: 450)
--	---

In the next example, the noun phrase “ทฬารอาศา” is repeated five times, possibly to accompany the fact that Khun Prem talks about them repeatedly. This excerpt also has many temporal conjunctions forming a collocation chain such as ไม่นาน ต่อกไปอีก วันหนึ่ง ๆ พอ... ไม่มีเวลาเสร็จงาน...ไปแล้ว ต่อกไปอีก คราวนี้. Khun Prem’s involvement with the contingent is repeated and continual.

¶ สงครามเสร็จไปแล้วไม่นาน คุณเปรมก็เริ่มต้นเต้นทหารอาสาต่อไปอีก วันหนึ่ง ๆ ก็มีแต่คุยเรื่องทหารอาสาไปสวนสนามที่โน่นที่นี้ พอทหารอสากลับถึงเมืองไทย คุณเปรมก็วุ่นวายด้วยการรับรองทหารอาสาจนไม่มีเวลาไปทำอื่นได้ เสร็จงานทหารอาสาไปแล้ว คุณเปรมก็มีเรื่องที่จะต้องเริ่มต้นต่อไปอีก คราวนี้เป็นเรื่องเรียไรเงินซื้อเรือรบ... (SP11: 77)	¶ The <u>war</u> was over. In Europe there were <u>victory parades and processions</u>, and the Thai <u>contingent</u> took part in some of these. <i>Khun Prem</i> was thrilled and enjoyed talking about <u>them</u> at great length. When the <u>soldiers</u> arrived back in town <i>he</i> was there in the front line of the cheering crowd, and the ensuing weeks saw <i>him</i> actively involved in the various homecoming celebrations—so much so that <i>he</i> had no time left for anything else. And when that phase had passed <i>he</i> promptly took up another engrossing avocation. A fund was set up for the <u>Royal Navy</u> to acquire a new <u>battleship</u>; ... (FR: 334)
---	--

In English, there is no repetition of the kind. Synonyms of “contingent” and “soldiers” are used instead of the repetition, together with the collocation chain of “war”, “victory parades and possessions”, “Royal Navy” and “battleship”. Khun Prem’s dedication to the soldiers is in the repetition of the use of pronoun references “he” and “him”. Temporal sequences still feature strongly in the English translation.

Conclusion

A fundamental significance of cohesion is in the interpretation of discourse. According to Halliday and Hasan (1976), “It is the continuity provided by cohesion that enables the reader or listener to supply all the missing pieces, all the components of the picture which are not present in the text but are necessary to its interpretation” (299).

As textual understanding and interpretation play a vital part in translation, the study of cohesion of text as in this research has significant implications for translation studies as a whole. The comparative study of *SP* and its translation demonstrates how cohesion plays a part in interpretation as reflected through the translation.

The findings of this research regarding cohesion have numerous implications for translation studies. With an understanding of cohesion in an original text and an awareness of its equivalence in the target language, translators can make informed decisions in their adaptation of texts.

The main objective of this research is, however, to demonstrate how stylistics can be applied to enhance the studies of translation. Though cohesion is the chosen framework in this study, other frameworks that lead to a better understanding of texts can also be applied. *SP* is chosen as a case study as the difference in volume of the original and the translation is apparent. However, any translated text is worthy of academic attention as the translation needs to be evaluated systematically rather than impressionistically. Stylistics is an insightful tool and should be applied to other translations to enhance the understanding of languages and translation in general.

References

- Baker, M. (1992). *In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation*. London and New York: Routledge.
- _____. (ed.) (2001). *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. London: Routledge.

- Bloom, A. (1981). *The Linguistic Shaping of Thought: A Study in the Impact of Language in China and the West*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Bunnag, C. (1981). *Four Reigns*. Bangkok: Silkworm Books.
- Chanawangsa, W. (1986). *Cohesion in Thai*. PhD Thesis. Georgetown University.
- Cook, G. (1989). *Discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fawcett, P. (2001). Linguistic approaches. In Baker, M. (ed). *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. London: Routledge, pp. 120-125.
- Halliday, M.A.K. and Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.
- Hoey, M. and Houghton, D. (2001). Contrastive analysis and translation. In Baker, M. (ed). *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. London: Routledge, pp. 45-49.
- Kaplan, R.B. (1966). Cultural thought patterns in inter-cultural education. *Language Learning* 16 (3-4): 1-20.
- _____. (1988). Contrastive rhetoric and second language learning: notes towards a theory of contrastive rhetoric. In Purves A.C. (ed.) *Writing across Languages and Cultures: Issues in Contrastive Rhetoric*. Newbury Park: Sage.
- Kenny, D. (2001). Equivalence. In Baker, M. (ed). *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. London: Routledge, pp. 77-80.
- Koller, W. (1989). Equivalence in translation theory. In Chesterman (ed.) *Readings in Translation Theory*. Helsinki: Oy Finn Lectura Ab.

- _____. (1995). The concept of equivalence and the object of translation studies. *Target* 7 (2): 191-222.
- Krzeszowski, T. P. (1990). Contrasting Languages: *The Scope of Contrastive Linguistics*. The Hague: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Nida, E.A. (1964). *Toward a Science of Translating*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Nida, E.A. and Taber, C.R. (1969). *The Theory and Practice of Translation*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Pramoj, K. (1995 [1953]). *Si Phaendin*. Bangkok: Nanmee Books Publication.
- Simpson, P. (1993). *Language, Ideology and Point of View*. London: Routledge.
- _____. (2004). *Stylistics*. London: Routledge.
- Sinclair, J. and Coulthard, M. (1975). *Towards an Analysis of Discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wannasin Bell, S. (2008). *Stylistic Analysis of Si Phaendin: Text and Translation*. Research report. Thammasat University.