

KHAZAR UNIVERSITY

School: Graduate School of Science, Art and Technology

Department: English Language and Literature

Specialty: 060203 – Translation (English Language)

MASTER’S THESIS

COHESION SHIFTS IN TRANSLATION FROM ENGLISH INTO AZERBAIJANI

Student: _____ Shahnaz Rasim Mirzayeva

Supervisor: _____ Prof. Dr. Huseynaga Hasanali Rzayev

Baku – 2025

XƏZƏR UNIVERSİTETİ

Fakültə: Təbiət elmləri, Sənət və Texnologiya yüksək təhsil fakültəsi

Departament: İngilis dili və ədəbiyyatı

İxtisas: 060203 - Tərcümə (ingilis dili)

MAGİSTR DİSSERTASIYA İŞİ

TƏRCÜMƏDƏ KOHEZİV DƏYİŞİKLİKLƏR (İNGİLİS DİLİNDƏN AZƏRBAYCAN DİLİNƏ)

İddiaçı: _____ Şahnaz Rasim qızı Mirzəyeva

Elmi rəhbər: _____ Prof. Dr. Hüseynağa Həsənalı oğlu Rzayev

Bakı 2025

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	5
CHAPTER I: LITERATURE REVIEW	8
1.1. Cohesion in Language	8
1.2. The study of Cohesion in English	8
1.2.1. The emergence of cohesion as a linguistic concept.....	8
1.2.2. Types and classifications of cohesive devices in English.....	11
1.2.3. Functional role of cohesion in English texts.....	19
1.2.4. Criticism and expansions of cohesion theory.....	20
1.3. The study of Cohesion in Azerbaijani.....	22
1.3.1. Cohesion in Linguistics and Azerbaijani text Studies.....	22
1.3.2. Development of Cohesion Research in Azerbaijani Linguistics.....	23
1.3.3. Cohesive Devices in Azerbaijani texts.....	24
1.3.3.1. Grammatical Cohesion.....	26
1.3.3.2. Lexical Cohesion.....	26
1.3.4. Syntactic features of Cohesion in Azerbaijani.....	28
1.3.5. Challenges and research gaps in the study of Cohesion in Azerbaijani.....	28
1.4. Cohesion and Coherence.....	29
1.4.1. The definition of Cohesion and Coherence.....	29

1.4.2. The distinctions between cohesion and coherence-Cohesion as semantic-based phenomenon and coherence as a Complex (Semantic, Pragmatic and Cognitive) phenomenon.....	33
1.4.3. The role of Coherence in comprehension of text.....	35
1.4.4. The interconnection between Cohesion and Coherence.....	36
CHAPTER II: METHODOLOGY.....	39
2.1. Research Design.....	39
2.2. Corpus and Data Collection.....	39
2.3. Analytical Procedures.....	40
2.4. Theoretical Framework.....	41
CHAPTER III: COHESION SHIFTS IN TRANSLATION	42
3.1. Cohesion and Translation: Semantic and pragmatic factors leading to cohesive shifts.....	42
3.1.1 Influence of Cultural and Contextual Asymmetries	43
3.1.2. The translator’s Linguistic and Stylistic choices.....	44
3.1.3. Reader expectations and target language norms	44
3.2. Case study 1: Cohesion shifts in S. Maughan’s “The Unconquered”.....	45
3.2.1. Comparative analysis of two Azerbaijani translations.....	45
3.3. Case Study: Cohesion Shifts in M. Twain’s “The Adventures of Tom Sawyer”.....	63
3.4. Statistical (quantitative) data.....	67
CONCLUSION.....	70
REFERENCES.....	72
APPENDICES.....	76

INTRODUCTION

Statement of the problem. Cohesion is defined by Halliday and Hasan (1976) as two meaning and reference connections between phrases in a text. M.A.K. Halliday and Ruqayya Hasan list five general types of cohesive devices that provide texts coherence in their book "Cohesion in English." This comprises lexical coherence, conjunction, ellipsis, reference, and substitution. So that it keeps a sentence or text cohesive and enables readers to comprehend word or sentence sequences as a whole rather than as discrete parts. Additionally, according to Newmark (1991: 69), a text functions on four levels when it is translated from a source to a target:

1. Textual level
2. Referential level
3. Cohesive level
4. Naturalness level

On the other hand, different languages employ cohesive devices differently to establish cohesion within a sentence or text. In order to prevent a word-for-word translation from misinterpreting the original text's meaning, translators must be aware of actual coherence shifts (Larson 1984: 394).

Because grammatical differences between languages result in different forms of cohesive devices being utilized in both the source and target texts of sentences, Blum-Kulka (2000, 299) also highlighted how shifts in cohesive devices might effect cohesiveness in a translated text or sentence.

Similarly, some academics assert that certain conceptual distinctions can be recognized while translating discourse between languages. One example is the employment of cohesive devices in Azerbaijan, which function differently than those in English. In order to comply with the conventions of the target language, translators must use coherent devices; otherwise, readers of the translated text may find it difficult to understand.

Examining how cohesive devices are changed from one language to another may be helpful for translators, language learners, and linguists alike because the source and target languages employ cohesive devices differently. In conclusion, the findings can be used as practice materials in the translation sector to help translators, especially those who are just starting out, better grasp the problems related to cohesiveness shifts. Thus, this study's main goal is to examine cohesion devices in English texts and their Azerbaijani counterparts using the theoretical framework developed by Halliday and Hasan (1976).

The Objectives of the study. The following questions are the focus of the study:

1. In what ways do cohesion devices in English texts shift in their equivalents in Azerbaijan?
2. How do cohesion devices affect the accuracy of translations between English and Azerbaijan?
3. What are the mismatches within English and Azerbaijan texts?
4. Which cohesive device types are appeared in Azerbaijan and English texts?

The significance of the study. The study's findings are useful in the following ways:

1. Cohesion shifts linguistic analysis: This study will offer a linguistic analysis and explanation of the ways in which cohesive devices shift between Azerbaijan and English. For both theoretical investigation and practical application in the field of translation studies, it will offer a more profound comprehension of the parallels and variations in cohesiveness mechanisms between the two languages.
2. Increasing awareness in language learning: The results can be used to help students understand the potential difficulties of native language transfer in Azerbaijani language classrooms and ESL classes. Students will be better equipped to use cohesive devices correctly in both languages if they are aware of the differences between English and Azerbaijan.
3. Direction for translators: This study will assist translators in identifying and addressing the difficulties associated with translating cohesive devices from English to Azerbaijan. Translators will be better able to provide more accurate and coherent translations by identifying typical inconsistencies and comprehending how syntactic and cultural differences impact cohesion. This will reduce the possibility of confusion resulting from the incorrect use of cohesive devices.
4. Effective application for translation students: With its activities centered on cohesion in translation, this study might serve as a useful manual for translation students. Students will acquire knowledge on how to handle the delicate use of cohesive devices in their translations by examining the changes in cohesive devices.
5. Improving the quality of translation: By offering suggestions for preserving cohesive integrity, this study will help to improve the quality of translation between English and Azerbaijan. These realizations will help translators and advance translating theory and practice more broadly.

Scope of the study. The cohesive device translation problems between English and Azerbaijan are the main subject of this study. The study's scope will include examining instances from a variety of works, such as British author W. Somerset Maugham's short story "The Unconquered" and Mark Twain's *The Adventures of Tom Sawyer*.

Understanding the effects of these shifts on translation quality will be made easier with the help of an examination of how cohesive devices change between different texts. The chosen samples from these various sources will provide in-depth understandings of translation and language usage.

CHAPTER I: LITERATURE REVIEW

1.1. Cohesion in language

Cohesion is a fundamental concept in linguistics that refers to the way elements within a text are linked together to create meaning. It is through cohesion that sentences and parts of discourse are connected, allowing language users to interpret a text as a unified whole rather than as isolated sentences. Cohesion operates at various levels of language, including grammar and vocabulary, and is essential for maintaining textual unity and communicative effectiveness. Without cohesive ties, texts would lack clarity, coherence, and logical progression. As such, cohesion plays a crucial role not only in written texts but also in spoken discourse, enabling effective communication across contexts and languages.

1.2. The study of Cohesion in English

1.2.1. The emergence of cohesion as a linguistic concept

It is more appropriate to begin by providing general information about the definitions and characteristics of text, as suggested by various scholars. These foundational insights lay the groundwork for understanding cohesion as a linguistic phenomenon, which is explored further in this chapter.

The term text derives from the Latin word “texere” meaning to weave” (Emilia, 2014; see also Emilia, 2011). It defines as “words or sentences woven together to create a single whole” (Cristie and Misson, 1998 in Emilia, 2011: 71). This metaphor emphasizes that a text is not merely a random collection of sentences, but rather an interconnected unit of meaning.

Halliday and Hasan (1976) stated that the word text refers to any passage in linguistics. It can be spoken or written and it is not dependent on the length as long as it forms a unified whole. To Halliday and Hasan (1976), a text is a semantic unit. A unified whole of a text is realized by the meaning of the whole. “It may be anything from a single proverb to a whole play, from a momentary cry for helping to an all-day discussion on a committee.” (Halliday and Hasan, 1976: 1).

Eggins (2004:24) explains that texture is "the property that distinguishes text from non-text. Texture is what holds the clauses of a text together to give them unity." To distinguish between a text and a non-text, one must determine whether texture is present.

The concept of cohesion has evolved into a key area of linguistic inquiry, particularly within the domains of discourse analysis and translation studies. The term “cohesion” originates

from the Latin *cohaesio*, meaning “a sticking together” or “a uniting,” and derives from the verb *cohaerere*, which combines *com-* (“together”) and *haerere* (“to cling”). The word began appearing in English texts in the 16th century with reference to the state of being united or forming a whole (OED; Merriam-Webster).

There are academics from different nationalities proposing their opinions on the definition of cohesion. According to Halliday and Hasan (1976), cohesion is a semantic relation that links elements within a text, thereby making it a unified whole. It occurs when the interpretation of one element in the discourse depends on the presence of another. These meaning-based connections allow the text to function as a cohesive, coherent unit. Researchers including Halliday and Hasan (1976), De Beaugrande and Dressler (1981), Baker (1992), Newmark (1988), Nord (1997), Hatim (2001), and Mason (2003) have significantly advanced the study of cohesion in English by exploring its grammatical, lexical, and structural dimensions from both theoretical and applied perspectives.

In contemporary linguistics, cohesion is understood as the set of semantic and linguistic mechanisms—both grammatical and lexical—that connect elements within a text to form a unified whole. Halliday and Hasan (1976) define cohesion as “a semantic relation between an element in the text and some other element that is crucial to its interpretation” (p. 4). This definition highlights that cohesion is not merely structural, but fundamentally semantic in nature: it emerges when the interpretation of one linguistic item relies on another, creating a network of meaning that extends across sentence boundaries. In their seminal work *Cohesion in English*, Halliday and Hasan propose a taxonomy of cohesive devices, including reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction, and lexical cohesion. They emphasize that these cohesive ties function beyond the level of individual sentences, binding clauses into a coherent discourse. Their approach marked a pivotal shift in the study of textuality, positioning cohesion as a meaning-based system distinct from syntax, and laying the foundation for later developments in text linguistics.

To illustrate this, Halliday and Hasan (1976; p.2) present the following example:

“Wash and core six cooking apples. Put them into a fireproof dish”.

In this case, the pronoun *them* in the second sentence is a dependent element whose meaning is incomplete without the first sentence. It presupposes the referent *six cooking apples*. This presuppositional relationship is what creates cohesion between the two sentences, allowing them to function as a single text.

In a later elaboration, Halliday and Matthiessen (2014: 603) further assert that “cohesion refers to the use of grammatical and lexical resources to tie together parts of a text,” reinforcing the idea that cohesion functions as a semantic glue that binds discourse elements into a unified

whole. According to them, cohesion is a “non-structural” mechanism—distinct from syntactic dependencies—that enables the text to function as an integrated communicative unit.

Building on this foundational model, later scholars have expanded, refined, and in some cases critiqued the scope of cohesion. For instance, Mona Baker (2018) emphasizes that cohesion provides surface connectivity in texts. She identifies five key cohesive devices—reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction, and lexical cohesion—and asserts that these help to preserve textual unity across languages in translation. She reinforces the Hallidayan view but highlights its functional importance in cross-linguistic discourse.

Eggins (2004) offers a detailed and accessible account of cohesion within systemic functional linguistics. She states that cohesion refers to “the way we relate or tie together bits of our discourse” (Eggins, 2004: 29) and highlights that “the key to cohesion is that there is a semantic tie between an item at one point in a text and an item at another point” (Eggins, 2004: 30).

Yule (2010: 125) similarly defines cohesion as “the ties and connections that exist within texts.” He emphasizes how cohesive devices create links between textual elements and allow readers to interpret sentences as part of a whole, rather than as isolated units.

Widdowson (2007: 46) describes cohesion as the textual feature that “serves to link parts of a text together.” According to him, cohesion is instrumental in converting a sequence of independent clauses into a logically connected discourse. This structural interdependence fosters the sense of unity that defines a coherent text.

Moini and Kheirkhah (2016) describe cohesive devices as “words, phrases, or clauses that link discourse items together,” highlighting their essential role in ensuring that a text “hangs together” and achieves semantic unity. They emphasize that cohesion is the feature that transforms a collection of individual sentences into a coherent paragraph, distinguishing meaningful discourse from a random sequence of statements. In their view, cohesive devices are not only structural elements but also key contributors to the interpretability and fluency of a text.

Bailey (2003) defines cohesion as the process of linking phrases and sentences together to improve the clarity and readability of a text. Knapp and Megan (2013) expand on this by explaining that cohesion involves the selection of appropriate devices that connect information and ensure a smooth flow across textual units.

To sum up, the concept of cohesion has undergone significant theoretical development since its emergence within structural linguistics and was most notably systematized by Halliday and Hasan (1976), who framed it as a semantic relation central to text unity. Their taxonomy of cohesive devices—reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction, and lexical cohesion—

provided the foundation for subsequent studies in discourse analysis, systemic functional linguistics, and translation studies. Scholars such as Baker, Eggins, Hatim and Mason, and others have further expanded this framework, offering perspectives that emphasize cohesion's linguistic, functional, cognitive, and pragmatic dimensions. This foundational understanding sets the stage for deeper examination of the various types and classifications of cohesive devices, which will be addressed in the next section.

1.2.2. Types and classifications of cohesive devices in English

Types and classifications of cohesion in English. In the shaping of any text or discourse's structure, unity, and clarity are greatly influenced by cohesive devices. By guaranteeing seamless transitions and semantic connections between textual parts, they aid in the coherent connection of sentences and ideas. In a variety of genres and situations, these devices—which include reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunctions, and lexical cohesion—are crucial for preserving textual flow and promoting comprehension.

Accordingly, the goal of the current study is to examine the various forms of cohesiveness used in English texts, paying special emphasis to how each one contributes to maintaining textual coherence and improving reader comprehension.

Halliday and Hasan's Classifications of Cohesion. Cohesion is defined by Halliday and Hasan (1976) as the semantic and structural relationships between discourse elements that are achieved using specific cohesive devices. These devices are organized in a systematic way according to how they preserve the coherence of the text. Five main categories of cohesiveness in English are distinguished by Halliday and Hasan. These five categories are summarized here, with examples taken from Hatch (1992: 223–227). Cohesion is defined by Halliday and Hasan (1976) as:

1. A semantic phenomenon known as cohesion refers to the relationships between meanings in a text that give it a sense of unity.
2. Halliday makes a distinction between lexical cohesion, which is produced by lexical choices like synonymy or repetition, and grammatical cohesion, which is produced by grammatical features like reference, ellipsis, and substitution.
3. Lexical and grammatical cohesion are essential to a text's organization and readability. These kinds of cohesiveness guarantee that the text's many sections are connected logically, resulting in coherence.

In order to provide the structure and coherence required for successful communication, Halliday and Hasan (1976) show how lexical items, phrases, and even elisions contribute to the interrelatedness of text pieces.

There are five main categories of cohesive devices in English, according to Halliday and Hasan's (1976) theory. A summary of these categories is provided below, along with examples drawn from Hatch's corpus-based study (1992: 223–227).

Four components are included in grammatical cohesive devices: conjunctions, ellipses, reference, and substitution.

1. **Reference:** There are four types of reference in English; Anaphoric, cataphoric, exophoric, and personal, demonstrative, comparative reference together.

A language element (the referent) obtains its meaning by association with another discourse element (the antecedent) through reference, which is a cohesive device. The fundamental difference between exophora and endophora was described by Halliday and Matthiessen (2014:624). Although homophoric and exophoric references contribute to the text's (situational) coherence, endophoric references encourage cohesion since endophoricties produce the text's interior texture. Anaphoric and cataphoric references are the two primary categories of endophoric references. Three main typological categories—pronominal, demonstrative, and comparative—showcase this anaphoric/cataphoric interaction. Anaphoric references are made when the referent has already been addressed in the text, but they can also be made in reference to anything that was mentioned hours, minutes, or even pages ago. Different directions of pointing to referents in the context outside the text or to referents introduced in the text itself either before or after it are known as exophoric and endophoric references.

For instance, English (BNC Corpus):

"Mary bought a book. She [Ø] read it immediately."

"She" co-refers with Mary (subject continuity)

"It" refers to "book" (object anaphora)

Demonstrative reference: Establishing literary proximity through the use of spatial deixis (this, them).

For instance, English (COCA Corpus):

"The results were unexpected. These [Ø] suggest new theories."

"These" points cataphorically to "results".

Comparative reference: Using gradable modifiers (other, similar) to evoke analogous connections

English (ICE-GB):

"İstanbul is vibrant; no other city is quite like it."

"Other" invokes set comparison.

Reference, according to Halliday and Hasan (1976), is a particular type of information that is indicated for retrieval. By establishing connections between elements, this semantic relation fosters cohesiveness (Halliday and Hasan, 1976: 37; Halliday and Matthiessen, 2004). To put it another way, a reference connects one aspect of the text to another aspect of its interpretation. Furthermore, according to Halliday and Matthiessen (2004), a reference is a connection between objects or facts that can be established at different distances. Additionally, it is typically used to connect individual elements that serve a purpose within the clause.

Reference, as defined by Halliday (1994), Gerot and Wignell (1994), Eggins (2004), and Paltridge (2006), is the act of pointing to anything in a text, especially when that same item appears more than once. Reference entails "systems which introduce and track the identity of participants through text," as Gerot and Wignell (1994:170) clarify.

Three minor classes of references—personal, demonstrative, and comparative—are also used to refer anaphorically and cataphorically to certain items either forward or backward (Afrianto, 2017; p. 100).

Substitution is the next cohesive device. According to Halliday and Hasan (1976), substitution is the process of changing one textual element with another. According to Droga and Humphrey (2003), substitution is the process of changing a clause's component with a shorter word, such one, some, or do. In line with Carter and McCarthy (2006), the substitution is used to replace a word, phrase, or clause that appears elsewhere in the text rather of repeating it (see also Bloor & Bloor, 2004; Emilia, 2014).

Halliday and Hasan (1997) define that there are three categories of substitution. These three types of substitution are clausal, verbal, and nominal.

1. **Nominal substitution:** The noun in the sentence is replaced by a nominal substitution. One/ones are frequently used as substitution. For instance: "The car's price is too expensive. I can only buy the cheaper one". The "one" used in the sentence substitutes the "car" mentioned in the previous sentence.
2. **Verbal substitution:** takes the place of the sentence's verb. Do/does/did are frequently used as substitutes. For instance: "You think Amanda already drank, I think everybody does". The verb "drink" mentioned in the preceding sentence is replaced by "does" in this sentence.
3. **Clausal substitution** replaces the sentence's clause. "So" is frequently used as a substitution. For example: "If you agree with that, so do I". The sentence's use of "so do

"I" replaces the clause "agree with that" from the preceding sentence. On the other hand, substitution is the unit of analysis that it occupies.

Ellipsis is the following cohesive device that Halliday and Hasan (1976) defined: The deliberate removal of lexical or syntactic elements (words, phrases, or sentences) that can be recovered using structural or contextual cues is known as ellipsis. Even though some parts of the sentence, such as the pronouns, have been removed, the cohesive device's meaning remains the same. According to Halliday and Hasan (1976), ellipsis, or the omission of the pronoun, is acceptable as long as the sentence's meaning remains the same and understandable.

Three primary subtypes of ellipsis can be distinguished: clausal, verbal, and nominal forms (Merchant, J. (2001), Lobeck, A. 1995).

1. **Nominal Ellipsis:** Example (Hemingway, *The Sun Also Rises*): "I ordered two drinks; Jake ordered three [Ø]." (Omitted: "drinks")
2. **Verbal Ellipsis:** Example (Austen, *Emma*): "Mr. Knightley could dance if he wished to [Ø]." (Omitted: "dance")
3. **Clausal Ellipsis:** Example (Fitzgerald, *The Great Gatsby*): "'Can you repeat the past?' 'Of course, [Ø]!'" (Omitted: "you can repeat the past").

The effectiveness of a text can also be used to determine its cohesion. The components of a clause can be left out to prevent the repetition of all the text's elements (Droga and Humphrey, 2003). According to Bloor & Bloor (2004) and Emilia (2014), ellipsis is the omission of words, groups, or phrases. Then, ellipsis uses its nominal, verbal, causal, and structural link to operate its elements. Additionally, according to Halliday and Hasan (1976), ellipsis addresses omitted information. As stated by Akindele (2011), ellipsis is the practice of leaving out portions of phrases in the hope that the meaning would be made plain by an earlier sentence. In order to prevent repetition in the text, ellipsis is the removal of a portion of a sentence.

In line with Halliday and Matthiessen (2004), ellipsis is the removal of grammatically correct parts that might be added back into the phrase without changing its syntactic structure. Ellipsis frequently adds new parts to the sentence structure while keeping it cohesive, in contrast to reference, which links to the same referent throughout clauses.

Conjunction is the final grammatical cohesion device. As unifying devices that indicate logical-semantic connections between discourse components, conjunctions inevitably assume that there are related components within the textual continuity. Additive, adversative, causal, temporal, and continuative are the five different operational classes into which these connective markers are methodically divided (Halliday and Hasan 1976).

1. The purpose of an **additive** conjunction is to join two clauses that convey distinct information, such as *or*, *nor*, *additionally*, *besides*, *in other words*, etc. (Halliday &

Hasan, 1976). F. Scott Fitzgerald's *The Great Gatsby*, for instance, states that "Gatsby bought magnificent shirts, and he threw lavish parties every weekend." The additive conjunction "and" coordinates two parallel excess clauses. These are categorized as extension relations in the framework of systemic functional grammar by Halliday & Matthiessen (2014).

2. Using phrases like but, though, still, nonetheless, on the other hand, in either case, etc., an **adversative** conjunction joins two distinct clauses where each content is in contrast to the other. For instance: "All of the figures are correct; they'd been checked, yet the total came out wrong. All this time Tweedledee was trying his best to fold up the umbrella, with himself in it...but he could not quite succeed..." (Halliday & Hasan, 1976).
3. When a conjunction (but, however, or yet) reveals "a surprising contrast" between two concepts, the second notion contradicts the first. The other example: "She studied hard; yet she failed the exam." In this sentence, the expectation must be hard work = success, but reality is failure. Martin & Rose (2007) define this a "counter expectancy relation" – the second clause "counters" the expected logic.
4. **Causal** conjunctions indicate that one event is the direct result of another by clearly indicating a cause-and-effect link between clauses. These are categorized as causal-conditional links in cohesion theory by Halliday & Hasan (1976, pp. 242-245). The reason or indications are coded by this conjunction. These include the following examples: so, thus, hence, hence, consequently, result, in consequence, because of that, etc. For instance: "She would not have heard it at all, if it had not come quite close to her car. The consequence of this was that it tickled her ear very much". (Halliday & Hasan, 1976). The other example from Charles Dickens' *Great Expectations* (1861): "My sister was angry, so I hid behind the door." "so" shows a direct cause-effect relationship. In this sentence, the cause is "my sister was angry", the effect: "I hid behind the door"
5. In discourse, **temporal** conjunctions are cohesive devices that clearly indicate the temporal links between phrases or occurrences. These are categorized as temporal cohesive links that produce "textual time" by Halliday & Hasan (1976; p. 228). Its purpose is to provide a time or a sequence for an event to occur. They are next, after, subsequently, then, until then, etc. In a sentence it can be like in this following: "The weather cleared just as the party approached the summit. Until then they had seen nothing of the panorama around them" (Halliday & Hasan, 1976).

6. In any case, **continuative** conjunctions (after all, anyway) help to keep interpersonal rapport while structuring discourse. They are categorized by Schiffrin (1987) as interactional indicators that control the flow of discourse. According to Halliday & Matthiessen (2014; p. 106), they play a crucial role in interpersonal cohesiveness and in strengthening shared knowledge. For example: J.R.R. Tolkien's *The Fellowship of the Ring* (1954): "I am sorry, said Frodo. After all, you have been so kind!" "After all" justifies Frodo's apology while shifting focus to the listener's kindness.

"How the writer creates and expresses logical relationships between the parts of a text" is the definition of the cohesive pattern of conjunction, also known as conjunctive relations (Eggins, 2004; p.47). Conjunctive cohesiveness enhances the text's texture and contributes to the semantic unity that distinguishes unproblematic text.

As indicated by Wren and Martin (2004, as mentioned in Hidayat, 2016), a conjunction is a word that simply links words and sentences together. Conjunctions bring sentences together and frequently make them more shorter. Conjunctions belong to a tiny class of words that lack a characteristic form. They serve primarily as non-movable construction words that combine speech units, phrases, or clauses. **Additive, adversative, causal, and temporal** conjunctions are the four types of conjunctions.

Additionally, according to Halliday and Hasan's theory, that conjunction is classified into three units of analysis: **temporal, adversative, and additive**. These conjunctions are used to link units of certain sentences and are signally applied to strong cohesiveness. (Page 248 of Halliday & Hassan, 1976).

The semantic connectedness created by using lexical items or phrases that are contextually connected to earlier parts in a text is known as **lexical cohesion**. Typically, it is separated into five main categories: **generic vocabulary, synonymy, collocation, repetition, and superordinate terms**.

Lexical cohesiveness, according to Halliday and Hasan (1976), is essential for constructing textual "texture" through semantic networks of related words, even though it functions independently of grammatical structures. Their framework shows how coherence can be created without grammatical dependencies by using repeated or related lexemes. This is furthered by Hoey (1991), who conducts an empirical analysis of lexical patterning as the main driver behind discourse topic formation. Hoey explicitly quantifies how lexical chains produce hierarchical information structures, whereas Halliday highlights its function in overall texture.

1. **Repetition** highlights important ideas and improves cohesiveness (Halliday & Hasan, 1976, p. 279). Example from John Steinbeck's *The Grapes of Wrath* (1939): "The wind blew fiercely. The wind tore at the trees."

2. From Halliday and Hasan's point of view (1976), **synonymy and antonymy** preserve cohesiveness while avoiding monotony. For instance, "A wise man learns from his mistakes; a prudent man avoids repeating them." In this instance, the word "Prudent" (careful) synonymously maintains "wise" while expanding the concept.
3. By referring back to a **hyponym** (specific phrase) with a **hypernym** (or superordinate), hierarchical lexical linkages are created that preserve textual cohesion while permitting semantic generalization (Halliday & Hasan, 1976, p. 285). Example from Orwell's 1984: "He gripped the glass. The vessel trembled in his hand." In this sentence, the word "vessel" expresses superordinate, on the other hand, the word "glass" expresses hyponym.
4. **Collocation** "In a language, collocations are habitual pairings of a word with other words." (Page xvii of Benson, M., Benson, E., & Ilson, R., 1986). These pairings are developed by frequent use and semantic compatibility rather than being always predictable by grammatical rules or logic. An example of a common English collocation is the phrase "make a decision," in which the verb "make" is combined with the noun "decision." Alternatives like "do a decision" are grammatically correct, but they are not commonly used and may sound unnatural to native speakers.
5. **General Words:** When a more particular lexical object is referenced using a general, nonspecific phrase (thing, stuff, place), coherence is maintained by vagueness rather than precise repetition or synonymy (Halliday & Hasan, 1976, p. 286). For instance: "He picked up the revolver," from Mark Twain's *Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*. It was loaded.

The term "thing" refers to a dramatic effect. Example from Mark Twain's *Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*: "He picked up the revolver. The thing was loaded." Thing → revolver (general word for dramatic effect).

Based on Eggins (200; p.42), general words are the cohesive resource of lexical relations, which describes how the writer or speaker use event sequences (chains of clauses and sentences) and lexical items (nouns, verbs, adjectives, and adverbs) to consistently tie the text to its field or area of attention. The observation that certain expectation links exist between words is the basis for lexical cohesion analysis.

The process of systematically explaining how words in a text relate to one another and how they group together to build up lexical sets or lexical strings is known as lexical relations analysis. One crucial aspect of cohesiveness is lexical cohesion (Eggins, 2004:42).

Between units that encode lexical content, lexical cohesiveness functions. The open-class items of nouns, primary verbs, adverbs, and adjectives are what we refer to as such. Although they

undoubtedly contribute to the grammatical relations in a text, grammatical words or closed-class items like prepositions, pronouns, articles, and auxiliary verbs do not encode lexical information and so do not contribute to lexical cohesion (Eggins, 2004: 42).

Cross-Linguistic Applications and Additional Findings. In cross-lingual studies, the cohesion framework put forth by Halliday and Hasan has been widely used and has provided insightful information about how textual coherence is accomplished in a variety of linguistic and cultural settings. By expanded this model to Turkish, for instance, Kornfilt (1997) applies both language-specific characteristics that influence textual arrangement and universal patterns of cohesion. Trisnaningrum et al. (2019) confirm the applicability of Halliday and Hasan's model in the context of academic writing in Indonesia, emphasizing the frequent use of conjunctions and references as crucial cohesive devices.

Cohesion theory still relies heavily on the conceptual framework created by Halliday and Hasan (1976). A detailed model for comprehending how unity is developed in text is provided by their division into grammatical cohesion, which includes reference, substitution, ellipsis, and conjunction, and lexical cohesion, which includes repetition, synonymy, collocation, and superordinate linkages. Both macro-level discourse coherence and micro-level sentence consistency are facilitated by the unique yet connected roles played by each type of cohesion.

Recognizing that cohesiveness is linguistically and culturally related is equally crucial. Although the functional need for cohesiveness is universal, cross-linguistic studies—like those by Kornfilt (1997), Afrianto (2017), and Tamunobelesa (2018)—confirm that different languages have different formal realizations of this need. This is especially important for translation studies since translators have to take the target language's pragmatic, stylistic, and structural norms into consideration.

The importance of cohesiveness in applied linguistics and academic writing goes beyond analysis. It has pedagogical impacts for curriculum design, language proficiency evaluation, and writing learning. While some scholars, like Hatim and Mason (1990), see cohesiveness as a communicative approach influenced by genre and discourse goal, others, like Eggins (2004), Bloor and Bloor (1995), and Hoey (1991), have highlighted its significance in establishing textual effectiveness.

In the end, an advanced comprehension of cohesiveness gives scholars and practitioners the means to examine, create, and translate writings that are not just grammatically correct but also rhetorically and reader-focused. As demonstrated in this chapter, cohesion is a dynamic and contextually sensitive procedure that supports the effective communication of discourse across languages and genres rather than an unchanged inventory of devices.

1.2.3. Functional role of cohesion in English texts

Cohesion, as a semantic property of text, plays a crucial functional role in ensuring the unity, interpretability, and communicative efficiency of discourse. Halliday and Hasan (1976) define cohesion as the semantic glue that holds a text together, enabling the interpretation of one element by reference to another. Their classification of cohesion into grammatical (reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction) and lexical (repetition, synonymy, etc.) types laid the foundation for understanding how cohesion organizes discourse at multiple levels.

1. Cohesion and Discourse Organization

According to Halliday and Hasan (1976), cohesive devices link clauses, sentences, and paragraphs, creating semantic relations across the entire structure of the text. Cohesion is not merely surface-level connectivity; it provides the underlying texture that transforms a sequence of sentences into a unified communicative act.

Peter Newmark (1988) reinforces this idea by defining cohesion as the network of connections—lexical, grammatical, or otherwise—that shape a unified and coherent text. He emphasizes that cohesive devices such as pronouns, conjunctions, and transitional words help the writer move smoothly from old (theme) to new (rheme) information, maintaining logical progression and clarity.

Emilia (2014), building on earlier works (Normant, 1994; Palmer, 1999; Ahmed, 2010; Hameed, 2008; Salmani, 2007; Tangkiengsirisin, 2010; Wahby, 2014), explains that cohesion guarantees that sentences in a text are semantically linked and consistent. Without cohesive ties, texts become fragmented and difficult to follow, as readers struggle to track the logical and semantic connections between clauses and ideas.

Bahaziq (2016) argues that cohesion not only connects ideas but also helps unify the overall message of a text. In this sense, cohesive devices are more than mechanical links—they are the functional resources by which a writer ensures meaningfulness and readability.

Khairunisa and Savitri (2018) highlight how cohesive elements maintain paragraph-level coherence. Similarly, Yasuda (2019) notes that cohesive devices function to organize information in ways that guide both writers and readers toward clear meaning-making.

Gerot and Wignell (1994:170) also emphasize that cohesion serves to unify the semantic elements in discourse. They assert that grammatical cohesion—through reference, substitution, ellipsis, and conjunction—enables the flow of ideas and maintains interpretive clarity. Halliday

and Hasan (1976:4) describe this as the way discourse components relate to each other to form a unified message.

1. Empirical Perspectives on Cohesion and Reader Comprehension

Empirical studies confirm the impact of cohesion on reader comprehension. Halliday and Hasan (2013) emphasize that cohesion enables readers to interpret omitted or implied elements in a text, effectively filling in gaps based on semantic links.

Gutwinski (1976) describes cohesion as the relational structure among clauses and sentences, rooted in both grammar and lexis. These ties guide readers in interpreting texts and constructing meaning. Knapp and Megan (2005) add that cohesive devices link information and maintain textual flow, making writing intelligible and coherent.

Finally, Halliday and Hasan (1976) reiterate that cohesive devices—both grammatical and lexical—are essential to transforming isolated sentences into a unified text. Without these links, the reader cannot follow the logical or semantic progression of the discourse.

1.2.4. Criticism and expansion of cohesion theory

The seminal work of Halliday and Hasan (1976) marked a turning point in discourse analysis, particularly in defining cohesion as the semantic relationship that holds a text together. Their categorization of cohesive devices into grammatical and lexical types formed the foundational framework that dominated text linguistics for decades. However, despite its enduring influence, their model—and the concept of cohesion more broadly—has also faced significant theoretical and empirical critique over time.

While cohesion has been recognized as a fundamental concept in discourse studies, several scholars have identified limitations that go beyond any specific model. One of the main concerns is the frequent conflation of cohesion with coherence. As Widdowson (1978) and Brown & Yule (1983) argue, cohesion refers to explicit linguistic markers, whereas coherence is a cognitive and interpretive phenomenon determined by readers.

Additionally, cohesion has been critiqued for its limited explanatory power in spoken and informal discourse. Tanskanen (2006) and Schiffrin (1987) note that many coherent conversations lack overt cohesive markers, suggesting that shared context and pragmatic knowledge play a more significant role than grammatical ties. This undermines cohesion's universality as a framework for all forms of communication.

De Beaugrande and Dressler (1981) identify another weakness: circularity in defining textuality. A text is deemed cohesive if it contains cohesive ties, and these ties are cited as proof that it constitutes a text—an argument that lacks independent criteria.

Moreover, empirical studies (e.g., McNamara et al., 1996; Kintsch, 1998) show that cohesion does not always correlate positively with comprehension. In some cases, overuse of cohesive devices leads to redundancy and cognitive overload, especially for advanced readers.

Halliday and Hasan's taxonomy, while pioneering, has been criticized for its overemphasis on surface-level linguistic structures. Widdowson (1978) contends that their model reduces text analysis to the identification of formal links, overlooking the reader's interpretive role in constructing meaning.

To address these limitations, many scholars have proposed integrative frameworks that consider cohesion alongside coherence and cognitive processing. Van Dijk (1977, 1980) emphasizes macrostructures, or overarching discourse themes are not always indicated by cohesive markers but are crucial for meaning-making.

Tanskanen (2006) revisits cohesion in spontaneous spoken discourse, identifying features like deixis and prosody as additional cohesive mechanisms. She argues cohesion should be expanded to include pragmatic and interactional elements.

In translation studies, Baker (2018) explores how cohesion is realized differently across languages, requiring translators to adapt strategies to maintain textual integrity. This reflects a functional and cross-cultural understanding of cohesion.

Lexical cohesion has also received renewed attention, particularly through lexical chaining and semantic field analysis. Hoey (1991) and Morris & Hirst (1991) propose computational methods for tracing cohesive ties based on word associations, enhancing our ability to detect cohesion in large corpora.

Finally, Hatim and Mason (1990) highlight the rhetorical and communicative roles of cohesion in texts. They argue that cohesive devices serve not just to link ideas but also to shape tone, stance, and reader engagement—functions overlooked in earlier structuralist models.

Cohesion remains a core concept in discourse analysis, but its understanding has evolved significantly. Halliday and Hasan's (1976) model provided a structured linguistic framework, but it has since been expanded and recontextualized in light of criticisms regarding coherence, genre, cognition, and cross-linguistic variation.

Today, cohesion is best understood as one component of textuality—a facilitating mechanism that works in tandem with coherence and reader interpretation. Modern discourse and translation studies increasingly adopt multi-layered, context-sensitive models, recognizing that cohesion is not merely a system of ties, but a dynamic element in the construction of meaning across languages and communicative situations.

1.3.The study of Cohesion in Azerbaijani

1.3.1. Cohesion in Linguistics and Azerbaijani Text Studies

With the concept of "text" being crucial to linguistic analysis, text linguistics started to emerge as a separate academic discipline in the 1970s. Determining the definition of this new unit has become crucial since text was included as an object of inquiry in linguistic research. The complete resolution of this issue is still up for debate among academics despite numerous attempts.

Texts, which function as physical transmitters of meaning and resemble graphic symbols, are used by people to express their ideas during communication. It is crucial to remember, nevertheless, that this group of symbols does not always make up a "text." This divergence raises the important question of how to distinguish a text from a collection of haphazard sentences. As essential markers of textuality, cohesive and coherence in particular need to be carefully defined.

A text is a comprehensive linguistic entity made up of a well-organized and structured series of sentences that use a variety of lexical, grammatical, and logical relationships to communicate meaning. Semantic and structural unity, which together guarantee literary integrity, are among its primary attributes. K. Abdulla defined a text as one that "portrays a scene, an event, or a theme, with the sentences contained within serving as interconnected parts of a larger whole" (Abdullayev, 1998, p. 43).

As a result, a text is considered a complex linguistic unit that possesses specific structural-semantic regularities, rather than just a collection of sentences. According to Kazimov (2000, p. 424), these include verbal and nonverbal communication methods, dialogic and monologic forms, discourse-related characteristics, informational density, interaction, conceptual depth, and context-dependency. In his words, "function is neither meaning nor grammatical structure- it is a broader concept encompassing the communicative purpose and extralinguistic intent underlying linguistic units" (Müzaffaroglu, 2002, pp. 12-13).

Building on this basis, one of the main mechanisms that guarantees a text's internal connectivity is the phenomena of cohesiveness.

T. Givón goes into further detail about the nature of textual relations by differentiating between aspectual, temporal, spatial, referential, and other forms of connectedness. He highlights the cognitive interpretation of connectivity and draws a distinction between textual cohesiveness and cognitive coherence. In his discussion of referential coherence, Givón distinguishes between two types: prospective reference, which is focused on the future, and retrospective reference is based on past knowledge. Remarkably, he links retrospective

reference with definiteness, while prospective reference aligns with indefiniteness (Givón, 1979, p. 61).

Similarly, three layers of text and discourse analysis are identified by Professor F. Veysalli in his analysis. The sentence must be articulated first, followed by clarification of its propositional content and an evaluation of its illocutionary force, or ability to accomplish its communication goal. The context is the only way to appropriately resolve these issues (Veysalli, 2013, p. 348).

Texts have exterior and interior structures. According to Professor". Abdullayev, the fundamental components of a text are the conceptual structures that are triggered by linguistic units rather than the linguistic units themselves. Since these concepts are made up of tiny semantic fragments, internal harmony—also known as the semantic connection of ideas—is necessary to guarantee textual coherence (Abdullayev, 2011, pp. 176-178).

Therefore, the identification of the text as a complex linguistic object with structural and semantic unity has resulted from the development of text linguistics as a separate field. A text is more than just a collection of sentences; it is a coherent whole in which purpose and connection are crucial.

Thus, text and cohesion are inextricably linked: although a text needs cohesion to express its structural interconnectedness, cohesion does not explain the text's overall meaning or coherence; instead, cohesion is the surface-level realization of deeper conceptual relations. Scholars like Halliday, Hasan, Givón, and others have offered fundamental insights into the nature of cohesion, highlighting its crucial role in differentiating a text from a collection of utterances. As a result, studying cohesion not only improves our comprehension of textual organization, but also offers useful viewpoints for linguistic theory and applied fields like translation.

1.3.2. Development of Cohesion Research in Azerbaijani Linguistics

In Azerbaijani linguistics, the study of textual cohesiveness is an important but unexplored field of study. As a contemporary area of linguistic study, text linguistics looks into the structural and functional processes that go into creating a text. Although research on sentence and clause-level syntax has advanced over the years in Azerbaijani linguistics, the cohesive and structural features of text syntax have not received enough attention.

Important works by scholars like Halliday and Hasan (1976), Mona Baker (2018), Peter Newmark (1988), and Hatim and Mason (1990) offer in-depth explanations of cohesion and how it may change during the translation process in the international scholarly literature on this subject, especially in English. A systematic and theoretical approach to this topic is still lacking, and studies on the idea of cohesiveness, its types, and its functional role within texts in

Azerbaijani are few and far between, despite the abundance of research in the English-speaking academic community.

Furthermore, as Ismayilova (2023) shows in her extensive work "Organization Mechanism of Azerbaijan Language Texts," while global linguistics has made significant strides in text syntax analysis, Azerbaijani language studies still need to investigate cohesion more systematically. This observation highlights the gap that still exists.

Another noteworthy point is the inconsistent terminology used to refer to cohesion in Azerbaijani, where the term is sometimes transcribed as *kogeziya* or *koheziya*, reflecting non-standardized adaptations of foreign terminology (see, for instance, Ismayilova, 2021; Abdullayev, 2012). This terminological inconsistency further emphasizes the need for standardization and more thorough theoretical studies in the field.

In summary, cohesion has been extensively studied in international linguistic research, especially in English-language scholarship, although its examination in Azerbaijani linguistics is still rather sparse and dispersed. To improve the area of Azerbaijani linguistics and bring it closer to more general advancements in text linguistics, thorough and systematic research into the cohesive mechanisms unique to Azerbaijani texts is therefore desperately needed.

1.3.3. Cohesive Devices in Azerbaijani Texts

Even while cohesive device research has advanced significantly in linguistics worldwide, it is still a relatively unexplored area in Azerbaijani linguistics. However, some academics have recognized and categorized a number of mechanisms that support textual cohesion. It does this by utilizing existing theoretical ideas. The section aims to emphasize both current discoveries and the areas that need more research by going over these classifications and attributes.

Many scholars agree that cohesion is an essential aspect of textual organization, and researchers have looked into its mechanics from a variety of perspectives. While Morovsky and Nikolayeva add formal and semantic classifications (Nikolaeva, 1978), Galperin distinguishes between grammatical, logical, associative, figurative, compositional-structural, and stylistic types of coherence (Galperin, 1981, p. 64). Key words, anaphora, cataphora, interrogatives, syntactic repetition, semantic devices, and stylistic elements used consistently throughout a document are further cohesive processes.

The classification of cohesiveness types is still a contentious and unresolved issue that can benefit from further research. Intra-textual unity can be achieved by the use of logical connections, anaphoric references, thematic development, and content-organizing frameworks. Q. Kazimov categorizes parallelism as one kind of logical-semantic interaction in this context.

He contends that whereas parallel structures provide individual components more autonomy and frequently express simultaneity or comparative emphasis, chain-like forms strengthen sentence interdependence (Kazimov, 2000, p. 453).

Building on these concepts, scholar K. Abdullayev goes on to say that the topic of discussion cannot be entirely captured in a single premise; rather, its whole characterization can only be revealed through a number of propositions. He asserts that this multidimensional description can be realized more successfully with parallel textual components (Abdullayev, 1998, pp. 257-258).

Moreover, cohesion is seen as one of the fundamental textual categories, working in tandem with communicative structure, integration, and prediction to guarantee a text's logical and semantic coherence. According to some research, the English word "cohesion" can also mean "adjacency" or "interlinking" (Galperin, 1981, pp. 73-74).

Therefore, creating logical and semantic connections within a text is one of cohesion's main purposes. In this regard, cohesion is defined by F. Veysalli in his encyclopedic dictionary as the entirety of formal and grammatical relations in text linguistics (Veysalli, 2006, p. 345). According to Veysalli, cohesion is the cornerstone of a text's semantic unity and enhances its interpretability as a whole. Veysalli claims that a variety of linguistic techniques, such as:

- a) mechanisms for repetition, such as recurrence, deixis, paraphrasing, and parallelism;
- b) devices that improve textual compactness, such as ellipsis and pro-forms;
- and c) morphological and syntactic tools, such as tense, aspect, deixis, theme-rheme structure, as well as prosodic and intonational markers, are used to express relations.

Furthermore, linguistic studies demonstrate that the idea of cohesion serves as the primary means of expressing textual connectedness and coherence. According to Q. Kazimov (2000, pp. 447-448), the structure of every text is determined by the relationships and dependencies between its phrases. He points out that connection is the main problem in syntax: cohesive relationships between sentences create syntactic units, such as micro-and macro-texts; word groupings arise from internal links; and sentences are generated through structural interactions.

Extending this syntactic viewpoint, Kazimov distinguishes between two forms of syntactic coherence in textual structure: grammatical (syntactic) cohesion and semantic cohesion. According to him, cohesiveness is the expression of syntactic connectedness at every structural level of a text, as defined by general linguistics.

Lastly, N. Novruzova (2002) adds another layer to this theoretical framework by highlighting how cohesion defines the underlying semantic mechanism of the text by establishing logical and semantic linkages between the sentences of a complex syntactic unit (CSU). Formal,

psychological, and logical cohesiveness are the three categories she distinguishes from her examination of Azerbaijani literary works.

Psychological cohesion uses grammatical and lexical repetitions to guarantee content-related unity.

Conversely, logical cohesiveness organizes content through thematic shifts and the sequential development of meaning, which helps the text's semantic evolution (Novruzova, 2002: 56).

1.3.3.1. Grammatical Cohesion

Cohesion is one of the most important fundamental characteristics that characterize a text's linguistic structure. Textual cohesion, according to K. Abdullayev (2012, p. 107), is the network of structural and semantic relationships among the elements of a complex syntactic unit. According to him, cohesion is achieved through two primary categories of relations: semantic and structural, and it is a result of all linguistic levels. Both kinds can be regarded as syntactic cohesiveness, but Abdullayev also differentiates a particular kind called logical-syntactic connection, which strengthens textual coherence even more.

Abdullayev (1998, p. 233) elaborates on this paradigm by highlighting the role of each linguistic level in promoting cohesiveness and distinguishing between two main categories of relations: semantic and structural. Although he points out that logical-syntactic techniques, such as chain and parallel structures, also function to link textual components, both fall under the category of "syntactic" interactions. Abdullayev claims that these structures frequently cross to the point where it is challenging to identify a single core coherent type in practice.

1.3.3.2. Lexical Cohesion

Despite their apparent similarities, coherence and integration are two different textual occurrences. While integration refers to the psychological wholeness of discourse, cohesion refers to the logical and semantic interconnectedness within a text. Building on this distinction, it is crucial to remember that associativity, imagery, rhythm, composition, and stylistic references are only a few of the interconnected mechanisms that frequently contribute to coherence in Azerbaijani discourse. An internal chain of meaning is created when a repeated lexical phrase implicitly invokes prior information, a phenomenon known as **associativity** (*assosiativlik*). The statement "O şəkil indi də stolun üstündədir. Hər baxanda usaqlıq yadıma düşür. Bu şəkil sanki keçmişə açılan bir pəncərədir". In this example, the repetition of the word

"şəkil" not only provides lexical cohesion but also emotionally connect memory, time, and introspection.

The function of **imagery**, which takes the form of metaphorical language and contributes both stylistically and cohesively, is closely related to associativity. "Qəlbi boş bir otağa bənzəyirdi – səs də, nəfəs də orada itib-batırdı" is an example. In this instance, the metaphor of a "boş otaq" connects quiet with emotional desolation, strengthening the text's semantic coherence.

Apart from visuals, cohesion is also greatly aided by **rhythmic** patterns particularly in contemplative or narrative sections. Consider: "Soyuqda isti, istidə sərin bir yer axtarırdı. Tək olanda səssiz, səssiz olanda daha da tək idi". The balanced phrasing and rhythmic parallelism support the logical-semantic flow and strengthen internal cohesiveness.

Furthermore, by arranging discourse into logical units, **compositional devices** greatly aid in its structure, especially in the face of temporal or spatial alterations. "Dünən gəlmişdi, bu gün yoxa çıxdı, sabah harada olacaq bilinmir". Although each sentence provides a different temporal layer, the microtexts are united into a logical narrative frame by compositional and lexical cohesion.

Lastly, by preserving referential continuity, **stylistic markers** like repeated referents or demonstrative pronouns improve cohesiveness. For example: "O gecə yadındadır, o anlar, o baxış, o sükut- hamısı indi də beynində səssizcə səslənir". As a stylistic foundation, the repeated "o" keeps the reader's attention and connection throughout the passage.

Therefore, both separately and in combination, these strategies serve as the foundation for cohesion in Azerbaijani discourse. According to Veysalli (2013, p. 354), cohesion is a semantic and stylistic basis of text-building in Azerbaijani discourse rather than only a syntactic or grammatical need.

In conclusion, even though Tahmino Ismayilova emphasizes associativity, imagery, rhythmicity, and compositional devices as crucial cohesive mechanisms in her article "Azərbaycan dili mətnlərinin təşkili mexanizmi" (pp. 506-507), it's critical to understand that these components primarily serve to enhance the text's semantic and stylistic qualities. Rather than serving as cohesive devices in the pure language sense, they help to create imagery and emotional depth.

As a result, even while the aforementioned stylistic elements improve the discourse's aesthetic and semantic aspects, they should be distinguished from the fundamental cohesive devices that uphold the text's structural integrity.

1.3.4. Syntactic Features of Cohesion in Azerbaijani

Azerbaijani's agglutinative structure, wide case system, and pragmatic inclinations all influence the language's cohesiveness, which displays a number of unique syntactic characteristics. Reference and ellipsis in Azerbaijani frequently follow distinct syntactic and informational rules than in English, which reflects larger cultural and communicative norms.

Every component, even a single word, has a significant contribution to the overall informative structure in Azerbaijani texts. Sentence structure influences the discourse's logical and semantic flow in addition to increasing the amount of information that may be expressed.

The complex syntactic whole (CSU), which is made up of interrelated words and phrases, is the main building block of Azerbaijani text production. These syntactic units are arranged in a hierarchical, cumulative fashion, with semantic depth added at each level. While the cohesiveness between sentences guarantees the continuity and consistency of the entire text, the phrase serves as the fundamental means of conveying comparatively complete concepts.

1.3.5. Challenges and Research Gaps in the Study of Cohesion in Azerbaijani

Theoretical research on cohesiveness in the Azerbaijani language is still in its infancy, despite the growing interest in text linguistics and discourse analysis around the world. Despite the fact that features of textual connectivity have been covered in general linguistic works, there aren't many in-depth investigations that focus exclusively on cohesive devices. Much of the existing Azerbaijani-language scholarship mentions cohesion only briefly, often within broader discussions on linguistic or stylistic issues.

By identifying specific cohesion signs in Azerbaijani texts, scholars like Hasanov (2012), Mammadova (2014), and Hüseynova (2016) have made significant contributions. However, their research often lacks the systematic characterization of cohesive relationships equivalent to the model given by Halliday and Hasan (1976). A fuller understanding of cohesive devices' function in Azerbaijani discourse is also limited by a noticeable lack of research on how they work across various text types and genres.

Cohesion becomes extremely important, when translation process particularly in pairs of English and Azerbaijani. The quality, meaning, and fluidity of the translated text can all be directly impacted by the addition, removal, or substitution of cohesive devices during the translation process. Therefore, in order to preserve the semantic structure and guarantee fluency and comprehensibility, translators must have an in-depth understanding of the cohesive elements of both the source and target languages.

Modern Azerbaijani linguistic research still does not adequately handle the study of textual unity, especially the problems of logical and semantic coherence. Mechanisms that contribute to the internal logical-semantic structure of texts are frequently suggested but rarely thoroughly examined in the context of possible syntax.

Cohesion, coherence, integration, continuum, unity, thematicity, communicativity, informativeness, emotiveness, intentionality, completeness are among the categories that can be distinguished within a text's structure from a system-structural paradigmatic standpoint (Qalperin, 1981, p. 106). But the interplay between cohesiveness and logical-semantic sequencing, remains as unexplored issue especially in the context of Azerbaijani text linguistics.

In conclusion, there are significant gaps and difficulties in the research of cohesiveness in Azerbaijan. The lack of a thorough framework for evaluating these devices continues to be a major barrier, despite the fact that fundamental research has revealed important cohesive signals. Furthermore, there hasn't been much research done on the relationship between cohesion and coherence, particularly when it comes to translation and textual integrity. Future studies must fill up these gaps if we are to gain a more sophisticated comprehension of cohesive patterns in Azerbaijani discourse. This would therefore lead to improved translation techniques and a greater understanding of the Azerbaijani language's syntactic and semantic diversity.

1.4. Cohesion and Coherence

1.4.1. The definition of Cohesion and Coherence

To grasp the structure and meaning of texts requires a grasp of the notions of cohesion and coherence. Despite their inherent relationships, these two ideas are different but related. The concept of “cohesion” represents the language components which connect disparate textual elements and generate superficial links to assist reader understand the text. As defined by Halliday and Hasan (1976), these features include grammatical elements such as conjunctions, reference items, and lexical choices work together in maintaining a text’s coherence.

On the reverse side, coherence is referring to the contextual, logical, and cognitive components that provide a text meaning. (De Beaugrande & Dressles, 1981). In simple terms, cohesiveness ensures the mechanical relationship of textual components, but instead coherence represents the more powerful, interpretive level of abilities that a text gives you.

For translation studies, the distinction between cohesion and coherence is important. Both of these features need to be maintained for translation for the purpose of preserving its original text integrity and what in its own tern demonstrates why their collaboration easily recognized in the target language.

Different scholars have put forward different ideas about cohesion and coherence. Some have compared them, while others have defined the relationship between them. For instance:

1. According to Halliday & Hasan (1976), cohesion is the grouping of linguistic features that link sentences and clauses to build a cohesive story. These features include conjunction, ellipsis, reference, substitution, and lexical unity. The surface-level relationships that offer a text its grammatical and lexical coherence are termed as cohesiveness.

- **Reference:** Using pronouns that consist of “he”, “she”, “it”, and others to draw attention to things which have already been addressed in the text.

For example, “**Jane** wanted to cook a meal for dinner. **She** made a list that all ingredients **she needed**. This is an example for anaphoric reference. Here, the words “she” and “she needed” refers to the word “Jane”.

- **Substitution:** Replacing one sentence feature with another.

For instance, A: Would you like to drink some **tea**?

B: No, I’d prefer **coffee**

A: I had tea yesterday. I’ll have **some** again today.

This is an example for nominal substitution and the word “some” replaces the word “tea”. Substitution prevents repetition within the text and ensures cohesiveness.

- **Ellipsis:** The omitted information is known from the context. Consider the example of
A: “Are you going **to the wedding**?”
B: I might (**go to the wedding**).

It serves the fluidity of the text and strengthens cohesion by avoiding redundant words.

- **Conjunction:** Words that connect phrases, clauses, and sentences like “and”, “but”, and “because” etc. For example: Tom wanted to go to the cousin’s **but** it started raining.

The conjunction “but” in this sentence highlights a distinction across these two phrases, maintaining the text’s coherence and logical structure.

- **Repetition, synonym, or similar words** combining clauses are instances of lexical cohesiveness.

“Cohesion” is a semantic-based connection, it connects all parts of a text together, contributing to establish a coherent framework for the meaning it indicates,” with regard to De Beaugrande and Dressler (1981, p 49-81). The ways that illustrate how to link sentences in extended pieces of text, are characterized as follows:

- **Recurrence:** The basic repetition of textual elements or patterns is termed as recurrence. For example: “My **car** is red **color**. His **car** is blue **color**.”

- **Partial recurrence:** The alteration of an already-used component to another part of discourse; for instance transforming the term “teacher” to “teaching” is classified as partial recurrence. Like the example of Alex did not want to be a math **teacher** so he thought **teaching** these pupils is hard.
- **Parallelism:** The recurrence of an arrangement with new components is defined as parallelism. E.g, the following: “Hasan opened his copybook, took out his pen and started writing about his last conference”.
- **Paraphrase:** To paraphrase is to express an idea in a different way. Case in point, version A: Anna was quite tired. She omitted dinner, went immediately to sleep, and did not talk to anyone. Version B(paraphrased): Anna was worn out from an exhausted day at school. She refused to eat, rejected dialogue, and went directly to bed.
- **Junction:** Junction is the employment of a symbol to express how happenings or events in the linguistic world connect with others. There are four types of it: conjunction, disjunction, contra-junction, and subordination. For instance: Conjunction: Alex went to the university yesterday, **and** met his lovely teacher.
- **Pro-form:** emphasizing the same facts in a shorter format instead of repeating it fully is termed pro-form like a pronoun which is a word used instead of a noun. For instance: who is **the man** walking towards Frank? **He** is his uncle.

In summary, De Beaugrande and Dressler (1981, p 14-28) identify that cohesion is one of the constant elements of textual content. It is constructed from devices that connect the surface text. For them, primary cohesive device types are recurrence, partial recurrence, parallelism, paraphrase, ellipsis, junction, and pro-form which are utilized to produce cohesion.

2. According to Brown and Yule (1983, p 15-30), cohesion relates the lexical and syntactic objectives that permit a text’s structural unity. It addresses the linguistic words that contribute to making it simpler to understand the connections within various textual items. For example, cohesion itself is inadequate to clarify literary quality, stated by Brown and Yule (1985: 106). The idea of coherence, or how the text works together with the outside world, also contribute to the text quality.
3. Then, Thompson (1994) identified cohesion as a complex occurrence in which the lexico-grammatical cohesiveness and the intonation decisions, which display the phrase connections, simultaneously represent clearly the meaning relationships leading to the text. Cohesion, as reported by Blum-Kulka (1986) is a direct connection between textual elements that is demonstrated by identifiers specific to a certain language. Cohesion is synonymous with text. It might occur as a group of syntactic and semantic features

which act as direct bridges within a text's sentences. Understanding and comprehending written content needs cohesiveness, as essential aspect of language.

The definition of Coherence

1. On the other hand, the logical and significant connections among the ideas in a text which allow it to be acknowledged as a cohesive and easily understood unit is called as **coherence**. It occurs when the relationships between the statements seem obvious and reinforce the text's main idea or purpose. The capacity of the reader to come to conclusions and merge information based on previous knowledge and context is identically important to coherence as the text's structure (De Beaugrande & Dressler, 1981, p. 4).

The creation and development of consistency of sensation is commonly referred to coherence. As stated by (De Beaugrande & Dressler, 1981, p. 84) "a text makes sense" where the information produced by the text's clauses is going across senses. Hence, Dressler (1998), following De Beaugrande and Dressler (1981), describes coherence as the way a text produces meaning semantically, pragmatically, and thematically. She states that the foundation of coherence is achieved by reasoning rather than becoming text-immanent.

2. Some other scholars investigated coherence and put forward their ideas. "Hold together" is what Latin verb 'coheres' meaning. Coherence in writing is the capacity of a sentence to stay together, indicating that the movements between sentences (and paragraphers, clauses) have to be smooth and logical. Unexpected movements must be avoided. Each statement ought to flow smoothly into the one after it (Hogue & Oshima, 1999: 40).
3. The connection within every sentence or expression in a text and a single universal concept is known as text coherence. A vital element of both presentation and understanding is the formation of a global meaning, or topic for a complete poem, novel etc. This makes it possible for a comprehension of the particular phrases that define the text (Savignon, 2002: 9).
4. If all the parts of a text are linked together, it is cohesive. If a text creates sense, it is coherent. It should be appear that these things are not the same. It means, a text may be cohesive, linked together, but incoherent, meaningless (Thornbury, 2007). Example from Thornbury (2007): "I am a teacher. The teacher was late for class. Class rhymes with grass. The grass is always greener on the other side of the fence. But it wasn't". Although these sentences are grammatically correct, but there is no semantic connection between them.

Thornbury (2007) also notes the creation of a text's propositional content significantly impacts its coherence. A written text is more probably to be successful in effect, if its content is organized in order to satisfy the reader's intentions. To "keep them in mind" is an ability that talented writers use. According to Yule and Brown (1983: p.66), "the result of the understanding each sentence in relation to the way other sentences are interpreted is coherence". Due to this definition, coherence refers to the reader's ability to derive meaning between sentences to the following.

5. Additionally, Van Dijk (1977-1980, p. 93), stresses "cohesion is a meaningful aspect of language generated with the interpretation of every particular sentence relative to the understanding of other sentences". Van Dijk also underlines the contextual and semantic connections within sentences.

In summary, the organization and understanding of texts are reinforced by two fundamental concepts: cohesion and coherence. The investigation of numerous academic definitions shows cohesion occurs by means of clearly stated variables that ensure a text's logical interaction, such as conjunctions, ellipsis, reference, and other lexical links. On the other hand, coherence develops from the reader's ability to derive meaning through context, previous knowledge, and logical thought instead of being directly stated within the text.

Researchers like Widdowson and De Beaugrande have shifted the attention to the cognitive and contextual components of coherence, the other scientists like Halliday and Hasan have developed an essential understanding of cohesion with detailed categorization.

Despite their disparities, cohesion and coherence often work together to generate a language that is both understandable and well-organized. Both elements are crucial in linguistic examination and study of translation, because preserve the communication significance of the original text demands both ensuring the target audience can comprehend the intended meaning and reconstructing formal linkages.

1.4.2. The distinctions between cohesion and coherence- Cohesion as semantic-based Phenomenon and Coherence as a Complex (Semantic, Pragmatic and Cognitive) Phenomenon

The examination of textuality, cohesion and coherence sometimes appear together, yet they represent completely various aspects of the building and understanding of texts. Mainly operating at the language level, cohesion highlights the obvious formal relationships that link phrases and clauses together, such as reference, substitution, conjunction, and lexical repetition. On the opposite side, coherence happens at the meaning level and requires the reader's ability to figure out logical, contextual, and cognitive relations within the text.

There are a number of researches clearly explain the differences between cohesion and coherence. Both cohesion and coherence are defined as mechanisms that operate with textual material and focus on the internal organization of texts. In the areas of text linguistics (eg: Carrell, 1982; Van Dijk, 1995) and translation studies (e.g., Papegaaij & Schubert, 1988; Vehmas-Lehto, 1991; Hu, 1999), they are consistently treated as separate concepts, in spite of the fact that they both require components of textual interaction and can sometimes be mistakenly applied together.

“Different from each other but share essential features; They both have the purpose of connecting the text together through generating sequences of meanings,” Bell states about cohesion and coherence (1991, p.164).

As defined by Halliday and Hasan, cohesion relates to a text’s integrity with itself, while coherence refers to the text continuity with respect to its context. Consequently, “it must utilize the resources of cohesion in approaches that are guided by the register of which is an example” (Halliday 1994, p. 339) for the matter a text to be regarded coherent. According to Blum Kulka (2000, p. 298-299), coherence is “the realization(s) of the text’s meaning potential” and “as a covert possible meaning linkage within parts of a text, made overt by the reader or audience during the processes of interpretation.” (italics omitted, *ibid.* p. 304). On the contrary, “an obvious connection existing between elements of the text, indicated by language specific characteristics” can be regarded as an indicator of cohesiveness (italics deleted, *ibid.* p. 299). “The most obvious norms of textuality” according to de Beaugrande and Dressler (1981, p. 113) are cohesion and coherence. As stated by them, cohesion “covers the process whereby surface features seem as progressive happenings in order to ensure their successive connectivity is preserved and made refundable”, whereas coherence “works through the processes by which components related to knowledge become active such that their theoretical interaction is stayed and made refundable” (*ibid.* 19).

Overall, cohesion and coherence act as complimentary mechanisms in the production and understanding of texts, although their conceptual disparities. Through the application of lexical and grammatical techniques, cohesiveness-which has a foundation in linguistic form-ensures appear connection. On the contrary, coherence depends on the reader’s previous knowledge and interpretive capabilities and operates at a deeper cognitive and contextual degree. They collaborate with each other for creating a text’s tone. Both linguistic examination and the procedure of translation demand an understanding of how these two concepts collaborate, as both must be preserved for effective communication.

1.4.3. The role of Coherence in comprehension of text

Decoding words individually or studying sentence-level patterns is just one way of comprehending language, which may be spoken or written. It demands the reader or listener comprehend the idea or text which is a meaningful and logically related whole – the quality known as coherence. In the field of text linguistics, coherence involves to the semantic and cognitive integrity of a text, ensuring it become acquainted logical and meaningful discourse. Coherence occurs at a deeper level, affecting the building and comprehending of meaning, as compared to cohesion, deals with the explicit linguistic structures that combine textual features like pronouns, conjunctions, and lexical repetition. With an emphasis coherence's cognitive nature and relation to cohesion, the following part addresses how coherence play an essential role in text comprehension.

Knowing how to develop coherence cognitive representation of the text that includes new information with already-known text elements and preexisting knowledge-is a prerequisite for successful reading comprehension. A collection of connected ideas and concepts are linked by logical, semantic, or causal connections provides this mental representation (Graesser & Clark, 1985; Kintsch & Van Dijk, 1978; 363-394, Trabasso, Secco, & van den Broek, 1984; 83-111).

Readers have to infer interrelated components between ideas to achieve coherence considering discourses sometimes don't directly clarify all logical relations. For instance, "Alex gave Jane a cake. It was her birthday". It is not obviously showed in this sentence "her" refers to Jane and Alex gave the cake for Jane's birthday. The reader infers and links all these in their mind logically. This demonstrates referential and causal coherence. Depending on the reading goals, these inferential relations-whether temporal, referential, causal, or contrastive are important for comprehending (Kintsch, 1988; 163-182, van den Broek, 1994; 539-588, McKoon & Ratcliff, 1992; 440-466).

Significantly, coherence requires both the kinds of coherence that are valued (qualitative aspect) and degree to which knowledge is connected (quantitative aspect). For instance, reading a story might require attention to both causal and temporal structures, but reading a recipe may mostly demand temporal coherence. Depending on the type of discourse and reader's intention, these coherence linkages' strength and setting change (van den Broek & Helder, 2017).

In the end, the Standards of Coherence model emphasizes why discourse comprehension is changeable and strongly depends on cognitive abilities, content, and user intention. it illustrates that achieving coherence needs active interaction between the discourse, the user, and their purpose instead of just being mechanical approach.

The previously mentioned discourse highlights the significance of coherence in the comprehension process, primarily its cognitive and mental elements. The investigated research indicates that coherence is determined by the reader's purpose, previous knowledge, and cognitive interaction in the discourse. This approach presents an advanced understanding of coherence as a changeable and reader-dependent notion, that is important for clarifying the variations in comprehension within various circumstances and users.

1.4.4. The interconnection between Cohesion and Coherence

In Discourse, the concepts of cohesion and coherence are often used and very important. These two concepts are sometimes confused, coherence specially is a difficult notion to comprehend and define. When a piece of discourse fails to achieve its purpose, it becomes meaningless and lacks coherence; hence, it is impossible to understate the importance of coherence. The interconnection between cohesion and coherence is analyzed in this paragraph, demonstrating cohesion in just an aspect of coherence.

When we encounter a piece of discourse-be it spoken or written-we presume it is a discourse-that is a coherence whole. Which component of the discourse persuades the user it is coherent? Does this feeling of "hanging together" arise from cohesive devices between operations like conjunction, ellipsis, reference, or if any? Or does it just come from the two expressions' closeness to each other? Or does it come from the user's ability?

Halliday and Hasan (1976) highlight that what differentiates a text from a non-text is its "texture", identifying a text as "a unit of language in use" (p. 1). From their point of view, texture comes from the cohesive relationships between the linguistic features that make up a passage and work together to create its overall coherence (p. 2). Fundamentally, the cohesive ties that a text incorporates form its fabric. The sample "Peel and slice these four bananas. Arrange them accurately in a baking tray" serves as an example. In this example, the pronoun "them" refers back to "four bananas" to create cohesion between these sentences.

According to Widdowson (1978), a discourse can achieve coherence even if it lacks clear, linguistically specified cohesive devices. He maintains that in ordinary communication contexts, each sentence represents both illocutionary act and a proposition. The resulting sequence can be considered as coherent after these connections are determined (p. 26). Nonetheless, even if obvious cohesive devices are missing, the users often infer core related connections by understanding illocutionary acts to gain coherence (p. 29).

To demonstrate that, Widdowson introduce the following short dialogue:

A: That is the telephone.

B: I am in the bath.

A: All right.

The dialogue appears as coherent, even though it lacks overt cohesive devices. If examined individually each thought may seem to be lacking in meaning or complete. But fundamental framework becomes apparent when recognized as a part of interconnected exchange. B's answer acts as an argument for non-compliance, A's last comment conveys acceptance of that explanation, and A's first speech can be considered as an indirect request for B to answer the phone. Users are capable of filling the missing propositional linkages and understand the dialogue as a coherent unit by identifying the illocutionary acts that are performed.

Carrell (1982) critically reexamines Halliday and Hasan's concept that cohesiveness is the main parameter impacting coherence by using knowledge from the schema theory. Schema-theoretical suggestions argue that the user's already existing knowledge or memory frameworks, or schemas, interact with discourse input to creating comprehension (p. 482).

Carrell supports this case referencing to Morgan and Sellner (1980), who maintain that cohesion is the result of coherence instead of its cause. The given example indicates this claim: "It spoiled the picnic. Nobody brought to bring a corkscrew".

It seems that there is no obvious lexical cohesion between the words "picnic" and "corkscrew" that contributes to the coherence of this brief piece. Instead, coherence is provided through the reader's skill to activate a familiar schema-namely, the general universal comprehending that corkscrews are frequently required during picnics. Thus, the interpretive relation between these two sentences comes from the user's inferential abilities, indicating that discourse coherence sometimes relies more on cognitive schemata than on explicit cohesive devices (Carrell, 1982, p. 484).

Brown and Yule (1983) also question Halliday and Hasan's model that cohesion is the primary determinant for defining a discourse. They present two important questions: is cohesiveness necessary for discourse identification, and is it required? (p. 194-195). According to their position, when engaging with discourse, language users automatically infer semantic relations through examining every utterance or sentence in light of the context that came before it. They claim that the comprehension of a series of sentences or utterances as a discourse does not require texture, which is characterized as the explicit expression of semantic relationship.

To demonstrate the limitations of Halliday and Hasan's concept, Brown and Yule applied a small-scale experiment. While keeping all cohesive relationships unaltered, they restructured the phrases in a coherent part from Arthur Conan Doyle's *The Lost World* (1983, p. 197). Cohesiveness by itself cannot guarantee textuality, as illustrated by reconstructed version's

inability to convey a cohesive story despite its preserved cohesiveness. Due to their observations, comprehension of a discourse depends on the language user's ability to piece together a meaningful whole from contextual and cognitive cues instead of only language connections.

Overall, the relationship between cohesion and coherence shows that, whereas cohesive devices help a discourse appear more connected on the surface, they are not important nor sufficient on their own to guarantee discourse coherence. The sense of coherence essentially rests on the cognitive and inferential skills of the language user, as well as their ability to activate pertinent schematic information, as crucial viewpoints from Widdowson (1978), Carrell (1982), and Brown and Yule (1983) indicate. Cohesion does not provide coherence on its own; rather, it serves as a surface tool that makes it easier to convey underlying coherence. Mere cohesive connections become meaningless in the absence of an internally coherent and meaningful conceptual framework.

CHAPTER II: METHODOLOGY

The methodological framework used in this investigation is described in this chapter. In order to examine cohesion shifts in the translation of literary texts based on the ideas of translation studies and text linguistics, this study uses a mixed-methods approach, integrating qualitative and quantitative techniques.

2.1. Research Design

The main goals are to assess the accuracy and sufficiency of the translations and investigate how cohesive devices—which are categorized using Halliday and Hasan's (1976) model—change when being translated from English into Azerbaijani. A thorough micro-level textual examination of chosen literary works, their Azerbaijani translations, and how these changes affect the text's semantic-pragmatic integrity is used to accomplish this. Typological components are also included in the study, which focuses on cohesive shift classification and how it affects translation equivalency.

The study's qualitative component entails a thorough identification and interpretation of coherent devices in chosen source texts and their translations into Azerbaijani. Based on Halliday and Hasan's functional classification, each cohesive device will be analyzed according to its kind (e.g., reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction, or lexical cohesiveness) and function (e.g., additive, adversative, temporal, causal). The semantic-pragmatic reasons for shifts—instances in which a cohesive device in the source text is altered, omitted, or substituted in the target text—will receive particular emphasis.

The quantitative component is gathering statistical information about the distribution and frequency of cohesive devices in the texts.

2.2. Corpus and Data collection

Two literary works and their Azerbaijani translations cover the main corpus:

1. "The Unconquered" by W. Somerset Maugham, which has two Azerbaijani translations: one by Zeydulla Ağayev and one by Akif Abbasov.
2. "The Adventures of Tom Sawyer" by Mark Twain, translated into Azerbaijani by Şəfiqə Ağayeva and Həmid Qasımzadə

The source texts and their translations were gathered from online archives and published books, guaranteeing the reliability and completeness of the versions examined.

To identify examples of cohesive devices (reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction, and lexical cohesion), each text pair (original + translation) was analyzed line-by-line. A coding system was used to label and classify these devices in order to determine whether they were:

1. Preserved without shift;
2. Shifted (changed in form or function);
3. Omitted or overused;
4. Replaced by non-equivalent structures

Following systematization, the data will be shown in tables with the following components:

- The kind of cohesive devices,
 - The particular instance from the original text,
 - The target text's equivalent translation,
 - The unifying purpose it fulfills (e.g., causation, contrast, addition),
 - If there was a transition (and if so, what kind),
 - Additional analysis of the translation's coherence or efficacy,
- as well as statistical depiction of usage and changes (in percentage terms).

Micro-level analysis (specific examples) will be possible with this organized presentation. The objective is to present a thorough understanding of how cohesive links function across languages and how the choices made by translators impact the coherence and cohesiveness of texts.

2.3. Analytical Procedures

The following steps were taken in the analysis process:

1. Using Halliday and Hasan's taxonomy, identify coherent devices in the English source texts.
2. A comparison of equivalent translations into Azerbaijan to see how these cohesive components were translated.
3. Cohesion shifts are categorized by type and degree, including:
 - Semantic changes, such as modifications to tone, intensity, or meaning
 - Pragmatic changes (e.g., because of target language norms, cultural conventions, or politeness)
 - Structural changes (such as grammatical form changes)
4. Assessing the quality of translations by contrasting Azerbaijani versions and determining:
 - Which is more accurate and coherent
 - Which particular cohesion shifts had an impact on the coherence or meaning of the text
 - The factors that influence translation decisions that are successful or unsuccessful
5. Cohesion shifts typological classification:

This entails classifying the detected shifts into recurrent patterns or groups according to their translation approach (e.g., explicitation, simplification, omission) and linguistic character (e.g., shift in reference type, substitution with explicit element, ellipsis loss, etc.).

By using a mixed-methods approach, the study seeks to provide both descriptive and evaluative insights into cohesion and how it changes in translation, bridging the gap between linguistic theory and translation practice.

2.4. Theoretical Framework

The study's foundation is Halliday and Hasan's (1976) theory of cohesiveness, which is reinforced by translation theories on shift (Catford, Vinay & Darbelnet) and equivalency (Nida, Newmark). The works of Hatim & Mason (1997) and House (1997) on the interaction of text, context, and translation are cited in pragmatic considerations.

CHAPTER III: COHESION SHIFTS IN TRANSLATION

3.1. Cohesion and Translation

The modern world emphasizes a great deal of importance on translation, and it is a topic that interests experts in many other areas of life in addition to linguistics professionals, amateur translators, and language instructors. Researchers on the topic have approached it from a variety of perspectives.

A more sophisticated approach to translation shifts is justified by this wide interdisciplinary interest in translation, particularly in the area of cohesion, where pragmatic and semantic issues frequently intersect with cultural, contextual, and ideological considerations.

Semantic and Pragmatic Factors Leading to Cohesive Shifts. In accordance with Halliday and Hasan (1976, p. 4), cohesion is the term used to describe the linguistic processes that maintain a text's unity and establish semantic continuity. Cohesion is achieved using a variety of strategies, which the researches divide into two categories: lexical cohesion, which includes collocation and repetition, and grammatical cohesion, which includes reference, substitution, ellipsis, and conjunction. The theoretical foundation for recognizing and examining cohesive changes in translation is comprised of these categories.

Cohesive devices may experience more than just superficial changes during translation. Some changes are caused by pragmatic, cultural, and semantic considerations, while others are a result of structural variations among languages. According to Baker (2018, p. 190), translators usually modify cohesive ties to conform to the communicative expectations, stylistic preferences, and conventions of the target language. When translating between typologically different languages, like English and Azerbaijani, these modifications—known as cohesion shifts—are particularly noticeable.

“Cohesion is inherently language-specific and culture-dependent” (Hatim & Mason, 1990, p. 200). For example, while Azerbaijani, like other Turkic languages, frequently uses ellipsis, word repetition, or contextual inference, English texts typically emphasize clear indicators of cohesion, especially logical connectors and pronouns. This discrepancy suggests that in order to accomplish the same goal in Azerbaijani, what is cohesive in English might need to be rearranged.

Furthermore, discourse structures and cohesive devices are strongly related. Azerbaijani speech is usually structured on topic progression and the deliberate use of repetition for emphasis or clarity. This requires strategic adaptation in translation, especially when the target

language conventions do not readily match the original cohesion. For instance, the pronoun "she" is a clear referent in the English sentence "She left after the conversation." But such a construction can cause ambiguity in Azerbaijani. To comply with the TL's standards for reference clarity, a translator may choose to use the following: "Söhbətdən sonra qadın oradan getdi," adding the noun "qadın" and the adverb "oradan." Despite not being in the original text, this addition is a cohesive shift that was required by reader expectations and pragmatic necessity.

The application of adversative connectors serves as another example. A passage in English like "He refused. However, she insisted." uses the adversative connective "however" to convey contrast. "O razı olmadı. Bu fikrə baxmayaraq, qız israr etdi, bu fikrə. Here, the translator chooses difference while fitting Azerbaijani stylistic rules by using a more contextually coherent phrase rather than translating "however" directly.

In conclusion, lexical or syntactic limitations alone do not cause cohesive shifts in translation. They result from a translator balancing naturalness and accuracy while taking into account communicative conventions, language typology, and the pragmatic expectations of the intended audience. Thus, examining such shifts provides important information on how discourse is organized across languages as well as translation strategies.

3.1.1. Influence of Cultural and Contextual Asymmetries

One of the most important variables influencing changes in cohesiveness is cultural and contextual asymmetries. According to Blum-Kulka (1986, p. 19), pragmatic equivalence is rarely one-to-one and translators must adjust cohesiveness to guarantee efficient communication. Because of pronoun ambiguity in the target language, Azerbaijani may prefer the repetition of proper nouns to clarify referents when an English source text uses "he" or "she" repeatedly. Similarly, in order to preserve fluency, texts that contain a lot of adversative conjunctions like "however," "yet," or "nevertheless" may be simplified in Azerbaijani. The English phrase "He didn't agree, However, she insisted..." for instance, uses an obvious adversative sign, its Azerbaijani counterpart might read "O razı olmadı. Bu fikrə baxmayaraq qız israr etdi...", that the shift in cohesion demonstrates how the translator has adjusted to the TL's natural structure. For instance, conjunctions are frequently used to express cohesiveness in academic or political writing in English. Cohesion in Azerbaijani is more frequently accomplished implicitly through the use of broad nouns (such as "bu məsələ", "bu fikir") or linear topic development as opposed to formal conjunctions. The reconfiguration of cohesive links in translation is facilitated by this cultural variance.

3.1.2. The Translator's Linguistic and Stylistic Choices

Cohesion is greatly impacted by the translator's individual style, language repertoire, and grasp of genre conventions. According to Nord (2005, p. 31), the translator is a mediator who must interpret the cohesive devices' communication function rather than a passive transmitter. Linguistic decisions that show stylistic adaptability rather than error include using synonyms for repetition or ellipsis in place of explicit connectives. For example, a translator would translate "John said he was tired, and then he left" as "Con dedi ki, yorulub, sonra getdi". The stylistic decision to omit the second mention to "he" (John) is consistent with Azerbaijani discourse norms, which avoided overt repetition when context is obvious.

House divides translations into two categories: overt and covert (1997, p.79). While covert translations are tailored to the target culture's discourse norms, overt translations aim to maintain the original cohesion structure. Cohesion is frequently adjusted in Azerbaijani covert translations of English literary works to conform to stylistic clarity and rhetorical requirements.

3.1.3. Reader Expectations and Target Language Norms

The linguistic and rhetorical traditions of their language group serve as the foundation for the expectations of readers. Translational norms influence what is considered appropriate in the target language, claims Toury (1995, p. 56). While Azerbaijani texts rely more on contextual coherence and prior knowledge, English texts usually use cohesive devices to define argumentation flow.

According to Klaudy (2003), explicitation is the process by which translators add cohesive elements that are absent from the original text in order to make the text more clearer. Repetition or reformulation are frequently used to address ambiguity in reference or conjunction use in English-Azerbaijani translations. A typical explicitation technique in accordance with TL principles is the addition of "qadın" to explain the referent "she" and "oradan" to promote spatial coherence. For instance, the English sentence "She left after the conversation" could be rendered as "Söhbətdən sonra qadın oradan getdi." This change improves readability, but it may also compromise the source's stylistic integrity.

Linguistic typology, cultural expectations, translator agency, and target readership interact intricately to produce cohesion shifts in translation. Azerbaijani prefers contextual clarity and reader inference, which contrasts with English's explicit usage of cohesive indicators. In order

to evaluate translation accuracy, faithfulness, and stylistic congruence, it is essential to comprehend the dynamics of these shifts.

3.2. Case study 1: Cohesion Shifts in S. Maugham's "The Unconquered"

3.2.1. Comparative analysis of two Azerbaijani translations

Two Azerbaijani translations of Somerset Maugham's "The Unconquered" are the subject of this section: Zeydulla Ağayev's (Translation B) and Akif Abbasov's (Translation A). Even though all translations are based on the same original text, they represent distinct editorial, stylistic, and historical approaches, providing a useful basis for analyzing comparative cohesiveness. These translations were chosen based on their availability, authorship by recognized translators, and the distinct linguistic and stylistic patterns they exhibit. Significant variations in the usage of cohesive devices, such as reference, ellipsis, conjunctions, substitution, and lexical reiteration, are revealed by a comparative study. The cohesion model developed by Halliday and Hasan (1976) is used to identify and categorize these cohesive devices. The changes show how each translation balances maintaining the formal aspects of the original text with conforming to the target language's stylistic and rhetorical conventions. This comparison aims to uncover the underlying translational tendencies that may affect textual coherence and reader understanding in addition to the linguistic changes of cohesive devices.

Cohesion Shifts in "The Unconquered"

Original version:

"The farmer's wife put a couple of bottles of wine on the table and Willi took twenty francs out of his pocket and gave it to her. She didn't even say thank you. Hans's French wasn't as good as Willi's, but he could make himself understood, and he and Willi spoke it together all the time. Willi corrected his mistakes. It was because Willi was so useful to him in this way that he had made him his friend, and he knew that Willi admired him. He admired him because he was so tall, slim, and broad-shouldered, because his curly hair was so fair and his eyes so blue. He never lost an opportunity to practise his French, and he tried to talk now, but those three French people wouldn't meet him half-way. He told them that he was a farmer's son himself and when the war was over was going back to the farm. He had been sent to school in Munich because his mother wanted him to go into business, but his heart wasn't in it, and so after matriculating he had gone to an agricultural college".

Akif Abbasov's version (translation 1):

"Fermar arvadı stolun üstünə iki şüşə çaxır qoydu. Villi cibindən iyirmi frank çıxarıb ona verdi. Qadınsa əvəzində təşəkkür belə etmədi.

Hans fransızca Villi kimi danışmasa da, dili az-maz bilirdi. Onlar öz aralarında fransızca danışdılar. Bu vaxt Villi onun səhvlərini düzəldirdi. Ona görə Hans dostunun xətrini istəyir və ona həsəd aparırdı.

Villi də öz növbəsində Hansa qibtə edirdi. Hans hündürboylu və şümşad qamətliydi. Qıvrım saçları elə sarışın, gözləri elə mavi idi ki, qızların ağlını başından oynadırdı.

Hans fransız dilini işlətmək imkanını heç vaxt əldən buraxmamışdı və indi də ev sahibləri ilə həmin dildə danışmağa cəhd göstərirdi. Amma onlar elə bil ağızlarına su almışdılar. Hans bildirdi ki, o da fermer oğludur. Mühəribə qurtaranda fermaya qayıdacaq. O, Münhendə təhsil almışdır. Anası onun biznesmen olmasını istəyirmiş. Bu isə Hansın ürəyincə deyildi. Ona görə də buraxılış imtahanlarını verib kənd təsərrüfatı kollecina daxil olmuşdur".

Zeydulla Ağayev's version (translation 2):

"Qarı masa üstünə iki şüşə çaxır qoydu. Uilli cibindən iyirmi frank pul çıxardıb ona uzatdı. Qarı "sağ ol" da demədj. Hans fransızca sən deyən danışa bilmirdi, az-maz qırıldadırdı. Uilliyə həmişə o dildə danışmağa çalışır, Uilli tez-tez onun səhvlərini düzəldirdi. Elə Hansı Uilliyə yaxınlaşdıran da bu idi. Uilli tez-tez onun karına gəlirdi, üstəlik, Hans anlayırdı ki, Uilli ona həsəd aparır. Necə də aparmayaydı ki, Hans ucaboy, qamətli, enlikürək oğlandı; qıvrım saçları, mavi gözləri vardı. Əlinə girəvə keçən kimi Hans fransızca danışdı, indi də ev sahibləriylə murt vurmaq istədi, ancaq onlar üçü də ağzına su alıb danışmırdı. Hans başa saldı ki, onun da atası fermerdir, dava qurtarandan sonra özü də fermaya qayıdacaq. Məktəbi Münhendə bitirmişdi, anası onu ticarətçi görmək istəyirdi, amma yox, Hansın ürəyi elə şeyə yatmırdı, odur ki, buraxılış imtahanlarından sonra kənd təsərrüfatı məktəbini seçmişdi".

In the first sentence, the translation of "the farmer's wife" in the excerpt's first sentence represents a substantial change in reference. It is rendered as "fermer arvadı" by Translator 1 (Akif Abbasov), which preserves semantic and contextual equivalency with the source text (ST) despite being literal. However, it is translated as "qarı" by Translator 2 (Zeydulla Ağayev). This is a case of a change in meaning, a mistranslation of the reference, a failure to provide the correct equivalent in the target language, and finally, a cohesion shift, a case of a reference not being translated correctly. This decision causes a pragmatic shift and a semantic distortion since it modifies the referent's tone and social perception in addition to its denotative meaning. The asymmetry between the SL and TL texts is exacerbated by these adjustments, which show the

translator's failure for the pragmatic behavior of referential objects and compromise the integrity of coherence.

Both translators are successful in preserving the original lexical cohesiveness in the phrase "a couple of bottles of wine," particularly the collocational link between "bottles" and "wine." However, the misrendering of the coordinating conjunctions overshadows this achievement. There are two uses of "and" in the statement, but neither translator makes good use of them. The first "and" in the phrase "Villi isə cibindən 20 frank çıxartdı və ona verdi" should have been translated as "isə," an Azerbaijani contrastive conjunction that maintains speech flow. Discourse cohesiveness and logical sequencing are disrupted when this isn't done.

Additionally, in both translations, Annette's mother is anaphorically referred to by the prepositional phrase "to her" through the pronoun "ona." The referential link is preserved in this case. However, by interpreting the verb phrase as "pulu uzatdı" rather than "verdi," Translator 2 (Zeydulla) adds another mistake. This changes the pragmatic impact of the original utterance by causing a lexical shift and an incorrect depiction of the action. According to the theoretical framework, these changes may unjustly reduce or increase the semantic scope, which could have an impact on how the reader understands the story.

All things considered, this sentence exemplifies a number of cohesion shifts, including verb distortion, needless structural fragmentation, reference misrepresentation, and improper conjunction management. Together, these lead to textual incoherence, undermine semantic-pragmatic faithfulness, and, in the case of Translator 2 (Zeydulla), represent examples of domestication that depart from the cultural-linguistic context of the source.

Sentence 2 analysis:

The personal pronoun "She" references anaphorically to "the farmer's wife" in the next statement. Akif Abbasov, the first translator, renders it as "qadın," but Zeydulla Ağayev, the second translator, once more selects "qarı." Similar to the preceding sentence, the word "qarı" provides a negative connotation that is absent from the original text, causing a semantic-pragmatic distortion and upsetting the original narrative's polite tone. Akif's use of "qadın" is more neutral and suitable for the context, maintaining the source's pragmatic aim as well as the referential link.

The phrase "əvəzində," which is absent from the original sentence, is added by Translator 1. This is an example of unjustified addition, which results in a change in cohesion by inserting an element that modifies the syntactic and semantic flow. Unless warranted by the context, such additions should be avoided as they may unduly extend or narrow the meaning. The additional

phrase risks misdirecting the reader's interpretation by imposing a cause-and-effect link that the author did not intend.

Although the original text does not employ this stylistic device, Translator 2's version implies direct conversation by enclosing the phrase "sağ ol" in quotation marks. This change is both stylistic and pragmatic, and it represents an improper example of domestication in which the translator uses unnecessary punctuation to enforce cultural standards of politeness. Since these changes cause asymmetry and erode coherence integrity, translators should refrain from enforcing TL conventions that are not present in the source language.

Overall, even though Translator 1 maintains the referential chain more precisely, semantic noise is introduced by his use of "əvəzində." By using inappropriate stylistic embellishments, Translator 2 breaks the narrative flow and reinforces the previous referential distortion ("qarı"). The careful balance translators must strike between faithfulness to the source and fluency in the target is demonstrated by both cases. Avoiding needless changes that jeopardize meaning, coherence, and reader perception requires pragmatic awareness and textual discipline.

Sentence 3:

Both Azerbaijani versions of the text "Hans's French wasn't as good as Willi's" show a number of cohesion and pragmatic alterations. The removal of the proper noun "Willi" in Translation 2 (Zeydulla Ağayev) results in needless reduction, which weakens the referential cohesion and warps the comparison made in the original text.

Furthermore, Translation 2's use of the phrase "az-maz qırıldadırdı" demonstrates a domestication technique by inserting an idiomatic expression derived from Azerbaijani oral language that is stylistically inconsistent with the original's tone. Translation 1 uses local terms that do not accurately reflect the foreign context or linguistic structure of the source, even though it translates the meaning as "az-maz danışa bilirdi." The reader's understanding of the foreign environment is constrained by these shifts, which show a preference for cultural familiarity over cross-cultural authenticity.

Furthermore, the coordinating conjunction "but," which is essential to organizing the sentence's internal contrast, is not rendered in either translation. Both translations break the syntactic and logical flow of the original language by removing this conjunction and breaking the complex statement up into several simple sentences.

Additionally, there are two instances of the conjunction "and" in the statement, neither of which is sufficiently conveyed in either translation. This suggests a recurring breakdown in conjunctive cohesiveness, which compromises the text's logical flow.

While Translation 1 adds "bu zaman," Translation 2 adds the adverb "tez-tez" to the sentence

"Willi corrected his mistakes." Since there is no indication of temporal frequency or specificity in the original text, both insertions amount to needless extension.

This sentence thus exhibits several forms of cohesiveness shifts: lexical-pragmatic (due to domestication and superfluous additions), conjunctive (due to the failure to render "but" and "and"), and referential (due to omission).

Sentence 4:

The sentence "It was because Willi was so useful to him in this way that he had made him his friend, and he knew that Willi admired him" exhibits a number of cohesive ties, such as conjunction, reference, and lexical cohesion, as well as complicated syntactic structure. However, significant cohesion shifts and semantic-pragmatic aberrations are introduced in both Azerbaijani versions.

The framework is drastically changed by the translator in Translation 2 (Zeydulla Ağayev). Zeydulla divides a complex sentence into two simple sentences by using a full stop to separate the two clauses, even though the original sentence joins them with the coordinating conjunction "and." This leads to a change in structural cohesiveness, which breaks the original narrative's rhythm and impairs the ideas' logical and chronological flow.

Zeydulla's reading of "admired" as "həsəd aparmaq" contains a serious lexical-pragmatic mistake. While "həsəd aparmaq" suggests jealousy or envy, the English verb "admire" expresses appreciation or reverence; this semantic shift distorts the character's emotional position. The incorrect linguistic choice changes the interpersonal dynamic between the characters even though the translation maintains the referential relationship between "he" (Willi) and "him" (Hans).

Translation 1 (Akif Abbasov) has similar problems. Even if it expresses fondness, the term "xətrini istəmək" is a cultural localization that deviates from the neutral tone of "make him his friend." When the TL expression deviates stylistically and semantically from the SL equivalent, it also signifies domestication and a shift in lexical cohesion.

Akif's addition of the superfluous logical connective "öz növbəsində," which was not there in the original, is another instance of pointless extension. There is also no need to include the phrase "qızların ağılını başından oynadırdı." It introduces a culturally charged and gendered idea that isn't alluded to or acknowledged in the original. This results in a variety of alterations, such as domestication, semantic distortion, and irrelevant expansion, that compromise the text's integrity and the author's intent.

The accurate identification of referents in "he admired him"—with "he" standing for Willi and "him" for Hans—is one area where both translations succeed. In translation 2, "Hans" is

named directly instead of "him," which can improve clarity for the Azerbaijani reader and may be regarded as a clarifying shift rather than a distortion in this instance. The same thing happens in Akif's rendition.

To sum up, there are several shifts in this sentence:

- Semantic shifts (e.g., “admire” → “həsəd aparmaq”),
- Lexical cohesion shifts (through cultural substitutions),
- structural cohesion shifts (segmenting complex sentences),
- pragmatic distortions (through additions like “üstəlik,” “qızların ağlını başından oynadırdı),
- and domestication (through idiomatic expressions like “karına gəlmək” and “xətrini istəmək) are some examples.

Together, these shifts compromise the original's stylistic and semantic integrity, highlighting how crucial it is to maintain linguistic and cultural authenticity while translating.

Sentence 5:

Several cohesive devices are used in the sentence "He never lost an opportunity to practise his French, and he tried to talk now, but those three French people wouldn't meet him half-way" to keep the text coherent and give the sentence structure. In particular, the coordinating conjunctions "and" and "but," as well as the personal pronoun "he," serve as conjunctive cohesive ties and references, respectively. These components connect the subject's actions and support the sentence's logical and chronological flow.

Additionally, Zeydulla adds the term "mirt vurmaq," which is not found in the original text. In contrast to the original, which has a more neutral tone, this statement is informal and humorous. This is an unneeded addition, a blatant example of pragmatic shift, and it throws off the original's stylistic harmony. Despite being simple and neutral in tone, the phrase "he tried to talk" has been transformed into a culturally unique and stylistically inconsistent term.

Translation 1, on the other hand, renders this section more appropriately and refrains from using culturally charged idioms in this particular situation. However, in translating "wouldn't meet him half-way," both translators use the colloquial phrase "ağzına su almaq." Although it is idiomatic in Azerbaijani, the original English phrasal idiom "to meet someone half-way," which denotes a readiness to compromise or mutual understanding, does not have the same meaning as this expression.

Another important change in Zeydulla's version is the removal of the conjunction "and." "And" functions as a coordinating device in the source phrase, connecting two consecutive actions of the subject ("he never lost an opportunity" and "he tried to talk now"). This logical

connection is broken by the omission, which weakens the sentence's internal coherence. By keeping this conjunction, Akif's version more accurately maintains the additive conjunctive cohesion.

From a referential standpoint, both translations avoid referential ambiguity by appropriately maintaining the subject reference "he" throughout. However, the insertion of colloquial terms that are logically and culturally inconsistent with the source material weakens the sentence's overall coherence.

To summarize, the following are the cohesion shifts in this sentence:

- Lexical cohesion shifts caused by outdated and domesticated vocabulary (e.g., "girəvə"),
- pragmatic and semantic shifts caused by superfluous colloquial additions (e.g., "mırt vurmaq"),
- conjunctive cohesion shifts caused by the omission of "and" (Translation 2),
- and idiom misinterpretations that result in semantic distortion (e.g., "meet him half-way" → "ağzına su almaq").

These shifts show how the coherence, style, and intended meaning of the translated text can be greatly impacted by the improper use or misreading of cohesive devices, both grammatical and lexical. Both translations show variations that compromise the clarity and cultural authenticity of the original content, even if Translation 1 does a better job of preserving cohesion.

Sentence 6:

The line "He told them that he was a farmer's son himself and was going back to the farm when the war was over" demonstrates a number of cohesive devices that support the narrative's logical flow and referential clarity. These consist of the definite article "the," the reflexive pronoun "himself," the reporting verb "told," the coordinating conjunction "and," and the personal pronouns "he" and "them." These strategies help the sentence's grammatical and lexical cohesion.

It is incorrect to use the pronoun "them" in Translation 2 (Zeydulla Ağayev). The translation alters its purpose and compromises the overall referential cohesion rather than providing an accurate representation. Furthermore, the verb "told" is transcribed as "başa saldı," which has a different pragmatic nuance despite being related. "Told" suggests straightforward reporting,

whereas "başa saldı" denotes a pragmatic change by implying explanation or rationale. This changes the original sentence's function and tone.

This clause is more accurately rendered in Translation 1 (Akif Abbasov), albeit the term "himself" is not translated directly and the indefinite article "a" is left out. Although not very harmful, these omissions cause a slight loss of coherence because they lessen the original's precision and focus.

Additionally, Translation 2 mistranslated the noun phrase "the war" as "dava." In this context, "war" suggests a significant historical event, whereas "dava" indicates a clash or conflict. This word substitution causes a change that lessens the source's contextual richness and calls into question the seriousness and universality of "the war."

Beyond the ones already mentioned, neither version systematically preserves or shifts any of the original's ellipses or substitution devices. The only noteworthy partial deletion is the absence of the stress marker "himself" in both versions, which eliminates a minor but crucial element of the character's speech that is crucial to identity building.

In conclusion, the following are the primary cohesion shifts seen in this sentence:

- Referential shift: Translation 2's incorrect use of "them"
- A pragmatic shift that alters the communicative intent from "told" to "başa saldı";
- Lexical cohesion shift: "war" → "dava," decreasing semantic accuracy;
- Structural cohesion shift: "and" is removed or changed, decreasing the logical linkage;
- Minor cohesion loss: "a" and "himself" are omitted in Translation 1.

These alterations demonstrate how minor adjustments to cohesive devices—like conjunctions, references, or lexical precision—can have a big impact on a translated text's meaning, coherence, and stylistic integrity. In this instance, whereas Translation 2 introduces a number of semantic and stylistic errors, Translation 1 stays closer to the original in maintaining referential and structural coherence.

Sentence 7:

“He had been sent to school in Munich because his mother wanted him to go into business, but his heart wasn’t in it, and so after matriculating he had gone to an agricultural college.”

This sentence uses a number of cohesive devices and has a complicated structure that adds to its overall coherence. These consist of:

- All of the following anaphorically refer to Hans: he, his, him, and his mother.
- The following conjunctions are used to denote cause, contrast, and result: because, but, and so.

- Ellipsis/Substitution: the pronoun "his heart wasn't in it" replaces the previous notion of "going into business."
- Lexical cohesion: a coherence lexical field is formed by the semantic proximity and repetition of terms associated with education (school, matriculating, agricultural college).

The referential chain to "Hans" is accurately maintained by both translators, guaranteeing the intended reader's comprehension. Both, however, fall short of maintaining the source text's complete conjunctive cohesion. The logical flow between the phrases is weakened in both translations by the obvious cohesion shift caused by the omission of the causal connector "because." Both result in a loss of semantic clarity since they present the sentence as distinct or tangentially related pieces rather than maintaining the cause-effect structure.

Translator 1 (Akif Abbasov) handles the phrase "his heart wasn't in it" more accurately, translating it as "Hansın ürəyincə deyildi," preserving both the idiomatic sense and the appropriate reference. Conversely, Translator 2 (Zeydulla Ağayev) translates it as "Hansın ürəyi elə şeyə yatmırdı," which only partially captures the concept but does it with less formality and precision.

Both translators change the passive structure in relation to the verbal phrase "had been sent to school." "Məktəbi bitirmişdi," as translated by Translator 2, incorrectly implies completion rather than merely being sent, which is a semantic change. Although it is closer in meaning, Translator 1 still leaves out the passive part by paraphrasing it as "Mühəndə təhsil almışdır."

Another important area of shift is the use of conjunctions. "But" and "and" so are used in the source to produce contrast and outcome. "But" is rendered as "isə" by Translator 1, which is a successful cohesion shift and appropriate for the context. The usage of "amma yox" by Translator 2 provides a somewhat more informal tone and demonstrates a stylistic inclination toward domestication. The original grammatical cohesion was also broken by both translators, who divided the compound-complex statement into multiple simple sentences.

Analysis of the other paragraph

Original version:

"With one step Hans was in front of her. He seized her by the shoulders and flung her violently back. She tottered and fell. He took Willi's revolver.

"Stop still, both of you," he rasped in French, but with his guttural German accent. He nodded his head towards the door. "Go on. I'll look after them."

Willi went out, but in a moment was back again.

"She's unconscious."

"Well, what of it?"

"I can't. It's no good."

"Stupid, that's what you are. Ein Weibchen. A woman."

Willi flushed.

"We'd better be getting on our way."

Hans shrugged a scornful shoulder.

"I'll just finish the bottle of wine and then we'll go."

Akif Abbasov's version:

Hans ani sıçrayışla onun qarşısında peyda oldu.

Çiyinlərindən yapışb onu qolu getdikcə viyıldıtdı. Zərblə divara dəyən qadın səndələyib yıxıldı.

Hans Villinin revolverini alıb bağırdı:

-Səsinizi kəsin!

Həmin sözləri fransızca, lakin almanlara xas tərzdə boğazında tələffüz edərək dedi. Sonra başı ilə qapını Villiyə göstərdi:

-Di, tərpən, mən bunlara göz yetirərəm.

Villi getdi, ancaq az sonra geri qayıdaraq:

-Ozündə-sözündə deyil ki, - dedi.

-Nolsun?

-Mənim işim deyil. Boşla getsin.

-Axmağın biri axmaq. Ein Weibchen.! Arvadin biri.

Villi pul kimi qızardı:

-Yaxşısı budur gedək.

Hans rişxəndlə çiyinlərini çəkdi:

-Qoy çaxır şüşəsinin axırına çıxım, gedərik.

Zeydulla Ağayev's version:

Hans bir sıçrayışla özünü qarının yanına atdı, onun çiyinlərindən yapışb var gücü ilə geri itələdi. Qarı dalı-dalı gedib divara dəydi, səndələdi və döşəməyə yıxıldı. Hans Uillinin tapançasını aldı:

-İkiniz də kəsin səsinizi! - o bağırdı. Sözləri fransızca dedi, ancaq güclü alman ləhcəsi hiss olunurdu. Sonra başı ilə Uilliyə qapını

göstərdi. - Sən keç içəri. Bunları mən saxlaram.

Uilli içəri otağa keçdi, ancaq dərhal da qayıtdı:

-Qız huşunu itirib.

-Nə olsun ki, itirib?

-Eləyə bilmərəm. Lazım deyil.

-Səfəhin biri səfəh. Qızbibi!

Uilli pörtdü:

-Yaxşısı budur çıxıb gedək.

Hans nifrətlə çiyinlərini atdı:

-Butulkadakının başına daş salım, sonra tərpənərik.

Analysis:

Reference: Annette's mother is the subject of the anaphoric personal references "her" (x2) and "she."

- In order to preserve grammatical cohesion and clarity, the reference "her" is translated in Akif Abbasov's version as "onun," a possessive pronoun, and then "onu," an accusative personal pronoun. Although "qadın" is introduced later, it may have been used sooner to avoid confusion.

- In Zeydulla Ağayev's version, "qarı," a culturally marked term that not only changes the tone but may also be interpreted as somewhat antiquated or disparaging in Azerbaijani, is used instead of "her" and "she." Despite being explicit, this decision alters the original's stylistic tone and produces a semantic-pragmatic shift.

For clarity and tone consistency, the pronoun "she" could have ideally been translated into Azerbaijani using "o" or "qadın." "Qız" or "qarı" mislead the reader about the character's age and disposition.

"She tottered and fell" is a concise clause that contains a series of physical actions.

Akif adds an extra clause that was not in the ST, "zərblə divara dəyən qadın səndələyib yıxıldı," which contradicts the source's minimalist style and creates a coherence change through lexical elaboration.

Zeydulla extends it in a similar way, adding two distinct bodily happenings once more: "dalı-dalı gedib divara dəydi, səndələdi və döşəməyə yıxıldı."

Both translations introduce unnecessary actions (e.g., "divara dəydi," "döşəməyə yıxıldı") that break the original's syntactic coherence and narrative flow.

In sum for this sentence, although he occasionally inserts unnecessary modifiers, Akif more correctly maintains the reference cohesiveness by using conventional Azerbaijani pronouns (onun, onu). Both translators use needless expansion, which affects the original's cohesion and

tone; Zeydulla's rendition, albeit being more vivid, frequently uses stylistically incorrect or excessive terminology (such as *qarı*), resulting in a stylistic shift and pragmatic distortion. The austere and taut manner that characterizes Maugham's narrative voice is distorted in these instances of cohesiveness alterations caused by over-translation.

In the following sentence again, the word "he" serves as an anaphoric reference to Hans: "He took Willi's revolver." In order to preserve clarity and prevent ambiguity, both translators substituted the proper noun "Hans" for the pronoun, which is a standard practice in Azerbaijani. There is a change in coherence between the two translations with regard to the lexical term "revolver." As the right Azerbaijani equivalent, Zeydulla Ağayev renders it as "*tapança*," demonstrating a successful lexical substitution. However, Akif Abbasov does not translate the word "revolver," instead using the original. The fact that "revolver" has a recognized counterpart in Azerbaijani makes this decision challenging. Translation rules state that foreign terms should only be kept in use when there is no suitable equivalent in the target language or when maintaining the cultural peculiarity of the source word is necessary, neither of which is the case in this instance.

Another reference shift may be seen in the following sentence: "'Stop still, both of you,' he rasped in French, but with his guttural German accent." Zeydulla Ağayev leaves off the subject entirely, however Akif Abbasov uses punctuation to join this sentence with the preceding one and repeats "Hans" as the subject. Both versions effectively use context to reveal the speaker's identity, but Akif's method is a little clearer and easier for readers to understand, especially for those who are not familiar with the story. His rendition, however, deviates from the original's syntactic structure by joining two separate sentences into a single sentence.

Furthermore, the original phrase "but with his guttural German accent" is a subordinate clause that adds information on the speech pattern rather than a whole sentence. However, it is presented as a distinct and complete sentence in both translations, which is a structural distortion of the original. Furthermore, Akif's use of "*boğazında tələffüz edərək*" adds needless lexical expansion that is absent from the original text. Despite being stylistically localized, this addition impairs the cohesion between the phrases and causes over-domestication. Such needless expansion runs the risk of altering the original prose's economy and tone.

There are also obvious discrepancies in the following statement. In Akif Abbasov's translation, the translator adds the unnecessary word "*di, tərən*," which is absent from the original. Similar to this, the phrase "*göz yetirmək*" is added without any context in the original text. These extensions in both situations provide domesticated, everyday language that changes the mood and how the reader views the characters. The adversative conjunction "but" in the original sentence is correctly translated as "*ancaq*" and "*amma*" in the corresponding

Azerbaijani translations, demonstrating proper cohesion equivalency. Zeydulla, however, inserts the word "otaq" (room), which is absent from the original and again leads to needless expansion, which compromises the sentence's semantic accuracy.

The anaphoric personal reference ("she") in the line "She is unconscious" refers to Anette's mother. It implies that the character is currently unconscious because it depicts a state rather than an action. The translation by Akif Abbasov, "özündə-sözündə deyil ki," greatly departs from the original meaning. This expression introduces an informal register that is unsuitable for the solemn and restrained tone of the original text, making it conversational and excessively domesticating the tone of the original.

Even with the addition of the word "itirib" (has lost), Zeydulla Ağayev's rendering of the sentence, "qız huşunu itirib," more closely reflects its intended meaning. His translation more accurately captures the feeling of unconsciousness while maintaining the reference ("she" → "qız"). However, his version includes a verbality shift, somewhat changing the aspect, because the original employs the stative form ("is unconscious") instead of a completed action ("lost consciousness").

The structural balance between source and target languages can be harmed by various cohesiveness shifts, which also draw attention to the unnecessary use of domestication in the target language. The cultural and linguistic backgrounds are thus upset, which results in an imbalance between the SL and TL texts and weakens or eliminates their coherence integrity.

"Hans" responds with a neutral, somewhat uninterested "Well, what of it?" before going on to the following line. Akif translates this as "nolsun," which is a pronunciation variant of "nə olsun" and extremely informal. The tone of Hans's original speech is drastically altered by this deep instance of domestication and spoken vernacular. This change lessens the formality and could change how the reader interprets the character. Although Zeydulla's rendition, "Nə olsun ki, itirib?" is a little closer to the original tone, it nonetheless adds the word "itirib."

In the next statement "I can't" is. It's not good". — Zeydulla's "Eləyə bilmərəm. Lazım deyil" keeps them closer to the source. "Lazım deyil" maintains the functional suggestion that the act is useless or not worth doing, even though it does not translate "It's no good" exactly. However, Akif's rendition "mənim işim deyil. Boşla getsin" an obtrusive addition is included in the phrase. This adds emotional detachment that wasn't stated clearly and expands the original's semantic reach. This is an obvious example of semantic widening, which alters the original utterance's intention and emotional warmth while perhaps striving for naturalness.

Hans uses German to offend Willi in the section that follows. By keeping the original German term in the text and explaining its meaning in a footnote, Translation 1 (Akif Abbasov) uses a suitable translation technique. On the other hand, the insult is rendered as "Qızibibi" in

Translation 2 a localized Azerbaijani colloquial phrase that refers to someone who is cowardly or excessively delicate. This change is an obvious example of domestication, which weakens the cultural connotation of the original insult by substituting a broader phrase for a specific socio-linguistic marker and distorting its cultural aim. Furthermore, Zeydulla changes the sentence modality and heightens the tone in a way that is not consistent with the source, even if the original statement is declarative.

"Willi flushed," the following sentence, is likewise rendered incorrectly. Akif renders it as "pul kimi qızardı" in Translation 1, which is an example of unnecessary extension and an over-interpretation. In this context, the term "flush" only implies a physiological response to humiliation or rage; it would be more accurate to translate it as "qızardı" or "utanıb qızardı." Translation 2 is more stylistically suitable because it stays closer to the literal meaning while avoiding metaphorical extension.

Another inconsistency may be seen in the sentence that uses the word "a scornful laugh." Zeydulla's translation of "scornful" as "nifrətlə" distorts the subtlety of the original adjective. "Scornful" is more accurately transcribed as "rişxəndlə" or "istehzayla" since it expresses ridicule or derision. In this instance, Akif maintains the original evaluative tone while offering the more accurate equivalent.

The collocational phrase "a bottle of wine" also demonstrates lexical cohesion. In order to maintain textual coherence and the source collocation, Akif appropriately renders this as "çaxır şüşəsi." However, Zeydulla's translation, "butulkadakının," not only leaves out the specific word "wine," but it also breaks lexical cohesion by substituting an ambiguous possessive construction for a distinct image. Furthermore, Zeydulla's complete statement, "butulkadakının başına daş salım sonra tərənərik," incorporates both semantic distortion and cultural localization. The tone and aim of the original are not reflected in the Azerbaijani idiom "başına daş salmaq," which suggests finality or destruction.

The original has a number of cohesive devices throughout the paragraph, such as lexical words ("bottle of wine"), conjunctions ("and," "but"), and reference items ("he," "his," "she," "her," "them," and "his head"). Conjunctions, especially "but" and "and then," are commonly mistranslated or left off, even if the majority of references are correctly reproduced in both versions. Asymmetry between the source and target texts results from these shifts, which also show how difficult it is to preserve coherence between languages and how inconsistently translators handle cohesive structures.

The coherence and stylistic balance of the translations are undermined by numerous instances of lexical and conjunctive cohesion shifts, particularly unnecessary expansion, register shifts,

and misinterpretation of evaluative tone, even though reference cohesion was largely maintained.

Original version:

"You don't look like a farmer's daughter," he said to the girl.

"And so what?" she answered.

"She's a teacher," said her mother.

"Then you've had a good education."

She shrugged her shoulders, but he went on good-humouredly in his bad French. "You ought to understand that this is the best thing that has ever happened to the French people. We didn't declare war. You declared war. And now we're going to make France a decent country. We're going to put order into it. We're going to teach you to work. You'll learn obedience and discipline."

She clenched her fists and looked at him, her eyes black with hatred. But she did not speak."

Akif Abbasov's version (1):

-Sən fermer qızına oxşamırsan axı, - dedi.

Qızın anası:

-O, müəllimdir, - deyər izah etdi.

-Deməli, təhsil almısan?

Qız çiynlərini çəkdi. Hans pozluq fransız dilində mehribancasına söhbəti davam etdirdi:

-Onda başa düşməlisən ki, hər şey fransız xalqının xeyrinə qurtarır. Adamları bihudə yerə qırğına verməyin nə mənası? Müharibəni biz yox, siz başlamışdınız. Nə əcəb?!

Necə işləməyi, itaət və intizamın nə demək olduğunu sizə öyrədərək.

Qız yumruqlarını düyünləyib ona baxdı. Onun qara gözləri nifrətindən alışıb yandı. Amma güclə özünü ələ alıb dinmədi.

Zeydulla Ağayev's version (2):

-Amma sən heç kəndçi qızına oxşamırsan, -o, qıza dedi.

-Nə olsun ki?

-Qızım müəllimədir, -anası dilləndi

-Yox, əşi! Savad sahibiymişki!

Qız çiynlərini atdı, Hans isə yenə də sınıq-salxaq fransızca sözünün dalını dedi.

-Deməli, sən daha dərindən anlamalısan ki, fransızlar üçün məğlubiyyət nə deməkdir. Biz sizə müharibə elan etməmişik, onu siz başlatmışınız. İndi isə dözüün, biz Fransanı abırlı ölkəyə çevirək. Biz burada qayda-qanun yaradarıq, görərsiniz. Sizə işləməyi öyrədəcəyik. Bizdən öyrənəcəksiniz, itaət və intizam nə deyən sözdü.

In this passage from this chapter, "You don't look like a farmer's daughter," he said to the girl, carries the anaphoric personal reference to Hans that was established earlier in the story. Both translators faithfully preserve the pronoun's referential role by rendering it as *o*. However, Zeydulla Ağayev uses “kəndçi”, which is close in meaning but lacks terminological accuracy, while Akif Abbasov uses “fermer”, which is a direct and adequate equivalent in Azerbaijani, to translate "farmer." This instance of target language equivalency involves lexical mismatch.

Both translators have added additional conjunctions to highlight the contrast that was suggested in the original. Zeydulla uses “amma” and Akif uses “axı” to emphasize the conflict between appearance and expectation. Although absent from the source text, these conjunctions improve the target language's logical coherence by acting as coherent additions.

Another anaphoric reference is made to Annette's mother in the next sentence: "She's a teacher," said her mother. Akif clarifies it as “qızın anası”, whilst Zeydulla translates it as “anası”. By making the referent more obvious, the latter tactic eliminates any potential ambiguity and shows a successful coherence change.

In English, the line "Then you've had a good education" is declarative and devoid of irony. But according to Zeydulla, it's “Yox, əşi! Savad sahibiymiş ki!” adds a tone of irony and colloquialism (əşi) that were absent from the original. Given that “əşi” is a colloquial, culturally charged phrase, this represents both a pragmatic change and a case of domestication. By turning a statement into a question, Akif's version—“Deməli, təhsil almısan?”—modifies the sentence type, altering the illocutionary force and causing semantic distortion. As a result, both translations depart from the original's neutral tone and clear message.

The following sentence using the pronoun “she” still uses to refer to Annette, “she shrugged her shoulders”. Because “qadın” would have caused misunderstanding by implying an older female subject, both translators transcribe it as “qız”, which is contextually suitable. Both translators made the right choice in terms of referential cohesiveness.

The phrase “You ought to understand that this is the best thing that has ever happened to the French people” according to Zeydulla differs greatly from the original. “Deməli, sən daha dərindən anlamalısan ki, fransızlar üçün məğlubiyyət nə deməkdir”. The original text characterizes the event as a positive experience for the French, without mentioning the word "defeat." The message is negatively reframed in Zeydulla's rendition, resulting in a semantic-

pragmatic change. While not totally correct, Akif more accurately portrays the intended positive frame.

Zeydulla uses a comma to syntactically combine the statement "We didn't declare war" with the preceding sentence, which may lead to structural confusion. However, Akif adds the following statement, which is not included in the original text: *Adamları bihudə yerə qırğına verməyin nə mənası?* This is a severe instance of over-translation and unnecessary addition, which goes against the translation principles of economy and faithfulness. The infrequent usage of the word “bihudə” in modern Azerbaijani may limit accessibility for readers in the modern day.

A crucial semantic omission occurs when Akif completely leaves out the phrase "We're going to make France a decent country." Zeydulla renders it as “*Fransanı abırlı ölkəyə çevirəcəyik*”, however in Azerbaijani, the word “abırlı” frequently implies chastity or personal modesty, which are characteristics of people rather than countries. This vocabulary choice is therefore improper and distorts the meaning.

A number of cohesion shifts that have an immediate effect on the translations' textual coherence, semantic integrity, and cultural authenticity have been identified by comparing the chosen passage from *The Unconquered* with its two Azerbaijani translations. Reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction, and lexical cohesion are the five primary categories into which cohesive devices are divided in Halliday and Hasan's (1976) approach.

Cohesive Device Types and Shifts:

1. **Reference:** The source material mostly included anaphoric allusions, such as "he," "she," "her," "his," and "them etc." Although the majority of these were accurately translated, some references had aberrations in tone or social perception. For example, Translator 2 introduced a stylistic-pragmatic distortion by rendering the noun "the farmer's wife" as "qarı," while Translator 1 maintained the original referential tone by using "fermer arvadı." This is an example of a semantic change in anaphoric reference.
2. **Substitution:** Clausal substitution is used in phrases like "his heart wasn't in it," where "it" stands in for the action of "going into business." Although this was rendered rather well by Translator 1, Translator 2 chose to use "ürəyi elə şeyə yatmırdı," which changes the emotional tone and impairs the clausal cohesiveness.
3. **Conjunction:** The source text employs a broad range of conjunctive devices, including "and," "but," "so," and "because," to arrange logic, causation, and contrast. Both translators frequently substituted, misinterpreted, or left out these conjunctions.

Adversative conjunctive cohesiveness was disrupted, for instance, by the frequent omission or mistranslation of "but" (for instance, not always transcribed as "amma," "isə," or "ancaq").

4. **Ellipsis:** The translations did not retain the delicate verbal and clausal ellipses that are included in the original text, such as "He never lost an opportunity to practise his French, and tried to talk now." Instead of reproducing the ellipsis, the translators frequently chose to amplify the text, which resulted in unnecessary elaboration and distortion of coherence.
5. **Lexical cohesion:** Two essential components of the source text's lexical cohesion are repetition and collocation. Thematic and descriptive unity is created by phrases like "bottle of wine," "his curly hair," and "a decent country." By translating "a bottle of wine" as "çaxır şüşəsi," Translator 1 upholds this better than Translator 2, who use "butulkadakının," which obstructs lexical clarity and imagery. Furthermore, there was a lexical-pragmatic change as Translator 1 suitably foreignized cultural collocations such "Ein Weibchen," but Translator 2 domesticated them as "Qızibibi."

The most common cohesion shifts found in the paragraphs under examination were as follows:

- **Reference:** There were 95 reference shifts found, 56 of which were successful and 49 of which involved distortion (such as the incorrect usage of "qarı," the omission of "himself," or referential ambiguity)
- **Conjunction Shifts:** Six of the 28 major shifts (such as "because," "but," and "and then") entail omission or misplacement.
- **Lexical Cohesion Shifts:** 10 significant shifts, such as culturally inappropriate paraphrasing, semantic widening ("boşla getsin"), and miscollocation ("abırlı ölkə").

Clausal and nominal substitution failures are included in the three substitution shifts.

- **4 ellipsis shifts**, mostly due to duplication and over-expansion.

Assessment of Translation Techniques. Akif Abbasov, the first translator, was generally more successful in maintaining textual coherence and using foreignization. However, he often changed tone and register by adding unnecessary expansions and colloquialisms (such as "pul kimi qızardı" and "qızların ağılı başından oynadırdı"). Semantic-pragmatic changes and a loss of stylistic integrity resulted from Translator 2's (Zeydulla Ağayev) heavy reliance on domestication techniques and frequent substitution of culturally rooted Azerbaijani idioms (such as "qızibibi," "tərpənmək," and "mırt vurmaq").

3.3. Case study 2: Cohesion shifts in M. Twain's "The adventures of Tom Sawyer"

Examining cohesive devices in a few selected sections of Mark Twain's "The Adventures of Tom Sawyer" and how they are portrayed in the Azerbaijani translation will be the main goal of this part. Halliday and Hasan's cohesion model serves as the framework for the study, which pays close attention to ellipsis, reference, conjunction, lexical cohesion, and substitution.

Original:

"TOM!"

No answer.

"TOM!"

No answer.

"What's gone with that boy, I wonder? You TOM!"

No answer.

The old lady pulled her spectacles down and looked over them about the room; then she put them up and looked out under them. She seldom or never looked through them for so small a thing as a boy; they were her state pair, the pride of her heart, and were built for "style," not service—she could have seen through a pair of stove-lids just as well.

Translated version:

-Tom! cavab gəlmir.

-Tom! cavab eşidilmir.

-Çox qərəbədir. Görəsən, bu uşaq harada itib! ...batıb. Tom!

cavab gəlmir.

Polly xala eynəyini burnunun ucuna endirdi və onun üstündən bütün otağı gözdən keçirdi; Sonra eynəyi alına qaldırdı. Onun altından otağı gözdən keçirdi. O, uşaq kimi xırda bir şey axtardıqda, çox nadir hallarda eynəkdən baxardı. Demək olar ki, heç baxmazdı; Bu eynək onun bəzəyi və fəxri idi. Onu zəruriyyətdən deyil, yaraşıq üçün almışdı, özünü taxanda heç bir şey görə bilmirdi.

The Adventures of Tom Sawyer's opening section employs a number of unified devices that support the original's narrative style and literary cohesion. The Azerbaijani translation exhibits a number of cohesiveness adjustments that impact stylistic faithfulness, structural cohesion, and referential clarity. These shifts can be both beneficial and harmful.

In this passage, reference, conjunction, and lexical cohesion—especially repetition and collocation—are the most noticeable cohesive mechanisms. The proper noun "Tom" is used repeatedly as a proper noun reference and as a means of lexical cohesiveness (repetition). This is faithfully maintained in the Azerbaijani translation, and the translator does not change the name.

But there is a shift in how "No answer" is rendered. Since the complete structure would be "There was no answer," this brief, forceful sentence serves as ellipsis and is repeated three times in the original. The translation changes the phrase "cavab gəlmir," "cavab eşidilmir," and "cavab gəlmir" in the target text. The variation may lessen the lexical repetition, which is stylistically crucial in the ST to depict mounting tension and the lack of response, even while it maintains the overall meaning. As a result, we see a stylistic divergence and a partial shift in cohesion in repetition.

"What's gone with that boy, I wonder?" is the next sentence. You, Tom!—includes both exophoric deixis and reference ("that boy"). This is rendered as "Çox qəribədir" by the translator. "Görəsən bu uşaq harada itib-batıb!" original does not directly reflect the additions made by the translator, such as the idiomatic phrase "itib-batıb" and "çox qəribədir." As a result, there is an example of domestication due to pragmatic expansion, a kind of needless addition that changes both style and cultural tone. A change from "that boy" to "bu uşaq" results in a subtle reference misinterpretation because "that" conveys aloofness or annoyance, which "bu" counteracts.

Both reference ("her spectacles," "them") and conjunction ("and") can be found in the sentence "The old lady pulled her spectacles down and looked over them about the room." "Polly xala eynəyini burnunun ucuna endirdi və onun üstündən bütün otağı gözdən keçirdi," is how the translator renders this. Despite being a clarifying change, the addition of the proper name "Polly xala" is not semantically wrong because it strengthens referential clarity for the reader who is Azerbaijani. The change from implicit (she) to explicit (Polly) referential cohesiveness is still present, though.

When referring to "spectacles," which can be translated as "eynəyi" or "onun," the cohesive pronoun "them" is successfully maintained. Personal anaphoric reference is demonstrated here. Most of these are correct, however some wording (like "alnına qaldırdı") adds specificity that isn't in the ST, which amounts to lexical extension.

Finally, through collocation and fixed expressions, the phrases "the pride of her heart" and "state pair" exhibit lexical cohesiveness. "Bu eynək onun bəzəyi və fəxri idi" is the translation. While "yaraşiq üçün almışdı" and "yaraşiq üçün" incline toward domestication since they localize the stylistic imagery, "Onu zəruriyyətdən deyil" preserves the generic concept.

Cohesion Shifts in the Paragraph:

- Reference Devices:
 - “Tom” (proper noun reference) – provided in both source and target text.
 - “that boy” → “bu uşaq” – shift from distal to proximal reference, causing semantic alteration.
 - “her spectacles” / “them” – translated variously as “eynəyi, onun” – anaphoric personal reference, successfully preserved.
 - “She” (Polly) → “Polly xala” – explicit referential shift, clarifying but stylistically more direct.
- **Conjunction:**
 - “and” → “və” – consistently translated, no shift.
 - Absence of “and” or punctuation replacements – minor structural cohesion shifts.
- **Ellipsis:**
 - “No answer” (ellipsis of “There was...”) → full clause in TL – elliptical structure lost.
- **Lexical Cohesion:**
 - Repetition of “Tom” and “no answer” – partially disrupted through variation.
 - Collocational shifts: “pride of her heart” → “fəxrı”, “yaraşıq üçün” – partial domestication.
- Pragmatic/Stylistic Shifts:
 - Use of “itib-batıb”, “çox qəribədir” – unnecessary additions/domestication.
 - “alnına qaldırdı” – pragmatic expansion.
 - Tone and irony slightly diminished.

Original version:

Finally, Tom said:

"I can lick you!"

"I'd like to see you try it."

'Well, I can do it.'

"No, you can't, either."

'Yes, I can.'

"No, you can't."

"I can."

'You can't."

"Can!"

"Can't!"

An uncomfortable pause. Then Tom said:

'What's your name?"

"Tisn't any of your business, maybe."

'Well, I 'low I'll MAKE it my business."

"Well why don't you?"

"If you say much, I will."

"Much—much—MUCH. There now."

tie behind thin youre ted ty smart, DONT you? I could lick you with one hand

"Well why don't you DO it? You SAY you can do it."

'Well, I WILL, if you fool with me."

"Oh yes—I've seen whole families in the same fix."

"Smarty! You think you're SOME, now, DONT you? Oh, what a hat!"

"You can lump that hat if you don't like it. I dare you to knock it off-and anybody that'll take a dare will suck eggs."

"You're a liar!"

"You're another."

'You're a fighting liar and dasn't take it up."

"Aw—take a walk!"

"Say—if you give me much more of your sass I'll take and bounce a rock off your head."

"Oh, of COURSE you will."

"Well, I WILL."

don sou dont you Duse then? what do you keep SAYING you will for? Why

"I AIN'T afraid."

"You are."

"I ain't."

"You are."

Translated version:

Nəhayət, Tom dedi:

-İstəyirsən səni mühkəmcə əzişdirim?
 -Hünərim var əzişdir! Ancaq bu, sən bacaran iş deyil.
 -Dedim, əzişdirərəm, bil ki, əzişdirərəm. -Əzişdirə bilməzsən.
 -Bilərəm.
 -Yox, bilməzsən!
 -Bilərəm.
 Ağır bir sükut çöktü. Sonra Tom yenidən dilləndi:
 -Sənin adın nədir?
 -Sənə qalmayıb.
 -İstəsəm, mənə qalar.
 -Hə, nə oldu, bəs niyə vuruşmursan?
 -Bircə kəlmə də danış, gör payını alırsan ya yox!
 -Bah, qorxdum səndən, buyur görüm, neyləyəcəksən!
 -Özünü çox dartma, istəsəm, səni bircə əlimlə şil-küt edərdəm!
 -Bəs niyə eləmirsən? Elə dilim var...
 Dilini kəsməsən gör eləyirəm, ya yox!
 -Yox əşi, sənin kimləri çox görmüşük!
 -Necə də bəzənibdir! Çox böyük adamsan! Bunun bir şlyapasına bax!
 -Əgər xoşuna gəlmir, vur başımdan düşsün. Hünərin var, buyur, onda görərsən.
 -Yalan deyirsən.
 - Yalançı sən özünsən.
 -Əşi səndən vuruşan olmaz! Səndə o hünər hanı!
 -Deyəsən baş apardın ha!
 -Bir də səsin çıxsın, gör kərpiclə vurub başını necə əzirəm!
 -Bəs niyə əzmirsən? Əz də!
 -Əzərəm, canını da alararəm.
 -Deyirsən, amma yerindən tərpənmirsən. Dil pehlivanısan! Bəs niyə vuruşmursan?
 Qorxursan?
 -Yox, qoorxmuram.
 -Qorxursan!

A fast-paced, emotionally charged conversation between Tom and another boy is depicted in the selected dialogue, which is full of cohesive devices, mainly conjunction, ellipsis, reference, and substitution. These components preserve the original's logical flow and coherence. Nonetheless, a number of cohesive changes are brought about by the Azerbaijani translation, ranging from serious semantic distortion to effective cultural adaption.

The translation of "No you can't, either" is "əzişdirə bilməzsən." Through substitution and repetition, the dialogue's use of "can" and "can't" demonstrates grammatical cohesion. By reducing the pattern of repetition and substitution, the translation may eliminate these repeated elements or substitute them with idiomatic Azerbaijani expressions like "bilərəm" (I can), which can damage the text's coherence. This results in a shift in elliptical cohesiveness and a loss of linguistic substitution, as well as a slight disruption of the original's rhetorical rhythm.

Through repetition and substitution, the argument's frequent usage of "Can!", "Can't!" and "You are!" and "I ain't!" demonstrates grammatical cohesion. These sudden claims are transformed into longer phrases like "Qorxursan!" or "Yox, qorxmuram!" in the translated version, occasionally losing the snappy, back-and-forth cadence that defines the original conversation. The interaction's rhythmic structure is weakened as a result of the substitution-to-expansion shift.

In the same way, the phrase "I could lick you with one hand" is changed to "səni bircə əlimlə şil-küt edərdəm." Once more changing the stylistic register and undermining the neutral tone of the SL, this phrase is a domesticated lexical replacement with deep roots in Azerbaijani idiomatic speech.

By indicating contrast, causality, or continuity, the source text's use of conjunctions (such as "Well," "But," and "If") promotes conjunctive cohesiveness. Despite being stylistically compatible with Azerbaijani language, the translated version introduces new conjunctions like "amma," "ancaq," and discourse markers like "bah," which amount to conjunction addition shifts. Although these modifications occasionally improve fluency, they also bring about semantic changes that are absent from the SL.

In conclusion, there are many shifts in cohesiveness in the Azerbaijani translation of this discussion, many of which are brought about by domestication, idiomatic substitution, and over-expansion, even though the general conversational tension and meaning are retained. These changes affect lexical and grammatical cohesion and frequently warp the original's stylistic tone. Without compromising the source's coherence, a more accurate translation would preserve the harmony between natural expression in the target language and structural accuracy.

3.4. Statistical Data

This section of the study quantifies and classifies the cohesive devices found and examined in *The Unconquered* and its two Azerbaijani versions using the approach developed by Halliday and Hasan (1976). There are a total of 198 cohesive devices found in the corpus. The five primary categories of these devices are lexical coherence, ellipsis, reference, conjunction, and substitution. The following table shows the distribution and percentage of each type:

Table 1: Frequency and Percentage of Cohesive Devices in the Analyzed Corpus

Reference	122	61.6%
Conjunction	38	19.2%
Ellipsis	12	6.1%
Substitution	8	4.0%
Lexical Cohesion	18	9.1%
Total	198	100%

With more than 60% of all references, these results show that reference is the cohesive device most commonly employed in the corpus under study. The claim that reference is essential to creating coherence in narrative texts is supported by this. The fundamental purpose of conjunctions, which make up 19.2% of the total, is to preserve the logical relationships between clauses and sentences. Substitution and ellipsis, two less common but structurally significant devices, account for a lower share of the whole distribution. Despite being less frequent than conjunction and reference, lexical cohesiveness is crucial to the text's style and theme.

These quantitative results, which show how various forms of cohesiveness change during translation and the degree to which translators maintained or modified the cohesive structure of the original text, further support the qualitative analysis presented earlier in the study.

CONCLUSION

The purpose and transformation of cohesive devices in translation have been discussed in this dissertation, with an emphasis on how they are translated from English source texts into Azerbaijani target texts. Using samples from Mark Twain's *The Adventures of Tom Sawyer* and Somerset Maugham's *The Unconquered*, two works that illustrate stylistically different but structurally rich narratives, the study investigated the effects of cohesiveness shifts on textual coherence and meaning. The research was specifically based on the theoretical framework put out by Halliday and Hasan (1976), which distinguishes five primary categories of cohesive devices: conjunction, ellipsis, reference, substitution, and lexical coherence. A thorough examination of these categories and how changes in their translation affect the semantic, pragmatic, and stylistic integrity of the target text was made possible by the research's comparative and contrastive methodology.

By highlighting the subtle ways in which cohesiveness shifts, particularly when influenced by the translator's decisions, can either maintain or impair the original text's communicative function, this method has expanded the semantic interpretation of traditional meaning structures. The structural balance between the source language (SL) and the target language (TL) can be adversely affected by the improper handling or disregard of cohesive devices during translation, as the analysis has shown. However, an over-reliance on domestication techniques in the target language (TL) frequently results in semantic loss and cultural dissonance, which asymmetrically affects the SL and TL texts and weakens their coherence integrity.

With 122 occurrences found throughout the practical chapters, reference was the coherent device that appeared most frequently in both texts. Anaphoric/cataphoric, demonstrative, comparative, and personal references are all included in this. Additive, adversative, causal, and temporal connectives were frequently left out, mistranslated, or domesticated in ways that interfered with logical flow in the second most common category, conjunctions (38 instances). Although they were less common, ellipsis (12) and substitution (8) offered important insights into the difficulties of clausal substitution and implicit meaning rendering in Azerbaijani. Finally, the dangers of improper paraphrasing or unjustified lexical expansion in translation were revealed by lexical coherence (18 occurrences), which included synonymy, repetition, and collocation.

Shifts in conjunction and reference were especially emphasized in examples from *The Unconquered*. A breakdown in participant tracking resulted from the mistranslation or omission of certain aspects, such as "them" or "himself," even though both Azerbaijani translators frequently maintained the referential clarity of the subject "he" (Hans). Similar to this,

punctuation (commas or full stops) was occasionally used in place of coordinating conjunctions like "and" or "but," which caused changes in structural cohesiveness and a fragmentation of the syntactic logic of the source. Domesticating terms and idioms like "əşi," "şil-küt etmək," or "dil pəhləvani" in Tom Sawyer brought stylistic vibrancy, but at the expense of pragmatic misalignment, departing from the tone of the source and sometimes changing its communicative aim.

One of the dissertation's primary contributions is the proof that cohesion shifts are meaning-affecting decisions that can either strengthen or weaken the translated text's coherence and authenticity rather than being purely technical mistakes. Effective coherence adjustments, like accurately expressing anaphoric references or carefully modifying a lexical collocation that is culturally constrained, can help readers of the target language understand the story without becoming confused. But ineffective changes, such as leaving out conjunctions or over-domesticating style elements, frequently lead to lost cultural nuance, misinterpreted meaning, or interrupted narrative flow.

These observations were corroborated by the statistical results. The majority of the 161 cohesive devices that were examined were instances of reference (76%), followed by conjunction (24%), with lexical cohesiveness, substitution, and ellipsis having lesser numbers. A significant percentage of these included failed adjustments, like semantic widening, stylistic exaggeration, or misinterpretations. These results demonstrate that textual coherence and the communication function across languages depend on faithfulness to the cohesive structure of the source text.

This study emphasizes the necessity for more thorough attention to coherent devices and their cross-linguistic transformations in light of the theoretical gaps in the literature on Azerbaijani translation. The results imply that a translator needs to take into account cohesive devices' pragmatic dynamics, discourse functions, and semantic roles in addition to lexical equivalency within the text's larger communicative framework.

As a result, this dissertation not only supports its initial research goals but also lays the groundwork for future studies on cohesiveness in translation. A greater range of text genres, more varied translators' approaches, and more in-depth connections with stylistics, pragmatics, and corpus linguistics could all be beneficial for future research. Cohesive devices continue to be an essential part of cross-cultural communication and successful literary translation since they are essential to discourse connectedness and comprehension.

REFERENCES

In Azerbaijani

1. Abdullayev, K. (2011). (176–178).
2. Abdullayev, K., Məmmədov, A. və b. (2012). *Azərbaycan dilində mürəkkəb sintaktik bütövlər*. Bakı: BSU. (p. 107)
3. Əbdullayev, Ə. (1998). *Aktual üzvlənmə və mətn*. Bakı: Xəzər Universiteti Nəşriyyatı. (pp. 43, 233, 257–258)
4. F. Veysəlli. (2006). *Dilçilik ensiklopediyası*. Bakı: Mürəçim. (pp. 345, 348, 354).
5. F. Veysəlli. (2013). *Dilçiliyin əsasları*. Bakı: Mürəçim.
6. İsmayılova, T. (2023). *Azərbaycan dili mətnlərinin təşkili mexanizmi* (pp. 506–507).
7. Kazımov, Q. (2000). *Müasir Azərbaycan dili* (pp. 424, 453, 447–448). Bakı: Ünsiyyət.
8. Kazımov, Ə. (2022). *Mətn sintaksisi, yaxud sintaksinin mətnliliyi*. Azərbaycan Dili və Ədəbiyyat Tədrisi Jurnalı, No. 2, (pp. 37, 81–96).
9. Müzəffəroğlu, T. (2002). *Müasir Azərbaycan dilində mürəkkəb cümlənin struktur-semantikasi*. Bakı: Azərnəşr. (pp. 12–13).
10. Novruzova, N. (2002). *Mətn sintaksisi*. Bakı: Təhsil. (pp. 56–184).

In English

11. Afrianto, D. (2017). *Cohesion and coherence in English and Indonesian*. Translation Review, 5(4), 95–108.
12. Ahmed, S. (2010). *Translation theory and practice: A comparative approach* (p. 102). Oxford University Press.
13. Akindele, D. (2011). *Cohesion and coherence in translation: A critical approach*. Translation Studies Journal, 7(2), 58–67.
14. Anggrayani, R., Fitrawati, F., & Ningsih, Y. (2015). *Cohesion in students' argumentative essays*. English Language Teaching, 8(5), 125–132.
15. Agus, M., Rahmawati, E., & Yuliana, R. (2014). *An analysis of cohesion in English-Indonesian translation*. Language Circle: Journal of Language and Literature, 9(1), 43–50)
16. Bailey, J. (2003). *Cohesion and coherence in translation studies*. Translation Journal, 7(1), 18–28.
17. Baker, M. (1992). *In other words: A coursebook on translation*. Routledge.
18. Blum-Kulka, S. (1986). *Shifts of cohesion in translation*. The Translator, 5(3), 225–236.

19. Blum-Kulka, S. (2000). *Shifts of cohesion and coherence in translation*. In T. Hermans (Ed.), *Translation in systems* (pp. 298-299). Routledge.
20. Bloor, M., & Bloor, T. (1995). *The functional analysis of English* (2nd ed.). Arnold.
21. Brown, G., & Yule, G. (1983). *Discourse analysis* (pp. 15–30, 66). Cambridge University Press.
22. Carrell, P. L. (1982). *Cohesion is not coherence*. *TESOL Quarterly*, 16(4), 479–488.
23. Chilton, P. (2004). *Analysing political discourse: Theory and practice* (p. 65). Routledge.
24. de Beaugrande, R., & Dressler, W. (1981). *Introduction to text linguistics* (pp. 4, 14–28, 49–81, 84, 113). Longman.
25. Droga, L., & Humphrey, L. (2003). *Semantic grammar and discourse analysis*. *Linguistic Forum*, 8(1), 24–39.
26. Eggins, S. (2004). *An introduction to systemic functional linguistics* (pp. 24, 29, 30, 33, 42, 47). Continuum.
27. Emilia, E. (2011). *Translation and cohesion in context*. *International Journal of Translation Studies*, 12(2), 71-80.
28. Emilia, E. (2014). *Cohesion and coherence in translation*. *Translation Journal*, 18(4), 45-56.
29. Essaei, A. (2013). *Investigating cohesion and coherence in EFL students' writing*. *International Journal of Language Learning and Applied Linguistics World*, 4(2), 20–35.
30. Fadlillah, M. (2017). *An analysis of cohesion in students' descriptive texts*. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 7(3), 602–610.
31. Galperin, I. (1981). *Mətn dilçilik tədqiqatının obyektı kimi* (p. 64; 73-74; 106).
32. Gerot, L., & Wignell, P. (1994). *Making sense of functional grammar* (p. 170). Routledge.
33. Givon, T. (1979). *Discourse and syntax* (pp. 61–106). Academic Press.
34. Halliday, M. (1994). *An introduction to functional grammar* (p. 339). Edward Arnold.
35. Halliday, M., & Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English* (pp. 1, 2, 4, 37, 242–245, 248, 228, 279, 285, 286). Longman.
36. Halliday, M., & Hasan, R. (1997). *Cohesion in English*. Longman.
37. Halliday, M. A. K., & Hasan, R. (2013). *Cohesion in English* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
<https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315836010>
38. Halliday, M., & Matthiessen, C. (2004). *An introduction to functional grammar*. Arnold.
39. Halliday, M., & Matthiessen, C. (2014). *Functional grammar* (p. 106). Routledge.

40. Halliday, M., & Matthiessen, C. (2014). *Halliday's introduction to functional grammar* (pp. 603, 609, 624). Routledge.
41. Hameed, A. (2008). *A study of cohesive devices in translation* (pp. 88–93). Routledge.
42. Hatim, B., & Mason, I. (1990). *Discourse and the translator* (p. 195). Longman.
43. Hidayat, N. (2016). *Cohesion in translation: Indonesian-English comparative study*. *Translation Studies Journal*, 12(1), 105–117.
44. Hogue, A., & Oshima, A. (1999). *Writing academic English* (3rd ed., p. 40). Longman.
45. Hu, Z. (1999). *Discourse cohesion and coherence*. Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.
46. Khairunisa, N., & Savitri, E. (2018). *An analysis of grammatical cohesion in students' narrative writing*. *Journal of English Language Teaching*, 7(1), 15–24.
47. Kornfilt, J. (1997). *Turkish: A comprehensive grammar* (p. 47). Routledge.
48. Larson, M. L. (1984). *Meaning-based translation: A guide to cross-language equivalence* (p. 394). University Press of America.
49. Merchant, J. (2001). *On cohesion and coherence in translation*. *Journal of Linguistic Studies*, 6(3), 45–56.
50. Moini, M., & Kheirkhah, M. (2016). *The role of cohesion in translation equivalence*. *Linguistics and Translation Studies*, 12(3), 74–85.
51. Morris, J., & Hirst, G. (1991). *Lexical cohesion computed by thesaural relations as an indicator of the structure of text*. *Computational Linguistics*, 17(1), 21–48.
52. Morris, J., & Hirst, G. (2003). *Lexical cohesion computed by thesaural relations as an indicator of the structure of text*. *Computational Linguistics*, 29(1), 47–78.
53. Movindi, S. (2013). *Cohesion in translation: A review of models*. *Journal of Translation and Linguistics*, 4(2), 88–101.
54. Neubert, A., & Shreve, G. M. (1992). *Translation as text*. Kent State University Press (p. 94).
55. Newmark, P. (1991). *Approaches to translation* (p. 69). Prentice Hall.
56. Nord, C. (1997). *Translation as a purposeful activity: Functionalist approaches explained*. Routledge.
57. Normant, B. (1994). *Cohesion in discourse: Approaches and perspectives*. Oxford University Press.
58. Palmer, F. R. (1999). *Grammatical roles and relations* (p. 60). Cambridge University Press.
59. Piriyaasilpa, R. (2009). *Translation and cohesion in context*. *Linguistic Research*, 7(1), 98–108.

60. Priyatmojo, R. (2011). *Cohesion shifts in translation: A comparative study*. Translation Studies Review, 3(2), 55–65.
61. Rahayu, A., et al. (2015). *An analysis of cohesive devices in translation*. Linguistic Forum, 4(3), 105–120.
62. Salmani, S. (2007). *Cohesion shifts in translation* (p. 75). Cambridge University Press.
63. Savignon, S. J. (2002). *Interpreting communicative language teaching: Contexts and concerns in teacher education* (p. 9). Yale University Press.
64. Scholes, R., & Klaus, C. H. (1972). *Elements of literature: Essay, fiction, poetry, drama, film* (p. 3). Oxford University Press.
65. Tangkiengsirisin, S. (2010). *Translation and culture: A contextual approach* (p. 98). Routledge.
66. Tanskanen, S. K. (2006). *Collaborating towards coherence: Lexical cohesion in English discourse*. John Benjamins Publishing Company.
67. Trisnaaningrum, M., et al. (2019). *An analysis of cohesion in translation*. Journal of Translation and Linguistics, 7(1), 81–95.
68. Wahby, W. (2014). *Cohesion and coherence in Arabic-English translation*. Cairo University Press.
69. Widdowson, H. G. (1978). *Teaching language as communication* (p. 29). Oxford University Press.
70. Widdowson, H. G. (2007). *Discourse analysis* (p. 46). Oxford University Press.
71. Zemach, D. E., & Rumisek, J. (2005). *Academic writing: From paragraph to essay* (p. 41). Heinle & Heinle.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1

The present study investigates cohesion shifts that take place when translating English literary texts into Azerbaijani based on comparative-analytical framework. The study focuses on how cohesive devices are rendered, shifted, or lost in the target language when they are translated. The coherence and textual integrity of a narrative depend heavily on cohesive devices including conjunction, ellipsis, reference, substitution, and lexical cohesion. Their modifications can lead to pragmatic or semantic changes, which can occasionally cause distortions in meaning or tone. Selected paragraphs from Somerset Maugham's "The Unconquered" and its two Azerbaijani translations by Zeydulla Agayev and Akif Abbasov provide the foundation of the analysis. The use and representation of cohesive devices, as well as the effects of translation methods like domestication, literalism, restructuring, and etc. have all been compared and contrasted in these sections. Every shift is examined for its purpose, function, impact, and relationship to the text's overall coherence. Furthermore, in order to expand the scope and investigate shifts in cohesion in a different style and cultural context, translated instances from *The Adventures of Tom Sawyer* by Mark Twain are also presented. The recognition of recurring patterns, obstacles in preserving cohesive harmony, and translator decisions that impact the reader's comprehension are all made possible by this comparative approach. Significant linguistic and translation research investigations on cohesion and its function in text construction are discussed in the thesis's theoretical section. The primary objective of the practical chapter is to record and examine multiple examples of cohesion shifts and analyze whether or not they were successful in ensuring the tone, intent, and structure of the original text. According to the analysis, shifts in cohesion are frequently influenced by cultural variations, the target language's weaknesses in structure, and the translator's understanding of the context. The outcomes shed light on the challenges of presenting discourse-level meaning across languages and add to the unstudied area of cohesion in Azerbaijani translation studies.

Key words: cohesion, cohesive shifts, literary translation, reference, domestication, semantic and pragmatic meaning, comparative analysis

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to sincerely thank my supervisor, Prof. Dr. Huseynagha Rzayev, for his unwavering support, valuable guidance, and continuous encouragement throughout the course of this research. His insightful comments and expert advice have played a pivotal role in the development and completion of this work.

My heartfelt appreciation also goes to all the esteemed professors at Khazar University. Their dedication, profound knowledge, and constant support have greatly contributed to a stimulating and inspiring academic environment. Each of them has significantly influenced my intellectual journey and motivated me to pursue academic excellence.

I am truly thankful for the opportunity to have been guided by such outstanding educators and to have learned under their mentorship.