



Birjand University

Faculty of Literature and Humanities

Department of English Studies

Thesis submitted in partial fulfillment for the requirements of the degree of Master of
Arts in English Translation at Birjand University

**Survey and Comparison of Explicitation in Two
Translations of 1984 Novel**

Supervisor:

Dr. Mohsen Mobaraki

Advisor:

Dr. Mohammad Hossein Ghorashi

Research by:

Amene Yari

July 2012

**In the Name of
God, the
Compassionate,
the Merciful**

Dedication

I lovingly dedicate this thesis to my parents and my spouse,
For their kindness and devotion, and their endless support

Acknowledgement

I would like to express my deep gratitude to Dr. Mohsen Mobaraki for his continued guidance and advice. Throughout all the work that this thesis may have entailed or prompted, it was his sustained support that helped overcome obstacles encountered, and it was his relentless advice that made this research attainable from the very beginning to the last stage.

I would also like to thank Dr. Mohammad Hossein Ghorashi, for his patient guidance, enthusiastic encouragement and useful critiques of this research work.

At the end, my very grateful thanks go to the faculty members of English department and all the people who have helped and encouraged me over the past few years.

Abstract:

Explicitation is the process of rendering explicit into a target text what is implicit on the linguistic surface of a source text. Being a general notion, explicitation is of different types, and occurs at different levels of language. It is a way for resolving ambiguity, improving and increasing cohesiveness of the texts and adding linguistic and extra-linguistic information. This study revolves around the investigation and comparison of explicitation in two translations of George Orwell's 1984 novel (Hosseini and Balouch's translations as a professional and non-professional translator respectively). For this aim, 600 sentences from the novel is selected and studied in different levels i.e. punctuation, word, phrase, clause, sentence; and based on Klaudy's classification i.e. obligatory, optional, pragmatic and translation-inherent explicitations. At the end, by comparing of the two translations, it is concluded that punctuation in the level of word and optional explicitation has the highest frequencies, but in general we observed more explicitation in the non-professional translation work and higher level of explicitation in the professional translation.

Keywords: translation universals, Klaudy's classification: obligatory, optional, pragmatic and translation-inherent explicitation, 1984, George Orwell.

Table of Contents

Chapter One: Introduction	1
1.1 Introduction.....	2
1.2 Explicitation vs. Implication.....	4
1.3 Statements of research problem.....	7
1.4 Research Questions.....	8
1.5 Research Hypotheses.....	8
1.6 Significance of the study.....	9
1.7 Methodology, Research Framework and Aims.....	10
1.8 Structure of the study.....	11
1.9 Definition of the key terms	11
Chapter Two: Review of the Related Literature	13
2.1. Introduction.....	14
2.2. The origin of translation universals.....	14
2.3. Hypotheses about translation universals.....	17
2.3.1. Prescriptive hypotheses.....	17
2.3.2. Descriptive hypotheses.....	19
2.4. proposed universals.....	21
2.4.1. Simplification.....	21
2.4.2. Normalisation or conservatism.....	26
2.4.3. Leveling out.....	28
2.4.4. Explicitation.....	29
2.5. Classifications of explicitation.....	36
2.5.1. House's classification.....	36
2.5.2. Klaudy's classification.....	37
2.6. Shifts and explicitation.....	38

Chapter Three: Methodology	42
3.1 Introduction.....	43
3.2 Materials.....	44
3.3 Procedure.....	48
Chapter Four: Data Analysis and Discussion	51
4.1. Introduction.....	52
4.2. Levels of explicitation.....	54
4.2.1. Punctuation.....	55
4.2.2. Word.....	57
4.2.2.1. Addition.....	57
4.2.2.2. Replacement of SL pronoun with its referent.....	58
4.2.2.3. Replacement of a SL word by a more specific word	58
4.2.2.4. Replacement of one SL word with a phrase, or a clause.....	59
4.2.3. Phrase.....	60
4.2.4. Clause.....	61
4.2.5. Sentence.....	63
4.3. Klaudy's classification.....	65
4.3.1. Obligatory explicitations.....	65
4.3.2. Optional explicitations.....	68
4.3.3. Pragmatic explicitations.....	70
4.3.3.1. Culture.....	71
4.3.4. translation-inherent explicitation.....	74
Chapter Five: Conclusion	78
5.1. Introduction.....	79
5.2. Conclusions.....	80
5.3. Implications.....	81
5.4. Limitations.....	82
References	83

List of Abbreviations

ATS: applied translation studies

DTS: descriptive translation studies

SL: source language

ST: source text

TL: target language

TS: translation studies

TT: target text

TUs: translation universals

Chapter One

Introduction

1.1. Introduction

Studying the characteristics of translated texts or, more specifically, what distinctive features typically translated texts exhibit and how they differ from original, non-translated texts written by native speakers has been a topic of long-standing interest in translation studies. Initial research goes back to Toury (1995) who put forward the laws of growing standardization and the law of interference, but it was Baker (1993) who formulated many of the so-called universals and proposed the use of corpora to study these characteristics. The universals attracted considerable attention from translation experts, but their formulation and initial explanation has been based on intuition and introspection with follow-up corpus research limited to comparatively small-size corpora, literary texts and semi-manual analysis.

Translation universal is the label for a research problem that is motivated by the question of whether there are general regularities and methodologies in translation that are independent of the particularities of individual translations (Gerzymisch-Arbogast, 2007). The general idea that translation tend to be more explicit than non-translations is considered as one of the translation universals. Even though the surge for translation universals happened in the last two decades, pointers towards the law of explicitation have existed since the middle of the century.

The commonly accepted definition of explicitation is the one that was originally provided by the inventors of the concept, Vinay and Darbelnet who defined explicitation as: "the process of introducing information into the target language which is present only implicitly in the

source language, but which can be derived from the context or the situation” (1995: 8).

What then became known as the “explicitation hypothesis” was formulated by Blum-Kulka in 1986. In its historical development, the hypothesis broadly states that a translation will be more explicit than a corresponding non-translation, which may be either the source text or a parallel text in the target language. Exactly what this term “explicit” means is then cause for debate. Much depends, we suspect, on the kinds of things we accept as examples of explicitation. Part of Blum-Kulka’s original claim was based on cohesion markers:

The process of interpretations performed by the translator on the source text might lead to a target language (TL) text which is more redundant than the source text. This redundancy can be expressed by a rise in the level of cohesive explicitness in the TL text. This argument may be stated as “the explicitation hypothesis”, which postulates an observed cohesive explicitness from source language (SL) to TL texts regardless of the increase traceable to differences between the two linguistic and textual systems involved. It follows that explicitation is viewed here as inherent in the process of translation. (2001: 300)

The concept was further developed by Nida. Without actually using the term explicitation, he distinguishes three main techniques used in the process of translation, namely addition, alteration, and subtraction. In his framework explicitation is most easily related to “addition” techniques such as “filling out elliptical expressions”, “additions required because of grammatical restructuring”, “addition of classifiers and connectives”, and

additions triggered by “categories of the receptor language which do not exist in the source language” (Nida 1964: 227).

Nida’s conception of addition shows that explicitation is basically a two dimensional concept. There is, on the one hand, “obligatory” explicitation caused by grammatical differences between the source and the target language. Without this kind of explicitation the target language structures would be ungrammatical (ibid).

On the other hand, there is “optional” explicitation. Optional explicitation is due to culture-specific world knowledge in the source and target language communities and differences in communicative conventions between these two communities, for example, with respect to text building strategies or the overt encoding of the writer persona in the text. In these cases, translation necessitates an adaptation – or “cultural filtering” – to local genres and the intended readers’ knowledge base in the target language community (House, 1997).

1.3. Explicitation vs. implicitation

Implicitation occurs, for instance, when a SL unit with a specific meaning is replaced by a TL unit with a more general meaning; when translators combine the meanings of several SL words in one TL word; when meaningful lexical elements of the SL text are dropped in the TL text; when two or more sentences in the ST are conjoined into one sentence in the TT; or, when ST clauses are reduced to phrases, etc.

Explicitation and implicitation are symmetrically arranged, counterpart of each other in a way that the existence of one of them proves the

existence of the other (Linke and Nussbaumer, 2000). But implicitation appears to have attracted less attention than explicitation. No such hypothesis has ever been formulated about it, and few systematic studies have been done on it. Klaudy and Károly (2005) report that Nida (1964) took the issue of implicitation in his book in the section on “Subtractions”: “Though, in translating, subtractions are neither so numerous nor varied as additions, they are nevertheless highly important in the process of adjustment” (p. 231).

Two hypotheses have been formulated with regard to the relationship between explicitation and implicitation. The asymmetry hypothesis holds that explicitation in the L1-----> L2 (language 1 to language 2) direction is not always matched by implicitation in L2-----> L1 direction. This holds especially true for cases of voluntary explicitation/implicitation. On the other hand in symmetric explicitation, when explicitations take place in L1----->L2 direction, implicitation can be observed in L2----->L1 direction (ibid).

All the researchers agree that there is such a thing as asymmetric explicitation, that is consistently more frequent than is implicitation and that it is a feature of translation situation rather than of language in contact (Pym 2005).

Here there are examples of symmetrical and asymmetrical explicitations and implicitations respectively:

Source: Frances liked her doctor.

Translation: Frances gostava dessa médica.

Back translation: Frances liked this [female] doctor.

Here the translator into Portuguese is obliged to specify the sex of the doctor, and this would count as explicitation (in Klaudy's sense). But the translator into English is under no such obligation and may thus choose the path of implication, giving no information corresponding to the sex of the doctor. The processes of explicitation and implicitation are in this case symmetrical. What we have here thus belongs to the languages in contact, and not to the specificity of translation.

Source: *Você também gosta dela?*

Translation: *So you like her too?*

Literal translation: *You like her too?*

In this example the translator has added the entirely optional adverbial *so* (yes, a pointer again), knitting the discourse together in a way that the source does not. Translated back into Portuguese, the adverbial can easily be retained, and is indeed quite likely to be retained. The relations between explicitation and potential implicitation are in this case asymmetric. This instance of explicitation is thus to be attributed to the translation situation, and not to the languages in contact. This second kind of explicitation is a candidate for status as a translation universal (ibid).

Though explicitations and implicitations, or additions and omissions, are inseparately intertwined in the process of translation, the tendency toward explicitation is always stronger than the tendency toward

implication. This hypothesis can be tested by large-scale empirical studies of the interlanguages produced by various groups, from language learners to non-professional and professional translators (Blum-Kulka, 1988), and by introspective data from investigations of the translation process (Kris, 1986). Crucial quantitative evidence can be expected from the use of computerized corpora, especially parallel and comparable corpora (Baker, 1993, 1995, 1997).

1.4. Statement of the research problem

The characteristics exhibited by translated texts compared to non-translated texts have always been of great interest in Translation Studies. As any translation of a given text is essentially a reading and a rewriting, or "a new reading" or "a new writing", the very process of translation involves some kinds of conscious or unconscious intervention on the part of the translator.

In the communicative translation this intervention is reflected through reducing unnatural language patterns in source texts and making clear the message for the given audience. Explicitation as a translation universal can be useful in this reader-oriented method of translations.

Since there is a close relationship between explicitation and readability, in this study the researcher wishes to focus on increasing the readability, cohesion, and coherence in the translated texts. Moreover by comparing the same work by two translators, we try to find clues and differences in explicitation strategies in their work; at the end, the results of this comparison may be useful in improving the quality of translated texts,

especially for amateur translators. Furthermore, the obtained results can be taken in strengthening the notion of translation universals in the given pairs of languages.

1.5. Research questions

Taking what is discussed above into consideration, this study tries to find answers to the following questions:

1. At which levels explicitation occur in the two translations?
2. What are the differences between types of explicitations taken by the professional and non-professional translators in this study?
3. Which explicitation has the most frequency in the case study?
4. According to the obtained results in this study, which of these two hypotheses on the relationship between professionalism and explicitation (Blum-Kulka or Levy) is confirmed?

1.6. Research hypotheses

This paper tries to accept or reject these hypotheses:

1. Explicitation occurs in levels lower than sentence in the 1984 novel.
2. Professional translator and non-professional one resort to translation-inherent and optional explicitation respectively more than other ones.
3. Optional explicitation and explicitation in the level of word have the most frequencies among explicitation types and levels.

4. According to Blum-Kulka's hypothesis on explicitation: ... The less experienced the translator, the more his or her process of interpretation of the SL might be reflected in the TL.

1.7. Significance of the study

In the years following Vinay and Darbelnet (1958) and Nida (1964) explicitation in translation has received considerable attention. This hypothesis has been tested in different language pairs. However little research has been done in English-Persian translation. A comprehensible investigation of this type would thus be significant in its own right.

The issue of the existence of translation universals remains highly controversial. While some scientists report that they have found sufficient support that such translation laws exist (Laviosa, 2002), others consider that it is not possible to even hypothesize on universals since we are not able to capture all translations from all languages and from all times (Tymoczko, 1998). The results of this study may provide some evidence for resolving these controversies.

Perhaps the main reason to investigate these hypotheses is to raise awareness among translators about the conscious or unconscious effects over translated texts, and the relationship between language and culture. Bringing unconscious tendencies to light will emphasize translators' decisions and strategies, and hence should pave the way to more accurate translations, with "more desired effects and fewer unwanted ones" (Mihaila, 2010).

What is done here is novel because no researcher has so far compared explicitation nature in the same translated book by the two translators (a

professional and a non- professional one based on Klaudy's classification of explicitation.

Whether explicitation is at all observable; whether professional or none-professional translator behaves differently in this way, the thesis hypothesis's verification or repudiation will be shown in this study.

This study would be contributory to applied translation studies .the study is looking for increasing the readability level in translated texts. In this way, it is tried to illuminate a professional translator's behavior toward explicitation; so the resulting strategies may be useful in teaching strategies in teaching translation trainees.

1.8. Methodology, research framework, & aims

The framework of the present study is theoretical, revolving around strategies of explicitation and translation universals. Among different kinds of explicitations this research focuses on Klaudy's four explicitations: obligatory, optional, pragmatic, and translation- inherent. These categorization and explicitation in different levels are explored and compared in two translations of the same novel. At the end, by examining the obtained results, frequencies of these four explicitations and also explicitation in different levels would be determined.

So, based on theoretical researches and frameworks, this paper tries to show differences between strategies taken by a professional and non-professional translators in increasing the readability in the English-Persian translated texts.

1.9. Structure of the study

This paper includes the following chapters:

Chapter One is introduction, focuses on the research problem and the significance of doing the research. Then the related questions and hypotheses, and research framework will be presented. It ends up by defining some basic terms and concepts related translation universals and explication.

Chapter Two revolves around the review of the literature, and also gives due consideration to the background of the research. It draws upon the works of some researchers about translation universals and especially explication.

The third chapter is the Methodology and procedures. It involves the case study, and detailed and comparative analysis of the ST and TT, based on the mentioned framework.

Chapter four focuses on the analysis of the result, by discussing the questions, answering them, and elaborating on the obtained result to support or reject the hypotheses.

The last chapter, chapter Five, is the conclusion of all of the stated facts, regarding to the given research.

1.10. Definition of the key terms

2. Translation universals (TUs): Universals in translation are often defined as those features which typically occur in translated texts rather than non-translated texts, and which are not dependent on the specific