

**EXPLICITATION IN TRANSLATION STUDIES:
DEFINING THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK**

Lyudmila M. Abdrashitova

Kazan Federal University

Gulnara V. Sadykova

Kazan Federal University

Natasha Anthony

Hudson Valley Community College, International Language Laboratory

24hrsperday@gmail.com

Abstract. The aim of the paper is to explore the concept of explicitation as a translation method used for making the implicit explicit and clear to the reader of a translated text. The article offers a literature review of a variety of interpretations of the common term “explicitation” and a broad range of its usage both in Russian and foreign translation studies. Comparing views of various researchers, the paper provides a full and adequate interpretation of the concept under analysis and develops a theoretical framework for further studies. The way of formulation and interpretation of explicitation is shown in a diachronic aspect compared with the common rendition of the term “explicitation”. The study embraces a range of explicitation types and recommended translation competence to provide an appropriate and first-class translation and a better adaptation of a translated text for a potential reader who is mainly a non-speaker of the language of the original text.

Keywords: explicitation, explication, explicit, explicature, implicit, translation.

1. Introduction. The main objective of the following study is to conduct a profound literature review of the studies that focus on the concept of explicitation and to develop a theoretical framework for further research of explicitation as a translation technique examined by many linguists and experts in translation.

Quality and methods of translation have always been a subject of discussion in research of many linguists all over the world. However, studies were mainly conducted in the field of translation theory and such a pragmatic method as explicitation was not paid much attention to. Nevertheless, explicitation is one of the most significant strategies of translation which enables the translator to provide a higher correspondence between the source text and the target text, a better and more adequate expression of the author’s intention. The very concept of explicitation is presented by sets of definitions that sometimes can be confusing for understanding the meaning of this translation method. In this paper we present all commonly used terms and interpretations of explicitation and formulate a unique rendition of the term in question. The analysis of the differences and similarities in the study of explicitation is worth attention and further examination.

2. Methods. In order to build a theoretical framework for the study of explicitation, we focused on different interpretations of this concept as exemplified in many research studies [1-28, 33]. To do so, we applied such methods as close review of related literature and approaches offered, their thorough examination, analysis and deduction.

The goal of the methods described was to generate reproducible results that allowed the formation of theoretical conclusions in regards to explicitation. Particularly we focused on defining the meaning of the concept, determining its place among other translation methods in translation studies, and classifying ways of achieving adequate translation at every level using explicitation.

3. Results And Discussion. In order to explain explicitation, we can define it as a translation technique for making implicit information of the source text explicit and clear to the reader of the target text. Implicit information here is something implied or suggested, but not clearly stated, and, thus, in cases requiring further explanation in translation.

Explicitation has been thoroughly studied and identified by many linguists [1-28], especially starting from the mid 20th century up to now. The paper provides definitions made by the majority of authoritative researchers interested in explicitation as a method, process and result of translation.

To begin with the examination of the concept, above all there should be mentioned the so-called “explicitation hypothesis”, first drawn by Shoshana Blum-Kulka in 1986 as follows:

The process of interpretation performed by the translator on the source text might lead to a TL (target language) text which is more redundant than the SL (source language) 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 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 [2-296].

Despite the central idea presented above and in other parts of Blum-Kulka’s work, concerning the process of translation including explicitation as such, some researchers consider the above definition to be too narrow and incorrect. Given the explanation of Blum-Kulka, linguists note that translations are longer regardless of the language pair, differences in structure and other reasons, and this does not necessarily mean any redundancy as a negative outcome of explicitness.

Before Blum-Kulka, in 1958, Jean-Paul Vinay and Jean Darbelnet give a broader definition. According to Murtisari, the very concept of explicitation was first introduced by Vinay and Darbelnet, and Blum-Kulka and Nida were the first ones to conduct its systematic study [16, p. 67-69]. The definition of Vinay and Darbelnet in its turn accounts for a way of introducing implicit information to be derived from the context or situation in the target text. Though, they do not include explicitation in the list of translation methods in their book. To be compared with Blum-Kulka, she points out explicitation as a method of a greater importance. Jean Demanueli and Claude Demanueli define explicitation as a sort of replacement of a culture-specific concept with no relevant equivalent in the target language by means of description [4, p.72].

Séguinot, having studied Blum-Kulka's explicitation hypothesis, tries to distinguish between explicitation due to language system differences and explicitation due to stylistic and text-type-related reasons, as well as explicitation due to the process of translation as such. She offers a criterion for explicitation identification and types as follows:

The term "explicitation" should therefore be reserved in translation studies for additions in a translated text which cannot be explained by structural, stylistic, or rhetorical differences between the two languages. In other words, to prove that there has been explicitation, there must have been the possibility of a correct but less explicit or less precise version. This is the only way to distinguish between choices that can be accounted for in the language system, and choices that come about because of the nature of the translation process [23, p.106-114].

Explicitation can take three forms in translation: something is expressed in the translation which was not in the original, something which was implied or understood through presupposition in the source text is overtly expressed in the translation, or an element in the source text is given greater importance in the translation through focus, emphasis, or lexical choice. The first larger-scale empirical study was conducted by Øverås. On the basis of Blum-Kulka's explicitation hypothesis she specifies explicitation as "the kind of translation process where implicit, co-textually recoverable ST material is rendered explicit in TT" [19, p. 571-588]. Co-text here means a part of context presented by the surrounding text, as opposed to the so-called situational context. Klaudy Karoly finds this definition rather restrictive due to Øverås' further lack of sticking to co-text. Although, understanding of explicitation of both Øverås and Klaudy overlap as they consider specification and generalization under explicitation, associating specification with explicitation and generalization with implicitation.

Renata Kamenická specifies and proves by appropriate examples that we cannot universally pair explicitation with specification as opposed to generalization – and similarly, as implicitation cannot always be associated with generalization, although examples of specifying implicitations are harder to be found, especially due to the generally lower frequency of implicitation in translation [9].

Klaudy specifies Séguinot's three types of explicitation as it is shown in the table below:

Types of explicitation	Séguinot	Klaudy
1	something is expressed in the target text, which was not expressed in the source text	simple addition
2	something is overtly expressed in the target text, which was only understood in the source text	semantic explication
2	something is given a greater importance in the target text, as was in the source text	explicitation through emphasis

Later researchers note ambiguity in this classification as the distinction between the first two types is quite unclear and is not supported by relevant examples.

Englund Dimitrova is one of the first researchers paying close attention to the problems of defining and subsuming explicitation. In her opinion, "at the present time in studies of translation, a host of phenomena with certain aspects in common are grouped together under the term "explicitation", which tends to be used as a kind of umbrella term to label certain phenomena of differences between the ST and the TT which seem to be permissible in translation"[5, p.40].

She explains the situation by the lack of researchers' discussion of other translation solutions with a resemblance to explicitation to some extent, though, not being explicitation as such.

Many linguists offer their own views. Yet, nowadays there is no universal definition of explicitation. The problem is brought about by having no proper interpretation of translation universals and other methods. When in other countries' translation studies the term "explicitation" is mainly used, in Russia a broad variety of terms used can confuse and lead to misunderstanding and incorrect rendition of the concept. Here we can find such alternatives to explicitation as, for instance, "описание"(description), "объяснительный перевод"(explicative translation), "описательный перевод" (descriptive translation), "разъяснительный перевод" (explanatory translation), "экспликация" (explicitation/explication), "перифраза"(periphrasis), "амплификация" (amplification), "прием лексических добавлений" (method of lexical addition), "прием лексической трансформации" (method of lexical transformation) etc. All the above definitions are not likely to offer a full range of the concept as it is viewed in the common tradition of translation studies in countries, apart from Russia.

If we try to find the explanation of explicitation in dictionaries, we may not find many of them to provide it. There are generally definitions of the verb “to explicate” and the noun “explication”, but not “explicitation”.

The so-called free dictionary Wiktionary provides the information as follows:

Explicitation:

Meaning: (rare, possibly nonstandard) The process or fact of becoming explicit or of causing to be explicit; that which makes something explicit.

Usage notes: Usage is confined almost entirely to academic journals, and to the field of translation studies [29].

Macmillan dictionary gives the same interpretation, but with no usage notes [30].

We tend to believe that the interpretation given in these two dictionaries is quite constricted, insufficient, lacking some crucial points of the concept of explicitation as such.

4.Summary. Explicitation can be considered in a narrower or a broader way subject to the term provided and the researcher’s view. For example, the term “explicitation” used in translation studies both in English and French, and other languages has a broader meaning and comprises a fuller spectrum of the concept implied. Russian translation studies’ usage of the term “экспликация”(explicitation) equates with the concept above. But if we study other variants in Russian or one-dimensional views towards explicitation, when it is limited only to specification as a translation method, we are likely to come to incorrect and constrained assumptions of not only explicitation as a concept but also as a translation strategy and process.

With regard to the above-mentioned interpretations, we need to set out translation levels at which explicitation should be carried out to make the target text explicit and intelligible for readers and translation performed to the highest standard. Following Kinga Klaudy’s classification of translation competence [10, p.4], there can be shown five levels of it to provide first-class translation:

- 1) linguistic competence;
- 2) subject-related competence;
- 3) inter-cultural competence;
- 4) transfer competence;
- 5) communicative competence.

Defining “competence” here we refer in some way to a particular type of knowledge (language proficiency, knowledge of subject and culture) and in part to skills (skills of information transfer and overcoming problems resulting from differences between two languages, communication skills).

In other words, to make the implicit explicit in the target text the translator must have a good command of the two languages he/she works with, know the topic of the source text, have cross-cultural competence, have skills and abilities to operate the two languages and properly go from thought to linguistic form and from linguistic form to thought in two ways and be a professional mediator.

5.Conclusion. Taking all of the above into account, we arrive at a fuller clarification of the term “explicitation” in view of translation.

At this point we shall attempt to formulate our approach to explicitation on the basis of all the interpretations presented herein. It is evident that explicitation can be deemed inherent in the process of translation. Furthermore, it is one of translation techniques or methods frequently applied.

From a closer examination we are able to define explicitation as a translation method stipulating a shift of meaning from the implicit to the explicit and to a higher extent of explicitness and clarity, for this purpose conveying the author’s intention, accounting for differences between source and target language systems, translational behaviour of languages, cross-cultural, social and situational factors, and context.

It is worth mentioning that explicitation plays an important role in translation. Researchers often emphasize the necessity of overcoming cultural, social, linguistic and ethnic barriers in the process of intercultural communication [31-34]. Translators as mediators in the process of intercultural communication tend to use explicitation as one of the ways for effective adaptation of a translated text for potential readers who are mainly representatives of cultures other than the author's one.

6.Acknowledgements. The work is performed according to the Russian Government Program of Competitive Growth of Kazan Federal University.

References

1. Alekseitseva T.A. *Eksplikatsiya kak sposob preodoleniya mezhyazykovoï assimetriï v perevode*. Sankt-Peterburg, 2009.
2. Blum-Kulka S. *Shifts of cohesion and coherence in translation // Translation Studies Reader*. New-York and London, 2006.
3. Blum-Kulka S. *Shifts of cohesion and coherence in translation*. In L. Venuti (Ed.), *The translation studies reader*. London & New York: Routledge, 2000.
4. Demanueli J., Demanueli C. *La traduction: mode d’emploi*. Paris, Milan, Barcelone, 1995.
5. Englund Dimitrova B. *Expertise and Explicitation in the Translation Process*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2005.

6. Heltái P. *Explicitation, Redundancy, Ellipsis and Translation* // *New Trends in Translation Studies*. Budapest, 2005.
7. Kamenická R. *Defining explicitation in translation*. *Brno Studies in English*, S13, 2007.
8. Kamenická R. *Forthcoming*. "On defining explicitation". *Brno Studies in English* 29.
9. Kamenicka R. *Explicitation profile and translator style*// Pym, A., Perekrestenko, A. (eds.) *Translation Research Projects 1*. Tarragona: Intercultural Studies Group, Universitat Rovira i Virgili, 2008.
10. Klaudy K. *The Role of Translation Theory in Translator Training*. <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/9a2d/a6873bfbe0883cc205ec438d941319b8c3cf.pdf> (May 10, 2018).
11. Klaudy K. "Explicitation". In M. Baker (ed.) *Routledge Encyclopaedia of Translation Studies*. London and New York: Routledge, 1998.
12. Klaudy K. *Languages in Translation. Lectures on the Theory, Teaching and Practice of Translation*. Budapest: Scholastica, 2003.
13. Komissarov V.N. *Teoriya perevoda (lingvisticheskie aspekty)*. M.: Vishaya shkola, 1990.
14. Komissarov V.N. *Language and Culture in Translation: Competitors or Collaborators?* // *TTR: traduction, terminologie, rédaction*, vol. 4, № 1, 1991.
15. Murtisari E.T. *The uses of relevance theory for the study of explicitation*. Monash University, Melbourne, Australia, 2011.
16. Murtisari E.T. *Explicitation in Translation Studies: The journey of an elusive concept*. // *The International Journal for Translation and Interpreting Research*. <http://www.trans-int.org/index.php/transint/article/download/531/264> (May 14, 2018)
17. Nida E. *Toward a science of translating: With special reference to principles and procedures involved in Bible translating*. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1964.
18. Olohan, Maeve, Mona Baker: "Reporting that in Translated English: Evidence for Subconscious Processes of Explicitation?" *Across Languages and Cultures* 1 [2], 2000.
19. Øverås Linn: "In Search of the Third Code: An Investigation of Norms in Literary Translation." *Meta* 43 [4], 1998.
20. Pápai V. *Explicitation: A Universal of translated text?* // Mauranen A., Kujamäki P. (eds.) *Translation universals: Do they exist?* Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2004.
21. Pym A. *Explaining Explicitation* // Karoly, K., Főris Á. (eds.) *New Trends in Translation Studies*. Budapest: Akademia Kiado, 2005.
22. Saldanha G. *Explicitation Revisited: Bringing the Reader into the Picture*. // *Journal of Translation and Technical Communication Research*, Vol. 1 [1], 2008.
23. Séguinot, Candace: "Pragmatics and the Explicitation Hypothesis." *Traduction Terminologie Rédaction* 1[2], 1988.
24. Shveitser A.D. *Teoriya perevoda: Status, problem, aspekty*. M.: Nauka, 1988.
25. Shveitser A.D. *Perevod i lingvistika*. M.: Voen. Izd. Min. Oborony SSSR, 1973.
26. Bentley, B., & Bossé, M. J. (2018). *College students' understanding of fraction operations*. *International Electronic Journal of Mathematics Education*, 13(3), 233-247.
27. Vinay J.-P., Darbelnet J. *Stylistique comparée du français et de l'anglais. Méthode de traduction*. Paris, 1999.
28. Vlahov S., Florin S. *Neperevodimoe v perevode*. Moskva, 1980.
29. <https://en.wiktionary.org/wiki/explicitation> (November 18, 2017)
30. <https://www.macmillandictionary.com/dictionary/british/explicitation> (November 18, 2017)
31. Aminova A.A., Gilazetdinova G.Kh., Edikhanov I.Zh. *Problems of Ethnocultural Identity and Cross-Language Communication* // *Journal of Language and Literature* 2014; 5(3), 39-42 DOI: [dx.doi.org/10.7813/jll.2014/5-3/7](https://doi.org/10.7813/jll.2014/5-3/7). ISSN: 2078-0303.
32. Guryanov I.O., Ayupova R.A., Kubedinova L.S. *Teaching Intercultural Communication to Would-be Translators* // *Modern Journal of Language Teaching Methods*. Vol.7, Issue.9.1, September (2017) pp.131-138.
33. Chacón, Juan Aspeé, Eduardo Cavieres-Fernández, and José González Campos. "El compromiso estudiantil ciudadano y su vínculo con el éxito educativo en la educación superior." *Opción* 34.86 (2018): 393-422.
34. Valeyeva A.F. *Linguistic Behavior as a Social and Cultural Potential in the Multiethnic Community* / A.F.Valeyeva // *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*. -Vol. 149, 5 September 2014. pp. 984-989.