Zeitschrift: Bulletin suisse de linguistique appliquée / VALS-ASLA

Herausgeber: Vereinigung für Angewandte Linguistik in der Schweiz = Association suisse de linguistique appliquée

Band: - (2005)

Heft: 81: Empirical research into translation and interpreting : processes and products = Recherches empiriques sur la traduction et l'interprétation : processus et produits = Empirische Übersetzungs- und Dolmetscherforschung : Prozesse und Produkte

Artikel: Combining product and process analysis : explicitation as a case in point

Autor: Englund Dimitrova, Birgitta

DOI: https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-978480

Nutzungsbedingungen

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist die Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften auf E-Periodica. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Zeitschriften und ist nicht verantwortlich für deren Inhalte. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern beziehungsweise den externen Rechteinhabern. Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen sowie auf Social Media-Kanälen oder Webseiten ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. Mehr erfahren

Conditions d'utilisation

L'ETH Library est le fournisseur des revues numérisées. Elle ne détient aucun droit d'auteur sur les revues et n'est pas responsable de leur contenu. En règle générale, les droits sont détenus par les éditeurs ou les détenteurs de droits externes. La reproduction d'images dans des publications imprimées ou en ligne ainsi que sur des canaux de médias sociaux ou des sites web n'est autorisée qu'avec l'accord préalable des détenteurs des droits. En savoir plus

Terms of use

The ETH Library is the provider of the digitised journals. It does not own any copyrights to the journals and is not responsible for their content. The rights usually lie with the publishers or the external rights holders. Publishing images in print and online publications, as well as on social media channels or websites, is only permitted with the prior consent of the rights holders. Find out more

Download PDF: 09.08.2025

ETH-Bibliothek Zürich, E-Periodica, https://www.e-periodica.ch

Combining product and process analysis: Explicitation as a case in point[1]

Birgitta ENGLUND DIMITROVA
Stockholm University, Institute for Interpretation and Translation Studies, SE-106 91
Stockholm, Sweden; birgitta.englund@tolk.su.se

Im vorliegenden Aufsatz wird für die Verwendung eines kombinierten Produkt- und Prozessansatzes bei der Untersuchung sprachlicher Merkmale von übersetzten Texten plädiert. Als Beispiel wird die Explizitierung herangezogen, d.h. die explizite Wiedergabe von Informationen im Zieltext, die im Ausgangstext lediglich implizit sind. Es wird argumentiert, dass Explizitierungen in zwei Kategorien fallen: (1) normgesteuerte Explizitierungen zeichnen sich durch ihre hohe Frequenz in übersetzten Texten sowie ihren problemlosen Umgang im Übersetzungsprozess aus; (2) strategische Explizitierungen sind Teil von Problemlösungsstrategien. Anhand von Daten aus einer Studie der Russisch-Schwedischen Übersetzung mit Versuchspersonen unterschiedlicher Übersetzungserfahrung wird veranschaulicht, wie strategische Explizitierungen dazu dienen können, zielsprachenspezifische Probleme zu lösen.
Schlagwörter: Explizitierung, Übersetzungsprozess, Übersetzungsstrategie, Russisch, Schwedisch.

Explicitation in translation

In translation, a frequently observed phenomenon is *explicitation*, by which is usually meant the explicit expression in the target text (henceforth abbreviated as TT) of certain elements that are implicit on the linguistic surface of the source text (henceforth abbreviated as ST). There is, however, no agreement on an exact definition of the term[2]. Examples of explicitation given in the literature include:

---

[1] This study has been financed by grants from the Swedish Research Council for the Humanities and Social Sciences and the Bank of Sweden Tercentenary foundation. I want to thank Alexander Künzli, Ulf Norberg and two anonymous reviewers for their comments on earlier versions of this paper.

[2] The term seems to have been used in the translation context for the first time by Vinay and Darbelnet, who give the following definition: "Procédé qui consiste à introduire dans LA [langue d'arrivée] des précisions qui restent implicites dans LD [langue de départ], mais qui se dégagent du contexte ou de la situation" (Vinay & Darbelnet, 1958/1977, p. 9). Shuttleworth and Cowie (1997, p. 55) define explicitation as "the phenomenon which frequently leads to TT stating ST information in a more explicit form than the original". This can mean that the translator includes additional explanatory phrases, spells out implicatures and adds connectives, in order to help the flow of the text and increase readability. Delisle, Lee-Jahnke and Cormier (1999, p. 139) define explicitation as a translation procedure where "the translator introduces precise semantic details into the target text", either for clarification or because of the constraints of the target language. These details are derived from/available from contextual knowledge or from the situation. However, the examples given seem to concern not semantic details, but rather inferences made from general knowledge. For a more detailed overview of definitions and studies of explicitation, see Englund Dimitrova (in press).

Bulletin suisse de linguistique appliquée
No 81, 2005, 25-39 • ISSN 1023-2044

© 2005 Institut de linguistique
Université de Neuchâtel

Example 1.

English: Walk in (signpost outside an office)

French: Entrez *sans frapper* 'Enter without knocking' (Vinay & Darbelnet, 1958/1977, p. 164).

Example 2.

English: Daniel Defoe, in 1725, was so impressed by this that he devotes far more space to it in his Tour Through the Whole Island of Great Britain than he does to the University.

German: Daniel Defoe war hiervon so beeindruckt, dass er dieser Messe 1725 in seinem *Führer* 'Tour Through the Whole Island of Great Britain' weit mehr Platz widmete als der Universität. (quoted from Schmied & Schäffler, 1997, p. 25)

Example 3.

French: Je lui ai demandé si on pouvait éteindre une des lampes. L'éclat de la lumière sur les murs blancs me fatiguait.

English: The glare from the white walls was making my eyes smart, *and* I asked him if he couldn't turn off one of the lamps. (Camus, quoted in Mason, 2001, p. 72)

Due to its frequency, it has been suggested that explicitation is a universal of translation (Laviosa-Braithwaite, 1998; Toury, 1980). However, it has also been claimed to be a (function of) translation norms (Weissbrod, 1992; Øverås, 1998) or the result of processing, i.e., the result of the translator's interpretation process (Blum-Kulka, 1986). Furthermore, it has been suggested that it is typical either of translations produced by professional translators (Blum-Kulka, 1986), or of those produced by learners (Laviosa-Braithwaite, 1996; Levý, 1965).

Explicitation seems to be quite a multi-faceted phenomenon. Klaudy (1998) tries to unite the various observations and proposals within one framework, distinguishing four different types of explicitation: *obligatory*, *optional*, *pragmatic* and *translation-inherent*. *Obligatory* explicitations are dictated by differences in syntactic and semantic structures between the source language (henceforth abbreviated SL) and the target language (henceforth abbreviated TL). Klaudy gives the example of the lack of definite articles in Russian, which entails "numerous additions" (Klaudy, 1998, p. 83) in translations from Russian into English. *Optional* explicitations are dictated by differences in text-building strategies and stylistic preferences between languages (p. 83), for instance, the addition of connective elements to strengthen cohesive links. Klaudy considers that they are not obligatory in order to construct grammatically correct sentences in the TL, but if they are not applied, the resulting TT as a whole will appear clumsy and unnatural. *Pragmatic* explicitations are dictated by differences between cultures, involving for instance the translator's inserted explanations of source culture specific concepts. Finally, *translation-inherent* explicitations are attributed to the nature of the translation process itself, and are "explained by one of the most pervasive, language independent features of all translational activity, namely the necessity to formulate ideas in the target language that were originally conceived in the source language" (p. 83). The distinctions between these types are by no means clear-cut, however, since they are based upon different types of criteria that overlap.

The quoted studies are all based upon textual evidence only, in the form of the ST and the *final* TT. In this paper, my aim is to propose that an analysis of the ST and TT alone is not sufficient for a more complete understanding of explicitation and its functions in translation. Such an understanding can be achieved only by analysing both the texts and the translation process leading to the TT, i.e., by taking a combined product and process perspective in the analysis. I will therefore present and discuss some examples of explicitations, with data taken from the translation process of subjects with differing amounts of experience in translation.

Methods and data

The methods used in this project are:

1. Concurrent verbalisations, which are transcribed into think-aloud protocols (TAPs) (see for example Ericsson & Simon, 1984/1993; Krings, 1986; Lörscher, 1991; and lately Jääskeläinen, 1999; Künzli, 2003; Norberg, 2003). In short, this method involves administering a task, in this case a translation task, to the participants, and asking them to verbalise whatever comes into their minds during this task. The verbalisations are taped and the subsequently transcribed protocols are used by the researcher to infer the participants' underlying cognitive processes.

2. Computer logging[3] of the writing process. The logging records temporal information about the process of writing down the TT, as well as any changes made in the TT by the translator. Various files can be generated from the log files; in this study, the final TTs are generated and analysed, as well as a linear representation of the writing process with pause values given in seconds and all changes made in the text.

The participants in the study were 4 professional translators with several years of professional experience, 2 translation students, and 3 language students, all with Swedish as their first language or mother tongue. They were given a text in Russian, a biographical text published in Stepovik (1984), sketching the life of the Ukrainian 19th century poet and artist Taras Grigorevich Shevchenko. The stated translation brief was that the TT was to be used by an art museum in Stockholm planning to exhibit the artist's works. The length of the Russian ST is 438 words.

---

[3] The software used for this purpose was ScriptLog, which runs on Macintosh computers and has been developed by Sven Strömqvist and Sven Moen at the Institute for Linguistics, Göteborg University.

The ST and the sentence fragment studied

In this paper, I will analyse how the last part of the fourth sentence of the ST is translated by the participants in the study. To introduce the readers of this paper to the co-text of the sentence, I quote in Example 4 the first four sentences of the English translation of the Russian text, which is also found in the book containing the ST. The sentence segment which will be discussed is given in italics:

> Example 4.
>
> Among the outstanding figures of Ukrainian culture, a place of special importance belongs to Taras Shevchenko (1814-1861). He reflected the age-old freedom-loving aspirations of the Ukrainian working people through his inspiring works of poetry and visual art. Shevchenko lived a short, yet highly dramatic life. As a poet, artist and thinker of a revolutionary-democratic trend, *Shevchenko ardently fought against the social and national oppression of his people.*

This translation is true to the Russian ST with respect to its content. As can be seen, the text hints at the lack of freedom of the Ukrainian people, but does not state why this was so. The ST thus presupposes that the reader has certain historical and cultural knowledge regarding Ukraine and its political and administrative situation in the middle of the 19th century. Such knowledge can well be expected in Russian readers, since Ukraine was part of the Russian empire during the 19th century, but it can be taken for granted to a far lesser extent in an ordinary Swedish reader, even if he or she is visiting an exhibition showing works of art from this period of time and this part of Europe.

The segment in focus here is the end of the last sentence in this example, which is given here in Russian in boldface, with a morphological analysis and an English word-for-word translation in italics:

Example 5.

on	**strastno**	**borolsja**	**protiv**	**social´nogo**
personal pronoun	adverb	verb imperfective aspect preterite	preposition	adjective neuter genitive singular
he	*passionately*	*fought*	*against*	*social*
i	**nacional´nogo**	**ugnetenija**	**svoego**	**naroda**
conjunction	adjective neuter genitive singular	noun neuter genitive singular	possessive reflexive pronoun masculine genitive singular	noun masculine genitive singular
and	*national*	*oppression*	*his REFL*	*people*

In this sentence the text hints at the difficult situation of the Ukrainian people at the time, by mentioning “social and national oppression”. There is no explanation for this state of affairs, since it is not stated in the text who oppressed the Ukrainian people and why. Linguistically, this implicitness of the ST is created through a construction with a verbal noun, *ugnetenija* 'oppression', which makes it possible to specify in the sentence only the semantic role of PATIENT, i.e., those oppressed (the people), while leaving the AGENT, the oppressor(s), implicit[4].

The nine target texts

The Swedish versions of this sentence fragment, found in the final versions of the nine TTs, are (*italics* mark explicitations):

Version 1. … kämpade lidelsefullt mot det sociala och nationella förtryck av sitt folk 'fought ardently against the social and national oppression of his people' (language student).

Version 2. … stred han hängivet mot det sociala och nationella förtrycket av hans *eget* folk. 'he fought devotedly against the social and national oppression of his *own* people' (professional translator).

Version 3. Han kämpade lidelsefullt mot det sociala och nationella förtrycket av *Ukrainas* folk. 'He fought ardently against the social and national oppression of *Ukraine's* people' (language student).

Version 4. … bekämpade lidelsefullt det sociala och nationella förtryck *som* hans folk *led under*. 'fought ardently the social and national oppression *from which* his people *suffered*' (professional translator).

Version 5. … bekämpade han aktivt det sociala och nationella förtryck *som* hans folk *led under*. 'he fought actively the social and national oppression *from which* his people *suffered*' (professional translator).

Version 6. … kämpade han lidelsefullt mot det sociala och nationella förtryck hans folk *led under* 'he fought ardently against the social and national oppression *from which* his people *suffered*' (translation student).

Version 7. Han bekämpade det sociala och nationella förtryck det *ukrainska* folket *var utsatt för*. 'He fought the social and national oppression *to which* the *Ukrainian* people *were subjected*' (professional translator).

Version 8. … förde han en lidelsefull kamp mot det sociala och nationalistiska förtryck *som* hans folk *utsattes för* 'he conducted a passionate fight against the social and national oppression *to which* his people *were subjected* (translation student).

---

[4] Quite possibly, this is the result of censorship, either external or by the author of the text. In the 19th century, the oppressor was the Russian Czar and his empire; when the ST was published in 1984, Ukraine was not (yet) an independent state, but still part of the USSR. Stating explicitly the identity of the 19th century oppressor would have made the parallel to the 20th century situation dangerously obvious.

Version 9. … kämpade han ivrigt för sitt folks *frigörelse från* socialt och nationellt förtryck. 'he fought eagerly for hisREFL people's *liberation from* social and national oppression' (language student).

As can be seen, almost all the translations have some kind of explicitation, the only exception being version 1, which is quite literal. Version 2 translates the reflexive pronoun of the ST with a personal possessive pronoun *hans* 'his', explicitating it with the adjective *egen* 'own'. Version 3 explicitates the reflexive pronoun of the ST by rendering it with a noun in the genitive, which specifies the national and geographical origin of the oppressed people. Versions 4 through 8 are very similar, translating with a relative subordinate clause and thereby explicitating an underlying, implicit verb that specifies the PATIENT role: *lida under* 'suffer from' or *vara utsatt för* 'be subjected to'. Version 7 in addition explicitates the reflexive pronoun by rendering it with an adjective, specifying the oppressed people's origin. Finally, version 9 explicitates by specifying the supposedly intended result of the fight against oppression: liberation from oppression.

The explicitations are thus structurally and semantically of several types. An attempt to classify them within the categories referred to above gives the following result. They do not seem to be obligatory from a contrastive point of view: firstly since there is also one non-explicitated version, and secondly since the actual explicitations are of different types, semantically and structurally. Some versions (2, 3 and 7), which strengthen the cohesive ties by specifying in various ways the Russian reflexive, could perhaps be classified as optional. A tentative explanation, based only on the textual data, could be that these translators increased the explicitness of cohesion to increase readability.

Five versions (4, 5, 6, 7 and 8) have explicitated a nominal construction in the ST by forming a subordinate clause. A tentative explanation, based only on the textual data, could refer to different characteristics of the SL and the TL and the translator's wish to adhere to TL norms. Indeed, Russian does have a high frequency of nominal constructions, whereas Swedish in many registers prefers a more verbal style – a style with verbal constructions to a higher degree. These versions might then also be classified as belonging to the optional kind of explicitation.

For the ninth version, a textually based tentative explanation might be that the translator added *frigörelse från (förtryck)* 'liberation from (oppression)' in order to emphasize further the fact of oppression, perhaps out of consideration for the assumed ignorance of the TT readers, i.e., for pragmatic reasons. On the other hand, from a pragmatic point of view, version 9 and indeed all TTs remain, as it were, just as implicit as the ST regarding the reasons for the lack of freedom and the presence of oppression. These explicitations thus do not seem to have the purpose of giving the reader of the TT information to bridge a potential knowledge gap, i.e., they are not pragmatic in the sense outlined above (Klaudy, 1998).

Having proposed hypothetical causes for the explicitated structures on the basis of textual data, I now turn to data from the participants' translation process to see whether they might throw more light on the underlying causes of these explicitations.

Analysis of process data – problems in the process

The first question to ask is whether the participants had any problems in the process of translating the sentence segment under analysis. This is investigated on the basis of the think-aloud protocols and logs, which are analysed for problem indicators, according to the operationalisation of the notion of problem proposed by Krings (1986, p. 121 ff)[5]. All potentially relevant sections of the protocols are taken into account, from the pre-writing phase, through the writing phase and post-writing phase with its possible sub-phases (see further Englund Dimitrova, in press). Table 1 shows the results.

Table 1. Number of problem indicators in process data (TAPs and logs).

	Professional translators (N=4)	Translation students (N=2)	Language students (N=3)
Problem identification	1	2	2
Use of aids	1	2	3
Competing translation equivalents	3	6	10
Change in log	3	2	5
Negative evaluation of TT		1	1
Unfilled pause of more than 3 seconds	4	5	6
Total	12	18	27

---

[5] Krings distinguishes the following problem indicators in the verbalisations: three primary indicators, i.e., explicit or implicit problem identification, the use of aids, leaving a gap in the TT; and eight secondary indicators: competing translation equivalents, changes in the TT manuscript, underlinings in the ST, negative evaluation of the translated product, metaproblematisation, unfilled pauses of more than 3 seconds, paralinguistic indicators, and lack of a primary equivalent association (Krings, 1986, p. 121). The protocols pertinent to this text fragment do not contain examples of all these types of indicators. Table 1 only lists those types that are actually found in the protocols. The indicator "change in the TT manuscript" has been changed into "change in the log", to reflect the nature of the data used.

A number of problem indicators are indeed found in the data. They are found in the protocols of all categories of participant, and also in those of all individuals. As can be expected, there are more problem indicators in the protocols of the students than in those of the professional translators. On the average, there are 3 problem indicators per professional translator and 9 per student (no difference was found in this respect between translation students and language students) when translating this segment. Also, with only two exceptions (one professional translator and one translation student), all participants make one or more changes in their logs, i.e., they write down more than one TL version of this segment. Furthermore, all participants, except one professional translator, generate more than one solution in the process (orally and/or in writing).

Process data thus indicate that the way to translate this segment into Swedish is by no means self-evident and straightforward for the participants in this study, but causes them problems, regardless of their previous experience in translation.

Target language related problems

Protocols that contain problem indicators have then been further analysed to see whether the nature of the problem can be determined and if so, how it relates to the solution in each TT. In two cases, both professional translators, this cannot be determined from the data, i.e., their process data are inconclusive in this respect. In the remaining cases, the common denominator is target language related problems.

Reflexive or possessive pronoun?

In four cases, the problem turns out to be precisely the textual/linguistic implicitness of the AGENT of oppression, not from a pragmatic perspective, but from a purely linguistic, target language specific point of view. More specifically, due to this implicitness, translating into Swedish the reflexive pronoun in the genitive phrase *svoego naroda* 'hisREFL people's' becomes a problem.

Swedish has a system of possessive reflexive pronouns, *sin/sitt/sina.* According to its grammatical rules, they are used for the third person singular and plural, instead of the personal possessive pronouns (*dess/hans/hennes/deras* 'its/his/her/their') when functioning as an attribute in an NP (object or prepositional phrase), if the correlate of the pronoun is the subject of the clause. Two simple examples illustrate this:

Example 6a.

Per älskar *sin* fru 'Per loves hisREFL wife'.

Example 6b.

Per älskar *hans* fru 'Per loves his wife'.

Example 6a states that Per loves his (own) wife, whereas 6b states that he loves his, i.e., someone else's, wife (precisely whose is not mentioned, but would of course normally be inferred from the co-text).

According to this rule, the Russian reflexive pronoun in the construction in the Russian text fragment (see example 5 above) would be translated by a Swedish reflexive pronoun, on the condition that the Swedish translation would use a construction similar to the Russian one. This seemingly simple rule does not always apply however, and especially in various types of embedded constructions, usage can differ regionally and between different language users, as noted by the Swedish grammar of the Swedish Academy (Teleman, Hellberg & Andersson, 1999, p. 331). One construction that is mentioned here as potentially problematic is the construction with a *nomen actionis*, where the (semantic) subject of the noun is not explicitly given, but differs from the subject of the finite verb. The choice between a reflexive pronoun and a personal possessive pronoun is here problematic for many Swedish speakers, who therefore tend to avoid *both* constructions (p. 334). The grammar gives the following examples:

Example 7a.

Hon klagade över det bristande intresset för {*?sina/?hennes*} böcker. 'She complained about the lack of interest in {*?herREFL/?her*} books.'

Example 7b.

Han överskattade behovet av {*?sina/?hans*} uppfinningar. 'He overestimated the need for {*?hisREFL/?his*} inventions.' (Teleman et al., 1999, p. 334.)

These examples are structurally identical with a literal translation into Swedish of the Russian construction in the sentence segment under analysis:

Example 8.

Han kämpade mot förtrycket av {*?sitt/?hans*} folk. 'He fought against the oppression of {?his/?hisREFL} people.'

Obviously, the problem of choosing between a possessive personal and possessive reflexive pronoun arises only if the proposed TL version bears a close formal correspondence to the SL structure. The data show that all participants, except one professional translator, generate (orally and/or in writing) several translation versions of this particular segment in the process. And indeed, all participants (except the same professional translator) generate at least one translation solution that is semantically and formally very close to the structure of the ST – a literal translation. The problematic nature of finding a correct Swedish translation of the Russian reflexive pronoun is shown by the fact that several participants try out both alternatives, i.e., translating both with a reflexive pronoun and with a personal possessive before eventually deciding on an explicitation. Some participants also indicate the reason for their explicitation – one of the professional translators most explicitly:

> Example 9.
>
> Professional translator/TAP[6]: active opponent / against (5s) the social (4s) (6s) and national oppression (5s) of (2s) the people to which he belonged (19s) (8s) (3s) I / have problems with hisREFL and his / in this sentence / an active opponent against the social and national oppression (2s) of his people / of hisREFL people (2s) I can try to solve it for the time being with the help of / of that formulation / the people to which he belonged
>
> Example 10.
>
> Translation student/TAP: fought against (6s) the social and national oppression which his people (3s) eehm (3s) well it sounds / it sounds then? if you should say / the social and national oppression of / hisREFL people (inaudible) hav- / you have to make this more explicit so that it does not become / ehm / no it / does not sound good / ehm (2s) to which / here perhaps you have to do something like / to which / his people was subjected

The four participants whose process data indicate problems in choosing between a reflexive and a personal possessive pronoun, opt for different textual solutions. Two of them form a subordinate clause (versions 4 and 8), where the NP *svoego naroda* ‘hisREFL people’s’ becomes the subject. In that case, the pronoun cannot be reflexive but has to be personal possessive, so the choice is avoided. One participant instead renders the pronoun by a noun in the genitive (version 3). These three solutions can thus be characterised as a strategy to avoid a problematic choice.

One professional translator first wrote the reflexive pronoun *sitt*, then during the post-writing phase changed this to the personal possessive pronoun *hans*, a clear indication of hesitation regarding the choice of pronoun. Furthermore, after having written *hans*, he paused in his writing process for as long as 5.1 seconds, before adding the adjective *egen* ‘own’ (version 2). It can be assumed that the addition of *egen* is intended to disambiguate the reference of *hans*[7].

Wishing to avoid repetition

Data show that explicitations can also be carried out to solve other problems. One translation student explicitated not because of problems in choosing the pronoun, but because her first TT version of the sentence contained a repetition of the preposition *mot* 'against', which she wanted to avoid:

---

[6] To facilitate reading, the TAPs have been translated into English and are given only in that version. Transcription conventions: figures within brackets indicate pause length in seconds; single slash indicates a pause shorter than 2 seconds; underlining indicates that the participant is typing on the computer while verbalising. Capital letters are used for parts of utterances pronounced with greater emphasis.

[7] Teleman et al. (1999, p. 332) mentions that some language users combine a reflexive pronoun with *egen* to indicate the frame of reference, giving the following examples: *Per lät Bengt köra sin egen bil* ‘Per allowed Bengt to drive hisREFL own car’, with preferred interpretation: Bengt’s car, as opposed to: *Per lät Bengt köra sin bil* ‘Per allowed Bengt to drive hisREFL car’, in which case the car can be Per’s or Bengt’s.

> Example 11.
>
> Translation student/TAP: he fought passionately against the social / and national oppression against his people (4s) fought passionately against the social and national oppression of his people (3s) that his people suffered under perhaps or something like that / otherwise it will become / he fought AGAINST / the oppression AGAINST his people

By forming a subordinate clause on the basis of the NP (version 6), this participant is able to remove one of the prepositions altogether, thus avoiding the repetition.

Solving a lexical problem

One language student explicitated the intended result of the fight against oppression (version 9). His TAP does not indicate any problem with the reflexive pronoun, which he first translated literally, with a Swedish reflexive pronoun. Instead, his problem was to find a suitable Swedish expression for Russian *strastno borolsja* 'fought passionately'; more precisely how to render the adverb in the combination with the particular verb. To solve this problem, he made a change of construction: *han var en liderlig förkämpe* 'he was a lecherous [sic!] fighter/champion'. The Swedish noun *förkämpe (för)* 'champion (of)' has only the meaning of "someone fighting for something/somebody" and obligatorily specifies for what. The student therefore added *frigörelse* 'liberation', creating the solution *för sitt folks frigörelse från såväl socialt som nationellt förtryck* 'for hisREFL people's liberation from social as well as national oppression'. Here, quite according to the rules the correlate of the reflexive pronoun is the subject of the sentence, so the choice of the reflexive pronoun is quite unproblematic. Later, he revised the segment, again writing the verb *kämpade* 'fought', but in doing so, he left the explicitation unchanged in the text.

Problems but no explicitation

The language student whose TT is the literal version (version 1) never contemplated any other solution for the genitive phrase *svoego naroda*. Her TAP shows, however, that she had significant problems related to choosing the exact morphological form of the prepositional NP, and she therefore generated a huge number of translation versions. The student had problems in her process, but her process data reveal that she diagnosed them as being which definite form to use in the construction: *det sociala och nationella förtrycket* or *det sociala och nationella förtryck*, and in the end she chose the second alternative. This, as a matter of fact, is ungrammatical in Swedish, since it can only be used as the correlate of a relative subordinate clause, but there is no such clause in her text. Her problems with the segment and her solution is perhaps “half-way” to an explicitation, similar to solutions 4 through 8 quoted above.

Conclusions

We have seen that 8 of the 9 TTs show various types of explicitations in the sentence segment under study. We have also seen that the textually based hypothetical explanations are not at all confirmed by the process data as reflecting the actual and focused decision-making at the local level of the sentence in question. The explicitations are thus not caused or triggered by the factors outlined in the textually based hypothetical explanations. Instead, in five cases, the process data give evidence that explicitation is resorted to as a strategy to solve a problem in the translation process. This problem is related to the target language: either the problem of choosing between a reflexive and a possessive pronoun (four cases); or to avoid the repetition of a certain preposition in the proposed TL sentence. In one case, the explicitation is the consequence of another lexical choice in the sentence. Only in two cases, both professional translators, do the data not give any indication as to why an explicitated solution is chosen.

The data thus demonstrate that when a problem occurs in the process, various types of explicitation can be a way of solving the problem, or a consequence of other problem-solving procedures. Why then are these problems solved by an explicitation? Most of the explicitations here were carried out as part of a reformulation in the TT and the TL, i.e., not in direct relation or contrast to the ST and SL. Explicitation therefore can be viewed as a form of paraphrasing. The ability to paraphrase is part of the individual’s linguistic and semantic competence, both in the individual’s L1 and L2 (Blum-Kulka & Levenston, 1983). As such, its textual results are accepted as legitimate by language users: by language producers (writers, translators) and by readers or listeners. This is the condition for their occurrence in translated texts.

From a process perspective, the term explicitation is not always felicitous, since it implies a comparison with the ST. The fragments in the TTs are certainly explicitated when the researcher compares the ST and the TTs. However, for the individuals doing the translating, in their processes, the TT versions are in most cases the result of TL rephrasing. This kind of explicitation is, in fact, the result of the translator’s process of interpretation (see Blum-Kulka, 1986; Klaudy, 1998), but in a specific way, namely the interpretative process which usually consists in reformulating segments of the TT in the TL (see Krings, 1986, p. 507).

In a larger study (Englund Dimitrova, in press), I concluded that in translated texts, from a process perspective there are at least two different kinds of explicitations occurring for different reasons in the process: norm-governed and strategic explicitations. *Norm-governed explicitations* are specific for a given pair of source and target languages, and are characterised by:

(a) their high frequency in TTs, i.e., most translators tend to do the same type of explicitation in the given linguistic environment;

(b) the decision regarding the explicitation is mostly taken as part of non-problematic processing.

In Russian-Swedish translation, the explicitation of certain types of implicit links were found to have a norm-governed character. Such explicitations obviously depend on some amount of experience in translation, and hence can be expected mainly in data from professional translators.

Strategic explicitations, on the other hand, have as their origin some problem in the translation process, and are part of a strategy in order to solve that problem. I call such explicitations strategic, in line with a definition of strategy as a potentially conscious plan to solve a concrete problem in the translation process (Krings, 1986, p. 175; see also Færch & Kasper, 1983)[8]. Clearly, there can be problems in the translation process, both for experienced professional translators and for students with little experience in translation. This paper shows that they can have quite similar problems, and also resort to similar solutions. In fact, in the data analysed in this paper, there do not seem to be any conspicuous differences between the participants according to their degree of experience in translation, neither textually nor in their processes. This fact speaks in favour of the importance of the individual's semantic competence in L1 as outlined above, also in the translation process.

The problem of choosing between a reflexive and personal possessive pronoun in this particular construction is specific to the TL Swedish, but is not dependent upon the SL. The construction type represented in the sentence fragment is naturally also found in other languages. Therefore, similar examples can be expected in translating from other languages into Swedish as well.

This paper has shown that there is no one-to-one correspondence between the type of problem and its textual solution. This means that there are limited possibilities to infer from the texts (ST + TT in comparison) the underlying processes leading to an explicitation or what triggers them. This does not mean, however, that we should discard altogether textually based typologies and frameworks like the one proposed by Klaudy (1998, see above). Norm-governed explicitations can be expected to fit within several of those categories fairly well. In the case of strategic explicitations, we may assume that once a problem occurs in the process and is (tentatively) solved by a TL reformulation, such as an explicitation, then factors such as the hypothetical explanations can have an influence on the actual formulations produced. However, this can only be determined by further research.

---

[8] For overviews of different strategy notions in translation, see Jääskeläinen (1993) and Chesterman (1998); a typology of strategies as textual manipulations is suggested in Chesterman (1997) and applied in Künzli (2003).

REFERENCES

Blum-Kulka, S. & Levenston, E. A. (1983). Universals of lexical simplicification. In C. Færch & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Strategies in interlanguage communication* (pp. 119-139). London/New York: Longman.

Blum-Kulka, S. (1986). Shifts of cohesion and coherence in translation. In J. House & S. Blum-Kulka (Eds.), *Interlingual and intercultural communication* (pp. 17-35). Tübingen: Narr.

Chesterman, A. (1997). *Memes of translation. The spread of ideas in translation theory.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins.

Chesterman, A. (1998). Communication strategies, learning strategies & translation strategies. In K. Malmkjær (Ed.), *Translation and language teaching. Language teaching and translation* (pp. 135-144). Manchester: St. Jerome.

Delisle, J., Lee-Jahnke, H. & Cormier, M. C. (1999). *Terminologie de la traduction.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins.

Englund Dimitrova, B. (2003). Explicitation in Russian-Swedish translation: Sociolinguistic and pragmatic aspects. In B. Englund Dimitrova & A. Pereswetoff-Morath (Eds.), *Swedish Contributions to the Thirteenth International Congress of Slavists, Ljubljana, 15-21 August 2003* (pp. 21-31). Lund: Lund University.

Englund Dimitrova, B. (in press) Expertise and explicitation in the translation process. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins.

Ericsson, K. A. & Simon, H. A. (1984/1993). *Protocol analysis. Verbal reports as data.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Færch, C. & Kasper, G. (1983). Plans and strategies in foreign language communication. In C. Færch & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Strategies in interlanguage communication* (pp. 20-60). London/New York: Longman.

Jääskeläinen, R. (1993). Investigating translation strategies. In S. Tirkkonen-Condit & J. Laffling (Eds.), *Recent trends in empirical translation research* (pp. 99-120). Joensuu: University of Joensuu.

Jääskeläinen, R. (1999). *Tapping the process: An explorative study of the cognitive and affective factors involved in translating* (University of Joensuu Publications in the Humanities no. 22). Joensuu: University of Joensuu.

Klaudy, K. (1998). Explicitation. In M. Baker, ass. by K. Malmkjær (Ed.), *Routledge's Encyclopedia of Translation Studies* (pp. 80-84). London/New York: Routledge.

Krings, H. P. (1986). *Was in den Köpfen von Übersetzern vorgeht.* Tübingen: Narr.

Künzli, A. (2003). *Quelques stratégies et principes en traduction technique français-allemand et français-suédois* (Forskningsrapporter 21) Stockholm: Stockholms universitet, Institutionen för franska och italienska.

Laviosa-Braithwaite, S. (1996). Comparable corpora: Towards a corpus linguistic methodology for the empirical study of translation. In M. Thelen & B. Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk (Eds.), *Translation and Meaning, Part 3* (pp. 153-163). Maastricht: Euroterm.

Laviosa-Braithwaite, S. (1998). Universals of translation. In M. Baker, ass. by K. Malmkjær (Ed.), *Routledge's Encyclopedia of Translation Studies* (pp. 288-291). London/New York: Routledge.

Levý, J. (1965). Will translation theory be of use to translators? In R. Italiaander (Ed.), *Übersetzen. Vorträge und Beiträge vom Internationalen Kongress literarischer Übersetzer in Hamburg 1965* (pp. 77-82*)*. Frankfurt-am-Main: Athenäum.

Lörscher, W. (1991). *Translation performance, translation process, and translation strategies. A psycholinguistic investigation.* Tübingen: Narr.

Mason, I. (2001). Translator behaviour and language usage: Some constraints on contrastive studies. *Hermes, Journal of Linguistics, 26,* 65-80.

Norberg, U. (2003). *Übersetzen mit doppeltem Skopos. Eine empirische Prozess- and Produktstudie (=Studia Germanica Upsaliensia 42).* Uppsala: Uppsala University.

Schmied, J. & Schäffler, H. (1997). Explicitness as a universal feature of translation. In M. Ljung (Ed.), *Corpus-based studies in English. Papers from the Seventeenth International Conference on English Language Research on Computerized Corpora* (pp. 21-34). Amsterdam/Atlanta: Rodopi.

Shuttleworth, M. & Cowie, M. (1997). *Dictionary of Translation Studies.* Manchester: St. Jerome.

Stepovik, D. V. (1984). *Taras Ševčenko. Živopis, grafika*. Kiiv: Mistectvo.

Teleman, U., Hellberg, S. & Andersson, E. (1999). *Svenska Akademiens grammatik. 2. Ord*. Stockholm: Norstedts.

Toury, G. (1980). *In search of a theory of translation.* Tel Aviv: Tel Aviv University, the Porter Institute for Poetics and Semiotics.

Weissbrod, R. (1992). Explicitation in translations of prose-fiction from English to Hebrew as a function of norms. *Multilingua 11*(2)*,* 153-171.

Vinay, J.-P. & Darbelnet, J. (1958/1977). *Stylistique comparée du français et de l'anglais*. Montréal, Québec: Beauchemin.

Øverås, L. (1998). In search of the third code: An investigation of norms in literary translation. *Meta, 43,* 4, 571-588.