

**THE USE OF EXPLICITATION IN MULTIPLE PERSIAN
TRANSLATIONS OF RHONDA BYRNE'S *THE SECRET***

MOHAMMAD RAHBAR

UNIVERSITI SAINS MALAYSIA

2015

**THE USE OF EXPLICITATION IN MULTIPLE PERSIAN TRANSLATIONS
OF RHONDA BYRNE'S *THE SECRET***

by

MOHAMMAD RAHBAR

Thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements

for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

July 2015

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to express my gratitude first and foremost to the God who enabled me to accomplish this research successfully.

I should like to humbly extend appreciation to my supervisor, Dr. Haslina Haroon, first for every bit of knowledge I learned from her during my research and then for her painstaking invaluable counselling, patience and advice from the very stage of this research as well as giving me extraordinary experiences throughout the work. I also appreciate my co-supervisor Dr. Leelany Ayob who gave me the freedom to explore on my own.

I pay homage to my parents (deceased), my very special sisters and brother. I wish to express my love and gratitude to my son Kambiz and my daughters Sahar and Neda who are the precious jewels of my life, and they illuminate every breath I take through their very existence, and finally to my courageous, and beautiful wife, Elahe who is always impatiently by my side and whose love and support knows no limits.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|------------------------------------|------|
| ACKNOWLEDGEMENT | ii |
| TABLE OF CONTENTS | iii |
| LIST OF TABLES | vii |
| LIST OF FIGURES | x |
| LIST OF SYMBOLS | xii |
| LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS | xiii |
| ABSTRAK | xiv |
| ABSTRACT | xvi |

CHAPTER 1- INTRODUCTION

| | |
|------------------------------------|----|
| 1.0 Background of the Study..... | 1 |
| 1.1 Statement of the Problem..... | 4 |
| 1.2 Objectives of the Study..... | 12 |
| 1.3 Research Questions..... | 13 |
| 1.4 Scope of the Study..... | 13 |
| 1.5 Significance of the Study..... | 15 |
| 1.6 Definition of Key Terms..... | 17 |
| 1.7 Organization of the Study..... | 19 |

CHAPTER 2- LITERATURE REVIEW

| | | |
|-------|---|----|
| 2.0 | Introduction..... | 21 |
| 2.1 | Translation Universals..... | 21 |
| 2.1.1 | Universals vs. Laws..... | 23 |
| 2.1.2 | Translation and the Concept of Norms..... | 24 |
| 2.2 | The Notion of Explicitation in Translation..... | 26 |
| 2.2.1 | Blum-Kulka's (1986) Explicitation Hypothesis..... | 26 |
| 2.2.2 | Definition of Explicitation..... | 27 |
| 2.2.3 | Tendencies to Explicitate..... | 30 |
| 2.2.4 | Englund-Dimitrova's (2005) Explicitation Typology..... | 32 |
| 2.2.5 | Klaudy's (1998) Explicitation Typology..... | 34 |
| 2.3 | Forms of Explicitation..... | 36 |
| 2.4 | Approaches to the Study of Translation..... | 37 |
| 2.5 | The Use of Corpus in the Study of Explicitation..... | 38 |
| 2.5.1 | Parallel Corpora in the Study of Explicitation..... | 39 |
| 2.5.2 | Comparable Corpora to the Study of Explicitation..... | 40 |
| 2.5.3 | Multiple Translation Corpora to the Study of Explicitation..... | 42 |
| 2.6 | Chapter Review..... | 45 |

CHAPTER 3- THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND METHODOLOGY

| | | |
|-----|---|----|
| 3.0 | Introduction..... | 50 |
| 3.1 | Theoretical Framework..... | 50 |
| 3.2 | Toury's (1995) Coupled-Pairs Model..... | 54 |
| 3.3 | House's (2004) Functional Model..... | 55 |

| | | |
|-------|----------------------|----|
| 3.4 | Methodology..... | 57 |
| 3.4.1 | Data Sources..... | 61 |
| 3.4.2 | Data Collection..... | 64 |
| 3.5 | Research Design..... | 69 |
| 3.6 | Chapter Review..... | 71 |

CHAPTER 4- CLASSIFICATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

| | | |
|-------|---|-----|
| 4.0 | Introduction..... | 69 |
| 4.1 | Data Collection and Data Analysis for TT1 (Fath- Ali)..... | 70 |
| 4.2 | Data Collection and Data Analysis for TT2 (Mo'takef)..... | 85 |
| 4.3 | Data Collection and Data Analysis for TT3 (Qarachedaghi)..... | 97 |
| 4.4 | Data Collection and Data Analysis for TT4 (Rahimi)..... | 109 |
| 4.5 | Data Collection and Data Analysis for TT5 (Sabt-al-Sheikh)..... | 126 |
| 4.6 | Exploited Strategies: Identical / Different..... | 146 |
| 4.6.1 | Adopting Identical Strategies to Explicitate a Single ST-item | 147 |
| 4.6.2 | Adopting Different Strategies to Explicitate a Single ST-item..... | 148 |
| 4.7 | Data Classification | 154 |
| 4.7.1 | Classifying the Data Based on the Elements of Explicitation..... | 154 |
| 4.7.2 | Classifying the Data Based on the Forms of Explicitation..... | 157 |
| 4.7.3 | Comparing the Five Translators with regard to Employing the Elements and Forms of Explicitation in Translating the Same ST..... | 160 |
| 4.7.4 | Classifying the Data Based on the Strategies Adopted by the Five Translators..... | 172 |
| 4.8 | Chapter Review..... | 173 |

CHAPTER 5- FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

| | | |
|-----|------------------------------------|-----|
| 5.0 | Introduction..... | 174 |
| 5.1 | Limitations of the Discussion..... | 175 |
| 5.2 | Findings and Discussion..... | 176 |
| 5.3 | Chapter Review..... | 188 |

CHAPTER 6- CONCLUSION

| | | |
|-----|---------------------------------------|-----|
| 6.0 | Introduction..... | 189 |
| 6.1 | Conclusion..... | 189 |
| 6.2 | Summary..... | 192 |
| 6.3 | Contributions..... | 194 |
| 6.4 | Suggestions for Further Research..... | 196 |
| 6.5 | Chapter Review..... | 197 |

| | |
|------------------------|------------|
| REFERENCES..... | 198 |
|------------------------|------------|

APPENDIX

LIST OF TABLES

| <u>Table</u> | | <u>Page</u> |
|--------------|--|-------------|
| Table 1.1 | Forms of explicitation provided by the different translators in example 1..... | 8 |
| Table 2.1 | Summaries of the definitions of explicitation provided by different scholars..... | 29 |
| Table 3.1 | Strategies employed by the different translators for a single ST- item in example 1..... | 65 |
| Table 4.1 | Frequency of elements of explicitation in the corpus investigated TT1. | 72 |
| Table 4.2 | Frequency of forms of explicitation in the corpus investigated TT1..... | 72 |
| Table 4.3 | Strategies observed in TT1..... | 74 |
| Table 4.4 | Frequency of elements of explicitation in the corpus investigated TT2 | 85 |
| Table 4.5 | Frequency of forms of explicitation in the corpus investigated TT2.... | 86 |
| Table 4.6 | Strategies observed in TT2..... | 87 |
| Table 4.7 | Frequency of elements of explicitation in the corpus investigated TT3..... | 97 |
| Table 4.8 | Frequency of forms of explicitation in the corpus investigated TT3 | 98 |
| Table 4.9 | Strategies observed in TT3..... | 99 |
| Table 4.10 | Frequency of elements of explicitation in the corpus investigated TT4..... | 110 |
| Table 4.11 | Frequency of forms of explicitation in the corpus investigated TT4. | 110 |
| Table 4.12 | Strategies observed in TT4..... | 116 |

| | | |
|------------|---|-----|
| Table 4.13 | Frequency of elements of explicitation in the corpus investigated | |
| | TT5..... | 127 |
| Table 4.14 | Frequency of forms of explicitation in the corpus investigated TT5. | 127 |
| Table 4.15 | Strategies observed in TT5..... | 129 |
| Table 4.16 | Elements of Explicitation provided by the different translators in | |
| | example 78 | 147 |
| Table 4.17 | Forms and elements of explicitation employed by the different | |
| | translators in translating a single ST-item..... | 149 |
| Table 4.18 | Forms/elements employed by the different translators in example | |
| | 79... | 152 |
| Table 4.19 | Normalization of the frequency of elements of explicitation in the | |
| | corpus investigated for the five translators..... | 154 |
| Table 4.20 | Normalization of the frequency of elements of explicitation in the | |
| | corpus investigated for the five translators..... | 157 |
| Table 4.21 | Frequency cross-tabulation of adopting Specifying provided by the | |
| | different translators in TTs..... | 161 |
| Table 4.22 | Frequency cross-tabulation of adopting Commenting provided by the | |
| | different translators in TTs | 159 |
| Table 4.23 | Frequency cross-tabulation of adopting Exemplifying provided by the | |
| | different translators in TTs..... | 162 |
| Table 4.24 | Frequency cross-tabulation of adopting Addition of New Element | |
| | provided by the different translators in TTs..... | 163 |
| Table 4.25 | Frequency cross-tabulation of adopting Provision of Exception | |
| | provided by the different translators in TTs..... | 164 |

| | | |
|------------|--|-----|
| Table 4.26 | Frequency cross-tabulation of adopting Offering an Alternative provided by the different translators in TTs..... | 164 |
| Table 4.27 | Frequency cross-tabulation of adopting Circumstances Element provided by the different translators in TTs..... | 165 |
| Table 4.28 | Frequency cross-tabulation of adopting Temporal Element t provided by the different translators in TTs..... | 166 |
| Table 4.29 | Frequency cross-tabulation of adopting Local Causal Element provided by the different translators in TTs..... | 167 |
| Table 4.30 | Frequency cross-tabulation of adopting Conditional Element provided by the different translators in TTs..... | 167 |
| Table 4.31 | Frequency cross-tabulation of adopting Elaboration provided by the different translators in TTs..... | 168 |
| Table 4.32 | Frequency cross-tabulation of adopting Extension provided by the different translators in TTs..... | 169 |
| Table 4.33 | Frequency cross-tabulation of adopting Enhancement provided by the different translators in TTs..... | 170 |
| Table 4.34 | Chi-square Test for elements of explicitation..... | 170 |
| Table 4.35 | Chi-square Test for forms of explicitation..... | 171 |
| Table 4.36 | Strategies observed in TT1-TT5..... | 172 |

LIST OF FIGURES

| <u>Figure</u> | | <u>Page</u> |
|----------------------|---|--------------------|
| Figure 3.1 | Universals in translation in House’s functional model modified and adapted from House, 2008)..... | 53 |
| Figure 3.2 | Design of multi-translators parallel corpora..... | 55 |
| Figure 3.3 | Methodology incorporating Toury's (1995) coupled-pairs model and House's (2004) functional model..... | 58 |
| Figure 3.4 | Research Design..... | 67 |
| Figure 4.1 | Frequency of explicitation elements extracted from T1..... | 73 |
| Figure 4.2 | Frequency of explicitation forms extracted from TT1..... | 73 |
| Figure 4.3 | Frequency of explicitation elements extracted from T2..... | 86 |
| Figure 4.4 | Frequency of explicitation forms extracted from TT2..... | 87 |
| Figure 4.5 | Frequency of explicitation elements extracted from TT3..... | 98 |
| Figure 4.6 | Frequency of explicitation forms extracted from TT3..... | 99 |
| Figure 4.7 | Frequency of explicitation elements extracted from TT4..... | 111 |
| Figure 4.8 | Frequency of explicitation forms extracted from TT4..... | 111 |
| Figure 4.9 | Frequency of explicitation elements extracted from TT5..... | 128 |
| Figure 4.10 | Frequency of explicitation forms extracted from TT5..... | 128 |
| Figure 4.11 | Comparing the frequency of explicitation elements extracted from the corpus investigated (TT1-TT5)..... | 156 |
| Figure 4.12 | Frequency of explicitation elements extracted from five TTs..... | 157 |
| Figure 4.13 | Comparing the frequency of explicitation forms extracted from the data sources (TT1-TT5) | 159 |

| | | |
|-------------|--|-----|
| Figure 4.14 | Frequency of explicitation forms extracted from the data sources (TT1-TT5)..... | 160 |
| Figure 5.1 | The cline indicating explicitation as an idiosyncratic or universal | 185 |

LIST OF SYMBOLS

| Persian Alphabet | Symbol | Phone |
|---------------------|--------|-------|
| ش | š | ʃ |
| آ | ā | a: |
| خ | x | kh |
| چ | ĉ | ch |
| ق | q | gh |

List of Persian alphabets and their equivalent in English

| Persian | English | Persian | English |
|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| ا | a | ط | t |
| ب | b | ظ | z |
| پ | p | ع | ‘ |
| ت | t | غ | gh |
| ث | th | ف | f |
| ج | j | ق | q |
| چ | ĉ | ک | k |
| ح | h | گ | g |
| خ | x | ل | l |
| د | d | م | m |
| ذ | dh | ن | n |
| ر | r | و | w/v |
| ز | z | ه | h |
| س | s | ی | y |
| ش | š | ی | y |
| ص | s | ة | T |
| ض | z | ای | i |

LIST OF ABBREVIATION

| | | | |
|------|-------------------|------|---------------------------------|
| TT1: | Target Text One | F | Frequency |
| TT2: | Target Text Two | TL: | Target language |
| TT3: | Target Text Three | SL: | Source language |
| TT4: | Target Text Four | ST: | Source text |
| TT5: | Target Text Five | TT: | Target text |
| T1: | Translator 1 | T&G | Translation and Gloss |
| T2: | Translator 2 | BT | Back Translation |
| T3: | Translator 3 | MTCs | Multiple Translation Corpora |
| T4: | Translator 4 | MCCs | Monolingual Comparable Corpora |
| T5: | Translator 5 | DTS | Descriptive Translation Studies |
| Ts: | Translators | N | Normalized |

PENGGUNAAN EKSPLISITASI DALAM TERJEMAHAN BERBILANG TEKS
***THE SECRET* OLEH RHONDA BYRNE DALAM BAHASA PARSİ**

ABSTRAK

Eksplisitasi sebagai satu fenomena universal telah dikaji oleh ramai sarjana melalui penggunaan korpus selari dan korpus sebanding dalam tempoh beberapa dekad yang lalu. Para sarjana, walau bagaimanapun, mendapati bahawa terdapat beberapa kekurangan pada pendekatan sedia ada dalam kajian tentang eksplisitasi. Kekurangan ini termasuk meneliti pola-pola yang tertentu tanpa serbarang penjelasan, menawarkan hanya satu penyelesaian bagi sebarang item teks sumber yang implisit dan tidak menunjukkan pelbagai penyelesaian yang lain yang mungkin ada. Hal ini menyebabkan timbulnya keperluan untuk membentuk satu kajian yang cuba untuk mengatasi kekurangan ini. Dengan menggunakan korpus terjemahan berbilang yang khusus, kajian ini cuba untuk meneliti pelbagai bentuk dan elemen eksplisitasi yang digunakan dalam terjemahan berbilang dalam bahasa Parsi bagi sebuah teks bahasa Inggeris untuk mengenal pasti sama ada eksplisitasi merupakan satu fenomena universal atau strategi individu. Secara khususnya, kajian ini mempunyai objektif berikut: (1) untuk mengenal pasti dan menerangkan elemen eksplisitasi dalam lima teks terjemahan dalam bahasa Parsi bagi sebuah teks bahasa Inggeris, (2) untuk mengenal pasti dan menerangkan bentuk eksplisitasi dalam terjemahan tersebut, (3) untuk mengelaskan insiden eksplisitasi yang dikenal pasti untuk menentukan strategi terjemahan, dan (4) untuk menentukan, berdasarkan data terkumpul, satu profil yang dapat menunjukkan sama ada eksplisitasi merupakan satu ciri universal atau satu idiosinkrasi. Model fungsional House (2004) dan model pasangan terganding Toury (1995) digunakan dalam analisis korpus yang terdiri

daripada teks kontemporari bukan sastera bertajuk *The Secret* oleh Rhonda Byrne (2006) dan terjemahannya ke dalam bahasa Parsi bertajuk *Raz* (راز) oleh Fath-Ali (2008), Mo'takef (2007), Qarachedaghi (2007), Rahimi (2008), dan Sabt-al-Sheikh (2008). Setiap sub-korpus dibandingkan dengan teks asal, dan kemudiannya sesama teks yang lain. Insiden eksplisitasi kemudiannya dikeluarkan dan dianalisis. Analisis menunjukkan bahawa walaupun terdapat ketakkonsistenan dari segi penggunaan bentuk dan elemen eksplisitasi, terdapat satu corak yang khusus dari segi penggunaan eksplisitasi. Elemen *penetapan* paling banyak digunakan manakala *elemen bersyarat* paling sedikit digunakan oleh semua penterjemah. *Nominalisasi* pula merupakan strategi yang paling diutamakan manakala *penggantian metafora dengan simili* merupakan strategi yang tidak begitu digemari. Dengan mengambil kira taburan ini, *penghuraian* dapat dianggap sebagai satu ciri universal dengan mengambil kira penggunaannya oleh semua penterjemah dan nisbah penterjemah yang menggunakannya. *Penambahan*, walau bagaimanapun, dianggap sebagai satu idiosinkrasi kerana tidak ramai penterjemah menggunakannya. Penggunaan korpus terjemahan berbilang untuk mengkaji konsep universal dalam penterjemahan bukan saja merupakan satu penambahbaikan jika dibandingkan dengan pendekatan semasa tetapi ia juga memberikan data yang lebih andal untuk pengkaji membuat kesimpulan tentang tahap universal eksplisitasi dalam teks bukan sastera. Kajian ini dan juga kajian lain yang serupa dapat memperlihatkan corak yang jelas tentang keuniversalan dalam penterjemahan. Penggunaan corak-corak ini seterusnya dapat menghasilkan terjemahan yang lebih mudah untuk dibaca dan diproses.

**THE USE OF EXPLICITATION IN MULTIPLE PERSIAN TRANSLATIONS
OF
RHONDA BYRNE'S *THE SECRET***

ABSTRACT

Explicitation as a universal phenomenon in translation has been investigated by many scholars through the adoption of parallel and comparable corpora during the recent decades. Scholars, however, have noted a number of shortcomings with current approaches in the study of explicitation, such as the translators' level of proficiency and text types. This necessitates a study which addresses these shortcomings. Adopting an approach which uses a special multiple translation corpora, this study aims to explore the different forms and elements of explicitation which might be employed in the translations of an English text into Persian in order to determine whether explicitation is a universal phenomenon or an individual strategy. More specifically, this study has the following aims: (1) to identify and explain elements of explicitation in five Persian translations of an English text, (2) to identify and explain forms of explicitation in the translations, (3) to classify the explicitated incidents in order to identify the strategies applied by the translators, and (4) to establish, on the basis of the data gathered, a profile in order to determine whether explicitation is a universal or an idiosyncratic feature. For this purpose, House's (2004) functional model along with Toury's (1995) coupled-pairs model are adopted in the analysis of the multiple translation corpora that was developed, which is made up of a contemporary self-help non-literary English text *The Secret* by Rhonda Byrne (2006) and its five translations into Persian, *Raz* (راز), translated by Fath-Ali (2008), Mo'takef (2007), Qarachedaghi (2007), Rahimi (2008), and Sabt-al-Sheikh (2008). Each

individual sub-corpus is first compared with the source text, and subsequently with each other. Incidents of explicitation are then extracted and analyzed. The analysis reveals that in spite of the inconsistency in the adoption of the elements and forms of explicitation, there is a particular pattern with regard to the use of explicitation. The elements of *specifying* and *conditional element* are the most and the least frequently exploited elements by all the translators respectively. Among the different strategies adopted by the translators, *nominalization* was a strongly preferred strategy and *replacing metaphor with simile* was the least preferred strategy. With such distribution, *elaboration* may be considered as universal because of the fact that it is strongly preferred by all five translators and also considering the ratio of translators who adopted it. *Enhancement*, however, is the least preferred form, and as such it might be considered as an idiosyncratic form. The use of the developed multiple translation corpora to investigate the notion of universality not only shows an improvement over current approaches but also provides a more reliable data to generalize the universality of explicitation through a non-literary text. This study, along with other studies along the same line, may lead to the establishment of clear patterns of translation universals.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.0 Background of the Study

The emergence of Descriptive Translation Study (DTS) in the 1970s and its subsequent development in the 1980s manifested a change in terms of how translation was viewed, i.e. from looking at translation as an ancillary discipline which is dependent on linguistics and grounded mainly in the prescriptive approach to studying translation as an independent phenomenon with the aim of establishing a scholarly discipline within which translation could be described, explained, and/or predicted. In this regard, different approaches were proposed by different scholars such as Vinay and Darbelnet (1958/1995) and Catford (1965) for studying the translation of a variety of source texts (ST) into different target language cultures with the aim of exploring and discussing finer principles and regularities in the translation process.

Toury (1995) stated that translated texts show specific features and regularities which occur only in the translation process. Toury (2008) proposed that exploring the translations to identify, describe, explain, and predict such features and regularities within the area of Descriptive Translation Studies (DTS) could be a fundamental task of researchers who aim at gaining a deeper understanding of translational behaviour.

Baker (1993) stated that all translations have common features or universals, which are independent of source and target languages. In other words, universals of translation are linguistic features which typically occur in translated rather than original texts and are thought to be independent of the influence of the specific language pairs involved in the process of translation (1993). With respect to regularities, it is defined by Hempel (1952) as "general patterns or regularities to which the individual phenomena

conform and by virtue of which their occurrence can be systematically anticipated" (cited in Toury 1995, p. 9). Consequently, exploring for such regularities was considered the fundamental task of DTS. Considering such regularities, some scholars such as Blum-Kulka (1986), Baker (1993), and Chesterman (2004) attempted to establish universalities and hypotheses regarding translation.

The claim about the existence of regularities in translation is rather controversial among translation scholars. While the existence of such regularities is supported in the works of scholars such as Laviosa (1998) and Øverås (1998), other scholars, for example Tymoczko (1998), believe that it is not possible to propose hypothesis for such regularities and that, since there are too many translations in the world that are translated into different languages at different times, studying all of these translations is not easy. Taking such claims into account, it would seem that studying translation regularities would be a debatable area in the realm of DTS.

Scholars such as Blum-Kulka (1986), Baker (1993), and Toury (1995), however, have carried out studies in support of the claim of translation regularities. They proposed different perspectives on translation regularities. Toury (1995), for example, proposed the concept of laws of translation, which is made up of the law of standardization and the law of interference. Likewise, Baker (1993) proposed four translation universals namely simplification, explicitation, convergence, and normalization. Since these phenomena, which are typical incidents of language processing, occur only in translation and not in any other kinds of activity, they have become the focus of attention in Translation Studies in recent years.

Explicitation, one of the translation universals proposed by Baker (1993), has received much attention and has been studied by scholars more than the other proposed

universals. Explicitation was first defined by Vinay and Darbelnet (1958/1995) as "a stylistic translation technique which consists of making explicit in the target language what remains implicit in the source language because it is apparent from either the context or the situation" (p. 342). Blum-Kulka (1986) later developed this idea and proposed the explicitation hypothesis in which explicitation is defined as "an observed cohesive explicitness from ST to target text (TT) regardless of the increase traceable to differences between the two linguistic and textual systems involved" (p.300). Following Blum-Kulka (1986), other scholars such as Schmied and Schaffler (1997) have stated the necessity of defining explicitation only with regard to the degree of explicitness in a given language or even with regard to a specific text in that language. This idea was supported by scholars such as Baker (1996).

As stated above, translation universals in general and explicitation in particular became the centre of attention for many scholars, especially after the explicitation hypothesis was proposed by Blum-Kulka (1986) and after Baker's (1993) seminal paper on the role of parallel corpora in investigating the nature of translation. In this regard, many scholars attempted to employ different approaches in investigating the different types of explicitation, for example, through the use of parallel corpora (Klaudy and Károly, 2005; Saldanha, 2008), as well as through the use of comparable corpora (Olohan and Baker, 2000; Olohan, 2001; Puurtinen, 2004). The combination of the above two approaches is also practised by many scholars (for example, Johansson, 1999/2002; Neumann and Hanson-Schirra, 2003; Guo, 2011; and Hirsch, 2011) to explore explicitation as a feature of translation.

1.1 Statement of the Problem

Research in translation universals is concerned not only with the question of whether they exist and under what conditions, but also with the ability to explain the nature of these universals, if they exist. Explaining the motivation behind translation universals is a new trend in the process of exploring and studying universal phenomena such as simplification, explicitation, and normalization. With regard to the motivation behind the search for occurrences of translation universals, different explanations are provided by different scholars. Pym(2008), for instance, presented his explanation for some translation universals. He stated that universals, for example, explicitation, occur because of the translator's desire to avoid risk. They are trained to be good communicators, so they say more rather than less.

However, the occurrence of translation universals might also be due to some extent to the difference between the language pairs in question. Linguistic and stylistic differences between the source language and the target language may be the source of emerging translation universals in the process of translation between the two languages. Based on the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis (1984), there are certain thoughts of an individual in one language that cannot be understood by those who operate in another language, thus the more the differences between languages, the more universal strategies are employed to make clear the possible problematic source language items. These issues might explain the motivation behind the exploration for the concept of explicitation.

At the core of translation universals is the concept of shift. Explicitation, for example, is used by linguists to refer to a shift in explicitness in translation. Blum-Kulka (1986) states that explicitation is a particular shift in meaning. She further distinguishes two semantic functions that might occur due to employing explicitation, namely addition

and specification. Klaudy and Károly (2005) identify explicitation and implicitation as two broad concepts covering a number of obligatory and optional transfer operations: Explicitation takes place, for example, when a SL unit with a more general meaning is replaced by a TL unit with a more specific meaning; when the meaning of a SL unit is distributed over several units in the TL; when new meaningful elements appear in the TL text; when one sentence in the ST is divided into two or several sentences in the TT; or, when SL phrases are extended or “raised” to clause in the TT, etc.

Implicitation occurs, for example, 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; or, when ST clauses are reduced to phrases in the TT, etc. (Klaudy and Károly 2005, p.15) They thus subsume specification under explicitation and generalization under implicitation i.e. they associate specification with explicitation and generalization with implicitation.

Despite prolific coverage in the literature, there seems to be a lack of recognition of the fact that the interpretation of the term itself varies from one researcher to another. Points on which authors tend to differ include especially the relation between explicitation and implicitation on the one hand and specification/generalization and addition/omission on the other.

Nida (1964), for instance, lists explicitation as one of his techniques of addition. Klaudy (1988) and Perego (2003) show that equating explicitation with addition and some subtraction with implicitation is a more accurate description. Øverås (1988) views addition as just one of the strategies of explicitation and subsumes specification and

generalization under explicitation and implicitation, associating specification with explicitation and generalization with implicitation.

While the relation between the concepts are left unsolved, Kamenická (2008) stresses that in the category of the so-called pragmatic (cultural) explicitation where a more general rather than more specific reference results in explicitation, the reversed connection can also be found. Generalizing explicitations may also be found in instances where the speaker's attitude toward the ST-item is explicitated or where abstract meanings expressed in the ST by relatively long stretches of text within relatively complicated sentences are summed up or shortened in TT.

Thus contrary to assumptions common to approaches to explicitation that acknowledges the existence of a relation between explicitation/implicitation and specification/generalization, explicitation cannot be universally paired with specification as opposed to generalization, and similarly implicitation cannot always be associated with generalization, although examples of specifying implicitation are harder to find due to the generally lower frequency of implicitation in translation. Thus she subsumes generalization under explicitation and specification under implicitation.

To be able to explore further the nature of explicitation, some scholars such as Klaudy and Károly (2005) and Konšalová (2007) suggested the use of bidirectional parallel corpora, i.e. a corpus of ST and its corresponding TT, or a corpus of an original text in similar genre in two different languages. The problem of using parallel corpora – a source text along with its corresponding translation – is that for each source text item, only one form of explicitation may be presented, and this would conceal the variety of probable forms of explicitation for the single ST item. It must be admitted, however, that the

different translations or forms of explicitation for one single ST is only possible if different translations of the same text are available.

Any claim about the variation or universality of explicitation is more valuable if it is supported by the analysis of several TTs for a single ST. This idea is supported by Malmkjaer (1998) who suggests that when attempting to explore the nature of explicitation, one possible way to overcome the problem of concealing various probable translation forms of explicitation is to include as many translations of the same source text as possible.

Although the above solution, that is, having as many translations of the same source text as possible, is clearly of some benefit to the analysis of explicitation, such parallel corpus is not always readily available. The reason is that many source texts are translated only once. The only exception is perhaps literary texts where it is possible to find various translations of a single text. However, even in instances where these different translations are available, such texts have their own problems. One problem is the fact that they are non-contemporary in nature. In other words, different translations of the same text are published in different periods of time and are usually decades apart. This in turn makes their comparison less valid due to possible language variations as well as inconsistency in sociocultural norms over the course of time.

To overcome this methodological shortcomings, some scholars such as Olohan and Baker (2000) suggested the use of comparable corpora, i.e. a corpus of translations in a language and a comparable corpus of non-translations in that same language. However, Laviosa (1998) criticizes the application of comparable corpora due to the following reasons: a) the researcher observes patterns without having any explanation for them, and

b) since the source text is not available, the researcher cannot consider the unavoidable impact of the source language on the translation.

To reduce such shortcomings, Castagnoli (2009) suggests using a corpus that consists of multiple translators of the same source text, i.e. a modified and developed parallel corpus. Since this kind of corpus consists of several translations in the same TL for one source text, like parallel corpora, it provides the possibility of observing the strategies employed by previous translators. The additional value is that it also makes available a range of forms of explicitation for each source text item rather than an individual's prospection (Malmkjaer 1998). Thus, to fulfil its role as the provider of diagnostic evidence, a multiple translation parallel corpora (MTPC), i.e. a source text along with its translated versions, is used for the study and for the purpose of exploring the notion of explicitation since they represent a more reliable source in investigating the variety of different strategies used and the effects of these different strategies in translation behaviour. The use of data from a text in English entitled *The Secret* and its five different translations in Persian is illustrated through Example 1.

Example 1

| | | |
|--|---------------------------|---|
| ST: The law responds to your thoughts, no matter what they may be. (<i>The Secret</i> , p. 7) | | |
| First translator | TT | قانون جذب به افکار شما پاسخ می دهد بدون توجه به آنکه این افکار دربردارنده ی چه موضوعاتی هستند. (p.16) |
| | Transliteration and Gloss | qānoone jazb be afkār-e šomā pāsox midahad [the law of attraction][to] [thoughts][your] [responds] bedun-e tavajoh be ānke in afkār [no matter] [this] [thoughts] darbar dārande-ye ê mozoo 'āti hastand. [include] [what matters] |
| | Back translation | The law of attraction responds to your thoughts, no matter what matters this thoughts include. (<i>Rāz</i> , translated by Fath-Ali) |
| Second translator | TT | Not translated |
| | Transliteration And | Not translated |

| | | |
|-------------------|---------------------------|--|
| | Gloss | |
| | Back translation | - |
| Third translator | TT | این قانونی است که به اندیشه برمی گردد، حال نوع اندیشه هرچه باشد. (p.29) |
| | Transliteration and Gloss | in qānooni ast ke be andiše barmygardad [this] [the law][is][that][to][thoughts] [responds] hāl no‘-e andiše har çe bāšad. [no matter] [type of thoughts] [what may be] |
| | Back translation | This is the law that responds to thought, no matter what type of thoughts may be. (<i>Rāz</i> , translated by Qarache) |
| Fourth translator | TT | قانون جاذبه به تفکرات شما پاسخ می دهد. فرقی نمی کند تفکرات شما از چه نوعی باشد. (p.17) |
| | Transliteration and Gloss | qānoone jāzebe be tafakorāt-e šomāpāsox midahad [the law of attraction][to][thoughts] [your] [responds] farqi nemikonad tafakorāt-e šomā az çe no‘ee bāšad [no maater] [thoughts] [your] [whatever] [may be] |
| | Back translation | The law of attraction responds to your thoughts, no matter what they may be. (<i>Rāz</i> , translated by Rahimi) |
| Fifth translator | TT | یادتان باشد که قانون کشش به افکار شما پاسخ می دهد، به هرچه فکر کنید، همان را هم بدست خواهی آورد. (p.15) |
| | Transliteration and Gloss | Yādetān bāšad ke qānoon-e kešeš be afkāre [remember] [that] [the law of attraction][to] [thoughts] šomā pāsox midahad be har çe fekr konid hamān rā [your] [responds] [to] [whatever] [you think] [it][om] bedast xāhi āvard [will achieve you] |
| | Back translation | Remember that the law of attraction responds to your thought, whatever you think you will achieve it. (<i>Rāz</i> , translated by Sabt-Al-Sheikh) |

The St-item ‘the law’ is explicited by exploiting different strategy by five translators.

The forms of explication provided by them are summarized in Table 1 below:

Table 1.1

The forms of explication provided by the different translators in example 1

| <u>Translator</u> | <u>ST-item: The law...</u> | <u>Forms of Explication</u> |
|-------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| T1 | The law of attraction | Elaboration |
| T2 | Left un-translated | Left un-translated |

| | | |
|----|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|
| T3 | The law of attraction | Elaboration |
| T4 | This is the law | Enhancement |
| T5 | Remember that the law of attraction | Elaboration / Enhancement |

As seen from the example given, all the translators, except the second one, made explicit the source text item '*the law*' by employing different forms of explicitation. The first, and the third translators elaborated the source text item '*the law*' by adding a specifying linguistic element '*attraction*', that is, the term '*the law*' in the source text is changed into '*the law of attraction*' in the target text to disambiguate the meaning of '*the law*' which is assumed to be too general. The fifth translator employed the strategy of explicitation through the use of both elaboration and enhancement, that is, by adding a specifying linguistic element '*attraction*' and also by adding the emphatic clause '*remember that,*' which makes explicit the term '*the law*'. Providing the variety of forms of explicitation for a single source text item The fourth translator enhanced the term '*the law*' by adding the emphatic clause '*this is the law*'. is the unique feature of this study that makes it distinctive over the other studies.

The process of translation involves three phases: analysis of the unit of translation, transfer it, and restructuring the concept in TL. In its restructuring phase where translators attempt to explicitate ST-items, the universality of explicitation is arisen. However, the claim about the universality or the idiosyncratic nature of explicitation is rather controversial among translation scholars. While the universality of explicitation is supported in the works of some scholars such as Baker (1993) and Becher (2011)' Blum-Kulka (1986) believes that translator builds a semantic redundancy which is absent in SL text. Pym (2005, 2008) states that such redundancy does not add new information, but only explicitate the implied ones. He concludes that the provided explicitations are the result of translator's attempt to end up with those redundancies.

The logic behind adopting multiple translation corpora (MTCs) is to support the claim about the variations or universality of explicitation (Malmkjaer, 1998). To explore the patterns of explicitation and the range of variations among translators, MTCs has been developed by many scholars such as Castagnoli (2009) and Guo (2011).

Dimitrova (2003, 2005), for example, adopted MTCs to study the strong orientation for translators to add connectives in target texts due to a tendency to increase explicitness. Dimitrova was uncertain about the universality of explicitation, thus, she argued that translators consciously or subconsciously attempt to end up with some redundancies which are governed by factors that can vary across individuals.

Pym's (2005, 2008) studies on explicitation through adopting MTCs have centred on the communicative aspect of explicitation as well as the motivation behind it. Pym's argument, that the translators attempt to end up with some redundancy, is in line with Dimitrova (2003, 2005).

Guo (2011) also adopted MTCs to explore the pattern of explicitation in translation. The superiority of Guo's study over other studies which adopted MTCs is that Guo focuses on three types of explicitation. One of its shortcomings is that, while explicitation is implied from the context or situation, the unit of translation in this study, *chapter titles*, is decontextualized. Thus, Guo's study does not have the advantage of generalizability of the results.

Johansson (2004) carried out a study adopting MTCs to investigate to what extent the translators choose to change ST subjects in their translation, and depending on which factors. In his study, different texts from different genres were to be translated into different target languages. Since in Johansson's study the homogeneity in STs and TL

were not observed, the results may lack the degree of generalizability due to that heterogeneity.

Kamenická (2007) also conducted a multiple translation study on the variety of source texts translated into a target language by two translators. Investigating shifts in explicitations of binary coherence relations on a parallel corpus was the aim of her study. However, the same shortcoming is observed in case of generalizing its results. In this case, although the target language was identical for both translators, the source texts varied across the genre.

The shortcomings of such studies are that almost all of them have investigated individual instances of explicitation at a time. In addition, they did not employ the use of a single source text to be translated by many translators into an identical target language, thus their findings might not be adequate to establish a reliable pattern to locate the observed explicitation somewhere between a cline of idiosyncraticity and universality. Additionally, they lack the advantage of providing more forms of explicitation for each possible source text item.

In short, there are three different views regarding translation universals: first, those who introduced, studied and confirmed translation universals, for example, Baker (1993), by introducing some universals such as explicitation and simplification, Toury (1995) by introducing laws of translation, and Blum-Kulka (1986) by proposing the Explicitation Hypothesis among others. Second, those who took the opposing side, for example, House (2008), who rejected the notion of universality. The third group is made up of scholars who are sceptical about the notion of universality and emphasized the need for more studies on universality which focus on different language pairs and different genres, for example non-literary texts. In this regard, the notion of universality is the subject of some

criticism by scholars such as Tymoczko (1998), Malmkjaer (1998), Pym (2005), Dimitrova (2003, 2005), and Becher (2010, 2011).

Considering the drawbacks in the approaches used in the investigation of explicitation and the need to fill the gap between these controversial views and to retest the theory of translation with respect to translation universals, the present study is an attempt to explore this notion from a different perspective. In this regard, the present study, which relies on an integrated and modified model as well as a special multiple translation corpora, aims to explore the different forms and elements of explicitation which might be employed in five translations of an English text into Persian, and to investigate whether explicitation is a universal phenomenon or an individual strategy.

1.2 Objectives of the Study

Taking into account the aims previously stated, the objectives of the present study are:

- i. to identify and explain elements of explicitation in five Persian translations of an English text titled "*The Secret*",
- ii. to identify and explain forms of explicitation in five Persian translations of an English text,
- iii. to classify the explicitated incidents in order to identify the strategies applied by the translators, and
- iv. to establish, on the basis of the data gathered, a profile to determine whether explicitation is an idiosyncratic feature or a universal or strongly preferred strategy by the translators involved.

1.3 Research Questions

Based on the objectives above, the following research questions are proposed:

- i. What elements of explicitation are used in non-literary translation from English into Persian?
- ii. What forms of explicitation are used in non-literary translation from English into Persian?
- iii. What strategies of explicitation are applied by each translator?
- iv. To what extent is explicitation a universal or an individual phenomenon with respect to the ratio of translators who adopted it?

1.4 Scope of the Study

Although the explicitation hypothesis as developed by Blum-Kulka (1986) is formulated based on the existence of text cohesive markers in the translation process, other forms of explicitation have also been identified, for example, the addition of modifiers and qualifiers (Vanderauwera, 1985), the addition of lexical specification (Perego, 2003), the replacement of nominalization with verb phrase (Puurinen, 2003), the addition of explanatory markers (Baker, 1992; Pápai, 2004), the reiteration of lexical items (Øverås, 1998; Pápai, 2004).

Some scholars such as Blum-Kulka (1986), Séguinot (1988), and Øverås (1998) viewed explicitation as a universal phenomenon independent of linguistic differences which might exist between two languages. This view is adopted in the present study, thus, syntactic changes due to obligatory explicating shifts are excluded; in addition to syntactic changes, shifts which occur due to stylistic differences between the two languages along with cohesive markers are also not dealt with in the present study because of the following reasons. Firstly, syntactic alterations are language bound; the shift is not

the result of a choice on the part of the translator because there is no choice to be made. In other words, syntactic alterations do not manifest the types of underlying strategies intended by the translator's interpretation of the source text. Second, the concept of style, and hence the term 'stylistic' is ambiguous and lends itself to a great many interpretations; yet the components of multiple translation corpora are made up of short indirect quotations from different individuals. Therefore, exploring the stylistic features is almost impossible due to the nature of the data sources. Third, the explicitation hypothesis is formulated based on the existence of cohesive markers in the process of translation; therefore, use of cohesive markers has been extensively studied. In addition, since data sources are compiled of short quotations ranging from a sentence to a paragraph, cohesive markers which demands longer text is not dealt with in the present study. Fourth, the term explicitation covers a wide range of probable syntactic and semantic changes existed between the two languages paired. Tracing all strategies of explicitation that might be employed to explicitate such changes is not easy for practical reason.

In order to identify different possible explicitation patterns which present themselves in the form of linguistic features, the present study favours House (2004) Functional Model. In this model, House (2004), relying on Halliday's (1994) systemic functional linguistics, distinguishes three levels of language meta-functions i.e. ideational, interpersonal and textual levels; she shows that translation universals might be located at these three levels functioning as elaboration, extension, and enhancement. In this study, with the aid of this model, only those types of shifts containing the addition of certain incidents of explicitation such as *lexical specification*, *offer an alternative*, and other incidents of explicitation are to be dealt with.

1.5 Significance of the Study

This research is a contribution to the examination and/or to the empirical research on translation universals, that is a subject matter that has been attracting the attention of a growing number of scholars in the field of Translation Studies in recent years. However, a number of problems and questions have emerged. Different conceptions and ideas relating to the nature of translation universals have been put forth. Questions regarding the methodology and the text types utilized have also been expressed. This necessitates further observational/empirical investigations to push the field of study forward.

Explicitation as one of the assumed universals of translation has been investigated from different perspectives first through parallel corpora comparing the source text with its corresponding translations (Øverås, 1998; Garcia, 2009), and later through comparable corpora, comparing translations with non-translations in the same language (Olohan & Baker, 2000; Olohan, 2001). Despite the fact that investigating the nature of explicitation through analysis of data consisting of several target texts for each source text item is more valuable and reliable, in fact, very few attempts have been made to carry out such investigation.

The present study which investigates the notion of explicitation through a special parallel corpus (involving multiple translators) is believed to be significant because of the following reasons:

The traditional approaches for investigating the notion of explicitation manifest significant methodological shortcomings. A parallel corpus, for example, allows the researchers to observe the source text patterns along with the explanations behind their occurrence. Although the source text as an essential component is included in parallel corpora, providing only one form of explicitation for each source text pattern as stressed

by scholars such as Malmkjaer (1998), and Baker (2000), however, is considered as their shortcoming.

In contrast to parallel corpora, although the source texts are excluded in comparable corpora, they make visible the patterns which are specific to translated texts. Assuming that the translated and non-translated texts are fully comparable, and focusing on the comparison between translated and non-translated text, this allows researcher to observe translation patterns without any explanations.

Since the aim of corpus-based translation studies is not just observing patterns, but providing an explanations for them, the inclusion of parallel corpora is essential, especially if it is supported by the analysis of several target texts for a single source text (as suggested by Laviosa, 1998; and Malmkjaer, 1998). It seems that each approach has its own limitations if taken in isolation, these limitations, however, can be overcome by integrating the two approaches.

Multiple translation corpora which is adopted for the current study represent a special kind of parallel corpora aimed to provide a more reliable forms of explicitation for each source text item. This approach not only allows the researcher to observe the translation patterns as well as explanation for them, but also provides the variety of forms of explicitation for a single source text item. Multiple translation corpora also provides data for the claim about the variability or universality of a translation pattern with respect to the ratio of translators adopted it. The insight which is offered only by multiple translation corpora is not available with the other two methodologies, also providing a variety of forms of explicitation for a single source text item is the unique feature of this study that makes it distinctive over the other studies.

In short, among the many factors that motivated the carrying out of the present study are: (a) the need to retest the theory of translation relating to translation universals, (b) the lack of consensus among scholars about the notion of universality in translation, (c) the shortcomings of current approaches used in investigating the notion of translation universals, and (d) the limited number of studies on non-literary corpus to investigate the phenomenon of translation universals.

Having the above in mind, the present study is believed to be significant due to the fact that it attempts to:

- a) introduce a modified and developed multiple translation corpora (MTCs) by including five translated versions of a single ST,
- b) overcome a few mentioned drawbacks of the current approaches i.e. parallel, comparable, and multiple translation corpora.

1.6 Definition of Key Terms

A brief and tentative definition of the key terms is provided as follows:

Translation: House (2009) believes that translation is a secondary communication. It has its own limitation and enabling function; and it is defined as “a process of replacing a text in one language by an equivalent text in another. The three basic features of translation are: text, equivalence, and processes” (House, 2009, p. 13).

Explicitation: “a stylistic translation technique which consists of making explicit in the target language (TL) what remains implicit in the source language (SL) because it is apparent from either the context or the situation” (Vinay and Darbelnet, 1995, p. 342).

Explicitation is also defined as a technique that is used by translators to make explicit in the target text the information that is left implicit in the source text (Baker, 2001). By employing this strategy the ultimate aim of translators is to provide a more comprehensible text for target language readers. This attempt may be conscious or subconscious (Baker, 2001).

Optional explicitations: those explicitations which are manifested because of stylistic preferences alongside the differences in text-building strategies between paired languages. They are necessary if one is to create a coherent and unified target language text. If the differences between languages in question are of discourse conventions, textual additions seem to be required. However, if the differences between source and target language are due to readers' background knowledge, then pragmatic additions are needed (Baker and Saldanha, 2009, pp. 208-10).

Corpus: any collection of running texts held in electronic form and analysable automatically rather than manually (Baker 2001, p. 50). Laviosa (2002), meanwhile, defines corpus as a collection of texts that are assumed as the representative of a given language used for linguistic analysis.

Parallel corpus: a corpus which consists of texts which are originally written in a language 'A' alongside their translations into a language 'B'. There are many different forms of parallel corpora. They may be multilingual or bilingual; they may consist of unidirectional, bidirectional or multidirectional translations (Baker, 2001, p. 51).

Comparable corpus: a corpus which consists of a collection of texts originally written in a language, for example, English, alongside a collection of texts translated (from one or more languages) into English. Features revealed through comparable corpus cannot be traced back to the influence of any one particular source text or language (Baker, 2001, p. 51).

Multiple translation corpus: a special kind of parallel corpus in which several translations into the same target language are available for each source text.

1.7 Organization of the Study

This study is organized as follows:

Chapter Two reviews the related literature. It deals with the definition of explicitation and the motivation behind it. The main tenets of explicitation, such as Blum-Kulka's explicitation hypotheses, are discussed in this chapter. Toury's coupled-pairs model and House's functional model are also dealt with in Chapter Two. A number of studies conducted using parallel as well as comparable corpora for investigating explicitation are also presented.

In Chapter Three, Descriptive Translation Studies (DTS), which forms the basis of the theoretical framework of this study, is introduced. The methodology for carrying out the research is discussed and the data sources are presented. This is followed by an explanation on the research tools and procedures for the data collection. Methods of the data analysis are also discussed in this chapter.

In Chapter Four, the data gathered will be classified by using House's (2004) functional model. The data will also be analysed and the findings will be presented.

Chapter Five is devoted to the discussion of findings. In this chapter the findings will be discussed with regard to the objectives of the study. It is hoped that through a discussion of findings, sufficient evidence could be provided for responding to the research questions set out in Chapter One.

In Chapter Six, the summary and, conclusion will be presented. Suggestions for further research will also be provided.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.0 Introduction

In this chapter, previous studies that have dealt with explicitation will be introduced. Their findings and their contribution to the present study along with the motivations behind the adopted approach, i.e., multiple translation corpora (MTCs) will also be discussed. Blum-Kulka's (1986) explicitation hypothesis, from which the majority of studies aiming at investigating explicitation departs, will be presented in detail. To compare source and target texts, Toury's (1995) coupled-pairs model will be discussed. For extracting probable incidents of explicitation and also for categorizing the extracted data, a description of House's (2004) functional model is also provided.

2.1 Translation Universals

Within the recent developments in translation studies, the phenomenon of translation is recognized by specific features which 'typically occur in translated text' rather than original utterance and as Baker (1993) suggests are not the result of interference from specific language systems. They could possibly be the result of sociocultural and cognitive rather than linguistic constraints, inherent in the process of translation; features which are called by Baker as "universal features of translation" or "translation universals" (Baker, 1993, p. 243). Baker defines universals as "linguistic features which typically occur in translated rather than original texts and are thought to be independent of the influence of the specific language pairs involved in the process of translation" (1993, p. 243).

In an attempt to describe features of translation, Toury (1975) states that translation universals are dominated by probabilistic regularities in translation. He therefore prefers the term 'laws of translation', and puts forth his two well-known laws of translation, i.e. 'laws of growing standardization', and 'laws of interference'.

Chesterman (2000, 2004), believes that scholars through the descriptive approach attempt to generalize the general regularities or laws of translation. He explains that the abstract notion about universals are operationalized through the comparative model of translation. He also stresses that general descriptive assumptions on the similarities between different types of translation are provided regardless of their differences and/or uniqueness. Chesterman distinguishes between S-universals, which refer to "universal differences between translations and their source texts" and T-universals, which refer to "universal differences between translations and comparable non-translated texts" (Chesterman, 2004, p. 39). He concludes that any claim about the T-universal can only be an approximate, and generalizing the universal features of translation based on the interpretation of data from some texts and combined texts probably would be misleading.

Munday (2014) points out that an important and a more general question is how universal such features really are. He further states that the term universal is now normally not taken to mean a feature that exists in all circumstances but one that is strongly a characteristic of many.

The concept of universals has been the subject of criticism. Tymoczko (1998), for example, states that exploring the laws of translation is dominated by traditional, empirical studies, whereas the claim based on which has been questioned because of the superiority of explorations of subjectivity over the scientific objectivity in social science.

The assumptions based on which translation universals are studied is that translation as a communicative event is apparently distinct from producing a common text because of the factor of time, social, cognitive, linguistic and cultural constraints, and since language is affected by the context under which is used, and presumably the process of translation is not affected by the languages involved, it is expected to observe its traces in the language that is produced by the translator (Baker, 1996).

2.1.1 Universals vs. Laws

Among the scholars who investigated the regularities of TTs, Toury (1995) was the first who suggested the general laws of translation as an alternative term for translation universal. The logic behind presenting the term 'laws' instead of 'universal' was that Toury believed in the case of an "exception" it would be possible to explain that "exception" by the use of a law and/or adding another law. Following Toury (1995), other scholars suggested different terms, for example, Laviosa (1998) used the term "core pattern", "tendencies" or "regularities", and Blum-Kulka (1986) provided the term "hypothesis". However, there were scholars such as Tymoczko (1998) who stated that the claim of universality needs to be revisited for the following reasons: first, there is not a widespread definition of the notion to be accepted among the scholars, and second, it is not possible to study the whole languages across the world to prove such claim.

The claim about the existence of regularities in translation is rather controversial among translation scholars. Similarly, such views justify more investigations to dig deeper the claim of universality.

Scholars such as Blum-Kulka (1986), Baker (1993), and Toury (1995), however, have carried out studies in support of the claim of translation regularities. Among the

different perspectives on translation regularities, explicitation as a typical incident of translation has received much attention and has been studied by scholars more than the other proposed universals. Although many studies have been carried out to investigate the notion of explicitation, it seems that there is no unanimous agreement on the definition of the term explicitation among the scholars in the field.

Kamincka (2007) states the following:

discussion of Blum-Kulka's explicitation hypothesis is essential for any discussion of definitions of explicitation especially because it has become a strategy for a number of authors writing on the translation universal to avoid any strict definition of explicitation by referring to Blum-Kulka's statement, concerning cohesive explicitation only, and then extending their discussion to explicitation in general (pp. 46-47).

The following is a discussion of Blum-Kulka's hypothesis before other different views on the definition of explicitation is provided.

2.1.2 Translation and the Concept of Norms

Translation is among the activities that entails at least two languages, two cultures and two traditions; therefore, it inevitably engages two systems and norms that encompass them. Thus, its values may include two major elements:

- (1) being a text in a certain language, and hence occupying a position, or filling in a slot, in the appropriate culture, or in a certain section thereof;
- (2) constituting a representation in that language/culture of another, pre-existing text in some other language, belonging to some other culture and occupying a definite position within it (Toury 1995, p. 63).

The above requirements are derived from two different sources, thought to be distant from each other. Within a culture-system, the translation behavior tends to manifest a particular regularities, and if, for whatever reason, deviates from it, the members of that