



# Explicitation of implicit logical links in Persian-English translation

*Sasan Baleghizadeh*  
Shahid Beheshti University, G. C.  
[sasanbaleghizadeh@yahoo.com](mailto:sasanbaleghizadeh@yahoo.com)

*Ahmad Sharifi*  
Shahid Beheshti University, G. C.  
[sharifi\\_translator@yahoo.com](mailto:sharifi_translator@yahoo.com)

**Abstract.** This research concentrates on a specific type of explication; namely, explication of implicit logical links between sentences and clauses in Persian-English translation, its effects on the cohesion of the target text (TT), and the underlying reasons behind its occurrence. For the purposes of this research, 'Introductory' and two other chapters from Sadi's *Gulistan* translated by Edward Rehatsek (1964) were yielded to scrutiny for any occurrence of explication of implicit logical links. Then the cases of explication were examined and analysed in terms of their effects on the cohesion of the TT and the possible reasons behind their occurrence. The model followed in this research for the analysis of cohesion was Halliday and Hasan's (1976).

Two types of phenomena were observed in the corpus of the study as regards the explication of implicit logical links. Firstly, different junctives are used within the structure of the TT sentences to explicate different types of logical relations between ST sentences and clauses (eighty-seven cases). They contribute to the intelligibility and naturalness of the text in the TL. Secondly, cohesive ties are added between TT sentences and clauses explicit (fifteen cases). They connect two sentences and create texture in the TL. All in all, differences in structures as well as text-building strategies between the two languages and the translator's endeavour to make the text cooperative and acceptable in the TL by providing more communicative clues and using natural cohesive patterns of the TL were found to be the potential causes behind the explication of implicit logical relations between sentences and clauses.

**Keywords:** translation, explication, implicit logical links, cohesion

## 1. Introduction

Explicitation is a translation feature which has received a lot of attention in studies of translation. It seems to have been first introduced by Vinay and Darbelnet (1958) who defined it as "the method of introducing into the TL clarifications/details which are implicit in the SL, but which become clear from the context or the situation" (p.9, translated from French by Dimitrova, 2005, p.34). One specific type of explication which has been observed in several studies is the explication related to the shifts of cohesion through translation. The first systematic study in this regard is associated with Blum-Kulka's (1986) work. Blum-Kulka takes a discursal and communicative approach to the study of translation and argues that the process of translation necessarily entails shifts both in textual and discursal relationships. She points out that these shifts occur on two levels, i.e. cohesion and coherence. On the level of cohesion, shifts in types of cohesive markers used in translation seem to affect translations in terms of level of explicitness and text meaning. Shifts in the levels of explicitness are partly related to grammatical differences between languages and differences in stylistic preferences for types of cohesive markers and partly related to the process of translation. Based on the latter part, i.e. the process of translation, Blum-Kulka formulates "the explication hypothesis," which postulates "an observed

cohesive explicitness from ST to TT regardless of the increase traceable to differences between the two linguistic and textual systems involved” (p.300).

Among the explicitations that occur through shifts of cohesion in translation is the explicit expression in the TT of logical links that are implicit in the ST. As there are few studies regarding this type of explicitation in Persian-English translation, the present research is an attempt to study this type of explicitation in this language pair, its effects on the cohesion of the TT, and the possible reasons behind its occurrence.

## 2. Literature review

The explicitation of implicit logical links between clauses and sentences has been touched upon in several studies. Van Leuven-Zwart (1990) notes that the “addition, deletion or replacement of function words may cause a shift with respect to the degree of explicitness through which cohesion is achieved” (p.81). Chesterman (1997) considers cohesion change as one of the syntactic strategies which “affects intra-textual reference, ellipsis, substitution, pronominalisation and repetition, or the use of connectors of various kinds” (p.98). He also lists the strategy of explicitness change among the pragmatic strategies as something which involves explicitation and implicitation.

Levy (1965) finds that a translator tends to explain the implicit logical relation between ideas to “explain away any breaks in thought or changes in perspective, to normalise the expression” (p.79), and suggests that this is due to the translator's effort to make the foreign text intelligible to the readers. Sidiropoulou (1995) finds an overall tendency for explicating implicit cause-effect relationships in the translation of newspaper texts from English into Greek. Shlesinger's (1989; 1995) study suggests that the explicitation hypothesis may apply to oral as well as written translations. She finds shifts of cohesion in simultaneous interpreting, both from English into Hebrew and from Hebrew into English which suggests that the interpreter tends to render implicit forms more explicitly, regardless of the languages concerned.

Some studies attribute the increased level of cohesive explicitness in the TTs to the function and manifestation of translation norms. Øveras (1998) examines explicating and implicitating shifts in a corpus of English-Norwegian and Norwegian-English translations of fiction and finds an increased level of cohesive explicitness and a stronger tendency towards explicitation than implicitation in both directions of translation. She also observes that there are more explicitations, as well as implicitations, in translations from English into Norwegian than in the other direction. Øveras discusses her results in terms of translation norms and argues that an increased level of cohesive explicitness may be one of the features characterising “the third code” (Frawley, 1984, p.168): translations as a sub-code of each of the linguistic codes involved.

Weissbrod (1992) investigates explicitation in fiction translated from English into Hebrew. He points to the parallel existence of competing norms, arguing that explicitation, its absence, or even implicitation, result from an interaction between several factors:

The universal tendency to accompany translation by explicitation, the position of the languages involved in the act of translation on an orality/literacy scale, and the translational norms operating in a certain section of a given culture at a given time (Weissbrod, 1992, p.168).

According to Weissbrod, these norms may encourage the tendency to explicitate or, on the contrary, undermine and even overpower it. Such an approach to the question of explicitation makes it possible to explain why the intensity and manner of explicitation vary greatly in translations that were produced in different literary systems or at different times.

Dimitrova (2005) looks at how persons with different amounts of experience in translation handle various types of implicit logical links in the translation process from Russian into Swedish and what TT solutions result from this. On the basis of her observations, she suggests two different kinds of explicitation, occurring for different reasons in the process: norm-governed explicitations and strategic explicitations. Dimitrova notes that certain kinds of explicitation occur with such a frequency and regularity that they can be claimed to be norm-governed. In her study, this type was found to be the case for the explicitation of certain implicit additive coordinative links within the sentence and for implicit contrasts between sentences. The norm-governed nature of the explicitation of additive links was evidenced not only by their frequency in the professional translators' TTs and in those produced by students, but also by the process leading to the explicitation, which was characterised mainly by non-problematic processing. For contrastive links between sentences, explicitation was found to be norm-governed only in the professional translator's TTs in the same way as the explicitation of additive links. In the student data, however, either this type of explicitation was not found at all in any version of the TT or the tentative TT segments, or it appeared late in the process, being characterized by uncertainty and problematic decision-making. According to Dimitrova, strategic explicitations occur when the translating individual reformulates a tentative TT solution in the TL to solve a problem, and in this process, various types of explicitation may arise. The examples of strategic explicitations and the analysis of problem representations in revising in Dimitrova's study suggest that "when translators evaluate a tentative TT solution negatively, they tend to resort in the first place to reformulation in the TL, rather than engaging in renewed processing of the corresponding ST chunk and subsequent renewed transfer into the TL" (p.237).

Explicitation indeed touches on many of the core questions of translation. It has been even claimed to be a universal characteristic of translation. The examination of explicitation in a specific language pair not only raises our awareness and understanding of the very nature of translation process and product, but also contributes to the translation theory by enabling us to explain and predict a phenomenon in translation. Taking this into account, the present research is intended to answer the following questions:

1. Are there explicitations of implicit logical links in Persian-English translation?
2. If the answer to question 1 is positive, how do the explicitations affect the cohesion of the translated text?
3. If the answer to question 1 is positive, what are the possible reasons underlying the explicitations?

### **3. Method**

#### **3.1 Corpus of the Study**

The text under investigation in this study was 'Introductory' and two other chapters from Sadi's *Gulistan*, namely 'On the advantages of silence' and 'On the effects of education' translated by Edward Rehatsek (1964).

### 3.2 Procedure

The cases of explicitation of implicit logical links were first identified in the corpus of the study. Then the textual instances of explicitation were analysed in terms of their effects on the cohesion of the translated text and the possible reasons underlying their occurrence.

### 3.3 Theoretical Framework

Cohesion in this study was analysed according to the model proposed by Halliday and Hasan (1976). In this model, cohesion is defined as a semantic relationship between two elements in a text, whereby one element is interpreted with reference to the other. Cohesive ties are the different devices that link a sentence to what has been mentioned before in the text. Cohesion as such does not have anything to do with sentence boundaries, but operates also within the sentence. However, it is more commonly studied at text level due to the fact that “cohesive ties between sentences stand out more clearly because they are the ONLY source of texture, whereas in the sentence there are the structural relations as well” (Halliday & Hasan, 1976, p.9).

The present research is mainly concerned with what Halliday and Hasan call conjunction. This, which is not identical with the grammatical term conjunction, is a specification of how what follows is systematically connected by certain elementary logical relations to what precedes in the text. Halliday and Hasan include four relations: additive, adversative, causal and temporal (p.238). The additive relation annexes information to the propositional content of the preceding sentence. The adversative relation means that the information to be expressed is contrary to the previous one. The causal relation conveys that some information or event is the result of the condition prior to it. Finally, the temporal relation expresses a subsequent occurrence.

## 4. Data Analysis

Data analysis revealed the occurrence of two types of phenomena, which involve explicit expression in the translation of implicit logical relations between ST sentences and clauses. Firstly, in eighty-seven cases, different types of logical relations between ST sentences and clauses including additive, adversative, causal and temporal are made explicit in the linguistic surface of the translation by using TL explicit naturalistic junctive expressions. As these junctives are used within the structure of the TT sentences, they do not form texture. However, they serve other important functions. In some cases, they are used to make the text easier to understand where the logical relations between ST sentences and clauses are left to be inferred by the reader or to make the text natural in the TL where these relations are expressed through implicit means not compatible with the grammar and/or norms of the TL (e.g. pattern of intonation, the use of the conjunction *و* (and) instead of more explicit junctives, etc.). And in some other cases, they are employed to make the text structurally and textually natural in the TL by sticking to the grammar and text-building strategies of the TL.

Secondly, in 15 cases, the logical relations between ST sentences and clauses including additive, adversative and causal are explicitated using cohesive ties in the TT. In other words, junctives are used as cohesive devices to signal the coherence relations between two sentences in the TT. This not only helps the readers to easily discover the relations between sentences but also in some cases adopts the text to the text-building strategies of the TL.

The table below indicates the frequency of the explicitations identified in the corpus of the study according to the type of relation explicitated.

| Type of Relation Explicitated | Intersentential | Intrasentential | Total |
|-------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-------|
| Additive                      | 4               | 25              | 29    |
| Adversative                   | 4               | 36              | 40    |
| Causal                        | 7               | 13              | 20    |
| Temporal                      | 0               | 13              | 13    |
| Total                         | 15              | 87              | 102   |

In order to analyse the types of explicitations observed in this study, the instances resulting in the addition or modification of junctives within the TT sentences are called intrasentential, and those leading to the addition of junctives between sentences are referred to as intersentential. In what follows, these explicitations are described and explained followed by examples extracted from the corpus of the study.

### 5. Intrasentential explicitations

In thirty cases, the conjunction *و* (and) in the ST is rendered by more explicit junctives including 'but', 'whilst', 'whereas', 'because', 'so that', 'when', and 'after' to signal adversative, causal and temporal relations between two states or events. Among these junctives, 'but' is of the highest frequency (nineteen cases). The translation of *و* by more explicit junctives might serve different purposes. In the following example, 'but' and 'whilst' are used not only to give a dynamism and variety to the use of junctives in the text, but also signal adversative relation between two states, thereby making the text natural and intelligible to the target readers:

ادیب خدمت کرد و متقبل شد و سالی چند بر او سعی کرد و به جایی نرسید و پسران ادیب در فضل و بلاغت منتهی شدند.

He kept the prince for some years and strove to instruct him **but** could effect nothing, **whilst** the sons of the tutor made the greatest progress in accomplishments and eloquence. (p.573)

In the example below, 'after' is used to show the temporal relation between two events. Moreover, the overuse of 'and' is not considered natural in the TT:

در تصانیف حکما آورده اند که کژدم را ولادت معهود نیست چنانکه دیگر حیوانات را بل احشای مادر را بخورند و شکمش را بدرند و راه صحرا گیرند ...

It is narrated in the compositions of philosophers that scorpions are not born in the same manner like other living beings but that they devour the bowels of their mother and, **after** gnawing through the belly, betake themselves to the desert. (p.579)

The bold 'but' in the second line of the following couplet signals the adversative relation between two states, thereby making the poem lines coherent for the TL readers:

گل همین پنج روز و شش باشد      وین گلستان  
همیشه خوش باشد

A flower endures but five or six days  
**But** this rose-garden is always delightful. (p.85)

In forty-seven cases, a junctive is added to the structure of TT sentences to signal different relations between two SL sentences, clauses, etc. The addition of junctives is due to the structural differences between the two languages, the differences in text-building strategies between the two languages, and the translator's attempt to make the text intelligible and natural in the TL. The following is an example of explicitation due to the differences in structural and text-building differences between the two languages:

یکی از شعرا پیش امیر دزدان رفت و ثنایی برو  
بگفت. فرمود تا جامه ازو برکنند و از ده بدر  
کنند. مسکین برهنه به سرما همی رفت، سگان در  
قفای وی افتادند. خواست تا سنگی بردارد و سگان  
را دفع کند، در زمین یخ گرفته بود. عاجز شد گفت  
این چه حرامزاده مردمانند، سگ را گشاده اند و  
سنگ را بسته. امیر از غرغه بدید و بشنید و  
بخندید. گفت ای حکیم از من چیزی بخواه، ...

A poet went to an amir of robbers and recited a panegyric **but** he ordered him to be divested of his robe. **As** the poor man was departing naked in the world, he was attacked from behind by dogs, **whereon** he intended to snatch up a stone **but** it was frozen to the ground **and**, being unable to do so, he exclaimed: "What whore-sons of men are these? They have let loose the dogs and have tied down the stones." The amir of the robbers who heard these words from his room laughed **and** said: "O philosopher, ask something from me." (p.449)

As can be seen in the above piece of story, 'but', 'as', 'whereon' and 'and' are added to the translation to indicate the adversative, temporal, causal and additive relations between two sentences or clauses, respectively. Without the application of these junctives, the text seems unnatural and unintelligible as a whole (cf. Klaudy, 1998, p.82). Indeed languages differ in their textual patterns. Such differences in terms of degree of cohesive explicitness are quite often referred to in studies on explicitation in translation. Hinds (1987) suggests that languages differ in where they place the responsibility for effective communication and how a text will be understood and interpreted – with the writer or with the reader. In languages characterised by writer responsibility, the writer is expected to provide explicit markers of cohesion through what Hinds terms transition statements. English is, according to Hinds, a writer responsibility language. In this study, it seems that the logical relations between sentences and clauses in the original text are left to be inferred by the reader. However, the translator has directed the text towards the communicative needs of the target audience and the norms of the TL.

## 6. Intersentential explicitations

In fifteen cases, the coherence relation between two sentences or clauses in the ST is made explicit using a cohesive tie in the TT. In other words, the translator has used different junctives to create texture or to strengthen the cohesive link between two sentences in the TT. In the following example, 'also' is added to the translation in the sense that there is yet another point to be taken in conjunction with the previous one. Thus, it can be considered a cohesive tie which signifies the additive relation:

درختان را به خلعت نوروزی قباى سبز ورق در بر  
گرفته و اطفال شاخ را به قدوم موسم ربیع کلاه  
شکوفه بر سر نهاده. عصاره نالی به قدرت او شهد  
فایق شده و تخم خرمایی به تربیتش نخل باسق  
گشته.

...the trees donned the new year's robe and clothed their breast with the garment of green foliage, whilst their offspring, the branches, adorned their heads with blossoms at the approach of the season of the roses. **Also** the juice of the cane became delicious honey by his power, and the date a lofty tree by his care. (p.71)

In the example below, 'but' is used in the translation to show the unexpectedness of the second event. It is a cohesive tie which shows the adversative relation between the two states:

توانگرزاده ای را دیدم بر سر گور پدر نشسته و با  
بچه ای مناظره در پیوسته که صندوق تربت ما درویش  
سنگین است و کتابه رنگین و فرش رخام انداخته و  
خشت پیروزه در او به کار برده به گور پدرت چه  
ماند خشتی دو فراهم آورده و مشتی دو خاک بر آن  
پاشیده.

I noticed the son of a rich man, sitting on the grave of his father and quarrelling with a dervish-boy, saying: "The sarcophagus of my father's tomb is of stone and its epitaph is elegant. The pavement is of marble, tessellated with turquoise-like bricks. **But** what resembles thy father's grave? It consists of two contiguous bricks with two handfuls of mud thrown over it." (p.601)

The following is an example of the explicitation of causal relation. 'Accordingly' is used as a cohesive tie to signal the result of an event:

باری پسر از بی طاقتی شکایت پیش پدر برد و جامه  
از تن دردمند بر داشت. پدر را دل به هم بر آمد.  
استاد را گفت که پسران آحاد رعیت را چندین جفا  
و توبیخ روا نمیداری که فرزند مرا سبب چیست؟

The boy, who could no longer bear this violence, went to his father to complain and when he had taken off his coat, the father's heart was moved with pity. **Accordingly** he called for the tutor and said: "Thou dost not permit thyself to indulge in so much cruelty towards the children of my subjects as thou inflictest upon my son. What is the reason?" (p.561)

As can be seen in the examples, here conjunctives are used as cohesive devices to make the coherence relations between two states or events explicit in the TT. In fact, the presence of cohesive devices in the text facilitates the task of recognising its coherence and increases its readability, intelligibility and fluency. On the other hand, in the literature on explicitation, clause initial addition of connective elements to strengthen cohesive links are given as an example of optional explicitations which are caused by the differences in text-building strategies between the two languages involved in translation (see Klaudy, 1998, p.82). They are optional, because grammatically correct but clumsy and unnatural sentences can be constructed without their application in the TL. However, it is difficult to distinguish optional explicitations of this kind from those resulting from the translator's communicative behaviour or to determine the higher degree of cohesive explicitness of English than Persian without doing a large-scale contrastive study of the cohesive patterns in Persian and English.

## 7. Conclusion

In this study, it was found that different types of implicit logical relations between ST sentences and clauses have been made explicit in the TT using explicit naturalistic junctive expressions. Although most of the junctives are used in the structure of the TL sentences, i.e. they do not connect two TL sentences, they signal important semantic relations, and contribute to the naturalness and intelligibility of the text in the TL. In fact, the translator has considered the norms of the TL and the communicative needs of his communicative partners, and attempted to reproduce the conceptual structure of the ST using the natural cohesive patterns of the TL.

As for the cause of explicitations in this study, it follows that differences in structures as well as text-building strategies between the two languages, the translator's tendency to cooperate with the readers by providing more communicative clues, and his effort to make the text natural, readable, cohesive and coherent in its receptive situation are the potential causes behind the explicitation of implicit logical relations between sentences and clauses.

As explicitation in this study is regular in the translator's behaviour, it can be said to be norm-governed. If norm-governed, it seems to be more compatible with the initial norm of acceptability, in Toury's (1980, 1995) terms, than with adequacy, since explicitation is directed towards the norms of the TL. In Chesterman's (1997) terms, it can be assumed that explicitation should be seen as an instance of the implementation of the communication norm, being a feature which (according to the translator) will optimise communication.

Whether it is the translator's process of interpretation or grammatical and textual differences between the languages which causes explicitation (see Blum-Kulka, 1986), it was discovered in this study that explicitation is totally reader-receiver-oriented. In other words, the translator has used the strategy of explicitation to put the original text in the communicative and normative matrix of the TL. Only contrastive studies of cohesion in English and Persian can help us distinguish exactly between explicitations resulting from the linguistic or normative differences and those pertaining to the translation process and the universal feature of all translational activity.



## References

- Blum-Kulka, S. (1986). Shifts of cohesion and coherence in translation. In Venuti, L. (Ed.), *The translation studies reader*, (pp. 298–314). London and New York: Routledge.
- Chesterman, A. (1997). *The memes of translation. The spread of ideas in translation theory*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Dimitrova, B. (2005). *Expertise and explicitation in the translation process*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Frawley, W. (1984). Prolegomenon to a theory of translation. In Venuti, L. (Ed.), *The translation studies reader*, (pp. 250–63). London and New York: Routledge.
- Haliday, M. & Hasan R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.
- Hinds, J. (1987). Reader versus writer responsibility: A new typology. In Connor, U., & Kaplan, R.B. (Eds.), *Writing across languages: Analysis of L2 text*, (pp. 141–152). Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley.
- Klaudy, K. (1998). Explicitation. In Baker, M. (Ed.), *Routledge encyclopaedia of translation studies*, (pp. 80–5). London: Routledge.
- Leuven-Zwart, K. (1989, 1990). Translation and original: similarities and dissimilarities I, II. *Target*, 1(2), 151–181; 2(1), 69–95.
- Levý, J. (1965). Will translation theory be of use to translators? In Italiaander, R. (Ed.), *Übersetzen. Vorträge und Beiträge vom Internationalen Kongress literarischer Übersetzer in Hamburg 1965*, (pp. 77–82). Frankfurt-am-Main: Athenäum.
- Øverås, L. (1998). In search of the third code: An investigation of norms in literary translation. *Meta*, 43(4), 571–588.
- Rehatsek, E. (1964). *The Gulistan or Rose Garden of Sa'di*. London: George Allen & Unwin LTD.
- Sadi, M. (2004). *Gulistan and Buustan* (E. Rehatsek & G. Wickers, Trans.). Tehran: Hermes.
- Shlesinger, M. (1989). *Simultaneous interpretation as a factor in effecting shifts in the position of texts on the oral-literate continuum*. Unpublished MA Thesis, Tel Aviv: Tel Aviv University.
- Shlesinger, M. (1995). Shifts in cohesion in simultaneous interpreting. *The translator*, 1(2), 193–214.
- Sidiropoulou, M. (1995). Causal shifts in news reporting: English vs Greek press. *Perspectives: studies in translatology*, 3(1), 83–98.
- Toury, G. (1980). *In search of a theory of translation*. Tel Aviv: Tel Aviv University, The Porter Institute for Poetics and Semiotics.
- Toury, G. (1995). The nature and role of norms in literary translation. In Venuti, L. (Ed.), *The translation studies reader*, (pp. 198–211). London and New York: Routledge.
- Vinay, J.P., & Darbelnet, J. (1958/1977). *Stylistique comparée du français et de l'anglais*. Montréal, Québec: Beauchemin.
- Weissbrod, R. (1992). Explicitation in translations of prose-fiction from English to Hebrew as a function of norms. *Multilingua*, 11(2), 153–171.