Explicitation profile and translator style

RENATA KAMENICKÁ

Masaryk University, Brno, Czech Republic

Abstract. *The empirical study presented in this paper is an attempt to link two important concepts that have emerged—not exclusively, but predominantly—within the descriptive approach to studying translation and thanks to the use of translation corpora: explicitation and translator style. We present the aims, methods and results of a pilot study for a dissertation exploring how explicitation contributes to translator's style in literary prose, within the context of the design of the whole dissertation project.*

Introduction

Since emerging as one of the first potential translation universals toward the end of the 1980s, explicitation has continued to haunt Translation Studies as an elusive and yet almost omnipresent concept. It appears to occupy a position at a cross-section of approaches to studying translations: approaches studying the general and the individual in translations, approaches studying translation as a process and as a product, and approaches studying the cognitive and sociocultural aspects of translation—and linked to concepts important to Translation Studies such as norms, potential translation universals, and style in/of translation. As such, explicitation needs to be addressed by systematic description covering all levels of textual functioning, from the linguistic to the level of literary discourse and cultural exchange. The study thus presents an opportunity to demonstrate that even within contemporary Translation Studies, using a linguistic approach need not necessarily be a synonym to being outdated.

My research is motivated by the belief that, given this position linking different approaches, explicitation should be studied by different methods. The results of the research should thus be used to provide an impetus and focus for further study of explicitation. Historically, explicitation was first studied through parallel corpora (as in Vanderauwera 1985; Øverås 1998), comparing translations with their source texts. The use of comparable corpora, comparing translations with non-translations in the same language, has helped to reduce the amount of human labor spent in the process (Baker and Olohan 2000). The "explicitation hypothesis" (Blum-Kulka 1986), claiming for explicitation the status of a translation universal, has thus been re-confirmed with respect to certain selected explicitation phenomena. However, problems with operationalization continue to limit the results of this kind of research to just some manifestations of explicitational behav-

ior—explicitation of markers of cohesion or optional *that* in translated English being the main examples (Baker and Olohan 2000). As Anthony Pym has pointed out, the concept of explicitation has been surrounded by much conceptual vagueness (Pym 2005). I would like to suggest that it is perhaps time to go back to the parallel-corpus approach to help to triangulate what needs to be addressed about explicitation. The present study is an attempt to show how this can be done.

My study proposes a typology of explicitation alternative to the now classic one developed by Kinga Klaudy (1996: 102–103, 1998: 82–83). It is based on different criteria, which, as I will argue below, may be revealing with respect to such important concepts as translator style. This categorization is used to establish what is referred to as an "explicitation profile"—a set of characteristics describing the translator's behavior in terms of explicitation with respect to a certain text and, if the research shows that this is justified, with respect to translation of literary prose in general. The proposed typology is based on the Hallidayian metafunctions of language: experiential, logical, interpersonal and textual (Halliday 1973, 1978; Halliday and Hasan 1989). To be more precise, the proposed typology is of translation-inherent explicitation; obligatory and optional explicitation are not considered, being dictated by factors other than those potentially contributing to translator style. Pragmatic explicitation is worth considering separately, since the translator's approach to it might be regarded as part of the explicitation profile, too. However, in itself it proves to be more problematic as a type of explicitation than the previous rather sketchy references in literature (e.g. Perego, 2003: 76) might suggest.

Here the term "explicitation phenomena" will be used to refer to implicitation too, since it is a twin concept which cannot be separated from explicitation. Implicitations are studied along with occurrences of explicitation, and have turned out to represent an important part of the data, even a crucial one. Similarly, for the sake of brevity, the term "explicitation profile" will be used in reference to what should, strictly speaking, be termed "explicitation/implicitation profile".

Kinga Klaudy has classified explicitation into obligatory (due to syntactic and semantic differences between the source language and the target language), optional (due to differences between text-building strategies and stylistic preferences of the two languages in question), pragmatic (due to the need to bridge the cultural gap in translation) and translation-inherent (resulting from the process of translation itself) (Klaudy 1998: 82–83). This is more revealing about systemic differences between languages than about explicitation patterns of individual translators. My proposal is that to be able to shift in the direction outlined by Baker (2000) and explored empirically by Bosseaux (2001), Winters (2004) and Saldanha (2005), we will have to leave obligatory and optional explicitation aside and use a finer categorization that will not shun the semantics of explicitation. It is by no means an

accident that in Winters (2004) and Saldanha (2005), explicitation (albeit of specific phenomena) has played an important role in identification of translator style. My involvement with explicitation in the roles of both teacher and translator has led me to the conviction that there are different kinds of explicitation/implicitation corresponding to the different aspects of the pragmatic situation in which the primary communicative act takes place: the referential reality, the relationship of the participants of the communication, and the textual level—and that the distinction between these types of explicitation is a fundamental one. It is easy to see that this division corresponds to the language metafunctions proposed by Halliday—ideational (further split into experiential and logical), interpersonal, and textual. This provides a basis for categorizing occurrences of translation-inherent explicitation (and implicitation) with a view to establishing the explicitation profile of a given translator with respect to a particular text.

Objectives

The objective of the study was to use my typology of translation-inherent explicitation phenomena to explore explicitation and implicitation in translations of literary prose as a phenomenon potentially differentiating individual translators and contributing to translator style. The study is designed as a pilot to a more comprehensive research project and is therefore meant to serve as a basis for formulation of hypotheses to be confirmed or disproved. It should provide answers to research questions and a focus for further study rather than test specific hypotheses. Basically two questions were asked at this stage of the research: (1) Which characteristics of explicitation behavior are shared by different translators? and (2) To what extent is explicitation behavior (in literary texts) an individual matter?

It was hoped that answers to these questions would enable us to address further questions such as: (1) To what extent does the explicitation profile of a translator depend on a particular text or is independent of it? (2) Is the explicitation profile of a professional translator stable over time, or does it change over their professional career? (3) Could any "prototypical" translator explicitation profiles be posited and linked to sociocultural parameters characterizing translators?

Material and methods

To avoid reducing the study of explicitation and implicitation to isolated phenomena, we opted to explore explicitation on a parallel corpus of translations. The corpus studied in the whole project included fiction—novels and, in several instances, other longer prosaic texts—by two important Czech translators, several by each. The corpus was designed to enable exploration of data by systematic study across a substantial body of

texts, with the possibility of linking patterns of explicitation choices to parameters such as the identity of a specific literary text, the translator's personality/style, and the stage of the translator's professional career. There has been no previous study of this kind, to our knowledge.

To ensure that the variables can be addressed and yet the study remain feasible, I decided to analyze translations by two translators. To account for the temporal parameter, one of my requirements for inclusion of translators was that they have as high a number of translations published as possible. My sampling frame was the database of the Czech Translators' Guild (Obec překladatelů)—the association of literary translators in the Czech Republic—of literary translations published after 1945. Another inclusion criterion to ensure a certain homogeneity of the corpus was to require that the translations be based on contemporary originals. Originals from 1940 till the present were allowed. In order to further support comparability, the texts were required to be novels or longer fiction, and restricted to fiction other than non-fiction novel and other than experimental fiction.

This set of criteria defined a list including less than a dozen translators. The criterion according to which the final choice from this shortlist was made was a maximum number of relevant translations covering a maximum span of time. The two clear candidates for inclusion were then Antonín Přidal and Radoslav Nenadál, with approximately 10 translations each. Another parameter that was found very convenient was the fact that their respective lists of translations conforming to the criteria cover almost an identical period—of over 15 years: the first translation by Nenadál relevant for the purposes of the study is from 1968, with the list becoming more dense after 1973, and the first relevant translation by Přidal is from 1974. The most recent items on the bibliographical lists of the two translators are in both cases from 1991. The two translators were thus likely to conform to the same translation norms and potential differences in their explicitation profiles are to be attributed to parameters other than the norms pertaining to explicitation in literary translation of the given period in the Czech Republic. The two translators were of approximately the same age, too: Nenadál was born in 1929 and Přidal is 6 years younger.

The lists of translations singled out for the study contain several novels by the same author: Nenadál translated William Styron repeatedly (three times) and Přidal's list includes three novels by David Lodge, two novels by Joseph Heller, and three novels by Patrick White. This coincidence seems favorable to a supplementary cross-comparison between explicitation profiles for novels by the same author, as opposed to explicitation profiles for novels by other authors, which might indicate some information about the effect of the ST author on the translator explicitation profile. The fact that there are no overlaps between the two lists in terms of authors is a real-life restriction that could not be avoided and is—I believe—compensated for by the merits of the research design.

A pilot study was clearly needed to verify the applicability of the proposed explicitation typology and yield some basic information on the frequency and distribution of explicitation phenomena. Translations of two novels, one by each translator, were selected for the pilot study. They are *Falconer* by John Cheever (R. Nenadál 1990) and *Small World* by David Lodge (A. Přidal 1988). Rather than a direct comparison, the aim was to gauge the frequency, distribution and variability of explicitation phenomena in translations by the two translators. In the pilot study I analyzed three samples of 5,000 running words each, from different parts of both novels and their translations (the word count refers to the translations). Section 1 was in either case the opening section while sections 2 and 3 were extracted from further parts of the text. Selecting the second and third section on the basis of specific criteria was considered, but given the relatively sizeable length of the samples, it was not clear what these criteria should be—each section covered narrative, descriptive, dialogical as well as argumentative passages anyway.

Each of the three parallel (source/target) sections per novel were analyzed for occurrences of experiential, interpersonal, logical and textual translation-inherent explicitation and implicitation. Occurrences of pragmatic explicitation were stored separately for further analysis. Units (usually sentences or units of similar length) containing occurrences of explicitation or implicitation were extracted into a MS Excel file and marked with the code of the translator, book and sample, and classified as experiential E/I, interpersonal E/I, logical E/I and textual E/I. The occurrences were also marked as to whether they were attributable to the narrator's or the characters' level of discourse.

Results

The study proved translation-inherent explicitation and implicitation to be phenomena shaping the target texts to a considerable degree: each of the six 5,000-word samples contained around 50 or more occurrences of explicitation, i.e. approximately one occurrence of translation-inherent explicitation could be traced in a 100-word segment on average, and the frequency of translation-inherent implicitations was far from negligible, too. A summary of the results is shown in Table 1.

Přidal—*Small World*					
	Sample 1	Sample 2	Sample 3	Average	Standard deviation	Result (rounded)
Explicitation	55	74	48	59.00	11.00	59±11
Implicitation	50	82	36	56.00	19.00	56±19
Shifts total	105	156	84	115.00	30.00	115±30
IMPL/EXPL	**0.91**	**1.11**	**0.75**	**0.92**	**0.15**	**0.92±0.15**
Nenadál—*Falconer*					
	Sample 1	Sample 2	Sample 3	Average	Standard deviation	Result (rounded)
Explicitation	67	96	81	81.33	11.84	81±12
Implicitation	17	28	25	23.33	4.64	23±5
Shifts total	84	124	106	104.76	16.36	105±16
IMPL/EXPL	**0.25**	**0.29**	**0.31**	**0.28**	**0.02**	**0.28±0.02**

Table 1. Quantitative analysis of occurrences of explicitation and implicitation in the two translations

The first observation is that the rates of explicitation and implicitation remained fairly stable across the three samples by either translator—within a range that might be expected with respect to the relatively small size of the samples and the great variability of language phenomena in general. The number of occurrences of explicitation in Přidal's translation ranged between 48 and 74, the average value being 59±11 occurrences of explicitation per 5,000 words. The number of occurrences in Nenadál's translation was somewhat higher: it ranged between 67 and 96 and the average value was 81±12 occurrences. The most interesting finding, however, is that the two translators did not differ in their use of explicitation so much as in their use of implicitation. Nenadál, with occurrences of implicitation ranging between 17 and 28 per 5,000 words (23±5 on average), made much less use of translation-inherent implicitation than Přidal, whose 36 to 82 occurrences (56±19 on average) per 5,000 words indicate that he used implicitation almost as often as explicitation. In one of the samples (Sample 2) taken from his translation the number of implicitations even exceeded the number of explicitations. Nenadál, on the other hand, used implicitation several times less frequently than explicitation.

What thus seems to differentiate the two translators' explicitation pro-files with respect to the two texts is, perhaps surprisingly, relative frequency of explicitation vs. implicitation rather than frequency of explicitation. This led to the idea that what might characterize the approach of either translator and differentiate them at the same time might be the relative frequency of explicitation and implicitation. Should this be the case, the ratios of implicitation to explicitation should remain approximately the same across the three samples for either of the two translators.

Table 1 shows that this was very much so. Dividing the number of occurrences of implicitation by the number of occurrences of explicitation in a given segment of translation compared with the source text, we obtain a ratio whose value is smaller than 1 for translations where occurrences of explicitation outnumbered occurrences of implicitations and bigger than 1 for translations where implicitations outnumbered explicitations. If the explicitation hypothesis is to hold true, this ratio should be smaller than 1 for all or most translations, depending on the strength with which the claim is made.

The ratio ranged between 0.75 and 1.11 for Přidal, with the average at 0,92±0,15, and between 0.25 and 0.31 for Nenadál, with the average at 0.28±0.02. The double condition that the ratio remains relatively stable for the given translator and text while differentiating the two translators has thus been met—and assuming that there is a reason to believe that the figures do indeed reflect the translator's more or less consistent approach to the use of explicitation and implicitation in the given translation, i.e. his explicitation profile, we may call the ratio "plicitation quotient".[1] The search for answers to our research questions might thus be found by testing the consistency of the plicitation quotient across samples of the same translation (as shown above) and a body of translations by the same translator/different translators, whose originals are by the same author/different authors, and translations made over a range of time.

It is evident that the plicitation quotients of the two translators are radically different; the ranges of their values for the three respective samples do not even overlap. This observation recommends the plicitation quotient as a good measure differentiating translators' styles as regards explicitation phenomena.

The next step was to examine explicitation and implicitation at the level of experiential, logical, interpersonal and textual functions. Occurrences of explicitation and implicitation at individual levels were totalled and the percentual shares of the types of ex/implicitation on the total number of occurrences were calculated. As Tables 2 and 3 show, the explicitation behavior of the two translators did not differ much in this respect. With both of them, experiential explicitation was the most frequent type of explicitation behavior and experiential implicitation was the most frequent type of implicitation behavior, followed by interpersonal explicitation and implicitation. The actual percentual figures were fairly similar, too, given the

---

[1] The term was selected after "implicitation/explicitation quotient" was rejected as too long a label and "explicitation quotient" discarded as foregrounding explicitation too much at the cost of implicitation, whose role for the ratio proved even more important than that of explicitation. The neologism seems to do justice to both phenomena.

relatively high degree of variation. The other types of ex/implicitation indicated no major differences in terms of rates.

	Přidal—*Small World*				
	EXPLICITATION				
	Sample 1	Sample 2	Sample 3	Total	%
Experiential	19	38	28	85	**48.02**
Logical	11	13	6	30	17.22
Interpersonal	18	11	11	40	**22.60**
Textual	7	12	3	22	12.43
Total	*55*	*74*	*48*	*177*	*100.00*
	IMPLICITATION				
	Sample 1	Sample 2	Sample 3	Total	%
Experiential	27	53	26	106	**63.10**
Logical	3	4	2	9	5.35
Interpersonal	13	17	5	35	**20.83**
Textual	7	8	3	18	10.71
Total	*50*	*82*	*36*	*168*	*100.00*

Table 2. Individual types of explicitation and implicitation in the translation by Přidal

	Nenadál—*Falconer*				
	EXPLICITATION				
	Sample 1	Sample 2	Sample 3	Total	%
Experiential	19	36	38	93	**38.11**
Logical	18	10	13	41	16.80
Interpersonal	16	36	20	72	**29.51**
Textual	14	14	10	38	15.98
Total	*67*	*96*	*81*	*244*	*100.00*
	IMPLICITATION				
	Sample 1	Sample 2	Sample 3	Total	%
Experiential	9	13	18	40	**57.14**
Logical	2	3	1	6	8.57
Interpersonal	3	7	3	13	**18.57**
Textual	3	5	3	11	15.71
Total	*17*	*28*	*25*	*70*	*100.00*

Table 3. Individual types of explicitation and implicitation in the translation by Nenadál

It was only a comparison making a distinction between these four types of explicitation and implicitation at the level of narrator's and characters' discourse that differentiated the two translators (see Table 4).

		Přidal—*Small World*				Nenadál—*Falconer*		
		EXPLICITATION				**EXPLICITATION**		
		Total	%				Total	%
Experiential	N	58	**51.79**	Experiential	N		64	**44.44**
Logical	N	23	20.53	Logical	N		28	19.44
Interpersonal	N	21	18.75	Interpersonal	N		23	15.97
Textual	N	10	8.93	Textual	N		29	20.14
Total		*112*	*100.00*	*Total*			*144*	*100.00*
Experiential	CH	27	**41.54**	Experiential	CH		28	28.28
Logical	CH	7	10.77	Logical	CH		13	13.13
Interpersonal	CH	19	29.23	Interpersonal	CH		49	**49.49**
Textual	CH	12	18.46	Textual	CH		9	9.09
Total		*65*	*100.00*	*Total*			*99*	*100.00*
		IMPLICITATION				**IMPLICITATION**		
		Total	%				Total	%
Experiential	N	92	**77.97**	Experiential	N		29	**60.42**
Logical	N	7	5.93	Logical	N		4	8.33
Interpersonal	N	11	9.32	Interpersonal	N		8	16.67
Textual	N	8	6.78	Textual	N		7	14.58
Total		*118*	*100.00*	*Total*			*48*	*100.00*
Experiential	CH	14	28.00	Experiential	CH		11	**50.00**
Logical	CH	2	4.00	Logical	CH		2	9.09
Interpersonal	CH	24	**48.00**	Interpersonal	CH		5	22.73
Textual	CH	10	20.00	Textual	CH		4	22.73
Total		*50*	*100.00*	*Total*			*22*	*100.00*

Table 4. Explicitation and implicitation in the two translations at the levels of narrator's and characters' discourse

At the level of narrator's discourse, the situation remained largely unchanged, with experiential explicitation and implicitation as the two most frequent types of behavior. But the picture was different, and indeed reciprocal, for the two translators at the level of characters' discourse. In Přidal's translation, experiential explicitation and interpersonal implicitation scored the highest, while in Nenadál's translation interpersonal explicitation and experiential implicitation were most prominent just as convincingly. This amounts to stating that Přidal tended to strengthen the experiential component of characters' discourse and subdue the interpersonal component, while Nenadál exhibited the exactly opposite tendency: to explicitate the interpersonal component of characters' discourse and implicitate its experiential component. For him, the characters' discourse is an even stronger medium for explicit communication of interpersonal meanings than it was for Cheever—while explicit communication of experiential meaning

gravitates to the narrator's level of discourse. This tendency seems to widen the gap between direct and indirect speech as to meanings expressed explicitly. Přidal, on the other hand, seems to distribute explicit experiential meanings more evenly between narrator's and characters' discourse. The reader is given much scope for inferencing, thanks to implicit coding of interpersonal meanings in characters' discourse. Another possible way of looking at these tendencies is to say that Přidal and Nenadál foreground the interpersonal component of characters' discourse in different ways: Nenadál by explicitating it and Přidal by relying on the process of active inferencing by readers.

Discussion

One potential objection against the approach taken in this study might be that the distinction between individual types of explicitation according to Klaudy (1998) is blurred (Englund-Dimitrova 2005: 38) and therefore occurrences of translation-inherent explicitation (and implicitation) in any text are hard to isolate from other types of explicitation, especially optional. My conviction is nevertheless that this fuzziness generally tends to be overestimated in literature, while one tends to neglect the fact that the concept of explicitation itself is a prototypical one with hardly any firm boundaries separating explicitatory shifts from other shifts (Kamenická forthcoming). With enough good literature covering the systemic differences between languages available (for English and Czech see e.g. Dušková et al. 1994), differentiating between obligatory and translation-inherent explicitation/implicitation is not a problem. As far as the borderline between optional and translation-inherent explicitation/implicitation is concerned, the existence vs. a lack of a competing more or less explicit stylistic variant in the TL conforming to the criterion of naturalness was used as a criterion of classification.

The proposed typology of translation-inherent explicitation/implicitation into experiential, logical, interpersonal and textual proved applicable to specific literary texts and its employment yielded interesting results. The important circumstance that the four metafunctions (with experiential and logical function kept separately) are not paradigmatic choices and interweave in utterances in a way which allows mapping them onto one another in a sort of polyphony—a likening of Halliday's own (Halliday 1978: 56)—did not prove an obstacle to deciding which of the "melodies" was upheld by a translator in an instance of explicitation or subdued in an instance of implicitation.

This study is by no means the first occasion on which the Hallidayan concept of language as social semiotic has been used in Translation Studies: one example that comes to mind is Leuven-Zwart's (1989, 1990) application of the distinction between ideational, interpersonal and textual levels of

discourse in linking microshifts identified on the basis of her complicated model to the macrolevels of the text to see which macroshifts they contribute to. The main difference between Leuven-Zwart's and my application of Halliday's metafunctions therefore consists in the level of application: while she considers the metafunctions at the macrolevel, my application of them takes place at the microlevel (and the results are then assessed at the macrolevel, too).

As far as the quantitative analysis is concerned, despite the relatively large samples analyzed, the occurrences of some explicitation phenomena are not too numerous, namely implicitations in Nenadál's translations and explicitations at the level of characters' discourse. This does not, however, invalidate the results as long as we rely on overall tendencies—as the case was above—rather than specific figures. The prevalence of the identified tendencies seems to be convincing enough, despite the numbers of occurrences being lower than with explicitation and the narrator's level of discourse.

In fact, the tendencies identified in the latter part of the analysis correspond to what was apparent already at the stage of sorting out and classifying the individual occurrences. Přidal was observed to be extremely flexible in managing meaning potential in terms of explicitation/implicitation, including a quite frequent use of compensation at the individual levels corresponding to language metafunctions in adjoining textual segments. On the other hand, explicitation of interpersonal meanings in characters' discourse was a phenomenon that could not escape a closer scrutiny of Nenadál's translation. Typical examples of this tendency involve the addition of amplifiers modifying the expression of attitude, as in:

(1) ST: "It's easy for me to remember things."
    TT: "It's extremely easy for me to remember things." [back translation into English, here and throughout]

or a change in the illocutionary force of the utterance, as in:

(2) ST: "Now, before you get upset listen to me."
    TT: "Now, before you get upset you must listen to me."

Another important point to be made concerns the distinction between the narrator's and characters' discourse. While *Small World* by David Lodge has an omniscient narrator allowing the readers insights into the minds of the numerous characters, with some of whom they find themselves more inclined to empathize than with others (and where differentiating between the two levels of discourse poses no problems), *Falconer* by John Cheever is a subjectivized first-person narrative with the main character, Farragut, as the narrator and no strict borderline between the narrator's and characters'

discourse. Since separating the two levels of literary discourse for the purposes of explicitation/implicitation analysis seemed to offer a useful insight despite this complicating factor, the problem was addressed by classifying the occurrences in which explicitation/implicitation concerned segments affected by this subjectivization of narrative as characters' discourse, even when they were part of the first-person narrator's discourse constituting the framework of the literary text.

Conclusion

The analysis of six 5,000 word samples taken from Czech translations of *Small World* by David Lodge and *Falconer* by John Cheever by A. Přidal and R. Nenadál respectively reveal that as far as translation-inherent explicitation was concerned, the two translators did not differ in their approach to explicitation so much as by their use of implicitation. While one of the translators (A. Přidal) used implicitation almost just as often as implicitation, the other translator (R. Nenadál) used implicitation much more sparingly. This difference in the explicitation profiles can be conveniently expressed by "plicitation quotient", defined as the ratio of the number of translation-inherent implicitations to the number of translation-inherent explicitations in the given—as long as possible—stretch of text. Besides this, the two translators were found to differ in their use of experiential and interpersonal explicitation and implicitation in textual segments attributable to narrator's and characters' discourse, exhibiting opposing tendencies.

The analysis of explicitation and implicitation in a parallel corpus of translations and the proposed typology of explicitation and implicitation based on Hallidayian language metafunctions thus proved fruitful in giving interesting insights into the translators' style. The typology as well as the plicitation quotient remain to be tested on a larger corpus of translations by the same and other translators.

References

Baker, Mona. 2000. "Towards a methodology for investigating the style of a literary translator". *Target* 12 (2): 241–66.

Baker, Mona, and Maeve Olohan. 2000. "Reporting *that* in translated English: Evidence for subconscious processes of explicitation?" *Across Languages and Cultures* 1 (2): 141–58.

Blum-Kulka, Shoshana. 1986. "Shifts of Cohesion and Coherence in Translation". Juliane House and Shoshana Blum-Kulka (eds) *Interlingual and Intercultural Communication. Discourse and cognition in translation and second language acquisition*. Tübingen: Narr. 17-35.

Bosseaux, Charlotte. 2001. "A study of the translator's voice and style in the French translations of Virginia Woolf's *The Waves*". In M. Olohan (ed.) *CTIS Occasional Papers*, Vol. 1. Manchester: Centre for Translation & Intercultural Studies, UMIST. 55–75.

Cheever, John. 1978. *Falconer*. New York: Ballantine Books.

Cheever, John. 1990. *Věznice Falconer*. [Falconer] Translation into Czech by Radoslav Nenadál. Prague: Odeon.

Dušková, Libuše, et al. 1994. *Mluvinice současné angličtiny na pozadí češtiny* (in Czech: A Grammar of Contemporary English on the Background of Czech). Prague: Academia.

Englund-Dimitrova, Birgitta. 2005. *Expertise and Explicitation in the Translation Process*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Halliday, M. A. K. 1973. *Explorations in the Functions of Language*. London: Edward Arnold.

Halliday, M. A. K. 1978. *Language as Social Semiotic: The Social Interpretation of Language and Meaning*. London: Edward Arnold.

Halliday, M. A. K., and R. Hasan. 1989. *Language, Context and Text: A Social Semiotic Perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kamenická, Renata. Forthcoming. "On defining explicitation". *Brno Studies in English* 29.

Klaudy, Kinga. 1993a. "Optional additions in translation". In *Translation the vital link*. Proceedings of the XIII. FIT World Congress. Vol. 2. 373–381. London: ITI.

Klaudy, Kinga. 1993b. "On explicitation hypothesis". In J. Kohn., K. Klaudy et al. (eds.) *Transferre necesse est... Current Issues of Translation Theory*. In honour of György Radó on his 80th birthday. Szombathely: Dániel Berzsenyi College.

Klaudy, Kinga. 1996. "Back-translation as a tool for detecting explicitation strategies in translation". In K. Klaudy, J. Lambert, A. Sohár (eds.) *Translation Studies in Hungary*. Budapest: Scholastica. 99–114.

Klaudy, Kinga. 1998. "Explicitation". In M. Baker (ed.) *Rotledge Encyclopaedia of Translation Studies*. London and New York: Routledge. 80–84.

Klaudy, Kinga, and Krisztina Károly. 2005 "Implicitation in translation: An empirical justification of operational asymmetry in translation". *Across Languages and Cultures* 6 (1): 13–28.

Leuven-Zwart, Kitty (van). 1989, 1990. "Translation and original: Similarities and dissimilarities I, II". *Target* 1 (2): 151–181; 2 (1): 69–95.

Lodge, David. 1984. *Small World*. London: Secker & Warburg.

Lodge, David. 1988. *Svět je malý* (Small World). Translation into Czech by Antonín Přidal. Prague: Odeon.

Martin, J. R., and David Rose. 2003. *Working with Discourse*. London and New York: Continuum.

Mauranen, Anna, and Pekka Kujamäki. 2004. *Translation Universals: Do They Exist?* Amsterdam and Philadelphia: Benjamins.

Olohan, Maeve. 2001. "Spelling out the optionals in translation: a corpus study". *UCREL Technical Papers*, Vol. 13: 423–432.

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

Perego, Elisa. 2003. "Evidence of explicitation in subtitling: Towards a categorisation". *Across Languages and Cultures* 4 (1). 63–88.

Pym, Anthony. 2005. "Explaining explicitation". In K. Karoly and Á. Fóris (eds) *New Trends in Translation Studies. In Honour of Kinga Klaudy.* Budapest: Akadémia Kiadó. 29–34.

Vanderauwera, Rita. 1985. *Dutch Novels Translated into English. The Transformations of a Minority Literature.* [Approaches to Translation Studies 6] Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Winters, Marion. 2004. "German translations of F. Scott Fitzgerald's *The Beautiful and Damned*: A corpus-based study of modal particles as features of translators' style". In I. Kemble (ed.) *Using Corpora and Databases in Translation*. Portsmouth: University of Portsmouth. 71–88.

Saldanha, Gabriela. 2005. *Style of Translation: An Exploration of Stylistic Patterns in the Translations of Margaret Jull Costa and Peter Bush.* PhD Thesis. Dublin: School of Applied Language and Intercultural Studies, Dublin City University.