The Universality of Explicitation in Sesotho Translation

Edwin Joseph Mohatlane

University of the Free State, Department of African Languages, P. O. Box 339,
Bloemfontein, 9300, South Africa
E-mail: mohatlaneej@ufs.ac.za

ABSTRACT This paper presents a critical account of the explicitation hypothesis which claims that translated texts in general, and the Sesotho translated texts in particular, are characterised as inherently universal. The researcher challenges the proposition that explicitation is an inherent universal feature of translation. Relative to this proposition, there is also a controversy among the translation critics regarding the universality of explicitation in translation. Some critics maintain that explicitation is an inherent translation universal as determined by the lexical and grammatical items that are implicit in the source text (ST). The big question that forms part of the argument in this paper is whether these items are always available in all source texts for explicitation to be reckoned as universal. It is for this purpose that critics present another different dimension of the argument. The explicitation hypothesis is perceived differently by other critics maintaining that explicitation is voluntary and optional as determined by the stylistic patterns employed by the translator. The paper aims to reflect on this argument around the universality of explicitation with a view to put it in its proper perspective. The results in this study reflect instances where explicitation appears to be inherent and universal whereas in some instances the Sesotho translation tends to be longer than the source text in accordance with the stylistic preferences of the translator. Novice translators as well as experienced translators are recommended to utilise explicitation to promote the meaningful translations that are culturally acceptable and linguistically accessible to the target readers.

INTRODUCTION

The concept of explicitation was first introduced by Vinay and Darbelnet (1995). They maintain that explicitation is the process of introducing information into the target language (TL) which is only implicit in the source language (SL) but can be derived from the context or the situation. It has become a trend among the various translation scholars that translations are inherently more explicit than the original source texts as well as other non-translated target texts.

This whole philosophy is based on Blum-Kulka's Explicitation Hypothesis (2000) as it states that "explicitation is a universal strategy inherent in the process of language mediation". The idea in this paper is to argue that although explicitation is applied in translation it cannot simply be conceived to be inherent. It is only brought about by specific factors, including the free choice of the translator to apply it or not.

There are, however, some of the translation critics who argue in favour of the universality of explicitation hypothesis but, in the same vein, there are those who oppose this particular hypothesis. The controversy between the translation critics can be illustrated as follows:

In Blum-Kulka's (2000) proposition "explicitation is a universal strategy inherent in the process of language mediation" (1986: 21), Olohan and Baker (2000) understand that Blum-Kulka (2000) refers to explicitation as a subconscious strategy. Overas (1998) assumes that Blum-Kulka (2000) means a conscious strategy.

Baker (2000) claims that explicitation is a translation universal, that is, characteristic and distinguishing feature of translated text. In this regard, Baker (2000) seems to motivate the same sentiments expressed initially by Blum-Kulka (2000) in her Explicitation Hypothesis. Conversely, House (2004) denies the alleged status of explicitation as a universal feature of translation. She advances factors that *"differences in linguistic-stylistic conventions between source language and target texts"* account for explicitation rather than a universal tendency of translators to explicitate. In the light of this view, it tends to be clear that the universality of explicitation in translation warrants a robust research.

As indicated before, the researcher in this particular study took a position that he intends to present, namely, that explicitation is not necessarily inherently universal. As part of the results achieved in this paper, we realise that some of the factors that cause doubt regarding the

universality of translation is the fact that it does not seem to be enshrined within the translation process but appears to surface as a product.

Many translation scholars only perceive explicitation as adding information explicitly in the target text (TT) that has been implicitly stated in the source text. They do not, however, show how it operates within the translation process towards its final formulation as a translation product. Klaudy (2009) even made a bold statement that explicitation hypothesis could be contemplated being replaced into the Asymmetry Hypothesis. In this particular hypothesis, there is no commitment made that explicitation is 'inherent' but only that translators are liable to be explicit when dealing with implicit information in the source text as a result of which they produce more explicit translation.

As alluded before, the understanding of explicitation as a translation universal has always been a controversial issue. This is the reason Vinay and Darbelnet (1995) define explicitation as the process of rendering information which is only implicit in the source text explicit in the target text. They, however, do not commit themselves that explicitation is universal as perhaps they further maintain that it is obligatory when the grammatical items of the target language forces the translator to add information which is not present in the source text. On the other side of the coin, explicitation occurs voluntarily and optionally when, for no grammatically compelling reason, the translator decides to do so.

Definitions of the concepts universality and explicitation:

In order for readers of this study to have a clearer perspective, the Oxford Dictionary (2000) defines "universality" as:

"Relating to or done by all people or things in the world or in a particular group; applicable to all cases"

On the other side of the coin, Blum-Kulka (2000) defines explicitation as:

"The process of introducing information in the target language which is present only implicitly in the source language but it can be derived from the context or the situation".

The tendency to explicitate sometimes may be caused by the concept that appears unfamiliar in the target language situation.

Aims of the Study

Based on the introduction, the fundamental aim of the paper is to establish whether explici-tation is in fact a Sesotho translation universal. Underlying this aim and within the context of this paper in the Sesotho language, it will be prudent to determine whether explicitation is merely caused by the implicit lexicogrammatical items in the source text ⁻(ST). One of the tentative aspects to verify is whether there are linguistic justifications to cause explicitation or whether it happens without any linguistic connection between the source text and the translation. The suspicion of the researcher is that explicitation is motivated by some various factors. It is assumed that those factors could be language specific, textual, determined by the translator or perhaps 'inherent'. It is prudent to also verify the expectation that if explicitation is universal at all, it has to happen in all the translation processes and without any specific reason. In the case where the above tentative questions are responded to, the researcher in this paper will have a clue to judge explicitation in Sesotho language as universal. As English-Sesotho language combination would be applied in this work, it would also be important to establish whether explicitation occurs at all times when an English source text is translated to Sesotho, or *vice versa*; for it to qualify to be universal or whether it happens under specific conditions being purported by specific reasons.

It is also important to establish whether explicitation and implicitation (Q Principle and R Principle) work together to yield meaningful translations that are functionally acceptable and linguistically accessible.

Literature Review

In the light of the above argument as outlined in the section that deals with the aim of paper, the researcher has collated and observed the views of the various scholars who perceive that the translated language is different from the natural and authentic everyday language in a number of respects. The whole issue of explicitation, simplification, implicitation as well as condensation characterise the translated language as "*translationese*" as maintained by Johansson (1994). This actually implies that the language used in translation is perceived to be different from the original language in either the source or the target language. However the issue of the universality of explicitation in translation is still questionable.

Pym (2005) opines that explicitation should not just be construed to imply adding of words in a sense of making long explanations. Of importance, Pym (2005) maintains that explicitation is caused by dealing with different languages as well as the psychology of the translator to make his own stylistic changes to the language of the source text. However, Pym (2005) cannot commit himself that explicitation is universal because it merely surfaces in some translations but not in all translation processes.

Baker (2000) is of the view that translation has features that are distinctive to itself and characterises it further as having:

"… features which typically occur in translated text rather than original utterances and which are not the result of interference from specific linguistic systems."

The above statement shows that Baker (2000) argues that the target text has language-independent features and, as a matter of fact, explicitation in this case does not necessarily depend on the language of the source text but it is being decided upon by the translator.

Frawley (1984) proposed a model of the translation as a third code, that is, a product of the negotiation of the translator between the first code of the source text, language, and culture, and the second code of the target language and culture, a product that differs not just in obvious ways from its source, but also from native texts of the "second code". This adds more interest on the researcher to establish the influence of explicitation on the nature of language in translation.

Toury (1995) maintains that there are particular laws operating in translating, particular not only because translating is a measurably different kind of text with features that identify it as a translation. In this way, Toury (1995) confirms the peculiarities and specific translation attributes. But, the question of universality of explicitation in translation is still not verified and therefore still open to research.

METHODS

In the discussion of the method that the researcher would apply in this paper, the researcher *'plucks a feather'* from the two approaches to studying translated texts as suggested by Ulrych and Murphy (2008); namely, the contrastive-linguistic approach and the ap-

proach taken by the descriptive studies. The two approaches will be applied on English-Sesotho translation language combination. We deem it necessary to use the two approaches because the contrastive-linguistic approach will be effective to show the pragmatic differences between the source and the target texts whereas the descriptive approach will be effective to reflect on the nature of the translation process itself.

When dealing with the translation process exclusively, Toury (1995) views the translation process as a phenomenon *sui generis* which is not only determined by the properties of the source language and the target language, but, also the translation specific principles themselves. The researcher intends to apply the following principles as part of the methods in this study:

The Contrastive-linguistic Approach

As part of the contrastive-linguistic approach, we will rely on Klaudy's (2008) distinction of the first three kinds of explicitation. The idea here is to establish whether the linguistic differences between the source and the target languages would help us to determine the universality of explicitation in Sesotho translation.

The first type of explicitation to consider is the *obligatory explicitation.* In this case we consider the lexicogrammatical differences between the English source language and the Sesotho target language.

The second type of explicitation is the *optional explicitation.* This particular type of explicitation is motivated by the stylistic preferences between the source language and target language. This is the area where the translator's operative skills are significant in revealing the universality of explicitation in Sesotho translation

The third type of explicitation is the *pragmatic explicitation.* This type of explicitation is motivated by the difference in the cultural and / or world knowledge shared by members of the source language and the target language communities. This will inform the application of explicitation with a view to conscientise the target reader to be versatile with the source text culture.

These first three types of explicitation are common in terms of being predictable. The ele-

ment of predictability comes in because we already know that there are lexicogramatical differences between the two languages. These languages (source language and target language) also differ in terms of style applied by the translator as well as the cultural differences of the two communities involved.

The fourth type of explicitation is the *translation-inherent explicitation.* This is the type of explicitation that is actually expected to clearly determine the universality of the explicitation hypothesis. It is the type of explicitation that is determined by the nature of the translation process itself. In spite of the alluded expectation, there is no empirical justification for explicitation to take place in this case. Explicitation at this level lacks the scientific evidence and a straitjacket type of understanding therefore cannot be readily applied that explicitation is a translation universal. The universality of explicitation appears therefore shrouded in mystery and it therefore reinforces the researcher to be keen to verify this particular phenomenon.

It will be prudent to consider the hypothetical statements that critics make about explicitation. In the first instance, critics are of the view that explicitation procedures are the outcome of translation. In other words, it is believed that explicitation occurs during the translation process. In the second instance, there is a firm belief that the linguistic dissimilarities between the source language (SL) and the target language (TL) induce the explicitation from the source text (ST) to the target text (TT). The two views will be considered as crucial principles underlying the explicitation process but not necessarily accounting for its universality as such.

In an endeavour to determine the universality of explicitation in Sesotho translation, the researcher desires to consider Chomsky's (2002) linguistic observation underlying the use of language. Chomsky (2002) maintains that for language to be universal, its deep structure is of paramount significance than its surface structure. The deep structure predetermines the inherent and the original linguistic structure (*langue*) whereas the surface structure merely signifies the linguistic competence (*parole*) of an individual language user (translator). Based on this observation by Chomsky, the researcher hopes to establish whether the universality of explicitation operates largely at the deep or surface structure level. Tentatively, readers may

draw some of the following hypothetical statements in relation to the universality of explicitation in Sesotho language:

If explicitation applies at deep structure level of the target language, then explicitation will be said to be inherently universal; but

If explicitation operates only at surface structure level, then it will not be reckoned to be universal in the Chomskyan sense.

As a matter of principle, the target readers will be guided on the findings subject to the application of these aspects of method. In doing so, the target readers will more or less have an empirical evidence to argue that explicitation is an inherent universal feature of translation or that it applies by chance.

Operationalisation

Obligatory Explicitation

The researcher in this case tries to establish instances of implication in the source text and how they are responded to by way of explicitation in the target text. It must be stressed that obligatory explicitation is determined by the implicit item in the ST that is explicitated in the TT. Let us consider the following example:

Example 1:
English   Sesotho
ST: My brother went to town
TT: *Moholwane o ile toropong*
In the given source text, the word "brother" is an implicit lexicogrammatical item. It may have a dual meaning in this context. It may refer to either "older brother" or "younger brother" in Sesotho translation. In other words, in the case where English serves as the source text language, the word "brother" is open-ended as it implies either "older" or "younger" brother, depending on its context.

Based on the above as background, it follows that the implicit item warrants further explicitation in Sesotho translation. The Sesotho translator would be obliged to explicitate the word further for the sake of Sesotho readers because in Sesotho language there are specific concepts (equivalents) that are applied to refer to "older brother" and "younger brother". The two words are *"moholwane"* and *"moena"* respectively.

At this stage, it is important to point out that the context in which an implied source text item

has been used is crucial to attract explicitation. It is the context that informs the translator when to explicitate and when not to explicitate. The role of context in the establishment of the need to explicitate is illustrated as follows:

Example 2:
English   Sesotho
ST1: My older brother went to town
TT1: *Moholwane wa ka o ile toropong*
ST2: My younger brother went to town
TT2: *Moena wa ka o ile toropong*

In the ST "my brother went to town" and its target text text *"moholwane wa ka o ile toropong"* the following observations can be specified:

Explicitation on the blood relationship between the speaker and the person referred to, is determined by the availability of the lexicogrammatical word "my" as it marks possession in the ST. It is for this reason that the Sesotho translator is obliged to explicitate by using *"wa ka"* (mine). In this way the explicitation *"wa ka"* (mine) clearly captures the added meaning and hence it depicts itself as an obligatory explicitation. The obligatory explicitation in this case presupposes possessive relationship between the speaker and the person referred to.

In the case where the lexical item "my" in "my brother went to town" had not been used in the ST as in "brother went to town", the meaning could be open-ended to refer to anybody (older or younger) to speaker as indicated in example 1 above. In Sesotho translation, the context in which a lexical or grammatical item has been used would be required to assist the translator to produce an optimally relevant interpretation or reference.

Based on the above example, it follows that 'brother' has been explicitated in the Sesotho translation as referring to either the older brother *('moholwane')* or the younger brother *('moena')*. Conversely, in the Sesotho situation, a specific term *'moholwane'* or *'moena'* will be used to determine reference to 'older' or 'younger' brother.

Let us now focus on the scenario where Sesotho serves as the source text and English as the target language:

Example 3:
Sesotho   English
ST1: *Moholwane o ile lapeng*
TT1: My older brother has gone home
ST2: *Moena o ile lapeng*

TT2: My younger brother has gone home

The above example determines that in the case of English target language, explicitation is based on implicit lexical items in the source language (Sesotho) in the given source text(s). It therefore confirms that explicitation is required as an obligatory explicitation. Otherwise, the translation in Sesotho language may not categorically state the complete sense communicated in the ST. In some cases, lack of such obligatory explicitation results in *translationese*.

It is also important to note that explicitation does not necessarily imply that the translation will be longer than the original text. Explicitation in general, and obligatory explicitation in particular, does not suggest redundancy in translation. An added explanation is not necessarily redundant but it is strictly warranted by an implicit content in the source text. If English serves as the original text, then explicitation occurs in the Sesotho translation. Otherwise, in the case of the Sesotho original source text scenario, then explicitation may be realised in the English target text as in the given example above.

Example 4:
English
ST: "The most important story ever told"
     Sesotho
TT1: *"Pale ya bohlokwa ka ho fetisisa e kileng ya bolelwa"*
TT2: *"Pale ya bohlokwa ka ho fetisisa e kileng ya phetwa"*

Explicitation in this case is brought about by the fact that the translator in the TT1 prefers to express the equivalent meaning of *"told"* as *"bolelwa"*. In this case the translator is influenced by the context in which the lexicogrammatical word *"told"* is used in the source text.

Under normal circumstances in the original Sesotho language one would expect the above source text to be translated as TT2: *"Pale ya bohlokwa ka ho fetisisa e kileng ya phetwa"*.

It therefore shows that the language of a translated text appears to be "third code" and the *"translationese"* as it tends to deviate slightly from the norms and traditions of the common Sesotho language structures.

Taken from the above example, the universality of explicitation may still be questionable because the implicit lexicogrammatical word may not necessarily be available at all times in other source texts and translations.

Voluntary (Optional) Explicitation

This category of explicitation serves as the area where the translator explicitates only if he feels that it is necessary to do so. One of the basic reasons for doing so could be to provide assistance to the target reader to come to better grips with the translation.

In the following example, the Sesotho translator explicitates during the translation process with a view to simplify and to make the source text accessible to the target group.

Example 5:
English
ST: "You must love the Lord your God with all your heart, all your soul, and all your mind." This is the first and the greatest commandment. A second is equally important: "Love **your neighbour** as yourself."

Sesotho
TT: *"Re rate Morena Modimo ka pelo ya hao yohle le ka moya, kgopolo ya hao yohle." Ena ke yona taelo e kgolo, ya pele, mme ya bobedi e tshwanang le yona e re: "Rata **wa heno** jwaloka ha o ithata."*

Taken from the given example, the translator decided voluntarily to translate "love your neighbour" as *"rata wa heno"*. One would have expected the Sesotho translator to translate it as *"rata moahisani wa hao"*. But, the translator decided voluntarily to translate it as *"rata wa heno"* (love your fellow man). Presumably, the translator decided to translate it in context so that it may be more explicit and culturally acceptable to the Basotho target readership. This also reflects on translation as a decision-making activity.

The role of the translator is illustrated above in expressing voluntary explicitation in Sesotho translation. However, this implies that explicitation in Sesotho translation is not necessarily universal because it is unpredictable when it would happen. It is also uncertain when it would be initiated by the translator or when it is source text based. It also appears to be clear that explicitation is applied for a particular purpose.

Another factor to be considered in this case is that explicitation is not necessarily a matter of increasing the length of the translation in relation to the length of a source text. The most paramount issue is for the translator to explicitly express the implicit information in the translation. The translator is keen to optimally determine the accessibility, the intelligibility and the functionality of the translation for the benefit of the intended readership.

Example 6:
English
ST: God brought the woman, Eve, to Adam as his wife.

Sesotho
TT: *Ka lehopo leo Morena Modimo a le ntshitseng ho motho, a bopa mosadi, Eva,a mo tlisa ho motho, Adama.*

Within the context of the above text, it appears that the translator brings about additional information that has not been given in the source text as captured by the phrase *"ka lehopo leo Morena Modimo a le ntshitseng ho motho"* (Out of the rib taken from man …). In other words, the translator provides details that had not been specified in the source text and decides to present them explicitly in the target text. Explicitation in this case is voluntary in the sense that it hinges on the translator to add the information that had not been stated in the target text. The translator as the minister of religion, decides to give more information with a view to try to make it more meaningful and explicit to readers.

Within the same text, the translator decided to add the information that God is the King in *"ka lehopo leo Morena Modimo …" (out of the rib...)*. In the original text, reference has been made of God but the translator decided to put it explicitly in the Sesotho translation that God is the King. Once more we realise that the translator has the capacity to voluntarily explicitate on the information that was never meant to be explicitated in the original text.

Pragmatic Explicitation

Pragmatic explicitation is largely determined by the availability of an item that is culturally lexicalised in the source text language but not so in the target text language. There are, for instance, meaning shifts from one language to the other. Languages are applied within specific cultural contexts and therefore explicitation is therefore necessary in the process of translation. If the word in the source text is known to the source text language group but not so in the target group, then it becomes imperative to explicitate for the benefit of the receiving group.

Example 7:
English
ST: You regularly read food labels, companies must be honest about ingredients.
Sesotho
TT: *Kamehla o bala mabitso a dijo a kgwebo jwale dikhamphani di lokela ho tshepahala mabapi le metswako ya tsona.*

In the above example, the researcher demonstrates pragmatic explicitation on the basis of the cultural words in bold. It appears to be clear that "food labels" tends to be a culturally based concept. It presumably surfaces as the cause of the translation difficulty on the part of the translator as the concept is not quite familiar in the Sesotho cultural situation. It therefore requires the translator to explicitate it as *"mabitso a dijo a kgwebo"* in order to contextualise it within the Sesotho target cultural background.

The study demonstrates that even in this case it is common among translators to explicitate if there is a need to do so. But, it still remains questionable that explicitation in Sesotho translation can be taken to be universal. It is unpredictable as to when it would happen and it is not in all Sesotho translations that it happens.

Example 8:
ST: He is going to cross the Rubicorn
TT: *O tla tshela (noka) ya Rubicorn.*

Language is the mechanism through which speakers give meaning to the world of their experiences. It is for this purpose that the Sesotho translator had to explicitate by including *"noka"* (river) as the added meaning. The translator deemed it necessary because within the socio-cultural context of the Basotho, "Rubicorn" does not have a clearly defined and an immediate identifiable meaning as in the English language situation. This is the reason the translator necessarily include the word "river" so as to simplify the content for the receiving target group. In this case, we realise that simplification serves also as another mechanism of explicitation. There is therefore a relationship between simplification and explicitation as possible translation universals in trying to deal with the less known cultural issues in the source text.

Example 9
ST: He goes to the bank to cash a cheque.
TT: *O ya bankeng ho a fetolela tjheke e le ho fumana tjhelete.*

The above example demonstrates that lack of knowledge of a source text culture motivates the translator to explicitate on the culture-based concept for the sake of clarity and information to the target readers. The concept of 'cashing a cheque" is actually not part of the Basotho culture. This is the reason the translator finds it necessary to put it more explicit in order to make it accessible to the Basotho target readers. Subsequently, the readers will realise that the Sesotho translation tends to be longer following the explicit articulation of the meaning of the cultural item.

Explicitation in this case tends to be pragmatic as based on cultural differences between the source text culture and the target text culture. It then follows that culture is one of the basic factors causing explicitation in Sesotho. However, explicitation cannot necessarily be taken to be universal.

RESULTS

When we consider examples 5, 6 and 7 and try to establish whether explicitation qualifies to be a translation universal we realise that it is not very clear where the argument underlying explicitation begins and where its premises and conclusions are. It therefore cannot clearly characterise itself as a translation universal.

Pym (2005) deems that one of the accounts for explicitation is regarding it as a translation universal. Consequently, like two other translation universals, normalisation and simplification, explicitation is also a universal reality in translation. Discussions of the above examples tend to demonstrate this view.

Frawley (1984) is of the opinion that *"universals are absolute whereas translation is probabilistic."* In other words, translation does not consist of a firm and constant structural outlook as in the case of a translation universal. Because of the tendency to explicitate, translation does not retain the characteristics that could be expected in the case where explicitation distinguishes itself as consistent and inherently universal. All the given examples in this study are meant to illustrate this observation.

Chesterman (2000) distinguishes between the *"S-universals"*, that is, differences between translations and their source texts, regardless of language and *"T-universals"*, that is, differences between translations and comparable texts in the target language. The differences between explicitated texts and the normal Sesotho utterances give evidence to this view.

Snell-Hornby maintains that translation is a "cluster concept" and refutes the universality of explicitation that *"not all conclusions of research are applicable to all translation types or all translation contexts"*. It speaks on its own therefore that explicitation in the target text cannot be said to be universal.

As part of the results identified in this work, the study has reflected on quite a number of reasons that cause explicitation and that can be perceived as making it difficult to qualify explicitation in Sesotho translation as universal. The following are some of the most formidable factors causing explicitation in Sesotho translation:

As in all the examples, the fact that the Sesotho translator is retelling or rewriting the text, sometimes it tends that the translator tends to be too explicit than the source text author.

Dealing with two different languages as in all the examples, warrants explicitation in the sense of encoding and decoding so as to build up a meaningful communication with the intended target text readers.

As indicated and demonstrated in the previous examples, the translator may feel obliged to explicitate (obligatory explicitation) in order to express an optimally accessible and culturally functional translation.

Despite all the reasons given for explicitation to take place, it tends to be clear that though explicitation happens from the source text to the target text, it is still questionable whether explicitation can be said to be universal. The study confirms also the fact that little has been done to research on empirical factors underlying universal explicitation in translation in general, and Sesotho translation in particular.

DISCUSSION

Explicitation in this work can be characterised as general but in some cases specific. It is general in the sense that it is inherently explicit as it conforms to the cultural being of the Sesotho language. It is relevant to the Basotho culture as it reflects on the language of the Basotho as a cultural group. It is the tendency of the Basotho to explain and provide finer details over the unknown source text data. It is specific as regulated by the dynamics of the use of Sesotho language as target language and English as the source language. In other words, explicitation is applied as a strategy to deal with un-usual concepts that do not necessarily have equivalents in the Sesotho language.

On the other hand, the paper has reflected that in the case where explicitation has not been applied as the preferred strategy, simplification has been used. In this case fewer words have been used instead of long descriptions and qualifications. In Sesotho language the trend is that simplification becomes more dominant in the case of technical translations. Literary translations as well as Bible translations in Sesotho prefer explicitation as the relevant strategy. This implies that explicitation in Sesotho translation is not necessarily universal.

Explicitation sometimes occurs unconsciously of the translator. The pressing need to put explicitly the information that has been presented implicit in the source text may result in greater redundancy that culminates into explicitation. However, explicitation in this case cannot be taken to be inherently universal because it may not always happen in all cases of translation processes. The philosophical perception of explicitation is that it should happen at all times, everywhere and in all translation processes.

Explicitation in English-Sesotho language combination reflects that it does not necessarily occur only where Sesotho serves as the target language but, instead, it also happens even when English serves as the target language. In other words, there are cases where explicitation occurs in the English target language situation but not necessarily in the Sesotho source text.

In the light of Baker's (2000) definition of 'translation universals' as recurrent features that occur in translated texts rather than original texts, independently of the influence of the particular languages involved in the process of translation, the translation social is different.

CONCLUSION

There is a distinction between voluntary or optional explicitations and the "inherent translations". However, it appears that most of the researchers did not do enough to distinguish between the "translation-inherent' explicitations and the optional or voluntary explicitations. In the case where researchers think of inherent explicitations, they do not provide motivations for the occurrence of such explicitations. There is even not enough research made in that regard. With the above statements as background, it

follows that it is quite difficult to claim that acts of explicitations in Sesotho language can be perceived to be universal without any empirical evidence to verify the argument.

Though cohesion markers raise the level of explicitness in the target language and that the explicitness is "inherent in the process of translation", the researcher argues that it happens only in some languages. There are various factors that cause explicitation to take place; such as lack of cultural knowledge of the source text among the target readers. The desire to explicitate may also be caused by the need to avoid ambiguity and the existing cultural gap between the source and the target text.

In most of the examples discussed in this work, the cause of explicitation cannot be attributed to the nature of the language(s) involved. In other words, explicitation appears not to be an inherent linguistic feature in the translation. In this case, explicitation is initiated by the psychology of the translator and not the language itself. It then follows that explicitation is used as inherent in the process of translation.

The analysis of examples confirms explicitation hypothesis even though it does not necessarily mean that it is universal. If something has been explicitated, we have to make sure that it has been implicitated in the source text. This means that explicitation in the target text is related to implicitation in the source text. In the analysis of explicitation in the target text, readers should also consider implicitation in the source text. The asymmetric relationship between the source text and the target text is such that there is a relationship between implicitation and explicitation respectively.

Explicitation and implicitation can occur within the same text. In other words, explicitation should not only be confined to the target text only, neither should the implicitation be limited only to the source text. Both these translation universals can occur within the same text based on the needs. Explicitation is therefore a process and not a mere product.

Based on the explicitation hypothesis, the study confirms and reflects that in the Sesotho language there is a universal tendency to explicitate. The acts of explicitation are caused by the translation process and not necessarily the nature of the languages involved in the translation process. However, it must be taken into consideration that the language combination dynam-

ics are crucial as well as the source language interference to verify the universality of explicitation in Sesotho translation.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The paper has reflected on the complexities of the explicitation hypothesis. Based on the observations and the results in this work, the researcher therefore recommends that this subject should be treated rigorously for the sake of conviction and acquisition of empirical evidence around the universality of explicitation in Sesotho translation.

Experienced as well as the budding translators should consider that explicitation should be applied meaningfully and logically. It should, for instance, clearly illuminate the meaning implied in the original text. Translators should be mindful of the fact that they should explicitate to provide more information in the translation presumably because it is already known in the source culture. In other words, it must be considered that not everybody in the target culture knows the source text cultural aspects. It also implies therefore that explicitation cannot be done merely for the fun of it. It must have a specific purpose and it must be made for the benefit of the target reader.

In some cases, it is important for translators to simplify the source text depending on the nature and standard of the intended target group. Translators explicitate, for instance, mostly when the technical text is directed to children. It will require a lot of explicitations in order to illuminate specific implied content in the source text.

By virtue of the Asymmetry hypothesis that encompasses the interplay between explicitness and implicitness, it is recommended that translations should maintain the balance between the two. The researcher strongly believes that the Asymmetry hypothesis can be a better replacement of the Explicitation hypothesis in case the latter should be abandoned as lacking strong research motivations.

Explicitation should not be misconstrued by translators to signify the provision of mere explanations. It should be understood that it presents explicitly what has been implicitly stated in the original source text. While the tendency to explicitate in the Sesotho translation is a reality, explicitation in the Sesotho translation does not occur in some but not all translation pro-

cesses and therefore cannot be strictly characterised as universal.

REFERENCES

Baker M 2000. Corpus linguistics and translation studies: Implications and applications. In: Mona Baker, Gill Francis, Elena Tognini-Bonelli (Eds.) 1993. *Text and Technology: In Honour of John Sinclair.* Philadelphia/Amsterdam: Benjamins, pp. 233-250.

Blum-Kulka S 2000. Shifts of cohesion and coherence in translation. In: *The Translation Studies Reader.* London: Routledge, pp. 298-313.

Chesterman A 2000. A Causal Model for Translation Studies. *Paper presented at UMIST/UCL Conference: Research Models in Translation Studies,* 28-30 April 2000, Manchester, UK.

Klaudy K 2008. *Explicitation.* In: M Baker (Ed.): *Routledge's Encyclopedia of Translation Studies.* London and New York, pp. 80-84.

Frawley W 1984. Prolegomenon to a Theory of Translation. In: W Frawley (Ed.) *Translation: Literary, Linguistic and Philosophical Perspectives.* University of Delaware Press; Associated University Presses, 1984, pp. 159-175. Reprinted in The Translation Studies Reader, L. Venuti, Ed., 250-263. Routledge.

House J 2004. *Explicitness in Discourse Across Languages.* Bochum: AKS.

House J 2008. *Translation Quality Assessment: A Model Revisited.* Tubingen: Gunter Narr.

Johansson Stig, Knut Hofland 1994. Towards an English-Norwegian parallel corpus. In: Udo Fries et al. (Eds.): *Creating and Using English Language Corpora: Papers from the Fourteenth International Conference on English Language Research on Computerised Corpora,* Zurich 1993. Amsterdam/Atlanta, GA.: Rodopi, pp. 25-37.

Olohan M, Baker M 2000. Reporting *that* in translated English: Evidence for subconscious processes of explicitation? *Across Languages and Cultures,* 1(2): 141-158.

Overas L 1998. In search of the third code: An investigation of norms in literary translation. *Meta,* 43(4): 557-570.

Pym A 2005. Explaining explicitation. In: Krisztina Karoly, Agota Foris (Eds.): *New Trends in Translation Studies: In Honour of Kinga Klaudy.* Budapest: Akademiai Kiado, pp. 29-34.

Snell-Hornby M 2006. *The Turns of Translation Studies: New Paradigms of Shifting Viewpoints.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Toury G 1995. *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond.* Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Ulrych M 2008. Translating and editing as mediated discourse: Focus on the recipient. In: R Dumitriu, J Shlesinger (Eds.): *Translators and Their Readers: In Homage to Eugene A. Nida.* Brussels: Editions du Hasard, pp. 219-234.

Vinay JP, Darbelnet J 1995. *Comparative Stylistics of French and English: A Methodology for Translation.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.