Meta
Journal des traducteurs
Translators' Journal

ΜΕΤΑ

In Search of the Third Code: An Investigation of Norms in Literary Translation

Linn Øverås

Cite this article

Article abstract

This paper is an investigation of explicitation in translational English and translational Norwegian. The study is aimed at unveiling the specificity of the language of translation regardless of the contrastive differences existing between the two languages. The ultimate objective, however, goes beyond the mere linguistic investigation in as far as it attempts to reach conclusions about the literary translational norms prevaling in the target communities it has studied.

IN SEARCH OF THE THIRD CODE: AN INVESTIGATION OF NORMS IN LITERARY TRANSLATION[1]

LINN ØVERÅS
Oslo, Norway

Résumé

  Cet article étudie l'explicitation en anglais et en norvégien traductionnels. L'auteur cherche à lever le voile sur la spécificité de la langue traduite sans se soucier des différences contrastives entre les deux langues en contact. Cependant, son objectif dépasse la stricte étude linguistique: dans la mesure où on tente de dégager des conclusions sur les normes littéraires traductionnelles admises dans la communauté cible étudiée.

Abstract

  This paper is an investigation of explicitation in translational English and translational Norwegian. The study is aimed at unveiling the specificity of the language of translation regardless of the contrastive differences existing between the two languages. The ultimate objective, however, goes beyond the mere linguistic investigation in as far as it attempts to reach conclusions about the literary translational norms prevaling in the target communities it has studied.

1. DESCRIPTIVE TRANSLATION STUDIES

Controversies regarding the characteristics of successful translation have been documented since the Roman Age. The awareness of central dilemmas has been present throughout, and historical variation in the context of translation appears to consist of shifts in emphasis rather than the accumulation of knowledge. It is only in the last couple of decades, however, that the acknowledgement of the sheer amount of differing views has seriously shaken the field and caused a move away from theoretical prescription to empirical, non-evaluative description within the framework of so-called Descriptive Translation Studies. As translation had been so hard to define at a theoretical level, the hope was that investigations of actual products might provide useful insights.

1.1. Polysystem Theory

  The position of translations (as entities) and of translating (as a kind of activity) in a prospective target culture, the form a translation would have (and hence the relationships which would tie it to its original), and the strategies resorted to during its generation do not constitute a series of unconnected facts. (Toury 1995: 24)

The term *polysystem* was coined by the Israeli cultural theorist Itamar Even-Zohar in the 1970s. Strongly influenced by Russian formalism, Even-Zohar regarded literature as a complex and dynamic system rather than a static collection of independent texts. According to this framework all texts within a given literature, from canonical centre to distant periphery, enter into a permanent struggle for domination.

Translated literature is only one of the elements in this battle, but the fact that Even-Zohar included it at all was significant:

> It is necessary to include translated literature in the polysystem. This is rarely done, but no observer of the history of any literature can avoid recognizing as an important fact the impact of translations and their role in the synchrony and diachrony of a certain literature (Even-Zohar qt. in Gentzler 1993: 116).

This framework was taken up by Even-Zohar's colleague, Gideon Toury, and elaborated in *In Search of a Translation Theory* (1980) and *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond* (1995). Traditional comparisons between one source text and its translation become less dominant in this context. Corpus projects of various kinds are encouraged because they facilitate comparisons of series of texts or translation problems, for example, of several translations of one source, different stages in the translation of a text, entire productions of individual translators, schools of translators, and above all of translations with corpora of TL originals. It is an approach that allows room for micro-level textual studies, but that also stresses the importance of macro-level sociological expansions of the field. In this way one hopes to gain insight into the many factors that characterize and determine the translation product. The polysystemist claim, however, is that this is only possible within a target-oriented approach.

1.2. Target Orientation

> Translations are facts of target cultures; on occasion facts of a special status, sometimes even constituting identifiable (sub)systems of their own, but of the target culture in any event. (Toury 1995: 29)

Scholars working within the polysystemic framework insist that the description of translations be consistently target-oriented. In what appears to be a relativization of textual meaning as well as the notion of equivalence, the question raised is not whether equivalence has been achieved but what kind of equivalence has been attempted. Equivalence becomes a descriptive, dynamic term for empirical matter rather than a theoretical term referring to a static, abstract ideal. The basic assumption is that "features are retained and reconstructed in target language material, not because they are important in any *inherent sense,* but because they are *assigned* importance, from the recipient vantage point" (Toury 1995: 12). Contrasting as it does recurring discussions within translation theory about the nature and range of untranslatability due to differences between SL and TL, polysystem theory restricts the notion of constraint to the target community.

Source orientation, with its comparison of translations with an ideal notion of equivalence, will always retain an element of prescription. According to Toury, this approach is largely to blame for the gap between theory and practice and also for the stagnation within theory itself. Confronting instances from entire texts to individual words, a source-oriented investigation regards any translated item that does not fit into the preconceived notion of equivalence as non-equivalence, or non-translation, and subsequently evaluates it negatively, or discards it as unworthy of investigation. Because of the many discrepancies regarding the view of appropriate equivalence, the entire object of investigation risks vanishing into thin air. Within the target-oriented framework, however "anything is included as a literary translation that is regarded as such by a certain cultural community at a certain time" (Hermans 1985: 13). Gideon Toury, then, recommends investigating what translations are, rather than what they fail to be, and presents a methodology for that purpose.

1.3. Translation Norms

> As strictly translational norms can only be applied at the receiving end, establishing them is not merely *justified* by a target-oriented approach but should be seen as its very *epitome*. (Toury 1995: 53)

Applying a definition taken from sociology, Gideon Toury explains norms as "the general values or ideas shared by a certain community as to what is right and wrong, adequate and inadequate — into specific performance instructions appropriate for and applicable to specific situations providing they are not (yet) formulated as laws" (Toury 1995: 51). The term refers to a notion of a graded and dynamic cline. Norms constitute a continuum between two extremes, with formulated rules on the one hand and instances of idiosyncratic behaviour on the other. They also make up a graded system, in which certain norms are ascribed greater importance than others. Moreover, the concept has a dynamic aspect. On the one hand, near-rules may fade while individual deviations acquire the status of norm; on the other, variations are likely to be found within as well as between cultures. Translation norms are regarded as independent of systemic differences between SL^2 and TL, and are not determined by the ST. The notion thus relates to the target orientedness of polysystem theory in that it represents the possibilities and constraints provided by the target community.

Gideon Toury speaks of norms at three levels, *preliminary, initial* and *operational*. Preliminary norms relate to extra-textual issues, such as the position of translation within the polysystem of a target culture, and the choice of languages and texts to be translated. Initial norms relate to the opposing poles of *adequacy* and *acceptability*. Whereas "adherence to source text norms determines a translation's adequacy as compared to the source text, subscription to norms originating in the target culture determines its acceptability" (Toury 1995: 57). Initial norms need not be verbalized or even conscious; on the other hand, they may contradict explicit intentions. As well, a given translation need not be consistent in its adequacy or acceptability: these are theoretical poles between which actual translations are likely to hover.

The assumption, then, is that such initial norms may be revealed through investigations of *operational* norms, i.e. textual features. Although the general claim that *explicitation* is characteristic of translation is frequently made, and has been confirmed by specific investigations, case studies are few and far between, and to my knowledge no such study has yet been attempted based on translations between English and Norwegian.

2. FOCUS OF THE PRESENT INVESTIGATION

According to William Frawley, "the translation itself [...] is essentially a third code which arises out of the bilateral consideration of the matrix and target codes: it is, in a sense, a sub-code of each of the codes involved" (Frawley 1984: 168).

The concept of translation as a kind of separate sub-language is not new. It has a long tradition, both in terms of recommended foreignization and in terms of warning or negative evaluation. In the latter case it has been known as *translationese,* i.e. when an "unusual distribution of features is clearly a result of the translator's inexperience or lack of competence in the target language" (Baker 1993: 248). What *is* new is the non-evaluative view within descriptive translation studies of interlanguage as an *inevitable* aspect of translation. Obvious instances can be found in terms of *interference,* where the translation reflects SL features that violate systemic rules within TL. Equally relevant, however, are the more subtle deviations, which "do not [...] manifest themselves in odd forms with regard to TL of the non-existing type (i.e. deviations from the code proper),

but [...] in odd forms of the unusual type, which are deviations from the *norm* of usage" (Toury 1979: 226).

It is this kind of unusual type that has been the focus of the present investigation. This focus was chosen in the belief that, although they undoubtedly occur, blatant violations of TL rules are not the most typical feature of translation, either as intentional strategy or as a result of insufficient mastery of TL. While such examples may have an anecdotal function, they do not provide the kind of insight into aspects of translation sought within the present framework.

2.1. The Explicitation Hypothesis

According to Shoshana Blum-Kulka (1986: 19) "the process of interpretation performed by the translator on the source text might lead to a TL text which is more redundant than the SL text." The suggested redundancy "can be expressed by a rise in the level of cohesive explicitness in the TL text" (1986). The explicitation hypothesis postulates that this rise takes place "regardless of the increase traceable to differences between the two linguistic and textual systems involved" (1986). The present project investigates the 50 first sentences of 40 novel fragments — 20 Norwegian originals and their translations into English and the same number of English originals and their translations into Norwegian — from the point of view of just such a postulated rise in cohesive explicitness. By analyzing translations in both directions, as well as excluding explicitating shifts caused by rule-governed language system differences, the investigation aims at transcending the limits of language specificity.

2.1.1. Norm-confirmation

The investigation has adopted Blum-Kulka's term *explicitation* to account for the kind of translation process where implicit, co-textually recoverable ST material is rendered explicit in TT, as in the following TT replacement of ellipsis by noun head:

(1)[3]   <s id=CL1.1.1.1.s7 corresp=CL1T.1.1.1.s8>Gikk fort med **halvlukkete eller halvåpne øyne**.</s>
(Literally: **half-closed or half-open eyes**)
<s id=CL1T.1.1.1.s8 corresp=CL1.1.1.1.s7>Walked quickly with **half-closed eyes or half-open eyes**.</s>

Such shifts may occur at different levels and include instances throughout the rank scale, from shifts at the level of the individual word at the lowest, to the addition of finite clause at the highest level, e.g. from substitution to lexical repetition, as in

(2)   <s id=MA1.1.2.s5 corresp=MA1T.1.2.s5>It puts the nature of time in its place, and also Stephen, who calls us the teenagers, as if he himself is not **one**.</s>
<s id=MA1T.1.2.s5 corresp=MA1.1.2.s5>Det setter tiden på plass, og Stephen også, som kaller oss tenåringene, akkurat som ikke han selv er **tenåring**.</s>
(Literally: as if he himself is not **a teenager**)

This extends to shifts across the rank scale at the other end, e.g. from Ø-item in ST to finite clause in TT:

(3)   <s id=BV1. 1.s11>Ulykkeligvis hadde Brita vært hos bestemoren på Torshov den dagen Bendixens flyttet inn og var også gått glipp av **det eventyrlig sjuskete flyttelasset**.</s>
(Literally: had also missed **the marvellously dilapidated removal load**)
<s id=BV1T.1.s11 corresp=BV1.1.s11>Unfortunately Brita had been over at her grandmother's house on the day the Bendixens had moved in, and so she had missed seeing **the vanload of dilapidated furniture which accompanied them.**</s>

2.1.2. Norm-disconfirmation

As well as norm-confirming instances, the survey includes what, for lack of a better term, I have called norm-disconfirming tendencies, i.e. *implicitation*. Even if explicitation *should* prove to be so frequent as to justify the notion of norm, it seems important to include possible deviations and to examine the rate and types of such instances. Implicitation includes instances where explicit ST items are rendered by ambiguous TT items, but where recoverability in the immediate TT environment makes the item implicit rather than ambiguous, as in the following shift from lexical word to proform:

(4) <s id=AT1.1.s6 corresp=AT1T.1.s6>**Jeans** had those stiff, hard seams and those rivets.</s>
<s id=AT1T.1.s6>**De** hadde sånne stive, harde sømmer, og så alle de naglene.</s>
(Literally: **They** had those stiff)

Shifts, then, may be inextricably linked up with other translation decisions, and may be well-founded and successful. The number of shifts at micro level does not necessarily result in a sense of significant shifts at macro level in the overall interpretation of the text, although some kind of cumulative effect might be plausible. The aim here is not to evaluate, but to test the hypothesis that explicitation is a significant characteristic of translation that may contribute to the definition of third code.

2.2. Investigating the English-Norwegian Parallel Corpus

The main value of cohesive markers seems to be that they can be used to facilitate and possibly control the interpretation of underlying semantic relations. (Baker 1992: 218)

The notion of facilitating and controlling interpretation seems closely linked to the phenomenon of explicitation in translation, and cohesion therefore appears to provide an appropriate framework for the description of explicitating shifts. While Blum-Kulka's hypothesis was based on the investigation of both cohesion and coherence, the present investigation restricts its search to cohesion, and where Blum-Kulka (1986) concentrated on grammatical ties, the present study focuses heavily on lexical cohesion.

The notion of cohesive ties is broadly based on Halliday & Hasan (1976). Examples of each type were selected from both sub-corpora, with the overall intention of achieving an even distribution. While this selection method may indicate that all categories are present in both sub-corpora, questions pertaining to the frequency of each type, and possible differences in this respect between translations from English to Norwegian and vice versa, transcend the scope of the investigation. In order to confirm or disconfirm Blum-Kulka's explicitation hypothesis, however, frequency rates regarding the number of explicitating (as opposed to implicitating) shifts are presented. In this case, differences between the two sub-corpora are included. While implicitating shifts have been included in the statistical material, the survey of examples includes explicitation only. Casual observation suggests, however, that implicitating shifts occur within all the categories established to account for explicitation.

2.2.1.Grammatical ties

The present section investigates the material from the point of view of two of the four grammmatical devices in English presented by Halliday and Hasan, i.e. conjunction and reference. The investigation of both grammatical and lexical explicitation include the subcategories of *addition* and *specification*.

Addition: Insertions in TT of conjunctions not present in ST, as in the linking of individual words:

(5)   <s id=NG1.1.s48 corresp=NG1T.1.s49>The definitive face that begins to emerge with adolescence was **long, slender**, and tenderly responsive beneath thick-browed, great black eyes ringed with dark skin as if in physical manifestation of deep thought.</s>
<s id=NG1T.1.s49 corresp=NG1.1.s48>Det endelige ansiktet som formet seg i de første ungdomsårene var **langt og smalt** og følsomt med store sorte øyne under tykke øyenbryn, omgitt av mørk hud, som et fysisk uttrykk for tankekraft.</s>
(Literally: **long and slender**)

The shift from asyndetic coordination to syndeton is also found in translations from Norwegian into English, as in the following coordination of clauses:

(6)   <s id=GS1.1.s13 corresp=GS1T.1.sl3>Han hadde et humoristisk glimt i øynene, og en gang **jeg var på vei inn, han på vei ut,** sa han i forbifarten: Inn til vanningsstedet?</s>
(Literally: **I was on the way in, he on the way out**)
<s id=GS1T.1.s13 corresp=GS1.1.sl3>His eyes had a humorous gleam in them and once, when **I was on the way in and he was on the way out**, he said as he passed me: Going into the watering-hole?</s>

A great many of the shifts serve to explicitate the semantic roles of time and place, by way of pro-adverb insertions:

(7)   <s id=TH1.1.s2S corresp=TH1T.1.s26>**She crossed her legs** and balanced the ashtray on one knee.</s>
<s id=TH1T.1.s26 corresp=TH1.1.s25>**Så la hun bena i kors** og plasserte askebegeret på det ene kneet.</s>
(Literally: **Then she crossed her legs**)

TT inserts a pro-adverb of time in sentence-initial position. The frequency of this type of pro-adverb insertion in translations from English to Norwegian may indicate a stylistic preference rather than a translation norm. Examples are also found in N>E,[4] however, as in the following pro-adverb of time insertion:

(8)   <s id=KH1.1.s35 corresp=KH1T.1.s27>**En av dem** får tak i øksa til tømmermannen.</s>
(Literally: One of them)
<s id=KH1T.1.s27 corresp=KH1.1.s34 KH1.1.s35>**But then one of them** got hold of an axe belonging to the carpenter, and they decided to take over the ship.</s>

Specification: The term specification refers to shifts involving either *expansion* or *substitution*. It includes expansions in the specification of nouns by way of determiners, such as articles, demonstratives and possessives. It also includes the replacement of one grammatical device by another where the latter is considered more informative, and the lexicalization in TT of ST pro-forms. Conversely, implicitating shifts included in the statistical material involve the reduction and replacement of proforms, as well as the pronominalization in TT of ST lexical words.

In the following example the insertion of possessive determiner appears to reduce the sense of intimacy achieved by the unmodified ST apposition:

(9)   <s id=TTH1.1.s18 corresp=TTH1T.1.sl8>Men når han lukket øynene kunne han se for seg de trygge, jordete nevene til faren, de gode øynene til moren og det rynkete, gamle ansiktet til **bestemor Gælion** der hun satt og rugget fram og tilbake og fortalte underlige eventyr og sagn.</s>
(Literally: **grandmother Gælion**)

<s id=TTH1T.1.s18 corresp=TTH1.1.sl8>And when he closed his eyes, he could picture his father's protective, earth-soiled hands, his mother's vigilant gaze, and the wrinkled, aged face of **his grandmother Gaelion,** as she sat rocking back and forth, telling strange tales and legends.</s>

Examples involving substitution of one grammatical tie for another have been included on the assumption that some cohesive ties contain more semantic information than others: Semantically, linkage may be placed on a scale of cohesiveness: the most cohesive signals are connectives like *therefore,* which makes a fairly explicit relation between two clauses: that of reason. *And,* on the other hand, is the vaguest of connectives — it might be called a 'general purpose link,' in that it merely says that two ideas have a positive connection, and leaves the reader to work out what it is. (Leech & Short 1981: 250)

The first example involves the shift from "vague" connective to result pro-form:

(10) <s id=AT1.1.s1 corresp=AT1T.1.s1>They were supposed to stay at the beach a week, but neither of them had the heart for it **and they decided** to come back early.</s>
<s id=AT1T.1.s1 corresp=AT1.1.s1>De skulle egentlig vært pa stranden en uke, men ingen av dem hadde lyst til å bli der lenger, **så de bestemte seg** for å dra hjem tidligere.</s>
(Literally: **so they decided**)

The sub-category of specification by way of substitution also includes shifts, for example, from negative indefinite pronoun to correlative coordination:

(11) <s id=KF1.1.1.s44 corresp=KF1T.1.1.s44>Jeg er ingen lommetyv, ingen veskenapper.</s>
(Literally: I'm no pickpocket, no purse snatcher)
<s id=KF1 T.1. 1.s44 corresp=KF1. 1. l.s44>I'm **neither** a pickpocket **nor** a purse snatcher.</s>

The final group of examples involving grammatical ties constitutes a link with the lexical section in that it involves the lexicalization of proforms. In the first example gender has already been specified, but TT replaces the pro-form by a lexical word:

(12) <s id=PDJ3.1.1.s35 corresp=PDJ3T.1.1.s37>Her companion hesitated, **looked at her**, then leaned back and released the rear door.</s>
<s id=PDJ3T.1.1.s37 corresp=PDJ3.1.1.s35>Den andre kvinnen nølte og **så på piken**, så snudde hun seg og trakk opp låseknappen på døren bak.</s>
(Literally: **looked at the girl**)

Finally, TT also explicitates the identity of the speaker in dialogues by lexicalizing proforms in reporting clauses:

(13) <s id=DF1.1.s47 corresp=DF1T.1.sSO>At least I haven't had to pin anything this time, **he said.**</s>
<s id=DF1T.1.sSO corresp=DF1.1.s47>Denne gangen slapp jeg i alle fall å bruke skruer, **sa ortopeden.**</s>
(Literally: **said the orthopaedist**)

2.2.2. Lexical ties

The study of lexical cohesion apparently entails venturing into a fuzzy area between coherence and cohesion. According to Blum-Kulka (1986: 25), texts may *cohere* "with respect to subject matter (e.g. mathematics), to genre conventions (literature) or with respect to any possible world evoked and/or presupposed by the text."

Halliday & Hasan (1976: 288), however, situate such features, i.e. the ways in which "discourse does not wander at random from one topic to another but runs on reasonably systematic lines with a certain consistency of topic and predictability of development," within the framework of *lexical cohesion*. Baker (1992: 218) suggests: "we could say that cohesion is the surface expression of coherence relations, [...] a device for making conceptual relations explicit." If this applies not only to grammatical markers but also to "the role played by the selection of vocabulary in organising relations within a text" (Baker 1992: 202), then the present analysis indicates that translators rely less on the reader's ability to make the text cohere and resort, to a greater extent than original texts, to cohesion.

Addition: The present category includes the replacement of an ST Ø-item or below constituent item by a constituent or proposition. The terminology provided by case grammar has been considered useful in this context in the description of the semantic relationships that result from TT additions. Constituents within the argument of the proposition follow the framework presented by Johansson and Lysvåg (1987). Following Brown & Miller (1980), the term process is used in the description of shifts pertaining to the predicate. The combination of these two approaches cohesion and case grammar, appear to provide more useful insight into types of explicitation than a narrowly syntactic description.

Additions within the argument cover a wide range of semantic roles. Blum-Kulka distinguishes between explicitating shifts that merely affect the style of the text and those that affect its meaning. No such distinction is made in the present investigation, but effects on meaning are commented upon to the extent that they seem relevant and are perceivable in the available co-text. In the first example the insertion of a cognate object apparently affects meaning only marginally, if at all:

(14)   <s id=FW1.1.s41 corresp=FW1T.1.s40>**It lived** in yet another shadow, being
        equidistant from the Mendip Mast and Glastonbury Tor.</s>
        <s id=FW1T.1.s40 corresp=FW1.1.s41>**Den levde sitt liv** under nok en skygge,
        midtveis mellom Mendip-masten og Glastonbury-varden.</s>
        (Literally: **It lived its life**)

Nevertheless, the insertion of a cognate object increases the semantic redundancy. Such examples were therefore included.

According to Blum-Kulka (1986: 19), shifts in levels of explicitness in translation "have been claimed to be linked to differences in stylistic preferences for types of cohesive markers in the two languages involved." The intransitive use of the verb in the next example is less acceptable in English than in Norwegian, and might thus be considered an instance of stylistic preference rather than an inherent feature of translation:

(15)   <s id=TB1.1.s22 corresp=TB1T.1.s22>Den hvite mannen **knipser**.</s>
        (Literally: **The white man klicks**)
        <s id=TB1T.1.s22 corresp=TB1.1.s22>The white man **clicks his camera.**</s>

The *stylistic preference hypothesis* pertains to an intermediate stage between obligatory shifts resulting from TL rules and translation specific norms, resulting from either culture-bound conventions or, as Blum-Kulka's explicitation hypothesis suggests, the translation process itself. While the intention has been to exclude the so-called obligatory shifts, the line between system related shifts and the stylistic preference hypothesis is not an easy one to draw. Nor is the distinction between the latter and the explicitation hypothesis: "To establish the relative validity of these hypotheses it would be necessary to first carry out a large scale contrastive stylistic study (in a given register) to establish

cohesive patterns in SL and TL, and then to examine translations to and from both lan-
guages to investigate shifts in cohesive levels that occur in translation" (Blum-Kulka
1986: 33). As such investigation into contrastive features was not possible, it was neces-
sary to rely on occasional informants who often differed in opinion or in personal intu-
ition. Shifts of the above kind, lingering, perhaps, between stylistic preference and
translation norm, were included on the assumption that, while not part of the present
survey, the investigation of *initial* norms may benefit from research that includes all
occurrences. If the same attitude informs the selection of implicitating shifts, there
seems to be no major methodological problem involved.

Many of the shifts are clearly textually motivated in that added items enter into a
reiteration relationship with items in the immediate co-text, as in the following inser-
tion of an instrumental object:

(16)   <s id=MA1.1.2.s38 corresp=MA1T.1.2.s38>0nly I'm going to have a yappy
        Pekinese, and chase kids off my lawn.</s>
        <s id=MA1T.1.2.s38 corresp=MA1.1.2.s38>Bare at jeg skal ha en gneldrende
        pekingeser, og jage ungene fra plenen **med stokken min.**</s>
        (Literally: **with my cane**)

By inserting a more general word, *stokken,* the translator anticipates information
provided by ST in the succeeding sentence:

(17)   <s id=MA1.1.2.s39 corresp=MA1T.1.2.s39>I'm going to have **a shepherd's
        crook.**</s>
        <s id=MA1T.1.2.s39 corresp=MA1.1.2.s39>Jeg skal skaffe meg **en hyrdestav**.</s>

The insertion of a truth-evaluating disjunct in the next example explicitates
renewed confirmation of a fact the main character has difficulties in understanding:

(18)   <s id=TTH1.1.s7 corresp=TTH1T.1.s7>**Han var** i det kalde landet langt mot nord,
        der en ny, lang vinter snart stod for døra.</s>
        (Literally: **He was**)
        <s id=TTH1T.1.s7 corresp=TTH1.1.s7>**He really was** in this frozen land so far
        north, with a new, long winter on the doorstep.</s>

While this element of positive conviction can be inferred from the ST co-text, it is
implied only, and depends e.g. on stress of the verb *var*. The explicitation of interpreta-
tion depending on stress and intonation, then, was found to be yet another motivation.
The next example shows the insertion of inference adjunct not present in ST:

(19)   <s id=GS 1.1.s35 corresp=GS1T.1.s36>Dukene på bordene var kulørte, og når du
        kom inn fra gaten, kunne det se ut som om de var plassert etter et slags mønster;
        men når du hadde sittet en stund, så du at de ble skiftet ut alt etter skjebnens
        lunefullhet så snart det ble sølt for mye øl eller aske over dem.</s>
        <s id=GS1T.1.s36 corresp=S1.1.s35>The cloths on the table were coloured ones
        and, when you came in from outside, it sometimes looked as though they had been
        arranged in some form of pattern; but, after you had been sitting down for a while,
        you observed that they were changed solely according to the whim of chance — as
        soon, **in other words**, as too much beer or cigarette ash had been spilt on them.</s>

Weissbrod notes that "there was no objection to rather large additions (phrases,
whole sentences) if they served the purpose of explicitation" (Weissbrod 1992: 163).
While the above examples illustrate the addition of different types of semantic role, the
following example confirms Weissbrod's observation in that TT also adds complete
propositions, as in the following shift from Ø-item:

(20)   <s id=GS1.1.s39 corresp=GS1T.1.s40>Jeg pleide å kjøpe med et par middagsaviser fra tobakkshandelen ved siden av, fant et lite bord borte langs en av veggene og ble sittende for meg selv.</s>
       <s id=GS1T.1.s40 corresp=GS1.1.s39>I would buy a couple of evening papers at the tobacconist's next door **and take them in with me to read,** find a small table against one of the walls at the back and sit there on my own.</s>

Again, TT reveals the process of interpretation performed on ST. Finally, several instances were found in which the translator inserts a reporting clause not present in ST:

(21)   <s id=EG1.1.s14 corresp=EG1T.1.sl3>-Husk nå at du ikke gir fra deg så mye som en bitteliten lyd.</s>
       <s id=EG1T.1.sl3 corresp=EG1.1.sl4>Now remember, **she admonished,** not a sound.</s>

<u>Specification</u>: The sub-category of specification includes explicitating shifts resulting from either expansion or substitution. On the one hand, TT constituents that could be traced back to ST had been elaborated by way of lexical specification. On the other, TT replaced the ST item by a more specific term. Specification within both argument and predicate were included.

Instances of this kind have been included as expansions of the semantic role, i.e. of the process in this case. In the following example the shift from primary verb to a more complex verb phrase appears to be significant:

(22)   <s id=TTH1.1.s30 corresp=TTH1T.1.s31>Patric var en from mann som **ble hellig** etter at han døde.</s>
       (Literally: **became holy**)
       <s id=TTH1T.1.s31 corresp=TTH1.1.s30>Patric was a pious man who **was made holy** after his death.</s>

In expanding the verb construction, TT adds an agent implication absent in ST. From being an acquired state in ST, holiness becomes something that is assigned. The shift appears to normalize the "naive" perspective in a dialogue that takes place between mother and child. The succeeding sentence adds to this shift of perspective:

(23)   <s id=TTH1.1.s31 corresp--TTH1T.1.s32>Nå er St. Patric den største helgenen i hele Irland.</s>
       (Literally: is the greatest saint)
       <s id=TTH1T.1.s32 corres~TTH1.1.s31>Now Saint Patric **is regarded** as the greatest saint in all of Ireland.</s>

Once again, the shift from active to passive changes the utterance from a statement of fact to a question of point of view, and TT thus undermines the ST atmosphere of unquestioned faith. The example illustrates the problem of distinguishing between shifts that "merely explicitate" and shifts that introduce changes of meaning. In a related investigation Kitty van Leuven Zwart (1989: 155) explains her selection criteria as follows:

> Only those shifts are determined and classified which may contain indications of interpretation or strategy. Such shifts result from a conscious or unconscious choice in the part of the translator, and may occur on any one of the levels — semantic, stylistic or pragmatic — which substantially affect meaning. Shifts with no effect on any of these levels are not taken into consideration.

As in the case of the style/meaning criteria suggested by Blum-Kulka, it often proved difficult to determine the *extent to* which a shift affects meaning. A slight change of the above kind may prove to have e.g. complex ideological implications, and van Leuven Zwart's criteria have not been followed; all instances perceived to explicitate have therefore been included.

Extremely frequent in both sub-corpora are additions in the specification of nouns, by way of determiners, pre-modifiers, appositions, explanatory noun heads, genitive constructions, etc. While many of these shifts appear to be motivated by ST features, target influence appears to be equally strong, as we shall see from the following examples. The first examples are clearly textually motivated; TT expands the noun phrase to an appositional construction, explicitating the reference by inserting the proper name:

(24)   <s id=KH1.1.s49 corresp=KH1T.1.s35>Hun er ennå ikke blitt mor til **polfareren.**</s>
(Literally: **the polar explorer**)
<s id=KH1T.1.s35 corresp=KH1.1.s48 KH1.1.s49>His young wife was also on board: she had not yet given birth to **Roald, the polar explorer.**</s>

Also, specifying noun heads are inserted to clarify culture specific phenomena, as in:

(25)   <s id=LSC2.2.s18 corresp=LSC2T.2.sl8>Jeg lente meg fram over bordet og fisket ut en Hobby.</s>
(Literally: **A Hobby**)
<s id=LSC2T.2.s18 corresp=LSC2.2.sl8>I leaned forward over the table and fished out a **Hobby cigarette.**</s>

The above shift may result from the fact that *Hobby* is an unknown trademark in the target culture, and the translator may therefore want to make sure the reader understands that the name refers to a cigarette, although the information is recoverable in the succeeding sentence where the protagonist talks about the cigarette he is lighting. Such insertions are not necessarily related to cultural phenomena, however. They also occur, for example, as complements to "metonymical" foci, as in the following addition of the more common signifier:

(26)   <s id=BV2.1.1.s27 corresp=BV2T.1.1.s29>Den gamle diakonissen står på **den røde fløyelen** ved alteret, hun sier de skal be for freden.</s>
(Literally: **the red velvet**)
<s id=BV2T.1.1.s29 corresp=BV2.1.1.s27>The old sister is standing on **the red velvet carpet** by the altar, she says that they must pray for peace.</s>

In the next examples the additions may be surprising from the point of view of ST, but not from the point of view of common TL collocation:

(27)   <s id=SK1.1.s7 corresp=SK1T.1.s9>Yet even in this enlightened age, when so many parents are aware of **the psychological damage** they may do to their children, surely there was one parent somewhere in Castle Rock — or perhaps one grandmother — who quieted the kids by telling them that Frank Dodd would get them if they didn't watch out, if they weren't good.</s>
<s id=SK1T.1.s9 corresp=SK1.1.s7>Men selv i vår opplyste tidsalder, da så mange foreldre er klar over hvor lett det er å påføre barn **alvorlige psykiske skader,** forekom det sikkert i Castle Rock at foreldre — eller kanskje en bestemor — truet med Frank Dodd hvis ungen var rampete.</s>
(Literally: **serious psychological damage**)

Similar instances occur frequently in both corpora:

(28)   <s id=KH1.1.s26 corresp=KH1T.1.s22>Det var **en blanding** av vill dristighet og en frøkenaktig, fornem finhet i hans slekt.</s>
(Literally: **a mixture**)
<s id=KH1T.1.s22 corresp=KH1.1.s26>There was **a strange mixture** of wild boldness and dignified gentility in the family.</s>

Both the above examples involve the insertion of evaluative additions. The explanation might be that the translator gets carried away, as it were, in his empathy with or "envisionment" of ST, and adds his impressions regarding the seriousness or the strangeness of a situation. Related to this phenomenon, as well as to examples mentioned earlier, are modifier insertions that seem to be motivated by the translator's sense of extra-textual logic — for example, that an *old pot lid* will probably be *bulkete*:

(29)   <s id=SK1.1.s9 corresp=SK1T.1.s11>He's out there, I can hear the grandmother whispering as the wind whistles down the chimney pipe and snuffles around **the old pot lid** crammed in the stove hole.</s>
<s id=SK1T.1.s11 corresp=SK1.1.s9>Han er der ute, kan jeg høre bestemoren hviske mens vinden piper i skorsteinen og skramler med **det gamle, bulkete kasserollelokket** som noen har slengt inn i vedkomfyren.</s>
(Literally: **the old, battered pot lid**)

In reading or listening to text, we process continuously, therefore by the time any given lexical item is taken in, its context has already been prepared; and the preceding lexical environment is perhaps the most significant component of this context. It frequently provides a great deal of hidden information that is relevant to the interpretation of the item concerned. (Halliday & Hasan 1976: 289)

Many of the examples show how the translator, with his access to the co-text, opts for the word that most precisely fits that co-text, overlooking the fact that ST was not equally specific. In example 30. ST describes a dining couple and the husband says:

(30)   <s id=MD1.1.s15 corresp=MD1T.1.s15>But the courgettes **taste** of chlorine.</s>

When the next sentence depicts the partner in the dialogue in the following manner:

(31)   <s id=MD1.1.s16 corresp=MD1T.1.sl6>Kate leaned over, helped herself to one, **ate it**.</s>

one naturally infers that she does this in order to taste the food and confirm or disconfirm the preceeding statement, hence:

(32)   <s id=MD1T.1.s16 corresp=MD1.1.sl6>Kate lenet seg over ham, tok en bit og **smakte**.</s>
(Literally: **took a bite and tasted it**)

But the fact remains that in ST she merely ate, with none of the indication of purpose that *smakte* serves to explicitate.

<u>Neutralization</u>: Within the notion of collocational range one finds the opposition also between common and less common collocation.

There is the possibility of four obviously distinct stylistic modes: normal collocations and normal grammar, unusual collocations and normal grammar, normal collocations and unusual grammar, unusual collocations and unusual grammar. (McIntosh qt. in Carter 1987: 54)

The present section has been included on the assumption that if the restriction of collocational range contributes to the cohesive effect, the shift from collocational clash to conventional combination may have a similar function.

Added to shifts from wide to more restricted ranges, then, the category involves shifts from unusual to more common collocations, as in the following neutralization of synaesthesia:

(33)   <s id=JC1.1.1.s24 corresp=JC1T.1.1.s24>With just a little teasing and some cash, the cook's fat son would play **plump tunes** on his accordion.</s>
<s id=JC1T.1.1.s24 corresp=JC1.1.1.s24>Ved hjelp av en smule godsnakk og litt penger skulle kokkens fete sønn spille **trivelige melodier** på trekkspillet sitt.</s>
(Literally: **pleasant tunes**)

Similarly, the next example appears to familiarize the collocation as a result of restricting the range. While *pristinely white* might semantically correspond to *nyfødt blankt,* the former collocation is more common:

(34)   <s id=EG1.1.s3 corresp=EG1T.1.s4>Arket i skrivemaskinen var like skinnende **nyfødt blankt** som da hun satte det inn i valsen for en time siden.</s>
(Literally: **newborn blank**)
<s id=EG1T.1.s4 corresp=EG1.1.s3>The sheet of paper in her typewriter was as **pristinely white** as when she had inserted it over an hour ago.</s>

Many of the examples appear to be related to Gideon Toury's claim that translations tend to produce *repertoremes* rather than *textemes.* The term texteme apparently coincides with Halliday's notion of instantial meaning: "Without our being aware of it, each occurrence of a lexical item carries with it its own textual history, a particular collocational environment that has been built up in the course of the creation of the text and that will provide the context within which the item will be incarnated on this particular occasion" (Baker 1992: 205). According to Toury, translators often fail to capture the complex web of these relationships and instead produce ready-made, cliche structures, i.e. repertoremes. The notion of repertoreme might apply to the strategy of dynamic equivalence in general, but seems to be particularly relevant in the case of neutralizing collocational clashes.

The next examples pertain to the field of colligation rather than collocation, but represent a similar kind of neutralization:

(35)   <s id=EH1.1.1.s39 corresp=EH1T.1.1.s42>Akkurat nå er det handelsmannen som kjem ut, og gar i gang med å skrense tomme oljefat fram til ferjelemmen, og han helser på Karl Magnus Skogmann da han **skranglar forbi.</s>**
(Literally: **clatters by**)
<s id=EH1T.1.1.s42 corresp=EH1.1.1.s39>Just now the shop keeper has come out and is starting to roll empty oil containers over to the loading platform and he says hello to Karl Magnus Skogmann as he **goes clattering past.**</s>

Apart from the somewhat unusual collocation arising from human + *skranglar (clatters),* ST inserts an adjunct of place rather than the expected instrumental role. The TT neutralizes this feature by inserting a more conventional main verb.

The following section shows instances where TT neutralizes metaphorical expressions. Such instances are considered explicitating shifts as they reduce the processing effort and thus increase readability. The assumption is that "readability refers [...] to the time and effort needed to comprehend a written text. As time and effort decrease, readability increases. As suggested by Amiran and Jones [...] readability

increases with explicitness" (Weissbrod 1992: 108). Example 36 illustrates the shift from metaphor to simile:

> (36) \<s id=SK1.1.s26 corresp=SK1T.1.s34 SK1T.1.s35\>And its eyes rolled to follow him as he sat up, his scrotum crawling, his hair standing on end, **his breath a thin winter-whistle** in his throat: mad eyes that laughed, eyes that promised horrible death and **the music of screams** that went unheard; something in the closet.\</s\>
> \<s id=SK1T.1.s34 corresp=SK1.1.s26\>0g øynene fulgte ham der han satte seg opp i sengen og kjente hvordan håret reiste seg på hodet og en prikkende følelse bredte seg i skrittet.\</s\>
> \<s id=SK1T.1.s35 corresp=SK1.1.s26\>**Pusten lød som en hes fløyte** i halsen hans: forrykte øyne flirte mot ham, øyne som lovet en forferdelig død, **skrik** som ingen ville høre; et uhyre i skapet.\</s\>
> (Literally: **His breath sounded like** ... **screams that went unheard**)

Instances of this kind have been included on the grounds that similes explicitate the relationship that holds between tenor and vehicle. The TT also omits the final genitive metaphor, i.e. *the music of screams.* The following examples do not include metaphors in the most narrow sense, but nevertheless involve a metaphorical use of language neutralized in TT:

> (37) \<s id=TB1.1.s14 corresp=TB1T.1.sl3\>Nå **står de i en forskremt klump** litt bakenfor den hvite mannen med kameraet.\</s\>
> (Literally: **stand in a frightened lump**)
> \<s id=TB1T.1.s13 corresp=TB1.1.sl4\>They **stand huddled together,** scared, just behind the white man with the camera.\</s\>

Both the collocation *frightened lump* and the use of the word *lump* to describe a group of people are uncommon.

Sylfest Lomheim (1995) in turn relates metaphor to irony in that its meaning is not to be taken literally. He observes that both phenomena tend to be activated only at a late stage in the native language acquisition of children. The neutralization of irony, then, may be seen as yet another type of shift that helps ease the processing effort. Thus, in the following example, TT removes the ironical element present in ST, as the term *season* is nonsensical in a description of the Californian climate:

> (38) \<s id=SG1.1.s18 corresp=SG1T.1.s20 SG1T.1.s21\>It was **a typical Californian season,** but it felt like fall and I was responding with inordinate good cheer, thinking maybe I'd drive up the pass in the afternoon to the pistol range, which is what I do for laughs.\</s\>
> \<s id=SG1T.1.s20 corresp=SG1.1.s18\>Det var **en typisk kalifornisk ikke-årstid,** men det føltes som om det var høst, og jeg reagerte med et ulogisk godt humør og tenkte jeg kanskje skulle kjøre til en skytebane oppe i passet den etterrniddagen.\</s\>
> \<s id=SG1T.1.s21 corresp=SG1.1.s18\>Det er det jeg pleier å more meg med.\</s\>
> (Literally: **a typical Californian non-season**)

2.3. Results

Table 1 shows the size of the material. The 50 first sentences of 40 novels and their translations were investigated (i.e. 20 aligned extracts in each direction). The total number of shifts, both explicitating and implicitating, amounted to 496 in the translations from English into Norwegian and 324 from Norwegian into English.

	English - Norwegian	Norwegian - English
Sentences	1000	1000
Shifts	496	324

Table 1
Number of sentences and shifts

Table 2 shows that a total number of 347 instances of explicitation were found in translations from English into Norwegian: an average of 17.3 shifts per text. There were 248 explicitating shifts in the opposite direction, an average of 12.4. Implicitating shifts amounted to 149 and 76, averaging 7.45 and 3.8 respectively. The translators into English applied fewer explicitating *and* implicitating shifts than their Norwegian colleagues.

	English - Norwegian	Norwegian - English
Explicitation	347	248
Implicitation	149	76

Table 2
Number of shifts in 1000 sentences

Table 3 shows that lexical explicitation was the most common in both sub-corpora. The translations from English into Norwegian contained 112 grammatical as opposed to 235 lexical shifts. In the translations in the opposite direction, grammatical shifts were found in 82 instances as opposed to 166 lexical shifts.

	Explicitation	
	English - Norwegian	Norwegian - English
Grammatical ties	112	82
Lexical ties	235	166

Table 3
Grammatical vs. lexical explicitation in the two sub-corpora

Table 4 shows that lexical shifts were also the most dominant in terms of implicitation. Translations from English into Norwegian contained 40 shifts involving grammatical implicitation, as opposed to 109 involving lexical implicitation. In translations in the opposite direction, the grammatical shifts amounted to 28 instances whereas 48 instances were found to involve lexical implicitation.

Table 5 shows the distribution of explicitating and implicitating shifts in the different translations in both sub-corpora. Explicitating shifts in the English-Norwegian corpus (E>N) range from three to 42 as opposed to one to 30 in the opposite direction. Only three translations, both from Norwegian into English (N>E), had more implici-

	Implicitation	
	English - Norwegian	**Norwegian - English**
Grammatical ties	40	28
Lexical ties	109	48

Table 4
Grammatical vs. lexical implicitation in the two sub-corpora

tation than explicitation, i.e. KF1: 1 vs. 2, SH1: 3 vs. 6 and JG: 7 vs. 11. In the same corpus LSC2 had an even number of both, 1 vs. 1. Although the extent varied, then, explicitation was a general tendency in both sub-corpora. The lower number of explici-tating shifts in translations from Norwegian into English also resulted from a fairly general tendency. Nine of the 20 translations in N>E contained less than 10 explicitating shifts, as opposed to only four out of the 20 translations in E>N. At the other extreme, E>N contained three texts with more than 30 shifts, while N>E had none.

Summing up the results of the investigation, one may safely conclude that within the framework of the present analysis Blum-Kulka's explicitation hypothesis is confirmed. Confirmation was stronger in translations from English into Norwegian than in the opposite direction. The higher number of shifts stemmed from a general tendency:

English - Norwegian	Explicitation	Implicitation	Norwegian - English	Explicitation	Implicitation
MA1[4]	7	7	KA1	3	0
JB1	17	4	TB1	11	5
ABR1	16	1	FC1	5	1
AB1	23	6	LSC2	1	1
JC1	8	0	KF1	1	2
MD1	13	13	KFL1	8	2
DF1	26	3	EG1	30	5
NG1	25	18	JG1	7	11
SG1	16	8	EHA1	12	2
TH1	10	3	TTH1	26	11
JH1	10	8	EH1	30	5
PDJ1	15	9	SH1	3	6
SK1	42	16	KH1	20	8
DL2	34	11	SL1	7	3
BO1	3	1	OEL1	5	2
RR1	18	8	CL1	13	1
JSM1	34	15	GS 1	23	2
GN1	8	8	BV1	19	7
AT1	12	8	BV2	13	0
FW1	10	2	HW1	11	2

Table 5
Number of shifts in the different translations

N>E contained more explicitation but also more implicitation. According to the above tables, the overall tendency resulted from an increase in almost all categories. Grammatical specification, lexical addition and deneutralization were the only categories to yield a higher number in N>E than in E>N, and the differences in all three cases were marginal. Although there were considerable differences within each sub-corpora, the results also reflect a *general* tendency among the translators into Norwegian to explicitate and implicitate more than the translators into English. The fairly even distribution may point to contrastive differences, despite the attempt to exclude instances resulting from differences between the language systems. They *may* also result from the force of translation norms in the respective target communities.

Rachel Weissbrod points to the parallel existence of *competing norms*, an aspect that may further complicate selection principles in investigations of translation characteristics:

> ... 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. 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 (canonized vs. canonized, for instance), or at different times. (Weissbrod 1992: 155)

Aspects pertaining to competing norms lie beyond the scope of the present study, but Erik Egeberg (1996) comments on a characteristic feature in translations into Norwegian in the 1950s, at least in translations from Russian, that contrast with the present results. In his view there was a conspicuous tendency at the time to shorten the text and to simplify it, not so much at the macro as at the micro level. In the wake of the Norwegian 1938 language reform, which among other things recommended short, simple sentences, Egeberg comments that the tendency to shorten sentences resulted from a prevalent view of Dostoyevsky as a major thinker but minor artist. Translators therefore felt free to "improve" his style. In general, the notion of the translator's right, or obligation, to improve the original text according to his own ideals appears to have faded in the latter half of the present century. Issues pertaining to initial norms (i.e. views within the target community regarding foreignization vs. domestication, fidelity vs. freedom etc.) are beyond the scope of the present study and will have to be dealt with in a separate context. Whatever initial norms inform the translator, however, the conscious or sub-conscious desire to improve on the original is as likely to lead to explicitation as implicitation. Egeberg also mentions the economic aspect: at a time when translators were apparently not paid per page, the tendency to delete and reduce may have resulted from being underpaid.

In the present survey, instances have been included as norm-disconfirming only according to their relevance in the particular context of explicitation. This does not mean, however, that implicitating shifts may not result from norm-confirming behaviour in other respects. An interesting question might be, for instance, whether implicitation in translation results from a negotiation between competing norms (e.g. explicitation and acceptability) to a greater extent than explicitation.

3. CONCLUSION

As the title implies, the present project involved a search for the object of investigation, as it were. The starting point was the common impression that translations differ from native texts. Suggestions presented by a number of scholars were considered before the focus was narrowed down to Shoshana Blum-Kulka's explicitation hypothesis. Within the types of explicitation and implicitation defined in the present approach, the material confirmed Blum-Kulka's observations, at least to the extent that explicitating shifts were found in all texts and that 33 out of the 40 texts (or 82.22%) contained more explicitation than implicitation (cf. table 5). Out of the remaining 7 texts, 4 contained an equal number of both types of shift, and in the 3 cases of dominating implicitation the differences were fairly small.

The question remains as to whether these results serve to illuminate the nature of the third code. The fact that the investigation was conducted in two directions, and that both sub-corpora yielded confirming results, should be a strong indication that the process of explicitation reaches beyond contrastive differences. This appears to be a justifiable conclusion, even considering the possibility that the two languages differ qualitatively rather than quantitatively in their levels of explicitness. What the results basically provide is the confirmation that explicitation is a characteristic feature of the translation *process.* They are less illuminating in characterizing the translation *product.* For the latter purpose future investigations are likely to benefit from the investigation of translations *vis-à-vis* original texts in the target language, the so-called "monolingual comparable corpus" (Laviosa 1997).

Insights into aspects of the translation process may serve as a preliminary stage, as they are likely to indicate to a certain extent types of feature to investigate in future TT/native text comparisons. The rise on the level of cohesive explicitness from ST to TT does not mean that all, or even most, translated texts will prove to be more cohesive than native texts. The latter will necessarily differ considerably in terms of cohesive density. Nevertheless, the observed rise may suggest that translated texts approximate the level of cohesion found in the most cohesive native texts. The present results, then, turn out at best to provide a partial definition of the third code. It is the level of cohesion, *combined* with other aspects found to be typical in translation, that may serve as a guide in the search for the distinguishing characteristics of translation. The third code apparently consists of a series of features present in individual translations to a greater or lesser extent. The presence of a series of certain features in typical combinations, such as a *high level of cohesive explicitness* combined with a *specific type of distribution of exotic features* (Baker 1993), a *low degree of lexical repetition* (Baker 1993), a *relative absence of colloquialism* (Gellerstam 1986) as well as of *occasional metaphor* (Koller 1988) — although each individual feature and sub-combinations appear in native texts as well — may prove to constitute parameters within which to identify a text as a translation.

While the present results may be more informative in terms of process than product, the analysis of explicitating shifts offers interesting insight into types of intervention or mediation concealed within the paradigm of so-called fluent or invisible translations which subtlety might remain subtconcealed in comparisons with native texts. Without hypotheses regarding shifts that occur from source to target, (e.g. Blum-Kulka) and investigations that test such hypotheses, TT/native text comparisons are more likely to maintain the ST influence focus applied by, for example, Gellerstam (1986). Although translationese remains an important issue within descriptive translation studies, it is a combination of the latter with the investigation of "translation patterns which are inexplicable in terms of the two repertoires involved" (Even-Zohar in

Baker 1993: 242) that may eventually lead to a more precise definition of the third code.

The present project aimed at being non-evaluative, as far as possible in terms of selection and focus. However, becoming familiar with central theoretical controversies and with the results of descriptive investigations may raise awareness and affect future translation decisions and strategies. From a common sense point of view, explicitation seems to be a natural consequence of the joint demands of source and target. In their mediating role between source text and target reader, conscientious translators will do their best to reduce to a minimum the damage related to the transfer process, and it seems better to end up with some redundancy than with major losses. The results of the present investigation induce one to agree with the claim, however, that the desire to unify and make sense is an inevitable aspect of interpretation and hence of translation, and that one might rightfully caution against excess.

Mona Baker (1993: 242) distinguishes between *"universal"* features of translation, the "product of constraints which are inherent in the translation process itself, and this accounts for the fact that they are universal," and norms, the "translation features that have been observed to occur consistently in certain types of translation within a partic-ular socio-cultural and historical context" (Baker 1993: 246). In line with Blum-Kulka, she suggests that we regard explicitation as an inherent feature of the translation pro-cess. Rachel Weissbrod, however, in an investigation of explicitation in translations from English to Hebrew, refutes this claim and contends that "explicitation in transla-tion is not, as previous research has suggested, solely a universal tendency or a function of translation on a literacy/orality scale. It is norm-dependent and thus changes with historical circumstances and according to the position of translated literature" (Weiss-brod 1992: 153). According to Gideon Toury (1980: 60) the identification of what is universal and what is norm-dependent can only be "gradually achieved through the combination of theoretical speculation and the accumulation of (tentative) conclu-sions of studies carried out along similar lines and relating to different languages/litera-tures and to various periods in history."

Whether explicitation is found to constitute a *norm* of translation or a *universal feature* of translation, translators and trainees "can be taught how to behave; not only in accordance with the law (which is what one tends to do anyway, otherwise it would hardly have emerged as a law in the first place), but also contrary to it, if this is deemed appropriate, be it for the sake of sheer exercise or for any other reason — fully aware, however, of the deviation from prevalent patterns of behaviour, and hence ready to take the consequences" (Toury 1995: 273). While the non-evaluative stance of Descriptive Translation Studies has indeed been a valuable move within translation research, there is no reason why textual investigations should not be of use to practising translators, as long as the latter also realize that there is as much to be learnt from insights into the many possibilities and constraints that operate on translation as there is from rigid pre-scription and definite answers.

Notes

1.   The article, a slightly different version of which appeared in *Working Papers in Applied Linguistics* 1: 1998, is based on the *hovedfag* thesis *IN SEARCH OF THE THIRD CODE, An Investigation of Norms in Literary Translation*, presented to the Department of British and American Studies at the University of Oslo, 1996.

2.   SL and TL refer to source and target language, respectively. Similarly, ST and TT refer to source and target text.

3.   The original text is consistently listed first, and a literal rendering of the relevant part of the Norwegian text is given within paranthesis. All examples include the code applied in the English-Norwegian Parallel

Corpus. For an explanation of the codes and a list of the corpus texts, see the web page of the project: http://www.hf.uio.no/iba/prosjekt/

4.   The abbreviations N>E and E>N indicate translations from Norwegian into English and from English into Norwegian, respectively. Codes refer to ST author and text.

REFERENCES

BAKER, M. (1992): *In Other Words,* London.
BAKER, M. (1993): "Corpus Linguistics and Translation Studies: Implications and Applications", M. Baker, G. Francis & E. Tognini-Bonelli (Eds), *Text & Technology: in Honour of John Sinclair*, Philadelphia.
BLUM-KULKA, S. (1986): "Shifts of Cohesion and Coherence in Translation", J. House & S. Blum-Kulka (Eds), *Interlingual and Intercultural Communication*, Tübingen.
BROWN, Keith & J. MILLER (1980): *Syntax: A Linguistic Introduction to Sentence Structure*, London.
CARTER, R. (1987): *Vocabulary. Applied Linguistic Perspectives*, London.
CHAFFEY, P. N., RYDNING, A. F. & S. S. ULRIKSEN (Eds) (1988): *Translation Theory in Scandinavia,* Oslo.
EGEBERG, E. (1996): "Dostojevskij-oversettelser på norsk", *Aftenposten,* 10 (3).
EVEN-ZOHAR, I. (1978): "Papers in Historical Poetics", B. Hrushovski and I. Even-Zohar (Eds), *Papers in Poetics and Semiotics*, 8, Tel Aviv, University Publishing Projects.
EVEN-ZOHAR, I. (1979/1990): "Polysystem Theory", *Poetics Today*, Special Issue on Polysystems Studies, Vol. 11, No. 1, pp. 9-26.
FRAWLEY, W. (1984): *Translation. Literary, Linguistic & Philosophical Perspectives*, Newark.
GELLERSTAM, M. (1986): "Translationese in Swedish Novels Translated from English", L. Wollin & H. Lindquist (Eds), *Translation Studies in Scandinavia*, Lund.
GENTZLER, E. (1993): *Contemporary Translation Studies*, London.
HALLIDAY, M.A.K. & R. HASAN (1976): *Cohesion in English*, London.
HALVERSON, S. (1995): "Studieobjektet i deskriptive oversettelsesstudier: ekvivalens, normer eller strategier?", *Proceedings av ANLA-symposiet 5. mai,* Bergen.
HERMANS, T. (Ed.) (1985): *The Manipulation of Literature*, London.
HOUSE, J. & S. BLUM-KULKA (Eds) (1986): *Interlingual and Intercultural Communication. Discourse and Cognition in Translation and Second Language Acquisition Studies*, Tübingen.
JOHANSSON, S. & P. LYSVÅG (1987): *Understanding English Grammar. Part 11: A Closer View*, Oslo.
KOLLER, W. (1988): "A Linguistic Approach to Translation; Its Range and Limitations", Chaffey, P. N., A. F. Rydning & S. S. Ulriksen (Eds), *Translation Theory in Scandinavia*, Oslo.
LAVIOSA, Sara (1997): "How Comparable can 'Comparable Corpora' be?", *Target*, Vol. 9, No. 2, pp. 289-319.
LEECH, G. N. & M. H. SHORT (1981): *Style in Fiction. A Linguistic Approach to English Fictional Prose,* London.
LOMHEIM, S. (1995): *Omsetjingsteori. Ei elementær innføring,* Oslo.
MCINTOSH, A. (1966): "Patterns and ranges", A. McIntosh and M.A.K. Halliday (Eds), *Patterns of Language: Papers in General, Descriptive and Applied Linguistics,* London, Longman, pp. 182-199.
ØVERÅS, L. (1996): *In Search of the Third Code; An Investigation of Norms in Literary Translation*, Unpubl. thesis, University of Oslo.
TOURY, G. (1979): "Interlanguage and its Manifestations in Translation", *Meta, Translator's Journal,* Vol. 24 No. 2.
TOURY, G. (1980): *In Search of a Theory of Translation*, Tel Aviv.
TOURY, G. (1995): *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond,* Amsterdam.
VAN LEUVEN-ZWART, K. M. (1989): "Translation and Original: Similarities and Dissimilarities, I", *Target*, Vol. 1, No. 2, pp. 151-181.
WEISSBROD, R. (1992): "Explicitation in Translations of Prose-fiction from English to Hebrew as a Function of Norms", *Multilingua,* (II:2).