

RENATA KAMENICKÁ

## TOWARDS A STATIC/DYNAMIC EXPLICITATION HYPOTHESIS?

### **Abstract**

The paper responds to an article by Christopher Hopkinson ('Explicitation and Implication of Binary Coherence Relations in Translation', 2007), by subjecting Hopkinson's hypothesis – that within the ideational and textual functions, there are not only quantitative, but also qualitative differences between explicitation and implicitation and that these qualitative differences can be revealed by studying shifts in explicitness of 'static' and 'dynamic' binary coherence relations – to testing on a parallel corpus of literary translations. The results of the quantitative analysis suggest that the distribution of explicitness shifts in binary coherence relations is different for literary and non-literary translation, especially as far as temporal coherence relations are concerned. Qualitative analysis of explicitness shifts in binary coherence relations on the borderline between the 'static' and 'dynamic' categories has shown that the concepts of 'staticity' and 'dynamism' of binary coherence relations need to be reconsidered.

### **Key words**

*explicitation; implicitation; literary translation; coherence relations; static; dynamic*

---

Since the recognition and general confirmation of explicitation as one of the processes consistently affecting the properties of translations as products of human text production (Toury 1995; Mauranen and Kujamäki 2004), the discourse devoted to the systematic study of this wide-ranging phenomenon has been showing signs of moving beyond this recognition to focus on the potential of explicitation to yield specific and differentiated insights into the processes of translating and translations as products (Englund-Dimitrova 2005). One of the more recent attempts at suggesting a key to the anatomy of explicitation has been the article 'Explicitation and Implication of Binary Coherence Relations in Translation' (2007) by Christopher Hopkinson. Hopkinson applies his Hallidayian typology of explicitness shifts, analogical to that proposed by Kamenická (2007, 2008),

and the distinction between static and dynamic explicitation and implicitation, analyzing a small corpus of non-literary translations from Czech into English, to show that some types of meaning attract a relatively higher degree of explicitation than other types, namely that “the more ‘dynamic’ the coherence relation is, the wider the gap between the frequency of explicitation and that of implicitation” (Hopkinson 2007: 57). The present study tests and discusses this observation by Hopkinson using a corpus of literary translations of a similar size (see below) used previously in another project (Kamenická 2007).

Firstly, the study by Hopkinson, who can be credited with introducing the distinction between static vs. dynamic binary coherence relations into the discourse on explicitation, will be summarized so that its results can be compared with the study of static and dynamic explicitation and implicitation in literary translation. Hopkinson’s corpus of parallel non-literary texts had around 50,000 words and involved 5 extracts of equal length taken from 5 essays by 3 different authors (V. Havel, I. Klíma and L. Vaculík) as the source texts, and their English translations, all published between 1986 and 2002. The first count, attributing shifts in explicitness to three types of meaning corresponding to Halliday’s metafunctions of language (ideational, interpersonal, textual), showed that although the total number of explicitations outnumbered the total number of implicitations in the corpus (482 vs. 437), this did not have to be true for the individual types of explicitations. Although ideational explicitations were significantly more numerous than ideational implicitations (190 vs. 76), interpersonal meanings were implicitated rather than explicitated (148 vs. 85) and the balance of explicitness shifts at the textual level depended on the specific type of textual cohesive ties: while shifts in explicitness involving conjunction and reference were biased towards explicitation (125 vs. 107), implicitation rather than explicitation of cohesive repetition was common (106 vs. 82), which seems to be in line with translators’ general tendency to avoid repetitions, itself another translation universal, as Hopkinson rightly observes (Hopkinson 2007: 54). All in all, in Hopkinson’s corpus, the explicitation hypothesis was confirmed solely on the strength of ideational explicitation (and its strong prevalence over ideational implicitation) since with the two remaining types of explicitness shifts, implicitations were more numerous than explicitations (textual  $E/I=207/213$ ; interpersonal  $E/I=85/148$ ); the tendency to avoid referential repetitions combined with a tendency to implicitate the role of the author in the text (2007: 54).

Pursuing the hypothesis that not only quantitative, but also qualitative differences between explicitation and implicitation can be traced and meaningfully interpreted, Hopkinson focuses on explicitation and implicitation of ‘static’ and ‘dynamic’ binary coherence relations, i.e. coherence relations concerning a link between two elements, as types of shifts in explicitness which “emerged naturally from the analysis of the corpus data” (2007: 55). Viewing static coherence relations as representing “the existence of two or more elements in stasis, alongside each other”, Hopkinson conceptualizes static coherence relations as additive or adversative, signalling either similarity or contrast (2007: 55). Dynamic coher-

ence relations, on the other hand, are viewed in the same paper as concerning “the notion of one thing leading to another” (2007: 55) and involving temporal or causal relations. Shifts in both types of coherence relations (and their subtypes) are found to be realized primarily through shifts in ideational and textual meanings, for which examples are given. Most importantly, the four resulting subtypes of explicitation of coherence relations are interpreted as characterized by different degrees of dynamism: **additive** relations, which express similarity, are found even more static than **adversative** relations while **temporal** relations, already involving the flow of time, are conceptualized as somewhat less dynamic than **causal** coherence relations, which are based not only on the mere flow of time, but also, in addition, on the cause-and-effect principle (2007: 57–8). The quantitative analysis of the corpus has shown that although there was no direct relationship between the amount of explicitation and implicitation and the degree of dynamism of coherence relations affected by them, what was correlated with the degree of coherence relations dynamism was the ratio of implicitation to explicitation, which was 1 : 0.5 (2.00) for additive relations, 1 : 1.4 (0.71) for adversative relations, 1 : 2 (0.50) for temporal relations and 1 : 3.8 (0.26) for causal relations (2007: 57–8). Put in other words, “the more ‘dynamic’ the coherence relation [was], the wider the gap between the frequency of explicitation and that of implicitation,” (2007: 57). Hopkinson concludes:

[...] though the status of explicitation as a ‘universal’ may be secure on the most general level, it does not always dominate over implicitation. It appears that semantic factors may have some influence over the relative predominance of explicitation or implicitation. More specifically, there is a tendency in the corpus for explicitness shifts to result in TT’s with a higher degree of internal coherence based on more ‘dynamic’ relations, and a relatively similar, or even lower, degree of coherence based on more ‘static’ relations. This observation could now be reformulated as a new hypothesis: With regard to the explicitness with which binary coherence relations are expressed, target texts tend to be more explicitly ‘dynamic’ than their source texts. (Hopkinson 2007: 58)

This new hypothesis certainly appears worthy of attention, testing and discussion. Even if we leave aside, for the time being, Hopkinson’s own proposal to test the new hypothesis using comparable corpora to determine “whether the occurrence of selected indicators of ‘staticity’ and ‘dynamicity’ differs between translated and non-translated texts in the same language” (Hopkinson 2007: 58), the ‘static’/‘dynamic’ explicitation hypothesis (S/D explicitation hypothesis) invites testing and discussion vis à vis other corpora such as parallel corpora of literary translations. Since such a corpus including identified occurrences of translation-inherent explicitations and implicitations was already available from a previous project (Kamenická 2007, 2008), the challenge was undertaken and the results of the analysis were made ready for discussion.

The parallel corpus of literary texts included extracts from a greater variety of source texts by multiple authors, all modern novels written in English and published after 1945 and their translations into Czech by 2 translators, A. Přidal and R. Nenadál, published between 1968 and 1991. It is important to note that the translators were chosen based on exclusively external criteria, namely due to the richness of their translation oeuvres as far as the target group of source texts and dates of publication of the translations were concerned. The corpus consisted of 5,000-word extracts and both translators were represented by 9 novel extracts/novels each, 8 of them covered by one sample each and one by three 5,000-word samples, the final length of either subcorpus thus being 55,000 words. (For more information on the corpus see Kamenická 2007, 2008.)

It was hoped that the analysis of explicitness shifts of ‘static’ and ‘dynamic’ coherence relations would provide material for a tentative conclusion as to whether literary translations seem to suggest a similar trend towards text coherence based on ‘dynamic’ rather than ‘static’ coherence relations. Other questions that the Přidal/Nenadál corpus was hoped to help to answer were: What is, in fact, the extent of the overall role of explicitation and implicitation concerning these binary coherence relations in literary texts compared with non-literary translations? And which are the specificities distinguishing shifts in explicitness of static and dynamic coherence relations in literary translation from similar shifts in non-literary translation? Apart from that, the actual make-up of the Přidal/Nenadál corpus seemed to be favourable to a rough assessment of individual variation within a potential general trend. Most importantly, if the hypotheses were to also prove valid in literary translation, it would, of course, be of utmost importance to find an explanation of these processes, consistent with what is already known about the cognitive basis for explicitation (e.g. Halverson 2003).

The actual corpus processing consisted, in fact, in analyzing the database of occurrences of translation-inherent explicitation and implicitation and classifying occurrences concerning binary coherence relations as additive, adversative, temporal or causal explicitation/implicitation. The results of this quantitative analysis are presented in Tables 1 and 2:

**Table 1** Explicitation and implicitation of BCR in the Nenadál subcorpus

|                        |             | <i>Falconer 1</i> | <i>Falconer 2</i> | <i>Falconer 3</i> | <i>Dog Soldiers</i> | <i>Garp</i> | <i>Grapes of Wrath</i> | <i>Have or Have Not</i> | <i>Hurry On Down</i> | <i>Long March</i> | <i>Ser This House On Fire</i> | <i>Sophie's Choice</i> | <b>Total</b> |
|------------------------|-------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|---------------------|-------------|------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|-------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------|--------------|
| <b>EXPLICITATION</b>   |             |                   |                   |                   |                     |             |                        |                         |                      |                   |                               |                        |              |
| Static                 | Additive    | 5                 | 3                 | 4                 | 1                   | 2           | 0                      | 3                       | 2                    | 2                 | 2                             | 1                      | <b>25</b>    |
|                        | Adversative | 4                 | 2                 | 4                 | 2                   | 1           | 2                      | 2                       | 1                    | 1                 | 4                             | 2                      | <b>25</b>    |
| Dynamic                | Temporal    | 5                 | 1                 | 2                 | 4                   | 7           | 6                      | 2                       | 5                    | 0                 | 7                             | 2                      | <b>41</b>    |
|                        | Causal      | 6                 | 6                 | 4                 | 5                   | 6           | 4                      | 3                       | 3                    | 0                 | 2                             | 2                      | <b>41</b>    |
| Static + dynamic total |             | <b>20</b>         | <b>12</b>         | <b>14</b>         | <b>12</b>           | <b>16</b>   | <b>12</b>              | <b>10</b>               | <b>11</b>            | <b>3</b>          | <b>15</b>                     | <b>7</b>               | <b>132</b>   |
| Explicitation total    |             | 67                | 96                | 81                | 83                  | 85          | 61                     | 72                      | 97                   | 61                | 110                           | 60                     | <b>873</b>   |
| <b>IMPLICITATION</b>   |             |                   |                   |                   |                     |             |                        |                         |                      |                   |                               |                        |              |
| Static                 | Additive    | 1                 | 0                 | 0                 | 0                   | 2           | 0                      | 0                       | 0                    | 0                 | 0                             | 1                      | <b>4</b>     |
|                        | Adversative | 0                 | 0                 | 0                 | 0                   | 0           | 0                      | 0                       | 0                    | 1                 | 0                             | 2                      | <b>3</b>     |
| Dynamic                | Temporal    | 1                 | 1                 | 1                 | 0                   | 4           | 1                      | 2                       | 0                    | 2                 | 3                             | 2                      | <b>17</b>    |
|                        | Causal      | 0                 | 1                 | 0                 | 0                   | 0           | 2                      | 1                       | 0                    | 2                 | 0                             | 2                      | <b>8</b>     |
| Static + dynamic total |             | <b>2</b>          | <b>2</b>          | <b>1</b>          | <b>0</b>            | <b>6</b>    | <b>3</b>               | <b>3</b>                | <b>0</b>             | <b>5</b>          | <b>3</b>                      | <b>7</b>               | <b>32</b>    |
| Implicitation total    |             | 17                | 28                | 25                | 18                  | 35          | 16                     | 11                      | 17                   | 22                | 36                            | 36                     | <b>261</b>   |

**Table 2** Explicitation and implicitation of BCR in the Nenadál subcorpus

|                        |             | <i>Small World 1</i> | <i>Small World 2</i> | <i>Small World 3</i> | <i>The British Museum</i> | <i>A Fringe of Leaves</i> | <i>Changing Places</i> | <i>Rabbit Run</i> | <i>Something Happened</i> | <i>The Tree of Man</i> | <i>Voss</i> | <i>God Knows</i> | <b>Total</b> |
|------------------------|-------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------|-------------------|---------------------------|------------------------|-------------|------------------|--------------|
| <b>EXPLICITATION</b>   |             |                      |                      |                      |                           |                           |                        |                   |                           |                        |             |                  |              |
| Static                 | Additive    | 4                    | 4                    | 1                    | 2                         | 1                         | 0                      | 0                 | 0                         | 0                      | 5           | 1                | <b>18</b>    |
|                        | Adversative | 4                    | 1                    | 5                    | 1                         | 1                         | 0                      | 2                 | 3                         | 3                      | 2           | 2                | <b>24</b>    |
| Dynamic                | Temporal    | 3                    | 1                    | 0                    | 2                         | 4                         | 7                      | 0                 | 6                         | 3                      | 3           | 0                | <b>29</b>    |
|                        | Causal      | 7                    | 10                   | 4                    | 0                         | 5                         | 11                     | 4                 | 6                         | 8                      | 4           | 3                | <b>62</b>    |
| Static + dynamic total |             | <b>18</b>            | <b>16</b>            | <b>10</b>            | <b>5</b>                  | <b>11</b>                 | <b>18</b>              | <b>6</b>          | <b>15</b>                 | <b>14</b>              | <b>14</b>   | <b>6</b>         | <b>133</b>   |
| Explicitation total    |             | 55                   | 74                   | 48                   | 34                        | 109                       | 96                     | 41                | 55                        | 63                     | 69          | 36               | <b>680</b>   |
| <b>IMPLICITATION</b>   |             |                      |                      |                      |                           |                           |                        |                   |                           |                        |             |                  |              |
| Static                 | Additive    | 1                    | 1                    | 1                    | 0                         | 2                         | 0                      | 1                 | 0                         | 0                      | 0           | 0                | <b>6</b>     |
|                        | Adversative | 1                    | 2                    | 0                    | 1                         | 4                         | 0                      | 0                 | 0                         | 0                      | 4           | 0                | <b>12</b>    |
| Dynamic                | Temporal    | 3                    | 6                    | 1                    | 8                         | 4                         | 7                      | 3                 | 9                         | 8                      | 5           | 3                | <b>57</b>    |
|                        | Causal      | 1                    | 2                    | 0                    | 0                         | 9                         | 4                      | 0                 | 3                         | 2                      | 5           | 1                | <b>27</b>    |
| Static + dynamic total |             | <b>6</b>             | <b>11</b>            | <b>2</b>             | <b>9</b>                  | <b>19</b>                 | <b>11</b>              | <b>4</b>          | <b>12</b>                 | <b>10</b>              | <b>14</b>   | <b>4</b>         | <b>102</b>   |
| Implicitation total    |             | 50                   | 82                   | 36                   | 38                        | 72                        | 96                     | 62                | 81                        | 50                     | 65          | 52               | <b>684</b>   |

Tables 1 and 2 clearly show that although shifts in explicitness concerning the more ‘dynamic’ binary coherence relations (temporal and causal) were more likely to take place than shifts in the more ‘static’ categories of binary coherence relations (additive and adversative), the cline of binary coherence relations from the most ‘static’ to the most ‘dynamic’ was not crucial in determining the final level of explicitness/implicitness of binary coherence relations. The ratios of implicitation to explicitation of binary coherence relations from additive to causal do not decline as expected (Table 3), but suggest a more diverse situation: trends shared by both translators combine with some individual accents which reflect the individual translator’s explicitation profiles identified in the previous project using the corpus (Kamenická 2007: 109–39).

**Table 3** Ratios of implicitation to explicitation shifts for types of BCR (both subcorpora)

|         |             | Nenadál |    |             | Přidal |    |             |
|---------|-------------|---------|----|-------------|--------|----|-------------|
|         |             | I       | E  | I/E         | I      | E  | I/E         |
| Static  | Additive    | 4       | 25 | <b>0.16</b> | 6      | 18 | <b>0.33</b> |
|         | Adversative | 3       | 25 | <b>0.12</b> | 12     | 24 | <b>0.50</b> |
| Dynamic | Temporal    | 17      | 41 | <b>0.41</b> | 57     | 29 | <b>1.97</b> |
|         | Causal      | 8       | 41 | <b>0.20</b> | 27     | 62 | <b>0.44</b> |

As suggested above, it was certainly true of both translators that they favoured temporal and causal explicitations and implicitations over additive and adversative ones. While Přidal’s pattern of frequency of explicating binary coherence relations follows the cline from additive to causal, the pattern followed by Nenadál was flatter – he seemed to explicitate additive relations just as frequently as adversative, and temporal just as frequently as causal.

One of the major features distinguishing both translators as regards their explicitation/implicitation behaviour identified by the previous study was the different degree to which they made use of implicitation: while the average implicitation quotient (implicitation to explicitation rate) across the corpus was  $0.31 \pm 0.13$  for Nenadál (who tended to explicitate much more often than implicitate), the same indicator was  $1.10 \pm 0.30$  for Přidal, who employed implicitation much more often and in much more diverse ways and whose overall repertory of explicitation and implicitation strategies was much more varied (Kamenická 2007). Considering these individual characteristics, it is no surprise that the absolute numbers of occurrences of implicitations of binary coherence relations are much lower for Nenadál. What the two translators share is the scarce use of additive and adversative implicitation (as far as binary coherence relations are concerned) combined with significant use of temporal implicitations, the rate being double that of causal implicitation for both of them.

Before discussing these results, it will be useful to compare the role of explicitness shifts of binary coherence relations in the corpus of non-literary texts

studied by Hopkinson and the corpus of literary translations explored here so that it is clear to which extent trends identified for explicitation and implicitation of binary coherence relations (BCR) are representative of shifts in explicitness in general. Although Hopkinson does not comment on this issue, his data allow us to infer that the share of explicitations of BCR on the total number of explicitations identified was 35% and the share of implicitations of BCR on the total number of identified implicitations was somewhat lower, 20%. The corresponding shares of explicitations and implicitations of BCR on the total explicitation/implicitation count in the Příklad/Nenadál corpus were lower, 20% and 15% for Příklad and 15% and 12% for Nenadál. This suggests that shifts in explicitness of BCR are therefore slightly more representative of the nature of explicitation and implicitation in general in non-literary rather than literary translations; the difference can be attributed to the very different communicative purposes of the two types of texts and the numerous shifts at the ideational (and for Nenadál, also at the interpersonal) level of meaning that these the literary involved and that only rarely concerned binary coherence relations.

Although the SD hypothesis as formulated by Hopkinson has not been confirmed on the Příklad/Nenadál corpus of literary translations, the quantitative data suggest that the distinction between explicitness shifts of 'static' and 'dynamic' BCR might still be a valid one and that a reformulation of the SD hypothesis might be needed. The qualitative analysis of the data from the Příklad/Nenadál corpus, nevertheless, provides evidence that the distinction as conceived by Hopkinson should be challenged. In order to justify this claim, the categories of explicitness shifts occurring on the borderline between 'static' and 'dynamic' BCR, i.e. adversative and temporal explicitations and implicitations, will be subjected to closer analysis.

Shifts in explicitness concerning temporal binary coherence relations may provide a convenient starting point. First of all, with temporal binary coherence relations it is perhaps less clear than with other BCR how the term 'binary' is to be applied. Since Hopkinson (2007) restricts himself to stating that "The term 'binary' is used because many common coherence relations concern a link between two elements: cause-consequence, problem-solution, contrast, comparison, and the like" (2007: 55), not specifying the two elements that temporal BCR concern, we are left to speculate that the pair of elements constitutive of temporal BCR might be the distinction between 'now' and 'then' or the opposition of the 'present' (or the 'future'?) and the 'past'. Conceptualizing temporal binary coherence relations as relations involving – as opposed to causal BCR, which are based on the cause-and-effect distinction – a 'mere' succession of events, with no claim to causality, we are likely to take the category for granted. It should be noted, on the other hand, that the above-suggested ambiguity regarding the binary opposition underlying temporal BCR renders the 'binary' nature of this category of coherence relations different from the manner in which the other categories can be viewed as 'binary'.

Complementing the top-down approach to dynamism vs. staticity of BCR with a bottom-up perspective, we arrive at further reasons to reconsider this binary distinction. There is little doubt that occurrences such as (1) and (2) should be regarded as explicitness shifts concerning binary temporal coherence relations:

- (1) ST: “The funny way you talk, they’ll put you in A, where they have the lieutenant governor and the secretary of commerce and all the millionaires.” (*Falconer*)  
 TT: “Podle toho, jak mluvíte, vás dají pak do Áčka, kde je viceguvernér a ministr obchodu a všichni milionáři.“  
 TT\*!: “[Judging from] the funny way you talk, they’ll put you later in A, where the lieutenant governor and the secretary of commerce and all the millionaires are.”
- (2) ST: It was of white grain. It still had, most terribly, most poignantly, its semblance of flesh. (*Falconer*)  
 TT: Celou bílou. Ale strašlivě, palčivě připomínající živé tělo.  
 TT\*: All white. But most terribly, most poignantly resembling live flesh.

If the Hallideyan distinction between the experiential and logical component of the ideational function is used, these shifts can usually be assigned to the logical function. The implicitation in example (3), on the other hand, involves a shift concerning experiential rather than logical meaning potential, since what is implicated is a circumstance of the process singled out for description (the abrupt character of the change) rather than its temporal situatedness (Caffarel 2004: 31):

- (3) ST: If that is not so, if there is no vanished and irretrievable little me and him so starkly different from what each of us since has been forced to become, if there is no wandering, desolate lost little being I yearn for and started from so far back in my history who took a sudden, inevitable lurch into some inaccessible black recess [...] (*Something Happened*)  
 TT: Jestli ne, jestli není žádné zmizelé a nenahraditelné já v něm ani ve mně, naprosto odlišné od toho, čím jsme se potom museli stát, jestli neexistuje žádná bludná, opuštěná, ztracená bytůstka, po které tak dlouho toužím a která kdysi nezadržitelně zapadla do jakéhosi temného, nepřístupného kouta, [...]  
 TT\*: If [that is] not so, if there is no vanished and irretrievable me neither in him nor in me, so starkly different from what we were forced to become then, if there is no wandering, desolate lost little being I have been yearning for and which sank into some inaccessible black recess, unstopably, a long time ago [...]

There are, however, many instances of shifts in explicitness of coherence rela-



tions which are situated on the fuzzy border between experiential and logical explicitation/implication. The source text information implicated in (4), for instance, designates the moment in the flow of events when the character's hands become hot (temporal binary coherence relation) on the one hand while expressing a circumstance (the abruptness) of the process (non-binary experiential meaning) on the other.

- (4) ST: She was anxious to give generously to some man, whereas Thelma looked away, holding her handbag in suddenly hot hands. (*Tree of Man*)
- TT: Dychtivě a štědrě obdarovávala mužské oči, zatímco její kamarádka se dívala jinam a hořícíma rukama svírala kabelku.
- TT\*: She presented gifts to male eyes anxiously and generously while her friend was looking away, holding her handbag in hot hands.

What seems to be an even more serious challenge to the attractive S/D explicitation hypothesis than the difficulties involved in deciding whether a particular temporal coherence relation should be regarded as binary or not, is the disputable dynamicity of some explicitness shifts of temporal BCR, especially compared with adversative BCR. At this point attention should be drawn to the use of inverted commas with the terms 'static' and 'dynamic', which I have taken over from Hopkinson without commenting upon yet.

Let us remind ourselves once more that Hopkinson's definition of 'static' coherence relations is based on "the existence of two or more elements in stasis, alongside each other", 'stasis' usually being understood as "a condition of balance among various forces; motionlessness" (The Free Dictionary), while 'dynamic' coherence relations are viewed as coherence relations concerned with "the notion of one thing leading to another" (Hopkinson 2007: 55). Hopkinson's distinction between 'static' and 'dynamic' is therefore based on the 'objective' processuality and arrangement in time of the events and processes being described rather than their perception by the human mind. What might be regarded as rather problematic is the application of this "objective staticity vs. dynamicity" to the shifts in the level of explicitness, since it is in the very nature of shifts in explicitness and implicitness to make the "objective" facts readily or less readily available for the *subjective* reader to *perceive*. No matter whether implicit or explicit, the 'information' (for lack of a better word) – is available to the reader (from text or context) and it is precisely a matter of *perception*, in dependence on the presentation of the information as central or peripheral, to determine with which degree of salience it will stand out. With respect to the nature of explicitation and implication, it would therefore seem more appropriate to use a distinction between 'static' and 'dynamic' based on subjective perception when categorizing shifts in explicitness.

Consider again, for instance, examples (1) and (2), i.e. the two more indisputable occurrences of explicitness shifts in binary coherence relations: whether the temporal information is explicit or not does not contribute in any significant way

to how the objective dynamism of the situation is perceived. Quite on the contrary, as students of stylistics know very well, explicit inclusion of too many details (including temporal circumstances) often reduces the dynamism of the situation being described as perceived by the recipient. This may, in fact, explain the frequent use of temporal implicitation by both translators whose fiction formed the Přidal/Nenadál corpus, which was, in fact, the most significant trend observed (see above) – in conflict with the S/D explicitation hypothesis formulated on the basis of data from Hopkinson’s corpus of non-literary texts.

Implicitation of temporal coherence relations is thus likely to be amply represented in texts with a strong narrative element (such as most literary fiction) – which however need not be a trend disconfirming the S/D explicitation hypothesis, provided the definition of the distinction between ‘static’ and ‘dynamic’ coherence relations is reconsidered in favour of subjective staticity/dynamicity.

Failing to do that, we might find explaining the trends observed by Hopkinson (2007) in his non-literary translation corpus – a task bypassed in the paper quoted from here by retaining the inverted commas and appealing to the “intuitive” understanding of the results by saying that “With regard to the explicitness with which binary coherence relations are expressed, target texts tend to be more explicitly ‘dynamic’ than their source texts” (Hopkinson 2007: 58) – a rather difficult if not impossible task.

Before concluding, several examples of shifts in explicitness of adversative binary coherence relations, i.e. coherence relations based on the notion of contrast and viewed as ‘static’ by Hopkinson, might throw some more light on the above argumentation, showing the potential of “subjective dynamicity” coming into play in occurrences of adversative explicitations and implicitations.

- (5) ST: Farragut was terribly excited and highly composed. (*Falconer*)  
 TT: Farragut byl úžasně vzrušený, ale přitom zároveň úžasně soustředěný a klidný.  
 TT\*: Farragut was terribly excited, but yet terribly composed and calm.
- (6) ST: “You reveal yourself, dollbaby,” he said. His voice was airy, but a touch of irritation remained. (*Set This House on Fire*)  
 TT: “No, však si na to přijdi sám, kocourku,” prohlásil. Jeho hlas už zněl zase bezstarostně, ale přece v něm zůstal stín podrážděnosti.  
 TT\*: “Well, you reveal yourself, dollbaby,” he said. His voice was light again, but yet a touch of irritation remained.
- (7) ST: It was necessary for him to enjoy complete freedom, whereas this weight had begun to threaten him. (*Voss*)  
 TT: Potřeboval mít naprostou volnost, a teď ho začalo ohrožovat toto břemeno.  
 TT\*: He needed to enjoy complete freedom, and this weight had begun to threaten him now.

The relative change in the dynamism of these examples brought about by the shift (explicitation in (5) and (6) and implicitation in (7)) seems, from the point of view of the reader, actually higher than the change in dynamism in examples of temporal explicitation and implicitation (1) and (2) above.

Willing to reconsider the static/dynamic boundary and moving towards a subjective-perception-based distinction between staticity and dynamism, we might want to turn to psychological and aesthetic accounts of the concepts such as the following one:

Dynamism/dynamic: These concepts have not been used in aesthetics until the 20<sup>th</sup> century and their significance in different disciplines such as metaphysics, mathematics, physics or sociology had been specific. Their spread in common speech in our [20<sup>th</sup>] century has been characterized by liberal usage. Dynamism refers to the property of potency, active force, movement and also ability to set something in motion. This common usage has been taken over by aesthetics, too. A work of art is dynamic provided it is characterized by intensity, vivacity, and power and provided it expresses fast movement or has the power to suggest movement and speed. [...] *Cases of continuous, peaceful movement or steady, toned down radiance, involve neither dynamism nor staticity, these cases standing between the two poles.* (Souriau 1994: 213; translated and italics added by RK)

The analysis of a parallel corpus of literary translations by two individual translators has thus shown that although staticity and dynamism of binary coherence relations affected by changes in explicitness occurring in the process of translation might indeed be factors which will help to clarify the qualitative nature of translatorial explicitation and implicitation, the static/dynamic explicitation hypothesis as proposed by Hopkinson (2007) and, perhaps even more importantly, his concept of ‘static’ vs. ‘dynamic’ coherence relations, should be reconsidered to fit a broader range of texts and be explainable in terms of what we know about explicitation and implicitation processes.

## Notes

- <sup>1</sup> The asterisk marks a back-translation by RK – a close translation of the Czech text back to English, designed to highlight the translation shift.

## References

- Caffarel, Alice, Martin, J. R., and Matthiessen, Christian M.I.M. (eds.) (2004) *Language Typology: A Functional Perspective*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

- Englund-Dimitrova, Birgitta (2005) *Expertise and Explicitation in the Translation Process*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Halverson, Sandra (2003) 'The cognitive basis of translation universals'. *Target*, 15 (2): 197–241.
- Hopkinson, Christopher (2007) 'Explicitation and Implication of Binary Coherence Relations in Translation'. In: Tomášková, Renata (ed.) *Translatologica Ostraviensia II. Sborník z konference Den s překladem*. Ostrava: Ostravská univerzita v Ostravě, Filozofická fakulta. 53–59.
- Kamenická, Renata (2007) *Explicitation and Translator's Style*. Prague: Charles University, PhD dissertation.
- Kamenická, Renata (2008) 'Explicitation profile and translator style'. In: Pym, Anthony and Perekrestenko, Alexander (eds). *Translation Research projects 1*. Tarragona: Intercultural Studies Group, Universitat Rovira i Virgili, 117–130.
- Mauranen, Anna and Kujamäki, Pekka (2004) *Translation Universals: Do They Exist?* Amsterdam and Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Souriau, Etienne (1994) *Encyklopedie estetiky*. Praha: Victoria Publishing.
- Toury, Gideon (1995) *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- The Free Dictionary*. <<http://www.thefreedictionary.com>>

RENATA KAMENICKÁ is an assistant professor at the Department of English and American Studies, Faculty of Arts, Masaryk University, Brno, teaching courses in Translation Studies and specializing in Literary Translation and Descriptive Translation Studies. Her PhD thesis, defended at the Department of Translation Studies, Faculty of Arts, Charles University, in 2007 was on *Explicitation and Translator's Style*.

Address: Mgr. Renata Kamenická, Ph.D., Department of English and American Studies, Faculty of Arts, Masaryk University, Arna Nováka 1, 602 00 Brno, Czech Republic. [email: [kamenick@phil.muni.cz](mailto:kamenick@phil.muni.cz)]