Pragmatic factors in the use of in-text additions as a technique for translating realia in literary translation

Miquel Edo, Zhannura Manapbayeva

The purpose of this study is to establish the criteria for successful deployment of in-text additions in the translation of realia. Uses and misuses of this technique have been assessed from the conflicting perspectives of foreignization and domestication, with reference to the rich corpus provided by the Russian and English translations of Smagul Yelubay's Kazakh novel, Ak Boz Uy. *From the discussion of specific sub-techniques, the primary conclusion emerges that in-text additions are better accommodated in direct, indirect or free indirect speech than in the voice of an omniscient narrator.*

Key words: *in-text additions, situational realia, pragmatic explicitation, pragmatic presupposition, literary translation.*

1. Introduction

Throughout the evolution of Translation Studies, as is usual in many disciplines, an array of concepts have been put forward whose meanings partially coincide. Furthermore, a less common phenomenon has appeared whereby each concept has given rise to a bibliography of its own which has developed autonomously. This has happened, in particular, with realia, presuppositions, explicitation and allusions. Specialists focus narrowly on a single concept and rarely consult the work of their counterparts with alternative foci. Of course, these four terms are not synonyms, and to a certain extent it is reasonable that each sector has moved towards its own objects of study.[1] Even so, overlaps between them are undeniable. Allusions and realia share a field of interest (Ruokonen 2010: 33–34), while subcategories such as 'cultural presuppositions' (Nida and Reyburn 1981: 17) and 'pragmatic explicitations' (Klaudy 1998: 83) are difficult to distinguish from realia. Therefore, the four sectors overlap sufficiently enough to logically suppose that mutual collaboration going forward would benefit researchers on all sides. The first objective of this article is to contribute to this transfer of knowledge at the most obvious point of intersection, the addition.

A second motivation comes from the lack of attention on the casuistry and variables of each technique, in the literature on realia.[2] Theoretical works have rarely gone beyond a few examples, while the results of empirical studies have been redirected rather to the global strategies of the translator and to the reception of the original text in the target culture. There are only a few specific studies on addition (Pym 2018 [1992]: 83–99; Mangiron 2006: 99–109, 568–577; Sharifabad 2015).[3] In order to help fill this gap, a novel in the Kazakh language by Smagul Yelubay and its translations into Russian and English have been used herein. *Ak Boz Uy* (Yelubay 2005) recounts the crisis and the transformation which has taken place in Kazakhstan and very specifically among the cattle-breeder nomads of the Ustirt area after annexation to the Soviet Union. The three parts of the trilogy, published in 1978 (and 1989), 1993 and 2003[4] respectively, describe the forced famine of 1932, the Stalinist repression of 1937, and the times of depression after the Second World War. Translators had to deal with a dense number of realia that they resolved by the means of a reasonable and globally satisfactory diversification of techniques. Among them,[5] the addition was neither the only nor the most common technique, but the frequency and disinhibition with which Lina

Kosmukhamedova and Aslan Zh. Zhaksylykov (Yelubay 2009) and Catherine Fitzpatrick (Yelubay 2016)[6] adopted it not only in the paratext (footnotes), but also in the mouth of the narrator and the characters attracts our attention.[7] His work thus constitutes an excellent benchmark against which to evaluate the options and possibilities offered by this technique.

2. The footnotes into the translation

First of all, in the two translations under examination the alternation between in-text additions and footnotes, although it is done quite randomly, seems to be aimed at avoiding imbalances in the use of one or the other option. It is curious to note, however, that despite translating from the Russian rather than the Kazakh version Catherine Fitzpatrick transforms several in-text additions introduced by Kosmukhamedova and Zhaksylykov into footnotes (specifically 20). Here is an example:

(1)　　Shyǵyrǵa jegilgen astaý bas qara nar mańqıyp teris aınala berip japyrylyp alǵa umtyldy. Ashamaıǵa baı-lanǵan qaıys arqandy julqa tartty.
　　　　(Yelubay 2005: 9)
[The big-headed black nar, harnessed to the shygyr, with its mouth open, turned back and headed forward. It pulled the rawhide lasso tied to ashamay.][8]

Ogromnyj chernyj nar, vprja-zhennyj v shygyr – spe-cial'noe sooruzhenie, prispo-soblennoe dlja vodopoja, – podalsja bylo nazad, no tut zhe vsej svoej massoj snova dvinulsja vpered, tashha syromjatnyj arkan, privjazan-nyj k sedelke na ego spinke.
　　　　(Yelubay 2009: 11)
[The enormous black nar, harnessed to the shygyr – a special construction, dedi-cated for watering – leaned back, but then with all its mass moved forward again, dragging a raw lasso, tied to the saddle on its back.]

An enormous black *nar*, har-nessed to the *shygyr** was opening its jaws; it was about to step back but once again tipped forward with its whole mass, dragging the rawhide lasso tied to the saddle on its back.
*A shygyr is a special device for getting water, a hoist.
　　　　(Yelubay 2016: 10)

　　Should we deduce, from these kinds of decisions, that the English translator is more in favour of footnotes than in-text additions? Does she censure or punish her Russian predecessors for a *modus operandi* she considers too daring? In part, this is a likely motivation. Just as important, however, is Fitzpatrick's unease about her Russian colleagues' language register, since their in-text additions are rather closer in tone and style to footnotes than the novel in which they fail to camouflage themselves.
　　In (1), the parenthesis is inserted with all the clumsiness of a foreign body, clearly manufactured by the translator and addressed to the reader of a target text. Scholars who have written about additions have not focused sufficiently on the radical difference between applying them inside or outside the text. In general, they speak of adding 'information', 'clarifications', an 'explanatory paraphrase' or a 'definition'. All of these terms are certainly not the most characteristic of a literary text typology. When considering how the addition should be written, theorists have in mind the modality of the paratextual note, not realizing the friction that can occur between this type of writing and the context in which the addition is going to be inserted. If it can be argued – as an excuse – that such studies do not focus

exclusively on literary translation while in other typologies this friction tends to have less impact, it is more surprising that some literary translators fail to make this distinction. The texts analyzed here show this weakness to the point that many of the in-text additions made, including some kept by the English translator, correspond to the syntactic schemes indicated by scholars, such as parentheses, nouns in apposition, or the inevitable adjectival clauses (Newmark 1988: 92; Moya 2000: 113-114):

(2)   The women pinched their cheeks from outrage – this was a gesture that indicated that [...] (Yelubay 2016: 29)

Of course, there will be literary texts that admit these didactic and lexicographic interferences more than others. Even in the case of a single writer or a single work there will be contexts in which it attracts more or less attention. However, in general terms they are not good travel companions for the literary genre.

Some additions clarify that what is narrated or described must be attributed to the customs and habits of the source culture. Also, this modality often becomes infected with the stylistic mismatch mentioned above, as demonstrated by the following examples:

(3a)   Izbili, ispinali, govoryat, do polusmerti i, zadom napered na konskij krup posadiv, vosvoyasi otpravili. Po stepnym kanonam vozvrashchat'sya na konskom krupe da eshche i zadom napered – pozornejshij dlya dzhigita udel. Aul, govoryat, posle takih nechistoplotnyh prityazanij «gosudarstvennogo cheloveka» s mesta v odin den' snyalsya, ischez v turkmenskih peskah. (Yelubay 2009: 197)
[It is said that the men of the Aday clan beat and scribbled him up to death, and making him seat on the horseback in reverse sent him away. *According to the nomadic canons, going back on the horseback in reverse is the most disrespectful destiny for a man.* It is said that after such unpure crimes of the "state person", the village has taken off in a day and disappeared in the Turkmen sands.]

(3b)   – CHto zhe eto ty, moj sokol? – sprosila ona, ne nazyvaya po stepnomu etiketu muzha po imeni. (Yelubay 2009: 36)
[– What have you, my falcon? – she asked, *not calling her husband's name according to the steppe ethics*.]

(3c)   Stariki propeli Koran, proveli tradicionno ladonyami po licu. (Yelubay 2009: 210)
[The old men sang the Koran, *traditionally* stroke their faces *with their palms*.][9]

As a general rule, in the source text it is unusual to provide information that is already familiar to the reader, so theorists do not recommend that the translator should put additions like those made in the previous excerpts (Mayoral 1994: 85). However, nothing prevents the infiltration of these kinds of additions in a source text if they are used with epithetical and rhetorical value.[10] Thus, the explicitation of the presence of realia is not a subtechnique that must be discarded a priori. It offers the undeniable advantage of warning the reader and thus preventing his confusion. It does not matter if the meaning of the realia is clear, since giving notice that something unusual is happening may suffice, without further explanation. Thus, in (3c) it is no longer reported that the gesture serves to request that the wishes expressed in the prayer come true, because it is considered enough that the reader understands that it has an undetermined symbolic meaning related to the religious tradition. Yelubay's Russian translators may have overused this subtechnique, and without doubt their wording here

continues to betray the style of the explanatory note addressed to a foreign recipient. However, this defect heavily spoils the first of the quotes, with a diminishing effect on the second quote, while in the third quote the addition effectively goes unnoticed. In conclusion, when metarealia can be seen as credible in the eyes of someone who had read them in the source text, and are written without falling into the style of an editor or commentator, they are a resource of unquestionable validity.

It is also important to underline that prolixity should not necessarily become a target of criticism. In the following passage the Russian translators lengthen the original sentence very generously but they effectively go along with the original free indirect speech, so this addition deserves favourable consideration. When one of their countrymen returns from Afghanistan and describes what he has seen there, the villagers, eager to escape the Soviet yoke and find a place to emigrate, imagine that country as a promised land. The original invokes the ancient myth about Assan Kaigy, who spent his whole life traveling on a camel in search of a paradise called Zheruyuk, which he never found:

(4)   Malyn baģyp, otyn jaģyp, tek jatqan eldi kóz aldyna keltirgende sharýa aýylǵa Aýǵan jeri beıne bir Asan Qaıǵy izdegen Jeruıyqtaı eles berdi.
            (Yelubay 2005: 195)
[When peasants imagined the village in which people independently herded cattle and made a fire to cook, Afganistan seemed like a Zheruyuk which Assan Kaigy looked for.]

Kazhdyj predstavil sebe obetovannyj kraj, tihij, mirnyj, ochagi vo dvorah, skotina na pastbishche, o chem eshche mechtat'? Kak skazochnaya strana imenuemyj ZHer Uyuk, kotoruyu legendarnyj Asan Kajgy ves' svoj vek proiskal.
            (Yelubay 2009: 201)
[Everybody imagined the quite, peaceful place of dreams, hearth in the yards, cattle in the pasture. Is there any other dream? Like the fairy-tale country named Zheruyuk which Assan Kaigy had searched for all his life.]

The evocative abandonment felt by the characters already invited an extension of the textual material, which was well taken advantage of by the translators. In this sense, rather than just an exception, we are facing an exception that confirms the rule. If there are no particular circumstances like these, the more extensive an addition is, the higher the likelihood that the translator will use a 'footnote' style. Therefore, although not necessarily open to criticism, the lenght of the addition is often relevant. Even in "the fairy-tale country named Zheruyuk", there are traces of explanatory language. It will be helpful, in this regard, to bring up a recent study on implicitation which establishes "bridging" and "commenting" as procedures "to compensate for anticipated knowledge deficits among TL readers" (Jamoussi 2017: 364). For Jamoussi, each one is "applicable to different textual manifestations" (379), the first for "elaborative inferencing", and the second for "evaluative inferencing" (370–376). This division would naturally elicit some objections, but the interesting input in relation to the length of the addition is not the function, but the form of both procedures. Although Jamoussi does not highlight it, the examples he provides by comment-type explicitation are either whole clauses or at least contain a verbal structure: "hence shielding him from evil", "as is customary with this welcome display of satiation", "wrapped in the warmth of" (Jamoussi 2017: 375, 379). In contrast, Jamoussi's bridging-type explicitations are limited to a word, which is never a verb, or to a part of a noun group. "The sixty" becomes "The sixty books of the Quran", "Isha prayer" is prolonged as "Isha evening prayer", and "burnoose" is rendered as "burnoose hoods" (Jamoussi 2017: 371–372). Not surprisingly, the word "commenting" clearly points to stylistic features such as those that have beeen criticized here in translations

of *Ak Boz Uy*, while "bridging" refers to a concise link or transition, namely the minimum required to bridge the cultural gap without resorting to a discursive development.

The danger of incurring the friction between the literary and commenting styles is not the only element in favor of short-range bridging. At least three other closely related arguments can be adduced. One of them runs through the entire history of translation studies and is still largely valid today, despite being somewhat eroded by opinions contrary to the invisibility of the translator. Literary translators continue to be urged not to overreach in the number and especially in the length of additions to avoid excessive intrusion of their voice through the narrator or the characters: "Thus, since translators are not supposed to be authors [...] paraphrase extended beyond the sentence tends to break with the situation of translational exchange, becoming a discourse of addition or nonequivalence" (Pym 2018 [1992]: 86). From this perspective, the passage (4) in the Russian version would exceed the limits of what can be defined as translation and enter the realm of adaptation or free translation.

The second argument relates to the current evolution of translation studies and especially translation practice, which is moving towards foreignization, while support for the readers provided by the commenting mode and the long additions exemplified above belongs to the domesticating line.

Thirdly, Leppihalme herself, dealing with the translation of proper names, anticipated Jamoussi's dichotomy by distinguishing between "adding a word or two" and "writing the footnotes into the translation", and warned about the second technique: "an allusion is usually meant to convey its meaning by connotation. It is easy to imagine overt explanations […] ruining the effect completely" (Leppihalme 1992: 188–189). In other words, the target text should be allusive in those parts where the source text is allusive, and this allusiveness cannot be treated as a secondary or expendable component: "These hidden clues cannot be explained to the TT receiver without running the risk of losing the literary charm of the text" (Nord 2005 [1988], 108–109).

3. The non-addition

What will translation that features foreignising bridging ahead of commenting be like? First of all, it will tend to avoid both procedures, namely all kinds of addition. Indeed, foreignising translators, with respect to their domesticating counterparts, are characterized by granting the reader a great contextualizing capacity and a certain dose of tolerance of incomprehensibility (Pym 2005: 39; Becher 2011: 50–51). Therefore, in the foreignising translation – among other concessions to exoticism – numerous realia will be kept in the original language without any further intervention, as transliterations if the alphabets do not match, and/or typographically marked where appropriate. The reader will only be provided with input to aid their comprehension in two quite obvious cases. Firstly, as alluded to above, if the density of the realia is very high, the techniques will have to be diversified, since an excessive number of foreign words in the whole work or in a certain passage can seriously hinder a reader's understanding. Secondly, if realia play an important role in the diegesis of the entire work or a particular episode, it will be necessary to worry about making their meaning transparent.[11] Both assumptions afford leeway to the translator, and regarding the latter, there are at least three considerations to help them to make a relevant decision about the diegetic role of the realia.

The first consideration affects the pragmatic presuppositions, that is, those presuppositions that are defined not by "the truth-conditions or *content* of what is said", but by "the *context* in which a statement is made – the attitudes and interests of speaker and audience", their "background beliefs" and their "mutual knowledge" (Stalnaker 1999 [1974]: 48, 61; Cui and Zhao 2014: 31–32). Without this *context*, "the key that opens the secrets of the conversation" ("la clé qui ouvre les secrets de la conversation", Rantanen 2012: 16) will be missing. To determine whether or not such a key is missing, the most useful method consists of measuring the weight of the "symbolic associative connotation" of the realia (Tarakov 2016: 69).[12] In recent decades studies on realia (Luque Nadal 2009: 96–97, 105, 107) and presuppositions (Ping 1999: 134) have been influenced by the concept of the symbol, which has made a strong impact in anthropology. According to these studies, symbolism characterizes all realia and cultural presuppositions, which is hardly refutable, yet it is no less true that symbolic meanings and denotative content coexist in them, and one or the other has greater weight in each context. Jamoussi and Mangiron highlight the same distinction when separating "evaluative inferences" from "elaborative inferences" (Jamoussi 2017: 369–376) and when distinguishing "between explicitness, that is, indicating the obvious pragmatic implications for the original reader, and the addition of linguistic, encyclopedic or geographical information" (Mangiron 2006: 572).[13] In fact, terms that are most commonly called realia (i.e. organs or bodies of administration, furniture, clothing, gastronomy, artistic or ideological movements) belong to the second group ("elaborative inferences", "addition of information"). Their supposed non-transferability is primarily based on denotative elements (peculiar features or competencies and attributions not shared by foreign equivalents), while their connotative or symbolic dimension does not usually go much beyond the exotic color they provide. Other realia, which are usually related to behavior, situations or habits, already have a strong inherent pragmatic character, and in different contexts they may activate to a greater or lesser degree those additional semes that are not limited to providing local flavor. Depending on the degree of activation of the connotative and symbolic load, different translation strategies will be chosen. In Yelubay's novel the pleasant connotations associated with *kuyrdak*, a traditional meal that is served to honorable guests, are activated very markedly in some scenes, while in others they are hardly felt. These connotations are absent in the first of the following quotations, where preparation of the dish is simply a part of household chores of the main character (Khansulu) before she hears a cry from her children warning her of an unexpected visit that breaks the everyday routine.

By contrast, the second quotation shows a tablecloth laid on the ground with a wide range of delicious dishes, and special importance is given to *kuyrdak*:

(5a)   Túske taman esik aldyndaǵy jer oshaqqa ot jaǵyp, qýyrdaq qýyryp jatqan. "Apa, ana qara!" dep aıqaılady shalshyq sý keship júrgen balalary. Balalary nusqaǵan tusqa moıyn bursa, kún astynda shoshaıyp bir atty kisi kele jatyr.

                    (Yelubay 2005: 261)
[By afternoon she lit a fire on the ground hearth in front of the house and was frying kuyrdak. "Apa, look!" – her children who were playing in the puddle cried. She

K obedu raskhlopotalas' vo dvore pod navesom, gotovya v kotle kuyrdak.
– Mama, smotri, smotri! – vdrug zashumeli rebyata, igravshie u luzhi vody. Hansulu vzglyanula tuda, kuda pokazyvali deti, i uvidela vsadnika, chernevshego pod kosymi luchami solnca.

                    (Yelubay 2009: 262)
[By afternoon she was busy in the yard under the tent cooking kuyrdak in the pot.
– Mama, look, look! – the children, who

turned her head to the place her children were indicating, and saw a lonely man under the sun coming on the horseback.]

were playing in the puddle, suddenly cried. Khansulu looked at the place her children were indicating, and saw a horseman darkening under direct sun rays.]

(5b) Sol ádetimen taza jerge ádemilep dastarqan jáıip, qorjynda bar azyn-aýlaq azyqty sándep dastarqanǵa qoıyp otyrǵany baıqalady. [...] Edige [...] jerdegi quraqty kórpesheniń ústine kelip otyrdy. Ot basy, kishkene dastarqan oılaǵanyndaı, muntazdaı taza. Qalaıy dúngirdiń aýyzy ashyq. İshi toly – pisken qýyrdaq.

(Yelubay 2005: 375)

[Habitually she laid a table on the clean ground, and beautifully put little food from the bag onto the tablecloth. (…) Edige (…) sat on the blanket on the ground. As he expected, the place around fire, the little tablecloth are ideally clean. The tin cask is open. It is full of cooked kuyrdak.]

[...] ona akkuratno nakryla dastarhan, ne zabyv nichego, so vkusom razlozhiv edu na podstilke. […] On […] sel na korpeshku. Dejstvitel'no, nebol'shoj dastarhan byl neobyknovenno opryaten, nakryt so vkusom. Burdyuk s edoj otkryt.

(Yelubay 2009: 393)

[(…) she tidily laid a dastarkhan, not forgetting about anything, and put the food on the cloth with taste. (…) He (…) sat on the blanket. Indeed, a small dastarkhan was unusually neat, laid with taste. The leatherbag with food is open.]

In the first quotation it follows that the transliteration adopted by Russian translators is sufficient. The denotative hyperonymic meaning of 'meal' or 'food' is perfectly deduced from the rest of the sentence. In the second quotation, substitution of *kuyrdak* with the hyperonym 'food' orients the reader towards the denotative meaning. In this case, the translator's decision is far more questionable, since the connotative meaning deserved the priority. It could have been conveyed by adding an adjective or any other structure with explicit or implicit evaluative charge, for instance with 'delicacy', a term added by translators in another part of the novel for another similar realia, *kurt*:

(6) Sdobrennyj sol'yu kipyatok daval osobyj privkus tayushchemu na yazyke lakomstvu. Hansulu pokazalos', chto ona moloko p'et. Da ved' kurt-to proizvodnoe ot moloka. Goryachee moloko rastekalos' po zhilam, sogrevaya telo, dushu. (Yelubay 2009: 238)
[The boiled water flavoured with salt gave special taste to the *delicacy* melting on the tongue. *It seemed to Khansulu that she is drinking milk. Indeed,* kurt *is made from milk.* The hot milk disseminated through veins, warming the body, soul.][14]

The second consideration that is worth making with regard to the relationship between realia and textual diegesis concerns the different diegetic levels. For a foreignising translator the addition (or generalization, if *delicacy* is not added but replaces *kurt*) will be equally expendable when the realia does not act in such a way that it causes a direct effect in the main diegesis, even if it maintains a strong symbolic load. Therefore, interventions will tend not to be favoured when symbolic meanings are merely used with exotic purposes or purposes related more to the setting than to the action.[15] Compare the aforementioned gesture of striking your palms over your face at the end of the prayer in (3c) with that of pinching your cheek in (2) and in footnote 10: the second presupposes a judgment about the behavior of a character; the first has a pragmatic meaning only within the ritual in which it is inscribed. Thus, the decision of the Russian translators to add an explanation to the second gesture and

not to the first is logical. In contrast, the additions that these same translators made when faced with the luxury of details with which Khansulu's wedding is narrated (Yelubay 2008: 57–61; Yelubay 2009: 64–68) will hardly obtain the same consensus. In this case, it may be advisable to resort to generalization or addition according to the assumption regarding the high density of realia, but not according to their diegetic relevance. The description of *jaulyk,* with which the bride is covered, *shashu,* that is scattered along the road that leads to the house of the newly married couple, and the content of *betashar,* sung by the poet, can all be judged as unnecessary information, or deductible from the context in terms that are perhaps approximate or hyperonymic, but sufficient.

The latter scenario invokes the degree of understanding as the third sub-criterion that informs the translator in their choice of strategy. A foreignising translator will not apply aid mechanisms if the sense of realia is not fully, but partially clear from the context. They will leave it in the original language (usually when it is a single word) or they will translate it literally (normally when it is made up of a phrase or clause and each of the component words is translatable). They will not only keep "situations", but even formulations that are unnatural in the target language. For instance, a translation like "we are guests from God" will be considered good in the following appeal from five Soviet military to the women of the town, so that they do not hide:

(7)　　– Aý, habarlas! Aý! Qudaıy qonaqpyz! – dep aıqaılady álgi daýys, dúńkildep. (Yelubay 2005: 90)
　　　　[– Hey, talk to us! Hey! We are guests from God! – cried the voice groaning.]

"We are guests from God!" sounds clearly bizarre but does not induce erroneous interpretation, because the reader will understand the sentence for what it is, a benevolent *captatio benevolentiae* akin to 'we come in peace'.[16] The Finnish experts in allusions have already pointed out that sometimes the literal translation can be satisfactory "if the loss caused by the unfamiliarity is considered not serious" (Leppihalme 1997: 91), that is, even if the context facilitates an understanding "incoherent to some extent" based on "general knowledge" (Ruokonen 2010: 41, 80–86, 98–105, 277–282). It is no less pertinent to invoke here the concept of partial but sufficient explicitation, relative to – for example – an in-text addition that does not provide readers with a complete picture of the particular folkloric tradition to which the original alludes, but just with some "indices communicationnels" [communicational clues] which are sufficient to "se faire une idée sur ce qu'elle peut être" [get an idea of what it can consist of] (Aleksejceva 2011: 218).

An additional argument, rarely mentioned in translation studies, in favour of partially transparent solutions comes from the specific field of literary translation. In literature, to a greater or lesser extent depending on the genre and the author, artistic creativity moves the text away from the language of everyday use. The deviation is achieved through allusiveness and suggestive force, which materialize in new and sometimes disconcerting utterances. Thus, opaque or semi-opaque realia can find good accommodation within the framework of this semi-opacity, which characterizes the textual typology of the original work to be translated. From this point of view, the realia are affected, beyond the foreignising or domesticating taste of each individual translator, by the call to avoid the orthonymy that hangs over all the literary translators. Indeed realia can help to perform this duty by giving guidelines that can be extrapolated to the translation of non-realia.

4. The bridging-type addition

It has been agreed that according to the translation model known as 'foreignising', it is better not to add than to add, and if it is necessary to add, bridging-type additions are better than commenting-type additions. But how are bridging-type additions deployed in practice? The most classic method, as discussed above (see Section 2), favours adding one or several terms, without reaching the structure or length of an entire sentence or clause. Within the framework of this practice, several scholars have identified additions of hyperonymic nouns like 'city' in "the city of Brno" (to translate "Brno", Newmark 1988: 282) as *classifiers*. Perhaps, a more general denomination such as *descriptor* would be useful before entering more specific variants to cover this and any other bridging-type addition of a descriptive nature. These additions should be oriented to limit the meaning of the original term by choosing and providing certain denotative semes that the target text reader does not possess and needs to understand the term within its context. The descriptor category would include not only classifier nouns, but also adjectives like those cited by Christiane Nord in "the *ice-cold* waters of Maine" (Nord 2010: 189) and "*blue* Muzo butterflies" (Nord 2005 [1988]: 106), without which the reader will not receive the main seme of the realia in the particular excerpt from where it is extracted.[17]

Along with these descriptors there would be, according to their function, at least two other types of additions. Firstly, those which make explicit that the term or fragment to be translated belongs to the domain of realia ('metarealia'), already exemplified above both in the bridging variant ("traditionally", see (3c)) and the commenting variant (see (3a) and (3b), or "as is customary with this welcome display of satiation" in Jamoussi 2017: 375). Secondly, the additions of evaluative nature preferably oriented to the transmission of connotative values, positive or negative values as a rule:

(8)   aq boz úı (Yelubay 2005: 17)   yurta, belaya kak sneg (Yelubay 2009: 19)
        [white yurt]   [a yurt *as* white *as snow*]

Evaluative additions for the gastronomic realia cited in (5b) and (6) could read: "It is full of *a more than appetizing* kuyrdak"; "The milky *and always delicate* taste of the kurt".[18] Sometimes aligning with this strategy, the Russian and English translations of *Ak Boz Uy* illustrate how the evaluation can be provided even without the need to add a lexical word. In the passage about the *kurt* the initial interjection "Oh" of the English translation, absent in the Kazakh and Russian versions, already brings a pragmatic surprise value to which the rest of the sentence will give positive connotation:

(9)   Oh, what was this drink of hot tea, seasoned with a pinch of salt, the kurt sweetly melting on
        their tongues; (Yelubay 2016: 257)

At another point in the novel, the mockery that the item *bosaga* (the threshold of the yurt, or more exactly the door jamb) carries with it (someone stands there because of being humiliated) is masterfully captured in the Russian version, jointly by the typical interjection of a laugh ("he-he...") and the attachment of the diminutive suffix with the meaning of contempt to the item itself ("porozhke"):

(10a)   – A-a, keldiń be, kispu-   – A-a, golovorez, yavilsya?   "Ah, the cut-throat has
        rysh! – dedi Shárip qozǵa-   – ozhivilsya SHarip, smeyas'.   appeared?" Sharip laughed,

laqtap keketip. – Otyrsyn solaı! Bosaǵada!

Sháriptiń sózi Ázbergendi qamshymen mańdaıdan tartyp jibergendeı boldy.
(Yelubay 2005: 26)
[– Ah, have you come, you bastard! – Sharip said mocking. – Let him sit that way! At the bosaga!

Sharip's words were like a blow of a whip on his forehead.]

– Pust'-ka tam i prisazhiva-etsya... na porozhke... he-he...

Replika Sharipa Azbergenu – kak udar hlysta po lbu.
(Yelubay 2009: 29)
[– Ah, have you come, you thug? – Sharip said laughing. – Let him sit just there… at the small threshold… ha-ha…

Sharip's words to Azbergen are like a blow of a whip on the forehead.]

growing animated. "Let him take a seat there…on the door jamb…haha…"

Azbergen perceived Sharip's remark like the blow of a whip on his forehead.
(Yelubay 2016: 32)

Kosmukhamedova and Zhaksylykov know how to take advantage here of the extreme flexibility and ease with which the Russian language allows these suffixes. This feature is only partly shared by other languages, as evidenced by the resignation to emulate the diminutive by Fitzpatrick. The damage to the English translation of the passage is not minor, since without the diminutive suffix the laughter ("haha...") can refer to the situation in general (the entry of the detainee and his humiliation by a member of the court) and not necessarily to the 'door jamb'. To overcome this challenge it would have been possible to use another subtechnique of the bridging-type: to make a repetition that, unlike interjection or suffix, would not result in a direct evaluative effect, but would indicate the presence of a realia towards which to orient the evaluative effect of the interjection. Here are two possible alternatives: "Let him take a seat there... *yes*, *there*, on the door jamb... haha..."; "Azbergen perceived Sharip's remark *about the door jamb* like the blow of a whip on his forehead."[19] Although less transparent than these, a few lines later, the author himself makes a repetition and emphasis of the realia. All of the translators omitted it. Probably they deemed it unnecessary and even inopportune according to the stylistic norm that penalizes short distance repetitions. In other words, they fell into hypercorrection and orthonymy:

(10b)　Ázbergen túsi qabaryp, tú-nerip bosaǵaǵa tize búkti.
(Yelubay 2005: 26)
[Azbergen having swollen and gloomy face bent his knees on the bosaga.]

Eshche bol'she pomrachnev, otchego ego myasistoe lico vspuhlo, Azbergen opustilsya tyazhelo na koleni.
(Yelubay 2009: 29)
[Becoming much more gloomy, and thus his meaty face swelling, Azbergen heavily fell on his knees.]

Growing even more gloomy, which made his meaty face swell, Azbergen fell heavily on his knees.
(Yelubay 2016: 32)

5. The commenting-type addition

From all that has been said so far it should not be deduced, of course, that a total and absolute ban on comment-type explicitations is called for. Commenting does not necessarily involve much greater intrusiveness than bridging. Compare the solution previously proposed for the *kuyrdak* in (5b), "It is full of *a more than appetizing* kuyrdak" with the following: "It is full of kuyrdak, *nothing better could be expected*". Commenting is limited here to a parenthesis

that, despite its brevity, gives the idea of a dish appreciated by the Kazakhs more clearly than the adjectival solution, where this idea rests on the association that the reader can make between a *kuyrdak* (very appetizing) and all the *kuyrdak* (all equally appetizing). Even with all the pertinent exceptions, a complete sentence usually allows a conceptual development superior to that of a term or phrase, which in certain situations can make it a more suitable or attractive solution.

On the other hand, the translator will inevitably come across especially difficult realia, which they may not be able to resolve with synthetic additions. In the following passage, for example, they will have to face a rare and paradoxical circumstance. The realia plays a relevant diegetic role but does not cause any 'bump' in the flow of the text, since it does not give rise to opacity or an erroneous interpretation:

(11a) Bosaǵa jaqqa bir kórpe-jastyqty laqtyryp tastady.
– Al, áne tósegiń! – dedi. Daýysy qatqyldaý estilse de Qozbaǵarǵa maıdaı jaqty. Bundaı sóz estımin dep kút-pegen ǵoı Hansulýdan.
Bosaǵa jaqtan ózi ózine tósek salyp jata ketti. Óz qasyna jatqyzbasa da Hansu-lýdyń qoly tıgen názik átir ıisi sezilip tur kórpe-jastyqtan.
(Yelubay 2005: 64)
[(She) threw a blanket and a pillow at the bosaga.
– Catch, that's your bed! – she said. Even if her voice seemed strict, Kozbagar felt glad. He didn't expect to hear even such words from Khan-sulu.
He made a bed near bosaga for himself, and lay down. Even if she didn't let him lie near her, he could feel the smell of Khansulu's tender perfume from the blanket and the pillow.]

Ona emu odeyalo i podush-ku na porog kinula.
– Postel' tebe!
ZHestkovat ton, no dlya Kozbagara on slashche meda. Ne zhdal on ot Hansulu etogo.
Postelil u poroga i leg. Ne polozhila Hansulu ryadom – da nichego, pust' obvyknetsya snachala. Zato na podushke i odeyale – zapah ee duhov.
(Yelubay 2009: 70)
[She threw to him a blanket and a pillow at the threshold.
– That's your bed!
Her voice tone was strict, but for Kozbagar it was sweeter than honey. He didn't expect that from Khansulu.
He made a bed at the threshold, and lay down. Khansulu didn't let him lie near her – but that was nothing, let her get used to him first. Meanwhile, the scent of her perfume was on the pillow and blanket.]

She threw him a blanket and pillow on the threshold.
"Make your own bed!"
Her tone was harsh, but for Kozbagar, it was sweeter than honey. He had not expected from Khansulu even these words. He made his bed near the door and lay down. Khansulu had not allowed him next to her – but that was nothing, let her at first grow accus-tomed to him. Mean-while, the scent of her perfume was on the pillow and blanket…
(Yelubay 2016: 81)

Khansulu sends Kozbagar to sleep outside the marital bed, which is quite humiliating and on a par with the tone and general attitude she exhibits towards him. This is the interpretation which the Russian or English language reader will make, as a result of the quasi-literal translation (without additions) of *bosaga* ("threshold"). The symbolic weight of *bosaga* as a realia is omitted without hindering the fluidity and coherence of the discourse, but in reality a misinterpretation does occur, because in the source text the place to which Kozbagar is sent to sleep (the *bosaga*) is part of the humiliation, while this information does not pass into the

target text. The repetition of the realia applied by the author ("He made a bed for himself near the bosaga, and lay down") will not be enough to make it noticeable. Therefore, the translator who worries about transferring the meaning of *bosaga* may have no other way than to resort to a more elaborate solution, such as the one proposed below, with an additional repetition and an evaluative commenting clause: "– Catch, that's your bed! *Where nobody wants to be: at the bosaga! –* she said." Alternatively, a brief apposition at the first occurrence of the term would also attain the objective: "She threw him a blanket and pillow on the threshold, *the place for the undesirable ones*."[20]

Does this last proposal contradict with what was said in Section 2 against parentheses and appositions? Not really. The parentheses and appositions of glossary or lexicographical tone, which squeaked in the midst of novelistic discursivity, have been criticized there. Something of that tone remains here as a result of the appositional structure itself and due to the definitory style of "the place for…". These two factors probably make the proposal "Where nobody wants to be: at the bosaga!" preferable. Nonetheless, the variation of register provided by "the undesirable ones" already distances the sentence from the 'footnote into the translation', although it puts it in tune not with the voice of the narrator, but with that of the characters. What makes this solution acceptable is indeed the fact that it can be attributed to Kozbagar's thinking, thanks to the sentences that precede it in its context:

(11b)   Perhaps Khansulu would come and stroke his head as well, he thought. But Khansulu did not approach him. She did not stroke his head. Her tassles just kept monotonously jingling and jingling. She threw him a blanket and pillow on the threshold. (Yelubay 2016: 81)

It is not, then, a coincidence that our two proposals for this realia are part of a direct speech (pronounced by Khansulu) and the other of a free indirect speech. Omniscient narrators run the risk of falling into an excess of didactism or of providing information that sounds implausible in their mouth because it is too obvious for the source reader. Even more importantly, this kind of narrators does not admit evaluative additions. In conclusion, then, they are not suitable for lending their voice to additions in nearly absolute terms. Instead, characters can express contempt, approval, irony or admiration. They can lower the register and even repeat what is obvious to their environment with the purpose of emphasizing it or projecting their feelings or opinions about it. Note how the examples given in (9) and (10) to illustrate the techniques of interjection, suffixation, repetition, put the realia in the mouth or the thought of a character. The same applies to solutions such as "a more than appetizing kuyrdak" in (5b), "a yurt as white as snow" in (8), and the literal translation "We are guests from God!" in (7). In passage (6) the sentence "Indeed, kurt is made from milk" fails to maintain the free indirect speech, while in (4) it is respected and seconded almost seamlessly. Those apparently exceptional circumstances that were detected when analyzing this last example about the myth of Zheruyuk have revealed, in the end, the recurring circumstances in most of the solutions proposed in the present article. In short, in narrative translation the direct, indirect and free indirect speech offer a more fertile and malleable terrain than the omniscient voice for a satisfactory resolution of the realia problem.

6. Conclusions

The purpose of the present study has not been merely descriptive. An assessment of good and bad uses of in-text additions has been made from translations of a novel that display a considerable number of instances of this technique. Methodologically speaking, the division between bridging-type and comment-type explicitation has been followed. A formal border has been established between them, namely single words or phrase fragments versus clauses or sentences. Also inspired by studies on explicitation, an equally fruitful division of a functional nature has been introduced in the form of the addition of denotative semes, connotative-evaluative semes or metarealia semes.

To begin with, we have rejected the doubtless common tendency to reproduce the glossary and exegetical style of the footnotes, which causes an ugly contrast with the narrator's and characters' diction within the text. Against such imbalances, a foreignising and exoticizing strategy has been considered a valid option if it is implemented by paying special attention to the pragmatic dimension of realia and if – in cases where the addition is deemed to be indispensable – the bridging-type procedure is prioritized over the commenting modality. The objective would be, rather than to explicitate, to suggest or just explicitate the minimum required in order to transmit the associated meanings, conserving to the greatest extent possible the degree of original implicitness. Seen from this perspective, nothing will prevent the translator from adopting solutions with a bearable level of opacity, as well as unusual or unnatural utterances, which by definition will fit with the canons of literary language more easily than the glossary and exegetical style.

Certainly, this approach does not imply a total rejection of the comment-type option. It is logical to assume that the winds currently favorable to the foreignising line will not completely sweep aside the domesticating model. There will always be those translators who want to offer more help to their readers, and a comment-type addition (understood simply as the addition of one or more clauses or sentences) that does not fall into the commenting style (understood as the gloss or definition typical of a footnote) does not raise major objections. Such risk can be avoided by carrying out the technique through the voices of the characters, provided that their tone and register are skillfully captured. In fact, this is the main conclusion to be drawn from the analysis of translations conducted so far: it is very difficult to conceal the foreign origin of an addition in the narrator's voice, while better results can be achieved when they are placed inside the direct, indirect or free indirect speech. More specifically, in the traditional third-person narration evaluating and connoting will be made easier and more natural when rendered in the characters' words. Almost all the in-text additions employed throughout the translation will then be of this evaluative type, especially if the technique has been reserved preferably for pragmatic presuppositions, since these presuppositions refer to attitudes and beliefs, always entailing adhesion to or rejection of the symbolic associations of realia.

It should be noted, however, that in the other two functions, namely addition of denotative semes and what we have called 'metarealia', the mediation of the character is no less important. Here, too, characters are more likely than the narrator to say or think something that is well known to them and their interlocutors, since they will give this information a connoted emphasis[21] and a more pragmatic articulation. The pragmatic dimension would thus change from a condition to intervene, as it is for the foreignising translator, to the method of intervention, both for realia with or without a pragmatic

presupposition. Compare these two solutions, the first of which has already been cited in (3b):

(12a)   – My falcon, what have you...? – she asked, *not calling her husband's name according to the steppe ethics*.

(12b)   – His name is Shege, his surname is..., his surname... [...] *As you know, our customs don't allow me...* – Clear, you cannot tell it, here you are, a pencil, write it down.[22]

The introduction of the addition is concealed much more effectively in (12b), firstly because the narrator is saved from saying something aimed specifically at the readers of the target text, but also because the addition is used to resolve a conflict between two interlocutors and expresses the anguish and disappointment of one of them. In dichotomous terms (approval / rejection, positive / negative connotation), it can be said that Khansulu expresses rejection, if not towards the taboo itself, then towards the small conversational incident generated by the taboo. In fact, this incident aggravates her relationship with the police officer who must inform her about the sentence that has been handed down against her husband. Similarly, in (12a) the result would have improved if the addition had been worded in an indirect or free indirect style: "she asked, *knowing that she was not allowed to call her husband's name*".[23] In short, the method would consist of taking advantage of the faint frontier that separates the three possible functions of addition to communicate denotative semes and metarealia by combining them with connotative semes. With regard to addition, subjectivity has always been invoked in extratextual terms: scholars have reflected on the subjectivity of the translator when deciding on the amount and type of information provided to the reader (Pym 2018 [1992]: 94–97; Jamoussi 2017: 376–379). In contrast, intratextual subjectivity has been postulated in this study, not as an ontological issue, but just as a technique of dissimulation. In-text additions, if couched in the subjective voices of the characters and camouflaged with their attitudes and feelings, help to skirt the difficulties presented by an objective explicitation delivered via the narrator.

Notes

[1] The explicitation-translation binomial has been predominantly explored either in theoretical speculation around translation universals, in the wake of the long debate generated by the Blum-Kulka's Explicitation Hypothesis, or, at the practical level, in connectives and textual cohesion (see bibliographic reviews in Becher 2011: 20–76; Mansour et al. 2014: 99–101; Murtisari 2016; Jamoussi 2017: 365–368; Marco 2018: 90–94). Allusions have rather moved towards the field of intertextuality (Leppihalme 1997; Ruokonen 2010). The reflection on the translation of presuppositions has remained substantially faithful to the typology of triggers established in its day by Levinson, with a special focus on deictics, definite articles, factive verbs and change of state verbs (see, for example, contributions by Rantanen, Cui and Zhao, Padiernos and Lee cited in this article). Since Newmark, realia have suffered a taxonomic fever resulting in multiple classification proposals and lists of techniques for translation (consult Molina 2001: 70–117; Molina and Hurtado Albir 2002; Mangiron 2006: 50–118; Fernández Guerra 2012: 5–12).

[2] Also called cultural references, culturemes, cultural words, culture-specific items, culture-bound terms. On the origin and nuances of each denomination see Inigo Ros 2003: 17–32; Mangiron 2006: 50-60; Ruokonen 2010: 33n.

³ For addition we consider the famous definition of explicitation by Séguinot (1988: 108): "[t]he term 'explicitation' should therefore be reserved in translation studies for additions in a translated text which cannot be explained by structural, stylistic, or rhetorical differences between the two languages". Further to addition and explicitation, the most common denominations of this technique are amplification, definition, description, diffusion, expansion, explanation, paraphrase and reinforcement (see states of the art cited at the bottom of footnote 1).

⁴ The edition the citations of which are taken here (Yelubay 2005) is the first that brings together the three books in a single volume. Subsequently the trilogy has been reissued in 2008, 2011 and 2017.

⁵ About 350 realia are counted throughout the novel that are repeated in a total of 2500 microcontexts. The techniques adopted range from mere transliteration to generalization or specification, from literal translation to recognized translation, cultural analogue or omission, among others.

⁶ According to information directly provided by Aslan Zh. Zhaksylykov to the authors of this article, he translated the second and third books, Lina Kosmukhamedova translated the first. The English translation only includes the first book.

⁷ The present study will be limited to the modality of the in-text addition and, therefore, will not face additions contained in the paratexts (par excellence, the footnotes and the endnotes). The "in-text addition" formula, although not very frequent, has been circulating for some time (see Ma 2002: 76, 251 and Veselica Majhut 78–80, among others). Other scholars have talked of "in-text explanations" or "in-text expansion" (Pym 2018 [1992]: 90–91), as well as "within-the-text notes" (Sharifabad 2015: 15) and "extra-allusive guidance added in the text "(Leppihalme 1997: 84). Javier Franco distinguishes between "intratextual gloss" and "extratextual gloss" (Franco Aixelá 1996: 62).

⁸ English translations in square brackets are always ours.

⁹ In these three quotes, as well as in note 10, the italic is ours and indicates the addition.

¹⁰ The stylistic use of tautology makes Fitzpatrick's following addition quite plausible: "«You should be ashamed at your age, eh?» The last retort was said by women who pinched their cheeks *to express their indignation*" (Yelubay 2016: 47).

¹¹ Several translators have stated that they add information only when it is necessary "to understand and enjoy the text" ("per entendre i gaudir del text", Mangiron 2006: 569).

¹² With due precautions, the pragmatic presupposition would not be far from the "situational realia" of Vlakhov and Florin (1980: 16, 331), named so because they express themselves "in a situation", not "by the use of a single word", which in turn usually occurs when "the peculiarities of behavior, customs, and habits of the people who speak the given language" (Alexeyeva 2004: 172–173) are reflected. Earlier, another Russian scholar, Venedikt Vinogradov, had already spoken of "associative realia", emphasizing the symbolism of flora, fauna, and colors (Vinogradov 1975: 37, 110, 115). In fact, Tarakov takes up Vinogradov's thesis.

¹³ The original quotation is in Catalan: "entre l'explicitació, és a dir, indicar les implicacions pragmàtiques òbvies per al lector original, i l'addició d'informació, sovint de caràcter lingüístic, enciclopèdic o geogràfic".

¹⁴ Addition has been italicized, although the whole passage has totally been remade.

¹⁵ A domesticating translator will probably attach more importance to this documentary component and will consider as unjustifiable loss the fact the original terms or actions are not accompanied or replaced with the gloss or generalization that deciphers their meaning.

¹⁶ Yelubay's Russian translators use the literal translation as well, but they subsequently add a sentence that from a foreignising point of view would be unnecessary (we emphasize it in italics): "Tak vyhodite! Bozh'i gosti my, nekhorosho vstrechaete!" (Yelubay 2009: 99) [Come out then! We are guests from God, *you are not meeting us well!*].

¹⁷ Italics is ours, and it indicates the additions. The first quotation is taken from an unidentified journalist ("I think of calling to shore while wading into the waters of Maine"); the second quotation ("las mariposas de Muzo") is from Neruda (poem entitled "Algunas bestias", line 18, in *Canto general*). Examples in Yelubay's Russian translation are: "voinstvennogo podroda kunanorys v rodu

adaj" (Yelubay 2009: 82) [the *warrior* subclan of the Aday clan]; "Spasitel'nuyu molitvu – kalimu" (Yelubay 2009: 431) [the *saving prayer* kalima].

[18] Our proposals. Additions are italicized.

[19] Our proposal. Addition is italicized.

[20] Our proposal. Addition is italicized.

[21] Because of their lower connoting capacity, omniscient narrator can resort to emphasis more occasionally (see the example of tautology discussed in footnote 10).

[22] Addition in (12b) is our proposal. The addition is italicized. Original text: "– Aty – Shege. Pámılesi... pámılesi... [...] – Túsinikti... Aıta almaımyn de... má... qaryndash... jazyp bere ǵoı!..." (Yelubay 2005: 342).

[23] Our proposal. Addition is italicized.

References

Primary references

YELUBAY, Smagul. 2005. *Ak boz uy. Trilogiya.* Almaty: Zhazushy, 2005.

YELUBAY, Smagul. 2009. *Odinokaya yurta: Trilogiya*. Translated from Kazakh by L[ina] Kosmukhamedovoy & A[slan Zh.] Zhaksylykova. Astana: Audarma, 2009.

YELUBAY, Smagul. 2016. *Lonely Yurt*. [The first book of the trilogy.] Translated from Russian by Catherine Fitzpatrick. New York: Metropolitan Classics, 2016.

Secondary references

ALEKSEJCEVA, Tat'jana A. 2011. L'explicitation en traduction littéraire. In MILLIARESSI, T. (ed.), *De la linguistique à la traductologie. Interpréter/traduire*. Villeneuve d'Ascq, France: Presses Universitaires du Septentrion, 2011, pp. 213–225.

ALEXEYEVA, Irina Sergeyevna. 2004. *Vvedenie v perevodovedenie* [Introduction into translation studies]. Saint Petersburg: Filologicheskiy facultet SPbGU / Moscow: Izdatelskiy tsentr 'Academiya', 2004.

BECHER, Viktor. 2011. *Explicitation and implicitation in translation. A corpus-based study of English-German and German-English translations of business texts*. Hamburg: Universität Hamburg, 2011.

CUI, Ying; ZHAO, Yanli. 2014. A contextual perspective on presupposition, with reference to translation studies. In *Stellenbosch Papers in Linguistics Plus*, 2014, vol. 43, pp. 31–42.

FERNÁNDEZ GUERRA, Ana. 2012. Translating culture: problems, strategies and practical realities. In *Art and Subversion*, December 2012, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 1–28.

FRANCO AIXELÁ, Javier. 1996. Culture-specific items in translation. In ÁLVAREZ, R.; VIDAL, M.C.A. (eds.), *Translation, power, subversion*. Clevedon / Philadelphia / Adelaide: Multilingual Matters, 1996, pp. 52–78.

INIGO ROS, Marta. 2003. *Cultural terms in King Alfred's translation of the "Consolatio philosophiae"*. València: Universitat de València, 2003.

JAMOUSSI, Rafik. 2017. Background knowledge explicitation. Blueprint for a theoretical model. In *Trans-kom*, 2017, vol. 10, no. 3, pp. 364–384.

KLAUDY, Kinga. 1998. Explicitation. In BAKER, M. (ed.), *Routledge encyclopedia of translation studies*. London / New York: Routledge, 1998, pp. 80–84.

LEPPIHALME, Ritva. 1992. Allusions and their translation. In NYYSSÖNEN, H.; KUURE, L. (eds.), *Acquisition of language – acquisition of culture. AFinLA yearbook 1992*. Jyväskylä, Finland: Publications de l'Association Finlandaise de Linguistique Appliquée, 1992, pp. 183–191.

LEPPIHALME, Ritva. 1997. *Culture Bumps. An empirical approach to the translation of allusions*. Clevedon / Philadelphia / Toronto / Sidney / Johannesburg: Multilingual Matters, 1997.

LUQUE NADAL, Lucía. 2009. Los culturemas: ¿unidades lingüísticas, ideológicas o culturales?. In *Language Design*, 2009, vol. 11, pp. 93–120.

MA, Aiying. 2002. *Cultural translation from Chinese to English: a case study of the problems in the translation and interpretation of selected contemporary texts*. Melbourne: Victoria University, 2002.

MANGIRON, Carme. 2006. *El tractament dels referents culturals a les traduccions de la novel·la "Botxan": la interacció entre els elements textuals i extratextuals*. Bellaterra, Spain: Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, 2006.

MANSOUR, Arwa; AL-SOWAIDI, Belqes; MOHAMMED, Tawffeek Abdou Saeed. 2014. Investigating explicitation in literary translation from English into Arabic. In *International Journal of Linguistics and Communication*, September 2014, vol. 2, no. 3, pp. 97–125.

MARCO, Josep. 2018. Connectives as indicators of explicitation in literary translation: A study based on a comparable and parallel corpus. In *Target*, 2018, vol. 30, no. 1, pp. 87–111.

MAYORAL, Roberto. 1994. La explicitación de información en la traducción intercultural. In HURTADO ALBIR, A. (ed.), *Estudis sobre la traducció*. Castelló de la Plana, Spain: Publicacions de la Universitat Jaume I, 1994, pp. 73–96.

MOLINA, Lucía. 2001. *Análisis descriptivo de la traducción de los culturemas árabe-español*. Bellaterra, Spain: Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, 2001.

MOLINA, Lucía; HURTADO ALBIR, Amparo. 2002. Translation techniques revisited: A dynamic and functionalist approach. In *Meta*, December 2002, vol. 47, no. 4, pp. 498–512.

MOYA, Virgilio. 2000. *La traducción de los nombres propios*. Madrid: Cátedra, 2000.

MURTISARI, Elisabet Titik. 2016. Explicitation in translation studies: The journey of an elusive concept. In *Translation & Interpreting*, 2016, vol. 8, no. 2, pp. 64–81.

NEWMARK, Peter. 1988. *A textbook of translation*. New York / London / Toronto / Sidney / Tokyo: Prentice Hall, 1988.

NIDA, Eugene A.; REYBURN, William D. 1981. *Meaning across cultures*. New York: Orbis Books, 1981.

NORD, Christiane. 2005 [1988]. *Text analysis in translation. Theory, methodology, and didactic application of a model for translation-oriented text analysis*. Amsterdam / New York: Rodopi, 2005 [1988].

NORD, Christiane. 2010. Text function and meaning in *Skopos*-oriented translation. In LEWANDOWSKA-TOMASZCZYIK, B.; THELEN, M. (eds.), *Meaning in translation*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2010, pp. 183–192.

PADIERNOS, Maria Olive Gay; LEE, Sangcheol. 2018. Cultural presupposition and accommodation. In *The Journal of Studies in Language*, 2018, vol. 34, no. 3, pp. 457–473.

PING, Ke. 1999. Cultural presuppositions and misreadings. In *Meta*, March 1999, vol. 44, no. 1, pp. 133–143.

PRINCE, Ellen F. 1981. Toward a taxonomy of given-new information. In COLE, P. (ed.), *Radical pragmatics*. New York: Academic Press, 1981, pp. 223–255.

PYM, Anthony. 2018 [1992]. *Translation and text transfer. An essay on the principles of intercultural communication*. Tarragona, Spain: Intercultural Studies Group, 2018 [1992].

PYM, Anthony. 2005. Explaining explicitation. In KAROLY, K.; FÓRIS, A. (eds.), *New trends in translation studies. In honour of Kinga Klaudy*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 2005, pp. 29–43.

RANTANEN, Sari. 2012. *Constance sous la traduction ? Une étude sur les présuppositions factives en français et leurs traductions en finnois et en espagnol*. Tampere: Université de Tampere, 2012.

RUOKONEN, Minna. 2010. *Cultural and textual properties in the translation and interpretation of allusions. An analysis of allusions in Dorothy L. Sayers' detective novels translated into Finnish in the 1940s and the 1980s*. Turku, Finland: University of Turku, 2010.

SÉGUINOT, Candace. 1988. Pragmatics and the explicitation hypothesis. In *TTR: Traduction, Terminologie, Rédaction*, 2nd semester 1988, vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 106–113.

SHARIFABAD, Ebrahim Davoudi. 2015. *Addition as a translation adjustment technique in the selected English translations of implicit direct object ellipsis in the Holy Qur'ān*. Penang: Universiti Sains Malaysia, 2015.

STALNAKER, Robert C. 1999 [1974]. *Context and content. Essays on intentionality in speech and thought*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999 [1974].

TARAKOV, Anuar Sauatovich. 2016. *Audarmanyn teoriyalyk jane pragmatikalyk maseleleri* [Theoretical and pragmatic issues of translation]. Almaty: Kazakh universiteti, 2016.

VESELICA MAJHUT, Snježana. 2012. *Cultural specificity in the translation of popular fiction from Englih into Croatian during the socialist and transition periods (1960-2010)*. Tarragona, Spain: Universitat Rovira i Virgili, 2012.

VLAKHOV, Sergej; FLORIN, Sider. 1980. *Neperevodimoe v perevode* [Untranslatable in translation]. Moscow: Mezhdunarodnye otnosheniya, 1980.

VINOGRADOV, Venedikt Stepanovich. 2001. *Vvedenie v perevodovedenie (obschie i leksicheskie vosprosy)* [Introduction into translation studies (General and lexical issues)]. Moscow: Izdatelstvo instituta obschego srednego obrazovaniya RAO, 2001.

Miquel Edo
Address: Office K/1006, Faculty of Translation and Interpreting, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, 08193 Cerdanyola del Vallès (Spain)
E-mail: Miquel.Edo@uab.cat

Zhannura Manapbayeva*
Address: Department of Foreign Philology and Translation Studies, Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, 71 al-Farabi Avenue, Almaty, 050000, Kazakhstan
E-mail: zh.manapbayeva@gmail.com

*Corresponding author