Explicitation and honorifics in the Buddhist scripture translation

Yoon-Cheol Park

Kyungnam University
South Korea

Yoon-Cheol Park: Department of English, Kyungnam University, South Korea. | E-mail: lingular@yahoo.co.kr

ONOMÁZEIN 63 (March 2024): 146 - 160
Yoon-Cheol Park
Explicitation and honorifics in the Buddhist scripture translation

147

Abstract

In translation, explicitation refers to something that is overtly expressed and redundant in the target text. The purpose of this research is to investigate explicitation in the Buddhist scripture translation and propose the inclusion of honorific forms as a type of explicitation. The sample in the research targets the Chinese-Korean translation of the Diamond Sutra. A literature review and a descriptive approach are applied to analyze the sample. The findings indicate that explicitation primarily occurs in the domains of amplification, connectives and honorifics by transferring explicit meanings. The Korean language is more developed than the languages of any other countries across the world. Although honorific forms of any language are less developed or do not exist in source texts, they are added in the target text of the developed language. Explicitation by honorific forms is related to the disparateness of language systems and features but can be attributed to external variables, such as social status, hierarchical relations of interlocutors, and kinship. This research suggests the inclusion of explicitation by honorific forms and highlights the need to investigate explicitation based on the specificity of individual languages.

Keywords: addition; Buddhist scripture translation; explicitation; honorific forms.

ONOMÁZEIN 63 (March 2024): 146 - 160
Yoon-Cheol Park
Explicitation and honorifics in the Buddhist scripture translation

148

1. Introduction

Buddhism has significantly influenced the culture and tradition of Korea for a long time. Its doctrines have also been propagated by Buddhist scriptures and monks' sermons. Among Buddhist scriptures, the Diamond Sutra (Vajracchedikā Prajñāpāramitā Sūtra) is well known to Korean society as a main sutra and emphasizes the idea of emptiness as a core belief. When it was first introduced from India via China to Korea, its messages were conveyed not by meaning-based translation but by transcription for recitation. That is why meanings in the original could be distorted by meaning-based translation. Thus, the Diamond Sutra has been widely propagated only by transcription. However, for better understanding of its contents, it is only recently that a meaning-based translation is applied to the Diamond Sutra, like other Buddhist scriptures. In fact, the Diamond Sutra includes jargon with profound meanings and requires explicitation in transferring messages. Explicitation performs a role in transferring messages more clearly than the source text. In the process of explicitation, a few stylistic techniques are involved, and this occurs primarily by adding something in the target text.

In translation, explicitation refers to "the technique of making explicit in the target text information that is implicit in the source text" (Klaudy, 1998: 80). Therefore, implicit, embedded meanings from the context and situation in the source text are explicitly exposed in the target text. Explicitation has been widely debated since Nida's (1964) foundational argument. Several scholars consider explicitation to be a universal translation phenomenon; others regard it as a procedure of translation. Whichever view we accept, explicitation adds or alters something to the target text. Previous studies of explicitation mainly focus on types of additions (Nida, 1964), the pragmatics and explicitation hypothesis (Séguinot, 1988), the explicitation hypothesis (Blum-Kulka, 1986) and the classification of explicitation types (Klaudy, 1998). However, these studies raise the following question: Why have previous studies not investigated explicitation added by honorific forms of language?

Answering this question is not easy, but the solution may be found in language inherence. The previous studies seem to lose sight of the fact that explicitation can occur by language inherence via language components, such as honorifics. In particular, the honorific system of Korean is more developed than other such systems because Korean society has been influenced by Confucianism, which values ethical norms, even today. It is usually expressed in appellation, the suffix of an honorific title and the rank of a profession. Honorifics function as polite expressions of hierarchal structure, age and kinship relations. Honorific forms in Korean are added to the target text, even though they do not appear in the source text. This reflects a kind of social relation between interlocutors in texts. This phenomenon is a burden to translators, who must consider how to convey explicit messages.

ONOMÁZEIN 63 (March 2024): 146 - 160
Yoon-Cheol Park
Explicitation and honorifics in the Buddhist scripture translation

149

In this respect, the purpose of this research is to propose the inclusion of honorific forms as a type of explicitation through Chinese-Korean translations of the Diamond Sutra. As the background for this study, there have heretofore been no studies on explicitation in the translation of the Diamond Sutra via language inherence, including honorific expressions. Therefore, this research is intended to investigate limited translation phenomena, such as honorific expressions that occur in the process of transferring messages explicitly. This paper introduces the research methods and data in section 2, reviews previous studies on explicitation in section 3, and analyzes explicitation in the Chinese-Korean translation of the Diamond Sutra in section 4. In section 5, the results of the analysis are presented, and in section 6, relations between honorifics and explicitation are explored. The conclusion and directions for future research are presented in section 7. In the next section, we look at research methods and data for examining explicitation in the Chinese-Korean translation of the Diamond Sutra.

2. Research methods and data

To achieve the purpose of this research, we use a literature review and a descriptive approach. The literature review examines previous studies on explicitation in translation, and the descriptive approach analyzes the collected data through Nida's (1964) explicitness from a translational perspective. These two methods allow us to provide insights into the procedures of explicitation and help us identify the relations between honorifics and explicitation in the process of translating Chinese into Korean. The sample for the research is restricted to the Chinese-Korean translation of a Buddhist scripture, the Diamond sutra (金剛般若波羅蜜經) (Training Institution for Jogye Order of Korea Buddhism, 2009), which, unlike other literature, involves text structures that include polite expressions in which explicitation can be easily observed.

In the literature review, it is important to identify the concept and types of explicitation based on previous studies. Explicitation appears in different forms in the target text, but most of it occurs by operations of addition, alternation, and substitution. Nida (1964) argues that explicitness is usually made by "addition in the types such as grammatical restricting, connectives, classifiers, and categories of the receptor language, etc.". This implies that explicitation can be an essential tool to clarify messages for readers in the target text because translation is not a process in which we start with messages in the source text that we then simply transcribe in an unchanged state onto the target text. For composing clear messages in the target text, translators alter and modify words and phrases in the target text. Considering inherent feature differences between the two languages, Nida's (1964) explicitness will be useful, and, in particular, Korean as an agglutinative language has properties to add honorific suffixes like "-eu sibsio" and "-b sio" to the roots of verbs and "-kkeseoneun" and "-nim" to the roots of nouns in forming honorifics. In contrast, Chinese expresses deference

ONOMÁZEIN 63 (March 2024): 146 - 160
Yoon-Cheol Park
Explicitation and honorifics in the Buddhist scripture translation

150

through insertion of several specific words as an analytic language in terms of linguistic typology. On this basis, the literature review explores explicitation in the Chinese-Korean translation of the Diamond Sutra.

The descriptive approach analyzes data on explicitation by honorifics based on the results of the literature review. In other words, it suggests that honorifics can be a type of explicitation because they are used naturally in communicating between people in Korean society. To analyze this explicitation by honorifics, we make use of the honorific system of Korean through Park's (1990) analysis. In analyzing explicitation, we need to look at linguistic features and social customs. Koreans have used honorifics for a long time, particularly in translation or communication. This use is notable in the relationship between Buddha and his dispel Subhuti in the Chinese-Korean translation of the Diamond Sutra. Although the words or language inherence relevant to their relationship was not revealed in the source text, honorific forms were applied to the Korean translation in the target text. In Korean, the addition of honorific forms can be considered a kind of language usage by social norms. For example, in a conversation between colleagues in a company, they must use honorifics with one another regardless of their gender, age, and position because they indicate that the speaker respects the hearer and that both accept one another socially. Therefore, most Korean people take this use for granted and value social contexts such as interpersonal relationships. On the basis of these characteristics of Korean, we first examine explicitation in the Chinese-Korean translation of the Diamond Sutra and classify its types. Then, we observe how explicitation occurs in transferring messages from the source text into the target text and what translational phenomena are involved. To begin with, in the next section, we examine previous studies on explicitation presented in the translation studies.

3. How did previous studies analyze explicitation?

In translation studies, the relationship between language inherence and explicitation was not a focus of previous studies, which were primarily interested in translation procedures and outcomes for explicitly transferring messages. However, because of the inherent specification of individual languages, adding meaning that remains implicit in the source sentences to the honorifics of the target language can be interpreted as a type of explicitation. In terms of linguistic features, explicitation is related to style and plays a role in narrowing the gaps between two language systems and cultures. However, Séguinot (1988: 108) notes that "the term 'explicitation' should be [...] reserved in translation studies for additions to a translated text that cannot be explained by structural, stylistic or rhetorical differences between the two languages". She argues that explicitation is not related to style, though Vinay and Darbelnet (1995) do regard explicitation as a stylistic translation technique. In the case of disparate or inherent features of language, such as honorifics, explicitation is introduced in the process of translation. Explicitation which discussed in translation usually

ONOMÁZEIN 63 (March 2024): 146 - 160
Yoon-Cheol Park
Explicitation and honorifics in the Buddhist scripture translation

151

describes the process of adding words in a target text. Explicitation makes the meaning of the source language clear and easy to understand. Vinay and Darbelnet (1995: 342) define explicitation as follows: "A stylistic translation technique which consists of making explicit in the target language what remains implicit in the source language because it is apparent from either the context or the situation".

As the definition above suggests, explicitation is a technique for overcoming differences between two languages to convey the same meaning as is found in the source language. In other words, explicitation refers to "the process of introducing information into the target language, which is present only implicitly in the source language, but which can be derived from the context or situation" (Vinay and Darbelnet, 1958: 8; Baker, 1998: 80). In this process, explicitation maintains the meaning of the original messages through losses and compensation.

On the other hand, regarding explicitation, Nida (1964: 227; Baker, 1998: 81) addresses the main techniques of adjustment used in the process of translating, namely, additions, subtractions and alterations. In particular, she focuses on addition as a procedure for transferring explicit meanings and suggests the following:

Addition type

· Filling out elliptical expressions

· Additions required because of grammatical restructuring

· Answers to rhetorical questions

· Connectives

· Categories of the receptor language that do not exist in the source language

· Doublets

· Obligatory specification

· Amplification from implicit to explicit status

· Classifiers (Nida, 1964: 227; Baker, 1998: 81).

In this descriptive approach to translation, Perego (2003) considers explicitation to be a type of addition that Nida (1964) suggests. Explicitation by addition is attributed to grammatical and structural differences between two languages. When messages are translated into the target language, explicitation operates through addition. In regard to explicitation, Blum-Kulka (1986) insists on yet another approach. She argues that at the discourse level, explicitation is viewed as inherent in the process of translation and suggests the following:

The process of interpretation performed by the translator on the source text might lead to a TL text which is more redundant than the SL text. This redundancy can be expressed by a

ONOMÁZEIN 63 (March 2024): 146 - 160
Yoon-Cheol Park
Explicitation and honorifics in the Buddhist scripture translation

152

rise in the level of cohesive explicitness in the TL text. This argument may be stated as "the explicitation hypothesis," which postulates an observed cohesive explicitness from SL to TL texts regardless of the increase traceable to differences between the two linguistic and textual systems involved. It follows that explicitation is viewed here as inherent in the process of translation (Blum-Kulka, 1986: 19).

As mentioned above, explicitation triggers redundancy in the level of cohesive explicitness in the target language text. However, Séguinot (1988: 108) criticizes Blum-Kulka's (1986) understanding of explicitation, arguing that this definition is too narrow in that explicitation does not necessarily mean redundancy. Furthermore, Séguinot (1988: 108) claims that "languages are inherently explicit or implicit in the kinds of information they convey and the way they convey it, first through their formal properties and secondly through their stylistic and rhetorical preferences". Explicitation, therefore, operates through translation procedures and transfers to convey messages from the source language into the target language. According to Séguinot's (1988: 108) argument, three forms of explicitation stand out in the target text:

- something that is expressed in the translation that was not in the original;
- something that was implied or understood through presupposition in the source text that is overtly expressed in the translation;
- an element in the source text that is given greater importance in the translation through focus, emphasis or lexical choice.

These three forms stem from "choices that can be accounted for in the language system, and choices that come about because of the nature of the translation process" (Séguinot, 1988: 108). This system exhibits language-dependent features and redundancies in the target language. In addition to these forms of explicitation, Klaudy (1993; 1996; 1998: 82-84) suggests four types of explicitation: obligatory, optional, pragmatic, and translation-inherent explicitation (Perego, 2003: 69-70).

"Obligatory explication is dictated by differences in the syntactic and semantic structures of languages" (Klaudy, 1998: 83). This form of explicitation is obligatory in that sentences in the target language would be ungrammatical without them. "Optional explicitations are dictated by differences in text-building strategies and stylistic preferences between languages" (Klaudy, 1998: 83). As noted in a prior study, "optional explicitation depends on the language use, and it is determined by different TT stylistic preferences that may induce the translator to employ more explicit means of expression" (Perego, 2003: 69). Therefore, this form of explicitation is optional in the sense that grammatically correct sentences can be constructed. Obligatory and optional explicitation forms are utilized in syntactic and semantic structures. Conversely, on the discourse level, pragmatic explicitation is offered to supplement the gaps between the

ONOMÁZEIN 63 (March 2024): 146 - 160
Yoon-Cheol Park
Explicitation and honorifics in the Buddhist scripture translation

153

source and target cultures. In particular, "pragmatic explicitations of implicit cultural information are dictated by differences between cultures" (Klaudy, 1998: 83). Therefore, "pragmatic explicitation involves the insertion of explanations of implicit cultural information or of concepts that have no exact equivalent in language other than the source language they belong to" (Perego, 2003: 70). Lastly, "translation-inherent explicitation is attributed to the nature of the translation process itself" (Klaudy, 1998: 83). It refers to "language-independent features of all translational activities, namely the necessity to formulate ideas in the target language that were originally conceived in the source language" (Klaudy, 1993: 71; 1996: 110).

As explained by Klaudy's argument above, explicitation develops with certain patterns common to the obligatory, optional, pragmatic and translation-inherent types in the target text. These patterns of explicitation ultimately focus on transferring exact messages and have common characteristics in that they are mainly deployed by addition. Even in the case of a well-translated text, such as the Diamond Sutra, which needs literal and semantic translation, explicitation happens and is adjusted by addition. As we mentioned earlier, Nida's (1964) concept of addition becomes a useful tool in examining explicitation because the Chinese-Korean translation of the Diamond Sutra appears to be transferred by addition and substitution, and there is no omission from the source language due to religious nature of the text. In the next section, we carefully examine explicitation and addition in the Chinese-Korean translation of the Diamond Sutra.

4. Examples of explicitation in the Chinese-Korean translation of the Diamond Sutra

With the concept of emptiness as its central focus, the Diamond Sutra specifies the performance of Bodhisattva practices without attachment. It was originally written in Sanskrit, but after translation into Chinese, it was again translated into Korean. When we consider that the Diamond Sutra has abstruse contents, it needs translation to become more accessible to the receptor. Newmark (1981) proposes that "semantic translation is appropriate for any text whose form has a high status form in the source culture, such as philosophical and literary texts as well as sacred texts; it respects the form of the original, and keeps as close as possible to the exact meaning" (Chesterman and Wagner, 2002: 49).

Likewise, it is necessary for the translation of the Diamond Sutra to respect original meanings and transfer messages without altering form or meaning to the extent possible. This leads us to expect perfect and good translations, but, in reality, the Diamond Sutra requires explicitation in the process of translation. Moreover, this explicitation is principally carried out by addition. In fact, "explicitation (implicitation) strategies are generally discussed together with addition (omission) strategies" (Vinay and Darbelnet, 1995; Baker, 1998: 80). Here, it is hard to accept the term "strategy," though some scholars regard addition as the

ONOMÁZEIN 63 (March 2024): 146 - 160
Yoon-Cheol Park
Explicitation and honorifics in the Buddhist scripture translation

154

more generic and explicitation as the more specific concept (Nida, 1964) because the term "strategy" means a general plan to achieve an overall goal, while explicitation concerns the manner in which technical details are treated. Whatever term we use, explicitation operates by transferring messages in the source text explicitly.

In this research, three main examples are analyzed to examine explicitation in the Chinese-Korean translation of the Diamond Sutra. And the research is restricted to three examples because explicitation by addition is observed for only three types: amplification, connectives, and honorifics. The first example, amplification, can be found with many condensed, implicative meanings used in jargon in the text of the Diamond Sutra. The following example is part of the conversation in which Subhuti answers Buddha's question about the definition of Anāgāmin:

> SL (Chinese): 何以故 阿那含名爲**不來**而
> (Because Anāgāmin is called "**the not-returning**" but)

> TL (Korean): Waenyahamyeon anaham-eun doedoraojian-neun **ja**rago bullijiman
> (Because Anāgāmin is called "**the not returning person**" but).

From the example above, the meaning of "not-returning" in the SL is transferred as "the not-returning person," with the word "person" added in the TL. This amplification is intended to expand the implicit meaning of Anāgāmin in the SL. Vinay and Darbelnet (1995: 193) note that "amplification is the technique of remedying a syntactic deficiency or highlighting the meaning of a word, in both cases by filling a lacuna in the lexicon or in the structure." The addition of "person" to the lacuna in the meaning "not-returning" in the SL is used to fill in any missing details about Anāgāmin. Therefore, amplification increases the importance of a specific word and brings it to a higher level. This type of addition presents amplification as something that changes the form while retaining the content. Namely, "a target language unit requires more words than the source language to express the same idea" (Vinay and Darbelnet, 1995: 339).

In the translation of the Diamond Sutra, explicitation by addition also occurs with connectives and is influenced by context. The following second example is part of the conversation in which Subhuti answers Buddha's question asking what he thinks about attaining Anāgāmin, showing the addition of connectives for explicitation:

> SL (Chinese): 不也世尊 若人[...] 爲他人說於前福德[...]
> (No, Buddha. Suppose that a man [...] for others to explain previous good luck [...])

> TL (Korean): Bulya Sejon (= Buddha), Darun saram-eul wihae seolhaeju-neun [...] saram-i itdagohaja. **Geuleomyeon**, apui bogdeog-eun [...]
> (No, Buddha. Suppose that a man [...] for others to explain. **Then**, previous good luck [...]).

ONOMÁZEIN 63 (March 2024): 146 - 160
Yoon-Cheol Park
Explicitation and honorifics in the Buddhist scripture translation

155

In the example above, the connective "Geuleomyeon (= then)" is explicitly added in the TL but is left implicit in the SL. It marks the meaning of the logical form in the context of the TL. In other words, what has proceeded represents a cause, and what follows represents its result. The connective establishes a link to indicate its result visually. Becher (2011: 41) claims that "connectives are an important means of making such connectives explicit, a means of making the reader see the coherence of a text". The connective form to be transferred has a more redundant meaning than that in the SL. The addition of connectives in the TL is induced with obvious contextual meanings.

On the other hand, explicitation by addition can be observed in honorific forms. They may play a role in compensating for deficient elements of the source language. The lexical addition of honorific forms requires stylistic changes in the target language. The Chinese-Korean translation of the Diamond Sutra provides explicitation by honorifics, such as in the following third example about part of the conversation in which Subhuti asks Buddha about the sermon of the Dharma:

SL (Chinese): 世尊 頗有 […] 聞設是法

TL (Korean): Sejon-**isiyeo**! i beop seol**hasim**-eul deutgo […] itget**seumnikka**?
(Buddha! Are there people […] after hearing the sermon of this Dharma?).

The example above shows a translation in which some suffixes for honorific forms in the TL are added in transferring meaning from the SL. They are caused by differences in linguistic features between Chinese and Korean. Chinese does not refer to honorifics and utilizes a plain speech style. Korean, however, marks honorifics with more letters in the TL by using the suffixes "~isiyeo," "~hasim" and "~seumnikka". When considering the relation of Buddha and Subhuti, the Korean text requires honorific expressions because Subhuti has a lower social status than Buddha. This hierarchical relation is embedded in the Chinese context and does not appear in words, but Korean reveals their relation more explicitly by honorific forms.

And in Korean society, "these honorific expressions are not vague and frequently used in most conversations in daily life since Korean speakers seem to perceive the notion of 'politeness' through honorific expressions" (Ahn and Kwon, 2014: 574). They also mark social status and relationships between the speaker and hearer. In the next section, we will summarize these analyses of explicitation discovered in the Chinese-Korean translation of the Diamond Sutra.

5. Analytical results of examples

Explicitation can appear in varied forms by addition in the target text, and it can lead to a translation that is better organized than the source text. In the Chinese-Korean translation

ONOMÁZEIN 63 (March 2024): 146 - 160
Yoon-Cheol Park
Explicitation and honorifics in the Buddhist scripture translation

156

of the Diamond Sutra, we have explored explicitation by using Nida's (1964) types of explicitness. The types of addition mean that semantic components in a certain deep structure reflect those in the surface structure. Furthermore, Nida's (1964) explicitness illustrates various types of addition but overlooks the sociolinguistic component of the addition by honorific forms. Explicitation in the Chinese-Korean translation of the Diamond Sutra is present in the addition of honorific forms and is attributed to a language-inherent feature. As Nida (1964) argued, "addition is used as an adjustment technique in the process of translating". Of the types of addition she proposes, the forms of addition for explicitation in the translation of the Diamond Sutra include the following:

- · amplification from implicit to explicit status,

- · connectives, and

- · honorifics.

The amplification referenced above is often observed in other translations, and something implicit becomes explicit influenced by jargon in the Chinese-Korean translation of the Diamond Sutra. Anāgāmin in the source language means a partially enlightened person, but ordinary people do not know what it is unless they know that word. Furthermore, "amplification can be utilized when important semantic elements implicitly carried in the source language may require explicit identification in the receptor language" (Nida, 1964: 228). However, "amplification is more complex: at the level of syntax it is a question of language, but at the level of lexicon it is about context, hence parole, which motivates translators to isolate semantic elements whose expressions constitute amplification" (Vinay and Darbelnet, 1995: 193). It illustrates the specification of meaning and involves a clearer, more detailed and transparent meaning.

Connectives are imposed semantically at the sequential sentence level by logical forms. On account of the different language systems of Chinese and Korean, what is implicit in Chinese may have to be made explicit in Korean with an appropriate conjunction such as "Geuleomyeon (= then)" by the sentence context. The translation of the Diamond Sutra as a religious text, however, needs to avoid connectives because unnecessary lexical addition can disturb the compact structure of the text, as difficult as this may be to accept. Translators need to insert connectives to convey the entire meaning of the message, operating as a device to transfer an explicit meaning and convey a natural style in the target language.

Lastly, honorifics perform functions to clearly reflect the hierarchical social status of Buddha and Subhuti. Of course, Chinese has an honorific system but differs from Korean in terms of linguistic features. Chinese honorifics developed in ancient and imperial China, but most of them disappeared after its communist revolution. In the sense that Chinese and Korean have honorific systems, we expect that explicitation by addition will not be necessary. However, with respect to the developed or undeveloped language of

ONOMÁZEIN 63 (March 2024): 146 - 160
Yoon-Cheol Park
Explicitation and honorifics in the Buddhist scripture translation

157

honorifics, Korean in the target text gives more sufficient information on communication than Chinese in the source text. In the target text of the Diamond Sutra, the addition of the Korean suffixes "~isiyeo," "~hasim" and "~seumnikka" represents encoding the relative social status of Buddha as the addressee through an honorific that expresses deference to the listener. These honorific morphemes are obvious in the relationships between interlocutors. We examine this in detail through the relations of explicitation and honorifics in the next section.

6. Relations between honorifics and explicitation

As Séguinot (1988: 108) insisted, if explicitation means "something is expressed in the translation which was not in the original", it exhibits a clear difference in the language form and text length between two languages. In the Chinese-Korean translation of the Diamond Sutra, such a remarkable difference is observed in honorific expressions. Honorifics vary from country to country and reflect the nature of different cultures and languages. In a broad sense, "honorifics can be defined as a system for the linguistic encoding of universal politeness and, more specifically, as a system for the sociolinguistic encoding of the relationship between the speaker and the addressee, or the referent, in a given situation" (Park, 1990: 112). Typically, an honorific refers to a word or expression that conveys esteem or respect to the other party. It is also conflated with systems of honorific speech, which are grammatical or morphological ways of encoding the relative social status of speakers. Korean has a relatively developed honorific system that can be classified into the following three types:

> Subject honorific refers to the speaker's expression of politeness toward the subject of a sentence. It can be used on almost any predicate [...]. Object honorific is used when the direct or indirect object refers to a person who deserves deference, although it is quite limited in distribution [...]. Addressee honorific concerns both the speaker's deferential expressions toward the addressee and that of the subject toward the addressee (Park, 1990: 115).

Depending on how these three types are used, honorific forms highlight different aspects of the relationship between the speaker, the addressee and the referent. Korean honorifics are mandatory in many formal and informal social situations. The honorifics incorporate six levels of speech styles from lowest to highest: "deferential, polite, blunt, familiar, intimate and plain" (Park, 1990: 115). Polite forms are used by a speaker referring to or addressing someone who is both older and higher in social position. In particular, occupational rank and social status are generally considered important determinants of honorific usage. Conversely, Chinese honorifics are conveyed by the specific words "nín (您) and wèi (位), and guì (贵)," which refer to respect or reverence. Therefore, they reflect polite expressions via lexical selection. In contrast, Korea's honorific system uses honorific stems that are appended to verbs and nouns that depend on the relation between the

ONOMÁZEIN 63 (March 2024): 146 - 160
Yoon-Cheol Park
Explicitation and honorifics in the Buddhist scripture translation

158

speaker and the other party. Adding honorifics to the target text shows another form of explicitation in the translation process. That is, we may overlook sociolinguistic aspects of the participants in a conversation.

In a society that uses them, honorifics have a significant effect on speech styles of translation. They increase readability, offer a naturalness of style and reduce awkwardness. With regard to explicitation, honorifics may fall into "categories of the receptor language which do not exist in the source language", as Nida (1964: 227) claimed. However, supposing that the two languages have honorific systems, it is a matter of which language is developed or undeveloped and natural or unnatural. Most readers want naturalness, fidelity and equivalence in translation. In this respect, regardless of whether the honorific system of the source or target language is developed, the style of one of the two languages definitely requires changes to add something in the target language. Though it is language restricted, the addition of honorific forms in the target text must be a technique for making information in the target text explicit.

7. Conclusion and directions for future research

Explicitation in the Chinese-Korean translation of the Diamond Sutra can be observed in the types of amplification, connectives and honorifics. These three types of explicitation are products of a literal translation strategy of the Diamond Sutra as a religious book.

Thus, these findings indicate that explicitation occurs by addition, which is consistent with Nida's (1964) explicitness. Her research, however, overlooked the fact that honorifics function as explicitation through the disparateness of the language system. An honorific is added to reveal explicit meaning in the receptor's language. Nevertheless, we are skeptical that honorific systems can occur by addition because of grammatical restructuring or stylistic preferences between languages. What is clear is that some languages necessitate the use of honorifics in the target language.

Recently, explicitation has become a more interesting issue than in the past. Several scholars have observed the asymmetry of explicitation and implicitation (Klaudy, 2009), or explicitational asymmetry (Becher, 2011). More empirical research is needed to prove their arguments because explicitation causes unexpected results from all world languages. We also need to consider how explicitation phenomena are mediated by the specificities of individual languages and the disparateness of language systems and features.

8. References

Aʜɴ, Hyun-Jung, and Yeon-Jin Kᴡᴏɴ, 2014: "Honorific Expressions and Registers in Korean", *Studies in Humanities* 41, 573-592.

BAKER, Mona, 1998: *Routledge encyclopedia of translation studies*, London: Routledge.

BECHER, Viktor, 2011: "When and why do translators add connectives? A corpus-based study", *Target. International Journal of Translation Studies* 23, 26-47.

BLUM-KULKA, Shoshana, 1986: "Shifts of cohesion and coherence in translation" in Juliance HOUSE and Shoshana BLUM-KULKA (eds.): *Interlingual and Intercultural Communication: Discourse and Cognition Translation and Second Language Acquisition Studies*, Tübingen: Narr, 17-35.

CHESTERMAN, Andrew, and Emma WAGNER, 2002: *Can theory help translator? A dialogue between the ivory tower and the wordface*, Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.

KLAUDY, Kinga, 1993: "On explicitation hypothesis" in Kinga KLAUDY (ed.): *Transferre Necess Est: Current Issues of Translation Theory*, Szombathely: Daniel Berzsenyi College, 66-71.

KLAUDY, Kinga, 1996: "Back-translation as a tool for detecting explicitation strategies in Translation" in Kinga KLAUDY, J. LAMBERT and A. SOHÁR (eds.): *Translation Studies in Hungary*, Budapest: Scholastica, 99-114.

KLAUDY, Kinga, 1998: "Explicitation" in Mona BAKER and Gabriel SALDANHA (eds.): *Routledge Encyclopaedia of Translation Studies*, London: Routledge, 80-85.

KLAUDY, Kinga, 2009: "The asymmetry hypothesis in translation research" in Rodica DIMITRIU and Miriam SHLESINGER (eds.): *Translators and their Readers*, Brussels: Les Editions du Hazard, 283-303.

NEWMARK, Peter, 1981: *Approaches to translation*, Oxford: Pergamon Press.

NIDA, Eugene A., 1964: *Toward a science of translating*, Leiden: E. J. Brill.

PARK, Mae-Ran, 1990: "Conflict avoidance in social interaction: a sociolinguistic comparison of the Korean and Japanese honorific systems" in Hajime HOJI (ed.): *Japanese/Korean Linguistics*, Stanford: The Center for the Study of Language and Information, 111-128.

PEREGO, Elisa, 2003: "Evidence of explicitation in subtitling: towards a categorisation", *Across Languages and Cultures* 4, 63-88.

SÉGUINOT, Candace, 1988: "Pragmatics and the explicitation hypothesis", *TTR: Traduction, Terminologie, Rédaction* 1, 106-113.

TRAINING INSTITUTION FOR JOGYE ORDER OF KOREA BUDDHISM, 2009: *Diamond Sutra: old Chinese-Korean language version* (金剛般若波羅蜜經), Seoul: The Jogye Order Publishing.

ONOMÁZEIN 63 (March 2024): 146 - 160
Yoon-Cheol Park
Explicitation and honorifics in the Buddhist scripture translation

160

VINAY, Jean-Paul, and Jeann DARBELNET, 1958: *Stylistique comparée du français et de l'anglais*, Paris: Didier.

VINAY, Jean-Paul, and Jeann DARBELNET, 1995: *Comparative stylistics of French and English: a methodology of translation*, trans. by Juan C. SAGER and M. J. HAMEL, Amsterdam/Philadephia: John Benjamins.