

EXPLICITATION AND THE TRANSLATION OF ENGLISH ADJECTIVAL COMPOUNDS INTO ROMANIAN

Ruxandra Drăgan*

Abstract: While English and other Germanic languages make extensive use of compounding as a means of expanding their lexicons, in Romanian and Romance languages, in general, compounding is merely a minor word formation process. For this reason, the translation of English compounds into Romanian is a challenging endeavour that usually involves the spelling out of syntactic and semantic information otherwise implicit in the original derivatives. Building on these ideas, the present paper explores the translation strategies employed to render deverbal *-ed* adjectival compounds into Romanian. It is shown that the typological differences between the two languages lead translators to adopt strategies which, to a large extent, entail obligatory explicitation (see Klaudy & Károly 2005, Klaudy 2003, 2009, 2017, Molés-Cases 2019, etc.), though cases of implicitation are not excluded.

Keywords: deverbal *-ed* adjectival compounds, translation strategies, grammatical transposition, compensation techniques, explicitation

1. Introduction

English and Romanian, and Germanic and Romance languages, in general, are typologically different with respect to the word formation processes they regularly employ to expand their lexicons. While English displays a marked preference for compounding (and conversion), Romanian is partial to affixation. Not only is compounding a minor derivational process in Romanian, but the compounds it derives follow patterns unlike those in English, patterns that frequently incorporate inflectional morphology as well. This typological distinction makes translating compounds from English into Romanian problematic for two readily apparent reasons: (i) most lexicalized compounds in English do not have equivalent compound forms in Romanian; (ii) English compounding regularly generates new, spontaneous creations, which, naturally, lack corresponding items in Romanian, and whose high semantic and syntactic variability complicates their rendition.

In view of these observations, the present study investigates the translation into Romanian of a specific subclass of synthetic compounds characterized by a high degree of syntactic and semantic variability – that of deverbal *-ed* adjectival compounds. The aim of the analysis is twofold: (i) to identify the strategies translators adopt to render them into Romanian, as well as the range of patterns said strategies generate; (ii) to relate the identified patterns to the general concept of explicitation as a translation universal, as proposed by Blum-Kulka (1986), Klaudy & Károly (2005), Klaudy (2003, 2009), among others. To this purpose, the analysis will rely on a corpus of hyphenated compounds selected from three fantasy books by Joe Abercrombie, each rendered by a different translator: *The Heroes* (2011), translated by Monica Șerban (*Eroii*, Editura Nemira, 2019), *Best Served Cold* (2009), translated by Ruxandra Toma (*Dulce răzbnare*, Editura

* University of Bucharest, Department of English, ruxandra.dragan@lils.unibuc.ro.

Nemira, 2017), and *Last Argument of Kings* (2008), translated by Mihnea Columbeanu (*Puterea armelor*, Editura Nemira, 2017). Abercrombie's books are especially suited to this study since the fast pace of the narratives is supported by a wide range of semantically rich, though syntactically compact structures, among which a substantial number of deverbal *-ed* adjectival compounds (409 tokens), distributed into four semantically and syntactically distinct patterns: N-V-*ed* items (188 tokens), Adv-V-*ed* items (162 tokens), Q-V-*ed* items (45 tokens), and A-V-*ed* items (14 tokens).

The analysis will reveal two opposing tendencies in the translation of deverbal *-ed* adjectival compounds. On the one hand, such derivatives will often be shortened in translation, possibly due to a strong preference for single adjectives as equivalents of lexicalized English compounds in bilingual dictionaries. On the other hand, the high degree of variability of new, spontaneous compounds will force translators to lengthen their renditions into Romanian in order to make explicit the semantic and syntactic relations between the two stems of the original derivatives. Of the two opposing tendencies, the latter will dominate the picture, mainly due to the fact that novel creations, which are typically translated by means of phrases and clauses, represent an open class of items. What is more, the findings of the present analysis, which are similar to those of studies of compound translation into other Romance languages, will further confirm that explicitation, as defined by Blum-Kulka (1986), Klaudy & Károly (2005), Klaudy (2003, 2009, 2017), Molés-Cases (2019) and others, is, indeed, a universal strategy, since most of the translation techniques identified in this study involve explicitation (grammatical transposition, compensation by splitting, compensation in kind, compensation in place, free translation).

The article is structured as follows. Section 2 defines deverbal *-ed* adjectival compounds, identifies several syntactic and semantic patterns, and makes a number of predictions based on these patterns. Section 3 provides an analysis of the corpus from the perspective of the translation strategies outlined by Hervey & Higgins (1992). Section 4 discusses the results of the analysis and relates them to the concept of explicitation. Section 5 summarizes the findings.

2. Background and predictions

-Ed adjectival compounds are a subclass of synthetic compounds whose second stem is deverbal and whose first stem, be it a noun, an adjective, an adverb or a quantifier, is interpretable either as an internal argument (complement) or as a semantic argument (adjunct) of the verb (see Lieber 1983, Plag 2003, Baciu 2004). As already stated, several patterns can be distinguished, depending on the lexical category of the first stem.

N-V-*ed* compounds, of which there are 188 tokens in the present corpus, represent a highly productive group, which includes many spontaneous formations. The nominal stem of this kind of compound, which corresponds to a prepositional phrase in syntax, typically operates as semantic argument of the verbal stem and is attributed diverse interpretations: Agentive (*man-made (thing)* < '(thing) made by man', *flea-bitten (nags)* < '(nags) bitten by fleas'), Cause (*rain-spoiled (gear)* < '(gear) spoiled by rain',

travel-stained (coat) < ‘(coat) stained by travel’, *wind-torn (tent)* < ‘(tent) torn by the wind’, Locative (*pan-fried (rump steak)* < ‘(rump steak) fried in a pan’, *battle-hardened (Carl)* < ‘(Carl) hardened in battle’), Locatum (*mud-smearred (animals)* < ‘(animals) smeared with mud’, *blood-sprayed (boy)* < ‘(boy) sprayed with blood’, *mud-spattered (clothes)* < ‘(clothes) spattered with mud’), Instrument (*straw-filled (mattress)* < ‘(mattress) filled with straw’, *leather-bound (ledger)* < ‘(ledger) bound with leather’, *gold-embroidered (white coat)* < ‘(white coat) embroidered with gold’). Infrequently, the nominal stem may function as argument of the verb (direct object/subject (?) in *jaw-clenched (effort)* < ‘effort that clenches one’s jaws/makes one’s jaws clench’, prepositional object in *clothes-obsessed (old women)* < ‘(old women) obsessed about clothes’ and *self-satisfied (man)* < ‘(man) satisfied with oneself’).

The Adv-V-ed pattern is another highly productive group that is well-represented in the corpus (162 tokens). In such cases, the adverbial stem operates as semantic argument of the verbal stem, denoting mostly Manner (*well-polished (heels)*, *ill-defined (order)*, *richly-dressed (corpses)*, *brightly-coloured (Union uniforms)*, *perfectly-shaped (thumbnail)*) and, infrequently, Time (*long-forgotten (designer)*, *long-founded (institution)*, *short-lived (relief)*). At the same time, the first stem may be a *bona fide* adverb (*brightly-coloured (Union uniforms)*, *richly-dressed (corpses)*, *well-structured (violence)*), or an adjective functioning as adverb in the context (*long-established (master)*, *rough-forged (swords)*, *tight-packed (slaughter)*, *hard-packed (earth)*, *deep-set (eyes)*). Quite importantly, many compounds built on *well*, *ill*, *long* (*well-known*, *well-deserved*, *ill-equipped*, *ill-advised*, *long-lived* and others) are lexicalized forms that have lexicalized (mainly single-adjective) equivalents in Romanian.

The Q-V-ed combination, illustrated by 45 tokens, is a subset of the Adv-V-ed pattern, in which the quantifier operates as semantic argument of the verbal stem and denotes Manner (*half-written (letter)*, *half-remembered (ghosts)*, *half-shrouded (festoons of decorative stonework)*, *half-glimpsed (face)*).

Finally, the A-V-ed pattern, of which only 14 tokens are present in the corpus, is characterized by low productivity, most likely because these compounds are somewhat less freely built. Specifically, they are based on the passivized forms of resultative constructions, with the adjectival first stem functioning as Result Phrase. Most of the A-V-ed compounds (*green-dyed (cloak)*, *black-forged (double coat of chain mail)*, *hard-boiled (egg)*, *blue-painted (forearm)*, *red-soaked (bandages)*, *clean-shaven (young officer)*, etc.) are adjectival passives of weak/false resultatives (see Washio 1997, Kaufmann & Wunderlich 1998, Farkas 2011), i.e. secondary predicate structures built on telic change-of-state verbs accompanied by Result Phrases specifying the final state lexicalized by the verbs themselves. Infrequently, the compounds may derive from strong/true resultatives, which consist of atelic activity verbs and adjectival Result Phrases whose meanings are independent of the meanings of the verbs they associate with (*clean-picked (bones)*, *bright-polished (weapons)*).

Given the complex picture introduced above, there are a number of predictions that can be made regarding the translation of this class of compounds into Romanian. Generally speaking, since compounding is restricted in Romanian, but highly productive in English, where it generates complex words whose stems are found in various semantic and syntactic relations, the translation of English compounds into Romanian is predicted

to be considerably problematic. On the one hand, lexicalized compounds are not expected to be an issue as they will be listed in bilingual dictionaries with their Romanian equivalents, be they corresponding lexicalized forms (typically single adjectives) or paraphrases. On the other hand, new spontaneous creations are expected to prove difficult to translate because of the variety of patterns, which translators will have to decode, i.e. make explicit by adding lexical material. As a result, the translators' solutions are expected to reveal two opposing tendencies, the shortening or the lengthening of the derivatives in the source language, with the latter taking centre stage since the new spontaneous formations represent an open class of items.

The next section, which focuses on the strategies adopted by the translators to render deverbal *-ed* adjectival compounds and the patterns they generate, will shed light on which of the suggested tendencies actually dominates the picture.

3. Translation strategies

As stated in the introduction, the analysis of the corpus is conducted within the framework provided by Hervey and Higgins (1992). Accordingly, the main strategy selected by the translators to compensate for the lack of corresponding compound forms in Romanian is grammatical transposition. This strategy entails the replacement of a given grammatical structure in the source language with another in the target language. However, in this case, there is no single corresponding structure, but rather a wide array of patterns, ranging from phrases (complex APs, PPs and NPs) to gerundial structures to clauses, be they independent or subordinate clauses of various types. What is more, as will be evidenced in what follows, the translators use grammatical transposition concurrently with a number of other compensatory techniques, and this accounts for the many different translation patterns.

Generally speaking, the strategy of compensation in place, which entails replicating a certain effect in the source text in a different place in the target text, is almost always at work since obligatory premodification in English is typically replaced with postmodification in Romanian. At times, compensation in place may have local effects as well, resulting in the reshuffling of the elements that translate the modifier and the modified in the source language, as illustrated below:

- (1) a. ... hauled him into the air with a **jaw-clenched effort**.
 b. ... îl ridică în aer, cu **fălcile strînse de efort**... (lit. 'jaws clenched with effort')
- (2) a. He ground Jezal's face into the **vomit-spattered floor** with his boot.
 b. Și, apăsând cu cizma, frecă fața lui Jezal în **voma de pe pardoseală**. (lit. 'the vomit on the floor')
- (3) a. Cosca was bent over on his knees, shaking with **ill-suppressed mirth**.
 b. Cosca se ținea de burtă și **hohotea de râs, incapabil să se stăpânească**. (lit. 'roared with laughter, unable to restrain himself')

In both (1) and (2), the first stems of the compounds (*jaw* and *vomit*) are translated as the modified elements (*fălcile* ‘jaws’ and *voma* (*vomit*)), i.e. they become heads of the complex NPs, while the modified nominals in the original structures (*effort* and *floor*) are rendered as complements of the prepositions heading the modifying PPs (*de* (*efort*) (*with* (*effort*)) and *de pe* (*pardoseală*) (lit. ‘from on floor’ > *on the floor*)). The translation of the compound modifier - modified nominal combination *ill-suppressed mirth* in (3) is even more complex, since it results in the association of clausal structures. The head nominal *mirth* is rendered by a verb-adjunct combination (*hohotea de râs*, lit. ‘roared with laughter’), while the compound itself is translated by means of an adjective modified by a subordinate clause (*incapabil să se stăpânească* ‘unable to restrain himself’). It should also be pointed out that *compensation in place* results in the lengthening of the original structures, to a greater or lesser degree, as Romanian requires at least the use of prepositions, if not of other more complex relational elements, to clarify the semantic and syntactic relations obtaining between the two stems of the compound, as well as between the compound and the nominal it modifies.

Alternatively, the translators use the strategy of compensation in kind, which entails the compensation for one type of textual effect in the source text by means of another type in the target text; specifically, it involves the replacement of literal meanings in the source text with connotative meanings in the target text and vice versa, as illustrated below:

- (4) a. The Carls there were hunched behind their **arrow-prickled shield wall**...
 b. Mercenarii de acolo se ascundeau după **scuturile lor înțepate de sute de ori**... (lit. ‘their shields pricked hundreds of times’)
- (5) a. ... holding **one ring-encrusted hand** out towards it.
 b. ... i-l arătă cu **un deget care abia dacă se vedea prin atâtea inele**. (lit. ‘a finger which one could hardly see under the many rings’)
- (6) a. Being in charge can seem like **a thing iron-forged**, but in the end it’s just an idea everyone agrees to.
 b. Să conduci pare **o chestie bine stabilită**, dar în definitiv, nu e decât o idee cu care toată lumea trebuie să fie de acord. (lit. ‘a thing well-acknowledged’)

Examples (4) and (5) illustrate the replacement of denotative meanings with connotative meanings. The translation of *arrow-prickled shield wall* in (4) adds extra information about the high number of arrows pricking it, giving rise in the reader's mind to a particular image that is not entailed by the original structure. Similarly, the translation of *one ring-encrusted hand* in (5) adds a hyperbolic comment on the number of rings covering the finger by stating that one could hardly see it because of them. In contrast, the connotative dimension of *a thing iron-forged* gets lost in translation, being replaced with the denotative *o chestie bine stabilită* (lit. ‘a thing well-acknowledged’), though notice that this is one of the few occasions the translator actually uses a Romanian compound (*bine stabilit* ‘well-established’, ‘well-acknowledged’).

Aside from grammatical transposition, the most widespread compensatory strategy is compensation by splitting. It involves the use of several words in the target text to render the meaning of a specific word in the source text. In the present corpus, this

translates into a shift from a compound to either a phrase or a clause, thus lengthening the original derivatives. In particular, compounds are rendered by a variety of syntactic phrases, as illustrated below:

- (7) a. the **sun-drenched fields**
 b. **câmpurile scăldate în lumina soarelui** (lit. ‘the fields bathed in the light of the sun/in sunlight’)
- (8) a. the inn’s **weed-colonised courtyard**
 b. **curtea năpădită de bălării** a hanului (lit. ‘the courtyard overgrown with weeds’)
- (9) a. That and a whole crowd of **heavy-armed, heavy-scarred**, heavy-scowled Carls.
 b. Ceva mai încolo zeci de mercenari **greu înarmați, plini de cicatrice** (lit. ‘full of scars’) și foarte încruntați.
- (10) a. He had crept from his **sweat-soaked bed...**
 b. Se strecurase din **patul jilav de transpirație...** (lit. ‘the bed damp with sweat’)
- (11) a. piles of **leather-bound ledgers**
 b. grămezi de **registre în scoarțe de piele** (lit. ‘ledgers in covers of leather’)
- (12) a. “Not unless you call a **full-blown revolt** serious.”
 b. “Numai dacă nu găsești serioasă **o răscoală în toată regula.**”
- (13) a. ... through small, high windows, their thick bars casting **cross-hatched shadows** across the shining floor.
 b. ... prin geamurile foarte mici, situate la înălțime, ale căror gratii groase aruncau **carouri de umbre** pe pardoseala strălucitoare. (lit. ‘diamonds of shadows’)
- (14) a. My long retreat from Puranti, which you thought so **ill-advised...**
 b. Îndelungata mea retragere din Puranti, pe care tu ai considerat-o **un gest necugetat...** (lit. ‘a gesture reckless’)

Whereas the compounds in (7) and (8) are rendered by complex APs built on adjectival participles accompanied by adjunct PPs ([*scăldate*]_{adjectival participle} [*în lumina soarelui*]_{PP} (≈ ‘bathed in sunlight’) and [*năpădită*]_{adjectival participle} [*de bălării*]_{PP} (lit. ‘overgrown with weeds’)), those in (9) and (10) are translated as complex APs built on *bona fide* adjectives modified by PPs with adjunct status ([*plini*]_A [*de cicatrice*]_{PP} (lit. ‘full of scars’) and [*jilav*]_A [*de transpirație*]_{PP} (lit. ‘damp with sweat’)).

Alternatively, the adjectival head of the complex AP can be modified by an AdvP, as is the case in (9) (*heavy-armed* (lit. ‘[*greu*]_{AdvP} [*înarmați*]_{adjectival participle}’)). This structure is an instance of literal translation, a strategy typically employed to render the Adv-V-ed pattern since Romanian can also readily generate the [adverbial modifier + adjectival participle] combination. In fact, 41 out of the 45 items illustrating the Q-V-ed pattern, which was analyzed as a subset of the Adv-V-ed pattern since the quantifier, just like the adverb, functions as Manner-denoting semantic argument, follow this particular word order.

In their turn, the compounds in (11) and (12) are rendered by PPs with attributive function (*în scoarțe de piele* for *leather-bound* and *în toată regula* for *full-blown*, which is actually an idiomatic PP). Finally, the compounds in (13) and (14) are translated as complex NPs, i.e. modified nouns. The translation of *cross-hatched shadows* as *carouri de umbre* is not only an example of compensation by splitting, but also of compensation in place, as once again, the first stem of the compound (*cross*) becomes the nominal head (*carouri* ‘diamonds’) modified by a PP which incorporates the original nominal head as the complement of P (*de umbre* ‘of shadows’). On the other hand, *ill-advised (retreat)* in (14) is replaced with a full-fledged NP *un gest necugetat* (lit. ‘a gesture reckless’ > ‘a reckless gesture’) whose nominal head the translator adds as extra element.

Once again, notice the pervasiveness of prepositional elements in the rendering of most of the above compounds, triggered by the need to spell out the syntactic and semantic relations between the two stems of the compounds and between the compounds and the nouns they modify. Naturally, their added presence will contribute to the lengthening of the original structures, making it the translators’ dominant tendency.

In addition, the use of compensation by splitting may produce clausal structures of various kinds and lengths, either independent or subordinate clauses, as illustrated below:

- (15) a. They looked up at him, **pain-twisted**, dirt-smeared or bandaged faces...
 b. Se uitară direct la el, **schimonosindu-se de durere**, cu fețele bandajate mânjite de noroi... (lit. ‘grimacing with pain’)
- (16) a. ... across the **battle-scarred** ground before the walls...
 b. ... terenul din fața zidurilor, **care purta rănille luptei de mai devreme...** (lit. ‘the grounds before the walls, which bore the wounds/scars of the earlier battle’)
- (17) a. But I feel **duty-bound** to point out that there is such a thing as being *too* determined.
 b. Dar cred **că este datoria mea** să precizez că prea multă hotărâre strică uneori. (lit. ‘that it is my duty’)
- (18) a. ... it seemed almost **a thing man-made**.
 b. ... încât părea **că oamenii îl ridicaseră special acolo**. (≈ ‘[seemed] that people had purposely built it there’)
- (19) a. “Cardotti’s House of Leisure is an old merchant’s palace,” Vitari was saying, voice chilly calm. “**Wood-built**, like most of Sipani...”
 b. “Casa de Huzur a lui Cardotti este fostul palat al unui negustor,” spunea Vitari pe un ton calm și rece. “**E făcută din lemn**, ca mai toate construcțiile din Sipani...” (lit. ‘it is made of wood’)

As the examples above indicate, the clausal structures translating the compounds may range from non-finite (gerundial) structures (15b) to different types of finite subordinate clauses – relative (attributive) clause (16b), direct object clause (17b), subject clause (18b)) to independent/root clauses (19b). They are mostly paraphrases and, in some cases, like in (18b), even instances of free translation.

In contrast to the strategies investigated so far, which all contribute to the expansion of the original compounds, compensation by merging has the opposite effect. It

is a technique that entails the conversion of a complex phrase in the source text to a single word or a shorter phrase in the target text. In the present corpus, the two-stem compound is reduced to a single adjective, as illustrated below:

- (20) a. a touch less **house-broken**
 b. mai puţin **dresat** (lit. ‘trained’)
- (21) a. Gorst’s **soot-stained** jacket
 b. haina **pătată** a lui Gorst (lit. ‘stained’)
- (22) a. **blood-daubed** palm
 b. palma **însângerată** (lit. ‘bloodied’)
- (23) a. Hairy’s bellow turned to a **high-pitched** howl...
 b. Răgetul Părosului deveni un urlet **ascuţit**. (lit. ‘shrill’)
- (24) a. a **heavy-built** veteran with a scar on his cheek
 b. un veteran **voinic**, cu o cicatrice pe obraz (lit. ‘stout’)
- (25) a. his **blood-spotted** aspect
 b. aspectul lui **înfiorător** (lit. ‘terrible’, ‘horrifying’)
- (26) a. The **long-established** master of the middle ground.
 b. De o veşnicie este maestrul **incontestabil** al compromisului.
 (lit. ‘incontestable’, ‘indisputable’)
- (27) a. their **bright-polished** weapons ready
 b. cu armele **lucitoare** gata de luptă (lit. ‘shining’)
- (28) a. her good **green-dyed** cloak
 b. pelerina ei **verde** (lit. ‘green’)

Leaving aside the statistics for the next section, most of the compounds that get translated as single adjectives are of the N-V-ed or the Adv-V-ed patterns, although the reasons why they end up translated as single adjectives only partially overlap.

Thus, N-V-ed compounds are rendered by single adjectives if there is a lexicalized equivalent in Romanian, as is the case in (20) (*dresat* for *house-trained*), or if the adjunct first stem is not deemed relevant enough to translate (see (21), where *soot* is lost in translation), or if there is an item in Romanian whose meaning combines the semantics of the two stems of the original compound (see (22), where *blood-daubed (palm)* becomes (*palma*) *însângerată* (lit. ‘bloodied’), an adjectival participle derived from the denominal verb *a însângea* (lit. ‘to bloody’, ‘to cover or stain with blood’). In other cases, compensation by merging occurs simultaneously with compensation in kind, allowing the translator to employ a lexicalized single adjective of their choice. It is the case in (25b) and (26b), where there is a shift from denotative to connotative meaning, as the descriptive compound adjectives *blood-spotted* and *long-established* are replaced with the evaluative adjectives *înfiorător* ‘terrible’, ‘horrifying’ and *incontestabil* ‘incontestable’, ‘indisputable’.

It is interesting to notice that the number of Adv-V-ed compounds rendered by single adjectives is roughly three times higher than that of N-V-ed compounds (there is a 56 to 18 ratio in favour of the Adv-V-ed pattern). A possible explanation is that most Adv-V-ed compounds are already lexicalized forms with recurrent first stems in English (*long* in *long-lived*, *long-established*, *long-held*, etc., *well* in *well-groomed*, *well-muscled*,

well-worn, etc., *ill* in *ill-disciplined*, *ill-equipped*, *ill-advised*, etc. and the list goes on). What is more, they have lexicalized equivalents in Romanian, for instance, *long-lived* is *îndelungat*, *well-groomed* is *fercheș*, *ill-disciplined* is *indisciplinat*. This is also the case for *high-pitched* in (23) (*ascuțit*) and *heavy-built* in (24) (*voinic*).

Finally, more than half of the number of A-V-ed compounds are rendered by single adjectives (8 out of 14 tokens), though this number is less significant given the scarcity of the pattern. However, notice that it is the first stem that is translated as a single adjective (*bright-polished* (*weapons*) becomes (*arme*) *lucitoare* (lit. 'shining') in (27) and *green-dyed* (*cloak*) becomes (*pelerina*) *verde* (≈ 'green cloak') in (28). This is not surprising considering that, as stated in the previous section, A-V-ed compounds are passivized versions of resultative constructions. Therefore, it is only natural that the focus fall on the first stem, since it is the item that functions as Result Phrase denoting the final state achieved by the modified noun.

So far the analysis has covered translation strategies that either expand or reduce the source language structures (grammatical transposition, compensation in place, compensation in kind, compensation by splitting vs. compensation by merging). In contrast, literal translation is defined by Hervey & Higgins (1992: 250) as:

a word-for-word translation, giving maximally literal rendering to all the words in the ST [source text] as far as the grammatical conventions of the TL [target language] will allow; that is, literal translation is SL [source language]-oriented, and departs from the ST sequence of words only where the TL grammar makes this inevitable.

According to this definition, there are two ways in which literal translation is employed in the present corpus and they are illustrated in (29) to (33) below:

- (29) a. a **much-loved** leader
b. **mult-iubitul** lider
- (30) a. ... your **well-deserved** elevation to the throne.
b. ... **binemeritata** urcare pe tron.
- (31) a. the **new-mortared** parapets
b. parapetele [**proaspăt**]_{Adv} [**tencuite**]_A
- (32) a. their **fresh-dug** ditch
b. șanțul lor [**recent**]_{Adv} [**săpat**]_A
- (33) a. the blades of their **rough-forged** swords
b. tășurile săbiilor [**făurite**]_A [**rudimentar**]_{Adv} (lit. 'forged roughly')

On the one hand, literal translation is only infrequently used to render English compounds by means of equivalent compounds in Romanian since Romanian compounds are few and far between and, moreover, do not generally follow the same patterns. The present corpus includes only four such items that perfectly mirror the original derivatives, two of them exemplified in (29) and (30) above (see also (6b)). On the other hand, as already pointed out, the Adv-V-ed pattern is frequently rendered by literal translation in so far as Romanian has a parallel syntactic structure with the modifying adverb preceding

the modified adjective, though without the two of them combining into a compound (see (31) and (32) above). As a rule, literal translation is applied concurrently with compensation in place, since the adverb-adjective modifying combination follows the noun. Alternatively, compensation in place may be taken one step further, when the order of the two stems – the adverb and the adjective – is reversed as well, as illustrated in (33).

Overall, the corpus analysis conducted in this section has demonstrated that, due to the general absence of corresponding lexicalized forms in Romanian, the translators are usually forced to forgo literal translation and, instead, frequently employ alternative strategies which, more often than not, expand the original derivatives by spelling out the semantic and syntactic relations between the stems.

4. Statistical analysis

This section provides a statistical analysis of the translation patterns uncovered in the previous section in order to assess the validity of the predictions stated in section 2.

The general prediction was that the strategies adopted by the three translators would reveal two opposing tendencies: the shortening or the lengthening of the source text structures, depending on the type of compound translated (lexicalized item or spontaneous creation). It was speculated that the tendency towards shortening would be related to the translators' possible preference for single adjectives as equivalents of lexicalized English compounds in bilingual dictionaries. In contrast, it was hypothesized that the tendency towards lengthening would be triggered by the variable semantic and syntactic relations between the stems of novel compound formations in English, which, in the absence of equivalent lexicalized forms, had to be made explicit to avoid translation loss. Last but not least, it was predicted that the tendency towards lengthening would dominate the picture due to the fact that new compound creations form an open class.

The statistical data in the tables below indicate that the predictions are borne out. Table 1 provides an inventory of the translation patterns generated by the various strategies discussed in section 3, shedding light on the translators' shortening/lengthening tendencies. Table 2 provides information about the distribution of single item vs. phrase/clause per identified compound pattern.

Table 1. Translation patterns

| Compound to phrase / clause | Compound to single item | Compound to compound | Omission | Shift in meaning (error) | Free translation | Total |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|-------------|--------------------------|------------------|-------|
| 278 68.65% | 86 21.02% | 4 0.97% | 23 5.62% | 12 2.93% | 3 0.73% | 409 |

Table 2. Single item and phrase/clause distribution/compound pattern

| Pattern | Complex AP | PP | Complex NP | Clausal structures | Single item |
|----------------------|------------|--------|------------|--------------------|-------------|
| N-V-ed (188 items) | 128 | 15 | 4 | 7 | 18 |
| Adv-V-ed (162 items) | 70 | 12 | 3 | 3 | 56 |
| Q-V-ed (45 items) | 32 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4 |
| A-V-ed (14 items) | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 8 |
| | 232/278 | 29/278 | 7/278 | 13/278 | 86 |
| | 83.45% | 10.43% | 2.51% | 4.67% | |

Table 1 confirms that the translators' tendency towards lengthening the original derivatives does dominate the picture, with 278 out of 409 tokens (68.65%) being either phrases of various types (complex APs, complex NPs, PPs) or clauses (both root and subordinate clauses, as indicated in the previous section). It follows the frequent application of grammatical transposition operating simultaneously with different compensatory techniques (compensation by splitting, compensation in place, compensation in kind). These strategies are needed to render the diverse semantic and syntactic relations existing between the two stems of compounds that are novel formations. It is the case of the great majority of items in the N-V-ed group as well as of more than half the items in the Adv-V-ed set.

Notice also that, when compounds are rendered by means of phrases and clauses, more often than not, they are translated as complex APs (232 out of 278 tokens – 83.45%), and less frequently as PPs (29 out of 278 tokens – 10.43%) or clausal structures (13 out of 278 tokens – 4.67%); in other words, there is a sharp contrast between the percentage of complex AP structures and the rest. One possible reason is that in both English and Romanian, past participles can operate as adjectives and can easily associate with semantic arguments by virtue of their basic verbal nature, hence, that would make them the translators' first choice.

Rendering compounds by means of single adjectives, thus shortening the original structures, ranks second, with 86 out of 409 tokens (21.02%), which is less than one third of the percentage of lengthened structures (68.65%). This choice derives from the application of the strategy of compensation by merging. As previously mentioned, it concerns mainly derivatives of the Adv-V-ed pattern (56 out of 86 tokens – 65.11%), to which one might add the four compounds in the Q-V-ed group, since it is a subset of the former. The 60-item group is followed by the set of derivatives belonging to the N-V-ed pattern (18 out of 86 tokens) and that of A-V-ed compounds (8 out of 14 tokens). The reason why the Adv-V-ed set has the highest percentage of single-adjective translations is that, as already shown in the previous section, many of the items in this group are lexicalized forms built on a small number of adverbs and adjectives operating as adverbs in the respective combinations (*ill, well, long, short, hard, heavy, etc.*) and they have corresponding lexicalized forms in bilingual dictionaries, which are usually single

adjectives, though sometimes they may also be paraphrased (*ill-fated* (*ghinionist*), *ill-tempered* (*irascibil*), *well-known* (*celebru*), *short-lived* (*trecător, de scurtă durată* (lit. ‘of short duration’)), etc.).

Although the number of A-V-ed items is small (14 tokens), eight of them are also translated as single adjectives (57.14%). Most likely, this is because the translated A stem corresponds to the Result Phrase of the resultative construction each compound is based on. As has been shown, the RP is the element that introduces the relevant information, i.e. it denotes the resulting state achieved by the entity affected by the event. What is more, in most cases, when the compounds are passivized versions of false/weak resultatives, the Result Phrase further specifies the resulting state inherent in the meaning of the change-of-state verb, so it is only natural that the translator should choose to focus on the element that details the achieved state.

Last but not least, the presence of only four compounds as the lexicalized equivalents of the English items verifies the claim that English and Romanian are typologically different with respect to the derivational processes they favour for expanding their lexicons (compounding and conversion for the former, and affixation for the latter).

Overall, the findings of this investigation are similar to those of studies of compound translation into other Romance languages (see Labrador de la Cruz & Ramón García 2010 for Spanish, Pierini 2015 for Italian). They also emphasized the typological differences between English and each of the respective languages and pointed out the translators' need to adopt strategies that would expand and explicate the original compounds. The existence of three separate studies of compound translation into Romance languages with similar conclusions lends support to the view that explicitation is, indeed, a universal strategy (see Blum-Kulka 1986, Klaudy & Károly 2005, Klaudy 2003, 2009, 2017, Molés-Cases 2019, etc.) since many of the techniques uncovered by these studies are operations that involve explicitation. They may call them “(syntactic) transposition”, “modulation”, “functional translation”, whereas here they are called “grammatical transposition”, “compensation by splitting”, “compensation in place”, “compensation in kind”, but they all have the same effect – explicitation. However, although explicitation is obligatory due to the above-mentioned typological differences between English and Romanian (Romance), implicitation, i.e. the shortening of the source text derivatives, is also (infrequently) a distinct possibility when it involves lexicalized forms.

5. Conclusions

Starting from the typological differences between English and Romanian regarding their preferred means of expanding their lexicons (compounding vs. affixation) and the minor status of compounding in the latter language, the present article has investigated the issue of compound translation into Romanian by focusing on the strategies involved in rendering deverbal *-ed* adjectival compounds.

The analysis has identified two tendencies in the way in which translators render deverbal *-ed* adjectival compounds into Romanian.

On the one hand, because Romanian has different means of deriving compounds and does so infrequently, translators are forced to opt for strategies that lengthen the English compound structures (grammatical transposition, compensation by splitting, compensation in place, compensation in kind) in order to clarify the syntactic and semantic relations existing between the two stems.

On the other hand, under specific circumstances, translators may opt for strategies that have the opposite effect – the shortening of the original structures. This occurs when the English compound is a lexicalized item that has a lexicalized equivalent in Romanian.

Of the two, lengthening the original structure is the dominant tendency given that compounding is an active derivational process in English constantly producing novel, spontaneous forms. These new creations represent an open class of items that are non-existent in Romanian and, thus, always require clarification, hence, they lead to the lengthening of compounds in translation.

The present analysis falls in line with other studies of compound translation into other Romance languages. Their similar findings regarding the translators' tendency towards expanding the source language structures supports the view whereby explicitation is a universal translation strategy.

Sources

- Abercrombie, J. 2008. *Last Argument of Kings*. London: Gollancz.
 Abercrombie, J. 2009. *Best Served Cold*. London: Gollancz.
 Abercrombie, J. 2011. *The Heroes*. London: Gollancz.
 Abercrombie, J. 2017. *Puterea armelor*. Translated by Mihnea Columbeanu. București: Nemira.
 Abercrombie, J. 2017. *Dulce răzbunare*. Translated by Ruxandra Toma. București: Nemira.
 Abercrombie, J. 2019. *Eroii*. Translated by Monica Șerban. București: Nemira.

References

- Baciu, I. 2004. *English Morphology: Word Formation – A Generative Perspective*. 2nd edition. Bucharest: Editura Universității din București.
 Blum-Kulka, S. 1986. Shifts of cohesion and coherence in translation. In J. House & S. Blum-Kulka (eds.), *Interlingual and Intercultural Communication*, 17-35. Tübingen: Narr.
 Farkas, I.A. 2011. Resultative expressions in Romanian. *Ianua. Revista Philologica Romanica* 11: 67-88.
 Hervey, S. & Higgins, I. 1992. *Thinking Translation. A Course in Translation Method: French to English*. London & New York: Routledge.
 Kaufmann, I. & Wunderlich, D. 1998. Cross-linguistic patterns of resultatives. Working Papers “Theory of the Lexicon” 109, SFB 282, University of Düsseldorf. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/245816553>.
 Klaudy, K. 2003. *Languages in Translation. Lectures on the Theory, Teaching and Practice of Translation. With Illustrations in English, French, German, Russian and Hungarian*. Budapest: Scholastica.
 Klaudy, K. 2009. The Asymmetry Hypothesis in translation research. In R. Dimitriu & M. Shlesinger (eds.), *Translators and Their Readers. In Homage to Eugene A. Nida*, 283-303. Brussels: Lés Éditions du Hazard.
 Klaudy, K. 2017. Linguistic and cultural asymmetry in translation from and into minor languages. *Cadernos de Literatura em Tradução* 17: 22-37.
 Klaudy, K. & Károly, K. 2005. Implication in translation: Empirical evidence for operational asymmetry in translation. *Across Languages and Cultures* 6 (1): 13-28.
 Lieber, R. 1983. Argument linking and compounds. *Linguistic Inquiry* 14 (2): 251-285.

- Labrador de la Cruz, B. & Ramón García, N. 2010. "Bollywood-loving countries" and "Bollywood-inspired films": English compound adjectives and Spanish translations. In R. Rabadán, T. Guzmán & M. Fernández León (eds.), *Lengua, traducción, recepción: En honor de Julio César Santoyo*, 247-270. León: Universidad de León, Área de Publicaciones.
- Molés-Cases, T. 2019. Why typology matters: A corpus-based study of explicitation and implicitation of manner-of-motion in narrative texts. *Perspectives: Studies in Translation Theory and Practice* 27(6): 890-907.
- Pierini, P. 2015. Translating English compound adjectives in Italian: Problems and strategies. *Translation and Interpreting* 7(2): 17-29.
- Plag, I. 2003. *Word-Formation in English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Washio, R. 1997. Resultatives, compositionality and language variation. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 6: 1-49.