



Explicitation, Omission, or Direct Translation? – A Case Study of Conjunction Translation in Two Chinese Translations of UNCITRAL Arbitration Rules

YAN Xi*

University of Macau, Macau SAR

In translation teaching and research in China, there is a perpetual debate regarding universalism-versus-particularism. This is reflected in the controversy over methods of conjunction translation, that is, direct translation, omission and explicitation. In recent years, translation studies are moving from prescriptive to descriptive, because of the multiple factors involved in the process of translation. Through a descriptive case study of method types adopted in translating conjunctions from UNCITRAL Arbitration Rules to two Chinese translations, the present study demonstrates that all of the three methods are used in Chinese translations. What's more, direct translation is the first choice and makes up the majority, whereas omission occupies a small part, despite the claim that Chinese is predominantly paratactic and English mainly hypotactic. The existence of both obligatory and optional explicitation proves that explicitation is a universal strategy inherent in the translation process. Although legal translators need to be faithful to the original law and try their best to avoid distorting the relations between legal clauses and sentences, our findings reveal that legal translators are not passive receptors of the original law. Instead, they are actively decoding the original law, as is evidenced by the use of three methods in both translations. It is hoped that the findings of this research will shed new lights on legal translation and be of some service and reference for translation teaching and research.