

ANDREA GÖTZ

ELTE Doctoral School of Translation Studies
gotzandrea@caesar.elte.hu

Andrea Götz: Are translations more explicit? A corpus investigation of marked interrogative polarity in translated and non-translated Hungarian
Alkalmazott Nyelvtudomány, XVII. évfolyam, 2017/2. szám
doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.18460/ANY.2017.2.004>

Are translations more explicit? A corpus investigation of marked interrogative polarity in translated and non-translated Hungarian¹

A jelen tanulmány az explicitáció fordítási univerzáléját kutatja a magyar fordítási nyelvben. A tanulmány ehhez az *-e* kérdőpartikula használatát vizsgálja meg két angolból fordított és egy nem fordított magyar szövegekből összeállított korpuszban. A két különböző regiszterű magyar fordítási korpusz használata a jelenség pontosabb vizsgálatát teszi lehetővé. Az explicitáció alapján elvárható, hogy a fordított szövegek explicitebbek az azonos nyelvű, nem fordított szövegeknél. A kutatás eredményei azonban nem igazolják ezt a feltételezést, mivel a fordítások nem mutatnak egységesen explicitebb nyelvhasználatot a nem fordított magyar szövegeknél.

1. Introduction

Explicitation can be broadly defined as “the verbalization of information that the addressee might be able to infer” that results in a rise “in explicitness in translation” (Becher, 2011: 26). Furthermore, explicitation can be defined as a textual translation operation, and explicitness as a textual property. As a result, explicitation relates both to the process and the product of translation. Although explicitation is widely regarded as a property of translated texts, its status as a translation universal (Baker, 1993, Klaudy, 2008, Laviosa, 2008) is contested (Becher, 2010, 2011). Indeed, the very concept of translation universals has come under criticism (House, 2008).

The concept of explicitation has undergone some changes since its inception. It was originally formulated by Blum-Kulka (1986) as a hypothesis about the increased level of cohesive explicitness in translated texts as opposed to their sources. The concept nevertheless has been extended to include the investigation of explicit language in translations as opposed to non-translations (Baker 1993). As a consequence, many studies explored explicitation in a lexicogrammatical or lexicosemantic sense (e.g. Klaudy, 1996, Øverås, 1998, Olohan and Baker, 2000, Klaudy and Károly, 2005, Becher, 2011). It has also been shown that individual translators’ personal translation theories can influence explicitation as

well (Saldanha, 2008), while other scholars emphasise the role of cross-linguistic norms in explicit language use (House, 2008, Becher, 2009, Bisiada, 2016), the level of explicitness in translated texts must be interpreted with reference to the usual level of explicitness in the target language in question (Séguinot, 1988).

Despite the controversy, explicitation remains a central topic in translation studies. Whether it is considered a translation universal or not, exploring the differences in the language use of translated and non-translated texts, i.e. texts originally produced in the target language, is essential to translation research.

This study examines explicitation in terms of interrogative polarity. The object of this investigation is to compare the levels of explicit marking of interrogative polarity through the frequency and distribution of the Hungarian polar marker (-*e*). The study uses three fiction corpora: two Hungarian translation corpora, with English source texts, and a reference corpus compiled of authentic Hungarian texts, meaning that these texts were originally composed in the target language. In this paper, these are referred to as non-translated texts.

First, a brief overview is presented with regard to the most relevant issues of the polar marker, explicitation, and Hungarian explicitation research in Section 2. Section 3 describes the methods and material of this study. Section 4 discusses and interprets the findings. Section 5 concludes the paper by examining the hypotheses and commenting on the results.

2. Explicitation and interrogative polarity in Hungarian

2.1 Marking Hungarian and English polar clauses

The interrogative polar marker *-e* has been described either as a particle (Keszler, 2000) or as an interrogative marker (É. Kiss, 2002). Although the use of the marker is thought to be compulsory in dependent interrogative polar clauses (Fábricz, 1983, É. Kiss, 2002, Gyuris, 2016), its use in independent clauses does not influence grammaticality and is thought to be optional. In addition, there is a pragmatic motivation for the use of this marker as well (see Schirm, 2011). In the following, two issues are examined which are important to classifying language as explicit in translations: cross-linguistic differences and source text motivation.

Sentences (1) and (2) illustrate the use and position of the Hungarian polar marker. As a clitic, it is attached to sentential predicates. Cross-linguistically, it has no counterpart in English in independent clauses as demonstrated by examples (1) to (3), which are inspired by (3) taken from Schirm (2011: 121).

(1) Nem akarod megtenni?

(2) Nem akarod-e megtenni?

Do you not want to do it?

(3) Azon gondolkozom, (hogy) meg akarod-e tenni.

I've been wondering if/whether you wanted to do it.

Example (1) demonstrates the case when the marker *-e* is not present (1), and (2) when it is present in independent polar questions. Although the two are equally grammatical, (2) offers the possibility of different readings than (1). The presence of *-e* could suggest that the speaker does not suspect and/or imply a positive answer. Though the participants surveyed in Schirm's (2011) comprehension test did not supply a definite answer to the function of *-e* as compared between (1) and (2), *-e* is known to influence the interpretation of questions (Gyuris, 2016). This means that translators could use *-e* to disambiguate implicatures, thus make target texts pragmatically more explicit. In independent clauses, there is no English parallel for the particle *-e*.

Example (3) demonstrates the case when without the use of *-e* the clause is thought to be ungrammatical. In this scenario, the marker *-e* corresponds to a polar conjunction (*if, whether*) in English. There might be a distinction between *if* and *whether* that goes beyond the distinction of formal language use (*whether* being more formal). Eckardt (2007) proposes that *if* and *whether* differ in the readings they suggest as relevant. In (3), this would mean that using *if* would imply that the speaker does not assume the hearer is committed to the content of the proposition, while *whether* leaves both possibilities open. Another optional element of subordinate Hungarian clauses is the complementizer *hogy*. As a subordinating operator (É. Kiss, 2002: 262), it can be brought into connection with *that*.

To sum up, English independent interrogative clauses cannot display a lexical marker for polarity, and cannot motivate the use of the polar marker in Hungarian translations by a specific lexical input. Hungarian independent polar marker clauses translated from independent English polar clauses are therefore considered to be unmotivated and more explicit than their source clauses. Independent polar marker clauses are also more explicit than clauses without the polar marker.

Dependent English clauses, however, are introduced by conjunctions (e.g. *if, whether*) that indicate polarity. Hungarian dependent polar marker clauses translated from English dependent polar clauses are considered to be motivated and not to be more explicit than their source clauses. However, they are more explicit than dependent Hungarian polar clauses which do not exhibit the marker.

In general, the use of the polar marker in translated Hungarian can be interpreted within the framework of explication, as it makes the polarity of interrogative clauses explicit, as well possibly utterance comprehension. Beyond whether Hungarian translations mark this category more explicitly than their

sources, or other, non-translated Hungarian texts, it is also worthwhile to investigate how different translations use the polar marker compared to each other. For this reason, this study uses two translation corpora representing different but related registers.

2.2 The concept of explicitation and explicitness

Though passing references are found to the concept of explicitation, the explicitation hypothesis was originally formulated by Blum-Kulka (1986), as a hypothesis about the increased level of cohesive explicitness in translated texts as opposed to their sources. The concept of explicitation has been expanded to include the investigation of the potentially higher level of general explicitness observed in translated texts as opposed to non-translated texts (Baker, 1993: 243). It has garnered a considerable amount of support and criticism since its introduction (see Becher, 2010, 2011).

Blum-Kulka (1986) investigated cohesion and coherence in relation to target text redundancy. She described explicitation as “a universal strategy inherent in the process of language mediation” (Blum-Kulka, 1986/2000: 302) and as such, it is better understood as a tendency which may or may not occur when the translator is presented with an opportunity to explicitate. As is the case with other universals, explicitation too has been re-interpreted as a tendency, since the explicitation hypothesis in its “most general form,” meaning that it applies to all translated texts, is considered falsified (Chesterman, 2010: 41). To a degree, the way in which the concept of explicitation has been interpreted contributes to the controversy surrounding it. Firstly, it can be interpreted as a linguistic tendency as observed between source texts and their target texts, and between translated texts and non-translated texts in the same language. Using Chesterman’s (2004) categories of S-universals (S for source, relating to the former scenario), and T-universals (T for target, describing the latter comparison), it is possible to describe S-explicitation and T-explicitation (Krüger, 2014). Furthermore, it is possible to distinguish norm-governed and strategic explicitation (Englund Dimitrova 2005: 236). Norm-governed explicitations are carried out with “such a frequency and regularity” (Englund Dimitrova, 2005: 236), with respect to translation between a language pair or of a specific text type, that they form a regular part of translator behaviour. Such regular linguistic behaviour to explicitate should manifest itself in textual-linguistic norms in translation, which “govern the selection of linguistic material for the formulation of the target text” (Toury, 2012: 83). What these descriptive concepts of explicitation are not capable of capturing is whether it has a translation-specific cause (i.e. it is translation-inherent, contested by Becher

2010), or whether they can be traced back to cross-linguistic differences, as some critics suspect (House, 2008; Becher, 2011).

It has been contested how explicitation is related to redundancy, i.e. the redundant marking of a linguistic property, or disambiguation, both mentioned by Blum-Kulka: redundancy can be created by a property being “marking twice”, such as gender (Blum-Kulka, 1986/2000: 300), and disambiguation is caused by making implicit “meaning potential” explicit (Blum-Kulka, 1986/2000: 299). This warrants closer examination as Heltai (2005: 47) cautions that researchers too readily assume that explicitation always results in greater explicitness, especially in corpus-based research. Ultimately, the questions of redundancy and disambiguation relate to the issues of the translation product and process, as well as processability. It cannot be maintained that the “sheer addition” of items necessarily increase clarity of meaning or aid comprehension, on the contrary they might obstruct it (Heltai, 2005: 49, 51). Redundancy of marking linguistic categories also varies greatly with languages, creating obligatory or optional redundancy (Heltai, 2005: 57–59), though neither type must be perceived as redundant. Optional redundancy, in which case more or less redundant linguistic options are available, could potentially help or hinder successful processing (Heltai, 2005: 62). While redundancy and explicitness are related concepts, they cannot be treated as one and the same. Explicitation as a textual operation could cause increased redundancy, but not all redundancy could be considered to produce more explicitness, and similarly, not all examples of explicitness could be regarded as redundant, as linguistic and true explicitness do not always match (Heltai, 2005: 66–67).

The use of the polar marker could only be regarded as redundant in independent questions since these are grammatical without it, and should also be marked by a rise and fall in intonation in speech, as word order offers no clear clue. Dependent polar clauses contain no other marker than *-e*, however, clauses which introduce them could contain verbs which render dependent polar clauses as questions. Example (3), on the other hand, contains a cognitive verb, and without the presence of *-e*, the dependent clause would be interpreted as a declarative. In writing, the reader also relies on clues from punctuation. In addition, since the use of the polar marker can also modify utterance comprehension, even in an independent polar question which is marked by intonation or punctuation, the marker could signal non-redundant information. On balance, the polar marker can be discussed under the category of explicitation, and could only be viewed as contributing to redundancy in a limited way, either in an obligatory, or optional sense.

The issue of obligatory versus optional is also relevant in a methodological sense for studying explicitation, as many researchers exclude examples of

optional cases when examining explicitation (Blum-Kulka, 1986/2000: 312). Obligatory explicitation is necessitated by the differences between the grammatical systems of the source and the target language, meaning “the translator has no choice” (Klaudy and Károly, 2005: 16) but to perform a shift of explicitation in translation. One frequently cited example is the case of gendered personal pronouns in Indo-European languages which have no parallel in Hungarian. By contrast, in the case of optional explicitation, translators do have a choice, as they “may produce a well-formed target language sentence even without carrying out explicitation” (Klaudy and Károly, 2005: 17).

However, there are slight differences in how scholars conceptualise optional explicitation (Murtisari, 2014: 276). Blum-Kulka (1986/2000: 312) attributes cases of optional explicitation to the “stylistic preferences” of individual languages. Klaudy (2008) views those examples of explicitation to be optional which are due to “differences in text-building strategies” and “stylistic preferences between languages” (Klaudy, 2008: 83). Although these explicating shifts are linked to norm-compliance, and not to grammar, they cannot be freely omitted without the risk of producing cumbersome texts. Notwithstanding the theoretical considerations discussed above, this paper does not intend to take a stance with regard to either the interpretation or the causes of explicitation. Explicitation is increasingly re-framed in line with the re-conceptualization of translation universals. Explicitation is no longer ubiquitously granted the status of a universal of translation, but rather a tendency or strategy of communication, specifically of interpretive language use (Heltai, 2011: 140), or more generally, linguistic communication (Becher, 2011: 44) that includes translation.

The present paper uses the concept of explicitness, limited to polar explicitness as marked by the polar marker *-e*, which may or may not change in translation, resulting in translated Hungarian target texts that may or may not be more explicit in this regard than their sources and non-translated Hungarian texts. For measuring this, the tallying up of “sheer additions” (Heltai, 2005: 49) of instances of the polar marker would not be satisfactory. Rather, with reference to target texts as well, it must be investigated whether the polar marker *-e* is indeed deployed or not when there is a possibility for its use.

2.3 Research on explicitation in translated Hungarian

To date, we find few comprehensive studies dedicated to the investigation of explicitation in translated Hungarian. The complaint levelled by Becher (2010) that findings on explicitation are hard to compare because the studies they are derived from are theoretically and methodologically too disparate, holds true for research on explicitation in translated Hungarian as well.

Klaudy (1996) found evidence for operational asymmetry between trainee and professional translation in the translation direction of Hungarian to English and vice versa. The main observation of Klaudy (1996) is that the explicitation shifts carried out by the professional translator working from Hungarian to English were preserved by the students translating the text back into Hungarian, even when implicitation would have been appropriate. This means that trainees failed to carry out implicitating shifts.

Heltai and Juhász (2002) found in texts translated from English into Hungarian, and vice versa, that personal pronouns show implicitation in the English to Hungarian direction, while in the opposite direction explicitation was dominant. These differences are due to grammatical contrasts between the referential systems of the two languages and are thus compulsory. Heltai's (2003) qualitative analysis, which looked at explicitation operations in a single text translated from English into Hungarian, lent support to the explicitation hypothesis, as explicitation was frequently deployed, increasing especially cohesive explicitness. Heltai (2009), examining the translation of different types of technical texts, concludes the explicitation varies from subject matter to subject matter, both in type and frequency, which can be explained by register, by how professionally-oriented the text is, and by translatorial choices. In technical translation, based on Heltai (2003, 2009), the main function of explicitating operations in the English to Hungarian translation direction is the clarification of anaphoric reference and the elimination of semantic or pragmatic ellipsis (Heltai, 2009: 275).

Pápai (2004) investigated a small corpus (45,000 words) of text excerpts taken from translated and non-translated Hungarian fiction and non-fiction. Pápai (2004) catalogued and counted shifts producing explicitation and items thought to perform it. Based on frequency, Pápai (2004) confirmed that translated Hungarian texts display a higher level of explicitness, and also found Hungarian translations to have a lower type/token ratio than non-translations. Nevertheless, these conclusions were reached based on a handful of items. In addition, the low word count of the corpora should caution against over-generalisations. Pápai (2004) did not examine whether explicitation was influenced by contrastive differences and motivated by the source language, which further compounds the difficulty of generalizing the results.

Klaudy and Károly (2005), while testing the asymmetry hypothesis, examined the lexical variety in translated and non-translated Hungarian. Type/token ratios of reporting verbs were measured in texts translated from Hungarian into English and vice versa. Their results show that type/token ratio increases when translating from English into Hungarian. In the opposite translation direction,

contrary to expectations, results are more varied, but overall, the Hungarian lexical variety in reporting verbs was preserved in translation.

3. Research design

3.1 Aims, research questions and hypotheses

The present study's aim is to investigate the level of explicit polarity, i.e. polarity marked with the polar marker in translated and authentic Hungarian texts. The fundamental questions of this study concern (1) whether translated texts are more explicit, i.e. more marked for interrogative polarity than non-translated texts, (2) whether polar clauses are marked differently in the corpora, and lastly (3) whether independent polar clauses, which cannot be motivated by the source, are more explicitly marked in translations.

Consequently, the study's specific aims can be defined as follows: to establish and contrast the polar marker's (1) frequency and (2) distribution patterns, and (3) the levels of marked polarity in the three corpora. On this basis, the following hypotheses were formulated:

1. The translation corpora will show a higher average usage frequency than the reference corpus.
2. The translation corpora will display more marked as opposed to unmarked polar clauses.
3. The translation corpora will also show a higher marking of independent clauses.

3.2 Corpora

The present study uses three corpora, with two being translation corpora containing parallel texts translated from English into Hungarian, and a reference corpus of non-translated Hungarian texts. Table 1 shows the word count of the individual texts in the corpora, and the total word count of each corpus. (All texts can be found in the Appendix according to their identification number.) The three corpora are almost identical in size, however, they do not contain the same number of texts. The translation corpora, the YAC (Young Adult Corpus) and the BAC (Brontë and Austen Corpus), are composed of Hungarian target and English source texts. The two translation corpora, although they both represent fiction, are of different registers, as well as of different periods.

Table 1. The word count of the corpora and their individual texts

	Translation corpora		Reference corpus
	YAC (HU)	BAC (HU)	HRC
Text #1	105,437	126,711	51,757
Text #2	99,893	95,407	98,569
Text #3	104,592	129,744	46,948
Text #4	71,678	180,803	50,299
Text #5	131,881	96,211	151,950
Text #6	55,793	68,013	91,449
Text #7	63,771		64,472
Text #8	64,782		37,414
Text #9			85,096
Total	697,827	696,889	675,186

The YAC contains contemporary novels and their translations of the young adult genre, while the BAC consists of somewhat older translations of 19th century novels by the Brontë sisters and Jane Austen. The texts of the BAC are in the public domain, available on various websites (gutenberg.org, mek.niif.hu). The YAC represents a selection from the Pannonia Corpus (see Robin et al., 2016). Since neither genre has a truly comparable counterpart in Hungarian fiction, a Hungarian reference corpus (HRC) was assembled comprising contemporary non-translated Hungarian novels. High-brow and low-brow texts for the HRC were selected to reflect the prestige of both the YAC and the BAC. The contemporary texts in the HRC constitute high-brow as well as low-brow novels. The HRC's high-brow portion stems from an online repository of modern Hungarian literature (dia.hu), the low-brow section also comes from the Pannonia Corpus. A list of all the texts used in this study can be found in the Appendix.

The relatively recent young adult genre rose to popularity in the past two decades, but some trace its origins back to post-war American youth culture, and name such highly regarded novels as *The Catcher in the Rye* as a predecessor (Gaffney, 2017: 9). The novels included in the YAC enjoy a much lower prestige, which is in sharp contrast to the high esteem in which texts in the BAC are held. Understanding register in Martin's (2001) sense, the novels share further similarities. Register is a composite of (a) tenor, (b) mode, (c) field (Martin, 2001: 46). Tenor encompasses social relations and relates to interpersonal meaning, mode is linked to textual meaning and information flow, while field constructs institutional activity and relates to ideational meaning. In this case, mode is narrative prose, tenor expresses the interaction of the young heroes of the novels with their peers and the grown-up authority figures, and field represents the coming-of-age events and the overcoming of obstacles in the young characters' lives.

Register is also used in a functional linguistic meaning, i.e. denoting the specific language use in certain contexts, creating such categories of register as legal English and academic English (Biber and Conrad, 2001: 175; Halliday and Matthiessen, 2014: 4). Register is used in this sense in Heltai (2009) as well. In this view, registers are “named varieties within a culture, such as novels, memos, book reviews, and lectures” (Biber and Conrad, 2001: 176). Registers can be broad or specific, for example “academic prose” is general, but “methodology sections in experimental psychology articles” is a specific one (Biber and Conrad, 2001: 176). Accordingly, the register of fiction can be further specified, either according to larger subgenres of novels (e.g. romance, crime, horror novels, or bildungsroman), or more specific ones such as YA novels, which could be further divided up. However, since the purpose of this paper is not to give a descriptive account of the translation of different registers, but rather to examine the use of a specific marker in texts of different (sub)genres and (sub)registers, in order to gauge whether translated texts of varying kinds can be described as more explicit than non-translated texts, such minute differences and fastidious categorisation is not within the scope of this study. Nevertheless, some justification for the selections of texts is necessary.

The similarity in the topics that some romanticism era novels and Regency era romance novels deal with have lead to certain parallels being drawn between them beyond the youth of its heroes and target audience: YA novels address social issues and provide social commentary, and depict turbulent relationships, this could be said of the works of Austen and the Brontës (Cart, 2010).

There is no clear Hungarian parallel for the profoundly American genre of YA, and no 19th century Hungarian novels could truly be thought of as comparable to the novels included in the BAC. However, what is possible, is to compile a reference corpus that consists of high and low prestige novels. The low-prestige section of the HRC can be described as mainly oriented at young readers. In some of the backgrounds they use for their narrative worlds further similarities emerge (e.g. fantastical creatures appear in YA novels, though ghosts and haunting are topics in some Brontë novels, i.e. *Wuthering Heights*). This comparison is no doubt far from perfect, which is why the corpus is labelled as a reference, and not as a comparable corpus. It, however, provides a useful basis for contrasting the use of the polar marker. Practical considerations analysis played a role in the compilation of the corpora as well. Sourcing contemporary, low and high prestige literature can be a challenge, as publishers may not be keen to or capable of providing texts due to concerns of a financial or legal nature. In the Hungarian National Corpus (MNSZ) only high literary texts can be found in the fiction register (e.g. with the specification of “regényirodalom”), which are sourced from the same repository (dia.hu) that

was used for the HRC as well, though they are considerable older than the texts chosen for the HRC.

Editing practices are implicitly believed to have declined over the past thirty odd years (Pápa, 2004:). Comparing the language between high literature translated and edited to a high standard (BAC), and recently translated and published texts (YAC) could enlighten this issue. However, the purpose of this investigation is not a deep exploration of the Hungarian translation of different registers, genres, the effect of literary prestige in a synchronic or diachronic sense. The purpose of the selecting such diverse texts is to provide a variety in which specific markers could potentially be diversely used, showing variation. This variation could provide evidence for the universal higher explicitness of translated texts, or undermine it. As only through comparing the language of translated texts to translated texts “can we arrive at any kind of generalization about textual feature that might be specific to translation as such” (Chesterman, 2010: 39).

3.3 Methods

This paper investigates the frequency and distribution of the polar marker *-e* in three semi-machine readable corpora. The corpora are used in two different ways. First, a corpus-level investigation of the frequency and distribution of the polar marker is carried out. Secondly, the corpora serve as data pools from which a smaller data set of interrogative polar clauses is extracted to examine marked polarity with the help of the interrogative pragmatic marker *vajon* (‘I wonder) as a test for interrogative clauses. These data sets are referred to as samples since they were extracted with marker *vajon*. Extracting a sample of interrogatives this way was necessary as even computerized corpora are not tagged for clause types the same they are annotated for parts of speech. Although the texts can be searched for punctuation, this could only distinguish between declaratives and interrogatives that display standard punctuation, and would still not offer a way to separate *wh* and polar clauses automatically, making extensive manual filtering necessary. For instance, dependent interrogatives and declaratives both receive a period, searching for *wh* interrogatives requires several searches, searching for question marks would exclude examples of non-standard marking. Non-standard marking refers to cases where interrogatives are, for example, incorporated into exclamations, as in *Még hogy nem zavarnak-e!* ([they have the nerve to ask] *If they are disturbing me!* — HRC Text 1). Ultimately, processing the search results yielded by punctuation-based queries would be too inefficient, time-consuming, and would leave too much up for interpretation. Whereas interrogative markers can be reasonably thought to appear only in interrogatives.

In the first investigation, all Hungarian texts were searched for the polar marker *-e*, all tokens were counted and labelled for clause type, i.e. whether the tokens occurred in dependent or independent clauses. Normalized usage frequencies were established based on the token count per ten thousand words. This analysis enables a comparison between translated and non-translated Hungarian, as well as translated Hungarian texts of a different register. The polar marker's token counts, frequencies, and distribution are presented in relation to the corpora, and in individual texts.

The second analysis presents the ratio of marked and unmarked clauses as observed in the samples, also with a view to the syntactic properties of these clauses. The third examination investigates the role of translation shifts in marking polarity, i.e. whether translation shifts impact polarity. Shifts, for example, could change the type of source clause interrogatives (e.g. turn *wh*-interrogatives into polar interrogatives and vice versa), or their syntax (e.g. shift dependent clauses into independent clauses). It is important to explore translation shifts because varying tendencies of translation shifts between the corpora could fundamentally impact the use of the polar marker by increasing or reducing the number of grammatical contexts in which it can be used.

These three analyses serve as a basis for identifying and contrasting the usage patterns of the polar marker in translated and non-translated Hungarian, yielding results which could accommodate conclusions about explicitation in translated Hungarian.

4. Results and discussion

4.1 Frequency and distribution of the polar marker in the corpora

Table 2 shows the frequency and distributional patterns of the polar marker in the corpora. Although the BAC contains more tokens of the marker than the YAC by 132, it is the HRC that shows both the highest token count, as well as the highest normalised frequency for the polar marker. Based on this result, it cannot be said the marker is more frequent in translated Hungarian.

Table 2. The distribution of the polar marker in the corpora

	YAC	BAC	HRC
Total no. of the polar marker tokens	508	640	668
Frequency of the polar marker	7.28	9.18	9.85
Average no. of polar marker per text	63.5	106.67	74.22
No. of dependent marked polar clauses	431	482	587
No. of independent marked polar clauses	77	158	81
Ratio (%) of dependent to independent clauses	84.84 to 15.16	75.31 to 24.69	87.87 to 12.13

Both in terms of frequency and token count, the BAC and the HRC resemble each other more than the YAC. The BAC displays a frequency of 9.18 for the polar marker, while this is 9.85 for the HRC, and 7.28 for the YAC. However, due to the uneven number of texts within each corpus, the average number of polar marker tokens per text varies considerably between the corpora. Texts in the BAC have on average nearly 40.47% more tokens of the polar marker than texts in the YAC, and 30.42% more than in the HRC. As such, the YAC shows the lowest values for the polar marker from the three corpora on all measures.

There is also a difference between the corpora in the ratio of marked dependent as opposed to marked independent polar clauses. In this regard, it is the YAC and the HRC which show similarities. While the BAC has the highest ratio for marked independent clauses as 24.69% of the BAC's polar marker tokens are found in independent clauses, this value for the YAC is 15.16%, and for the HRC it is somewhat lower at 12.13%. This finding indicates that the BAC has a higher propensity for marking independent polar clauses with the polar marker compared to the other corpora. This could possibly be a result of the overall nature of the properties of the texts in the BAC themselves. It could be speculated that the characteristically witty conversations of Austen, or the more jarring tone of the Brontës might motivate the use of items that communicate the characters' intention to chide, taunt and ridicule. It is also possible that the BAC contains more independent polar clauses to begin with, and thus offers more opportunities for this category to be marked than does the YAC. Since the BAC and the HRC show similar values, it is also possible that texts in the BAC were translated more in mind with the regular Hungarian usage of the marker *-e*, meaning that the YAC diverges from the Hungarian norm. It could be another explanation that the YAC's texts were translated under more time pressure and since English source clauses do not suggest the use of a lexical marker explicitly, and the use of *-e* is not grammatically obligatory in independent clauses, marking independent polar clauses requires more

processing and is not as automatic in independent clauses as it is in dependent clauses. At this point, however, this is speculation.

4.2 Overview of marked polarity in the samples

Table 3 demonstrates the markedness of polar interrogative clauses in the samples.

Table 3. Number and percentage of marked and unmarked polar clauses in the samples

	YAC (HU)		BAC (HU)		HRC	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
No. of polar clauses	186		109		93	
Dependent	82	44.09	67	61.47	66	70.97
Independent	102	54.84	42	38.53	27	28.72
Marked clauses	102	54.84	94	86.24	69	74.19
Unmarked clauses	84	45.16	15	13.76	24	25.80
Marked dependent	77	93.90	63	94.03	61	92.42
Unmarked dependent	5	6.10	4	5.97	5	5.38
Marked independent	25	24.51	31	73.81	8	29.63
Unmarked independent	77	75.49	11	26.19	19	70.37

The most marked sample came from the BAC, which marked 86.24% of its polar clauses, followed by the HRC with 74.19%, meaning that both the reference corpus and the BAC were more marked than the YAC. Overall, although the YAC contained the most polar clauses, with only 54.84% of its polar interrogative clauses being marked for polarity, it is the least marked from all samples.

In light of this finding, it cannot be said, at least for the corpora under investigation, that translations are more marked in terms of polarity than authentic texts. This point is made particularly poignant by the fact that the YAC contained the highest number polar clauses, nevertheless, the lowest level of marking. When we take a closer look at the syntax of the polar clauses, it becomes clear that they are not marked uniformly, which partly also explains the overall variation in marked polarity between the corpora. Dependent polar clauses are marked at over 90% in all three samples. The picture for independent clauses is quite different. By far, the BAC contains the highest amount of marked independent clauses, with the YAC and the HRC showing similar levels. Although the BAC contains fewer marked dependent clauses in the source section of the sample, it produced more in the target texts in addition to marking

independent Hungarian clauses at a much higher rate than did the YAC, or the HRC, which all feeds into the high level of marked polarity in the BAC. These diverging tendencies warrant a closer look.

The BAC and the HRC offer an interesting opportunity for comparison. The BAC comprises 15.96% more polar clauses than the HRC, yet it marks 36.23% more of its polar clauses. Since both of these corpora mark dependent polar clauses at approximately the same level, the overall difference stems from the BAC's much higher tendency to mark independent polar clauses. Indeed, the BAC stands out from the corpora, as it marks 73.81% its of independent polar clauses in the sample, the YAC marks 24.51%, while the HRC shows a somewhat higher ratio of 29.63%.

The number of dependent and independent clauses combined with their rate of marking explain the differences in marked polarity between the corpora. For example, since the YAC contains a much higher ratio of independent clauses in the sample than does the HRC, even at the HRC's rate of marking independent clauses, the YAC sample would have produced only marginally more marked independent clauses. As this study only examined marked polarity in samples, no broad generalisations can be reached. These findings nevertheless indicate that more attention has to be paid to both the individual properties of translated texts, as well as the role of sampling.

These discrepancies caution us about making broad statements about explicitation in translation, as evidently many factors influence explicit language use. Not only do translation tendencies, regarding the changes translators make to syntax, impact the properties of translated language but sampling itself, coupled with the idiosyncratic tendencies of the given sample, could skew the data. In light of these differences, it might be of interest to examine the level of marked polarity in the individual texts.

Table 4 shows the overall number and level of markedness of polar clauses in the individual texts of the samples while Table 5 displays the level of marked polarity according to clause type. As seen before, the overall marked polarity is the highest in the BAC, followed by the HRC, with the YAC being the least marked. However, the markedness of the individual texts shows a great variety, both in their overall marking of polarity, as well as in marking dependent and independent polar clauses.

Table 4. The markedness of polarity in the individual Hungarian texts in the samples

	No. of polar clauses			No. dependent and independent polar clauses						No. of marked clauses			% of marked polarity		
	YAC	BAC	HRC	YAC	BAC	HRC	YAC	BAC	HRC	YAC	BAC	HRC			
Text #1	19	9	5	7	10	6	3	3	2	13	6	5	68.4	66.67	100
Text #2	26	14	12	19	7	5	9	12	0	19	10	12	73.08	71.43	100
Text #3	15	21	2	8	7	11	10	0	2	10	20	1	66.67	95.24	50
Text #4	16	28	8	8	8	15	13	7	1	7	26	5	43.75	92.86	62.5
Text #5	47	11	20	13	34	8	3	15	5	19	7	18	40.43	63.64	90
Text #6	20	26	15	9	11	22	4	7	8	12	25	7	60.00	96.15	46.67
Text #7	19		11	6	13			8	3	10		8	52.63		72.73
Text #8	24		3	12	12			1	2	12		2	50.00		66.67
Text #9			17					13	4			11			64.71
Total	186	109	93	82	102	67	42	66	27	102	94	69	54.84	86.24	74.19

In many texts, a low level of marking polarity is mostly due to the low marking of independent polar clauses and to the varying number of dependent and independent clauses. This means that texts that mark independent clauses at a low rate, but also contain a low number of independent clauses, might still achieve a high ratio of markedness. The discrepancies in the individual texts underline the importance of detailed examinations of the effect individual texts have on the overall data.

Table 5. Marked polarity according to clause types in the individual Hungarian texts in the samples

	No. of marked dependent clauses			% marked polarity in dependent clauses			No. of marked independent clauses			% marked polarity in independent clauses		
	YAC	BAC	HRC	YAC	BAC	HRC	YAC	BAC	HRC	YAC	BAC	HRC
Text #1	6	6	3	85.71	100	100	7	0	2	70	0	100
Text #2	19	4	12	100	80	100	0	6	0	0	66.67	0
Text #3	7	10	0	87.50	90.91	0	3	10	1	42.86	100	50
Text #4	7	15	5	87.50	100	71.43	0	11	0	0	84.62	0
Text #5	13	6	15	100	75	100	6	1	3	17.65	33.33	60
Text #6	9	22	7	100	100	87.50	3	3	0	27.27	75	0
Text #7	4		7	66.67		87.50	6		1	46.15		33.33
Text #8	12		1	100		100	0		1	0		50
Text #9			11			84.62			0			0
Total	77	63	61	93.90	94.03	91.04	25	31	8	24.51	73.81	29.63

The examination of the individual texts has confirmed that the overall tendency to mark polarity is mainly influenced by the tendency to mark polarity in independent clauses, as dependent clauses tend to be uniformly highly marked, save for a few exceptions like Text 7 in the YAC. Text 7 marked dependent polarity at 66.67%, representing the lowest value of all corpora. However, all corpora showed a wide range of values for marking independent clauses.

Even though the YAC had a slightly higher overall value for marking dependent polar clauses than the HRC, the difference in their overall marking can be mainly attributed to the difference in the number of independent and dependent clauses they contained, as these offered different opportunities to mark polarity to begin with. While the YAC's sample contained 54.84% independent clauses, this was only 28.72% the HRC. This underlines the importance of the source texts.

Although translation can change some properties of the source clauses, it is unlikely that it would fundamentally change for example the make-up of source texts in terms of the ratio of independent to dependent polar clauses. This means that a source text which contains dependent polar clauses in the majority would also offer a greater opportunity for Hungarian polar clauses to be marked in translation than a source text in which most polar clauses are independent. This means that simple frequency counts alone, which would not differentiate between dependent and independent clauses, cannot properly assess the usage of the polar marker in translation. For explicitation to be adequately examined, properties of the source texts and regular target language usage tendencies for the items under investigation must be known.

4.3 Marked and unmarked polar clauses in translation

Table 6 demonstrates the polar markedness of dependent source clauses in the samples. It also shows what conjunctions dependent source clauses featured.

Table 6. Marking of interrogative polarity in dependent source clauses in the samples

	YAC (EN)		BAC (EN)	
	No.	%	No.	%
Marked dependent	88	98.88	56	96.55
Unmarked dependent	1	1.12	2	3.57
<i>whether</i>	16	18.18	46	82.14
<i>if</i>	72	81.82	6	10.71
<i>as to, as to whether</i>	0	0.00	2	7.14

Almost all English polar dependent clauses were marked, with the YAC showing a much heavier reliance on *if* to mark these clauses, in contrast to the BAC which utilised *if* less and *whether* more. The higher use of *if* in the YAC could be attributed to its more informal language use, as a simple search for the lemma *if* produces 2605 tokens in the BAC, and 3053 in the YAC, but 134 tokens of *whether* in the YAC, and 330 in the BAC. However, clauses that did not contain a conjunction, and thus were not syntactically marked as polar, could also be semantically interpreted and translated as such (e.g. *my curiosity about balls and their coolness* appears as *elgondolkoztam azon, hogy a bálók vajon menőek-e* in the target text, lit. *I wondered if balls were cool*).

Not all clauses which were translated into Hungarian as polar and syntactically dependent exhibited these properties in the source. There are examples where *wh* clauses are transformed into polar clauses. Or, alternatively, gerund and possessive constructions could also be turned into polar clauses in Hungarian. Although these constructions could be translated with parallel or similar structures, these could be stylistically unacceptable, for instance gerund constructions such as *Anne's being tempted* could be rendered as *Anne megkörnyékezése* (lit. the temptation of Anne), but are rather translated with a dependent clause, as in *...megkörnyékezi-e Anne-t* (lit. *...whether he will tempt Anne* — BAC Text 6).

Table 7 shows how translation affected the markedness of interrogative polarity. By examining whether marked polar source clauses were translated as marked or not, and whether the source clauses of marked polar target clauses were themselves marked or not, we can determine if the two translation corpora operated with a similar tendency in terms of preserving marked polarity.

Table 7. Marked and unmarked polarity in the translation corpora with respect to source and target clauses

	YAC	%	BAC	%
No. of all polar source clauses	183		94	
No. of marked polar source clauses	88	48.09	56	59.57
No. of marked target clauses	74	84.09	52	92.86
No. of unmarked polar source clauses	96	52.46	38	40.43
No. of marked target clauses	23	23.96	27	71.05
	YAC	%	BAC	%
No. of all polar target clauses	186		109	
No. of marked polar target clauses	102	54.84	94	86.24
No. of marked polar source clauses	74	72.55	52	55.32
No. of unmarked polar target clauses	84	45.16	15	13.76
No. of marked polar source clauses	12	14.29	4	26.67

As discussed before, in terms of English source clauses, only dependent clauses can be considered to be marked through the presence of conjunctions (e.g. *whether, if, as to whether*). Although the source section of the YAC contained a higher number of marked polar clauses than the BAC, with 88 and 56 such clauses, marked polar clauses make up a smaller percentage of the YAC than of the BAC, with approximately 48% to 60%, respectively. From these clauses, more were translated as markedly polar in the BAC than in the YAC. The BAC translated 92% of markedly polar dependent source clauses as markedly polar into Hungarian. In contrast, the YAC only preserved marked polarity in 84% of these clauses. The BAC's more stringent tendency to mark polarity is evident in that it translated fewer marked source clauses as unmarked in the target texts than did the YAC. This is caused by the YAC's greater propensity to shift dependent polar clauses into independent clauses than the BAC. This seems to be due to a preference of certain translators, as ten examples of the thirteen shifts come from three texts. Additionally, the YAC has also shown a proclivity to mark independent clauses less frequently than the BAC, these separate facts also help to explain the discrepancies observed between the corpora.

5. Conclusion

This paper sought to investigate the explicitness of translated Hungarian texts as expressed by marked interrogative polarity. For this aim, the study tested three hypotheses formulated about the relative markedness of the corpora. Based on the findings on explicitation widely reported in the literature, translations were expected to be more explicit than non-translations. However, this study rejected all three hypotheses in a surprising result.

Hypothesis 1 assumed that the translation corpora would show a higher average usage frequency than the reference corpus. But since both translation corpora displayed a lower usage frequency than the reference corpus (7.28 in the YAC, 9.18 in the BAC, and 9.85 in the HRC), this hypothesis is rejected.

Hypothesis 2 anticipated that the translation corpora would overall be more marked than the reference corpus. Nevertheless, due to the fact that one translation corpus was more, while the other less marked than the reference corpus (HRC marked 74.19% of its polar clauses, the BAC 86.24%, and the YAC 54.84%), this hypothesis is also rejected.

Hypothesis 3 expected the translation corpora to show a higher marking of independent clauses. Nevertheless, Hypothesis 3 is similarly rejected as one translation corpus exhibited a lower rate of marking for independent clauses, while the other one a higher rate than the HRC (the YAC marked 24.51% of independent clauses, the BAC 73.81%, the HRC 29.63%).

In conclusion, translations were not found to be more marked, either in terms of frequency or markedness than the reference corpus. Therefore it cannot be confirmed that translated Hungarian is more explicit than non-translated Hungarian based on the results of this study.

It has to be noted that the current data does not allow to draw broad conclusions. Rather, the main take-away of this study is that there is a great linguistic variety in different sets of translated texts. Some values for the translation corpora are very similar to each other and to the reference corpus, while others differ greatly. Comparing the language of translations to each other could help to reveal what properties of translated texts are due to genre or register characteristics, and what can be attributed to the effect of translation (Chesterman, 2010: 39).

The differences between the corpora have also shown that simply examining frequencies is not sufficient enough to probe explicitation. Comparing translated texts of different registers further showed how specific diverging linguistic tendencies can affect the overall language use. This cautions us about the necessity of detailed investigations. The difference between the patterns in the two translation corpora suggests that isolated, corpus-driven approaches may not be able to capture the complexity of all those conditions which might lead to a higher or lower level of explicitness in the target texts. All factors shaping the target language, such as the linguistic input from the source text, as well as the register, or tendencies specific to individual texts, must be taken into consideration to avoid making potentially misleading generalization based on isolated data. These issues raised by the variation between the corpora indicate the necessity of closer examination that investigates the observed rates of marking polarity in translated texts, which the present author intends to carry out in future research.

References

- Baker, M.** (1993) Corpus Linguistics and Translation Studies: Implications and Applications. In: Baker, M., Francis, G., Tognini-Bonelli, E. and Sinclair, J. (eds) *Text and Technology: In Honour of John Sinclair*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 233–250.
- Becher, V.** (2009) Convergence and Divergence Through Language Contact in Translation. In: Braunnüller, K., House, J. (eds.) *Convergence and Divergence in Language Contact Situations*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 125–151.
- Becher, V.** (2010) Abandoning the Notion of ‘translation-Inherent’ Explicitation: Against a Dogma of Translation Studies. *Across Languages and Cultures* 11/1. 1–28.
- Becher, V.** (2011) When and Why Do Translators Add Connectives? A Corpus-Based Study. *Target* 23/1. 26–47.
- Biber, D., Conrad, S.** (2001) Register Variation: A Corpus Approach. In: Schiffrin, D., Tannen, D., Hamilton H.E. (eds.) *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. 175–196.
- Bisiada, M.** (2016) Structural Effects of English–German Language Contact in Translation on Concessive Constructions in Business Articles. *Text & Talk* 36/2. 133–154.

- Blum-Kulka, S.** (1986/2000) Shifts of cohesion and coherence in translation. In: Venuti, L. (ed.) *The Translation Studies Reader*. London: Routledge. 298–313.
- Cart, M.** 2010. *Young adult literature: from romance to realism*. Chicago: American Library Association.
- Chesterman, A.** (2004) Beyond the Particular. In: Mauranen, A. and Kujamäki, P. (eds.) *Translation Universals: Do They Exist?* Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 33–49.
- Chesterman, A.** (2010) Why study translation universals? *ATH* 1. 38–48.
- Eckardt, R.** (2007) The Syntax and Pragmatics of Embedded Yes/No Questions. In: Schwabe K., Winkler, S. (eds) *On Information Structure, Meaning and Form*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 447–466.
- Englund Dimitrova, B.** (2005) *Expertise and Explicitation in the Translation Process*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Gaffney, L. M.** 2017. *Young Adult Literature, Libraries, and Conservative Activism*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Gyuris B.** (2016) A magyar nyelv tagadószós eldöntendő kérdő mondatainak jelentéséhez. *Jelentés és Nyelvhasználat* 3. 169–190.
- Halliday, M.A.K., Matthiessen, C.M.I.M.** 2014. *Halliday's Introduction to Functional Grammar*. Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.
- Heltai P., Juhász G.** (2002) A névmások fordításának kérdései angol–magyar és magyar–angol fordításokban. *Fordítástudomány* 4/2. 46–62.
- Heltai P.** (2003) Az explicitáció egyes kérdései angol-magyar szakfordításban. *Porta Lingua: Szaknyelvoktatásunk az EU kapujában*. Debrecen: DE ATC. 173–198.
- Heltai P.** (2005) Explicitation, Redundancy, Ellipsis and Translation. In: Károly, K., Fóris, Á. (eds.) *New Trends in Translation Studies*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó. 45–74.
- Heltai P.** (2009) Explicitációs műveletek különböző szakszövegekben. *Porta Lingua: Szaktudás idegen nyelven*. Debrecen: Szaknyelvoktatók és –kutatók Országos Egyesülete. 265–277.
- Heltai P.** (2011) Az explicitáció mint kommunikációs univerzálé. In: Navracscics J., Lengyel Zs. (szerk.) *Lexikai folyamatok egy-és kétnyelvű közegben*. Budapest: Tinta Könyvkiadó. 124–134.
- House, J.** (2008) Beyond Intervention: Universals in Translation? *trans-kom* 1/1. 6–19.
- Keszler B.** ed. (2000) *Magyar grammatika*. Budapest: Nemzeti Tankönyvkiadó.
- É. Kiss, K.** (2002) *The Syntax of Hungarian*. Cambridge Syntax Guides. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Klaudy K.** (1996) Back-Translation as a Tool for Detecting Explicitation Strategies in Translation. In: Klaudy, K., Lambert, J. and Sohár, A. (eds.) *Translation Studies in Hungary*. Budapest: Scholastica. 99–114.
- Klaudy K.** (2008) Explicitation. In: Baker, M. and Saldanha, G. (eds.) *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. London: Routledge. 104–108.
- Klaudy K., Károly K.** (2005) Implication in Translation: Empirical Evidence for Operational Asymmetry in Translation. *Across Languages and Cultures* 6/1. 13–28.
- Krüger, R.** (2014) From S-explicitation to T-explicitation? Tracing the development of the explicitation concept. *Across Languages and Cultures* 15/2. 153–175.
- Laviosa, S.** (2008) Universals. In: Baker, M. and Saldanha, G. (eds.) *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. London: Routledge. 306–311.
- Martin, J. R.** 2001. Cohesion and Texture. In: Schiffrin, D., Tannen, D., Hamilton H. E. (eds) *The Handbook of discourse analysis*. 35–53.
- Murtisari, E.T.** (2014) Response to Becher's Two Papers on the Explicitation Hypothesis. *trans-kom* 7/2. 272–281.
- Olohan, M., Baker, M.** (2000) Reporting that in Translated English: Evidence for Subconscious Processes of Explicitation? *Across Languages and Cultures* 1/2. 141–158.
- Øverås, L.** 1998. In Search of the Third Code: An Investigation of Norms in Literary Translation. *Meta* 43/4. 557–570.

- Pápai V.** (2004) Explication: A universal of translated text?. In: Mauranen, A. and Kujamäki, P. (eds.) *Translation Universals: Do They Exist?* Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 143–164.
- Robin E., Dankó S., Götz A., Nagy L., Pataky É., Szegh H., Török G., Zolczer P.** (2016) Fordítástudomány és korpuszkutatás: bemutatkozik a Pannonia Corpus. *Fordítástudomány* 18/2. 5–26.
- Saldanha, G.** (2008) Explication Revisited: Bringing The Reader Into The Picture. *trans-kom* 1/1. 20–35.
- Schirm A.** (2011) *A diskurzusjelölők funkciói: a hát, az -e és a vajon elemek története és jelenkori szinkrón státusa alapján*. PhD dissertation. Szegedi Tudományegyetem.
- Séguinot, C.** (1988) Pragmatics and the explication hypothesis. *TTR: traduction, terminologie, rédaction* 1/2. 106–113.
- Toury, G.** (2012²) *Descriptive translation studies—and beyond*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Appendix: Sources

The texts are presented according to their identification number.

Texts in the YAC

- Harris, J. 2008. *Runemarks*. New York: Knopf.
Harris, J. 2009. *Rúnajelek*. Budapest: Ulpius-ház. Translated by Katalin Szűr-Szabó.
- Cashore, K. 2008. *Graceling*. Boston: Harcourt.
Cashore, K. 2010. *A garabonc*. Szeged: Könyvmolyképző Kiadó. Translated by Orsolya Farkas.
- Cashore, K. 2009. *Fire*. New York: Dial.
Cashore, K. 2011. *Zsarát*. Szeged: Könyvmolyképző Kiadó. Translated by Eszter Balogh és Virág Szalai.
- Stiefvater, M. 2009. *Shiver*. New York: Scholastic.
Stiefvater, M. 2009. *Shiver – Borzongás*. Szeged: Könyvmolyképző Kiadó. Translated by Tímea Gazdag.
- Cashore, K. 2012. *Bitterblue*. New York: Dial.
Cashore, K. 2014. *Keserkék*. Szeged: Könyvmolyképző Kiadó. Translated by Virág Szalai.
- Day George, Jessica 2009. *Princess of the Midnight Ball*. New York: Bloomsbury Publishing.
Day George, Jessica 2011. *Éjféli bál*. Szeged: Könyvmolyképző.
- Diamand, E. 2008. *Reavers' Ransom*. Frome: Chicken House.
Diamand, E. 2009. *Kalózok nyomában*. Budapest: Agave Könyvek. Translated by Etelka Görgey.
- Gray, C. 2008. *Evernight*. New York: Harper Collins.
Gray, C. 2009. *Evernight – Örökéj*. Szeged: Könyvmolyképző Kiadó. Translated by Viktória Bosnyák.

Texts in the BAC

- Austen, Jane 1815. *Emma*. <http://www.gutenberg.org/ebooks/158>
Austen, Jane 1969. *Emma*. Translated by Csanak Dóra. Budapest: Európa.
<http://mek.oszk.hu/05900/05903>
- Brontë, Emily 1847. *Wuthering Heights*. <http://www.gutenberg.org/ebooks/768>
Brontë, Emily 1965. *Üvöltő szelek*. Translated by István Sótér. Budapest: Európa.
<http://mek.oszk.hu/04300/04369>
- Austen, Jane 1814. *Mansfield Park*. <http://www.gutenberg.org/ebooks/141>
Austen, Jane 1978. *A mansfieldi kastély*. Translated by Réz Ádám. Budapest: Európa.
<http://mek.oszk.hu/05900/05929>
- Brontë, Charlotte 1849. *Shirley*. <http://www.gutenberg.org/ebooks/30486>
Brontë, Charlotte 1977. *Shirley*. Translated by Szepessy György. Budapest: Európa.
<http://mek.oszk.hu/05900/05904>
- Austen, Jane 1813. *Pride and Prejudice*. <http://www.gutenberg.org/ebooks/42671>
Austen, Jane 1979. *Büszkeség és balítélet*. Translated by Miklós Szenczi. Budapest: Európa.

<http://mek.oszk.hu/00300/00317>

6. Austen, Jane 1818. Persuasion. <http://www.gutenberg.org/ebooks/105>
Austen, Jane 1980. *Meggyőző érvek*. Translated by Ilona Róna. Budapest: Európa.
<http://mek.oszk.hu/05900/05962>

Texts in the HRC

1. Parti Nagy Lajos 2000. Hősöm tere. Budapest: Magvető. Source:
http://dia.pool.pim.hu/html/muvek/PARTI/parti00544_kv.html
2. Spiró György 2009. Feleségverseny. Budapest: Magvető.
3. Esterházy Péter 2008. Semmi művészet. Budapest: Magvető. Source:
<http://dia.jadox.pim.hu/jetspeed/displayXhtml?docId=0000007505&secId=0000811485>
4. Zakály Viktória 2012. Szívritmuszavar. Szeged: Könyvmolyképző.
5. Závada Pál 2002. Milota. Budapest: Magvető. Source:
<http://dia.jadox.pim.hu/jetspeed/displayXhtml?docId=0000003001&secId=0000472648>
6. Spirit Bliss 2010. Árnyékvilág. Szeged: Könyvmolyképző.
7. Böszörményi Gyula 2009. 3... 2... 1... Szeged: Könyvmolyképző.
8. Bene Viki 2006. Eszterlánc. Budapest: Európa.
9. Virág Emília 2016. Sárkánycsalogató. Budapest: Athenaeum.