

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF INFORMATION CHANGE IN TRANSLATION OF NONFICTION LITERATURE

Nina Havumetsä*
University of Eastern Finland

ABSTRACT: The present paper compares translations from Russian into Finnish, Swedish, and English of a work of political non-fiction, *Вся кремлевская рать: Краткая история современной России* (*lit.* All the Kremlin men: A short history of contemporary Russia) by Mikhail Zygar (2016a) and investigates the use of information change as a translation strategy. Information change covers addition and omission of non-inferable content, used either separately or sequentially (i.e. addition following omission resulting in substitution). De Metsenaere's and Vandepitte's (2017) notions of addition and omission are applied. The study shows that the translations into Finnish and Swedish exhibit similarly infrequent use of information changing strategies while the English translation appears more liberal in their use. Possible reasons for the additions, omissions, substitutions, and their effects are discussed, as is the potential impact of the English translations on translation norms.

KEYWORDS: Translation Strategy, Information Change, Addition, Omission, Nonfiction Literature

1. Introduction

The purpose of this study is to examine present-day use of the information changing strategies of omission, addition, and substitution in the translation of nonfiction literature by comparing different language versions to the original book and to each other. The research material consists of three translations into three languages of a volume of political nonfiction. The original Russian-language book is called *Вся кремлевская рать: Краткая история современной России* (*lit.* All the Kremlin men: A short history of contemporary Russia) by Mikhail Zygar (2016a), which became a bestseller in Russia and was subsequently translated into several languages. This original book and its translations into Finnish (Zygar, 2016b), Swedish (Zygar, 2018), and English (Zygar, 2016c) were chosen as material for this study to examine how, if at all, the translations differ on the level of the information that they contain. What reasons might there be for an eventual use of information changing strategies in translation? In the book, the author, a professional Russian journalist, gives an account of how the current Russian president came into power and how politics at the highest level has been conducted in Russia since the turn of the 21st century until about 2015. The book was originally written for a Russian audience so, naturally, it contains references to recent Russian history, politics, and social reality, which in many respects are different from the target cultures of the translations. Such references presumably present some difficulty in translation because (1) they may contain culture-bound terms, (2) if translated literally, they may require more cognitive effort to be understood by the target-culture readers due to differences in background knowledge, and (3) they contain information that may be regarded as either irrelevant or insufficient to readers outside Russia. Such potentially problematic sections of the source text may

*nina.havumetsa@uef.fi

motivate the use of information changing strategies (see, for instance, Leppihalme [2001] on translation solutions for culture-bound terms and Dimitriu [2004] on omissions). In the present study, I examine the translation strategies that have been used in translations into the target languages to add or remove information, or to substitute it by first removing a section of text and then adding non-translated target-language information in the same place. The genre under investigation is political nonfiction which includes subgenres such as politicians' memoirs, biographies, accounts and analyses of historical or present-day events in domestic and international politics. To my knowledge, there are no similar studies comparing contemporary translations of nonfiction literature aimed at least three different target cultures.

2. Information change as a translation strategy

The term information change is used by Chesterman (2000, pp. 87-116) to denote, among other strategies, addition and omission. Chesterman divides translation strategies into the linguistic categories of mostly syntactic, mostly semantic, and mostly pragmatic local strategies. The word "mostly" implies that there are no strict boundaries between the categories. Chesterman sees strategies as problem-centred and potentially conscious. The strategies that are relevant to this study are those that are mostly pragmatic, "often the result of a translator's global decisions concerning the appropriate way to translate the text as a whole" and that "primarily have to do with the selection of information in the TT, a selection that is governed by the translator's knowledge of the prospective readership of the translation" (Chesterman, 2000, p. 107). Of the 10 strategies included in this category, information change refers to "the addition of new (non-inferable) information which is deemed to be relevant to the TT readership, but which is not present in the ST, or the omission of ST information deemed to be irrelevant" (Chesterman, 2000, p. 109). Another pragmatic strategy, visibility change, refers to "a change in the status of the authorial presence, or to the overt intrusion or foregrounding of the translatorial presence" (Chesterman, 2000, p. 112) through, for instance, translator's notes. Whether the translator's visibility changes is not the focus in this paper, but translator's notes may constitute added information and therefore information change.

As referred to above, Chesterman mentions knowledge of the target audience as a source of guidance that the translator uses when deciding on information change. Also, Pym (2016) brings up reasons for using content-change strategies that take into consideration the target readership and situation. Pym's (2016, pp. 219-242) approach to translation solutions is pedagogical and, as such, provides decision-making guidance for the translation process in situations where the translator can choose between alternative solutions. Pym's translation solutions move gradually from copying the smallest linguistic units to changing perspectives and to adding, omitting, or moving content. In Pym's tentative typology, the lines between strategies are not watertight and a strategy may be categorized differently depending on the interpretation of the situation. He presents three basic kinds of solutions for the "bump mode" of translating, i.e. when a translation problem

arises: “you can copy something that is there, you can change the way it is expressed or you can change what is there” (Pym, 2016, p. 221). The first category refers to copying words and structures such as idioms, or sentence and paragraph division. The second category (Pym, 2016, pp. 224-231) covers a wide range of changes of expression, e.g., transforming passive voice into active or changes in register, and dealing with issues concerning cultural correspondence. Also included in this category are placing the translation in a new textual location, translator’s notes, and explicitation and implicitation. Pym’s (2016, pp. 231-232) third category is called text tailoring or content change. It is very close to Chesterman’s (2000) information change strategies, and it covers adding content (such as notes and glossaries, which can also be categorized as instances of using the strategy of new place in text [Pym, 2016, p. 229]) or omitting content “not pertinent to the translation purpose” (p. 232), as well as correcting, updating, or censoring information. In the present study, information change covers a combination of some of the solutions of strategies described above, namely, addition of information (in footnotes or elsewhere), omission of information, and substitution (i.e. first omitting and then adding different information in the same place). Omitting or adding information seems at first glance to be an uncomplicated object of analysis. Some researchers place addition under pragmatic explicitation (see Klaudy, 1998, p. 83), or regard implicitation, or stylistically motivated changes that reduce redundancy, as a subcategory of omission (Dimitriu, 2004). In the following section, an attempt will be made to distinguish more clearly between adding or omitting information or content and making information more explicit or implicit.

3. Explicitation and implication vs addition and omission

“Information” in information change can refer to meaning of any size that adds to or diminishes the non-inferable information (content or “semantic material”, as in Pym, [2004, p. 99]) available to the reader from the translation as compared with the original. For a more explicit definition, De Metsenaere’s and Vandepitte’s (2017) account of explicitation, implicitation, addition, and omission is utilized.

Explicitation has been studied extensively, and for a long time, in Translation Studies (see Englund Dimitrova, 2005, p. 33ff. for an overview). Some forms of explicitation may be resorted to unconsciously in the process of translating and be something that all translators tend to do, as posited by the explicitation hypothesis (introduced by Blum-Kulka in 1986 [2000]; see Becher [2010] for an analysis of concrete reasons for explicitation/implicitation), or, in accordance with the asymmetry hypothesis, have a preference for (Klaudy and Károly, 2005). Also, De Metsenaere and Vandepitte (2017) provide a review of several scholarly accounts of explicitation and implicitation and suggest a definition of what exactly is meant by inferring, what constitutes explicitation and implicitation, and how they differ from addition, omission, and substitution. They focus on the variety of explicitness change that is not prompted by differences in the language systems but by pragmatic reasons (De Metsenaere and Vandepitte, 2017, p. 390). Applying relevance theory, they define explicitation as:

the result of encoding developed or inferred *conceptual features* from the *explicatures* and/or *implicatures* of utterance A in a new utterance, thus producing utterance B, some of whose assumptions can be shown to be *more explicit (less implicit)* than the assumptions of utterance A, given that utterances A and B refer to the same state of affairs when produced in a similar communicative situation. (De Metsenaere and Vandepitte, 2017, p. 402, emphasis in the original)

When implicitation takes place, such conceptual features inferable from the linguistic encoding of the utterance or from the context are toned down or removed. Addition, on the other hand, refers to:

the result of encoding *conceptual features* that were not in any way inferable from utterance A or its context in a new utterance, thus producing an utterance B, given that utterances A and B refer to the same state of affairs when produced in a similar communicative situation. (De Metsenaere and Vandepitte, 2017, p. 405, emphasis in the original)

In De Metsenaere and Vandepitte's (2017, pp. 405-406) account, the opposite information changing strategy, omission, means excluding conceptual features of the source text although they are not inferable from the target text or its context. Substitution takes place when "conceptual features such as action/event/state, person, time, place, or reason are deleted and added simultaneously" (pp. 405-406), resulting in the target text referring to a state of affairs that is different from the source text. De Metsenaere and Vandepitte (2017) stress that the context of communication should play a major role in attempting to distinguish between, for instance, explicitation and addition. For the authors, the contextual features, whether they are explicatures (assumptions that are linguistically encoded or directly inferable from the immediate context) or implicatures (i.e. non-encoded "assumptions that rely on information that is further remote from the immediate act of communication" [De Metsenaere and Vandepitte, 2017, p. 397]) appear to focus in interpreting the text in the source text context, although in translation, the communicative situations and the source and target culture readers' ability to retrieve the intended contextual features are very different. The authors do point out, however, that the translator's interpretation process needs to be taken into account and that cultural background knowledge can be seen as a part of an utterance (.;).

As an explanation of why translators use addition, omission and substitution as well as explicitation or implicitation, De Metsenaere and Vandepitte (2017, p. 407) offer Pym's (2005) concept of risk management: translators' acts are motivated by their willingness to minimize communicative risks. Such a risk, if realized, might lead to, for instance, a misunderstanding or frustration over irrelevant information. A similar notion is included in Chesterman's (2000, p. 69) communication norm which requires the translator to "optimize communication, as required by the situation, between all parties involved." The translator then uses his/her experience, knowledge, and assumptions about the target audience and the parties involved, when deciding on information change.

The concepts of omission and addition presented above place much emphasis on knowing the cognitive needs of the readers and suggest that decisions to omit or add information should be based on the relevance of the information and the purpose of the translation. Also, Dimitriu (2004, pp. 163, 166-167) takes a “descriptive target reader-oriented perspective” and presents a typology of omission that is based on real-life instances of omission and their presumed motivations. She lists implicature, stylistic omissions that are used to avoid redundancy and that focus on grammar instead of meaning, and omissions for the purpose of making a summary, which are not the focus of the present paper. Other reasons for omissions, which Dimitriu (2004, pp. 167-173) suggests, appear to be such that might lead to non-inferable information being omitted in translations. These reasons range from readers’ expectations to political and commercial motives: omission may be the result of information being considered unnecessary, harmful because of cultural taboos or political ideologies, or too extensive based on editorial practices. Additionally, omission may be used to comply with text-type or genre conventions and with target-audience expectations.

In Leppihalme’s (2001, pp. 144-145) discussion of translation strategies for culture-bound terms, omission is mentioned as a strategy that leads to the loss of some details only. Omission is used to avoid translating culture-bound lexical items with another strategy: addition, possibly a lengthy one, to explain the culture-bound word. In her account of translation strategies for general purposes, Leppihalme (2007, p. 372) notes that omission may be a quick fix in certain less-than-ideal circumstances when, for instance, the translator is in a hurry. Translators may also feel they need to omit inappropriate or irrelevant information, or decide to leave out interjections, etc., for pragmatic reasons. According to Leppihalme (2001, 2007), Finnish translators resort to omission rarely and reluctantly.

Similar reasons for justifiable omissions are discussed by Davies (2007). Her account provides additional insight into the reasoning behind a translator’s decision to omit information from the source text. She observes that offensive – and even mildly irritating – content may cause the reader to stop reading, which might be seen as a bigger communicative failure than adapting the translation to the tastes and norms of the target readers (Davies, 2007, p. 63). Such a motivation is ultimately a commercial one, as is omitting text to prevent the translation from being considered too exotic or foreign (pp. 69-70).

There seems to be very little research on addition in translation. This lack may be explained by the fact that adding information requires extra effort from the translator in the form of text production, which would lessen its appeal as a translation solution. Addition is discussed most often as a means of including information to help the readers of translation understand the text and in connection with peritexts like translator’s notes.

Peritext (Genette, 1997), which includes prefaces, notes, glossaries, and other insertions within the volume, is analysed in the present study only as a possible location for additions. Additionally, peritext may be used as a place for translations of culture-

bound terms (Leppihalme, 2001, p. 144) and annotations, “to clarify difficult points, to provide background information, or to discuss specific allusions” (Jianming, 2005, p. 184). In other words, to ensure understanding of even the foreign, the exotic, and the allusive elements of the text. Footnotes and endnotes can be used also for relocating sections of the main text. The strategy of a new place in text results in omission in the original place but not from the point of view of the whole text. According to Newmark (2010, p. 178), “the more scholarly the text, the more justified are detailed translated or supplementary notes in the translation”.

Additions and omissions are closely connected to ethical issues. Especially in non-literary translation, omission and addition are usually regarded as serious errors. Pym (2004, p. 105) stresses the importance of maintaining “the translational status of that which is neither added nor deleted” to protect the authority of the persons involved “to establish relations of equivalence” and to maintain trust. His maxim of representational quantity in translation holds that there should be no significant difference between the quantities of the “start text” and the translation (Pym, 2004, p. 88).

The default setting of translating seems to be, therefore, to produce a translation that has “the same” information as the source text, which is why deviating from that “sameness” should be done for acceptable reasons. Chesterman (2000, pp. 68-69, 175-185; see also Toury, 1995), in his account of the norms and values of translation, sees that the translator forms a relationship of relevant similarity between the source text and the translation. It does not exclude the possibility of using information changing strategies, but the translator is required to uphold the value of truth, to maintain trust, and facilitate understanding between the parties. The ultimate guidelines are the expectations that the parties involved have of translations.

Ethical issues are also discussed by Dimitriu (2004) in her article about omission in translation. She writes in favour of recognizing that there are legitimate reasons for applying omission in translation but also sees potential ethical problems in the possibility of manipulating the content (Dimitriu, 2004, p. 174). It is, however, important to notice that because additions and omissions involve no translating, they can be made not only by translators but also by other parties, such as editors, who have the authority to make such decisions (Pym, 2004, pp. 102-104) and who are responsible for a translation’s commercial success. Editorial influence over translations may be significant depending on the genre, and it should be studied to distinguish between translated language – as it is produced by translators – and final, published texts (Bisiada, 2018, p. 305). In the present study, published texts are examined as they appear to the target readers.

4. Method and material

The focus of this paper is on full sentences because of the size of the material, but other aspects and items (clauses, phrases, lexis, modality, and discourse presentation) will also be considered. Explicitation and implicitation are discussed as phenomena bordering on addition and omission.

The analysis is based on two samples of the original text. First, a non-probability sample was chosen for the investigation. It consists of chapter 1, which seemed most likely to contain first mentions of concepts related to Russian society, politics and history and thus translation strategies that might not be repeated later in the book. The chapter consists of 416 sentences (calculated by hand), excluding chapter headlines. Chapter 1 represents one out of a total of 19 chapters, plus an introduction, and concluding remarks by the author, or 24 pages of a total of 400 pages of the original book (Zygar, 2016a). Second, a probability sample of 15 pages was selected by systematic sampling to make the sample more representative of the material by random selection. Full sentences that begin on each page (sometimes ending on the following page), altogether 245 sentences, were compared with their translations sentence-by-sentence. The research material comprises altogether 661 Russian-language sentences and their translations.

5. Analysis of information changing strategies

5.1 The Finnish translation

The Finnish translation follows the original closely both semantically and on the levels of sentence and clause breaks, sometimes even as to word order. The Finnish word order is fairly free, so such translational precision is perhaps only detectable for someone making close comparisons. The assumed goal of producing a faithful translation appears to have led the translator to some solutions that raise questions about the inferability of the same information in both languages and cultures. This suspicion arises in connection with concepts that are specific to Russian politics and society. Here is an example of a loan translation (transliteration):

(1) [...] Волошин считался убежденным **государственником**, отстаивавшим интересы государства в том виде, в каком он их видел. (Zygar 2016a, p. 14, emphasis added)

[(...) Voloshin was considered a committed advocate of a strong state who defended its interests as he saw them.¹]

[...] *Vološinia pidettiin vakaumuksellisena **gosudarstvennikkina**, joka puolusti valtion intressejä sellaisina kuin hän ne näki.* (Zygar, 2016b, p. 18, emphasis in the original; faithful translation from Russian)

The word *государственник* is rendered as *gosudarstvennikki*, a loan translation which does not convey the meaning to readers without sufficient background knowledge about Russian politics and language. Such a reader is likely to take the following clause of the translation as an explanation of the word. The word *государственник* (*gosudarstvennik*), however, has a different meaning, “an advocate of a strong state”. Here, an increase in quantity could have transferred more of the information contained in the source text

¹ All translations from Russian, Swedish, and Finnish into English are mine.

word. What happens instead is an implicature close to omission for readers with insufficient background knowledge. The same thing occurs with the word *чекист* (chekist, a member/employee of the security organs; derived from *Cheka*, the Soviet state security organ founded in 1917) rendered as *tšekisti* in Finnish (Zygar, 2016b, p. 20). Only readers who already know about the history of the Soviet Union and Russia are likely to retrieve the relevant explicatures and implicatures.

The omissions found in the Finnish translation are occasional. I discovered only one full sentence that has been omitted: “Для убежденных карьеристов это было убийственно” (Zygar, 2016a, p. 20) [For hard-core careerists this was lethal]. There were three omissions below the sentence level, which did not lead to significant changes of meaning or misunderstandings in their respective contexts. In one instance, the modal adverb *наверное* (“apparently”) is omitted (Zygar, 2016a, p. 401), resulting in a change of the epistemic status of the proposition. One addition was discovered, namely, the Finnish word *Venäjä* (“Russia”) added in brackets after the word *Русь* (“Rus”) (Zygar, 2016b, p. 305). This addition might be categorised as an explicitation if the reader has the corresponding background knowledge and is able to retrieve the meaning of *Rus* from it. There are no other additions and therefore no combinations of omissions and additions, that would result in a change of meaning. There are some cases of explicitation of, for instance, abbreviations as in where “ЦК” (CK, abbreviation of the Russian words for the Central Committee) is rendered as “keskuskomitea” in Finnish (Zygar, 2016b, p. 22).

5.2 The Swedish translation

The Swedish translation has one footnote informing the reader of a list of persons at the end of the volume, and four in-text notes in square brackets with names of Russian political parties in transliterated form. In contrast to the Finnish translation, the Swedish text contains clearly more explicitations and implicatures. Omissions and additions are slightly more frequent: I counted four omitted complete sentences. The first omitted sentence (Zygar, 2016a, p. 9) refers to a person’s frequent use of English words in Russian speech and has the word “agenda” in English. That word is also used in Swedish to mean the same, so it could not have served as an example of a person’s use of English. The Swedish translator may thus have omitted the sentence to avoid the risk of misunderstanding. As there are more examples of the idiosyncrasies of the person quoted, no remarkable loss of information takes place. Another omission could be explained by a wish to avoid repeating information, which appears to have guided the translator in minor omissions as well. The two remaining omitted sentences are more difficult to account for. One of them is an unflattering characterization of the USA as “self-assured, inefficient, and unreasonable” (Zygar, 2016a, p. 10, my translation from Russian) and the other one (Zygar, 2016a, p. 19) describes shortly what happened in the campaign headquarters of an over-optimistic Russian politician who hoped to become president. Together they do not appear to form a pattern of, for instance, avoiding politically sensitive topics. Omission by mistake, or other reasons, is also possible.

Instances of omitted text below sentence level occur on several of the analysed pages of the Swedish translation. Giving exact numbers is difficult because the line between implicitation and omission is not clear. Here is an example of both an omission that could be regarded as an implicitation, and a clearer implicitation:

(2) *Первая в СССР и главная на тот момент в России деловая газета «Коммерсантъ» уверяла, что из-за демарша Примакова Россия потеряла \$15 млрд, которые могла бы заработать в результате подписания подготовленных в Вашингтоне соглашений: «Тем самым премьер-министр России сделал свой выбор – выбор настоящего коммуниста. Большевика, готового полностью пренебречь интересами своей Родины и народа в угоду интернационализму, понятному только ему и бывшим членам КПСС», – негодовал «Коммерсантъ»* (Zygar, 2016a, p. 12; emphasis added, superscript as in the original)

[Kommersant, **the first** business newspaper **in the Soviet Union and the leading one in Russia at the time**, insisted that due to Primakov's demarche Russia lost 15 billion USD that it could have earned had the agreements that had been prepared in Washington been signed: "In this way, the Prime Minister of Russia made his choice – the choice of a true Communist. A Bolshevik who is prepared to completely ignore the interests of his country and people for the benefit of the sort of internationalism that only he and former members of the CPSU can understand," **Kommersant disapproved**. (Omission and implicitation emphasized)]

Den ledande affärstidningen Kommersant hävdade att Primakovs markering hade kostat Ryssland 15 miljarder dollar i uteblivna vinster från de avtal som skulle ha undertecknats i Washington: "Och på samma gång har Rysslands premiärminister fattat sitt beslut som en sann kommunist. Som en bolsjevik, beredd att fullständigt nonchalera sitt Fosterlands och sitt folks intressen för att främja en internationalism som är begriplig bara för honom och andra gamla kommunister." (Zygar, 2018, p. 15; implicitation emphasized)

The omissions are in bold and the phrase that has been implicitated in the Swedish translation is underlined. Omissions present some loss of information for some readers but others, who are familiar with the Soviet and Russian society, the history of the newspaper Kommersant and the status of communists in the Soviet Union, could infer what is not linguistically encoded. "Former members of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union" is translated into a more implicit expression "other old communists", adding, in fact, the word *andra* ("other") for explicitness. The reporting phrase ("Kommersant disapproved" in English) has been omitted, but the paper's stance is inferable without it from the content and the tone of the citation.

Another aspect of interest for the present study in the above example is the omission of modality expressed by the conditional mood in *могла бы заработать* ("could have earned") which is translated as *uteblivna vinster* ("unattained profit"). A similar modality change took place in the Finnish translation as well. They are minor changes quantity-wise, but actually affect the tone and change the certainty of the information given and the level of the author's or the speaker's commitment to it. These examples represent information change of linguistically encoded non-inferable information. Additions in the Swedish text

are small, mostly added words, and often interpretable as cases of explicitation. Only one clause, and explanation of the word *politbyrån* (“politburo”) has been added in parentheses, but that too can be seen as an explicitation.

5.3 The English translation

The English translation differs from the Finnish and Swedish translations in many respects. The most striking difference is the number of omissions. In addition to numerous omitted clauses, phrases and words, seventy-one full sentences were omitted from different places. Most omissions occurred in stretches of one to three sentences. Some of them contained information that may be regarded as irrelevant for readers outside Russia. There was, for instance, a description of an incident in an election campaign, and a reference to someone who was not of interest in the chapter in question. Some omissions, however, deserve a closer look. The largest omission was a 21-sentence-long description of President Putin’s visit to New York, him giving a speech in the UN, and meeting President Clinton (Zygar, 2016a, p. 28-29). The reason for its omission does not seem to be either the difficulty to translate or its relevance for the readers. Another longer omission is a quote from a British newspaper regarding Putin’s then modest financial status compared with the luxuries of the London hotel where he stayed during his visit (Zygar, 2016a, p. 25). Both of these omitted stretches of text can be interpreted as critique of the way the Russian president was received in the two countries or as something that might explain his future behaviour.

The English translation offers ample material for analysing additions. The number of added sentences was twenty-four, which includes those used in substitutions to replace omitted ones. An example of an addition is a sentence added to a quote: President George W. Bush’s famous remark about looking into Putin’s eyes and seeing his soul has been completed with a sentence: “I looked the man in the eye. *I found him to be very straightforward and trustworthy and we had a very good dialogue.* I was able to get a sense of his soul” (Zygar, 2016c, p. 19, endnote referring to an English source removed, addition emphasized). Altogether three quotations from leaders of the USA and the UK have been added to or replaced by longer quotations from English sources that are listed in the endnotes. Such practice makes sure that the information presented is correct regarding the reality outside the translation even if the translation does not repeat faithfully the information of the source text. It also shows an appreciation for the accuracy of information and the convention of using endnotes, which are common also in the scientific genre.

Additions provide further information to the readers, as in the following example:

(3) [...] *he ensured that the presidential election would be held in March instead of June (under the constitution new elections had to be called within three months after the resignation of a president).* (Zygar, 2016c, p. 12; added information emphasized)

The information that is given in the text in bold is inferable only to the most knowledgeable readers, who the target readers are apparently not considered to be – the use of explicitation, for instance, to explain that a person referred to simply as *Буш* (“Bush”) in the Russian original (Zygar, 2016a, p. 27) is “the Republican candidate, George W. Bush” in the English translation (Zygar, 2016c, p. 18) points to the target audience being considered laymen in politics. The material contains several explicitations of mostly the Russian political system, geography, etc., for instance, “Kharkiv *in eastern Ukraine*” (Zygar, 2016c, p. 269, explicitation emphasized). Drawing the line between an addition and explicitation depends on which explicatures and implicatures the readers are assumed to be able to retrieve from the context and background knowledge.

Some additions appear to have been made simply to enhance cohesion, such as the addition of the sentence “But things turned out differently” (p. 12) at the beginning of a new paragraph. In example (4), substitution and addition take place, apparently, to accentuate a meaning but still changing it:

(4) *Александр Волошин действительно был хорошо знаком и со Стробом Тэлботтом, и с Ларри Саммерсом и отлично знал, как выстраивать отношения с командой Гора, если она победит.* (Zygar, 2016a, p. 27)

[Aleksandr Voloshin was actually well acquainted with both Strobe Talbott and Larry Summers and knew very well how to build relations with Gore’s team should they win.]

*Alexander Voloshin got on very well with Larry Summers and **even better** with Strobe Talbott, and he knew how to build relations with a potential Gore administration.* (Zygar, 2016c, p. 18; substitution and **addition** emphasized.)

Yet another motivation for addition appears to be to increase the appeal of the text as a source of interesting information, for instance, by adding the sentence “In 1996 he [Sergei Pugachev] was one of the main sponsors of Yeltsin’s campaign” (p. 13). This piece of information concerns a person mentioned briefly in the text. It is not, in my view, in any way essential for understanding the text, nor does it help to avoid any communicative risk in the context.

The remaining three cases of addition form in fact substitutions. Next, I shall take a closer look at a stretch of text where omissions, additions and other changes take place.

(5) *О политике он предпочитает говорить в сугубо деловых терминах: “Американцы создали у себя огромную, диверсифицированную, восприимчивую к инновациям экономику благодаря жесточайшей конкуренции. Такая же напряженная конкуренция видна в американской политике, в том числе внутри основных политических партий. И благодаря этому они сформировали устойчивую политическую систему, отвергающую крайности. А вот в международной политике Соединенные Штаты после исчезновения Советского Союза стали де-факто монополистами. И в отсутствие конкуренции стали самоуверенными,*

неэффективными, неразумными. Наделали кучу серьезнейших ошибок, нанесли огромный ущерб международной безопасности и самим себе". (Zygar, 2016a, pp. 9-10)

[He prefers to speak about politics in inherently business terms: "Thanks to tough competition, the Americans have created for themselves a huge, diversified economy that is open to innovation. Such intense competition is also visible in American politics, including the key political parties. And thanks to this, they have formed a political system that shuns extremities. In international politics, however, the United States has become de facto monopolists after the Soviet Union disappeared. And without competition, they have become self-assured, ineffective, and unreasonable. They have made a number of grave mistakes and caused a great deal of damage to international security and to themselves."]

On the topic of politics, he prefers to speak on purely business terms: "The United States built the best economy in the world through competition. But it somehow forgot that world politics also needs competition. That's why its foreign policy is a failure." (Zygar, 2016c, p. 4)

Here, as the sections of text are placed next to each other, the quantitative difference (Pym, 2004) is clearly visible. Additionally, the excerpt above is an example of a quote being quite significantly changed in the translation process by substitution of information. This substitution occurs in the very beginning of the book, which may offer an explanation. As Davies (2007) suggests, a reader who is dissatisfied with the content may stop reading, which would lead to communicative failure.

The changes made with regard to quotations is another dimension of information change with ethical considerations. Here, two more examples of quotations are presented:

(6) *Свою главную историческую миссию Волошин, **наверное**, считает выполненной: он обеспечил политическую стабильность и капитализм – и на покой*. (Zygar, 2016a, p. 9; omissions emphasized)

[**Apparently**, Voloshin considers his main **historic** mission fulfilled: he achieved political stability and capitalism--**and can now rest**.]

Voloshin believes that he has fulfilled his primary mission: "to transfer Russia from a state of permanent revolution to a state of evolution". In other words, before he resigned from the government in October 2003, he succeeded in bringing political stability and capitalism to Russia. (Zygar, 2016c, pp. 3-4; addition emphasized)

In example (6), the translation contains an added quotation. First, however, the modal adverb *наверное* ("apparently") has been removed from the beginning, changing the author's attitude toward the content of the first sentence, as well as the epistemic status of it, which makes it an instance of omitting non-inferable information. In the example (7) below, quotation marks have been added and the pronoun changed from third person singular to first person singular, resulting in a change from free indirect to direct speech.

(7) *Впрочем, об Америке он отзывается хоть и с изрядной критикой, но все же любовно, с неожиданными деталями: там он случайно познакомился с Джемом*

Бушем, а тут увидел старую знакомую Кондолизу Райс, но решил не здороваться.
(Zygar, 2016a, p. 10)

*Despite subjecting America to the occasional tongue-lashing, he does so lovingly, with unexpected details: "...and then I bumped into Jeb Bush"; "...and then I spotted **my** old acquaintance Condoleezza Rice but decided not to say hi."* (Zygar, 2016c, p. 4; emphasis added to indicate addition and substitution.)

In the above example, the narrative point of view changes, removing the narrator's voice, which in free indirect speech co-exists with that of the protagonist, who in this case is an actual person (Alexander Voloshin), and leaving only the latter (see Kuusi 2016 for an account of narrative change in fiction). Such a change can be seen as standardization (i.e. a tendency to make translations conventional and easy to read), or as something that is typical of all mediated discourse (Kuusi, 2016, pp. 6-19). From the point of view of inferability, two changes take place. First, due to the added quotation marks and pronoun change, a reader of the English text is likely to interpret the quote as *verbatim*, and second, to interpret the author as responsible for the wording. This is non-inferable typographically expressed information, present in the translation but absent in the source text.

In another instance, a quote is attributed to a named speaker (Zygar, 2016c, p. 4) although in the original text the source of the quotation are unnamed officials in the Kremlin administration (Zygar, 2016a, p. 10). Quotation-related changes thus take place in the present material in four ways: substitution of the content of the quotation, addition of a quotation, change of attribution of a quotation, and change of the form of reported speech. They attribute the responsibility of the utterance differently than in the original and, ultimately, change the original author's perceived responsibility for the content.

Modality changes have in a sense similar effect: what the original author wrote as being uncertain to a degree turns into a certain statement, thus increasing his commitment to the truthfulness of the information or the possibility of the state of affairs it describes. A change of epistemic modality can easily happen by mistake, which is why the frequency of such changes should be considered and a larger sample used to draw any conclusions.

On four occasions, a section of the text had been moved to a different location not too far from the original place, resulting in no information change. There were three cases where two to six sentences had been transferred from the main text to footnotes. One footnote contained only additional non-translated information. Both types of footnotes were marked similarly with only an asterisk, so readers cannot know whether they are reading the translator's or the author's notes. Square brackets were used once to mark an explicating addition within a quotation (Zygar, 2016c, p. 4). In addition, one subheading had been added to the English text (Zygar, 2016c, p. 8).

6. Concluding remarks

The present study shows that if the number of sentences omitted or added is used to indicate quantitative equivalence, the Finnish translation exhibiting one omitted sentence

and zero added is closest to the original. It seems possible to conclude that Finnish readers received “the same” information as the Russian readers as far as the linguistically encoded conceptual features go; providing, of course, for the translator’s interpretation which is bound to be somewhat subjective. Also, the explicitation strategy was used sparingly. The Swedish translation is in this sense similar to the Finnish one with four omitted full sentences and none added. In contrast, in the process of making the English edition clearly more information change has taken place. The results of the analysis suggest that, just like omission (Davies, 2007; Dimitriu, 2004), addition of information, too, can be motivated by reasons other than a lack of relevant information in the source text and a corresponding risk of communication failure, or “a bump”, in translating. Additional motives might be a wish to improve cohesion, accentuate the message by enhancing contrasts, and simply to provide a piece of interesting information, i.e. commercial considerations. Commercial considerations such as keeping up the readers’ interest may also explain omissions of larger sections of text in the English translation. Smaller-scale but potentially significant instances of information change were found to include an omission of a modal adverb, which changes the certainty of the information given, and quotation-related changes affecting the attribution of the quotation content. This study focused on the translations as they appear to the reader, but research into the process of translating and editing could produce a fuller picture of what motivated the use of different strategies. A comparative study of translations in the genre of political nonfiction might shed light on, for instance, patterns in omitted content.

The method of analyzing a sample instead of a whole text presents some problems for drawing conclusions. A sample may be enough to show differences between translations or to survey the use of different strategies, but it may not reveal large omissions or additions, which may only occur once or twice in a book, or instances where text has been relocated. In addition, for explicit texts, as in the present study, applying De Metsenaere and Vandepitte’s (2017) notions of addition and omission is fairly uncomplicated, but does not completely remove the use of subjective judgement or the problem of drawing a clear line between addition and omission, on one hand, and explicitation and implicitation, respectively, on the other.

Nonfiction may often have a significant translational impact by spreading information about different worldviews, important events, discoveries in arts and science as well as new terminology. The findings of the present study suggest that more research into information change is needed on omission and addition in different genres and target cultures. Judging from the media coverage on an instance of information change made in the Russian edition of Yuval Noah Harari’s international bestseller *21 Lessons for the 21st Century* in 2019 (see, e.g. Flood, 2019; Tsoi, 2019), the expectations that readers have regarding the use of information changing strategies, who can make them, and perhaps also regarding marking them to show where information has been added or omitted, requires more study.

It is easy to purchase a book in translation in one's non-native language and expose oneself to a product intended for a different target culture. Such a possibility is perhaps most easily available with English language literature, English being a global lingua franca. Already in 1995, Lawrence Venuti brought up the small numbers of books translated into English in the UK and the US, the popularity of English as a source language of translated literature in many countries, and the large-scale exports of English-language literature from the US (Venuti, 1995, pp. 12-16). Additionally, not only original English-language literature but also literature translated into English is consumed by many people outside the Anglo-American world in the absence of translations into their own languages. In the present study, the English version (Zygar, 2016c) was on the market for two years before the Swedish translation (Zygar, 2018) was published. It follows that products of the Anglo-American translation culture, like Zygar (2016c) in the present case, can have several secondary target cultures, or cultures of reception and consumption, with different norms and conventions of translation. The readers in those cultures are likely to be unaware of any differences, and probably have no influence over the norms governing the translation process (for process norms, see, e.g. Toury, 1995 or Chesterman, 2000). In the long run, this could have an impact on how the expectations of and attitudes toward translations into the domestic languages in the receiving cultures evolve.

REFERENCES

Primary sources

- Zygar, M. (2016a) *Вся кремлевская рать: Краткая история современной России*. Moscow: ООО «Интеллектуал'наâ литература».
- Zygar, M. (2016b) *Putinin sisäpiiri. Nyky-Venäjän lyhyt historia*. Translated by Jukka Mallinen. Helsinki: Otava.
- Zygar, M. (2016c) *All the Kremlin's Men: Inside the Court of Vladimir Putin*. Translated by Tom Hodson. New York: Public Affairs.
- Zygar, M. (2018) *Männen i Kreml. Inifrån Putins hov*. Translated by Nils Håkanson. Stockholm: Ordfront.

Secondary sources

- Becher, V. (2010) 'Abandoning the notion of 'translation-inherent' explicitation. Against a dogma of translation studies', *Across Languages and Cultures*, 11(1), pp. 1-28.
- Bisiada, M. (2018) 'The editor's invisibility. analysing editorial intervention in translation', *Target*, 30(2), pp. 288-309 [online]. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1075/target.16116.bis>
- Blum-Kulka, S. (2000) 'Shifts in cohesion and coherence in translation' in Venuti, L. (ed.) *The Translation Studies reader*. London: Routledge, pp. 298-313.
- Chesterman, A. (2000) *Memes in translation: the spread of ideas in translation theory*. 2nd edn. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Davies, E. E. (2007) 'Leaving it out: on some justifications for the use of omission in translation', *Babel*, 53(1), pp. 56-77 [online]. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1075/babel.53.1.06dav>

- Havumetsä, N. – A comparative study of information change in translation of nonfiction literature *Translation Matters*, 3(1), 2021, pp. 8-24, DOI: https://10.21747/21844585/tm3_1a1
- De Metsenaere, H. and Vandepitte, S. (2017) 'Towards a theoretical foundation for explicitation and implicitation', *trans-kom*, 10(3), pp. 385-419.
- Dimitriu, R. (2004) 'Omission in translation', *Perspectives: Studies in Translatology*, 12(3), pp. 163-175 [online]. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1080/0907676X.2004.9961499>
- Englund Dimitrova, B. (2005) *Expertise and explicitation in the translation process*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Flood, A. (2019) 'Yuval Noah Harari admits approving censored Russian translation', *The Guardian*, 26 July [online]. Available at: <https://www.theguardian.com/books/2019/jul/26/yuval-noah-harari-admits-approving-censored-russian-translation-sapiens> (Accessed: 28 December 2020).
- Genette, G. (1997) *Paratexts: thresholds of interpretation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jiaming, H. (2005) 'On annotation in translation' in Hung, E. (ed.) *Translation and cultural change: studies in history, norms, and image projection*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 183-190.
- Klaudy, K. (1998) 'Explicitation' in Baker, M. (ed.) *Routledge encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. London: Routledge, pp. 80-84.
- Klaudy, K. and Károly, K. (2005) 'Implicitation in translation: Empirical evidence for operational asymmetry in translation', *Across Languages and Cultures*, 6(1), pp. 13-28 [online]. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1556/Acr.6.2005.1.2>
- Kuusi, P. (2016) 'Features of discourse presentation in translation: literary and narratological insights into translation universals', *International Journal of Literary Linguistics*, 5(3), pp. 1-24 [online]. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.15462/ijll.v5i3.68>
- Leppihalme, R. (2001) 'Translation strategies for realia' in Kukkonen, P. and Hartama-Heinonen, R. (eds.) *Mission, vision, strategies, and values. A celebration of translator training and Translation Studies in Kouvola*. Helsinki: Helsinki University Press, pp. 139-148.
- Leppihalme, R. (2007) 'Kääntäjän strategiat' in Riikonen, H. K., Kovala, U., Kujamäki, P. and Paloposki, O. (eds.) *Suomennoskirjallisuuden historia 2*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura, pp. 365-373.
- Newmark, P. (2010) 'Translation and culture (dedicated now to the dear memory of a fine translation teacher and translation critic Gunilla Anderson)' in Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk, B. and Thelen, M. (eds.) *Meaning in translation*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, pp. 171-182.
- Pym, A. (2004) *Moving text: localization, translation, and distribution*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Pym, A. (2005) 'Explaining explicitation' in Karoly, K. and Fóris, Á. (eds.) *New trends in Translation Studies: in honour of Kinga Klaudy*. Budapest: Akadémia Kiadó, pp. 29-34.
- Pym, A. (2016) *Translation solutions for many languages: histories of a flawed dream*. London: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Toury, G. (1995) *Descriptive Translation Studies and beyond*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Tsoi, I. (2019) 'В российском переводе книги о постправде поменяли Путина на Трампа, а оккупацию Крыма — на присоединение', *The Insider*, 22 July [online]. Available at: <https://theins.ru/antifake/167351> (Accessed: 28 December 2020).
- Venuti, L. (1995) *The Translator's invisibility: a history of translation*. London: Routledge.

Havumetsä, N. – A comparative study of information change in translation of nonfiction literature
Translation Matters, 3(1), 2021, pp. 8-24, DOI: https://10.21747/21844585/tm3_1a1

About the author: Nina Havumetsä holds a PhD in Translation Studies. She is a university teacher of Russian translation at the Department of Foreign Languages and Translation Studies at the University of Eastern Finland.