

# Explicitation of Conjunctions in Two English Translations of *Luoyang Jialan Ji*

Yuying Huang<sup>1</sup> & Junjie Yan<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> School of Foreign Languages, East China University of Science and Technology, Shang Hai, China

Correspondence: Yuying Huang, School of Foreign Languages, East China University of Science and Technology, 130 Meilong Road, Xuhui District, Shanghai, China.

Received: March 25, 2024

Accepted: May 8, 2024

Online Published: May 23, 2024

doi:10.5539/ells.v14n2p68

URL: <https://doi.org/10.5539/ells.v14n2p68>

## Abstract

The translation of Chinese classics is vital to promoting Chinese culture, gaining increasing attention from the academic community in recent years. This study selected *Luoyang Jialan Ji*, a representative of Chinese classics, as the research data. The study examines conjunctions in different texts by constructing comparable and parallel corpora of the source text and two English translations. The findings indicate that the frequency of conjunctions in the two English versions is higher than that in the Chinese version, which proves a tendency of explicitation in the translation process from Chinese to English. Notably, there are some differences between the two English versions in the use of conjunctions, especially conditional and causal conjunctions, which reveals the different styles of translators. Furthermore, the paper summarizes translation methods of conjunctions, offering insights into the translation practice of Chinese classics.

**Keywords:** conjunctions, corpus, explicitation, C-E translation

## 1. Introduction

As an ancient literary masterpiece imbued with profound historical and cultural significance, *Luoyang Jialan Ji* not only delves into the conditions of Buddhist temples in Luoyang during the Northern Wei Dynasty but also provides a comprehensive glimpse into the political, economic, cultural, and religious landscapes of that era. This illustrious work has consistently attracted academic attention due to its literary and historical worth. Given the ongoing globalization and the deepening cultural exchanges between China and other countries, translating Chinese classics holds immense significance in disseminating traditional Chinese culture and fostering international cultural understanding and dialogue.

In translation, a pivotal aspect lies in achieving seamless conversion between the source and target languages. The accurate portrayal of the logical relationships and information structures inherent in the source text is significant. Conjunctions, crucial vehicles for expressing sentential logical relationships, occupy a substantial position in the translation process. Their apt usage enhances the coherence and logic of the translation and elevates its expressive prowess and readability, thereby rendering the translated text more authentic and engaging. However, the grammatical disparities, expressive nuances, and cultural divergences between Chinese and English necessitate meticulous adjustments or conversions of conjunctions during translation. By employing explicitation translation of conjunctions, translators can more faithfully preserve the logical connections and the semantic content of the source text, thereby enhancing the precision and fluidity of the translation.

Although some research has been conducted on the English translation of *Luoyang Jialan Ji*, more studies are still needed, focusing on the explicit translation of conjunctions within this text. Therefore, this study explores the application and effects of explicitation translation of conjunctions in translation practice by analyzing two English versions of *Luoyang Jialan Ji*, enhancing the understanding of translation theory and practice and providing reference and inspiration for future translation work.

## 2. Literature Review

The concept of “explicitation” is initially introduced by Vinay and Darbelnet (1958) as incorporating implied details in the target language. Blum-Kulka’s explicitation hypothesis (1986) links this with alterations in cohesion and coherence in translation, potentially lengthening target texts. Klaudy (2004) categorizes explicitation into various types, such as obligatory, optional, pragmatic, and translation-inherent explicitation. In

China, researchers have also investigated explicitation in translation. For instance, Liu Zequan and Yan Jimiao (2010) examine English translations of *Dream of the Red Chamber*, finding that while all translations utilized explicitation, they employed distinct translation approaches influenced by cultural and linguistic factors.

It has been found that according to the theories of Halliday and Hassan (1976), conjunctions play a crucial role in discourse, particularly in translation, where they serve as a critical aspect of explicitation. Xu Wensheng (2015) highlights that English exhibits a higher frequency of conjunction usage than Chinese, reflecting the language's emphasis on the completeness of sentence structures. While Chinese prioritizes semantic cohesion, English leans towards syntactic cohesion, often incorporating explicit cohesive elements such as vocabulary and conjunctions to ensure coherence in discourse. Moreover, variations in translation styles among translators lead to differences in the utilization of conjunctions.

*Luoyang Jialan Ji* is an ancient Chinese Buddhist historical book. It recapitulates the political affairs of the Northern Wei Dynasty's capital city of Luoyang for the past forty years, the transportation of the foreign and domestic communities, the biographies of the people, the cityscape, folk customs, legends, and anecdotes. The content is exceptionally rich in customs, legends, and anecdotes. The *Luoyang Jialan Ji* can represent the characteristics of ancient Chinese traditional culture to a very high degree. The English translation of *Luoyang Jialan Ji* has been disseminated worldwide for decades, and its influence is quite far-reaching. In terms of spreading influence, *Luoyang Jialan Ji* has been translated into several languages, such as Japanese, Korean, and English, and it occupies a specific position in the international sinology community and is an essential channel for global scholars to understand Chinese traditional culture. With Li Daoyuan's *Commentary on the Classic of Water*, the book has always been regarded as the twin jewels of the literature of the Northern Dynasties. Therefore, *Luoyang Jialan Ji* can be viewed as a typical representative of Chinese culture. The existing English translations of *Luoyang Jialan Ji* include W. J. F. Jenner's *Memories of Lo-yang* and Wang Yitong's *A Record of Buddhist Monasteries in Lo-yang*.

Different scholars have studied the English translation strategies of the two English translations of *Luoyang Jialan Ji* in terms of the English translation of folklore events, the translation strategies of geographical names, and the translation of high-frequency words. However, the existing studies on the English translation of *Luoyang Jialan Ji* need to be more comprehensive, particularly in terms of the need for comparative studies on the translation styles of the two English versions. Therefore, this paper analyzes the translation styles of the two English translations, focusing on conjunctions.

### 3. Methodology

This study mainly adopts a corpus-based approach. Small specialized corpora exhibit high professionalism and specificity, enabling us to perform data statistics and quantitative analysis. For translated classics like the *Luoyang Jialan Ji*, corpora can provide abundant linguistic data to assist translators in understanding and drawing from previous experiences, facilitating researchers in summarizing general translation patterns (Xu et al., 2017). In this research, we constructed comparable and parallel corpora of the *Luoyang Jialan Ji* source text and two English translations. Additionally, the translations were compared with the BNC Baby, a four-million-word corpus covering four domains: academic writing, imaginative writing, newspaper texts, and natural conversations. Through comparison, the aim is to identify differences between the Chinese original and its English renditions and to explore the different translation styles of the two English translations. Initially, ICTCLAS was used to segment the source text, while Tree Tagger processes the translated text, accurately identifying conjunctions as “c” in Chinese and “CC” or “IN” in English. AntConc managed the annotated conjunction data, focusing on “CC” or “IN” words for analysis. The final step involves comparing data from a bilingual parallel corpus created by Computer-Assisted Translation (CAT). A log-likelihood calculator was also utilized to evaluate conjunction frequency, considering the resulting log-likelihood and significance level (p-value). The log-likelihood score is directly associated with the p-value. When the log-likelihood score exceeds the critical values of 3.83, 6.64, and 10.83 for one degree of freedom, it indicates statistical significance at the 0.05, 0.01, and 0.001 significance levels, respectively. Establishing direct correlations between conjunctions in the source text and their translations may be challenging due to their diverse types and abundance. Nonetheless, these results offer valuable insights into variations in conjunction usage in translations.

### 4. Analysis of Conjunctions in Two Translations

#### 4.1 Conjunctions in Source Text, the Two Translations, and BNC Baby

##### 4.1.1 General Comparison of Conjunctions

In the research, analyzing the conjunctions marked as “c” in the source text and those identified as “CC” and

“IN” in English allows for the calculation of their respective conjunction proportions. Because some conjunctions in English (such as “for” and “before”) have other functions besides conjunctions, they were manually removed based on AntConc statistical data. A more comprehensive categorization of conjunctions has been carried out, explicitly encompassing conditional, adversative, and causal conjunctions. The selection of English conjunctions and their corresponding Chinese conjunctions is based on Huang’s research (Huang, 2007). We employ the designations Corpus W, Corpus J, Corpus S, and Corpus B to respectively denote the translations by Wang Yitong, Jenner, the source text, and BNC Baby. Table 1 shows the general frequencies and standardized frequencies of conjunctions in two English translations and source text.

Table 1. General comparison of conjunctions frequency

Types of Conjunctions	Corpus W		Corpus J		Corpus S	
	Freq.	Standardized Freq.	Freq.	Standardized Freq.	Freq.	Standardized Freq.
Conditional Conjunction	316	6.31	196	4.53	57	1.69
Adversative Conjunction	227	4.53	169	3.91	48	1.42
Causal Conjunction	588	11.73	398	9.21	69	2.04
Total Conjunction	2729	54.46	2522	58.34	354	10.50

Note. 1. Standardized Frequency = frequency of conjunction tokens/corpus tokens number\*1000.

Table 1 shows that both Corpus W and Corpus J use more conjunctions than the source text, showing a clear tendency of explicitation. Cultural and grammatical differences between English and Chinese contribute to this tendency. Consequently, translators often include a higher frequency of conjunctions to maintain the logical consistency and natural fluency of sentences.

Next, by using a log-likelihood calculation, the comparison is made between the conjunctions in the two English translations and BNC Baby.

Table 2. Comparison of conjunctions in Corpus W, Corpus J, and Corpus B

	Corpus W	Corpus J	Corpus B
Corpus Size	50101	43227	4000000
Total Conjunction Freq.	2729	2522	196204

The log-likelihood scores for total conjunctions in Corpus W and Corpus J are 28.58 and 70.88, respectively, both surpassing the critical value of 10.83. This indicates that the result is statistically significant at the 0.001 level. This suggests that compared to Corpus B, both Corpus W and Corpus J exhibit a higher proportion of conjunctions, with Corpus J’s use of conjunctions being more evident.

#### 4.1.2 Comparison Between the Two English Translations

As shown in the data above, although the conjunctions in both translations are used more frequently compared to the source text, there are still differences between them. By running a log-likelihood test, the authors further analyzed the three types of conjunctions in the two translations. The differences between the two translations regarding adversative conjunctions are not very apparent, as the log-likelihood scores fall below the critical value of 3.83. However, distinctions are evident in conditional and causal conjunctions at the 0.001 significance level, as their log-likelihood scores exceed the critical value of 10.83. This phenomenon contributes to the overall disparity in conjunction usage between the two translations.

Table 3. Comparison between Corpus W and Corpus J

Types of Conjunctions	Corpus W	Corpus J	Log-likelihood	Significance(p)
Conditional Conjunction	316	196	13.46	0.000
Adversative Conjunction	227	169	2.12	0.145
Causal Conjunction	588	398	14.17	0.000
Total Conjunction	2729	2522	6.18	0.013

Due to the pronounced disparities between the two translations in conditional and causal conjunctions, the subsequent analysis will delve into the specific occurrences of these conjunction types. Table 4 illustrates the

specific occurrences of conditional conjunctions in both translations. Table 5 presents the log-likelihood tests.

Table 4. Specific occurrences of conditional conjunctions in two translations

Corpus W	Corpus S					Total
Types of Conditional Conjunctions	若	假	倘	假令	唯	
if (33)	6	3	1	2	0	12
then (70)	4	1	0	0	0	5
as if (9)	3	0	0	0	0	3
as (200)	14	1	0	0	1	16
even if (2)	0	1	0	1	0	2
unless (2)	1	0	0	0	0	1
Corpus J	Corpus S					
Types of Conditional Conjunctions	若	假	倘	假令	唯	Total
if (31)	6	1	0	5	0	12
assuming that (1)	1	0	0	0	1	1
if only (1)	0	0	0	0	1	1
then (48)	1	0	0	0	0	1
as (115)	5	3	0	2	0	10

Table 5. Comparison in terms of conditional conjunctions

Types of Conditional Conjunctions	Corpus W	Corpus S	Log-likelihood	Significance(p)
if	33	12	3.63	0.057
then	70	5	44.41	0.000
as if	9	3	1.23	0.267
as	200	16	120.90	0.000
even if	2	2	0.16	0.693
unless	2	1	0.06	0.806
Types of Conditional Conjunctions	Corpus J	Corpus S	Log-likelihood	Significance(p)
if	31	12	4.63	0.031
assuming that	1	1	0.03	0.861
if only	1	1	0.03	0.861
then	48	1	47.24	0.000
as	115	10	79.42	0.000

Through comparison, the log-likelihood score for “as” in the translation by Corpus W is higher, reflecting Wang Yitong’s greater inclination towards using “as” to denote conditions compared to Jenner. Additionally, concerning “if,” the log-likelihood score in Corpus W is 3.63, failing to surpass the critical value of 3.83, whereas, in Corpus J, the log-likelihood is 4.63, signifying a notable disparity at the 0.05 significance level. Thus, in comparison to the translation by Wang Yitong, Jenner’s translation employs “if” more frequently.

Similarly, a comparative analysis is conducted on causal conjunctions. Table 6 illustrates the specific occurrences of causal conjunctions in both translations. Table 7 presents the log-likelihood tests.

Table 6. Specific occurrences of causal conjunctions in two translations

Corpus W	Corpus S						Total
Types of Causal Conjunctions	因	以	故	是以	由是	因而	
for (322)	5	4	10	5	0	0	24
as (88)	5	0	4	3	0	0	12
because (32)	4	0	0	1	0	0	5
since (21)	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
so that (8)	0	1	1	0	0	0	2
so (69)	4	2	1	1	0	0	8
hence (8)	1	2	1	0	1	0	5
as a result (31)	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
thus (9)	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
Corpus J	Corpus S						
Types of Causal Conjunctions	因	以	故	是以	由是	因而	Total
for (213)	3	2	4	4	0	0	13
as (50)	5	2	5	3	0	0	15
because (18)	4	2	0	2	0	1	9
since (5)	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
so that (10)	0	1	1	0	0	0	2
so (86)	3	1	1	2	0	0	7
hence (7)	1	1	1	1	0	0	4
as a result (1)	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
thus (8)	0	2	0	1	0	0	3

Table 7. Comparison in terms of causal conjunctions

Types of Causal Conjunctions	Corpus W	Corpus S	Log-likelihood	Significance(p)
for	322	24	200.72	0.000
as	88	12	39.04	0.000
because	32	5	12.73	0.000
since	21	1	15.30	0.000
so that	8	2	1.87	0.172
so	69	8	34.21	0.000
hence	8	5	0.02	0.897
as a result	31	1	24.82	0.000
thus	9	2	2.47	0.116
Types of Causal Conjunctions	Corpus J	Corpus S	Log-likelihood	Significance(p)
for	213	13	169.59	0.000
as	50	15	12.18	0.000
because	18	9	1.24	0.266
since	5	1	2.01	0.156
so that	10	2	4.02	0.045
So	86	7	61.05	0.000
hence	7	4	0.25	0.615
as a result	1	1	0.03	0.861
thus	8	3	1.28	0.257

Based on the data regarding causal conjunctions in the two translations, it is evident that in Corpus W, the log-likelihood scores of six conjunctions exceed 10.83: “for”, “as”, “because”, “since”, “so”, and “as a result”. In contrast, Corpus J only exhibits log-likelihood scores exceeding 10.83 for three conjunctions: “for”, “as”, and “so”. This observation indicates that, in terms of causal conjunctions, Corpus W manifests a more apparent trend of explicitation. Moreover, Corpus W uses diverse conjunctions to indicate causal relationships in the source text, potentially enhancing the clarity and coherence of the translated text.

#### 4.2 Application for C-E Translation

Conjunctions are pivotal in maintaining sentences' coherence, logic, and semantic unity. Consequently, delving into the translation techniques of conjunctions in Chinese-English translation holds immense significance for enhancing the overall translation quality. Many scholars have delved into the translation strategies of

conjunctions in Chinese-English translation. Zhang Peiji (2008) emphasizes that in translating conjunctions, translators need to make suitable adjustments based on contextual and semantic relationships, occasionally resorting to amplification, omission, or conversion to ensure the coherence and naturalness of the translated text. Wang Dongfeng (2009) highlights the need for translators to deeply comprehend the distinct characteristics and differences between English and Chinese, adopting techniques such as literal translation, free translation, amplification, or omission as per the specific situation to achieve accuracy and authenticity in translation. This study aims to build upon previous research, focusing on the explicit features exhibited in these two translation approaches and further exploring the explicit translation of conjunctions in Chinese-English translation.

#### 4.2.1 Reconsideration of Logic Relationship

As a reader-responsible language (Kinkley, 2009), Chinese puts sentences together, but the readers themselves must understand the inner relationship between them. Therefore, before translators do C-E translation, they should first understand and analyze the logical relationship between the original sentences and enhance the logic of the sentences by adding conjunctions.

(1) 栝、柏、椿、松、枝叶繁茂，遮蔽着屋檐；竹丛、香草，生意盎然，散布于台阶。[6:18]

W. J. F. Jenner: Junipers, cypresses, firs, and cedars spread over the eaves **while** bamboo clumps and fragrant herbs grew around the steps. [3:149]

Wang Yitong: Luxuriant cypress, juniper, and pine trees brushed the eaves of the building, **while** bamboo groves and aromatic plants lined the courtyards and stairways. [6:19]

The original sentence delineates the growth patterns of two distinct categories of plants: the towering, leafy trees of various species and the robust, relatively low-growing bushes and grasses. Although the logical relationship between these two descriptions is implicit in the source text, it is evident that the plants occupy opposing positions regarding their height, exhibiting a clear contrast. Recognizing this, both translators have aptly added the conjunction "while" to articulate the underlying logical relationship latent in the original Chinese sentence.

(2) 这个地方干旱无雨，靠引水种麦，不知道使用牛，而用耒耜耕作。[6:262]

W. J. F. Jenner: **As** no rain falls on the land here, they breach the banks of the rivers in order to grow wheat. **As** they do not know the use of oxen, they will the fields with hand- ploughs. [3:256]

Wang Yitong: This land was deficient in rainfall, **so** the people grew wheat by inundating their fields with water. They did not know how to use oxen for cultivation, **but** they tilled their fields with plows and plowshares. [6:263]

This sentence encompasses two distinct layers of logical relationships. Firstly, water diversion for planting is necessitated by the drought and scarcity of rain, a cause-and-effect relationship that is unambiguously portrayed. Both translations aptly capture this relationship through the use of appropriate conjunctions. Secondly, despite their unfamiliarity with using oxen, they possessed knowledge of alternative farming tools, reflecting the adversative relationship. W. J. F. Jenner elects to introduce the concessive clause with "as", whereas Wang Yitong opts for the more direct and coordinated conjunction "but" to express meaning.

#### 4.2.2 Addition of Subordinated Conjunctions

The overuse of coordinated conjunctions can create redundancy in translation. Moreover, there are times when coordinated conjunctions do not indicate a logical relationship; however, the appropriate addition of subordinating conjunctions can make the translation and relationship more transparent, including hypothetical, temporal, and conditional relationships.

(3) 胡太后听说尔朱荣发兵，召集王公商议对策。[6:28]

W. J. F. Jenner: **When** the Empress Dowager heard that Jung had risen, she summoned the princes and nobles for consultation. [3:153]

Wang Yitong: **When** she heard of [Er-zhu] Rong's uprising, the empress dowager called the various dignitaries for a meeting. [6:29]

Although there is no conjunction in the original sentence, both translations use the subordinated conjunction "when" to indicate the reaction of the dowager Empress Hu when she heard about the dispatch of troops and summoned the princes to discuss the matter.

(4) 对于罪该偿命的人，不实行死刑的处罚，只是流放到荒山中，与鱼鸟为伍。[6:276]

W. J. F. Jenner: **If** a man is guilty of murder, he is not executed but is exiled to an uninhabited mountain and

allowed to eat and drink as best he can. [3:261]

Wang Yitong: **If** a criminal deserved the death penalty, he would not be subject to instant execution. Instead, he would be transferred to a deserted mountain area where he was free to drink and eat, but nature was allowed to determine his fate. [6:277]

Both translations of this sentence employ the subordinating conjunction “if,” resulting in a subordinate clause that denotes a hypothetical scenario where an individual who commits a crime deserving of capital punishment will face exile.

#### 4.2.3 Appropriate Omission of Conjunctions

4.2.1 and 4.2.2 discussed how to increase the level of explicitation in the translation by adding conjunctions from the perspective of logical relationships and subordinate conjunctions. However, it is worth noting that increasing the level of explicitation in the translation means something other than mindlessly adding conjunctions. We can appropriately omit conjunctions in the source text that do not affect the semantics but only serve a specific cohesive function while translating from Chinese to English.

(5) 萧宝卷有一个宫女名叫吴景晖，当时怀着萧综已有一个月，萧衍**因为**曾经将景晖占为己有，**所以**等到萧综出生时，萧衍就认他为自己的儿子，小名缘觉，封他为豫章王。[6:88]

W. J. F. Jenner: He favored Wuhui Ching, a beauty of Hsiao Pao-chuan's who was already one month pregnant with Hsiao Tsung, and on Tsung's birth took him for his own son. Tsung's childhood name was Yuan-chueh, and he was created as Prince of Yu-chang. [3:177]

Wang Yitong: Wu Jing-hui, a consort of [Xiao] Bao-Juan, who had been pregnant with Xiao Zong for several months, had an affair with [Xiao] Yan. After [Xiao] Zong's birth, [Xiao Yan] then took [the baby] as his own son renamed him Yuan-jue (Enlightened through Reasoning), and ennobled him as the Prince of Yu-zhang. [6:89]

It is evident that in the original Chinese sentence, there is a group of conjunctions indicating causal relationships (因为...所以...). However, there are no conjunctions indicating causal relationships in either translation. This is because there is sufficient information in this sentence, no conjunctions are needed, and the logic and meaning of the sentence are also very apparent.

#### 4.2.4 Transformation into Other Structures

During the translation process, the addition of conjunctions enhances the explicitation of the translation to a certain degree. Nevertheless, using identical or similar conjunctions can render the translation more varied. Consequently, in pursuing effective Chinese-to-English translation, translators can exercise creativity by transforming conjunctions into other structures, including phrases and clauses, to connect sentences and faithfully express the original meaning. This approach avoids monotony and enriches the translation's linguistic palette, making it more engaging and readable.

(6) **因此**，邢子才撰写的碑文中有“俯听激电，侧览奔星”之语。[6:156]

W. J. F. Jenner: **This was why** Hsing Tzu-Tsai said in the inscription he wrote for it: One looks down and hears the thunder. While shooting, stars flash past. [3:207]

Wang Yitong: **This is why** Xing Zi-cai's stone inscription reads: “[One can] hear the flashing thunder below, [and see] the shooting stars on either side.” [6:157]

The Chinese source text used the conjunction “因此”，but neither W. J. F. Jenner nor Wang Yitong used the corresponding English conjunction “therefore”. Instead, they use a structure like “this is (was) why” to express the causal relationship in the source text in the form of a predicate clause.

(7) 孝昌初年，萧衍的儿子豫章王萧综来归降，听到这里的钟声，感到很惊奇，**于是**创作了《听钟歌》三首，传诵于世。[6:86]

W. J. F. Jenner: Early in *Hsiao-ch'ang* [525], Hsiao Tsung, Prince of Yu-chang and a son of Hsiao Yen, came to submit, and he found the sound of this bell **so** remarkable **that** he wrote three poems' on hearing the bell' which were circulated. [3:177]

Wang Yitong: In the early years of the Xiao-chang period, [Xiao] Zong, Prince of Yu-zhang and son of Xiao Yan, came over and surrendered (A.D. 525). **Impressed by** the unusual sound of this bell, he composed three songs entitled “Listening to the Bell” 20 that are presently in circulation. [6:87]

The Chinese source text uses the conjunction “于是” to express the causal relationship between sentences; that is, because Xiao Zong heard the shocking bell sound, he created “Listening to Bell Songs”. Both translations do not

choose to directly use conjunctions in English to express causal relationships, such as “because”, “so”, and “as”. Instead, they choose to use other structures for connection and semantic expression. W. J. F. Jenner chooses to use the structure of “so... that...” to guide the result adverbial clause, while Wang Yitong chooses to use the non-finite structure of “impressed by” to guide the reason adverbial clause.

#### 4.3 Summary

To conclude, by comparing the source text of *Luoyang Jialan Ji*, two English translations, and the BNC Baby original corpus, we can observe an apparent phenomenon of explicitation, particularly in conjunctions. Both English translations utilize more conjunctions than the source text, yet they differ in applying conditional and causal conjunctions, reflecting distinct translation styles and preferences. Wang Yitong’s translation predominantly uses “as” to express conditionality, indicating a meticulous understanding of the original context and a preference for direct expression. Jenner’s translation, in contrast, favors “if”, suggesting a different interpretation of conditional relationships or translation preferences. When it comes to causal conjunctions, Wang Yitong’s translation demonstrates a greater tendency towards explicitation, likely aiming to highlight causal connections between sentences and enhance clarity for readers. A deeper understanding of the challenges and strategies in the translation process can be gained by thoroughly analyzing the disparities between the two translations, offering valuable insights for cross-cultural communication and translation practices.

Various strategies are utilized to ensure accuracy and reader comprehension in translating Chinese text into English. These strategies involve reevaluating logic relationships, incorporating subordinated conjunctions, omitting unnecessary conjunctions, and transforming conjunction forms. The translation caters to reader preferences and enhances clarity by implementing these techniques.

#### 5. Conclusion

Utilizing a corpus-based approach, a comparative analysis was conducted on the usage of conjunctions in the translations by Wang Yitong and W.J.F Jenner, revealing a phenomenon of explicitation in Chinese-to-English translation. Both translations employ numerous conjunctions to enhance logical relationships, but there are differences in conjunction usage.

By analyzing these data alongside the two translations, this study deepens the understanding of conjunction explicitation. It provides insights for the translation of conjunctions in English. Additionally, the study aims to guide translators in handling semantic information from the source text and achieving coherence in sentence structure during translation. Nevertheless, it is crucial to recognize the limitations of this study, such as the possibility of data inaccuracies and bias stemming from manual computations. Future studies should explore the categorization of conjunctions in greater detail and employ more sophisticated research methodologies for a thorough investigation.

#### Acknowledgments

We express our sincere gratitude for the valuable input and recommendations offered by our instructor regarding our work.

#### Authors’ contributions

Not applicable.

#### Funding

This work was supported by the Undergraduate Training Program on Innovation and Entrepreneurship grant 202310251103.

#### Competing interests

Not applicable.

#### Informed consent

Obtained.

#### Ethics approval

The Publication Ethics Committee of the Canadian Center of Science and Education.

The journal’s policies adhere to the Core Practices established by the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE).

#### Provenance and peer review

Not commissioned; externally double-blind peer reviewed.



### Data availability statement

The data that support the findings of this study are available on request from the corresponding author. The data are not publicly available due to privacy or ethical restrictions.

### Data sharing statement

No additional data are available.

### References

- Blum-Kulka, S. (1986). Shifts of Cohesion and Coherence in Translation. In J. House & S. Blum-Kulka (Eds.), *Interlingual and Intercultural Communication* (pp. 17–35). Tübingen: Gunter Narr.
- Halliday, M., & Hassan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. London and New York: Longman.
- Huang, G. W. (2012). Translation of Classics: From Intralinguistic Translation to Interlinguistic Translation: A Case Study of the English Translation of the Analects. *Chinese Foreign Languages*, 6, 64–71.
- Huang, L. B. (2007). *Research on translation commonality based on Chinese-English/English-Chinese parallel corpus*. Fudan University Press.
- Jenner, W. J. F. (1981). *Memories of Lo-yang: Yang Hsuan-chih and the lost capital* (pp. 493–534). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kinkley, J. C. (trs.). (2009). *Border Town: A Novel*. New York: Harper Collins.
- Klaudy, K. (2004). *Encyclopedia of Translation Studies* (pp. 80–84). Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Languages Education Press.
- Lian, S. N. (2006). Chinese and Western Ways of Thinking: Perception and Rationality: Also, on the Common Expressions of Chinese and English. *Languages. Foreign Language and Foreign Language Teaching*, 7, 35–38.
- Wang, Y. T. (1984). *Record of Buddhist Temples in Luoyang*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Xie, C. L. (2018). Investigation of the Foreign Translation of Luoyang Jialanji. *Journal of Huaihai Institute of Technology (Humanities and Social Sciences)*, 4, 68–71.
- Xu, M., Wang, S. Y., Chang, Y., & Liu, H. (2017). A Comparative Corpus of Translation of Classics for Undergraduate Students and International Students Majoring in English from a Cross-Cultural Perspective: A Case Study of Wuhan University of Technology. *Science and Technology Journal*, 10, 38–39. <https://doi.org/10.16400/j.cnki.kjdx.2017.04.019>
- Xu, W. S. (2015). Comparison and Translation of English-Chinese Conjunctions from the Perspective of Language Typology: Based on the Sampling Analysis of the Corpus of English-Chinese Literary Masterpieces. *Journal of Foreign Chinese University*, 3, 41–52.
- Xu, W. S., & Zhang, B. R. (2006). A Comparative Study on Causal Conjunctions Based on the Corpus of English-Chinese Masterpieces. *Foreign Language Teaching and Research*, 4, 292–296, 320.
- Yang, J. Z. (2012). *Luoyang Jialan Ji* (Shang Rong Translation). Beijing: Zhonghua Book Company.

### Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author, with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).