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1. Introduction

Translated text often differs from the original text. One of the reasons is that translators sometimes explicitate or implicitate elements of the original text. These are two translation techniques called respectively *explicitation* and *implicitation* (Molina, 2002, p. 500). The motivation for the application of these two techniques has triggered a lot of research, especially on *explicitation*. However, research on the subject applied to the Dutch language is rather limited. Furthermore, not all researchers who have conducted a study on *explicitation* and/or *implicitation* have the same view on those translation techniques, whatever the language. This study will, among other things, elucidate those different views, for example Blum-Kulka’s view (1986) in contrast to Becher’s view (2011). Different views entail different definitions on *explicitation* and *implicitation*. Consequently, two definitions will be established through the analysis of previous research on those two translation techniques. Becher, for example, conducted research to investigate *explicitation* and *implicitation* in translation (2011), as did Klaudy (2005). In translation studies the emphasis is mainly on *explicitation*, a translation universal several researchers have studied, e.g. Blum-Kulka (1986), Baker (1995, 1996), Puurtinen (2004), Becher (2011), Laviosa (1996) etc. The present master’s dissertation will be based on the research of Viktor Becher (2011). In his study *When and why do translators add connectives* Becher aims to clarify why translators add or omit connectives, focusing mainly on the addition of connectives. Becher used a bidirectional parallel corpus with English and German business texts that he analysed by means of five triggers: (1) comply with the communicative norms of the target language community (2) exploit specific features of the target language system (3) deal with specific restrictions of the target language system (4) avoid stylistically marked ways of expression (5) optimize the cohesion of the target text. In the present master’s dissertation, we will conduct a study similar to Becher’s in order to investigate whether the additions and omissions of connectives in another language pair, English-Dutch, can also be attributed to Becher’s triggers. The results of Becher’s study indicated that most of the additions and omissions could be attributed to English-German distinctions (syntax, lexis and communicative norms) that had already been established in previous studies. Therefore, these results indicate that translators do not follow a “universal strategy of explicitation”. Accordingly, Becher (2010a) does not consider *explicitation* a universal (p. 23). Instead of starting a study from Blum-Kulka’s Explicitation Hypothesis, Becher (2010a) suggests that future studies should start from his adapted version of Klaudy’s Asymmetry Hypothesis (p. 17), which claims that *explicitations*
always exceed *implicitations* in quantity. In Becher’s adapted version, three types of *explicitation* are mentioned: obligatory, optional and pragmatic *explicitation* (Becher, 2010b, pp. 2-3). Obligatory *explicitation* regards the semantic and syntactic structure of a language that makes that the sentences in the target language are grammatically correct. Optional *explicitation* regards the differences in text-building strategies and stylistic preferences between the source and target language. Pragmatic *explicitation* regards the differences between cultures. These additional distinctions are made in an attempt to clarify Klaudy’s definition of the Asymmetry Hypothesis. Although Klaudy’s Asymmetry Hypothesis has already been tested by observing *explicitation* and *implicitation* in the Dutch-French language pair (Denturck, 2012), we nevertheless chose a language pair that contained Dutch (Dutch-English) because each different language pair may possibly lead to different conclusions. The results of Denturck’s study for example show that *explicitations* are not exceeding the quantity of *implicitations*, thus contradicting Klaudy’s Asymmetry Hypothesis. If the results of the present study would contradict the Asymmetry Hypothesis as well, then that would provide us with better insight on the Asymmetry Hypothesis applied on another language pair than the pair Becher used (English-German).

In order to test the Asymmetry Hypothesis, we will conduct a corpus study by observing what happens to the connective “therefore” in translation: how often is it explicitated and how often implicitated. Connectives seem ideal for testing the Asymmetry Hypothesis “since they are regularly added and omitted by translators, and their addition/omission is generally easy to spot” (Becher, 2011, p. 30). We prefer to focus on one single connective due to time and place constraints. “Therefore” was specifically selected since it is a common connective that provides us with enough example sentences to properly conduct our study but also because there is no unanimity on its word class and translation, which makes it a very interesting subject to do further research on.

Starting from Becher’s assumption that “Obligatory, optional and pragmatic explicitations tend to be more frequent than the corresponding implicitations regardless of the SL/TL constellation at hand” (Becher, 2010a, p. 17), the following research questions might lead to interesting results:

1) What is the most common translation of “therefore” in the Dutch Parallel Corpus? Does the genre (journalistic texts, administrative texts, external communication, fictional literature and instructive texts) have an influence on how “therefore” is translated?
2) Can the addition or omission of connectives in the language pair English-Dutch be attributed to the triggers Becher established to clarify why translators add or omit connectives?

3) Do we make observations similar to Becher’s observations, i.e., are the obligatory, optional and pragmatic explicitations more frequent than the corresponding implicitations? If that is the case, does that mean that obligatory, optional and pragmatic explicitations are more frequent than the corresponding implicitations, regardless of the SL/TL constellation at hand? In other words, is Becher’s Asymmetry Hypothesis applicable to language pairs other than German-English?

The present study is structured as follows. In chapter 2, we will elaborate on interesting studies concerning the subject of the present master’s dissertation. Translation universals, in particular explicitation, will receive a lot of attention. At the end of this chapter, we will discuss our expectations (hypotheses). In chapter 3, we will explain what corpus we will use and why, how we will retrieve our data and how we will conduct our research. Becher’s triggers will be elaborated on at the end of chapter 3. In chapter 4, the results will be described and analysed and in chapter 5, we will draw a number of conclusions according to these results and we will try to answer the initial research questions. In the final chapter, chapter 6, the significance of the findings will be discussed.
2. Theoretical framework

In the present study, we will test Becher’s Asymmetry Hypothesis (2010a), based on Klaudy’s Asymmetry Hypothesis (2009). According to the hypothesis, *explicitations* exceed *implicitations* in quantity in translated texts. Where Becher used German as a second language, we will use Dutch and instead of using only one text type, we will use multiple text types. Before we test Becher’s hypothesis, we will first explain why we chose the connective “therefore”. Afterwards, in order to test Becher’s hypothesis, we will need to define *implicitation* and *explicitation* in translated texts. These are two translation techniques, but *explicitation* is also referred to as a “translation universal”, along with *simplification*, *leveling out*, *normalization* etc. In this section we will first explain what a translation universal is. Second, we will present some of the most widely accepted universals: *simplification*, *normalization*, *leveling out* and *explicitation*. Third, we will observe the most common views on *implicitation* and *explicitation* and critiques (including those of Becher) on those views in order to have a comprehensive idea of those two translation techniques. After observing those other views and critiques, we can establish our own definitions of *explicitation* and *implicitation*. Only then we can approach Becher’s Asymmetry Hypothesis with a critical eye.

2.1 The connective “therefore”

The focus of the present study will be on the connective “therefore”. Connectives seem ideal for testing the Asymmetry Hypothesis “since they are regularly added and omitted by translators, and their addition/omission is generally easy to spot” (Becher, 2011, p. 30). As opposed to some other connectives like for example “because”, “and”, “but” and “also”, the connective “therefore” is not clearly defined. As regards the word class of “therefore”, we found different answers in different dictionaries. The suggested synonyms were also different depending on the dictionary. Some synonyms occurred in multiple dictionaries, but the same defined set was not found twice. These two findings are shown in the table below.
It is rather remarkable that a common connective like “therefore” has no unequivocal word class. Five out of seven dictionaries agree that the word class of “therefore” is a type of adverb. Practical English Usage (2016), however, claims that “therefore” is an adverbial although an adverbial is not even a word class according to the online Oxford Dictionary (Word classes (or parts of speech), s.d.). Another noteworthy result in the description of “therefore” in the Practical English Usage (2016) is the remark next to “adverbial”: “no conjunction”. This is remarkable because Macquary Dictionary (2005) gives “therefore” the label “conjunction”, the exact opposite. At this point, dictionaries even seem to contradict each other.

As regards the suggested synonyms, the outcome is not unequivocal either. Some dictionaries like the Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English (1999) and Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language (1985) suggest no synonyms. The Cambridge Dictionary of English Grammar (2013) gives us only one possible synonym: “thus”. The other four

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dictionary</th>
<th>Word class</th>
<th>Synonyms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Practical English Usage (Fourth Edition - 2016)</td>
<td>adverbial (no conjunction)</td>
<td>consequently, as a result, so, then</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 The Cambridge Guide to English Usage (2004)</td>
<td>adverb</td>
<td>consequently, for that reason</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Macquarie Dictionary (Fourth Edition - 2005)</td>
<td>conjunction</td>
<td>as a result, consequently in consequence of that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Cambridge Grammar of English - A Comprehensive Guide (2006)</td>
<td>linking adjunct</td>
<td>accordingly, so, then, thus, consequently, hence, as a consequence, as a result</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 The Cambridge Dictionary of English Grammar (2013)</td>
<td>connective adverb or conjunct, and a marginal conjunction</td>
<td>thus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English (1999)</td>
<td>adverb, linking adverbial</td>
<td>no synonyms suggested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language (1985)</td>
<td>compound adverb: conjunct</td>
<td>no synonyms suggested</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
dictionaries give us a bigger range. “Consequently” appears to be the preference of all four
dictionaries and “as a result” is also a rather popular synonym.

All things considered, “adverb” is according to the greater part of the dictionaries the word
class of “therefore” and “consequently” seems to be the most frequent synonym.

In terms of the translation of “therefore”, there is less confusion. Both “Van Dale” and
“Prisma”, two prominent translation dictionaries, suggest “daarom” as the first possible
translation of “therefore”. The Dutch language clearly has a preference as it comes to the
translation.

2.2 Translation universals

Baker (1993) defines translation universals as “features that typically occur in translated text
rather than original utterances and which are not the result of interference from specific
linguistic systems” (as cited in Laviosa, 2002, p. 43). According to her (1996), there are four
translation universals: simplification, explicitation, normalization and leveling out (pp. 179-
183). In the following section, each of these translation universals will be discussed, but we
will elaborate on explicitation, as that translation universal is the focus of the present study.

2.2.1 Simplification

According to Baker (1996), simplification is “the tendency to simplify the language used in
translation” (pp. 181-182), “the idea that translators subconsciously simplify the language or
message or both” (p. 176). This means that translators will avoid complex constructions in
order to make sure that the reader does not experience obscurities or difficulties and that he or
she fully understands the message.

2.2.2 Normalization

normalization is “a term generally used to refer to the translator’s sometimes conscious,
sometimes unconscious rendering of idiosyncratic text features in such a way as to make them
conform to the typical textual characteristics of the target language” (p. 54). Baker (1996)
defines this translation universal as “the tendency to conform to patterns and practices which
are typical of the target language, even to the point of exaggerating them” (pp. 176-177). This
means that the translator tries to comply with the communicative norms of the target language.
community, a thought that is literally described in Laviosa’s definition as well: “...make them conform to the typical textual characteristics of the target language”. The main difference between Laviosa’s definition and Baker’s definition is the description of whether the translator applied the translation universal normalization conscious or unconscious. Laviosa leaves that question open for debate, mentioning both possibilities: “…the translator’s sometimes conscious, sometimes unconscious rendering of idiosyncratic text features…”. Baker on the other hand seems to ignore the question whether the translator applied the translation universal normalization consciously or unconsciously. However, Baker delivers the same message (except for the conscious or unconscious application) in a less cumbersome definition. Ideal would be the combination of both definitions: “the conscious or unconscious tendency to conform to patterns and practices which are typical of the target language, even to the point of exaggerating them”.

The hypothesis of normalization has been the subject of multiple studies. Olohan (2004) for example investigated Baker’s hypothesis and confirmed it. In her study, she observed words ending in the suffix -ish. The first finding is that this suffix often modifies colours and numbers, meaning “approximately” or “similar to”. The second finding is that there are more -ish forms in the Translational English Corpus (hereafter referred to as TEC) than in the British National Corpus (hereafter referred to as BNC) although the latter has a wider range of colours. The conclusion of Olohan’s study is that the suffix -ish after colours in the translational component of the corpus shows that translators tend to prefer giving a rough description of colours by choosing the most accepted basic colour of the target languages and adding the suffix -ish (=normalization). Otherwise, the colour described in the source text may sound very strange to the target text audience and might even not be understood.

2.2.3 Leveling out

Baker (1996) describes this translation universal as “the tendency of translated text to gravitate towards the centre of a continuum” (p. 184). Another term for this translation universal is convergence (Laviosa, 2002), “which implies a relatively higher level of homogeneity of translated texts with regard to their own scores on given measures of universal features, e.g. lexical density, sentence length, etc. in contrast to originals” (Lapshinova-Koltunski, 2015, p. 95). In other words, translated texts are more similar to each other than original texts, meaning that translated texts show less variation than original texts (Lapshinova-Koltunski, 2015).
2.2.4 Explicitation

Explicitation is one of the actions that can take place between the original text and the translated text. Klaudy and Károly (2005, p. 15) give some examples of what these actions might be:

- a SL unit with a more general meaning is replaced by a TL unit with a more specific meaning;
- the meaning of a SL unit is distributed over several units in the TL;
- new meaningful elements appear in the TL text;
- one sentence in the ST is divided into two or several sentences in the TT;
- SL phrases are extended or “raised” to clause level in the TT;
- etc.

2.2.4.1 Existing views and critiques

Many studies have been carried out on the subject of explicitation. As we want to form our own definition in the present study, we will first give a critical overview of existing views on explicitation and critiques on those views. Only then will we be able to pose a proper definition of explicitation which takes into account former research. The following authors will be discussed: Blum-Kulka (1986), Baker (1996), Puurtinen (2004), Ippolito (2013), Klaudy (2008) and Becher (2010).

Blum-Kulka postulated in Shifts of cohesion and coherence in translation (1986) the Explicitation Hypothesis, which was supported by multiple other researchers, including Olohan, Baker and Øverås. According to Blum-Kulka (1986), “explicitation is a universal strategy inherent in the process of language mediation” (p. 21). She claims that, when translators interpret a source text, the target language text might be more redundant than the source language text itself. Therefore, a higher level of cohesive explicitness can be found in the target language text. This reasoning is what Blum-Kulka called ‘the Explicitation Hypothesis’: it postulates “an observed cohesive explicitness from SL to TL texts regardless of the increase traceable to differences between the two linguistic and textual systems involved” (Blum-Kulka, 1986, p. 19). Consequently, explicitation is in this case seen as a translation universal that is inherent in the process of translation (Blum-Kulka, 1986, p. 21). As multiple studies are cited as proof of Blum-Kulka’s theory, the Explicitation Hypothesis has become a dogma in translation studies. That is why, according to Becher, “previous studies on explicitation have tended to be quick to ascribe seemingly unexplainable
occurrences of explicitation to an allegedly “universal strategy inherent in the process of language mediation” (Blum-Kulka 1986: 21)” (Becher, 2011, p. 27).

One of the authors trying to support the Explicitation Hypothesis is Baker. As we have already mentioned earlier in this study, Baker (1996) believes that the translation universal explicitation is applied when you “spell things out rather than leave them implicit” (p. 180). The paper written in collaboration with Olohan in 2000 “sets out to provide evidence of explicitation in translation into English” (p. 141) by analysing the optional use of the complementizer that in combination with the reporting verbs say and tell in translated vs. non-translated English texts. The aim of their study was to test a version of Blum Kulka’s Explicitation Hypothesis. In order to carry out their study, they used the Translational English Corpus (TEC) and a comparable sample from the British National Corpus (BNC). The former consists of different genres of English target texts translated from different source languages and the latter consists of non-translated English texts, chosen to mirror the makeup of the TEC (Becher, 2010a, p. 9). The study was carried out as follows: they searched both corpora for the reporting verbs say and tell. Where these verbs appeared without a clausal complement (for instance, tell a lie) was not included because they only needed the cases where that could potentially be used as an optional complementizer, for instance she told me that she is happy (Becher, 2010a, p. 10). Olohan and Baker compared these two corpora and observed how many times say and tell occurred with optional complementizer and how many times without. If the optional that would occur more frequently in translated English, it would prove “inherent, subliminal processes of explicitation in translation” (Olohan and Baker, 2000, p. 143). These were the results of their study, summarized by Becher:

- In the TEC, occurrences of say with and without reporting that are essentially equally frequent (50.2% vs. 49.8%, respectively). In the BNC sample, on the other hand, the picture is very different. Here, only 23.7% of all occurrences of say occur with the complementizer that, while 76.3% occur without.
- In the case of tell, similar differences can be observed between the TEC and the BNC sample. In the TEC, the optional complementizer was used in 62.7% of all cases and omitted in 37.3%. In the BNC sample, the figures showed nearly the reverse: 41.5% for that vs. 58.5% for its omission.

(Becher, 2010a, p. 11)

These results show us that reporting that occurs more frequently in English translated texts than in English non-translated texts and should thus provide evidence in favour of explicitation in translation, as “a higher incidence of the optional that in translated English would provide evidence of inherent, subliminal processes of explicitation in translation”
(Olohan and Baker, 2000, p. 143). This would mean that Olohan and Baker found proof in favour of Blum-Kulka’s Explicitation Hypothesis, postulating that “explicitation is a universal strategy inherent in the process of language mediation” (Blum-Kulka, 1986, p. 21).

What makes this study genuinely interesting in the light of the present study, is Becher’s critique on it. He has two main points of critique on the TEC (1) and in addition he argues there are other explanations that are less dubious than the Explicitation Hypothesis (2).

1) Critique on the TEC
   - The work-in-progress version of the TEC Olohan and Baker used is very imbalanced in terms of text genres. Although the TEC contains four genres, the TEC concentrates mainly on one genre: fiction (82%). Newspaper texts covered only 1% of the TEC. The TEC can thus not be seen as a representative corpus for English translated texts (Becher, 2010a, p. 9).
   - It is not clear which are the source languages of the texts in the work-in-progress version of the TEC used by Olohan and Baker (Becher, 2010a, p. 10).

2) Less dubious explanations
   Becher (2010a) thinks Olohan and Baker’s study does not provide evidence in favour of Blum-Kulka’s Explicitation Hypothesis (p. 11). He argues there are other explanations that are less dubious than the assumption of “subliminal processes of explicitation in translation” (Becher, 2010a, p. 11). He suggests two more plausible explanations: source language interference (1) and conservatism (2) (Becher, 2010a, p. 11-12):

1. Source language interference:
   The texts in the TEC were translated out of different source languages and some of these source languages will probably allow for the use of a complementizer with reporting verbs, while other source languages will require it. Becher gives the example of the Spanish and Portuguese language in comparison with the French and Italian language: Spanish and Portuguese allow for and favour the use of a complementizer after reporting that while French and Italian require it. As long as we do not know how many source languages allow for a complementizer and how many require it, the results of Olohan and
Baker’s study cannot be seen as evidence for Blum-Kulka’s Explicitation Hypothesis. If the TEC would contain more translations of a language that requires a complementizer than a language that just allows for a complementizer, than reporting *that* would occur rather often, which would be the result of source language interference.

2. Conservatism

In the studies she wrote in 1993 and 1996, Baker suggested that a translator would rather use more conservative language (the translator tries to comply with the communicative norms of the target language community) than authors of non-translated texts. Related to this translation universal (also called normalization, standardization and conventionalization) is the effort to make use of more formal means of expression and because reporting *that* is mostly left out of informal language, translators would choose reporting *that* more frequently than the authors of non-translated texts. The fact is that formal verbs and verbs that are less common require a reporting *that*.

According to Becher (2010), both source language interference and conservatism offer more plausible explanations for the observations of Olohan and Baker than Blum-Kulka’s Explicitation Hypothesis (p. 12) and they do not assume “a subconscious tendency to explicitate on the part of translators” (Becher, 2010, p. 12). Becher’s observation helps us to understand why we should not start the research of the present study from the Explicitation Hypothesis but rather from an alternative proposed by Becher himself (the Asymmetry Hypothesis).

The corpus-based study of Puurtinen, *Explicitation of clausal relations* (2004), is an important study for the present master’s dissertation because it demonstrates that it is important not to just assume the Explicitation Hypothesis. Since the present study focuses on the application of *explicitation* (and *implicitation*), Puurtinen’s finding is important to take into account. In her study, Puurtinen (2004) examines the clause connectives in translated and non-translated Finnish children’s literature and she compares relative frequencies of a number of connectives signalling for example causal, temporal and postmodifying relations (p. 165). She observed that her findings neither supported nor contradicted Blum-Kulka’s Explicitation
Hypothesis. It turned out that some connectives were more frequent in translated text and thus showed a higher degree of *explicitation*, which is exactly what Blum-Kulka’s Explicitation Hypothesis postulates (Puurtinen, 2004, p. 174). In that sense, Puurtinen’s findings do not contradict Blum-Kulka’s hypothesis. However, two connectives tend to appear more frequently in the original text than in the translated text, which contradicts the first finding where some connectives were more frequent in translated text. Obviously, the finding that shows higher frequency of the connective in the original text does not support Blum-Kulka’s Hypothesis. We could conclude that Puurtinen’s study demonstrates that it is important not to just assume the Explicitation Hypothesis because it cannot always be confirmed.

Ippolito (2013, p. 10) explains that the translation universal *explicitation* refers to the grammatical and lexical elements that are absent in the source text but occur in the target text, making it more precise and thus less ambiguous.

Klaudy (2009) mentions 4 different types of *explicitation* in translation: obligatory *explicitation*, optional *explicitation*, pragmatic *explicitation* and translation-inherent *explicitation* (pp. 106-107). It is relevant for this study to make this distinction between multiple types of *explicitation* because these types will reoccur in the definition we will apply for the Asymmetry Hypothesis. The explanation of these types is based on Becher 2011 (pp. 21-23).

- **Obligatory explicitation:** This type of *explicitation* regards the semantic and syntactic structure of a language that makes that the sentences in the target language are grammatically correct. As regards the syntactic structure, obligatory *explicitation* occurs especially when things are missing in the source language, like for example the definite article in Russian. As a consequence, when translating a Russian text into English, many additions will occur because the English language uses definite articles as opposed to the Russian language. Another example is the Hungarian language that uses no prepositions and thus a translation from Hungarian into English would contain many additions in the form of prepositions. The semantic structure on the other hand, is about “choosing more specific words in the target text” (Klaudy, 2009, p. 106). It occurs that the target language has more specific words for certain phenomena than the source language. In the Hungarian language, for example, there exist specific terms that refer to ‘younger brother’, ‘younger sister’, ‘older brother’, and ‘older
sister’. Supposing that English is the source language, a language that has no specific terms for ‘younger brother’, ‘younger sister’, ‘older brother’, and ‘older sister’, the translator would have to explicitate as the Hungarian has no terms that refer to ‘brother’ and ‘sister’ without indicating whether it is the older or younger brother or sister.

In other words, obligatory explicitation refers to the syntactic and semantic structure of a language. The syntactic structure is at the basis for the increase in words in the target text while the semantic structure entails more specific words in the target text.

- Optional explicitation: Optional explicitation regards the differences in text-building strategies and stylistic preferences between the source and target language. As the term suggests, this type of explicitation is optional because the sentences are, regardless of the optional explicitation, grammatically correct. However, these grammatically correct sentences would not sound elegant and natural without the addition of optional explicitation. Klaudy mentions that the additions that can be attributed to optional explicitation often strengthen cohesive links, contain emphasers to clarify sentence perspective etc. For example, in English business texts, employers tend to refer to their employees as ‘our people’. If one would translate ‘our people’ into German, also in the business environment, ‘unsere Mitarbeiter’ would be more appropriate than the literal translation ‘unsere Leute’. The reason behind this particularity is that, although it would be lexicogrammatically correct, stylistically it would be a very strange sentence as the stylistic conventions of German business writing tend to prefer the more explicit ‘unsere Mitarbeiter’ to the literal translation ‘unsere Leute’.

- Pragmatic explicitation: The reason behind the occurrence of pragmatic explicitation are the differences between cultures. Some aspects of the source text may be considered general knowledge for the source text readers, but is unknown to the target text readers, for example names of food and drinks, villages, rivers etc. In that case, the application of pragmatic explicitation makes sure that these references to a specific culture are clear to the target text reader as well. In practice, this means for the language pair of the present study that a translator would translate the Dutch word ‘Schelde’ with ‘the river Schelde’, as to explain to the English-speaking target readers that ‘Schelde’ refers to a river.
Translation-inherent explicitation: The fourth type of explicitation does not quite fit in with the three other types because this type of explicitation is caused by “the nature of the translation process itself” (Klaudy, 2008, p. 107), unlike the other three types of explicitation that are caused by language pair-specific parameters (Becher, 2011, p. 20). However, the fact that Klaudy has adopted this fourth type of explicitation in her list, does not mean that she fully agrees with it. She adopted this type of explicitation in her list because it has become a “widely held consensus in translation studies” (Becher, 2011, p. 20). “Since Blum-Kulka postulated her famous Explicitation Hypothesis in 1986, translation scholars have increasingly – and uncritically – adopted the notion that “explicitation is a universal strategy inherent in the process of language mediation” (Blum-Kulka, 1986, p. 21)” argues Becher (2011, p. 20). This fourth type of explicitation will be discussed more elaborately in the following sections.

Another thought on explicitation was formulated by Becher. He defines explicitation as “the verbalization of information that the addressee might be able to infer (e.g. from the preceding discourse) if it were not verbalized. Explicitation may then be defined as an increase in explicitness in translation” (Becher, 2010a, p. 3). The combination of those two definitions provides us all the relevant information in one sentence, which results in a better overview when comparing it with definitions of other authors: “Explicitation may be defined as the verbalization of information that the addressee might be able to infer (e.g. from the preceding discourse) if it were not verbalized.”. Because the present study is based on Becher’s findings, we will elaborate on his studies and ideas in a separate section.

2.2.4.2 Comparison of different views

Becher, Baker, Ippolito and Blum-Kulka have different views on the same phenomenon. The aforementioned authors attribute characteristics to the term explicitation that differ quite a lot:

In a first analysis, the definitions of Becher, Baker, Ippolito and Blum-Kulka can be divided into two groups:

- Becher & Ippolito
- Baker & Blum-Kulka

Becher’s and Ippolito’s definitions of explicitation are more specific, more explicit, while
Baker’s and Blum-Kulka’s definitions are rather vague. That part of the definition that points out what is explicitated, is described comprehensively in Becher’s and Ippolito’s definition:

- Becher: “...information that the addressee might be able to infer (e.g. from the preceding discourse) if it were not verbalized.”
- Ippolito: “... the grammatical and lexical elements that are absent in the source text but occur in the target text, making it more precise and thus less ambiguous.”

Meanwhile in Baker and Blum-Kulka’s definition that part of the sentence that points out what is explicitated is barely mentioned or not at all:

- Baker: “things”
- Blum-Kulka: /

Although the definitions of Becher and Ippolito have more in common with each other than with Baker’s and Blum-Kulka’s definition, the definitions of Becher and Ippolito differ from each other as well. The second half of Becher’s definition, “information that the addressee might be able to infer (e.g. from the preceding discourse) if it were not verbalized”, implies that the *explicitation* is not really necessary. This becomes clear if we add the implied “even” in the second half of the sentence: “information that the addressee might be able to infer (e.g. from the preceding discourse) *even* if it were not verbalized”. In other words, whether or not a certain piece of information is verbalized, the addressee might still be able to infer (e.g. from the preceding discourse). *Explicitation* is then the act of a translator of verbalizing information that does not necessarily have to be verbalized in order for the reader to receive the information. Ippolito’s second half of the definition on the other hand, “making it more precise and thus less ambiguous”, implies with the phrase “and thus less ambiguous” that the target text sentence would be ambiguous and thus that it would be better if *explicitation* was applied. After all, a translator would at all times try to avoid delivering ambiguous sentences. In order to create a translation that will be one hundred percent clear to the target text audience, *explicitation* would be the safer option. From that point of view, *explicitation* may be considered necessary, as Ippolito implied. However, many sentences would also be clear, like Becher suggested, if a particular part of the sentences was not explicitated in translation. Therefore, *explicitation* may be considered unnecessary. This could be regarded as a nuance between Becher’s definition and Ippolito’s definition. A combination of Becher’s definition and Ippolito’s definition seems to be the most accurate and comprehensive option: “Explicitation refers to the translation universal that may be defined as the verbalization of
information that is absent in the source text but present in the target text and which the addressee might have been able to infer (e.g. from the preceding discourse) if it were not verbalized”.

2.2.4.3 Becher

As we have already mentioned, another important name in the field of explicitation is Becher. Not only has he written a study on when and why translators explicitate, he also questioned Blum-Kulka’s Explicitation Hypothesis. Becher ought this dogma of translation-inherent explicitation to be based on “fallacious theoretical considerations and premature interpretations of empirical data” (Becher, 2010a, p. 1). This is of importance for the present study because Becher’s critique will give us more insight into possible problems of the Explicitation Hypothesis. Consequently, it will become clear why Becher’s Asymmetry Hypothesis is a better alternative as a starting point for a scientific study.

In this section, we will expound Becher’s arguments against Blum-Kulka’s Explicitation Hypothesis. In brief, Becher thinks that the hypothesis is unmotivated, unparsimonious and vaguely formulated and thus not even a scientific hypothesis. Becher will demonstrate that previous studies in favour of Blum-Kulka’s hypothesis are unsuccessful in providing conclusive evidence in favour of the translation-inherent nature of explicitation, due to “a number of methodological shortcomings” (Becher, 2010a, p. 10).

Becher states that:

1) Blum-Kulka’s hypothesis is unmotivated;
2) Blum-Kulka’s hypothesis is unparsimonious;
3) Blum-Kulka’s Hypothesis is vaguely formulated.

We will now go more deeply into each of these three major problems formulated by Becher (2010a, pp. 6-8):

1. **Unmotivated**: Blum-Kulka suggests that when a translator interprets a source text, this might lead to a target text that is more redundant than the source text. More specifically, there can be a rise in the level of cohesive explicitness (Blum-Kulka, 1986, p. 19). This argumentation is defined as the “Explicitation Hypothesis” and does not take into account
the rise in cohesive explicitness that can be attributed to the linguistic and textual systems of both the source and target language. Instead, Blum-Kulka thinks that *explicitation* is inherent in the translation process. Becher (2010a), however, argues that the hypothesis does not provide a reason why “translations are “inherently” more explicit than (1) their corresponding source texts and (2) comparable, non-translated texts written in the target language” (p. 1). As long as there is no specific answer to the question which property is responsible for the occurrence of translation-inherent *explicitation*, Blum-Kulka’s hypothesis will remain some sort of speculation. Becher stresses that a scientific hypothesis must be motivated. If it is not motivated, it may lead to the production of, as he calls it, “pseudo-significant findings” (Becher, 2010a, p. 6). Except for their statistical significance, the results of these findings are meaningless. Clear examples of this “pseudo-significant findings” can be found in the online statistics textbook of Dallal (2007):

(…) in the early part of the twentieth century, it was noticed that, when viewed over time, the number of crimes increased with membership in the Church of England. This had nothing to do with criminals finding religion. Rather, both crimes and Church membership increased as the population increased. *Association does not imply causation*! Should opposition increase or decrease accuracy? During WWII it was noticed that bombers were more accurate when there was more opposition from enemy fighters. The reason was that fighter opposition was less when the weather was cloudy. The fighters couldn’t see the bombers, but the bombers couldn’t see their targets! *Association does not imply causation*, at least not necessarily in the way it appears on the surface! (para. 1)

According to Becher, Dallal’s example proves that statistical association does not necessarily imply real-world causation: the hypothesis that, for example, the presence of many enemy fighters leads to bomber pilots aiming better, is clearly not a hypothesis we would want to accept. He thinks that the reason why this statistical association does not imply real-world causation is because it is not motivated and the theoretical assumption (if any) that underlies the hypothesis does not make sense. Another of Dallal’s examples is the hypothesis that “smoking causes lung cancer when we find a significant correlation, for example in a large-scale epidemiological study” (Becher, 2010a, p. 7). We are more likely to accept this hypothesis because, unlike the previous war hypothesis, this hypothesis is well motivated (e.g. laboratory studies). In other words, in the smoking hypothesis, “the potential connection between association and causation is backed by evidence gathered on independent grounds” (Becher, 2010a, p. 7), the key element for a scientific hypothesis.
As regards Blum-Kulka’s hypothesis, it is clearly more related to Dallal’s war hypothesis than to the smoking hypothesis: there is no proof on independent grounds. However, suppose that we found that there is a higher level of cohesive explicitness in the target text than in the source text, then the Explicitation Hypothesis could still not be confirmed, as there could be other reasons underlying the higher degree in cohesive explicitness than the process of a translator interpreting a source text. This process can be compared with the weather conditions in Dallal’s war hypothesis. Another possible reason for the higher degree in cohesive explicitness could be “the (hypothesized) universal tendency of translators to simplify” (Baker, 1993, p. 244; 1996, p. 181), which, according to Baker (1996), potentially “raises the level of explicitness by resolving ambiguity” (p. 182). As a consequence, this could possibly result in target texts with a higher degree of cohesive explicitness as well.

2. **Unparsimonious**: One of the cornerstones of scientific research is the Occam’s Razor principle: “entia non sunt multiplicanda praeter necessitatem” (entities must not be multiplied beyond necessity), formulated by William of Occam in the late Middle Ages (Gibbs, 1996). Based on this principle, Isaac Newton stated the rule: "We are to admit no more causes of natural things than such as are both true and sufficient to explain their appearances" (as cited in Gibbs, 1996, para. 5). In order to comply with Occam’s Razor principle, hypotheses need to be parsimonious in their assumptions, making them easier to handle and more likely to be true. Blum-Kulka postulates the existence of a new language pair-independent and translation-inherent type of *explicitation*. Any other hypothesis that might be formulated to explain a higher degree of cohesive explicitness in the target text than in the source text, without assuming a new type of *explicitation*, would be preferable to Blum-Kulka’s Explicitation Hypothesis because it fits better within the Occam’s Razor principle. In other words, Blum-Kulka assumes a whole new type of *explicitation*, which clashes with the Occam’s Razor principle that postulates more simplicity for more truthful results.

3. **Vaguely formulated**: A third issue with the Explicitation Hypothesis concerns its vagueness. Instead of using trivial terms, Blum-Kulka chooses to pick terms that are not self-explanatory and as a consequence her explanation of the hypothesis is not so straightforward but simply vague. When Blum-Kulka (1986) used for example “universal
strategy” (p. 21), it is not clear what she means exactly. Does she mean by ‘universal’ that it is followed by all or just most translators? Does she mean by ‘strategy’ that it is a conscious or subconscious strategy? The vagueness of the latter can be demonstrated by the simple fact that Olohan and Baker (2000) seem to interpret ‘strategy’ as a subconscious strategy whereas Øverås (1998) interprets ‘strategy’ as a conscious strategy. Although both studies are based on Blum-Kulka’s considerations, it is not sure whether they are talking about the same thing, as the one term ‘strategy’ used by Blum-Kulka seems to be interpreted in a different way by different researches. Therefore it is clear that Blum-Kulka’s Explicitation Hypothesis causes confusion in the research field of explicitation.

Becher argues that all together, these three problems are fundamental issues that question the value of Blum-Kulka’s Explicitation Hypothesis. Therefore, these three problems pose an unscientific hypothesis that is in no need for further investigation (Becher, 2010a, p.8).

In his corpus-based study When and why do translators add connectives, Becher (2011) wanted to elucidate when and why translators explicitate, as to prove “that we do not need the assumption of a translation-inherent process of explicitation in order to explain the ubiquity of explicitation in translation” (p. 27). Specifically, he chose to focus on the explicitation of connectives as they can easily be omitted or added. In addition, these omissions and additions are easy to find (Becher, 2011, p. 30). In order to find out when and why translators explicitate, Becher manually identified the connectives of a bidirectional translation corpus. He identified implicitations (connective omissions) as well as explicitations (connective additions). Becher used a bidirectional English-German translation corpus consisting of the following four quantitatively comparable subcorpora:

1. English texts (21,222 words)
2. Their German translations (21,808 words)
3. German texts (21,253 words)
4. Their English translations (24,474 words)

Most of the texts of Becher’s corpus were business texts (letters to shareholders) published between 1993 and 2002. All target texts were searched for possible translation equivalents and for connectives that have no equivalent in the corresponding source text segment. The qualitative results of Becher’s study were subdivided in five different triggers of explicitation and implicitation. Because we will use some of these triggers in the present study, they are a
part of the method I apply to carry out an analysis of the corpus entries. Therefore, these five triggers will be discussed elaborately in the method chapter.

2.2.4.4 Implicitation

Although *implicitation* is not a translation universal, it can be seen as the opposite of *explicitation*. *Implicitation* is one of the actions that can take place between the original text and the translated text. Klaudy and Károly (2005, p. 15) give some examples of what these actions might be:

- a SL unit with a specific meaning is replaced by a TL unit with a more general meaning;
- translators combine the meanings of several SL words in one TL word;
- meaningful lexical elements of the SL text are dropped in the TL text;
- two or more sentences in the ST are conjoined into one sentence in the TT;
- ST clauses are reduced to phrases in the TT;
- etc.

In comparison to the translation universal *explicitation*, the literature on *implicitation* is not so elaborated (Klaudy, 2005, p. 14). Nida dedicated a section of the book he wrote in 1964 to “subtractions”, which is one of the three “techniques of adjustment”. He said: “Though, in translating, subtractions are neither so numerous nor varied as additions, they are nevertheless highly important in the process of adjustment” (Nida, 1964, p. 231). What Nida means is that *explicitation* occurs more often in translation than *implicitation*, one of the elements the present study will try to find evidence for. In one of Klaudy’s studies, she found that “Explicitations in the L1→L2 direction are not always counterbalanced by implicitations in the L2→L1 direction because translators – if they have a choice – prefer to use operations involving explicitation, and often fail to perform optional implicitation” (Klaudy and Károly, 2005, p. 14), a finding that seems to have the same result as Nida’s: translators tend to explicate rather than to implicitate. As there are more studies that have similar findings (Blum-Kulka, Baker etc.), this might be one of the reasons why there is less literature on *implicitation* than on *explicitation*. Now that we know how it fits within translation studies, we will explain what *implicitation* exactly is.

According to Vinay and Darbelnet (1995), *implicitation* is “A stylistic translation technique which consists of making what is explicit in the source language implicit in the target language, relying on the context or the situation for conveying the meaning” (p. 344).
According to Becher (2011), *implicitation* is “an increase in implicitness in translation” (p. 44), and Becher defines that implicitness as “the non-verbalization of information that the addressee might be able to infer” (p. 44). Combining Becher’s two definitions, *implicitation* according to Becher in one definition would be: “an increase in the non-verbalization of information in translation that the addressee might be able to infer”.

Although both the definition of Vinay & Darbelnet and the definition of Becher probably have the same vision on *implicitation*, Vinay and Darbelnet’s definition seems to be more explicit. Vinay and Darbelnet specifically mention the source language and target language while Becher uses the more general phrase “in translation”. The last part of their definition, “relying on the context or the situation for conveying the meaning”, explicitly says what the last part of Becher’s definition, “that the addressee might be able to infer”, intends. The combination of both definitions would be more precise and clear: “A stylistic translation technique which consists of making what is explicit in the source language implicit in the target language, relying on the context or the situation for conveying the meaning, as the addressee might be able to infer the non-verbalized information”.

2.3 Asymmetry Hypothesis

With all the above mentioned issues taken into account, Becher (2010a) claims that there is a better, more scientific hypothesis: the Asymmetry Hypothesis. “Obligatory, optional and pragmatic explicitations tend to be more frequent than the corresponding implicitations regardless of the SL/TL constellation at hand” (p. 17). The first version of this hypothesis, however, was postulated by Klaudy (2005): “Explicitations in the L1→L2 direction are not always counterbalanced by implicitations in the L2→L1 direction because translators – if they have a choice – prefer to use operations involving explicitation, and often fail to perform optional implicitation” (p.14). Becher (2010a) argues however that the formulation of this hypothesis causes some issues (p. 17):

1. It is not clear what kind of *explicitations* are covered. It could be Klaudy’s types 1 to 3 or only optional types of *explicitation*.
2. The term ‘prefer’ refers to a conscious decision made by the translator, which excludes the possibility of *explicitation* being an unconscious decision.
3. The term ‘fail’ has a “prescriptive flavor” (Becher, 2010, p. 17) to it, although he thinks that it is not the fault of the translator that he or she is more explicit than the author of the source text.
Due to these three issues, Becher formulated an altered version of Klaudy’s hypothesis. In Becher’s version of the Asymmetry Hypothesis it is said that translators show a tendency to explicitate rather than to implicitate, but the Asymmetry Hypothesis avoids, contrary to Blum-Kulka’s Explicitation Hypothesis, assuming a new, separate translation-inherent type of explicitation. Also the first problem (1), ‘it is not clear which kinds of explicitation are covered, it could be Klaudy’s types 1 to 3 or only optional types of explicitation’, has been taken care of by mentioning all three of Klaudy’s types: obligatory, optional and pragmatic explicitation. Of course, the hypothesis still needs to be motivated.

Motivation of the Asymmetry Hypothesis according to Becher (2010a)

Becher (2010a, p. 18) explains that human communication is driven by two contradicting principles (adapted from Horn, 1984, p. 13):

1. The Q Principle, which refers to explicitness, encouraging a person to say as much as he/she can;
2. The R Principle, which refers to implicitness, encouraging a person to say no more than he/she must.

The Q and R principles can be regarded as the two end points of a scale with on the one end explicitation and on the other end implicitation. It is impossible to pick one of the two principles regardless of the situation. In a face-to-face situation for instance, the speaker will have a tendency to apply the R Principle rather than the Q Principle, and thus be rather implicit than explicit. The underlying reason is that, in case the speaker was not entirely clear, the person the speaker is addressing can ask ‘What do you mean?’ or a similar phrase and the speaker immediately knows that he/she needs to be more explicit. In written text, the writer will have a tendency to apply the Q Principle rather than the R Principle, and thus be rather explicit than implicit. In a face-to-face situation, a communication problem can easily be solved by asking the speaker what he/she means, whereas in a written text it is not so easy for a reader to find out what is meant with a specific part that he/she does not understand. It mostly takes quite some of time before you can contact the author and receive an answer. In other words, it is less evident to ask a clarification to the author of a written text than to the person one is talking to. That is why the person who writes or translates a text would rather explicitate than being too implicit and create obscurity.

As regards translated texts, the main focus of this study, they can be regarded as “written texts par excellence” (Becher, 2010a, p. 18) and as a consequence translations should tend to be
located even further towards the *explicitation* end than non-translated texts. Becher (2010a) explains this via two properties of the communicative situation that underlies translation (pp. 18-20):

**Property 1:** Becher summarizes House’s finding (1997) as to explain property 1. “The communicative situation underlying translation is typically characterized by cultural distance between (SL) author and (TL) reader” (Becher, 2010a, p. 18). According to Konrad Ehlich (1984), written discourse is a “dilated speech situation” (as cited in Becher, 2010a, p. 18), being temporally and spatially dilated. Translation is an even more dilated speech situation, because next to spatial and temporal, there is also a cultural distance. In order to compensate for that cultural distance, a translator will tend to be even more explicit than the author of the source text. One could say that it are just conscious or subconscious (not of importance in this context) attempts of the translator to compensate for the cultural distance, rather than subconscious processes as formulated by Olohan and Baker (2000). Because dealing with the dilated speech situation is not translation-specific, *explicitations* as a result of the translator’s effort to reduce the cultural distance is not translation-inherent. However, the strategy to compensate is also used in contexts where cultural differences are not even relevant.

**Property 2:** “The communicative situation underlying translation is typically characterized by a great deal of communicative risk” (Becher, 2010a, p. 20). The main difference between an author and a translator is that the author must focus on content whereas the translator must focus on communication, making sure that the source text author is understood by the target text reader. In the event of communication problems, the translator will mostly be the prime suspect. Consequently, a translator always runs the risk of not being understood, urging him/her to make sure no communication problems could arise by being very explicit. This seems to be a sensible reaction of the translator as the only risk he takes by being very explicit is wasting energy and paper, whereas the risk he takes by being too explicit is “communicative breakdown” (Becher, 2010a, p. 20).

Again it should be noted that the risk-avoiding behaviour of translators is not translation-inherent. Firstly, it depends on how much risk the translator is willing to take, and furthermore, the risk depends on the translation situation. Secondly, not only translators, but also the authors of non-translated text need to consider taking a risk or not (although not to the same degree as the translator) for example a technology expert writing an article to be read by laymen.
These two properties formulate the motivation for the Asymmetry Hypothesis. According to Becher (2011) the Asymmetry Hypothesis claims that “among the language pair-specific types of explicitation (…) whose existence is uncontroversial, explicitations tend to outnumber the corresponding implicitations” (p. 29). Within the framework of his study, this means that connectives will more frequently be added than left out and consequently explicitation will occur more than implicitation (Becher, 2011).

2.4 Definitions

Now that we have analysed different ideas on implicitation, explicitation and the Asymmetry Hypothesis, we can define what those three terms mean in the present master’s dissertation.

For explicitation, we have chosen the combination of Becher’s definition and Ippolito’s definition because we ought that to be the most accurate and scientific explanation (unlike Blum-Kulka’s definition) of that particular translation universal. However, given the rather controversial nature of the word “universal” (Becher, 2010a, p. 44), we chose for the alternative “technique”: “A translation technique which consists of verbalizing information that is absent in the source text but present in the target text and which the addressee might be able to infer (e.g. from the preceding discourse) if it were not verbalized”.

As regards implicitation, the better option seemed to be the combination of Vinay & Darbelnet’s definition and Becher’s definition, as that combination appeared to be the most comprehensive and precise definition for the present master’s dissertation. “A stylistic translation technique which consists of making what is explicit in the source language implicit in the target language, relying on the context or the situation for conveying the meaning, as the addressee might be able to infer the non-verbalized information”

Unlike the definitions for explicitation and implicitation, we chose not to formulate a new definition for the Asymmetry Hypothesis, as one of the existing definitions seems comprehensive and precise. “Obligatory, optional and pragmatic explicitations tend to be more frequent than the corresponding implicitations regardless of the SL/TL constellation at hand.” (Becher, 2010a, p. 17).
2.5 Hypotheses

As mentioned in the introduction, the present study focuses on explicitation and implicitation. By examining whether or not there is more explicitation in translation than implicitation, we might be able to conclude whether Becher’s Asymmetry Hypothesis can be confirmed for another language pair than the pair Becher used. In this chapter, we elaborated on different views toward explicitation and implicitation. After formulating a comprehensive and precise definition of both translation techniques, we discussed the Asymmetry Hypothesis. Becher’s version of the Asymmetry Hypothesis, the version we prefer for the present study, postulates that: “Obligatory, optional and pragmatic explicitations tend to be more frequent than the corresponding implicitations regardless of the SL/TL constellation at hand.” (Becher, 2010a, p. 17). Becher’s assumption helps creating the following hypotheses:

As a **first hypothesis**, we expect that the most common translation of “therefore” will be “daarom”. As a translation for “therefore”, “daarom” is the first translation that two prominent translation dictionaries (“Van Dale” and “Prisma”) suggest.

As a **second hypothesis**, we expect that additions or omissions of the connective “therefore” in the language pair English-Dutch can be attributed to the triggers of explicitation and implicitation Becher established to clarify why translators add or omit connectives. Although Becher applies those triggers on instances of his language pair (English-German) these triggers seem to be five general triggers that can probably be tested on other language pairs as well. However, the difference in our data (Becher covers multiple connectives whereas we only cover “therefore”) might cause a limited application of Becher’s triggers on the data of the present study.

As a **third hypothesis**, we expect to observe that implicitation occurs less in Dutch translations of English source texts than explicitation in English translations of Dutch source texts. In short, we expect to observe that implicitation occurs less than explicitation in the language pair English-Dutch. Accordingly, that would confirm Becher’s Asymmetry Hypothesis.
3. Research methodology

In the foregoing chapter we summarized previous research relevant for the present study and explained important theoretical notions within this study. In this chapter, chapter 3, we will focus on the research methodology, elaborating on how we organised the actual research. This chapter will be structured as follows:

First we will elaborate on which corpus we will use and why. Then we will discuss how we will retrieve our data by explaining how the annotation will look like, why we start from Becher’s study (and more particularly from the five triggers he suggested), what these five triggers are and how we will try to apply Becher’s triggers on the data of the present study.

3.1 Corpus

The corpus that we will use to extract original and translated English sentences with “therefore”, is the Dutch Parallel Corpus (DPC), a high-quality parallel corpus for Dutch, French and English, containing five different text types and consisting of more than ten million words (Macken, De Clercq, & Paulussen, 2011, p. 375). The DPC is in many aspects preferable to similar corpora such as the Europarl corpus, the Canadian Hansard corpus etc. First of all, it contains sentences in Dutch, which is one of the two languages we will use in our study. Furthermore, Macken et al. (2011, pp. 376-377) believes that the DPC deals with three problems that cause issues in other corpora:

1) Other corpora such as the Europarl corpus and the Canadian Hansard corpus have a limited set of text types, mostly one or two. The DPC offers a wider range of text types, five to be precise: administrative texts, external communication, fictional literature, journalistic texts and instructive texts. The end user of the corpus is able to compare a certain phenomenon in several text types, each with a different writing and translation style. Since we will be comparing different text types within the present study, it is necessary to use a bilingual corpus that offers a relatively wide range of text types. If we would use a corpus with, for example, only two different text types, the answer to the main research question would not be valid because more than two text types are necessary to be able to represent a wide range of text types. Although the number of text types the DPC offers is not very elaborate either, the DPC will still offer a more representative view of text types than other corpora with less text types.
2) A second problem is about Intellectual Property Rights (IPR). The English-Norwegian corpus, for example, is not accessible to the research community because of Intellectual Property Rights issues. The DPC addressed this problem by obtaining copyright clearance for all the texts included in the corpus, in order to make it accessible to the research community.

3) A third problem lies in the fact that “not all corpora are processed in the same way” (Macken et al., 2011, p. 377). In order to make sure that users of parallel corpora can retrieve source text examples with their translation, these corpora need to be aligned at sentence level, which is what the DPC did. This is mostly carried out automatically, with almost no manual intervention. However, this manual intervention is important for retrieving linguistic information, for example part-of-speech tags and lemma’s, essential for the multidisciplinary character of the corpus.

Not only does the DPC offer a language that is absent in many other corpora (Dutch), it also tackles some of the most common issues that create an obstacle for other researchers. Consequently, the DPC is preferable to other corpora in the light of the present study.

3.2 Data retrieval

We will extract sentences from the DPC according to the following conditions:

1) English source text sentences that contain the connective “therefore” and their Dutch translation (in order to find, among other things, instances of implicitation);

2) Dutch source text sentences and their English translation containing the connective “therefore” (in order to find, among other things, instances of explicitation).

For each English source text sentence and its Dutch translation, we will examine if and how “therefore” is translated. For each Dutch source text sentence and its English translation, we will examine what the Dutch source text equivalent is of “therefore”, if there is any. The annotation of the Dutch and English translations will then be observed to see whether there is implicitation in the Dutch translations of the English source text sentences and whether there is explicitation in the English translation of the Dutch source text sentences.
Instances of *implicitation* will be detected as follows:

In order to detect instances of *implicitation*, we will concentrate on English source text sentences that contain “therefore” and the Dutch translation of those source text sentences. The definition¹ we use for *implicitation* implies that we come across an instance of *implicitation* if something is made implicit in the target text which was explicit in the source text, relying on the context or situation to convey the meaning. In practice this means that whenever we detect an English source text sentences that contains the connective “therefore”, but that connective has not been translated into Dutch, this could possibly be an instance of *implicitation*. As to find instances of *implicitation*, we will check in our selected data whether the context or situation conveyed the meaning that normally would have been conveyed by translating the connective “therefore” from the English source text sentence. An example to clarify the process:

**English source text**

(Preceding discourse: Care has been taken to ensure that the information in this publication is accurate, but this information is not contractual.)

**Therefore** ArcelorMittal and any other ArcelorMittal Group company do not accept any liability for errors or omissions or any information that is found to be misleading.

**Dutch target text**

ArcelorMittal en elk ander bedrijf van de ArcelorMittal-Groep aanvaarden geen enkele aansprakelijkheid voor fouten of gebreken of voor informatie die misleidend wordt geacht.

Although “therefore” is not translated, there is no shift in meaning in the translation and it is possible for the target audience to understand that this sentence is a logical consequence (that would normally have been expressed by a connective like “daarom”) of the preceding discourse.

---

¹ *Implicitation*:

“A stylistic translation technique which consists of making what is explicit in the source language implicit in the target language, relying on the context or the situation for conveying the meaning, as the addressee might be able to infer the non-verbalized information”
Instances of *explicitation* will be detected as follows:

In order to detect instances of *explicitation*, we will concentrate on Dutch source text sentences and their English translation containing the connective “therefore”. According to the definition\(^2\) of *explicitation* we use for the present study (2), *explicitation* occurs if something that is absent in the source text is made present in the target text, although the target text reader might still be able to infer it if it were not present in the target text. This means that whenever we detect a Dutch source text sentence that has no source text equivalent for the connective “therefore” of the English target text sentence, this could possibly be an instance of *explicitation*. As to find instances of *explicitation*, we will check in our corpus entries whether the target text sentence that contains the connective “therefore” would convey the same meaning if “therefore” were not present. An example to clarify the process:

**Dutch source text**

We mogen allemaal trots zijn op wat we vandaag hebben bereikt.

**English target text**

(Preceding discourse: It is the fulfilment of a dream to reunite our continent and thus create a free and prosperous Europe.)

Today *therefore* marks an achievement that we should all be proud of.

In the Dutch source text there is no connective present that could be an equivalent for the connective “therefore” in the English target text. However, if we would leave “therefore” out of the target text (“Today marks an achievement that we should all be proud of.”), the meaning would still be conveyed as the preceding discourse makes clear that the selected sentence is a logical consequence.

Provided that we find both *implicitation* and *explicitation*, we will test the Asymmetry Hypothesis. Should there be more *explicitation* than *implicitation*, than these findings would confirm the Asymmetry Hypothesis for the language pair English-Dutch.

---

\(^2\) *Explicitation*:

“Explicitation refers to the translation universal that may be defined as the verbalization of information that is absent in the source text but present in the target text and which the addressee might be able to infer (e.g. from the preceding discourse) if it were not verbalized”.

3.3 Annotation

3.3.1 Instances of implicitation

In order to assemble the corpus entries we need for this part of the annotation, we extracted all English target text sentences that contain the connective “therefore” from the DPC. As we want to observe instances of implicitation and detect the most common translations of “therefore”, we selected 209 out of the 256 English source text sentences that contain the connective “therefore” and their translation. The 47 other sentences were not selected because of two possible reasons:

1) sentences appear more than once (repetition)
2) sentences are incomplete, for example when there is no English source text sentence or no Dutch translation

An example of what the annotation will look like when analysing English source text sentences that contain the connective “therefore” and their Dutch translation:

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English source text</th>
<th>Dutch translation</th>
<th>Translation of “therefore”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 The editor-in-chief needed the article immediately and therefore he started yelling at the journalist.</td>
<td>De eindredacteur had het artikel meteen nodig en begon te roepen tegen de journalist.</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 The president will therefore punish such action.</td>
<td>Daarom zal de voorzitter zo’n actie bestraffen.</td>
<td>daarom</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In table 1, we give two fictitious examples of corpus entries. In example (1), we see the English source language sentence containing the connective “therefore”, and the translation of the sentence into Dutch. In this example “therefore” is not translated. The inference in the English source text sentence which is explicitated by “therefore” and which links the two juxtaposed constituents, is no longer explicitly present in the Dutch target text sentence. In this case, we can speak of implicitation, because in the Dutch translation, the yelling at the
journalist is not explicitly mentioned as a consequence of his immediate need: no translation of "therefore" is explicitly mentioned. Although the inference is not explicitly present in the target text sentence, the target audience will most likely understand that the yelling at the journalist is a consequence of the editor-in-chief’s need.

In example (2), contrary to the first example, the connective “therefore” is translated as “daarom”. The inference in the English sentence which is explicitated by the connective “therefore” is present in the Dutch translation as well. In this case we cannot speak of implicitation because the inference is not left implicit in translation.

3.3.2 Instances of explicitation

In order to assemble the corpus entries we need for this part of the annotation, we extracted all English target text sentences that contain the connective “therefore” from the DPC. With the aim of observing instances of explicitation, we selected 691 out of the 701 Dutch source text sentences and their translation into English containing the connective “therefore”. The 10 other sentences were not selected because of the same reasons indicated above. For each of the 691 sentences, we manually annotated the source language connective which we consider to have led to the translation “therefore” in English.

An example of what the annotation will look like when analysing Dutch source text sentences and their English translation containing the connective “therefore”:

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dutch source text</th>
<th>English translation</th>
<th>Dutch equivalent for “therefore”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Het leek wel de beste dag van zijn leven te zijn.</td>
<td>Today <strong>therefore</strong> felt like the best day of his life.</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 <strong>Daarom</strong> zal hij tegen morgen nog niet klaar zijn.</td>
<td><strong>Therefore</strong>, he will not have finished by tomorrow.</td>
<td><strong>daarom</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In table 2, we give again two fictitious examples of corpus entries. In example (1), we see the Dutch source text sentence and the translation of that sentence in English, containing the connective “therefore”. In this example, there is no Dutch equivalent for “therefore” in the source text and thus the inference in the English target text sentence which is explicitated by
the connective “therefore” is not present in the Dutch source text sentence. Imagine that the following sentence is the preceding discourse: “He finally found his biological parents”. The addition of “therefore” in the target text sentence is in this case an instance of *explicitation* because the feeling of having the best day of his life is explicitly mentioned as the consequence of something that is mentioned in the preceding discourse. Even without the addition of “therefore”, the target audience would most likely still be able to understand that that the feeling of having the best day of his life is a consequence of finally finding his biological parents.

In example (2), contrary to the first example, there is a Dutch equivalent for “therefore” in the source text: “daarom”. The inference in the English target text sentence which is explicitated by the connective “therefore” is present in the Dutch source text sentence as well. In this case we cannot speak of *explicitation* because the inference was yet explicit in the source text sentence.

### 3.4 Becher’s triggers (2011)

In order to find out why translators explicitate or implicitate, we will try to make a subdivision of the results using Becher’s five triggers of *explicitation* and *implicitation* (2011) that he used to subdivide the results of his research. These triggers are a good starting point as we do not know the identity of most of the translators whose translations are in the DPC (which is why we cannot ask them why they explicitated or implicitated). Another reason why we base the present study on Becher’s research is because he uncovers some issues concerning a dogma in the field of translation studies (Blum-Kulka’s Explicitation Hypothesis, 1986). As the focus of the present study is mainly on *explicitation* (and *implicitation*), it is important to take different views into consideration as to have a more comprehensive idea on the matter.

In the next section, I will sum up Becher’s five triggers of *explicitation* and *implicitation* and subsequently describe them more elaborately. Although Becher (2011) only discusses examples of *explicitation*, the same reasoning applies to connectives that have been implicitated (p. 32). Similarly, we will only discuss examples of *explicitation*, as the inclusion of examples of *implicitation* would not bring added value.
3.4.1 Becher’s method, based on Becher 2011

Becher’s five triggers:

(1) Comply with the communicative norms of the target language community
(2) Exploit specific features of the target language system
(3) Deal with specific restrictions of the target language system
(4) Avoid stylistically marked ways of expression
(5) Optimize the cohesion of the target text

Trigger (1) “Comply with the communicative norms of the target language community” implies that the translator adds connectives in order to fit in the target text. In the following example, the connective “damit” is added in the German translation of the English sentence.

1) **EngOrig:** We outperformed the S & P 500 for the second consecutive year, and we’ve now beaten the index nine years out of the past 11.
   
   **GerTrans:** Zum zweiten Mal in Folge haben wir ein besseres Ergebnis erzielt als der S & P 500 und den Index damit 9 Mal in den letzten 11 Jahren geschlagen.

   Gloss: “...therefore we’ve now beaten the index nine years out of the past 11.”

According to Becher, “damit” was added because in general “damit” appears significantly more frequent than the English equivalents “thus” and “then”, which hardly appear at all. “Damit” can thus be seen as a “communicative norm” of the target language community: when adding that connective in translation, it makes the translation fit in the target text as “damit” is a frequently used connective in German. A similar situation could occur in the Dutch translation of an English sentence:

2) **EngOrig:** Hundreds of people want their money back and now the banks are in deep trouble.
   
   **DutTrans:** Honderden mensen willen hun geld terug en daarom zitten de banken nu in de problemen.

   Gloss: “... and therefore, the banks are in deep trouble”

Assuming that the English sentence is a part of a business text, the following reasoning (similar to Becher’s reasoning) would apply: while “daarom” in general occurs rather
frequently in Dutch, Becher (2011) observed that English equivalents like “thus” or “therefore” were found to occur hardly at all in English business texts (p. 32).

If we would try to apply this trigger on our corpus entries (that all contain “therefore”), a difficulty arises. Since we analyse only sentences containing the word “therefore”, this trigger would either always be applicable, for every corpus entry of the present study, or never. There are two options: (1) generally, “therefore” is used more frequently than a Dutch equivalent like “daarom” or “dan ook” (2) generally, “therefore” is used less frequently than a Dutch equivalent like “daarom” or “dan ook”. Because of this difficulty, we will not include this trigger in the analysis of the corpus entries but instead we will alter Becher’s trigger system to one that is applicable on the corpus entries of the present study.

Trigger (2) “Exploit specific features of the target language system” means that sometimes a connective is added in order to “make full use of the offered syntactical and lexical features of the target language system”. For example, some syntactical slots are present in one language but not in the other language and vice versa. In his study, Becher explains this trigger by means of several examples. For instance:

3) **EngOrig**: Medical Systems used it to open up a commanding technology lead in several diagnostic platforms [...].

**GerTrans**: Medical Systems z.B. [‘for example’] hat dadurch seine technologische Führungsposition bei diversen Diagnosesystemen erlangt [...].

Gloss: “As a result medical Systems, for example, …”

The German translation of the English sentence has the phrase ‘z.B.’ after the subject of the sentence. This position is called the after-first-position or in German the *Nacherstposition*. The phrase ‘z.B.’ in this position is tagged on the first constituent of the sentence, “since elements filling this syntactic slot are integrated into the sentence prosodically and syntactically” (Breindl, 2008, as cited in Becher, 2011, p. 33). In English, this after-first-position does not exist. Consequently, inserting ‘for example’ in that non-existing position, would give either an ambiguous sentence (Medical systems for example used to…) or require comma’s (Medical systems, for example, used to…). This example shows us that German allows for a more flexible use of certain connectives due to this after-first-position. In the language pair English-Dutch, the trigger would look very similar.
4) **EngOrig**: Disadvantaged adults have less choice on the labour market.

**DutchTrans**: Kansarme volwassene hebben daarentegen minder keuze op de arbeidsmarkt.

Gloss: “Disadvantaged adults, on the other hand, have...”

Similar to the English-German example, “daarentegen” is explicitated because English grammar cannot insert an equivalent connective in the same syntactic position (*Disadvantaged adults have in contrast less choice on the labour market*). As opposed to the first trigger, this trigger can be applied on the corpus entries of the present study.

Trigger (3) “Deal with specific restrictions of the target language system” suggests that when the target language does not offer a close equivalent to a certain source language construction (a lack of certain target language features), the translator tends to add a connective. One of Becher’s examples is the English –*ing*-adjunct. This adjunct serves as an example of a language construction that is hard or impossible to translate with a similar construction in the target language.

5) **EngOrig**: Throughout the world, our operating divisions are sharing service facilities and administrative offices wherever appropriate, saving tens of millions in field operating costs.

**GerTrans**: Überall in der Welt nutzen unsere Betriebsabteilungen Einrichtungen und Büros gemeinsam, wo immer dies sinnvoll ist, und sparen dadurch Millionen an Betriebskosten vor Ort ein.

Gloss: “...and in this way save millions in field operating costs.”

The English source text uses the –*ing*-adjunct ‘saving’, but the German language does not offer a language construction that is equivalent to this English construction. In order to convey the message of the source text, the translator used the connective “dadurch”. This is regarded as an *explicitation* because the German translation now contains a causal connective, although the English –*ing*-adjunct does not necessarily need to be read as such. If the translator had chosen not to add this *explicitation*, the translation of the source text would have lost its linguistically encoded meaning. This trigger can also be applied to the language pair English-Dutch.
6) **EngOrig:** Harry lives with his parents, **saving money to buy his own house.**

**DutchTrans:** Harry woont bij zijn ouders en spaart zo geld om zijn eigen huis te kopen.

Gloss: “... and saves in this way money to buy his own house”

Similar to German language, Dutch does not offer a construction that is equivalent to the English -ing-adjunct. “Zo” was added in the Dutch translation as to convey the message of the source text. This trigger can be applied on the corpus entries of the present study.

Trigger (4) “Avoid stylistically marked ways of expression” means translators tend to explicitate, in order to produce a more standardized translation. The reason behind is that they want to “comply with standard, conventional target language usage” (Becher 2011, p. 39). Scholars mentioned that translated texts tend to be more “standardized” or “homogeneous” than non-translated texts. In other words, they tend to “move the text towards the centre of the oral-literate continuum” (Baker, 1996, p. 184) and avoid extremes, also referred to as leveling out (Baker, 1996) and convergence (Laviosa, 1998). Consider the following example.

7) **EngOrig:** We are better prepared today than at any other time to compete, to balance the paradoxical demands of the future marketplace, to earn the loyalty of consumers worldwide.

**GerTrans:** Wir sind heute besser denn je darauf vorbereitet, im Wettbewerb mitzuhalten, die widersprüchlichen Anforderungen kün iger Märkte zu erfüllen und uns weltweit das Vertrauen der Verbraucher zu verdienen.

Gloss: “...and to earn the loyalty of consumers worldwide.”

In the English source text, an asyndesis is used (to compete, to balance, to earn), “a stylistically marked rhetorical device” (Becher, 2011, p. 40) to highlight the three capacities of the company. When a sentence contains an asyndesis, it means that the sentence contains a construction with no grammatical linkage, as is the case in the example of trigger (4) (https://nl.thefreedictionary.com/). The translator chose to standardise the target text by turning the asyndesis into a syndesis. With syndesis we mean that a syndetic (= used as a conjunction) construction is being used (https://nl.thefreedictionary.com/). In order to turn the asyndesis into a syndesis, the translator added “und” [and] where there is no such connective in the English source text; in other words, he explicitated what was meant in the original English sentence. A possible reason why a translator would opt for this standardization is
avoiding the risk to present a text that “does not meet the acceptance of clients or readers” (Becher, 2011, p. 40). This fourth trigger can also be applied on the language pair English-Dutch:

8) **EngOrig:** We will try **to live healthy, to be kind** to other people, **to help make this world a better place.**

**DutchTrans:** We zullen proberen **gezond te leven, vriendelijk te zijn** tegen andere mensen **en ['and'] de wereld een beter plek te maken.**

**Gloss:** “... and to make the world a better place”

The reasoning applied here is similar to the reasoning of the English-German example: The asyndesis of the English source text sentence is turned into a syndesis in the Dutch target text sentence as to avoid that the target text would not meet the acceptance of the target audience. It seems that no difficulties would arise, should we apply this trigger on the corpus entries of the present study.

Trigger (5) “Optimize the cohesion of the target text” can be seen as some kind of residual group, meaning that at first sight, there is no reason why the translator added a connective in the translation. In this case, the translator most likely inserted a connective in order to optimize the cohesion of the target text, to make sure that the source text author and the target text readers understand each other. Therefore, the translator is seen as the “mediator between cultures” (Becher, 2011, p. 40). In his study, Becher offers a concrete example:

9) **GerOrig:** Flexible Preismodelle und Biet-Verfahren sind unter Kaufleuten seit jeher üblich. **Mit der Globalisierung der Märkte ist ein Verfahren nötig, mit dem Produkte weltweit angeboten werden können.**

**Gloss:** “With the globalization of the markets, a procedure is necessary…”

**EngTrans:** Flexible pricing models and bidding procedures have always been the norm among business people. **However the globalization of the markets means that a procedure is now necessary** whereby products can be offered world-wide.

The connective “however” appeared in the German-English translation with no specific reason other than to optimize the cohesion of the text. Even when the source text is not clear or even very vague, the reader or client will blame the translator for not conveying the message properly. It is in other words also the translator’s job to produce a clear, well-written
translated product, even if that implies adding certain cohesive devices, in this case connectives, where the author of the source text did not do so. In order to ‘improve’ the source text, a translator needs to “recognize its coherence, understand what every individual segment (e.g. sentence, paragraphs etc.) contributes to the overarching communicative purposes of the text” (Becher 2011, pp. 40-41). This is how a similar example would look in the language pair English-Dutch.

10) EngOrig: I will not go to that meeting, I have already given my opinion.
   DutchTrans: Ik ga niet naar die vergadering omdat ik mijn mening al gegeven heb.
   Gloss: “... because I have already given my opinion”

In this example, considering that we do not include the first trigger in our research, no particular reason other than optimizing the target text justifies the addition of “omdat” in the Dutch translation. As this is some sort of residual group (in case no other explanation fits this instance of explicitation), this trigger will probably be applicable on the corpus entries of the present study.

3.4.2 Application of Becher’s triggers on the data of the present study

Although we will not include the first trigger (“comply with the communicative norms of the target language community”), it is still possible to carry out our research. Due to the nature of our research (focusing on one connective instead of multiple), the outcome of this research may be seen as smaller and somewhat less representative version of Becher’s research. However, the results will not lose their value as similar research for the Dutch language is rather limited. This research may be carried out on a larger scale (examining more than one connective) in future studies.
4. Results: description, analysis and discussion

In this chapter we will describe, analyse and discuss the results of the corpus analysis.

The corpus analysis can be divided in two similar analyses:

1) English source text sentences that contain the connective “therefore” and their Dutch translation
2) Dutch source text sentences and their English translation containing the connective “therefore”

In order to clarify the results we will elaborate on, charts of the corpus analysis are added in the present chapter.

4.1 Description

4.1.1 Instances of implicitation

The first analysis we carried out was the analysis of English source text sentences that contain the connective “therefore” and their Dutch translation.

The graph above represents how “therefore” has been translated from English into Dutch in the DPC. In the corpus entries there appeared to be 24 different possible translations for
“therefore”. The translation that has been applied the most, is “daarom” (39.1%), followed by “derhalve” (15.5%), “dan ook” (12.1%) and “dus” (9.7%). In a considerable number of cases, “therefore” has not been translated (hence “NA”), namely in 4.8% of the cases. The other 20 applied translations are listed below:

- bijgevolg (4.8%)
- daardoor (2.9%)
- om deze reden (1.4%)
- om die reden (1%)
- daarmee (1%)
- waardoor (1%)
- omdat (0.5%)
- geen wonder dus dat (0.5%)
- om zo (0.5%)
- aldus (0.5%)
- zodoende (0.5%)
- vandaar (0.5%)
- mogelijk (0.5%)
- dit betekent dat (0.5%)
- dientengevolge (0.5%)
- hierdoor (0.5%)
- dit is ook de reden waarom (0.5%)
- hiervoor (0.5%)
- hiermee (0.5%)
- daartoe (0.5%)

Each translation that represents 1% of all possible translations appeared twice in the corpus entries and each translation that represents 0.5% of all possible translations appeared only once. In the table below, we sorted the translations by text genre to see whether or not the genre has an influence on how “therefore” is translated.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Frequency external texts</th>
<th>Frequency administrative texts</th>
<th>Frequency fictional literature</th>
<th>Frequency instructive texts</th>
<th>Frequency journalistic texts</th>
<th>Total frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>daarom</td>
<td>43.14% (22)</td>
<td>29.11% (23)</td>
<td>20% (1)</td>
<td>56.14% (32)</td>
<td>20% (3)</td>
<td>81 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>derhalve</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>18.99% (15)</td>
<td>20% (1)</td>
<td>28.07% (16)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dan ook</td>
<td>7.84% (4)</td>
<td>20.25% (16)</td>
<td>20% (1)</td>
<td>5.26% (3)</td>
<td>6.67% (1)</td>
<td>25 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dus</td>
<td>11.76% (6)</td>
<td>6.33% (5)</td>
<td>20% (1)</td>
<td>3.51% (2)</td>
<td>40% (6)</td>
<td>20 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bijgevolg</td>
<td>9.80% (5)</td>
<td>6.33% (5)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>daardoor</td>
<td>7.84% (4)</td>
<td>2.53% (2)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>om deze reden</td>
<td>1.96% (1)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3.51% (2)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>om die reden</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2.53% (2)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>daarmee</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2.53% (2)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>waardoor</td>
<td>1.96% (1)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6.67% (1)</td>
<td>2 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>omdat</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6.67% (1)</td>
<td>1 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>geen wonder dus dat</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6.67% (1)</td>
<td>1 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>om zo</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1.27% (1)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aldus</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1.27% (1)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zodoende</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1.27% (1)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vandaar</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1.27% (1)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Findings:

1) From the subdivision of translations of “therefore” according to text genre, we can tell that “daarom” is the most common translation of “therefore” for each text genre except for journalistic texts. In the latter, “dus” is the most frequent translation of “therefore”.

2) The second most frequent translation of “therefore” is different for each text genre: for external texts it is mostly “dus”, for administrative texts “dan ook”, for fictional literature, all five translations (“daarom”, “derhalve”, “dan ook”, “dus” and “mogelijk”) count for twenty percent, for instructive texts it is mostly “derhalve” and for journalistic texts mostly “daarom”.

3) Multiple times, “therefore” was not translated, hence “NA”. As regards journalistic texts, in 13.3% of the translations “therefore” was not translated, which makes it the text genre with the highest percentage for untranslated instances of “therefore”.

4) Some translation options appear only once: “omdat”, “geen wonder dus dat”, “om zo”,

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>mogelijken</th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>20% (1)</th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>1 (100%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>dit betekent dat</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1.27% (1)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dienstengevolge</td>
<td>1.96% (1)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hierdoor</td>
<td>1.96% (1)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat is ook de reden waarom</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1.27% (1)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hiervoor</td>
<td>1.96% (1)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hiermee</td>
<td>1.96% (1)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>daartoe</td>
<td>1.96% (1)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>5.88% (3)</td>
<td>3.80% (3)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3.51% (2)</td>
<td>13.33% (2)</td>
<td>10 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total frequency</td>
<td>51 (100%)</td>
<td>80 (100%)</td>
<td>5 (100%)</td>
<td>47 (100%)</td>
<td>15 (100%)</td>
<td>198 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“aldus”, “zodoende”, “vandaar”, “mogelijk”, “dit betekent dat”, “dientengevolge”, “hierdoor”, “dat is ook de reden waarom”, “hiervoor”, “hiermee” and “daartoe”. This means that 58.3% of all translations of “therefore” that were found in the corpus entries appear only once.

4.1.2 Instances of explicitation

The second analysis we carried out was the analysis of Dutch source text sentences that contain the connective “therefore” and their English translation.

The graph above represents which connectives have been translated by “therefore”. As opposed to the previous paragraph, which contains a graph that represents the translations of the connective “therefore”, this graph does not show us how “therefore” is translated from an original English text in a translated Dutch text, but which words have been translated as “therefore”. When we list up the most frequent source text connectives that have been translated as “therefore”, we see a list that shows resemblance to the list of most frequent translations of “therefore”: the most frequent source text connective in translations from Dutch into English is “dus” with 40.6%. “Dus” is followed by “daarom” (23.2%), “dan ook” (17.7%), “bijgevolg” (2.3%) and “daardoor” (2.3%). Some instances had no connective in the Dutch source text, although the connective “therefore” was present in the English target text.
That was the case in 4.2%. As regards the connectives that I did not mention, the difference in percentage is negligible. Placing both results next to each other, the resemblance becomes clear:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1 (English → Dutch)</th>
<th>Table 2 (Dutch → English)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 “daarom” (39.1%)</td>
<td>“dus” (40.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 “derhalve” (15.5%)</td>
<td>“daarom” (23.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 “dan ook” (12.1%)</td>
<td>“dan ook” (17.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 “dus” (9.7%)</td>
<td>“bijgevolg” (2.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 “bijgevolg” (4.8%)</td>
<td>“daardoor” (2.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 “daardoor” (2.9%)</td>
<td>“zo” (1.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 “om deze reden” (1.4%)</td>
<td>“daarmee” (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 “om die reden” (1.0%)</td>
<td>“derhalve” (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 “waardoor” (1.0%)</td>
<td>“waardoor” (0.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 “daarmee” (1.0%)</td>
<td>“aldus” (0.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 “daartoe” (0.5%)</td>
<td>“op die manier” (0.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 “hiermee” (0.5%)</td>
<td>“dan” (0.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 “hiervoor” (0.5%)</td>
<td>“vandaar dat” (0.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Dutch Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>“omdat” (0.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>“geen wonder dus dat” (0.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>“aldus” (0.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>“om zo” (0.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>“zodoende” (0.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>“vandaar” (0.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>“mogelijk” (0.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>“dit betekent dat” (0.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>“dientengevolge” (0.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>“hierdoor” (0.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>“dit is ook de reden waarom” (0.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Focussing on the first six Dutch connectives in both table 1 and 2, the sequence may not be exactly the same for the translation from English into Dutch and from Dutch into English, but five out of six connectives correspond: “daarom”, “dan ook”, “dus”, “bijgevolg” and “daardoor”. The position of “derhalve”, however, is rather surprising. In table 1, “derhalve” is positioned at the second place with 15.5%, which means that “derhalve” is very frequently used as a translation of “therefore”. If we compare its position in table 1 with the position in table 2, we notice a big difference: 15.5% in table 1 versus only 1% in table 2. We tried to find an explanation in the existing translation universals that we described in the theoretical framework of the present study:

- “Therefore” is not translated with “derhalve” as to simplify the language or message (simplification) as it is a rather archaic and formal word in Dutch.
- The rather high percentage of “derhalve” used as a translation of “therefore” may be a case of leveling out. That translation universal would be applicable if a certain construction/connective/... appears often in translation, resulting in target texts that do not show a lot of variation as opposed to the source texts. However, due to the study design, the connective in the source text sentences is always the same. Therefore, we cannot prove that the source texts show more variation as the target texts.
- In the studies Baker wrote in 1993 and 1996, she suggested that translators would rather use more conservative language (the translator tries to comply with the communicative norms of the target language community) than authors of non-translated texts. An article on Onzetaal (2011) suggests that “derhalve” is a rather conservative word and thus this translation seems to be a fine example of the translation universal normalization or conservatism.

Another remarkable difference is the percentage of the connectives “dus” and “daarom” in table 1 and table 2. In table 1, “dus” represents 9.7% and “daarom” 39.1% of all translation of “therefore” and in table 2, “dus” represents 40.6% and “daarom” 23.2% of all translations of “therefore”. However, the position of both connectives is similar in table 1 and table 2 (unlike
the position of “derhalve”), which makes the remarkable difference less relevant. In table 1, “dus” is the fourth most frequent translation of “therefore” and “daarom” the first and in table 2, “dus” is the first most frequent source text connective and “daarom” the second.

The percentage of instances that have no Dutch connective, “NA” (or no connective in the Dutch source text although the connective “therefore” is present in the English target text; or no translation for “therefore” in the Dutch target text, although the connective “therefore” is present in the English source text) is relatively similar for both table 1 and table 2: 4.8% for table 1 and 3.8% for table 2.

We could conclude from the comparison of both tables (translations from English into Dutch and from Dutch into English) that the first results seem to be relatively similar, except for the frequency of the connective “derhalve”.

4.2 Analysis

4.2.1 Analysis according to our adaptation of Becher’s triggers

After selecting instances of explicitation and implicitation, these results were analysed (see Appendix) according to our adaptation of Becher’s triggers. In the method chapter, we decided not to include the first trigger in our research. This means that we would use triggers 2 (exploit specific features of the target language system), 3 (deal with specific restrictions of the target language system), 4 (avoid stylistically marked ways of expression) and 5 (optimize the cohesion of the target text) to analyse the instances of explicitation and implicitation. That analysis was not as straightforward as initially expected. First of all, some translations, especially when analysing instances of implicitation, had a very different word order from the original text which made it hard to link the explicitations to the triggers. That difficulty did not occur in Becher’s study (the examples he gives to explain his triggers have a rather similar word order) and that is why it is hard to subdivide these results: we do not know how Becher would subdivide such sentences. When it was unclear to which trigger the instance of explicitation or implicitation could be attributed, the instance was attributed to trigger 5 (optimize the cohesion of the target text), as that trigger is regarded as some kind of residual group. However, some explicitations or implicitations did not seem to “optimize the cohesion of the target text”. Consider the following example of our corpus entries.
EngOrig: “That is the right way to go, and therefore I very much congratulate the rapporteur and hope that we will not support the amendments to an excellent report.”

DutchTrans: “Nogmaals, mijn complimenten aan de rapporteur. Ik hoop dat het Parlement de amendementen op dit uitstekende verslag niet zal steunen.”

In the Dutch translation, a Dutch equivalent (e.g. “daarom”) of the connective “therefore” has been implicitated. Neither trigger 1, nor 2, nor 3 can be applied. Although the message of the original text may be conveyed, the implicitation of the translation of “therefore” does not seem to have “optimized” the target text. Therefore, trigger 5 does not seem to be the appropriate trigger. A temporary solution would be a residual group including all instances: instances of explicitation or implicitation that optimize the cohesion of the target text and instances that make the translation less cohesive. In Becher’s triggers, trigger 5 functions as a residual group, but the instances in that group should all have the feature of optimizing the cohesion of the target text (which is not always the case in our corpus entries). Therefore, a general residual group would be a safer option.

As regards the instances of explicitation, 14 out of 25 could be classified in the residual group (56%), 11 could be attributed to Becher’s trigger 2 (44%) (exploit specific features of the target language system) and 0 instances to triggers 3 (deal with specific restrictions of the target language system) and 4 (avoid stylistically marked ways of expression). As regards the instances of implicitation, 5 out of 10 could be classified in the residual group (50%), 4 could be attributed to Becher’s trigger 2 (40%), 1 to Becher’s trigger 4 (10%) and 0 to Becher’s trigger 3.

It appears that in our study, more than half of the instances can be classified in the residual group. The fact that a great part of the explicitations and implicitations cannot be attributed to one of the triggers might have something to do with the difference in corpus entries. As Becher’s study did not contain example sentences with a word order that differed a lot from the original text, we do not know how to classify such instances that occurred in our corpus entries and hence we classified these instances in the residual group.

4.2.2 Analysis according to the Asymmetry Hypothesis

In order to find out whether or not Becher’s Asymmetry Hypothesis is applicable to language pairs other than German-English, we need to examine if obligatory, optional and pragmatic explicitations are more frequent than the corresponding implicitations, regardless of the
SL/TL constellation at hand. With that goal in mind, we established a comprehensive definition of both *explicitation* and *implicitation* in the theoretical framework. These definitions were:

**Implicitation:**
A stylistic translation technique which consists of making what is explicit in the source language implicit in the target language, relying on the context or the situation for conveying the meaning, as the addressee might be able to infer the non-verbalized information.

**Explicitation:**
A translation technique which consists of verbalizing information that is absent in the source text but present in the target text and which the addressee might be able to infer (e.g. from the preceding discourse) if it were not verbalized.

In order to detect instances of *implicitation*, we concentrated on English source text sentences that contain “therefore” and the Dutch translation of those source text sentences. The definition implies that we come across an instance of *implicitation* if something is made implicit in the target text which was explicit in the source text, relying on the context or situation to convey the meaning. In practice this means that if an English source text sentence was detected that contained the connective “therefore”, but without a Dutch equivalent in its translation, this could possibly be an instance of *implicitation* (referred to as “NA” in the tables above that show the possible translations of “therefore”). As to find instances of *implicitation*, we checked in our selected data whether the context or situation conveyed the meaning that normally would have been conveyed by translating the connective “therefore” from the English source text sentence.

Out of 209 useful English source text sentences and their translation, 10 did not have a translation for the connective “therefore” and accordingly, those were possible instances of *implicitation*. For each instance we verified if, as is mentioned in our definition of *implicitation*, the addressee might be able to infer the non-verbalized information. Consider the following example.
English source text

(Preceding discourse: Care has been taken to ensure that the information in this publication is accurate, but this information is not contractual.)

Therefore ArcelorMittal and any other ArcelorMittal Group company do not accept any liability for errors or omissions or any information that is found to be misleading.

Dutch target text

ArcelorMittal en elk ander bedrijf van de ArcelorMittal-Groep aanvaarden geen enkele aansprakelijkheid voor fouten of gebreken of voor informatie die misleidend wordt geacht.

Although “therefore” is not translated, there is no shift in meaning in the translation and it is possible for the target text reader to understand that this sentence is a logical consequence (that would normally have been expressed by a connective like “daarom”) of the preceding discourse.

For all 10 instances, there was no shift in meaning and the target text reader could easily infer the non-verbalized information. This means that all the 10 instances are instances of implicitation, covering 4.8% of all useful corpus entries.

In order to detect instances of explicitation, we concentrated on Dutch source text sentences and their English translation containing the connective “therefore”. According to the definition of explicitation we established, explicitation occurs if something that is absent in the source text is made present in the target text, although the target reader might still be able to infer it if it were not present in the target text. In concrete terms this means that whenever we detect a Dutch source text sentence that has no source text equivalent for the connective “therefore” of the English target text sentence, this could possibly be an instance of explicitation (referred to as “NA” in the tables above that show the possible translations of “therefore”). As to find instances of explicitation, we checked in our selected data whether the target text sentence that contains the connective “therefore” would convey the same meaning if “therefore” were not present.

Out of 691 useful Dutch source text sentences and their translation, 26 source text sentences did not have an equivalent for “therefore”. For each instance we verified whether the target text sentence would still convey the same meaning if the connective “therefore” would not be present. An example of one of those sentences:
Dutch source text

We mogen allemaal trots zijn op wat we vandaag hebben bereikt.

English target text

(Preceding discourse: It is the fulfilment of a dream to reunite our continent and thus create a free and prosperous Europe.)

Today *therefore* marks an achievement that we should all be proud of.

In the Dutch source text there is no connective present that could be an equivalent of the connective “therefore” in the English target text. However, if we would leave “therefore” out of the target text (“Today marks an achievement that we should all be proud of.”), the meaning would still be conveyed as the preceding discourse makes clear that the selected sentence is a logical consequence.

In the end, 25 out of 26 instances did not have a shift in meaning and even if the connective were not verbalized, the target text reader would still be able to infer the inference. This means that those 25 instances are instances of *explicitation*. The other instance did have a shift in meaning: the connective “daarnaast” in Dutch is a listing connective while the connective “therefore” is a causal connective.

Dutch source text


English target text

(Preceding discourse: In the first place more young talent must go on to higher education and be encouraged to take more scientific and technical/technological studies.) A career as a researcher must *therefore* become a more attractive proposition: more young graduates must be given the chance to pursue postgraduate research and later capitalise on their research in economic or social terms" states the policy document Economie, Ondernemen, Wetenschap, Innovatie en Buitenlandse Handel 2004-2009.

As opposed to “therefore”, “daarnaast” does not imply that that sentence is a consequence of the preceding sentence. Due to the shift in meaning, this instance is not an instance of explicitation.
Instances of *implicitation* vs. instances of *explicitation*

Now that we have observed how many instances of *implicitation* and *explicitation* are present in the retrieved data, we can test Becher’s Asymmetry Hypothesis (2010): “Obligatory, optional and pragmatic explicitations tend to be more frequent than the corresponding implicitations regardless of the SL/TL constellation at hand” (p. 17). This means that we could confirm the Asymmetry Hypothesis if we find in our retrieved data (English and Dutch sentences) more explicitations than corresponding implicitations. We learned that for our data 4.8% of all English source text sentences and their Dutch translation are implicitations and 3.8% of all Dutch source text sentences and their English translation explicitations. These results do not confirm the Asymmetry Hypothesis as there are more instances of *implicitation* than of *explicitation*. 
5. Conclusion

The objective of the present study was to formulate an answer to the following research questions: (1) What is the most common translation of “therefore” in the Dutch Parallel Corpus? Does the genre (journalistic texts, administrative texts, external communication, fictional literature and instructive texts) have an influence on how “therefore” is translated? (2) Can the addition or omission of connectives in the language pair English-Dutch be attributed to the triggers Becher established to clarify why translators add or omit connectives? (3) Do we make observations similar to Becher’s observations, i.e., are the obligatory, optional and pragmatic explicitations more frequent than the corresponding implicitations? If that is the case, does that mean that obligatory, optional and pragmatic explicitations are more frequent than the corresponding implicitations, regardless of the SL/TL constellation at hand? In other words, is Becher’s Asymmetry Hypothesis applicable to language pairs other than German-English?

In this chapter we will summarize the results of the study investigating those research questions.

As regards question (1), the most common translation of “therefore” in the Dutch Parallel Corpus is “daarom” with 39.1%, followed by “derhalve” with 15.5%, “dan ook” with 12.1% and “dus” with 9.7%. It is rather remarkable that “derhalve” is on the second place as it is a quite formal and archaic word in Dutch. However, the translation universal normalization or conservatism seems to explain this peculiarity.

The results concerning the most frequent Dutch source text connectives translated into English are similar to the most common translation of “therefore”: “dus” is the most common Dutch source text connective that is translated as “therefore” with 40.6%, followed by “daarom” with 23.2%, “dan ook” with 17.7% and “bijgevolg” and “daardoor” with 2.3%.

In general, it appeared that the genre did not have a major influence: except for the journalistic genre, the most frequent translation of “therefore” in the other genres (administrative texts, external communication, fictional literature and instructive texts) was “daarom”. The second most frequent translation of “therefore” was different for each genre. In terms of administrative texts, the second most frequent translation was “dan ook”, in external communication “dus”, in instructive texts “derhalve” and in fictional literature the
five possible translations ("daarom", "derhalve", "dan ook", "dus" and "mogelijk") each counted for 20%.

As regards question (2) concerning Becher’s triggers, there was a difficulty that made it rather challenging to classify the instances of *explicitation* and *implicitation* according to Becher’s triggers. Not all the instances that appeared in our corpus entries seemed to optimize the cohesion of the target text. This means that if we came across an instance that could not be attributed to trigger number 2, 3 or 4, but that also did not seem to optimize the cohesion of the target text, we would not know how to categorize that instance (as trigger 5 contains only instances that optimize the cohesion of the target text). Therefore, we chose to slightly alter Becher’s trigger system: we changed trigger 5 into a residual group, containing both instances that do optimize the cohesion of the target text and instances that do not optimize the cohesion of the target text. Another amendment we already implemented in the method chapter concerns trigger 1: we decided not to include trigger 1 in our research, as trigger 1 would either always be applicable or never (due to the focus of the present study on the connective “therefore”). All things considered, it is difficult to answer the question whether the addition or omission of connectives in the language pair English-Dutch can be attributed to the triggers Becher established to clarify why translators add or omit connectives. For the present study we were able to use Becher’s trigger system but in an altered form. If, however, future studies would set up a research with similar conditions to that of Becher (focusing on multiple connectives; examples of *explicitation* and *implicitation* in which the word order does not differ very much), then it is rather likely that Becher’s unaltered trigger system would be applicable to the language pair English-Dutch.

As regards the third and final question (3) concerning Becher’s Asymmetry Hypothesis, we came to the conclusion that the Hypothesis is not confirmed for the English-Dutch corpus entries of the present study. As for the Asymmetry Hypothesis to be applicable on our language pair, there should be more instances of obligatory, optional and pragmatic explicitations than corresponding implicitations. The results of the present study, however, are the other way around: 4.8% of all English source text sentences and their Dutch translation are *implicitations* and 3.8% of all Dutch source text sentences and their English translation *explicitations*. Although the difference is very small (only 1%), we cannot confirm Becher’s Asymmetry Hypothesis.
6. Discussion

Although the present study has led to interesting results, some nuances should be taken into consideration. First, it should be noted that the present study only investigates *explicitation* and *implicitation* of the connective “therefore”. This means this study probably would have had a more elaborate outcome if the focus was not exclusively on the connective “therefore”, but on multiple connectives. Second, the total number of instances of *explicitations* and *implicitations* is rather limited. Only 25 instances of *explicitation* of the connective “therefore” and 10 instances of *implicitation* were found. Such a small number of useful corpus entries does not truly represent all existing instances of *explicitation* and *implicitation* of “therefore”. However, the present study might be a good start for the language pair English-Dutch and future studies could consider using a more elaborate corpus, if possible, to obtain more representative results.
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## 8. Appendix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dutch source text</th>
<th>English target text</th>
<th>Explicitation</th>
<th>Trigger</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. We mogen allemaal trots zijn op wat we vandaag hebben bereikt.</td>
<td>(It is the fulfilment of a dream to reunite our continent and thus create a free and prosperous Europe.) Today therefore marks an achievement that we should all be proud of.</td>
<td>Explicitation</td>
<td>Residual group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Dat kan volgens de BBL-economisten de rente op de Amerikaanse 10-jaarsobligaties in de richting van 5,25% duwen binnen zes maanden.</td>
<td>(On the other hand, we do not expect this cap to be pierced until interest rates begin to rise again, probably at the end of the second quarter.) Therefore, according to BBL's economists, this could sway American 10-year bond rates towards 5.25% over six months.</td>
<td>Explicitation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. De daling van de Zwitserse frank die voor dit jaar was vooropgesteld, wordt pas in het volgende kwartaal verwacht.</td>
<td>(Fundamentally, the Swiss franc is expected to take a downward turn, however the tension in the Middle East will maintain the CHF’s status as safe-haven currency.) Therefore, the decline of the Swiss franc which was projected for this year will probably not begin until the third quarter.</td>
<td>Explicitation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Ze bieden voor een beperkt risico toch mooie returnvooruitzichten;</td>
<td>(Over the past five years, these shares have produced the best risk/return ratio.) For a limited risk therefore, they offer appreciable return prospects;</td>
<td>Explicitation</td>
<td>Residual group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. De opwaartse winstherzieningen halen</td>
<td>(On the corporate profits front, things are also looking</td>
<td>Explicitation</td>
<td>Residual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>geleidelijk de bovenhand op de neerwaartse herzieningen, wat de aanleiding geeft tot goedkopere waarderingen en de beurzen opnieuw aantrekkelijker maakt.</td>
<td>rosy.) More positive profit revisions are gradually gaining the upper hand over negative revisions, resulting in cheaper valuations and therefore more attractive stock markets again.</td>
<td>group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Ook voor de komende jaren lijkt de groep stevig in het zadel te zitten.</td>
<td>(Liqueurs also put their best foot forward with outstanding sales of Cointreau and Passoa thanks to a well-oiled sales and marketing policy.) Therefore, the company also seems to be sitting nicely for the years to come.</td>
<td>Explicitation 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Hoewel een oorlog tussen Irak en de VS ongetwijfeld een impact zou hebben op de reisbusiness en de luxesector, blijft het aandeel LVMH koopwaardig.</td>
<td>(The group is persevering along the path of internal growth, shedding loss-making posts and reducing its level of indebtedness.) Although a war between Iraq and the United States would inevitably impact on travel activities and therefore also on the luxury sector, we continue to recommend buying LVMH.</td>
<td>Explicitation Residual group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>De regering is zich ervan bewust dat dit zorgvuldigheid vereist bij het indienen van de begroting voor 2007.</td>
<td>(Elections to a new House of Representatives will be held on 22 November.) The government realises that it must therefore exercise caution in submitting the budget for 2007.</td>
<td>Explicitation Residual group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Daarnaast moet de loopbaan als onderzoeker aantrekkelijker worden: meer jonge afgestudeerden moeten kansen krijgen doctoraatsonderzoek te verrichten om vervolgens hun onderzoek economisch of maatschappelijk te</td>
<td>(In the first place more young talent must go on to higher education and be encouraged to take more scientific and technical/technological studies.) A career as a researcher must therefore become a more attractive proposition: more young</td>
<td>Other relation: DUT: listing connective ENG: causal connective NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td>Explicitation</td>
<td>Residual group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>&quot;valoriseren&quot;, zegt de Beleidsnota Economie, Ondernemen, Wetenschap, Innovatie en Buitenlandse Handel 2004-2009. graduates must be given the chance to pursue postgraduate research and later capitalise on their research in economic or social terms&quot; states the policy document Economie, Ondernemen, Wetenschap, Innovatie en Buitenlandse Handel 2004-2009.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Het is meer dan raadzaam om op een doordachte manier met deze voedselbronnen om te springen. Dit gebeurt bij voorkeur binnen een gestructureerd kader op basis van grensoverschrijdende afspraken. (Whereas land-based food production can be stepped up, seafood resources are more complicated.) We therefore need to think carefully about how we exploit these food sources, preferably within a structured framework based on cross-border agreements.</td>
<td>Explicitation</td>
<td>Residual group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Elke leerling wint ermee. (By opting for a comprehensive approach, the school not only provides better educational opportunities to children from deprived backgrounds, but also to children who do not meet the equal opportunities indicators.) Therefore, there are beneficial effects on all pupils.</td>
<td>Explicitation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>- De verplichting tot het voldoen van het loon van de werknemer valt ten laste van de onderneming die de arbeidsovereenkomst heeft gesloten, ongeacht wie het loon daadwerkelijk uitbetaalt. (- the posting undertaking must retain the power to determine the &quot;nature&quot; of the work performed by the posted worker, not in terms of defining the details of the type of work to be performed and the way it is to be performed, but in the more general terms of determining the end product of that work or the basic service to be provided;) - the obligation</td>
<td>Explicitation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
with regard to the remuneration of the worker rests with the undertaking which concluded the contract, irrespective therefore of who actually makes the payment.

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Dit zijn maximaal 50 verzekerde jaren.</td>
<td>(The rate of your AOW pension depends on the number of years you were insured under the AOW scheme between your 15th and 65th birthdays.) Full pension rights are therefore accrued over a period of 50 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Dat betekent dat er sprake is van meer dan solidariteit van onze kant.</td>
<td>(Mr President, the attacks in New York and in Washington also claimed many of our own citizens.) That means, therefore, that there is more than simply a display of solidarity on our part.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>De 'koude stad' domineert op bestuurlijk vlak: gebruikers en bewoners voelen zich alleen nog als klant behandeld en gedragen zich ook zo.</td>
<td>(The administrators are in danger of losing their 'eyes and ears' as a result of these developments.) The 'cold city' is dominant at the administrative level, users and inhabitants feel that they are only treated as clients, and therefore behave as such.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Sindsdien is het verschil tussen jongens en meisjes ook iets groter geworden.</td>
<td>(This was not the case in PISA2000.) Since then, therefore, the difference between boys and girls has increased a little.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Het gaat ons vooral om de vaststelling dat dit aspect van de relatie tussen burger en</td>
<td>(Obviously these are important objectives in themselves: services must</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Die wordt dan vaak ingehuurd, maar dat leidt niet tot een versterking van de capaciteit, en het leervermogen van de eigen organisatie blijft beperkt.</td>
<td>(It is often contracted in, but this does not result in strengthening the capacity.) The ability of the organisation to learn is therefore limited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>De nood aan achtergrond en duiding is des te groter.</td>
<td>(Both are highly topical issues, which continue to evolve.) The need for background information and clarification is therefore all the greater.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Voorzitter, wij zijn geen bankiers. Ik weet niet hoe je banktarieven moet berekenen, ik wil dat eerlijk gezegd ook niet weten, daar heb je bankiers voor.</td>
<td>(Finally, why is it a choice between two evils?) We are not bankers and therefore do not know how bank charges should be calculated, nor do we want to know, in all honesty, for that is why we have bankers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Het kabinet wil dynamiek combineren met zekerheid.</td>
<td>(At the same time, the government was aware that rapid change gave rise to feelings of insecurity among many people.) It therefore sought to combine dynamism with security.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Het onnauwkeurige gebruik van de term 'ononderbroken/continu' betekent in de praktijk dat de tijd voorzien voor</td>
<td>(While Article One of the General Stipulations for Cooperation on Culture and Education stipulates compulsory cultural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>23</strong></td>
<td><strong>Deze student wordt als drie verschillende personen in de cijfers opgenomen.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(For example do drama, music and dance.) This student would therefore appear as three separate people.</td>
<td><strong>Explicitation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>24</strong></td>
<td><strong>In vergelijking met Europa blijkt dat er in Vlaanderen in absolute cijfers minder ondernemingen opgestart worden met deze ambitie.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Although more than half of Flemish start-up entrepreneurs said their company is based on innovation, only 18% of them (or 0.39% of the entire labour force) expected that the new start-up would create twenty or more jobs in the coming five years.) In absolute figures, therefore, fewer companies are started with this ambition in Flanders compared to Europe as whole.</td>
<td><strong>Explicitation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
<td><strong>Zij bevinden zich in een te jonge fase om na ontwikkeling door de bedrijven op de markt te worden gebracht. Gezien het marktpotentieel van dergelijke breakthrough technologieën, is overheidssteun hier essentieel en van grote toegevoegde waarde.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Highly advanced and/or unexpected research results are usually the result of research fuelled by curiosity.) They are at too early a stage to be brought to market and developed by commercial organisations, and therefore, given the market potential of breakthrough technologies like these, government support is essential and brings huge added value.</td>
<td><strong>Explicitation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>26</strong></td>
<td><strong>Voor een volledig beeld kan dit hoofdstuk het best samen</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(The present chapter of the annual report provides</td>
<td><strong>Explicitation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The factual information on corporate governance, including any changes in corporate governance policy and relevant events during the past financial year. For a complete picture, this chapter should therefore be read in conjunction with the Corporate Governance Charter.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English source text</th>
<th>Dutch target text</th>
<th>Implicitation</th>
<th>Triggers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Care has been taken to ensure that the information in this publication is accurate, but this information is not contractual.) <strong>Therefore</strong> ArcelorMittal and any other ArcelorMittal Group company do not accept any liability for errors or omissions or any information that is found to be misleading.</td>
<td>φ ArcelorMittal en elk ander bedrijf van de ArcelorMittal-Groep aanvaarden geen enkele aansprakelijkheid voor fouten of gebreken of voor informatie die misleidend wordt geacht.</td>
<td>Implicitation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(We worked on the basis of Arcelor's steel solutions that matched our development planning.) This enabled us to design an intrinsically simple structure which simplified the assembly process and therefore reduced costs.'</td>
<td>Zo slaagden wij erin een intrinsiek eenvoudige structuur te ontwerpen die het assemblageproces vereenvoudigt en φ de kosten drukt.'</td>
<td>Implicitation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(The combined shareholding of Lasko, Cogito and Perutnina Ptuj amounts to 56% of Union's shares.) <strong>Therefore</strong>, such a link will continue to provide Lasko</td>
<td>φ Dit percentage geeft Lasko alle middelen om de feitelijke controle over Union uit te oefenen.</td>
<td>Implicitation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
with all means to exercise de facto control over Union.

4 (Certainly when it comes to manufactured goods rather than services, all the talk of India's rise to equal and even surpass it is simply wishful thinking.) Other South-east Asian countries might manage it in bits, but not on China's scale and therefore cost competitiveness.

| 4 | Andere landen uit Zuidoost-Azië kunnen dit misschien hier en daar een beetje, maar φ niet op de schaal van de kostenefficiëntie van China. |Implicitation | Residual group |

5 (For Spengler, New York was the loftiest creation of the over-stretched Western world; after its fall, the rise of an Eastern empire begins.) Such terrors were optional, imaginary, and therefore enjoyable.

| 5 | De Amerikanen kregen zowaar een kick van angsttaferelen, alsof ze op een roetsjbaan zaten, en φ ze verkneukelden zich bij het vooruitzicht van de complete vernietiging. |Implicitation | 4 |

6 (Instead, the report quite correctly identifies as a potential model, the Chilean deposit system, which introduces an incentive for investors to invest long-term in an emerging market rather than going for short term paper because that involves a longer-term investment for depositors.) That is the right way to go, and therefore I very much congratulate the rapporteur and hope that we will not support the amendments to an excellent report.

| 6 | φ Nogmaals, mijn complimenten aan de rapporteur. Ik hoop dat het Parlement de amendementen op dit uitstekende verslag niet zal steunen. |Implicitation | Residual group |

7 (We should ask the Court of Auditors to assess the performance of financial control systems in the applicant countries; improve the Court of Auditors' cooperation with the national

<p>| 7 | φ Dit is een tamelijk apolitieke benadering. Wanneer over deze zaken helderheid is ontstaan, zou er geld kunnen worden vrijgemaakt voor de extra |Implicitation | Residual group |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Audit institutions - which is a requirement of the Treaty of Nice - and establish more detailed specific DAS assessments - again, a requirement of the Treaty of Nice.) We would therefore be fairly apolitical and once those issues had been clarified, we would ask for the money to be released for the other posts.</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>(Recently treated animals should not be allowed to sleep in the same bed as their owners, especially children.) Amitraz is a monoamine oxidase inhibitor (MOAI); therefore people taking MOAI-containing medication, such as antidepressants, should take particular care when handling this product.</td>
<td>Amitraz is een monoamine oxidase inhibitor (MOAI); gebruikers van geneesmiddelen die een monoamine oxidase inhibitor bevatten, zoals antidepressiva, moeten φ uiterst voorzichtig zijn bij gebruik van dit middel.</td>
<td>Implicitation 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>(Skin contact with the pipette content should be avoided.) The use of protective gloves when handling the product is therefore recommended.</td>
<td>φ Aangeraden wordt om bij toediening van het middel beschermende handschoenen te dragen.</td>
<td>Implicitation &amp; Residual group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>(As a result, an impairment loss has been recognized on the post offices, which will be closed, and the property, plant and equipment of Taxipost.) The decrease by 51.9 million euros in the category &quot;Other property, plant and equipment&quot; (which concerns mainly assets under construction) between 31 December 2007 (8.3 million euros) and 2006 (60.2 million euros) is explained by the completion of the last phase of the new sorting centers</td>
<td>Het verschil van 51,9 miljoen euro in de categorie &quot;overige materiële vaste activa&quot; (het betreft hier activa in aanbouw) tussen 31 december 2007 (8,3 miljoen euro) en 31 december 2006 (60,2 miljoen euro) is φ te verklaren door de overdracht van de nieuwe sorteercentra naar de andere categorieën van de materiële vaste activa.</td>
<td>Implicitation &amp; Residual group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and therefore, the transfer to the other property plant and equipment categories.