Explicitation and implicitation in translation

A corpus-based study of English-German and German-English translations of business texts

---

Dissertation zur Erlangung der Würde des

Doktors der Philosophie

der Fachbereiche Sprache, Literatur, Medien
& Europäische Sprachen und Literaturen der

UNIVERSITÄT HAMBURG

vorgelegt von

Viktor Becher

aus Wasserburg am Inn

Hamburg, 2011

Hauptgutachterin: Prof. Dr. Dr. h.c. Juliane House
Zweitgutachterin: Prof. Dr. Kristin Bührig
Datum der Disputation: 19.08.2011

Angenommen von der Fakultät für Geisteswissenschaften der Universität Hamburg am: 22.08.2011

Veröffentlicht mit Genehmigung der Fakultät für Geisteswissenschaften der Universität Hamburg am: 08.09.2011

For my mother,
Klaudia Becher

Abstract

This book presents a study of explicitation and implicitation in translation. Explicitating and implicitating shifts were manually identified in a corpus of English and German business texts and their translations in both directions. Shifts were classified according to formal and functional critieria. The study departed from the observation that explicitations in one translation direction are often not 'counterbalanced' by implicitations in the other direction (cf. Klaudy's Asymmetry Hypothesis). The main aim of the study was to specify the conditions under which this state of 'explicitational asymmetry' can be observed.

Unlike most other studies of explicitation in translation, the present study did not depart from the assumption of a 'translation-inherent', universal process of explicitation (cf. Blum-Kulka's Explicitation Hypothesis). Rather, the prediction underlying the study was that every instance of explicitation (and implicitation) can be explained as a result of lexicogrammatical and/or pragmatic factors. This prediction was essentially confirmed by the study's findings. Thorough qualitative analysis has made it possible to compile a list of factors that regularly lead translators to explicitate or implicitate. The factors explain why implicitations are often outnumbered by the corresponding explicitations.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank the following people:

- First and foremost, I wish to thank my supervisor Juliane House for her exemplary support, which has by far exceeded the normal responsibilities of a thesis supervisor. Thank you for helping me with any kind of problem quickly and unbureaucratically, and thank you for giving me the freedom that I needed to design and execute the research that has formed the basis of this book.
- I am indebted to Svenja Kranich and Hardarik Blühdorn for much stimulating discussion of my work, which has certainly contributed to improving this book.
- This book was written in LyX, a free writing software program. I thank the creators of LyX for distributing this great piece of software free of charge under a free software license.

Finally, I would like to thank the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (German Research Foundation) for their financial support. This book was written in the context of the project Covert Translation. The project led by Juliane House is located at the University of Hamburg's Research Centre on Multilingualism, which has been sponsored by the German Research Foundation for a total of twelve years.

Contents

I Background **9**

1 Introduction **10**
1.1 How to read this book 10
1.1.1 How the book is structured 13
1.2 The approach taken in this book 13
1.3 Defining explicitation and implicitation 17

2 Previous research **20**
2.1 Types of explicitation 21
2.2 The Explicitation Hypothesis 23
2.2.1 Problems with the Explicitation Hypothesis 25
2.3 Studies on the Explicitation Hypothesis 28
2.3.1 Subconscious processes of syntactic explicitation? The case of reporting *that* 28
2.3.2 Reporting *that* in German-English translations 32
2.3.3 Explicitation and implicitation in literary translations between English and Norwegian 34
2.3.4 Additions of connectives in translated Chinese 39
2.3.5 Other studies on the Explicitation Hypothesis 42
2.4 Qualitative studies on explicitation 48
2.4.1 Explicitation as a norm-dependent phenomenon . . . 48
2.4.2 Explicitation and translator style 50
2.4.3 Expertise and explicitation 52
2.4.4 Explicitness in English and German discourse 55
2.5 The Asymmetry Hypothesis 57
2.5.1 Motivating the Asymmetry Hypothesis 59
2.5.2 What explicitational asymmetry looks like in practice 64
2.6 Studies on the Asymmetry Hypothesis 66
2.6.1 Explicitational asymmetry in translations of reporting verbs 66

2.6.2 Obligatory additions vs. optional omissions in translation . . . 70
2.6.3 Explicitation and implicitation of causal relations in translations between Dutch and French . . . 72
2.7 Summary and conclusion (and a brief outlook) . . . 73

3 Methodology 77
3.1 A word of caution . . . 78
3.2 Data . . . 79
3.3 Procedure . . . 82
3.4 Identification and classification of shifts . . . 85
3.5 Interactional shifts . . . 89
3.6 Cohesive shifts . . . 94
3.6.1 Shifts involving coreferential expressions . . . 96
3.6.2 Shifts involving the encoding of semantic relations . 99
3.7 Denotational shifts . . . 110
3.7.1 Additions and omissions . . . 111
3.7.2 Substitutions . . . 114
3.8 Shifts excluded from analysis . . . 116
3.9 Hypotheses . . . 122
3.10 Summary and conclusion . . . 123

II Results 125

4 Interactional shifts 126
4.1 Pronoun-based shifts . . . 127
4.1.1 Additions and omissions of pronouns . . . 128
4.1.2 Substitutions of pronouns . . . 141
4.2 Proper name-based shifts . . . 143
4.2.1 Additions and omissions of proper names . . . 143
4.2.2 Substitutions of proper names . . . 145
4.3 Summary and conclusion . . . 147

5 Cohesive shifts 149
5.1 Pronoun-based shifts . . . 150
5.1.1 Additions and omissions of pronouns . . . 151
5.1.2 Substitutions of pronouns . . . 161
5.2 Noun-based shifts . . . 162
5.2.1 Additions of nouns . . . 163
5.2.2 Omissions of nouns . . . 166

5.2.3 Substitutions of nouns 167
5.3 Connective-based shifts 169
5.3.1 Additions and omissions of connectives 170
5.3.2 Substitutions of connectives 184
5.4 Summary and conclusion 188

6 Denotational shifts 190
6.1 Noun-based shifts 191
6.1.1 Additions and omissions of nouns 191
6.1.2 Substitutions of nouns 196
6.2 Adjective-based shifts 201
6.2.1 Additions, omissions, and substitutions of adjectives 202
6.3 Adverb-based shifts 209
6.3.1 Additions and omissions of adverbs 210
6.4 Summary and conclusion 214

7 Conclusion 216

A Some English-German contrasts 220
A.1 Is German more explicit than English? 220
A.1.1 Explicitness in grammar 220
A.1.2 Explicitness in discourse 224
A.2 Interactionality in English and German 229

B List of corpus texts 233

Bibliography 235

Part I

Background

Chapter 1

Introduction

This book presents a study that has counted and analyzed explicitating and implicitating shifts in a corpus of English-German and German-English translations of business texts. The aim of the study was to find out when and why (i.e. under which conditions) translators explicitate or implicitate. In this introductory chapter, I give some advice on how to read this book (Section 1.1), present the linguistically oriented approach to translation taken – and advocated – in the book (Section 1.2), and provide definitions of some basic terms (Section 1.3).

1.1 How to read this book

Dear reader, I have good news for you: You can skip this chapter! In fact, you can skip quite a lot when reading this book, since I have done my best to make it as reader-friendly as possible. In particular, the book exhibits the following features aimed at maximizing usability:

No abbreviations. To optimize readability, I have refrained from using any abbreviations in this book.

Transparent structure. I have tried to structure this book as transparently as possible, allowing you to selectively read those parts that are of interest to you while skipping others. I have taken great care to split the book into sections and chapters that may be read independently of each other (though this has not always been possible). In particular, Chapters 4 through 6, where the results of the study forming the basis of this book are presented, do not build up on each other, so that each chapter can be read separately. What is more, each of these three chapters is centered around a number of observations that are

printed in boldface (a) where they are introduced and (b) where they are explained. This allows the reader who is interested only in a particular observation to skim the text for crucial references to this observation. Finally, sections that are of minor importance, e.g. because they present results that are not generalizable, are clearly marked as such, i.e. they are headed by a remark that invites the reader who is only interested in the 'big picture' to skip ahead.

Summaries. The last sections of Chapters 2 through 6 are entitled "Summary and conclusion". Unlike what is common in the academic literature, these short sections contain *real* summaries, i.e. they are (a) understandable and (b) informative to the reader who has not read the chapter they summarize. I have taken great care to make these sections as simple and jargon-free as possible. The summaries render the key points of the summarized chapter without presupposing the knowledge of any terms or concepts that have been introduced in the chapter. The conclusion parts of these sections feature some general remarks that have mostly not been touched upon in the main text of the chapter.

Narrative format. Usually, book-length linguistic studies begin with a couple of chapters featuring clarifications of basic terms and concepts, theoretical considerations, information on the languages investigated, etc., and you are not sure whether you need to read all those chapters in order to understand the study presented in the later parts of the book. In this book, I have tried another, more "narrative" way of exposition: Relevant background information is not presented in dedicated chapters; instead, basic concepts will be introduced 'as we go along', i.e. in the core chapters of the book. The only exception to this are certain English-German contrasts relevant to the present study, which (due to their complexity) could not be discussed *passim* and were therefore moved to Section A of the appendix. Moreover, many basic concepts are not introduced at all, as the reader may look them up in suitable reference works of linguistics and translation studies, such as the excellent Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies (Baker and Saldanha 2008). Finally, I have tried to minimize the use of abbreviations.

Frequent cross referencing. I have boasted above that you can skip this chapter. However, it does contain a lot of useful information (otherwise I would not have written it), part of which might be useful for following my argumentation in later parts of the book (see e.g. my

definitions of explicitation and implicitation provided in Section 1.3). Still, it should be no problem for you to select your reading, because there are a lot of cross references throughout the book that will 'warn' you whenever you may want to refer to earlier parts of the book for improved understanding.

Colloquial style of writing. My writing style is quite 'chatty' for the academic register. For example, I occasionally use short sentences such as "So far so good", rhetorical questions, and especially the 1st person pronouns "we" and "I". I have done this to grant the reader a bit of relief in between chains of arguments and descriptions, which can be quite complicated and nested at times. Some readers may complain that my rather colloquial style of writing is "unscientific" and that a more formal, impersonal writing style would be more "adequate" to the subject matter at hand. However, I claim that the opposite is the case: By using passives, impersonal constructions, and nominalizations, academic authors consciously or subconsciously shadow the subjectivity that is *necessarily* inherent in every piece of scholarship, no matter how carefully the analysis has proceeded. As a human being I am not infallible, and I think it is not a bad idea to occasionally remind the reader of this fact by writing "I assume that..." instead of "It is assumed that...".

Clear stance. Many scholarly authors hedge their claims to such an extent that it remains completely unclear what they are arguing for. Authors do this, for example, by using attenuating expressions such as *may*, *might*, or *could* all over the place. I have to admit that I also use these expressions quite a lot (primarily where I lack evidence for a claim), but in the end, it does become clear what my stance is. In fact, my stance is quite a radical one: I argue in this book that the widespread assumption of a "translation-inherent" type of explicitation is seriously misguided and should be abandoned. Authors who disguise their arguments in hedges and mitigations try to render themselves immune to criticism – at the cost of providing useful and discussible conclusions. I have no problem if you tell people that "Becher is wrong", as long as you have good arguments for this claim. My (sometimes radical) views are not meant to be universally and eternally valid, but to be challenged and refined by you, the reader.

Returning to the question of how to read this book: You can read the book as you would read any scholarly work, i.e. by selectively reading the parts

that are relevant to your work while skipping other parts. By implementing the features listed above, I have tried to make selective reading as easy and comfortable as possible. Of course, you can also read the book from cover to cover. Due to its narrative format and colloquial style of writing, the book should be a relatively fast and easy read (although my heavy reliance on linguistic methods and terminology may complicate things a bit).

1.1.1 How the book is structured

The book is structured as follows. Chapter 2 features a review of the literature on explicitation and implicitation. The insights gained from this review have laid the foundations of the study presented in this book. In Chapter 3, I discuss the methodology adopted in the present study. Most importantly, the chapter presents the basic hypotheses that have been investigated (see Section 3.9). My methodological framework for identifying and classifying instances of explicitation and implicitation (see Sections 3.4 through 3.7) distinguishes between three types of shifts: interactional shifts, cohesive shifts, and denotational shifts. The findings concerning the three types of shifts will be presented in Chapters 4 through 6. Finally, Chapter 7 concludes this book by collecting the factors that the present study has identified as triggers of explicitation and implicitation in translation.

The book features two appendices: Appendix A discusses some English-German contrasts relevant to the study of explicitation and implicitation, and Appendix B provides a list of the texts contained in the investigated corpus.

1.2 The approach taken in this book

According to Ulrych and Murphy (2008), two approaches to studying translated texts may be distinguished: the contrastive-linguistic approach and the approach taken by descriptive translation studies. The contrastive-linguistic approach focuses on systemic (and, sometimes, pragmatic) differences between the source and target languages and on how these differences impact the translation process and product. In contrast, the approach taken by descriptive translation studies focuses on the nature of the translation process itself. This approach, pioneered by Toury (1995), views the process of translation as a phenomenon *sui generis* which

is not only determined by properties of the source and target language, but also by additional, translation-specific (e.g. cognitive) principles.

From its inception, the (sub)field of corpus-based translation studies has mostly followed the paradigm of descriptive translation studies. Researchers have concentrated on looking for possibly "universal" properties of translated discourse (cf. Baker 1993, 1996), which are supposed to be due to specific properties of the translation process. Unfortunately, the preoccupation of corpus-based translation studies with theories from descriptive translation studies has had the effect that the contrastive-linguistic perspective on translation has been neglected.

Ulrych and Murphy (2008: 144ff) emphasize that the contrastive-linguistic approach and the descriptive translation studies approach offer "complementary perspectives" on translation. It is not healthy for a discipline to neglect one approach in favor of the other although both approaches are equally interesting and important. Sadly, this is exactly what has happened in translation studies in the last two or three decades. In neglecting the contrastive-linguistic perspective on translation while focusing on translation-specific processes, translation scholars seem to have forgotten Nida's insight (1986, cited in Doherty 2006: XIV) that "translating is not a strictly mechanical or rule-governed activity, but a complex process for making critical judgements about a myriad of linguistic, cultural, and aesthetic matters."[1]

The case of explicitation is a prime example of the detrimental effects of translation studies' recent disregard for the contrastive-linguistic approach to translation. Instead of carefully analyzing occurrences of explicitation in context, trying to identify possible language pair-specific causes (e.g. the non-availability of a grammatical construction in the target language), researchers were quick to attribute occurrences of explicitation to an allegedly universal mechanism "inherent in the process of translation" (cf. Blum-Kulka's 1986 Explicitation Hypothesis). However, as I will show in Chapter 2, this way of dealing with explicitation is superficial and has regularly lead to false conclusions. A better way of investigating explicitation would have been to trace as many occurrences of explicitation as possible back to lexicogrammatical and pragmatic differences between the source and target language. This contrastive-linguistic approach to the study of explicitation is essentially the one that is taken in the present book. Only if a contrastive-linguistic analysis has failed

[1]As for the "aesthetic matters" mentioned by Nida, Doherty (e.g. 1996) has convincingly argued that the aesthetic/stylistic norms of a language can be heavily influenced by the obligatory and optional choices offered by the language's grammatical system.

to explain all occurrences of explicitation should the researcher resort to translation-specific cognitive processes.

The contrastive-linguistic approach to explicitation taken in this book draws much of its inspiration from the works of two translation scholars working on the language pair English-German, Monika Doherty (e.g. 2001) and Juliane House (e.g. 1997). While Doherty focuses on syntactic differences and House on pragmatic differences between English and German, both scholars have in common that they pursue the investigation of language-pair specific factors as far as possible instead of quickly turning to the assumption of translation-specific principles. I tried to do the same when I carried out the study presented in the later chapters of this book.

To illustrate the contrastive-linguistic perspective on translation taken in this book – and to demonstrate its importance for the study of explicitation – let us consider the following example (discussed in Doherty 2006: 57ff):

(1) Theorists have tried two schemes.

Bisher ist mit zwei Hypothesen gearbeitet worden.

Gloss: 'So far, two hypotheses have been worked with.'[2]

The example contains an instance of implicitation (omission of *theorists*) and an instance of explicitation (addition of *bisher*). If it were not for the instance of implicitation, proponents of Blum-Kulka's Explicitation Hypothesis would probably say that (1) is yet another example of the "translation-inherent" process of explicitation. In no way, however, does this hasty explanation (or pseudo-explanation) do justice to the complexities involved in the present example. Let us briefly discuss these complexities (following Doherty 2006: 57ff).

Why didn't the translator choose a more 'literal' rendering of (1)? For example, the translator could have rendered the example as follows:

(2) Theoretiker haben zwei Hypothesen versucht.

We immediately see that this version is not adequate. First, *Theoretiker* 'theorists' sounds odd in this context because the lexeme is unusual in German

[2]The translation examples rendered in this book generally adhere to the following format: The source text is followed by the target text. In order to avoid cluttering the printed page with example text (the book contains more than a hundred examples), glosses of the German translation will not be provided as part of the example text (as it is done exceptionally in (1)). Selected parts of the German text will be glossed in the running text, which should be sufficient for readers with no knowledge of German to follow my argumentation.

and evokes unwanted (viz. negative) connotations. Second, the German verb *versuchen* 'to try' sounds odd in combination with the complement *zwei Hypothesen* 'two hypotheses'. This seems to be due to differences in complementation patterns between *versuchen* and its English equivalent *try*.

What can we do about this? Doherty observes that the subject *theorists* of the English original is somewhat of a grammatical 'dummy', i.e. a semantically weak element, used mainly for grammatical reasons (namely to fill the obligatory subject slot). Since it is easily inferable *who* has tried the hypotheses mentioned (viz. researchers of some sort), a passive construction seems like a good solution. Moreover, the oddness of *versuchen* can be avoided by choosing another verb such as *arbeiten mit* 'to work with'. This results in the following translation of (1):

(3) Es ist mit zwei Hypothesen gearbeitet worden.

This version is much better than (2), but it is not perfect. We note that a semantically empty dummy subject, *es* 'it', occupies the preverbal position of (3).[3] The only reason for this is that no other constituent is available that might occupy the preverbal position. So why not introduce a suitable constituent? The presence of a dummy subject shows us that (3) offers a syntactic slot for accomodating additional information 'free of charge', so to speak. So it makes sense to add a piece of information in order to (a) fill the available syntactic slot and (b) achieve an optimal distribution of information across the sentence. A suitable addition would be the adverb *bisher* 'so far', which results in the following translation solution:

(4) Bisher ist mit zwei Hypothesen gearbeitet worden.

We see that (4) is identical to (3), except that the dummy *es* has been replaced by a more informative element, *bisher*. All things considered, (4) represents an[4] optimal translation solution, since lexical problems have been avoided and a good information structure has been achieved. Note that what native speakers perceive as an optimal verbalization solution largely depends on the grammar of the language at hand. (This is a central tenet of Doherty's work.) Thus, a literal back translation of (4) to English would sound a lot worse than the solution presented in (1) (cf. e.g.: *So far, two hypotheses have been worked with*).

[3]This way of forming the passive is unique to German (cf. König and Gast 2009: 137).

[4]I say *an* (not *the*) optimal translation solution because there are generally several translation solutions that may be called optimal from a semantic and information-structural perspective.

Now, the important point for my argumentation is the following: That our final translation solution (4) contains both an explicitation and an implicitation is *not* due to translation-specific cognitive processes of some sort. Rather, we have seen that the two shifts (the omission of *theorists* and the addition of *bisher*) are basically 'side-effects' that have been produced by our efforts to achieve a stylistically optimal translation solution. This shows that it is not up to the personal taste of the individual researcher whether to choose a contrastive-linguistic approach to explicitation or not. The above discussion has shown that a contrastive-linguistic perspective is in fact *necessary* to adequately describe and explain occurrences of explicitation. Whether a descriptive translation studies perspective is also necessary to elucidate the phenomenon of explicitation, we cannot tell yet: The contrastive-linguistic approach needs to be pushed to its limits before we can speculate about possible translation-inherent causes of explicitation. This is why I take – and advocate – a contrastive-linguistic approach to the study of explicitation (and implicitation) in this book.

1.3 Defining explicitation and implicitation

The commonly accepted definition of explicitation is the one that was originally provided by the 'inventors' of the concept, Vinay and Darbelnet (1958), who define explicitation as "[a] stylistic translation technique which consists of making explicit in the target language what remains implicit in the source language because it is apparent from either the context or the situation." (1995: 342 [translation of Vinay and Darbelnet 1958]) The problem with this definition is that it is highly vague. Questions and doubts that come to mind are: What does *explicit* mean? What does *implicit* mean? (How can these terms be defined?) *What* is made explicit in explicitation (words, thoughts)? What does *apparent* mean? Etc.

Of course, I do not want to blame Vinay and Darbelnet for the vagueness with which they formulated their definition of explicitation back in 1958. When a concept is formulated for the first time, a considerable deal of vagueness is probably unavoidable. The real problem is that, as will become clear in the following, translation scholars have tended to adopt Vinay and Darbelnet's definition of explicitation uncritically without noting its vagueness. As a result, in the most extreme cases, scholars have investigated totally different concepts under the label of "explicitation". In other words, people have had very different ideas in mind about what explicitation is while holding the erroneous belief that they were all talk-

ing about the same thing.[5]

To avoid misunderstandings, it is important to know what exactly one is talking about, i.e. to have precise definitions of terms such as explicitness, implicitness, explicitation, and implicitation. Thus, in the present section, I am going to propose definitions of all four terms. Let us start with implicitness:

> **Implicitness** is the non-verbalization of information that the addressee might be able to infer.

The reader is asked to note the following important points about this definition. First, there is the epistemic modal *might*: It does not matter whether the addressee is actually able to infer the non-verbalized information or whether the inference fails – which obviously happens occasionally in conversation. For the definition above, it is sufficient when the piece of information in question is inferable in a "theoretically motivated sense" (cf. Steiner's 2005: 11) definition of explicitation).

Second, there is the (deliberately) vague term *information*. This may be syntactic, semantic/pragmatic, or even phonological information. Any aspect of a linguistic message may be left implicit by the sender.

Third, the definition deliberately avoids spelling out *from where* the addressee might infer the non-verbalized information. From the previous discourse? From the extralinguistic context? From her world knowledge? It is of course legitimate and highly relevant to ask for the inferential sources that are available to the addressee. But we do not want this question to make our definition unnecessarily complicated.

We can now define explicitness, which is nothing more than the absence of implicitness, as follows:

> **Explicitness** is the verbalization of information that the addressee might be able to infer if it were not verbalized.

To put it somewhat informally, explicitness means saying something that the addressee might have understood anyway. From this definition, it also becomes clear that explicitness often (but not necessarily) entails redundancy, i.e. the encoding of information by means of more linguistic material than is necessary.

[5]The following paragraphs have been adapted from Becher (2010a: 2ff).

Now that we have defined explicitness, it is easy to provide proper definitions of explicitation and implicitation:

Explicitation is observed where a given target text is more explicit than the corresponding source text.

Implicitation is observed where a given target text is less explicit (more implicit) than the corresponding source text.

It should be pointed out that the definitions provided in this section are purely product-based; they deliberately ignore processing considerations. Thus, the definitions of implicitness and explicitness discussed above are agnostic as to whether relatively explicit texts are easier to process than comparatively implicit texts. (For a process-based perspective on explicitation, see Heltai 2005.) What is more, the given definition of explicitation does not say how the target text's higher degree of explicitness is related to the translation process. This latter point is particularly important. When we investigate translation corpora, we do not see an increase in explicitness in the process of translation, strictly speaking. We merely observe the product, i.e. a higher degree of explicitness in the target text as compared to the source text, so we need to be careful with our conclusions. This is why the definition of explicitation provided does not say anything about the translation process.

Chapter 2

Previous research on explicitation and implicitation

In this chapter, we will discuss previous studies that have dealt with explicitation and implicitation. Since explicitation has been the phenomenon that has first caught the attention of translation scholars, most previous work has focused on this concept. Hence, the present review of literature, too, will initially focus on explicitation. However, towards the end of this chapter, implicitation will become increasingly important, since we will see that it is highly problematic to investigate explicitation without taking implicitation into account.

The following section will present a typology of explicitating shifts proposed by Klaudy (2008), which will serve as a background for the rest of the chapter. In her typology, which has become widely accepted in the translation studies literature, Klaudy distinguishes between obligatory, optional, pragmatic, and "translation-inherent" explicitations. We will see that the fourth and last type of explicitation, the translation-inherent type, is somewhat peculiar, since (in contrast to the other three types) it is supposed to be caused by "the nature of the translation process itself" (Klaudy 2008: 107) rather than by language pair-specific parameters.

The fact that Klaudy has included this hypothesized type of explicitation in her typology mirrors a widely held consensus in translation studies: 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" (1986: 21). It is one of the aims of the present chapter (and of the present book) to show that this consensus is based on a number of (a) serious theoretical misconceptions and (b) false inter-

pretations of empirical data and thus is in urgent need of revision.[1] In accordance with this aim, the present chapter is structured as follows:

Section 2.1 will present Klaudy's (2008) typology of explicitating shifts. Zooming in on the fourth, translation-inherent type assumed by Klaudy, Section 2.2 discusses Blum-Kulka's (1986) Explicitation Hypothesis along with its grave theoretical problems. Despite these problems, a number of quantitative, corpus-based studies that have been carried out claim to offer evidence in support of the hypothesis. However, this conclusion has been wrong. This will be shown in Section 2.3, where quantitative studies on the Explicitation Hypothesis are discussed critically.

Section 2.4 reviews some qualitative studies on explicitation. While these do not test the Explicitation Hypothesis specifically, they do provide strong evidence against the hypothesis, showing that the communicative act of translation cannot be reduced to a cognitive process (which is supposedly characterized by explicitation), but may be influenced by many factors, including cultural, linguistic, and individual ones.

Having shown the fatal theoretical deficiences of the Explicitation Hypothesis and its lack of empirical support, I go on to present Klaudy's (2009) Asymmetry Hypothesis as a better and more plausible guide for future research on explicitation in Section 2.5. Section 2.6 will then discuss empirical studies that have been conducted to test the Asymmetry Hypothesis. Finally, Section 2.7 will round off this chapter with a summary and some concluding remarks.

2.1 Types of explicitation

In an often cited encyclopedia article, Klaudy (2008; previous version: 1998) distinguishes between the following four kinds of explicitation in translation:

1. **Obligatory explicitation.** Caused by lexicogrammatical differences between the source language and the target language.

   e.g. English *to be* → Spanish *ser/estar*

[1]The other aim of the chapter is to give an overview of previous research on explicitation, thus providing a context for the study presented in this book. Parts of the chapter have been adapted from two of my earlier publications (Becher 2010a, 2010c). Readers who are familiar with these publications may want to skip these parts (Sections 2.1, 2.2, 2.3.1, and 2.3.3 as well as parts of Sections 2.3.5 and 2.5).

2. **Optional explicitation.** Motivated by differences in stylistic preferences between source language and target language.

   e.g. English *our people* → German *unsere Mitarbeiter*

3. **Pragmatic explicitation.** Motivated by differences in cultural and/or world knowledge shared by members of the source and target language communities.

   e.g. German *die Alster* → English *the lake Alster*

4. **Translation-inherent explicitation.** Caused by "the nature of the translation process itself" (Klaudy 2008: 107).

   e.g. ???

Let us briefly go through the examples of explicitation provided above. (1.) The English copula *to be* has two possible equivalents in Spanish, *ser* and *estar*, which slightly differ in meaning (cf. Maienborn 2005). Thus, a speaker of Spanish choosing between *ser* and *estar* (obligatorily) gives the hearer more information on the state of affairs expressed than a speaker of English using *to be*. Accordingly, when an English-Spanish translator encounters *to be*, she is forced by the lexicogrammar of Spanish to choose between *ser* and *estar*, thus obligatorily making the target text more explicit than the source text. (2.) Authors of English business texts typically refer to their company's employees as *our people* (see Section 6.1.2). Now, if an English-German translator translates *our people* as *unsere Leute* 'our people', this would result in a lexicogrammatically correct, but stylistically awkward target text sentence, since the stylistic conventions of German business writing prefer the more explicit expression *unsere Mitarbeiter* 'our employees'. In consequence, most English-German translators will (non-obligatorily) choose the latter term, thus introducing an instance of optional explicitation into the target text. (3.) Most native speakers of English will not know what the Alster is, namely a lake (in the center of Hamburg). Thus, an English-German translator is likely to provide her target text readers with this piece of information by translating *die Alster* as *the lake Alster*, thus performing what Klaudy calls a pragmatic explicitation.

Two important points deserve to be mentioned in connection with Klaudy's classification. First, Klaudy's Types 1 to 3 are (obligatorily) caused or (non-obligatorily) motivated by certain differences between the source and target language (in the case of pragmatic explicitation: between the source and target language communities). This means that

these types are predicted to exist; they simply *have to* exist. When we translate from English to Spanish, for example, we know in advance that at some point explicitation will become necessary because Spanish has *ser* and *estar*, while English has only *to be*. In general, we know from linguistics that lexicogrammatical, stylistic and cultural differences exist for every conceivable language pair. These will inevitably cause or motivate instances of explicitation in translation, and we would be very surprised if this prediction were not supported by empirical data. Type 4, on the other hand, is a very different beast: The translation-inherent type of explicitation is not predicted, but rather *postulated* to exist, namely by Blum-Kulka's (1986) Explicitation Hypothesis. It would therefore not be surprising if we were not to find evidence for this type of explicitation in a given corpus.

Second, while the list above provides typical examples of obligatory, optional and pragmatic explicitations, it fails to give an example of a translation-inherent explicitation. This is because it is not clear to me at all what an instance of this type of explicitation is supposed to look like. In this connection it is interesting to note that Klaudy (2008) herself provides many examples for her Types 1 to 3 (the examples given above are my own), but does not provide a single example of a translation-inherent explicitation. She probably had the same problem as the author of the present book.

2.2 The Explicitation Hypothesis

As we have seen in the previous section, Klaudy's fourth explicitation type seems to be shrouded in mystery. In order to find out more about this postulated type of explicitation, we now travel back in time to witness the birth of Shoshana Blum-Kulka's Explicitation Hypothesis. I would like to stress right here that the aim of the present section is not to denigrate Blum-Kulka's interesting and useful work, but to show that after an initial phase of pioneering explicitation research, the time has come to abandon the Explicitation Hypothesis and to look for a better alternative.

Blum-Kulka proposed her famous Explicitation Hypothesis in a seminal and highly insightful paper from 1986. It is instructive to quote the relevant passage in full:

> The process of translation [...] necessitates a complex text and discourse processing. The process of interpretation performed by the translator on the source text *might* lead to a [target

> language] text which is more redundant than the [source language] text. This redundancy can be expressed by a rise in the level of cohesive explicitness in the [target language] text. *This argument* may be stated as 'the explicitation hypothesis', which postulates an observed [increase in, VB] cohesive explicitness from [source language] to [target language] texts regardless of the increase traceable to differences between the two linguistic and textual systems involved. (1986: 19; my emphases)

Blum-Kulka tells us that the process of interpretation that invariably occurs in translation "might" lead to a target text which is more redundant, or explicit, than the corresponding source text. However, we do not learn *how* the interpretation process is supposed to produce this effect. The author then goes on to call her claims an "argument", which is somewhat surprising: Where is the "argument"? If there is an argument at all, neither its premises nor its conclusion are discernible. While we might be inclined to agree that a given target text *might* come out as more explicit than its source text, Blum-Kulka provides no reason for putting forward her Explicitation Hypothesis, which claims that this *has to* be the case.

The postulated increase in cohesive explicitness is supposed to occur "regardless of the increase traceable to differences between the two linguistic and textual systems involved." This additional stipulation makes clear that Blum-Kulka does acknowledge the existence of obligatory explicitations (due to differences between "linguistic" systems) and optional explicitations[2] (due to differences between "textual" systems); however, the Explicitation Hypothesis postulates an additional, translation-inherent type of explicitation which is supposedly caused by the "process of interpretation performed by the translator on the source text".

Note that this famous passage from Blum-Kulka (1986) definitely assumes the existence of a separate type of explicitation qualitatively different from the other, language-pair specific types. The passage cannot be taken in a different way. If there are explicitations that are caused or motivated by differences between the source language and target language and if there are explicitations that occur *regardless* of these differences, then there has to be an additional type of "translation-inherent" explicitation – Klaudy's (2008) mysterious Type 4.

[2]Blum-Kulka also seems to accept the existence of Klaudy's Type no. 3, viz. pragmatic explicitations.

2.2.1 Problems with the Explicitation Hypothesis

There are three serious problems to be noted in connection with Blum-Kulka's Explicitation Hypothesis:

Problem 1. Why do I criticize that it is not clear where the "argument" is behind the Explicitation Hypothesis? Does a hypothesis have to rely on an argument? Yes, it has to. More precisely, a scientific hypothesis has to be *motivated*, i.e. its postulation has to be justified, and Blum-Kulka's Explicitation Hypothesis is not motivated. This is of crucial importance, as non-motivated hypotheses entail the danger of producing what I like to call *pseudo-significant* findings, i.e. statistically significant but otherwise meaningless results. In his online statistics textbook, Dallal (2007) provides interesting examples of pseudo-significant findings:

> [I]n 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! (Dallal 2007; emphasis removed)

Clearly, we would not want to accept the hypothesis that, for example, the presence of many enemy fighters *leads to* bomber pilots aiming better, even if the correlation mentioned by Dallal is significant. Statistical association in this context clearly does not imply real-world causation. The reason is that this hypothesis is not motivated; the theoretical assumptions underlying it (if there are any) just do not make much sense.

On the other hand, we do want to accept the hypothesis that, for example, smoking causes lung cancer when we find a significant correlation, e.g. in a large-scale epidemiological study. The reason is that this hypothesis is wellmotivated; we are justified in postulating it, as small-scale laboratory studies make the assumption of a causal link seem plausible. In other words, in this case the potential connection between association and causation is backed by evidence obtained on independent grounds.

It will have become clear that the Explicitation Hypothesis is much like the fighter–bomber hypothesis mentioned above. It is not motivated on independent grounds and therefore does not qualify as a scientific hypothesis. Thus, even if we did find that translations are significantly more explicit than their source texts and comparable target language texts, we still could not accept the Explicitation Hypothesis. The higher degree of explicitation observed could have causes other than "[t]he process of interpretation performed by the translator on the source text" (cf. the weather conditions in the bomber example). An example of an alternative cause would be a (hypothesized) universal tendency of translators to simplify (cf. Baker 1993: 244, 1996: 181ff), which potentially "raises the level of explicitness by resolving ambiguity" (1996: 182) and thus may also result in target texts that are more explicit across the board. (By the way, Baker [1993, 1996] also lists explicitation among her hypothesized universals of translated text.) It is a general problem of corpus-based translation studies that "the same surface expression may point to different features or tendencies" (1996: 180). If we want to accept Blum-Kulka's Explicitation Hypothesis, we need to demonstrate that it is better motivated than the 'Explicitation through Simplification Hypothesis' just sketched. But the big problem is that it is not motivated at all.[3]

Problem 2. Blum-Kulka's Explicitation Hypothesis clashes head-on with Occam's Razor: *Entia non sunt multiplicanda praeter necessitatem* ('entities must not be multiplied beyond necessity'). This principle, which has become one of the cornerstones of scientific research, calls for hypotheses to be parsimonious in their assumptions and thus not only easier to handle, but also more likely to be true. Blum-Kulka assumes the existence of a new entity, namely a new, translation-inherent type of explicitation. This means that *any* other hypothesis that might explain an observed tendency of explicitation in translation without assuming a new type of explicitation would be more compatible with Occam's Razor and thus preferable to the Explicitation Hypothesis.

[3]It is sometimes claimed that the Explicitation Hypothesis can be motivated as follows. When translators interpret the source text, they enrich their interpretation with inferential meaning (e.g. by interpreting temporal sequence as causal sequence), as it is normal in text comprehension (cf. e.g. Graesser et al. 1994, Carston 2009). This pragmatically enriched interpretation is of course more explicit than the source text itself. (So far I agree.) It is thus likely to lead to a more explicit target text. This conclusion, however, is a fallacy. It depends on the assumption that translators directly verbalize their (more explicit) mental representation of the source text without applying operations that might render it more implicit, such as politeness strategies, omission of contextually inferable material, etc. There is no reason why translators – in contrast to authors of non-translated texts – should skip the application of such operations.

For example, the 'Explicitation through Simplification Hypothesis' sketched above could explain a universal tendency of explicitation without postulating a new type of explicitation. We would assume that the (hypothesized) urge of translators to simplify leads them to resort to optional and pragmatic explicitations more often than is appropriate and/or necessary, *et voilà*, we have explained the data without assuming any mysterious, translation-inherent kind of explicitation. In this way, this hypothesis is more compatible with Occam's Razor and should thus be preferred over Blum-Kulka's Explicitation Hypothesis. (However, the Explicitation through Simplification Hypothesis is similar to the Explicitation Hypothesis in that it is not motivated; cf. Problem 1).[4]

Problem 3. In a later passage of her paper, Blum-Kulka paraphrases the Explicitation Hypothesis as postulating that "explicitation is a universal strategy inherent in the process of language mediation" (1986: 21), where our attention is particularly called to the vague term "strategy". It is not clear whether Blum- Kulka means a conscious or a subconscious strategy. Olohan and Baker (2000) seem to interpret her as meaning the latter, while Øverås (1998) seems to assume that she means the former. In other words, although both Olohan and Baker as well as Øverås invoke Blum-Kulka's considerations as the basis for their studies (which will be discussed in the following section), it is not even clear whether they are investigating the same thing. The vagueness with which Blum-Kulka has formulated her hypothesis has led to much confusion in the literature on explicitation right from the outset.

The three problems pointed out above are not merely minor shortcomings, but rather fundamental issues that seriously question the usefulness of Blum-Kulka's Explicitation Hypothesis. In summary, the hypothesis is unmotivated, unparsimonious and vaguely formulated. Since there is a much better hypothesis that can be motivated on independent grounds and is compatible with Occam's Razor (namely Klaudy's Asymmetry Hypothesis; see Section 2.5), the upshot from the above discussion is that Blum-Kulka's Explicitation Hypothesis should be abandoned entirely and no longer investigated, at least not in its present form.

[4] Another problem with respect to Occam's Razor is that Blum-Kulka applies her Explicitation Hypothesis not only to translations, but to all kinds of linguistic mediation, under which she also subsumes speech production by foreign language learners (1986: 19–21). It is easy to see that the latter assumption, which presupposes that translators rely on similar cognitive processes as foreign language learners, strongly conflicts with Occam's Razor.

2.3 Studies on the Explicitation Hypothesis

In the following four subsections, I am going to discuss four representative studies on Blum-Kulka's Explicitation Hypothesis in detail. The discussion will turn up several points of criticism that are so severe that the studies discussed cannot be taken as providing evidence in favor of the Explicitation Hypothesis – despite their authors' claiming the opposite. The reader will notice that the points of criticism will soon start repeating themselves, i.e. most of these points are shared by several or all of the studies discussed. This is why the detailed discussions of Sections 2.3.1 through 2.3.4 focus on reviewing four representative studies. Subsequently, other studies on the Explicitation Hypothesis will be discussed in less detail (Section 2.3.5).

Before we begin, it is interesting to note that Blum-Kulka (1986) only talked about "cohesive explicitness" (and the explicitation of "cohesive ties"), not about explicitness in general. Nevertheless, as we will see in the following, many studies on explicitation have investigated explicitness and explicitation in linguistic features unrelated to cohesion, thus considerably widening the scope of the Explicitation Hypothesis. However, this is not a shortcoming of these studies, since there is no *a priori* reason to restrict the hypothesis to the study of cohesion. (If there is a translation-inherent tendency to explicitate, it should apply to many different kinds of linguistic phenomena, not only to cohesion.) Speaking of shortcomings: It is not the aim of this section to malign the importance or quality of the studies discussed. All studies are highly interesting and offer intriguing results, which, however, are difficult to interpret due to the problems that will be pointed out in the following.

2.3.1 Subconscious processes of syntactic explicitation? The case of reporting *that*

Olohan and Baker (2000) investigated the optional use of the complementizer *that* in combination with the reporting verbs *say* and *tell* in translated vs. nontranslated English texts ("reporting *that*"). First of all, it must be said that the authors must be given credit because they "have tried to be as explicit as possible concerning [their] methodology in order precisely to allow future studies to confirm or challenge [their] results" (2000: 158). In the following, I hope to do just that, namely challenge Olohan and Baker's results. I am going to argue that their study design is problematic in several respects and that their findings can also be explained as the (com-

bined?) effect of other alleged universals of translation.

Olohan and Baker carried out their research using the Translational English Corpus (TEC) and a comparable sample from the British National Corpus (BNC). The TEC consists of English target texts from four different genres translated from "a range of source languages" (2000: 151), and the BNC sample, containing non-translated English texts, was chosen so as to mirror the makeup of the TEC. Both corpora contain approximately 3.5 million words. I have two main points of criticism regarding the TEC as employed by Olohan and Baker (2000):

1. The authors conducted their research using a preliminary, work-in-progress version of the TEC. As they themselves point out, this version of the TEC was very imbalanced, with each of the four genres being represented very differently. Most notably (and problematically), 82% of the corpus consisted of fiction texts, while newspaper texts represented only 1% of the corpus material (2000: 152). This means that the corpus used by Olohan and Baker could essentially be described as a single-genre corpus and not as a representative sample of translated English.

2. The authors fail to disclose the source languages of the texts contained in their preliminary version of the TEC. The current version of the TEC contains translations from 24 different source languages: Arabic, Brazilian Portuguese, Chinese, Czech, Danish, Dutch, Finnish, French, German, Hebrew, Hopi, Hungarian, Italian, Modern Greek, Norwegian, Polish, Portuguese, Russian, Serbo-Croatian, Spanish, Swedish, Tamil, Thai and Welsh.[5] It is not clear which source languages were represented in the version of the TEC used by Olohan and Baker (2000).

While the first problem is not grave, as single-genre analyses can yield interesting results concerning explicitation, the second problem will have to be addressed in more detail later on.

Let us briefly review how Olohan and Baker conducted their investigation. In a first step, the authors searched the TEC and the BNC sample for occurrences of the reporting verbs *say* and *tell*. In a second step, occurrences where these verbs do not occur with a clausal complement (as e.g. in *to tell a lie* or *to tell someone to go away*) were excluded so that only

[5] See `http://ronaldo.cs.tcd.ie/tec2/jnlp/`, where the TEC may be queried online free of charge. Again, Olohan and Baker deserve credit for making their data openly available, giving other researchers the chance to challenge and/or expand upon their findings.

cases remained where *that* could potentially be used as an optional complementizer (as e.g. in *She told me [that] she's happy*). In a third step, the two corpora were compared with respect to the frequency with which *say* and *tell* were used with or without the optional complementizer. The rationale behind this approach was that:

> a higher incidence of the optional *that* in translated English would provide evidence of inherent, subliminal processes of explicitation in translation. Translators clearly do not adopt a conscious strategy of spelling out optional syntactic elements such as *that* in reporting clauses more often than writers producing original texts in the same language. (Olohan and Baker 2000: 143)

In other words, Olohan and Baker set out to test a version of Blum-Kulka's Explicitation Hypothesis. Although it is probably overly optimistic to say that translators "clearly" do not have any conscious control over their use of the complementizer *that* after reporting verbs, Olohan and Baker nonetheless found a very interesting object of investigation in reporting *that*, since translators arguably put less thought into using or not using this purely syntactic – i.e. semantically empty – element than is the case for semantically laden explicitating shifts.

The main results of Olohan and Baker's study can be summarized as follows:

- 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.

These results indicate that reporting *that* is indeed used more frequently in translated than in non-translated English. But unlike Olohan and Baker suggest, their findings do not represent evidence for the Explicitation Hypothesis; there are alternative explanations that do without the dubious assumption of "subliminal processes of explicitation in translation" and are thus more plausible. (This point of criticism equally applies to other

studies that have been conducted on the TEC, such as Olohan 2002.) Two explanations that come to mind are:

1. **Source language interference.**[6] As has been mentioned above, the texts contained in the TEC were translated from a large variety of different source languages. Now the question is: How many of these languages *allow* for the use of a complementizer with reporting verbs, and how many *require* it? (For example, Spanish and Portuguese favor the use of a complementizer, but also allow complementizer-free infinitive constructions [Vanderschueren, personal communication], while French and Italian have an obligatory complementizer after reporting verbs.) Without a full answer to this question, Olohan and Baker's results cannot be interpreted properly, because the greater the number of source languages represented in the TEC stipulating a complementizer after reporting verbs, the more likely it becomes that the higher occurrence of reporting *that* in this corpus is the result of source language interference (cf. Saldanha 2008).[7]

2. **Conservatism** (also called *normalization*). It has been suggested that translators tend to use more conservative language than authors of non-translated texts, a tendency that Baker has hypothesized to be a "translation universal" (Baker 1993: 244, 1996: 183ff). The related effort to employ more formal means of expression should make translators choose reporting *that* more often than authors of original English texts, since *that* is typically omitted when writing "in an informal style [...]. After more formal and less common verbs, *that* cannot be left out" (Swan 1980, cited in Olohan and Baker 2000: 144).

[6]The detrimental effects of source language interference as a disturbing factor in studies on explicitation have already been observed by Puurtinen (2004). Her quantitative investigation of clause- and sentence-level connectives in English-Finnish translations and non-translated Finnish texts yielded a random looking pattern of implicitations and explicitations: "some connectives are more frequent in Finnish originals [. . .], others in translations [. . .], and a few connectives have roughly equal frequencies in both subcorpora" (Puurtinen 2004: 170). However, the results are not uninterpretable: Puurtinen argues that at least some of the observed frequency differences are the result of "a tendency to translate [source text] expressions literally" (Puurtinen 2004: 174), i.e. caused by source language interference.

[7]The problem pointed out here is not specific to Olohan and Baker's study. In general, one has to be very cautious when doing research on monolingual translation corpora, i.e. corpora containing translations only. Corpora of this type should only be used for hypothesis formation, not for hypothesis testing (cf. Bernardini 2010).

Both of these approaches, which draw on proposed translation universals other than explicitation, are more attractive than the Explicitation Hypothesis, since they (1.) offer real, more plausible explanations for the observations made and (2.) do not presuppose a subconscious tendency to explicitate on the part of translators.

2.3.2 Reporting *that* in German-English translations

In the above discussion of Olohan and Baker (2000), I have criticized that the authors' findings may be better explainable as resulting from source language interference than from subconscious processes of explicitation. To see whether this is actually the case, one would have to investigate shifts involving reporting *that* in a corpus of translated English texts including their source texts. This is what Kenny (2005) has done. The author has investigated the use of the verb *say* with or without reporting *that* in Gepcolt, a German-English translation corpus of narrative prose comprising approximately one million words per language. According to Kenny, "[t]he German/English language pair offers considerable advantages in [this] kind of study [. . .] as German too has an optional [complementizer] *dass*, which can be used in reporting structures." (2005: 157)

Kenny's results may be summarized as follows:

1. Looking at all occurrences of *say* where reporting *that* is optional, the complementizer is used in 42% of all cases and omitted in 58% of all cases. This distribution of reporting *that* is comparable to Olohan and Baker's findings (reported in the previous section).

2. Looking at all occurrences of *say* + optional *that*, the complementizer translates German *dass* in 49% of all cases (= no shift) and has been added by the translator in 51% of all cases 9 (= explicitation).

3. Looking at all occurrences of *say* + NULL (i.e. *say* without optional *that*), there is a *dass* in the German source text in 21% of all cases (= implicitation), while in 79% of all cases there is no complementizer in the German source text (= no shift)

From (2.) and (3.) Kenny concludes that "the overall tendency seems to be one of explicitation rather than implicitation" (2005: 161). However, this conclusion is not valid. By comparing explicitation in *say* + *that* with implicitation in *say* + NULL, Kenny has compared apples and oranges. The result that explicitation in say + *that* is more frequent than implicitation in *say* + NULL does not tell us much. In fact, it does not tell us anything at all

when considered in isolation. The reason is that English and German are different languages with different grammatical and stylistic constraints on the use of reporting *that*/*dass*. To determine whether the data exhibit an "overall tendency of explicitation", it is not enough to look at occurrences of *say* in the English target texts. Rather, a proper analysis has to depart from the German source texts, examining occurrences of *sagen* 'to say' (or other suitable verbs).

To see why, let us engage in a little thought experiment. Let us assume that English and German exhibit different stylistic constraints concerning the use of reporting *that*/*dass* which amount to the following (fictional!) regularities:

- **Regularity 1:** Where *dass* is used in the German source text, the use of *that* is stylistically preferred in the English target text (⇒ implicitation is difficult).
- **Regularity 2:** Where *dass* is not used in the German source text, the use of *that* is neither preferred nor dispreferred stylistically in the English target text (⇒ explicitation is easy).

If we were to investigate occurrences of *say* in a German-English translation corpus where the above regularities hold (which are exclusively due to stylistic differences between English and German), we would not be surprised if we found a considerable number of explicitations among all occurrences of *say* + *that* (due to Regularity 2), but a small number of implicitations among all occurrences of *say* + NULL (due to Regularity 1) – and these are exactly Kenny's results. But in the present, fictional case the findings would not be due to an overall tendency of explicitation, as Kenny concludes, but simply the result of English-German differences in stylistic norms which make explicitation easy and implicitation difficult for translators. (In other words, the findings would be the result of a certain kind of source language interference. In neglecting this possibility, Kenny has essentially repeated one of Olohan and Baker's 2000 mistakes.)

I have no idea whether the regularities assumed in the above thought experiment even remotely resemble the stylistic constraints that actually govern the use of a complementizer with reporting verbs in English and German, and to uncover these constraints would be clearly beyond the scope of the present book, since it would require detailed contrastive study. But that is not the point. What I wanted to show with the above thought experiment is that corpus findings concerning explicitation are impossible to interpret if relevant (grammatical and) stylistic differences

between the source and the target language – and the resulting 'danger' of source language interference – are not taken into account.

As was already mentioned, in the case of Kenny's study, a simple way of taking cross-linguistic differences properly into account would have been to reverse the direction of analysis, i.e. to search for occurrences of a German reporting verb such as *sagen* and see how translators have dealt with them. Such an analysis might proceed as follows:

1. Isolate all source text – target text segment pairs where *sagen* has been translated by means of an English reporting verb such as *say* (occurring with a complement clause).

2. Exclude all source text – target text segment pairs where *that* had to be used in the target text to achieve an (a) grammatical and (b) *stylistically felicitous* sentence.

3. Having done that, one may determine whether this adjusted data set contains more explicitations (NULL → *that*) than implicitations (*that* → NULL). If yes, one may speak of a general tendency of explicitation.

As they stand, the results of Kenny's study cannot provide an answer to the question of whether translators tend to explicitate and thus cannot be taken to disambiguate Olohan and Baker's (2000) results.

2.3.3 Explicitation and implicitation in literary translations between English and Norwegian

Øverås (1998) reports the results of a study whose aim was to test Blum-Kulka's Explicitation Hypothesis through the investigation of English-Norwegian and Norwegian-English literary translations. Her corpus consisted of 1000 sentences taken from 40 novel fragments for each translation direction. She manually identified and counted all explicitations and implicitations occurring in these sentences, with the exception of obligatory shifts, i.e. shifts due to lexicogrammatical differences between English and Norwegian. As with Olohan and Baker (2000), Øverås deserves praise for presenting her methodology with exemplary transparency, making it possible to properly evaluate – and criticize – her results.

The first problem with Øverås' study is the improper and inconsistently applied definition of explicitation on which it is based. Øverås defines explicitation in passing as "the kind of translation process where implicit, co-textually recoverable [source text] material is rendered explicit in

[the target text]" (1998: 4). Although this definition is quite vague, it seems to be compatible with the definition proposed in the present book (see Section 1.3). However, as we will see in the following, Øverås does not adhere to this definition, counting cases as explicitations in which information is verbalized that is definitely not "co-textually recoverable".

The second issue is of a theoretical nature and is related to the general weaknesses of the Explicitation Hypothesis that we noted in Section 4. As we have seen, Blum-Kulka (1986) leaves us wondering about the exact nature of translation-inherent explicitation. Is it a conscious or a subconscious phenomenon? What are its causes? Øverås offers a simple answer to these questions: Translation-inherent explicitation is the result of an *operational norm*[8] in the sense of Toury, i.e. a norm on the lowest and most concrete level that directly governs "the decisions made during the act of translation" (1995: 58ff). It remains completely mysterious to me how Øverås has come to conceive of translation- inherent explicitation as the effect of a translational norm. Toury (1995: 61f) goes to great lengths to emphasize "two features inherent in the very notion of norm [. . .]: the *socio-cultural specificity* of norms and their basic *instability*." If translation-inherent explicitation were indeed the result of a translational norm, it should be highly language-pair specific (contrary to the claims of the Explicitation Hypothesis). Since norms are (1.) culture-specific and (2.) unstable, they epitomize the opposite of universality. A conception of translation-inherent explicitation as the result of an operational norm thus has to be rejected.

A third problem is connected with an important suggestion given by Blum- Kulka. In her 1986 paper, Blum-Kulka concludes that "it should be possible to ascertain by empirical research to what extent explicitation is indeed a norm that cuts across translations from various languages and to what extent it is a language pair specific phenomenon" (1986: 23). In other words, she recognizes the problem of distinguishing between optional and translation-inherent explicitations. Optional explicitations of course need to be identified and excluded when investigating the Explicitation Hypothesis. Blum-Kulka thus cautions her readers that "it would be necessary to first carry out a large scale contrastive stylistic study (in a given register) [. . .] and then to examine translations to and from both languages to investigate shifts [...] that occur in translation" (Blum-Kulka 1986: 33).

[8]Strangely, nowhere in Øverås (1998) is it directly said that she views translation-inherent explicitation as a translational norm. We have to infer this from some vague remarks on page 3 of her article, as well as from its subtitle, "An investigation of norms in literary translation".

Øverås quotes this important advice given by Blum-Kulka but then goes on to say that "such investigation into contrastive features was not possible" (1998: 9). It is understandable that a full-blown investigation into the stylistic norms of English and Norwegian was not possible within the scope of Øverås' study. But the lack of this contrastive foundation implies a big problem: Ignorant of many stylistic contrasts between English and Norwegian, Øverås of course encounters a number of cases where it is not clear whether they are optional or potentially translation-inherent explicitations, which she "included on the assumption that, while not part of the present survey, the investigation of initial norms may benefit from research that includes all occurrences" (1998: 9). I cannot see how the investigation of initial norms (Toury 1995: 56f), which is at best only peripherically related to the aim of Øverås' study, could justify such a methodologically fatal step. Doubtful cases should never be regarded as evidence for or against anything.

Speaking of doubtful cases, let us have a look at three examples that Øverås included in her study as potentially translation-inherent explicitations:

(5) Den hvite mannen knipser.
'The white man clicks.'

The white man clicks his camera. (Øverås 1998: 8)

In (5), the author of the Norwegian original uses the verb *knipse*, which means 'to click', or, in this context, 'to photograph, to take a snapshot'. Since the direct English equivalent of *knipse*, *to click*, does not share the idiomatic meaning of its Norwegian counterpart, the translator decides to expand the verb to the collocation *to click one's camera* (which, for obvious reasons, is more explicit than *knipse*). Since English does not have an expression comparable to *knipse* in terms of implicitness, the translator is forced to perform this explicitating shift given her prior decision to translate *knipse* as *to click*. We are therefore dealing with what appears to be an instance of obligatory explicitation possibly triggered by an instance of source language interference. Thus, it is incorrect to count this example as evidence in a study aiming to test the Explicitation Hypothesis (and purporting to exclude obligatory shifts). The instance of explicitation in question is clearly the result of a lexical contrast between English and Norwegian and is thus specific to this particular language pair.

(6) Jeg lente meg fram over bordet og fisket ut en Hobby.
'[...] and fished out a Hobby.'

I leaned forward over the table and fished out a Hobby cigarette.
(Øverås 1998: 11)

In (6), the translator explicitates the word *cigarette*. The motivation behind this minor shift seems to be the fact that while most Norwegian readers probably know that *Hobby* is a cigarette brand, English readers might have difficulty in drawing this inference. This example therefore appears to be a paradigm case of pragmatic explicitation, which should of course be excluded from a study on translation-inherent explicitation.

Let us look at a final example:

(7) Nå er St. Patrick den største helgenen i hele Irland.
'Now St. Patrick is the greatest saint in all of Ireland.'

Now Saint Patrick is regarded as the greatest saint in all of Ireland.
(Øverås 1998: 10)

Øverås' inclusion of (7) as evidence for the Explicitation Hypothesis is particularly troubling, as this example does not even qualify as an instance of explicitation, neither according to the definitions provided in Section 1.3 nor to Øverås' own definition quoted above. In the Norwegian source text of (7), the author expresses his belief in the proposition that St. Patrick is the greatest saint in all of Ireland. In the English target text, on the other hand, things are very different. Here, the translator has expanded the verb phrase to *is regarded as*, entailing a considerable change in meaning: The belief in the proposition is no longer attributed to the author, but rather to an unspecified person or group of persons. The translator has fundamentally changed the truth-conditional meaning of the target text vis-à-vis the source text.

So we are not dealing with a shift from implicit to explicit meaning here, but with an (ideologically motivated?) *change* in meaning brought about by the translator; the target text encodes a different state of affairs from the source text, so the question of whether the expansion of the verb phrase performed by the translator is to be counted as a case of explicitation does not even arise. (If anything, the expansion should be counted as an implicitation rather than an explicitation, since the passive verb form *is regarded as* leaves implicit to whom the belief of the proposition expressed is attributed.)

Øverås justifies her decision to include (7) as an instance of explicitation by informing us that "it often proved difficult to determine the extent to which a shift affects meaning" and that "all instances perceived to explicitate have therefore been included" (1998: 11). It should go without saying that counting data as evidence for a hypothesis should not rely on

the "perception" of the researcher but on objective criteria such as those proposed in Section 1.3.

Let us turn to Øverås' results. Table 2.1 (taken from Øverås 1998: 15) presents an overview of the explicitating and implicitating shifts that she counted in her data.

	English-Norwegian	Norwegian-English
Explicitation	347	248
Implicitation	149	76

Table 2.1: Explicitations and implicitations counted by Øverås (1998) in her translation corpus (containing 1000 sentences per translation direction)

We can see from the table that there are roughly 100 more explicitating shifts in the English-Norwegian translations than in the Norwegian-English translations investigated by Øverås. As for the implicitating shifts, they show a similarly skewed distribution over the two translation directions which in this case is even more pronounced: There are almost twice as many shifts from English into Norwegian than in the opposite translation direction. Most interestingly, explicitating shifts in both translation directions are consistently more frequent than implicitating ones.

Despite the lopsided distribution of explicitations across the two translation directions, Øverås optimistically tells us that "one may safely conclude that [...] Blum-Kulka's explicitation hypothesis is confirmed". However, she adds the proviso that "[c]onfirmation was stronger in translations from English into Norwegian than in the opposite direction" (1998: 16). I find this conclusion highly implausible. How can the hypothesis that "explicitation is a universal strategy inherent in the process of language mediation" (Blum-Kulka 1986: 21) find "stronger" confirmation in one translation direction than in the other? There is clearly something wrong here.

I would like to propose an alternative conclusion that seems much more plausible: The explicitations identified by Øverås are not of the translation-inherent type; rather, they go back to a mixture of obligatory, optional and pragmatic explicitations (cf. the examples discussed above). This would explain the imbalanced distribution of explicitations across the two translation directions quite nicely: We would expect English and Norwegian to differ in terms of the degree of explicitness they favor lexicogrammatically and stylistically, and these differences probably account for the skewing observed by Øverås. Overall, the lexicogrammatical prop-

erties and/or stylistic preferences of English seem to favor a higher degree of explicitness than those of Norwegian.

Since the alternative interpretation of Øverås' findings offered in the previous paragraph does not require the assumption that a number of translation-inherent explicitations are 'hidden' among her data, it is more in line with Occam's Razor and thus to be preferred over Øverås' interpretation of her results as evidence for the Explicitation Hypothesis. Still, her finding that there are more explicitations than implicitations in both translation directions is remarkable. We will have to explain it in the following (see Section 2.5).

2.3.4 Additions of connectives in translated Chinese

In a pilot study, Chen (2004) investigates the use of connectives in English source texts, their Chinese translations, and comparable Chinese texts. The source texts and translations among his data originate from the author's English-Chinese Parallel Corpus (ECPC), a work-in-progress translation corpus of "non-literary published works in the genres of popular science and information technology" which "is expected to contain 700,000 running words (fifteen works) in the English sub-corpus and 900,000 words in each of the two Chinese sub-corpora, totaling 2.5 million words." (2004: 300f). The quotation evokes the impression that Chen (2004) has investigated a yet incomplete corpus, but we do not learn how many words the corpus contained at the time of Chen's study. It is interesting to note that Chen's corpus, contains two Chinese translations per English source text, one published in Taiwan (traditional Chinese characters) and the other from a Chinese publishing house (simplified Chinese characters). This split makeup of the translation part of the corpus allows interesting comparisons of two potentially different sets of translation norms, one for Taiwan and one for China.

To compare the English-Chinese translations with non-translated Chinese texts, Chen draws on a big reference corpus of Chinese called the Sinica Corpus. The author claims that "the Sinica Corpus is especially comparable [to the ECPC] in that 12.97 per cent of its texts are science-related [...]." (2004: 304) It is not clear how Chen comes to consider the Sinica Corpus as "especially comparable" to his ECPC, but this assumption is clearly misled. How can a corpus containing only 12.97% of "science-related"[9] texts be comparable to a corpus containing texts from

[9] We do not learn what Chen means by "science-related" – popular scientific or 'real' academic texts? There are big differences between these two genres (see e.g. Baumgarten

the genres popular science and information technology? A look at the website of the Sinica Corpus[10] reveals that the other genres represented are as diverse as "Society", "Art" and "Literature" (for example), which means that this reference corpus is definitely not comparable to the ECPC compiled by Chen.

Chen quotes Chinese scholars who assume that connectives are used much more rarely in Chinese than in English. For example, Si claims that "Chinese is a language of no links, at least it is so on the surface" (quoted by Chen 2004: 298). So it is indeed very "reasonable to consider translated Chinese text as a good candidate for the investigation of explicitation, at least at the level of overt cohesive relationships expressed by [connectives]." (2004: 299) Since the stylistic norms of Chinese seem to tend towards a relatively low degree of cohesive explicitness, explicitation and the heightened degree of explicitness it causes should particularly stand out in translated Chinese. (On the other hand, there is also the danger of heavy source language interference from English, which might cause an over-use of connectives in Chinese target texts.)

Chen's tentative conclusion from his pilot study is "that translated Chinese in the genres under investigation tends to exhibit a higher level of conjunctive explicitness than both the [source text] and the comparable non-translated Chinese texts." (2004: 309). However, both parts of this conclusion are unwarranted. (Part 1: English-Chinese translations are more explicit than their source texts. Part 2: English-Chinese translations are more explicit than non-translated Chinese texts.) To see why, let us have a look at the author's results. They may be summarized as follows:

1. Nine of the most frequent Chinese connectives (e.g. *dan* 'but' and *yinwei* 'because') were searched for in the Chinese target texts in order to determine whether the connective in question has an equivalent in the English target texts or has been added (explicitated) by the translator.

   Result: 42% of all connectives in the Taiwanese translations and 29% of all connectives in the Chinese translations were added by the translator.

   Problem: These figures are meaningless if implicitations are not taken into account. How many connectives in the English source texts were left untranslated ('implicitated')? It might well be that

and Probst 2004: 70ff), Hansen-Schirra et al. 2009).

[10]See `http://rocling.iis.sinica.edu.tw/CKIP/engversion/20corpus.htm`.

there are more implicitations than explicitations in the Chinese translations, which would invalidate the first part of Chen's conclusion.

2. Ten[11] of the most frequent Chinese connectives were counted in (1.) the non-translated Chinese texts, (2.) the English-Chinese translations published in China and (3.) the English-Chinese translations published in Taiwan.

   Result: 350 connectives in the non-translated texts, 372 connectives in the Chinese translations (+6.3% vis-à-vis non-translated texts), and 393 connectives in the Taiwanese translations (+12.3% vis-à-vis non-translated texts).

   Problem: As we have seen above, English texts seem to contain a lot more connectives than Chinese texts, so it is impossible to say whether the elevated frequencies of connectives in the English-Chinese translations are due to explicitation or source language interference. (Since the frequency difference between the two translated subcorpora on the one hand and the non-translated texts on the other is rather small, it may well be that explicitation does in fact play a minor role here – if any – compared to source language interference.)

Again, we see that investigating explicitation is a tricky business. More precisely, it seems to be impossible to investigate explicitation in isolation. In order to be able to draw valid conclusions from the investigation of a translation corpus, the researcher has to take various other phenomena besides explicitation into account, such as implicitation and source language interference. If this is not done, results can be highly misleading and difficult to interpret.

In my eyes, the most important and interesting finding of Chen's (2004) study is one that the author does not comment on very much, namely the remarkable differences in terms of explicitation between the English-Chinese translations published in Taiwan and the English-Chinese translations published in China. It seems that translators' explicitation behavior is strongly influenced by communicative conventions, which may be translation norms, assumed stylistic preferences of the target audience, register conventions, or the like. Above all, Chen's study suggests to me that explicitation is a phenomenon highly sensitive to such pragmatic factors. The importance of these factors is underlined by Weissbrod's

[11] It is unclear why Chen (2004) investigated nine connectives in the first part of his study but ten in the second part.

(1992) study of explicitation in English-Hebrew translations of fictional texts, which will be discussed in the Section 2.4.1.

2.3.5 Other studies on the Explicitation Hypothesis

As the major problems shared by most studies on the Explicitation Hypothesis have already been identified in the detailed discussions of the preceding sections, it is not necessary to pursue the discussion at the same level of detail. Thus the following discussion of further studies will be limited to briefly pointing out their most important problems. Section 2.5 will provide a summary of all points of criticism that have been raised in this chapter against studies of Blum-Kulka's hypothesis.

Similarly to Øverås (1998), Pápai (2004) acknowledges that there are types of explicitation other than the hypothesized translation-inherent type, but she nevertheless includes all explicitations she encountered in her frequency counts. It is thus not surprising that Pápai found higher frequencies of explicitness-related features (such as conjunctions or discourse particles) in English-Hungarian translations than in non-translated Hungarian texts. From this finding, she concludes that "explicitation is likely to be a universal feature of translated texts, i.e. this set of data supports Blum-Kulka's hypothesis" (Pápai 2004: 157). As in the case of Øverås (1998), I cannot see how data which include optional explicitations could support Blum-Kulka's assumption of a translation-inherent process of explicitation in any meaningful way. To name just one example of an alternative explanation, Pápai's findings may equally well be explained as resulting from an overly generous use of optional explicitations by translators, i.e. as a case of normalization. Another, even simpler explanation of Pápai's findings would be that the 'overuse' of explicitness-related features in the translated Hungarian texts may be the result of source language interference.

Another problem in Pápai's study is that the author does not properly apply her definition of explicitation to her corpus data. On the one hand, Pápai defines explicitation as "a technique of resolving ambiguity, improving and increasing cohesiveness of the [source text] and also of adding linguistic and extralinguistic information" (Pápai 2004). On the other hand, she claims:

> If we consider the structural differences between the two languages involved (the agglutinative Hungarian uses fewer words to express the same meaning than the analytical English, e.g. *I love you* → *Szeretlek*) translations from English into

> Hungarian would be expected to result in implicitation (making things more general, omitting linguistic or extralinguistic information of the [source text]) rather than in explicitation. (Pápai 2004: 159)

This argumentation is clearly fallacious. Just because Hungarian in certain cases encodes functional categories such as subject or object by means of verbal affixes rather than by means of separate words, that does not mean that the language is 'inherently implicit' in comparison with English.[12] Like my definition of explicitation given in Section 1.3, Pápai's definition refers to the addition of (lexicogrammatically encoded) *information*, which of course is not equivalent to the addition of *words*. Her above claim that Hungarian is generally characterized by a lower degree of explicitness than English shows that her view of explicitation is much more superficial (equating explicitation with the addition of words) than her definition suggests.

While Pápai (2004) provides a definition of explicitation, but does not seem to apply it to empirical data consistently, there are studies that do not even offer a definition of explicitation at all. One example would be Kamenická's (2008) study of explicitation-implicitation ratios in English-Czech translations by two different translators. Although Kamenická acknowledges that "the concept of explicitation has been surrounded by much conceptual vagueness" (Kamenická 2008: 188), she does not define what she counted as explicitations. Only at the very end of her article does Kamenická provide two examples of what she considers as cases of "interpersonal explicitation", one of which definitely does not qualify as such:

(8) Now, before you get upset listen to me.

'Now, before you get upset you must listen to me'[13] (Kamenická 2008: 127)

For some reason, the Czech translator of (8) has chosen to translate the imperative of the English original as an indicative plus a modal expression ('must'; probably *muset* was used in the Czech translation that Kamenická

[12] As Klaudy (1993: 68) notes, "[l]anguages cannot be divided into inherently explicit or implicit languages". However, Klaudy falls into the same trap as Pápai when she goes on to claim that "Hungarian for instance is implicit on phrase level (synthetic noun and verb forms), but explicit on sentence level (finite clauses)" (Klaudy 1993: 68). The fallacy that Pápai and Klaudy seem to commit is to equate synthetic with implicit and analytic with explicit, an equation which is not admissible.

[13] Unfortunately, Kamenická only provides English glosses of the Czech translations.

does not quote). Nevertheless, contrary to what Kamenická states, the illocutionary force of the utterance is the same in both cases: An obligation is imposed on the addressee to listen. The only difference between the English original and its Czech translation is that in the former, the obligation is expressed by means of the imperative while in the latter it is encoded by means of the modal 'must'. (Cf. Verstraete 2007: 39ff, who highlights the parallels between the English imperative and modal expressions such as *must*.) The target text does not express more information lexicogrammatically than the source text, so there is no explicitation here.[14]

That the English original in (8) does not contain the personal pronoun *you* is irrelevant with respect to explicitness, since the existence of an addressee is part of the imperative's constructional meaning (cf. von Polenz 1981: 97) and thus does not need to be inferred. We could say that in the target text reference to the addressee is encoded lexically (by means of the personal pronoun *you*), while in the source text it is encoded grammatically (by means of the constructional meaning of the imperative). The example shows that Kamenická's (2008) study was based on a superficial and intransparent notion of explicitation, which unfortunately casts serious doubts on the validity of her interesting findings.

Another methodologically problematic study that I would like to briefly discuss here was conducted by Konšalová (2007), who has investigated explicitating and implicitating shifts in the domain of syntax (e.g. the rendering of nonfinite clauses as finite clauses, the latter of which are more explicit as they contain an overtly encoded subject). She counted these shifts in a corpus of German-Czech and Czech-German translations in order to compare the resulting levels of explicitness with those of non-translated texts in the two languages. While she found a higher degree of explicitness in the Czech-German translations than in the non-translated German texts, the analysis of the opposite translation direction "did not reveal any clear-cut explicitation tendencies" (Konšalová 2007: 31).

First, this finding indicates that Konšalová's data contain a considerable number of (direction-dependent) obligatory and/or optional explicitations, which are likely to account for the observed skewing. Second, the Explicitation Hypothesis is clearly disconfirmed for this data set: If explicitation were really "a universal in syntactic de/condensation", as the title of Konšalová's paper suggests, both investigated translation direc-

[14] In fact, it is even the other way round: (8) is an instance of implicitation. The modal 'must' is vague between a subjective and an objective reading on the one hand and between a deontic and an epistemic interpretation on the other (Lyons 1982: 109). The English imperative is not vague in these respects (cf. Verstraete 2007: 39ff), i.e. more explicit than 'must'.

tions should display a tendency towards explicitation, not just one. But, quite surprisingly, once again we read the familiar chorus: "The results of this study are in line with the findings of other authors, whose research offers data in support of the explicitation hypothesis (e.g. Øverås 1998, Fabricius-Hansen 1998, Olohan and Baker 2000, Pápai 2004)" (Konšalová 2007: 31).

Incidentally, the studies Konšalová quotes can hardly be said to support the Explicitation Hypothesis either. The results of Øverås (1998), Olohan and Baker 2000, and Pápai (2004) have already been discussed above. With regard to Fabricius-Hansen (1998), Konsalová acknowledges that "it remains unclear whether the explicitations can in this case be attributed to the translation process itself, or different stylistic preferences [...]" (Konsalová 2007: 18). It is thus unclear why she cites the study as evidence for the Explicitation Hypothesis. Fabricius-Hansen herself, by the way, only considers stylistic and structural contrasts between the languages studied (German, Norwegian and English) as possible explanations for her findings (Fabricius-Hansen 1998: 232).

All of the studies discussed so far have been shown to share one problem: Alternative explanations of the obtained findings, i.e. other explanations than the one provided by Blum-Kulka's Explicitation Hypothesis, have not been considered to a sufficient extent. There are only few studies where the necessity of considering alternative explanations has been taken seriously. They will be discussed in the remainder of this section.

Hansen-Schirra, Neumann, and Steiner (2007) report on a study that they have carried out using their CroCo corpus, a carefully constructed corpus of English and German texts as well as their translations in both directions.[15] Drawing on the Hallidayan framework of Systemic Functional Linguistics, the authors of the study seek to provide a theoretically motivated operationalization of explicitation "by defining explicitness and explicitation, by stratifying it in terms of different linguistic levels, by tightening its boundaries, and by modularizing it in a multifunctional perspective" (Steiner 2005: 19). As the citation suggests, one component of this approach is to thoroughly control for disturbing factors such as source language interference or normalization. Hansen-Schirra et al. (2007) have done this in an exemplary way, always comparing source texts, target texts and non-translated texts from comparable registers.

Unfortunately, the authors' results do not have much to offer in sup-

[15]This study does not investigate the Explicitation Hypothesis specifically. It has nevertheless been included here since the authors claim to have found a type of explicitation that "might be due to the translation process" (see below).

port of the Explicitation Hypothesis; in all phenomena they have investigated so far, increases of explicitness from source to target text could be explained without assuming the existence of a translation-inherent type of explicitation. The only case where the authors feel the need to speculate that a type of explicitation "due to the translation process" might be involved is the case of lexical cohesion. Hansen-Schirra et al. (2007) report that in certain registers represented in their corpus, English-German translations consistently display higher type-token ratios than their English source texts. They argue that:

> This can be seen as an indicator of a higher level of lexical cohesion. The influence of contrastive differences does not provide a satisfactory explanation for this phenomenon, considering that the differences between source and target texts vary considerably. Therefore, this rise in lexical density might be due to the trans- lation process. (Hansen-Schirra et al. 2007: 261)

While it seems plausible to interpret higher type-token ratios as an increase in lexical cohesion (and thus as a case of explicitation), the authors do not explain why "[t]he influence of contrastive differences does not provide a satisfactory explanation for this phenomenon". To substantiate this claim, Hansen-Schirra and her colleagues would have to show that (a) non-translated German texts exhibit lower type-token ratios than English-German translations and that (b) the elevated type-token ratios in the translations are not the result of normalization.

The next study that I would like to discuss has been conducted by Baumgarten, Meyer, and Özçetin (2008) using a corpus of English-German translations of popular scientific texts. The authors have investigated the addition of parenthetical expressions by translators, finding 284 cases of explicitation. Following Blum-Kulka's (1986) advice to start out with a contrastive investigation of stylistic contrasts between source and target language, Baumgarten et al. first established the different ways in which parentheticals are used by English and German authors. Drawing on the results of this contrastive pilot study, the authors then 'filtered' the 284 cases of explicitation identified in the translation analysis by excluding optional and pragmatic explicitations (obligatory explicitation did not play a role in their study, since the addition of a parenthetical is never obligatory). Only five possibly translation-inherent instances of explicitation remained, leading Baumgarten et al. to conclude that:

> explicitation [...] is clearly not a universal phenomenon.

> Sometimes it occurs, sometimes it does not, and when it occurs it is [...] more often than not an explicitation triggered by the communicative conventions and stylistic norms of the target language community rather than being inherent (i.e. beyond the control of the translator) in the process of translation. (Baumgarten et al. 2008: 198f)

The five instances of explicitation that Baumgarten et al. were unable to explain as optional or pragmatic explicitations all concerned "the addition of translations of foreign-language terminology" (2008: 193). I have not seen their data, but on the face of it, the addition of a parenthetical to elucidate a foreign language term rather sounds like a case of pragmatic than translation-inherent explicitation. (In any case, Baumgarten, et al. found only 5 of the 284 observed parentheticals to be of this kind.)

In Becher (2010c), I have applied Baumgarten et al.'s (2008) 'filtering method' of identifying possible cases of translation-inherent explicitation to the investigation of cohesive explicitation. Searching for occurrences of the German demonstrative adverb *damit* 'thus' in a corpus of English-German translations of popular scientific texts (the same corpus as the one used by Baumgarten et al.), I isolated all occurrences where *damit* had no equivalent in the English source text, i.e. where the adverb constituted an addition by the translator. From the remaining set of occurrences I excluded all instances of obligatory, optional and pragmatic explicitation, hoping to obtain a residue of translation-inherent explicitations. It turned out that only very few additions of *damit* (approximately 5 to 10 occurrences) survived this filtering process. Although I did not find any evidence for classifying these instances as obligatory, optional or pragmatic explicitations, I still hesitated to open up a new category of translation-inherent for them, because:

> it is generally unclear how cases of translation-inherent explicitation may be identified, since no independent criteria have been proposed and the 5–10 cases under consideration – apart from their extreme redundancy – have nothing in common that would make their attribution to the (hypothesized) category of translation-inherent explicitation seem plausible. (Becher 2010c: 19)

This brings me to an important point, with which I would like to conclude my discussion of studies on Blum-Kulka's Explicitation Hypothesis. Although the last three studies – Hansen-Schirra et al. (2007), Baumgarten

et al. (2008), and Becher (2010c) – have largely managed to avoid the errors commited in previous studies, they still did not manage to provide any firm evidence for the existence of a translation-inherent type of explicitation. The reason is that, as the above citation from my 2010c article illustrates, the putative category of translation-inherent explicitation is so hopelessly fuzzy and poorly defined that no one really knows what exactly to look for when trying to point out instances of translation-inherent explicitation. This problem is nothing more than a reflex of the grave theoretical problems surrounding the Explicitation Hypothesis that have been identified in Section 2.2 and once again emphasizes that this is not a useful hypothesis. Section 2.5 will introduce the Asymmetry Hypothesis as a much better alternative to the Explicitation Hypothesis.

2.4 Qualitative studies on explicitation

While quantitative studies usually test some sort of hypothesis, qualitative studies most often have the purpose of generating new hypotheses, drawing the attention of the researcher to phenomena that have not been accounted for so far. Thus, research on a given phenomenon usually starts with qualitative studies, which are later superseded by quantitative studies once the phenomenon is better understood, i.e. all major relevant factors determining the phenomenon have been identified.

The relatively large number of quantitative studies on explicitation discussed in the previous section may evoke the impression that the transition from qualitative to quantitative research has already been made in the case of explicitation. However, as the present section shows, this impression is false. Qualitative studies on explicitation still have much to contribute to this strand of research. This is evidenced by the studies to be discussed in the following, which shed light on a number of factors that have been largely ignored in quantitative studies on explicitation. They show that explicitation is a norm-dependent phenomenon (Section 2.4.1) that can vary across translators (Sections 2.4.2 and 2.4.3) and source/target language pairs (Section 2.4.4).

2.4.1 Explicitation as a norm-dependent phenomenon

In a purely qualitative study, Weissbrod (1992) has investigated explicitation in translations of fictional narratives from English to Hebrew that were published between the 1960s and 1970s. The author distinguishes

between two registers that she calls "canonized" and "non-canonized" literature. Although Weissbrod does not offer any quantitative results, the results of her study are highly interesting since, unlike most other studies on explicitation, it departs from the "assumption [...] that explicitation in translation is not, as previous research has suggested, solely a universal tendency [...]. It is norm-dependent and thus changes with historical circumstances [...]." (1992: 153) In the following, I am going to give a brief summary of Weissbrod's results.

According to Weissbrod, two different registers may be distinguished in English-Hebrew literary translations of the 1960s and 1970s: "canonized" literature and "non-canonized" literature. Canonized literature comprised literary works by renowned and venerable authors such as William Faulkner or Charles Dickens, while non-canonized literature comprised entertaining light fiction such as Ian Fleming's *James Bond* novels. The two types of literature were translated from English by different publishers, who employed different translators following different translational, registerial, and linguistic norms. In her study, Weissbrod observes that the different sets of norms employed in translations of canonized and non-canonized literature seem to have led to different explicitation profiles. Her main results may be summarized as follows:

1. "In non-canonized literature of the 1960s the tendency to explicitate in translations from English to Hebrew was stronger than in canonized literature. It brought about more shifts of translation and more drastic ones." (1992: 161) This was because translators of canonized literature strived to follow the stylistic norms of Biblical Hebrew, which tend towards a high degree of implicitness (1992: 156).

2. Translators of canonized and non-canonized literature of the 1960s were found to explicitate for different reasons:

   (a) Translators of canonized literature mainly explicitated in order to live up to certain stylistic ideals. For example, they completed unfinished or elliptic sentences, which were meant to simulate spoken language. "This was probably due not only to the tendency to explicitate but also to the strong language norm which dictated a preference for well-built sentences and objected to the use of authentic spoken language." (1992: 160) In other words, explicitations in English-Hebrew translations of canonized literature were mostly triggered by translators' *conservatism* (a hypothesized 'translation universal', cf. Baker 1996).

(b) Translators of non-canonized literature mainly explicitated in order to improve readability, e.g. "by transforming the coherent into the cohesive" (1992: 164). They did this because readers of non-canonized literature "were perceived as an unsophisticated audience which should not be confronted with any difficulties in reading the texts." (1992: 161) In other words, explicitations in English-Hebrew translations of canonized literature were mostly triggered by translators' tendency to *simplify* (another putative 'translation universal', cf. Baker 1996).

3. In the late 1960s and during the 1970s, canonized and non-canonized litarature drew closer to each other as explicitation became less frequent in both registers. The reason for the decline of explicitation across registers was that (a) source language interference became more acceptable and (b) the two registers influenced each other over time, resulting in a partial convergence of norms.

Weissbrod's results confirm a doubt that was raised in several of the studies on explicitation discussed above: that a putative tendency to explicitate may really be the reflex of a more fundamental tendency of source language interference, normalization/conservatism, simplification, or the like. Moreover, the diachronic trend towards less explicitation sketched by Weissbrod makes unmistakably clear that explicitation in not an invariant feature of translated text but a tendency that is heavily influenced by pragmatic factors such as the existence of generally accepted communicative norms.

2.4.2 Explicitation and translator style

Saldanha (2008) addresses some aspects of explicitation that have been largely neglected in translation studies. The present section summarizes some of her most important points. The part of Saldanha's paper that is most important for our purposes is the second part, where the author reports on a corpus study in which she compared the explicitation profiles of two renowned literary translators, Margaret Jull Costa and Peter Bush, using two corpora of Spanish-English and Portuguese-English translations by the two translators (Saldanha 2005). In this study, the author found "that there was a more marked tendency towards explicitation in translations by Margaret Jull Costa than in translations by Peter Bush" (Saldanha 2008: 30). To find out why, Saldanha turned to Jull Costa's and Bush's writings about translation and conducted interviews with the two translators,

concluding that "their own different conceptions of their roles as intercultural mediators in relation to their audience" (2008: 31) were responsible for the translators' different explicitation profiles.

More specifically, Saldanha found that:

> Jull Costa wants her translations to be acceptable in the terms established by the target culture, her translations are driven by a desire to make their reading a pleasurable experience, which is not interrupted by encounters with information, such as source language words, that the readers cannot process in their own cognitive environment. [...] Bush, on the other hand, is driven by a desire to introduce new foreign authors to Britain's literary market [...] and is ready to challenge readers to shift out of their usual patterns to read them. (Saldanha 2008: 31f)

The quotations suggest that the higher number of explicitations in Jull Costa's translations vis-à-vis Peter Bush's translations results from a tendency to normalize and to simplify her target texts. (Normalization and simplification have already been touched upon in sections 2.3.1 and 2.4.1 as possible causes of explicitation.) Peter Bush, in contrast, is ready to tolerate and, in fact, to embrace a much higher degree of source language interference in his translations.

Saldanha's study is highly interesting in that it once again underlines that explicitation is not an invariant property of translated text. Rather, explicitation is a phenomenon that (1.) can differ radically across translators and (2.) may be a 'side effect' of translators' efforts to normalize and/or simplify.

While we are at it, let us also have a quick look at the first part of Saldanha's paper, which is less important for our present purposes, but still very interesting, since it shows that defining explicitation is not as easy as it might seem. In the first part of her paper, Saldanha questions the commonly made assumption that explicitation generally results in a target text that is more informative than the source text. As an example, she considers the translation of Spanish *chicha* as English *chicha beer*, arguing that "the item *chicha*, on its own, is likely to be much more informative to a source culture reader than *chicha beer* to an Anglo-saxon reader" (2008: 27) – although this shift definitely represents an instance of explicitation, at least according to the definitions usually found in the literature. What is going on here?

Saldanha's solution to this paradox "is to explain explicitation as a strategy that is not necessarily associated with implicitness in the source text, but with translators' assumptions about their readership and about

their role as literary and cultural mediators." (2008: 28). My own solution to this paradox, which I would like to briefly present here, is to divide the notion of *information* in two: linguistically encoded information and derivable (inferable) information. If only linguistically encoded information is considered, the English term *chicha beer* is more informative than the Spanish term *chicha*, since only the former (linguistically) specifies that chicha is a kind of beer. If derivable information is additionally taken into account, it is the other way round: The Spanish term is more informative for (most) Latin-American[16] readers than the English term is for (most) English readers, because only in the former is the term *chicha* likely to activate associated encyclopedic information such as the fact that chicha is a fermented beverage usually made from maize.

So, can we consider *chicha beer* an explicitation at all if the term is more informative in one respect but less informative in the other? Doubts such as this one are the reason why I define explicitness as the *verbalization* (i.e. linguistic encoding) of information, derivable (i.e. inferable) information being precisely the kind of information that makes an utterance implicit. Saldanha's interesting discussion of informativeness and explicitation once again shows how important it is for researchers to provide proper definitions of key terms such as explicitness and implicitness instead of relying on their intutions.

2.4.3 Expertise and explicitation

The only psycholinguistic investigation on explicitation that I know of has been carried out by Birgitta Englund Dimitrova (2003, 2005a, 2005b). Being the first study to combine a product-based with a process-based perspective on explicitation, this is certainly one of the most revealing studies on the topic. Englund Dimitrova asked nine subjects to translate a short text from Russian into their native language, Swedish, using a computer. Among the subjects were four professional transators, two translation students, and three language students. The idea behind this heterogenous composition of subjects was to find out whether a translator's explicitation behavior might be connected to his or her level of expertise. While being limited in terms of generalizability (due to the low number of subjects), Englund Dimitrova's results suggests that such a connection indeed exists.

To gain some insight into what might be going on in a translator's mind

[16]Saldanha points out that source-text readers from Spain might not be at all familiar with *chicha*.

when translating, Englund Dimitrova asked the participants of her study to think aloud while translating, recording their utterances on tape. Furthermore, participants' keystrokes were recorded by a suitable software tool. In this way, in addition to obtaining participants' translated texts, Englund Dimitrova was able to collect two kinds of psycholinguistic data offering insight into the translation process. In the following, I would like to briefly summarize three main results of Englund Dimitrova's study that seem particularly relevant to our present discussion of explicitation and implicitation.

First, the author found that "from a process perspective there are at least two different kinds of explicitation occurring for different reasons" (2005a: 36): The explicitations she observed in her study may be divided into two groups according to the reasons for which participants explicitated:

1. **Norm-governed explicitations.** This type of explicitation is language pair-specific, occurring as a result of lexicogrammatical and pragmatic contrasts between the source and target language. Norm-governed explicitations (a) are characterized by their high degree of regularity ("i.e., most translators tend to do the same type of explicitation in the given linguistic environment"; 2005a: 37) and (b) tend to be independent of translators' processing problems.

2. **Strategic explicitations.** This type of explicitation occurs when a translator encounters a processing difficulty in her target text: If a translator comes up with a translation solution that she finds difficult to process, she may explicitate by reformulating the target text in order to make processing easier.

It is interesting to note that when performing strategic explicitation, participants rarely went back to the source text, but generally preferred to reformulate the translation solution they had in mind. Englund Dimitrova formulates this as the following "regularity":

> When translators evaluate a tentative [target text] solution negatively, they tend to resort in the first place to reformulation in the [target language], rather than engaging in renewed processing of the corresponding [source text] chunk and subsequent renewed transfer into the [target language]. (2005b: 237)

The author adduces this regularity as an explanation of why translators tend to use explicitation (instead of e.g. implicitation) as a strategy for resolving processing difficulties, implying that the process of reformulation

carries with it a necessary increase in explicitness. However, this is not a real explanation, since it relies on the unproven assumption that reformulation is associated with explicitation. In Section 2.5, I will propose a better explanation of why translators tend to resort to explicitation (and not implicitation) when encountering possible processing difficulties.

The second main result of Englund Dimitrova's study is that differences between translators in terms of explicitation behavior can be remarkable (cf. the previous section on Saldanha 2005). In her 2003 paper, Englund Dimitrova investigates in detail how the participants of her study have dealt with two particular source text passages that 'invite' the addition of a connective. Overall, the author found that professional translators tended to explicitate, while rather inexperienced translators were found to explicitate rarely or inconsistently. However, Englund Dimitrova emphasizes that this difference between professional and non-professional translators is merely a tendency, since there were individuals that did not follow the established trend. For example, one of the four professional translators did not explicitate in either of the two text passages under investigation, while one of the two student translators did explicitate in both passages (2003: 26). The author concludes that explicitation seems to be a "professional norm" in Russian-Swedish translation, which, however, may be overridden by "parallel, competing norms, or [by] idiosyncratic behavior." (2005b: 238) It follows that explicitation is not a "universal strategy inherent in the process of language mediation" (Blum-Kulka 1986: 21), but rather one strategy among many.

Third, and finally, Englund Dimitrova's study can contribute to answering the old question (cf. our discussion of Blum-Kulka 1986 in Section 2.2) of whether explicitation is a "subconscious process" (Olohan and Baker 2000) or a conscious strategy. The author's findings suggest that explicitation is more often than not the result of a conscious decision on the part of the translator. Cf. the following extracts from the think-aloud protocols collected by the author (adapted from Englund Dimitrova 2003: 27f), where participants consciously decide to add (the Swedish equivalent of) the connective *however*, justifying their solution as easier to process:

(9) I'll add a *however* [. . .] so that the contrast becomes clearer

(10) this sentence is difficult to 'chew' [. . .] *however* it has to be [. . .] although it does not say so here

Think-aloud data such as the above show that explicitation does not happen automatically, eluding the conscious control of the translator, but rather seems to be the result of conscious reasoning processes. However,

Englund Dimitrova suggests that explicitating translation solutions that are evaluated positively (by translators themselves, clients, teachers, etc.) "may tend to be repeated and perhaps eventually become automated." (2005b: 239)

In sum, Englund Dimitrova's study once again shows that explicitation cannot be considered as "universal" or "translation-inherent", but should rather be described as a frequent – but not ubiquitous – phenomenon governed by factors that can vary across individuals.

2.4.4 Explicitness in English and German discourse

Like Weissbrod's (1992) study that has been dealt with in Section 2.4.1, House's (2004a) paper entitled "Explicitness in discourse across languages" is very different from most studies on explicitation in that it does not assume explicitness to be a universal, invariant phenomenon of translated text. Rather, House departs from the much more fruitful assumption that explicitness is a varied phenomenon that emerges in discourse and can substantially differ across languages.

To substantiate her idea, House discusses examples of explicitation and implicitation from English-German and German-English translations. Her qualitative analysis suggests that English-German translations are characterized by a prevalence of explicitating shifts, while German-English translations display a tendency towards implicitation. According to House, this observation can be linked up to independently established generalizations concerning English and German discourse norms. Thus, in accordance with her previous work (summarized in House 2006), which has shown that German discourse is generally characterized by a higher degree of explicitness than English discourse (see Section A.1.2 of the appendix), House observes that English-German translators tend to add items that can be seen as typical exponents of the German norm of explicitness. Conversely, these items are regularly omitted in German-English translations. For example, as House points out, English-German translators tend to add 'typically German' pronominal adverbs such as *damit* 'thus' or *womit* 'with what', while German-English translators tend to omit these items (2004a: 202f).

The main value of House's study is that it points to the crucial role of cross-linguistically different communicative conventions in the investigation of explicitation and implicitation in translation: A researcher unaware of the crucial role of the pronominal adverbs in the German system of cohesion might erroneously conclude that additions of *damit* or *womit* result

from a translation-inherent process of explicitation. However, as House shows, many shifts that may seem puzzling at first sight in fact go back to deep-seated cross-linguistic differences in discourse norms that may be studied and substantiated on an independent basis. Such a study of communicative norms is in fact necessary if one wants to properly appreciate the reasons for which translators explicitate (and implicitate) (cf. e.g. the discussion of Øverås 1998 in Section 2.3.3). When conducting the study to be presented in this book, I was in the lucky situation to be able to resort to House's and others' contrastive work on the language pair English-German. As we will see in later chapters, this made it possible to elucidate a large number of explicitating and implicitating shifts of various kinds.

To summarize the considerations made in her paper, House (2004a: 204) offers the following (slightly abridged) schema that gives an overview of possible "sources" of explicitness (or implicitness) in translation and thus at the same time represents an apt summary of the studies discussed in the present section:

1. Linguistic system-internal sources (source language/target language)
   (a) Obligatory linguistic choices
   (b) Optional linguistic choices
2. Other sources
   (a) Translator variables (who)
   (b) Situational variables (where, when)
   (c) Translation-task variables (why, who for)

In House's schema, the label *obligatory linguistic choices* refer to instances of explicitations that translators have to perform in order to achieve a grammatically well-formed target text. *Optional linguistic choices* subsume shifts not on the level of grammar, but on the level of discourse, e.g. shifts performed by the translator in order to comply with the communicative norms of the target language community (cf. Klaudy's 2008 distinction between obligatory and optional explicitations discussed in Section 2.1). Although optional shifts are not necessary, House's classifying them along with obligatory shifts as resulting from "linguistic system-internal" sources correctly emphasizes their systematic character, which has been overlooked in many studies dealing with explicitation.

Finally, House identifies additional factors that may determine the degree of explicitness found in a particular instance of translation: *translator variables (who)* (cf. Saldanha 2008), *situational variables (where, when)*, and *translation-task variables (why, who for)* (cf. Weissbrod 1992). Including linguistic as well as pragmatic factors, the above schema nicely summarizes the results of the qualitative studies discussed in the present section and simultaneously anticipates some important considerations that will be made in connection with the Asymmetry Hypothesis in the following section.

2.5 The Asymmetry Hypothesis

The preceding sections have pointed out four main problems with the Explicitation Hypothesis. The first two are of a theoretical nature (summarizing the three problems pointed out in connection with Blum-Kulka (1986) in Section 2.2), while the other two are of the methodological kind:

1. The assumption of a separate, translation-inherent type of explicitation is unmotivated, has been vaguely formulated, and collides with Occam's Razor. Thus, instead of explaining anything, the Explicitation Hypothesis only creates need for further explanation. Moreover, its investigation entails the danger of producing what I have called pseudo-significant findings.

2. The nature of translation-inherent explicitation is not clear. Is it supposed to be a subconscious or a conscious phenomenon? What does an instance of translation-inherent explicitation look like? How can it be distinguished from language pair-specific instances of explicitation? Etc.

3. Almost all of the studies on translation-inherent explicitation discussed in Section 2.3 have failed to control for interfering factors such as other types of explicitation, source language interference, the effect of other (putative) translation universals, etc.

4. Many studies either do not provide a definition of explicitation at all, or they provide one but do not adhere to it. This of course entails the danger of counting pseudo-explicitations such as the one evidenced in example (7) (discussed in Section 2.3.3 on Øverås 1998).

The four problems summarized above permit the following two, somewhat radical conclusions. First, the Explicitation Hypothesis should be

abandoned[17] because it is not a useful[18] hypothesis. Second, previous studies have failed to provide conclusive evidence for the hypothesis anyway.

In the remainder of this section, I am going to argue that a slightly adapted and properly motivated version of Klaudy's (2009) Asymmetry Hypothesis[19] can serve as a more useful and plausible guide for further research on explicitation. The hypothesis postulates 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: 14)

I find this formulation somewhat problematic,[20] as (1.) it does not specify which kinds of explicitation are covered (Klaudy's Types 1 to 3, or only optional explicitations?), (2.) the term *prefer* evokes the impression that a conscious decision is being made on the part of the translator (I would like to admit the possibility of subconscious explicitation in my version of the hypothesis) and (3.) the term *fail* has a prescriptive flavor to it. As will become clear in the following, I do not think we can blame translators for being more explicit than authors of non-translated texts. I would thus like to propose a slightly modified version of Klaudy's hypothesis:[21]

[17] If in the future we should find out that more conservative theories cannot explain the occurrence of explicitation phenomena in translation, we can still go back to Blum-Kulka's assumption of a translation-inherent type of explicitation, which, however, would have to be made a lot more precise before it could serve as a useful guide for research.

[18] The Explicitation Hypothesis is not useful in the sense that it is dangerous to investigate. Still, the hypothesis has sparked a great deal of interest in the important phenomenon of explicitation (and impliciation) in translation. In this respect, the Explicitation Hypothesis has been extremely useful for translation studies.

[19] The hypothesis was originally proposed in a 2001 conference paper (Klaudy 2001).

[20] What I like about Klaudy and Klaudy's formulation of the Asymmetry Hypothesis is the "not always" part (corresponding to "tend to" in my version of the hypothesis): They do not claim that explicitations outnumber implicitations in each and every case. As will become clear in the following, this weak formulation is fully justified.

[21] This is a corrected version of the formulation offered in Becher (2010a), where I inaccurately stated that: "Obligatory, optional and pragmatic explicitations tend to be more frequent than implicitations regardless of the [source language]/[target language] constellation at hand." (2010a: 17) This earlier formulation is faulty, since it erroneously implies that a lack of explicitation-implicitation counterbalancing means that explicitations are more frequent than implicitations. However, this is only the case if explicitations and implicitations in the L1→L2 direction as well as in the L2→L1 direction are considered.

The **Asymmetry Hypothesis** (modified version): Obligatory, optional and pragmatic explicitations in one translation direction tend to be more frequent than (i.e. not 'counterbalanced' by) the corresponding implicitations in the other translation direction, regardless of the source/target language constellation at hand.

The Asymmetry Hypothesis claims that translators display a tendency to explicitate, but it avoids positing a separate, translation-inherent type of explicitation. It makes do with Klaudy's explicitation Types 1 to 3, which are unproblematic and uncontroversial. The only remaining problem is that the Asymmetry Hypothesis still needs to be properly motivated (see Klaudy 2009 for a first sketch). This is what I am going to do in the following.

2.5.1 Motivating the Asymmetry Hypothesis

It is well known that human communication is driven by two competing forces, or principles (adapted from Horn 1984: 13; see also Atlas and Levinson 1981, Fabricius-Hansen 2005, Grice 1975):

1. **The Q Principle:** "Say as much as you can!" (→ explicitness)
2. **The R Principle:** "Say no more than you must!" (→ implicitness)

It is obvious that strictly speaking, the two principles contradict each other: "A speaker obeying only Q would tend to say everything she knows on the offchance that it might prove informative, while a speaker obeying only R would probably, to be on the safe side, not open her mouth" (Horn 1984: 15). It is impossible for a speaker to stick to just one of the two principles (which would not be very smart anyway); rather, when preparing her message for formulation, the speaker has to decide which principle to follow to which degree. In other words, the speaker has to determine the most favorable trade-off between the two principles. The Q and R principles can thus be regarded as the two (virtual) end points of an explicitness–implicitness scale inherent to linguistic communication.

It will be apparent that the specific communication situation at hand determines where a favorable trade-off between the two principles might

If one of the two translation directions, say L1→L2, is considered in isolation, it may turn out that there are *less* L1→L2 explicitations than L1→L2 implicitations, but still *more* L1→L2 explicitations than implicitations *in the other direction* (L2→L1).

be, i.e. which point on the explicitness–implicitness scale should be chosen for the message to be formulated. In face-to-face communication, the trade-off will tend towards the implicit end of the scale: If the hearer signals that my message turned out to be too implicit ("Huh, what do you mean?"), I can elaborate, i.e. make it more explicit *ex post*. In written text, on the other hand, the trade-off will tend towards the explicit end of the scale: Since I do not have access to direct hearer feedback in this case,[22] I will tend to be too explicit rather than too implicit when in doubt (cf. von Hahn 1997).

What is important to see here is that in terms of the explicitness– implicitness scale spanned by the Q and R Principles, *translations are written texts par excellence*. In other words, translations should tend to be located even further towards the explicit end of the scale than non-translated texts (cf. Klaudy 2009). This is due to two properties of the communicative situation typically underlying translation:

Property 1: The communicative situation underlying translation is typically characterized by cultural distance between (source language) author and (target language) reader (House 1997).

Konrad Ehlich has insightfully described written discourse as a "dilated speech situation" (1984). Writers and readers communicate as they would in face-to-face communication, albeit in a spatially and temporally "dilated" manner. (For example: An author produces a book and the reader answers by writing the author a letter.) This is why it was claimed above that written communication tends to be relatively explicit: Increasing the explicitness of the message *ex post* is not very practical in this communication situation.

Now, in translation, the speech situation is even more dilated than in monolingual written discourse: The distance between writer and reader is not only spatial and temporal, but also cultural. Recognizing this, responsible translators will move even further than authors of non-translated texts towards the explicit end of the Q–R scale in order to compensate for the perceived cultural distance. Viewed from this perspective, the tendency of translators to explicitate is nothing mysterious; it is not due to "subconscious processes" (Olohan and Baker 2000), but rather the result

[22]To ease exposition, I will ignore hybrid scenarios such as real-time written communication (as it takes place in Internet chatrooms, for example), which on the explicitness–implicitness scale would fall somewhere between face-to-face communication and 'traditional' written discourse. Also, it should be borne in mind that, as Biber (1988) has pointed out, there is no single linguistic dimension that neatly corresponds to the distinction 'spoken vs. written', and the dimension 'explicit vs. implicit' is no exception. The relative explicitness of written as compared to spoken discourse is just a tendency.

of a number of – conscious or subconscious (it does not matter in the present context) – attempts of translators to compensate for the cultural 'dilatedness' characteristic of translation as a specific communication scenario (cf. Saldanha [2008: 28], who stresses the dependence of explicitation on "translators' assumptions about their readership and about their role as literary and cultural mediators").

Note that the perceived need to deal with a dilated speech situation is not translation-specific. Thus, explicitations resulting from translators' preoccupation with reducing cultural distance cannot be called "translation-inherent". First, as I have argued above, translators follow the same communicative principles as authors of non-translated texts: They choose a certain point on the explicitness–implicitness scale in accordance with the perceived dilatedness of the communication situation at hand. Second, the need to bridge cultural gaps also arises in monolingual communication. Imagine, for example, the case of an immigrant author writing about the culture of his country of origin. Here, the same cultural bridging takes place as in translation. We should thus expect the author to pick a point on the Q–R scale near its explicit end – as would a translator.

Finally, it is worth pointing out that compensatory strategies are not necessarily applied only where appropriate. It may well be that translators, driven by an unspecific desire to bridge the cultural gap between source language author and target language reader, explicitate even in contexts where cultural differences are not directly relevant. For example, translators might compensate for the (possible) incoherence of text passages expressing source-culture specific concepts by increasing explicitness in other (related) text passages. (Another possibility would be that translators simply overuse compensatory, explicitating strategies.) Explicitations of this type might look puzzling to the researcher as to their origin. However, as the above line of argumentation has shown, we do not need to appeal to a mysterious notion of "translation-inherence" to explain their occurrence.

Property 2: The communicative situation underlying translation is typically characterized by a great deal of communicative risk (cf. Pym 2005, 2008, whom the line of argument below follows).

Authors of non-translated texts are paid for *content*, whereas translators are paid for *communication*.[23] The main task of the author is to make her thoughts available to the reader by putting them on paper. The

[23]This sweeping claim is of course an overgeneralization, but I think it nicely highlights an important difference between the task of the author and that of the translator (see the following remarks).

main task of the translator, in contrast, is to ensure understanding between source language author and target language reader, avoiding misunderstanding at all costs. If the reader – for whatever reason – has difficulties in understanding the translated text, she will be quick to blame the translator. Since translators are paid for linguistic mediation, i.e. for achieving understanding, they are always the prime suspects when communication problems occur. There is even the unpleasant case where a translator is blamed for the difficulty of a text that was already hard to understand in its source language version.

The upshot is that translators have to cope with a certain kind of risk – the risk of not being understood. Accordingly, it is not surprising that translators will go to great lengths to ensure understanding, and this is where explicitation comes into play. Implicitness is a viable option where readers can be expected to be able to infer the implicit information. But even in cases where the inference is an easy and obvious one, it may still happen that a given reader fails to draw it. The result may be a failure to understand – and thus a problem for the poor translator, who had merely attempted to stay true to the source language text. Therefore, it seems plausible to assume that translators will move up on the Q–R scale, i.e. they will tend to be too explicit rather than too implicit when in doubt (and maybe even when not in doubt).

What is the risk of being too explicit? A waste of energy and paper – not too bad. What is the risk of being too implicit? Communicative breakdown – very bad. This shows that it is perfectly natural and justifiable for translators to adopt a strategy of avoiding implicitness, even where it is not licensed by the source text.

Again, note that the tendency of translators to avoid risk cannot be called "translation-inherent". First, it depends on the individual translator how much risk she is willing to take. Translators may either be rather confident or averse to risk-taking. Moreover, risk differs across translation scenarios (cf. e.g. the translation of a law vs. the translation of a cooking recipe). Second, authors of non-translated texts have to deal with the same kind of risk that translators face (cf. von Hahn 1997), albeit to a lesser degree. Imagine, for example, the case of a scientist writing for a lay public, who has to deal with the very same kind of communicative risk as a translator.

A thought experiment. To see how the two principles outlined above can work together in engendering explicitational asymmetry and how they apply to a translation situation where the source and the target language are governed by different sets of communicative norms, let us engage in a little thought experiment. Consider the case of two fictional

languages, Ex and Im.[24] In both languages, connective adverbs are optional. However, speakers of Ex use a connective adverb in almost every sentence while speakers of Im only use one in rare cases where ambiguity may result otherwise.

Now, if we were to translate a text from Im to Ex, we would find ourselves adding a lot of connective adverbs, i.e. we would find ourselves explicitating. Otherwise speakers of Ex, being used to texts where semantic relations tend to be explicitly signalled, might perceive our text as incoherent or even incomprehensible. If we were to translate from Ex to Im, on the other hand, it would not be that important to omit connective adverbs, i.e. to implicitate: Speakers of Im will understand our text anyway and perceive it as coherent. In the worst case, they might find it stylistically awkward, wondering why all those semantic relations are explicitly signalled that they would have easily inferred on their own. (End of thought experiment.)

The above thought experiment illustrates quite nicely that in typical translation situations, implicitation has by far not the same significance as explicitation. Readers should not have much of a problem understanding a text that is more explicit than they expect. But they can have quite a big problem when the text in question is more implicit than the texts they are used to. The upshot of this is that (from Principles 1 and 2) we should expect the relation between explicitation and implicitation to be asymmetric in most (but not all – see below) translation situations. The relationship between explicitation and implicitation tends towards asymmetry by nature of the concepts involved: Explicitness is 'more', implicitness is 'less'. And in the case of language, a 'too much' is in most cases better than a 'not enough': A piece of information encoded with excessive redundancy tends to be better than one which ends up not being understood because certain parts have not been explicitly encoded. Somewhat casually speaking, we can say that in language, explicitness is a basic commodity while implicitness is a luxury.

In the present section, I have argued that translation is not fundamentally different from monolingual discourse as far as the balance between explicitness and implicitness is concerned. When choosing a point on the explicitness–implicitness scale, translators are guided by the very same

[24] 'Any resemblance to real languages, living or dead, is purely coincidental' – no, wait, it is not! Ex and Im represent exaggerated versions of German and English, with Ex resembling German and Im resembling English (cf. Section A.1.2 of the appendix, where English and German are compared in terms of explicitness). As we will see in Chapter 5, explicitations and implicitations of connectives in translations between English and German behave as we would expect from the present thought experiment.

considerations as monolingual authors. At times, the latter also have to deal with cultural distance and/or communicative risk. This means that explicitation, insofar as it is caused by the tendencies of translators to compensate for cultural distance and to avoid risk, is neither "translation-inherent" (translators do not do anything translation-specific, they only do what authors of non-translated texts do) nor "universal" in a strict sense (there will always be situations in which translators do not display the mentioned tendencies).

As far as the explicitness–implicitness dimension of language use is concerned, translation is not a "third code";[25] it is not an exceptional or anomalous kind of discourse governed by other constraints than normal language use. As stated by House, "[t]ranslation is no more and no less than a practical activity. It can be described as an act of performance, of parole, not of langue or competence" (2008: 11). Rather, the relative explicitness of translated discourse is a straightforward result of the communicative circumstances under which it is typically produced. The Asymmetry Hypothesis that I have argued for above does justice to this insight, as it merely claims that explicitations in one translation direction *tend to* be more frequent than the corresponding implicitations in the other translation direction, thus allowing for exceptional cases where cultural distance is insignificant and/or communicative risk is low. In these cases, we do not expect explicitations to outnumber implicitations.

2.5.2 What explicitational asymmetry looks like in practice

We have now provided a motivation for postulating the Asymmetry Hypothesis: Explicitations in one translation direction tend not to be counterbalanced by implicitations in the other translation direction due to two typical properties of the communication scenario underlying translation. In this way, we have also offered an explanation for Øverås' (1998) finding that explicitations outnumber implicitations in her corpus. Let us see how the explicitation-implicitation imbalance posited by the Asymmetry Hypothesis works out in practice by looking at a concrete example:

(11) The virus is one of the major causes of chronic liver disease, probably accounting for even more cases than excessive alcohol use.

HCV verursacht wahrscheinlich mehr chronische

[25] As far as less controversial phenomena such as source language interference are concerned, it may well be justified to call translation a "third code". The term goes back to Frawley (1984).

> Lebererkrankungen als Alkoholmißbrauch. Das Virus steht *damit* in vorderster Reihe der Faktoren, die zu Leberleiden führen.
>
> 'HCV probably causes more cases of chronic liver disease than alcohol abuse. The virus *thus* is among the prime factors that cause liver disease.'

The example consists of an excerpt from an article published in the popular scientific magazine Scientific American alongside its German translation, which appeared in the German magazine Spektrum der Wissenschaft. The English source text sentence consists of a main clause to which an *ing*-adjunct has been attached, a construction which is highly underspecified semantically (cf. Blühdorn 2010 on semantic underspecificity in clause linkage). *Ing*-adjuncts may express a variety of relations ranging from temporality to causality (Behrens 1999). The translation problem that we witness here is that German does not have a construction syntactically and semantically equivalent to the English *ing*-adjunct. The translator has thus decided to split the source text sentence into two target text sentences, a common translation choice in such cases (cf. Fabricius-Hansen 1998, 1999). This leaves the translator with an interesting choice: If she uses a connective such as *damit* 'thus' to clarify the semantic connection between the two sentences, as was done in (11), the target text comes out as more explicit that the source text; if she does not use a connective, the target text will be more implicit than the source text.

We see here a confirmation of Toury's claim that "the need [...] to deviate from source-text patterns can always[26] be realized in more than one way" (1995: 57).[27] In this case, the necessary deviation from the source text pattern may either be an explicitation or an implicitation – both would be justifiable choices given the semantic unspecificity of the English *ing*-adjunct. We do not know the exact reason why the translator of (11) chose the explicit over the implicit variant. Maybe risk avoidance? Since German discourse is generally characterized by a higher degree of explicit-

[26]The *always* part of this claim might be too strong, but that does not need to concern us here.

[27]Cf. also Klaudy (2009):

> It is a misconception that differences between the [source language] and [target language] systems automatically determine [target language] solutions. On the contrary, such differences (e.g. lack of the category of gender in Hungarian) only mean that one road is blocked, but many other roads are open, and this calls for creativity by the translator (e.g. the many ways of expressing gender in Hungarian). (2009: 290)

ness in the encoding of semantic relations than English discourse (see Section A.1.2), it is also possible that the explicitation performed by the translator of (11) is simply due to the application of a "cultural filter" (House 1997), i.e. adjustment of the source text to the stylistic norms of the target language. But even if this is not the case, we have no fundamental problem in explaining this instance of explicitation, as the two typical properties of translation *qua* communication scenario outlined above allow us to predict the predominance of explicitating shifts in cases where translators could have chosen an impliciating shift instead.

2.6 Studies on the Asymmetry Hypothesis

I only know of three studies that have been carried out to test the Asymmetry Hypothesis, which is not surprising, since the hypothesis is still quite young. The studies will be discussed in the following. The first two studies (Sections 2.6.1 and 2.6.2) deal with the language pair English-Hungarian, while the third study investigates translations between Dutch and French.

2.6.1 Explicitational asymmetry in translations of reporting verbs

Klaudy and Károly (2005) have investigated explicitations and implicitations of reporting verbs in literary translations between English and Hungarian, expecting (from the Asymmetry Hypothesis) to find a lack of explicitation-implicitation counterbalancing. Their corpus consisted of:

1. The English novel *1984* by Orwell along with its Hungarian translation
2. Two Hungarian novels (*Édes Anna* by Kosztolányi and *Szent Péter esernyöje* by Mikszáth) along with their English translations

Klaudy and Károly's analysis "focus[ed] on the investigation of 100 [occurrences of] reporting verbs and their translations from a randomly selected part of each novel, which adds up to 600 reporting verbs altogether." (2005: 19) (Unfortunately, we do not learn how the authors selected the reporting verbs to be analyzed; presumably they selected the first 100 occurrences of reporting verbs encountered in each randomly chosen novel part.) It should be noted that the results of Klaudy and Károly's study are somewhat limited in terms of generalizability, since only three authors

and three translators have been investigated. Nevertheless, as will become clear in the following, the results may be taken as a starting point for a number of highly interesting considerations on explicitational asymmetry in translation.

First of all, Klaudy and Károly (2005) note that the two Hungarian novels under investigation make use of a much wider variety of reporting verbs than the English novel, hypothesizing that this is due to a general English-Hungarian contrast in communicative norms. Thus, in the extract from Orwell's *1984*, the high-frequency verb *say* accounts for 79 of the 100 tokens of reporting verbs under investigation, while the vocabulary of the two Hungarian novel extracts is much more varied, consisting to a much greater degree of rather rare verbs such as *megjegyez* 'remark' or *suttog* 'whisper'. This can be seen in the following table (adapted from Klaudy and Károly 2005: 21), which lists the number of verb lemmas (types) for each of the texts investigated by Klaudy and Károly:

	source text		target text	
	tokens	types	tokens	types
Orwell's *1984*	100	14	100	32
Kosztolányi's *Édes Anna*	100	56	100	56
Mikszáth's *Szent Péter esernyöje*	100	27	100	24

Table 2.2: Types and tokens of reporting verbs across English and Hungarian novels and their translations in both directions

The number of reporting verb verb tokens (verb occurrences) listed in Table 2.2 is the same for all six subcorpora, which is a result of Klaudy and Károly's research design. The number of reporting verb types (verb lemmas), however, differs considerably across the six subcorpora. Let us walk through the table one step at a time:

1. Comparing the English source text to the Hungarian source texts, we see that the number of types is considerably higher in the Hungarian novel extracts than in the English text, which is due to the fact that the Hungarian authors make use of a much more varied vocabulary (as has been noted above). This is particularly visible in Kosztolányi, who uses as many as 56 different reporting verbs. Mikszáth uses only 27 different reporting verbs, which is still almost double the amount that the English author, Orwell, uses (14 verb types).

2. Comparing the source texts to the target texts, we note an interesting difference between the English-Hungarian translation on the one hand and the Hungarian-English translations on the other:

- The Hungarian translation of Orwell's novel features 32 different verb types, more than double the amount that may be found in the English source text. Since, as we have seen above, 79 of the 100 verb tokens in Orwell's *1984* are instantiations of the verb *say*, the translator must have explicitated a great deal, regularly translating *say* by means of more explicit reporting verbs such as *kérdez* 'ask', *megállapít* 'remark', etc. (Listing the 100 verb tokens found in each subcorpus, Klaudy and Károly show that this is actually the case.) This tendency to explicitate is to be expected from the observation that the Hungarian novels exhibit a more varied vocabulary than the English novel: The Hungarian translator of Orwell's *1984* seems to have performed a number of optional explicitations in order to comply with the (assumed) communicative preferences of Hungarian readers.

- From the above, we should expect that Hungarian-English translators of literary texts should tend to implicitate, in order to conform to the more implicit communicative conventions of English literary writing (Klaudy and Károly 2005: 24). However, Table 2.2 shows that this is not the case. (This is also shown by Klaudy and Károly's lists of verb tokens, which are not reproduced here.) The English target texts exhibit approximately as many verb types as their Hungarian source texts, "which means that the rich variety of reporting verbs in the Hungarian original is preserved in the English translation, that is, the translator [...] failed to perform semantic implicitation." (2005: 24)

Why did the English-Hungarian translator explicitate so much, while the Hungarian-English translators "failed" to perform implicitation? Klaudy and Károly do not provide an answer to this question. I would argue that the present case is very similar to the situation described in the thought experiment offered at the end of Section 2.5.1. The only major difference is that in the scenario described in the thought experiment, coherence (i.e. understanding) was at stake, while the present case rather concerns esthetic sensibility.

Why is there no tendency towards implicitation in the Hungarian-English translations? Because translators did not feel the need to implicitate. Maybe they even wanted their readers to get a glimpse at the 'typically Hungarian' style of writing by preserving the Hungarian source texts' large repertoire of different reporting verbs. Readers of these translations might be surprised by the variety of reporting words they encounter, including rarities like *yawn* or *enthuse*. Some might even wonder whether the Hungarian language in general is so varied in this respect or if it is

just these particular authors. But in any case, it does not seem much of a problem that the Hungarian-English translators did not implicitate as expected.

In contrast, Hungarian readers of literary translations from English where explicitation has not been performed may find them repetitive or even boring. Being ignorant of the English original, some readers might even accuse the translator of having delivered a bad translation, one that does not tap the full potential of the Hungarian language. This is why the Hungarian translator of Orwell's *1984* investigated by Klaudy and Károly might have felt the need to explicitate. Remember that we should expect translators to avoid risk (cf. Section 2.5), and producing a literary translation that might be perceived as boring by Hungarian readers represents a great deal of risk for the translator.

Like the thought experiment offered at the end of Section 2.5.1, the above discussion suggests that explicitation is generally quite a safe bet, while implicitation can be a risky enterprise, regardless of whether coherence/understanding or esthetic sensibility is concerned. Thus, Klaudy and Károly's statement that translators "often *fail* to perform implicitation" (2005: 27; my emphasis) seems to be somewhat unjust. As the above discussion as well as the considerations made in Section 2.5 have shown, explicitation can be considered a legitimate strategy for avoiding risk. Hence, we should think twice before blaming translators for their commonly observed tendency to be more explicit than authors of non-translated texts. However, as Klaudy (2009: 293) argues, implicitation can have important functions. Quoting Nida, she suggests that implicitation can be "highly important in the process of adjustment" (Nida 1964: 231). Thus, in translator training it does seem to make sense to educate prospective translators about how and when to perform implicitation.

Klaudy and Károly conclude their paper with some theoretical implications of their study that I would like to cite here in abridged form:

> By finding evidence for the asymmetry hypothesis, it may become possible to prove that explicitation is indeed a universal feature of translation. [...] If [...] we can identify a special group of cases where explicitation occurs in translation from [any] given source language into [any] given target language without implicitation occurring in the opposite direction, then we have succeeded in identifying a language-pair-independent universal feature of translator behaviour. (Klaudy and Károly 2005: 27)

I find this conclusion highly implausible. Klaudy and Károly themselves suggest that "explicitation and implicitation can be *automatic operations* or *conscious strategies*" and that "[t]he causes of both explicitation and implicitation can be language-specific and non-language-specific." (2005: 15) If explicitation and implicitation were solely automatic operations, it would seem plausible to assume that there is some universal aspect to explicitational asymmetry. However, if explicitation and implicitation can also be conscious strategies (aimed at bridging cultural gaps, avoiding risk, etc.), which furthermore may be influenced by language-specific factors, it seems highly implausible to assume that there might be "a special group of cases" where explicitational asymmetry is universal.

2.6.2 Obligatory additions vs. optional omissions in translation

My version of the Asymmetry Hypothesis (see Section 2.5) states that obligatory, optional, and pragmatic explicitations tend to be more frequent than the corresponding implicitations in the other translation direction. How can obligatory explicitations in one direction be more frequent than the corresponding implicitations in the other direction, if obligatory explicitations are determined by the lexicogrammatical systems of the source and target language? The answer to this question may be found in a highly informative paper by Klaudy (2009). The author observes that in translations between English and Hungarian (as well as in other language pairs) there are certain types of shifts that are obligatory in one translation direction but optional in the other. To exemplify her observation, she cites the following four grammatical categories where additions (explicitations) are obligatory in the direction Hungarian-English, while the corresponding omissions (implicitations) are optional in the direction English-Hungarian:

- Subject
- Object
- Possessive determiner
- Indefinite article

In all four categories, additions are obligatory in the direction English-Hungarian in certain contexts, while in the same contexts the corresponding omissions are optional in the opposite direction, Hungarian-English.

As an example, let us consider the case of obligatory Hungarian-English object additions vs. optional English-Hungarian object omissions:

- Translating from Hungarian into English, *megkóstoltam* 'I tasted PRO' (where PRO stands for an implicit/inferable object) has to be translated as *I tasted it* (where the object *it* has been added/explicitated) (→ explicitation).
- Translating from English into Hungarian, *I tasted it* may be translated as *megkóstoltam* (→ implicitation), but it may also be translated as *megkóstoltam azt* 'I tasted it' (→ explicitation)

The example illustrates how in the four cases listed by Klaudy explicitation is obligatory in one translation direction but optional in the other. This gives rise to the prediction that in the above-mentioned grammatical categories, English-Hungarian translators might tend to implicitate less frequently than Hungarian-English translators explicitate – which would lead to explicitational asymmetry. This possibility was explored by Klaudy in a little pilot study, where she compared the number of obligatory additions in 100 sentences from the English translation of Mikszáth's *Szent Péter esernyöje* to the number of optional omissions in 100 sentences from the Hungarian translation of Orwell's *1984*. The results are listed in Table 2.3.

	obligatory additions Hu→En	optional omissions En→Hu	unperformed omissions En→Hu
subject	50	47	7
object	5	7	3
possessive determiner	25	20	2
indefinite article	16	10	16

Table 2.3: Frequency of obligatory additions and optional omissions in 100 sentences of two translated novels (table adapted from Klaudy 2009: 296)

Klaudy comments on this table only very briefly. According to her, the table "show[s] that optional omission is not always practiced by translators." (2009: 295) I am not sure what this vague remark is intended to tell us, but to me, Table 2.3 looks like evidence against the Asymmetry Hypothesis! While there are less implicitations than explicitations in

possessive determiners and indefinite articles, the table shows that obligatory additions of subjects in the direction Hungarian-English are approximately counterbalanced by the corresponding omissions in the direction English-Hungarian – which is remarkable given the fact that this kind of omission in optional. That "optional omission is not always practiced by translators" should not surprise us at all, since overt subjects do have certain functions in Hungarian, such as the expression of emphasis or contrast (cf. e.g. Rounds 2009: 115). In light of this, the rather low numbers of unperformed omissions (listed in the rightmost column of Table 2.3) do not speak in favor of the Asymmetry Hypothesis.

Why are there so many subject omissions (and so few unperformed subject omissions) in the English-Hungarian translation featured in Table 2.3, unlike the Asymmetry Hypothesis predicts? As we have seen above, overt subjects have certain pragmatic functions in Hungarian, so a Hungarian text where subjects are overused would sound highly awkward. The translator of Orwell's *1984* investigated by Klaudy was probably well aware of this, which seems to be the reason for the high number of subject omissions observed. The findings of Klaudy's study thus suggest that factors such as translators' striving for stylistic/pragmatic adequacy can override translators' commonly observed tendency to explicitate.[28]

2.6.3 Explicitation and implicitation of causal relations in translations between Dutch and French

In an ongoing study, Denturck is investigating how four "rather frequent" Dutch connectives (*omdat*, *want*, *aangezien*, and *doordat*) and French connectives (*parce que*, *car*, *puisque*, and *comme*) were handled by translators in a bidirectional parallel corpus of literary translations (Denturck 2009, Niemegeers and Denturck 2010). All of these connectives have in common that they may encode causal relations. Thus, the Dutch and French connectives investigated by Denturck are frequently used as equivalents of each other in translations between the two languages. For example, according to Denturck, the Dutch connective *want* is comparable to French *car*. (An English equivalent of these two connectives would be *because*.)

Denturck's analysis proceeded as follows. For each source text occur-

[28]Towards the end of her paper, Klaudy (2009) presents an additional study on explicitational asymmetry that she conducted together with Krisztina Károly. However, the results of this study will not be discussed here, since they are of a highly tentative character, as Klaudy herself notes. She presents the results "without drawing any conclusion" (2009: 300).

rence of the connectives listed above, she checked whether the translator used a more or less explicit equivalent expression. To accomplish this, the author resorted to a scale of causal explicitness proposed by Vandepitte (1990), which assumes that causal connectives express causality more explicitly than causal verbs and prepositions, which in turn are more explicit than non-causal connectives, etc. The results of Denturck's analysis are summarized in Table 2.4 (adapted from Niemegeers and Denturck 2010).

	Dutch-French	French-Dutch
explicitation	12.0%	33.5%
implicitation	22.5%	17.0%

Table 2.4: Proportion of explicitations and implicitations in translations of causal connectives between Dutch and French

From the table, we see that explicitations in the direction French-Dutch are not counterbalanced by implicitations in the opposite translation direction, Dutch-French (33.5% > 22.5%). However, unlike the Explicitation Hypothesis predicts, there actually is a counterbalancing of explicitations in the direction Dutch-French by implicitations in the direction French-Dutch (12.0% < 17.0%). This result is puzzling. How can the Explicitation Hypothesis find confirmation in one translation direction but not in the other? For the time being, this question has to remain unanswered, since Denturck has not offered a conclusive explanation of her findings (yet). It is one of the aims of the present book to shed light on the question of when and why translators tend to implicitate rather than explicitate.

2.7 Summary and conclusion (and a brief outlook)

The review of literature on explicitation and implicitation provided in this chapter has furnished some important insights. They may be summarized as follows:

- The literature has distinguished between four different types of explicitation: (a) optional explicitation, (b) obligatory explicitation, (c) pragmatic explicitation, and (d) translation-inherent explicitation (Klaudy 2008). While the existence of the first three types is almost trivially obvious, the fourth type of explicitation is somewhat mysterious, since it has been assumed to occur independently of

source–target language contrasts. This assumption goes back to the so-called *Explicitation Hypothesis*.

- Blum-Kulka's Explicitation Hypothesis postulates that there is a "translation-inherent" type of explicitation which is supposed to be caused by "[t]he process of interpretation performed by the translator on the source text" (1986: 19). This hypothesis has had a tremendous impact on the translation studies literature, although it has never been made clear *how* and *why* the above-mentioned "process of interpretation" should lead to explicitation. In the present chapter, I have argued that the Explicitation Hypothesis should not be investigated anymore, because it is (a) unmotivated, (b) unparsimonious, and (c) vaguely formulated.

- A number of studies have been carried out that claim to offer results in support of the Explicitation Hypothesis. This chapter has discussed some of the most important exponents of these studies, coming to the conclusion that they do *not* offer conclusive evidence for the hypothesis. This is because a number of grave methodological errors have been made. For example, studies have failed to control for interfering factors such as language pair-specific types of explicitation, source language interference, the effect of other (putative) translation universals, etc.

- I have proposed Klaudy's *Asymmetry Hypothesis* as a more useful and more plausible guide for further research on explicitation. This hypothesis assumes 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: 14) As has been argued in this chapter, the hypothesis can be properly justified with recourse to pragmatic properties of typical translation situations.

- A discussion of quantitatively-oriented studies on the Asymmetry Hypothesis has shown that explicitation-implicitation asymmetry obtains in some cases but not in others. It generally remains unclear

This latter point suggests that the Asymmetry Hypothesis, which claims that explicitations are "not always" counterbalanced by the corresponding implicitations, is still too vague. Future studies should thus try to find out *under which conditions* explicitational asymmetry occurs and under which

conditions it does not. In other words, the Asymmetry Hypothesis can only serve as a kind of general guidepost for future studies on explicitation. From this chapter's discussion it has become quite clear that translators, e.g. due to their common tendency to avoid risk, seem to follow a general rule which says:

> "When in doubt, be explicit!"

However, the studies discussed near the end of this chapter have shown that this rule does not always result in a lack of explicitation-implicitation counterbalancing. Thus, it was the principal aim of the present study to find out *when* and *why* translators explicitate or implicitate, i.e. to specify the factors which – in addition to or independently of the above rule – can serve as triggers of explicitation and implicitation in translation (see Section 3.9 of the following chapter).

From the above, it should have become clear that it is highly misleading to call explicitation a possible "universal" of translated text, as e.g. Baker (1996) has done (cf. House 2008, Pym 2008, Becher 2010a: 22f). As has been argued in Section 2.5, explicitation is dependent on pragmatic factors, which are variable in nature. Thus, for example, we should not expect to find a predominance of explicitations over implicitations in translation scenarios where communicative risk is low. Moreover, our discussion of studies on the Asymmetry Hypothesis in Section 2.6 has made clear that explicitation is *not* universal.

One might try to salvage the notion of "translation universals" (Baker 1996) by arguing that the term refers to "universal tendencies" rather than to phenomena that are universal in a strict sense (i.e. ubiquitous). However, proponents of this view (e.g. Mauranen 2007) need to specify what the term "universal tendency" is supposed to mean. Which criteria would explicitation have to fulfill so as to qualify as a universal tendency of translated text? More generally: When can we call a tendency universal? If it occurs in 90 percent of all translation corpora? Or in 80 percent? What about 70 percent – would this still be a universal tendency? In my opinion, the search for translation universals is of limited epistemic value in the first place.[29] Instead of trying to prove or disprove the allegedly universal status of explicitation, future studies should try to identify the factors

[29] Incidentally, in many cases it would probably be more justified to speak of "mediation universals" (Ulrych and Murphy 2008), if anything. Cf. also Chesterman (2010: 9), who has repeatedly pointed out that "so-called translation universals may not be specific to translation, but have to do more generally with language use under particular constraints."

that determine when explicitation occurs and when it does not. As it has already been said above, this was the main aim of the present study.

Finally, here is the brief outlook promised by the title of this section. After I had already written this chapter, a new reason came to my mind why we should expect to find explicitational asymmetry in translation: It tends to be easier in language to add something than to take something away. Let me explain this by means of an analogy. Consider the building of a house. It is easy to add a new pillar here or a wall there. All that is necessary to perform such an addition is some free space and enough building material. In contrast, it can be difficult to take something away from the house: If I remove the wrong pillar or wall, the house might collapse. Before I remove a particular element, I need to check whether the change might break something.

Now, a linguistic sentence is like a house. It tends to be easy to add something to a sentence. All that I need to perform such a change is a syntactic slot to accommodate my addition. In contrast, it can be difficult to take things away from a sentence. There are optional elements that may be removed just like that (e.g. attributes or adverbials), obligatory elements that may not be removed, at all (e.g. subjects or main verbs), and then there are 'half-obligatory' elements whose removal requires additional changes to be made (e.g. sentence-initial adverbials in German, whose removal requires a change in word order). If I want to omit something from a sentence, I need to check whether grammar allows me to do so and perform additional changes where necessary. It is obvious that this can be difficult in translation, where time is often limited.

Furthermore, while I can add pretty much anything that comes to my mind to a sentence, I can only omit something that is already there. Thus, if I want to max out a sentence's potential for implicitness (by omitting as many elements as possible), I need to create a 'mental list' of omissible elements first. In comparison, maxing out a sentence's potential for explicitness is easy, since it does not require such a list. In fact, I do not even have to read a sentence in full in order to add something. It seems plausible to assume that (especially under time pressure), translators may find it difficult to build up and/or retain a mental list of omissible elements when translating a sentence.

The upshot of the above considerations is that translators might tend to 'underuse' implicitations simply because it tends to be more difficult to implicitate than to explicitate. Unfortunately, this idea came to me too late to be systematically explored in the present study (but see the discussion of Observation 2 in Section 6.2.1), so it is up to the reader to pursue this line of thought in her own studies.

Chapter 3

Methodology

In this chapter I describe the methodology that was used in the present study. To begin with, the following section will outline some theoretical problems that any large-scale study of explicitation and implicitation has to deal with. The most important problem is that due to the complexity of the investigated phenomenon, studies have to make a number of subjective choices so as to render explicitating and implicitating shifts[1] measurable and quantifiable. It goes without saying that these choices can have a considerable impact on the results of a study. I have thus tried to make the choices that I made in the present study as transparent as possible, which is why the present chapter has turned out rather lengthy. For readers who are not interested in methodological details, it will be sufficient to read the "Summary and conclusion" section at the end of the chapter.

This chapter is structured as follows. Following the "word of caution" provided by the next section, Section 3.2 will present the corpus data that was used for the present study. Section 3.3 will briefly outline how the data were analyzed. The analysis relied on a formal-semantic framework for identifying and classifying shifts, whose fundamentals will be presented in Section 3.4. The framework distinguishes between interactional, cohesive, and denotational shifts. How these shifts were identified and distinguished from each other will be the topic of Sections 3.5 through 3.7. Section 3.8 explains which kinds of shifts have been excluded from analysis and why. In Section 3.9 I present the hypotheses that were investigated in the present study. Finally, Section 3.10 will feature a summary and conclusion of this chapter.

[1]When I talk about *shifts* in the following, I exclusively refer to explicitations and implicitations.

3.1 A word of caution

Strictly speaking, linguistics is not advanced enough for the study of explicitation and implicitation. To name just one example, it is not clear at all whether additions of modal markers such as *probably* or *could* should be counted as explicitations (or implicitations?), since the study of modality has (to my knowledge) never been approached from the perspective of explicitness and implicitness. Thus, it is by no means clear what the concept of explicitness means in the context of modality (cf. Section 3.8). Nevertheless, I would argue that a study of explicitation and implicitation in translation is possible, and of course highly desirable – but only if one bears in mind that the concept of explicitness is not as easy to operationalize as we would like it to be.

As a result, a corpus study of explicitation has to rely on a number of subjective, sometimes even arbitrary decisions, for example as to which phenomena to exclude from analysis. Moreover, in classifying explicitating and implicitating shifts, a number of assumptions have to be made, many of which are of an intuitive rather than objective nature. This is not necessarily a bad thing. In fact, it is perfectly normal in applied linguistics, and thus also in translation studies, that assumptions have to be made for practical purposes which cannot be objectively justified, but without which an investigation of the phenomenon in question would not be possible.

In the present study, a lot of choices concerning the identification and classification of explicitating and implicitating shifts had to be made for practical purposes that could not be justified with the desirable degree of rigor. It is thus important that these choices be made as transparent as possible. This is one of the prime goals of the present chapter. Another way in which I tried to compensate for the subjectivity of some of the decisions that had to be made in the process of analysis was to document the results as transparently as possible. The following chapters will thus present the results of the study by discussing a wealth of examples from the corpus, allowing the reader to disagree with the decisions made.

Finally, I would like to emphasize that the focus of the present study is a qualitative one, not a quantitative one. The aim of the study was not to find out *how often*, but *when* and *why* translators explicitate or implicitate. Since the classificatory framework used in the study was deliberately restricted in scope for practical reasons, the numbers presented in the following chapters of this book are to be taken with a grain of salt. Accordingly, I have refrained from testing my quantitative results for statistical significance. I regard the detailed qualitative analyses of corpus examples

presented in Chapters 4 through 6 as the main value of this book. My analyses show that the phenomenon of explicitation is by far not as mysterious as previous research has assumed it to be, but rather dependent on a number of concrete lexicogrammatical and pragmatic factors (which will be summarized in Chapter 7).

3.2 Data

The study was carried out on a random subset of the business corpus of the project *Covert Translation* (cf. House 2002). This corpus consists of English and German business texts as well as their translations in both directions. The subset was created by automatically extracting random texts from the project corpus until the target word count of c. 20,000 words per source language was reached.[2] A subset of the project corpus was used rather than the full corpus because the method of analysis adopted in the present study was a very time-consuming one: All texts were read, analyzed and annotated manually, i.e. without the help of a concordance program (see the following section).

The corpus used for this study consists of the following four parts:

1. English texts (16 texts, 21,222 words)
2. Their German translations (16 texts, 21,808 words)
3. German texts (27 texts, 21,253 words)
4. Their English translations (27 texts, 24,474 words)

The texts contained in the corpus originate from corporate reports published by large, internationally operating companies between 1999 and 2002 (see Appendix B for a list of corpus texts). The majority of the texts is made up of so-called *letters to shareholders* (also called *CEO's letters*). A letter to shareholders is a short, letter-like text that typically functions as an introduction or preface to a company's annual report. As to their communicative purpose, letters to shareholders typically serve to:

1. Provide a concise account and justification of the company's activities and performance

[2]Since the English-German part of the project corpus already comprised some 20,000 words, the random extraction procedure only had to be carried out on the German-English part of the project corpus.

2. Demonstrate that the policies enacted are the best possible under the circumstances
3. Get across to investors and potential investors the idea that the company's management deserves investors' confidence
4. Transmit a positive, attractive corporate image

   (Garzone 2004: 322; cf. also Hyland 1998)

Only few texts contained in the corpus do not belong to the genre of letters to shareholders, but to a closely related genre: *mission statements*. A mission statement is a short text in which a company describes its "philosophy" or "corporate identity" to customers and shareholders. Common titles for texts of this genre are "Our Mission", "Our Spirit", or the like. Mission statements are most commonly found in companies' annual reports and in the "About Us" section of corporate websites. Not surprisingly, the main pragmatic function of this genre is to communicate a positive and trustworthy image of the company to its shareholders (Leuthesser and Kohli 1997).

The two genres described above were both included in the project corpus (and also in the subset investigated here) without risking inhomogeneity because they are very similar in terms of their communicative functions. Both genres make use of non-specialist language (Baumgarten and Özçetin 2008: 300) and are highly persuasive in nature, their overarching communicative goal being to build up trust among customers and shareholders. The two genres are also comparable in terms of authorship, since letters to shareholders as well as mission statements are typically (but not always) written by the company's Chief Executive Officer (CEO) and/or Chairman of the Executive Board – at least officially (cf. Garzone 2004: 313); it is conceivable that some texts are written in a collaborative effort by several executive board members and/or board-external staff members. In rare cases, the author of the text in question is not stated at all.

The reason why letters to shareholders and mission statements were chosen as data for the present study is a very practical one: Texts belonging to these genres are generally translated somewhat 'literally', i.e. using a partly overt mode of translation. House (1997) famously distinguishes between two different modes of translation, overt and covert. Simplifying somewhat, overt translations are characterized by an effort of the translator to stay as close to the source text as possible. When translating overtly, the translator does not try to establish an exact match between the communicative function of the source text in the source language community

and the communicative function of the target text in the target text community. This contrasts with covert translation, where the translator tries to produce a target text that fulfills the same communicative function in the target culture as the source text fulfills (or fulfilled) in the source culture. In order to achieve this, the translator may apply a "cultural filter" that brings the target text in line with the communicative conventions of the target culture. In this way, the process of covert translation often results in a target text that deviates considerably from the source text. In overt translation, on the other hand, no cultural filter is applied.

The distinction between overt and covert should not be seen as a strict dichotomy. Rather, overt and covert should be seen as the two endpoints of a cline ranging from rather 'literal' translations on the one end to rather 'free' (non-literal) translations on the other end. The two genres introduced above were chosen as data for the present study because they are located somewhere in the middle between overt and covert. This makes them good candidates for an investigation of explicitating and implicitating shifts in translation. If a target text deviates considerably from its source text, as it is the case in many 'purely covert' translations, there will be many passages where sentences or parts of sentences have been omitted, added or rearranged, making the identification of shifts difficult or even impossible. The partly overt, partly covert translations investigated here, on the other hand, were comparatively easy to analyze, since the translators have mostly tried to stay somewhat close to the source text, both in terms of semantic content and linguistic realization. This is evidenced by examples such as the following:

(12) Im Frühjahr 1999 eröffnete XYZ[3] deshalb eine Plattform für Auktionen unter Privatleuten.

As a consequence, in Spring 1999 XYZ initiated a platform for auctions among private individuals.

(13) Auch der Private-Channel übertrifft mit seinem schnellen Wachstum alle Erwartungen.

The fast growth of the Private-Channel has also exceeded all expectations.

(14) Die Anzahl der Page Impressions stieg auf über eine Million täglich (Stand: September 1999).

[3]Througout the book, company names occurring in the corpus have been anonymzed as "XYZ", "ABC", or the like.

> The number of page impressions has risen to over one million a day (status as at September 1999).

The examples represent consecutive sentences taken from the same corpus text. It is striking that the English translation does not only mirror the German original semantically, but also mirrors its syntactic surface structure to a considerable degree. Thus, connectives translate connectives (e.g. *deshalb* → *as a consequence*, *auch* → *also*), subjects translate subjects, adverbials translate adverbials (e.g. *täglich* → *a day*), etc.[4] We get the impression that the translator has made a conscious effort to stay as close to the source text as possible, i.e. to produce an overt translation.

Examples such as the above, where we find few or no semantic deviations and only minor syntactic deviations from the source text, are frequent not only in the text from which (12) through (14) originate, but throughout the corpus as a whole (cf. many of the examples discussed in the remainder of this book). For the present study, this means that explicitations and implicitations were comparatively easy to identify.

3.3 Procedure

The analysis of the data proceeded as follows. I carefully read through all corpus texts multiple times, identifying all explicitating and implicitating shifts according to the criteria laid down in the following sections. Shifts were formally classified as (a) additions, (b) substitutions, and (c) omissions, depending on the type of operation that the translator has performed (see Section 3.7 for examples). Moreover, the syntactic category of the explicitated/implicitated material was determined (noun, pronoun, proper name, adjective, adverb, connective).

As the label *connective* suggests, the syntactic classification incorporated both formal and functional criteria. This resulted in the following classificatory choices:

1. Subordinating conjunctions (e.g. *obwohl* 'although'), coordinating conjunctions (e.g. *but*), and a number of adverbs (those functioning as markers of semantic relations, e.g. *therefore*) were treated as "connectives" (cf. Section 3.6).

[4]Only minor exceptions violate this 'rule'. For example, *der Private-Channel [...] mit seinem schnellen Wachstum* (noun phrase as subject, prepositional phrase as adverbial) has been translated as *the fast growth of the Private-Channel* (two combined noun phrases as subject) – a subtle syntactic deviation from the source text.

2. Pronominal adverbs (e.g. *damit* 'with that') and pronominal adjectives (e.g. *diesbezüglicher* 'related to this') were treated as "pronouns".[5]

3. For reasons which will be explained in Section 3.7, the class of noun-based shifts includes additions, omissions, and substitutions of prepositional phrases, which were regarded as chiefly nominal in nature.

Finally, shifts were classified according to functional/pragmatic criteria as (a) interactional, (b) cohesive, and (c) denotational shifts (see Sections 3.5 through 3.7 for the criteria applied).

The shifts identified in the corpus were marked directly in the text files by means of suitable labels. For instance, <u>cohes</u>ive <u>expl</u>icitations consisting in the <u>add</u>ition of a <u>pron</u>oun were labeled "cohes_expl_pron_add". Following annotation, the frequency of different types of shifts was determined by electronically searching the text files for the associated labels. This is how the figures presented in the following chapters were obtained.

As has been emphasized in Section 3.1, the quantitative findings are not the focus of the present study. I regard the detailed qualitative analyses presented in the following chapters as the main value of my study. Shifts of different types were linguistically analyzed (cf. Section 1) and compared within and across translation directions in order to find out when and why (i.e. under which conditions) translators explicitate or implicitate. This analysis has turned up a number of factors that can be assumed to act as triggers of explicitation and implicitation in translation (see Chapter 7 for a summary of factors).

The most important fact to remember about the process of analysis is that source and target text sentences were not compared in a phrase-by-phrase manner, but taking into account the whole of the sentence. Moreover, syntactic 'upgrades' and 'downgrades' were not counted as explicitations or implicitations. Let me illustrate this by means of an example:

(15) *Year-end* surveys of oil company E & P budgets indicated that spending would be up around 10% in 2000 compared to 1999 levels.

Die Umfragen unter den Ölfirmen *am Ende des Jahres* bezüglich deren Erkundungs- und Produktionsbudgets lassen vermuten, daß im Vergleich zu 1999 die Ausgaben im Jahre 2000 um etwa 10% steigen werden.

[5] A more accurate name for this category would have been 'pronominal material' or 'items with a pronominal function'. However, I decided to use the term *pronouns* for the sake of brevity.

If we were to perform a phrase-by-phrase analysis of (15), we would have to say that the change from *year-end surveys* to *Umfragen* 'surveys' is an instance of implicitation. However, the present study took the whole sentence as a unit of analysis. Taking the whole target text sentence into account, we see that the adjective *year-end* has been rendered as a postmodifying prepositional phrase, am *Ende des Jahres* 'at the end of the year'. Thus, neither the omission of *year-end* nor the addition of *am Ende des Jahres* has been counted as an implicitating/explicitating shift. Explicitations and implicitations were identified on sentence level, not on phrase level.

Incidentally, my analyses indicate that translators translating between English and German regularly perform syntactic upgrades (e.g. adjective → prepositional phrase) and downgrades (e.g. relative clause → prepositional phrase). While such shifts do seem to have subtle semantic effects on the target text's level of explicitness in some cases, they have not been counted as explicitations or implicitations for practical reasons (see Section 3.8). The present study departed from the simplified assumption that a prepositional phrase like *am Ende des Jahres* is semantically equivalent to an adjective like *year-end*.

Another point that needs to be emphasized here is that multiple shifts of the same type occurring inside the same phrase were counted as a single shift. An example will illustrate:

(16) *The integration* has given our management new strength.

Der erfolgreich abgeschlossene Integrationsprozeß hat das Management von XYZ noch stärker gemacht.

The translator of (16) has rendered *the integration* as *der erfolgreich abgeschlossene Integrationsprozeß* 'successfully completed integration process'. Ignoring the rule given above, we would have to say that the translator has performed an adverb-based explicitation (addition of *erfolgreich*), an adjective-based explicitation (addition of *abgeschlossene*), and possibly also a noun-based explicitation (substitution of *Integrationsprozeß* for *integration*). However, such a procedure of counting multiple shifts per phrase would lead to a downright 'inflation' of explicitations and implicitations, so it was decided to count multiple shifts of the same type occurring inside the same phrase as a single shift. Since it is not clear whether *Integrationsprozeß* can be regarded as more explicit than *integration* (cf. the test for cross-linguistic hyponymy presented in Section 3.7.2) and the adverb *erfolgreich* is syntactically subordinate to the adjective *abgeschlossene*, it was decided to count the three shifts listed above as a single instance of

adjective-based explicitation. Other cases of multiple shifts occurring inside a single phrase were treated similarly: Only the hierarchically highest shift was counted.

Note, however, that multiple shifts of different types were not subsumed under a single shift. Cf. the following example:

(17) we're starting to see the benefits *in our results*

wir sehen die ersten positiven Auswirkungen

In (17), the omission of *in our results* was counted as two shifts: one interactional implicitation (omission of *our*) and one denotational implicitation (omission of *results*).[6]

3.4 Identification and classification of shifts

All shifts encountered were classified according to their communicative function. To do that, it was necessary to find an appropriate classificatory framework that could be used as a guideline in the coding process. The framework should also be able to serve as a guideline for identifying explicitating and implicitating shifts. The first thing that came to mind was to use the Hallidayan framework of Systemic Functional Linguistics (Halliday and Matthiessen 2004),[7] which has considerably enriched linguistic research by offering a predominantly functional and multidimensional perspective on language. However, I found this framework to be inappropriate for the task at hand, since it was formulated with a considerable degree of vagueness and in many cases fails to offer objective criteria for analyzing empirical data.

Let me name just one of the problems that I found with the framework offered by Systemic Functional Linguistics. In clause linkage, Halliday and Matthiessen (2004) famously distinguish between "elaborating", "extending", and "enhancing" relations. It would be great if one could use this categorization for distinguishing between different types of explicitation. However, I do not see how this would be possible, since the authors do not offer any objective criteria for distinguishing between elaborations, extensions, and enhancements.

Halliday and Matthiessen do give (very vague) "definitions" of the three types of relations. For example, they define elaboration as "restating [a clause] in other words, specifying in greater detail, commenting,

[6]For reasons that will be given in Section 3.7.1, the omission of *in* was not counted as an instance of implicitation.

[7]This framework was used by Kamenická (2008) in her study of explicitation.

or exemplifying" and extension as "adding some new element, giving an exception to it, or offering an alternative" (2004: 377). However, it remains completely unclear where the difference lies between "specifying in greater detail" and "adding some new element", for example. A categorization is useless to empirical research if it fails to offer objective criteria for keeping the provided categories apart.

This problem is not specific to Halliday and Matthiessen's (2004) classification of semantic relations, but is encountered again and again througout the theory of Systemic Functional Linguistics. For example, when classifying linguistic items it often remains unclear whether they belong to the "ideational", "interpersonal", or "textual" metafunction of language. The reason is that, again, there are no objective criteria for keeping the three categories apart. This makes it impossible to apply the framework of Systemic Functional Linguistics to empirical data in a reliable way. Halliday and Matthiesen themselves classify countless linguistic items as belonging to one of the three metafunctions of language, but the basis of their decisions often remains unclear. For example, I do not see why the authors assign adverbs such as *still* or *entirely* to the interpersonal metafunction of language (2004: 128f) – the way I see it, these items have an ideational function.[8] (But then, it is not clear what "ideational" means in the first place, since Halliday and Matthiessen fail to provide a precise definition of the concept.)

Given the fundamental problem with the framework of Systemic Functional Linguistics noted above, I decided to set up my own framework for identifying and classifying explicitating and implicitating shifts. My framework is loosely based on Halliday's functional theory of language, but it is (a) more objective and reliable, (b) terminologically precise, and (c) incomplete in the sense that, unlike the Hallidayan framework, it does not aim to be a full-fledged theory of language. The aim of my framework is to be able to identify explicitating and implicitating shifts, and to tell for any given shift whether it mainly affects the interactional, cohesive, or denotational meaning of the target text as compared to the source text. The framework distinguishes between the following three types of shifts:

1. **Interactional shifts** concern the appearance of the source text author and the target text addressee in the target text (cf. Halliday's interpersonal metafunction).

2. **Cohesive shifts** concern the cohesion of the target text as compared

[8] Accordingly, my framework (to be discussed below) classifies shifts involving adverbs such as *still* or *entirely* as denotational shifts.

to the source text (cf. Halliday's textual metafunction).

3. **Denotational shifts** concern the description of the states of affairs expressed by the target text (cf. Halliday's ideational metafunction).

While the three types of shifts roughly correspond to the three Hallidayan metafunctions of language briefly mentioned above, they are more clearly delimited from each other and their range of application is smaller. The downside of this is that unlike Halliday's metafunctions, my three classificatory types do not cover the whole range of linguistic phenomena. In other words, there are shifts that fall out of this classification (see Section 3.8). But since such shifts are rare, this does not have to concern us. It is better to classify 70 or 80 percent of the shifts in a given corpus reliably than 100 percent with errors.

My framework draws heavily on the theory of formal semantics. It departs from the highly simplified – but practically useful – assumption that language is primarily used as a means of representing the world (cf. Wittgenstein 1921 and any good introduction to formal semantics, e.g. Chierchia and McConnell-Ginet 1990). A sentence is seen as depicting or representing one or more *states of affairs*. A state of affairs consists of (a) one or more entities/objects and (b) one or more conditions that are valid of these entities.

For example, the sentence *Jan is a student* depicts a state of affairs where the entity *Jan* is subject to the condition of being a student: `student (jan)`. More formally, viz. in set-theoretic terms, we might also say that Jan is an element of the set of all students. A slightly more complex example would be *John loves Mary*, where the entity John is subject to the condition of being in love with Mary. More formally, we could say that John is an element of the set of all objects (or persons) that love Mary. From a different perspective, we could call the condition of being in love a *relation*, since it involves two entities: `loves (john, mary)`.

In the formal-semantic approach to the study of language adopted in this study, a sentence represents a state of affairs by virtue of its subject (typically) denoting a real-world entity, its verb a real-word condition, etc. A sentence is informative if it puts *constraints* on what reality could be like. For example, the sentence *Felix is Felix* is not informative semantically (maybe pragmatically in certain situations, but that is a different story). The only information that it provides us with is that an entity named Felix exists. The sentence *Felix is a cat*, on the other hand, is highly informative, because it puts strong constraints on what the world could be like. To put it more formally, the sentence constrains the set of *possible worlds*.

The information that Felix is a cat is only the tip of the iceberg. The sentence simultaneously tells us that Felix is not a hamster or a dog, not human, does not study linguistics, etc. In this way, the sentence excludes countless possible states of affairs, or possible worlds. From a formal-semantic perspective, this is what makes a sentence informative (cf. Gamut 1991: 54). We now have a definition of the term *information/informativity* – viz. the amount of contraints put on reality by a linguistic message – which is a good thing, because our definitions of explicitness and explicitation rely on this concept (see Section 1.3).

While the view of language sketched above is of course highly simplified and incomplete (what about illocutionary force, for example?), it allows a precise and reliable identification of the great majority of explicitating and implicitating shifts in translations of expository prose. To see how this works, let us have a look at an example of an explicitating shift from the investigated corpus:

(18) I have challenged *the organization* to double pre-tax earnings in 2000 [. . .].

Ich habe *das Unternehmen* aufgefordert, die Einkünfte vor Steuer im Jahre 2000 zu verdoppeln [. . .].

The term *Unternehmen* 'company' strikes us as more explicit than the source text's corresponding term *organization*. Why? Because the set of companies is a proper subset of the set of organizations: a company is an organization, but an organization is not necessarily a company. So, when the term *organization* in a description of a state of affairs is replaced by the term *Unternehmen* or *company*, the set of possible worlds decreases. As a result, the sentence is more informative and, since the increase in informativity is due to linguistically encoded (verbalized) meaning, also more explicit.

Let us now come back to the three functional types of shifts proposed above. My simple framework can only handle shifts pertaining to the description of states of affairs. That is, all three types of shifts relate to denotations of nouns, adjectives, etc. In other words, types 1 and 2 are really subtypes of type 3. The *denotation* of a term is the set of all entities to which it might refer. For example, the denotation of the term *cat* is the set of all cats. It should have become clear that the shifts captured by my classificatory framework are all denotational. Interactional and cohesive shifts are nothing more than special cases of denotational shifts. (However, due to their distinct communicative functions, it makes sense to treat them separately.) In the following, I am going to explain how shifts of the three

types discussed above have been identified and classified as explicitations or implicitations in the present study.

3.5 Interactional shifts

Throughout this book, I use the term *interactional* in the sense of Thompson and Thetela (1995) and Thompson (2001), who (like Halliday and Matthiessen) work within the framework of Systemic Functional Linguistics. (So I do stay close to Systemic Functional Linguistics and its three metafunctions of language in my classification, although I try to avoid some imprecise notions by sacrificing some detail.) Thompson and Thetela distinguish between *interactivity* and *interactionality*:

Interactivity concerns an author's "awareness of [his] audience's likely reactions and needs" (2001: 59), as evident from the selection and presentation of information represented in a text.

Interactionality concerns "the ways in which writers more or less *overtly* conduct interaction with their readers, particularly by assuming for themselves and assigning to the readers roles in the interaction (e.g., questioner and answerer), and by intruding in the message to comment on and evaluate it." (Thompson and Thetela 1995: 104; my emphasis)

Interactivity is not the concept that we need, since all three types of shifts represented in my framework (i.e. interactional, cohesive, and denotational shifts) are interactive in the sense that translators may perform them in an effort to cater to the target language readers' "reactions and needs". In general, as Thompson and Thetela (1995) point out, every text is interactive to the extent that the choice and order of the information presented is driven by the author's effort to make the text comprehensible to its target audience.

What is interesting for our study of explicitation and implicitation is Thompson and Thetela's concept of interactionality, which covers the extent to which an author makes her text appear as a *social and communicative event involving the author and reader as participants*. Every text is a social and communicative event, but an author may signal this "more or less overtly" (see the quote above). For example, "the speaker/writer may appear in the text [...] with greater or lesser degrees of visibility." (Thompson and Thetela 1995: 109) Thus, the interactionality of an utterance, a sequence of

utterances, or even of a full discourse can be located on an explicitness–implicitness scale (1995: 109). This makes the concept of interactionality particularly suitable for providing the basis of an investigation of explicitating and implicitating shifts in translation. I thus decided to count shifts pertaining to the interactionality of the translated text as "interactional shifts" and to ignore everything else that might be called 'interpersonal'.

According to Thompson and Thetela (1995: 107), an author may engender interactionality in her text by:

1. Assigning interactional roles (e.g. questioner and answerer) to author and reader, e.g. by using questions and imperatives.

2. Referring to author and reader, e.g. by means of personal pronouns.

The first way of making a text interactional is highly interesting and has first been recognized by Kamenická (2008) as being subject to explicitation and implicitation in translation. For example, an imperative may be seen as interactionally more explicit than a request guised as a question. Cf. the following fictitious example:

(19) Können Sie das Fenster schließen?

Please close the window!

The English target text of (19) is unmistakably a request for action. The use of the imperative makes this clear. In contrast, the German source text of (19) is not a request for action (at least not semantically), but a request for information (i.e. a question). However, the addressee can infer from this request for information that the speaker actually wants her to close the window. In the English translation, such an inference on the part of the addressee is not necesssary, so we could say that the shift from question to imperative in (19) represents an interactional explicitation. Unfortunately, shifts between imperatives, questions, and declaratives do not occur at all in the data investigated in the present study, so we will ignore this type of interactional shift from now on.

The second way of making a text interactional mentioned by Thompson and Thetela is by referring to the author[9] and reader of the text, e.g. by means of personal pronouns. Shifts involving reference to the author

[9]As it was mentioned in Section 3.2, it is often unclear which and how many people were involved in the production of a business text. But that does not need to concern us, since the actual writers of these texts only very rarely refer to themselves (e.g. by means of the personal pronoun *I*), and this was not found to be involved in any explicitating or implicitating shift. When the writers of the investigated business texts refer to themselves, they usually do it by referring to all members of the company they are a part of

or reader of a text are abundantly represented in the translation corpus investigated in the present study. In line with Thompson and Thetela (1995), I assume that expressions referring to the author or reader of a text may be ranked in terms of explicitness. I found four degrees of explicitness to be enough for the investigated corpus. The degrees that my classification of interactional shifts distinguishes are the following:

Scale of Interactional Explicitness

1. **High degree** of interactional explicitness: Reference to author or reader by means of personal pronoun
   (a) Author: *I*, *we*
   (b) Reader: *you*
2. **Medium degree** of interactional explicitness: Reference to author by means of company's name, e.g. *XYZ Corporation*
3. **Low degree** of interactional explicitness: Reference to author or reader by means of a descriptive expression
   (a) Author: e.g. *the company*, *the Group*, *the organization*
   (b) Reader: e.g. *the reader*
4. **Lowest degree** of interactional explicitness: No explicit reference to author or reader, as e.g. in passive constructions
   (a) Author: e.g. *New products will be launched...* (cf. We *will launch new products...*)
   (b) Reader: e.g. *It is easy to see that...* (cf. *You can easily see that...*)

According to my classification, the highest degree of interactional explicitness is obtained when author or reader are referred to by means of personal pronouns. This classificatory decision was made because such pro-

(e.g. *We at XYZ Corporation...*). In this way, the whole company is essentially presented as the virtual author of the text. This allows me to simplify my exposition somewhat: When I speak of "the author" of a text here and in the following, I do not mean the actual persons that have performed the writing task, but the "writer-in-the-text", i.e. "the participant who is represented as responsible for the text" (Thompson and Thetela 1995: 110) – namely the company as a whole.

nouns are "speaker-hearer deictic"[10] elements (Baumgarten and Özçetin 2008: 297), i.e. they 'point to' the speaker and/or hearer of the utterance containing them. (The term *deictic* derives from Ancient Greek *deiknynai* 'to point'). The use of a personal pronoun in this function thus makes unmistakably clear that the entity referred to is identical with one of the participants involved in the current interaction (represented by the text at hand). In contrast, the use of a company name, for example, "suggests that the writer is writing on behalf of an impersonal [. . .] organization which is inherently third-person and exists above and beyond any individuals in it." (Thompson and Thetela 1995: 118). There is a big difference between Version 1 and Version 2 of the following (fictitious) example:

(20) Version 1: *We* posted losses last year. . .

Version 2: *XYZ Corporation* posted losses last year. . .

In Version 1, the use of the speaker-deictic pronoun *we* makes clear that the author of the text,[11] i.e. one of the participants in the interaction represented by the text, has lost money. In Version 2, this is not clear at all, but has to be inferred by the reader. The reader is not told explicitly that the author of the text has lost money; he has to infer this by going through a syllogism along the following lines: (1.) XYZ Corporation posted losses last year; (2.) XYZ Corporation is the author of the text; (3.) so the author of the text posted losses last year. The participation of the text's author in the state of affairs described thus appears in disguise. This is what gives Version 2 its impersonal flavor (cf. Garzone 2004: 326f).

Following these considerations and the definition of interactionality provided above ("the extent to which an author makes her text appear as a social and communicative event involving the author and reader as participants"), we can say that Version 1 of Example (20) is interactionally more explicit than Version 2; or, to put things more generally: that

[10]Speaker-hearer deictics have also been called "personal deictics" (e.g. by Ehlich 1992: 207, Kameyama 2007), "partner deictics" (Blühdorn 1993, 1995), and "role variables" (Braunmüller 1977: 23). All of these terms describe the interactional potential of speaker-hearer deictic elements very well, albeit from different perspectives. For example, the term "role variables" proposed by Braunmüller nicely illustrates that the referents of speaker-hearer deictic pronouns play specific roles in the ongoing communicative situation – as speaker and hearer.

[11]The personal pronoun *we* does not have to refer to the author exclusively; its reference may include a number of other persons. One such case would be the "inclusive" use of *we* (see e.g. Harwood 2005), where the pronoun refers to a group of persons including the reader (e.g. *We are now going to look at. . .*). However, this does not occur in the investigated data.

reference to the author of a business text by means of a personal pronoun is interactionally more explicit than reference by means of the company name.[12]

Next, there is the case where the author or reader of the text is referred to by means of a descriptive expression such as *the company* or *the reader*. Cf. the following, adapted version of example (20):

(21) *The company* posted losses last year...

In (21), the definite article (*the*) presupposes that the addressee is familiar with a certain company, to which the associated noun phrase (*the company*) refers (Heim 1983). This means that in interpreting (21), the reader has to make the same inferences as in interpreting Version 2 of example (20), plus she has to make the additional inference that the company referred to is the company responsible for the report.

The pragmatic effect of this obligatory inferencing is that the company in question appears even more depersonalized and less involved in the interaction with the addressee than it is the case in Version 2 of example (20). What contributes to this depersonalizing effect is the fact that the proper name *XYZ Corporation* may only be used to refer to XYZ Corporation, while the descriptive expression *the company* in principle may be used to refer to any company. In this way, *the company* in (21) is interactionally less explicit than the referentially identical proper name *XYZ Corporation*. In general, we can say that reference to the author of a business text by means of a descriptive expression is interactionally less explicit than reference by means of a proper name. (Cases where a descriptive expression is used to refer to the reader of the text do not occur in the investigated data.)

The final and limiting case of interactional explicitness is where reference to the author or reader of the text in question is implied or implicated but not verbalized at all. A prominent and frequent example of this is be the passive construction. In English as well as in German, the passive construction allows the non-verbalization of the verbal argument representing the "actor" of the state of affairs expressed (see e.g. Foley and Van Valin 1984; the authors use "actor" as a cover term for a variety of ver-

[12]One could argue that a company name, while interactionally less explicit, is *denotationally* more explicit than a pronoun, since it may only refer to the corresponding company while a personal pronoun may refer to any individual in principle. However, since a company name tells us very little – if anything at all – about its referent (company names that are pure proper names do not even tell us that reference to a company is made), shifts from pronouns to company names were not counted as denotational explicitations.

bal argument types that the passive construction may leave implicit, e.g. Agent, Instrument, Experiencer, etc).

Now that we have a scale of interactional explicitness for classifying references to the author and addressee of a text, it is easy to see what an explicitating or implicitating shift with respect to the different forms of reference means: An *interactional explicitation* occurs when a translator moves up on the scale (e.g. replacing *XYZ corporation* by *we*), while an *interactional implicitation* occurs when a translator moves down on the scale (e.g. replacing *XYZ corporation* by *the company*). This will be illustrated by a variety of examples when we discuss the results of the present study regarding interactional shifts in Chapter 4.

3.6 Cohesive shifts

There is some confusion in the literature regarding the terms *cohesion* and *coherence*. For example, it is sometimes assumed that texts are necessarily cohesive or that a text can be "made coherent" by specific linguistic means (such as pronouns). To my mind, both statements are wrong, or at least misleading. It is generally acknowledged that cohesion concerns the *formal* or *linguistic* connectedness of a text, while coherence means a text's *functional* or *pragmatic* connectedness. Still, authors seem to have different ideas regarding what the two different concepts comprise in detail. Since cohesion (and not coherence) is the concept that is most relevant to the present study, it seems necessary to make clear how cohesion and coherence may be distinguished. Let us do this by looking at a couple of concrete examples.

(22) I like potato chips. Hamburg is in Germany.

The two sentences of (22) strike us as incoherent because we do not see how they are functionally/pragmatically related, i.e. in what way they are *relevant* to each other. This is why most people would not regard (22) as a (piece of) text or discourse. It follows that coherence may be seen as a defining characteristic of what counts as text or discourse (cf. Bublitz 2000).

(23) Sorry I'm late. I got into a traffic jam.

In contrast to (22), the little stretch of discourse given in (23) strikes us as coherent, because the two sentences of the example are clearly related to each other: The state of affairs described in the second sentence is obviously meant to supply a reason for the state of affairs expressed in the

first sentence. We can infer this from our world knowledge, which tells us that (in our culture) excuses are often backed up by reasons (cf. Gohl 2000). This suggests that the perception of coherence relations in discourse is crucially reliant on *inference* (cf. Smith and Hancox 2001).

To see where the difference between coherence and cohesion lies, consider the following example:

(23′) Sorry I'm late. *It*'s *because* I got into a traffic jam.

In this variant of (23), the semantic and pragmatic 'connectedness' of the two sentences is made explicit by means of two cohesive devices, the personal pronoun *it* and the causal conjunction *because*. The contrast between (23) and (23′) nicely exemplifies what cohesive devices are good for: They make explicit coherence relations that would otherwise have to be inferred by the reader. Cohesion, then, is nothing more than a textually 'overt' (explicit) way of marking textually 'covert' (implicit) coherence relations. In other words, cohesion may be regarded as a concrete lexicogrammatical manifestation of a text's coherence. However, we should always bear in mind that, as the above discussion has shown, cohesion is "neither a sufficient,[13] nor, indeed, a necessary prerequisite for a text to be understood as coherent." (Bublitz 1994: 216).

Coming back to the two false or misleading claims mentioned at the beginning of this section, it should have become clear by now why texts are not necessarily cohesive ((23) is not cohesive, for example)[14] and why a text cannot be "made coherent" by linguistic means (the use of *it* and *because* in (23)′ is only acceptable because (23) is coherent). It is true, however, that texts are necessarily *coherent* (because coherence is a defining criterion of 'textuality') and that texts can be made *cohesive* by linguistic means (e.g. pronouns and conjunctions).

Now that we have properly distinguished between cohesion and coherence, we can apply the two concepts to the study of translation. The translators of the corpus investigated in the present study generally preserve the coherence of the source text (i.e. the order in which states of affairs are presented etc.; cf. Section 3.2). However, translators were found to perform a great number of shifts on the level of cohesion. Thus, the

[13]Compare the incoherent example (22), which does not get coherent if we add cohesive devices. In fact, it only gets worse. Cf. e.g.: # *I like potato chips. It's because Hamburg is in Germany*. This shows that cohesion is not a sufficient criterion for coherence. A text has to be coherent by itself so as to be able to profit from cohesive devices.

[14]This is a slight exaggeration: The repetition of the personal pronoun *I* creates what Halliday and Hasan (1976) call lexical cohesion.

present study deals exclusively with cohesive shifts. There are different kinds of cohesive shifts, since there are different ways of establishing cohesion. In sum, two main ways may be distinguished in which authors and translators can create cohesion (cf. Halliday and Hasan 1976):

1. Referring to the same entity multiple times (*coreference*)[15]

2. Encoding *semantic relations* between entities[16]

In the following, the two ways will be dealt with in turn. We will look at the most important means of encoding coreference and semantic relations and try to rank these means according to their degree of explicitness. This will allow us to identify translators' cohesive shifts as explicitations or implicitations.

3.6.1 Shifts involving coreferential expressions

Since verb-based shifts were excluded from analysis (see Section 3.8), the present study is exclusively concerned with coreference relations on the level of the noun phrase and prepositional phrase. Let us briefly contemplate how coreference across phrases can be established, i.e. how two phrases can be made to 'corefer' with each other. The simplest way would be by means of lexical repetition (cf. Halliday and Hasan 1976: 277ff), as in the following example:

(24) Die Methoden, die wir zur Erreichung *unserer Ergebnisse* einsetzen, sind genau so wichtig wie *die Ergebnisse* selbst.

In (24), the two noun phrases *unsere Ergebnisse* 'our results' and *die Ergebnisse* 'the results' refer to the same entity; they are *coreferent*, i.e. they have the same referent. Simplifying somewhat, we can say that coreference has been achieved in this example by repeating the noun *Ergebnisse*.[17] Another way of establishing coreference across two phrases would be by means of pronominalization. This strategy is evidenced in the following example:

(25) The world's population will soon exceed *six billion persons* with rising standards of living. To meet *their* nutritional needs we must [...]

[15]The term *coreference* subsumes Halliday and Hasan's (1976) notions of "reference", "substitution", "ellipsis", and "lexical cohesion".

[16]My notion of *semantic relations* (which will be elaborated in the following) largely corresponds to what Halliday and Hasan (1976) call "conjunction".

[17]The definite article *die* 'the' also plays a role here, but I will not go into that, since article-based shifts have been excluded from the present study (see Section 3.8).

In the English source text of (25), coreference has been established by means of pronominalization. We know that the noun phrase *their* corefers with the noun phrase *six billion persons* because the pronoun *their* cannot be interpreted on its own. Casually speaking, third-person pronouns contain an instruction to the addressee saying something like: 'I refer to an entity that has been referred to before!' (cf. Ehlich 1982) It is the task of the addressee to work out the referent of a pronoun, e.g. by identifying the pronoun's *antecedent*. In (25), the antecedent of *their* is *six billion persons*.

While in (24) lexical repetition and in (25) pronominalization is used to establish coreference, there is also a 'mixed strategy' where a coreferential phrase is used that contains both a pronoun and a lexical specifier. Cf. the following example:

(26) At the same time, the way we sell our vehicles and serve our customers will also be transformed. And the Internet will play a huge part in *these changes*.

The coreferential strategy chosen in (26) can be seen as occupying a middle ground between lexical repetition and pronominalization. On the one hand, a pronoun has been used (*these*); on the other hand, the author has augmented the pronoun by a specifying noun, *changes*. (Note that *in this* could have also been used instead of *these changes*.) The lexical specification of the referent by means of the noun *changes* makes it potentially easier for the addressee to find out what *these* refers to.

Example (26) is particularly interesting because it points to a general problem that troubles studies dealing with pronominalization. As the term suggests, most previous research on 'pronominalization' rests on the assumption that pronouns are mere substitutes for nouns. This naive approach, which has also been implicit in the above discussion, views a pronoun as a kind of surrogate for its antecedent. From this perspective, pronouns are nothing more than a means of avoiding lexical repetition. However, examples such as (26) show that this view rests on some crude simplifications. In (26), *these changes* does not have a proper antecedent, so the phrase cannot be seen to act as a substitute for a more verbose expression. We get the impression that *these changes* corefers with the whole of the preceding sentence, referring to the state of affairs verbalized by it. How do we arrive at this interpretation? While the details of the process of 'pronoun resolution', as it is called in the literature, remain yet to be elucidated, it is already clear that the process relies heavily on inference (see e.g. Wykes 1983, Wolf et al. 2004).

Lyons (1977: 636f) has criticized the term *pronoun* for evoking the false impression that a pronoun stands for ('pro') a noun. Indeed, as the above

discussion has shown, pronouns cannot be seen as substituting nouns. Pronouns can refer to anything ranging from simple objects (25) to complex states of affairs (26), and (especially in the latter case) it can be difficult to pinpoint an antecedent expression in the previous discourse. What do we make of this? I decided to retain the use of the terms *pronoun* and *antecedent*, but readers should bear in mind that pronouns are a lot more than mere placeholders and often do not have concrete antecedents.

Moreover, it should be pointed out that we do not need a complete theory of how pronouns work to investigate explicitation and implicitation in translation. Applying the definitions of explicitness and implicitness provided in Section 1.3, we can say that pronouns are less explicit than lexical repetitions (cf. Biber et al. 1999: 240), because the latter give us more (lexicalized) information about possible referents: While *die Ergebnisse* in (24) can only refer to some kind of results, *their* in (25) can refer to just about anything – depending on context. As for phrases such as *these changes* in (26), consisting of a coreferential element (the demonstrative pronoun *these*) and a lexical element (the noun *changes*), I decided to view them as occupying a middle ground between isolated pronouns and lexical repetitions. These considerations led to the following (tentative) Scale of Coreferential Explicitness:

Scale of Coreferential Explicitness

1. **Pronoun.** Referent not specified additionally (e.g. *the company ... it*)
   → low degree of cohesive explicitness

2. **Pronoun + noun.** Referent of pronoun specified by additional, lexical means (e.g. *the company ... this enterprise*)
   → medium degree of cohesive explicitness

3. **Lexical repetition.** Reader does not need context to establish referent (e.g. *the company ... the company*)
   → high degree of cohesive explicitness

The scale assumes that a phrase gets coreferentially implicit through the presence of a pronominal element. If the phrase exclusively consists of this pronominal element, it can be regarded as minimally explicit (Case 1). If the reference of the pronominal element is constrained by an accompanying noun, I assume a medium degree of cohesive explicitness (Case 2). If no pronominal element is present at all, cohesive/coreferential explicitness is maximal (Case 3).

3.6.2 Shifts involving the encoding of semantic relations

There are two ways in which the term *semantic relation* has been used in the literature. In its first sense, the term means relations such as synonymy or hyponymy, i.e. relations between *linguistic items*. In its second sense, the term means relations such as causality or temporality, i.e. relations between *real-world entities*, which may be linguistically encoded by means of connectives (e.g. *because*, *after*). In the present study, the term *semantic relation* is used exclusively in the latter sense.

Semantic relations in the sense intended here are configurations of real-world entities. Entities may be configured in different ways. For example, physical objects may be configured spatially, while temporal objects (= states of affairs) may be configured temporally:

(27) The bird is *in front of* / *behind* / *inside* the house.
[spatial configuration]

(28) The concert takes place *before* / *after* / *during* dinner.
[temporal configuration]

Example (27) tells us how two objects, a bird and a house, are configured in space, while (28) tells us about the temporal configuration of two 'objects' existing in time, a concert and a dinner.[18] In both cases, the configuration – or semantic relation – in question is expressed by a preposition.

Semantic relations are highly interesting for our study of explicitation and implicitation, since relations may be encoded more or less explicitly. Cf. the following example:

(29) Sascha is tall, *while* Morgane is short.

Sascha ist groß, Morgane *hingegen* ist klein.

Like many other connectives, *while* is characterized by its vague meaning. Simplifying somewhat, the connective may encode a temporal or a contrastive relation, which means that (29) allows (at least) two different interpretations:

(30) (a) 'Sascha is tall. *At the same time*, Morgane is short.' [temporal]

(b) 'Sascha is tall. *In contrast*, Morgane is short.' [contrastive]

[18]As the example shows, states of affairs may be expressed by nouns, although they are prototypically expressed by verbs.

The reader has to infer which of these two interpretations is intended by the speaker. In this case, the inferencing process should go something like this: since it seems quite irrelevant to assert that two persons have their respective body heights at the same time (temporal interpretation), the speaker of (29) most probably uses *while* in order to alert us to a contrast between Sascha's and Morgane's body height. We thus infer that the contrastive interpretation of *while* is the intended one. The German translation of (29) is more explicit than the English original. The connective *hingegen* is more explicit than *while* because it does not have a temporal reading at all, only a contrastive one. Thus, the reader of the German translation does not have to infer that a contrast is being expressed, since the lexical meaning of *hingegen* supplies him with this information.

From the brief introduction to semantic relations provided above we have seen that (a) there are different types of semantic relations, (b) different kinds of entities may be connected by semantic relations and (c) the linguistic encoding of semantic relations (e.g. by means of connectives) may be more or less explicit. In order to be able to systematically investigate increases and decreases in explicitness with respect to the encoding of semantic relations, we need to answer the following questions:

1. Which kinds of entities may enter into semantic relations?
2. Which kinds of semantic relations may be encoded linguistically?

In other words, we need a systematic account of which kinds of entities may enter into which kinds of semantic relations. Luckily, such an account already exists (Blühdorn 2008b, 2009, 2010), and it turns out that it is ideally suited for an investigation of explicitation and implicitation of semantic relations in translation. In the following, I am going to give an overview of Blühdorn's model of semantic relations (in simplified form), drawing largely on the works just cited. Since the model is of considerable complexity, I cannot explain it in every detail. The purpose of the following exposition is not to give a full introduction to Blühdorn's model, but to provide the reader with enough knowledge so as to understand why and how the model was used in the present study.

Types of entities (types of relata)

Blühdorn assumes that the following four kinds of entities may be denoted by means of language:

1. Spatial objects (physical entities)

2. States of affairs (temporal entities: events, states, etc.)
3. Propositions (epistemic[19] entities)
4. Speech acts (deontic[20] entities).

This ontological classification of entities (originally proposed by Lyons 1977: 442–446 and refined by Dik 1989: Ch. 12, Sweetser 1990, and Blühdorn 2003: 16–20) makes clear why I have repeatedly used the vague term *entity* above: because language does not only encode semantic relations between real-world objects, but also also between 'objects' of the human mind such as propositions or speech acts. I use the term *entity* as a cover term for the diffent kinds of 'objects' listed above, i.e. mental as well as real-world ones. I will also use the term *relata* (singular: *relatum*) to refer to entities that form part of a linguistically encoded semantic relation.

Types of semantic relations

Traditional accounts of the meaning of connectives, such as the ones that are commonly found in large reference grammars of English and German, typically list a multitude of semantic relations that may be encoded by means of connectives, e.g. "cause", "result", "contrast", "concession", "restriction", "explication", etc. (see e.g. Quirk et al. 1985: 484f, 634ff; Zifonun et al. 1997: 809ff, 2386ff). However, as Blühdorn (e.g. 2008b) points out, this way of classifying semantic relations is unsystematic and therefore unsatisfying. For example, traditional classifications of semantic relations generally leave unclear (a) how the different types of relations may be distinguished and (b) why connectives such as *while* or *and* can encode different types of relations – questions that are crucial to any study of connective-based shifts in translation. To remedy this situation, Blühdorn (2008b, 2009, 2010) has proposed a new, feature-based typology of semantic relations which assumes four basic types of relations:

1. Similarity relations
2. Situation relations
3. Condition relations
4. Causation relations

[19] *epistemic* (from Greek) = 'related to knowledge'
[20] *deontic* (from Greek) = 'related to obligation or desirability'

The typology is feature-based, which means that the four types of relations may be distinguished from each other on an objective basis (e.g. using linguistic tests). Since this chapter is long enough already, I will not discuss the four types of relations and the features by which they may be distinguished (see the works by Blühdorn cited above). The meaning of the relations should become clear enough in the following discussions of various connectives.

The linguistic encoding of semantic relations

The four types of entities/relata and the four types of semantic relations distinguished by Blühdorn span a matrix of linguistically encodable semantic relations, which may be depicted as follows:

	Similarity	Situation	Condition	Causation
Deontics	deontic Similarity	deontic Situation	deontic Condition	deontic Causation
Epistemics	epistemic Similarity	epistemic Situation	epistemic Condition	epistemic Causation
Time	temporal Similarity	temporal Situation	temporal Condition	temporal Causation
Space	spatial Similarity	spatial Situation	spatial Condition	spatial Causation

Table 3.1: The universe of linguistically encodable semantic relations (taken from Blühdorn 2009)

According to Blühdorn, Table 3.1 represents "the universe of semantic relations capable of being encoded in language. "This means that any semantic relation established between two linguistic expressions by means of a connective is either a Similarity relation, or a Situation relation, or a Condition relation, or a Causation relation, and its relata are either physical objects, or states of affairs, or propositions, or [speech acts]." (2009: 8) In other words, if Blühdorn is right, the table is all we need for describing the encoding of semantic relations in language, i.e. there is no relation that cannot be described in terms of the $4 * 4 = 16$ categories listed in Table 3.1.

As for the types of semantic relations distinguished by traditional grammar such as temporality, contrast, causality and concession, it turns out that each of them corresponds to one or more fields of the above table (cf. Blühdorn 2009: 8). Thus, according to our new terminology:

- The relation of "temporality" (as it is listed in most traditional accounts) subsumes relations of temporal Similarity (expressed by connectives such as *when*, *at that time*, etc.) and of temporal Situation (expressed by connectives such as *after*, *then*, etc).
- Relations traditionally called "contrastive" are relations of epistemic or deontic Situation.
- The traditional notion of "causality" gets split up into spatial, temporal, epistemic and deontic Causation.
- "Concession" turns out to be a special case of temporal, epistemic and deontic Causation (Blühdorn and Golubeva 2007).
- Etc.

We see that the present account breaks up the categories assumed by traditional grammar into a much more precise and better motivated typology of semantic relations.

Now, what about connectives? Connectives are linguistic items that encode semantic relations. Let us adopt the following definition of the term *connective*:

> A **connective** is a conjunction, adverb, particle, or a higher-level "linking construction" (Bührig and House 2007) that encodes a semantic relation (Similarity, Situation, Condition or Causation) between two relata (states of affairs, propositions or speech acts). The relata of a connective may be expressed by clauses, sentences or larger stretches of discourse.

This definition largely overlaps with what linguists commonly regard as "connectives" (e.g. Behrens 2005), "connectors" (e.g. Altenberg 2007), "discourse relators" (e.g. Doherty 2001), etc., while being a lot more precise than the definitions usually given. I would like to emphasize some important properties of the above definition:

1. The definition is predominantly semantic in nature. Syntactic considerations do not play much of a role for the purpose of the present study, where we are chiefly interested in the degree of explicitness associated with a connective (see Pasch et al. 2003 and Blühdorn 2008a, 2008b for detailed discussions of the syntax of connectives).

2. My definition deliberately excludes prepositions, allowing only relata that are expressed by clauses or higher-level units. (The relata of prepositions are expressed by phrases.) The reasons for the exclusion of shifts involving prepositions from the present study will be given in Section 3.8.

3. The class of connectives is a syntactically heterogeneous class comprising elements belonging to different lexical categories (conjunctions, adverbs, and particles) and even elements that do not belong to any lexical category at all, but are syntactically composite items (linking constructions). Semantically, however, the class of connectives, as it is delimited by the above definition, is perfectly homogeneous: Connectives are *relational expressions* that share the function of encoding semantic relations between relata.

The third and arguably most important point of the above list may need illustration. The following group of examples illustrates the syntactic heterogeneity and semantic homogeneity of the class of connectives:

(31) (a) Roman is in Hamburg. *And* Max is in Hamburg.
(b) Roman is in Hamburg. *Moreover*, Max is in Hamburg.
(c) Roman is in Hamburg. Max is *also* in Hamburg.
(d) Roman is in Hamburg. *What is more*, Max is in Hamburg.

The connectives in (31 a) through (31 d) all encode the same semantic relation, namely a Similarity relation,[21] although the connective in (31 a) is a conjunction, the connective in (31 b) is an adverb, the connective in (31 c) is a particle, and the connective in (31 d) is what Bührig and House (2007) call a "linking construction", i.e. a group of words that fulfills a connective function.[22]

The above discussion has already hinted at the main point of this section, which is crucially important for our present study of explicitation and implicitation: *A given connective does not simply encode one basic type of semantic relation; rather, it may encode several different relation–relata combinations while excluding others*. In other words, every connective may be

[21] It is true that there are subtle meaning differences between the individual connectives used in (31 a) through (31 d), but this observation does not contradict the fact that they all encode a relation of Similarity. The subtle meaning differences that we perceive between the connectives seem to be mainly due to differences in phonological weight (inducing different pragmatic effects).

[22] I say "group of words" here because a linking construction may or may not form a syntactic unit; cf. linking constructions such as *the reason is that*...

seen as occupying specific fields of Table 3.1 which together represent the semantic profile of the connective. Thus, the semantic profile of *and*, the most flexible of all English connectives, may be illustrated as follows:

	Similarity	Situation	Condition	Causation
Deontics	*and* →	*and* →	*and* →	*and*
Epistemics	*and* →	*and* →	*and* →	*and*
Time	*and* → (32)	*and* → (33)	*and* → (34)	*and* (35)
Space	*and* →	*and*		

Table 3.2: Semantic profile of *and* (cf. Blühdorn 2009: 13)

Table 3.2 shows that *and* may encode relations of all four basic types between all four types of entities/relata. (Only relations of spatial Condition and Causation seem to be excluded from the semantic profile of *and*, cf. Blühdorn 2009: 13.) How does *and* achieve its extreme semantic flexibility? By being highly underspecified semantically. The basic meaning of *and* is that it encodes a Similarity relation. However, depending on context, *and* may be 'overinterpreted' as expressing Situation relations, and from there it may again be overinterpreted as expressing relations of Condition and Causation. This is indicated by the rightwards arrows in Table 3.2. In *and*, as in all other connectives, the process of overinterpretation appears to be driven by general pragmatic principles as they have been formulated by Grice (1975) or Sperber and Wilson (1995, 2004) (see Posner 1980, Carston and Blakemore 2005).

Since a full discussion of the semantically underspecified, and therefore pragmatically determined, meaning of *and* would be well beyond the scope of the present work, I am only going to illustrate the semantic flexibility of the conjunction in expressing relations between states of affairs:

(32) Svenja is at home *and* [at the same time] Agnieszka is in her office.
[temporal Similarity]

(33) Sol finished work *and* [then] went partying.
[temporal Situation]

(34) If Paul misses the train *and* [therefore] comes late, we have a problem.[23]
[temporal Condition]

[23] *And* can encode a relation of temporal Condition when used in combination with *if*.

(35) Paul missed the train *and* [therefore] came late.
[temporal Causation]

In each of (32) through (35), *and* (according to the most plausible interpretation) encodes a different type of relation, which may be made explicit by adding a more specific connective such as *at the same time*, *then* or *therefore*.

The above examples as well as Table 3.2 should have made clear that *and* is semantically the most flexible of all connectives, filling out almost the whole "universe of semantic relations". All other connectives are specialized on a smaller set of relation–relata combinations. As an example, let us consider *also* (cf. (31 d) above):

	Similarity	Situation	Condition	Causation
Deontics	*also*			
Epistemics	*also*			
Time	*also*			
Space				

Table 3.3: Semantic profile of *also*

Table 3.3 shows that the meaning of *also* represents a proper subset of the meaning of *and*. Like *and*, *also* can express Similarity relations between states of affairs, propositions and speech acts. But, in contrast to *and*, it cannot encode spatial Similarity relations, and, more importantly, it cannot be overinterpreted as expressing other types of relations such as Causation. Cf. the following variant of (35):

(35′) Paul missed the train. He *also* came late. / *Also*, he came late.

In (35′), *also* cannot be interpreted as expressing a Causation relation. In other words, relations other than Similarity seem to be blocked by *also*. Thus, *also* has to be regarded as more explicit than *and*, since it leaves less room for interpretation to the hearer, requiring less inferential work on the part of the addressee to be fully interpreted.

Explicitness and implicitness in the encoding of semantic relations

We now have everything in place for classifying connectives in terms of explicitness and for judging whether a given target text connective is more or less explicit than the corresponding source text connective. We stipulate that in any two given connectives A and B (of any language):

A is *more* explicit than B if and only if A can encode *less* relation–relatum pairs than B, i.e. A occupies less fields of Table 3.1 than B (leaving less room for interpretation to the hearer). In contrast, A is *less* explicit (= more implicit) than B if and only if A can encode *more* relation–relatum pairs than B, i.e. A occupies more fields of Table 3.1 than B (leaving more room for interpretation to the hearer).

Readers might worry about two things here. First, the above definition might be perceived by some as too complicated and/or too difficult to apply to empirical data. Second, the case where A and B occupy the same number of fields is not covered by the definition. However, this case does not occur in the investigated data. Moreover, applying the definition to empirical data is much more straightforward than it may seem. In fact, all connective substitutions identified in the present study were found to be clear-cut cases of explicitation or implicitation according to the above definition. The reason is that in all cases, the meaning of the source text connective was found to *include* the meaning of the target text connective (explicitation), or vice versa (implicitation). To see what this means, let us look at a representative example of a connective substition from the investigated corpus:

(36) *While* our strategy depends on distinct product lines, we *also* understand the need to reduce our costs in supporting them.

Obgleich es unsere Strategie bleibt, uns auf ausgeprägte Produktlinien zu konzentrieren, müssen wir *zugleich* versuchen, die Kosten für deren Aufrechterhaltung zu senken.

It is easy to see that the translator of (36) has substituted *obgleich* 'although' for *while* and *zugleich* 'at the same time' for *also*. Let us begin with the first substitution. Is this an explicitation? Yes, it is. The meaning of *while* is quite non-specific. As the following table shows, the connective can encode relations of Situation, Condition, and Causation:

	Similarity	Situation	Condition	Causation
Deontics		*while* (?)	*while* (?)	*while*
Epistemics		*while*	*while*	*while*
Time		*while*	*while*	*while*
Space				

Table 3.4: Semantic profile of *while*

I have marked two relation–relata combinations of Table 3.4 with a question mark where I was not sure whether *while* can be used for encoding or not. I have chosen this example on purpose, since uncertainties like this frequently turn up when investigating the meaning of connectives, and I do not want to gloss them over. The good thing is that in general (at least in the investigated data), such uncertainties were not found to impede analysis, since in each case it was still possible to determine whether the connective substitution in question was an explicitation or an implicitation. The present case, for example, was easy to identify as an explicitation because the meaning of *obgleich* is included in the meaning of *while*. Cf. the following table, which depicts the meaning of *obgleich*:

	Similarity	Situation	Condition	Causation
Deontics				*obgleich* (?)
Epistemics				*obgleich*
Time				*obgleich*
Space				

Table 3.5: Semantic profile of *obgleich*

From Table 3.5, we see that *obgleich* covers only part of the semantic spectrum of *while*, and it does not cover any additional fields where *while* has no entry. This means that formally speaking, the meaning of *obgleich* is a proper *subset* of the meaning of *while*. (Or, to put it the other way round: The meaning of *while* is a proper *superset* of the meaning of *obgleich*.) And this means nothing else than that *obgleich* is more explicit than *while*: Being a rather specific connective specialized on only two or three different relation–relatum pairs, *obgleich* leaves the hearer with a lot less room for interpretation than *while*.

Let us now turn to the second shift evidenced in example (36), the substitution of *zugleich* for *also*. Is this an explicitation? Yes, it is. Again, the meaning of *zugleich* turns out to be included in the meaning of *also*. Cf. the following table:

	Similarity	Situation	Condition	Causation
Deontics				
Epistemics				
Time	*zugleich*			
Space				

Table 3.6: Semantic profile of *zugleich*

Table 3.6 shows that *zugleich* is as explicit as a connective can be. It can only encode a single kind of semantic relation (temporal Similarity), all other kinds of relations being blocked. As we saw in Table 3.3, *also* is less explicit. For example, *also* can express epistemic Similarity, a type of relation that *zugleich* cannot encode. Cf. the following pair of examples:

(37) (a) Nine is an odd number. Eleven is *also* odd.

(b) * Neun ist eine ungerade Zahl. *Zugleich* ist elf ungerade.

Being the clearest case of epistemic objects, mathematical propositions exclude any temporal readings. This is why the use of *zugleich* yields a semantically deviant utterance (marked with "*"), while the use of *also* – a connective that is able to connect epistemic objects – is semantically adequate.

The model by Blühdorn used in the present study for the identification of connective substitutions as explicitations and implicitations seems quite complicated, but it is the only model I know of that allows for a reasonably objective and reliable way of comparing connectives in terms of explicitness – even across languages. Moreover, I hope to have shown that in the context of the present study, the model is not as difficult to use as it might seem, since English and German connectives generally differ enough from each other so as to allow a fairly confident assessment of whether one connective is more or less explicit than the other.

So far, I have only talked about connective substitutions. What about additions and omissions of connectives? It will have become obvious from the above discussion that connective additions are generally explicitations, and connective omissions are typically implicitations. Cf. the following example:

(38) Für die im abgelaufenen Geschäftsjahr geleistete Arbeit bedanke ich mich bei allen Mitarbeiterinnen und Mitarbeitern sehr herzlich. Und Ihnen, liebe Aktionärinnen und Aktionäre, danke ich für das Vertrauen, das Sie XYZ entgegenbringen.

I would like to warmly thank all employees for their hard work during the past fiscal year. And I would *also* like to thank you, the shareholders, for having placed your trust in XYZ.

In (38), the reader of the German source text has to infer that there is a relation of Similarity between the speech acts verbalized by the first and second sentence, since the connective *und* 'and' is compatible with a wide variety of semantic relations (cf. Table 3.2). In contrast, the presence of the connective *also* (added by the translator) relieves the target text reader

of this inferential work. Since *also* verbalizes a semantic relation that is inferable from the discourse context, the addition of the connective qualifies as an instance of explicitation according to the definition provided in Section 1.3.

In general, all connective additions identified in the investigated corpus are explicitations by definition (and all connective omissions are implicitations). The reason for this becomes evident from our discussion of cohesion and coherence at the very beginning of this section: Since a text can only be made cohesive if it is already coherent, translators can only add a connective if there is already an implicit coherence relation. Conversely, if a translator omits a connective, the underlying coherence relation is still there, i.e. in principle inferable by the reader.

3.7 Denotational shifts

As mentioned above, the term *denotational shifts* is somewhat of a misnomer for this third and last category of shifts, because all shifts captured by my framework are denotational. (A better term might be *descriptive shifts*, but this would belie the fact that interactional and cohesive shifts can be seen as subtypes of denotational shifts.) As we have seen in Section 3.4, the present study departs from the simplified assumption that a linguistic sentence consists of a number of terms (combined according to the syntactic rules of the language), with each term having its own denotation, i.e. a set of entities to which the term may refer.

Nouns typically denote objects, and verbs typically denote states of affairs. However, the state of affairs denoted by a verb is incomplete in the sense that the objects or persons participating in the state of affairs are missing. If I just say *likes*, for example, it remains unclear who likes whom/what. In order to express a complete state of affairs, a verb needs to be complemented by one or more nominal expressions, for example: *Charlotte likes music*. We could say that the verb *like* encodes the (incomplete) state of affairs `like (x, y)`, where x and y are variables that need to be filled. While this formal-semantic view of language may seem highly simplified and artificial, it represents the only objective way of investigating explicitation and implicitation that I could come up with.

In what way are interactional and cohesive shifts denotational? Interactional shifts are denotational in that they further specify a state of affairs by filling in the participants of the current speech situation. And (simplifying somewhat) cohesive shifts are denotational in that they express a new state of affairs, which, however, is inferable from the discourse con-

text (e.g. `cause (p, q)`, where p and q represent states of affairs). In this section we are concerned with shifts that do the same, but without any interactional or cohesive function. I call these shifts *denotational*.

The category of denotational shifts should not be mistaken as a kind of 'trash category' where shifts without a discernible function are collected. In fact, the opposite is the case: Denotational shifts do have clearly identifiable functions. While interactional shifts are concerned with the verbalization of author–reader relationships and cohesive shifts with the cohesion of the target text, *denotational shifts demonstrate translators' concern for describing states of affairs in a way that complies with the requirements of the current speech situation* (taking into account the communicative norms of the target language, etc.) The fact that what I call denotational shifts have this observable communicative function (cf. Chapter 6) shows that shifts of this kind represent a pragmatic category of their own, not just a remainder of phenomena that do not fit in elsewhere.

In denotational shifts, it is particularly important to distinguish between additions/omissions on the one hand and substitutions on the other. Let me briefly explain in the following how these operations differ from each other in terms of their effect on the target text's degree of explicitness. For the sake of brevity, I am going to focus on explicitating shifts.

3.7.1 Additions and omissions

From a formal-semantic point of view, the addition of a linguistic item represents an explicitation:

1. if the item further specifies a state of affairs (in an inferable way) expressed by the surrounding discourse.

2. if the item expresses an additional state of affairs (that would be inferable if it were not verbalized).

The first case is illustrated by the following example:

(39) die kompetente Begleitung bei der Entwicklung von neuen Flugzeugen

the competent collaboration *with manufacturers* on the production of new aircraft

The translator of (39) has added the nominal expression *with manufacturers* as an argument of the noun *collaboration*, thus further specifying the state

of affairs expressed by the noun. Why is this an explicitation (and not a deviation from the source text)? The noun collaboration expresses the state of affairs `collaborate (x, y)`, where x collaborates with y. In the source text, the participants x and y are left implicit. The reader has to infer from the context that the collaboration talked about takes place between the author of the text (x) and aircraft manufacturers (y). The reader of the target text, on the other hand, only has to infer the value of the variable x, because y is specified by the prepositional phrase *with manufacturers*. The addition of *with manufacturers* in (39) is an explicitation (and not an addition of genuinely new information) because it further specifies a state of affairs expressed by the surrounding discourse.

The second case mentioned above is illustrated by the following example:

(40) Vorstand und Aufsichtsrat nehmen die positive Geschäftsentwicklung zum Anlass, der Hauptversammlung eine gegenüber dem Vorjahr erhöhte Dividende [. . .] vorzuschlagen.

Based on the positive business trend, the Board of Management and Supervisory Board propose to the Annual General Meeting *the payment of* an increased dividend [. . .].

Simplifying somewhat, the English source text's subordinate clause expresses the state of affairs:

```
propose (board, increased_dividend, general_meeting)
```

By adding *the payment of*, the translator of (40) has expressed an additional state of affairs, viz. `pay (x, increased_dividend, y)`, where we infer that x = the company issuing the report and y = the company's shareholders. Why is this an explicitation? Because the additional state of affairs is inferable from the state of affairs verbalized by the source text: It is characteristic of a dividend that it gets paid out to shareholders. The addition of *the payment of* by the translator of (40) is an explicitation because it expresses an additional state of affairs that would be inferable if it were not verbalized.

The mechanisms outlined above also work the other way round, i.e. translators may omit states of affairs or individual participants from the target text that can be assumed to be inferable by the reader. Cf. the following example of a denotational omission:

(41) Die NHTSA ist außerdem *vom Gesetzgeber* angehalten worden, Fahrdynamiktests zu entwickeln [. . .].

The NHTSA has also been required to develop stability tests [. . .].

The German source text of (41) expresses the following state of affairs:

```
require (legislator, develop (NHTSA, stability_tests))
```

The English translator has omitted the nominal expression *vom Gesetzgeber* 'by the legislator'. In doing so, she has acted on the (reasonable) assumption that the target text reader is able to infer the missing participant (denoted by "x" in the following formalization) from her world knowledge:

```
require (x, develop (NHTSA, stability_tests))
```

The omission of the nominal expression *vom Gesetzgeber* evidenced in (41) is an implicitation (and not a genuine omission of information) because the argument/participant verbalized by the expression can be inferred by the target text reader.

You have probably noticed that I have talked about the addition and omission of "nominal expressions" in the preceding paragraphs, although *with manufacturers* (39) and *vom Gesetzgeber* (41) are prepositional phrases and *the payment of* (40) is not a phrase at all (but part of a phrase). In fact, I have treated cases such as the above as *noun-based* additions and omissions, although the shifts incorporate prepositional material. This was done for two reasons:

First, preposition-based shifts were excluded from analysis for practical reasons (see Section 3.8), and if we ignore the prepositions contained in the above additions/omissions, we are essentially left with nominal material. Second, while the above shifts do involve prepositions, from a semantic perspective they are all about the addition/omission of nominal material. For example, the addition of *with manufacturers* amounts to the addition of a participant semantically (encoded by the noun *manufacturers*); from a semantic perspective, the preposition *with* is merely stipulated by the head noun *cooperation* and is of minor semantic importance, i.e. it neither expresses a participant nor a state of affairs. Thus, it was decided to count additions and omissions of prepositional phrases as "noun-based" shifts. A more correct (but overly verbose) name for these shifts might be "shifts consisting in the addition/omission of chiefly nominal material". The reader is asked to bear this in mind.

What about additions and omissions of adjectives and adverbs? From a formal-semantic perspective, adjectives are closely connected to nouns (cf. Hamann 1991). When adjectives are used predicatively, they are semantically similar to nouns. Thus, for example, *Svenja is German* (predicative adjective) is semantically equivalent to *Svenja is a German* (predicative noun). Both sentences say that the entity Svenja belongs to the set of all Germans.

Due to the central role that predicative adjectives play in the sentence, additions and omissions of predicative adjectives rarely occur in the investigated data. When adjectives are used attributively, i.e. as modifiers of nouns, they constrain the range of objects that their head noun could possibly refer to. For example, the noun phrase *friendly German* denotes a subset of all Germans. In this way, attributive adjectives make the reference of nouns more precise. It is easy to see how the reference-modifying function of adjectives can be exploited by translators to perform explicitation and implicitation (see Section 6.2 for examples).

Turning to additions and omissions of adverbs, let us begin by considering an example of an adverbial addition:

(42) We pay billions of dollars in taxes and royalties [...].

Wir zahlen *jährlich* Steuern und Förderabgaben in Milliardenhöhe [...].

It is quite clear that the semantic function of *jährlich* 'annually' in the German translation of (42) is to give us more information about the state of affairs in question by telling us when it takes place (viz. every year). We could say that states of affairs do not only incorporate variables for the participants/arguments involved in them, but also 'special' variables for providing information about when, how, where, etc. the state of affairs takes place. Thus, we could semantically formalize the English source text of (42) as follows:

```
pay (we, billions..., T),
```

where the variable "T" symbolizes the point in time when the state of affairs takes place. In the English source text, the reader needs to infer T from their world knowledge. By adding the adverb *jährlich*, the translator of (42) has relieved the target text reader of inferring the state of affairs' temporal specification:

```
pay (we, billions..., every_year)
```

It is easy to see that the addition of adverbs falls in the first of the two categories mentioned above. By adding an adverb, a translator can further specify a state of affairs expressed by the surrounding discourse.

3.7.2 Substitutions

Throughout the explicitation literature, one can find statements such as the following: "Explicitation takes place, for example, when a [source language] unit with a more general meaning is replaced by a [target language]

unit with a more specific meaning" (Klaudy and Károly 2005: 15). However, it is never specified what "general" and "specific" are supposed to mean. When can a term be said to be more general/specific than another term? The formal-semantic approach adopted in the present study makes it easy to answer this question: A term x is more specific (= less general) than another term y if (and only if) the meaning of x includes the meaning of y, but not vice versa (cf. e.g. Croft and Cruse 2004: 142f). To see what this means, let us have a look at an example of a denotational shift (cf. also example (18) discussed in Section 3.4):

(43) [. . .] in Budapest, Monterrey, Tokyo, Paris and other *places* around the globe.

[. . .] aus Budapest, Monterrey, Tokio und anderen *Ländern* rund um den Globus.

The translator of (43) has substituted *Ländern* 'countries' for *places*. This shift is an instance of denotational explicitation because the meaning of *Land* 'country' includes the meaning of *place*. Another way of saying this is that the set of countries is a proper subset of the set of places (cf. Allan 2001: 228). Yet another way of saying this is that *Land* is a (cross-linguistic) *hyponym* of *place*, and *place* is a *hyperonym* of *Land*. How do we know that this is so? There is an simple test that may be used to establish hyponymy, the so-called "is a" test (cf. Croft and Cruse 2004: 142):

A country is a place, but a place is not necessarily a country.

The good thing about this test is that it does not only work inside one language, but it can also be applied across language boundaries: Any speaker competent in English and German can confirm that a *Land* is a *place*, but a *place* is not necessarily a *Land*, so *Land* can be regarded as a cross-linguistic hyponym of *place*. It follows that the term *Land* is more explicit than the term *place*. Similarly, *Unternehmen* 'company' is more explicit than *organization*, *Umfeld* 'environment' is less explicit than *working environment*, etc. (See Section 6.1.2 for many more examples.) We now have everything in place for identifying nominal substitutions as explicitations or implicitations.

Whenever the above test is not applicable, this means that the shift in question is neither an explicitation nor an implicitation. Consider the substitution of *collaboration* for *Begleitung* evidenced in (39) (discussed above), for example. Intuitively, the term *collaboration* may strike us as more specific than the term *Begleitung* 'attendance'. However, the test for hyponymy fails: A *collaboration* is sometimes, but not always a *Begleitung*,

and a *Begleitung* is sometimes, but not always a *cooperation*. This shows that the meanings of the two terms overlap to some extent, but neither is included in the other. Thus, it would be wrong to count the shift from *Begleitung* to *collaboration* evidenced in (39) as an instance of explicitation.

Since substitutions of adjectives and adverbs are very rare in the investigated data (see Chapter 6), I do not want to discuss in detail how such shifts were identified. Suffice it to say that adjectives and adverbs are connected by the same hyponymic/hyperonymic relations as nouns (cf. Croft and Cruse 2004: 142). Thus, for example, the set of all things that are *maroon* is included in the set of all things that are *red*, the set of all states of affairs that happen *annually* is included in the set of all states of affairs that happen *once in a while*, etc.

Summing up what has been said in this section on the identification of denotational shifts, I hope to have shown convincingly that what I call denotational shifts are not simply a residual of shifts that could not be classified as interactional or cohesive, but a genuine pragmatic category of shifts that are united by a common function, namely to describe states of affairs as precisely (or imprecisely) as it is demanded by the communicative situation at hand. This will become even clearer in Chapter 6, where we will discuss many examples of denotational shifts.

3.8 Shifts excluded from analysis

Shifts were excluded from analysis for various reasons. In summary, a (possible) shift was excluded from analysis whenever:

1. The semantic effect of the shift was unclear.
2. The shift was not covered by the definitions of explicitation and implicitation provided in Section 1.3.
3. The shift was associated with a semantic deviation from the source text.
4. Practical reasons made it necessary or desirable to exclude the shift.

In the following, I am going to elaborate on these four cases in turn.

1. The first case, where the semantic effect of a shift was unclear, is nicely illustrated by the following example:

(44) [. . .] wir werden deshalb weiter umfassend investieren [. . .].

[. . .] we will now make new and extensive investments [. . .].

The example contains a variety of (possible) shifts. Some of them are straightforward. For example, the translator of (44) has omitted *deshalb* 'therefore' (= connective-based cohesive implicitation) and added *now* (= adverb-based denotational explicitation). As a result, the target text has become cohesively less explicit and denotationally more explicit than the source text. So far, so good.

Next, we note that the translator of (44) has replaced the verb *investieren* 'to invest' by a verbal-nominal compound, *make investments*. Is this an explicitation? I would argue that it is not, because *make* can be regarded as semantically empty "dummy verb" (cf. Doherty 2002, 2006). However, this question did not have to be answered for the present study, because verb-based shifts were excluded from analysis for practical reasons (see below). But this shift is associated with another change that the translator has made: She has turned the adverbs *weiter* and *umfassend* into adjectives, *new* and *extensive*. While *umfassend* 'comprehensively' and *extensive* seem to be similar in meaning (with *umfassend investieren* ≈ *make extensive investments*), it is unclear how *weiter* 'further' and *new* compare semantically.

On the one hand, *to make new investments* implicates that there has been at least one previous investment – and this is what *weiter* says, too. On the other hand, this piece of information is lexically encoded by *weiter*, while it is only implicated by *new*. (More precisely, *weiter* "presupposes" its meaning, as semanticists would say. The hallmark of presupposed meanings is that they remain constant under negation: *weiter investieren* and *nicht weiter investieren* 'not further invest' both presuppose that there have been prior investments. Thus, presupposition seems to be 'stronger' semantically than conversational implicature, whose hallmark is cancelability. Cf. e.g. Levinson 1983.) From this perspective, *new* may be seen as less explicit than *weiter*. But then, *new* brings in a new meaning component, that of 'newness', which is only implicated by *weiter*. From this perspective, *new* may be seen as more explicit than *weiter*.

Don't worry, I will not further digress into a discussion of complex semantic and pragmatic phenomena such as presupposition and implicature – and that is exactly my point. In a large-scale study of a translation corpus pursuing a concrete aim (viz. finding translators' motivations for performing explicitating and implicitating shifts), it is simply not feasible to carry out a detailed semantic and pragmatic analysis of every single change that translators have made. Thus, I decided to count only clear and straightforward cases of explicitation and implicitation as such. Whenever I found myself wondering whether a certain meaning is semantically entailed, presupposed, or only implicated, or whether a certain lexical item might have yet another subtle meaning component that I had not noticed

before, I decided to ignore the shift in question and turn my attention to more productive considerations. In other words, I followed the general rule:

> "When in doubt, do not count!"

If I had tried to analyze in detail every possible instance of explicitation and implicitation, my analysis would have taken many years more – a bad trade-off in my eyes. On the other hand, rash decisions would have compromised my results (cf. my criticism of Øverås 1998 in Section 2.3.3). So the above rule seemed to me like a good compromise between the two extremes.

2. Let us now turn to the second case mentioned above, the case of shifts that were not covered by the definitions of explicitation and implicitation proposed in Section 1.3. Many of these shifts superficially look like explicitations or implicitations, although they are not. Cf. the following example:

(45) And, I *strongly* believe that XYZ has the potential to create more value for its stockholders and its customers.

Und drittens glaube ich, daß XYZ über das Potential verfügt, eine noch höhere Wertschöpfung *sowohl* für seine Aktionäre *als auch* für seine Kunden zu erbringen.

At first glance, the omission of *strongly* in (45) looks like an instance of implicitation. However, closer analysis reveals that the meaning of *strongly* is not recoverable by the target text reader – there is no reason to infer that the author "strongly" believes what he says. Thus, the omission of *strongly* in (45) should be regarded as a genuine loss in meaning rather than a case of implicitation. What we can also observe in (45) is that the translator has 'expanded' the conjunction *und* into a composite connective, *sowohl... als auch* 'both... and, as well as'. Unlike what is often assumed in the translation studies literature,[24] this is not a case of explicitation. The reason is that from a semantic perspective, *und* means the same as *sowohl... als auch*. (Both connectives express a relation of Similarity.) The only difference between the two connectives is that the latter puts special emphasis on its two relata. Again, this emphasis is not recoverable by the source text reader from the context, so we cannot talk of explicitation here.

[24] For example, Séguinot (1988: 108) regards cases where "an element in the source text is given greater importance in the translation through focus, emphasis, or lexical choice" as instances of explicitation. However, the author does not specify in what way such cases qualify as explicitations.

The two shifts just discussed are not isolated cases. They belong among what I like to call *mitigations* and *boosts*. My study has turned up several dozens of such shifts, which indicates that a detailed analysis would be highly worthwhile. However, as the above discussion of (45) suggests, such an analysis is beyond the scope of a study dealing with explicitation and implicitation.

3. A number of shifts were encountered that were found to be so tightly linked to other changes performed by the translator that it did not seem justified to count them as explicitations or implicitations. Cf. the following example:

(46) We have seen the future... and it is us.

Damit gehört Ihrem Unternehmen die Zukunft.

One might be tempted to view the addition of *damit* 'thus' in (46) as an instance of cohesive explicitation. However, it is important to note that the source and target text of this example – while serving a similar communicative function – encode totally different states of affairs, which may be formalized (in simplified form) as follows: `see (we, future)` and `belong_to (future, we)`. It follows that the addition of *damit* by the translator cannot be seen as making explicit a semantic connection that is implicit in the source text. Shifts occurring in the context of semantic deviations, such as the one evidenced in (46), were thus excluded from analysis. By the way, examples like the present one show that it is highly problematic to base studies of explicitation and implicitation on quantitative findings only. Frequency counts need to be supported by qualitative analysis.

4. Finally, the following kinds of shifts were excluded for practical reasons, viz. because their investigation would go beyond the scope of this book:

Obligatory shifts. These comprise cases where translators *have to* explicitate or implicitate due to particular lexicogrammatical differences between the two language systems involved (see Section 2.1). This kind of shift is therefore irrelevant to an investigation of the Asymmetry Hypothesis, which posits that translators tend to prefer rather explicit to rather implicit translation solutions *where they have the choice*. The hypothesis does not apply to cases where a shift is 'imposed' on the translator by a particular lexicogrammatical contrast. Take the following shift, for example: *their expertise, integrity, drive and hunger* → *ihrem Fachwissen, ihrer Integrität, ihrem Bestreben und ihrer Bereitschaft*, where the addition of *ihrer/ihrem* 'their' was necessitated

by the grammar of German and thus does not tell us anything new about why translators explicitate.

Article-based shifts. Additions, omissions and substitutions of the definite or indefinite article (e.g. *die* ['the'] *europäischen Werkstrukturen* → *European factory structures*) were excluded from analysis because the meaning of these items is far from clear and has yet to be elucidated by semantic research (see e.g. Chesterman 1993, Birner and Ward 1994, Breul 2008: 268ff). Moreover, the use of the definite/indefinite article in English and in German is strongly constrained by language-specific lexicogrammatical rules (see e.g. Quirk et al. 1985: 265ff, Zifonun et al. 1997: 1930ff), which means that many shifts involving articles are obligatory shifts.

Verb-based shifts. These were excluded from analysis because they flow smoothly into the category of syntactic 'upgrades' and 'downgrades' (cf. Doherty 2006), which was deemed to be too complex for analysis in the context of the present study. Cf. e.g. *im weiteren Verlauf des Jahres* → *as the year progressed*, where the German original's prepositional phrase has been 'upgraded' to a subordinate clause. Are clauses generally more explicit than phrases (as e.g. Konšalová 2007 presupposes)? When is an upgrade/downgrade obligatory, when can it be considered optional? Which factors influence the occurrence of optional upgrades and downgrades in translation (see Doherty 2006 for a highly sophisticated, but complex approach)? These questions, whose answers are far from obvious, would warrant a book-length study of their own.

Preposition-based shifts. Additions, omissions, and substitutions of prepositions were excluded from analysis although such shifts would semantically qualify as cohesive shifts (cf. examples (27) and (28) discussed in Section 3.6). The reason is that prepositions can be highly complex semantically (e.g. if they are derived from verbs whose meaning still 'shines through' to some extent), which often makes it impossible to say whether one is dealing with an explicitation or implicitation. Take the following shift, for example: *angesichts der veränderten Marktbedingungen* → *as a result of changes in the market environment*, where it is unclear whether *angesichts* 'in view of' is more or less explicit than *as a result of*. The semantics of many prepositions remain to be elucidated by future research, which made it seem desirable to exclude preposition-based shifts from the present study.

Modal marker-based shifts. These comprise additions, omissions, and substitutions of modal adverbs (e.g. *probably*), modal verbs (e.g. *may*), and modal particles (e.g. *schon* 'already'). Such shifts were excluded from analysis because they did not fit into the classificatory framework used in the present study. For example, epistemic modal markers (such as *probably* or *may*) "serve to indicate that the speaker is not fully committed to the truth of the propositional content of the clause" (Kranich 2011: 77) and thus do not contribute to the denotational meaning of a text. Moreover, it is far from clear what explicitness means in the context of modality, a question that would merit a dedicated study.

(47) Year-end surveys *of* oil company E & P budgets *indicated* that spending *would be up* around 10% in 2000 compared to 1999 levels.

Die Umfragen *unter den* Ölfirmen am Ende des Jahres *bezüglich deren* Erkundungs- und Produktionsbudgets *lassen vermuten*, daß im Vergleich zu 1999 *die* Ausgaben im Jahre 2000 *um* etwa 10% *steigen werden*.

To get an idea of how the exclusion of the above-mentioned types of shifts has affected analysis, let us return to example (15) discussed in Section 3.3:

(15) Year-end surveys *of* oil company E & P budgets *indicated* that spending *would be up* around 10% in 2000 compared to 1999 levels.

Die Umfragen *unter den* Ölfirmen am Ende des Jahres *bezüglich deren* Erkundungs- und Produktionsbudgets *lassen vermuten*, daß im Vergleich zu 1999 *die* Ausgaben im Jahre 2000 *um* etwa 10% *steigen werden*.

The example contains a number of preposition-based shifts (*of* → *unter*, addition of *bezüglich* and *um*), article-based shifts (addition of *den*, *deren*, and *die*), and verb-based shifts (*indicated* → *lassen vermuten*, *would be up* → *steigen werden*), one of them involving the omission of a modal marker (*would*). All of these shifts were excluded from analysis. (However, the shift from *E & P budgets* to *Erkundungs- und Produktionsbudgets* and the addition of *Jahre* have been counted as denotational explicitations.)

To conclude this section: What does it mean for the findings of the present study that so many (kinds of) shifts have been excluded? It means that the study does not tell the full story of explicitation and implicitation in translations between English and German – only 70 or 80 percent of the full story, to give a rough estimate. The reader is asked to bear this in mind.

3.9 Hypotheses

The general, overarching hypothesis that formed the basis of the present study was Klaudy's (2009) Asymmetry Hypothesis (see Section 2.5). However, the hypothesis was only used as a kind of general 'guidepost', since in Section 2.6 we have seen already that the hypothesis has been falsified in its strong form. Thus, the main aim of my study was not to test the Asymmetry Hypothesis once again, but rather to find out *when* and *why* explicitational asymmetry obtains and when and why it does not.

Instead of testing a fixed hypothesis implying concrete predictions, the present study departed from the following *basic assumption*:

> Every instance of explicitation and implicitation has a distinct cause, e.g. cultural filtering, risk avoidance, etc. The assumption of a "translation-inherent" cognitive process of explicitation is not necessary to explain the frequent occurrence of explicitation in translation.

In combination with previous contrastive research on the language pair English-German, this assumption of course implies a number of expectations, e.g. that interactional explicitations should occur more frequently in the direction German-English (since English discourse tends to be more interactional than German discourse) while cohesive explicitations should be more common in the direction English-German (since German discourse tends to be cohesively more explicit than English discourse) (cf. Appendix A, where some English-German contrasts relevant to the study of explicitation and implicitation are discussed).

However, such expectations were not used as hypotheses for the present study, since the main aim of the study made it seem desirable to take *all* factors possibly governing the occurrence of explicitation and implicitation into account, not just language pair-specific ones. By departing from the rather general basic assumption formulated above, I tried to keep my eyes open for factors that might have been overlooked if a fixed set of hypotheses had been tested. Expectations or predictions such as the above were kept in mind while conducting the study, but were not allowed to guide the process of analysis. This 'informed exploratory' approach proved highly fruitful for the present study: In Chapter 7, I summarize more than a dozen factors that were found to have caused or motivated instances of explicitation and implicitation in the investigated data.

3.10 Summary and conclusion

The present chapter may be summarized as follows:

- In investigating explicitation and implicitation, a number of subjective choices have to be made that can have a considerable impact on the results of the investigation. Such choices concern the selection of investigated data, the procedure used for identifying and classifying explicitations and implicitations, the phenomena to be excluded from analysis, etc. It is desirable that these choices be made as transparent as possible. This is what the present chapter has tried to achieve.

- The present study has investigated English-German and German-English translations of business texts (mostly letters to shareholders), a genre that has some unique properties distinguishing it from other genres. For example, translations of business texts between English and German tend to stay rather close to their source texts, which makes them particularly amenable to a study of explicitation and implicitation. (In translations that depart from their source texts frequently and considerably, it can be difficult to identify explicitations and implicitations.)

- The analysis of the data proceeded as follows. All corpus texts were read multiple times. Explicitations and implicitations were identified manually according to formal-semantic criteria. In classifying the shifts, I formally distinguished between additions, omissions, and substitutions of nouns, pronouns, proper names, adjectives, adverbs, and connectives. Functionally, I distinguished between interactional, cohesive, and denotational shifts:

    1. **Interactional shifts** concern the appearance of the source text author and the target text addressee in the target text.
    2. **Cohesive shifts** concern the cohesion of the target text as compared to the source text.
    3. **Denotational shifts** concern the description of the states of affairs expressed by the target text.

- Various kinds of shifts were excluded from analysis for practical reasons. For example, verb-based shifts were not analyzed because the syntactic 'upgrades' and 'downgrades' associated with this kind of

shift were deemed too complex for an analysis in the context of the present study. Verb-based explicitations and implicitations clearly warrant a detailed study of their own.

- The present study did not test a conrete hypothesis. Rather, it departed from the basic assumption that *every instance of explicitation and implicitation has a distinct cause* (e.g. cultural filtering, risk avoidance, etc.) In particular, I assumed that I would not need to resort to the speculative assumption of a "translation-inherent" cognitive process of explicitation to explain my findings.

Part II

Results

Chapter 4

Interactional shifts

The present chapter analyzes explicitations and implicitations that change the degree of interactionality expressed in the target text as compared to the source text. Table 4.1 gives an overview of the interactional shifts that have been encountered in the investigated corpus.

		Eng → Ger	Ger → Eng
explicitation	pronoun	58	168
	name	6	4
	noun	–	2
	TOTAL	64	174
implicitation	pronoun	71	60
	name	17	6
	noun	5	2
	TOTAL	93	68

Table 4.1: Interactional shifts across lexical categories

We see from the table that the interactional explicitations and implicitations identified in the corpus mainly involve personal pronouns. Thus, we will focus on pronoun-based shifts in this chapter, which account for all interesting observations that the investigated corpus allows to be made with respect to interactional explicitation and implicitation (see Section 4.1). Shifts involving the addition, substitution, and omission of proper names will be only briefly addressed in Section 4.2. Finally, noun-based interactional shifts (e.g. *you* → *the reader*) were found to be so rare that I decided not to discuss them at all.

4.1 Pronoun-based shifts

First, a terminological note: When I speak of "pronouns" or "personal pronouns" in the following, I refer exclusively to the speaker-hearer deictic pronouns of English and German, i.e. the 1st person and 2nd person pronouns *we/wir* and *you/Sie* (unless otherwise noted). Shifts involving 3rd person pronouns, which function very differently from 1st and 2nd person pronouns (cf. Section 4.1.2 below), will be discussed in Chapter 5 on cohesive shifts.

Interactional shifts concerning the addition, omission, and substitution of personal pronouns are listed in Table 4.2.

		Eng → Ger	Ger → Eng
explicitation	addition	47	160
	substitution	11	8
	TOTAL	58	168
implicitation	omission	71	60
	substitution	–	–
	TOTAL	71	60

Table 4.2: Interactional shifts consisting in the addition, omission, or substitution of a pronoun

The table allows us to make the following observations:

Observation 1: Overall, there are a lot more explicitations than implicitations of pronouns in the direction German-English (168 explicitations vs. 60 implicitations), while implicitations are more common in the direction English-German (71 implicitations vs. 58 explicitations).

Observation 2: Explicitations of pronouns in the direction German-English are not counterbalanced by the corresponding implicitations in the direction English-German (168 explicitations vs. 71 implicitations).

Observation 3: In contrast, the relationship between English-German explicitations and German-English implicitations is remarkably symmetrical (58 explicitations vs. 60 implicitations).

We are going to explain these observations in the following.

4.1.1 Additions and omissions of pronouns

The first example that I am going to cite in this section is a very nice one, since it highlights a central issue that we will be concerned with in the following, thus setting the scene for the rest of the chapter (and for the rest of the book). We are thus going to discuss this example in more detail than the following ones.

(48) Unser Ziel für das Geschäftsjahr 2002/2003 ist, entsprechend dem besseren Ergebnis wieder eine höhere Dividende ausschütten zu können.

Our goal for the 2002/2003 fiscal year is to achieve improved earnings which will allow *us* to pay *you* a higher dividend.

(48) contains two interactional shifts. The translator has added two pronouns: *us*, referring to the author of the text, and *you*, referring to the addressee. As a result, the English translation has a distinct 'interactional feel' to it that the German original lacks. Using simple and non-abstract language, the translation explicitly depicts a future state of affairs where the author will pay the addressee a certain amount of money (in the form of a dividend). The German source text expresses the same state of affairs, but without referring to the author or addressee; the two participants in the event of paying (or distributing [*ausschütten*]) the dividend are not verbalized, but have to be 'filled in' by the reader.

I would like you to note the following points in connection with example (48):

- The author of the German original could have used a personal pronoun referring to the addressee, as in: *wieder eine höhere Dividende* an Sie *ausschütten zu können*. However, the author chose to leave the reference to the source text's addressee implicit.

- On the other hand, the author of the German original could *not* have used a self-referential (1st person) pronoun such as *wir* within the bounds of the syntactic construction used, because the construction does not allow this: The clause expressing the payment of the dividend is a non-finite (infinitive) clause that does not allow the insertion of a subject.

- In contrast, the syntax of the corresponding clause in the English source text (*allow [X] to do Y*) does allow the (optional) insertion of a subject, and the translator has made use of this opportunity. It is worth pointing out that the object of pay (*you*) is optional here

as well (cf. *allow us to pay a higher dividend*); a closer equivalent of *ausschütten*, namely *to distribute*, would also have been possible (cf. *allow us to distribute a higher dividend*).

- The example features a number of other, non-interactional shifts that I cannot discuss in detail (but which have been counted as shifts of the respective categories). In general, in the discussion of the following examples I am going to focus on the shifts relevant to the category being discussed. I will only mention other shifts where they might be causally related to the shifts on which the discussion focuses.

In sum, (48) illustrates nicely a general issue that we will encounter many times throughout the following chapters, namely the complex interplay of grammatical (i.e. linguistic) and cultural (i.e. non-linguistic) contrasts as potential causes of translational shifts. With respect to the present example, although this is by far not a simple case, it is fair to say that despite the grammatical complexities involved, the translator did have the choice of whether to make the target text more interactional, or interactionally more explicit, than the source text. While the interactionally implicit formulation *allow to pay a higher dividend*, with both personal pronouns omitted, may sound a bit strange due to the high number of verbal arguments omitted, the translator could have chosen the phrase *allow to pay you a higher dividend* or *allow us to pay a higher dividend*. She could have also chosen to stay even closer to the German target text by selecting lexemes that make it easy to avoid reference to author and addressee, e.g.: *which will make it possible to distribute a higher dividend*.

As example (48) may have already suggested, additions and omissions of speaker-hearer deictic pronouns were found to involve the (chiefly) speaker-deictic pronouns *we/wir* on the one hand and the (chiefly) hearer-deictic pronoun *you* on the other. (The German hearer-deictic pronoun *du* or its polite form *Sie* was not found to occur in the investigated data.) The following sections will take up the two different types of pronouns in turn. Note that the present study has counted and analyzed *all* forms of the mentioned pronouns, including non-nominative forms such as *us/uns* and possessive forms such as *our* and *unser* (along with their inflected forms).

Additions and omissions of *we/wir*

Luckily, cases like (48), where different kinds of changes performed by the translator are interwoven with each other, are rather an exception to the rule. Most cases of interactional explicitation and implicitation turned

out to be far less complicated. The following examples represent the most frequent and also the most straightforward kind of interactional shift observed in the corpus:

(49) Die noch Anfang des Jahres erwartete Ergebnissteigerung konnte nicht in allen Bereichen realisiert werden.

However, in some areas *we* were unable to realize the earnings growth anticipated at the beginning of the year.

(50) Des Weiteren werden alle Geschäftsfelder auf den Prüfstand gestellt.

[...] at the same time *we* are examining all business units.

(51) In March 2002, *we* promoted four of our key leaders: [...]

Im März 2002 wurden vier unserer wichtigsten Führungsmitglieder befördert: [...]

(52) In 2002 *we* again raised the dividend rate and split our stock two-for-one.

Im Jahr 2002 wurde der Dividendensatz erneut angehoben und ein Aktiensplit im Verhältnis 1:1 durchgeführt.

In (49) and (50), the translator has converted a passive into an active sentence, while in (51) and (52) an active sentence has been converted into a passive one. This bidirectional kind of shift, comprising 'activization' in the direction German-English and 'passivization' in the direction English-German, is what we should expect from previous research on the language pair at hand. As the reader can verify in Section A.2 of the appendix, results from a number of contrastive studies indicate that English discourse tends towards a greater degree of interactionality than German discourse. This cross-linguistic difference in communicative norms constitutes a plausible explanation for **Observation 1** formulated at the beginning of this section, and it suggests that the bidirectionality of the shifts evidenced in (49) through (52) is the result of cultural filtering, i.e. translators' tendency to mediate between different sets of communicative norms. Since German discourse tends to be less interactional than English discourse, we should expect personal pronouns referring to author and addressee to get 'filtered out' in English-German translations, and vice versa.

Turning to Observation 2, we have seen in Table 4.2 that there are as many as 168 interactional explicitations of pronouns in the direction German-English, while there are only 71 interactional implicitations of

pronouns in the direction English-German. Given our assumption that cultural filtering can be seen as the most plausible cause of Observation 1, should we not expect that explicitating shifts in the one direction are 'counterbalanced' by implicitating shifts in the other direction? Or, in other words, that English-German translator throw out personal pronouns to exactly the same extent that German-English translators put them in?

In Section 2.5 I have argued that explicitation is related to translators' role as linguistic mediators who are paid to establish understanding across languages and cultures. Our discussion of example (48) above has shown that adding personal pronouns not only makes the target text more explicit interactionally, but also denotationally. (Recall that in the classificatory framework proposed in Chapter 3, interactional explicitation is really a subcategory of denotational explicitation.) The addition of personal pronouns provides for a more precise description of states of affairs by encoding the participants involved instead of leaving them implicit. In this way, the addition of personal pronouns may be seen as the result of a strategy that translators may follow in order to minimize the risk of misunderstanding. Since the omission of pronouns generally has the opposite effect, rendering the description of states of affairs less precise and therefore more prone to misunderstanding, English-German translators might tend to retain pronouns when in doubt rather than leave them out. Such a tendency might be responsible for the lack of counterbalancing observed in Table 4.2, providing a plausible explanation for **Observation 2**.

Let us now turn to Observation 3, namely the observation that the relationship between English-German explicitations and German-English implicitations is surprisingly symmetrical. To explain this observation, we have to back up a bit and note that despite the overall tendency towards the omission of pronouns in English-German translations and the addition of pronouns in the opposite translation direction, there are counterexamples to this trend. To explain Observation 3, we have to find out how these counterexamples come about. Let us begin by considering two examples where German-English translators have omitted speaker-deictic pronouns:

(53) ¶ Die Technologiebasis in unseren drei Sparten haben *wir* uns in 100 Jahren erarbeitet.

The technology base in our three divisions has been developed over the last century.

(54) ¶ Das Fundament, auf dem wir dabei aufbauen können, haben *wir* im vergangenen Jahr weiter gefestigt.

> The foundation on which we will be building was strengthened further during the previous year.

Examples (53) and (54) both start a new paragraph (indicated by "¶"). In both cases, an active construction containing the personal pronoun *wir* has been implicitated, i.e. converted into an agentless passive construction – a shift that seems surprising given the strong tendency of German-English translators to increase interactionality that we have observed above. On closer look, however, we see that the switch from an active to a passive "perspective" (Doherty 1996) is not surprising at all: The translators of (53) and (54) have pursued a goal that they deemed more important than cultural filtering, namely a close rendering of the German original's pragmatically effective information structure.

In the German source text of both (53) and (54), we note that the object of the sentence has been fronted, or topicalized, i.e. 'moved' to the first position of the sentence. This is never done haphazardly, since fronting has distinct pragmatic effects. Büring (1999: 145f) distinguishes between three different (but related) functions of topicalization. The fronted objects in (53) and (54) represent what Büring calls "contrastive topics": By promoting the object to the (particularly salient) first position of the sentence, a speaker can signal a contrast to what has been talked about before. In this way, a contrastive topic "can be used to move the conversation away from an entity given in the previous discourse." (Büring 1999: 145) In (53), for example, by topicalizing the object the author wants to implicate something along the lines of: 'In this new paragraph I want to talk about the technology base in our three divisions.' The same is true for (54), *mutatis mutandis*.

The German-English translator now faces a dilemma. Since the capabilities of English to topicalize objects are severely limited (cf. Hawkins 1986: 167ff), object fronting is not possible here. The only viable alternative way of drawing attention to the constituent that the new paragraph deals with seems to be the choice of a passive structure. But passivization entails a loss of interactionality. The translator is thus faced with two mutually excluding alternatives: He can either choose to reproduce the interactionality of the source text by using an active sentence while loosing the pragmatic effect of object fronting; or he can use a passive structure instead, thus reproducing the topic-changing effect of object fronting in the translation at the cost of a loss of interactionality. The translators of (53) and (54) have both chosen the second alternative, judging information structure to be more important than interactionality. This is not the place to discuss whether this decision is justified or not; what is important

here is the fundamental insight that where professional translators diverge from the communicative norms of the target language, they usually have a good reason.

Let us look at another example where a German-English translator's concern for a neat information structure has prevented her from reproducing the interactionality of the source text:

(55) [...] hat XYZ 1999/2000 spürbar an Fahrt gewonnen. Den Umsatz haben *wir* um rund 15% auf 37 Milliarden Euro gesteigert; der Auftragseingang erhöhte sich um 22% auf 39 Milliarden Euro.

[...] XYZ noticeably gained speed in 1999/2000. Sales rose around 15% to 37 billion Euros, and order intake rose by 22% to 39 billion Euros.

In (55), the first sentence somewhat non-specifically informs us that XYZ gained in speed in 1999/2000. The second sentence then elaborates on the first sentence by telling us *in what respect* XYZ gained in speed. We learn that it gained in speed in two respects, namely in terms of sales and in terms of order intake. The rhetorical structure just outlined is mirrored by the information structure of the sentences employed. In the German original text, the object *den Umsatz* has been topicalized. The constituent *der Auftragserhöhung* of the second clause did not need to be topicalized because it functions as the inanimate subject of an "anticausative" reflexive clause, where the reflexive fulfills a similar function as the passives in (53) and (54) (cf. Dixon and Aikhenvald 2000: 7). The fronted constituent *den Umsatz* is what Büring calls a "partial topic", which signals that the referent associated with the topicalized constituent is not the only referent that the speaker wants to talk about (Büring 1999: 145f).

Since topicalization is not available in English in this context (* *The sales we increased...*), the translator had to find another solution to convey this pragmatic information. Instead of a passive construction, the translator chose an active construction with the anticausative verb *to rise* as its predicate. This latter construction has the same information-structural effect as a passive, namely a fronting of the constituent *sales*. (Note that a passive construction would have worked as well: *Sales were increased by 15%...*) The pragmatic effect of the German original's topicalized object is thus approximately reproduced. Again, we see that the translator seems to have pursued a specific, information-structural goal in omitting the personal pronoun *wir*.

Let us look at a final example showing translators' concern for information structure:

(56) Wir haben die erste bundesweite TV-Werbung für die "Aktie des Altenpflegemarkts" produziert [...]. *Wir* wollen mit dem Spot auf das immense Wachstum unseres Marktes und somit auf unsere Chancen und die Chancen unserer Aktie hinweisen.

We have produced our first nation-wide TV spot on "Old People's Homes Equities" [...]. The spot aims to show that this is a huge growth market and demonstrate both our potential and the performance potential of our shares.

The translator of (56) has dropped the personal pronoun *wir* that occurs at the beginning of the source text's second sentence. This seemingly anomalous translation choice needs to be explained, since it goes against the general tendency of interactional explicitation in the translation direction German-English. (Here and throughout the rest of the book, I use the term *anomalous* exclusively in the sense of 'going against the norm'.) What the translator did here is the following: He moved the sentence-internal adverbial *mit dem Spot* to the beginning of the sentence by 'promoting' it to a subject. This made it necessary to omit the subject of the German original, *wir*.

By now it should be easy to see why the translator did this. The TV spot talked about represents given information, i.e. a referent already known to the addressee from the previous sentence. (This is signalled by the definite article *dem/the*.) Since English and German discourse both follow the pragmatic strategy 'Given before New Information' (cf. Doherty 2001: 224f), it makes a lot of sense to assign *the spot* to the first position of the sentence. In this way the translator has achieved a better information structure than the author of the source text – while sacrificing some interactionality.[1] The example shows again that where a shift goes against an established tendency, it is worthwile to look for the reasons the translator may have had.

We have seen that where German-English translators oppose the general tendency of omitting personal pronouns, this primarily happens for information-structural reasons. Let us now look at the opposite translation direction. In Table 4.2, we have seen that the English-German part of the corpus also contains a number of anomalous interactional explicitations, i.e. cases where translators add personal pronouns. In the following, we are going to look at some examples of such cases.

[1] Note that the translator has added the possessive pronoun *our* in the first sentence of the target text. One might speculate that he did this in order to 'compensate' for the interactional implicitation performed in the second sentence.

(57) When European sales are included, our global coverage will be more than $3 billion. (Income was $188 million [...].)

Unter Einbeziehung von Europa belaufen sich unsere weltweiten Umsätze insgesamt auf über 3 Milliarden US-Dollar. (*Unser* Gewinn belief sich auf 188 Millionen US-Dollar [...].)

(58) Not only did we accelerate volume and sales growth [...]

Wir haben nicht nur *unser* Absatz- und Umsatzwachstum beschleunigt [...].

In (57) and (58), translators have added the possesive pronoun *unser*, resulting in a target text which is interactionally more explicit than the source text. The reason for these shifts is not difficult to see. I would argue that English-German translators do not add pronouns with the specific aim of increasing the interactionality of the translation – which would contradict their general tendency to apply a cultural filter – but rather to maximize the target text's overall degree of explicitness or informativity. (Once again, recall that interactional explicitation is a subcategory of denotational explicitation.)

In (57), the translator cannot translate *income* as a bare noun (* *Gewinn belief sich auf...*), the syntactic rules of German demanding the addition of a determiner. Two possible determiners come to mind: the definite article (*der Gewinn*) or a possesive pronoun (*unser Gewinn*). Since the translator is basically forced to choose one of these items, it is not surprising that he chooses the more informative one, i.e. the possessive pronoun. The same is true for example (58), *mutatis mutandis*. From this perspective, the addition of *unser* in (57) and (58) may be seen as conforming to the general rule "When in doubt, be explicit!", which in Chapter 2 has been argued to be a popular risk avoidance strategy among translators.

Another example of an interactional explicitation in the direction English-German is the following one:

(59) Judged on superior service to customers, product/service innovations that assist customers, and demonstrated dedication to the food industry, we were very pleased to be recognized with this award.

Beurteilt wurden *wir* im Hinblick auf überlegenen Kundenservice, Kunden unterstützende Innovationen im Produkt/Dienstleistungsbereich und bewiesenes Engagement in Bezug auf die Lebensmittelindustrie. Wir fühlten uns geehrt, durch diesen Award anerkannt worden zu sein.

The English source text sentence consists of an *ed*-adjunct (*Judged on...*) attached to a main clause (*we were very pleased...*). A German translation comparable to the source text in terms of explicitness would have been possible by translating the *ed*-adjunct as a non-clausal sentence-initial adverbial, followed by the verb in second position: *Beurteilt im Hinblick auf überlegenen Kundenservice [...], fühlten wir uns geehrt...* However, such a heavy adverbial occupying the first position of the sentence and thus relegating the subject (*wir*) to third position would sound highly unnatural in German. The translator has thus decided to split off the English original's *ed*-adjunct to the left as a separate sentence, which has made it necessary to add *wir* as a subject of this new sentence. Again, it does not seem plausible to assume that the increase in interactionality entailed by this shift was the primary intention of the translator. It makes much more sense to assume that the translator decided to perform the shift in order to avoid a stylistically awkward syntactic construction that is difficult to process. The anomalous addition of *wir* in (59) has thus found a straigthforward explanation.

An example similar to (59) with respect to the translator's (most likely) motivation to explicitate is the following one:

(60) We understand that to be a great services company, we must be a great leading-edge product technology company – they go hand in hand.

Wir wissen, dass *wir* nur eines der besten Dienstleistungsunternehmen sein können, wenn wir auch im Bereich der Produkttechnologien eine Spitzenstellung einnehmen – beides hängt untrennbar zusammen.

The translator of this example faced a similar problem as the translator of (59). A syntactically equivalent translation of (60) to German would go like this: *Wir wissen, dass wir, um eines der besten Dienstleistungsunternehmen sein zu können, [...] sein müssen*. But this translation is stylistically awkward (due to the many commas, i.e. intonational breaks) and difficult to process (due to the sentence-final position of the verbal group *sein müssen*). The translator thus had to look for another solution. Replacing the *to*-construction of the English original by a conditional *wenn*-construction, the translator has found a solution that closely renders the meaning of the source text[2] while avoiding the awkwardness of a syntactically equivalent

[2]The semantic relations of conditionality and finality are very similar (see e.g. Blühdorn 2009), which justifies the translator's decision to use *wenn* as an equivalent of *to*.

translation. But both clauses of a *wenn*-construction need a subject, which made it necessary to explicitate by adding *wir*.

We could refer to the explicitations evidenced in (59) and (60) as language pair-specific explicitations, since their ultimate triggers seem to be certain English constructions that do not carry over easily to German. The following example represents a case of anomalous interactional explicitation in the direction English-German that may not be said to be language pair-specific, but rather due to risk avoidance behavior on the part of the translator:

(61) New technologies that integrate Web services directly into the XYZ Office user experience, as well as tools that enable users to more efficiently store, access and analyze crucial business information, are being developed for future versions of XYZ Office.

Darüber hinaus entwickeln *wir* derzeit neue Technologien, durch die Web-Services direkt in XYZ Office integriert werden, sowie Tools, die dem Nutzer die effizientere Speicherung, den optimierten Zugriff und die Analyse kritischer Unternehmensinformationen am PC ermöglichen.

Example (61) deals with a computer software product called XYZ Office. The interactional explicitation here is the translator's (anomalous) substitution of an active construction for a passive construction, which entails the addition of the personal pronoun *wir*. Why did the translator explicitate?

The passive constructions that we observed in the previous examples all had in common that the 'missing' verbal argument, i.e. the one not verbalized in the passive version of the verb, was quite easy to infer from the discourse context. For example, in the English translation of (53) (*The technology base in our three divisions has been developed over the last century*), it is quite obvious that the technology base of the company's three divisions has been developed by the company and not by someone else. In (61), on the other hand, the agent of the passive predicate *are being developed* is not obvious at all, since it is common for extensions of a software product to be developed by third party companies.

The English source text of (61) leaves it open whether the *new technologies* and *tools* talked about are being developed by the creator of XYZ Office – i.e. by the company authoring the text – or by various third party software companies. The translator has removed this ambiguity by choosing an active construction (*entwickeln wir* 'we develop'), thus making unmistakably clear that the software is being extended by the authoring company of the text. The communicative risk associated with an ambiguos

translation, which the translator has tried to avoid, has most likely been the motivation for performing this shift.

The above discussion has shown that German-English and English-German translators anomalously omit/add personal pronouns for very different reasons. We have seen that German-English translators mainly omit pronouns in order to optimize information structure, thus securing optimal processing. In contrast, English-German translators add pronouns in order to avoid stylistic awkwardness, improve processability, and resolve possible ambiguites. Thus, the reason why German-English translators omit pronouns is very different from the various motivations that lead English-German translators to add pronouns (the only common denominator being translators' tendency to improve processability). In other words, the observed types of shifts are not bidirectional. German-English pronominal omissions and English-German pronominal additions are completely unrelated to each other (they do not represent inverse operations), so we should not expect to find explicitational asymmetry in the first place. The fact that explicitations in one direction appear to be counterbalanced by implicitations in the other direction is a mere coincidence, i.e. the counterbalancing to be observed here is a quantitative one that has no qualitative basis. **Observation 3** has thus found an easy, albeit somewhat surprising explanation.

From the preceding discussion one could get the impression that the basic assumption underlying this study, namely the assumption that every instance of explicitation and implicitation has a distinct cause (see Section 3.9), is true without restrictions. But I do not want to overstate the point. There are rare cases where this rule does not hold, such as the following example:

(62) It [viz. "our commitment to premier customer service"] is realized through the design, manufacture and delivery of quality products and services and the personal support we provide.

Wir ermöglichen dies durch die Konstruktion, Herstellung und Lieferung hochwertiger Produkte und Dienstleistungen und durch persönliche Unterstützung, die wir auch nach dem Verkauf anbieten.

(62) represents yet another case of anomalous interactional explicitation. As in (57) through (61), the translator has added the personal pronoun *wir*, thus deviating from the general tendency of a loss of interactionality in English-German translation. But while we found specific reasons for the interactional explicitations evidenced in (57) through (61), we cannot

say what it was that motivated the translator of (62) to add *wir*. Neither English-German contrasts nor information-structural peculiarities nor possible ambiguities come into consideration as possible triggers of the shift. In fact, a word-for-word translation retaining the passive of the English original would have been even better from an information-structural point of view, since it would have placed the given element *dies* at the beginning of the sentence: *Dies wird ermöglicht durch...*

The interactional explicitation evidenced in (62) is impossible to elucidate with recourse to general contrasts or tendencies. We have to accept it as the result of an idiosyncratic choice by the translator in question that we cannot explain. It is possible that the translator has followed a general strategy of risk avoidance through across-the-board explicitation, which, as I have argued in Section 2.5, may lead to an overuse of explicitating shifts. Luckily, there are only very few cases like (62), which may thus be regarded as exceptions that, *qua* rare exceptions, ultimately do confirm the validity of the basic assumption formulated in Section 3.9. As the examples discussed above indicate, the vast majority of anomalous interactional explicitations do have distinct, identifiable reasons.

Additions and omissions of *you*

Shifts involving hearer-deictic pronouns (English *you*, German *Sie*) were found to be extremely rare in the investigated corpus: There are only six omissions of *you* in the direction English-German and three additions of *you* in the direction German-English, i.e. nine shifts in total. Substitutions of hearer-deictic pronouns do not occur at all in the investigated data, neither do shifts involving the German hearer-deictic pronoun *du* or its polite form *Sie*. Nevertheless, I would like to briefly discuss additions and omissions of *you* in order to avoid giving the impression that interactional shifts only involve 1st person pronouns. Readers who are not interested in this quantitatively negligible kind of shift may skip this section.

We have already looked at one of the three additions of *you* that occur in the direction German-English, viz. example (48). Here are the other two instances of interactional explicitation involving *you*:

(63) Feste Preise haben ihre Berechtigung nur beim schnellen Kauf im Supermarkt [...].

Fixed prices are justifiable in situations where *you* want to buy in a hurry, as in a supermarket [...].

(64) Heute treffen sich im Internet Millionen Menschen im virtuellen Auktionsraum und schaffen so einen virtuellen Marktplatz, auf

dem genügend Käufer für die unterschiedlichsten Dinge zu finden sind.

Today, millions of people meet up in the Internet in virtual auction rooms and thus create a virtual market place in which *you* can then find sufficient buyers for the widest variety of things.

In (63), *you* in combination with two verbs (*want* and *buy*) substitutes for a nominal construction in the German original text (*beim schnellen Kauf* 'in the quick purchase'), while in (64) the pronoun replaces an impersonal construction (*zu finden sind* 'can be found'). In both cases it is arguable whether the addition of *you* should count as an interactional explicitation at all, since the pronoun does not exclusively refer to the addressee, but to an unspecified group of people including the addressee (in its most plausible reading; cf. below). On the one hand, Quirk et al. (1985: 354) claim that in this "generic" use, *you* "retains something of its 2nd person meaning: it can suggest that the speaker is appealing to the hearer's experience of life in general". On the other hand, the generic use of *you* has also been called "impersonal" (Kitagawa and Lehrer 1990) due to its wide referential range: Generic/impersonal *you* may refer to a group of people of arbitrary size.

I would argue that *you* should be treated as interactional irrespective of whether the pronoun is used 'personally' or generically because in both (63) and (64) the reference of *you* necessarily includes the addressee (Kitagawa and Lehrer 1990). In any case, the question is not of crucial importance for the present investigation since the data contain only few instances of interactional shifts involving the addition or omission of (generic) *you*.

Let us now have a brief look at the other translation direction. The following examples give an impression of when and why the English-German translators represented in the corpus omit *you*.

(65) *Your* handheld computer, Web-enabled telephone, and PC will synchronize with each other wirelessly and automatically [...].

Handheld Computer, Telefon und PC werden drahtlos und automatisch miteinander synchronisiert [...].

(66) In every area of our business, *you* can see this pattern.

Dieses Schema lässt sich in allen Geschäftsbereichen erkennen.

The English source texts of (65) and (66) both contain an instance of *you*/*your* that is ambiguous between a generic and a genuinely hearer-

deictic interpretation.[3] On the one hand, the pronoun may be read as directly addressing the reader of the text. But on the other hand, it may also be assigned a generic interpretation, which is evident from the fact that *you* may be replaced by *one* (cf. Kitagawa and Lehrer 1990; see also Quirk et al. 1985: 354, who treat generic *you* as an "informal equivalent" of *one*):

(65′) *One's* handheld computer, Web-enabled telephone, and PC will synchronize with each other wirelessly and automatically [. . .].

(66′) In every area of our business, *one* can see this pattern.

The translator of (65) has dropped *your*, thus fixing interpretation to the generic reading: The article-less noun phrase (cf. Zifonun et al. 1997: 2061f) *Handheld Computer, Telefon and PC* generically refers to all devices of such sort. Similarly, the translator of (66) has selected the generic reading of *you* by choosing a passive-like impersonal construction (*lässt sich . . . erkennen* 'may be identified') that roughly corresponds to the meaning of generic *you*.[4]

4.1.2 Substitutions of pronouns

In the context of interactional shifts, pronominal substitutions comprise cases where a translator has substituted a 1st or 2nd person pronoun for another referential expression. Since only few such shifts were encountered among the investigated data (cf. Table 4.2), this section has been kept rather brief. Readers who are only interested in the most important tendencies, which have already been pointed out in the above discussion of pronominal additions and omissions, are invited to skip this section.

First of all, let us make clear what was *not* counted as a pronominal substitution. Consider the following example:

(67) Our continued success depends on keeping *our* promises.

[3]The examples are representative in that the investigated data do not feature cases in which an unambiguously hearer-deictic instance of *you* has been omitted by the translator.

[4]One could argue that this "fixing" of the interpretation of *you* should be counted as a denotational explicitation in both cases. However, I have not done that, since this kind of denotational shift is not captured by my classificatory framework, where explicitation generally means the addition or substitution of lexical material, not its omission. Since we are only dealing with a handful of cases, the quantitative consequences of this decision are negligible.

Die Fortsetzung unseres Erfolgs hängt davon ab, dass wir *diese* Versprechen halten.

The italicized shift in (67) might be called a pronominal substitution, since the translator has substituted a demonstrative pronoun (*diese* 'these') for a personal pronoun (*our*). However, cases like this were not counted as pronominal substitutions, because the substituted and the substituting pronouns serve different communicative functions (cf. Lyons 1977: 638f): *Our* is interactional, referring to the author of the text, while *diese* is cohesive, establishing a relation of coreference with a previously verbalized expression (which is not shown here). Therefore it was decided to treat the substitution evidenced in (67) as two shifts, namely one interactional implicitation (omission of a personal pronoun) and one cohesive explicitation (addition of a demonstrative pronoun).

Let us now turn to some representative examples of cases that were actually counted as interactional pronominal substitutions:

(68) *Der Konzern* legt mit diesem Abschluss das sechste Mal hintereinander Zahlen vor, die sowohl im Umsatz als auch im Ergebnis über denen des jeweiligen Vorjahrs liegen.

In the 1999 financial statements, *we* are presenting, for the sixth time in a row, advances over the previous year in both sales and earnings.

(69) [. . .] so gewinnt *der Konzern* einen zusätzlichen Hebel, um den Unternehmenswert zu steigern.

[. . .] giving *us* an additional lever to increase the value of the Company.

In the German original of (68) and (69) the company authoring the report refers to itself neutrally as *der Konzern* 'the corporation'. In both cases the translator has increased the interactionality of the text by substituting the speaker-deictic pronoun *we*/*us*. The shifts thus conform to the general trend of an increase in interactionality in German-English translations noted in Section 4.1.1.

Not only definite descriptions such as *der Konzern*, but also proper names may be replaced in translation by speaker-deictic pronouns, as the following corpus examples illustrate:

(70) Vor allem aber soll *XYZ* für Sie, unsere Aktionärinnen und Aktionäre, ein langfristig lohnendes Investment sein.

But more than anything else, *we* want to be a strong long-term investment for you, our stockholders.

(71) *XYZ's* contributions to society are wide-ranging.

Unsere Beiträge in der Gesellschaft sind vielfältig.

Example (70) is pretty straightforward. In line with typical communicative preferences of Anglophone readers, the German-English translator has increased interactionality by substituting the speaker-deictic pronoun *we* for the more 'neutral' proper name of the German original. Example (71), on the other hand, represents an example which goes against the norm of decreased interactionality in English-German translations. Similar to (62), it is not clear at all why the translator of (71) made the text more interactional, since a direct rendering of the genitive proper name would have been possible: *XYZs Beiträge in der Gesellschaft sind vielfältig.* Perhaps the translator found the genitive stylistically inadequate (although I would consider it perfectly acceptable in this context) and thus preferred to use the possesive personal pronoun *unsere*.

4.2 Proper name-based shifts

As we have seen in Table 4.1, interactional shifts involving proper names are rare in the investigated corpus. Thus, the data do not allow any meaningful generalizations, which is unfortunate, since it would be interesting to see if the addition, omission, and substitution of proper names follows the same general tendencies as the addition and omission of personal pronouns that we have discussed above. Nevertheless, for the sake of completeness, we are going to discuss some examples of shifts involving proper names in the following. Readers who are only interested in the 'big picture' and do not care about quantitatively insignificant details are invited to skip this section.

4.2.1 Additions and omissions of proper names

The following two examples show interactional explicitations consisting in the addition of a proper name, viz. the name of the company authoring the report in question:

(72) Seit der vollständigen Privatisierung im Herbst 1997 hat die Börsenkapitalisierung damit um mehr als 60 Prozent zugelegt!

This means that since full privatisation in autumn 1997 *XYZ's* stock market value has increased by more than 60 per cent.

(73) "H" gas turbine technology, the world's most advanced, is now improving the efficiency and heat rate of customers' 20- and 30-year-old power plants.

Die weltweit fortschrittlichste "H"-Gasturbinentechnologie *von XYZ* wird nun dazu genutzt, die Effizienz der 20 bis 30 Jahre alten Elektrizitätswerke zu verbessern.

In both cases, it is easy to see how the addition of the (self-referential) proper name increases the interactionality of the target text. In the source text of (72), for example, *die Börsenkapitalisierung* 'the stock market value' is presented as a separate, independent entity. The text thus gives a neutral, depersonalized impression (if it were not for the question mark at the end of the sentence). In the English translation, on the other hand, the addition of the proper name *XYZ* makes clear that the state of affairs expressed by the sentence directly relates to the company responsible for the text, and thus also to the reader, who is a (potential) shareholder. Note that this instance of interactional explicitation is not obligatory; a translation of *die Börsenkapitalisierung* as *stock market value* would have been grammatical.

Example (73) is similar. Here, the English source text sentence may be described as interactionally implicit because it 'neutrally' presents a state of affairs involving the author of the text without saying so explicitly: The text neither verbalizes *whose* technology it is that is improving customers' power plants, nor *whose* customers are being talked about. The reader has to infer on her own that the mentioned *"H" gas turbine technology* was developed by the company authoring the report, which now sells it to its customers. This gives the text its impersonal flavor. The translator has made explicit the involvement of the author in the state of affairs presented, thus increasing the target text's degree of interactionality vis-à-vis the source text.

The corpus contains only two instances of interactional implicitation consisting in the omission of a company's proper name. Here is one of them:

(74) To size the business to the lower market volume, *XYZ* reduced staff by approximately 10,000 employees from peak 1998 levels [. . .].

Um das Unternehmen an das geringere Marktvolumen anzupassen, wurde die Belegschaft um ca. 10.000 Mitarbeiter im Vergleich zum Spitzenniveau von 1998 verringert [. . .].

The German target text's passive construction does not name the agent responsible for the reduction in staff – which happens to be the authoring

company – and is thus interactionally less explicit than the English original.

4.2.2 Substitutions of proper names

Given the scale of interactional explicitness proposed in Section 3.5 and the general tendency towards a lower degree of interactionality in German as compared to English discourse, we would expect English-German translators to replace personal pronouns by (interactionally less explicit) proper names. Indeed, this is what we find in the investigated data. Cf. the following examples:

(75) [. . .] we accomplished four points in *your company* this year [. . .].

Wir haben 1999 vier Schwerpunkte für profitables Wachstum bei *XYZ* gesetzt [. . .].

(76) Also for the second straight year, *we* were named "The World's Most Respected Company" by the Financial Times.

Ebenfalls zum zweiten Mal in Folge ernannte die Financial Times *XYZ* zum "am meisten respektierten" Unternehmen der Welt.

In (75), the company authoring the report is pictured as belonging to the reader (*your company*) – which is technically correct, since a joint stock company is the property of its shareholders. The English-German translator, however, has substituted the company's proper name for *your company*, most probably in order to avoid the high degree of interactionality associated with the hearer-deictic pronoun *your*. (76) is similar, although a speaker-deictic pronoun – *we* – has been replaced by a proper name in this case. (Note that the switch from passive to active voice does not need to concern us here. The translator might as well have chosen to mirror the passive construction of the English original, e.g. like this: *. . . wurde XYZ von der Financial Times zum "am meisten respektierten" Unternehmen der Welt ernannt.*)

While (75) and (76) both conform to the norm of decreasing interactional explicitness in English-German translation, there are some anomalous cases of interactional implicitation involving proper names in the direction German-English. Cf. the following example:

(77) Auch *bei uns* verschlechterte sich die Geschäfts- und Ergebnisentwicklung im Geschäftsjahr 2000/2001 von Quartal zu Quartal [. . .].

At *XYZ*, too, the business and earnings situation deteriorated from quarter to quarter in fiscal year 2000/2001.

Considering the Anglophone preference for interactional explicitness, why did the translator of (77) choose the interactionally implicit expression *XYZ* over a pronoun? The most likely reason is that * *at us* is not a grammatical combination and the translator wanted to avoid a clumsy paraphrase such as *in our case*. Stylistic considerations thus seem to have overridden the demands of the cultural filter (cf. examples (59) and (60) discussed in Section 4.1.1).

So far we have only looked at how proper names figure in interactional implicitations. As the following two examples show, proper names are also used by translators to substitute interactionally more implicit expressions, thus giving rise to interactional explicitation:

(78) Wir haben die umfangreichen Zahlen und Fakten wieder zu einer abwechslungsreichen Lektüre aufbereitet, um Ihnen einen lebendigen Einblick in die Welt *des Konzerns* zu bieten.

We have once again packaged the extensive facts and figures in a highly readable report to give you a true-to-life insight into the world *of XYZ*.

(79) Guided by *the company's* overall vision, they [viz. division managers] have total responsibility for setting a clear mission and priorities for their division, including all product planning and marketing strategies.

Im Rahmen der Gesamtfirmenvision *von XYZ* setzen sie genau definierte Ziele und Prioritäten für ihren Geschäftsbereich und legen alle Produktplanungs- und Marketingstrategien fest.

I have counted (78) and (79) as interactional explicitations (cf. the scale of interactional explicitness presented in Section 3.5) although they do not give the impression of a marked incease in interactionality. In fact, one might argue that a company's proper name is not more explicit in terms of interactionality than a definite description such as *des Konzerns* or *the company's*. However, we should not forget that a definite description may refer to different entities in different contexts. Thus, in a business text *the company* does not have to refer to the authoring company. The phrase may as well refer to another company mentioned in the preceding discourse (cf. e.g.: *ABC posted good results last year.* The company *is our strongest competitor*). A proper name, on the other hand, is a "rigid designator" (Kripke 1972): Its use is tied to a single entity to which it exclusively refers. On the

basis of this observation I would argue that a proper name is interactionally more explicit than a definite description, but the reader is welcome to disagree with this view. In any event, the issue is not important for the present study, since (78) and (79) represent the only shifts of this type identified in the corpus.

4.3 Summary and conclusion

The most important findings of the present chapter may be summarized as follows:

- English-German translators frequently perform interactional implicitation by omitting personal pronouns and proper names. They do this in an effort to make the target text less interactional than the source text and thus more in line with the communicative conventions of German. In contrast, German-English translators regularly explicitate by adding personal pronouns and proper names in order to comply with typical communicative preferences of Anglophone readers.

- There are cases that go against the tendency just described, i.e. cases where English-German translators add personal pronouns and German-English translators omit these items. Qualitative analysis has shown that these 'anomalous' cases generally result from distinct, identifiable causes. For example, English-German translators occasionally add personal pronouns with the aim of avoiding stylistic awkwardness. Such motivations can override translators' overall tendency to apply a cultural filter that mediates between the communicative norms of English and German.

- There are many more interactional explicitations in the direction German-English than there are interactional implicitations in the opposite direction, English-German. The reason for this is that interactional implicitation entails a less precise description of states of affairs and may thus lead to misinterpretation on the part of the reader. Translators try to avoid this risk by employing interactional implicitation carefully and sparingly.

The findings indicate that occurrences of interactional explicitation are generally caused by distinct lexicogrammatical and/or pragmatic factors, even if these factors can be difficult to pinpoint in individual cases. Since

the vast majority of interactional explicitations (and implicitations) can be explained with recourse to these factors, we do not need the assumption of a "translation-inherent" cognitive process of explicitation as it is common in the translation studies literature.

Chapter 5

Cohesive shifts

The present chapter analyzes explicitations and implicitations that change the degree of textual cohesion expressed in the target text as compared to the source text. Table 5.1 gives an overview of the cohesive shifts that have been identified in the investigated corpus.

		Eng → Ger	Ger → Eng
explicitation	pronoun	18	37
	noun	32	36
	connective	139	79
	TOTAL	189	152
implicitation	pronoun	32	25
	noun	2	6
	connective	44	64
	TOTAL	78	95

Table 5.1: Cohesive shifts across lexical/functional categories

The table nicely demonstrates the great usefulness of a fine-grained subclassification of shifts for studies dealing with explicitation and implicitation. If we only were to consider the total numbers given in the table, we would conclude that:

1. Explicitations are not counterbalanced by implicitations in both translation directions (189 English-German explicitations vs. 95 German-English implicitations; 152 German-English explicitations vs. 78 English-German implicitations).

2. There are more explicitations (189 > 152) and less implicitations (78 < 95) in the direction English-German than in the opposite direction,

German-English.

However, if we look at the individual numbers of explicitations and implicitations across word classes, we see that there are some remarkable exceptions to these two conclusions. For example, English-German explicitations of pronouns *are* (more than) counterbalanced by German-English pronominal implicitations (18 explicitations vs. 25 implicitations), an observation which contradicts the first conclusion. Moreover, nominal explicitations are not more frequent in the direction English-German than in the direction German-English (32 explicitations Eng $\rightarrow$ Ger vs. 36 explicitations Ger $\rightarrow$ Eng), an observation which goes against the second conclusion.

Thus, Table 5.1 shows that it is dangerous to lump different kinds of shifts together into a single category, as some previous studies on explicitation and implicitation have done (see Chapter 2). Conclusions drawn from studies that do not distinguish between different kinds of shifts are hardly generalizable. Accordingly, we will not dwell on Table 5.1 any longer, but rather 'zoom in' on the individual kinds of shifts listed in the table. Pronominal and nominal shifts, which both concern the encoding of coreference, will be discussed in Sections 5.1 and 5.2. Section 5.3 will then discuss shifts involving connective-based shifts, which concern the encoding of semantic relations.

5.1 Pronoun-based shifts

To begin with, recall that in the present study the term *pronoun-based* does not only mean shifts involving traditional pronouns such as *it* or *this*, but also additions, omissions and substitutions of other pronominal elements such as pronominal adjectives and pronominal adverbs (cf. Section 3.3). Also note that in the present chapter the term *pronoun* is exclusively used to refer to coreferential elements. 1st person and 2nd person pronouns (e.g. *we*), which cannot be used to encode coreference, are treated in Chapter 4 on interactional shifts. Table 5.2 gives an overview of the pronoun-based additions, omissions, and substitutions that have been identified in the investigated corpus.

		Eng → Ger	Ger → Eng
explicitation	addition	18	37
	substitution	–	–
	TOTAL	18	37
implicitation	omission	29	19
	substitution	3	6
	TOTAL	32	25

Table 5.2: Cohesive shifts consisting in the addition, omission, or substitution of pronominal material

The table allows us to make the following observations. Since substitutions are rare in the investigated data, the observations are based on the findings regarding pronominal additions and omissions only:

Observation 1: Pronominal additions in the direction English-German are counterbalanced by pronominal omissions in the direction German-English (18 additions vs. 19 omissions).

Observation 2: Pronominal additions in the direction German-English are almost – but not quite – counterbalanced by pronominal omissions in the direction English-German (37 additions vs. 29 omissions).

Observation 3: Pronominal additions outnumber omissions in the direction German-English (37 additions vs. 19 omissions), while the opposite is the case in the other translation direction (18 additions vs. 29 omissions).

We are going to explain these observations in the following. Observation 3 is somewhat surprising, since we would expect that English-German translators explicitate more than German-English translators as far as cohesive devices such as pronouns are concerned (cf. Section A.1.2 of the appendix). As we will see below, there is a simple, almost trivial reason for this exceptional observation.

5.1.1 Additions and omissions of pronouns

Additions and omissions of pronouns are due to a number of interesting tendencies and thus show a rather varied picture. Roughly, we can distinguish between the following three types of pronoun-based cohesive shifts:

1. Shifts among which explicitations and implicitations occur with equal frequency in both translation directions
2. Shifts among which explicitations are more frequent in the direction English-German than in the direction German-English
3. Shifts among which explicitations are more frequent in the direction German-English than in the direction English-German.

In the following, we are going to deal with these three types of shifts in turn.

1. Why do translators add pronouns? In many cases the answer seems to be: because they can. The results obtained from the investigated corpus suggest that translators like to add pronouns when the opportunity arises. The following two examples illustrate this:

(80) [. . .] cost savings of $ 135 million achieved after the XYZ merger by combining facilities and administrative functions. *The merger* also has created synergies between operating divisions [. . .].

[. . .] Kosteneinsparungen von 135 Mill. $ durch die Zusammenlegung von Einrichtungen und Verwaltungsaufgaben nach der Fusion mit XYZ. *Diese Fusion* führte auch zu Synergien zwischen den Geschäftsbereichen [. . .].

(81) [. . .] auch wenn die Wachstumsprognosen für das Jahr 2003 zumeist auf einen weiter verzögerten und insgesamt nur moderaten Aufschwung hindeuten. Politische Risiken erhöhen *die konjunkturellen Unsicherheiten*.

[. . .] despite most growth forecasts for 2003 indicating that the economic recovery will be delayed further and the upswing only moderate. Political risks are adding to *these economic uncertainties*.

In (80) and (81) the plural demonstrative pronoun *diese/these* has been added by the translator without there being an equivalent expression in the source text. Note that syntactically speaking, one could say that the pronoun has not been added in both cases, but substituted for the definite article *the*. However, as stated in Section 3.8, shifts concerning the definite or indefinite article were excluded from analysis. This is why cases such as the above were counted as pronominal additions, not substitutions.

Now, what does the addition of *diese/these* in (80)/(81) amount to semantically? Or, in other words, why do we feel that the translated versions are cohesively more explicit than the corresponding originals? Simplifying considerably, the definite article expresses "unique identifiability" of

its referent, i.e. it signals to the reader: "You can identify this!" (cf. Gundel et al. 1993: 276). But identifiability is a pretty vague notion. When someone uses the definite article, we know that we are expected to be able to identify the intended referent, but we do not know *how* we are supposed to identify it. Thus, die *konjunkturellen Unsicherheiten* in (81) is ambiguous with respect to its reference. The expression may either refer to general economic uncertainties that the writer assumes to be part of the reader's world knowledge (possible paraphrase: 'the economic uncertainties of our time'),[1] or to the specific economic uncertainties talked about in the previous sentence, i.e. the economic uncertainties implied by the moderate growth forecasts for 2003 (possible paraphrase: 'the economic uncertainties just mentioned').

Demonstrative pronouns are more explicit in this respect.[2] They may only be used when the intended referent is retrievable from (a) the surrounding discourse or (b) the extralinguistic context. The translator of (81) has thus removed the referential ambiguity elucidated above by using *these* instead of the definite article, making explicit that the economic uncertainties implied by the previous discourse are being referred to, not general economic uncertainties that the hearer is supposed to be able to retrieve from her world knowledge. The addition of *these* in (81) thus makes referent tracking easier for the addressee, which means that we are dealing with an instance of cohesive explicitation. The same holds for (80), *mutatis mutandis*.

Just as demonstrative pronouns are often added by translators in both translation directions, they are also regularly omitted. Cf. the following examples:

(82) Despite *these adverse market developments*, substantial progress was achieved this past year to position XYZ to meet the coming challenges for agriculture.

Trotz *der schwierigen Marktentwicklungen* konnte XYZ im vergangenen Jahr seine Position weiter festigen und sich damit für die kommenden Herausforderungen der Landwirtschaft rüsten.

(83) Ohne die hervorragenden Leistungen und ohne den Einsatz unserer

[1]Cf. the definite description *the sun*, where it is also our world knowledge that enables us to identify the intended referent (unique identifiability being given because there is only one sun in our solar system).

[2]Demonstrative pronouns are also more explicit in another respect: they feature a near/far distinction (*this* vs. *that*, *these* vs. *those*) that the definite article lacks. However, I will not go into that here, since the presence of this additional feature has far-reaching and quite complicated consequences.

Mitarbeiterinnen und Mitarbeiter sowie die vertrauensvolle Zusammenarbeit mit den Vertreterinnen und Vertretern unserer Belegschaft hätten wir *dieses Ergebnis*, auf das wir zu Recht stolz sein können, nicht erreicht.

Without the excellent performance and dedication of our employees and the good cooperation with employee representatives we would not have achieved *the results*, of which we can be truly proud.

The use of *these* in (82) makes clear that the autor intends to refer to the adverse market developments talked about in the previous discourse, not to a more general, previously unverbalized state of affairs that he assumes the reader to be familiar with. The translator has decreased cohesive explicitness by omitting *these*, thus creating coreferential ambiguity. Similarly, (83) represents an instance of cohesive implicitation through pronoun omission in the other translation direction.

As examples (80) through (83) indicate, demonstrative pronouns are added and omitted in both translation directions. Translators seem to add pronouns where they are in doubt as to whether the addressee is able to infer a given coreference relation, while they omit pronouns where they feel that it is easy for the addressee to recognize coreferential bonds. Since this happens likewise in both translation directions, pronominal additions and omissions of this type cannot explain any of the observations noted at the beginning of this section.

2. We will now discuss the second type of cohesive pronominal shifts that was found to occur in the investigated data. As mentioned above, among the shifts of this type there are more explicitations in the translation direction English-German than in the direction German-English. Let us begin by looking at an example:

(84) At these meetings, leaders [. . .] describe how they are implementing the particular initiative in their own operations. [. . .] Every Company activity and every Company event during the year add energy and momentum to the initiative.

Auf diesen Meetings beschreiben die einzelnen Führungskräfte [. . .] wie sie die Initiative in ihrer eigenen Organisation eingeführt haben. [. . .] *So* gewinnt die Initiative durch jede Unternehmensaktivität und jedes Unternehmensereignis zunehmend an Schwung.

In (84), the pronoun *so* has been added by the translator. *So* is similar to demonstrative pronouns such as *dieser* 'this' in that the pronoun refers to a contextually given entity (Umbach and Ebert 2009). But while 'prototypical' demonstratives refer to the entity itself, *so* is a "quality deictic"

(Blühdorn 1993, 1995), referring to a quality, or property, of the entity in question (see also Becher 2010b).

So may not only refer to qualities of concrete objects, but also to qualities of higher-order entities such as states of affairs or propositions. This is what *so* does in (84). In the discourse preceding the sentence containing *so*, a state of affairs (viz. regular meetings designed to support a certain initiative) is described. *So* refers to a certain quality of these meetings and might thus be paraphrased as 'in this way' or the like. The pronoun is very vague in its reference, since we do not know *which* quality of the aforementioned state of affairs is being referred to: Is it the regularity of the meetings? Or their collaborative, communicative nature? *So* does not tell us, but what the pronoun does tell us is that the meetings are 'such that'[3] they add *Schwung* 'momentum' to the initiative.

Why did the translator of (84) add *so*? The most plausible answer seems to be: because *so* is 'typically German'. The meaning contribution of the pronoun is characterized by a great deal of redundancy, so communicative risk does not seem to have been involved in the translator's decision to add *so*. Rather, it seems that the translator considered the addition of *so* to be a stylistic amendment that brings the translation closer to the communicative preferences of German readers. Indeed, the use of *so* in (84) is reminiscent of a general tendency evident in German language use: Speakers of German tend towards a greater degree of cohesive explicitness than English speakers (see Section A.1.2 of the appendix).

In particular, German authors show a marked tendency to explicitly signal the macrostructure of their texts to their readers (Becher 2010c). This is exactly what *so* does in (84): By referring to a certain quality of the previously verbalized state of affairs, *so* acts as a 'hinge' between the previous discourse and the sentence containing the pronoun (cf. Ehlich 1987, House forthcoming), thus underlining the concluding character of the sentence. Using the discourse-analytic terminology of Jordan (1984) and Hoey (2001), one could say that *so* in (84) functions as an explicit marker of the "discourse pattern" Situation–Evaluation. The explicit signaling of this discourse pattern may be particularly characteristic of German communicative conventions (cf. Becher 2010c).

Here is another example of a pronoun-based cohesive explicitation in the direction English-German:

(85) [...] we needed to refine our organization [...]. In addition to forging an organization that will be more effective and responsive

[3] *Such* is a quality deictic that shares a great deal of its semantics with German *so* (cf. Becher 2010b).

for the long term, our efforts will result in significant annual cost savings.

[...] mussten wir unsere Organisation gezielter ausrichten [...]. Wir werden dadurch nicht nur zu einem effektiveren und verstärkt reaktionsfähigen Unternehmen werden; unsere *diesbezüglichen* Anstrengungen werden auch zu erheblichen Kosteneinsparungen beitragen.

In (85), the translator has added what may be called a pronominal adjective, i.e. an adjective consisting of a relational part and a deictic/demonstrative part (cf. Rehbein 1995, Becher 2010b: 1327f) that refers to a previously verbalized entity. The meaning of *diesbezüglich* may be paraphrased as 'related to this' or 'associated with this'. The use of the adjective in (85) makes explicit that *Anstrengungen* 'efforts' refers to the efforts necessitated by the refinement of the organization talked about earlier. Since *diesbezüglich* does not have an equivalent in the English original, the reader of the English source text has to infer this connection from the context (which will not be difficult).

Again, culturally determined discourse norms are the most plausible reason for the addition of *diesbezüglich* by the translator, which would make this shift a case of cultural filtering. The mere fact that English does not have an equivalent of *diesbezüglich* makes the adjective something that is 'typically German' and that we would expect English-German translators to add when applying a cultural filter. German has a very large inventory of composite deictics such as *damit*, *diesbezüglich* etc. (cf. Rehbein 1995, Pasch et al. 2003), which is probably both a reason for and a consequence of the German tendency to explicitly verbalize coreference relations. English has a much smaller inventory of these 'linking words', which poses a difficulty for German-English translators. Translating from German to English, a translator basically has two choices when faced with a composite deictic that has no obvious English equivalent: She may try to find an ad-hoc paraphrase of the item, or she may not translate it at all. The latter strategy regularly results in pronoun-based cohesive implicitations, as the following examples illustrate:

(86) Details *hierzu* ['on this'] finden Sie im Kapitel "Mitarbeiterinnen und Mitarbeiter".

You will find the details in the chapter on "Our Employees".

(87) An dem *dafür* ['for this'] neu gegründeten Unternehmen erwirbt XYZ in einem ersten Schritt 30% der Anteile.

In a first step, XYZ will acquire a 30% stake in the newly established joint venture.

(88) Über den physischen Transport der Waren hinaus bieten wir unseren Kunden auch alle *damit* ['with this'] verbundenen Mehrwertdienste aus einer Hand an.

Over and above the physical transportation of goods, we offer our customers all of the associated value added services from one source.

In all three cases, the translator has dropped a pronominal expression whose meaning is easily inferable from the preceding discourse. The result in each case is a sentence where an argument of a noun (86), verb (87), or adjective (88) is not verbalized, but has to be inferred by the reader. In (86), for example, the translator could have written *You will find the details on this...*, but that would sound highly redundant because it is clear from the preceding discourse which details are meant.

Why does the German original of (86) not sound redundant? Maybe because in German the meaning of *on this* appears compressed into a single word, *hierzu*, which makes the German version stylistically more elegant than the English version. Or because the communicative norms of German license a higher degree of explicitness in the encoding of cohesive ties (see Section A.1.2). Tentative evidence from a contrastive pilot study suggests that in general, it seems to be customary in English to omit arguments of nouns and adjectives in situations where speakers of German tend to use a pronominal adverb (such as *hierzu*, *dafür*, *damit*, or the like) that explicitly encodes the argument in question (Becher 2010b). Be that as it may, the bottom line is that composite deictics like *hierzu* regularly trigger cohesive implicitation in German-English translations.

Examples (87) and (88) are particularly interesting, since they show how (a) the lexical inventory of a language, (b) its syntactic structure and (c) the norms governing its use may all function as (possibly interacting) triggers of implicitation in translation. Let us briefly discuss these three triggers in turn.

First, *dafür* in (87) and *damit* (88) do not have direct equivalents in English, 'for that [purpose]' and 'with that' being possible paraphrases. Such paraphrases can sound stylistically awkward, which would be a first possible reason for the fact that *dafür* and *damit* have been left untranslated.

Second, in the above examples *dafür* and *damit* appear in the same syntactic slot. They premodify an adjective phrase (*neu gegründeten* in (87), *verbundenen* in (88)), which in turn premodifies a noun (*Unternehmen* in

(87)), *Mehrwertdienste* in (88)). In English, this syntactic slot is not available, i.e. this type of premodification is not possible: * *the for that purpose newly established joint venture* and * *all with that associated [...] services* are ungrammatical combinations. Thus, in order to carry over the meaning of *damit* in (88) to English the translator would, for example, have to change premodification into postmodification and render the noun phrase as: *value added services associated with that* – which would sound highly awkward stylistically.

Third, as has been pointed out before, the mere fact that German has a large inventory of pronominal adverbs like *dafür*, *damit*, *hierzu*, etc. already suggests that speakers of this language conventionally opt for explicitness in situations where these words can be used (e.g. for modifying nouns and adjectives). In contrast, we would expect speakers of English, a language that does not offer equivalents for many of these words, to be used to a lower degree of explicitness in such contexts.

In combination, the three implicitation triggers just discussed build up a strong pressure on German-English translators to omit pronominal adverbs and adjectives. This explains our **Observation 1** noted at the beginning of this section, namely the observation that pronominal additions in the direction English-German are counterbalanced by the corresponding omissions in the direction German-English.

3. Let us now turn to the third and last type of pronoun-based cohesive shifts listed above, namely the one among which there are more explicitations in the direction German-English than in the opposite direction. In the appendix of this book, I discuss empirical evidence which suggests that English prefers[4] the explicit encoding of possessors (see Section A.1.1). As we will see shortly, this characteristic of English grammar accounts for the relatively large number of German-English explicitations observed in Table 5.2. The following examples show pronominal additions that seem to have been triggered by the preference of English for explicit possessors:

(89) Wir bedanken uns bei allen [...] unseren Mitarbeiterinnen und Mitarbeitern für die guten Leistungen, die unser Unternehmen auf einen wieder sehr guten Weg gebracht haben.

We thank [...] our staff for *their* excellent work in helping steer our company back on a successful course.

(90) Aus kleinen Anfängen im 19. Jahrhundert wuchs eine weltweite

[4]The appendix discusses cases where the explicit encoding of a possessor is obligatory in English. However, the following examples show that there are also cases where the explicit encoding of a possessor is not required, but merely preferred in English.

Gruppe, die mit den Marken X, Y und Z ein Markenartikelgeschäft von globaler Bedeutung entwickelt hat.

From small beginnings in the 19th century there emerged a worldwide group that has built up a branded products business of global importance with *its* brands X, Y and Z.

(91) Deshalb bleibt XyzTech mit positivem Cash Flow und gutem Ergebnis im Konzern.

As a result, we shall retain XyzTech, with *its* positive cash flow and good earnings.

As it is discussed in the appendix, English regularly indicates possession by means of possessive pronouns such as *their* and *its*, while in German the relation between possessor and possessed is often not explicitly verbalized and thus has to be inferred by the reader. The pronoun-based cohesive explicitations evidenced in examples (89) through (91) mirror this contrast. In the German source text of (89), for example, the reader has to infer that there is a relation of possession holding between the staff of the company and *die guten Leistungen* 'the good achievements'. The English translator has made the possessive relation explicit by adding a possessive pronoun.

It is interesting to note that in all three examples, non-explicitating translation solutions would have been possible grammatically (*the excellent work*; *the brands X, Y and Z*; *with positive cash flow*), but less adequate stylistically. Therefore, I assume that it is predominantly the desire to apply a cultural filter that motivates German-English translators to add possessive pronouns. Conversely, we should expect that English-German translators tend to omit possessive pronouns. This is indeed the case, as the following examples illustrate:

(92) Citing increased innovation and changes to *its* organization structure, the company [...] expressed optimism about future benefits from *its* Organization 2005 initiative.

Das Unternehmen wies auf verstärkte Innovationen und Änderungen in der Organisationsstruktur hin [...] und äußerte sich optimistisch im Hinblick auf künftige Vorteile durch "Organisation 2005".

(93) Everything we do focuses on allowing people and organizations to create and manage *their* information.

Unsere gesamten Bemühungen sind darauf ausgerichtet, Anwender und Unternehmen beim Erstellen und Verwalten von Informationen zu unterstützen.

(94) Even now, the majority of consumers – along with many small and medium-sized businesses – still access the Internet via *their* regular telephone lines.

Heute schalten sich die meisten Verbraucher – ebenso wie viele kleinere und mittlere Betriebe – immer noch über normale Telefonleitungen in das Internet ein.

Note that in all cases a retention of the possesive pronoun in the German target text would have been possible, and the resulting sentence would not even strike German readers as stylistically awkward. It would be wrong to think that the communicative norms of German *prohibit* explicit possessors; rather, they *favor* implicit possessors. Cf. the following variant of (92):

(92′) Das Unternehmen wies auf verstärkte Innovationen und Änderungen in *seiner* Organisationsstruktur hin [. . .] und äußerte sich optimistisch im Hinblick auf künftige Vorteile durch *seine* "Organisation 2005".

Example (92′) is perfectly acceptable stylistically. This shows that the English preference for explicit possessors vs. the German preference for implicit possessors does not represent an absolute dichotomy, but merely a tendency – albeit a very strong one. In fact, this tendency is so strong that it accounts for **Observation 2** made at the beginning of this section, namely the observation that pronominal additions in the direction German-English are almost – but not quite – counterbalanced by pronominal omissions in the direction English-German.

Why did translators 'fail' to achieve complete explicitational symmetry? The reason is that on the one hand, English-German translators are strongly motivated by the grammar and communicative norms of German to omit explicit possessors. But on the other hand, there are examples such as (92′), which show that there are cases where an explicit possessor is stylistically adequate in German. Given translators' general tendency to avoid communicative risk by choosing explicitness rather than implicitness when in doubt (cf. Section 2.5), it is not surprising to see that English-German translators do not omit possessive pronouns as often as they could.

Turning to **Observation 3**: Why are there – somewhat surprisingly – more explicitations in the direction German-English than in the direction English-German? The answer to this question is a surprisingly trivial one. The concept of possession plays a particularly important role in the investigated genre (business writing), which means that German-English

translators get many opportunities to explicitate by adding possessors – in fact, in the present data they get even more opportunities to explicitate than their English-German colleagues (who can add a pronominal adverb or adjective once in a while). Thus, the observation that there are more explicitations in the direction German-English is due to a rather accidental characteristic of the investigated data, namely the prominent role that possessive relations play in business writing.

5.1.2 Substitutions of pronouns

The present study does not have much of interest to say about pronoun-based cohesive substitutions, since the investigated corpus contains only 9 such shifts in total: 3 in the direction English-German and 6 in the direction German-English (see Table 5.2). Moreover, all of these shifts are implicitations. Nevertheless, let us look at two examples to get an impression of what these shifts look like and where their causes might lie. (Readers who are not interested in this quantitatively negligible kind of shift may skip ahead to the next section.)

(95) [. . .] mit dem Ziel, Logistikprozesse über das "World Wide Web" zu steuern und zu überwachen. Außerdem soll *das Internet* verstärkt als Vertriebsplattform genutzt werden.

[. . .] the aim being to manage and monitor logistics operations via the Internet as well as use *it* increasingly as a marketing platform.

(96) The emergence of the Internet and XYZ services will make technology more accessible and relevant to *small businesses* than ever before.

Durch das Internet und die XYZ Services werden *diesen Betrieben* neue, für sie interessante Technologien zur Verfügung gestellt.

The German source text of (95) refers to the Internet by means of two different, but coreferential descriptive expressions, namely *das "World Wide Web"* and *das Internet*. The English translator, on the other hand, has used the personal pronoun *it* for referring to the Internet a second time. One explanation for this decision of the translator would be that she did not like the expression *the world wide web* and avoided the use of this synonym by substituting a pronoun. Another possible reason for the use of the pronoun would be the lowered distance between the two mentions of the Internet in the target text as compared to the source text (*the Internet* and *it* being separated by only four words). In any case, it should be clear

that the substitution of *it* for a descriptive expression was not performed by the translator with the specific aim of being less explicit or decreasing the cohesion of the text, but rather seems to be due to stylistic reasons.

Example (96) originates from a paragraph dealing with *small businesses*, a term that is repeated over and over in that paragraph. It seems that the German translator has tried to reduce the number of repetitions by using the mixed pronominal/descriptive expression *diesen Betrieben* instead of the full phrase *small businesses*. This translation choice is in line with previous, tentative contrastive findings which suggest that German has stronger stylistic constraints on lexical repetition than English.[5] If this is true, the cohesive implicitation evidenced in (96) should be seen as a result of cultural filtering. Unfortunately, the investigated corpus does not provide enough examples so as to enable us to determine whether shifts of this type are systematically employed by English-German and German-English translators to adjust the number of lexical repetitions to a level that is adequate to target language conventions.

5.2 Noun-based shifts

As has been pointed out in Section 3.7.1, the title of this section may be a bit misleading. In the present study, the term *noun-based* does not only mean shifts concerning noun phrases. Rather, it covers all kinds of shifts where *nominal material* has been added, omitted or substituted in phrases of any type. For example, I have counted the substitution of *to this result* for *dazu* 'to this' as a noun-based shift (see example (100)) on account of the fact that a noun has been added (viz. *result*), although the phrase is question is a prepositional phrase (which appears compressed into a single word, *dazu*, in the German source text).

Table 5.3 gives an overview of the additions, omissions, and substitutions of nominal material that have been identified in the investigated corpus:

[5] Lexical variation seems to be an important locus of English-German language contrast. House (1997, 2006) reports on findings which suggest that in contrast to English, German discourse prefers *ad hoc* formulations to verbal routines. Moreover, (tentative) corpus analyses presented by Steiner (2008) and González-Díaz and Kranich (2009) indicate that German texts of different genres tend to have higher type-token ratios than comparable English texts. These findings suggest that German has stronger stylistic constraints on lexical repetition than English.

		Eng → Ger	Ger → Eng
explicitation	addition	12	25
	substitution	20	11
	TOTAL	32	36
implicitation	omission	–	6
	substitution	2	–
	TOTAL	2	6

Table 5.3: Cohesive shifts consisting in the addition, omission, or substitution of nominal material

The table allows us to make the following observations:

Observation 1: There are approximately twice as many nominal additions in the translation direction German-English as in the direction English-German (25 additions Ger-Eng vs. 12 additions Eng-Ger).

Observation 2: Conversely, there are approximately twice as many nominal substitutions in the translation direction English-German as in the direction German-English (20 substitutions Eng-Ger vs. 11 substitutions Ger-Eng)

Observation 3: There is a marked lack of explicitation-implicitation counterbalancing in both translation directions (68 explicitations vs. only 8 implicitations in total).

I will try to explain these observations in the following.

5.2.1 Additions of nouns

To begin with, let us look at a type of nominal addition that occurs with approximately equal frequency in both translation directions:

(97) With its Web-based collaboration tools, XYZ Office 2000 is already a powerful component of a knowledge management solution. In the coming year, we will augment *it* with several other key initiatives.

Mit seinen webbasierten Kollaborationstools hat sich XYZ Office 2000 bereits als leistungsstarke Komponente einer Wissensmanagementlösung etabliert. Im kommenden Jahr werden wir *dieses Programm* durch weitere Schlüsselinitiativen noch weiter ausbauen.

(98) One-Stop-Shopping, Supply Chain Management und eBusiness: Das sind Themen, die in der logistischen Fachwelt seit langem diskutiert werden. XYZ verleiht *ihnen* Konturen, sie werden für Kunden und Investoren real.

One-stop shopping, supply chain management and e-business: these are all ideas that have been debated by experts in the field for a long time now. XYZ is giving *these concepts* a more concrete shape, helping them become reality for our customers and investors.

In (97), the English source text as well as the German translation contain a pronoun referring to the aforementioned software product *XYZ Office 2000*, the pronouns in question being *it* and *dieses*. Only the German translation contains an additional noun, *Programm* 'program', that further specifies the referent of the pronoun as a (computer) program.[6] Note that the addition of the noun *Programm* was by no means necessary, since a translation of *it* by means of the German personal pronoun *es* would have been possible. But apparently, the translator was worried about target language readers having problems identifying the referent of *es*. I assume that this is the reason why the translator has chosen to make referent identification easier by translating *it* as *dieses Programm* 'this program'.

Example (98) is similar. It would have been possible to directly translate *ihnen* as *them*, but this could cause a slight processing difficulty, since the English target text offers two possible antecedents for a plural pronoun like *them*: *ideas* and *experts in the field*. (This ambiguity does not arise in the German source text, where the experts in question are referred to by means of the singular noun *Fachwelt* 'professional world'.) Although referent identification should be unproblematic ultimately, since the English target text sentence only makes sense if the pronoun corefers with *ideas*, the use of *them* would represent a potential processing difficulty. This may be the reason why the translator of (98) has preferred to add a specifying noun, rendering *ihnen* as *these concepts*.

As it was said above, nominal additions with the (hypothesized) purpose of easier referent identification occur independently of the translation direction, i.e. both English-German and German-English translators seem to pursue this strategy. But as we have seen in Table 5.3, there are more than twice as many nominal additions in the direction German-English

[6] I have treated cases like the present one as nominal additions despite the fact that *it* is a personal pronoun while *dieses* is a demonstrative pronoun. Note that for grammatical reasons, it is impossible for a translator to add a specifying noun to a personal pronoun without turning it into a demonstrative pronoun.

than in the opposite translation direction. The reason for this is the systematic occurence of a type of nominal addition that exclusively occurs in the direction German-English. The following examples illustrate this specifically German-English type of nominal addition:

(99) Der XYZ Konzern ist auf dem Weltmarkt gut positioniert. *Dafür* bildet das Produktprogramm das Fundament und sichert die nachhaltige Stärkung unserer Ertragskraft.

The XYZ Group is well positioned on the world market. The foundation stone *of that position* is the product range, which also safeguards the long-term enhancement of our earning power.

(100) Die angestrebte Umsatzsteigerung auf 10 Mrd Euro haben wir erreicht. *Dazu* trugen sämtliche Konzernbereiche bei.

We achieved our goal of increasing overall sales to EUR 10 billion with all Divisions contributing *to this result*.

(101) Die Risikovorsorge haben wir mit 2,5 Mrd Euro dotiert. *Davon* entfielen 0,9 Mrd Euro auf die operative Risikovorsorge [...].

We have allocated EUR 2.5 billion to risk provisions. *Of this total*, EUR 0.9 billion relates to operational risk provisions [...].

In all three examples, a pronominal adverb in the German source text can be seen as a trigger of a nominal addition in the English translation. In (99), the closest English equivalent of *dafür* would (in this context) be *of that*. But *the foundation stone of that* would sound highly awkward stylistically, so the translator has decided to add the noun *position*, an explicitating shift which (somewhat redundantly) emphasizes what the demonstrative pronoun *that* refers to. In contrast, the use of *dafür* in the German original, although semantically equivalent to *of that*, is not stylistically awkward at all.

Examples (100) and (101) are similar. Here, a non-explicitating translation of *dazu* and *davon* as *to this* and *of this* would be considered as stylistically bad by most Anglophone readers, since the use of a 'bare' pronoun is not conventional in this context. This seems to be the reason why in both cases an explicitating noun has been added, *result* and *total*.

In this connection, an interesting question comes up. In the examples (86) through (88), which we have discussed in Section 5.1 on pronoun-based shifts, German-English translators were faced with the same situation as the translators of (99) through (101), namely with a pronominal

adverb in the German source text that has no obvious equivalent in English. Why did the translators of (86) through (88) choose to implicitate (by omitting the pronominal adverbs in question), whereas the translators of (99) through (101) preferred to explicitate (by adding nominal material)?

It seems that when judging whether to translate a given pronominal adverb or not, German-English translators seem to be led by the informational value of the item in question, in its respective context. In (88), for example, the informational value of *damit* seems to be rather low, its meaning being easy to infer from the context. In (101), on the other hand, the meaning of *davon / of this total* is a lot more difficult to infer, so an implicitation here might result in considerable processing difficulties or even misunderstanding.

In general, 'minimal pairs' such as (86) through (88) on the one hand versus (99) through (101) on the other hand suggest that when translators encounter a lexicogrammatical item that is difficult to translate, they seem to consider carefully the effect that an omission vs. an addition would have on the reader of the target text, taking into account factors as diverse as the syntactic options offered by the target language and the degree of explicitness demanded by its communicative norms, to name just two examples. This clearly contradicts the assumption that explicitation is due to "subconscious processes" or a "universal strategy" allegedly followed by translators.

Summarizing our findings on cohesive explicitations involving the addition of nouns, we have seen that nouns are added in both translation directions with the hypothesized aim of easier referent identification on the part of the target text reader. Additionally, nouns are added in the direction German-English in order to compensate for the lack of pronominal adverbs in English. This second type of nominal addition was found to account for the higher overall number of nominal additions in the direction German-English as compared to the direction English-German. **Observation 1** is thus explained.

5.2.2 Omissions of nouns

As we have seen in Table 5.3, cohesive implicitations involving the omission of nouns only occur in the direction German-English. It may be possible that this observation is indicative of an interesting cross-linguistic contrast, but unfortunately, absolute numbers are too small here so as to allow any generalizations. Nevertheless, for the sake of completeness, let us have a brief look at an example of a cohesive nominal omission in the

investigated corpus:

(102) Seit der vollständigen Privatisierung im Herbst 1997 hat die Börsenkapitalisierung damit um mehr als 60 Prozent zugelegt! *Diese Entwicklung* war nur durch das beispielhafte Engagement unserer Mitarbeiterinnen und Mitarbeiter in der ganzen Welt möglich.

This means that since full privatisation in autumn 1997 XYZ's stock market value has increased by more than 60 per cent. *This* was made possible by the exemplary commitment of our employees all over the world.

The translator of (102) has omitted the noun *Entwicklung* 'development'. This shift was possible because the demonstrative pronoun *this* in the target text's second sentence has only one plausible referent, namely the increase in stock market value mentioned in the first sentence. I therefore assume that the translator has performed the nominal omission with the purpose of reducing redundancy.

5.2.3 Substitutions of nouns

My results regarding cohesive explicitations involving the substitution of nouns largely correspond to the pattern established in the preceding section for nominal additions and omissions. Cohesive implicitations involving the substitution of nouns will not be discussed here, since only two occurrences of this type were found (see Table 5.3), which were moreover restricted to the translation direction English-German and do not afford any interesting observations.

First and foremost, nominal substitutions are performed in both translation directions to make referent identification easier for the target text reader:

(103) By refocusing totally on offering customers what they want rather than what technology can provide, we will help *them* succeed in the PC-Plus world.

Indem wir vollständig umdenken und den Kunden das bieten, was sie haben wollen, und nicht nur das, was technologisch möglich ist, werden wir *unseren Kunden* im PC-Plus-Bereich einen neuen Weg bahnen.

(104) Fördermittel sind lt. den gesetzlichen Vorgaben direkt für die Absenkung der Heimpflegekosten [...] einzusetzen. *Sie* dienen

> damit zur Absicherung der langfristigen Wettbewerbsfähigkeit unserer Einrichtungen.
>
> The law requires such grants to be used to reduce the rates charged in nursing homes [...]. *The grants* thus ensure the long-term competitiveness of our facilities.

In the German target text of (103), the noun phrase *unseren Kunden* 'our customers' has been used instead of the personal pronoun *them*, which corefers with *customers* in the English source text. And in (104), the translator has substituted *the grants* for the German original's personal pronoun *sie*. The result in both cases is that cohesion in the translation is achieved by means of lexical repetition instead of pronominal coreference, which potentially eases coreference resolution for the addressee.

In (104), we again find a potential processing difficulty that might arise if a pronoun were used: If we replace *the grants* by *they*, the pronoun would have two possible (plural) antecedents, namely *such grants* and *the rates charged in nursing homes*. By using the full noun phrase *the grants*, the translator of (104) has removed this potential ambiguity. Cf. the above discussion of examples (97) and (98), where similar processing difficulties were argued to be involved.

In contrast, there is no concrete processing difficulty involved in (103) that might come up if a pronoun were used. If we substitute *ihnen* 'them' for *unseren Kunden* in (103), no ambiguity arises, since the pronoun has only one potential antecedent (*den Kunden* 'the customers'). Still, it can be reasonably assumed that the translator has used a full noun phrase instead of a pronoun in order to make processing easier for the addressee. Translators are not linguists. They do not consciously check possible antecedents for every pronominal expression they use (which would not be feasible anyway given typical time constraints). But they do care about their readers, or at least we should expect them to (cf. Section 2.5), so it is reasonable to assume that translators substitute a common noun for a pronoun where their gut feeling tells them that the resulting text will be easier to process. In general, "[i]f a speaker is unsure of the accessibility of an entity in a hearer's consciousness, s/he is likely to oversupply information so that comprehension is ensured." (Toole 1996: 278) I assume that this has been the case in (103).

When we discussed Table 5.3, we observed that there are 20 explicitating substitutions of nouns in the direction English-German vs. only 11 such shifts in the direction German-English (**Observation 2**). Unfortunately, qualitative analysis did not yield an explanation for this skewed frequency distribution. It seems that it is shifts of the type evidenced in

(103) and (104) that occur more frequently in the direction English-German than in the other direction. One possible interpretation would thus be that English-German translators are even more concerned about easy referent identification than their colleagues translating into English. But this has to remain a speculation for the time being, given the rather low number of occurrences and the absence of further evidence pointing in this direction.

Finally, turning to **Observation 3**, it is easy to see why there so few cohesive implicitations in the investigated corpus that involve the omission and substitution of nouns. We have seen that as far as noun-based shifts are concerned, translators have good reasons to explicitate: They chiefly add and substitute nouns in order to ease referent tracking for the addressee, thus avoiding the risk of a translation that is difficult to process. In contrast, it is difficult to come up with a good reason for why translators should make the target text *less* cohesive by omitting nominal material. In fact, the analysis of the few implicitations encountered in the data turned up only one such reason, namely the reduction of redundancy (see example (102)). Since, for obvious reasons, ensuring optimal processability and intelligibility is much more important than eliminating redundancy, we should expect translators to explicitate much more often than to implicitate as far as the encoding of coreference relations is concerned.

5.3 Connective-based shifts

To begin with, Table 5.4 gives an overview of the additions, omissions, and substitutions of connectives identified in the corpus.

		Eng → Ger	Ger → Eng
explicitation	addition	114	48
	substitution	25	31
	TOTAL	139	79
implicitation	omission	32	51
	substitution	12	13
	TOTAL	44	64

Table 5.4: Cohesive shifts consisting in the addition, omission, or substitution of a connective

The table allows us to make the following observations:

Observation 1: The number of explicitations occurring in the direction English-German (139 instances) is disproportionately high.

Observation 2: Both translation directions exhibit a clear lack of explicitation-implicitation counterbalancing (139 explicitations Eng-Ger vs. 64 implicitations Ger-Eng; 79 explicitations Ger-Eng vs. 44 implicitations Eng-Ger).

Observation 3: Among the explicitations listed in the table, there are a lot more additions than substitutions in the direction English-German (114 additions vs. 25 substitutions). In contrast, explicitating substitutions are relatively frequent in the direction German-English (48 additions vs. 31 substitutions).

We are going to explain these observations in the following.

5.3.1 Additions and omissions of connectives

Qualitative analysis has identified five different triggers or motivations that lead to the addition and omission of connectives in the investigated corpus.[7] Translators add and omit connectives in order to:

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 following, I am going to present examples illustrating these five explicitation/implicitation triggers.

1. Complying with communicative norms

The following examples illustrate how translators sometimes insert and omit connective adverbs in order to comply with the communicative norms of the target language community:

[7] This section has been adapted from Becher (2011b). The text has been revised and expanded.

(105) 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.

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.

(106) Deshalb bleibt es unser Ziel, dass die AKTIE GELB und *damit* auch unser Unternehmen von den Kapitalmärkten wieder zutreffend bewertet werden.

That is why it is still our goal to make sure that the true value of Deutsche Post stock and of our company is captured by the capital markets again.

Why did the translator of (105) add the causal connective adverb *damit* 'thus'?[8] In a previous study using largely the same data as the present study, I found that causal connectives seem to be considerably more frequent in German than in English business texts (Becher 2009). The item *damit* was found to be particularly frequent, while English equivalents such as *thus* and *therefore* were found to hardly occur at all. This result is in line with previous studies on the language pair English–German which suggest that speakers of German make more extensive use of connectives than speakers of English (see Section A.1.2 of the appendix).

Thus, it should come as no surprise that English-German translators regularly add connectives, among them *damit*, which seems to be particularly popular among authors of German business texts. Conversely, we should expect German-English translators to reduce the number of connectives – in (106) – in order to make their translations conform to the communicative preferences of an Anglophone readership. Shifts such as the ones evidenced in (105) and (106) should be seen as resulting from translators' application of a cultural filter.

Here is another pair of examples that shows how the application of a cultural filter may lead to the addition and omission of connective adverbs in translations between English and German:

[8]Readers might wonder why I counted the addition of *damit* in (88) (discussed in Section 5.1.1 above) as a pronoun-based shift, while I treat (105) and (106) as connective-based shifts. The reason is that *damit* may function as a pronominal expression and as a connective, depending on context. Where *damit* has a concrete, nominal antecedent in the preceding discourse, I counted the item as a pronominal expression (paraphrase: 'with it'). Where *damit* encodes a semantic relation between states of affairs, propositions, or speech acts, I counted the item as a connective (paraphrase: 'thus, therefore'). I proceeded similarly with other multifunctional lexical items.

(107) As a company and as individuals, we do the right things and never compromise our values.

Als Unternehmen und als Einzelpersonen tun wir stets das Richtige und gefährden *dabei* niemals unsere Werte.

(108) Wir haben im Jahr 2000 begonnen, unsere Organisation produktübergreifend auf den Kunden auszurichten. "One Face to the Customer" heißt *dabei* das Ziel [. . .].

In 2000 we began realigning our organization and product groups toward our customers' needs. Our goal is to provide "one face to the customer" [. . .].

The translator of (107) has added the German connective adverb *dabei*, presumably in order to make the target text more explicit and thus more in line with the typical communicative preferences of German readers. This assumption is supported by examples such as (108), where the opposite shift was performed in the other translation direction, i.e. *dabei* has been omitted by the German-English translator. Note that although English does not have a connective corresponding exactly to *dabei* (Fabricius-Hansen and Behrens 2001: 28), possible translational equivalents would have been available to the translator of (108), such as *here*: *Our goal* here *is to provide. . .* However, in the present case an omission of *dabei* seems to be more in line with the communicative norms of English.

2. Exploiting features of the target language system

In this section, we will look at some examples which suggest that translators sometimes add connective adverbs in an effort to make full use of the syntactic and lexical features that the target language system has to offer.

(109) Medical Systems used it to open up a commanding technology lead in several diagnostic platforms [. . .].

Medical Systems *z.B.* hat dadurch seine technologische Führungsposition bei diversen Diagnosesystemen erlangt [. . .].

In (109), the translator has added the connective adverbial *zum Beispiel* 'for example' (abbreviated as *z.B.*) in a specifically German syntactic slot called the *Nacherstposition* ('after-first position') (Pasch et al. 2003: 71f). As the name of this syntactic position suggests, an element occupying the German *Nacherstposition* appears to be 'tagged on' to the first constituent of the sentence, since elements filling this syntactic slot are integrated into the sentence prosodically and syntactically (Breindl 2008).

The syntax of English, on the other hand, does not offer a *Nacherstposition*. Thus, the insertion of *for example* in the second position of the English source text sentence would either be ambiguous semantically (*Medical systems for example used it...*) or would require a prosodically weighty and syntactically disintegrated parenthetical (*Medical systems, for example, used it...*). From this, we see that the syntax of German, due to the availability of the *Nacherstposition*, allows a more flexible and elegant use of certain connective adverbs (see Pasch et al. 2003: 504ff) than the syntax of English. Thus, it should come as no surprise, especially in connection with the above-mentioned norm of cohesive explicitness in German, that English-German translators regularly exploit the availability of the *Nacherstposition* in German by adding a connective, as the translator of (109) has done.

Here is another example of a translator exploiting a syntactic slot offered by German that is not available in English:

(110) Product services consisted of less-exciting maintenance of our high-value machines – turbines, engines, medical devices and the like.

Produktbezogene Dienstleistungen umfassen *hingegen* ['in contrast, on the other hand'] weniger aufregende Aufgaben, z.B. die Wartung hochwertiger Maschinen wie etwa Turbinen oder medizinischer Geräte.

The translator of (110) has inserted the connective *hingegen* 'in contrast, on the other hand' right after the finite verb, a syntactic position that the grammar of English does not offer (cf. * *Product services consisted in contrast of less-exciting maintenance...* and * *Product services consisted of in contrast less-exciting maintenance...*). The availability of this position is representative of a more general contrast between English and German: While the rigid SV syntax of English makes it difficult at times to integrate adverbials into the syntactic frame of the sentence without interfering with information structure, the German sentence is capable of absorbing a multitude of optional adverbials without problems (Doherty 2002, Fabricius-Hansen 2007: 73).

Both English and German strive to follow the principles 'Given before New' and 'Balanced Information Distribution'. But German, due to its relatively free word order, has the better means to comply with these principles. (See Doherty 2001, 2002.) Example (110) illustrates this. If we try to insert *in contrast* (or a comparable one-word connective such as *however*) into the English source text sentence of (110), we note that no matter

where we put the connective, the discourse assumes a somewhat choppy quality, either because one of the above principles is violated or because the connective appears in a syntactic position that is prosodically and syntactically disintegrated (cf. e.g. *Product services, in contrast, consisted of...*).

The syntax of German, on the other hand, offers a prosodically integrated syntactic slot right behind the verb, where the insertion of a connective does not interfere with information-structural principles. Thus, it seems plausible to assume that it is this specific feature of German syntax that (in connection with the German preference for cohesive explicitness noted above) has 'invited' the translater of (110) to add *hingegen*. To put it somewhat informally, one of the reasons why the translator has added *hingegen* is: because he could.

The next example to be discussed here illustrates the case where a translator exploits a specific lexical feature of the target language in adding a connective, namely the connective itself:

(111) The bear market has undermined some investors' faith in stocks, but it has not reduced the need to save for the future.

Das Vertrauen einiger Anleger in Aktien hat *zwar* ['certainly'] angesichts der rückläufigen Börsenmärkte gelitten, aber der Gedanke der Zukunftssicherung bleibt weiterhin das Gebot der Stunde.

The connective adverb added in (111), *zwar*, does not have a direct equivalent in English. Its meaning can only be approximated by paraphrases such as 'certainly' or 'it is true that'. In German discourse, *zwar* has the specific function of serving as an optional precursor to a concessive connective, marking the conceded part of the concessive structure (König 1991). Thus, on encountering *zwar*, a German reader knows that a concessive connective has to follow (Primatarova-Miltscheva 1986). (If *zwar* is followed by a contrastive connective such as *aber*, as it is the case in (111), *zwar* has the additional semantic effect of imposing a concessive reading on the contrastive connective.) In this way, *zwar* serves as an (additional) marker of discourse structure, potentially easing processing for the reader (Becher 2011a).

In the investigated corpus, translators regularly add *zwar*, and this is everything but surprising: Since English source texts do not contain expressions that could possibly be translated by means of *zwar* (except, maybe, rare occurrences of *certainly*, *it is true that*, and the like), English-German translators who want to avoid 'translationese' and make their target texts conform to what is considered a good style of writing in German

have to insert the connective even in the absence of a source text trigger. In other words, it seems plausible to assume that English-German translators insert *zwar* simply in order to make use of the full potential of the German lexicon.

In this connection it has to be pointed out that the case of *zwar* is representative of a much more general contrast between English and German: German is a 'connective language', the Handbook of German Connectives (*Handbuch der deutschen Konnektoren*; Pasch et al. 2003) listing a total of 334 connectives (Waßner 2001) – an impressive number. I do not know of a comparable statistic for English,[9] but the number of connectives will be much lower for this language, not least because English has much fewer pronominal adverbs (such as *therefore*) than German (Becher 2010b).

This brings me to an important point. We witness here a neat correspondence between the communicative norms, the lexicon and the syntax of German: The communicative norms of German demand a high degree of cohesive explicitness, the German lexicon provides a multitude of connectives that speakers may use to comply with these norms, and the syntax of German offers a number of prosodically integrated syntactic slots that speakers may exploit to accommodate connectives elegantly. In combination, these three properties of German account for **Observation 1** made at the beginning of this section, namely the observation that explicitations are disproportionately frequent in the translation direction English-German.

Of course, there are also cases where the lexicon of English offers a connective that German lacks, but such cases are rare. Here is an example:

(112) Inzwischen werden konzernweit mehr als 1.000 Projekte bearbeitet, der Wissens- und Erfahrungstransfer innerhalb des Konzerns wird von Tag zu Tag intensiver [...].

With more than 1,000 projects now running throughout the Group, the exchange of knowledge and experience among Group companies is intensifying daily [...].

The German source text of (112) has two asyndetically connected clauses, which means that the reader has to infer the semantic relation between

[9] Halliday and Hasan (1976: 242f) list 122 examples of "conjunctive elements" available in English; Halliday and Matthiessen (2004: 542f) provide a list of 119 "conjunctive Adjuncts"; and Quirk et al. (1985: 634-636) list 144 "common conjuncts" for English. When comparing these figures to the number of German connectives given in the Handbook of German Connectives (334 items), it is important to note that the inclusion criteria used by the authors of the Handbook are much stricter than the ones used by the above-quoted authors writing on English. On the other hand, the latter authors did not aim for completeness in compiling their lists. Thus it remains unclear how far the statistics cited are comparable.

them (cf. Breindl and Waßner 2006). Readers of the English target text, on the other hand, have to do less inferential work, since the translator has inserted the connective *with*. I would argue that the translator has done this because she saw herself in a position where she could actually improve on the source text by exploiting a unique option of English lexicogrammar (the non-finite *with*-clause).

To see where this argument goes, let us try to back-translate the English target text sentence to German. First of all, we note that German does not have a connective equivalent in syntax and semantics to the English *with*-clause. We could try a connection with *während* 'while', but that would be too 'strong' a translation, since it would fix the semantic relation as one of (temporal or epistemic) Situation. The meaning of *with*, in contrast, is highly unspecific. The connective can encode a variety of semantic relations ranging from Similarity to Causation (cf. Quirk et al. 1985: 564). A Situating connective such as *während* does not reproduce the cohesive vagueness of *with*. Another thing we could try as a German equivalent of the English *with*-clause would be a paratactic connection by means of *und* 'and'. But that would be too 'weak' a translation, as *und* is even vaguer than *with*.

The brief discussion above is intended to illustrate that no matter what we do, we cannot reproduce the exact meaning of *with* in German. I do not want to digress into further discussion of possible German translation equivalents of the English *with*-clause. Rather, my point here is that the translator of (112) has managed to convey a meaning in the English target text that would be very difficult (if not impossible) to convey in German – by exploiting a 'typically English' lexicogrammatical item.

3. Dealing with restrictions of the target language system

In the previous section, we have seen that English-German translators regularly add a connective where the syntax of German offers the opportunity to do so – an opportunity that the author of the English source text in many cases did not have. Given the considerations on the syntax of English and German made above, we would expect that the opposite is the case in German-English translations, i.e. that German-English translators tend to omit connective adverbs that are difficult to accommodate syntactically. In the investigated data, this indeed happens regularly. Cf. the following examples:

(113) Um künftig *jedoch* ebenso erfolgreich zu sein wie bisher, werden neue Antworten verlangt.

In order to be just as successful in future as we are today, new answers have to be found.

(114) Ein großer Teil der künftigen Investitionen wird *zudem* nicht mehr zu einer weiteren Ausdehnung unseres Anlagevermögens führen [...].

In future the majority of investment will no longer be used for a further expansion of our fixed assets [...].

The translator of (113) has omitted *jedoch*, while the translator of (114) refrained from translating the connective *zudem*. Note that in both cases a suitable translational equivalent would have been available: *jedoch* may be translated as *however*, while *zudem* may be rendered as *moreover*, for example. Taking (113) as an example, let us evaluate the options that the translator had. As far as I can see, there are only three possible ways in which *however* could be used as a translation of *jedoch* in (113):

(113a) *However*, in order to be just as successful in future as we are today, new answers have to be found.

(113b) In order, *however*, to be just as successful in future as we are today, new answers have to be found.

(113c) In order to be, *however*, just as successful in future as we are today, new answers have to be found.

In (113a), *however* appears at the beginning of the sentence, an information-structurally highly prominent position that ascribes more informational value to the connective than would be appropriate in this context (cf. Doherty 2001). (113b) and (113c) are better in terms of information structure, but here *however* appears as a syntactically and prosodically disintegrated parenthesis, which gives the discourse a choppy, old-fashioned quality that seems inappropriate for the register at hand. These observations suggest that the omission of *jedoch* in (113) and *zudem* in (114) was triggered by a specific restriction of the target language system, namely the relative lack of syntactic slots for accomodating connective adverbs in English.

Having looked at two examples of implicitation triggered by restrictions of the target language system, let us now turn to explicitation, i.e. the addition of connectives with the aim of overcoming restrictions of the target language system. Qualitative analysis has shown that translators tend to add connectives when they face certain source language constructions that do not have a close equivalent in the target language. One of

these constructions is the English *ing*-adjunct, which regularly motivates explicitation in English-German translations (cf. Becher 2010c: 13). The following example illustrates this:

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

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.

The English source text sentence of (115) contains an *ing*-adjunct (*saving. . .*), a construction whose vague meaning covers a broad spectrum ranging from temporal sequence to concession (cf. Quirk et al. 1985: 1124). In this case, the construction invites a causal reading (see Behrens 1999 on how this may come about). And the translator is faced with a problem: The lexicogrammar of German does not offer a construction syntactically and semantically equivalent to the English *ing*-adjunct. The translator thus decides to 'promote' the *ing*-adjunct to a regular, finite main clause which she coordinates to the preceding clause by means of *und* 'and'.

In order to preserve the causal interpretation invited by the source text's *ing*-adjunct, the translator decides to add the causal/instrumental connective *dadurch* 'thus, in this way'. This is of course an explicitation, since the *ing*-adjunct does not have to be read as expressing Causation – although this is the most plausible reading. But what else could the translator have done? Not adding a connective such as *dadurch* would have resulted in a loss of linguistically-encoded meaning, so explicitation seems to be the most sensible option here (cf. König 2001: 325).

The above considerations suggest that the translator of (115) has added *dadurch* primarily in order to compensate for a restriction of German morphosyntax, namely the lack of a construction semantically comparable to the English *ing*-adjunct. (Conversely, German-English translators occasionally omit connectives such as *dadurch*, introducing an *ing*-adjunct that approximates the connective's meaning. I will not give an example of this inverse operation, which might be subsumed under the category "Exploiting features of the target language system".)

Before we move on, let us have a look at another example of an English-German translator adding a connective in order to explicitate the meaning of an *ing*-adjunct:

(116) Return on beginning shareholders' equity was 25 percent, exceeding our corporate goal of 20 percent for the 10th consecutive

year.

Die Eigenkapitalrendite zu Beginn der Rechnungsperiode betrug 25 Prozent und übertraf *damit* ['thus, in this way'] zum 10. aufeinander folgenden Jahr das uns gesetzte Ziel von 20 Prozent.

In (116) the *ing*-adjunct of the English source text may be said to encode the semantic relation of "elaboration", i.e. the adjunct may be taken to elaborate on the clause to which it is attached by expressing the same state of affairs from a different perspective (Behrens 1999). The English-German translator has reproduced this meaning of the *ing*-adjunct by choosing a coordinating construction and adding *damit*, which here is to be interpreted in its elaborating sense ('thus, in this way').

Let us now move on to the other translation direction. Here is an example of a compensating connective addition in the direction German-English:

(117) Wir haben eine überschaubare Zahl globaler Marken, auf deren Pflege wir uns konzentrieren. [...] Strategische Akquisitionsmöglichkeiten werden wir nutzen.

We have a manageable number of global brands, and we concentrate on managing and developing them. [...] We will *also* take advantage of opportunities for strategic acquisitions.

Why did the German-English translator of (117) add *also*? To answer this question, we need to have a close look at the word order of the German source text sentence. We see that the object of the sentence, *strategische Akquisitionsmöglichkeiten* 'opportunities for strategic acquisitions', comes first in the linear ordering of syntactic constituents. This is possible because German is not an SV (Subject–Verb) language like English, but what may be called an XV language: In German not only the subject, but almost any syntactic constituent (represented by "X") may precede the verb and thus form the first part of the sentence (see e.g. König and Gast 2009: 181). When another constituent than the subject precedes the verb in a German sentence (e.g. object, optional or obligatory adverbial, etc.), one speaks of *fronting* or *topicalization*, the fronted constituent being called a *sentence topic*, or simply *topic*. This syntactically determined notion of topic is not to be confused with the topic of a discourse, or *discourse topic* (see below).

When speakers of German topicalize a syntactic constituent, they generally do this for a specific pragmatic purpose. Büring (1999) distinguishes between three different kinds of sentence topics according to their pragmatic function: contrastive topics, partial topics and purely implicational

topics. In (117), we are dealing with a *partial topic*. The topicalization of the constituent preceding the verb here signals that the sentence topic forms part of a larger group of things to be talked about in the discourse. In other words, the topicalization signals that the sentence topic addresses only part of the overarching discourse topic. Cf. the following (fictional) discourse:

(118) Speaker A: Hast du den Abwasch gemacht, den Müll raus gebracht und deine Hausaufgaben gemacht?

Speaker B: Den Abwasch habe ich gemacht. Den Müll habe ich raus gebracht. Aber meine Hausaufgaben habe ich nicht gemacht.

English gloss: 'The dishes I washed. The garbage I took out. But my homework I did not do.'

English translation: I washed the dishes. I *also* took out the garbage. But I didn't do my homework.

In the little discourse given in (118), speaker A establishes the *discourse topic* 'things I told you to do' by asking a question. In her answer, speaker B uses a topicalized object (functioning as a partial topic) in every one of her three sentences. She uses partial topics in order to signal that each sentence answers only part of the discourse topic. Partial topics may thus be seen as a genuine cohesive device – akin to connectives. In English, topicalization is not available as a means of signaling that a sentence forms part of a list-like structure that addresses a single discourse topic. Thus, a proper English translation of speaker B's utterance either has to do without explicit topic management devices, or it can make use of a connective such as *also* which makes explicit that the sentence containing the connective forms part of a larger list-like complex addressing a single discourse topic. This is what the translator of (117) has done.

The discourse topic of (117) may be taken to be 'things that the company authoring the report intends to do', with each of the two sentences addressing one part of the discourse topic: First, the company plans to manage and develop its global brands; second, it wants to take advantage of opportunities for strategic acquisitions. In the German source text of (117), the fact that the second sentence (*Strategische Akquisitionsmöglichkeiten werden wir nutzen*) continues the discourse topic of the preceding one is marked by means of topicalization. The English-German translator, however, does not have access to this purely syntactic cohesive device. He has to stick with SV word order, but he inserts a connective (*also*) to prevent a loss of cohesion vis-à-vis the source text – a skilled translation choice perfectly justifiable by the English-German syntactic contrast

discussed above. We can thus say that the addition of a connective evidenced in (117) was performed by the translator in order to compensate for a 'missing' feature of the target language system. As the following examples show, the connective *also* is regularly employed for this purpose by German-English translators:

(119) Unser Ziel, mindestens 50% der Pkw- und Lkw-Reifenproduktion in Europa an Niedrigkostenstandorten zu fertigen, haben wir erreicht.

We have *also* achieved our goal of manufacturing at least 50% of European passenger and truck tire production at low-cost locations.

(120) Eine weitere Kooperation sind wir 2002 mit den japanischen Reifenherstellern XYZ und ABC eingegangen.

We *also* entered into another cooperation with the Japanese tire manufacturers XYZ and ABC in 2002.

(121) Ihnen, unseren Aktionärinnen und Aktionären, danken wir für das auch in schwierigen Zeiten XYZ entgegengebrachte Vertrauen.

We would *also* like to thank you, our shareholders, for the trust you have placed in XYZ even in difficult times.

4. Avoiding stylistically marked ways of expression

Several translation scholars have suggested that translations tend to be more "homogenous", "conventional", or "standardized" than non-translated texts, i.e. they tend to "gravitate towards the center of a continuum" and to "move away from extremes" (Baker 1996: 185f). Baker (1996) has referred to this hypothesized tendency of translators as "leveling out", Laviosa (1998) has used the term "convergence", and Toury (1995) assumes a "law of growing standardization" for translated text.[10] Indeed, there is some evidence suggesting that translations make use of more high-frequency words and less ad-hoc word coinages than non-translated texts (Laviosa 1998, Olohan 2004: 108ff). While I think it would be misleading to call leveling out a possible "translation universal",[11] the

[10]Cf. also Kenny's (1998) notion of "sanitization".

[11]Following Baker (1993, 1996), it has been repeatedly suggested that the tendency to stick to conventionalized patterns of language use might be a "universal" of translated language. However, as Pym has forcefully argued, this assumption is highly unrealistic and misleading. It makes much more sense to see the commonly observed tendency of translators to standardize as a result of a more fundamental tendency, namely the tendency to avoid risk (Pym 2008).

translators in my corpus, too, do exhibit a tendency to explicitate in order to make their texts comply with standard, conventional target language usage. Cf. the following examples:

(122) 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.

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

(123) Sie sind klar strukturiert, verfügen über eine flache Hierarchie und motivierte Mitarbeiter.

They are clearly structured *and* have flat hierarchies and motivated employees.

The English source text of (122) makes use of asyndesis as a – stylistically marked – rhetorical device intended to highlight three alleged capabilities of the company in question (*to compete – to balance – to earn*). The English-German translator, however, has turned asyndesis into syndesis by inserting *und* 'and', thus doing away with the rhetorical markedness of the text. It is plausible to assume that the translator's main aim behind this move was to make the target text appear more conventional or 'normal', in this way avoiding the risk of delivering a translation that does not gain the acceptance of clients or readers. The same seems to be true for (123).

5. Optimizing the cohesion of the target text

The data investigated were found to contain some instances of explicitation that could not be explained with recourse to the four explicitation triggers discussed above. But as I have argued in Section 2.5, this should not worry us at all, since we should expect to find such instances of explicitation in translated discourse. Let us begin by looking at a concrete example:

(124) This year of record performance by XYZ was not evident in the XYZ share price.

Diese außergewöhnlich gute Entwicklung von XYZ schlug sich *allerdings* ['however'] nicht im Kurs der Aktie nieder.

(125) Mit der Globalisierung der Märkte ist ein Verfahren nötig, mit dem Produkte weltweit angeboten werden können.

However the globalization of the markets means that a procedure is now necessary whereby products can be offered world-wide.

(126) Wir haben die notwendigen Maßnahmen eingeleitet, um auf mittlere Sicht auch im amerikanischen Pkw-Reifenbereich Gewinn zu erzielen

We *therefore* started the necessary steps for our American Passenger Tire operations to generate profits in the medium term.

While we might assume that the higher degree of explicitness conventional in German discourse is responsible for the explicitation evidenced in (124), an explanation in terms of cross-linguistic differences in communicative norms is not possible for (125) and (126), since here a connective has been 'anomalously' added in the direction German-English. We do not see an immediate reason why the translators of (125) and (126) have inserted *however* and *therefore*. But that does not need to worry us, since we should expect translators to add a connective once in a while.

The reason for this is that translators are mediators between cultures. Their job is to ensure understanding between the source text author and her target text readers. If understanding does not occur, clients and readers will tend to blame the translator for not having done his job properly. If the source text itself is not understandable, that is the translator's problem. Clients and target language readers often do not care about the source text, they just want an understandable translation, and if they do not get it, the translator has a problem. The task of the translator is thus characterized by a great deal of risk – the risk of losing clients, of getting complaints from target language readers, etc. (Pym 2005, 2008). It follows that translators will go to great lengths to ensure understanding, not hesitating to deviate from the source text where intelligibility could be improved (see Section 2.5). In particular, translators should not hesitate to add connectives.

To understand a text as an intentional communicative act means to recognize its *coherence*, i.e. to understand what every individual segment (e.g. sentence, paragraph, etc.) contributes to the overarching communicative purpose of the text, or "discourse purpose" (see Grosz and Sidner 1986 for some highly insightful considerations on how to define coherence). If a reader fails to see the connections between individual segments and the discourse purpose, the result is a failure to understand the text as a purposeful communicative event. Connectives are an important way of

making such connections explicit, a way of making the reader see the coherence of a text.

The view of translators as risk-avoiding mediators between cultures proposed by Pym (2005, 2008) and adopted here should make us expect that translators tend to be very concerned about *cohesion*, which may be defined as the overt marking of coherence relations (cf. Section 3.6). Consequently, it should come as no surprise that translators (a) insert cohesive devices – such as connective adverbs – more frequently than they leave them out and (b) insert connectives even in places where there is no specific trigger or motivation to do so (such as in (125) and (126)). **Observation 2** made at the beginning of this section is thus explained. (Translators' above-mentioned tendency to avoid stylistic markedness also contributes to explaining this observation.)

5.3.2 Substitutions of connectives

Let us begin with substitutions of connective adverbs in the direction English-German and then move on to the opposite translation direction. It was found that most of the connective substitutions identified in the direction English-German may be grouped with the first category established in the previous section, "Complying with communicative preferences". Cf. the following examples:

(127) *And* there is a proven link between economic development and advances in societal welfare and environmental improvement [. . .].

Gleichzeitig gibt es erwiesenermaßen einen Zusammenhang zwischen wirtschaftlicher Entwicklung, Fortschritten im gesellschaftlichen Wohlergehen und Verbesserungen im Umweltbereich – besonders in Entwicklungsländern.

(128) XYZ's mission has always been to connect customers with the information they need. *But* today there is more information to connect with than ever before [. . .].

Die Hauptaufgabe von XYZ bestand von Anfang an darin, eine Verbindung zwischen Kunden und den von ihnen benötigten Informationen herzustellen. *Allerdings* ist das Informationsangebot heutzutage größer als je zuvor [. . .].

In both (127) and (128), the English-German translator has substituted a semantically precise connective adverb for a semantically vague conjunction, namely *gleichzeitig* 'at the same time' for *and* in (127) and *allerdings* 'however' for *but* in (128).

And is as vague as a connective can be (cf. Lang 1991: 614f on the German equivalent *und*), encoding a semantic relation of similarity that may however be 'overinterpreted' by the hearer as a more informative semantic relation (e.g. causation). In a given utterance introduced by *and*, the hearer has to infer the semantic relation to the preceding disourse by drawing on general communicative maxims à la Grice (cf. Section 3.6.2). The translator of (127) has relieved the reader of inferentially working out the semantic relation between the target text sentence and the preceding discourse by substituting *gleichzeitig* for *and*. *Gleichzeitig* fixes the semantic relation in question to one of temporal Similarity, not allowing more informative readings. (For example, *gleichzeitig*, in contrast to *and*, may not be interpreted as expressing causality.)

The English source text of (128) contains the contrastive conjunction *but*, which may also be overinterpreted as encoding concession (Umbach and Stede 1999). (In (128), a concessive reading of *but* is the only plausible reading, since there is no potential contrast to be found between the sentence containing *but* and the preceding discourse.) The translator has made the encoding of the semantic relation in question more explicit by substituting *allerdings*, a contrastive connective adverb that does not allow a concessive reading (Breindl 2003: 81f).

Why are the connective explicitations evidenced in (127) and (128) to be seen as resulting from the application of a cultural filter? First, because German discourse tends to be more explicit than English discourse as far as the signaling of coherence relations is concerned (see Section A.1.2 of the appendix). It is thus not surprising that English-German translators increase the target text's degree of explicitness by substituting more explicit connectives for less explicit ones. Second, the sentence-initial use of *and* and *but* is strongly associated with Anglophone communicative conventions, since it engenders an informal, interactional, addressee oriented style as it is typical of English discourse. We should thus expect professional translators to mitigate the interactionality of the target text by substituting a less informal connective that is more in line with German communicative norms (see Baumgarten 2007 on *And* and Becher et al. 2009 on *But*).

In contrast to the shifts discussed above, there are also shifts that do not conform to translators' tendency to apply a cultural filter. However, such shifts are rare. Moreover, they only occur under specific conditions, as the following example illustrates:

(129) Each component of our business was evaluated *to* determine its potential to contribute to our global network and generate

shareholder value.

Jeder Geschäftsbereich wurde genau betrachtet *und* auf sein Potential zur Verbesserung unseres globalen Netzes und der Erzielung eines höheren Shareholder Value hin beurteilt.

Although the English source text of (129) has a final (= Conditional) connective, the connective *und* has been used by the translator. This is an anomalous shift given what we know about cultural filtering in English-German translations, but it was not performed without reason. A final subordinator such as *um... zu* '[in order] to' would have made the German translation stylistically awkward, because its elements *um* and *zu* would be separated by a lot of lexical material and a clustering of two particles near the end of the sentence would result (*hin zu*):

(129') Jeder Geschäftsbereich wurde genau betrachtet, *um* ihn auf sein Potential zur Verbesserung unseres globalen Netzes und der Erzielung eines höheren Shareholder Value hin *zu* beurteilen.

The example is intended to illustrate the observation that where translators diverge from the general rule of increasing (cohesive) explicitness in English-German translation, they do it for specific reasons.

Let us now turn to the translation direction German-English. Qualitative analysis has shown that German-English translators tend to substitute more explicit connectives for less explicit ones in a – somewhat questionable – effort to carry over all of the source text's linguistically encoded meaning to the target text. In order to do so, they do not even hesitate to translate pronominal adverbs that do not have an exact English equivalent by means of lengthy paraphrases. Cf. the following examples:

(130) *Hierzu* werden wir weiterhin erfolgreiche Markenpflege betreiben.

To this end we will continue to execute our successful strategy of brand development.

(131) *Damit* ist es uns gelungen [...] mit unserem Dienstleistungsangebot wieder neue Rekordzahlen zu erwirtschaften.

That is why [...] we again succeeded in generating new record figures with our service offering.

(132) *So* entfallen von den gesamten Sachinvestitionen des Automobilbereichs bis zum Jahr 2001 rund 58% auf die Werke in Deutschland.

> *This is illustrated by the fact that* some 58% of the total investments in tangible assets in the automotive sector through to the year 2001 will be in the plants in Germany.

Examples (130) to (132) are all alike in that they contain a German pronominal adverb that is difficult to translate into English, since the lexicon of the language does not feature a comparable item. On the one hand, we should expect from translators' tendency to apply a cultural filter that they simply leave out such connectives, since (a) they are difficult to translate elegantly and (b) their frequent use in the German source texts seems to collide with the Anglophone communicative norm of cohesive implicitness. On the other hand, we should expect translators to try and reproduce the meaning of the German pronominal adverbs in an effort to reduce communicative risk by optimizing the cohesion of the target text (cf. the preceding section). As the above examples illustrate, the second tendency wins out, i.e. translators' urge to avoid risk by spelling out semantic relations seems to be so strong as to actually override translators' urge to obey the communicative norms of the target language.

Thus, translators come up with some remarkably creative paraphrases when it comes to translating the pronominal adverbs of German, such as *this is illustrated by the fact that* as a translation of the German connective *so* (on which see Becher 2010b and House forthcoming). Recall that "linking constructions" such as the ones evidenced in (130) through (132) were counted as connectives since they serve to encode semantic relations between states of affairs, propositions, and speech acts (see Section 3.6.2). From the semantic perspective taken in the present study, *to this end* should be seen as a final connective, *that is why* as a causal connective, and *this is illustrated by the fact that* as a connective encoding the semantic relation of exemplification (cf. Halliday and Matthiessen 2004: 541f). All three linking constructions should be considered as explicitations, since they have a very specific meaning, while the pronominal adverbs they translate are rather vague semantically. For example, *damit* may be read as elaborating (paraphrase: 'in this way') or as causal (paraphrase: 'therefore'), while *that is why* only has a causal reading.

Almost all of the explicitating connective substitutions listed in Table 5.4 are of the type evidenced in examples (130) through (132). In other words, translators' effort to reproduce the German pronominal adverbs' meaning in English accounts for the relatively large number of explicitating connective substitutions in the direction German-English vs. the predominance of connective additions in the direction English-German (**Observation 3**).

5.4 Summary and conclusion

Cohesive explicitation and implicitation can result from many different lexicogrammatical and pragmatic factors (which will not be summarized here, since an exhausting list of factors will be given in Chapter 7). The factors responsible for the occurrence of a given instance of cohesive explicitation or implicitation can be difficult to determine. Nevertheless, qualitative analysis has succeeded in suggesting a number of plausible explanations for when and why translators perform cohesive shifts. The following list summarizes some recurrent explanations:

- Translators add and substitute pronominal and nominal material in order to increase textual cohesion, making it easier for the reader to identify and resolve coreference relations. Qualitative analysis suggests that translators do this in order to minimize the risk of misunderstanding and to comply with typical communicative preferences of target language readers.

- Connective adverbs are explicitated and implicitated by translators in order to (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, and (5.) optimize textual cohesion.

- Cohesive implicitations tend to be infrequent (in all investigated types of cohesive elements) because there is rarely a good reason for making the target text less cohesive than the source text. In contrast, there is often a good reason for performing cohesive explicitation, such as minimizing the risk of misunderstanding. This regularly results in explicitational asymmetry.

As the observations summarized above indicate, qualitative analysis has turned up a large number of – sometimes surprising – causes of cohesive explicitation (and implicitation). Some of these causes were difficult to identify, requiring in-depth analysis taking into account a variety of lexicogrammatical and pragmantic factors. Complex causes of this kind are likely to escape the attention of the researcher who is looking to verify an overly simplistic hypothesis such as the Explicitation Hypothesis. The results presented in this chapter show that even cases of explicitation that may seem enigmatic at first often do have distinct causes. Instead of invoking the putatively "translation-inherent" character of explicitation whenever an obvious explanation is not available, future studies should seek to

provide in-depth analyses of explicitating shifts taking into account all potentially relevant factors, such as the ones identified in the present chapter.

Chapter 6

Denotational shifts

The present chapter deals with explicitations and implicitations that affect the target text's degree of denotational explicitness. The denotational shifts that have been identified in the investigated corpus are listed in Table 6.1.

		Eng → Ger	Ger → Eng
explicitation	nouns	269	203
	adjectives	58	34
	adverbs	40	15
	TOTAL	367	252
implicitation	nouns	99	185
	adjectives	33	42
	adverbs	11	41
	TOTAL	143	268

Table 6.1: Denotational shifts across lexical/functional categories

The table shows that there is a general lack of explicitation-implicitation counterbalancing in both translation directions. However, there are cases where the lack of counterbalancing is particularly evident, which contrast with cases where counterbalancing is more pronounced, the extreme case being adverb-based shifts, where explicitations in the direction English-German (40 instances) are actually fully counterbalanced by implicitations in the direction German-English (41 instances). To find out which factors account for this diversified picture, Sections 6.1 through 6.3 will 'zoom in' on the individual rows of Table 6.1, submitting the shifts in question to detailed qualitative analysis. The final section (6.4) will then provide a brief summary of the most important findings.

6.1 Noun-based shifts

Since there is a multitude of reasons why translators explicitate and implicitate by adding, substituting and omitting nominal material, I decided to focus on the most important tendencies in this section. Thus, some highly interesting, but quantatively unimportant kinds of shifts will not be discussed in the following, such as the expansion of German nominal compounds by German-English translators (e.g. *Mobilbautentochter* → *subsidiary for container modules for use as temporary premises*).

6.1.1 Additions and omissions of nouns

Table 6.2 lists the additions and omissions of nominal material that have been identified in the investigated data.

	Eng → Ger	Ger → Eng
addition	136	100
omission	65	77

Table 6.2: Denotational shifts consisting in the addition or omission of nominal material

The table allows us to make the following two observations:

Observation 1: Overall, the findings exhibit a marked lack of explicitation-implicitation counterbalancing (136 additions Eng-Ger vs. 77 omissions Ger-Eng; 100 additions Ger-Eng vs. 65 omissions Eng-Ger).

Observation 2: There is a disproportionately large number of nominal additions in the direction English-German (136 instances).

We are going to explain these observations in the following.

Qualitative analysis has identified three situations, or types of situations, in which translators tend to add or omit nominal material. We will discuss them in turn.

1. First of all, my data indicate that translators tend to add nouns in order to fill argument slots of nouns and verbs. Cf. the following examples:

(133) [. . .] Know what the company vision and values are and actively play my part.

[. . .] Die Unternehmens-Vision und -Werte zu kennen und aktiv *zur Umsetzung* beizutragen

(134) Für Ihr Vertrauen danke ich Ihnen.

I thank you for your continuing confidence *in our Company*.

Nouns and verbs both take arguments. For example, we say that *A plays a part in B*, or *X's confidence in Y*, where the variables *A*, *B*, *X*, and *Y* denote argument slots that may be filled by lexical material (prototypically nouns). In certain circumstances, namely when a verbal or nominal argument may be assumed to be inferable by the reader, the associated argument slot may remain unfilled (provided that grammar allows this, i.e. the filling of the argument slot is optional). Thus, in the English source text of the above examples, a verbal argument (133) and a nominal argument (134) have been omitted. The translators of (133) and (134) have filled the empty argument slots by adding the prepositional phrases *zur Umsetzung* and *in our Company*. (Recall that in the present study, the term *noun-based* does not only mean shifts on the level of the noun phrase, but also refers to additions, omissions, and substitutions of prepositional phrases, which are largely made up of nominal material; see Section 3.7.1.)

The tendency of translators to fill nominal and verbal argument slots, which can be regularly observed in the investigated data, is not difficult to explain given what we have discussed in Section 2.5 (and observed in the previous chapter). The goal of expository prose is to provide a comprehensible description of states of affairs. An expository text can be considered as good if it enables the reader to build up a representation of these states of affairs in her knowledge. Translators of expository prose are essentially paid for extending the target audience of an expository text. Thus, their success is measured by the extent to which readers manage to understand the target text, or more precisely: to build up a cognitive representation of the states of affairs expressed by the target text. As a result, it should not surprise us that translators – when in doubt – tend to be rather too explicit than too implicit when determining which participants (= arguments) of a given state of affairs should be verbalized and which ones should be left implicit. For translators, being explicit means avoiding risk.

As the following example shows (cf. also example (41) discussed in Section 3.7.1), argument omissions also occur in the investigated data:

(135) XYZ's Family Relationship Program has helped *people* get answers to questions and access resources.

Mit dem Family-Relationship-Programm hat XYZ geholfen, Fragen zu klären und Zugang zu Ressourcen zu öffnen [. . .].

However, argument omissions were found to be considerably less frequent than the corresponding additions, which is to be expected from the

considerations made above.

2. Another tendency represented in the corpus is the noun-based verbalization of additional states of affairs that are inferable from the context. Cf. the following examples:

(136) These financial statements are the responsibility of the Company's management.

Das Management der Gesellschaft ist für die *Erstellung* dieser Jahresabschlüsse verantwortlich.

(137) Vorstand und Aufsichtsrat nehmen die positive Geschäftsentwicklung zum Anlass, der Hauptversammlung eine gegenüber dem Vorjahr erhöhte Dividende [...] vorzuschlagen.

Based on the positive business trend, the Board of Management and Supervisory Board propose to the Annual General Meeting *the payment of* an increased dividend [...].

In (136), the translator has added the noun *Erstellung*, which makes explicit in what way the company's management is responsible for *these financial statements*: The management is responsible for preparing them. In doing so, the translator has verbalized an additional state of affairs – `prepare (management, financial statements)` – that is implicated, but not overtly expressed by the source text. Example (137) has already been discussed in Section 3.7.1.

It is interesting to note that there are no examples of implicitations involving this kind of shift. Our brief discussion above has already provided a plausible reason for this: Translators of expository prose have good reasons for increasing explicitness, but there is little that might motivate them to decrease explicitness. Thus, a translator back-translating the German target text of (136) to English, for example, will have no reason for omitting *Erstellung*, especially since salient equivalents of this noun are available in English (e.g. *preparation* or *preparing*).

The lack of motivation to perform implicitations in the two cases just discussed – (a) the filling of argument slots and (b) the verbalization of inferable states of affairs – explains **Observation 1** made at the beginning of this section, namely the observation that there is a marked lack of explicitation-implicitation counterbalancing in both translation directions.

3. While the two cases discussed above occur across translation directions, the third case to be discussed here concerns a rather 'unidirectional' type of shift, where nouns are added in the direction English-German but tend to be omitted in the direction German-English. The high frequency of

this type of shift accounts for our **Observation 2**, namely the observation that explicitations are disproportionately frequent in the translation direction English-German. To name an example of this kind of shift, English-German translators routinely add the noun *Jahr* 'year' to numerals denoting dates:

(138) In 2000, this number will be $17 billion.

Im *Jahr* 2000 wird dieser Servicebereich die $17 Mrd. Marke erreichen.

(139) If the events of 2001 have taught us anything, it's that predicting the future is a very tricky proposition.

Wenn uns die Ereignisse des *Jahres* 2001 etwas gelehrt haben, so ist es die Lektion, dass das Vorhersagen der Zukunft eine äußerst riskante Angelegenheit ist.

(140) Although these savings will begin in 2002 [. . .]

Obwohl bereits im *Jahr* 2002 mit derartigen Einsparungen gerechnet werden kann [. . .]

It is easy to see why translators do this. The translator of (138) might have translated *In 2000 wird dieser Servicebereich. . .* , but the use of the preposition *in* with dates is considered as an "annoying anglicism"[1] by German prescriptivists. The 'correct', preposition-less version would be: *2000 wird dieser Servicebereich. . .* , but this version sounds a bit awkward because the bare numeral introducing the sentence is difficult to parse syntactically. Thus, the translator of (138) has decided to add the noun *Jahr*. Similar considerations apply to examples (139) and (140).

The analysis of the opposite translation direction has shown that German-English translators are surprisingly good at performing the opposite kind of shift, i.e. they regularly omit the noun *Jahr* in this context. This can be nicely observed in the following introductory passages taken from three different corpus texts (by three different companies):

(141) Sehr geehrte Damen und Herren, *das Jahr* 1999 war für die XYZ-Gruppe ein sehr erfolgreiches Jahr.

Ladies and Gentlemen, 1999 was a very successful year for the XYZ Group.

[1]See `http://www.spiegel.de/kultur/zwiebelfisch/0,1518,311727,00.html` [last accessed 2010-12-07].

(142) Liebe Aktionärinnen, liebe Aktionäre, *das Jahr* 2000 war für den Konzern XYZ ein einzigartiges und sehr erfolgreiches Jahr.

Dear Shareholders, 2000 was a unique and exceptionally successful year for XYZ.

(143) Liebe Aktionärinnen und Aktionäre, XYZ hat im *Geschäftsjahr* ['fiscal year'] 1999 seine positive Entwicklung fortgesetzt.

Dear Shareholders, XYZ continued its positive performance in 1999.

As examples (141) through (143) indicate, there is some explicitation-implicitation counterbalancing to be observed in this case. The same is the true for the noun *Bereich* 'area', which is regularly added to English-German translations, but omitted in German-English translations, as the following pair of examples illustrates:

(144) New consumer demands and dramatic advances in automotive technology [...]

Neue Kundenerwartungen und dramatische Veränderungen im *Bereich* der Automobiltechnologie [...]

(145) Der Umsatz von XYZ liegt mit rund 70% im *Bereich* Sicherheits- und Fahrwerkelektronik.

About 70% of XYZ's sales are generated in safety and chassis electronics.

Although *Veränderungen in der Automobiltechnologie* would have been a possible rendition of *advances in automotive technology*, the translator of (144) has decided to add the noun *Bereich*. The reason for this seems to be that the use of *Bereich* in this context is very popular in German business texts. Accordingly, English-German translators regularly add *Bereich*, while German-English translators tend to omit the item. Note that in (145) a direct translation of *Bereich* would have been possible (cf. e.g.: *in the area of safety and chassis electronics*), but the translator has decided to omit the noun, most probably in order to comply with the communicative preferences of the Anglophone target audience.

In sum, both in the case of *Jahr* and *Bereich*, we see a tendency to counterbalance English-German additions by German-English omissions, which seems to be driven by translators' urge to observe the communicative conventions of the target register, i.e. to apply a cultural filter. However, as the following examples show, the counterbalancing is far from perfect, i.e. translators do not implicitate as often as they could:

(146) Die einschneidenden Restrukturierungsmaßnahmen haben *im Geschäftsjahr* 2001 zu einer erheblichen Belastung des Ergebnisses und des Cash Flow geführt.

The drastic restructuring measures posed a considerable burden on earnings and cash flow *in fiscal year* 2001.

(147) Hohes Wachstumspotenzial liegt im *Bereich* Chassiselektronik.

The chassis electronics *area* offers considerable opportunities for growth [...].

The translator of (146) has translated *im Geschäftsjahr 2001* as *in fiscal year 2001*, although the more implicit variant *in 2001* would be more in line with the communicative conventions of the English business register, as examples (138) through (143) indicate. Similarly, the noun *area* could have been omitted in (147): *Chassis Electronics offers considerable opportunities for growth* (cf. (145)).

Why do translators sometimes 'fail' to implicitate in the third category of shifts discussed here? Nouns such as *Jahr*/*Geschäftsjahr* and *Bereich* are not very salient to the translator. They do not pose a translation problem that would require a creative solution. Thus, translators will only omit these nouns if they specifically watch out for them in the source text. Translators who do not watch out for these nouns will tend to render them using equivalent nouns in English. Moreover, even translators who do try to get rid of redundant nouns such as *Jahr* and *Bereich* might overlook some exponents of this group. This explains the lack of explicitation-implicitation counterbalancing in the present type of shift (and, along with what has been said under 1. and 2. above, accounts for **Observation 1**).

6.1.2 Substitutions of nouns

Table 6.3 shows the frequency of explicitating and implicitating substitutions that have been counted in the corpus.

	Eng → Ger	Ger → Eng
explicitation	133	103
implicitation	34	108

Table 6.3: Explicitating vs. implicitating substitutions of nouns

The table allows us to make the following observations:

Observation 1: Explicitations are a lot more frequent than implicitations in the translation direction English-German (133 explicitations vs. 34 implicitations). German-English translators are surprisingly good at performing implicitating shifts, almost achieving explicitational symmetry (133 explicitations Eng-Ger vs. 108 implicitations Ger-Eng).

Observation 2: Still, there is a lack of explicitation-implicitation counterbalancing in both translation directions.

The observations will be explained in the following discussion of qualitative results.

The main tendency to be noted in the substitution of nouns is that the German authors represented in the corpus tend to use rather explicit terms for denoting entities, whereas the terminology found in the English part of the corpus is characterized by a considerable degree of implicitness. This tendency holds for both non-translated and translated texts. That is, translators of both translation directions consistently apply a cultural filter mediating between the terminological explicitness conventional in German business texts and the terminological implicitness customary in English business writing. This is evidenced by pairs of examples such as (148)/(149) and (150)/(151):

(148) This *report* covers our first full year since the creation of XYZ [...].

Dieser *Geschäftsbericht* umfaßt das erste vollständige Jahr seit der Gründung von XYZ.

(149) Über das außerordentlich positive Echo auf den letztjährigen *Geschäftsbericht* [...] haben wir uns gemeinsam mit Ihnen gefreut.

Like you, we were delighted by the extraordinarily positive response to last year's *report* [...].

(150) For that, we owe a great deal to our *people* all around the world [...].

Für diesen Erfolg danken wir unseren *Mitarbeiterinnen und Mitarbeitern* in der ganzen Welt.

(151) Mit einer massiven Lernoffensive haben wir unsere *Mitarbeiter* in der Produkt- und Systemwelt der neuen XyzBank trainiert.

In a major training initiative, we taught our *people* to master the product and system environment at the new XyzBank [...].

When looking up the word *Geschäftsbericht* in a dictionary, one is most likely to find *annual report* as its English equivalent. However, as my corpus data suggest, Anglophone authors scarcely use this term; they almost exclusively use the more implicit expression *this report*. This is in marked contrast to authors of German business texts, who almost never say *Bericht* 'report', but generally use the full term *Geschäftsbericht*. This cross-linguistic register difference is reflected in the pair of examples (148)/(149). Translators seem to be aware of the communicative preferences of Anglophone and German readers and apply a cultural filter accordingly. Thus, the translator of (148) has converted the rather implicit term *report* into its more explicit counterpart *Geschäftsbericht*, while the translator of (149) has performed the opposite shift.

Similarly, possible formal English equivalents of *Mitarbeiter/in* would be *employee* or *staff member*. However, the investigated data indicate that English business authors – as well as German-English translators of business texts – prefer the more implicit term *people*, which, given the right context, may be easily inferred to refer to the staff of a company. Shifts caused or motivated by this cross-linguistic register difference are very frequent in the investigated data and are illustrated by the pair of examples (150)/(151).

The pairs (148)/(149) and (150)/(151) are but examples of a massive tendency towards denotational implicitness found in the English business texts, which stands in striking contrast to the German business authors' marked preference for explicit terminology. In fact, 'bidirectional pairs' of the type evidenced in the above examples, where an implicit English term is routinely translated by a more explicit German term – and vice versa – are so frequent that I cannot give examples of all of them. Instead, Table 6.4 lists some of the most frequent of these terminological pairs. Note that each of the English terms listed in the table has at least one more explicit synonym (for example, *activity* has the more explicit synonym *business activity*), which, however, tends to be dispreferred vis-à-vis the more implicit variant. This shows that the contrast in explicitness noted above is not due to lexical differences between English and German, but to different sets of communicative norms.

English term		German term
(this) report	↔	*Geschäftsbericht*
(our) people	↔	*Mitarbeiter/innen*
field	↔	*Geschäftsfeld*
division, business	↔	*Geschäftsbereich*
operations	↔	*Geschäft*
value	↔	*Wertschöpfung*
sales	↔	*Umsatzvolumen*
share	↔	*Stückaktie*
organization	↔	*Unternehmen*
activity	↔	*Geschäftstätigkeit*
...		...

Table 6.4: List of terminology typically employed in English and German business texts (where "↔" means "typically translates" as well as "typically translated by")

The strong tendency of English-German as well as German-English translators to use terminological pairs such as the ones listed in Table 6.4, i.e. their consistent application of a cultural filter mediating between the communicative conventions of English and German business texts, explains our **Observation 1**, namely the observation that explicitations are disproportionately frequent in the translation direction English-German, while German-English translators are surprisingly good at performing the corresponding implicitations. Moreover, my findings confirm House's (1997) generalization that German speakers tend towards higher degrees of denotational explicitness than speakers of English (see Section A.1.2 of the appendix).

What about the other observation made at the beginning of this section? Why is there an overall lack of explicitation-implicitation counterbalancing (Observation 2) – in spite of translators' strong tendency to apply a cultural filter? This is due to the following two tendencies:

1. German-English translators do not always succeed at substituting a more implicit English term when they encounter one of the German terms listed in Table 6.4. The most probable reason for this is that exponents of these German terms occasionally escape the translators' attention.

2. Irrespective of the tendency to apply a cultural filter noted above, translators of both translation directions display a general tendency

to maximize denotational explicitness by using more precise terms than the source text. In contrast, they rarely implicitate by substituting less precise terms.

These two tendencies, which will be elaborated in the following, explain our **Observation 2**. The following examples illustrate the first of the two tendencies:

(152) [. . .] wie in diesem *Geschäftsbericht* präsentiert.

[. . .] as is outlined in this *Annual Report*.

(153) Wir danken allen *Mitarbeiterinnen und Mitarbeitern* für ihre Leistung und ihr Engagement im abgelaufenen Jahr.

We would like to express our appreciation to all our *employees* for their efforts and commitment in the past year.

In (152) the translator has rendered the source text term *Geschäftsbericht* as *Annual Report* in the English translation, although the more implicit expression *this report* is used much more commonly in English business writing. Similarly, the translator of (153) has used the term *(our) employees* to translate the source text expression *Mitarbeiterinnen und Mitarbeitern*, although in this context *our people* would have been a more adequate choice given the communicative norms of the English business register.

The second tendency noted above is illustrated by the following two examples:

(154) Sehr geehrte Aktionäre, das vergangene Geschäftsjahr 1998/99 hat unser *Unternehmen* mit großem Erfolg abgeschlossen.

Dear Shareholders, our *Group of companies* has brought the financial year 1998/99 to a very successful close.

(155) Deshalb wollen wir unseren Mitarbeiterinnen und Mitarbeitern das *Umfeld* und die Anreize bieten, die für optimale Leistungen notwendig sind.

Therefore, we want to offer our employees the *working environment* and incentives which they need to be able to excel.

In (154), the German source text term *Unternehmen* 'company' has been translated as *Group of companies*, a more explicit expression that has been used for no obvious reason. Similarly, *Umfeld* 'environment' has been translated as *working environment* in (155), although *environment* would have worked as well. The tendency to increase the target text's degree of

denotational explicitness as compared to the source text is also observed in the English-German part of the investigated corpus, where *fluid sampling* is translated as *Ölprobennahme* 'oil sampling', *performance* as *Gesamtleistung* 'overall performance', etc.

Why do translators display this striving for precision? The answer to this question should sound rather familiar by now (cf. Section 6.1.1): I assume that translators regularly explicitate by substituting more precise terms because they want to avoid risk. It is easy to see how imprecision is associated with risk in expository prose. If the translator of (154) had translated *Unternehmen* as *company*, for example, readers might complain that the entity responsible for the report in question is not a company, but a group of companies. That the source text, too, says *Unternehmen* and not *Unternehmensgruppe* 'group of companies' is a fact that will be unknown to most target text readers. Thus, a translator who tends to replace rather implicit terms by more precise terms can be assumed to follow a strategy of risk avoidance, a strategy that is likely to cause explicitational asymmetry. If such a strategy gets automated, it may lead to an overuse of explicitating nominal substitutions and thus to an even more pronounced lack of explicitation-implicitation counterbalancing.

6.2 Adjective-based shifts

The adjective-based denotational shifts identified in the corpus are listed in Table 6.5.

		Eng → Ger	Ger → Eng
explicitation	addition	50	29
	substitution	8	5
	TOTAL	58	34
implicitation	omission	32	40
	substitution	1	2
	TOTAL	33	42

Table 6.5: Denotational shifts consisting in the addition, omission, or substitution of an adjective

The table allows us to make the following observations:

Observation 1: There are more explicitations in the direction English-German than in the direction German-English (58 instances Eng-Ger vs. 34 instances Ger-Eng).

Observation 2: Explicitations in the direction English-German are not counterbalanced by implicitations in the direction German-English (58 explicitations vs. 42 implicitations).

Observation 3: In contrast, explicitations in the direction German-English *are* counterbalanced by implicitations in the direction English-German (34 explicitations vs. 33 implicitations).

We are going to explain these observations in the following. Note that I will mention adjective-based substitutions only in passing due to the rarity of this kind of shift.

6.2.1 Additions, omissions, and substitutions of adjectives

Let us begin by looking at the translation direction English-German. As shown in Section A.1.2 of the appendix, studies indicate that German discourse generally tends towards a higher degree of denotational explicitness than English discourse. Employing this generalization to explain why English-German translators explicitate can be a bit dangerous, because it lends itself to functioning as a lazy, passe-partout explanation when in fact other, more subtle factors are really at work. Still, my findings regarding adjective-based shifts clearly show that English-German translators exhibit a remarkably strong tendency to increase denotational explicitness which (a) can be observed independently of other factors and (b) is so strong that translators do not even shy away from introducing a considerable degree of redundancy to the German target text. The following examples illustrate this:

(156) They [viz. customers, VB] want it tailored to their needs and tastes.

Er [viz. der Kunde, VB] will ein Fahrzeug, das genau auf seinen *persönlichen* Geschmack und seine *jeweiligen* Bedürfnisse zugeschnitten ist.

(157) [. . .] to create momentum for the initiative.

[. . .] der Initiative *neuen* Schwung zu verleihen.

(158) When it does not, we take action.

Ist dies nicht der Fall, leiten wir *entsprechende* Maßnahmen ein.

The translator of (156) has increased denotational explicitness by adding two adjectives, *persönlichen* 'personal' and *jeweiligen* 'respective'. It is remarkable that both of these adjectives make a highly redundant, almost

pleonastic impression, because it is obvious that tastes vary across individuals – which is the only information that *persönlichen* and *jeweiligen* provide us with. Thus, from an Anglophone perspective, the two adjectives are not informative enough to qualify for inclusion. This is why an English back-translation of the German sentence, *They want it tailored to their personal needs and respective tastes*, would be bad stylistically. Examples (157) and (158) are similar. *Neuen* 'new' in (157) and *entsprechende* 'corresponding' in (158) are again highly redundant from an Anglophone point of view (albeit to different degrees: While *new momentum* would be OK stylistically, *we take the corresponding measures* seems overly explicit from an English perspective). However, this did not prevent the German translators of the examples to add these adjectives.

Since lexicogrammatical factors clearly do not play a role here and an explanation in terms of communicative risk does not seem to make much sense either (due to the low degree of informativeness of the added adjectives), the only plausible explanation for the shifts evidenced in (156), (157), and (158) is that English-German translators tend to increase denotational explicitness in order to comply with German communicative conventions. This idea, which explains our observation that explicitations are much more frequent than implicitations in the direction English-German (**Observation 1**), is supported by the additional observation that German-English translators in the investigated data tend to omit adjectives of low informational value. This is illustrated by the following examples:

(159) Es ermöglicht allen Partnern den Zugriff auf die *jeweiligen* EDV-Systeme der übrigen Mitglieder.

This gives all the Alliance partners access to the IT systems of the other members.

(160) Damit einher gehen die Stärkung der Verantwortlichkeit der *einzelnen* Geschäftsfelder sowie ein konsequentes Portfolio Management.

[...] which means increasing the responsibility of business units and making systematic portfolio management a priority.

In (159) and (160), *jeweiligen* and *einzelnen* have been omitted by the translators, although English equivalents of these adjectives are available. (*Einzelnen* could, for example, be translated as *individual*.) The examples illustrate that German-English translators, too, tend to apply a cultural filter which, in this case, decreases denotational explicitness to comply with typical communicative preferences of Anglophone readers. This can also

be observed in the following example of an implicitating adjective-based substitution, where two semantically weak adjectives are 'collapsed' into one:

(161) Gleichzeitig war diese Auszeichnung eine Herausforderung für uns, den vorliegenden Bericht ebenso *informativ und lesenswert* zu gestalten.

At the same time, the award acted as a spur to make this year's report just as *good*.

To say that a report is *good* implicates that the report is *informativ und lesenswert* 'informative and worth reading', and the English translator of (161) has made use of this fact to reduce denotational explicitness in the target text, in line with Anglophone communicative conventions.

Although German-English translators tend to reduce denotational explicitness, they do not do so consistently. The following example illustrates this:

(162) Damit ist es uns gelungen, in einem Jahr, das geprägt war von Krisen und konjunktureller Schwäche, mit unserem Dienstleistungsangebot *wieder neue* Rekordzahlen zu erwirtschaften.

That is why, in a year that was dominated by crisis and a weak economy, we *again* succeeded in generating *new* record figures with our service offering.

The translator of (162) has rendered *wieder* as *again* and *neue* as *new*, although it would have been preferable to omit *neue*, since the meaning of the adjective is implicated by *again*, which makes the English translation sound redundant. A version without *new*, where redundancy has been eliminated, sounds a lot better and would be preferred by most Anglophone readers: *We again succeeded in generating record figures*.

Why did the translator of (162) 'fail' to omit *new*? Maybe she simply overlooked the possibility of doing so. It seems plausible to assume that German-English translators occasionally overlook opportunities to implicitate. This may be taken as an explanation of our **Observation 2**, namely the observation that English-German explicitations are not counterbalanced by German-English implicitations. But is this a real explanation? Are English-German translators not equally likely to miss opportunities to explicitate? No, I would say they are not. It tends to be easier in translation to add something than to take something away (cf. Section 2.7). English-German translators can explicitate pretty much everywhere they want to: Almost any sentence offers the opportunity to add a semantically

weak adjective such as *neue*, *jeweilige*, *entsprechende*, or the like. In contrast, it is much harder for German-English translators to implicitate, since they can only do so when they spot an adjective in the German source text that qualifies for omission. We should expect them to overlook such adjectives once in a while.

Before we move on to explaining Observation 3, I would like to discuss another kind of explicitating shift characteristic of the translation direction English-German, which, however, does not contribute to explaining Observation 2. The reason for this is that shifts of this kind are caused, or rather motivated, by syntactic differences between English and German and are thus of a highly symmetric nature. Consider the following example:

(163) We are a global leader, and we already have the tools and people in place to achieve our goals in 2002 and the years to come.

Wir sind ein globaler Marktführer und verfügen über die erforderlichen Mittel und Mitarbeiter, um die uns für 2002 und die Jahre danach *gesetzten* Ziele zu erreichen.

Why did the translator of (163) add *gesetzten* 'set'? My answer would be: in order to optimize information structure. In my following justification of this answer, I will draw strongly on the work of Monika Doherty (e.g. 2002, 2006), who has insightfully pointed out that for syntactic reasons (which are too complex to be explained here) English is a mid-focus language while German is an end-focus language. In other words, speakers of English expect the focus earlier in the sentence than German speakers.

In line with this principle, the focused part of the English source text of (163) – *our goals* – does not appear at the end of the sentence, but is followed by an informationally less important element, *in 2002 and the years to come*. In the German target text, on the other hand, this latter element has been moved to the front (*für 2002 und die Jahre danach* 'for 2002 and the years to come'), so that the focus *Ziele* 'goals' appears as far to the right of the sentence as possible. Doherty (and I) would argue that this was done by the translator to secure optimal processing in an end-focus language. However, this change also made it necessary to add the adjective *gesetzten* as a syntactic 'anchor point' of *für 2002 und die Jahre danach* – without this anchor point, the prepositional phrase would not be able to serve as a premodifier of *Ziele*. From this perspective, the addition of *gesetzten* in (163) should be regarded as a 'side-effect' of the translator's effort to optimize information structure, which is subject to different constraints in English and German.

While English-German translators tend to perform adjectival additions such as the one just discussed, analysis of the opposite translation direction has shown that German-English translators tend to omit adjectives for the same, viz. information-structural, reasons. Consider the following example:

(164) Gemeinsam mit XYZ entwickeln wir eine hochwertige, *international einsetzbare* Standardsoftware für Banken.

Together with XYZ, we are also developing a cutting-edge standard software package for banks.

Doherty (2006: 101f) has argued that adjective phrases imply greater informativeness than prepositional phrases in English, while things are the other way round in German, where prepositional phrases are informationally more prominent than adjective phrases. (This is an indirect consequence of syntactic differences between English and German that I cannot elucidate here.) I assume that this (hypothesized) contrast accounts for the omission of *international einsetzbare* performed in (164). In the German source text, the focus of the sentence is on *eine hochwertige, international einsetzbare Standardsoftware für Banken* 'a cutting-edge, internationally deployable standard software for banks'. Inside this focused phrase, the prepositional postmodifier *für Banken* 'for banks' (telling us what the software is good for) clearly verbalizes more important information than the adjectival premodifier *international einsetzbare* 'internationally deployable', which only gives us additional information on where the software can be deployed. This distribution of information is in line with the abovementioned principle that prepositional phrases tend to carry more informational weight than adjective phrases in German.

However, since things are the other way round in English, the translator of (164) faces a dilemma: No matter how she translates *international einsetzbare*, the distribution of information inside the target text sentence will turn out to be suboptimal. If she chooses the rather 'literal' translation *internationally deployable standard software package for banks*, the premodifying adjective phrase ends up as more prominent than the (informationally more important) prepositional modifier *for banks*. We thus get the impression of a noun phrase that is overloaded with information. If the translator moves the adjective phrase past the head noun *standard software*, it would lead to a 'garden path effect': In *standard software package for banks deployable internationally*, the adjective phrase *deployable internationally* may be temporarily mistaken as a modifier of *banks*, resulting in processing difficulties. A relative clause such as *that can be deployed internationally* would

lead to the same problem, as well as all other possibilities to translate *international einsetzbare* that come to mind. The translator of (164) thus decided to omit the (contextually inferable) adjective phrase, a decision perfectly justifiable by the information-structural considerations just made.

The somewhat lengthy discussion of (163) and (164) offered above is intended to avoid the false impression that differences in communicative norms are the only factor determining the addition and omission of adjectives in translations between English and German. (However, shifts triggered by information-structural differences between the two languages are necessarily symmetric in nature, so that they cannot contribute to explaining our Observation 2.) What I also want to emphasize in this connection is that the cultural perspective taken in the discussion of examples (156) through (158) and the information-structural perspective taken in the discussion of examples (163) and (164) need not exclude each other. There may well be adjective-based shifts where both cultural and information-structural considerations have motivated the translator to explicitate or implicitate.

Let us now turn to Observation 3 formulated at the beginning of this section: that German-English explicitations are actually counterbalanced by the corresponding implicitations in the direction English-German. To explain this observation, we have to determine the reasons that lead German-English translators to perform adjective-based explicitations. The following examples illustrate the most important of these reasons:

(165) enhanced *home-based* networking features

verbesserte Netzwerkfeatures

(166) a one-box, one-service *enhanced* TV solution

eine one-box, one-service TV-Lösung

(165) and (166) highlight the impressive capability of the English language to create new adjectives *ad hoc* which can be hard or even impossible to reproduce in German. In (165), the translator has omitted the adjective *home-based*. Possible ways of translating this adjective to German would be *für die Anwendung zu Hause* 'for home use' or a nominal compound such as *Heimnetzwerkfeatures* 'home networking features'. Both solutions are suboptimal stylistically, which seems to be the reason why the translator has decided to omit *home-based*.

In (166) we witness an interesting strategy of dealing with English ad-hoc adjectives: The translator has adopted *one-box* and *one-service* as anglicisms. However, it seems that he was reluctant to pursue this strategy any

further, thus omitting *enhanced*. This second example is intended to show that not only English ad-hoc adjectives, but also 'regular' adjectives such as *enhanced*, which do not have close equivalents in German, can represent a challenge to English-German translators. In general, the results of the present study suggest that, as far as business and IT terminology is concerned, there are more lexical gaps concerning adjectives in German than in English.

If this is true, we should expect adjectival additions in the direction German-English to reflect the (possibly) larger adjective inventory of English. Indeed, as the following examples show, German-English translators typically add adjectives that do not have an equivalent in German:

(167) Nicht zuletzt durch das Tempo der Integration haben wir bewiesen, dass der Zusammenschluss die richtige Lösung für Thyssen und Krupp war.

Not least through the speed of the *post-merger* integration we proved that the merger was the right solution for Thyssen and Krupp.

(168) Umbrüche wie eine strategische Neuausrichtung oder ein Wechsel in der Verantwortung führen oft zu Verwerfungen, die sich auch in den Zahlen ausdrücken.

Sweeping changes such as a strategic reorientation or a switch in executive responsibilities often lead to aberrations, which are in turn reflected in the *corporate* figures.

The adjective added by the translator of (167), *post-merger*, is an ad-hoc creation that nicely suits the context at hand, thus increasing the informativeness and intelligibility of the English target text as compared to the German source text. In (168), the translator has added *corporate*, an adjective typical of English business texts that does not have a German equivalent. (In some cases, the meaning of *corporate* can be rendered in German by means of nominal compounding. For example, *corporate strategy* can be translated as *Unternehmensstrategie*.) Thus, the translator of (168) seems to have added *corporate* with the aim of exploiting the rich business vocabulary of the English language.

I certainly do not want to claim that my data are sufficient to conclude that English offers more adjectival business and IT terms than German. However, the investigated corpus contains many examples of the type evidenced above, which lends some plausibility to this hypothesis. Be that as it may, the bidirectionally balanced kind of shifting evidenced in examples (165) through (168) does seem to account for our **Observation 3**

formulated at the beginning of this section, namely the observation that German-English explicitations are counterbalanced by the corresponding implicitations in the direction English-German.

6.3 Adverb-based shifts

Table 6.6 shows the frequency of adverb-based shifts in the investigated corpus:

		Eng → Ger	Ger → Eng
explicitation	addition	39	15
	substitution	1	–
	TOTAL	40	15
implicitation	omission	10	41
	substitution	1	–
	TOTAL	11	41

Table 6.6: Denotational shifts consisting in the additions, omission, or substitution of an adverb

The table allows us to make the following observations:

Observation 1: Explicitations outnumber implicitations in the direction English-German (40 explicitations vs. 11 implicitations), while explicitations are considerably less frequent than implicitations in the direction German-English (15 explicitations vs. 41 implicitations).

Observation 2: Explicitations in the direction English-German are counterbalanced by implicitations in the direction German-English (40 explicitations vs. 41 implicitations).

We are going to explain these observations in the following. Since there are only 15 explicitations in the direction German-English and only 11 implicitations in the direction English-German, it is difficult to say whether we should speak of a lack of counterbalancing in this case or not, so I did not note this as one of the observations to be explained in the following. Similarly, I am not going to say anything about adverb-based substitutions, since there are only two shifts of this type, both occurring in the direction English-German.

6.3.1 Additions and omissions of adverbs

The first type of adverb-based additions and omissions that I would like to discuss is one that occurs in both translation directions and does not contribute to explaining the observations noted above. Cf. the following examples:

(169) We pay billions of dollars in taxes and royalties [...].

Wir zahlen *jährlich* Steuern und Förderabgaben in Milliardenhöhe [...].

(170) Die beschriebenen Projekte untermauern unseren Ansatz, Systemintegrator für die Automobilindustrie zu sein.

The projects described *above* are key elements in our plan to become a systems integrator for the automotive industry.

It is easy to see that the translators of (169) and (170) have performed the explicitations in question in order to make the target text as informative as possible, thus avoiding the risk of misunderstanding. Thus, it seems that the translator of (169) has added *jährlich* in order to make clear what kind of taxes and royalties are meant, namely the regular ones that have to be paid each year (not some kind of irregular, special payments).[2] Similarly, it seems plausible to assume that *above* has been added in (170) in order to make clear which projects are meant, namely the ones decribed earlier in the text that the addressee is reading. While the explicitations evidenced in (169) and (170) cannot be taken to address severe misunderstandings that would inevitably occur without the translators' intervention (after all, the source text of the examples is not difficult to understand), it does seem quite clear that these shifts have been performed to minimize communicative risk.

It is important to note that direction-independent shifts such as the ones evidenced in (169) and (170) are the exception rather than the rule, since most adverb-based shifts observed in the investigated data are direction-specific. Let us now turn to this latter, larger group of direction-dependent shifts. To begin with, many adverb-based additions that can be observed in the direction English-German seem to be the result of cultural filtering. This becomes particularly evident in the following example:

(171) As activity levels improve, we must be disciplined in our efforts to recover our costs and to restore adequate levels of profitability.

[2] This example has already been discussed in Section 3.7.1.

> Wenn es *insgesamt wieder* zu einem Aufschwung kommt, dann müssen wir uns sehr diszipliniert um die Deckung unserer Kosten und die Gewährleistung einer angemessenen Rentabilität kümmern.

In (171), the translator has added two adverbs, *insgesamt* 'overall' and *wieder* 'again'. Why do I regard these explicitations as a result of cultural filtering (as opposed to the explicitations evidenced in (169) and (170) above)? First, *insgesamt* and *wieder* are very weak semantically. If the two adverbs are not present, their meaning will be understood anyway due to an application of general communicative maxims. This means that communicative risk is unlikely to play a role here. Second, my data show that English-German translators regularly add *insgesamt* and *wieder*, as well as other semantically weak adverbs such as *nun* 'now', *heute* 'today', *bislang* 'so far', and *stets* 'always'. Taken together, these adverbs account for approximately half of all adverb-based additions in the translation direction English-German and approximately half of all adverb-based omissions in the direction German-English. There is clearly a pattern here, with cultural filtering as the most likely explanation.

Let me briefly show why I regard adverbs such as *insgesamt* and *wieder* as semantically weak. If I say that "activity levels have improved", you will not call me a liar if activity levels have only improved *overall* (*insgesamt*) rather than in each and every respect. Turning to *wieder*, the previous discourse of (171) (not printed here) already talks about a "pending recovery", which means that the meaning of *wieder* is easily inferable by the reader in this case. In general, Fabricius-Hansen has pointed out that:

> When nothing in the preceding context could prevent the reader or hearer from drawing the right inferences and thus arrive at the intended discourse representation anyway, *wieder* or its counterpart [viz. *again*, VB] is redundant from a (discourse) semantic point of view; and that may favor its absence in English. Blatant discourse semantic redundancy does not seem to disfavor the use of *wieder* in German, however [...]. (2005: 29)[3]

[3]Fabricius-Hansen (2005) has treated *again* and *wieder* as "connectives", i.e. cohesive devices. In contrast, these items were treated as denotational elements in the present study, since they often, but not always have a cohesive function. For example, if I say "Merkel was elected *again*", you will understand (without accessing the prior discourse, if any) that Merkel has been elected previously. However, if I say "*Therefore* Merkel was elected", you will not understand why Merkel was elected unless this is specified by the prior discourse. This is why I have treated adverbs such as *wieder* and *again* as denotational elements and not as cohesive elements such as *therefore*.

Why does the redundancy of *wieder/again* "favor its absence in English", while translators regularly add *wieder* (as well as other semantically weak adverbs such as *nun* and *stets*)? In Section 2.5, we have seen that there are two general, contrarian principles of human communication, namely "Say no more than you must!" and "Say as much as you can!" The only plausible answer to the above question is that (especially in borderline cases) speakers of English tend to stick to the first principle while speakers of German tend to follow the second principle (Fabricius-Hansen 2005: 43). In other words, the translator of (171) has added *wieder* in order to adapt the target text to typical communicative preferences of German readers. Conversely, as it has already been pointed out above, German-English translators regularly omit semantically weak adverbs such as *insgesamt* and *wieder*. Cf. the following examples:

(172) Denn der neu gewählte Gesetzgeber legt bei seinen gesundheitspolitischen Konzepten *wieder* mehr Wert auf Qualität in der so wichtigen Nachsorge von schwer erkrankten Menschen [...].

The newly elected government's health care concepts place stronger emphasis on the quality of the vital post-acute care of seriously ill patients [...].

(173) Zur Entlastung des Vorstands in den Unternehmensbereichen Privatkunden und Geschäftskunden, Firmenkunden sowie Immobilienfinanzierungsgeschäft und Immobilienkunden haben wir *insgesamt* sechs Bereichsvorstände ernannt.

To ease the workload on the managing directors in the divisions Private Customers and Professionals, Corporate Customers, and Heal Estate Finance and Real Estate Customers, we have appointed six executive vice presidents.

The regular pattern of additions and omissions illustrated by examples (171) through (173) argues strongly in favor of an explanation in terms of cultural filtering. However, there are two additional reasons why German-English translators tend to omit semantically weak adverbs. First, as it has already been noted in Section 5.3.1, the syntax of English has lower capacities for accomodating optional adverbials than the syntax of German. This can constitute a strong motivation for German-English translators to omit adverbial material, as the following example illustrates:

(174) *Insgesamt* wurden zunächst rund 29% des Grundkapitals von XYZ verkauft und ein Emissionserlös von 6,6 Mrd Euro erzielt.

Initially around 29% of XYZ's share capital was sold, achieving issuing proceeds of EUR 6.6 billion.

I would argue that the translator of (174) has decided to omit *insgesamt* in order to avoid a stylistically awkward clustering of sentence-initial adverbials (*Overall, initially around...*) or an infelicitous scattering of the two adverbs across the sentence (*Overall... was sold initially*, ...). In the German source text, this problem of adverbial integration does not occur, with *insgesamt* occupying the preverbal syntactic slot and *zunächst* 'initially' fitting into the postverbal slot – no awkward clustering or scattering necessary.

The second reason why German-English translators often omit adverbs is a specific feature of English grammar that is not shared by the grammar of German: the progressive aspect. As the following example shows, temporal adverbs such as *heute* 'today' can become redundant if a progressive verb form is used:

(175) Bereits *heute* fertigen wir in unserem Werk in der Tschechischen Republik jährlich 12 Millionen Stück.

We are already turning out 12 million tires a year at our plant in the Czech Republic.

The semantics of (175), where an ongoing event is reported, basically forced the translator to use a progressive verb form in the English target text (*turning out*). Since the progressive here clearly signals that the state of affairs expressed by the verb is "currently in progress" (Biber et al. 1999: 470), the translator felt it unnecessary to use a target text equivalent of the adverb *heute*, which would not add a significant amount of information to the translation. (Moreover, the adverb would be difficult to integrate syntactically.)[4] Conversely, English-German translators sometimes add temporal adverbs in order to compensate for the lack of a progressive aspect in German, as illustrated by the following example:

(176) To help knowledge workers access information more efficiently, we're also developing what we call a digital dashboard.

Um Wissensarbeitern dabei zu helfen, Informationen gezielt abzurufen, entwickeln wir *zur Zeit* das sogenannte Digital Dashboard, eine Art digitale Pinnwand.

[4]We can see this if we try to fit an adverbial equivalent of *heute* such as *today* into the target text sentence. If we use the adverb clause-initially, the target text gets a contrastive flavour which does not fit the context at hand, cf.: *Today, we are already turning out...* If we use *today* in postverbal position, we produce a stylistically awkward and difficult-to-process clustering of adverbials, cf.: *...a year today at our plant in the Czech Republic*.

The translator of (176) has added *zur Zeit* 'currently'[5] in order to carry over the meaning of the English source text's progressive aspect (*developing*) to the German target text.

In sum, we have found three reasons why semantically weak adverbs such as *wieder*, *insgesamt*, *heute*, and *zur Zeit* are systematically added by English-German translators and omitted by their German-English colleagues:

1. Cultural filtering, i.e. the German tendency to maximize denotational explicitness, which is not shared by English speakers (see Section A.1.2 of the appendix)

2. The relative scarcity of syntactic slots for accomodating adverbials in English

3. The lack of a progressive aspect in German

In combination, these three factors exert a strong pressure on English-German translators to add certain adverbs and on German-English translators to omit them. This pressure accounts for both **Observation 1** and **Observation 2** made at the beginning of this section.

6.4 Summary and conclusion

Here is a summary of this chapter's most important findings:

- In both translation directions, translators add nouns in order to fill argument slots of nouns and verbs. Moreover, they add nominal material in order to verbalize states of affairs that are inferable from the discourse context. Both tendencies are due to translators' more general tendency to minimize the risk of misunderstanding.

- English-German translators tend to substitute more precise terms for less precise ones (e.g. *sales* → *Umsatzvolumen* 'sales volume'), while German-English translators tend to do the exact opposite (e.g. *Umsatzvolumen* → *sales*). This remarkably strong tendency has been argued to be a result of cultural filtering.

- English-German translators add adjectives (a) in order to comply with the communicative norms of German and (b) for informational-structural reasons. German-English translators omit adjectives for

[5]Prepositional phrases fulfilling an adverbial function have been counted as "adverbs" in the present study.

the same reasons. However, they do not do this as often as they could, resulting in explicitational asymmetry. German-English translators also add adjectives to exploit the adjective inventory of the English language, which seems to be bigger than the German inventory as far as business and IT terminology is concerned.

- English-German translators tend to add semantically weak adjectives such as *wieder* and *insgesamt*, a tendency which is in line with the (denotationally more explicit) communicative conventions of German. Accordingly, German-English translators omit such adverbs. Adverb-based omissions in this translation direction are also triggered by the (more restrictive) syntax of English and the availability of a progressive aspect in this language, leading to a counterbalancing of English-German explicitations by German-English implicitations.

At the beginning of this chapter, we have noted that among the denotational shifts identified in the corpus, there are cases where a counterbalancing of explicitations by the corresponding implicitations was nearly or fully achieved by translators, while other cases were found to exhibit a strong degree of explicitational asymmetry. The qualitative analyses offered in this chapter have been able to explain this pattern of explicitational symmetry and asymmetry, mostly drawing on English-German contrasts in terms of lexicogrammar and communicative norms. Like the previous chapters, the present chapter thus demonstrates that there is no need (and, in fact, no justification) for assuming a "translation-inherent" process of explicitation in order to explain patterns of explicitation and implicitation as found in corpora of translated texts. Rather, the findings presented in this chapter suggest that every explicitating and implicitating shift has a distinct cause – although elaborate qualitative analysis may be necessary to identify it.

Chapter 7

Conclusion

I am not going to give a comprehensive summary of the preceding chapters here, since this has already been done. (If you want a summary of the study presented in this book, please read the "Summary and conclusion" sections of Chapters 2 through 6. I have taken great care to make these sections as fast and easy to read as possible.) Instead, I will try to provide a concise synthesis of my main findings by listing the factors that have been found to determine the occurrence of explicitation and implicitation in translation.

The present study has shown that translators explicitate and implicitate for many different reasons. In sum, translators tend to explicitate:[1]

- if they feel that a coreference relation implicitly given in the source text is not easily inferable (which may lead to processing difficulties).
- if they feel that the antecedent of a coreferential expression is not easy to identify (which may lead to processing difficulties).
- if the target language offers a lexical item that suits the context at hand but is not available in the source language.
- if the target language offers a syntactic slot unavailable in the source language that lends itself to being filled (e.g. by a connective).
- in order to comply with typical communicative preferences of target language readers.
- following a general strategy of maximizing explicitness in order to minimize the risk of misunderstanding.

[1] The following lists are not meant to be exhaustive.

Conversely, translators tend to implicitate:

- if they feel that a coreference relation explicitly given in the source text will be easily inferable if it is verbalized less explicitly or not verbalized at all.
- if a particular lexical item in the source text has no straightforward equivalent in the target language.
- if the target language lacks a syntactic slot offered by the source language.
- in order to comply with typical communicative preferences of target language readers.
- to avoid stylistic awkwardness.
- to achieve a neat information structure, i.e. a distribution of given and new information that secures optimal processing in the target language.

Some of the above factors, such as the availability of additional syntactic slots in the target language, have not been considered in previous studies on explicitation and implicitation. The ignorance of these factors is likely to have contributed to the widespread, somewhat esoteric assumption of a "translation-inherent" type of explicitation (cf. Blum-Kulka's 1986 Explicitation Hypothesis), which has been used as a simple, lazy way of explaining non-trivial occurrences of explicitation (see Sections 2.2 and 2.3). In contrast, the present study has departed from the more plausible assumption that every instance of explicitation (and implicitation) has a distinct, non-esoteric cause that may be identified by thorough qualitative analysis (cf. Section 3.9). As the comprehensive lists of factors offered above suggest, this assumption has been essentially confirmed.

It is true that the present study has identified a small number of exceptional cases where it was not possible to pinpoint specific factors that are likely to have caused the translator to explicitate (see e.g. example (62) discussed in Section 4.1.1). However, we should note two things. First, additional factors might be at play that the present study has failed to identify (e.g. because the linguistic tools used were not sophisticated enough). Such additional factors might be uncovered in future studies. Second, the above-mentioned exceptional cases were found to be very rare, representing a tiny fraction of all explicitations. So even if translation-inherent explictation were actually proved to exist one day, the phenomenon would

only get the chance to account for an insignificant remainder of explicitations that linguistic analysis has failed to explain.

Turning to Klaudy's (2009) Asymmetry Hypothesis, the present study has shown that translators occasionally 'fail' to implicitate (i.e. do not implicitate although this would be licensed by one or more of the reasons listed above):

- because they are "risk-averse" (Pym 2005; cf. Section 2.5).
- because there is often no good reason to do so (see e.g. the discussion of Observation 3 at the very end of Section 5.2).
- because taking things away tends to be more difficult in language than adding things (see the discussion of Observation 2 near the middle of Section 6.2.1).

These three reasons for translators' occasional 'failure' to implicitate explain why explicitations in one translation direction tend not to be 'counterbalanced' by implicitations in the other translation direction (Klaudy's Asymmetry Hypothesis). In the present study, we have seen many examples of this phenomenon, which has also been referred to as explicitational asymmetry. However, we have also observed cases where the relationship between explicitations and implicitations was in fact symmetrical. In these cases, multiple factors can be seen to override the three causes listed above, producing a symmetical relationship between explicitating and implicitating shifts.

One such case is the addition of pronominal expressions by English-German translators and the omission of the same items by German-English translators, where fundamental differences in (a) the syntax, (b) the lexical inventory, and (c) the communicative norms of English and German were found to produce a counterbalance of explicitations by the corresponding implicitations (see the discussion of Observation 1 in Section 5.1). Where multiple factors build up pressure on the translator to implicitate, the three obstacles to implicitation listed above can lose their power over the translator, resulting in explicitational symmetry.

On the one hand, this justifies Klaudy's cautious formulation of the Asymmetry Hypothesis, which claims that explicitations are "not always" counterbalanced by the corresponding implicitations (Klaudy and Károly 2005: 14). On the other hand, we have to ask what the hypothesis is good for if it does not tell us when explicitational asymmetry is expected to hold and when it is not. Thus, the Asymmetry Hypothesis can only serve as a kind of general guidepost for studies of explicitation and implicitation. As a more specific hypothesis, I would like to propose the following one:

> The occurrence of explicitating and implicitating shifts is uniquely determined by (a) lexicogrammatical and (b) pragmatic variables.[2]

I refuse to give this hypothesis a fancy name because it is in fact a kind of null hypothesis: It does not postulate any new, possibly controversial factors, but sticks to the factors that previous research (such as the present study) has demonstrated to be relevant. Instead of resorting to the far-fetched assumption of a "universal strategy inherent in the process of language mediation" (Blum-Kulka 1986) or "subconscious processes of explicitation" (Olohan and Baker 2000), future research should seek to elaborate the above-mentioned lexicogrammatical and pragmatic factors, finding out how they differ across language pairs, translators, social contexts, etc., producing varying explicitation-implicitation ratios.

One way of pursuing this research program would be to derive specific predictions from the above hypothesis that may then be tested against empirical data. One such prediction might be the following:

> Where communicative risk is low and/or translators are willing to take risks, the relationship between explicitation and implicitation is more symmetrical than in cases where risk is high and/or translators are risk-averse.

Future studies departing from boldly formulated, operationalizable, and falsifiable predictions such as the above one are likely to shed more light on the phenomenon of explicitational asymmetry in translation.

[2]The values of these variables are determined by the translation situation at hand (language pair, translator style, social factors, etc.) Lexicogrammatical variables are: the lexical inventory of the target language, its syntactic properties, etc. Pragmatic variables are: the translator's willingness to take risks, her perception of her role as a cultural mediator, the communicative norms of the source and target language register, etc.

Appendix A

Some English-German contrasts

A.1 Is German more explicit than English?

For the sake of brevity, the title of this section has been somewhat sloppily formulated. It should be fairly clear that "[l]anguages cannot be divided into inherently explicit or implicit languages" (Klaudy 1993: 68). Still, when comparing two languages, one can ask whether the grammar of one language forces its speakers to make certain distinctions that the grammar of the other language does not require to be made, or whether the communicative preferences typically observed in speakers of the two languages favor rather implicit or rather explicit ways of expression. From this perspective, it has been suggested that German is more explicit than English both in terms of grammar (Hawkins 1986) and in terms of communicative preferences (House 1977, 1997). In the following, we will consider these claims in turn.

A.1.1 Explicitness in grammar

In a highly interesting monograph on grammatical contrasts between English and German, John A. Hawkins (1986) argues that the grammatical system of German exhibits a 'tighter fit' between form and meaning than the grammar of English. The author derives this conclusion from his investigation of a variety of grammatical phenomena. Hawkins' results are summarized in the following table (taken from Hawkins 1986: 121):

	German	English
1.	More grammatical morphology	Less grammatical morphology
2.	More specific selectional restrictions	Less specific selectional restrictions
3.	More word order freedom	Less word order freedom
4.	More Pied Piping	Less Pied Piping
5.	Less semantic diversity of grammatical relations	More semantic diversity of grammatical relations
6.	Less raising	More raising
7.	Less extraction	More extraction
8.	Less deletion (of NPs)	More deletion (of NPs)

Table A.1: Summary of English-German contrasts identified by Hawkins (1986)

Among the grammatical features listed in Table A.1, no. 1 through 4 are characterized by a close correspondence between form and meaning (= explicitness), while in features no. 5 through 8 the fit between form and meaning is rather loose (= implicitness). As is evident from the table, German has more of the explicit features and less of the implicit features than English. Thus, there is one generalization that subsumes all of the contrasts listed in the table: As far as the linguistic phenomena investigated by Hawkins are concerned, German grammar is more explicit than English grammar. This means that "German speakers are forced to make certain semantic distinctions which can regularly be left unspecified in English" (1986: 28), while "users of English have, in effect, more work to do in extracting meaning from form." For example, speakers of English "must infer semantically relevant material that is not overt in surface." (1986: 125)

Since a full discussion of the grammatical domains investigated by Hawkins would be beyond the scope of this book, I would like to exemplify the author's findings by briefly discussing just one representative example case: the relative 'poverty' of grammatical morphology in English (feature no. 1 in Table A.1). The morphological poverty of English becomes evident, for example, in the broad functional spectrum of the English *ing*-form, which "provides a superb example of the pasimony in the formal inventory of English morphology" (König and Gast 2009: 72). In total, eight different uses of the English *ing*-form may be distinguished:

1. Deverbal adjective
   This is very interesting.

2. Progressive aspect
   I am not talking to you.

3. Adverbial participle
   Walking along the river, I suddenly saw a crane.

4. Gerund(ive nominal)
   Not reading poetry impoverishes your life.

5. Non-finite relative clause
   The guy talking to George is my boss.

6. Attributive participle
   A barking dog is a nuisance.

7. Action nominalization
   No reading of poetry is good enough for Mary.

8. Deverbal preposition
   Concerning your recent proposal, I think...

The uses of the *ing*-form cited in the above list (taken from König and Gast 2009: 72) "differ from each other semantically and/or syntactically, even though they are morphologically indistinguishable" (2009: 72). It is easy to see that the grammatical categories listed above are mostly expressed using different grammatical morphology in German.[1] For example, *interesting* is *interessant*, but *a barking dog* is *ein bellender Hund* in German. Thus, in German, functional diversity tends to be mirrored in formal diversity, whereas in English, formal similarity does by no means exclude functional diversity, as the many different uses of the English *ing*-form illustrate.

Rohdenburg (1990) has challenged Hawkins' generalization by pointing out a number of cases where English grammar is in fact more explicit than German grammar. For example, speakers of English have access to a wide array of deverbal prepositions formed with *-ing* such as *barring*, *concerning*, *considering*, *following*, etc. (see use no. 8 of the *ing*-form in the above list), which may be used to encode noun phrase-internal semantic relations more explicitly than by means of traditional prepositions. Cf. the following examples (taken from Rohdenburg 1990: 145):

[1]Note, however, that some uses of the English *ing*-form (e.g. deverbal prepositions formed with *-ing*; see below), do not have a formal equivalent at all in German.

(177) ein Kasten *mit* neunzehn weiteren Bierflaschen

a case *containing* nineteen more beer bottles

(178) die Texte *zu* den abgebildeten Pflanzen

the descriptions *accompanying* the photographs

The English version of (177) is more explicit than the German version, since the *ing*-participle *containing* makes clear that the bottles are *in* the case, while the German preposition *mit* may also be used if the bottles are somewhere near the case (but not in it). Similarly, *accompanying* in (178) is more explicit than *zu* in the German version of the example, since *accompanying* implies spatial proximity while *zu* may also be used if the descriptions are nowhere near the photographs (e.g. if they have to be downloaded from the Internet).

Rohdenburg's argument is the following: By providing *ing*-participle forms such as *containing* or *accompanying*, the grammar of English allows speakers to attain a higher degree of explicitness in encoding noun phrase-internal semantic relations than the grammar of German, where such relations have to be expressed by means of semantically vague prepositions such as *mit* or *zu*. It is interesting to note that one and the same linguistic phenomenon – the versatility of the English *ing*-form – accounts for both implicitness (looseness of form-function mapping) and explicitness (availability of semantically precise deverbal prepositions) at the same time.

Does this mean that Hawkins' generalization is wrong? Yes and no, say Kortmann and Meyer (1992) in their article entitled "Is English grammar more explicit than German grammar, after all?" The authors argue that Hawkins is right in that German is more explicit than English in terms of the *obligatory* distinctions that grammar requires to be made (e.g. concerning grammatical morphology). On the other hand, Rohdenburg is right in that English is more explicit than German as far as certain *optional* distinctions are concerned, such as the possibility to spell out noun phrase-internal semantic relations by means of *ing*-participles.

It is important to point out that this new, more fine-grained generalization offered by Kortmann and Meyer (1992) is not universally valid either, since there are domains of grammar where German offers more optional distinctions than English. One such domain is the encoding of possessors, where Kortmann and Meyer's generalization seems to be turned on its head. Here, the grammar of English is obligatorily explicit, while the grammar of German is optionally implicit. Cf. the following examples (taken from König and Gast 2009: 119):

(179) Die Kinder hoben *die* Hand. – The children raised *their* hands.

(180) Der Minister senkte *den* Kopf. – The minister lowered *his* head.

(181) Ich kann mit *den* Ohren wackeln. – I can wiggle *my* ears.

(182) Ich öffnete *die* Augen. – I opened *my* eyes.

The examples illustrate the phenomenon of 'implicit possessors', which are allowed (even preferred) in German but disallowed in English. In the German versions of (179) through (182), possession is not explicitly encoded, but has to be inferred by the hearer. Explicit versions of the examples would be possible in German (e.g. *meine Augen* 'my eyes' instead of *die Augen* 'the eyes' in (182)), though they would sound somewhat redundant or unusual. In English, the explicit encoding of possessors is obligatory. A sentence such as *I opened the eyes* would be possible grammatically, but would evoke the strange implicature that I opened the eyes of someone else. Thus, in the present case, the grammar of English requires its speakers to make an obligatory distinction (thus enforcing explicitness), while the grammar of German allows speakers to opt between explicitness and implicitness – the implicit solution paradoxically being the preferred one.

What does the above discussion leave us with? Kortmann and Meyer offer the following conclusion, which I would like to advocate here as well:

> Ultimately, both the question of whether German grammar is more explicit than English grammar, or whether it is rather the other way round, will not yield trustworthy answers, and should better not be asked, at all, with the whole of a grammar in mind. (Kortmann and Meyer 1992: 164f)

Instead of trying to come up with far-reaching generalizations, it seems to make more sense to compare individual systems and subsystems of English and German grammar in order to answer more specific research questions. This is basically the approach followed in the present book: For each of the investigated phenomena (explicitations and implicitations involving nouns, pronouns, adverbs, etc.), relevant subsystems of English and German grammar are compared in order to assess to what extent translators' choices between explicit and implicit verbalization strategies are determined by grammatical differences between the two languages.

A.1.2 Explicitness in discourse

Over the course of several decades, Juliane House has collected large amounts of qualitative data (e.g. audio-taped role plays, interviews, au-

thentic conversations, diary-type records provided by friends and colleagues, a corpus of translated and non-translated children's books, etc.) which suggest that speakers of German tend to express themselves more explicitly than speakers of English, a tendency that seems to hold across individuals and discourse contexts. (See House 2006 for a summary of her work on pragmatic differences between English and German.) While House's data are largely qualitative and sometimes anecdotal in nature, her findings do point to some important tendencies. In the following, we are going to look at some extracts from her data (taken from House 1997: 86f). Subsequently, we will have a look at some more quantitatively oriented studies by other authors which have confirmed and elaborated many of House's findings.

The following example reproduces the text of a sign displayed at the University of Hamburg a few years ago:

(183) Zur Vermeidung von Gesundheitsschäden und unzumutbaren Belästigungen ist in den Hallen, Fluren, Treppenhäusern und Veranstaltungsräumen dieses Gebäudes mit Ausnahme der Cafeteria und der Eingangshalle das RAUCHEN UNTERSAGT. Bitte nehmen Sie Rücksicht auf die Gesundheit Ihrer Mitmenschen.

Native speakers of English with some knowledge of German tend to be puzzled by signs like this, asking themselves why the sign has not been reduced to its basic message, namely *Rauchen untersagt* 'no smoking'. Instead, the German sign gives explicit reasons for obeying the order (*zur Vermeidung von Gesundheitsschäden und unzumutbaren Belästigungen* 'to avoid damages to [others'] health and unacceptable nuisances') and exactly specifies the places covered by the prohibition (*in den Hallen, Fluren, Treppenhäusern...* 'in the halls, corridors, staircases'). While the strategy of maximizing explicitness exhibited by the sign would be out of place in an Anglophone context, directions similar to (183) are not uncommon in Germany. Cf. the following two examples:

(184) [Traffic sign in Hamburg's Ohlsdorf cemetery:]

30 km/h
Auf dem Friedhof

(185) [Advice given by airport personnel:]

Ladies and Gentlemen, please do not leave your luggage unattended at any time!

Meine Damen und Herren, bitte lassen Sie Ihr Gepäck aus Sicherheitsgründen nie unbeaufsichtigt.

The traffic sign reproduced as (184) explicitly specifies where the speed limit is valid (on the cemetery grounds), a piece of information that is easily inferable and thus makes (184) seem redundant from an Anglophone perspective. Similarly, the German version of (185) explicitly verbalizes the reason why luggage should not be left unattended (*aus Sicherheitsgründen* 'for security reasons'), while this information is left implicit in the English version.

Throughout her work, House analyzes countless examples similar to the ones discussed above, coming to the conclusion that German discourse seems to be characterized by an "aesthetic of spelling things out", while English speakers tend to prefer an "aesthetic of suggestions and implicitness" (House 2004b: 187). This English-German contrast in communicative preferences is highly relevant to the study of translation, since the contrast regularly leads to explicitation in English-German translations and implicitation in German-English translations. It seems that translators are well aware of cross-linguistic differences in communicative conventions and adjust their translations accordingly, a tendency that House has famously referred to as "cultural filtering". The following extract from a popular scientific text along with its German translation (taken from House 2004b: 201) illustrates this tendency:

(186) The fluid that surrounds a fetus in the uterus can now be examined for the prenatal detection of genetic disorders.

Das Fruchtwasser, in dem das Ungeborene schwimmt, enthält Zellen, die sich vom Fetus abgelöst haben. Führt man eine Kanüle in die Fruchtblase ein, die den Fetus umgibt, so kann man eine Probe des Fruchtwassers entnehmen, die enthaltenen Zellen auf Fehler in der Erbinformation untersuchen und damit bereits beim Ungeborenen Erbkrankheiten nachweisen.

The translator of (186) has performed numerous additions and substitutions, among which are the following:

- While the English source text simply talks about a *fluid*, the German translator has substituted the more specific term *Fruchtwasser* 'amniotic fluid'.
- The English source text briefly states that the above-mentioned fluid *can now be examined*. In contrast, the German target text additionally tells the reader how such an examination can be carried out, namely by inserting a cannula into the fluid, taking samples, etc.

- The German translator has inserted connectives such as *so* 'then' and *damit* 'thus, in this way' in order to establish cohesive links among the newly inserted linguistic material.

In sum, we could say that the author of the English source text of (186) has tried to keep things relatively short and simple, while the German target text provides the reader with a great deal of background information. As House (2004b) shows, changes such as the above are regularly performed by English-German translators (cf. also Stein 1979 for some early observations), a finding which corroborates her previous results on pragmatic differences between English and German and substantiates her notion of cultural filtering in translation.

However, two points of criticism regarding House's work need to be raised in connection with example (186):

1. Some of the changes made by the translator of (186) transcend the limits of the concept of explicitness, which refers to the verbalization of inferable information (cf. Section 1.3). Much of the information added by the translator of (186) is not inferable, but genuinely new. The addition of inferable information and the addition of new information should not be treated on a par, since it seems likely that the two kinds of changes are governed by different factors. Studies of explicitation need to take care to exclude additions of new information from analysis (cf. my criticism of Øverås 1998 in Section 2.3.3).

2. House has focused on English-German translations throughout her work (but see House 2004b). However, we should expect cultural filtering to be bidirectional. To prove that the changes observed by House are really due to cultural filtering (and not to other, possibly language pair-independent factors), the opposite translation direction must also be taken into account. The prediction would here be that German-English translators should tend to omit rather than add linguistic material.

Luckily, both points of critique do not apply to more quantitatively oriented studies by other authors that have been carried out on the language pair English-German. These studies have evaded the problems noted above by (a) applying a much narrower concept of *cohesive explicitness*, focusing on the use of certain cohesive devices in translated and non-translated texts and (b) comparing English-German and German-English translations systematically. The studies' results may be summarized as follows:

- Behrens (2005) has investigated the use of the Norwegian connective *dermed* 'thus' in translations between Norwegian, English, and German. She found that Norwegian-German translators never omitted the connective (choosing equivalents such as *damit* 'thus' or *dabei* 'in doing so, at the same time'), while Norwegian-English translators omitted the connective in 5 of 24 cases (21%). Behrens' results suggest that English and German translators apply a different cultural filter (resulting in diverging degrees of explicitness), thus confirming House's findings.

- Using the same data as Behrens (2005), Fabricius-Hansen (2005) found that German-English translators regularly omit the adverb *wieder* 'again' (in 98 of 249 cases [39.4%]), while English-German translators omit *again* only rarely (in 34 of 345 cases [9.9%]). Conversely, she found that English-German translators regularly added *wieder*, while German-English translators almost never added *again*. The author obtained similar results for the connective *dabei*, which she found to be systematically added by English-German translators and omitted by German-English translators. Fabricius-Hansen concludes that speakers of English and German tend to follow different communicative strategies, which is reflected by the translation choices that she observed.

- Using a superset of the data used for the present study, I found that German business authors make more frequent use of causal connectives (e.g. *also* 'thus, therefore', *damit*) than English business authors (Becher 2009). Moreover, in a study of the use of deictic expressions in English and German popular scientific texts, I found that German popular science authors tend to follow a strategy of maximizing cohesive explicitness which is not followed by English authors (Becher 2010b).

Taken together, the studies summarized above can be seen as an impressive confirmation of House's generalization that German discourse tends to be more explicit than English discourse due to cultural differences between the two speech communities. However, there is no rule without exceptions. While the above discussion has suggested that German speakers tend towards higher degrees of *denotational* and *cohesive* explicitness than English speakers, there is evidence which indicates that English discourse tends to be *interactionally* more explicit than German discourse. This latter contrast will be dealt with in the following section.

A.2 Interactionality in English and German

In the preceding section, we have discussed House's (1997) generalization that German speakers tend towards a higher degree of denotational and cohesive explicitness than speakers of English. On the other hand, her research indicates that English discourse tends to focus on the interaction between author and addressee ('interactional focus'), while German discourse tends to focus on the subject matter at hand ('transactional focus'). In practice, this means that English texts are often characterized by a higher degree of interactional explicitness than comparable German texts. House explains this cross-linguistic contrast (as well as the contrast in terms of denotational and cohesive explicitness discussed in the previous section) with recourse to (hypothesized) cultural differences between the English and German speech communities (2010: 580).

While House's generalizations have been largely based on qualitative studies, her findings concerning typical degrees of interactionality in English and German discourse have been confirmed by a number of more quantitatively-oriented studies by other authors. Most prominently, House's project Covert Translation (see e.g. House 2002, Becher et al. 2009, Kranich 2011), in the context of which the present book was written, has yielded a number of findings in confirmation of House's generalizations. The project has investigated a corpus of business texts (from which the texts analyzed in the present study were taken) and a corpus of popular scientific texts. Both corpora are translation corpora, containing English-German as well as German-English translations along with their respective source texts.

The results of the project Covert Translation (see Becher et al. 2009 for a recent overview) have substantiated House's findings regarding interactionality in English and German, showing that:

1. English texts tend to be more "subjective" and "addressee-oriented" than German texts.

2. English-German and German-English translators tend to apply a cultural filter mediating between the different sets of communicative norms operative in the two languages.

These two tendencies are illustrated by the following examples (taken from the project's popular science corpus).

(187) *Suppose you are a doctor* in an emergency room and a patient tells *you* she was raped two hours earlier. She is afraid she may have

been exposed to HIV [...]. Can *you* in fact do anything to block the virus from replicating and establishing infection?

In der Notfallaufnahme eines Krankenhauses berichtet eine Patientin, sie sei vor zwei Stunden vergewaltigt worden und nun in Sorge, dem AIDS-Erreger ausgesetzt zu sein [...]. Kann *der Arzt* überhaupt irgend etwas tun, was eventuell vorhandene Viren hindern würde, sich zu vermehren und sich dauerhaft im Körper einzunisten?

This example represents the opening passage of a popular scientific magazine article on HIV infections. The English source text of the example goes to great lengths to involve the addressee in the states of affairs presented by offering the reader to identify with a doctor in a hospital facing a challenging situation. It is evident that the German translator has done away with this rather extreme way of addressee involvement, by omitting the sentence-initial (text-inital) imperative *Suppose you are a doctor...* and by turning *you* into *der Arzt* 'the doctor'. This application of a cultural filter has brought the German target text more in line with typical communicative preferences of German readers.

While example (187) has nicely illustrated the high degree of addressee involvement typical of Anglophone discourse, the following example (discussed in Becher et al. 2009: 140) casts a spotlight on English-German differences in the domain of "subjectivity":

(188) The public perception is that we have looked extensively for signs of life elsewhere. *But* in reality, *we* have hardly begun to search.

Für die Öffentlichkeit scheint es, als hätten wir unsere Fühler bereits weit ins All ausgestreckt. Tatsächlich hat die Suche nach außerirdischem Leben *aber* kaum erst begonnen.

The English source text of (188) exihibits the discourse pattern "Claim–Response" as it has been described by Hoey (2001): The authors contrast the (alleged) public perception regarding the search for extraterrestrial life with their own opinion, which is presented as more accurate. The English source text reminds us somewhat of spoken discourse. This is not only due to the high degree of interactionality achieved by the discourse pattern Claim–Response, but also to the sentence-initial use of *but*, which is reminiscent of the use of *but* as a "turn-getter" (Schlobinski 1992) in face-to-face communication (cf. Gumperz et al. 1984: 11; Schiffrin 1987). Applying a cultural filter, the German translator has mitigated the interactionality of the English source text by turning *but* into a 'more neutral'

sentence-internal connective (*aber*). In line with this change, the translator has omitted an instance of the personal pronoun *we*, choosing a depersonalized construction instead (*... hat die Suche ... kaum erst begonnen* 'the search has hardly begun').

Finally, here is an example of cultural filtering in the translation direction German-English:

(189) Bei der aktiven Sicherheit haben diese meistverkauften Fahrzeuge einen enormen Effekt auf die Verkehrssicherheit insgesamt.

As these are the most frequently sold cars, they *could* have an enormous effect on road traffic safety.

Epistemic modal markers such as *could* "serve to indicate that the speaker is not fully committed to the truth of the propositional content of the clause" (Kranich 2011: 77). Why did the translator of (189) add *could* although the source text author did not use a modal marker? In her studies on the expression of epistemic modality in English and German, Kranich (2009, 2011) has shown that speakers of English epistemically mitigate their claims to a greater extent than speakers of German. This cross-linguistic contrast is in line with the Anglophone preference for "indirectness" vs. the German preference for "directness", another generalization proposed by House (1997, 2006). It seems that speakers of English tend to use epistemic modal markers even if they are sure that the proposition expressed is true. Kranich assumes that they do this in order to leave the addressee room for disagreement – a kind of face-saving strategy (cf. Hyland 1996). In contrast, speakers of German tend to use epistemic modal markers only if they are genuinely unsure as to the truth of a proposition. (See Kranich 2009, 2011 and Becher et al. 2009: 128ff.)[2]

The shifts evidenced in examples (187) through (189) are not isolated cases, but rather representative of quantitatively significant general tendencies. Thus, the above-cited studies from the project Covert Translation have shown that speaker-hearer deictic pronouns (e.g. Baumgarten 2008), sentence-initial conjunctions (e.g. Becher et al. 2009), and epistemic modal markers (e.g. Kranich 2009) are traditionally[3] more frequent in English

[2]Our discussion of (189) has shown that the use of modal markers can have important effects on the interaction between author and reader. Nevertheless, modal markers were ignored in the present study for practical reaons (see Section 3.8).

[3]The communicative preferences of German regarding interactionality have changed considerably over the last few decades (which is in part due to Anglophone influence, cf. Becher et al. 2009), so some of the mentioned frequency differences can no longer be found in recent texts.

than in German discourse.[4]

[4]Note that studies from the project *Covert Translation* have focused on texts from the genres popular science and business communication. Other genres may pattern differently with respect to English-German differences in interactionality.

Appendix B

List of corpus texts

The corpus investigated in the present study consists of the following source and target texts:[1]

- Translation direction English-German
  - ADM (1999): To our Shareholders
  - ADM (1999): Report of Independent Auditors
  - American Standard (2002): Our Mission
  - Baker Hughes (1999): Letter to stockholders
  - Daimler Chrysler (1999): Chairmen's Letter
  - Ecolab (2001): We are one
  - Exxon Mobil (2002): A letter from Chairman Lee Raymond
  - Exxon Mobil (2003): A letter from Lee Raymond
  - General Electric (1999): Letter to Our Share Owners
  - GlaxoSmithKline (2000): Our Spirit
  - Microsoft (1999): Bill's Letter
  - Microsoft (2000): Letter to Shareholders
  - MMC (2002): Dear Shareholder
  - Procter and Gamble (1999): Letter by Durk I. Jager, President and Chief Executive

[1] The references are in the following format: *Company name (fiscal year): text title*. Only the source texts have been listed, since all texts have been published in companies' annual reports, which is also true of the respective translations.

  - Procter and Gamble (1999): P & G Reports Acclerated Growth Behind New Initiatives
  - Unilever (2000): Values

- Translation direction German-English

  - Beiersdorf (1999): Vorwort des Vorstands
  - Continental (1999): Brief an die Aktionäre
  - Continental (2000): Brief an die Aktionäre
  - Continental (2001): Brief an die Aktionäre
  - Continental (2002): Brief an die Aktionäre
  - Deutsche Bank (2000): Im Überblick
  - Deutsche Post (2000): Vorwort
  - Deutsche Post (2001): Brief an die Aktionäre
  - Hapag-Lloyd (2001): An unsere Aktionäre
  - Henkel (1999): Liebe Aktionärinnen und Aktionäre
  - HypoVereinsbank (1999): An unsere Aktionäre
  - Jenoptik (2000): Brief an die Aktionäre
  - Lufthansa (2000): An unsere Aktionäre
  - Lufthansa (2001): An unsere Aktionäre
  - Mannesmann (1999): Liebe Mannesmann Aktionäre
  - Marseille-Kliniken AG (1998–1999): Sehr geehrte Aktionäre
  - Marseille-Kliniken AG (1998–1999): Von der Schönheit des Alters
  - Ricardo.de (1998–1999): Brief des Vorstands
  - RWE (2000): Brief an die Aktionäre
  - Thyssen Krupp (1999): Brief an die Aktionäre
  - Thyssen Krupp (2000): Brief an die Aktionäre
  - Thyssen Krupp (2001): Brief an die Aktionäre
  - Thyssen Krupp (2002): Brief an die Aktionäre
  - Tomorrow Internet AG (2000): Vorwort
  - Volkswagen (1999): Brief an die Aktionäre
  - Volkswagen (2000): Brief an die Aktionäre
  - Volkswagen (2001): Brief an die Aktionäre

Bibliography

Allan, Keith. 2001. *Natural language semantics*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Altenberg, Bengt. 2007. The correspondence of resultive connectors in English and Swedish. *Nordic Journal of English Studies* 6(1).

Atlas, Jay & Stephen C. Levinson. 1981. It-clefts, informativeness, and logical form: Radical pragmatics (revised standard version). In Peter Cole (ed.), *Radical pragmatics*, 1–61. New York: Academic Press.

Baker, Mona. 1993. Corpus linguistics and translation studies: Implications and applications. In Mona Baker, Gill Francis & Elena Tognini-Bonelli (eds.), *Text and technology: In honour of John Sinclair*, 233–250. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Baker, Mona. 1996. Corpus-based translation studies: The challenges that lie ahead. In Harold Somers (ed.), *Terminology, LSP and translation. Studies in language engineering in honour of Juan C. Sager*, 175–186. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Baker, Mona & Gabriela Saldanha (eds.). 2008. *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. London & New York: Routledge, 2nd edn.

Baumgarten, Nicole. 2007. Converging conventions? Macrosyntactic conjunction with English *and* and German *und*. *Text & Talk* 27. 139–170.

Baumgarten, Nicole. 2008. Writer construction in English and German popularized academic discourse: The uses of *we* and *wir*. *Multilingua* 27(4). 409–438.

Baumgarten, Nicole, Bernd Meyer & Demet Özçetin. 2008. Explicitness in translation and interpreting. A review and some empirical evidence (of an elusive concept). *Across Languages and Cultures* 9(2). 177–203.

Baumgarten, Nicole & Demet Özçetin. 2008. Linguistic variation through language contact in translation. In Peter Siemund & Noemi Kintana (eds.), *Language contact and contact languages*, 293–316. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Baumgarten, Nicole & Julia Probst. 2004. The interaction of spokenness and writtenness in audience design. In Juliane House & Jochen Rehbein (eds.), *Multilingual communication*, 63–86. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Becher, Viktor. 2009. The explicit marking of contingency relations in English and German texts: A contrastive analysis. Paper presented at the *42nd Annual Meeting of the Societas Linguistica Europaea*, workshop on *Connectives across Languages*, September 9–12, University of Lisbon. URL `http://www.francais.ugent.be/index.php?id=19&type=file`. Last accessed 2011-03-03.

Becher, Viktor. 2010a. Abandoning the notion of 'translation-inherent' explicitation. Against a dogma of translation studies. *Across Languages and Cultures* 11(1). 1–28.

Becher, Viktor. 2010b. Differences in the use of deictic expressions in English and German texts. *Linguistics* 48(6). 1309–1342.

Becher, Viktor. 2010c. Towards a more rigorous treatment of the Explicitation Hypothesis in translation studies. *trans-kom* 3(1). 1–25.

Becher, Viktor. 2011a. Von der Hypotaxe zur Parataxe: Ein Wandel im Ausdruck von Konzessivität in neueren populärwissenschaftlichen Texten. In Eva Breindl, Gisella Ferraresi & Anna Volodina (eds.), *Satzverknüpfungen. Zur Interaktion von Form, Bedeutung und Diskursfunktion* (Linguistische Arbeiten 534). Berlin & New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Becher, Viktor. 2011b. When and why do translators add connectives? A corpus-based study. *Target* 23(1).

Becher, Viktor, Juliane House & Svenja Kranich. 2009. Convergence and divergence of communicative norms through language contact in translation. In Kurt Braunmüller & Juliane House (eds.), *Convergence and divergence in language contact situations* (Hamburg Studies on Multilingualism 8), 125–151. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Behrens, Bergljot. 1999. A dynamic semantic approach to translation assessment. ING-participial adjuncts and their translation in Norwegian. In Monika Doherty (ed.), *Sprachspezifische Aspekte der Informationsverteilung*, 90–112. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.

Behrens, Bergljot. 2005. Cohesive ties in translation: A contrastive study of the Norwegian connective *dermed*. *Languages in Contrast* 5(1). 3–32.

Bernardini, Silvia. 2010. Parallel corpora and the search for translation norms/universals. Paper presented at the conference *Methodological Advances in Translation Studies*, January 8–9, Hogeschool Gent. URL `http://liquid.hogent.be/~disgram/MATS2010/bernardini.ppt`. Last accessed 2010-01-30.

Biber, Douglas. 1988. *Variation across speech and writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Biber, Douglas, Stig Johansson, Geoffrey Leech, Susan Conrad & Edward Finegan. 1999. *The Longman grammar of spoken and written English*. London: Longman.

Birner, Betty J. & Gregory Ward. 1994. Uniqueness, familiarity, and the definite article in English. *Proceedings of the Berkeley Linguistics Society* 20. 93–102.

Blühdorn, Hardarik. 1993. Deixis und Deiktika in der deutschen Gegenwartssprache. *Deutsche Sprache* 21(1). 44–62.

Blühdorn, Hardarik. 1995. Was ist Deixis? *Linguistische Berichte* 156. 109–142.

Blühdorn, Hardarik. 2003. Zur Semantik der Konjunktion *als*. Paradigmatische und syntagmatische Aspekte. In Elke Hentschel (ed.), *Particulae Collectae. Festschrift für Harald Weydt zum 65. Geburtstag*, 11–53. Linguistik online 3(1).

Blühdorn, Hardarik. 2008a. On the syntax and semantics of sentence connectives. Unpublished manuscript. URL `http://www.ids-mannheim.de/gra/texte/blu_connectives.pdf`. Last accessed 2010-11-12.

Blühdorn, Hardarik. 2008b. Syntax und Semantik der Konnektoren: Ein Überblick. Unpublished manuscript. URL `http://www.ids-mannheim.de/gra/texte/blu_ueberblick.pdf`. Last accessed 2010-11-12.

Blühdorn, Hardarik. 2009. A semantic typology of sentence connectives. Unpublished manuscript. URL http://www.ids-mannheim.de/gra/texte/blu_semantic_typology.pdf. Last accessed 2010-11-12.

Blühdorn, Hardarik. 2010. Semantische Unterbestimmtheit bei Konnektoren. In Inge Pohl (ed.), *Semantische Unbestimmtheit im Lexikon*, 205–221. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Blühdorn, Hardarik & Nadežda A. Golubeva. 2007. Konzessivkonnektoren und ihre morphologischen Bestandteile im Deutschen und im Russischen. *Germanistisches Jahrbuch Russland* 23. 77–100. URL http://www.daad.ru/wort/inhalt2007.htm. Last accessed 2011-03-03.

Blum-Kulka, Shoshana. 1986. Shifts of cohesion and coherence in tanslation. In Juliane House & Shoshana Blum-Kulka (eds.), *Interlingual and intercultural communication*, 17–35. Tübingen: Gunter Narr.

Braunmüller, Kurt. 1977. *Referenz und Pronominalisierung. Zu den Deiktika und Proformen des Deutschen*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer.

Breindl, Eva. 2003. Das Rätsel um das paradoxe allerdings: (K)ein Fall für die Textgrammatik der deutschen Sprache? In Maria Thurmair & Eva-Maria Willkop (eds.), *Am Anfang war der Text. 10 Jahre „Textgrammatik der deutschen Sprache“*, 73–94. München: iudicium.

Breindl, Eva. 2008. *Die Brigitte nun kann der Hans nicht ausstehen*. Gebundene Topiks im Deutschen. In Eva Breindl & Maria Thurmair (eds.), *Erkenntnisse vom Rande. Zur Interaktion von Prosodie, Informationsstruktur, Syntax und Bedeutung. Festschrift für Hans Altmann zum 65. Geburtstag* (Deutsche Sprache 1/2008), 27–49. Berlin: Erich Schmidt.

Breindl, Eva & Ulrich Hermann Waßner. 2006. Syndese vs. Asyndese. Konnektoren und andere Wegweiser für die Interpretation semantischer Relationen in Texten. In *Text – Verstehen. Grammatik und darüber hinaus*, 46–70. Berlin & New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Breul, Carsten. 2008. On identifiability and definiteness in English and German. *Languages in Contrast* 8(2). 263–285.

Bublitz, Wolfram. 1994. In the eye of the beholder: 'The rather mystical notion of coherence'. In Keith Carlon, Kristin Davidse & Brygida Rudzka-Ostyn (eds.), *Perspectives on english. studies in honor of professor emma vorlat*, 213–230. Leuven & Paris: Peeters.

Bublitz, Wolfram. 2000. Cohesion and coherence. In Jef Verschueren, Jan-Ola Östman, Jan Blommaert & Chris Bulcaen (eds.), *Handbook of pragmatics. 1998 installment*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Bührig, Kristin & Juliane House. 2007. 'So given this common theme...' Linking constructions in discourse across languages. In Christiane Hohenstein, Lukas Pietsch & Jochen Rehbein (eds.), *Connectivity in grammar and discourse*, 345–365. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Büring, Daniel. 1999. Topic. In Peter Bosch & Rob van der Sandt (eds.), *Focus – linguistic, cognitive, and computational perspectives*, 142–165. Cambridge University Press.

Carston, Robyn. 2009. The explicit/implicit distinction in pragmatics and the limits of explicit communication. *International Review of Pragmatics* 1. 35–62.

Carston, Robyn & Diane Blakemore. 2005. The pragmatics of sentential coordination with *and*. *Lingua* 115(4). 569–589.

Chen, Wallace. 2004. Investigating explicitation of conjunctions in translated Chinese: A corpus-based study. *Language Matters* 35(1). 295–312.

Chesterman, Andrew. 1993. Articles and no articles. *Anglistik & Englischunterricht* 49. 13–24.

Chesterman, Andrew. 2010. The space between the data and the concepts. *MikaEL – Electronic proceedings of the KäTu symposium on translation and interpreting studies* 4. 1–12.

Chierchia, Gennaro & Sally McConnell-Ginet. 1990. *Meaning and grammar: An introduction to meaning*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Croft, William & Alan D. Cruse. 2004. *Cognitive linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dallal, Gerard E. 2007. The little handbook of statistical practice. Chapter on *Cause and Effect*. URL `http://www.jerrydallal.com/LHSP/cause.htm`. Last accessed 2010-01-30.

Denturck, Kathelijne. 2009. Explicitation of causality in translation: A corpus-based study on French and Dutch. Paper presented at the *42nd Annual Meeting of the Societas Linguistica Europaea*, workshop on *Connectives across Languages*, University of Lisbon, September 9-12.

Dik, Simon C. 1989. *The theory of functional grammar*. Dordrecht: Foris.

Dixon, R.M.W. & Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald. 2000. Introduction. In R.M.W. Dixon & Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald (eds.), *Changing valency. Case studies in transitivity*, 1–29. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Doherty, Monika. 1996. Passive perspectives: Different preferences in English and German – a result of parametrized processing. *Linguistics* 34(3). 591–643.

Doherty, Monika. 2001. Discourse relators and the beginnings of sentences in English and German. *Languages in Contrast* 3(2). 223–251.

Doherty, Monika. 2002. *Language processing in discourse. A key to felicitous translation*. London & New York: Routledge.

Doherty, Monika. 2006. *Structural propensities: Translating nominal word groups from English into German*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Ehlich, Konrad. 1982. Anaphora and deixis: Same, similar, or different? In Robert J. Jarvella & Wolfgang Klein (eds.), *Speech, Place, and Action*, 315–338. Chichester: John Wiley and Sons.

Ehlich, Konrad. 1984. Zum Textbegriff. In Annely Rothkegel & Barbara Sandig (eds.), *Text – Textsorten – Semantik*, 9–25. Hamburg: Buske.

Ehlich, Konrad. 1987. *So* – Überlegungen zum Verhältnis sprachlicher Formen und sprachlichen Handelns, allgemein und an einem widerspenstigen Beispiel. In Inger Rosengren (ed.), *Sprache und Pragmatik* (Lunder grammatische Forschungen 55), 279–298. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell.

Ehlich, Konrad. 1992. Scientific texts and deictic structures. In Dieter Stein (ed.), *Cooperating with written texts*, 201–229. Berlin & New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Englund Dimitrova, Birgitta. 2003. Explicitation in Russian–Swedish translation: Sociolinguistic and pragmatic aspects. In Alexander Pereswetoff-Morath & Birgitta Englund Dimitrova (eds.), *Swedish Contributions to the Thirteenth International Congress of Slavists, Ljubljana, 15–21 August 2003*, 21–31. Lund: Lund University.

Englund Dimitrova, Birgitta. 2005a. Combining product and process analysis: Explicitation as a case in point. *Bulletin suisse de linguistique appliquée* 81. 25–39.

Englund Dimitrova, Birgitta. 2005b. *Expertise and explicitation in the translation process*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Fabricius-Hansen, Cathrine. 1998. Informational Density and Translation, with Special Reference to German – Norwegian – English. In Stig Johansson & Signe Oksefjell (eds.), *Corpora and cross-linguistic research. Theory, method, and case studies*, 197–234. Amsterdam & New York: Rodopi.

Fabricius-Hansen, Cathrine. 1999. Information packaging and translation: Aspects of translational sentence splitting (German–English/Norwegian). In Monika Doherty (ed.), *Sprachspezifische Aspekte der Informationsverteilung*, 175–214. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.

Fabricius-Hansen, Cathrine. 2005. Elusive connectives: A case study on the explicitness dimension of discourse coherence. *Linguistics* 43(1). 17–48.

Fabricius-Hansen, Cathrine. 2007. Dreimal (nicht) dasselbe: Sprachliche Perspektivierung im Deutschen, Norwegischen und Englischen. *Zeitschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Linguistik* 145. 61–86.

Fabricius-Hansen, Cathrine & Bergljot Behrens. 2001. Elaboration and related discourse relations viewed from an interlingual perspective. *SPRIKreports* 13. URL `http://www.hf.uio.no/ilos/forskning/prosjekter/sprik/docs/pdf/cfh/HansenBehrensReport13.pdf`. Last accessed 2011-03-03.

Foley, William A. & Robert D. Van Valin. 1984. *Functional syntax and universal grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Frawley, William. 1984. Prolegomenon to a theory of translation. In William Frawley (ed.), *Translation: Literary, linguistic and philosophical perspectives*, 159–175. London & Toronto: Associated University Press.

Gamut, L.T.F. 1991. *Logic, language, and meaning*, vol. 1: Introduction to Logic. Chicago & London: The University of Chicago Press.

Garzone, Giuliana. 2004. Annual company reports and CEO's letters: Discoursal features and cultural markedness. In Christopher N. Candlin & Maurizio Gotti (eds.), *Intercultural aspects of specialized communication*, 311–341. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Gohl, Christine. 2000. Causal relations in spoken discourse: Asyndetic constructions as a means for giving reasons. In Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen & Bernd Kortmann (eds.), *Cause – condition – concession – contrast. Cognitive and discourse perspectives. Cognitive and discourse perspectives*, 83–110. Berlin & New York: Walter de Gruyter.

González-Díaz, Victorina & Svenja Kranich. 2009. Appraisal strategies: A cross-linguistic investigation. Paper presented at the workshop *Appraisal Strategies: Recent Change and Cross-cultural Tendencies*, June 17, University of Hamburg.

Graesser, Arthur C., Murray Singer & Tom Trabasso. 1994. Constructing inferences during narrative text comprehension. *Psychological Review* 101(3). 371–395.

Grice, Herbert P. 1975. Logic and conversation. In Peter Cole & Jerry L. Morgan (eds.), *Speech acts* (Syntax and Semantics 3), 41–58. New York: Academic Press.

Grosz, Barbara J. & Candace L. Sidner. 1986. Attention, intentions, and the structure of discourse. *Computational Linguistics* 12. 175–204.

Gumperz, John J., Hannah Kaltman & Mary Catherine O'Connor. 1984. Cohesion in spoken and written discourse: Ethnic style and the transition to literacy. In *Coherence in spoken and written discourse*, 3–20. Norwood: Ablex.

Gundel, Jeanette K., Nancy Hedberg & Ron Zacharski. 1993. Cognitive status and the form of referring expressions in discourse. *Language* 69(2). 274–307.

Hahn, Walther von. 1997. Das Postulat der Explizitheit für den Fachsprachengebrauch. In Lothar Hoffmann, Hartwig Kalverkämper & Herbert Ernst Wiegand (eds.), *Fachsprachen. Ein internationales Handbuch zur Fachsprachenforschung und Terminologiewissenschaft / Languages for Special Purposes. An International Handbook of Special-Language and Terminology Research*, 383–389. Berlin & New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Halliday, Michael A.K. & Ruqaiya Hasan. 1976. *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.

Halliday, Michael A.K. & Christian M.I.M. Matthiessen. 2004. *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. London: Arnold.

Hamann, Cornelia. 1991. Adjektivsemantik. In Arnim von Stechow & Dieter Wunderlich (eds.), *Semantik. Semantics. Ein internationales Handbuch der zeitgenössischen Forschung*, 657–673. Berlin & New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Hansen-Schirra, Silvia, Sandra Hansen, Sascha Wolfer & Lars Konieczny. 2009. Fachkommunikation, Popularisierung, Übersetzung: Empirische Vergleiche am Beispiel der Nominalphrase im Englischen und Deutschen. *Linguistik online* 39(3). URL `http://www.linguistik-online.de/39_09/hansenschirraEtAl.html`. Last accessed 2011-03-03.

Hansen-Schirra, Silvia, Stella Neumann & Erich Steiner. 2007. Cohesive explicitness and explicitation in an English-German translation corpus. *Languages in Contrast* 7(2). 205–229.

Harwood, Nigel. 2005. "We Do Not Seem to Have a Theory. . . The Theory I Present Here Attempts to Fill This Gap": Inclusive and exclusive pronouns in academic writing. *Applied Linguistics* 26(3). 343–375.

Hawkins, John A. 1986. *A Comparative Typology of English and German: Unifying the Contrasts*. London & Sydney: Croom Helm.

Heim, Irene. 1983. File change semantics and the familiarity theory of definiteness. In Rainer Bäuerle, Christoph Schwarze & Arnim von Stechow (eds.), *Meaning, use, and interpretation of language*, 164–189. Berlin & New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Heltai, Pál. 2005. Explicitation, redundancy, ellipsis and translation. In Krisztina Károly & Ágota Fóris (eds.), *New trends in translation studies: In honour of Kinga Klaudy*, 45–74. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.

Hoey, Michael. 2001. *Textual interaction: An introduction to written discourse analysis*. London: Routledge.

Horn, Lawrence. 1984. Toward a new taxonomy for pragmatic inference: Q-based and R-based implicature. In Deborah Schiffrin (ed.), *Meaning, form, and use in context: Linguistic applications*, 11–42. Washington: Georgetown University Press.

House, Juliane. 1977. *A model for translation quality assessment*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr.

House, Juliane. 1997. *Translation quality assessment. A model revisited*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr.

House, Juliane. 2002. Maintenance and convergence in covert translation English–German. In Hilde Hasselgård, Stig Johansson, Bergljot Behrens & Cathrine Fabricius-Hansen (eds.), *Information structure in a cross-linguistic perspective*, 45–61. Amsterdam & New York: Rodopi.

House, Juliane. 2004a. Explicitness in discourse across languages. In Juliane House, Werner Koller & Klaus Schubert (eds.), *Neue Perspektiven in der Übersetzungs- und Dolmetschwissenschaft*, 185–208. Bochum: AKS.

House, Juliane. 2004b. Linguistic aspects of the translation of children's books. In Harald Kittel, Armin P. Frank & Norbert Greiner (eds.), *Übersetzung – translation – traduction. An international encyclopedia of translation studies*, 683–697. Berlin & New York: Walter de Gruyter.

House, Juliane. 2006. Communicative styles in English and German. *European Journal of English Studies* 10(3). 249–267.

House, Juliane. 2008. Beyond intervention: Universals in translation? *trans-kom* 1(1).

House, Juliane. 2010. Impoliteness in Germany: Intercultural encounters in everyday and institutional talk. *Intercultural Pragmatics* 7(4). 561–595.

House, Juliane. forthcoming. Linking constructions in English and German translated and original texts. In Svenja Kranich, Viktor Becher, Steffen Höder & Juliane House (eds.), *Multilingual discourse production. diachronic and synchronic perspectives*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Hyland, Ken. 1996. Writing without conviction? Hedging in science research articles. *Applied Linguistics* 17. 433–454.

Hyland, Ken. 1998. Exploring corporate rhetoric: Metadiscourse in the CEO's letter. *The Journal of Business Communication* 35(2). 224–245.

Jordan, Michael P. 1984. *Rhetoric of Everyday English Texts*. London: Allen & Unwin.

Kamenická, Renata. 2008. Explicitation profile and translator style. In Anthony Pym & Alexander Perekrestenko (eds.), *Translation Research Projects 1*, 117–130. Tarragona: Intercultural Studies Group.

Kameyama, Shinichi. 2007. Persondeixis, Objektdeixis. In Ludger Hoffmann (ed.), *Handbuch der deutschen Wortarten*, 577–600. Berlin & New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Kenny, Dorothy. 1998. Creatures of habit? What translators usually do with words. *Meta* 43(4). 515–523.

Kenny, Dorothy. 2005. Parallel corpora and translation studies: Old questions, new perspectives? Reporting *that* in Gepcolt: A case study. In Geoff Barnbrook, Pernilla Danielson & Michaela Mahlberg (eds.), *Meaningful texts: The extraction of semantic information from monolingual and multilingual corpora*, 154–165. London: Continuum.

Kitagawa, Chisato & Adrienne Lehrer. 1990. Impersonal uses of personal pronouns. *Journal of Pragmatics* 14. 739–759.

Klaudy, Kinga. 1993. On explicitation hypothesis. In Kinga Klaudy & Janos Kohn (eds.), *Transferre necesse est… current issues of translation theory*, 69–77. Szombathely: Dániel Berzsenyi College.

Klaudy, Kinga. 1998. Explicitation. In Mona Baker (ed.), *Routledge encyclopedia of translation studies*, 80–85. London: Routledge, 1st edn.

Klaudy, Kinga. 2001. The Asymmetry Hypothesis. Testing the asymmetric relationship between explicitations and implicitations. Paper presented at the *Third International Congress of the European Society for Translation Studies: Claims, Changes and Challenges in Translation Studies. August 30 – September 01, Copenhagen*.

Klaudy, Kinga. 2008. Explicitation. In Mona Baker & Gabriela Saldanha (eds.), *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*, 104–108. London & New York: Routledge, 2nd edn.

Klaudy, Kinga. 2009. The asymmetry hypothesis in translation research. In Rodica Dimitriu & Miriam Shlesinger (eds.), *Translators and their readers. In Homage to Eugene A. Nida*, 283–303. Brussels: Les Editions du Hazard.

Klaudy, Kinga & Krisztina Károly. 2005. Implicitation in translation: Empirical evidence for operational asymmetry in translation. *Across Languages and Cultures* 6(1). 13–28.

König, Ekkehard. 1991. Concessive relations as the dual of causal relations. In Dietmar Zaefferer (ed.), *Semantic universals and universal semantics*, 190–209. Berlin, New York & Dordrecht: Foris.

König, Ekkehard. 2001. Kontrastive Analysen Deutsch-Englisch: Eine Übersicht. In *Deutsch als Fremdsprache: Ein internationales Handbuch*, vol. 1, 324–330. Berlin & New York: Walter de Gruyter.

König, Ekkehard & Volker Gast. 2009. *Understanding English-German Contrasts*. Berlin: Erich Schmidt.

Konšalová, Petra. 2007. Explicitation as a universal in syntactic de/condensation. *Across Languages and Cultures* 8(1). 17–32.

Kortmann, Bernd & Paul G. Meyer. 1992. Is English grammar more explicit than German grammar, after all? In Christian Mair, Manfred Markus & Joseph Wallmannsberger (eds.), *New departures in contrastive linguistics*, 155–166. Universität Innsbruck: Institut für Anglistik.

Kranich, Svenja. 2009. Epistemic modality in English popular scientific texts and their German translations. *trans-kom* 2(1). 26–41.

Kranich, Svenja. 2011. To hedge or not to hedge: The use of epistemic modal expressions in popular science in English texts, English-German translations, and German original texts. *Text & Talk* 31(1). 77–99.

Kripke, Saul. 1972. Naming and necessity. In Donald Davidson & Gilbert Harman (eds.), *Semantics of natural language*, 253–355. Dordrecht: Reidel.

Lang, Ewald. 1991. Koordinierende Konjunktionen. In Arnim von Stechow & Dieter Wunderlich (eds.), *Semantik. Semantics. Ein internationales Handbuch der zeitgenössischen Forschung*, 597–623. Berlin & New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Laviosa, S. 1998. Core patterns of lexical use in a comparable Corpus of English narrative prose. *Meta* 43(4).

Leuthesser, Lance & Chiranjeev Kohli. 1997. Corporate identity: The role of mission statements. *Business Horizons* 40(3). 59–66.

Levinson, Stephen C. 1983. *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lyons, John. 1977. *Semantics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lyons, John. 1982. Deixis and subjectivity: *Loquor, ergo sum*? In Robert J. Jarvella & Wolfgang Klein (eds.), *Speech, Place, and Action*, 101–124. Chichester: John Wiley and Sons.

Maienborn, Claudia. 2005. A discourse-based account of Spanish *ser/estar*. *Linguistics* 43(1). 155–180.

Mauranen, Anna. 2007. Universal tendencies in translation. In Gunilla Anderman & Margaret Rogers (eds.), *Incorporating corpora. The linguist and the translator*, 32–48. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Nida, Eugene A. 1964. *Toward a science of translating*. Leiden: Brill.

Nida, Eugene A. 1986. Barriers and bridges in translating. In *Building bridges. Proceedings of the 27th Annual Conference of the ATA*, 3–14. Medford: Learned Information.

Niemegeers, Sofie & Kathelijne Denturck. 2010. Explicitation – Implicitation – Unique Items: The case of modal particles and causal connectives. Paper presented at *Methodological Advances in Corpus-Based Translation Studies 2010*, January 8–9, Hogeschool Gent.

Olohan, Maeve. 2002. Leave it out! Using a comparable corpus to investigate aspects of explicitation in translation. *Cadernos de Tradução* 9. 153–169.

Olohan, Maeve. 2004. *Introducing corpora in translation studies*. London: Routledge.

Olohan, Maeve & Mona Baker. 2000. Reporting *that* in translated English: Evidence for subconscious processes of explicitation? *Across Languages and Cultures* 1(2). 141–158.

Pasch, Renate, Ursula Brauße, Eva Breindl & Ulrich Hermann Waßner. 2003. *Handbuch der deutschen Konnektoren*. Berlin & New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Polenz, Peter von. 1981. Über die Jargonisierung von Wissenschaftssprache und wider die Deagentivierung. In Theo Bungarten (ed.), *Wissenschaftssprache. Beiträge zur Methodologie, theoretischen Fundierung und Deskription*, 85–110. München: Fink.

Posner, Roland. 1980. Semantics and pragmatics of sentence connectives in natural language. In John R. Searle, Ferenc Kiefer & Manfred Bierwisch (eds.), *Speech act theory and pragmatics*, 169–203. Dordrecht: Reidel.

Primatarova-Miltscheva, Antoinette. 1986. *Zwar ... aber* – ein zweiteiliges Konnektivum? *Deutsche Sprache* 14(2). 125–139.

Puurtinen, Tiina. 2004. Explicitation of clausal relations: A corpus-based analysis of clause connectives in translated and non-translated Finnish children's literature. In Anna Mauranen & Pekka Kujamäki (eds.), *Translation universals. Do they exist?*, 165–176. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Pym, Anthony. 2005. Explaining Explicitation. In Krisztina Károly & Ágota Fóris (eds.), *New trends in translation studies. In honour of Kinga Klaudy*, 29–34. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.

Pym, Anthony. 2008. On Toury's laws of how translators translate. In Anthony Pym, Miriam Shlesinger & Daniel Simeoni (eds.), *Beyond descriptive translation studies*, 311–328. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Pápai, Vilma. 2004. Explicitation: A universal of translated text? In Anna Mauranen & Pekka Kujamäki (eds.), *Translation universals. Do they exist?*, 143–164. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech & Jan Svartvik. 1985. *A comprehensive grammar of the English language*. London: Longman.

Rehbein, Jochen. 1995. Über zusammengesetzte Verweiswörter und ihre Rolle in argumentierender Rede. In Harald Wohlrapp (ed.), *Wege der Argumentationsforschung*, 166–197. Stuttgart: frommann-holzboog.

Rohdenburg, Günter. 1990. Aspekte einer vergleichenden Typologie des Englischen und Deutschen. In Claus Gnutzmann (ed.), *Kontrastive Linguistik*, 133–152. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Rounds, Carol H. 2009. *Hungarian: An essential grammar*. London & New York: Routledge, 2nd edn.

Saldanha, Gabriela. 2005. *Style of translation: An exploration of stylistic patterns in the translations of Margaret Jull Costa and Peter Bush*. Ph.D. thesis, School of Applied Language and Intercultural Studies, Dublin City University.

Saldanha, Gabriela. 2008. Explicitation revisited: Bringing the reader into the picture. *trans-kom* 1(1).

Schiffrin, Deborah. 1987. *Discourse markers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schlobinski, Peter. 1992. *Funktionale Grammatik und Sprachbeschreibung. Eine Untersuchung zum gesprochenen Deutsch sowie zum Chinesischen*. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.

Smith, Elliot & Peter Hancox. 2001. Representation, coherence and inference. *Artificial Intelligence Review* 15(4). 295–323.

Sperber, Dan & Deirdre Wilson. 1995. *Relevance: Communication and cognition*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2nd edn.

Sperber, Dan & Deirdre Wilson. 2004. Relevance Theory. In Gregory Ward & Lawrence Horn (eds.), *Handbook of pragmatics*, 607–632. Blackwell: Blackwell.

Stein, Dieter. 1979. Zur Satzkonnektion im Englischen und Deutschen: Ein Beitrag zu einer kontrastiven Vertextungslinguistik. *Folia Linguistica* 13. 303–319.

Steiner, Erich. 2005. Explicitation, its lexicogrammatical realization, and its determining (independent) variables – towards an empirical and corpus-based methodology. *SPRIKreports* 36. URL `http://www.hf.uio.no/ilos/forskning/prosjekter/sprik/docs/pdf/Report_36_ESteiner.pdf`. Last accessed 2011-03-03.

Steiner, Erich. 2008. Empirical studies of translations as a mode of language contact. "Explicitness" of lexicogrammatical encoding as a relevant dimension. In Peter Siemund & Noemi Kintana (eds.), *Language contact and contact languages*, 317–345. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Swan, Michael. 1980. *Practical English usage*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sweetser, Eve. 1990. *From etymology to pragmatics: Metaphorical and cultural aspects of semantic structure*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Séguinot, Candace. 1988. Pragmatics and the explicitation hypothesis. *TTR: traduction, terminologie, rédaction* 1(2). 106–113.

Thompson, Geoff. 2001. Interaction in academic writing: Learning to argue with the reader. *Applied Linguistics* 22(1). 58–78.

Thompson, Geoff & Puleng Thetela. 1995. The sound of one hand clapping: The management of interaction in written discourse. *Text* 15(1). 103–127.

Toole, Janine. 1996. The effect of genre on referential choice. In Thorsten Fretheim & Jeanette Gundel (eds.), *Reference and referent accessibility*, 263–290. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Toury, Gideon. 1995. *Descriptive translation studies and beyond*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Ulrych, Margherita & Amanda Murphy. 2008. Descriptive translation studies and the use of corpora: Investigating mediation universals. In Carol Taylor Torsello, Katherine Ackerley & Erik Castello (eds.), *Corpora for university language teachers*, 141–166. Bern: Peter Lang.

Umbach, Carla & Cornelia Ebert. 2009. German demonstrative *so* – intensifying and hedging effects. *Sprache und Datenverarbeitung* 33(1-2). 153–168.

Umbach, Carla & Manfred Stede. 1999. Kohärenzrelationen: Ein Vergleich von Kontrast und Konzession. *KIT Report* 148. URL `http://flp.cs.tu-berlin.de/publikationen/kit/r148/Kohaerenzrelationen.pdf`. Last accessed 2011-03-03.

Vandepitte, Sonia. 1990. *Every why has a wherefore: A generative-pragmatic study of the expression and interpretation of causality in modern spoken British English, with particular reference to conjuncts and conjunctions*. Ph.D. thesis, Gent University.

Verstraete, Jean-Christophe. 2007. *Rethinking the coordinate–subordinate dichotomy. Interpersonal grammar and the analysis of adverbial clauses in English*. Berlin & New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Vinay, Jean-Paul & Jean Darbelnet. 1958. *Stylistique comparée du français et de l'anglais*. Paris: Didier.

Vinay, Jean-Paul & Jean Darbelnet. 1995. *Comparative stylistics of French and English: A methodology for translation*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Waßner, Ulrich Hermann. 2001. Konnektoren und Anaphorika – zwei grundlegende sprachliche Mittel zur Herstellung von Zusammenhang zwischen Textteilen. In Alain Cambourian (ed.), *Textkonnektoren und andere textstrukturiernde Einheiten*, 33–46. Tübingen: Stauffenburg.

Weissbrod, Rachel. 1992. Explicitation in translations of prose-fiction from English to Hebrew as a function of norms. *Multilingua* 11(2). 153–171.

Wittgenstein, Ludwig. 1921. Logisch-Philosophische Abhandlung. *Annalen der Naturphilosophie* 14.

Wolf, Florian, Edward Gibson & Timothy Desmet. 2004. Discourse coherence and pronoun resolution. *Language and Cognitive Processes* 19(6). 665–675.

Wykes, Til. 1983. The role of inferences in children's comprehension of pronouns. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology* 35. 180–193.

Zifonun, Gisela, Ludger Hoffmann & Bruno Strecker. 1997. *Grammatik der deutschen Sprache*. Berlin & New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Øverås, Linn. 1998. In search of the third code: An investigation of norms in literary translation. *Meta* 43(4). 557–570.