Connectives as indicators of explicitation in literary translation: A study based on a comparable and parallel corpus

Josep Marco

Universitat Jaume I (Castelló, Spain)

Abstract: This study aims to answer three questions: (1) whether there are differences in the frequency of use of connectives between translated and non-translated Catalan literary texts; (2) whether these differences (if they exist) are sensitive to the type of semantic relation conveyed; and (3) to what extent they are due to explicitation or other factors. Quantitative analysis reveals that there is no significant difference in the overall frequency of occurrence of connectives in translations and non-translations, but the behaviour of connectives in translations is sensitive to the type of semantic relation conveyed. Moreover, the higher frequency of connectives expressing consequence in translations seems to be related to explicitation. Qualitative analysis suggests that explicitation is strongly associated with two factors: the semantic relation conveyed by the connective being part of the common ground shared by participants, and the predominance of the procedural function of the connective.

1. Introduction

The aim of this study is to analyse the behaviour of Catalan connectives in a comparable corpus of literary translations (from English) and non-translations, and to account for possible differences by looking at the source texts matching the translations. Results will be examined in the light of the explicitation hypothesis, "which postulates an observed cohesive explicitness from SL to TL texts regardless of the increase traceable to differences between the two linguistic and textual systems involved" (Blum-Kulka 1986, 19). It must be noted, however, that no matter how central the notion of explicitation may be in our discussion, the present study does not purport to test out the hypothesis as such, for reasons that will be explained in the methodology section. The overall aim just formulated could then be broken down into the following partial aims: (a) to identify differences in the use of connectives between translated and non-translated Catalan literary texts; (b) to find out whether, and to what extent, such differences are sensitive to the type of semantic relation conveyed by the connectives and to specific connectives; (c) to determine to what extent such differences are due to explicitation or to other factors. In order to answer the second question, connectives expressing result/consequence and

contrast/concession will be dealt with. There is a neat, one-to-one correspondence between these three partial aims and the three questions listed in the abstract. All in all, the present article intends to contribute new evidence to the ongoing debate on explicitation in general and, more particularly, on the extent to which explicitation is at play in the area of connectives.

The layout of the study is as follows. Section 2 will provide a brief overview of explicitation in translation. Section 3 will focus on connectives as indicators of explicitation and on the notion of connective in Catalan grammar. Section 4 will outline the methodology employed in the study, with an emphasis on corpus description and the steps followed in the analysis. Section 5 will report on results and provide a discussion of them. Section 6 will be an attempt to summarise the argument by putting forward some concluding remarks.

2. Explicitation

The notion of explicitation was first introduced into translation studies by Vinay and Darbelnet ([1958] 1995, 342), who defined it 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". However, the best-known and most often quoted definition is the one by Blum-Kulka (1986) provided in the

introduction. This definition was soon perceived to be lacking in precision. Only two years after its formulation, Séguinot (1988) argued that cross-linguistic differences are often responsible for a certain degree of explicitness in translation and suggested that "[t]he term 'explicitation' should therefore be reserved in translation studies for additions in a translated text which cannot be explained by structural, stylistic, or rhetorical differences between the two languages" (1988, 108). A major contribution to the debate on the scope of explicitation was made by Klaudy (e.g. 2008, although there are earlier versions), who identified four types: obligatory, optional, pragmatic and translation-inherent, the latter being explicitation due to "the nature of the translation process itself" (2008, 107). This follows on the heels of Blum-Kulka's own claim that "explicitation is a universal strategy inherent in the process of language mediation" (1986, 21). No wonder, then, that Baker's list of (alleged) universals of translation (e.g. 1993, 243-245) should feature explicitation, amongst others. Klaudy further claimed that studies on explicitation far outweigh those on implicitation, and argued for striking a balance between the two, which took the shape of the so-called *asymmetry hypothesis*, formulated as follows (Klaudy and Károly 2005, 14): "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's asymmetry hypothesis lies at the basis of Becher's (2010) scathing

attack on the explicitation hypothesis as formulated by Blum-Kulka. In fact, Becher suggests (2010, 1) abandoning the latter altogether and replacing it with a slightly modified version of the former, which reads as follows (2010, 17): "Obligatory, optional and pragmatic explicitations tend to be more frequent than the corresponding implicitations regardless of the SL/TL constellation at hand." On comparison, the main difference between Klaudy's and Becher's versions is that the latter rejects the notion of translation-inherent explicitation as unmotivated and unnecessary. Then Becher goes on to motivate his new hypothesis on the general grounds that translation acts are above all acts of communication and, as such, they are ruled by the same general principles as rule human communication.

Even though a number of scholars claim to have found evidence in support of the explicitation hypothesis, such evidence is inconclusive. It might be said that the jury is still out on this one – just as it is arguably out on the rest of so-called translation universals too. On the basis of different kinds of corpora and various linguistic indicators, the explicitation hypothesis finds support in such studies as Øverås (1998), Olohan and Baker (2000), Klaudy (2001), Pápai (2004) and Klaudy and Károly (2005). But other studies offer less clear-cut results: Puurtinen (2004) and Englund-Dimitrova (2005) find mixed evidence, whereas Espunya (2007) and Hansen-Schirra et al. (2007) are rather cautious of attributing their findings

to explicitation, since other factors such as the influence of target language conventions and cross-linguistic differences might be at play.

It has just been said that various linguistic or textual elements have been used as indicators of explicitation in empirical research. Cohesive devices, culture-specific items and lexical specification, for instance, feature in several studies, but there are authors, such as Øverås (1998), who still widen the scope of the concept to include other features like neutralisation of marked collocations and metaphorical expressions. At any rate, possibly as a consequence of Blum-Kulka's influential definition, cohesion markers have been and remain very closely linked to explicitation. Since the present study focuses on Catalan connectives, and connectives signal cohesion and coherence relations in language use, they will be particularly dealt with in the next section.

3. Connectives as indicators of explicitation

Connectives have been defined by Pander Maat and Sanders (Vandepitte et al. 2013, 48) as "one-word items or fixed combinations that express the relation between clauses, sentences, or utterances in the discourse of a particular speaker" and indicate how their host utterances are "relevant to the context." Cuenca (2002), in a work that in many respects has served as a point of reference for the present study as regards the conception and typology of Catalan connectives, draws a clear distinction between what she

calls *parenthetical* connectives (the Catalan counterparts of such English connectives as *in fact*, *on the other hand*, *as a result*, etc.), conjunctions (which operate within the sentence, not between sentences or groups of sentences, although they may incidentally do so) and other, more peripheral, connectives.

Translation scholars who have regarded connectives as fertile ground for testing the explicitation hypothesis (either in its traditional form or, more recently, reformulated as the asymmetry hypothesis) have paid attention not only to its confirmation (or otherwise) but also to the factors or conditions influencing explicitation. In fact, both aspects are closely linked, as the answer to the explicitation question is often more complex than a mere yes/no dichotomy allows. Corpus data analysis frequently suggests that certain factors, or conditions, favour explicitation, whereas others do not.

One such factor is the type of semantic relation conveyed. Puurtinen (2004), drawing on a comparable corpus about one million words in size, examines a relatively wide range of Finnish connectives and finds that some are more frequent in translated texts, whereas others occur more often in non-translated texts. Even though her data suggests that "[t]here is no clear overall tendency of either subcorpus favouring connectives more than the other" (2004, 170), their distribution across both sub-corpora is uneven. Among connectives occurring more frequently in translation, Puurtinen identifies a temporal conjunction sometimes used causally and two purpose

conjunctions. Englund Dimitrova (2005), for her part, sets out to investigate the relationship between translators' amount of experience and (degrees of) explicitation. In order to operationalise explicitation she chooses "logical links that are not explicitly expressed by a connective in the ST" (2005, 155). Her study yields different results for different types of implicit logical links, explicitation being clearly visible where additive and contrastive relations are at play, but not when the logical link is causal or temporal. However, it must be borne in mind that Englund Dimitrova's study was not observational, but experimental, as it was geared to finding out whether professional translators and students handled explicitating techniques differently. It remains to be seen, then, what would happen in an observational study with a large amount of data in which just this variable (type of logical link) was the central one.

A second factor brought to bear on the occurrence of explicitation stems from the twofold function of connectives as reflected in the definition which opens this section. Connectives signal semantic relations between clauses or sentences, indeed, but they also point to the context by indicating in what ways the utterance is relevant to it and/or by providing signs of the speaker's attitude. The former function may be said to refer to the *propositional* meaning (Cuenca 2002, 3189) of the connective, whereas the latter refers to its *procedural* meaning (ibid.). Several translation scholars have referred to the functions of connectives. Aijmer (2007, 33) describes

the procedural meaning of discourse markers in the following terms: "discourse markers contribute to procedural meaning rather than conceptual or representative sentence meaning (their meaning as representing concepts): they 'provide instructions to the addressee on how the utterance to which the discourse marker is attached is to be interpreted' (Fraser 1996, 186) 'and are the linguistically encoded clues which signal the speaker's potential communicative intentions' (Fraser, ibid)." Sometimes differences in metalanguage blur what may otherwise be perceived as basic conceptual affinities between authors. Thus, Zufferey and Cartoni (2012, 234), following Sweetser (1990), use the term *domains of use*, which is not so different from function. Sweetser put forward a threefold distinction between content or real-world uses of connectives, epistemic uses and speech-act uses, but later authors have tended to conflate these three domains into just two – *objective* versus *subjective* relations between propositional content. It will be seen later on how this aspect affects the potential of connectives for explicitation.

A third factor identified in the literature is the extent to which the semantic relation between two given clauses or sentences can be inferred from the context, i.e. whether such a relation is to be interpreted as given or new information. Translators' decisions, once this aspect has been factored in, may lead to explicitation, to implicitation or to the preservation of the source text connective. In fact, the authors of several contrastive studies,

when dealing with a particular connective, wonder why connectives are often omitted in translation. Traugott (2007, 54) ventures the following: "[a] question worth investigating is whether non-translation is possibly not so much a function of a particular connective, but rather of the extent to which the prior context provides a sufficiently explicit indication of the speaker's discourse purposes (refutation, elaboration, etc.)." Likewise, Aijmer (2007, 50) tentatively puts forward the hypothesis that "omission can take place if there are other functional clues in the context making the discourse marker redundant". As in the preceding paragraph, we need to pay attention to conceptual overlaps between authors who use different terminologies. Zufferey and Cartoni (2012, 235) prefer to talk about the *information status* of the clauses or sentences linked by a semantic relation, which is based on the distinction between given and new. Vandepitte et al. (2013), for their part, focus on *information structure* in causal expressions and how it is dealt with in translation. Information structure has to do with *manifestness*, which is regarded as a gradual concept. Over and above surface differences, all these terms refer to the amount of information that can be inferred from context (or that the speaker assumes that can be inferred from context) and how this impinges upon explicitating or implicitating techniques in translation.

An important contribution both *per se* and as an illustration of all the factors mentioned in the preceding paragraphs is Zufferey and Cartoni

(2014), which uses a corpus made up of several sections of Europarl. Causal connectives are chosen to test the explicitation hypothesis because they are usually optional, as causal relations can be explicitly marked by connectives (and by other means) or left implicit. The factors brought under scrutiny are the roles of different source languages, different target languages, specific lexical items and discourse relations. To test the first factor, four French causal connectives are chosen for analysis in a corpus of French original texts and four French sub-corpora of translations from English, German, Italian and Spanish. To test the second factor, the analysis focuses on three English causal connectives (very similar to the French ones), with English as the target language and French, German, Italian and Spanish as source languages. For both factors, the differences observed in the explicitation of causal connectives are shown not to be statistically significant. However, explicitation turns out to be sensitive to the other two factors. As to specific connectives, results show that some causal connectives are more strongly associated with explicitation than others for all source languages, and the differences observed are statistically significant. This is true of both the French and the English connectives chosen for the study. The reason for these differences lies, according to the authors, in the properties shared by the connectives most strongly used for explicitation. Two criteria are brought to bear: the objective or subjective nature of the relation signalled by the connective, and the information status of the cause segment. The connectives typically used for explicitation are those which mark a

subjective relation where the cause is introduced as part of the common ground. An important role is played by the alternative options to a connective available in a given language, as already noted by Becher (2011). The fourth factor, discourse relations, is tested on a single French connective, *en effet*, which may indicate either confirmation or justification. This connective is shown to be used much more frequently for explicitation in the justification than in the confirmation sense, which bears out the hypothesis that explicitation is sensitive to the type of discourse relation marked by the connective. Moreover, in the justification sense, *en effet* usually marks a subjective relation. The authors summarise their argument (2014, 379-380) by suggesting that translators feel the need to add connectives marking causes as part of the common ground in order to strengthen the coherence of a target text aiming at a different culture, in which readers may not perceive the obviousness of a causal link. A second explanation might be that "subjective relations conveying common ground may be less explicit than other types of causal relations in original texts, thus leaving more room for explicitation in translated data" (2014, 380). Temporal relations, for instance, are easy to infer without the help of connectives and can be left implicit, thus allowing more room, cross-linguistically, for explicitation. The opposite would be true of concessive relations, which are less easy to infer without connectives.

As we have just seen, Zufferey and Cartoni (2014) refer to an article by Becher (2011) in which it was claimed that the alternative options to a connective available in a given language impinge on explicitation. In fact, that claim is part of a much more ambitious objective: to explain when and why translators add connectives. Drawing on a small parallel bi-directional corpus (English-German, German-English), the author manually identifies all instances of connectives. On a quantitative level, he finds that additions far outnumber omissions for the English-German direction, whereas the opposite is true for German-English. This is in line, Becher claims, with the well attested fact that German is a more explicitly cohesive language than English. Moreover, the asymmetry hypothesis is confirmed by the fact that additions in the English-German direction are not counterbalanced by omissions in the opposite direction. On the qualitative level, Becher (2011, 32) identifies five reasons why translators add connectives: 1) to comply with the communicative norms of the target language community; 2) to exploit specific features of the target language system; 3) to deal with specific restrictions of the target language system; 4) to avoid stylistically marked ways of expression; and 5) to optimise the cohesion of the target text. Reason 1 leads to standardisation, which may be carried to the point of overusing target language typical elements (reason 2). Reason 3 ensures the occurrence of target language typical elements even if the source text offers no trigger for them. Reason 4 leads to normalisation in Kenny's (2001) sense: stylistically marked, or creative, segments in the source text are

replaced with unmarked segments in the target text. And reason 5 all but grants translators *carte blanche* to add connectives, or indeed any other cohesion marker, whenever they think that coherence is compromised. The first four reasons may be said to stem from cross-linguistic differences, whereas the fifth is pragmatic in nature and ties in particularly well with the third factor impinging on explicitation mentioned in this section.

Denturck (2012) follows Becher's advice to replace the explicitation hypothesis with Klaudy's asymmetry hypothesis, even if slightly modified. She focuses on causal connectives because they are claimed to be the most explicit means of expressing causality. In order to test whether instances of explicitation in a given translation direction actually outnumber instances of implicitation in the opposite direction regardless of the language pair involved and of the translation direction within that pair, she compiled a small parallel bi-directional corpus made up of fragments from novels both in French and Dutch and of their respective translations into Dutch and French. She used four causal connectives in French and another four in Dutch as search words, and corpus analysis was carried out both from source to target and from target to source, thus yielding four different sets of data. Searches starting from the source text components could only unveil instances of preservation of a similar degree of explicitness or of implicitation, whereas searches starting from the target text components aimed to discover cases of preservation or explicitation. Translation

direction turns out to be crucial in this particular study, since explicitation outweighs implicitation in French to Dutch, and also implicitation in the opposite direction (as predicted by the hypothesis), but in Dutch to French cases of implicitation outnumber those of explicitation. Denturck suggests that, since causal connectives occur more frequently in Dutch than in French, in general, the difference observed between the two parallel corpora can be laid down to standardisation, or normalisation – i.e. to the translators' effort to conform to target language conventions or norms.

Some of the factors bearing on explicitation which have been mentioned in this section will be taken up again in the results and discussion section. The type of semantic relation conveyed by connectives is the focus of one of the partial aims of this study, as mentioned in the introduction; and two other factors (the function of the connective, and the information status of the relation signalled by the connective as given or new) will be brought into the picture in the discussion. Other factors, however, such as language pair or translation direction, will not be touched upon, as only one pair and one direction (English to Catalan) are here accounted for.

4. Methodology

As explained in the first paragraph, the main goal of this paper is to analyse the behaviour of Catalan connectives in a comparable corpus of translations

and non-translations. That goal was broken down into three sub-goals, which will now be rephrased as questions:

1. Are there any differences in the frequency of use of connectives between the translated and non-translated Catalan literary texts making up the comparable corpus?

2. If there are differences, are they sensitive to the type of semantic relation conveyed by the connectives? In other words, are frequencies in the use of connectives evenly distributed across the two types considered – consequence and contrast?

3. If there are differences, to what extent are they due to explicitation or to other factors?

Obviously, the method followed stems directly from the general aim and its operationalisation through these questions.

The analysis draws on data extracted from a corpus that is both parallel and comparable. The parallel corpus is constituted by the English-Catalan section of COVALT (Valencian Corpus of Translated Literature), a multilingual corpus made up of the translations into Catalan of narrative works originally written in English, French, and German published in the autonomous region of Valencia from 1990 to 2000, together with their corresponding source texts. The English-Catalan sub-corpus includes 41 source text + target text pairs which amount to 2,297,564 words (1,096,226 English, 1,201,338 Catalan). As to the comparable corpus, it is made up of

the English-Catalan translations just mentioned and a set of 30 narrative texts written originally in Catalan amounting to 1,122,542 words.[1] Comparability criteria include size, time of publication (between 1990 and 2000), place of publication (the autonomous region of Valencia) and genre (fiction, both full-length novels and short story collections).

The connectives chosen for analysis belong to two different sets, defined on the basis of the type of semantic relation they convey: those indicating result/consequence and those signalling contrast/concession. Cuenca (2002, 3189) identifies four large groups of connectives in Catalan on a semantic basis: addition, disjunction, contrast and consequence, each of which can host a number of procedural meanings (e.g. continuity, intensification, distribution, etc.). Since it was impossible to account for the four of them in a single study, two types were selected which were well-defined and whose use was seldom (if ever) obligatory. As has already been seen, the optional character of many connectives turns them into a suitable element for the study of explicitation. Five connectives were chosen for analysis under the category 'consequence': *així doncs* ('thus', 'so'), *aleshores* ('then', 'so'), *doncs* ('then'), *llavors* ('then', 'so') and *per tant* ('therefore'). As to the category 'contrast/concession', the following connectives were selected: *ara bé* ('now'), *de tota manera* ('anyway', 'at any rate'), *de totes maneres*

---

[1] Both the parallel and the comparable corpus have been compiled at the Translation and Communication Department, Universitat Jaume I (Castelló, Spain) and can be accessed for research purposes upon request (http://www.covalt.uji.es). However, the version of the English-Catalan subcorpus used in this article is slightly larger than the one currently lodged in the server.

('anyway', 'at any rate'), *en canvi* ('but', 'however'), *en qualsevol cas* ('in any case'), *en tot cas* ('in any case', 'at any rate'), *malgrat tot* ('yet'), *no obstant* ('however'), *tanmateix* ('however') and *tot i això* ('yet', 'still'). Since the full list of connectives for both categories was rather long, two criteria were used for selection: frequency of occurrence in the comparable corpus (because frequency is an indicator of prototypicality) and data manageability. According to the latter criterion, some connectives were excluded because they would have yielded too many occurrences, on account either of sheer frequency as connectives or of polysemy, which would have resulted in many unwanted matches to be discarded later through manual analysis.

Corpus analysis proper consisted of the following steps. Firstly, the non-translated component of the comparable corpus was searched by introducing our fifteen connectives as queries in Wordsmith Tools 4.0 (Scott 2004-2007). Secondly, the parallel corpus (i.e. the English-Catalan section of COVALT, as explained above) was analysed by inserting the connectives in the search utility of Microsoft Access.[2] Thirdly, all the matches yielded by

---

[2] This rather peculiar procedure calls for an explanation. Some time ago the COVALT group decided to make the parallel multilingual corpus amenable to analysis through the Corpus Query Processor (CQP) utility of Corpus Workbench. Therefore, texts had to be aligned, lemmatised and POS-tagged. But the annotation software used (TreeTagger for English, French and German, Freeling for Catalan) was found to be defective both as regards lemmatisation and tagging. Even though we knew it would be very time-consuming, we decided to manually check mistakes with the help of hired research assistants. This mistake-checking process was carried out through Microsoft Access, which proved a friendly, helpful tool. Since the corpus was not yet ready for analysis through CQP when the present study began to take shape, Access was used as a bilingual

the two concordancers (Wordsmith for Catalan originals and Access for Catalan translations from English) were manually scanned so that unwanted or irrelevant uses could be discarded. Most matches for the connectives indicating contrast/concession were relevant, but in the cases of *aleshores* ('then', 'so'), *llavors* ('then', 'so') and *doncs* ('then') a lot of sifting was necessary because *aleshores* and *llavors* are very often used in a temporal sense (and the temporal and consequential uses are difficult to tell apart), and *doncs* often signals continuity rather than consequence. Once the results for both corpora had been manually sifted, they were exported to a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet, which greatly facilitates counts by means of its filter utility. The log-likelihood test was applied to find out whether differences in the frequency of occurrence of connectives across the two components of the comparable corpus were significant. This test compares observed frequencies and expected frequencies in corpora of different sizes and does not assume a normal distribution. It has often been used in corpus-based translation studies. The fourth and final step in data retrieval was to identify all the source text segments which triggered the occurrence of the connectives in the Catalan target texts.

As regards the latter step, a concept must be mentioned which was first put forward in contrastive linguistics but may also be useful in translation studies and at the interface between both disciplines. Different terms have

---

concordancer, without the lemma and POS-tag columns, as the information provided by these columns was not necessary for analysing connectives.

been used to refer to this concept, which could be defined as the set of translation equivalents for a given word or expression yielded by a parallel corpus. Behrens (2004) borrows Dyvik's term *mirror image* in her study of the Norwegian connective *dermed*. Drawing on the Oslo Multilingual Corpus, the translation mirror image of *dermed* is established for English and German by looking not only at the range of translation solutions for the Norwegian connective in those languages but also at the triggers in English and German source texts giving rise to *dermed* as a solution in Norwegian translations. Analysis of translation mirror images is revealing from the point of view of translation, but also, inherently, from the point of view of the item under scrutiny, as it serves to indicate "the range of meanings" of the connective.[3] Aijmer (2007, 34), for her part, prefers the term *translation paradigm*, defined as a set of lexical correspondences of the source item in the target language, in her study of the Swedish connective *alltså* in English translation. Nølke (2007) is also interested in sets of correspondences generated by translation, in that they may prove useful in identifying the semantic, pragmatic or textual functions (2007, 175) constituting a *function domain*. In this study, for practical purposes the terms *mirror image* or *translation paradigm* will be used interchangeably.

---

[3] Dyvik's semantic mirrors method was first intended to reveal meaning relations on the basis of translation solutions, but Vandevoorde et al. (2017) have extended it to account for translational phenomena, such as the influence of translation on the structure of semantic fields.

Once raw data was available, it was possible to start answering the research questions posed at the beginning of this section. By comparing the number of occurrences of connectives in both components of the comparable corpus, similarities and differences could be established between their use in translated and non-translated texts, which is the object of question 1. If the kind of comparison carried out on the whole for question 1 was then made separately for connectives indicating consequence and contrast, an answer would be obtained for question 2 (whether explicitation is sensitive to the type of semantic relation conveyed by connectives). In both cases, frequencies of occurrence were normalised per 100,000 words. However, the results of these comparisons must be treated with caution, as over-representation of connectives in translations when compared to non-translations, for instance, cannot be immediately construed as a consequence of explicitation. It might alternatively be due to source text influence, if it is shown that all or most of the connectives are triggered by matching connectives in source texts. Only such instances of target text connectives stemming from zero or from segments not including a connective can be regarded as explicitation proper. Therefore, analysis of source text triggers enables us to answer the third question: to what extent a higher number of connectives in translations than in non-translations (if and when that is the case) can be attributed to explicitation.

Now, a word of caveat is here in place. Even if the possibility just mentioned did find support in the data (either generally or for a specific type of semantic relation), it could not be taken to confirm the explicitation hypothesis, because the analysis carried out in this study starts from target texts only and is therefore unbalanced. For it to be balanced, a set of English connectives similar to the one analysed for Catalan (e.g. *then*, *therefore*, *so*, etc. for result/consequence, and *however*, *nevertheless*, *yet*, *still*, *anyway*, *at any rate*, *on the other hand*, etc. for contrast/concession) would have to be searched for instances of preservation of source text connectives or (crucially) of implicitation. As it is, our analysis could only detect cases of explicitation, not implicitation, which can be treated as partial evidence for explicitation but not as support for the explicitation hypothesis proper.

5. Results and discussion

Table 1 offers the basic quantitative results of the corpus-based analysis of connectives in the comparable corpus. As to question 1, what this data reveals is that there is no significant quantitative difference in the overall frequency of occurrence of connectives in translations and non-translations, the log-likelihood test yielding a value of +2.11.[4] These results are in line

---

[4] In the log-likelihood test, the higher the value, the more significant the difference between the two frequencies. For a 95% level of confidence (i.e. for a p value of <0.05), the critical value is 3.84; for a 99% level of confidence (p<0.01), the critical value is 6.63; etc. Therefore, any LL value lower than 3.84 indicates that differences do not reach the threshold of statistical significance.

with the ones obtained by Zufferey and Cartoni (2014) both for French and English target texts in Europarl when compared to original texts in the same languages. For question 2, however, the picture is rather more complex. The differences observed between the two components of the comparable corpus are not statistically significant for contrast connectives (the log-likelihood test was applied and the result was LL -0.01), but they were for consequence connectives, with LL +5.68, $p<0.05$. The type of semantic relation conveyed by the connectives, then, does seem to have an impact on the over-representation (or not) of connectives in target texts when compared to non-translations.

Table 1. Raw and normalised frequencies of connectives expressing contrast and consequence in a comparable corpus made up of Catalan translations (from English) and originals

Type	Connective	Translations – Raw frequencies	Translations – Normalised	Non-trans – Raw frequencies	Non-trans – Normalised
	ara bé	43	3.58	32	2.85
	de tota manera	55	4.58	88	7.84
	de totes	38	3.16	2	0.18

	maneres				
	en canvi	58	4.83	161	14.34
	en qualsevol cas	37	3.08	13	1.16
Contrast	en tot cas	14	1.17	36	3.21
	malgrat tot	57	4.74	40	3.56
	no obstant	211	17.56	50	4.45
	tanmateix	207	17.23	292	26.01
	tot i això	60	4.99	19	1.69
	TOTAL	780	64.9	733	65.3
	així doncs	66	5.49	30	2.67
	aleshores	150	12.49	65	5.79
Consequence	doncs	125	10.41	219	19.51
	llavors	22	1.83	13	1.16
	per tant	236	19.64	157	13.99
	TOTAL	599	49.9	484	43.12
	GRAND TOTAL	1,379	114.79	1,217	108.41

As remarked above, in order to be able to answer the third question (to what extent differences observed between connectives in translations and non-translations are due to explicitation or to other factors), we need to manually scan the bilingual concordances in search of source text triggers for target text connectives. Since a full list of triggers for each of the 15 connectives included in the study would take up too much space and even include partially irrelevant information, the list of triggers for connective *doncs* (i.e. its mirror image in English source texts) will be presented, by way of illustration, in Table 2, and the overview of instances of explicitation, as balanced against non-explicitation, will be provided in Table 3. (Even though *doncs* is the only consequence connective that is under-represented in translations, it has been chosen for the illustration on the basis of its high number of occurrences and the intuition that it is relatively often used as an explicitation device. This intuition is confirmed by the results in Table 3.) Table 2 shows that the range of ST triggers for Catalan *doncs* includes several English connectives expressing consequence or result (*then*, *therefore*, *thus*, *so*, *accordingly*, *well then*), which account for most occurrences of *doncs*, but also links conveying a different semantic relation (*now*, *why*, *however*, *in fact*), the connective *and*, which shows a high degree of semantic indeterminacy, and zero correspondences (i.e. cases in which no source text segment was found to match *doncs*). For practical purposes, it was decided that only cases of absolute explicitation like the latter, stemming from zero correspondences, would be counted as

explicitation in this paper. In those cases where the type of semantic relation is altered, it could be argued that, even if there is a shift in meaning, the level of explicitness is not altered as a result of the translation process. And in cases where the source text features a less explicit connective, such as *and*, or even a segment which is not a connective, a more fine-grained analysis could have drawn a distinction between absolute explicitation, with zero as trigger, and relative explicitation, with a less explicit source text segment as trigger.[5] However, this subtle nuance was discarded on the grounds that there were very few cases among the query matches of the kind of relative explicitation just referred to. Moreover, entering into degrees of explicitness would have introduced a kind of subjectivity that had better be avoided.

Table 2. Raw frequencies of source text triggers for Catalan connective *doncs* in the English-Catalan sub-corpus of COVALT

TT connective	ST trigger	Raw frequency
	accordingly	1
	and	1
	however	1
	in fact	1

---

[5] Denturck (2012, 217), following Vandepitte (1998), talks about a scale of explicitness in the expression of causal relations.

doncs (125)	now	3
	so	6
	then	53
	therefore	22
	thus	6
	well, then	1
	why	2
	Ø	28
	TOTAL	125

Therefore, for each connective, all the target text segments matching a source text segment which included an English connective or any other element were grouped under the heading 'non-explicitation', whereas target text connectives with no identifiable source text trigger were regarded as instances of 'explicitation'. Table 3 shows the ratio of non-explicitation to explicitation for each connective under scrutiny in terms of raw frequency and the number of explicitations as a percentage of the total number of occurrences. The data contained in this table shows a clear relationship between the higher frequency of connectives expressing consequence in translations than in non-translations, seen above, and explicitation. As reflected in Table 1, consequence connectives are more frequent in translations than in non-translations, whereas contrast connectives are not;

and explicitation accounts for a higher percentage of TT connectives when the semantic relation conveyed is one of consequence (17.02%) than when the relation involved is one of contrast (6.15%). When the number of explicitation cases out of the total number of occurrences for contrast (48 out of 780) and consequence (102 out of 599) are measured against each other, the difference turns out to be extremely significant, with LL +36.75, p<0.0001. Our quantitative analysis, then, could be summarised by saying that the differences observed in the frequency of use of connectives between translations and non-translations are highly sensitive to the type of relation conveyed, and, for the type where connectives are more frequent in translation (consequence), over-representation can be attributed to explicitation and not to other factors.

Table 3. Ratio of non-explicitation to explicitation involving connectives in the English-Catalan sub-corpus of COVALT

Type of relation	Connective	Raw frequency of connective in translations	Rationon-explicitation / explicitation (raw frequency)	Relative frequency of explicitation (%)

	ara bé	43	43/0	0
	de tota manera	55	55/0	0
	de totes maneres	38	38/0	0
	en canvi	58	40/18	31.03
	en qualsevol cas	37	37/0	0
Contrast	en tot cas	14	13/1	7.14
	malgrat tot	57	50/7	12.28
	no obstant	211	199/12	5.68
	tanmateix	207	201/6	2.89
	tot i això	60	56/4	6.66
	TOTAL	780	732/48	6.15
	així doncs	66	61/5	7.57
	aleshores	150	144/6	4
Consequence	doncs	125	97/28	22.4
	llavors	22	15/7	31.81
	per tant	236	180/56	23.72
	TOTAL	599	497/102	17.02
	GRAND TOTAL	1,379	1,229/150	10.87

Once the quantitative analysis has been completed, let us now turn to qualitative aspects. If we look at Table 1 on the whole, we notice, as seen above, that there are no significant differences in overall frequency of occurrence between translations and non-translations as far as connectives indicating contrast/concession are concerned. However, if we zoom in on the details, differences are observed in their pattern of distribution. This is in line with other studies, such as Puurtinen (2004). If, for instance, we group together two close synonyms like *de tota manera* and *de totes maneres*, their joint normalised frequency is 7.74 for translations and 8.02 for non-translations, but *de totes maneres* is very rare in Catalan originals whereas it is almost as frequent as *de tota manera* in Catalan translations. A similar thing occurs with *en qualsevol cas* and *en tot cas*: their joint normalised frequency is 4.25 for translations and 4.37 for non-translations, but the former is more frequent in translated texts whereas the opposite is the case for originals. This over-representation of *en qualsevol cas* might be due, at least in part, to source text influence, as out of the 37 occurrences it features in the translated component, 25 matching source text segments contain *any* (*anyway*, 11; *in any case*, 6; *at any rate*, 4; *anyhow*, 4), which is more likely to trigger *qualsevol* than *tot*. Another case of dissimilar distribution is that of two other synonyms like *no obstant* and *tanmateix*: whereas in non-translations *tanmateix* is almost six times as frequent as *no obstant*, in translations their normalised frequency is almost the same (17.23 vs. 17.56). Apart from these pairs of synonyms displaying different patterns of

distribution, there are three connectives which are more frequent in translation than in non-translations: *ara bé* (3.58 vs. 2.85), *malgrat tot* (4.74 vs. 3.56) and *tot i això* (4.99 vs 1.69). For *malgrat tot*, over-representation in translations may be partly due to explicitation, which accounts for 12.28 of the cases. As to *tot i això*, this connective is almost three times as frequent in translations as in non-translations, with explicitation playing a relatively minor role (6.66%). The only explanation, then, for this fact is that it is a favoured translation solution for a wide range of English connectives expressing contrast, such as *yet* (12), *still* (11), *however* (10), *though* (9), etc. On the contrary, *ara bé* is mostly triggered by a single English connective, *now* (35 cases out of 43), used to change subject, draw the addressee's attention, resume a former topic, etc. It is a clear case, then, of source text influence. Finally, *en canvi* is under-represented in translations, as it is used almost three times as frequently in Catalan originals as in translated texts (14.34 vs. 4.83, respectively, in normalised frequencies). This might be an instance of the alleged tendency of unique, or typical, target language items to be under-represented in translations for lack of stimulus in source texts, as *en canvi* does not seem to have a *prima facie*, ready equivalent in English. The main source text triggers for this connective are Ø (18), *but* (14), *yet* (10) and *however* (8), explicitation thus playing a large role in its use, as it accounts for 31.03% of its occurrences. These are all instances of genuine, typical explicitation, which can take two shapes: either creating a contrast relation which was absent from the source

text (as in example 1), or strengthening such a relation, which was already present in the source text (usually conveyed by *but*), through addition of *en canvi* (as in example 2):

(1)

Connective	Source Text	Target Text	Text	ST trigger
en canvi	I knew a grizzly once that wasn't much bigger'n a dog, an' he was a game-killer.	Una vegada vaig veure un ós gris que no era molt més gran que un gos i, en canvi, era carnívor. "	CURWOOD-Grizzly	zero

Back translation: Once I saw a grizzly bear which was not much bigger than a dog and, **however**, was carnivorous

(2)

Connective	Source Text	Target Text	Text	ST trigger
en canvi	He could smell nothing,	No en captà cap, però en	CURWOOD-Grizzly	zero

| | but he heard! | canvi sí que va sentir alguna cosa." | | |

Back translation: He captured nothing, but, **however**, he did hear something.

This tendency on the part of translators to use a connective which is felt to be typical of the target language even if its use is not triggered by any source language item which may be regarded as its formal equivalent ties in well with the normalisation hypothesis, or with Becher's (2011) claim, reproduced in section 3, that translators tend to exploit specific features of the target language system.

But, as explained above, explicitation is found to be more frequently at play where the semantic relation conveyed is one of consequence. Four out of the five consequential connectives analysed here display a higher frequency of occurrence in translations than in Catalan originals, the only exception being *doncs*, which is clearly more frequent in non-translations (19.51 vs. 10.41 in normalised frequency). However, when seen in the light of their source text triggers in the parallel corpus (see Table 3), the connectives with the highest percentage of zero trigger, entailing explicitation, are *llavors* (31.81%), *per tant* (23.72%) and *doncs* (22.4%). If we manually scan the 102 cases of explicitation of consequential

connectives found in the parallel corpus, it is clearly perceived that the two factors influencing explicitation identified by Zufferey and Cartoni (2012, 2014) and others are present. When a consequential connective is added, the semantic relation is part of the common ground shared by addresser and addressee and can, therefore, be inferred from the context. That may be the reason why it was not made explicit, or manifest, in the source text, thus leaving room for explicitation in translation. If the relation in question had been part of the new information, i.e. if its informative value had been higher, it would probably have been made explicit in the source text, to begin with, thus leaving no room for explicitation. When translators fill that room, they optimise the cohesion of the target text, to put it in Becher's terms (2011). As to the other factor, namely, the double function of connectives as bearers of propositional and procedural meaning, Zufferey and Cartoni's claim is perhaps not borne out so clearly, as in many occurrences the two functions seem to be conflated into one, i.e. the consequential relation conveyed by the connective concerns both the events narrated and the speech situation in which they are narrated. But, even so, procedural meaning is almost always present, and in many cases it clearly prevails over propositional meaning. To put it in Zufferey and Cartoni's (2012, 2014) terms, when explicitation is at work, subjective relations prevail over objective ones.

In what follows, five examples will be provided from the corpus, one for each consequential connective, where these factors can be observed.

(3) Explicitation of *així doncs*

Connective	Source Text	Target Text	Text	ST trigger
així doncs	The impossibility of egress, by means already stated, being thus absolute, we are reduced to the windows.	La impossibilitat d'eixida pels ja esmentats mitjans és, per tant, absoluta. Així, doncs, no ens queden més que les finestres. "	POE-Mysteries Paris	zero

Back translation: The impossibility of way-out by the already mentioned means is, therefore, absolute. **As a result**, we only have the windows left.

(4) Explicitation of *aleshores*

Connective	Source Text	Target Text	Text	ST trigger

aleshores	"Colonel Geraldine," replied the Prince, with some haughtiness of manner, "your life is absolutely your own. I only looked for obedience; and when that is unwillingly rendered, I shall look for that no longer. I add one word your: importunity in this affair has	—Coronel Geraldine — constestà el príncep amb una certa arrogància—, la vostra vida és absolutament vostra. Jo només vull, de vós, l'obediència, i si me l'heu de donar a contracor, aleshores ja no la vull, tampoc. I afegiré un mot, encara: en aquest afer	STEVENSON-Suicide Club	zero

	been sufficient."	ja heu estat prou i massa importú."		

Back translation: "Colonel Geraldine," answered the Prince with some arrogance, "your life is absolutely yours. I only want, from you, obedience, and if you must give it to me unwillingly, **then** I do not want it, either. I will add another word: in this business you have already been importunate enough and too importunate."

(5) Explicitation of *doncs*

Connective	Source Text	Target Text	Text	ST trigger
doncs	But they were friends of many years' standing and their careers had been parallel, first at the University and then as teachers: he could not risk a	Però eren amics de molts anys, amb carreres paral·leles a la universitat primer i després com a professors: no podia, doncs, usar amb ella una frase grandiloqüent. "	JOYCE-Dead	zero

	grandiose phrase with her.			

Back translation: But they were friends of many years, with parallel careers at university first and then as teachers: he could not, **then**, use with her a grandiloquent phrase.

(6) Explicitation of *llavors*

Connective	Source Text	Target Text	Text	ST trigger
llavors	Should I avoid claiming a property of so great value, which is known that I possess, I will render the animal at least, liable to suspicion.	Si renunciara a reclamar una cosa de tant de valor, i que se sap que em pertany, llavors les sospites caurien sobre l'animal. "	POE-Mysteries Paris	zero

Back translation: If I failed to claim a thing of such value, and which is known to belong to me, **then** the suspicions would fall upon the animal.

(7) Explicitation of *per tant*

Connective	Source Text	Target Text	Text	ST trigger
per tant	He had been born close to the earth, close to the earth had he lived, and the law thereof was not new to him.	Havia nascut en contacte amb la terra; en contacte amb la terra havia viscut i la seua llei, per tant, no li era desconeguda. "	LONDON-Adventurers	zero

Back translation: He had been born in contact with the earth; in contact with the earth he had lived and its law, **therefore**, was not unknown to him.

In example 3, the fact that the only means of escape left was the windows is a consequence of the first part of the sentence, and the semantic relation concerns the argument put forward by Auguste Dupin, not the facts described. Therefore, the relation has a low informative status and is subjective in nature. In example 4, the chain of reasoning resembles a syllogism: the Prince only wants obedience that is willingly granted; the Colonel's is not willingly granted, therefore the Prince does not want it. Since the two premises have already been formulated, the conclusion

follows logically from them and the consequential relation as such is not informative. Again, then, the relation is part of common ground and subjective in nature, as it is part of the argument and not the facts. In example 5, the character in Joyce's "The Dead" cannot use a grandiose phrase because it would make no sense to address it to an old friend. In example 6, the sailor in Poe's famous story feels obliged to claim his orangutan because, if he did not, the animal would be suspected. And in example 7, the law of the earth is not unknown to the character because he was born close to it. In all cases, the cause-consequence relation between the propositions can be inferred from context, and such a relation is mainly subjective in that it is part of an argument, of a chain of reasoning, even though the objective function cannot be said to be wholly absent from it. In the light of these examples, then, it might be argued that low informative value, as a factor, has a more direct bearing on explicitation than prevalence of a subjective relation.

6. Conclusions

The quantitative analysis reported on in this paper has revealed that:

a. there is no significant difference in the overall frequency of occurrence of connectives expressing contrast/concession and consequence/result in translations and non-translations, their joint normalised frequencies being 114.79 for translations and 108.41 for non-translations;

b. differences observed between translations and non-translations are not statistically significant as regards contrast connectives, but they are in the case of connectives conveying result or consequence. This suggests that frequency of occurrence of connectives in translations, as opposed to non-translations, is sensitive to the type of semantic relation conveyed. The normalised frequency of occurrence per 100,000 words is virtually the same for contrast connectives (64.9 for translations vs. 65.3 for non-translations) whereas it is significantly higher in translations for consequence connectives (49.9 for translations vs. 43.12 for non-translations);

c. the analysis of parallel concordances reveals that the higher frequency of connectives expressing consequence in translations than in non-translations is related to explicitation, as translation solutions involving explicitation account for 17.02% of the occurrences of consequence connectives, whereas for contrast connectives this figure stands at just 6.15%. This difference, expressed in raw frequencies, is shown to be extremely significant in statistical terms. The over-representation, then, of consequence connectives in translations, as opposed to non-translations, is due to explicitation and not to other factors.

The qualitative analysis, more attentive to details, yields the following conclusions:

a. contrast connectives, whose overall frequency of occurrence in translations and non-translations is practically identical, show nevertheless

noticeable differences in their patterns of distribution, which can be variously accounted for by explicitation or source text or language influence (either through interference or the under-representation of typical target language items);

b. consequence connectives show that explicitation is strongly associated with two factors identified by Zufferey and Cartoni (2012, 2014) and others: the semantic relation conveyed by the connective being part of the common ground shared by addresser and addressee, and, therefore, inferable from context; and, to a lesser degree, the predominance of the procedural function of the connective (even if in most cases both functions, propositional and procedural, are co-present).

What all this may amount to, in the final analysis, is that Becher (2011) was probably right to suggest that the relevant question is not so much whether translators explicitate as when and why they do. Without, of course, losing sight of the *whether* question, quantitative in nature, more research needs to be done into the more qualitative *when* and *why*, or even into the *who* – since other studies could be envisaged focusing on particular translators and comparing them. And the particular factors or conditions favouring explicitation could also be brought to bear on indicators of explicitation other than connectives, i.e. other cohesive devices, culture-specific items, etc. This is indeed a promising direction for research dealing with features of translation, universal or not, as it combines quantification

(and therefore evidence in support, or otherwise, of a general hypothesis) with a more fine-grained inquiry into the possible reasons underlying translators' solutions.

Acknowledgements

References

Aijmer, Karin. 2007. "The Meaning and Functions of the Swedish Discourse Marker *alltså* – Evidence from Translation Corpora." *Catalan Journal of Linguistics* 6: 31-59.

Baker, Mona. 1993. "Corpus Linguistics and Translation Studies – Implications and Applications." In *Text and Technology. In Honour of John Sinclair*, ed. by Mona Baker, Gill Francis, and Elena Tognini-Bonelli, 233-250. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Becher, Viktor. 2010. "Abandoning the Notion of 'Translation-inherent' Explicitation: against a Dogma of Translation Studies." *Across Languages and Cultures* 11 (1): 1-28.

Becher, Viktor. 2011. "When and Why Do Translators Add Connectives?"
Target 23 (1): 26- 47.

Behrens, Bergljot. 2004. "Cohesive Ties in Translation: A Contrastive
Study of the Norwegian Connective *dermed.*" *Languages in Contrast* 5
(1): 3-31.

Blum-Kulka, Shoshana. 1986. "Shifts of Cohesion and Coherence in
Translation." In *Interlingual and Intercultural Communication.*
Discourse and Cognition in Translation and Second Language
Acquisition Studies, ed. by Juliane House, and Shoshana Blum-Kulka,
17-35. Tübingen: Gunter Narr.

Cuenca, Maria Josep. 2002. "Els connectors textuals i les interjeccions." In
Gramàtica del català contemporani [Grammar of contemporary
Catalan], vol. 3, *Sintaxi* [Syntax], dir. by Joan Solà, Maria Rosa Lloret,
Joan Mascaró, and Manuel Pérez Saldanya, 3173-3237. Barcelona:
Empúries.

Denturck, Kathelijne. 2012. "Explicitation vs. Implicitation: A Bidirectional
Corpus-based Analysis of Causal Connectives in French and Dutch
Translations." *Across Languages and Cultures* 13 (2): 211-227.

Englund Dimitrova, Birgitta. 2005. *Expertise and Explicitation in the*
Translation Process. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Espunya, Anna. 2007. "Is Explicitation in Translation Cognitively Related to Linguistic Explicitness? A Study on Interclausal Relationships." *Belgian Journal of Linguistics* 21: 67-86.

Fraser, Bruce. 1996. "Pragmatic Markers." *Pragmatics* 6 (2): 167-190.

Hansen-Schirra, Silvia, Stella Neumann, and Erich Steiner. 2007. "Cohesive Explicitness and Explicitation in an English-German Translation Corpus." *Languages in Contrast* 7 (2): 241-265.

Kenny, Dorothy. 2001. *Lexis and Creativity in Translation. A Corpus-based Approach*. Manchester: St. Jerome.

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", 30 August-1 September 2001, Copenhagen, Denmark.

Klaudy, Kinga. 2008. "Explicitation." In *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*, ed. by Mona Baker, and Gabriela Saldanha, 80-85. London: Routledge.

Klaudy, Kinga, and Krisztina Károly. 2005. "Implicitation in Translation: Empirical Evidence for Operational Asymmetry in Translation." *Across Languages and Cultures* 6 (1): 13-28.

Nølke, Henning. 2007. "Connectors in a Cross-linguistic Perspective."

Languages in Contrast 7 (2): 167–183.

Olohan, Maeve, and Mona Baker. 2000. "Reporting *that* in Translated

English. Evidence for Subconscious Processes of Explicitation?" *Across*

Languages and Cultures 1 (2): 141-158.

Øverås, Linn. 1998. "In Search of the Third Code: An Investigation of

Norms in Literary Translation." *Meta* 43 (4): 557-570.

Pápai, Vilma. 2004. "Explicitation: A Universal of Translated Text?" In

Translation Universals: Do They Exist?, ed. by Anna Mauranen, and

Pekka Kujamäki, 143-164. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Puurtinen, Tiina. 2004. "Explicitation of Clausal Relations: A Corpus-based

Analysis of Clause Connectives in Translated and Non-translated Finnish

Children's Literature." In *Translation Universals: Do They Exist?*, ed. by

Anna Mauranen, and Pekka Kujamäki, 165-176. Amsterdam: John

Benjamins.

Scott, Mike. 2004-2007. *WordSmith Tools Version 4.0*. Oxford: Oxford

University Press.

Séguinot, Candace. 1988. "Pragmatics and the Explicitation Hypothesis."

TTR Traduction, Terminologie, Rédaction 1 (2): 106-114.

Sweetser, Eve. 1990. *From Etymology to Pragmatics*. Cambridge:

Cambridge University Press.

Traugott, Elizabeth Closs. 2007. "Discussion Article: Discourse Markers, Modal Particles, and Contrastive Analysis, Synchronic and Diachronic." *Catalan Journal of Linguistics* 6: 139-157.

Vandepitte, Sonia. 1998. "Causaliteit en haar Uitdrukkingsvormen in het Engels: een Classificatie." *Handelingen Koninklijke Zuid-Nederlandse Maatschappij voor Taal- en Letterkunde en Geschiedenis*: 141–157.

Vandepitte, Sonia, Kathelijne Denturck, and Dominique Willems. 2013. "Translator Respect for Source Text Information Structure: A Parallel Investigation of Causal Connectors." *Across Languages and Cultures* 14 (1): 47-73.

Vandevoorde, Lore et al. 2017. "A corpus-based study of semantic differences in translation. The case of inchoativity in Dutch." *Target*.

Vinay, Jean-Paul, and Jean Darbelnet. 1995. *Comparative Stylistics of French and English. A Methodology for Translation* [Stylistique comparée du français et de l'anglais]. Translated by Juan C. Sager, and M.-J. Hamel. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Zufferey, Sandrine, and Bruno Cartoni. 2012. "English and French Causal Connectives in Contrast." *Languages in Contrast* 12 (2): 232-250.

Zufferey Sandrine, and Bruno Cartoni. 2014. "A Multifactorial Analysis of Explicitation in Translation." *Target* 26 (3): 361-384.

Author's address

Josep Marco

Universitat Jaume I

Dept. de Traducció i Comunicació

Facultat de Ciències Humanes i Socials

Avgda. Sos Baynat, s/n

12071 CASTELLÓ

Spain

e-mail: jmarco@uji.es